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## Abstract

Fowkes, A.S. and Marks, P. (1985). The Results of a Survey of Business Travel Policies in Greater London and North East England.

This report sets out the initial results of a telephone survey, of 311 organisations, which gathered data on these organisations' travel policies, with particular reference to how these policies affect mode choice decisions for long distance (i.e greater the 50 miles one way) business trips. This survey is one of three carried out by ITS as part of an SERC funded project to investigate Business Travel.

The reported results show there are systematic differences between the travel policies of large and small, and private and public sector organisations. Public and large organisations are more likely to have formal travel policies, and mode choice decisions made by the organisation and not the individual. However, regardless of who decided the travel mode it is found that the employer plays an important role in limiting the mode choices available to the business traveller. The nature of these choices is found to vary with the seniority and income of the business traveller.

## Introduction

In this note we report initial results of a telephone survey of 311 organisations which gathered data on organisations' travel policies, with particular reference to how these policies affect mode choice decisions for long distance (i.e. greater than 50 miles one way) business trips. This survey is one of three carried out by ITS as part of an SERC funded project to investigate Business Travel. The other two surveys comprise a self-completion questionnaire distributed to:
(1) Respondents to British Rail's 1983 East Coast Main Line Survey who were then making a business trip and indicated their willingness to be further interviewed. Descriptive results of this survey have appeared in an earlier paper 'Survey Results for Long Distance Business Travel from Respondents Contacted Via the East Coast Main Line Survey' by I Johnson and A S Fowkes.
(2) Staff of agreeable organisations interviewed in the telephone survey reported in this paper. Data gathered from this survey has not yet been analysed.

The organisation of this note is as follows. First, the survey design is discussed, with particular reference to the desired composition of the sample in terms of location, organisation size and industry type. The achieved sample was drawn in roughly equal proportions from Greater London and Tyne and Wear, because it is believed that long distance business travellers from these areas have an effective choice of mode and that many mode decisions are marginal. In so far as these two areas differ from elsewhere in the United Kingdom, the results presented below are area specific.

Second, the respondents in the achieved sample are described in terms of their relationship to other sites in the same company/ corporation and their labour force. Third, the business travel undertaken by these employees is described with particular emphasis on differences between organisations of different sizes and industrial classifications. Fourth, organisations' travel policies are categorised according to their formality and who in the organisation makes travel decisions. Recent and future policy changes are also described and we consider in some detail the nature of company car policy.

The fifth section of the paper deals with reimbursement for travel expenses - who pays and how much. The survey asked respondents to place a value on a one hour saving of their employees travel time, for a trip between London and Newcastle. In the sixth section of the paper answers to this question are analysed and median values of travel time are presented. Lastly, we conclude the paper with a brief summary of our results.

## 1. SURVEY DESIGN

Our interest in the way companies and individuals react to travel choices dictated that we deliberately focus on a study area (or areas) in which we believe an effective choice of mode exists and in which many mode decisions are marginal. We believe a good example of such an area in Britain to be that of Tyne and Wear, and Cleveland. Air and rail are highly competitive to Greater London (with car playing a lesser role), and car and rail are competitive for travel to other areas (Midlands, Greater Manchester, Central Scotland) with air playing a lesser role. Thus it was decided to draw our survey sample from Tyne and Wear, and a matching sample from Greater London.

The organisational/production unit for the survey includes all activities carried on at a single address or, equivalently, a single site. This is very similar to the census definition of an establishment:
'the smallest unit which can provide information normally required for an economic census. Typically the establishment embraces all activities carried on at a single address'.

In the census definitions an enterprise group is a business consisting of either a single establishment or 2 or more establishments under common ownership or control. In this note the respondent is a site or establishment and the term enterprise will be used, as in the census, to refer to any larger organisation which either owns or controls the establishment.

A survey sampling frame was derived which satisfied the following principles:
(i) There should be 150 firms in total from each of the North East and Greater London (GLC) areas.
(ii) For each of the 2 areas (the North East and the GLC) there should be 50 small firms, up to 50 large firms and the remainder medium.
(iii) Because of our particular interest in the public/ private split and, within the public sector, in the split between commercial and non-commercial organisations, there should be adequate sample sizes for each of these categories of organisation.
(iv) Industries unlikely to generate much business travel should be given a low sampling fraction.
(v) There should not be too many industry segmentations.

In accordance with these principles the data was collected for the following size and type categories:

| (i) $\quad$ Size | Small (S) | 1-50 employees |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Medium (M) | $51-500$ | $\prime \prime$ |
|  | Large | (L) | $501+$ | $" 1$ |

(ii) Industrial Type - (A) Other (this is the low sampling fraction mentioned (iv) above)
(B) Light Industry
(C) Heavy Industry
(D) Public Commercial
(E) Public Non-Commercial
(F) Business and Professional Services
(See Appendix 1 for a list of the industry (SIC) codes associated with each of these 6 sectors).

The desired sampling frame for each of the two survey areas, with upper limits given in brackets, was as follows:

| Public | Public | Prof. | Light | Heavy | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non. Comm. | Comm. | Services | Industry |  |  |  |

Industry

| Small | $4(6)$ | $4(6)$ | $20(28)$ | $8(12)$ | $10(26)$ | $4(5)$ | $50(50)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Medium | $4(8)$ | $4(8)$ | $14(26)$ | $8(12)$ | $16(28)$ | $4(5)$ | $50(80)$ |
| Large | $6(10)$ | $6(10)$ | $8(20)$ | $8(12)$ | $18(28)$ | $4(5)$ | $50(50)$ |
|  | $-14(20)$ | $42(54)$ | $24(28)$ | $44(78)$ | $12(13)$ | 150 |  |

This sample frame was derived on the basis of data from the 1971 Census of Production, Business Monitor PA1003 (1979) and an earlier study of business travel by public transport (James, Marshall and Waters (1979)) - see Table 1.

The survey data were collected by telephone interview with one member of each establishment contacted. All interviews were carried out in March 1984 by the commercial survey firm, FDS (Market Research) Ltd. A copy of the questionnaire used for these interviews is given in Appendix 3. Sites of private firms contacted to participate in the survey were chosen from the Kompass Register of British Industry and Commerce (1982). This register lists about 400 names and addresses for Tyne and Wear. The industry classification of the site and, in many cases, the number of employees are also provided by the register. Where this data source did not provide sufficient addresses, in particular for public organisations, the telephone directory was used although, clearly this did not allow a priori stratification by establishment size. Consequently establishments were allocated to cells on the basis of their reported size and industry type, and cell targets achieved as well as possible by phoning likely candidates.
Table 1 Percentage of units, employment and business trips (on public transport) in S, M, L and A, B, C, D, E, F, from James, Marshall and Waters (1979), 1971 Census, and Business Monitor PA1003 (1979), respectively.
BY UNIT BY EMPLOYMENT BY BUSINESS TRAVEL (P.T.)

|  | 58.5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $M$ | 33.5 |
| $L$ | 8.0 |

8.3
34.2
57.5
24.3
11.0
23.7
10.7
29.3

M 33.5

A
B
ع
D
E
6.6
33.7
8.0
37.0

Table 2 Location of Respondents by County
Greater London 150
Oxfordshire 1
Tyne and Wear 149
Cumbria 1
Northumberland 1
Durham 9
Total 311

In Appendix 2, details of how addresses for the sample were obtained and general comments about the achieved sample are given. The most important points to note are:
(1) The achieved sample contained far fewer large establishments than was originally intended. This was because some large establishments reclassified themselves as medium sized and, in the first place, there were insufficient addresses of large firms on the Kompass Register.
(2) Many establishments in the initial London sample either refused to participate or did not have any business travel over 50 miles; everyone came to them. It should be noted that firms with no long distance travellers were omitted from the sample.

The achieved sample contains 311 establishments, 151 from the South East and 160 from the North East. Establishments in the South East comprise 150 from Greater London and one from Oxfordshire (Table 2). For simplicity throughout the rest of this paper we shall refer to these sites as coming from Greater London. 149 of the 160 establishments in the North East are situated in the Tyne and Wear, 9 establishments are in Durham, and Cumbria and Northumberland account for a further one each.

The size and industry type distributions of the total sample and the subsamples from Greater London and the North East are given in Tables 3a, 3b and 3c, respectively. The classification of establishments used in these tables is based on information given by the respondent at the start of each interview. 54\% of establishments gave a different size and 14\% a different industry classification from that derived from the Kompass Register.

The information in Table 3a shows that:
(i) Public non-commercial establishments are generally larger than others and public establishments are larger than private ones.
(ii) Establishments providing professional services are typically smaller than other establishment types.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE ESTABLISHMENTS IN THE SAMPLE

Of the 311 survey respondents $37 \%$ were the sole location for their enterprise group, $42 \%$ were head offices and the remaining 21\% were either regional or branch offices. Because over half the respondents belonged to enterprises with 2 or more sites in the U.K. we expected a lot of business travel would be between establishments in the same enterprise. James, Marshall and Waters (1979) found this to be the main reason for business travel between the North East and South East England.

Table 3a Distribution of Sample by Size and Industry Type
(Frequencies)

| Type <br> Size | Public <br> Non-com | Public <br> Comm | Professional <br> Services | Light <br> Industry | Heavy <br> Industry | Other | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-10$ | 3 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 41 |
| $11-20$ | 4 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 37 |
| $21-50$ | 3 | 2 | 17 | 14 | 13 | 9 | 58 |
| $51-100$ | 1 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 4 | 37 |
| $101-200$ | 2 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 16 | 10 | 53 |
| $201-500$ | 4 | 3 | 9 | 17 | 10 | 3 | 46 |
| $501-1000$ | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 20 |
| $1001+$ | 9 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| Total | 26 | 19 | 82 | 71 | 77 | 36 | 311 |

1. Note the size of an establishment is the number of employees at the single site/address contacted and not the number of employees for the entire enterprise.

Table 3b Distribution of Greater London Sample by Size and Industry Type

| Type <br> Size | Public <br> Non Comm | Public <br> Comm | Professional <br> Services | Light <br> Industry | Heavy <br> Industry | Other | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-10$ | 1 | - | 10 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 24 |
| $11-20$ | - | - | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 15 |
| $21-50$ | 2 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 26 |
| 51-100 | 1 | - | 3 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 16 |
| $101-200$ | 2 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 32 |
| $201-500$ | 3 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 24 |
| $500-1000$ | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | 6 |
| $1001+$ | 2 | 2 | 4 | - | - | - | 8 |
| Total | 11 | 7 | 47 | 37 | 30 | 19 | 151 |

Table 3c Distribution of North East Sample by Size and Industry Type

| Type <br> Size | Public <br> Non Comm | Public <br> Comm | Professional <br> Services | Light <br> Industry | Heavy <br> Industry | Other | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1-10$ | 2 | - | 11 | - | 3 | 1 | 17 |
| $11-20$ | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 22 |
| $21-50$ | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 32 |
| $51-100$ | - | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 21 |
| $101-200$ | - | 2 | - | 7 | 9 | 3 | 21 |
| $201-500$ | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 22 |
| $501-1000$ | - | 2 | 1 | 8 | 3 | - | 14 |
| $1001+$ | 7 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 11 |
| Total | 15 | 12 | 35 | 34 | 47 | 17 | 160 |


|  | North East |  | Greater London |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |
| Sole Location in UK | 58 | 36 | 57 | 38 | 115 | 37 |
| Head Office | 55 | 34 | 74 | 49 | 129 | 42 |
| Regional Office | 19 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 26 | 8 |
| Branch Office | 26 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 39 | 12 |
| Other | 2 | 1 | - | - | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 160 | 100 | 151 | 100 | 311 | 100 |
| Table 5 N | ber <br> ted | Sites gdom | ging t | Ente | ise in | the |
|  |  | h East mple | Great S |  | Total |  |
| 1 |  | 67 |  |  | 128 |  |
| 2 |  | 16 |  |  | 28 |  |
| 3-4 |  | 17 |  |  | 40 |  |
| 5-10 |  | 21 |  |  | 38 |  |
| 11+ |  | 37 |  |  | 75 |  |
| Total |  | 58 |  |  | 309 |  |

Our findings are, however, that the predominant reason for business trips made by employees is 'going to see a client/customer' (Table 6). Employees of a sole location are most likely to make these trips, although visiting a client is still the most common reason for making a business trip for all other establishment types. Contrary to our expectations, employees of branch offices are less likely to visit their head office than employees of the head office are to visit branch offices (see Table 6). However, regional office employees are more likely to visit their head office than vice-versa.

The occupational structure of establishments, not surprisingly, varies depending on the activity carried out by the establishment (Table 7). For the light and heavy industry classes manual workers make up proportionately more of the workforce than for other industry classes and they have fewer secretarial and clerical workers. The median proportions of staff accounted for by senior and middle management are, however, fairly stable across industry classes, at $1-19 \%$ of the site workforce.

## 3. EMPLOYEE BUSINESS TRAVEL

Each establishment was asked how many trips per month were made by staff for each of the 7 occupation classes: senior, middle and junior management, secretarial/clerical, technical, manual and other. A clear pattern emerged of senior and middle managers making a much larger number of trips than other occupational classes (Table 8). Technical staff and junior management were the next most frequent business travellers, whilst less than $10 \%$ of establishments reported one or more business trips per month for either secretarial/clerical, manual or other staff. That senior and middle managers are the most frequent business travellers has also been found by Hensher (1977) and University of Southampton (1971).

Taken together with our earlier observation that staff fractions for senior and middle managers are relatively stable across the sample, one would expect the number of business travellers to be positively correlated with establishment size. Table 9 suggests this is the case for our sample. 54\% of all sites sampled had less than 7 travellers per month, whilst only $30 \%$ of sites with more than 50 employees had less than 7 travellers/month.

The tabulation of number of travellers against industry type shows public establishments are likely to have more travellers than private establishments, however, this would appear to be caused by the larger size of public organisations. Note that in Table 9 the median size of establishment for each cell increases with the number of travellers.

Table 6 Destination for the Largest Proportion of Travel from Establishment
(Number of respondents, with percentage by origin in brackets)

|  | Destination |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin | Head <br> Office | Regional <br> Office | Branch <br> Office | Visit Client/ <br> Customer | Other | Total |
| Sole Location <br> in UK | $2(2)$ | - | - | $92(80)$ | $21(18)$ | 115 |
| Head Office | - | $18(14)$ | $36(29)$ | $56(45)$ | $15(12)$ | 125 |
| Regional <br> Office | $6(23)$ | $1(4)$ | $4(15)$ | $13(50)$ | $2(8)$ | 26 |
| Branch Office | $5(13)$ | $1(3)$ | $3(8)$ | $25(64)$ | $5(13)$ | 39 |
| Other | $2(100)$ | - | - | - | - | 2 |

Table 7 Occupation of Employees by Industry Type (median percentage of the work force for given occupation and industry type)

| Industry/ Occupation | Public <br> Non Comm | Public Comm | Prof. Services | Light Industry | Heavy Industry | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Senior Man. | 1-19 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 1-19 |
| Middle Man. | 20-29 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 1-19 |
| Junior Man. | 1-19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Secretarial/ Clerical | 30-39 | 30-39 | 30-39 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 30-39 | 30-39 |
| Technical | 0 | 1-19 | 0 | 1-19 | 1-19 | 0 | 1-19 |
| Manual | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50-59 | 50-59 | 1-19 | 1-19 |

Table 8 Average Number of Business Trips/Month by Employees Occupation
(Percentage respondents)

|  | Senior <br> Man. | Middle <br> Man. | Junior <br> Man. | Secretar./ <br> Clerical | Tech. Manual | Other |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| None/Missing | 4 | 31 | 76 | 93 | 66 | 92 | 90 |
| $1,2,3$ | 27 | $24 \ldots$ | 11 | -4 | 15 | 3 | 1 |
| 4 plus | 69 | 45 | 13 | 2 | 18 | 5 | 6 |
| Don't know | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 4 |

Table 9 Number of Travellers by Establishment Type (percentage of each type responding)*

| No. of | Public | Public | Prof. | Light | Heavy | Other | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Business | Non Comm. | Comm. | Services | Industry | Industry |  |  |
| Travellers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (1-10) \end{aligned}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (1-10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (11-20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (11-20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (1-10) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1-10) \end{gathered}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (1-10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (21-50) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3 | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (11-20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{9}{(11-20)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ |
| 4 | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{6}{(11-20)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (11-20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (0-10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (11-20) \end{gathered}$ |
| 5-6 | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & (51-100) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (201-500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ |
| 7-10 | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (11-20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{9}{(101-200)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (501-1000) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ |
| 11-30 | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (201-500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{20}{(201-500)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{22}{(101-200)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ |
| 31-100 | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (201-500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (501-1000) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{6}{(101-200)}$ | $\stackrel{6}{(101-200)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ |
| 101+ | $\stackrel{8}{(1000+})$ | $\stackrel{26}{(201-500)}$ | $\stackrel{6}{(1000+)}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (201-500) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{5}{(501-1000}$ |
| Number of Responden | 26 | 19 | 82 | 71 | 77 | 36 | 311 |

* Median size of organisation in each cell in brackets

|  | (Percentage in brackets) |  |  |  |  | size |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Public <br> Non Comm | Public Comm | Prof. <br> Services | Light Industry | Heavy Industry | Other | Total |
| Formal | $\begin{gathered} 81 \\ (201-500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (501-1000) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (201-500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ |
| Informal | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (101-200) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & (21-50) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ |
| None | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1-10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (1-10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{20}{(11-20)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (51-100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (21-50) \end{gathered}$ |

Table 11 Who Decides Travel Mode by Establishment Type
(Frequency, with median establishment size in brackets)

|  | Public <br> Non-Comm | Public <br> Comm | Prof. <br> Services | Light <br> Industry | Heavy <br> Industry | Other |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | Total.

Table 12 Who Decides Travel Mode by Travel Policy
(Percentage respondents, with median establishment size in brackets)

|  | Formal <br> Policy | Informal <br> Policy | No Policy |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual | 42 | 61 | 76 |
|  | $(51-100)$ | $(51-100)$ | $(21-50)$ |
| Organisation | 58 | 39 | 24 |
|  | $(201-500)$ | $(51-100)$ | $(11-20)$ |

4. ORGANISATION TRAVEL POLICY
(A) OVERALL TRAVEL POLICY

83\% of respondents reported having either a formal or an informal travel policy, whilst the remaining 17\% stated they had no travel policy. Public establishments are more likely to have a travel policy than private ones, and this policy is more likely to be formal than informal (Table 10). Also large firms are more likely to have a formal policy than an informal one. Amongst the private sector, firms offering Professional Services are more likely to have a formal travel policy than others. Because we were interested in whether the nature of the firms travel policy has an influence on the travel mode used by the business traveller, respondents were asked who decided on the travel mode used for business trips, the individual or the organisation. 188 respondents answered that the individual decides, 139 said the company and 1 respondent said other decision procedures were used (note that this sums to 328 responses because a number of respondents replied with two alternatives).

Who decides travel mode is clearly associated with establishment size, larger establishments generally having the organisation, rather than the individual, deciding. Our results show that an organisation with an informal travel policy is more likely to allow the individual to decide on travel mode than an organisation with a formal travel policy (Table 12). Nevertheless, the data do not allow any definitive statement about who decides (the individual or the organisation) the travel mode to be used on long distance business trips.

In addition to information concerning the current state of business travel policy, questions were asked to investigate how these policies change over time. Over $81 \%$ of respondents had not changed their travel policies in the past few years and $90 \%$ did not foresee any changes in their existing policy, both figures suggesting business travel policies are fairly stable over time.

Those companies whose policies had changed in recent years reported a large number of different reasons for these changes. These are given in Table 13. As we do not have a fixed base with which to compare these results, it is not possible to say what effect the recession has had on business travel policy. We note, however, that adding up those organisations who gave reasons which are likely to imply reduced expenditures (indicated by a * in Table 13) per traveller one has (a) 29 out of 47 respondents gave expenditure reducing reasons for recent past changes in travel policy and, (b) 7 out of 12 respondents gave expenditure reducing reasons for likely future changes in travel policy.
(B) COMPANY CAR POLICY

A very large fraction ( $88 \%$, rising to $94 \%$ if public noncommercial establishments. are excluded) of the sample gave at least one member of their staff a company car for their sole

| Frequencies |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nature of Change 1st | Past Change | Change 2nd Change | Future <br> 1st Change | Change 2nd Change |
| More Air Travel | 4 | 1 | - | - |
| Less Air Travel* | 4 | - | - | - |
| More Rail Travel | 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| No or Less 1st Class Travel* | 10 | - | - | - |
| More Public Transport | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Smaller/More Economical Cars* | 1 | 4 | 3 | - |
| Hire/Lease Car | - | - | 1 | - |
| Own Car Discouraged | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Less Employees Entitled to |  |  |  |  |
| Smaller Mileage Allowances* | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Other Cuts in Car Allowance* | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| Stricter Travel Policy* | 2 | - | - | - |
| Special Travel Person |  |  |  |  |
| Appointed | - | 1 | - | - |
| Less Travel* | 3 | 2 | 1 | - |
| General Economy* | 4 | 7 | 2 | - |
| Travel Policy Reviewed More Often |  |  |  |  |
| Other-Reduced Travel |  |  |  |  |
| Expenditure* | - | 1 | - | - |
| Other-Increased Travel |  |  |  |  |
| Expenditure | 5 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Other General | 3 | - | - | - |
| Don't Know | 2 | - | 3 | - |
| Total | 47 | 22 | 12 | 1 |

use. In contrast only 34\% of establishments had pool cars available for staff use and $30 \%$ made both pool and company cars available to some staff. (See G. Moody (1983) for similar findings.)

Access to either a pool or a company car depends on an employee's occupation. Senior and middle management are far more likely to have access to a company car than other occupational classes. Technical staff are the third most likely group to have a company car and they also fare quite well in access to pool cars, which is generally less variable across occupation classes (Table 14).

Crosstabulations of company car and pool car access against establishment size, establishment type and number of travellers suggests that establishment type is the most important factor affecting access. Public non-commercial establishments are much less likely that others to provide company cars, whilst public commerical establishments are much more likely than other organisations to have pool cars for staff use (Table 15).

Of those establishments who did provide employees with company cars, approximately one half encouraged their staff to make use of these cars on long distance business trips. The other half presumably provided these cars primarily for either short trips or for non-travel reasons, e.g. as a salary supplement (see Potter and Cousins (1983)).

## 5. REIMBURSEMENT FOR TRAVEL EXPENSES

(A) COMPANY CARS

Of the 275 establishments who reported providing company cars to at least one employee approximately $90 \%$ paid for each of maintenance costs, road tax and car insurance. 69\% gave free petrol for business purposes and 24\% paid mileage rates. The data in Table 16 show the private sector to be slightly more generous than the public sector in their payments for company car running costs.

Those companies who pay mileage rates were asked for values of up to 3 different rates they paid staff. Unfortunately, this question was poorly answered, with only 35 organisations reporting a first mileage rate. Of these 20 paid rates of 10 p per mile and less and, of the remaining 15, 14 paid between 10p and 32 p per mile and one paid 52 p per mile (see Table 20 ).

In order to gauge whether these car mileage rates cover car running costs and standing charges we compare them with the A.A.s cost estimates (Appendix 3). (Note TEST (1984) consider the A.A. cost estimates to be overly generous.) To do this we first subtract any capital charges included in the A.A.s costings under the assumption that these are paid by the employer. Second, as most company cars fall into the 1501-2000 cc rating (see Potter and Cousins (1983)) all cost comparisons will be for this size of

Table 14 Company and Pool Car Access by Occupation
(Percentage of Respondents)
Senior Middle Junior Sec/Cler. Tech. Manual Other Mgt. Mgt. Mgt.

Company Car:

| Yes | 54 | 30 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 4 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| No/Not |  |  |  | 54 | 42 | 54 | 51 |
| Available | 1 | 25 | 49 | 54 |  |  |  |
| Don't | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 |
| Know | 45 | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |

Pool Car:

| Yes | 18 | 21 | 11 | 11 | 17 | 8 | 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| No/Not <br> Available | 13 | 9 | 20 | 20 | 13 | 22 | 30 |
| Don't | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Know | 69 | 69 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 15 Company and Pool Car Availability by Establishment Type (Percentage of Respondents)
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Public } & \text { Public } & \text { Prof. } & \text { Light } & \text { Heavy } & \text { Other Total } \\ \text { Non-Com } & \text { Comm } & \text { Services } & \text { Industry } & \text { Industry }\end{array}$ Non-Com Comm Services Industry Industry

| Company Car | 31 | 95 | 88 | 97 | 95 | 97 | 88 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pool Car | 23 | 90 | 17 | 37 | 40 | 34 | 12 |


| (Percentage of Respondents to Reporting One or More Types of Reimbursement) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Public <br> Non-Comm | Public Comm. | Private | Total |
| Mileage Rate | 38 | 29 | 24 | 24 |
| Maintenance Costs | 75 | 78 | 90 | 89 |
| Road Tax | 88 | 78 | 92 | 90 |
| Car Insurance | 88 | 78 | 92 | 91 |
| Free Petrol for Business Use | 38 | 61 | 71 | 69 |
| Other | 25 | 17 | 14 | 14 |
| Total Respondents | 8 | 18 | 249 | 275 |
| Total in Sample | 26 | 19 | 266 | 311 |
| Table 17 Costs Covered by Establishments |  |  |  |  |
| Cost Items* | \% of Establishments Providing Company Cars |  |  |  |
| $2+3+4$ | 87 |  |  |  |
| $2+3+4+5$ | 67 |  |  |  |
| 1-4 | 19 |  |  |  |
| 1-5 | 3 |  |  |  |
| ```* Key 1 = Mileage Rate 2 = Maintenance Costs 3 = Road Tax 4 = Car Insurance 5 = Free Petrol for Business Use``` |  |  |  |  |

Table 18 Reimbursement Method by Establishment Type (Percentage Respondents)

|  | Public <br> Non-Comm | Public Comm. | Private | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixed at Public <br> Transport Level | 19 | 29 | 10 | 11 |
| Travel Warrant | 35 | 71 | 35 | 36 |
| Actual Cost Paid | 69 | 71 | 78 | 75 |
| Credit Card | 4 | 29 | 26 | 24 |
| Company Car Mileage Rate | 4 | 6 | 13 | 11 |
| Own Car Mileage Rate | 65 | 71 | 34 | 38 |
| Other | - | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| Total Respondents Giving at Least One Method | 26 | 17 | 261 | 304 |

Table 19 Mileage Rates (Frequencies)

| Own Car | Own Car | Company |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Necessary Travel | Discretionary Travel | Car |


| $1-9$ | - | - | 19 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10-14 p$ | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| $15 p$ | 19 | 5 | 3 |
| $20-24 p$ | 29 | 6 | 6 |
| $25-29 p$ | 18 | 1 | 1 |
| $30-34 p$ | - | 2 |  |
| $35 p$ and over | - | - | 1 |
|  | - | - | - |
| Total | 71 | $20.2 p$ | 35 |
| Average $=$ | $21.2 p$ |  | $13.6 p$ |

Table 20
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Percentage of Establishments Reimbursing } \\ & \text { Business Travel by Transport Mode }\end{aligned}$

|  | Air | 1st Class <br> Rail | All <br> Rail | Own <br> Car |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Senior Mgt. 86 64 91 |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Mgt. | 60 | 31 | 69 | 36 |
| Junior Mgt. | 21 | 8 | 27 | 15 |
| Secretarial/ <br> Clerical | 8 | 1 | 13 | 11 |
| Technical | 24 | 9 | 32 | 18 |
| Manual | 5 | 1 | 6 | 5 |

car. Third, we assume the driver travels between 10,000 and 15,000 miles per annum in the company car.

Given these assumptions the costs faced by the company car user at the time of the survey were:

| Standing Charges | $4 \mathrm{p}-6 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{mile}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Running Costs | $12 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{mile}$ |
| Total Costs | $16 \mathrm{p}-18 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{mile}$ |

Ten of the 35 respondents paid rates in excess of $20 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{mile}$ implying they probably over compensate their employees for use of company cars. This is, however, a small number in comparison with the total number of establishments, in the sample, supplying company cars. As has already been mentioned most organisations do not pay mileage rates, but rather pay for specific cost items. See Table 17 where we give the percentage of companies paying certain combinations of cost items.
(B) OTHER TRAVEL

Information on the level of reimbursement for long distance travel by mode used (other than the company car) was obtained by asking respondents which of 7 methods of reimbursement was used by their establishment (Table 18). Reimbursement of actual costs is by far the most common method for the sample in aggregate and for private and public non-commercial establishments separately. Public commercial establishments are, however, as likely to issue a travel warrant for the ticket as pay for the actual cost. The public sector is more likely than the private sector to reimburse expenses equal to the cost of a reasonable public transport service and to pay at own car mileage allowance rates. Assuming that reimbursement by either paying actual costs, issuing travel warrants or the use of a company credit card means all travel costs are paid by the organisation, one has that at least 294 of respondents (i.e. 97\%) pay full travel costs. It seems safe to conclude all travel costs are paid by the establishment. However, what is not clear from the data is whether the establishment can affect mode choice through the method of reimbursement or whether different methods of reimbursement are used for different kinds of trips.

Details of own car mileage rates paid were requested and, as Table 19 shows, these were on average higher than rates paid for company cars. This is to be expected given the company doesn't directly pay for any capital costs. On the basis of the A.A. schedule, own car running costs are $10.5-12 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{mile}$. Thus the average rate of reimbursement is approximately double out of pocket costs for own car use. This constitutes a strong financial incentive to use one's own car for business purposes, except when serious inconvenience is caused to another family member who wishes to use the car at the same time.

We were interested not only in the level of reimbursement offered to staff but also whether the establishment's willingness to
reimburse staff varied with travel mode and an employee's occupation. It was expected, as has been found elsewhere (Hensher (1977)), that organisations would be more willing to reimburse senior staff than junior staff for travel on faster, more comfortable modes. Reasons usually suggested for this behaviour include: (i) The greater opportunity cost of time for senior employees and, related to this, (ii) the desire for senior staff to use their travel time productively and to arrive at their destination feeling alert.

Our expectations were confirmed by the data. Establishments reported they are more willing to reimburse senior and middle management for travel on fast, comfortable modes (i.e. air and first class rail) than for other groups of employees (Table 20). We note in this context Hensher's finding that businesses like to feel they are treating their senior staff well which may obscure any strictly economic rationale for mode choice. For all classes of employees establishments are more willing to allow them to travel by rail rather than air or own car.

## 6. VALUE OF BUSINESS TRAVEL TIME AS REPORTED BY THE EMPLOYER

Here we report the results of answers to the following two questions:
(1) 'Now suppose a first class (only) premium accelerated rail service between London and Newcastle was introduced, saving one hours travel time on the round trip, compared with their usual means of travel. Would senior staff be allowed to use the service if the extra cost was £5... was £20... was £50'

And what about other staff?
(2) 'It would be useful to us if we could have some indication of the average salary/earnings of the different categories of employee. Would you please give an average to the nearest $£ 1000$ for each category:
Senior Management
Middle $\quad " \quad$
Junior
Secretarial/Clerical
Technical
Manual.

The first of these questions gives data on the establishment's valuation of saving one hour of business travel time for senior and other staff. Specifically, the data gives the number (or percentage) of establishments whose, values of business travel time, $V$, fall into one of the 4 ranges:
(a) $0 \leqslant V<£ 5$
(b) $£ 5 \leqslant \mathrm{~V}$ く£20
(c) $£ 20 \leqslant V<£ 50$
(d) $V \geqslant £ 50$

Plotting the cummulative frequency (or percentage of responses)

Table 21 Median Values of Time (£/hour) (Early 1984)


BY DESTINATION

| London | 16 | 4 | 162 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Newcastle | 15 | 7 | 149 |

BY MODE NORMALLY
USED*

| Sample <br> Size | Sample <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: |
| Senior | Other |
| Staff | Staff |


| Air | 20 | 12 | 62 | 34 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1st Rail | 18 | 15 | 84 | 22 |
| 2nd Rail | 12 | 11 | 58 | 110 |
| Car | 11 | 6 | 38 | 31 |
| Other | 5 | 4 | 8 | 7 |

* Only respondents giving a single response to the question on mode normally used were included in this analysis.

Table 22 Income by Occupation as Reported by Organisation Median Range £/annum

|  | Median Range | £/hour * |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Senior Management | $15-16,000$ | $8.6-9.2$ |
| Middle " $"$ | $10-11,000$ | $5.7-6.3$ |
| Junior | $8-9,000$ | $4.6-5.2$ |
| Secretarial/Clerical | $5-6,000$ | $2.9-3.4$ |
| Technical | $7-8,000$ | $4.0-4.6$ |
| Manual | $5-6,000$ | $2.9-3.4$ |

* Assuming people work 38 hours/week, 46 weeks/year. The New Earnings Survey for 1983 shows full-time non-manual males work, on average, 38 hours per week.

Table 23 Median Incomes for Different Occupations by Industry and Organisation Size
(£000's/annum)

| Industry | Senior Mgt | Middle Mgt | Junior Mgt | Sec/ Clerical | Tech | Manual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public Non Commercial | 15-16 | 10-11 | 7-8 | 5-6 | 9-10 | 4-5 |
| Public Comm | $20+$ | 14-15 | 9-10 | 6-7 | 8-9 | - |
| Professional Services | $20+$ | 14-15 | 11-12 | 6-7 | 9-10 | 7-8 |
| Light Ind | 14-15 | 10-11 | 8-9 | 5-6 | 8-9 | 5-6 |
| Heavy Ind | 14-15 | 9-10 | 6-7 | 4-5 | 6-7 | 5-6 |
| Other | 14-15 | 11-12 | 8-9 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 5-6 |
| $\frac{\text { Size }}{\text { (no employees) }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-50 | 14-15 | 9-10 | 7-8 | 5-6 | 8-9 | 5-6 |
| 51-500 | 16-17 | 10-11 | 8-9 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 5-6 |
| 501+ | 17-18 | 11-12 | 10-11 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 4-5 |

against these ranges one can obtain a median value of time by linear interpolation/extrapolation. This is illustrated in Fig. 1 where the median value of time is $£ 12.50 / \mathrm{hr}$.

## Figure 1

\% Respondents


The results given below were obtained using this procedure.
Answers to the second question allow us to compare establishment's valuation of an employee's travel time savings with the latter's wage rate.

Median values of time for different categories of establishments and by the travel mode normally used are given in Table 21. These results show:
(a) Time savings by senior staff are valued at approximately $2 \frac{1}{2}$ times the rate for other staff. This is to be expected given the higher salaries of senior staff (Table 22).
(b) Public non-commercial establishments place a lower value on their employees' time than establishments in other industrial groups.
(c) Large establishments value the travel time of their senior staff (but not necessarily their other staff) at a higher rate than small establishments. This possibly reflects the higher salaries of senior staff employed by large establishments (Table 23).
(d) Values of travel time are correlated with the cost of travel by the mode normally used by an employee. That is as the
cost of travel increases so too does the value of travel time.

Median income ranges for different occupations are given in Table 22. These show senior staff, which we assume includes senior management, are paid approximately twice as much as other staff. Comparing the hourly wage rates in Table 22 with the hourly values of time reported in Table 21, shows that the value of travel time for senior staff is approximately twice their average wage rate. Evidence from the Royal Commission on the Distribution of Income and Wealth shows that fringe benefits and employers contributions to superannuation schemes cost between 20 and $30 \%$ of the gross salary of high income earners. Adding to this national insurance payments (15\% of gross wages - 10\% plus 5\% surcharge) means our estimated values of time are approximately 30\% larger than the cost of senior staff to the employer. Sampling errors and possible biases arising from our use of the median income as an estimate of the mean income for the population of senior staff mean, that at this stage, we cannot say anything further about the relationship between the cost of labour and employers' valuation of travel time savings for senior staff.

Disaggregating the income data by establishment type and size (Table 23) and comparing this with the value of time data shows:
(a). Values of time are in general, positively correlated with employees' salaries. One exception to this is the case of public non-commercial establishments who pay relatively high salaries, especially to their senior staff, but place low values on savings in travel time.
(b) As the size of the establishment both managers' salaries and values of time (as given by the employer) increase.
7. CONCLUSION

To summarise, the main findings from our survey of establishments in Greater London, and Tyne and Wear are:
(i) Business travellers are likely to be senior or middle managers and their most common reason for travelling is to see a client/customer.
(ii) If the traveller is employed by the private sector he/she is more likely to have chosen the travel mode than if employed by the public sector.
(iii) Public sector establishments are more likely to have formal travel policies than private sector establishments. Also large establishments are more likely to have formal travel policies than small establishments:... ..
(iv) Senior managers are likely to be provided with a company car for which most, if not all, running and standing costs will be paid by their employers.
(v) Access to company cars and other travel modes depends on the traveller's job and/or seniority. The more senior the employee and/or the higher their income the better the access to different travel modes.
(vi) Most organisations reimburse the full cost of business travel incurred by employees.

Relating these results to our interest in mode choice decisions for business travel one can say that, for employees of our sample of establishments, mode choice decisions are unlikely to be made in the same way as they would be for private travel by the individual. In the case of business travel, the individual does not pay travel costs and furthermore the choice of mode will often be either dictated or limited by company policy. Our results suggest these factors should be explicitly modelled if we are to have a good explanation of mode choice decisions for business travel. Such modelling will form the basis of future work to be carried out on this project and will be reported in later working papers.
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## Appendix 1

Table A1 Employment by Industry in the Tyne and Wear (hundreds of full time employees)

| Our <br> Classification | SIC | Industry Description | 1971 | \% | 1981 | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | I | Agriculture, forestry, fishing | 446 | 0.7 | 148 | 0.3 |
| D | II | Mining and quarrying | 4010 | 6.1 | 1475 | 3.1 |
| B | III | Food, drink and tobacco | 2028 | 3.1 | 1453 | 3.0 |
| C | IV | Coal and Petroleum products | 130 | 0.2 | 94 | 0.2 |
| C | v | Chemicals and allied industries | 1234 | 1.9 | 708 | 1.5 |
| C | VI | Metal manufacture | 1219 | 1.8 | 323 | 0.7 |
| C | VII | Mechanical engineering | 3902 | 5.8 | 2855 | 6.0 |
| B | VIII | Instrument engineering | 179 | 2.7 | 161 | 0.3 |
| C | IX | Electrical engineering | 3759 | 5.7 | 1943 | 4.1 |
| C | X | Shipbuilding \& marine engineering | 3167 | 4.8 | 2023 | 4.2 |
| C | XI | Vehicles | 392 | 0.6 |  |  |
| C | XII | Metal goods n.e.s. | 724 | 1.1 | 367 | 0.8 |
| B | XIII | Textiles | 511 | 0.8 | 157 | 0.3 |
| B | XIV | Leather, leather goods and fur | 50 | 0.1 | 12 | - |
| B | XV | Clothing and footwear | 1704 | 2.6 | 719 | 1.5 |
| C | XVI | Bricks, pottery, glass, cement, etc | 1105 | 1.7 | 485 | 1.0 |
| B | XVII | Timber, furniture, etc | 678 | 1.0 | 419 | 0.9 |
| B | XVIII | Paper, printing and publishing | 1100 | 1.7 | 922 | 1.9 |
| B | XIX | Other manufacturing indutries | 1003 | 1.5 | 510 | 1.1 |
| A | XX | Construction | 4819 | 7.3 | 3431 | 7.1 |
| D | XXI | Gas, electricity and water | 1130 | 1.7 | 959 | 2.0 |
| A/D | XXII | Transport and communications | 3777 | 5.7 | 2939 | 6.1 |
| A | XXIII | Distributive trades | 8866 | 13.5 | 6779 | 14.2 |
| F | XXIV | Insurance, banking, finance and business services | 1694 | 2.6 | 2605 | 5.4 |
| F | xxv | Professional and scientific services | 8055 | 12.2 | 6190 | 12.9 |
| F | XXVI | Miscellaneous services | 5895 | 8.9 | 5363 | 11.2 |
| E | XXVII | Public administration and defence | 4325 | 6.6 | 4692 | 9.8 |
|  |  | Total | 65902 |  | 47805 |  |

Sources: 1971 and 1981 10\% sample Census of Economic Activity Subregional tables

1. Note that the SIC ehanged between the 1971 and 1981 Censuses. We have matched the 1981 data as closely as possible to the 1971 SIC.
```
Table A2 Employment by Industry in Greater London
(hundreds of full-time employees)
```

| Our | SIC | Industry Description | 1971 | \% | 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1981 | \% |
| Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A |  |  | I | Agriculture, forestry, fishing | 624 | 0.2 | 456 | 0.1 |
| D | II | Mining and quarrying | 470 | 0.1 | 926 | 0.3 |
| B | III | Food, drink and tobacco | 10569 | 2.6 | 7250 | 2.0 |
| C | IV | Coal and Petroleum products | - |  | - |  |
| C | V | Chemicals and allied | 8164 | 2.0 | 6816 | 1.9 |
| C | VI | Metal manufacture | 2142 | 0.5 | 1052 | 0.3 |
| C | VII | Mechanical engineering |  |  |  |  |
| B | VIII | Instrument engineering |  |  |  |  |
| C | IX | Electrical engineering | 33689 | 8.4 | 20426 | 5.7 |
| C | $X$ | Shipbuilding \& marine engineering |  |  |  |  |
| C | XI | Vehicles | 6598 | 1.6 | 4451 | 1.2 |
| C | XII | Metal goods n.e.s. | 7194 | 1.8 | 3174 | 0.9 |
| B | XIII | Textiles | 1779 | 0.4 | 727 | 0.2 |
| B | XIV | Leather, leather goods and fur | 1309 | 0.3 | 339 | 0.1 |
| B | XV | Clothing and footwear | 8997 | 2.2 | 5615 | 1.6 |
| C | XVI | Bricks, pottery, glass, cement, etc. | 2335 | 0.6 | - | - |
| B | XVII | Timber, furniture, etc. | 5382 | 1.3 | 3113 | 0.8 |
| B | XVIII | Paper, printing and publishing | 15922 | 3.9 | 11836 | 3.3 |
| B | XIX | Other manufacturing | 5250 | 1.3 | 3770 | 1.0 |
| A | XX | Construction | 24955 | 6.2 | 23034 | 6.5 |
| D | XXI | Gas, electricity and water | 6226 | 1.5 | 4610 | 1.3 |
| A/D | XXII | Transport and communications | 42221 | 10.5 | 37610 | 10.6 |
| A | XXIII | Distributive trades | 54754 | 13.6 | 46833 | 13.1 |
| F | XXIV | Insurance, banking, finance and business services | 37934 | 9.4 | 58235 | 16.3 |
| F | XXV | Professional and scientific services | 50672 | 12.6 | 39165 | 11.0 |
| F | XXVI | Miscellaneous services | 44540 | 11.0 | 44423 | 12.5 |
| E | XXVII | Public administration and defence | 31598 | 7.8 | 32595 | 9.1 |
|  |  | Total | 403224 |  | 356456 |  |
|  | Sources: | 1971 and 1981 10\% sample, Subregional tables | Census | Econo | mic | ivity, |

1. Note the SIC changed between the 1971 an 1981 censuses. We have matched the 1981 data as closely as possible to the 1971 SIC.

Table A3 Employment by Industry by Area (\% full-time employees)

| Industry | Tyne and Wear |  | Greater London |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1971 | 1981 | 1971 | 1981 |
| A Other | 24.3 | 24.6 | 25.2 | 25.0 |
| B Light Industry | 11.0 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 9.0 |
| C Heavy Industry | 23.7 | 18.3 | 14.9 | 10.0 |
| D Public Commercial | 10.7 | 8.2 | 6.8 | 6.9 |
| E Public Non-Comm. | 6.6 | 9.8 | 7.8 | 9.1 |
| F Professional Services 23.7 | 29.5 | 33.0 | 39.8 |  |

Source: Tables A1 and A2

Table A4 Comparison of Industrial Classification used in this Paper with Classification used in the Kompass Register of British Industry and Commerce

Industrial Classification used in this Paper*

| D | 11-19 Mining \& Quarrying |
| :--- | :---: |
| B | 20 Food Manufacture |
| B | 21 Beverages |
| B | 22 Tobacco \& Snuff |
| B | 23 Textiles |
| B | 24 Footwear, Wearing Apparel \& Textile Goods |
| B | 25 Products of Wood \& Cork, except Furniture |
| B | 26 Furniture \& Fittings |
| B | 27 Paper Making Pulp \& Board |
| B | 28 Printing \& Publishing |
| B | 29 Manufacture of Leather \& Fur |
| B | 30 Rubber \& Plastic Products |
| C | 31 Chemicals \& Chemical Products |
| C | 32 Products of Petroleum \& Coal |
| C | 33 Non-metallic Mineral Manufacture |
| C | 34 Basic Metal Industries |
| C | 35 Metal Products |
|  | Nuclear \& Boiler Plant, Furnaces |
|  | Fabricated Steel Work |
| C | Fire Fighting Equipment |
| C | 37 Electrical \& Electronic Industries |
| B | 38 Transport Equipment |
|  | 39 Scientific \& Professional Instruments |
| C | Optical \& Process Control Equipment |
| A | Specialized Manufacturing Industries |
| D | $40-41$ Machinery \& Equipment |
| D | 50 Building \& Construction Contractors |
| A | 51 Public Supply Services |
| F | 61 Distribution Trades |
| F | 62 Banking \& Finance |
| A/D | 63 Insurance |
| A | 65 Real Estate |
| F | 71 Transport Services |
|  | 72 Storage \& Warehouses |
|  | 83 Business \& Professional Services |

* $\quad A=$ Other (Low Sampling Fraction)
$B=$ Light Industry
C = Heavy Industry
D = Public Commercial Organisations
E = Public Non-commercial Organisations
F = Professional and Business Services


## Drawing the Sample Frame in Tyne and Wear

1. All the addresses provided by the Kompass Register of British Industry and Commerce within the stipulated postal districts were used.

- 80-90 addresses were rejected because full details were listed in another part of the country
- 30-40 addresses were rejected because there was no classification data
- 10-20 addresses quoted product groups but not number of employees
- 10-20 were rejected for a miscellany of reasons.

2. At this stage it was apparent that we were short of large companies. KBE was searched, yielding only 5 or 6 additional large companies within the area.
3. We arrived at the following sampling frame:

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { Low Sampling } & \text { Light } & \text { Heavy } & \text { Professional } \\
\text { Fraction } & \text { Industry } & \text { Industry } & \text { Services }
\end{array}
$$

| Company Size | A | B | C | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Small | 42 | 29 | 66 | 12 |
| Medium | 34 | 10 | 60 | 7 |
| Large | 10 | 11 | 24 | 2 |

Seven Category $D$ addresses and one Category $E$ were also obtained.

Using local telephone directories and Yellow Pages, further addresses were provided for Categories D, E and F.
4. We tried every possible address for Category $D$ (main offices only). The addresses we chose for Categories $E$ and $F$ covered a wide variety of possibilities within each category.

## Comments on the Sampling Frame/Achieved Sample in Tyne and Wear

1. The original hypothesis was over-optimistic as to the number of large organisations, especially in Category C. In Category A, organisations listed in Kompass as large reclassified themselves as medium or small.
2. Amongst potential medium sized 'C's many re-classified themselves as 'B'. On looking at the product groups listed for each company, --both ' $B$ ' and ' $C$ ' products were listed. These addresses had been allocated to 'C' because more ' $C$ '
than ' $B$ ' products were listed. It would seem that mixed 'C'/'B' companies see themselves as in the "light industry" category. Hence the achieved sample has more medium $B$ companies than anticipated.
3. Category $E$ addresses divided themselves into small or large organisations. In Category $F$ small firms predominated. A full quota of type $F$ could have only been achieved by an over-large segment of small firms.

## Drawing the Sample Frame in London

1. Every 11 th page of the London addresses was used to yield a similar number of pages as in Tyne and Wear.
2. In practice there were less addresses - the entries were often much longer in London. However, there were few addresses where full details were listed elsewhere.

- 10-20 addresses said full details were elsewhere
- 20-30 were rejected because they were overseas banks or concerned with trading entirely in, say, the Middle East.

3. However, far more companies (than in Tyne and Wear) were listed without stating their number of employees. Searching KBE did not help in this respect. It was decided to include these No Size companies in the sampling frame.
4. Thus the sampling frame was -

| Low Sampling | Light | Heavy | Professional |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fraction | Industry | Industry | Services |

A
B
C
F*

Company Size

| Small | 13 | 27 | 32 | 18 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Medium | 13 | 29 | 52 | 24 |
| Large | 18 | 10 | 14 | 6 |
| N.S. | 29 | 18 | 29 | 42 |

* Category $F$ only needed supplementing with a few addresses from Yellow Pages.
The procedure for $D$ and $E$ was similar to that in Tyne and Wear.


## Comments on Sampling Frame/Achieved Sample

1. London differed from Tyne \& Wear in that the refusal rate was much higher. Moreover, many organisations insisted that there was no business travel over 50 miles, "Everyone comes to us in London".

| Category | Refusals | No travel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 11 | 12 |
| B | 4 | 28 |
| C | 11 | 27 |
| D | 2 | 8 |
| E | 5 | 9 |
| F | 19 | 23 |
|  | -- | --- |
|  | 52 | 107 |

2. Despite trying all possibilities Category $D$ was underrepresented compared with the original target. This also applied to the larger firms and Category C. Category F was nearer to the target. Professional services are centred on London.

## APPENDIX 3. SURVEY. QUESTIONNATRE.

Institute for Transport Studies, The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9 JT JOB NO. 1742

LONG DISTANCE TRAVEL IN THE COURSE OF WORK SUFVEY

## TRANSFER FROM CONTACT SHEET

Name of Respondent: $\qquad$ Position In Organtsation: $\qquad$
Name of Organisation: $\qquad$
CHECK
Âddress: $\qquad$ IF DIFFERENT FROM CONTACT SHEET
$\qquad$

CHECK
Talaphone Number: $\qquad$ IF DIFFERENT FROM CONTACT SHEET


## TRANSFER FROM CONTACT SHEET



## CLASSIFICATION

Size of Company/Organisation
Type of Company/Oroanisation
$\left.\begin{array}{|cc|c|} \\ \text { Yeilow } & 0 & -50 \\ \text { Blue } & 51 & -500 \\ \text { Green } & 501+ & 1 \\ \text { Not known } & 2 \\ 3 \\ \hline\end{array}\right]$

Respondent's Classification if different from above

| $0-50$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $51-500$ | | $c 13$ |
| :---: |

1 i.

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | C14 |
| A | 1 |
| B | 2 |
| C | 3 |
| D | 4 |
| E | 5 |
| F | O |

Good morning/good afternoon. We are conducting a survey by telophone on behalt of the Instltute for Transport Studtes, to establlsh the means long distance travel people use during the course of their work.

We weuld appreciate your help in answering the following questions and assure you that all information given is strlctly confidential, to be used by the Institute in statistical form only.

We nead to talk to someone who is familior with your comany policy with regerd to long distance business travel.

REPEAT INTRODLUCTION AS NECESSARY WHEN PUT THFOUGH TO THE AFPROPRIATE RESFONDENT.
in the case of respondents seriously querying the validity of the SURVEY, PLEASE OFFER THE TELEPHONE NUMBER OF THE INSTITUTE FOR TIMANSPORT STUDIES. THE PERSON TO SPEAK TO IS DR. IAN JOHNSON OR DR. TONY FOWKES - LEEDS (0532) 431 751, EXT. 7211.

THANK THE RESPOHDEINT FOR AGREEING TO BE INTERVIEMED FOR THE INSTITUTE FOR TRANSFORT STUDIES.
Q.la. Can I start by asking you how you would describe your company/organisetion, particularly in terms of the work you do and the way you are organised. RECORD VERBATIM.
Q.ib. And which of the following classifications best describes your company/organisation? READ OUT. RING ONE CODE

| $\qquad$ Pubtic nen-commerclal organlsations | 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D $\qquad$ Public commercial organisations | 2 |  |
| F $\qquad$ Providing Frotessional \& Businass services | 3 | Q.23. |
| B._m_m Light Industry | 4 |  |
| C -__ Heavy Industry | 5 |  |
| A $\qquad$ Agriculture: distribution, retailing, storage, warehousing, $\frac{\text { private tronsport/ }}{\text { mining/cuarrying }}$ | 6 |  |

## NOTES FOR: INTERVIEWE:

IF NECESSARY EXPIND THE DESCRIPTION ABOVE.
E - Public Non-Commercial
Public bodies not required to operate in $\quad$ commercial manner and make 3 profit -- e.g. local councils, Pribation service, Dept. of Employment, Hospital, governmant committaes etc.

| D- Public Commercial | Nationalisad industrios - gas, electricity, rall, coal, nationalised trensport, water, i.e. they aro organised on a commerclal basis. |
| :---: | :---: |


| F - Business \& Profossionel Services | Solicitors, accountants, banks, insuranca brokers, estate agents, con consulting engineers, design consultancy atc, stc. |
| :---: | :---: |
| B - Light Industry | Food, drink, textlios, clothing, paper, instruments etc. |
| C - Heevy Industry | Oll, chumicals, metals, shipbuilding, vehiclas, bricks, pottery. NOT MINA: on quatraing. Electrical ets. |

に
Q.2a. Approximately how many employs are there at your site?

WRITE IN ACTUAL. SUMER
THEN RING APPROPRIATE CODE


## INTERVIEWER

At the beginning of each work session check with the supervisor as to what you must do if Q's 1 and 2 conflict with the classification on page 1.
Q.2b. You say there are ......... employees on this site. Approximatoly what proportion of your employees fit into each of these occupational categories? READ OUT. WRITE IN.
Note if able to split sensibly whom

Senior management
No. $\quad \%$ groups bracllebed tole Minder management have done so. If
not cocked as Secratarial/Clorical
DaK.
Junior managomen

$\frac{\text { OFFICE }}{\text { USE }}$
(18)
(19)
(20)
(21)
(22)
(23)

1 (26)


INTERVIEWER ACCEPT WHOLE NUMBERS OR PERCENTAGES, BUT CHECK THEY ADD UP TO THE TOTAL SHOWN AT Q.2ב. OR ADD TO 100\%.
$\mathrm{P}_{1}$
Cds 18-24

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
0=N_{i 1} & 6=60-69 \% \\
1=1-19 \% & 7=70-79 \% \\
2=20.29 \% & \delta=80-100 \% \\
3=30-39 \% & 9=D K . \\
4=40-49 \% & \\
S=50-59 \% &
\end{array}
$$

Q.3a. Which of these descriptions best fits your presunt office/factory site? READ OUT.

| Sole location of organisation in U.K. |
| ---: |
| Organisation's haad office |
| Organlsation's regional head office |
| Other (WR!TE IN) Branch office |

* IF SOLE LOCATION OF ORGANISATION ROUTE TO Q.4. OTHERSS (CODED 2 - 5) ROUTE TO Q. 30 .
Q.3b. How many locations/sltes in the U.K. does your organlsation work from?

Q.3c. How many puopls work for the
organisation os n whole?

Q.3d. Whare is the Head Office located?


I would now like to discuss the types of long distance trips enfley es es make in the course of work. By long distance 1 mean trips of DEf 50 Miles. Plums exclude goods delivery trips.

Thinking separately about each of the categorios of employees we discussed oarller - In an average month, how many long distance business trips (50 or more miles) would each category of staff make?
Q.4a. Now first of all, Senior Managemant - on average in a month, how many long distance business trips would they mako?

ASK FOR EACH CATEGORY IN TURN AND CODE REPLIES

Q.5a. Which of the following destinations account for the largest proportion of travel from your site? READ OUT.

CODE 1 IN
APPROPRIATE BOX
Q.5b. And which is the next most important?


Mustbel oncols 40-44 Couldbennn 2 n
Q.6. Do any of the staff at your site have -


IF ORGANISATION HAS BOTH COMPANY \& POOL CARS
Q.7. What categories of staff have a company car or access Note it both punch to 3 pool car? READ OUT.
IF NEITHER COMPANY NOR POOL CAR, ROUTE TO Q.9. IF ONLY POOL CAR, FOUTE TO 0.9. IF BOTH POOL AND COMPANY CAR, ROUTE TO Q.7. IF ONLY COMPMATY CARR, ROUTE TO Q.8a.


REFER TO DEFINITION
OF COMPANY \& POOL CAFE
IN INSTRUCTIONS IF NECESSARY.


ROUTE TO OTB.
IF ORGANS SATIN HAS COMPANY CAR (S)
Q.80. Are COMPANY CAR users encouraged to uso the car for all ling distance business trips?
Q.8b. How are users reimbursed for usa of COMPANY cars? READ OUT.

The petiole for Business
MULTI-CODING PERMITTED


Q. Be. What ls/are the ml loge rato (s)?

RECALL ALL FATES

Q.8d. Are COMPANY CAR users permitted to use and claim for other means of travel if the COMPANY CAR is a reasonable alternative for a long distance business trip?

K SK ALL
Q.9. Does your organisation have .... (READ OUT)

> A formal written document on travel policy An informal standard practice (not written down) on travel policy No travel polly

DaK. $\quad$ a
Q.10. Which categories of employee would be reimbursed the cost of using the following means of travel on long distance trips in the U.K?
First of all, senior management - would they be reimbursed for air travel, inst class rall, ind class rail, own car, coach, any others? ASK FOR EACH CATEGORY IN TURN AND CODE THOSE MEANS OF TRAVEL THAT HOLD BE REIMBURSED.


Gonlartcol =


[^0]Q.11a. How Is the level of reimbursement dacided?
READ OUT. READ OUT.

> Fixed at cost of reasonable public transport service
Trevor issued $/$ Travel warrant issued

IF OWN CAR MILEAGE MENTIONED
Q.11b. What is/are the mileage ratels) for ... (READ OUT)

- necessary travel in own car RECORD ALL RATES
$\qquad$
 $\square$ (56) (57)
$\square$ (58) (59)

OFFICE USE


## ASK ALL

Q.12. Whether or not you have a travel policy, who decides what means of travel will be used for particular trips?


NotE where both cocked
ip 80 motives a cement.

| COL | ROUTE |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 .(64)$ |  |
| 2 | $(65)$ |
| 8 | 0.13. |
| 9 |  |
| 66 |  |
| 1 | 0.130 |
| 2 | 0.130 |
| 8 |  |
| 9 |  |

Q.13b. IF YES In what way - and why? RECORD VERBATIM. PROMPT Has the economic recession affected company policy? - In what way?

Q.13c, Do you foresee any change in your organisation's travel policy?
Q.13d. In what way? RECORD VERBATIM. PROEE Anything else?


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ASK ALL } \\
& \text { Q.14. Usually how would a member of your } \\
& \text { RING } \\
& \text { APPROPRIATE } \\
& \overline{C O D E} \\
& \text { (TYNE \& WEAR INTERVIEWS) Central London } \\
& \text { (LONDON JNTERVIEWS) Newcastle } \\
& \text { ASK FOR SENIOR STAFF, THEN OTHER STAFF. } \\
& \text { Q.14a. First Senior Staff. } \\
& \text { READ OUT Air Give relevant airport } \\
& \text { 69.73 Blank = } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Senior staff do not go } \\
\text { to hondion/Newreatte }
\end{array} \\
& \text { dst Rail Give station } \\
& 7311=\text { Exvainfo. } \\
& \text { Other (WR:TE IN) } \\
& \text { Q.14b. And now other staff } \\
& \text { READ OUT Air Give relevant airport } \\
& 74-78 \text { Block }=\text { Other swift } \\
& \text { no not trowed trowcomelehst Rail viva station } \\
& \text { K } 7811=\text { Extra } 1-j_{0} . \\
& 7819=\text { Nobody trauelts to } \begin{array}{c}
\text { end Rall } \\
\text { London }
\end{array} \\
& \text { other (WRITE IN) } \\
& 7 \text { Neweartle Car } \\
& 78 / 8=0 \mid k \text {. } \\
& \text { (1) - (8) }
\end{aligned}
$$


PERmitted At

Q.16. It would be useful to us if we could have some indication of the average salary/arning of the different categories of employee.
Would you please give an average to the nearest el 000 for each category.

READ OUT EACH CATEGORY:
SENIOR MANAGEMENT
MIDDLE MANAGEMENT
JUNIOR MANAGEMENT
SECRETARIAL/CLERICAL
TECHNICAL
MANUAL
First Senior Management
Rowed $=1$ on list col.


## NEGOTIATION

We should like to send a self-completion questionnaire to members of your organisation who have made a long distance business trip of 50 mlles or over in the preceding month.

A FREE POST envelope (no stamp required) would be provided to return each complatad questionnsire to the institute. All information would be confidential - the questionnalre is monymous.

Would you nominate a person in your organisation to whom we could send the questionnsire, who would be responslble for distributing them to members of your staff who have mide 3 long distance business trip over 50 mllas in the preceding month.

RECORD NAME OF NOMINEE $\qquad$

ADORESS $\qquad$

$\qquad$

TELEPHONE $\qquad$ Extension
$\stackrel{r}{4}$

## $O R$

TICK IN BOX IF
QUESTIONNAIRES
TO BE SENT TO
RESPONDENT


A
DURING NEGOTIATION you MUST USE the following at an
approprlafe moment:
F.
"If you would like more details of the rusearch plase feel free to contact either Dr. Ian Johnson or Dr. Tony Fowkes an. Leevs (0532) 431751 Ext. 7211".
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[^0]:    * SEE INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION.

    STRESS 'OWN CAR' ENTIRELY OWNED BY EMPLOYEE - NOT COMPANY, NOT POOL CAR.

