

12<sup>th</sup> February 2015

# **Eurofound external multiannual programme evaluation – Ex post evaluation of 2009-2012 Work Programme**

**Annexes – Final Report**

© 2015 Ipsos MORI – all rights reserved.

The contents of this report constitute the sole and exclusive property of Ipsos MORI. Ipsos MORI retains all right, title and interest, including without limitation copyright, in or to any Ipsos MORI trademarks, technologies, methodologies, products, analyses, software and know-how included or arising out of this report or used in connection with the preparation of this report. No licence under any copyright is hereby granted or implied.

The contents of this report are of a commercially sensitive and confidential nature and intended solely for the review and consideration of the person or entity to which it is addressed. No other use is permitted and the addressee undertakes not to disclose all or part of this report to any third party (including but not limited, where applicable, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act 2000) without the prior written consent of the Company Secretary of Ipsos MORI.

# Contents

- Annex A:** Qualitative topic guides
- Annex B:** List of Eurofound staff interviewees
- Annex C:** List of external interviewees
- Annex D:** User satisfaction survey
- Annex E:** Voting session questions
- Annex F:** List of case study examples
- Annex G:** Case studies
- Annex H:** User survey analysis
- Annex I:** Voting session analysis
- Annex J:** Glossary

# ANNEX A: Qualitative topic guides for consultations with internal and external stakeholders

Included in this section are the three topic guides used for consultations with different stakeholders as part of the evaluation. The topic guides used for internal and external staff are included in full while a summary of the topic guide used for consultations with users is included.

- Section A.1 includes the topic guide used for consultations with internal Eurofound staff
- Section A.2 includes the topic guide used for consultations with external stakeholders
- Section A.3 includes a summary of the topic guide used for consultations with Eurofound output users

## A.1 Topic guide for consultations with internal Eurofound staff

**Instructions to interviews:** This topic guide is designed to guide discussions with policy stakeholders and internal staff as part of the scoping research. The primary objectives of these consultations are to obtain an **overview of the processes that were employed to plan and deliver the Work Programme 2009-2012 (ex-post) and inform development of the next multi-annual programme (2017 onwards) [ex-ante]**.

Not all topic areas highlighted below will be relevant to each stakeholder: areas of relevance have been mapped to individuals in the Scoping Map, though interviewers will need to check this in the opening questions and tailor the interview accordingly.

### a. Involvement in WP 2009-2012 and informed view on evaluation questions

1. Could you give me an overview of what specific involvement you have had in four year programme period 2009-2012?

- *Were you involved in Policy design and objectives-setting for this four year programme?*
- *Do you have good understanding of Eurofound's activities and outputs and priorities of EU social partners?*
- *In your view, to what extent have the objectives stated for the 2009-2012 four year programme been achieved?*
- *Do you have a view on the means by which and to what extent Eurofound's activities contributed to policy developments?*
- *Can you comment on your views to what extent Eurofound's resources (money and people) have been deployed efficiently to achieve the objectives?*
- *Do you have a view on the extent to which Eurofound has contributed to 'EU added value'?*

*Enter a tick in the table below and use this as a framework for selecting which questions are relevant. Note: not all stakeholders will have been involved in the design or delivery of WP2009-2012*

<b>Set of questions</b>	
<b>Relevance – Policy design and rationale</b>	
<b>Coherence – activities and outputs priorities of policymakers and social partners</b>	
<b>Effectiveness – activities and outputs and impact on policy</b>	
<b>Efficiency – resources deployed to achieve the objectives</b>	
<b>Value added</b>	

## b. Relevance (Policy Design and rationale)

2. What was the process for establishing the Eurofound's 'intervention logic' and identifying relevant activities for the work programme?

3. How did this process ensure alignment to the needs of socio-economic policy-makers and stakeholders?

- *Were these involved if yes, which ones were consulted?*

4. How did the work programme preparation (consultation of stakeholders, process etc.) ensure the priorities of the EU socio-economic policy makers and EU social partners are reflected in Eurofound's activities/outputs?

5. Why does Eurofound do what Eurofound does?

- *In your understanding, what is Eurofound's main rationale?*
- *To what extent has it changed over time and specifically during 2009-2012? (Which years did any significant changes occur?)*

To what extent have the organisational changes in 2011 affected the rationale / mission and EF's ability to implement it? (Positively or negatively?)

*Ex ante Question 1: Should anyone else be consulted in the design in development of the next multi-annual programme (2017 onwards)?*

- *Are there any (existing or new) organisations in the relevant policy landscape?*

*Ex ante Question 2: How should Eurofound's mission change in future in order to stay / become more relevant in future?*

*Ex ante Question 3: Are there any (existing or new) organisations that could be considered a competitive threat for Eurofound in the future programming period*

## c. Coherence

6. To what extent do Eurofound's activities / outputs reflect the priorities of the EU socio-economic policy makers, and EU social partners?

- *How are the priorities of EU socio-economic policy makers, and EU social partners translated into Eurofound's activities?*
- *What structures / processes are in place to ensure this reflection?*
- *How is coherence with other agencies ensured?*

*Ex ante Question 4: What changes can be made in the future to ensure better coherence between Eurofound's activities and the priorities of the EU socio-economic policy makers, and EU social?*

#### **d. Effectiveness**

7. How responsive was Eurofound to unforeseen changes arising notably from the economic and financial crisis during the programming period?

- *Can you identify instances when programme or project objectives were changed or methodologies adapted for changed circumstances?*
- *Were there any new topics identified during annual work programming development processes relating / responding to the changing environment in Europe?*

8. Can you identify any gaps / priorities which were not covered in 2009-2012 (compared to the commitments undertaken in the programme document)?

- *Are there any objectives that haven't been sufficiently addressed?*
- *Did all planned activities actually take place? If not, why not?*
- *Were any unfinished projects carried over to the next WP?*

9. To what extent did Eurofound fulfil the expectations set out in the programming?

- *Were all topics that were selected fully (?) implemented? (were the needs of those Eurofound wanted to serve met)*
- *Were all methods and instruments optimally utilised? (methodology, quality assurance, etc)*
- *Did Eurofound reach its target audience? (people, products, placement)*

10. In your view, to what extent are Eurofound's outputs delivered in time for decisions by stakeholders?

- *How effective are the specific processes such as hot spots in achieving alignment with major policy developments?*
- *Was there any major misalignment / policy deadline missed and why?*

11. To what extent does Eurofound's research take account of and builds on previous / existing research?

- *To your knowledge, to what extent do Eurofound projects effectively build on / follow-up on previous research conducted by either Eurofound and/or other organisations?*
- *If this took place to a large extent, what was the reason for Eurofound rather than another (organisation conducting this follow-up research)?*

12. To what extent did (do) Eurofound's structures and processes support the implementation of the [2009-2012] programme and the achievement of its objectives?

- *Governing Board structures*
- *Advisory Committees*
- *Work programme decision-making processes.*

13. To what extent do Eurofound's activities and outputs contribute to relevant socio-economic policy developments?

- *Can you point towards any such developments in 2009-2013?*
- *Are there any (named?) policy-makers on EU or national level who can explain how Eurofound's activities have contributed towards these policy developments?*

*Ex ante Question 5: What can be changed in future multiannual programme development processes to ensure early identification of (research?) gaps?*

*Ex ante Question 6: Can you point towards any emerging topics for the next multi-annual programme (2017 onwards)?*

*Ex ante Question 7: Can you point towards any novel research methodologies to be considered as relevant for the next multi-annual programme (2017 onwards)?*

*Ex ante Question 8: Were there any organisations that should be targeted by Eurofound's research and have not been reached?*

#### e. Added value

14. In your view, what is the unique added value of Eurofound?

- *Could any of the research / activities be undertaken outside Eurofound's structures and achieve the same objectives?*

## A.2 Topic guide for consultations with external stakeholders

**Instructions to interviews:** This topic guide is designed to guide discussions with external stakeholders. The overall aim of the evaluation is twofold: (1) to evaluate the extent to which the commitments made by Eurofound in the 2009-2012 work programme and its constituent annual work programmes have been achieved and (2) collect views on the Agency's changing mission in the coming years to feed into the next multiannual work programme. These interviews form a part of the research for this assignment, and we aim to obtain views on the key evaluation issues.

Stakeholders will be sent a list of key projects undertaken by the Foundation in the relevant work period as a reminder. Please ensure you have this to hand and that they have received a copy.

### a. Introduction

Thank participant for taking part, Introduce Ipsos MORI and the evaluation

Explain confidentiality – the interviews are undertaken in confidence and at no point will we attribute a statement to an interviewee (unless requested by the interviewee). Highlighting examples of policy impacts on national level might point towards identifying the origin of input. We welcome all input and if the interviewee wishes to express their views on negative aspects of a project or publication, we will ensure this is presented in non-attributable manner. For example if a publication did not respond to the needs of a group of member states, we will not list the member states but say that it was limited in its relevance across the EU member states.

### Role and responsibilities

1.1 Can you tell me a little bit about your role and your involvement with Eurofound?

- *Were you in this role throughout the period 2009-2012? (if not, what were you doing previously)*

## b. Relevance (Policy Design and rationale)

### 2.1. Why does Eurofound do what Eurofound does?

- *In your understanding, what were the ambitions (or planned achievements or objectives) of Eurofound during this period?*
- *How much influence do you have and should you have over this process? Why?*
- *To what extent has it changed over time and specifically during 2009-2012? (Which years did any significant changes occur)?*

### 2.2 To what extent, if at all, do you feel Eurofound's activities and outputs in the 2009-2012 period aligned to your needs?

- *Were there topic areas that were covered by Eurofound that were crucial to your work?*
- *Were there any topics that Eurofound covered which nobody else did, and you found useful?*
- *Can you identify any gaps / priorities which were not covered in 2009-2012? Was there anything you expected them to cover and could not find?*

### 2.3. How much influence do you have and should you have over this process? Why?

- *To what extent has it changed over time and specifically during 2009-2012?*

## c. Coherence

***Refer respondent to list of projects sent in advance of the interview. Note to the interviewee that the surveys were seen as a strategic activity and refer to any flagship publications.***

***The main strategic objectives for the programme period were:***

- ***Be a reliable source of high quality data, information and analysis, identify emerging issues for research and debate***
- ***Strengthen the tripartite character and stakeholder relationships of Eurofound's activities***

### 3.1. To what extent do you consider Eurofound's activities in 2009-2012 to be a coherent work programme?

By this I mean both

- *internally consistent – did the different activities and outputs work together to achieve Eurofound's stated aims, and*
- *externally consistent – did the different activities and outputs complement the work of other European bodies/agencies?*



#### d. Effectiveness

4.1 How well do you feel Eurofound's activities and outputs in the 2009-2012 period met your needs? To what extent did they contribute to your work?

If appropriate: And to what extent did they contribute to socio-economic policy developments (at EU level or in member states)?

- *Do you have any concrete examples of this? Can you point towards any such developments?*
- *Are there any (named?) policy-makers on EU or national level who can explain how Eurofound's activities have contributed towards these policy developments?*
- *IF NO EXAMPLES – why not? Are there things Eurofound could have done to increase the likelihood of this? (PROBE: timeliness, topics, format, publicising widely)*

4.2 One of Eurofound's strategic objectives during the period was to 'strengthen tripartite character and stakeholder relationships of Eurofound's activities'. To what extent do you think that it did this?

- *How much influence did you have and should you have had over this process? Why?*
- *To what extent has it changed over time and specifically during 2009-2012?*

4.3 How (by which means) do the activities and outputs of Eurofound contribute to relevant socio-economic policy developments?

- *PROBE: Contribution to impact assessment, presentation of new proposals, quotation by official reports, quotation in scientific papers, etc?*

4.4. In your view, to what extent are Eurofound's outputs delivered in time to inform decisions being taken by you and your colleagues?

- *Can you identify any research outputs that demonstrate responsiveness of Eurofound to unforeseen changes arising notably from the economic and financial crisis during the 2009-2012 programming period?*
- *Was there any major misalignment / any policy which could have been informed by Eurofound research which was published after a decision was made?*
- *What examples can you think of where Eurofound successfully or unsuccessfully anticipated emerging (new) topics and future needs, and used innovative methodologies in the 2009-2012 programming period?*

4.5 In your opinion, to what extent does Eurofound's research take account of and build on previous / existing research?

## e. Added value

5.1 In your view, what is the unique added value of Eurofound?

- *Could any of the research / activities be undertaken outside Eurofound's structures and achieve the same objectives?*
- *How would the EU be different if Eurofound didn't exist?*
- *What does Eurofound do that nobody else does and what impact does this have?*

**f. Eurofound in the future** (if time is running out, ask to extend the interview slightly as these questions are important)

6.1 How do you think Eurofound's objectives should change in future in order to stay / become more relevant to you/your organisation?

- *If the interviewee notes that it would be helpful to know the current objective: it is to provide high-quality, timely and policy-relevant knowledge as input to better informed policies in four priority areas:*
  1. Increasing labour market participation and combating unemployment by creating jobs, improving labour market functioning and promoting integration.
  2. Improving working conditions and making work sustainable throughout the life course.
  3. Developing industrial relations to ensure equitable and productive solutions in a changing policy context.
  4. Improving standards of living and promoting social cohesion in the face of economic disparities and social inequalities.

6.2 What organisations (existing or new) do you think might overlap with Eurofound's mission in the future programming period, if any?

6.3 What new activities, services or types of publications would you appreciate from Eurofound for the future? And, is there anything they should stop doing?

- How can they improve relevance to yourself, EU socio-economic policy makers, and EU social partners more generally?

6.4 Can you point towards any:

1. Emerging topics for the next multi-annual programme (2017 onwards)?
2. Novel (research) methodologies to be considered as relevant for next multi-annual programme (2017 onwards)?
3. Organisations that would find Eurofound's research helpful but might not be aware of it? (new potential users)

## f. Wrap-up

**Is there anything else you would like to comment on in relation to the evaluation? Is there anyone else in your organisation who should be consulted?**

### A.3 Topic guide for consultations with Eurofound output users

#### Interview summary

Section	Aims
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orientation and outline of the structure of the interview</li> <li>• Appraisal of the extent to which interviewees were users' of Eurofound activities and outputs in 2009-2012 period (or not)</li> </ul>
Questions relating to Eurofound's 2009-2012 programming period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To obtain interviewees' views on activities and outputs of Eurofound in period 2009-2012.</li> <li>• To gain interviewees' assessments of the relevance and impacts of 2009-2012 research on policy developments</li> </ul>
Introduction to user satisfaction section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To introduce a detailed discussion of interviewees' usage of Eurofound publications over the past year</li> </ul>
Overall usage of Eurofound publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For interviewees to describe their overall usage of Eurofound publications in the past year</li> </ul>
Usage of most important publication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To explore in detail how interviewees practically use the Eurofound publication they view as most important to their work</li> </ul>
Overall satisfaction with Eurofound's outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To explore interviewees' satisfaction across the Eurofound publications used in the past year</li> <li>• Possible areas of improvement</li> </ul>
Questions about the future developments of Eurofound's work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To obtain views on future user needs and implications for next programming period (2017 onwards)</li> </ul>
Last remarks, thanks and close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capture any final thoughts and close interview</li> </ul>

## ANNEX B: List of interviewees (Eurofound staff)

Name	Role
<b>David Foden</b>	Chair sub-group 'monitoring and trends development'; also: sub-group 'survey development'
<b>Donald Storrle</b>	WP development group member (European adjustment to change); also: sub-group 'monitoring and trends development'; New research area (c. Jobs monitor / ERM (EMCC) / NEETS)
<b>Erika Mezger</b>	Deputy Director (since July 2009) (successor of previous Deputy Director, Willy Buschak (ca 2002 (tbc) - 2009)
<b>Greet Vermeylen</b>	Sub-group 'survey development'
<b>Jim Halpenny</b>	Head of ICT
<b>Jorma Karppinen</b>	Former director of Eurofound
<b>Juan Menendez-Valdes</b>	New Director (Dec 2010 - current)
<b>Markus Grimmeisen</b>	Head of Administration (incl Finance); remaining member of 'supervisory group' Secretary to Gov. Board
<b>Mary McCaughey</b>	WP development group member (Communication)
<b>Mattanja de Boer</b>	WP development group member (chair)
<b>Ray Comerford</b>	Head of Human Resources
<b>Robert Anderson</b>	WP development group member (social cohesion); New research area (Migration)
<b>Sylvie Jacquet</b>	WP development group member (European debate), Brussels Liaison Office

## ANNEX C: List of interviewees (external)

The list below contains all the stakeholders consulted as part of this evaluation. All interviews were undertaken by phone and took between 30 minutes and an hour and a half. As part of the consultations and in advance of the interviews, stakeholders were sent a list of main projects undertaken by the Foundation in the 2009-12 Work Programme as an aide memoire.

	Job Title	Organisation
<b>Alfonso Arpaia</b>	Head of Sector – Labour market analysis	DG for Economic and Financial Affairs
<b>Aviana Bulgarelli</b>	General Director	Italian Istituto per lo Sviluppo della Formazione Professionale dei Lavoratori
<b>Bartek Lassaer</b>	Socio-Economic Analyst – Economist	DG Employment
<b>Eric Meyermans</b>	Economic Analyst	DG Employment
<b>Kasia Jurzak</b>	Policy analyst	DG Employment
<b>Guido Schwartz</b>	Policy Officer	DG Employment
<b>Jean Lambert</b>	MEP	European Parliament
<b>Jean Paul Tricart</b>	Head of Unit, European Social Dialogue	DG Employment
<b>Jozef Niemiec</b>	Deputy General Secretary	European Trade Union Confederation, (ETUC)
<b>Juha Antila</b>	Development Manager	The Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions, SAK

<b>Lambert Kleinman</b>	Policy Officer	DG Employment
<b>Lieve Franssen</b>	Director, Europe 2020: Social Policies	DG Employment
<b>Liliane Volozonskis</b>	Director Social Affairs	European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, (UEAPME)
<b>Luciano Forlani</b>	Dirigente INPA	Italian Ministry of Labour and Social Policies
<b>Magdalena Bober</b>	Advisor	Business Europe
<b>Mats Essemyr</b>	Research Officer	Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees (TCO)
<b>Maureen O'Neill</b>	President of SOC section	European Economic and Social Committee, (EESC)
<b>Paul Cullen</b>	Principal officer, Labour Market and EU-EPSCO Coordination	Irish Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation
<b>Pervenche Beres</b>	MEP	European Parliament
<b>Rita Skrebiskiene</b>	Director	Lithuanian Department, Ministry of Social Security and Labour
<b>Tim Van Rie</b>	Policy analyst	DG Employment
<b>Tom Bevers</b>	Advisor	Belgian Service public fédéral Emploi, Travail et Concertation sociale
<b>Vladka Komel</b>	Secretary	Slovenian Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs

The below table breaks down the stakeholders we consulted as part of this evaluation according to organisation type.

	Number of stakeholders consulted
<b>European Commission</b>	9
<b>National Ministries</b>	5
<b>Trade Unions</b>	3
<b>European Parliament</b>	2
<b>Employers organisations</b>	2
<b>Other multi-representative institutions</b>	2

# ANNEX D: User Satisfaction Survey questionnaire

Included in this Annex are the two sections of the User Satisfaction Survey questionnaire developed by GfK relevant to the evaluation. These are Section 1, asking about the profile of the respondents, and Section 3, the evaluation module. Section 2, asks respondents about the Usage and Satisfaction with Eurofound publications, and is the subject of a separate report published by GfK group and is not included here.

## GfK Group User Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire 2014

### HIDDEN VARIABLES [NOT ASKED TO RESPONDENT]

#### HV1

Panel Member [INVITED BY EMAIL]	1
Other Eurofound user [INVITED BY EMAIL]	2

## Section 1 – profile

### 1. What does your job mainly involve?

Please select one answer which best reflects your role.

[SINGLE RESPONSE]

[DO NOT RANDOMISE – USE THIS ORDER]

Shaping policy, i.e. taking decisions on policies	1
Advising on policy, i.e. providing advice and information to those who take decisions on policies	2
Research	3
Communication and dissemination (externally or internally)	4
Advocacy and lobbying	6
Intermediation and mediation between parties	5
Other roles - Please specify [INSERT TEXT BOX]	97

### 2. Are you a member of Eurofound's Governing Board and/or an Advisory Committee?

Yes	1
No	2



### 3. Which of the following best describes the employer that you work for?

[SINGLE RESPONSE]

EU Commission	1	Business organisation / private company / trade or professional organizations	7
European Council	2	Think tank/research organisation	8
European Parliament	3	Employer Organisation	9
European Economic and Social Committee	4	Government	10
Committee of the Regions	5	International Organisation	11
Other EU body – Please indicate organisation [INSERT TEXT BOX]	6	NGO, International NGO	12
University	15	Political Institution (Parliaments, Others) Federal / National / Regional	13
		Trade Union Organisation	14
		Other organisation – Please indicate organisation [INSERT TEXT BOX]	98

[AUTOMATICALLY RECODE INTO VARIABLE “EUROFOUND USER TYPES”:

1. Eurofound PRIMARY target group: CODES 1-6, 9, 10, 14
2. Eurofound SECONDARY target group: CODES 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15
3. OTHER Eurofound users: CODE 98]

### 4. In which country do you mainly work?

[SINGLE RESPONSE]

[INSERT DROPDOWN LIST]

Country		Country	
		Lithuania	17
Austria	1	Luxembourg	18
Belgium	2	Malta	19
Bulgaria	3	Netherlands	20
Croatia	4	Poland	21
Cyprus	5	Portugal	22
Czech Republic	6	Romania	23
Denmark	7	Slovakia	24
Estonia	8	Slovenia	25
Finland	9	Spain	26

France	10	Sweden	27
Germany	11	UK	28
Greece	12	Serbia	29
Hungary	13	Turkey	30
Italy	14	Iceland	31
Ireland	15	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	32
Latvia	16	Montenegro	33
Other - Please specify [INSERT TEXT BOX]	98		

## Section 2 – Usage and Satisfaction with Eurofound publications

*Not included here*

## Section 3 - EVALUATION MODULE

ASK ALL

Eurofound has commissioned Ipsos MORI to undertake an external evaluation of its work programme 2009 – 2012 and collect information about its next work programme (commencing 2017). As part of this exercise please answer the following questions.

ASK ONLY IF BOARD MEMBER AT Q2

Ipsos MORI attended the working group meeting in June and will attend the Governing Board meeting in October where similar questions will be asked. Therefore, if you feel you have already contributed to the study, please feel free to skip this section. How would you like to proceed?

1. I'd like to skip this section – SCRIPT TO SKIP TO LAST SECTION
2. I'd like to answer the questions anyway – SCRIPT TO CONTINUE TO QE1

[NEW SCREEN]

A list of the research projects completed by Eurofound in the 2009-12 work programme can be found by clicking on the link below. Please take a look through these to remind yourself of them.

- INSERT LINK TO A POP-UP WINDOW WITH THE LIST

QE1 Were you aware of Eurofound's publications and activities in period 2009-2012?

REVERSE SCALE

*Yes*

*No*

*Don't know*

IF YES OR DK AT QE1

QE1a In period 2009-2012 did you use any of Eurofound's publications and activities?

REVERSE SCALE

*Yes*

*No*

*Don't know*

IF NO AT QE1

**QE1b Would the Eurofound publications and activities have been relevant to you in 2009-12?**

REVERSE SCALE

Yes

No

Don't know

[FILTER: RESPONDENTS ANSWERING YES or Don't know to QE1a GO TO QE2]

[FILTER RESPONDENTS ANSWERING NO to QE1 or QE1a GO TO Q10]

**QE2 To what extent, if at all, do you think that Eurofound's activities and publications produced in 2009-2012 contributed to socio-economic policy developments?**

REVERSE SCALE

<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>To some extent</b>	<b>To a small extent</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

IF CODE 1 OR 2 AT QE2

**QE2a By which means did Eurofound's activities and outputs contribute to relevant socio-economic policy developments? We are especially interested how Eurofound impacts on the national level (Government and social partners).**

Contribution to policy impact assessments	1
Preparation of new policy proposals	2
Citation in official reports	3
Citation in scientific papers	4
<i>Other please specify:</i>	5

IF CODE 1 OR 2 AT QE2

**QE2b Which was the most important policy development significantly influenced by Eurofound's publications and activities that you are aware of?**

OPEN END

IF CODE 3 OR 4 AT QE2

**QE2c Why do you think that Eurofound's activities and outputs [only contributed to a small extent / did not contribute] to relevant socio-economic policy developments?**

OPEN END

ASK ALL

**QE3 How responsive was Eurofound to unforeseen changes arising, notably from the economic and financial crisis during the 2009-2012 programming period?**

REVERSE SCALE

Very responsive	Fairly responsive	Not very responsive	Not at all responsive	Don't know
-----------------	-------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	------------

IF CODE 1 OR 2 AT QE3

**QE3a** Why do you say that it was very/fairly responsive to changes? Please give examples of projects/specific outputs if you can.

OPEN END

--

**QE4 In your opinion, to what extent, if at all, did Eurofound's research in the period 2009-12 take into account existing research?**

REVERSE SCALE

To a large extent	To some extent	To a small extent	Not at all	Don't know
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------	------------

**QE5 Eurofound's research applies a variety of research methods. Would you say that the level of rigour in the methods applied during 2009-2012 was**

REVERSE SCALE

Less rigorous than I require	More rigorous than I require	About right	Don't know
------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------	------------

**QE6 How frequently were Eurofound's outputs delivered in time for policymakers to make better informed decisions?**

Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Never	Don't know
--------	--------	-----------	-------	------------

**QE7 To what extent do you consider Eurofound's activities in 2009-2012 to be a coherent set of activities?**

To a large extent	To some extent	To a small extent	Not at all	Don't know
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------	------------

**QE8 To what extent do you feel Eurofound demonstrated expertise when delivering publications and activities in 2009-2012?**

To a large extent	To some extent	To a small extent	Not at all	Don't know
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------	------------

**QE9 To what extent, if at all, was Eurofound's work in 2009-2012 valuable to you?**

To a large extent	To some extent	To a small extent	Not at all	Don't know
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------	------------

IF CODE 1 OR 2 AT QE9

**QE9a** What characteristic of Eurofound's work in 2009-2012 did you value the most?

MULTICODE OK *Tripartite governance*

*European coverage*

*Rigorous methodologies*

14-050532-01 v1 | Client use only

*Reputation*

*Reliable trend data*

*Information not available elsewhere*

*Other, please specify*

ONLY THOSE ANSWERING NO to QE1 or QE1a GO TO Q10

**Q10 To what extent, if at all, is Eurofound's current work valuable to you?**

To a large extent	To some extent	To a small extent	Not at all	Don't know
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------	------------

IF CODE 1 OR 2 AT QE10

**QE10a** What characteristic of Eurofound's work do you value the most?

MULTICODE OK

*Tripartite governance*

*European coverage*

*Rigorous methodologies*

*Reputation*

*Reliable trend data*

*Information not available elsewhere*

*Other, please specify*

ASK ALL

*Eurofound's current strategic objective for 2013–2016 is to provide high-quality, timely and policy-relevant knowledge as input to better informed policies in four priority areas:*

*1 Increasing labour market participation and combating unemployment by creating jobs, improving labour market functioning and promoting integration.*

*2 Improving working conditions and making work sustainable throughout the life course.*

*3 Developing industrial relations to ensure equitable and productive solutions in a changing policy context.*

*4 Improving standards of living and promoting social cohesion in the face of economic disparities and social inequalities.*

**QE11** What should Eurofound's future strategic objectives be in order to stay / become more relevant in the period 2017 onwards? *OPEN END*

[MOVE TO SEPARATE SCREEN]

---

Thank you very much for completing the Eurofound Annual User Survey for 2014.

# ANNEX E: Voting session questions

*On 24<sup>th</sup> of October 2014 the evaluation team ran a voting session with all present members of the governing board at the meeting<sup>1</sup> (agenda point 8). Below details all the questions the governing board responded to.*

## List of questions

Q1. Were you a member of the Governing Board, or aware of Eurofound's work, during the 2009-2012 period?

Q2. To what extent, if at all, do you think that Eurofound's activities and publications produced in 2009-2012 contributed to socio-economic policy developments?

Q3. In your view, what was the most important means by which Eurofound contributed to relevant socio-economic policy development?

Q4. In your view, how responsive was Eurofound to the unforeseen changes arising, notably from the economic and financial crisis during 2009-2012 programme period?

Q5. In your opinion to what extent did Eurofound structures and processes support the implementation of the 2009-2012 work programme?

Q6a. Was Eurofound's collaboration with the following organisation appropriate during 2009-2012 period?

- EU-OSHA (Bilbao)
- CEDEFOP (Thessaloniki)
- ETF (Turin)
- OECD
- ILO

(Options of response were either: Yes, No, or I don't know enough about Eurofound's collaboration with X to comment)

Q7. Which group of the Eurofound Governing Board do you represent?

---

<sup>1</sup> 53 members of the governing board signed in and 43 signed out

# Annex F: List of case study examples for ex-post evaluation of Eurofound's 2009-2012 Work Programme

## 1.1 Introduction

The table overleaf presents the list of proposed projects to be included as case studies by research unit<sup>1</sup> (Employment and Change – EMPC, Working Conditions and Industrial Relations – WCIR, Living Conditions and Quality of Life – LCQL).

The case study list contains the final selection of 6 projects. This selection also adheres to other selection criteria such as the size of project and types of methods applied.

The list was constructed based on input from the workshops with members of the governing board, stakeholder interviews, user survey and interviews, and consultations with the Evaluation Steering Group.

---

<sup>1</sup> Number of Research Units was reduced during the period of the Work Programme in the process of reorganisation. The list refers to the current organisation of work.

Case study information				Measure of impact			Justification
Shortlist no.	Project name	Res. Unit	Size	Impact (overall)	Downloads	No. EU documents quoting	Comment on justifications for inclusion
EMPC 1	Youth employment: Challenges and solutions for higher participation of young people in the labour market	EMPC	Small	High	Medium	71	Triggered a discussion and provided the basis for a very interesting policy debate which in the end led to agenda setting and a policy development. (Youth Guarantee).
WCIR 1	European Working Conditions Survey	WCIR	Large	High	High	85	One if not the most successful project in terms of downloads and citations in official documents. Widely used by policymakers.
WCIR 2	Representativeness Study on the Audio-visual sector	WCIR	Small	Low	Low/Information N/A	0	A relatively low performing project in terms of number of users. Interesting example from a methodological point.
WCIR 3	European Company Survey	WCIR	Large	Low	Medium	30	Highlighting responsiveness by refocusing the data being collected. Impact on common understanding of issues among the EU member states.
WCIR 5	EIRO CAR Posted Workers	WCIR	Medium	Low	Low/Information N/A	6	The project presents an example in which Eurofound set out to find out what the reality looked like with regards to a relatively controversial issue of sending and receiving workers on EU level. It demonstrates value of tripartite structure as employers' interests differ from those of the governments and workers organisations.
LCQL 5	Income after retirement	LCQL	Small	Low	Low/Information N/A	3	Activity of People Aged 50+ policy developments in Poland.



# Annex G – Case Studies

## EIRO CAR Posted Workers

### Introduction and justification for inclusion

This case study was selected as an example of a ‘medium size’ project within the Industrial Relations and workplace development Unit with a high number of downloads (14,896) but having a low impact as measured by the number of documents referencing the project in the Eurofound EU Impact Tracking database. The project had six specific quotations in the Eurofound EU Impact Tracking database, and three Hotspots identified.

The topic of posted workers was chosen as one of the Comparative Analytical Reports (CAR) relating to industrial relations and organisation of work through the Network of European Correspondents. Eurofound published its first CAR in 2003 on this topic, completed at this time because the deadline for the 96/71/EC Posted Workers Directive had recently elapsed. The 2003 report was updated with the publication of the report “Posted Workers in the European Union” in 2010 which is the subject of this case study.

### Project objective

The objective of the project was to provide an overview of the context of the 96/71/EC Directive and to update the 2003 report. The primary reasons for the update of the 2003 report on posted workers in 2010 were twofold:

- The topic of posted workers was hotly debated, mainly due to several controversial European Court of Justice (ECJ) rulings on the matter, in particular the cases of Laval in Sweden/Latvia (EU0801019I, SE0801019I, SE0706029I), Viking Line in Finland/Estonia (EU0706029I, EU0605029I) and Rueffert in Germany/Netherlands (EU0805029I). It was therefore important for Eurofound to update the previous report in light of these rulings.
- The EU expansions in 2004 and 2007 meant that there was a need to include data on the posting of workers from the new member states.

At the time of the CAR on posted workers much research was conducted on the topic because of the ECJ rulings and the confusion around the meaning of the Directive.

The proposal for the project was accepted after much negotiating in the Eurofound Governing Board. The topic is particularly sensitive, with the employers and the trade unions having opposing views on the free movement of labour under the Posting of Workers Directive. The employers were of the view that there should be no barriers to services within the EU, while the trade unions were of the opinion that the rights of the workers and the trade unions must come first. The Directive should be applied in view to ensure protection of the workers’ rights; and also that companies offering services abroad and companies hosting posted workers comply with these rights.

### Project inception

The report generated much discussion among the European Social partners, mainly around the wording of the report. Stakeholders wanted to make sure that the report was kept neutral, not expressing either stakeholder’s view too strongly.

The questionnaire was developed in association with a contractor from the University of Milan who were also national correspondents for EIRO. At the time, the choice of an overview report contractor was done according to the presentation of the list of CAR planned during the following year, the expression of interest of some potential contractors and the selection of the proposals. The questionnaire was developed in collaboration between the

internal Eurofound team and the contractor. It was kept simple by mainly focussing on updating the 2003 report, on evolution and new member states (MS), and Social Partners (SP) actions. The questionnaire was designed to capture developments on the implementation of the 96/71/EC Directive, especially given the ECJ rulings, as well as the impact of, and response to, the Directive from the member countries and the European Social Partners (ESPs).

## **Project execution**

The internal project team consisted of the lead researcher acting as the research manager and one trainee. They worked on this project along with the two contractors from the University of Milan. Desk research to inform the questionnaire included the EC documents informing the 96/71/EC Directive and the Directive itself, as well as the Eurofound 2003 report on posted workers.

The standard CAR methodology was employed for this project. The questionnaire developed was sent to the national EIRO correspondents who completed the survey by consulting relevant actors in their country. The relevant information collected was sent to the correspondents as background to the project, with a particular recommendation to consult the 2003 national reports and the summary report before filling out the survey.

## Challenges

While the difference in quality of the EIRO correspondents constituted a challenge for this project as for the others, a far bigger problem was the availability of data in the different countries. The topic of posted workers was not seen as a priority for certain member states, reflected in poor quality data and, in some cases, a lack of data for certain sections of the questionnaire. Some countries lacked data or even a procedure for gathering data on, and the tracking of the posted workers which were stationed in their countries or which have been posted from their country to another. While the report did not focus on such quantitative aspects of the issue, it impacted on the qualitative data collection as well, and it was difficult for some of the correspondents to obtain reliable numbers, making the data less trustworthy and comparable.

The interest at national level in the topic was very varied.. The project objective did not include finding out about the number of posted workers in each of the EU countries, but one of the findings of the study was the fact that data was lacking in many countries on this basic information around posted workers. Furthermore, for many of the measures in the questionnaire, data was not comparable across countries and therefore could not be included. The two sectors which were most engaged were the construction sector and the food industry.

Due to some problems in finding information about the topic in certain countries and, in certain sectors within countries, the project took slightly longer than anticipated, one year rather than the nine months normally envisaged for a CAR. It should be noted here that the average foreseen length is mainly devised for budgetary reasons and has been increasingly difficult to work within for a number of reasons: the main being the increase in the number of national contributions, the decrease in national correspondents' seniority and the increased complexity of identifying the appropriate people to speak to in the European Social Partner organisations (ESPs).

## **Dissemination of results**

The project was regarded a contentious topic and as such it was promoted modestly in comparison to some other Eurofound projects. Views are two-sided and the dissemination is focused on specific user groups, such as the ESPs and specific committees at the European Parliament. The Brussels Liaison Office (BLO) managed to identify the key players in the field in order to generate the maximum impact for the project. Posting of workers was a relevant topic and at the time of the publication there were many opportunities for presentations within these specific user groups.

The project generated 27 individual country reports of varying quality due to the availability of information and buy-in from the EIRO correspondents, and one overall summary report. The subject is mainly relevant at the EU-wide level, which might explain the total low number of downloads of the country-reports, but higher number of downloads of the overall report.

## Impact

The EC used the Eurofound report as input into a proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services. This proposal was later adopted, on 13th May 2014, as the Posting of Workers Enforcement Directive<sup>1</sup>. The main use of the Eurofound report was as background and context, illustrating the existing problems of the Directive, and it was used in conjuncture with several other documents and research reports on the subject. The reason for this new Directive was the allegation of the non-functioning of the original EU Directive 96/71/EC, sparked by confusion in light of the recent ECJ rulings. Several preparatory events and publications to this change in the Directive also used the Eurofound report as background information, including:

- SWD(2012) 63 and 64 – Commission staff working documents, impact assessment on Revision of the legislative framework on the posting of workers in the context of provision of services<sup>2</sup>
- COM(2012) 131 – Proposition de Directive du Parlement Européen et du Conseil relative à l'exécution de la Directive 96/71/CE concernant le détachement de travailleurs effectué dans le cadre d'une prestation de services<sup>3</sup>
- Various events in 2010 and 2011 for the European Commission in preparation for the proposal at which Eurofound presented and had an input for. Eurofound BLO also organised a lunch debate for the ESPs (on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2010), "Posted Workers: Challenges for Europe", attended by the MEP rapporteur on the issue of posting of workers as commentator. The presentation generated a very intense debate.

The Eurofound report and presentations were very useful as non-controversial background on a very controversial issue. The debate around this issue was more heated than some Commissioners had seen in 20 years. The Eurofound report was useful, as it was not polemic and it represented a document which the ESPs could find sufficient common ground to sign off and adopt. Many other reports developed by employers and employees organisations were presented and debated in the development of this process, naturally these presented more subjective views of one of the parties in the debate.

Apart from the new Directive, the Eurofound report has been used as a background document for several other debates, such as two EP EMPL conferences and an EP IMCO Committee Opinion on special request from a Green MEP. The report has also been used by the EESC SOC and EU NGO Solidar. More recently Eurofound held a joint-national seminar in Lithuania on the posting of workers. Eurofound was requested to assist in hosting the event, including organising speakers and presentations from six EU countries. This is evidence that Eurofound is continuing to lead in the debate around posting workers and that the report is still relevant. However, this report has not been used to directly inform policy options beyond provision of the historical background to the policy debate. This is mainly due to the tripartite structure of the organisation; since research projects have to be agreed upon by both the employers and the employees, no controversial research on the subject is likely to be agreed upon.

<sup>1</sup> Posting of Workers Enforcement Directive, 13 May 2014, <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=sv&catId=89&newsId=2066&furtherNews=yes>, accessed 27/11/2014

<sup>2</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2012:0064:FIN:EN:PDF>

<sup>3</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/prelex/detail\\_dossier\\_real.cfm?CL=en&DosId=201462](http://ec.europa.eu/prelex/detail_dossier_real.cfm?CL=en&DosId=201462)

## Lessons Learnt

### Inception

The initial idea to update an outdated report produced useful background document but failed to be viewed as a proactive research effort which could add value by anticipating changes or change the context or direction of the debate. Nevertheless, the value of Eurofound in mapping the situation was recognised and seen as nice to have.

### Execution

The contractor appointed for this project had strengths both in knowledge of the topic area and the working of the EIRO network which was found to be one of the contributing success factors of the project. Moreover good project management capacity of the contractor helped the completion of the project on time and meant that Eurofound could concentrate on the dissemination of the results and presenting the findings at the EC.

### Dissemination of results and Impact

Despite this being a very controversial subject, especially for a tripartite organisation of Eurofound's structure, the Agency managed to get the project approved and completed. While there was much disagreement and discussion between the trade unions and the employer organisations in the Governing Board, Eurofound managed to compromise and take into account all opinions in the open forum of the Governing Board. The tripartite structure ensured that the final report was balanced and provided an accurate overview of the sector. The fact that a Eurofound report can be trusted as neutral, i.e. presenting all the opinions and views fairly, is in this case added value for the EC, and the report was regularly presented at seminars and conferences leading up to the proposal for a new EU Directive concerning 96/71/EC. However, neutrally written reports on controversial topics are seen by policymakers to have lower ability to steer policy developments.

# Representativeness Study on the Audiovisual Sector

## Introduction and justification for inclusion

This case study was selected as an example of a small project within the Working Conditions and industrial Relations Unit with a relatively low number of downloads (3,676) and low impact as measured by the number of documents in the Eurofound EU impact Tracking database, of which there were none recorded.

The representativeness studies were conducted up until 2006 by the Université Catholique de Louvain. Since then they are conducted by Eurofound, as the agency is considered optimally placed for these studies by the European Commission (EC). Eurofound has a tripartite structure, which directly involves the relevant actors and thus guarantees the quality and the acceptance of the studies at European and national level. Furthermore, Eurofound has a network of EIRO correspondents across Europe to draw upon to conduct these studies, contributing to increased efficiency. The EC requested Eurofound to conduct six representativeness studies, on sectoral level, a year.

## Project objective

The aim of the EIRO series of representativeness studies is to identify the relevant national and supranational social partner organisations in selected sectors. The impetus of these studies arises from the goal of the European Commission to identify the representative European Social Partner (ESP) organisations that must be consulted under the provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and that may initiate social dialogue at European level.

There are three main objectives of the representativeness studies in general, including the representativeness study on the audio-visual sector:

1. The European Commission (EC) must consult the representative European social partner organisations on any policy initiative in the social policy field. In addition, ESPs are expected to be consulted on any other policy initiative with social implications, including for specific sectors. The representativeness studies ensure that, for each of the 43 sectors and/or for the cross-industry level, the major stakeholders, Trade Unions and Employer organisations, are consulted.
2. Participants in sectoral social dialogue committees (SSDC) need to be representative of their sector, both on the workers' and the employers' side. Representativeness studies give legitimacy to this process and the outcomes of this autonomous social dialogue, ensuring that all the relevant organisations are represented at the table.
3. When ESPs negotiate agreements and request their implementation through EU legislation, an assessment will be made by the EC, including of the representativeness of the contracting parties. The latter is particularly important to ensure democratic legitimacy, as these decisions will be the basis for EU-wide, and national legislation.

## Project inception

The EC is the client and direct user of these studies. Each representativeness study is followed up by a Policy Officer at the EC in charge of the sector concerned. The sectors differ in complexity due to the number of actors, trade unions and employer organisations, on EU and national levels.

The questionnaire for the project was co-developed with the EC and discussed with the Eurofound researcher responsible for the project. The Governing Board and Advisory Committees are consulted in the inception phase, but due to the (standardised) nature of the project, there is often little input into the methodology or the content of the project.

Eurofound uses its internal network to put the representativeness studies out to tender. This project was managed externally by an academic from Spain. Two researchers from Eurofound formed part of the project team.

### **Project execution**

The research was undertaken both top-down and bottom-up. The top-down part of the research looked at the EU-level actors and affiliated organisations at national levels. In addition, in order to not miss out on other actors in the sector, each correspondent carried out a bottom-up study to find trade unions and employer organisations which may not be affiliated to one of the EU-level organisations which are part of the SSDC concerned.

The project employed a qualitative methodology, sending out a questionnaire to EIRO correspondents in each EU member state for them to fill out. The national reports produced by these correspondents were not signed off by Eurofound, but they checked them and the external contractor then sent them out to the ESPs for comments.

### Challenges

There were four main challenges with this project related to its execution:

1. Running a project with the number and nature of the actors in the audiovisual sector was a complicated process. This was the first time the academic had managed anything of this sort and Eurofound had to step in to support at certain points in the project. This led to a slight delay.
2. Public service broadcasters, being the only organisations of their sector in a given country, are not members of a national employer organisation but are affiliated directly to the European-level organisation (EBU). This added to the complexity in mapping the actors and who they represent in the sector since the survey was not designed for the EIRO correspondents to consult this category of actors, i.e. individual companies/organisations instead of social partner organisations. Some correspondents flagged this issue while others simply excluded them from the research altogether. After this issue was flagged by the EBU, Eurofound modified some of the research material (i.e. the questionnaire) in order to include them.
3. The same issue applied to one of the other European employer organisations, ACT, representing the major private broadcasters. An additional problem was the lack of cooperation of this organisation. As a consequence, no information on the involvement of ACT members in collective bargaining and the other topics requested was collected.
4. The quality of the national reports was very varied, mainly due to the diverging levels of commitment and the expertise of the EIRO representatives. Some took the time to do thorough research while others did not. This led to some national reports being of lower quality than others, and subsequent loss of trust in findings by some ESPs. Eurofound was aware of this issue and attempted to address it, but there was tension due to the budgetary constraints and the other work which the correspondents were carrying out.

The methodology was refined during the course of the project in order to deal with some of the issues identified above. The focus of representativeness was emphasised, with the national correspondents being told to focus less on giving background on the sectors and instead make sure they took account of the changes in the research tools. This was to make sure all relevant actors were identified by the study. There was also strengthened focus on providing proof of organisations having a mandate to negotiate on behalf of their

members, such as a copy of their statutes or proof of collective bargaining agreements.

Apart from the inception meeting, the ESPs invited Eurofound to a meeting early on in the process. Eurofound was not able to send a representative to this meeting which was unfortunate for the project. It is possible that some of the challenges mentioned above, especially point 2 and 3, may have been flagged and the project might have been able to run smoother. However, the ESPs were present at the inception meeting with Eurofound and they did not seize the opportunity to raise these points then.

Due to the challenges described above the project took longer than envisaged to complete, but the project still successfully managed to capture the characteristics of the major players in the sector. The ESPs consulted sent back around 60 pages of comments in total on the national and overall reports. The large number of comments was mainly due to the sheer number of actors in the sector. The project took around a year and a half to complete.

### **Dissemination of results**

Eurofound publishes their representativeness studies on the website but there is no specific need to disseminate these further due to a narrow user group. All the relevant actors are directly involved in the research process and the result is presented to them and the relevant actors in the EC at the end of the project. Due to the specific objectives, there is little relevance or use for these studies more widely.

The project was presented to the ESPs at the inception phase and then at the end for commenting. There is potentially scope to disseminate representativeness studies more widely, for example to academic users. Eurofound has already seen some use of the representativeness studies in this way, not however in the case of the audiovisual sector study.

### **Impact**

There are no examples of this study leading to any impact on EU policy. It did confirm that the European social partner organisations involved in the audiovisual SSDC are as a whole representative for their sector, both on employer and worker side, which reinforces the legitimacy of any joint text issued by the committee. The study has not yet been used to investigate the representativeness of negotiating parties for agreements in the sector, and no such agreement is expected to be negotiated in the near future.

The sector has agreed on a framework of actions on gender equality in 2011, a text that is not of a legally binding nature. This was published in 2013, prior to the publication of the representativeness study under examination was published. However, using evidence from the previous representativeness study, the EC was able to conclude that the relevant actors were involved in drawing up this text.

### **Lessons Learnt**

#### Execution

Some of the challenges identified in the project, especially the issues of European organisations affiliating individual companies/organisations (instead of national social partners) and the lack of cooperation of one of the European actors, could have been flagged and (possibly) resolved earlier. In order to do so in the future, two learnings emerged from the project which could apply to all representativeness studies:

1. The Eurofound researchers responsible for the representativeness studies need to increase their cooperation with the Policy Officers at the EC. The Policy Officers know their sectors well and may be able to flag such issues at an earlier stage so that these can be taken into account and reduce the risk for unexpected difficulties during the project.

2. The communication between Eurofound and the ESPs in the inception phase of the studies needs to be improved so that issues such as those experienced in the audiovisual study are avoided. The process of learning from this has begun, with the elaboration of a new information sheet on the representativeness studies, specifically addressed to European and national social partner organisations. It includes the request to ESPs to flag any nuances about the sector which may have an impact on the research.



# Fifth European Working Conditions Survey (2010)

## Introduction and justification for inclusion

The fifth European Working Conditions Survey was selected as a case study as an example of a large project within the Working Conditions and Industrial Relations Research Unit, with a high impact and direct links to policy developments on European and National levels. The project was quoted<sup>4</sup> in 114 specific EU policy documents in the EU Impact tracking database (mainly by European Commission International organisations and European Social Partners but also the European Parliament and European Economic and Social Committee). The overview report, one of the Eurofound flagship publications, was among the top five downloaded reports during the period of 2009-2012.

## Project objective

The European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) is the longest running of three surveys that Eurofound regularly repeat that contribute to the planning and establishment of better living and working conditions in Europe. The subject of this case study is the fifth iteration of the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) the fieldwork for which was undertaken in 2010.

The scope of the questionnaire has broadened substantially since the first wave in 1990, to ensure that it represents the reality of work in Europe today. The fifth questionnaire paid special attention to gender mainstreaming and a number of questions were also included to capture the impact of the economic downturn on working conditions. Although the questionnaire has changed, the objectives have not differed between the five waves except a fifth objective that was suggested by the research manager in 2010, to make the policy contribution of the EWCS to quality of work more visible. As they stood in 2010, the objectives were to:

- Assess and quantify the working conditions of both employees and the self-employed across Europe on a harmonised basis;
- Analyse the relationships between different aspects of working conditions;
- Identify groups at risk and issues of concern as well as of progress;
- Monitor trends by providing homogeneous indicators on these issues, and added in 2010:
- Contribute to European policy development in particular on quality of work and employment issues.

## Project inception

As with other Eurofound research projects, the European Working Conditions Survey is dependent on acceptance under an annual Work Programme. The proposal for the fifth wave of the EWCS set out the objectives and the themes that were being suggested for the survey. The theme of gender mainstreaming was proposed by the research unit, as it was considered an important emerging topic, and approved by the Governing Board.

---

<sup>4</sup> As provided by the Brussels Liaison Office on 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2014

Before the proposal a substantial body of work was conducted, namely a review on the feasibility of keeping the three large Eurofound surveys separate. In the end, it was decided not to merge them but a certain level of streamlining of questions was employed to avoid duplication.

The questionnaire development period was led by Eurofound and begun a year in advance of the survey launch. Careful attention was needed to balance the continuous nature of the survey, the needs of data users and the need to update the themes that had been included in the fourth wave: particularly in light of the economic crisis that had occurred. As such, an expert questionnaire development group were formed to develop the questions and to ensure that the questions would provide findings that were relevant to a wide audience of data users. The question-by-question discussions took place over several days and as much of a consensus as possible was sought from the Governing Board on the priorities for development and revision of the questionnaire.

## Project execution

### Methodology

The Fifth European Working Conditions Survey involved face-to-face interviews with a random sample of employees and self-employed people. In total 43,816 face-to-face interviews were carried out in 32 different languages between January and June 2010. The average interview length was 42 minutes and the overall response rate was 44 per cent<sup>5</sup>, although both of these varied greatly by country. In order to increase the response rate, three recalls were made after the initial visit before an address could be defined as a non-contact.

In 2010, three more countries were surveyed than in the 2005 wave (a total of 34 took part in 2010). This extension was made possible by Instrument for the Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) funding. New to 2010 were 'sample top-ups' for three countries: Belgium, Slovenia and France, funded by the countries themselves. The sample top-ups resulted in mutual gain for the countries and the survey: improving analytical ability at a national level while embedding the findings in a European comparative framework.

### Fieldwork

The main stage of the fieldwork was carried out by a network of thirty-five fieldwork partners that were coordinated by one contractor, who competitively tendered for the work. The contractor met formally with Eurofound five times, provided weekly progress reports and contributed to weekly telephone conferences throughout the fieldwork period. The research team recalled being more closely involved with the fieldwork processes and its preparation than had been the case in previous waves of the survey. This was perceived as generating particularly high quality processes and outputs.

Before fieldwork commenced, a pilot stage was conducted between December 7<sup>th</sup> 2009 and January 9<sup>th</sup> 2010 and was managed by the same contractor. Following this, minor changes were then made by Eurofound to the questionnaire: with a focus on gathering more information on the self-employed. As a result of needing to allow for local events (particularly in Norway), while maintaining the strict protocol to be followed before opening a new contact (relevant to full fieldwork period), there was a staged start of fieldwork with some of the countries being three weeks after others. As a result, the main fieldwork period did need to be extended.

The Technical Report produced by Gallup Europe on behalf of Eurofound noted that interviewer retention was more problematic in Belgium, France, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway and Luxembourg than in the other countries where the survey was conducted. In fact the report stated that 'about 500 potential interviewers decided

---

<sup>5</sup> In order to establish EWCS response rates, the calculation scheme developed by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for surveys.

to turn down the opportunity to work on EWCS' due to the length and complexity of the questionnaire<sup>6</sup>. While this meant higher than anticipated allocations to the interviewers who remained, analysis conducted after the fieldwork reported that this did not have any impact on the quality of the interviews<sup>7</sup>.

### Resource and support

The internal project team was comprised of six Eurofound researchers, including a statistician and a project management assistant. However, none of the six worked on the EWCS full-time and the team underwent several changes during the life of the project: the latter was thought to have had an adverse effect on the project, in that skills were lost and new team members needed to be trained.

Eurofound's role was to develop the questionnaire and participate in the development, checking and monitoring of fieldwork protocols as well as to prepare and develop the programme of analysis and carry out some analysis internally. It monitored the fieldwork protocols by the signing off on planning documents and verifying feedback reports that were delivered during the various stages of the fieldwork.

Initially the EWCS had a dedicated Advisory Committee, to provide policy insight prior to the implementation of the project, feedback on draft reports, suggest real life illustrations to relate the research to the current context and to help in disseminating the findings. The Advisory Committee was set to meet with the research team twice a year for a day and a half on each occasion. However, the Advisory Committees' structure was revised during the lifespan of the project so that the EWCS analysis was not overseen by a dedicated Committee. This change was thought to have resulted in the expert stakeholders that made up the initial Committee being less involved in the analytical phase than had previously been the case for EWCS.

### Delays

There was around six months delay in the analysis of the data which, in turn, affected the timely publication of the EWCS overview report. One reason for this delay was the fieldwork for the European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS) being given temporary priority. Researchers working on the EWCS, who were partly committed to the EQLS, were required to transfer from one project to another in the absence of an EQLS researcher (as a result of long-term sick leave). The development of EQLS was at a critical stage at this point and under-resourcing it may have resulted in financial and quality losses.

The delay to the analysis had a significant impact on the planned activities of the Information and Communication unit (I&C) and on Eurofound's ability to feed information to the target group, within the planned timeframe. In lieu of a published report however, the research team presented on the EWCS findings at several events, to reduce the effect of the delays. This also had the effect of contributing feedback from participants into the report. The research teams also utilised resource with the necessary language skills to produce the first findings. These activities to present the findings before the release of a report may be a reason why the delayed timing of the EWCS report was not seen as an issue by any consulted stakeholders.

---

<sup>6</sup> [http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef\\_files/surveys/ewcs/2010/documents/technical.pdf](http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_files/surveys/ewcs/2010/documents/technical.pdf)

## Quality Assurance

Eurofound has developed an important policy on the quality assurance of its surveys. Each survey has an individualised quality control plan. This sets targets and indicators and includes a number of a priori, random or a posteriori checks: amongst which are fieldwork visits. The EWCS team did make visits with interviewers in several countries during fieldwork for quality control purposes. Several additional stages of the research underwent stringent quality assurance processes as a result, with each stage being subject to detailed documentation. Specific controls were put into place to verify compliance with the technical specifications. A report detailing the assessments made about the quality of the EWCS was published by Eurofound in March 2012.<sup>8</sup>

## **Dissemination of results**

A résumé of the first findings was published in 2010 under the title *Changes over time: the fifth European Working Conditions Survey*. The analysis was conducted in-house by five Eurofound researchers. In 2012, the EWCS overview report was published by Eurofound, which was one of the flagship publications for the year, being downloaded over 3,000 times in 2013 alone. The analysis for this report was also conducted in-house by Eurofound staff: many of which were involved at the fieldwork stage.

An important and new development for the 5<sup>th</sup> wave of the EWCS was the development of an integrated programme of analysis. As a result of this, Eurofound published eight analytical reports that were separate to the overview report, in 2012 and 2013. The secondary analysis for these was contracted out: in total 144 proposals were received for the work. More recently, in 2014, three further secondary analyses as well as a report on the policy lessons derived from the fifth EWCS were published. Most of these pieces of secondary analysis were contracted out to take advantage of a very high level of external expertise but some of the reports were drafted internally by Eurofound research teams.

The launch of the above mentioned publications was organised by Eurofound's I&C. The launch of the first findings report was accompanied by a video news release, produced by the I&C unit, with thematic interviews and a descriptive animation. In parallel to the production process, there was an intensification and formalisation of the collaboration with DG COMM and the Audiovisual Services of the European Commission, to ensure a wider distribution of Eurofound's video work.

Between October 2010 and March 2011, the findings were strategically communicated to journalists and the general audience for the biggest possible impact, in a campaign based on three distinct phases – the anticipation stage (leading up to the launch), the launching phase (the publication of the report, and the high profile event) and the presentation phase (the period during which detailed report on many issues in the report was presented, in close collaboration with the research experts). This was the first large-scale Eurofound communication campaign that jointly incorporated both press and multimedia. The presentation of results included an infographic, reaction videos, follow-up of participants and systematic targeting of user groups by the I&C.

However, the aforementioned delays caused by slippage of timetable from the primary research pilot and its further extension during the analysis phase resulted in pressures on both the research team and the I&C. The Eurofound teams however managed to resolve the issue of capacities by utilising available resource with necessary language skills and managed to meet the extended deadline for publishing and presenting first findings at the Belgian presidency event.

---

<sup>8</sup> [http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef\\_files/surveys/ewcs/2010/documents/qualityassessment.pdf](http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_files/surveys/ewcs/2010/documents/qualityassessment.pdf)

A major event was organised in close collaboration with the Belgian presidency to launch the first results. This resulted in a high impact launch and the inclusion of selected EWCS findings soon after, in the Council's conclusions.

EWCS results and methodology web pages have been translated into 25 languages. A total of 45 additional entry-level web pages are being translated at present, also into 25 languages. There was a Joint EP-Eurofound conference organised by BLO to launch the overview report on 5<sup>th</sup> EWCS on 12 April 2012.

Table 1 presents the publications relating to the 5<sup>th</sup> EWCS and their respective downloads between 2010 and 2012.

**Table 1 Publications relating to the 5th EWCS and downloads between 2010 and 2012**

	Date published	2010	2011	2012
Changes over time: Fifth European Working Conditions Survey - first findings (résumé)	15.11.2010	1,183	4,534	1,882
5th EWCS - Overview report	12.4.2012	N/A	N/A	2,807
5th EWCS Overview report - Executive summary	12.4.2012	N/A	N/A	825
Trends in job quality in Europe	13.8.2012	N/A	N/A	N/A
Trends in job quality in Europe - Executive summary	13.8.2012	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sustainable work and the ageing workforce	10.12.2012	N/A	N/A	173
Sustainable work and the ageing workforce - Executive summary	10.12.2012	N/A	N/A	144
Total		3,402	20,876	2,091

Source: Eurofound I&C unit, 2014

Use and quotation of the EWCS findings were promoted in close collaboration between the research team, I&C unit and Brussels Liaison Office (BLO). The BLO were described by the research project manager as having engaged fully with the EWCS findings and to have provided 'excellent added value' in terms of generating interest. In particular, the research team were grateful for the role of the BLO in ensuring cooperation with the European Parliament at highest political level (BLO linking with the EP President Martin Schulz) and preparing the launch of the overview report at the the Belgian Presidency Conference, organised by the I&C unit. The communication between the BLO and the research team to disseminate the results to various EU policy audiences was also successful, as the BLO discussed with the research team what questions might be posed at various events, so that they could prepare appropriate and detailed answers. The BLO also took responsibility for recording various dissemination efforts to MEPs, although none led to a specific, direct policy impact, except the launch of the overview report at the EP. The EESC speaker Leila Kurki, President of the EESC SOC section at that time, got direct inspiration from the conference debate to initiate her own work at EESC level on the issue of work organisation.

The research team was also grateful to Eurofound stakeholders in the advisory committee dealing with the EWCS which have trusted the team to be able to deliver good quality work and have facilitated contact with the Belgian

government in order to organise an ambitious launch. Work with the I&C department on the launch was intense but occurred in good spirit and cooperation and resulted in a successful event.

## Impact

There is strong evidence of high level of use of the EWCS results from the EU impact tracking database as well as from the primary research undertaken within this evaluation. Many of the consulted stakeholders highlighted the EWCS as the most valuable data that the agency produces. During the workshop with Eurofound's stakeholders in June 2014 the workers and employers groups have highlighted EWCS as the most important product of the Agency that is well executed and provides invaluable information on specific topics such as organisation of pay.

The *EU Impact tracking database* provides a long list of EU level documents which have drawn on or directly quoted findings from the EWCS. They include use of the data in analytical reports by the European Commission and the European Parliament, as well as direct quotations from speeches such as the one given by Commissioner Andor in September 2012 on occupational health and safety. Additionally, the findings were quoted in November 2012 at the European Parliament's Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality. This was followed by a reference made by the Directorate-General's *Opinion on Women's working conditions in the service sector*.

The *interviews with policymakers on EU level* (mainly Directorate-General of Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion) indicated that they have made use of the EWCS findings in several ways, including being quoted in reports (for example in *Job Quality and Work Organisation section* in the 2012 Employment in Europe analytical report) and presented during meetings and conferences. The European Commission have an advisory role in policy development and act to present on social challenges and engage social partners and governments in dialogue. As such, proposals or recommendations from the European Commission that have been made to the Council of Ministers have drawn on the EWCS findings on job quality, particularly in relation to technological developments and globalisation. However, there have not been any concrete policy developments that have directly resulted from the EWCS findings to date. Going forward however, policy debates about encouraging 'green jobs' will need to be informed by data on working conditions, at which point Eurofound's EWCS and related data will prove invaluable.

One example of a realised impact is incorporation of the EWCS indicators on job quality by the European Commission's Joint Assessment Framework on employment guidelines. The report findings on active ageing and sustainable work have also been well received by various audiences: such as the European Commission services and European Parliament, as well as sector specific committees for social dialogue. There are examples of upcoming changes in regulations that will draw heavily on research undertaken within the EWCS, such as the amendments to the Working Time Regulations (1998).

## Lessons learned

### Inception

- A highly engaged group of stakeholders and close consultation with the expert questionnaire development group, in an extensive consultation and review process, ensured that the findings would be relevant and accessible to a wider audience.

### Execution

- Developments on other surveys could be identified and the knowledge transferred, to deal with low response rates in particular countries quickly.

- There is a need for better strategic planning of human resources, particularly with respect to fieldwork and during the analysis of Eurofound's large surveys. The execution of the 5<sup>th</sup> EWCS had delays mainly due to insufficient planning processes and lack of capacity during critical periods.
- An integrated and coherent programme of secondary analysis by external experts, managed by the EWCS research team, resulted in high quality analytical pieces that further promoted the findings of the EWCS to a wider audience.
- Use of research team members with the necessary language skills resulted in the deadline being met for presenting the first findings during the Belgian Presidency Conference but stricter planning and tighter coordination with the I&C in the event of delays would guard against this.
- Lower number of changes in the team setup would reduce further delays caused by need to train new team members

#### Dissemination and Impact

- Attaching high profile 'super researchers' to the EWCS during the analysis in 2011 provided expert guidance and lent credibility to the EWCS outputs and findings.
- Pro-active alignment by the Brussels Liaison Office of the EWCS to contemporary and forthcoming policy debates (for example via their 'Hotspots' database) related the findings to appropriate audiences and allowed the research team to anticipate potential questions.
- The concerted efforts made by the BLO, I&C and research team in organising the presentation at the Belgian Presidency Conference, organised by the I&C, demonstrates the ability for cross-team coordination.
- Strategic communication to journalists and the general audience by I&C
- Large scale campaign by the I&C that jointly incorporated both press and multimedia, resulted in a high volume of downloads and citations.



# 2<sup>nd</sup> European Company Survey (2009)

## Introduction and justification for inclusion

This case study was selected as an example of a large project within the Working Conditions and Industrial Relations (Monitoring & Surveys unit (MSU) prior to 2009) with a relatively limited impact and no identified direct links to policy developments on European and National levels. The project had a relatively modest number (39) of EU policy documents quoting its reports in the EU Impact tracking database (mainly European Commission and European Social Partners) and remains the least quoted and referenced of the three Eurofound surveys to date. The overview report, one of the Eurofound flagship publications, was nevertheless among the top 5 downloaded reports of 2010, with 1,982 downloads.

## Project objective

The European Company Survey (ECS) in 2009 was the second iteration of its kind, with its predecessor taking place in 2004-2005 under the title of European Establishment Survey on Working Time and Work-Life Balance (ESWT). The second survey was completed in 2009 and was followed up in its third version in 2013. The subject of this case study is the second ECS but its rationale and inception are linked to the previous work programme period and beyond. The survey focused on documenting the flexibility strategies of companies and it is a unique source of comparative information on social dialogue at the workplace level.

The survey had four specific objectives:

- To map, assess and quantify information on company policies and practices across Europe on an harmonised basis;
- To analyse relationships between company practices and their impact as well as looking at practices from the point of view of structures at company level, focusing in particular on social dialogue;
- To monitor trends; and
- To allow for the development of homogeneous indicators on these issues for a European audience.

The core objectives as such remained unchanged across the three rounds of the ECS but the 2009 project was marked by an extended scope both in terms of number of countries covered and the themes that it was trying to address.

## Project inception

The idea of a company survey organised by Eurofound was not new. Firstly, establishment survey on new forms of work and employment in early 1990s, and then in 1998 an Employee direct Participation in Organisational Change (EPOC) project included company surveys, though on a much less organised basis and limiting its scope to 10 countries. The need and the requests for data-collection at a firm level continued throughout the early 2000s when the European Commission published a green paper on work organisation and established a European network on work organisation (discontinued) which indicated a need for European-wide research into these issues by collecting views from managers and employees at firm level.

The long-established European Working Conditions Survey focusing on employees was to be complemented by a new type of survey which was launched in 2004-5, the European Survey on Working Time and work-life balance



(ESWT). This survey focused on working time and work-life balance policies in establishments in the former EU15 Member States and six of the new: Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Poland and Slovenia.

The key objective of the initial survey was to complement existing Eurofound data and research on working time which is based primarily on surveys of individual workers and on literature reviews and case studies. It was designed to find out whether, why and how companies make use of the broad variety of working time arrangements (e.g. full- and part-time work, overtime, flexi-time, shift work, phased and early retirement and childcare leave arrangements) and the scope was to include all companies with 10 or more employees across all sectors of activity, including the public sector.

The second ECS, under the title European Company Survey, was carried out in 2009 and addressed a very wide range of flexibility practices working-time flexibility, contractual flexibility, variable pay and financial participation, as well as accompanying human resource measures, and the nature and quality of workplace social dialogue. The process for project selection and definition of scope was a standard one, starting off with an internal research unit meeting (at the time MSU), followed by a formal submission of the proposal to the governing board meeting. Topics addressed by the European Company Survey were of great interest to all three groups represented on the governing board but employers and workers have specific agendas in relation to issues they would wish to be covered. As a result and due to the large relative size of the project there has been a wide discussion both in the bureau and the wider governing board, which concluded in a much broader variety of topics being addressed, especially in comparison to the first European Company Survey that was run in 2004/5.

The changes to the project scope resulted in an additional challenge of covering the breadth of themes identified, especially with respect to reaching the managers and employee representatives. The project was ambitious as the project team was attempting to cover the variety of new topics while trying to keep as many questions as possible from the 2004/5 survey in order to be able to draw comparisons. The 2004/5 survey focused predominantly on issues relating to work-life balance.

### **Project execution**

The internal project team consisted of 8 Eurofound researchers of whom none were assigned only to this project for 100% of their time. The project coordinator was allocated a larger share in her role and other team members were aware of their tasks and priorities. The fieldwork was carried out in early 2009 by a contractor research firm implementing it in 30 countries, i.e. the 27 EU Member States and the three Candidate countries (Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey). Several countries expressed interest in extending the sample and Eurofound offered the possibility however none of the countries took it up.

The survey was conducted by telephone interviews (CATI) in the language(s) of the country covering 27,160 establishments across Europe. The target population was all establishments with 10 or more employees. All sectors of economic activity were covered except for 'Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing', 'Private Households' and 'Extraterritorial organisations' (NACE rev 1.1 A, B, P and Q and NACE rev. 2 A, T and U). The initial survey design process started with consultations with stakeholders and users / experts groups and the updating of the survey questionnaire. A special feature of the survey is that interviews take place with the manager responsible for human resources in the establishment and where possible with an employee representative.

The ECS team cooperated with EU OSHA in tendering for the sampling as the Bilbao Agency was implementing its Enterprise survey on new and emerging risks (ESENER<sup>9</sup>) survey and the two studies has overlapping target

---

<sup>9</sup> In order to ensure that the survey results are cross-nationally comparable, it is essential that the sampling strategy result in the same type of units being surveyed in each country. The quality of the available address registers varies across the participating countries in terms of coverage (especially the sectors of activity included) and in terms of the availability and accuracy of the necessary background information

groups in their samples. The cooperation was based on the sampling and it is apparent from the 2<sup>nd</sup> ECS tender specification “In the event of financial participation by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, the contractor will in addition prepare a sampling frame for a survey to be conducted by this Agency, in which the management respondents will be specified in an identical manner, but the employee representative respondents will be health and safety representatives as defined by the Framework Directive (89/391)”. As a consequence of this tender specification, EU OSHA contributed to the costs for the sampling investigation and preparation. In addition the knowledge and experience that Eurofound had with this type of surveys allowed sharing their design with the Bilbao Agency.

The subsequent analyses of the data were performed by Eurofound staff (e.g. in thematic area of social dialogue) as well as other contractors (e.g. management practices and sustainable organisational performance). There was a slight re-focus of the analysis to assess reduction in jobs and the impact of competition on the organisation which directly related to the economic crisis. The ECS team took into account the emerging economic crisis mainly through subsequent analysis of the data.

The size of the project meant that there was a close oversight of project execution by the advisory committees. At the initial stages of the project, there was a dedicated advisory committee but due to concerns that there were too many advisory committees, at the final stages of the ECS, it shared a committee with the European Working Conditions Survey.

One of the main challenges in executing the project was achieving a high response rate. Eurofound and the contractor have implemented a variety of strategies for maximisation of responses from hard to reach groups. One such example was implementation of a standard sampling protocol in which after completion of approximately 30 interviews the country datasets were checked with regard to technical correctness of the programmed CATI and structure of the data file; and real time checking which was efficient to identify problems in fieldwork and highlight the need to attend to them quickly. The quality assessment of the 2<sup>nd</sup> ECS undertaken by Agilis SA, following the fieldwork, also highlighted the well-established quality assurance framework that enabled real-time monitoring of the fieldwork process but pointed towards further consideration and improvement in respect to further increasing the response rate. As a solution, they recommended:

- Use of multi-mode data collection method (Besides telephone interviews consider also on-site face-to-face interviews or the possibility of establishing a web-based questionnaire).
- Identification of other sources of response errors (e.g. length of the questionnaire, common characteristics of non-respondents, etc.).
- Take into consideration cost and time (i.e. fieldwork duration) constraints in deciding on the actions to be taken in future rounds of the survey in order to improve response rates.

In terms of the timing of the execution, the survey design and tendering the contractor for the overview report took place in the previous Work Programme period. The tender was organised by the Research Manager in collaboration with the central tendering function. The first findings resume was published in late 2009, with the

---

(such as the sector of activity and number of employees). Existing address registers are not cross-nationally comparable, therefore considerable efforts have been made to build samples that provide the necessary quality and ensure cross-national comparability. This work has been carried out in collaboration with the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound).

Stratification of the sample is based on a matrix of two groups of sectors ("Producing Industries" and "Service Sector") and five size classes (10-19 employees, 20-49, 50-199, 200-499, and 500+ employees) and follows the sampling strategy used by Eurofound in its establishment surveys.

main overview report being delivered in 2010. Subsequent analytical works based on the data continued in 2010-12 period as the ECS represents a unique source of firm level data.

### Dissemination of results

In late 2009, Eurofound published the first findings, in 2010 the overview report was published which was one of the flagship publications for the year and received wide popularity in terms of downloads. In 2010 there was a separate report on 'Flexibility profiles of EU companies' and the following year there were two additional analytical reports, one on 'Part time work' and one on 'Management practices and sustainable organisation performance'. In 2012, Eurofound published one last analytical report, HRM practices and establishment performance, and Policy relevance and implications for future surveys. The publications and their respective downloads figures are presented in Table 1.

All of the abovementioned publications have been accompanied by media activities organised by the information and communication unit. The ECS first findings in 2009 were launched along with the Swedish EU Presidency, during 2010 the media activities largely focused on the launch of the overview report for the second European Company Survey in March. The second European Company Survey was launched on 1 March 2010 at a high-profile event in the European Parliament (organised by the BLO), with the participation of EU Commissioner László Andor, sponsored by Spanish MEP Alejandro Cercas. The event attracted a number of Brussels-based journalists from news agencies (Belga, Bloomberg, Agence Europe) and online news sources (Europolitics, Euractiv and the EU Parliament Magazine). The event was followed by an informal question and answer session with participating journalists.

Table 2 Publications relating to the 2nd ECS and downloads by year

	Date published	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014 <sup>10</sup>
<b>First findings: resume</b>	14/12/2009	1,284	4,703	142	89	29
<b>Overview report</b>	01/03/2010	1,982	4,322	325	311	176
<b>Flexibility profiles of European companies</b>	20/10/2010	136	3,652	184	139	72
<b>Flexibility profiles of European companies - Executive summary</b>	20/10/2010		3,269	86	30	8
<b>Part-time work in Europe</b>	27/01/2011		2,931	386	284	144
<b>Part-time work in Europe - Executive summary</b>	27/01/2011		1,259	161	115	38
<b>Management practices and sustainable organisational performance</b>	17/10/2011		557	115	45	35
<b>Management practices and sustainable organisational performance - Executive summary</b>	17/10/2011		183	107	69	38
<b>HRM practices and establishment performance</b>	10/02/2012			227	41	38

<sup>10</sup>January-August

<b>HRM practices and establishment performance - Executive summary</b>	10/02/2012			343	217	89
<b>Policy relevance and implications for future surveys</b>				15	10	8
<b>Workplace social dialogue in Europe: An analysis of the European Company Survey 2009</b>	17/04/2012	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Employee representation at establishment level in Europe</b>	2011	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Total</b>		3,402	20,876	2,091	1,350	675

Source: Eurofound I&C unit, 2014

In addition to the publishing and dissemination activities relating to the above-listed publications, the project team has launched a mapping tool which had undergone considerable improvements in 2009 with the first findings. In 2010 the most viewed graphic/barchart/table from the European Company Survey mapping tool was Companies with night workers (11pm to 6am) (413) which in relative terms compared to the most viewed chart from EWCS is relatively modest number (EWCS had over 1,000 views). In the following years the respective number of views of the mapping tool graphics from ECS decreased year by year where in Feb-Sept 2011 they only received 87 views.

The data has been also made available through the UK Data Service. The most frequent user type of the data service were postgraduate students (35% of all requests in 2009-2013) followed by the University staff. Only 10 of the 605 requests registered throughout the period were submitted by local and central government staff. None of these project abstracts however outline how the data will be useful for development of new policies. Mostly it was used to investigate trends and provide background information for researchers and, to a limited extent, policymakers. The data requests had a rising tendency throughout the period. The trend is presented below in table 2. Academic use is encouraged by Eurofound as recognition of the scientific value of the Agency's work by the academic community strengthens the findings and provides an additional dissemination channel by opening possibilities for access by national and EU policy makers (in their own languages).

**Table 3 Number of requests for ECS data**

	2009*	2010*	2011	2012	2013
<b>Number of data requests for ECS data</b>	30	63	106	171	235

Source: UK Data Service

\*2009 and 2010 figures include EWTS figures

As one of the three main Eurofound surveys, the project should have a more formal long-term communication and dissemination strategy. The communication and dissemination activities surrounding the launch of short findings report and the overview report were seen as sufficient but there was no strategic long term plan for use and re-use of results for specific policy developments. A more consistent and continuous basis for dissemination of results linked to the identification of political debates relating to ECS could benefit higher impact but dissemination activities did not go beyond standard publishing activities. There were some ad hoc dissemination activities such as email alerts about Eurofound publishing the reports and the launch conferences to EU level

cross-sectoral, sectoral social partners (AKEuropa, BusinessEurope, ETUC, CEEP UEAPME, CESI, Cettar, CEEMET, DGB Europa, EFFAT, Eurocommerce, EFBH, FIEC, Eurociett, CEC European managers, CEMR, IndustriALL) or to members of the European Parliament.”

The researchers involved in the project were not aware of any policy developments that were identified in production of the overview or any of the further analytical reports. The communications and information unit decide upon the communication policy of every publication and there is space for a more significant steer from the researchers, especially from those who have a long track record of dealing with policymakers on regular basis. The editorial process and preparation of the published report was efficiently set up. There is space for improvement of collaboration in drawing up the key messages between editorial staff and lead researchers in order to make the best use the collective knowledge and experience. The policymakers are seen by the researchers to demand accurate and scientifically grounded information.

Press and media coverage analysis were not covered in the first yearly progress report to the advisory committee while the second progress report critiqued this dissemination activity and concluded that the data from the ECS was not timely to make it to the news. The researchers and policymakers tend to view Eurofound research as having a long shelf-life solely on the basis that it is a unique source of information. The research findings need to be utilised at every possible occasion. There have been a number of direct requests for information by policymakers, detailed in the next section.

## Impact

Despite the wide-ranging efforts from the Eurofound staff in research and communication of results, there have been very few direct links to specific policy developments on EU level. The ECS data and its analytical reports are however useful to policymakers to obtain a common understanding of issues among the EU member states and have been quoted in a number of EC documents. Some of the examples include information and consultation directive, EC reports on Employment and social developments in Europe 2013 and on Industrial relations in Europe 2013; Operation and effects of information and consultation directives in the EU/EEA countries, "Fitness Check" and the EC staff working document: 'Fitness check' on EU law in the area of information and Consultation of Workers, SWD(2013)293 final. ECS related work was also quoted in an ILO report Conditions of Work and Employment Series n° 44: The use of working time-related crisis response measures during the Great Recession. ECS data was referred to in an annual report<sup>11</sup> building upon the country-specific recommendations and supporting documents of the May 2013 European Semester, feeding into the policy monitoring cycle of the next cycle, and focuses on microeconomic policies where it deepens the analysis. It aims at helping policy-makers to focus on obstacles to growth, and advocates the learning of lessons from good practices. The main two units from the EC that have used the ECS data are the Social Dialogue and the Policy Analysis units of DG employment.

One of the economic analysts in DG Employment and Social Affairs and Inclusion detailed that policymakers make use of research produced within the European Company Survey through a number of channels. The knowledge is shared and acknowledged through quotation and use of interpreted data for specific reports (e.g. the work in Job Quality and Work Organisation in the 2012 Employment in Europe), through presentation of results at meetings and conferences to individual requests for specific data. The European Commission has an advisory role in the policy development cycle and strictly reflects on social challenges and engages social partners and governments in dialogues. Despite the fact that there was no direct impact yet, there might be proposals in relevant areas for which the ECS data will be invaluable.

---

<sup>11</sup>EC staff working document: Industrial Performance Scoreboard and Member States' Competitiveness Performance and Implementation of EU Industrial Policy, SWD(2013) 346

While there was no direct link to a policy development, there were ad hoc examples of how the Eurofound researchers worked and fed information directly to EU level policymakers:

- ECS included topics relevant to Workplace Innovation and at the same time the DG Enterprise & Industry introduced the EUWIN the European Workplace Innovation Network.
- The researchers proactively contacted staff in a number of DGs on both the head of research and analyst levels. For example DG ECFIN have been contacted by one of the researchers involved in the project and while they hadn't been aware of the findings, they found the research very useful and requested access to data.
- Chinese government requested information on flexibility of staff arrangements in EU firms
- There has been a wide uptake by the research community which can result in indirect impact and scientific backing for the results. MEPs have indicated that the scientific backing is viewed as an important feature of Eurofound's work.
- There was a specific request for very detailed information from EC delegation on a visit to Turkey in relation to its accession. One of the researchers was able to provide this type of information within hours and the EC representatives were delighted.

Large surveys such as the second European Company Survey have the potential to contribute to the EU policy agenda but it was noted by policymakers that most of its contribution will be delivered in combination with other Eurofound projects such as the other surveys and qualitative case studies.

## Lessons learnt

### Inception

ECS is the youngest in the family of Eurofound surveys and therefore its questionnaire was during the 2009-2012 period as stable as its counterparts. Broadening of scope in the 2008 work programme discussion had pros and cons. There is an evident trade-off between the ability to produce trend data and exploration of specific topical issues (running a survey with a different theme every 3 years). The broadening of coverage of issues whilst attempting to retain as many transferable findings as possible resulted in challenges in execution. On the other hand if having trend data is one of the key study objectives, then broad thematic focus will result in limiting depth in which the specific issues can be examined, especially on an EU-wide level. An indication that the breadth of the topics covered in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ECS is that in 2013, the company survey's focus returned to the narrower thematic scope, addressing three topic areas which were much interlinked. The thematic focus of the second Company Survey was broader than optimal within the budget, timeframe and fit within the series of Eurofound company surveys.

There is a need for a process or an instrument that would have the ability to challenge decisions of the Governing Board on the scope of large and methodologically challenging projects so that these do not become unwieldy. Such instrument would require a strong reputation and authority in order to present strong evidence for change to project scope proposed and approved by the bureau.

### Execution

The 2<sup>nd</sup> ECS was a large project run by a cross-unit team which caused some challenges. There is a need to keep the whole team engaged and aware of the progress and general coordination.

This complexity was even greater due to the bulk of the work (fieldwork and production of the overview report) being contracted out (though less than the first ECS). In such instances everyone involved needs to respect the deadlines as other peoples' work might be dependent on the delivery of an interim output. Controlling colleagues in other units and those who are not members of the core team can prove challenging. This challenge was mainly overcome by regular planning meetings and an effective execution of the research tasks leading up to interim results.

Any methodological challenges were tackled in collaboration with the contractors and the quality of data has been assessed by an external contractor which led to a number of actions improving the dataset and increasing the response rate. Such collaborative behaviour shall be ensured in all large complex projects with a large contracted-out component.

### Dissemination and Impact

There were examples and evidence behind strong use of ECS data by policymakers, however they stated that it was in general used in conjunction with other sources of evidence such as the ECWS and as contextual information. The project of this size would be expected to have a strategic plan for feeding into the policy debates which needs to be developed and regularly revisited by the research and communication functions of the agency to maximise benefits from knowledge that the respective sides possess. This would result in a sustained use and dissemination of findings, not only short term, after the periods related to publication of results.

A more proactive propagation of the availability of raw data through the UK Data service to policymakers might result in a new channel for influencing policy.



# Income After Retirement

## Introduction and justification for inclusion

*Income after Retirement* was selected for case study as an example of a small project that had a relatively low number of downloads and quotations in policy documents at European level but its comparative nature fed towards supporting policy developments at a national level. The research project was conducted by Eurofound's Living Conditions and Quality of Life unit. The work began in 2011 and the report was published in late 2012.

## Project objectives

The inspiration for *Income after Retirement* is cited as coming from a special Eurobarometer<sup>12</sup>, which reported that one-third of people want to work beyond retirement age: much higher than had previously been thought. As such, the research was conceived as an exploration of the reasons why Europeans are increasingly motivated to work beyond statutory retirement age<sup>13</sup>. The project also explored who these working retirees are and characterised the work they tend to do.

A broader aim for *Income after Retirement* was to inform European social and employment policies, which are placing an increasing emphasis on extending working lives<sup>14</sup>. A more specific requirement for the research was to contribute a report in 2012 for the European Year of Active Ageing<sup>15</sup>, which had as its focus the adequacy and future sustainability of pension provision in Europe, as well as on the social and economic contribution of older people.

The following were identified as additional objectives in Eurofound's 2011 Annual Programme outline:

- To examine the sustainability and adequacy of pensions; in light of Europe's 2020 strategy which highlighted the implications of an ageing population and workforce;
- To report on income sources during retirement and the incentives and opportunities of gaining income after retirement.
  - 1 The methods decided upon were a review of existing research about (earned) income beyond pension age, a workshop and a comparison of the experience of work after retirement in the US and EU<sup>16</sup>. This was the first Europe-wide study of work after retirement age.
  - 2 The main intended outputs at the beginning of the project were the workshop, which was attended by experts in the field, and the main report.

## Project inception

The initial idea for research in this topic was conceived by the Head of the Living Conditions and Quality of Life research unit at Eurofound during the development of the 2009-2012 multiannual Work Programme. He then developed the proposal that was submitted to the Governing Board, outlining the rationale and justification for the project to be included under Eurofound's annual Work Programme.

<sup>12</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_378\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_378_en.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> [http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef\\_files/pubdocs/2012/59/en/2/EF1259EN.pdf](http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_files/pubdocs/2012/59/en/2/EF1259EN.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> [http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef\\_files/pubdocs/2011/13/en/3/EF1113EN.pdf](http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_files/pubdocs/2011/13/en/3/EF1113EN.pdf)

<sup>16</sup> The US was included as a country where work beyond retirement has traditionally been more common than in the EU.



The sensitive nature of the topic resulted in an animated discussion between the groups of the Governing Board. There was apparent initial resistance from members of the workers group, who voiced their concern about implications of a report that might suggest that employees need to work beyond a statutory retirement age. Nevertheless the discussions concluded in an agreement for the project to be included in the annual work programme on the condition that these groups were involved at a number of workshops at the inception stage. These workshops contributed to formative parts of the research, so that the project objectives that were developed were mindful of their concerns. This detailed process of deliberation at the inception stage was a relatively lengthy process dating back to 2009 and ending with an approved project in the 2011 annual work programme. The research was included under Eurofound's overarching theme of 'Promotion of social inclusion and sustainable social protection'.

### Project execution

The project was managed on a day-to-day basis by a research manager, with the Head of the unit overseeing it as a whole. Much of the research manager's work involved co-ordinating the research relating to development of seven reports that were contracted out to national experts, and the drafting of the overview report (written entirely by Eurofound). The country reports covered Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, Poland, Sweden and the UK. As well as ensuring that submissions were made on time, the research manager was involved in quality assurance, approval and subsequent editing and condensing of the material for inclusion in the overall report. The country reports were based on a national literature review, secondary data analysis, expert interviews and case studies in organisations employing retired people. At least three people were interviewed for each case study, including one retired worker, someone from the company's management, and someone from the Human Resources department if the organisation had one. Most interviews were conducted face-to-face. The rationale for the selection of these seven Member States was a mix of seeking maximum variation on the one hand and identifying countries where interesting cases can be found on the other hand.

The project methodology consisted of a literature review, with comparisons drawn between the US and EU<sup>17</sup>; secondary data analysis<sup>18</sup> and examples gathered from EU Member States (that were not already contributing a report). While the seven country reports provided a solid basis for information about emerging trends, the research manager also explored other important developments in the topic area. For example, a Eurofound case study on an employment agency in the Netherlands that operates specifically for retirees (included in the main report at page 60).

The Living Conditions Advisory Committee commented on draft outputs, which had already gone through a number of iterations as a result of feedback from experts in the field (from outside of Eurofound) and approval by the unit internally. The Advisory Committee was seen to have scrutinised the content of the research more than was perhaps the case for other projects included under the Work Programme. The reason for this higher level of scrutiny was the formerly mentioned concern from Workers' representatives that the findings might suggest that people should be encouraged to work during their retirement.

The review of the literature took place in 2011 and the first half of 2012. The same holds for the analysis of EU data. The country reports were written by five different contractors in 2011 (Austria, Poland and Sweden) and the first half of 2012 (the Czech Republic, Germany, Italy and the UK). There was a slight delay in publishing the final report (a few weeks) however this was not perceived by the research team or the Brussels Liaison Office (BLO) to have any effect on realising policy impact as there was no specific hotspot associated with this project. Should an

---

<sup>17</sup> The US was included as a country where work beyond retirement has traditionally been more common than in the EU

<sup>18</sup> Secondary data analysis was conducted using the Eurostat Labour Force Survey (LFS), the European Survey of Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC), the European Social Survey (ESS), the European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS) and data from the Eurobarometer.

instance occur where a stakeholder makes a request to the BLO and the final report is not published, most of the time there is a possibility to present/introduce preliminary findings, which provide sufficient level of detail.

## Dissemination of results

The key project output was the report *'Income from work after retirement in the EU'* published in late 2012. The publication date was preceded by a number of presentations by the research manager and Head of the unit, primarily to gain feedback on the interim findings and draft report. One of these events was at an Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) seminar, titled 'The Future of Retirement', hosted by the University of Kent in May 2012. There were a further two presentations to generate interest in the report's publication, including at a conference hosted by the European Institute of Paritarian Institutions (AEIP) in Riga. The research was also discussed before publication at four workshops. Two of these were organised by Eurofound and were attended by members from the European Commission, policymakers, experts in the field, members of NGOs and stakeholders from Eurofound's tripartite Governing Board. The main publication was launched at a joint European Policy Centre/ Bertelsmann Foundation event and was launched internally by Eurofound at an event shared with other projects.

After the publication, the research team presented approximately fourteen times at various events between May 2012 and November 2014<sup>19</sup>. These included an expert meeting at the Joint Research Centre (in Seville in May 2012), a European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) conference: 'Improving solidarity between the generations and active ageing' (October 2012), and more recently at the fifth World Pension Summit, held at The Hague (November 2014).

### *Publications and press articles*

The Research Manager and Head of unit were proactive in identifying media sources for promoting the research. As a result, the research was featured in (among others):

- *The Financial Times*, under the headline 'Old-age wisdom can benefit companies' (April 2013);
- An article in the journal *Retraite et Société*, titled 'Le travail après la retraite dans l'Union européenne' (June 2013);
- The Spanish newspaper, *El Mundo*, under the headline '*Pensiones: orígenes y ¿futuro?*' (June 2013), and;
- An article in the *Life and Pensions Newsletter*, published by the Geneva Association and titled 'Work after retirement in the EU' (September 2013).

The research manager recounted that he had been closely involved in identifying and organising many of the dissemination points. For example, he contacted a journalist at the Financial Times after seeing an article that related to *Income from Work after Retirement*. The journalist passed the report onto a colleague, who then contributed the article mentioned above. These activities are seen to have contributed towards raising awareness of the project's profile and the agency's work in the area.

The researcher's initiatives were accompanied and supported by the Information and Communication unit and the Brussels Liaison Office (BLO). In the following year after publishing the main report, the BLO had identified a policy 'hotspot' for the European Parliament's report on access to employment for vulnerable groups and facilitated provision of input to rapporteurs involved in drafting the report in February 2013. Whilst there was no

<sup>19</sup> A list was provided by the Research Manager but is not comprehensive.

direct quotation of the project findings, this and one other report by the European Parliament have adopted the findings in text. BLO was seen by the researcher to have provided 'excellent information' on the number and type of quotations that the report received.

## Impact

One of the main objectives of the research project, as perceived by the research manager, was to inform (rather than influence) European policies on working lives, specifically during / after retirement. This relates to the formally acknowledged objective within the project proposal to explore the income sources and incentives and motivations of people beyond retirement age to work. However the other objective refers to exploring sustainability and adequacy of pensions; in light of Europe's 2020 strategy which highlighted the implications of an ageing population. The key project report included policy pointers for both policymakers and companies.

There have been three instances of adoption of project findings in a policy paper/publication recorded by the BLO:

- EC JRC technical reports: Literature review on Employability, Inclusion and ICT<sup>20</sup>, report 1: The Concept of Employability with a Specific Focus on Young people, Older Workers and Migrants.
- European Policy Centre<sup>21</sup> - Bertelsmann Report Second career labour markets - Assessing challenges, advancing policies
- EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review, December 2012

One of the interviewed stakeholders indicated that the research findings were used in the Social Protection Committee's background document for the Pensions Adequacy Report.

Despite the relatively low number of downloads and mainly indirect use of the findings there was an indication of at least one direct influence of policy. The Polish representative of the government group on Eurofound governing board specified that there was an initiative on the national level which was informed by the project findings. Since 2008 Poland has a programme in place supporting occupational activity of people aged 50+. The programme is called 'Generations' Solidarity: Actions for Increasing Occupational Activity of People Aged 50+', and was developed within the social dialogue institutions. So far it has been implemented through legislation, most importantly with regard to the pension system, and specifically raising and equalising the statutory retirement age for men and women and restricting access to early retirement schemes. Very few actions revolve around improving the quality of work of older workers. The Eurofound project provided useful confirmation of the extent of the problem in a number of countries and gives a basis for introduction of second phase of the programme. This phase of the implementation will consist of the drafting of an implementation document that will contain a systematic and detailed set of legislative and extra-legislative measures together with entities responsible for carrying out these tasks. The second phase of the implementation has not yet been approved by the Polish parliament and the extent to which the final decision will be informed by findings from Eurofound research is impossible to estimate at this point.

In addition there was a request from the German Minister for Labour for a briefing note about the research after its publication, which was co-ordinated and provided by Eurofound.

---

<sup>20</sup> The research manager participated in the ICT for Employability Expert Validation Workshop at the JRC

<sup>21</sup> The research manager participated in the project Task Force

The project, being a unique research initiative in this field, has achieved an intermediate level of impact in that it has ‘inspired’ further research projects about work after retirement, or related topics. One such example is the UK country report that was prepared for *Income after Retirement*, which reported that a third of retired people in the UK are not claiming the pension credits that they are eligible for. This finding influenced further Eurofound research that is seeking to explore the incidence of people not claiming other state benefits for which they are eligible<sup>22</sup>. *Income after Retirement* has also influenced a project under the 2015 Work Programme, which will focus on combining part-time work with partial pensions<sup>23</sup>. Additionally, analysis of the third wave of EQLS was prompted by *Income after Retirement* and resulted in a policy brief, *Work preferences after 50*<sup>24</sup>. The forthcoming wave of EQLS may include questions that will be used to add to these findings.

## Lessons learned

### Inception

The project has, from the idea formation and the long period of discussions surrounding its inception, been considered to be important and within Eurofound’s remit. This high number of iterations and discussions about its objectives and scope resulted in an acceptable compromise. Despite these efforts for clarification, the project description in the 2011 annual work programme did not constitute a very precise definition of scope and required further discussion during the inception workshops with the advisory committee. This process was not uncommon in the Agency but it might have been streamlined so that the project could have started sooner and could potentially have fed towards earlier policy developments on European level.

### Execution

*Income after retirement* was a project that consisted of an in-house literature review, data analysis and input from contracted out national case studies; with only limited internal resource being dedicated to synthesising these, on schedule. All of these inputs fed into in-house produced main report. The project was delivered successfully, according to the set timescales and contracting out the country reports meant that experts were secured to provide comment and feedback on the project in general. The methodology was relatively standard and provided a good fit for the provision to inform policies in general. Drawing on a number of sources and involving national experts was seen as a key strength of this approach, despite requiring more intense work by the Eurofound research team to synthesise the various strands of the research together, from which the main added value was derived.

### Dissemination and impact

There were a number of pre-publication dissemination activities that provided feedback for the draft versions of the report and were found to be useful for improving its quality and securing buy-in from both the expert and stakeholder community. The dissemination activities around the publication could have been complemented by ‘a post on Eurofound’s homepage’, to announce the reports publication. In addition, the report could have had its own Eurofound launch event (rather than sharing one with other projects) but this would result in higher cost per event and the additional benefits have not been identified.

It was perceived that an event that focused exclusively on *Income after Retirement* would have been more likely to have directly influenced policymakers, should the right people be targeted for their attendance. Going forward, there is potential for greater continued dissemination at events and conferences to keep the topic and findings in

<sup>22</sup> [http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef\\_files/extranet/board/documents/committees/2014/20140925\\_01/accesstobenefits.pdf](http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_files/extranet/board/documents/committees/2014/20140925_01/accesstobenefits.pdf)

<sup>23</sup> [http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef\\_publication/field\\_ef\\_document/ef1467en\\_0.pdf](http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef1467en_0.pdf)

<sup>24</sup> [http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef\\_files/pubdocs/2014/03/en/1/EF1403EN.pdf](http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_files/pubdocs/2014/03/en/1/EF1403EN.pdf)

policy makers' minds: which might result in wider and more direct adoption of findings. However, the project has been successful in 'inspiring' a range of other, related, studies, which will help to generate policy interest in the topic. Since the project finished the topic became more prominent on the policy agenda, this was exemplified by its inclusion at the recent fifth World Pension Summit, held at The Hague (November 2014).

# Youth employment: Challenges and solutions for higher participation of young people in the labour market

## Introduction and justification for inclusion

This case study was selected as an example of a small size project within the Employment and Change Unit with exceptionally high impact with a direct link to policy development on European level. The project findings have been referenced in 82 EU policy documents in the EU impact tracking database. The key publication of the project was among the top 5 downloaded reports of 2012 and a number of stakeholders referred to it as the research that triggered policy debate and led to agenda setting at EU level.

## Project objective

The original project set out to explore the situation of young people in general and specifically those who are part of the Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETs) group. The specific project objectives were to:

- Provide an overall statistical description of the situation of young people and NEETs in particular in Europe;
- Analyse current NEET related labour market policies in all Member States and make an estimation of the economic and social cost of the NEET group;
- To assess the effectiveness of various measures taken by Member States to increase the employability and to promote a higher employment participation of young people, e.g. apprenticeships and internships.

The objectives were from the outset very ambitious and haven't been adjusted at any point, once the project scope had been approved in the annual Work Programme. The added challenge was not only to map the extent of the problem but also the effectiveness of the various instruments in place to tackle it. The high level of ambition was evidenced also by the fact that this project applied an innovative and, on European level, ground-breaking methodology attempting to monetise a cost of inaction relating to a labour market problem (previously only applied in the US).

## Project inception

The initial idea for the project came from one of the Eurofound's research managers, who has been in this position in Eurofound since 2009. The project leader holds a PhD in Applied Statistics, served as a visiting fellow in a number of universities and the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission in Italy and had a substantial record of published articles in high impact academic journals prior to joining Eurofound's Employment and Change Unit.

After his initial stint at leading a project in the area of labour market policies for older workers, at the end of 2010, the lead researcher identified an opportunity to explore such policies for young people which were about to become very topical. It was his first proposal for a project and from the beginning it had received a strong support from the head of the Employment and Change research unit and recognition from the institution at an internal presentation at which it won a prize. It was formally submitted for approval by the Eurofound Governing Board within the 2011 annual work programme and passed with only one amendment – an inclusion of a specific project

objective requiring the project to assess the effectiveness of various measures taken by Member States to improve employability of young people.

The proposal was considered by all three groups of the Governing Board to be of high relevance and did not pose any controversy.

The issue that the project addressed was defined as the most serious long term labour market consequence of the recession with a potential to cause a long term disruption of various groups' participation in the labour market. This serious demographic imbalance was initially picked up in the Employment Guidelines as early as 2010 (under the 'Increasing labour participation objective') and the need to provide further evidence of the extent of the problem and the varying approaches by individual countries to address it. At the outset, the proposed project identified the following types of measures designed to encourage youth employment:

- Ensuring education and training systems transmit basic competences, in particular basic literacy and numeracy skills;
- Providing better assistance for young people to find a job;
- Generating incentives for employers to offer more apprenticeships;
- Improving the attractiveness of employing young people.

The scope of the project beyond the addition of an objective remained unchanged, focusing on two target groups which were partly overlapping: the NEETs and young people in general (with the main focus on the former group). The analysis was to be based on all EU Member States and emphasised that the scope of NEETs is relatively broad, including well educated or trained people with or without an employment history, the point being that currently they are Not in Education, Employment or Training.

At the inception period of the project, the upcoming policy developments in the relevant policy areas were not formally identified and by the procedures for spotting 'policy hotspots'. There were however 27 hotspots identified during and in the follow-up of the project. These are outlined in the dissemination and impact sections of this case study.

### **Project execution**

The internal project team consisted of the lead researcher acting as the research manager, who was working on the project full time and three Eurofound researchers, who had a smaller role on this and other projects.

The extended project scope – with an added objective to assess effectiveness of policies – required an involvement of a specialist contractor in area of policy evaluation<sup>25</sup>. In addition to this, the project made use of a Eurofound comparative analytical report (CAR) project which mapped schemes tackling youth unemployment through the existing network of correspondents. From the research manager's own initiative, the project methodology included recruitment of an independent academic panel<sup>26</sup> formed by most relevant academics that produced seminal papers identified in the literature review. Most of the approached academics agreed to sit on the panel – mainly because of the academic credibility of the project leader. The panel held three meetings, which were found to be extremely useful for increasing quality and challenging the applied methods. In addition to the

---

<sup>25</sup> The contracting out was organised and arranged by the research manager with assistance of one of the colleagues

<sup>26</sup> The project did not include any academics on the advisory committee



panel there was a specific methodological input from a specialist in use of propensity score matching at University of Florence.

The project methodology consisted of quantitative analytical methods in the initial phase of the project, using descriptive statistics and multivariate statistical models to examine risk of becoming NEETs and propensity score matching to estimate costs associated with inaction. The methodology was novel in the policy arena but the project leader was familiar with the concepts from related fields and was aware of their suitability on the presumption that similar attempts were made in the US.

The quantitative methods were complemented by desk research, literature review and interviews detailing the policy developments and assessment of their effectiveness by use of contracted evaluation experts. .

In terms of sources, the in-house analysis was complemented by the research based on a Comparative Analytical Report covering all EU Member States' youth employment policy measures. The description of the NEET phenomenon by country, sex, age, nationality, educational level, etc. was analysed using the European Labour Force Survey (ELFS), EU SILC, European Value Survey and the European Social Survey.

The project took a year and a half to complete but already in its first year produced a number of outputs marking main project milestones. The first one of which was a resume of first findings in 2011, then a short document presenting results of the evaluation of the effectiveness of selected policy measures introduced by Member States to improve the employability of young people focusing on pioneering countries in this policy area (Finland and Sweden) in early 2012 and the full results report in late 2012 (complemented by a report on effectiveness of relevant policies written by the contractor).

The whole team had a strong focus on policy-relevant topics which was evident when making choices in the process of synthesising large amounts of information produced by the national correspondents and the specialist contractor<sup>27</sup>. This was ensured by listening to policy feedback from presentation of early findings at numerous events and demonstrated flexibility of the team and their openness to input from policy.

The project was executed to the original specification, with only a slight delay due to internal capacity problems which could have been flagged to the head of the research unit at an earlier stage. This, in the lead researcher's opinion, did not have any effect on the achieved level of impact. Other challenges encountered during the execution of the project included the challenge of coordinating the 28 contributing national correspondents whose inputs varied in quality and required further requests from the research manager in order to pass the quality threshold. Likewise the collaboration with an external contractor demanded a greater amount of quality assurance but after 4 iterations of comments, the signed off work was seen to be of a very high standard.

## Dissemination of results

The formal dissemination activities were part of the launch event, prepared as part of the EU Presidency collaboration programme, and publication of the abovementioned four reports and two 2-page summaries of the full results report and the report on effectiveness of relevant policies. These formal dissemination activities were, in relative terms, modest, especially if compared to other outreach activities surrounding larger Eurofound projects. The research manager presented the research results at the Cypriot presidency<sup>28</sup> event on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 when the report was made available on Eurofound website.

---

<sup>27</sup> 90 pages policy report and 30 pages on existing schemes needed to be summarised in 25 pages of only the 'most relevant' condensed information

<sup>28</sup> EU Presidency Conference on Employment Priorities in Nicosia, Cyprus, on 'Developing sustainable youth employment policies in an era of fiscal constraints'



There were nevertheless a number of other developments and activities surrounding the main delivery of research outputs. The first one was a direct request by DG Employment several months prior to the publishing of the final report, to see its draft version (in September 2012) which would have most likely not been necessary without the aforementioned 2 months delay. Nevertheless, this meant that at its launch, the report was already destined to be quoted in the upcoming proposal for what was about to become the Youth Guarantee programme. Similarly, an unplanned output in a form of a short thematic report was requested by the European Parliament for their thematic committee.

The formal dissemination activities were complemented by a series of proactive efforts of the project leader. These included an article published on the launch day in *The Guardian*, which was directly re-quoted in further 330 global newspapers. The coverage in *The Guardian* was secured by contacts of the project leader and a member of the Information and Communication Unit at Eurofound.

The coverage subsequently resulted in media appearances and presentations made by the project leader on the Jeff Randall show and in Euronews programming. Following this viral media success, there was a lunch debate with the European social partners organised by the Brussels Liaison Office in November 2012, attended by 23 representatives of social partners with varying levels of ability to influence policy and a Danish MEP, rapporteur on the youth issue at that time. This event was seen as one of the dissemination activities and resulted mainly in citations of the report by the organisations represented at the meeting rather than in a direct influence on policy.

In total there were 27 identified policy ‘hotspots’ in youth-related policies, spanning across the period since November 2011 when the first findings were published until late 2014. The majority of these policy hotspots were identified and acted upon in 2012. The identified policy opportunities ranged from possibilities of providing input into hearings of the European Parliament, through presenting at EU presidencies and meetings of the SOC EESC, to presentations to the Council of Ministers and the Committee of Regions with respect to support of new measures. The outcomes of these efforts varied as in some cases they did not lead to any formal contribution, in some cases they resulted in the supply of research findings and documents to the policymakers in the various organisations and in a number of instances these efforts resulted in presentation of results and direct contact with policymakers. The most impactful of these events were presentations to the Council of Ministers and the Committee of Regions prior to the decision on Youth Guarantee described in detail in the next chapter.

Other dissemination activities relating to hotspots included email alerts to EU level cross-sectoral and sectoral social partners (AKEuropa, BusinessEurope, ETUC, CEEP UEAPME, CESI, Cettar, CEEMET, DGB Europa, EFFAT, Eurocommerce, EFBH, FIEC, Eurociett, CEC European managers, CEMR, IndustriALL) and a broad selection of MEPs, and EESC and CoR members. Information and communication unit has further disseminated findings on the topic of Youth unemployment and NEETs in spotlight focus online and cluster events.

## Impact

The policy impact from the project was established both on European and subsequently cascaded down to the national member state level. The project outputs enjoyed a wide level of quotation in policy documents by governments and social partners alike. There were 82 EU policy documents referring to the project registered by the Brussels Liaison Office. The impact quotations took place mainly in 2012 and 2013 with only a few in 2011. This high number of tracked impact is a good indicator of how successful the project has been in its outreach at EU level. The number of quotations and provision of specific information are too numerous to list but the key impact on policy as perceived by the research manager is outlined below.

We have in addition to this impact recorded two impacts on policies on national level directly influenced by activities within the project (one in Italy and one in the UK).

In the first instance, the research 'First Findings', which were presented as part of the collaboration programme of the EU Presidencies, triggered a discussion and provided the basis for a very interesting policy debate. This debate provided the basis for a three-way discussion between the representatives of the European Commission, the Irish Presidency and Eurofound at the directorate level. The European Commission was represented by the Director EU2020-Employment policy, the Irish Presidency by the Director of EU Labour Affairs and EPSCO and Eurofound was represented by the agency's Director and the Head of Information and Communication. These meetings during late 2012 and early 2013 enabled a cross-departmental group of Irish civil servants to highlight to the Commission the importance that the Irish Government gave to this issue ahead of the publication of the Commission's Youth Guarantee proposal. It subsequently helped to crystallise thinking on the balance of priority employment issues to be addressed as part of the seminars/conferences during the Irish Presidency. The Eurofound's work in the area allowed for advancing the issue from the Working Group to council level and then led to the realisation of the main policy impact. This case study indicates the high level of usefulness of the collaboration programme of the EU presidencies which provided the basis for realisation of this impact.

This main impact was realised after a contact with two Irish ministries within the Irish presidency under which the Irish Minister for Social Protection and the chair of EPSCO meeting of Council of Ministers on the 7<sup>th</sup> February 2013, arranged a presentation by the leader of the NEETs project on economic cost of NEETs and effectiveness of Youth Guarantee to limit these costs. The presentation was seen to have provided a strong case for the existing youth guarantee programmes and contributed towards the Council of Ministers' decision to approve funding for the EU-wide initiative (formal decision two months later). Later in the year at a presentation to the Eurofound governing board, Minister Joan Burton expressed that this presentation and the work within the NEETs project was instrumental to this policy development and backing of the initiative by the European Council of Ministers.

It needs to be acknowledged that the events and efforts from the European Commission in preparation of the proposal for Youth Guarantee in 2012, the coordination and a strong push from the Irish Ministries and efforts of the Eurofound directorate and information and communication unit made it possible for Eurofound research to gain high exposure at the aforementioned EPSCO meeting. It was nevertheless the high quality research covering both the extent of the problem the EU was facing (presented in the form of the cost of inaction) and investigation of the effective solutions which had strong implications for the issue of Council's decision to support the EU-wide policy. On the national level, the project leader presented work and justified a national support scheme in Italy and served as a witness of evidence at the House of Lords which decided to adopt their position to youth guarantee based on his statement.

## **Success factors**

### Inception

The project was from the outset regarded as a good idea however the high policy impact was not anticipated and despite the drive from the identified future policy development, the idea proved highly relevant. The key success factor at the inception phase was high ambition and a strong belief in the idea from the researcher and support from the head of unit. The proposal identified a unique opportunity for a research gap.

### Execution

- Knowledgeable and credible project team lead by an academically highly regarded researcher able to recruit an academic panel to challenge the approach and respond to challenges with well researched justification for specific research choices
- Suitable and innovative methodology of monetising inaction – a novelty in the policy arena (only done in the US before) and the presentation of results in the form of a monetary value for 'cost of inaction'

- Validation of methodology by involving top academics in the field
- Strong focus on policy-relevant topics which was evident when making choices in the process of synthesising large amounts of information and listening to early feedback

#### Dissemination and Impact

- Proactive efforts by the research manager and the information and communications unit securing wide exposure in the media and at the various events
- Cost figure backed by a strong methodology meant that a complex story was sold to the reader by a great headline
- Urgency of the need for evidence for a pressing societal issue – youth unemployment become a social issue and the policymakers required a report that would establish the NEETs terminology
- Efforts of the European Commission to fast-track policy developments in order to address the problem
- Irish Presidency and the support from the Irish Minister who was instrumental in agenda setting at the EPSCO meeting

# ANNEX H: Analyses of user survey evaluation component

## 1.1 Introduction

The User Satisfaction Survey was designed in collaboration between GfK and Ipsos MORI. The online survey was administered by the main contractor of the user satisfaction study for Eurofound, GfK. This annex presents results from the evaluation component of the survey. The tables present the topline descriptive statistics. For each of the evaluation questions, there were further analyses of the data investigating differences between the EU15 (referred to as the 'old' EU member states) and the 'new' EU member states (joining since 2004)<sup>1</sup>, and additionally by the role of the respondent, so those directly impacting policy<sup>2</sup> (referred to as Policy Makers) vs those that have no direct impact on/relation to policy (Other users). Details for such findings are presented in bullet points under each table. The test applied was the Chi-square test for association, which usefully tests for any group level differences by comparing expected and actual frequency counts for each possible answer. The Chi-square test is a widely accepted statistical method for assessing two groups that yield two independent samples of nominal data. The statistical test for significance of differences between groups was run at a confidence level of 95%'

---

<sup>1</sup> Analysis undertaken in this document has required the EU member states to be split into two categories- new and old member states. Old being: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, UK and new: Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia. Respondents from countries outside the EU have been excluded from this analysis.

<sup>2</sup> Analysis undertaken in this document required categorising respondents by their role between those that have a directly impact on policy development and those that have no direct impact on policy. The first category includes respondents with the following roles: Advising on policy, Shaping policy and Advocacy and lobbying, The latter category (users not directly influencing policy) were defined by the following roles: research, Communication and dissemination, Intermediation and mediation between parties, and other roles.

## 1.2 Respondent Profile

Q1. What does your job mainly involve? Please select ONE answer which best reflects your role.

Role of the respondent	Share of responses
Research	36%
Advising on policy, i.e. providing advice and information to those who take decisions on policies	22%
Communication and dissemination (externally or internally)	11%
Shaping policy, i.e. taking decisions on policies	7%
Advocacy and lobbying	5%
Intermediation and mediation between parties	5%
Other roles - Please specify	14%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 244

Q2. Are you a member of Eurofound's Governing Board and/or an Advisory Committee?

Answer	Share of responses
Yes	5%
No	95%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 244

Note: the governing board members were given a choice to skip the evaluation questions but all 11 of them decided to complete the survey in its entirety.

Q3. Which of the following best describes the employer that you work for?

Answer	Share of responses
University	18%
Government	16%
Business organisation/ private company/ trade or professional organizations	12%
Trade union organisation	9%
Think tank/ research organisation	8%

NGO, international NGO	7%
EU Commission	5%
International organisation	2%
Political institution (parliaments, Others) federal/ national/ regional	2%
European Parliament	1%
Employer organisation	1%
European Council	0%
European Economic and Social Committee	0%
Other EU body - Please indicate organisation	4%
Other organisation – Please indicate organisation	12%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 244

---

## Q4. In which country do you mainly work?

Answer	Share of responses
Austria	2%
Belgium	11%
Bulgaria	2%
Croatia	2%
Cyprus	1%
Czech Republic	1%
Denmark	1%
Estonia	0%
Finland	2%
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	1%
France	4%
Germany	5%
Greece	5%
Hungary	1%
Ireland	9%
Italy	9%
Latvia	1%
Lithuania	0%
Luxembourg	2%
Malta	1%
Netherlands	4%
Poland	0%
Portugal	5%
Romania	2%
Serbia	1%
Slovenia	1%
Spain	5%
Sweden	5%
Turkey	1%
UK	8%
Other - Please specify	8%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 244

### 1.3 Responses to Evaluation Questions

QE1. Were you aware of Eurofound's publications and activities in the period 2009-2012?

Answer	Share of responses
Yes	56%
No	31%
Don't know	14%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 244

- Respondents from new EU member states (78.8%) were more aware of Eurofound's publications and activities in 2009-2012 than their counterparts from old EU member states (51.6%). The differences between these two groups were statistically significant.
- Respondents from the category 'Policy Makers' (64.1%) were more aware of Eurofound's publications and activities in 2009-2012 than their counterparts in the category 'Other user' (50.7%). The differences between these two groups were not statistically significant.

QE1a. In the period 2009-2012 did you use any of Eurofound's publications and activities? (Only those who answered yes or don't know to QE1)

Answer	Share of responses
Yes	86%
No	9%
Don't know	5%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 169

- There were no statistically significant differences between respondents from old and new EU member states.
- There were no statistically significant differences between respondents from the category 'Policy Makers' and those in the category 'Other users'.



QE1b. Would the Eurofound publications and activities have been relevant to you in 2009-12? (Only those who answered no to QE1)

Answer	Share of responses
Yes	53%
No	21%
Don't know	25%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 75

- There were no statistically significant differences between respondents from old and new EU member states.
- Respondents from the the category 'Policy Makers' (60.9%) were more likely to find Eurofound's publications and activities in 2009-2012 relevant to them than those from the category 'Other users' (50%). The differences between these two groups were not statistically significant.

QE2. To what extent, if at all, do you think that Eurofound's activities and publications produced in 2009-2012 contributed to socio-economic policy developments? (Only those who answered yes or don't know to QE1a, those answering No to QE1 or QE1a to go to Q10)

Answer	Share of responses
To a large extent	15%
To some extent	50%
To a small extent	20%
Not at all	4%
Don't know	12%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 153

- Respondents from new EU member states (80%) were more likely to state that Eurofound's activities and publications contributed to at least some extent to policy developments than their counterparts from old EU member states (60.6%). These differences were not statistically different.
- There were no statistically significant differences between respondents from the category 'Policy Makers' and those in the category 'Other users'.

QE2a. By which means did Eurofound's activities and outputs contribute to relevant socio-economic policy developments? We are especially interested in how Eurofound impacts on the national level (Only those who answered yes or don't know to QE1a)

Answer	Share of responses
Preparation of new policy proposals	60%
Contribution to policy impact assessments	47%
Citation in official reports	38%
Citation in scientific papers	27%
Other – please specify	4%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 99 (this base was the same across the five above cited options)

- Respondents from both old and new EU member states most frequently stated that the main contributor to socio-economic policy development was *preparation of new policy proposals*, while the least contributor was the *citation in scientific papers*. These differences were not statistically significant.
- Respondents from both categories 'Policy Makers' and 'Other users' most frequently stated the main contributor to socio-economic policy development was *preparation of new policy proposals*, while the least contributor was the *citation in scientific papers*. These differences were not statistically significant.

QE2b. What is the most important policy development significantly influenced by Eurofound's publications and activities that you are aware of? (Open ended)

Categorised open-ended answers	Share of responses
Policy developments relating to working conditions	21%
Policy developments relating to Flexicurity	6%
Europe 2020	3%
Health and safety policy	3%
Mobility policy	3%
Policy developments relating to industrial relations	2%
Policy developments relating to living standards	2%
Policies relating to social inclusion	2%
Policies relating to youth unemployment	2%
Policies relating to ageing workers	2%
Policies relating to austerity and economic crisis	2%
Background information for Presidency conferences	1%
Changes in the collective bargaining policy	1%
Commission's 'Beyond GDP' initiative	1%
Policies relating to labour outputs	1%
Presentation of the SIP package in early 2013	1%
Strategic policy documents	1%
Anti-Corruption policies	1%

Job quality and Horizon 2020	1%
Policy developments relating to restructuring	1%
New policy proposals	1%
Multiple policies on EU level	8%
Not sure	21%
None	11%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 98

A wide variety of answers were given when respondents were asked to detail the most important policy developments significantly influenced by Eurofound's publications and activities that they were aware of. The main findings are detailed in the above table. What can be concluded from this table is that:

- 21% of the replies mentioned *working conditions* as one of the most important policy development fields significantly influenced by Eurofound's publications and activities. More specifically, projects focusing on work related stress and working hours were mentioned by respondents as those areas most influential. Under this umbrella there have also been mentions of wage related policies as well as mentions of comparative working conditions between different countries.
- 21% replied *Not sure*. It is important to note that *Not sure* is not equivalent to *None*, as there is a separate code for this. This can be interpreted as respondents being aware of policy developments having been influenced by Eurofound's publications, but that these respondents cannot be sure which policy development.
- 6% of the respondents mentioned Flexicurity as one of the most important policy development fields significantly influenced by Eurofound's publications and activities.
- 8% of the respondents mentioned that there were multiple policy developments significantly influenced by Eurofound's publications and activities, but that these could not be specified.
- Other policy areas, such as; ageing, youth, mobility, and industrial were also options mentioned by respondents as being significantly influenced by Eurofound's publications and activities

In terms of further analysis:

- 32% of respondents from old member states whom answered the question indicated that they were not sure as opposed to only 15% of their counterparts from new member states. Working conditions related policies were the most frequently mentioned policies by both groups.
- There were no significant differences between policymakers and other users.

QE2c. Why do you think Eurofound's activities and outputs only contributed to a small extent/ did not contribute to relevant socio-economic policy developments? (Open ended)

Categorised open-ended answers	Share of responses
Unable to assess	40%
Economic/ Financial constraints	13%
Standard outputs (publications) have limited ability to influence policy developments	13%
Eurofound does not have a wide enough recognition	7%
Eurofound does not have a wide enough recognition - within some user organisations	7%
Policy developments are often not evidence based	7%
Problems with attribution of policy developments to one publication	7%
Tripartite nature of Eurofound results in politically neutral publications that do not endeavour to promote a paradigm shift on policy level	7%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 15

It is important to note that the base is very low for this question, only 15 respondents. Therefore the responses are to be treated as indicative. The table lists seven main reasons why respondents believe Eurofound's activities did not contribute greatly, if at all, to the socio-economic policy:

- Economic and financial constraints were mentioned as options behind why Eurofound's activities did not contribute greatly to relevant socio-economic policy and developments.
- Most respondents were unable to specify the main reason behind why Eurofound's activities and outputs have had little or no contribution to policy developments. 40% responded *Unable to assess* for this question.
- Some respondents mentioned that the main reason behind why they believed Eurofound's publications did not, or did very little, to contribute to the policy developments was because influence of any such publications on policy development is limited.

QE3. How responsive was Eurofound to unforeseen changes arising, notably from the economic and financial crisis during the 2009-2012 programming period?

Answer	Share of responses
Very responsive	9%
Fairly responsive	51%
Not very responsive	11%
Don't know	29%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 153

- Respondents from new EU member were more likely to state that Eurofound was fairly or very responsive (88%) than their counterparts from old EU member states (53.5%). These differences were statistically significant.
- Respondents from the category 'Other users' (64.8%) more frequently detailed that Eurofound was fairly or very responsive to unforeseen changes arising in comparison to their counterparts from the group 'Policy Makers' (53.2%). These differences were also statistically significant.

QE3a. Why do you say that it was very/fairly responsive to changes? Please give examples of projects/specific outputs if you can. (Open ended)

Categorised open-ended answers	Share of responses
Specific examples on responsiveness	39%
Specific examples on unresponsiveness	2%
No specific example - General statement on responsiveness	18%
No specific example - General statement on unresponsiveness	6%
Unable to specify	36%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 90

Based on the answers collected from the above open ended question, responses were split into five main categories, as above displays:

- 39% of respondents offered specific examples to explain why they agreed Eurofound was very/ fairly responsive to changes, specifically with regards to the economic and financial crisis during 2009-2012. Examples included: The impact of the crisis on labour relations, flexicurity and employment (some specifying youth unemployment), the impact of the crisis on the quality of life and working conditions, the impacts of the crisis on the nation's health and the ageing/ vulnerable workers. Some further specified examples on childcare, and social inclusion as their examples.
- 36% of the respondents were *unable to specify* exactly why they considered Eurofound to be very/fairly responsive to unforeseen changes, but agreed that they were.

The examples of responsive projects were included in list of case studies.

QE4. In your opinion, to what extent, if at all, did Eurofound's research in the period 2009-12 take into account existing research?

Answer	Share of responses
To a large extent	18%
To some extent	47%
To a small extent	4%
Not at all	0%
Don't know	31%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 153

- Respondents from new EU member states (76%) more frequently stated that Eurofound's research, in the period 2009-12, to at least some extent took into account existing research, in comparison to their counterparts from old EU member states (61.4%). These differences were not statistically significant.
- Respondents from the category 'Other users' (69.2%) more frequently stated Eurofound's research, in the period 2009-12, to at least some extent took into account existing research, in comparison to their counterparts in the group 'Policy Makers' (59.7%). These differences were not statistically significant.

QE5. Eurofound's research applies a variety of research methods. Would you say that the level of rigour in the methods applied during 2009-2012 was...

Answer	Share of responses
More rigorous than I require	7%
About right	57%
Less rigorous than I require	7%
Don't know	29%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 153

- Respondents from new EU member states (72%) more frequently stated that Eurofound's research applied the right amount of variety of research methods in comparison to their counterparts from old EU member states (56.1%). These differences were not statistically significant.
- There were no statistically significant differences between respondents from the category 'Policy Makers' and those in the category 'Other users'.

QE6. How frequently were Eurofound's outputs delivered in time for policymakers to make better informed decisions?

Answer	Share of responses
Always	5%
Mostly	31%
Sometimes	16%
Never	1%
Don't know	48%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 153

- Respondents from new EU member states (44%) more frequently stated that Eurofound's outputs were *mostly* delivered on time for policymakers to make better informed decisions than their counterparts from old EU member states (26.3%). These differences were not statistically significant.
- There were no statistically significant differences between respondents from the category 'Policy Makers' and those in the category 'Other users'.

QE7. To what extent do you consider Eurofound's activities in 2009-2012 to be a coherent set of activities?

Answer	Share of responses
To a large extent	27%
To some extent	41%
To a small extent	5%
Not at all	1%
Don't know	27%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 153

- Respondents from new EU member states (84%) more frequently considered Eurofound's activities in 2009-2012 to be at least to some extent a coherent set of activities than their counterparts from old EU member states (63.2%). These differences were however not statistically significant.
- Respondents from the category 'Other user' (71.5%) more frequently considered Eurofound's activities in 2009-2012 to be at least to some extent a coherent set of activities than their counterparts from the category 'Policy maker' (61.3%). These differences were not statistically significant.

QE8. To what extent do you feel Eurofound demonstrated expertise when delivering publications and activities in 2009-2012?

Answer	Share of responses
To a large extent	41%
To some extent	27%
To a small extent	5%
Not at all	0%
Don't know	27%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 153

- Respondents from new EU member states (92%) more frequently stated Eurofound at least to some extent demonstrated expertise when delivering publications and activities in 2009-2012 in comparison to their counterparts from old EU member states (76.3%). These differences were not statistically significant.
- There were no statistically significant differences between respondents from the category 'Policy Makers' and those in the category 'Other users'.

QE9. To what extent, if at all, was Eurofound's work in 2009-2012 valuable to you?

Answer	Share of responses
To a large extent	27%
To some extent	56%
To a small extent	9%
Not at all	0%
Don't know	7%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 153

- Respondents from new EU member states (92%) were more likely to state Eurofound's work in 2009-2012 was at least to some extent valuable to them than their counterparts from old EU member states (80.7%). These differences were not statistically significant.
- There were no statistically significant differences between respondents from the category 'Policy Makers' and those in the category 'Other users'.



## QE9a. What characteristic of Eurofound's work in 2009-2012 did you value the most?

Answer	Share of responses
European coverage	38%
Reliable trend data	29%
Information not available elsewhere	21%
Tripartite governance	7%
Reputation	4%
Rigorous methodologies	2%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 128

- Respondents from old EU member states more frequently stated that the characteristic they most valued in Eurofound's work, in 2009-2012, was *European Coverage*, while those from new EU member states most frequently detailed *reliable trend data*. Both old and new EU member states least valued the characteristic *rigorous methodologies* in Eurofound's work. These differences were not statistically significant.
- Respondents from both categories 'Policy Makers' and 'Other users' most frequently stated the characteristic they most valued in Eurofound's work in 2009-2012 was *European Coverage*, while the least was *rigorous methodologies*. These differences were not statistically significant.

## Q10. To what extent, if at all, is Eurofound's current work valuable to you? (Only asked of those answering No to QE1 or QE1a)

Answer	Share of responses
To a large extent	9%
To some extent	58%
To a small extent	22%
Not at all	8%
Don't know	3%

Base: 91

- Respondents from new EU member states (100%) more frequently stated that Eurofound's current work was valuable to them than their counterparts from old EU member states (63.9%). These differences were not statistically significant.
- Respondents from the category 'Other' (72.2%) more frequently stated that Eurofound's current work was valuable to them than their counterparts in the category 'Policy Makers' (56.6%). These differences were not statistically significant.

QE10a. What characteristic of Eurofound's work do you value the most? (Only asked of those answering No to QE1 or QE1a)

Answer	Share of responses
European coverage	44%
Reliable trend data	25%
Information not available elsewhere	13%
Rigorous methodologies	10%
Reputation	7%
Tripartite governance	2%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 61

- Respondents from old and new member states most frequently stated that the characteristic they valued was *European Coverage*. Respondents from old member states were least likely to state that *tripartite governance* was the most valuable characteristic while their counterparts from new member states were least likely to select *reliable trend data*. These differences were not statistically significant.
- There were no statistically significant differences between respondents from the category 'Policy Makers' and those in the category 'Other users'.

# Annex I: Ex post evaluation of Work programme 2009-2012 Multi-annual Work Programme evaluation

On 24th of October the evaluation team ran a voting session with all present members of the governing board at the meeting<sup>1</sup> (agenda point 8). Below details the questions in section 1.1, and then compares the voting session results to the survey results in section 1.2.

## 1.1 Voting results

The tables below depicts responses collated from the voting session covering each question in turn.

Q1. Were you a member of the Governing Board, or aware of Eurofound's work, during the 2009-2012 period?

Member of GB in 2009-2012?	Percentage
Yes	59%
No	41%
Not sure	0%
Grand total	100%

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 46

Q2. To what extent, if at all, do you think that Eurofound's activities and publications produced in 2009-2012 contributed to socio-economic policy developments?

Extent of contribution to socioeconomic development	Percentage
To a large extent	13%
To some large extent	56%
To a small extent	23%
Not at all	0%
I don't have enough information to assess this	8%
Grand Total	100%

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 48

<sup>1</sup> 53 members of the governing board signed in and 43 signed out

Q3. In your view, what was the most important means by which Eurofound contributed to relevant socio-economic policy development?

Means of contribution	Percentage
Contribution to policy impact assessments	6%
Preparation of new policy proposals	4%
Citation in official reports	4%
Citation in scientific papers	4%
Informing policy debate by providing of background and contextual knowledge	72%
I don't have enough information to assess	9%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 47

Q4. In your view, how responsive was Eurofound to the unforeseen changes arising, notably from the economic and financial crisis during 2009-2012 programme period?

Responsiveness	Percentage
Very responsive	17%
Fairly responsive	50%
Not very responsive	13%
Not at all responsive	0%
I don't have enough information to assess this	20%
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 46

Q5. In your opinion to what extent did Eurofound structures and processes support the implementation of the 2009-2012 work programme?

<b>Eurofound structures</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>To a large extent</b>	27%
<b>To some extent</b>	31%
<b>To small extent</b>	9%
<b>Not at all</b>	0%
<b>I don't have enough information to assess</b>	33%
<b>Grand Total</b>	100%

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 45

Q6a. Was Eurofound's collaboration with the following organisation appropriate during 2009-2012 period?

<b>Collaboration with EU-OSHA (Bilbao)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	36%
<b>No</b>	11%
<b>I don't know enough about Eurofound's collaboration with EU-OSHA to comment</b>	53%
<b>Grand Total</b>	100%

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 45

Q6b. Was Eurofound's collaboration with the following organisation appropriate during 2009-2012 period?

<b>Collaboration with CEDEFOP (Thessaloniki)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	20%
<b>No</b>	9%
<b>I don't know enough about Eurofound's collaboration with CEDEFOP to comment</b>	72%
<b>Grand Total</b>	100%

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 46

Q6c. Was Eurofound's collaboration with the following organisation appropriate during 2009-2012 period?

Collaboration with ETF (Turin)	Percentage
Yes	11%
No	7%
I don't know enough about Eurofound's collaboration with ETF to comment	83%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 46

Q6d. Was Eurofound's collaboration with the following organisation appropriate during 2009-2012 period?

Collaboration with OECD	Percentage
Yes	19%
No	15%
I don't know enough about Eurofound's collaboration with OECD to comment	66%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 47

Q6e. Was Eurofound's collaboration with the following organisation appropriate during 2009-2012 period?

Collaboration with ILO	Percentage
Yes	45%
No	11%
I don't know enough about Eurofound's collaboration with ILO to comment	45%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 47

### Q7. Which group of the Eurofound Governing Board do you represent?

Collaboration with ILO	Percentage
Government	36%
Employers	26%
Workers	36%
European Commission	2%
Grand Total	100%

Source: Eurofound Voting results by Governing Board 2014

Base: 47

## 1.2 Comparison of the voting session results to survey results

There were three questions that were posed to Eurofound Governing Board and were explored also with the broader user base by the user survey. For this analysis we excluded the 11 responses by governing board members who responded to the user survey.

To what extent, if at all, do you think that Eurofound's activities and publications produced in 2009-2012 contributed to socio-economic policy developments?

GB member/User	To a large extent	To some extent	To a small extent	Not at all	Don't know
Governing Board members	12.5%	56.3%	22.9%	.0%	8.3%
Users	14.6%	49.3%	20.1%	4.2%	11.8%
Total	14.1%	51.0%	20.8%	3.1%	10.9%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 48 Governing Board members and 144 users

- There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups.

By which means did Eurofound's activities and outputs contribute to relevant socio-economic policy developments? We are especially interested in how Eurofound impacts on the national level (Only those who answered yes or don't know to QE1a)

Answer	Rank by users*	Rank by GB
Preparation of new policy proposals	2 (46.7%)	3 (6.4%)
Contribution to policy impact assessments	1 (57.6%)	4 (4.3%)
Citation in official reports	3 (35.9%)	4 (4.3%)

<b>Citation in scientific papers</b>	4 (28.3%)	4 (4.3%)
<b>Other – (for users) Informing policy (for Governing Board)</b>	5 (4.3%)	1 (72.3%)
<b>Don't have enough information</b>	n/a	2 (8.5%)

\*Survey allowed the respondents to select multiple answers and therefore percentages add to more than 100%

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 48 Governing Board members and 92 users

How responsive was Eurofound to unforeseen changes arising, notably from the economic and financial crisis during the 2009-2012 programming period?

<b>GB member/User</b>	<b>Very responsive</b>	<b>Fairly responsive</b>	<b>Not very responsive</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>Governing Board members</b>	17.4%	50.0%	13.0%	19.6%
<b>Users</b>	6.9%	50.7%	11.8%	30.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>27.9%</b>

Source: Eurofound User Satisfaction Survey 2014

Base: 48 Governing Board members and 144 users

- Unsurprisingly, the users tend to be much more likely to be unable to judge whether Eurofound had been responsive to the economic and financial crisis.
- Of those Governing Board members who were able to judge responsiveness, 84% indicated that it was fairly responsive or very responsive. Similarly 83% of those users who were able to judge the level of responsiveness, indicated that Eurofound was fairly or very responsive. There were therefore no significant differences between the way that Governing Board members and Users responded to this question. This suggests that there is a high perception of Eurofound being responsive during the 2009-2012 period.



## Annex J - Glossary

<b>BLO</b>	Brussels Liaison Office
<b>CAR</b>	Comparative Analytical Report
<b>CEDEFOP</b>	European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training
<b>CoR</b>	Committee of the Regions
<b>CRM</b>	Customer Relationship Management
<b>DG COMM</b>	Directorate-General for Communication
<b>DG ECFIN</b>	Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs
<b>DG EMPL</b>	Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion
<b>DG</b>	Directorate-General
<b>EC</b>	European Commission
<b>ECJ</b>	European Court of Justice
<b>ECS</b>	European Company Survey
<b>EEC</b>	European Economic Community
<b>EESC</b>	European Economic and Social Committee
<b>EIRO</b>	European Industrial Relations Observatory
<b>EMCC</b>	European Monitoring Centre on Change
<b>EMCO</b>	The Employment Committee
<b>EMPC</b>	Employment and Change Unit
<b>EP</b>	European Parliament
<b>EPMS</b>	Eurofound Performance Monitoring System
<b>EPSCO</b>	Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs
<b>EP IMCO</b>	Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection
<b>EQLS</b>	European Quality of Life Survey
<b>ERM</b>	European Restructuring Monitor
<b>ESENER</b>	Enterprise Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risks
<b>ESRC</b>	Economic and Social Research Council

ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
ESP	European Social Partner
ESS	European Social Survey
ESWT	European survey on working time and work-life balance
ETF	European Training Foundation
ETUC	European Trade Union Confederation
EU SILC	EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions
EU	European Union
EU15	The number of member countries in the European Union prior to the accession of ten candidate countries on 1 May 2004, comprising: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom
EU27	The Member States before or on 1 January 2007, including: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom
EU28	EU27 and Croatia after joining the EU on 1st July 2013
EU-OSHA	European Agency for Occupational Safety and Health
Eurofound	The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions
EWCO	European Working Conditions Observatory
EWCS	European Working Conditions Survey
FRA	European Agency for Fundamental Rights
GB	Governing Board
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HR	Human Relations
I&C	Information and Communication
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IPA	Instrument for the Pre-Accession Assistance

IR	Industrial Relations
IR&WD	Industrial Relations & Workplace Development
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LCQL	Living Conditions and Quality of Life
MAC	Management Advisory Committee
MEP	Member of the European Parliament
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSU	The Monitoring and Survey Unit
NEET	Not in Employment, Education or Training
NEO	Network of European Observatories
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OBSU	Observatories Unit
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSU	Operation Support Unit
PIAAC	Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies
ProjeX	Eurofound's former project management system
SOC	Section for Employment, Social Affairs and Citizenship
SPC	Social Protection Committee
STU	Surveys & Trends Unit
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
UEAPME	European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
WCIR	Working Conditions and Industrial Relations Unit