
10 Developing harmonized measures of the dynamics of organizations and work

Nathalie Greenan and Edward Lorenz

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an overview of a set of guidelines for collecting and interpreting harmonized information on organizations and on processes of organizational change and innovation. The guidelines are the result of an EU Coordination Action Project, MEADOW (Measuring the Dynamics of Organisations and Work), which involved 14 teams covering nine European countries.¹ The guidelines have been designed to provide a framework within which existing European surveys could evolve towards comparability, as well as providing norms for the construction of new survey instruments in the field (MEADOW Consortium 2010). The starting point of the project was that reliable harmonized statistics on organizations and organizational change could make a significant contribution both to research and to policy initiatives at the EU and national levels.

There are a number of reasons why a deeper understanding of organizations and processes of organizational change is of research and policy relevance. First, as the discussion in the third edition of the *Oslo Manual* (OECD/Eurostat 2005) points out (Chapter 2 in this volume), the full range of changes that affect firm performance and the accumulation of knowledge requires a broader framework than technological product and process innovation and in particular should include organizational changes and innovations. In part, this widening of the concept of innovation to include organizational innovations reflects an appreciation that in many service sectors innovation is less technological in nature and takes the form of changes in the organization of interactions between service providers and their clients.

Second, as developed in the literature on organizational design and performance, the capacity of firms to develop new products and processes is affected by their internal structure, including the way work is organized. Forms of work organization that stimulate interaction among agents with a diverse set of experiences and competences could be more creative, leading to the development of original ideas for new products and processes. Work organization forms that delegate responsibility for problem

solving to a wide range of employees could be more successful, both in upgrading the competences of workers and in transforming ideas into new products and processes.²

Third, organizational structure and change have an impact on employee outcomes. Job stress is directly affected by the design of tasks and the way teamwork is structured. Job satisfaction depends in part on intrinsic rewards associated with the potential for work activity to offer opportunities for the creative use and further development of skills and knowledge. Thus policies focusing on improving the quality of working life can benefit from better information on how work is organized and how employees experience organizational change and innovation.

These different areas of research and policy relevance are reflected in two central features of the guidelines developed in the MEADOW project. The first, which concerns the scope of measurement, is that the guidelines develop definitions and concepts suitable for measuring both organizational change and prevailing organizational structures or states. Knowledge-based theories emphasize the way changes in the economic and institutional context require firms to be more adaptable and innovative than in the past. Dynamic or adaptive capabilities at the levels of technology, product development and markets often require complementary changes in organizational practices and methods, and for this reason there is great theoretical interest in the extent and nature of organizational changes and their relation to economic fluctuation.

Capturing organizational states is of paramount importance for policy makers, and measures of organizational change that are not linked to measures of initial states can lead to mistaken policy evaluations by giving the impression of stagnation or inertia when in fact the relevant changes were implemented before the survey reference period. In the EU context many areas of policy making, including employment, innovation and information and communication technology (ICT) policy, rely on the 'open method of coordination' in which harmonized surveys are used to identify best practice or sets of best practices as a basis for setting targets and for judging the progress of nations and regions in achieving them. Such targets can be quite general and can serve as a basis for national or regional specific policies that take into account particular features of the local context. Adopting the kinds of organizational structures that promote greater flexibility in enterprises and employees is a general target of this nature and a harmonized survey measuring organizational structure and change could contribute to developing relevant indicators for benchmarking in this area.

The second central feature, which concerns the general survey framework, is that the proposed guidelines consider a survey that links the

interview of an employer with the interviews of his or her employees as the richest survey setting for measuring organizational change and its economic and social impacts. From the research perspective, a linked survey can enrich information derived from one level with information from the other. For example, employer-level information provides useful contextualization to the description of work provided by employees, while employee-level information can be used to compute indicators on topics that cannot be easily observed by an employer, such as the nature of intrinsic rewards or work-related stress. Developing a linked survey also allows choosing the most informed and relevant respondent for each topic of the survey. For example, an employer will be better informed about the organization's strategy and overall structure, while an employee can more easily describe his or her job characteristics, such as whether colleagues can provide assistance in carrying out a job. Developing both employer-level and employee-level measures can therefore bring about an improvement in the measurement strategy for each level, which can also feed back into conceptual considerations.

From the policy perspective, linked surveys could provide useful indicators for policy making that cannot be constructed with single-level survey instruments. For example, adding an employee questionnaire to an employer-level survey providing measures of innovation performance would allow scoring the share of employees with innovative behaviour or specific further training and computing this score in the population of innovative employers and non-innovative employers across European countries. Linked surveys could also be used in monitoring the impact of labour market or industrial government intervention. An example is active ageing, which is moving up the policy agenda. Analysis based on linked surveys of organizations could contribute to identifying the flexible working arrangements, the types of further training or the job design characteristics that are best suited to maintain older workers in employment. The effect of employer incentives to keep older workers in employment could also be assessed using the temporal and spatial variation in policies across European countries.

A linked employer–employee survey adds complexity to the practical side of data collection. It may increase costs if it requires adding a new survey to an already-existing employer or employee survey. It also requires that the two survey levels be coordinated. In terms of the choice of primary sampling unit (PSU), the most common strategy in existing linked surveys is to take the employer as the PSU. However, it is also possible first to sample and interview the employees and to then derive the interviewed sample of employers in a second stage. These two different ways of linking are not equivalent, and in Section 3 the advantages and disadvantages of

each linking method are considered. Section 3 also examines the advantages and disadvantages of a panel and retrospective questions for capturing processes of change. Before discussing these aspects of the survey design, Section 2 presents the measurement framework developed in the MEADOW project for characterizing organizational change and its economic and social impacts. The framework draws on the major theories of organizational structure and change, and identifies key organizational elements, their determinants, and the relations between the elements in order to provide guidance on the choice of indicators of organizational change. Section 4 provides more detail on the choice of indicators and discusses the employer- and employee-level questionnaires that were developed in order to measure organizations, their evolution and their impacts. As there is insufficient space here to present the entire questionnaires, the emphasis in Section 4 is on the complementary nature of the employer and employee survey questions designed to measure organizational design and its change.

The MEADOW project included a phase of cognitive testing of the employer and employee survey questionnaires in order to ensure that the questions were understood in the same way by respondents from different linguistic and cultural areas, working in different sectors, and employed by firms or organizations of vastly different sizes.³ The project did not involve full-scale tests of the survey instruments. A first large-scale test of the employer-level survey instrument was undertaken independently by Statistics Sweden in 2010.⁴ Key results of the Swedish employer-level survey are presented in Section 5.

2. THE ORGANIZATIONAL MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK

Figure 10.1 presents the basic measurement framework adopted in the MEADOW guidelines. The measurement framework draws inspiration from an overview of the major theories of organizational structure and change (Nielsen et al. 2008a),⁵ as well as a background report on the state of the art in surveys of organizational change (Nielsen et al. 2008b).

The framework does not reflect a particular theory of organizational structure and change. Rather, its purpose is to recognize the key elements and relations between elements that are identified in the major theories in order to provide guidance for the choice of indicators. Ideally the results of a survey measuring the different indicators would allow researchers to test propositions associated with different and possibly competing theories of organizational structure and change. An important proviso is that it is recognized that there are clear limitations to what can be reliably meas-




Figure 10.1 Basic measurement framework

ured with surveys. It is very difficult to measure unplanned incremental changes in work and interactions that often even go unrecognized by the actors directly involved. Thus, for the purposes of the measurement framework, organizational change is defined only to include intended changes in the organizational structure and the organization of work.

The framework draws attention to the driving forces behind organizational change. Key aspects of the external environment that affect the

internal policies of enterprises include those connected to global competition and technology as well as changes in public policies, notably in the areas of labour markets, systems of education and training, health and safety, and the environment. Organizational change surveys can provide some information on these contextual factors but it will necessarily be limited to the perceptions of respondents concerning how these external economic or institutional factors are experienced.

The strategies and policies of the organization affect the specific management practices and techniques adopted. One area that is especially important to the objectives of EU employment policy is the adoption of practices designed to increase organizational flexibility and adaptability. Flexibility has external and internal dimensions. Organizational practices and techniques that increase internal flexibility include job rotation, multi-skilling and the set of 'lean' production methods designed to minimize inventories and allow the customer to pull value from the producer (Womack and Jones 2003). ICT tools such as performance-tracking software and client relationship software may contribute to increased flexibility and performance. Another policy-relevant area is practices and techniques designed to improve product quality. Total quality management (TQM) refers to a set of techniques for monitoring and improving product quality, including the use of quality circles and delegating responsibility for quality control to the individual employee. A third area is knowledge management practices, including the use of databases documenting good working practices or the monitoring of external ideas and technical developments (OECD 2003).

In Figure 10.1, downward-pointing arrows indicate that the practices and techniques adopted affect the design of the organization and its employment relations. Organizational design is seen as being composed of the organizational structure and the organization of work. Organizational structure refers to the grouping of people, tasks and objects (e.g. equipment or buildings) into sub-units and divisions and the systems to ensure coordination and control both horizontally and vertically within the boundaries of the organization and outside these boundaries, with suppliers, customers and other business partners. The coordination mechanisms, including relations of authority and control, are central to how the management governs and changes the organization, and to how employees experience their working conditions and possibilities for personal development.

Work organization refers to how work is actually divided into tasks, the bundling of tasks into jobs and assignments, the interdependencies of workers in performing the job, the job demands, and the degree of control over the work done. As the arrow linking the organizational structure and the organization of work suggests, these two components of the organi-

zational design are closely related. In organizations relying on relatively decentralized control mechanisms employees will tend to exercise greater control over their work activity and job descriptions will tend to be broader, incorporating multiple tasks.

The research literature shows that key elements of the organization can be combined in various ways, leading to different types of organizational designs and related outcomes. A common theme in the contemporary literature is the move from bureaucratic and/or authoritarian types to more organic and flexible organizations. An example is the concept of an 'adhocracy' (Mintzberg 1979). This type is characterized by specialists deployed in project teams, much training, little formalization and coordination by mutual adjustment. While the MEADOW project placed emphasis on developing indicators for organic or flexible organizations, it was also recognized that many organizations are characterized by bureaucratic dimensions and that it is common to combine both bureaucratic and non-bureaucratic structural features in the same organization.

The measurement framework includes an arrow connecting the organizational design to employment relations. While employment relations are not defined as components of the organization's structure *per se*, a vast literature shows that both economic and social performances are affected not only by the organizational design but also by the system of employment relations. Employment relations include such elements as recruitment practices, contractual arrangements, training and competence development, and career paths and internal mobility. The literature on human resource management (HRM) argues that employment relations are highly complementary to the organization of work and that they have an impact on job quality and hence on work-related stress and job satisfaction. A recent strand of literature has focused on identifying the positive performance effects of combining specific sets of HRM practices with managerial practices designed to enhance employee discretion and more fully involve employees in problem-solving activities. In the organizational behaviour literature, this issue is conceptualized as one of HRM complementarities (Ichniowski et al. 1997; Laursen and Mahnke 2001; Lorenz et al. 2004; Michie and Sheehan 1999).

The measurement framework shows that the organizational design in combination with various elements of the employment relations affect both economic and social performance. The framework includes an arrow connecting economic performance to social performance. The reasons for this are to some extent implicit in the literature on HRM complementarities, which points to the way worker well-being including intrinsic rewards, impact on employee morale and commitment to the organization's goals with further effects on productivity. The stability of employment tenures

and career prospects within the organization will affect an employee's interest in investing in firm-specific skills, which in turn will affect the ability of the employee to contribute to making improvements to the quality of products and processes.

There is a growing focus on how to reform public sector organizations so that they become more market oriented, assuming that this leads to more efficiency in terms of serving the needs of citizens, customers and clients at low costs. This is related to the modernization agenda in the public sector, influenced by new public management (NPM), which advocates performance measures for the efficient use of resources and personnel in public sector organizations comparable to those in the private sector and by the implementation of e-government schemes. The common objectives of many management practices mean that many of the core elements and interrelations identified in the measurement framework apply to both private and public sector organizations and are relevant for constructing common indicators for the entire economy; this is the approach taken in the MEADOW project.

At the same time, organizations in the public sector are exposed to transformation pressures emanating from the political system, as well as to pressures from the changing demands of citizens around such issues as access to education and training and work-life balance. Further, while reforms based on the NPM model have seen the introduction of private sector type performance measures into the public sector, there are dimensions of performance with no obvious private sector counterparts. These include the scientific output of public research organizations, the level and quality of education and training, and the quality and level of coverage of health care. Public administration may also be evaluated on the criteria of transparency and justice as related to democratic principles. Transparency laws are thus seen as means of increasing public trust in government, and the optimistic view is that they will produce a culture of openness in public organizations. The MEADOW survey does not develop measures for these features of public sector organizations and they could be the focus of specialized modules.

3. ELEMENTS OF A GENERAL SURVEY FRAMEWORK

Linked Employer–Employee Surveys

Although the MEADOW employer and employee surveys were designed so that they could be administered independently, as discussed above

there are a number of reasons for preferring a linked survey for measuring the different elements and interrelations summarized in the measurement framework. There are two possible methods for administering such surveys that are not equivalent in terms of advantages and drawbacks. The employer can be sampled first, while the employee is sampled later in a second stage (linked employer–employee survey). Or, the opposite procedure may be adopted, with the employee sampled and interviewed first, and the interviewed sample of employers being derived from this employee sample (linked employee–employer survey).

Among existing linked survey instruments, the most common practice is for the employer to be designated as the primary sampling unit. One reason for doing this is that it seems obvious to explore the employer level first in a survey focusing on organizational change, as it can be assumed that changes are more often initiated at the employer level than at the employee level. Further, it is reasonable to begin by interviewing persons in a position both to have an understanding of the organization as a whole and to impart this information. There are also a number of more practical advantages to this approach. First, taking the employer as the primary sampling unit (PSU) makes it easier to survey the various employees who are linked to it. A clustered sample is obtained, which is both simpler and cheaper to administer than a simple random sample, as fewer contacts are needed overall. Second, in the absence of linked employer–employee registers, the unit that is sampled first will be easier to follow up in the case of a longitudinal survey. Consequently, if employees are the PSU it will be more difficult to obtain a panel of employer units. Third, the representativeness of the sample of employers should be easier to guarantee in a setting where the employer is the PSU since the dispersion of sampling rates is always higher within the sample for the second stage.

Taking the employer as the PSU may, however, result in several practical difficulties. One problem is that it may result in a bias in the employee sample towards employees who are more satisfied with their employer or their work (social climate bias) if they are selected from a list given by the employer. Thus, even if employees are randomly selected from this list, it will be practically much more difficult to obtain a random sample of employees because the employers provide the sampling frame for the employee survey within their units.

From the EU perspective, a main difficulty with the employer-first approach is the absence of a harmonized employer register. At the European level, no exhaustive and up-to-date database is available that includes: addresses of employer units (headquarters, subsidiaries etc.); a classification of industries such as the NACE; and more generally the information that is required to stratify and optimize sampling rates. In

practice, existing harmonized employer surveys cope with this constraint in two quite different ways. One approach is centrally coordinated with a single organization developing and translating a questionnaire, prescribing the survey methodology, and contracting out the fieldwork to a network of contractors. The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (EFILWC) plays this role in the case of the European Company Survey (ECS).⁶

The Community Innovation Survey (CIS) and the European Structure of Earnings Survey (ESES) illustrate a decentralized mode. These surveys are covered by European regulations that require each member state to participate. Eurostat is responsible for coordination and quality issues and, in close cooperation with EU member states, develops a standard core questionnaire in English and an accompanying set of definitions and methodological recommendations. The responsibility for implementing the survey at the national level lies in most cases with the national statistical office.

With respect to the MEADOW framework, the ESES is of particular interest as it is the only harmonized European linked employer–employee survey. This survey was carried out in 1995, 2002, 2006 and 2010 and has been progressively extended to all 27 member states of the EU. A central feature of ESES is flexibility: information can be obtained from ‘tailor-made’ questionnaires, existing surveys, administrative data, or from a combination of these sources. In some countries, participating organizations provide general information about their wage policy and then assemble information from their own files about the individual earnings of a sample of employees or, in some cases, their whole workforce. In other countries, employer-provided information about wage policies is enriched by administrative data on the earnings of all employees working for the participating employer units. Some countries, such as France, survey a random sample of establishments and a random sample of employees within these establishments using a linked employer–employee register.

While the cross-national experience of carrying out several waves of the ESES provides an important knowledge base for implementing a MEADOW-style organizational survey, its flexible approach has some drawbacks as it creates certain barriers to comparability (Desai 2008). At the most basic level, the definition of the survey unit can be variable. Thus European-wide results obtained from the data sometimes fall below the standards applied at a national level due to differences in the units of observation, sampling frames and classifications. The consequences of these differences are difficult to assess, since much of the knowledge about them remains tacit, and is related to the routines and practices of national statistical offices in each country. However, Eurostat’s coordination of the

survey promotes further convergence in these practices and progressively improves the documentation of cross-country differences through a series of quality reports (Eurostat 2006, 2009).

An advantage of taking the employee as the PSU is that in contrast to the situation in respect of employer databases, good-quality household databases can be obtained in most European countries through the national statistical offices or other national institutions.⁷ Moreover, taking the employee as the PSU allows one to cover a very large field of employers (all kind of establishments, in all sectors, as well as the self-employed) in a way that does not depend upon the availability of a business register and the extent to which it is up to date. The sample of employers derived from a random sample of employees will be automatically proportionate to the size of employer units. The sample will reflect the employer unit's share in total employment and can be easily weighted to make it representative of the population of organizations (Leombruni 2003).

When consideration is given to using the MEADOW framework for surveys conducted outside the EU in developing or emerging market economies, a further factor that may favour an employee-first approach is the existence of a large informal sector. Even where there are up-to-date business registers they are unlikely to include units in the informal sector. This limitation of business registers explains the trend in recent years to survey the informal sector through mixed-household enterprise surveys in which a survey of households is used in a first phase to identify owners and then in a second phase a sample of enterprise owners is interviewed to gain information on their operations.⁸

The employee-first option may lead, however, to some specific difficulties. There is the risk of attrition and bias because of the refusal or inability of some employees to provide good contact information about their employer. There is also the fact that the distribution of businesses in terms of size is skewed and thus it is difficult to reach very large employer units for which a census is generally conducted in employer-level surveys such as CIS. Other drawbacks are simply the counterparts of the advantages of an employer-first approach, namely: the representativeness of the employer sample; difficulties in following up employers over time; and budget optimization.

Although both linking options face limitations, either could provide linked data of good quality. Besides the methodological issues emphasized above, practical issues such as sampling database availability, and legal constraints regarding the access rights for individual data will necessarily play a role in the choice of survey design. While the ability of employers to provide relevant information on the overall structure and strategy of the organization constitutes a strong argument in favour of an employer-first

approach for a survey focusing on organizational change, problems related to the lack of availability or poor quality of registers of employers make it nonetheless worth considering the alternative of a linked employee–employer survey.

The Longitudinal Aspect: A Combination of Retrospective Questions and a Panel

The first section of this chapter discussed the importance of measuring organizational states and their relation to knowledge development and performance. Measuring changes without measuring states can result in pooling together employer units that remain inert and units that have undergone major changes in previous periods. But changes in the organization also need to be identified. Measuring the dynamics of change at the employer level is central in order to make some assessment of organizational flexibility and adaptation. It is also important in order to identify the adjustment costs of change, including training needs, renewal of the labour force, accidents, and perception of work intensification and stress. To understand barriers to the diffusion of organizational forms that appear to be virtuous in terms of performance requires collecting information on how firms are adopting and absorbing changes.

Retrospective questions and a panel considered as alternative methods for capturing the dynamics of organizations have advantages and drawbacks. Whereas a panel by definition consists of measurements at two or more points in time (e.g. over a time period of several years), the immediate availability of retrospective data is an argument in favour of their use. Moreover, a sole reliance on retrospective questions removes the requirement for repeated surveys and is therefore cheaper. Another factor favouring the use of retrospective questions is the possibility of focusing on the most recent organizational innovations in a manner that cannot be done with a panel. With retrospective questions, after having described features of the organization and its use of managerial practices at two dates, it is possible to ask the respondent to focus on the major change that occurred during that period and to describe the difficulties encountered. This cannot be done in a panel design, which seeks only to measure states, at least when organizational innovation takes place between panel measurements.

Another advantage – albeit one that concerns only the employer level – is that retrospective questions can provide more consistent and comparable information on activities carried out by organizations and workers, because an individual provides all the information at a single point in time. Thus there is no bias linked to a change of respondent between two differ-

ent waves, as can occur in an employer-focused panel survey, and changes in the general context in which the organization operates are not likely to influence the interpretation of a given question.

Counterbalancing these advantages are certain drawbacks of using retrospective questions. One is that if organizational changes lead to mobility and turnover among management, the respondent may not have experienced the change and may have only limited or no knowledge of it. Thus, if retrospective questions may serve to limit some biases in the measurement of change, the *quid pro quo* is that information may be missing or incomplete. Another principal drawback is the risk of 'recall error': memories may be short, leading to omission, or unauthentic, leading to a 'telescoping effect', in which respondents report things in the current period that actually took place in a prior period (especially when people are dealing with daily problems and plan for the future).⁹

In this respect, one obvious advantage of a panel design is that it does not rely upon memories. However, panels can only measure changes that can be consistently defined over time, and there is then a significant emphasis on fixing the content of the questionnaire at wave 1. This poses a problem for a survey on organizational change, as it is likely that a fraction of the survey will have to evolve over time. For example, management practices follow fads (Abrahamson and Fairchild 1999), and from one wave to the next some practices may become obsolete while others may evolve during their diffusion process. Using two waves of the workplace employment relations survey (WERS), Freitas (2008) investigated employers' use of 'quality circles' and 'business process reengineering' through measures based on questions that were identically formulated in 1990 and 1998. She finds that the patterns of use of these practices have changed over time. An explanation is that these practices refer to management concepts that are soft rather than precisely defined, and that are constantly recycled as they diffuse in relation to changes in the social and competitive environment. Thus a longitudinal survey of these practices calls for a renewal of some questions from one survey to the other, even if they relate to the same management concept. This points to the need for qualitative investigation in preparing survey questionnaires, along with an analysis of management publications, in order to monitor the evolution and renewal of management concepts.

Another argument in favour of panel surveys is the possibility of analysing changes not only within the organization, but also between them (and especially between the older ones and those more recently established). Of course, this implies that employers from previous waves are followed up while the panel is refreshed with new enterprises, some of these being newly created organizations. Indeed, such data should enable one to observe the demographics of organizations and thus to estimate the

effects of the structural transformation of the economy on the dynamics of organizations and work. Here again there is a drawback as it is expensive and time-consuming to trace employers, employees or both.¹⁰ Even with adequate resources and appropriate procedures, there will be some attrition, which means that a part of the initial sample is lost in each of the following waves since some particular companies, workplaces or employees prefer to stop participating in the panel after a while.¹¹ Another point is that the initial sample has to be large enough to cope with any attrition, both in aggregate and within each stratum. So the initial sampling is more complex in a panel. The refreshment strategy, taking into account birth, death and attrition, is another important issue, and attention must be given to the computation of dynamic weights (Forth 2008).

A strategy to derive benefits from the advantages of each option and to limit the associated disadvantages is to combine the use of retrospective questions and a panel design. An advantage of using a combined approach is that data from the first wave are available quickly to support the analysis of the dynamics of organizations and of work in the recent past. Then, repetition of the survey in a second wave makes it possible to monitor trends in change and to undertake longitudinal analyses that can investigate the causality of relationships. Asking retrospective questions in a subsequent wave fills the gaps in the longer timeline and provides useful additional information.

Figure 10.2 represents a combined approach consisting of a four-year follow-up period between the employer survey waves combined with the use of retrospective questions, which have a (maximum) recall period of two years.¹² This would be adequate for measuring the organization of work, which may change quickly but also needs time to show its effects. With a four-year cycle, two waves of the survey provide four distinct time points, each separated by a two-year period.

In this survey design, information on changes over periods of two years might not be fully comparable from one period to the other. For example, changes between 2012 and 2014 are assessed through retrospective questions addressed to a unique respondent, while changes between 2014 and 2016 are based on the comparison between a state variable given by one respondent describing the situation at the date of the survey in wave 1 and a state variable given by another respondent in wave 2 and deriving from a retrospective question. The comparability of these two different measures of change over a time period of two years would need further assessment. Figure 10.2 indicates that a one-year follow-up for the employee survey could be considered, leading to a two-wave employee panel. This design makes it possible to analyse short-term effects at the employee level using the panel dimension of the data.




Figure 10.2 A proposed survey design

4. INDICATORS FOR MEASURING ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN AND ITS CHANGE

A central theme in this chapter has been the advantage of a linked survey framework for measuring organizations and their dynamics. This relates to the fact that information gathered at one level can be enriched by information at another. Employers, for example, are better placed than employees to answer questions about the overall structure of the organization, while employees are better placed to describe the characteristics of their daily work activity and how they interact with other employees. In order to illustrate the complementary nature of the information that can be collected at the employer and employee levels, this section presents selected questions from the MEADOW employer and employee surveys designed to measure organizational design and its change.¹³

Box 10.1 lists questions from the employer-level questionnaire. As discussed in Section 2 above, there is an important literature looking at the relation between performance outcomes and the design of the organization, including the types of coordination mechanism used. An important theme in this literature has been the move from bureaucratic or hierarchical organizational structures to more decentralized ones in which elements of decision-making authority are delegated to employees at lower levels of the organizational hierarchy. Such decentralized organization structures are seen as being more flexible or adaptable and hence better able to compete in global markets often characterized by rapid technological change.

While it is difficult to measure directly at the employer level the use of different coordinating mechanisms, much can be learned by asking questions about the divisional structure of the organization, the use of teamwork and by identifying the category of personnel responsible for different types of decision making and activities.

As the literature on 'learning organizations' has argued, an objective in delegating decision-making authority and increasing the control employees exercise over their jobs is to foster employee learning and creativity. Much of this literature argues that in hierarchical structures crucial elements of the organization's knowledge base that could contribute to improved performance, including innovative performance, remain untapped (Senge 1990; Garvin 2003; Jensen et al. 2007; Greenan and Lorenz 2010). Employers are poorly placed to provide detailed information on what employees do and learn at work; Box 10.2 presents questions from the employee questionnaire designed to capture such aspects as how much learning and problem solving takes place on the job and the extent to which employees are able to choose or change the way they undertake their jobs. Employee-level questions can also be used to provide direct measures of the types of coordinating mechanism exercised in the organization. In particular it is possible to ask employees about the factors that determine their pace of work: one's boss or supervisor; the automatic movement of equipment, or the requirement to respect quantitative production targets. Questions about the forms of assistance employees receive or give at work can be used to measure the importance of more informal methods of coordination, or what Mintzberg (1979) calls 'mutual adjustment'.

5. RESULTS FROM THE SWEDISH EMPLOYER SURVEY

The first full-scale test of the MEADOW employer survey was conducted by Statistics Sweden under the coordination of Hans-Olof Hagén in 2010.

BOX 10.1 EMPLOYER-LEVEL QUESTIONS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND INTERNAL COORDINATION

B1HIE How many organizational levels are there in your establishment, including the highest level (for example, senior management) and the lowest level (for example, production staff)?

Number _____

B1HIE2007 How many organizational levels were there two years ago?

Number _____

B1DIVTYPE Does this establishment have each of the following types of divisions or departments?

[Provide separate 'yes or no' response options to each of questions a to c]

- a. Separate divisions or departments by function: sales, production, administration, research etc.
- b. Separate divisions or departments by type of product or service
- c. Separate divisions or departments by geographical area: sales regions etc.

1. Yes
2. No

B1NDIV How many separate departments or divisions report directly to the head of this establishment?

Number: _____

B1STRUCT Who normally decides on the planning and execution of the daily work tasks of your non-managerial employees?

1. The employee undertaking the tasks
2. Managers or work supervisors
3. Both employees and managers or supervisors

B1DLGQLT Are each of the following responsible for quality control?

[Provide separate 'yes or no' response options to each of questions a to e]

- a. The employee undertaking the tasks
- b. Managers or work supervisors
- c. Specialist group or division within the enterprise or organisation
- d. External groups – customers, external evaluation experts etc.
- e. [only ask if responses to a to d all 'no'] Quality control not relevant to this establishment

1. Yes
2. No

B1TEAM Are any of the employees at this establishment currently working in a team, where the members jointly decide how work is done?

1. Yes
2. No

B1TEAMPER What percentage of the employees at this establishment currently works in such teams?

1. Up to 24%
2. 25% to 49%
3. 50% to 74%
4. 75% or more

B1TEAM2007 Did any of your employees work in such a team two years ago?

1. Yes
2. No

B1TEAMCHG Compared with two years ago, has the percentage of employees currently working in such teams:

1. Increased?
2. Decreased?
3. Remained approximately the same?

B1DLGSCHD Can any of the non-managerial employees at this establishment choose when they begin or finish their daily work, according to their personal requirements?

1. Yes
2. No

B1DLGSCHDPER What percentage of the non-managerial employees at this establishment can currently choose when they begin or finish their daily work?

1. Up to 24%
2. 25% to 49%
3. 50% to 74%
4. 75% or more

B1DLGSCHD2007 Could any of the non-managerial employees at this establishment choose when to begin or finish their daily work two years ago?

1. Yes
2. No

The Swedish MEADOW survey was administered at the company rather than at the establishment level, with no employee-level counterpart, which is one of the possible implementation options of the guidelines. As a matter of fact, this survey is inscribed in the prolongation of a previous company-level survey, the Flex survey, conducted in 1995 and 1997, which focused on measuring work organization and learning. In 1997, the flex survey was matched with a linked employer–employee register that produced some additional information for the purpose of secondary analysis. This linking option was retained for the Swedish MEADOW survey and it could be used in future waves for developing a linked employer–employee survey. However, in the 2009 edition, another option was explored: that of a positive coordination with the sampling frames of the Community Innovation Survey (CIS) and the Information and Communication Technology use survey (ICT use), two harmonized surveys coordinated by Eurostat. The MEADOW employer questionnaire was thus sent to the 1400 firms with over 15 employees that participated in both of these surveys in 2009.

Even though the MEADOW survey was voluntary in Sweden, it achieved more than the 60 per cent target response rate recommended in the MEADOW Guidelines: 64 per cent. Some possible reasons for this

**BOX 10.2 EMPLOYEE-LEVEL QUESTIONS
FOR COORDINATION AND WORK
ORGANIZATION**

Work organization and task description

BWRKGROUP In performing your tasks, do you ever work together in a permanent or temporary team? (*Interviewer note: People could be from your firm [organization] or from another firm [organization]*)

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know
9. Refused

BWRKGROUPb Does this team have a team leader?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know
9. Refused

BWRKGROUPE Excluding the team leader, can the others in this team influence what tasks you do yourself?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know
9. Refused

CAUTC In your job, what proportion of the time can you choose or change the content of your work tasks?

1. Less than 25% of the time
2. 25% up to 50% of the time
3. 50% up to 75% of the time
4. 75% or more of the time
8. Don't know
9. Refused

CAUTH What proportion of the time can you choose or change how you undertake tasks?

1. Less than 25% of the time
2. 25% up to 50% of the time

3. 50% up to 75% of the time
4. 75% or more of the time
8. Don't know
9. Refused

DLRNNEW How often does your job involve learning new things?

1. Every day
2. At least once a week
3. At least once a month
4. Less often than once a month/never
8. Don't know
9. Refused

DPROBSOLVE In your work, are you ever confronted with new or complex problems that take at least 30 minutes to find a good solution? Only consider the time needed to THINK of a solution, not the time needed to carry it out.

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know
9. Refused

Internal coordination

BWORKPRES Are any of the following important in determining the pace of your work:

[Rotate order of questions randomly]

- a. Clients or customers
 - b. Supervisor or manager
 - c. Your co-workers
 - d. Your own discretion
 - e. Pay incentives
 - f. A computer or computer system
 - g. A machine or assembly line
 - h. Targets you have been set
1. Yes
 2. No
 7. Not applicable
 8. Don't know
 9. Refused

BQUALMON Thinking of your job as a whole, who usually monitors the quality of your work? You may answer yes to one or more of the following:

- a. You yourself
- b. Your supervisor or manager
- c. The team you work with most often [Ask if BWRKGROUP=1]
- d. A person from a separate department
- e. Customers or clients

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know
9. Refused

BWRKASSIS Sometimes people want to get assistance with a work overload or difficult situation. Do you ever feel the need for assistance?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Don't know
9. Refused

BWRKASSISa In these situations, how often do you receive assistance from your supervisor or manager?

1. Always
2. Sometimes
3. Never
7. Not applicable
8. Don't Know
9. Refused

BWRKASSISb In these situations, do you receive assistance from other co-workers?

1. Always
2. Sometimes
3. Never
8. Don't know
9. Refused

relatively high response rate in a voluntary survey are the use of register data and the piggy-backing on the CIS and ICT survey, which limited the time of the interviews to 15–20 minutes. The availability of additional information from these databases allowed an in-depth analysis of the non-response, showing that there are no large differences in productivity, innovation and ICT use for the non-responding group of firms compared to the responding group, which confirms the quality of the data.

The main results of the survey were published in a collective volume entitled *Learning Organisations Matter* (Statistics Sweden 2011). Here, selected results are summarized to show how the information from a MEADOW employer survey can be used to characterize learning forms of organization. Learning organizations are those that are able to adapt and compete through learning. Most of the research sees the learning organization as a multi-level concept and defines learning organizations in terms of the interrelations of managerial practices, team organization and individual behaviour. Three composite indices were constructed from the survey results in order to capture key characteristics of learning organizations: decentralization, individual learning and structural learning. They are based on questions about the way the firm operates at the date of the survey, in 2009. Each index sums a varying number of questions with different item responses in a standardized way so that it takes values between 0 and 1.

The decentralization index is based on five of the questions on organizational structure and coordination displayed in Box 10.1: BIHIE on the number of hierarchical layers, BISTRUCT on the planning of daily tasks, B1DLGQLT on quality monitoring, B1TEAMPER on the proportion of employees working in autonomous teams and B1DLGSCHDPER on the flexibility of hours worked per day. An index close to 1 indicates a high level of decentralization for operational decisions, structured around autonomous teams.

Box 10.3 presents the questions related to individual learning. This index tries to capture the importance of continuous learning at the individual level. It includes both formal and informal learning activities. Two questions in this list are specific to the Swedish MEADOW survey: the one on competence development and the one on non-paid time off the job for training purposes.

The index of structural learning measures activities that aim to develop knowledge in a systematically organized way (Box 10.4). Employee participation in continuous improvement (B1CIRCLE) as well as regular meetings between the line managers and the workers they are responsible for (CBRFANY) contribute to a learning culture where all employees play a part in knowledge development around daily activities. Technological

BOX 10.3 EMPLOYER-LEVEL QUESTIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL LEARNING

Is competence development part of the normal everyday work?

1. Yes
2. No

CTRNONPC What proportion of employees have received on the job training over the past 12 months?

1. Up to 24%
2. 25% to 49%
3. 50% to 74%
4. 75% or more

CAPPPC Approximately what proportion of your employees have a performance appraisal or evaluation interview at least once a year?

1. None
2. 1 % to 24%
3. 25% to 49%
4. 50% or more

CTRNOFFPC What proportion of employees have been given paid time off from their work to undertake training in the past 12 months?

1. Up to 24%
2. 25% to 49%
3. 50% to 74%
4. 75% or more

What proportion of employees have been given non-paid time off from their work to undertake training in the past 12 months?

1. Up to 24%
2. 25% to 49%
3. 50% to 74%
4. 75% or more

BOX 10.4 EMPLOYER-LEVEL QUESTIONS FOR STRUCTURAL LEARNING

B1CIRCLE What percentage of employees at this firm currently participates in groups who meet regularly to think about improvements that could be made within this workplace?

1. Up to 24%
2. 25% to 49%
3. 50% to 74%
4. 75% or more

CBRFANY How often do you have meetings between line managers or supervisors and all the workers for whom they are responsible?

1. Every day
2. At least once a week
3. At least once a month
4. At least once a year
5. Never

B2QUAL Does this firm monitor the quality of its production processes or service delivery?

1. Yes, on a continuous basis
2. Yes, on an intermittent basis
3. No
4. Not relevant

B2KMBASE Do employees in this firm regularly update databases that document good work practices of lessons learned?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not relevant

B2KMEX Does this firm monitor external ideas or technological developments for new or improved products, processes or services?

1. Yes, using staff assigned specifically to this task
2. Yes, as part of the responsibilities of general staff
3. No

B2CUSAT Does this firm monitor customer satisfaction through questionnaires, focus groups, analysis of complaints, or other methods?

1. Yes, on a regular basis
2. Yes, but infrequently
3. No

intelligence through quality monitoring (B2QUAL), internal and external knowledge management practices (B2KMBASE, B2KMEX), as well as customer orientation (B2CUSAT) contribute to strengthening the knowledge base of the firm.

Decentralization, individual and structural learning are positively correlated with one another, suggesting that they represent complementary dimensions of a model of learning organization.

The three learning organization indices are then correlated with measures of innovation from the CIS survey, with the classic distinctions between product, process, organizational and marketing innovations (Table 10.1). All coefficients are positive, and the highest correlations relate the different types of innovation with the individual learning index.

These results are still tentative and need more in-depth analysis, but they are promising and show that a MEADOW survey allows capturing some important organizational features that are conducive to more innovativeness. These characteristics combine work organization practices,

Table 10.1 Learning organization indexes and innovation: Pearson correlation coefficients

	Mean (std)	Product innovation	Process innovation	Organizational innovation	Marketing innovation
Decentralization	0.43 (0.23)	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.09
Individual learning	0.64 (0.33)	0.18	0.16	0.22	0.11
Structural learning	0.73 (0.17)	0.11	0.17	0.10	ns

Note: All correlation coefficients are significant at the 1% level; ns means not significant at the 10% level.

Source: Statistics Sweden (2011).

human resource management and supportive technologies. Moreover, the structure of the survey that links information collected at the employer and employee levels creates new opportunities for investigating economic performance as well as quality of working life issues that are key to achieving the EU 2020 objectives of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth in ageing economies. It is hoped that the MEADOW linked employer–employee surveys that have been administered in Norway in 2011 and in Denmark and Finland in 2012 will contribute to demonstrate the usefulness of such a survey instrument to guide evidence-based policies for firms as well as for administrations and governments.

NOTES

1. The MEADOW Guidelines are a collective effort. In addition to the core consortium members responsible for the drafting of the Guidelines, the project benefited from the assistance of a large number of external contributors. A complete list of the consortium team members and external contributors is provided in the Appendix.
2. For an overview of the literature on the relation between organizational structure and innovation, see Lam (2004).
3. The cognitive testing was coordinated by Anthony Arundel and Adriana van Cruysen from UNU-MERIT in the Netherlands. For a detailed presentation of the cognitive tests, see the synthesis report in the Annex to the MEADOW Guidelines (MEADOW Consortium 2010).
4. The Swedish employer-level survey was undertaken at the initiative of Hans-Olof Hagén, Statistics Sweden. See Statistics Sweden (2011).
5. Work on the measurement framework, including the overview of major theories, was coordinated by the team from the University of Aalborg, Denmark, under the leadership of Peter Nielsen.
6. This survey could provide the primary sampling units for a linked employer–employee survey at the European level.
7. For a discussion of the availability of registers of employers and employees in EU member countries that might serve as sampling frames for surveys in which either the employer or employee comprises the primary sampling unit, see the Guidelines (MEADOW Consortium 2010, ch. 7). Work on survey methodologies, including sampling, was coordinated by John Forth from the National Institute of Economic and Social Research in the UK.
8. For a discussion of mixed-household enterprise surveys, see OECD (2002) and Asian Development Bank (2011).
9. Moser and Kalton (1971) refer to these dual problems. They noted that ‘recall loss’ or ‘omission’ is likely to be greater if the recall period is longer, while the telescoping effect can be greater for shorter recall periods. They identify diary methods as an approach that has been used in surveys of individuals to address the problem of recall loss. Another approach is bounded recall, where the respondent is reminded of some information concerning the previous period, but in this case additional panel information is needed.
10. Statistics Canada implemented an ambitious linked employer–employee frame, the Workplace and Employee Survey (WES), where establishments were followed in a panel and employees were followed for two years. Three waves were carried out, in 1999, 2001 and 2005 respectively (see Statistics Canada 2008).
11. However, attrition does not necessarily imply a bias. It depends on who falls out and whether their characteristics are correlated with the behaviour one wants to observe.

- For example, in its long labour supply and demand panels in the Netherlands, the Institute for Labour Studies (OSA) has not found that attrition has been concentrated in specific size groups or sectors.
12. Regarding the follow-up period between the waves, it is important to find a balance. It should not be too short (e.g. one or two years) since such regular observations are not required to measure organizational changes. Moreover, such an option would be costly and lead to practical difficulties and an extra burden for companies. However, a low frequency (e.g. six or eight years) is not practical either since it would probably lead to important attrition biases (one might encounter major difficulties in tracing employers, and even more so in tracing employees). It would also leave part of the timeline unobserved and the data would suffer from the obsolescence of a large fraction of the questions.
 13. The drafting of the employer questionnaire was coordinated by Amelia Román of the Institute for Labour Studies (OSA), The Netherlands. The drafting of the employee questionnaire was coordinated by Francis Green of the University of Kent in the UK. For downloadable versions of the core English questionnaires and translations into the seven other languages represented by the MEADOW Consortium, see http://www.meadow-project.eu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=25&Itemid=41.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, E. and G. Fairchild (1999), 'Management fashion: lifecycles, triggers, and collective learning processes', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **44**(4), 708–40.
- Asian Development Bank (2011), *A Handbook on Using the Mixed Survey for Measuring Informal Employment and the Informal Sector*, Manila, Philippines: Asian Development Bank.
- Desai, T. (2008), 'Development of linked and panel datasets for European labour market and social policy analysis', in D. Marsden (co-ord.), (2008), *Study and Conference on European Labour Market Analysis using Firm-level Panel Data and Linked Employer–Employee Data*, Final Report, March, Project for the European Commission DG Employment, Contract N. VT/2006/0046, Brussels: European Commission.
- Eurostat (2006), *Structure of Earnings Survey 2002*, Unit F2 Quality Report, May, Luxembourg: Eurostat.
- Eurostat (2009), *Structure of Earnings Survey (SES) 2006 – Synthesis of Quality Reports*, Unit F2, Luxembourg: Eurostat.
- Forth, J. (2008), 'Methods for longitudinal panel surveys', in *Methodological Review of Research with Large Businesses*, Paper 6, Prepared for HM Revenue and Customs, London: HM Revenue and Customs.
- Freitas, I.M.B. (2008), 'Sources of differences in the pattern of adoption of organisational and managerial innovations from early to late 1990s in the UK', *Research Policy*, **37**, 131–48.
- Garvin, D.A. (2003), *Learning in Action. A Guide to Putting the Learning Organization to Work*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Greenan, N. and N. Lorenz (2010), *Innovative Workplaces. Making better use of skills within organizations*, Paris: OECD. <http://dx.doi.org/9789264095687-en>.
- Ichniowski, C., K. Shaw and G. Prennushi (1997), 'The effects of human resource management policies on productivity: a study of steel finishing lines', *American Economic Review*, **87**(3), 291–313.
- Jensen, M., B. Johnson, E. Lorenz and B.-Å. Lundvall (2007), 'Forms of knowledge and modes of innovation', *Research Policy*, **36**, 680–93.
- Lam, A. (2004), 'Organisational innovation', in J. Fagerberg, D. Mowery and R. Nelson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 115–47.
- Laursen, K. and V. Mahnke (2001), 'Knowledge strategies, firm types, and complementarity in human-resource practices', *Journal of Management and Governance*, **5**(1), 1–27.

- Leombruni, R. (2003), *Firm Data Analysis in Linked Employer–Employees Datasets*, available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=886683> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.886683>.
- Lorenz, E., J. Michie and F. Wilkinson (2004), 'HRM complementarities and innovative performance in British and French industry', in J.L. Christensen and B.-Å. Lundvall (eds), *Product Innovation, Interactive Learning and Economic Performance*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 181–210.
- MEADOW Consortium (2010), *The MEADOW Guidelines*, Project funded within the 6th Framework Programme of the European Commission's DG Research, Grigny: France, <http://www.meadow-project.eu/index.php?/Article-du-site/Guidelines.html>.
- Michie, J. and M. Sheehan (1999), 'HRM practices, R&D expenditure and innovative investment: evidence from the UK's 1990 Workplace Industrial Relations Survey', *Industrial and Corporate Change*, **8**(2), 211–34.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979), *The Structuring of Organisations*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Moser, C. and G. Kalton (1971), *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*, 2nd edn, London: Heinemann.
- Nielsen, P., R. Lund, B.-Å. Lundvall, A.N. Gjerding, R.N. Nielsen, J.G. Rasmussen, A.D. Hesselholdt, C. Makó, M. Illéssy, P. Csizmadia, A. Härenstam, E. Bejerot, O. Som, E. Kirner, R. Huys, N. Lazaric and A. Coutts (2008a), 'Multi-level theoretical framework, theoretical key elements and interactions reflected in data collection on organisational change, innovation and work conditions', MEADOW background document, No.1, http://www.meadow-project.eu/images/docmeadow/backdocument_mtf.pdf.
- Nielsen, P., R.N. Nielsen, R. Lund, B.-Å. Lundvall, J.G. Rasmussen, A.N. Gjerding and A. Hesselholdt (2008b), 'Grid report, state of the art in surveys on organisational change', MEADOW background document, No.2. http://www.meadow-project.eu/images/docmeadow/back_gridreport.pdf.
- OECD (2002), *Measuring the Non-Observed Economy, A Handbook*, Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2003), *Measuring Knowledge Management in the Business Sector: First Steps*, Paris: OECD.
- OECD/Eurostat (2005), *Oslo Manual: Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data*, Paris: OECD.
- Senge, P. (1990), *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Statistics Canada (2008), *Workplace and Employee Survey Compendium 2005*, September, Ottawa: Statistics Canada, <http://publications.gc.ca/Collection/Statcan/71-585-X/71-585-XIE.html>.
- Statistics Sweden (2011), *Learning Organisations Matter*, Stockholm: Statistics Sweden, http://www.scb.se/statistik/_publikationer/NR9999_2011A01_BR_NRFT1101.pdf.
- Womack, J. P. and D.T. Jones (2003), *Lean Thinking. Banish Waste and Create Wealth in Your Corporation*, New York: Free Press.

APPENDIX: MEADOW CONSORTIUM AND EXTERNAL CONTRIBUTORS

MEADOW Consortium

**Centre d'Etudes de l'Emploi (CEE), Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis
France (UNSA), France**

**Research Unit: Dynamics of
Organisations and Work**

EU Project coordinator and team
leader: Nathalie Greenan

Project coordinator and team
leader: Edward Lorenz

Adam Coutts (University of
Cambridge)

Nathalie Lazaric

Fabrice Le Guel

Rakhi Rashmi

Thomas Amossé

Sophie Bressé

Danièle Guillemot

Sylvie Hamon-Cholet

Jenny Koutsomarkou

Samira Ouchhi

**Aalborg Universitet (AAU),
Denmark**

**Department of Economics, Politics
and Public Administration**

Team leader: Peter Nielsen

**Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KU
LEUVEN), Belgium**

Team leader: Monique Ramioul

Rik Huys

Bengt-Åke Lundvall

Anders Hesselholdt

Jørgen Gulddahl Rasmussen

Allan Naes Gjerding

**Bundesagentur für Arbeit,
Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und
Berufsforschung (IAB), Germany**

Team leader: Lutz Bellmann

**Fraunhofer Institute for Systems
and Innovation Research (ISI),
Germany**

Industrial and Service Innovations

Team leader: Eva Kirner

André Pahnke

Oliver Som

**Szociológiai Kutatóintézet/Institute
of Sociology of the Hungarian
Academy of Sciences (ISB),
Department: Research Group of
Organization and Work, Hungary**

**Italian National Research Council
(CNR), Italy**

**Institute on Population and Social
Policy (IRPPS)**

Team leader: Daniele Archibugi

Team leader: Prof. Csaba Mako

Miklos Illéssy
Peter Csizmadia

Maastricht Universiteit (UNU-MERIT), The Netherlands

Team leader: Anthony Arundel

Adriana van Cruysen

Nederlandse organisatie voor toegepast natuurwetenschappelijk onderzoek (TNO) TNO Quality of life: Work and Employment, The Netherlands

Team leader: Karolus Kraan

Irene Houtman
Ernest de Vroome

National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR), UK

Team leader: John Forth

Giorgio Sirilli
Stefano Sirilli

Institute for Labour Studies (OSA), The Netherlands

Labour market research department

Team leader: Amelia Román

University of Gothenburg (UGOT)- Sweden

Department of Work Science

Team leader: Annika Härenstam

Eva Bejerot

University of Kent (UKENT), UK Economics Department

Team leader: Prof. Francis Green

Stephen Allan

External contributors

Eurostat

Bernard Felix
Veijo-Ismo Ritola

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

Alessandra Colecchia

NORC, University of Chicago and National Science Foundation (USA)

Julia Lane

Adviser European Affairs

Johan van Rens

University of Warwick (UK)

Peter Elias

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (EFILWC)

Agnès Parent-Thirion

Greet Vermeylen

- | | |
|--|--|
| DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, European Commission
Radek Maly
Joao Medeiros | Statistics Sweden (SCB), Sweden
Hans-Olof Hagén |
| The Swedish Hotel and Restaurant Association (SHR), Sweden
Anette Nylund | Italian National Statistical Office (ISTAT), Italy
Giulio Perani |
| French Ministry of Employment – DARES, France
Elisabeth Algava
Thomas Coutrot | Institute of Labour and Social Studies, Poland
Lukasz Sienkiewicz |
| Faculty of Management, Comenius University, Slovak Republic
Lubica Bajzikova | S&T Statistics Department, National Research Center for Science and Technology for Development, China
Gao Changlin |
| European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA), Spain
William Cockburn | Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO), Hungary
Judith Lakatos |