

Working Paper 4

**The Unorganised Worker: Problems at Work, Routes to Support and
Views on Representation**

The Unrepresented Worker Survey 2004

Examining the Problems of Unrepresented Workers in Britain

Anna Pollert

2005

ISBN 978-1-86043-416-7

**Centre for Employment Studies Research
Bristol Business School
University of the West of England**

Anna.Pollert@uwe.ac.uk

ESRC Research Project Grant R000230679

Revised Version (2007)

Abstract

The majority of workers in the UK are unorganised. There has been a steady decline in union membership among those in employment from 29 per cent in 1995 to 26.2 per cent in 2005 and among employees, from 32.6 per cent to 29 per cent (DTI, 2006a). Approximately 70 per cent of employees are not unionised, and two thirds have no collective bargaining coverage. Yet very little is known about how this majority of workers experience work, or deal with problems. The ESRC Project, *The Unorganised Worker, Problems at Work, Routes to Support and Views on Representation*, provides the first survey-based study, The Unrepresented Worker Survey, of how non-unionised workers deal with problems at work. This was achieved by a telephone survey conducted over a six-week period from October to November 2004 by IFF of a sample of 500 workers who were currently employed, or had been at some time in the past three years; were not unionised; earned at or below the median wage in their region¹ and had experienced a problem at work. Previous Working Papers 1 and 2 discuss technical, methodological and conceptual issues and the sample composition. Working Paper 3 explores the types of problems experienced by the sample over the previous three years and in one job where the main ones occurred. Sample characteristics compared with the Labour Force Survey are in Appendix 1. This paper addresses how different problems were experienced by different groups of people in terms of respondents' workplace, demographic and socio-economic background.

¹ The pay threshold of those earning at or below the median wage was £425 per week for London and the South East and £341 for the rest of the country. Hourly pay was calculated on the basis of information given on working hours and median pay was £5.77 per hour. The hourly pay bands started at an extremely low wage, well below the Minimum Wage. These were: 1: £1.97-£4.92; Band 2: £4.93-£5.76; Band 3: £5.77-£7.20; Band 4: £7.21-£12.00

Overview of problems experienced

'Problems' at work were initially broadly framed as *difficulties, concerns or worries*, in order to capture workers who might under-estimate their problems and consider the terminology 'problem' too severe to apply to their experiences. The questionnaire then clearly specified key workplace problem areas with prompts, to exclude trivial irritations, which were not considered suitable for inclusion. Ten problems were explored, and after cognitive testing and piloting, were asked in the following order: *pay*, such as not being paid the correct amount, not being paid regularly, or not receiving pay for holidays or overtime, etc.; *job security*, such as fear of unfair dismissal or being forced to quit; *opportunities to advance at work*; *discrimination towards yourself*; *taking time-off*; *working hours*; *workload*; *health and safety*; *concerns relating to your contract or job description*; and *work relations*, such as stress or bullying. Those with none of the above were not interviewed. Respondents included in the sample were initially asked about all problems experienced in the previous three years, to gain a broad overview of the kinds experienced, but in order to allow focus on the exact nature of the problem, were then asked to narrow attention to all the problems in *one job*.²

For the majority (80 per cent) of workers, problems over the past three years had occurred in one job, so that where multiple problems occurred, these were part of a single work experience. For a further 13 per cent, the problems had occurred in two jobs, and for 5 per cent, in more than two jobs. The most frequently cited problems were pay-related (almost two-fifths), followed by work-relations, such as stress and bullying (36.7 per cent), workload (31.9 per cent) job security (30.3 per cent) and working hours (28.5 per cent). Almost a quarter cited problems with contracts or job descriptions, job opportunities, health and safety and taking time-off. The smallest category was discrimination, which was reported by 17.8 per cent of the sample.

² This was in response to the prompt: 'I'd now like you to think about the ONE job over the last 3 years where you had your main concerns or difficulties'.

The frequency of occurrence of problems in one job was similar to that over the previous three years. Since the problems were now confined to one job, the sample percentages are slightly lower than for three years, but the frequency of occurrence is very similar (Table 1), although some problems rose in importance when one job was focused upon.

Table 1: Problems experienced in previous three years and in one job, 2001-2004

Problems Experienced	Number of respondents with problems over 3 years	Number of respondents with problems 1 job	% of Respondents with problems in One Job	% of Respondents with problems during 3 years
Pay (1)	191	181	36.1	(38.1)
Work relations, such as stress or bullying	184	172	34.3	(36.7)
Workload	160	143	28.5	(31.9)
Working hours	152	127	25.3	(28.5)
Job Security	143	124	24.8	(30.3)
Contract/job description	133	114	22.8	(26.5)
Health and Safety	122	109	21.8	(24.4)
Taking time-off	121	109	21.8	(24.0)
Opportunities	120	102	20.4	(24.2)
Discrimination (2)	89	76	15.2	(17.8)

Notes: (1) Such as not being paid the correct amount, not being paid regularly, or not receiving pay for holidays or overtime etc

(2) Towards yourself.

Multiple problems were experienced by the majority. While 42 per cent experienced just one problem, the other 58 per cent had several (21 per cent had two problems, 13 per cent three, 9 per cent four, 8 per cent five and the remainder more than this). Whether or not these were considered an infringement of rights gave some indication of the degree of knowledge of employment rights respondents felt they had and over half (56 per cent) felt their problems were such an infringement. Nevertheless, the other 44 per cent did not think so, but were sufficiently concerned about their problems to participate in the survey. The highest percentages *within each problem area*

who regarded their problems as an infringement of their rights were among those with discrimination, health and safety, pay, work relations and working-hours problems, and the lowest among those with opportunities and job security problems.

Problems in one job: The workplace and the worker

The following outlines a broad analysis of problems experienced, comparing the average frequency of their occurrence with the variations demonstrated by workplace and sample characteristics.

Pay problems were (average 36.1 per cent of sample), were, unsurprisingly, most likely to occur among those in the lowest pay band (42 per cent compared with 33 per cent in Band 4). They were more likely to occur in the private sector and in very small workplaces (below 25 workers) (Table I, Appendix 2). They were reported more frequently by men than by women, by ethnic minorities³ than White workers, by those with less than one-year's tenure, by workers aged 40-49 years (42 per cent) and slightly more frequently by part-time than by full-time workers (Table II, Appendix 2, for most but not all variables). Workers in transport and storage were the most likely to have these problems (50 per cent), with those in Other Services, Education, Real State and Renting and Financial Services also reporting above the average (41 per cent of each). Interestingly, they were more likely at the extremes of the occupational spectrum: 45 per cent of managers, 55 per cent of professional workers and 48 per cent of Elementary occupations (tables not included)

Work relations problems (average 34.3 per cent) were most likely among those in the voluntary sector (54 per cent), companies contracted to the public sector (46 per cent), the public sector (38 per cent) and in the 25-49 workplace size (42 per cent). Workers in Finance were also over-represented (although cell size is only 17 here), as they were in Health (46 per cent),

³ Because of the small cell sizes for each ethnic minority group, they are aggregated as all 'Non-White' in this analysis.

Education (41 per cent) and Real Estate and Renting (41 per cent). There was no gender or ethnic difference in work-relations problems, but those aged between 40 and 49 years (41 per cent), working full-time (especially over 48 hours), and working either between 3-6 months, or 2-5 years, were more likely to have these problems. Interestingly, those in the top two pay bands were most likely to experience work relations problems (40 per cent each), while those in Band 2 (second to bottom) the least (23 per cent). The highest incidence was among managers and administrative workers (45 per cent and 42 per cent respectively).

Workload problems (average 28.5 per cent), the third in importance, were most prevalent in the public sector, where they were reported by 40 per cent of respondents, compared with the average of 29 per cent. Public administration, Health and Social Work and Education were the major workload problem sites (38 per cent, 37 per cent and 31 per cent respectively), and associate professionals, administrative workers and managers were the most prone occupations (44 per cent, 36 per cent and 36 per cent respectively). The top two pay bands were also slightly over-represented (32 per cent each). Workload problems were more likely among women than men (29 per cent and 25 per cent), among ethnic minorities (32 per cent among Non-White, 28 per cent among White workers) and among those over 30 years old. Full-time workers were much more likely than part-time workers to report this (32 per cent and 18 per cent), and incidence increased with working hours, rising from 34 per cent among those working between 41 and 48 hours per week to 44 per cent among those working above 48 hours.

Working-hours (average 25.3 per cent) problems showed a marked difference between the private and public sectors (30 per cent and 13 per cent respectively) – which suggests the stronger effect of legal regulation in the latter. The sectors with the highest incidence of working-hours problems were Wholesale and Retail, Construction (both 31 per cent), Hotels and Restaurants, Financial Mediation (both 29 per cent) and Health and Social

work (28 per cent). Men were slightly more likely than women to have working-hours concerns (28 per cent compared with 24 per cent), as were Non-White workers compared with White workers (32 per cent compared with 25 per cent). Younger workers were more likely than older ones over 40 years old to have these problems, and among those over 50, the rate declined to 19 per cent. Working hour problems rose with hours worked per week, with almost half of those working over 48 hours reporting these problems (48 per cent). They were also more likely among those with less than a year's service (especially those with 3-6 months' service), and among those in the bottom pay-band (32 per cent). The occupations most vulnerable to working hours are spread al spread between manual and non-manual work, with over-representation of those in the skilled trades (41 per cent), professions (35 per cent), sales work (34 per cent) and management (30 per cent).

Job security (average 24.8 per cent) as a perceived problem is a conceptually highly complex area (Heery and Salmon, 2000) and has been narrowed in this study to an immediate sense of threat of job loss.

Insecurity was more prevalent among men than among women (31 per cent compared with 21 per cent), and among those in the lowest pay-band (31 per cent). Interestingly, while it might be expected that young workers would be most prone to an insecurity problem, only 19 per cent of those younger than 22 reported this, while the highest incidence was among those aged 30-39 years. White workers had an average 26 per cent propensity for insecurity, but, surprisingly in view of the disadvantaged labour market status of ethnic minority workers, Non-White workers reported this less (16 per cent).

Felstead *et al.* (1998) analysed *changing* experiences of insecurity, and found high levels among workers either with short or long tenure, among part-time workers and increases among workers in finance and construction, those with higher education and in non-manual and professional work (see Robinson 2000: 28). Our findings were that, while there was little overall difference between those with more or less than a year's service (24 per cent and 26 per

cent), three groups had greater propensity to insecurity: those with less than 3 months' service (27 per cent) those with between 1 and 2 years (28 per cent) and those with between 2 and 3 years – the greatest proneness to this problem (41 per cent). This supports the argument that there is no straightforward relationship between job tenure and insecurity (Robinson, 2000). Like Felstead *et al.* (1998) we did not find especially high insecurity in manufacturing, but we did in Construction (63 per cent). While Finance did not stand out, other sectors did, such as Hotels and Restaurants (35 per cent), Transport, Storage and Communication (33 per cent) and Business Activities (30 per cent). Part-time workers, contrary to expectations based on Felstead *et al.* (1998) and the literature which identifies part-time work and insecurity, were less likely than full-time workers to experience insecurity (17 per cent and 27 per cent respectively). This could be related to the sectoral distribution of part-time and full-time workers: those in the public sector were far less likely to experience insecurity than those in the private sector (17 per cent compared with 25 per cent), and part-time workers were over-represented in the public sector (22 per cent compared with 16 per cent of full time workers and the 18 per cent average) and under-represented in the private sector (59 per cent of part-time workers compared with 66 per cent of full-time workers and the 64 per cent average). Full-time workers working over 40 hours per week were more likely than those with fewer hours to report job insecurity, and those working over 48 hours per week were still more prone (30 per cent and 36 per cent respectively).

Confirming Felstead *et al.*'s (1998) earlier study, we found above-average insecurity problems among managers and professional workers (30 per cent and 35 per cent respectively), although the highest occurrence was among the skilled trades (43 per cent). The most highly educated, with Degree-level qualifications, were not, however the most insecure. Instead, this was reported at two extremes: those with higher secondary education (GCSE A Level, 28 per cent) and those with no qualifications (30 per cent).

Job descriptions and contract problems (average 22.8 per cent) were most frequent in the voluntary sector (33 per cent), but least among those working for contractors to the public sector (18 per cent) – a surprising finding, considering that both in the public and private sectors, the incidence was average. The high reporting in the voluntary sector suggests that, despite observations in the literature of high ideological commitment among voluntary sector workers to caring and charity organisational aims overriding concern with working conditions, changes in management style and culture may be altering this picture (Cunningham, 2000). A further surprise, in view of the literature on a more highly developed personnel function in larger than in smaller workplaces (Cully *et al*, 1998: 50) is that the incidence of contract problems was higher among those in workplaces with over 250 workers than in those with below 25 (27 per cent and 20 per cent respectively). There may be a combination of different dynamics of objective factors of fewer such problems in small workplaces, and lower levels of awareness that contract and job description might be ‘problems’. The first might occur if informal arrangements are substitutes for formal contracts in small workplaces, preventing perception of ‘problems’. It is notable that the second size-band of ‘small’ workplaces (25-49 workers), which is possibly too large for informal arrangements to operate so easily, produced higher than average contract problem reporting (26 per cent), while medium-sized workplaces (50-249) had lower incidence than the large workplace.

Sectoral analysis shows that the Education sector was associated with a high rate of contract problems (28 per cent), yet 49 per cent of Education employees worked in establishments of 50-249. Other Service activities also showed more frequent contract problems (26 per cent) although 68 per cent of these worked in establishments with fewer than 25 workers. Transport, storage and communication had a higher 29 per cent incidence, although workers were spread between very small, medium and large workplaces.

Contractual problems were equally common among full-time and part-time workers, with either long, or short hours most frequently at risk – those

working over 48 hours reporting at a 27 per cent rate, and those working between 16 and 34 hours showing a 28 per cent rate. Gender and ethnicity made little difference, but certain age and tenure groups did: the mid-age range of 22 to 39, and those with 3 to 6 months and 1 to 2 years' service reported above average. There was less extreme variation by profession here than in some problems such as pay and workload. However, associated professionals and managers had above average propensity (28 per cent and 27 per cent respectively).

Health and safety problems (average 21.8 per cent) were more heavily present in the private sector (24 per cent) than in the public (16 per cent). Perhaps surprisingly, there is a contrast between the smallest workplaces (below 25 workers), where reporting was below average (19 per cent) and small to medium workplace (25-49 workers), where it was above average (29 per cent). This is difficult to explain, as it could be related to the possibility that such issues are easier to deal with where there are very few people or there are lower levels of awareness in small workplaces. Nor can it be explained by a greater presence of workers in this size-range in the sectors with the greatest prevalence of health and safety problems, for this varies. Construction, Manufacturing, Transport and Health and Social Work were the sectors with the highest rate of health and safety problems (56 per cent, 31 per cent, 25 per cent and 28 per cent respectively), the first three endorsing Health and Safety Commission research in 2001.⁴ Health and safety problems were more likely to be reported by men (27 per cent) than by women (19 per cent) (partly reflecting the sectoral incidence), by two age-groups – those between 22 and 29 years, and between 40 and 49, and by two tenure bands – those with less than 3 months service and those with between 3 and 5 years service (25 per cent and 35 per cent respectively). Reporting frequency clearly rose with working hours - 14 per cent of those working less than 35 hours per

⁴ The Health and Safety Commission (2001) identifies as 'small' workplaces those with less than 50 employees, and 'large' as those above 200 workers. However, it shows that 76 per cent of employment in construction is in small enterprises compared with 29 per cent in manufacturing. The sectors with the highest risk of injury are transport, construction and energy (extraction). However, types of injury vary by size, fatal ones being most common in small workplaces, but serious fracture and non-fatal injury being most common in medium and large workplaces.

week and 32 per cent for those working over 48 hours per week. Ethnicity and pay showed no variation of incidence.

Taking time off problems show a similar pattern (21.8 per cent of the sample) to Health and Safety problems, with a much higher incidence in the private sector (25 per cent) than the public sector (10 per cent). Surprisingly, those in larger workplaces (250-499) were much more likely to have this problem (37 per cent), while medium-sized establishments (50-249) produced half this level (16 per cent). Difficulties with taking time off were most prevalent in Other Services (29 per cent), Health and Social Work (28 per cent) and the Wholesale and Retail trades (27 per cent), and among sales workers and managers (33 per cent and 27 per cent). Full-time workers were more likely than part-time workers to experience this problem (23 per cent and 19 per cent), those working less than a year (26 per cent compared with 18 per cent of those working over a year), Non-White workers (36 per cent compared to 20 per cent of White worker) were more likely to have problems here.

Job opportunities problems (average 20.4 per cent) were more likely to be voiced by those in the public and voluntary sectors (25 per cent), the private sector remaining at near-average, while establishments with over 250 workers reported the highest incidence (27 per cent), and those with below 25 workers the lowest (15 per cent).

Pay has a clear association with job opportunities problems, with workers in the top two pay bands far more likely to have opportunities problems than those in the bottom one (26 per cent compared with 14 per cent). This is closely associated with the wide differences between workers in large and small workplaces, with the higher paid more likely to be in larger workplaces.⁵ This is an area of problems in which awareness and expectations are likely to play a key role. For example, the lower reporting of opportunities problems

⁵ Those in the lowest pay-band were over-represented in the small workplace range (56 per cent of workers in this pay band compared to 41 per cent of the sample), while workers in the highest pay-band were under-represented in the small workplace range (31 per cent) and over-represented in large workplaces of over 250 workers (17 per cent compared with the 14 per cent average across the sample).

among the lowest pay band may be to do with the fact that, compared with the high incidence of other problems here, particularly pay and work hours (see above), matters of advancement pale into insignificance. The higher paid may be in jobs and professions where career/grade advancement has a greater subjective prominence. Those in Public Administration, Construction, Manufacturing and Education all reported at above average levels in this area (41 per cent, 38 per cent, 26 per cent and 26 per cent) and the occupations most prone to opportunities problems were the skilled trades and administration (30 per cent and 26 per cent).

Opportunity problems were more common among men than among women (26 per cent compared with 17 per cent), among the disabled (32 per cent) and slightly so among ethnic minorities (23 per cent compared with 20 per cent among white). Full-time workers were almost twice as likely as part-time workers to report these problems (23 per cent and 12 per cent). The lower representation of women and part-time workers in this problem area is interesting and may be attributable to the importance of the availability of job/career ladders to aspire to – or the greater lack of these for women and part-time workers. This in turn suggests that women and part-time workers are more concentrated in labour market segregated enclaves with few opportunities for advancement. The importance of sex segregation is highlighted by the finding that while only 16 per cent of women working with mostly women had this problem, 30 per cent of those working mostly with men did so.⁶

An age and tenure analysis suggests a work life-cycle explanation for opportunities problems: only 15 per cent of those below 22 years experienced this problem, but frequency doubled to 30 per cent for those between 22 and 29 years old and dipped to 23 per cent for older groups (although this is still above the 20 per cent average). It dropped to 12 per cent for those aged 50 years and older. While 16 per cent of those with less than 3 months service reported opportunities problems, frequency increased with tenure to 35 per

⁶ Respondents were asked whether their workplace was mainly male, mainly female or mixed.

cent for those with 2-3 years in a job, remaining high at 3-5 years service (26 per cent) – thereafter declining to below 10 per cent.

Discrimination problems (average 15.2 per cent) were further divided here between justiciable ones (those with legal redress: sex, sexual orientation, race, religious belief and disability, which were reported by 10 per cent) and non-justiciable problems of broad victimisation (reported by 6 per cent). The former was slightly more frequent in the public sector, while the latter in the private, and both were most common in the 25-49 size group. Among justiciable discrimination problems, women were more preponderant than men (11 per cent against 8 per cent), and ethnic minorities than white workers (16 per cent against 9 per cent). Part-time workers were also more likely to have justiciable discrimination problems (12 per cent compared with 9 per cent for full-time workers), which is to be anticipated, since 85 per cent of the part-time workers in the sample were women. Young workers (below 22 years) were also more likely to experience justiciable forms of discrimination (15 per cent) and younger women (below 40 years) were also more likely than men of a similar age (13 per cent compared with 9 per cent for young men), while the reverse occurred for non-justiciable discrimination (6 per cent for young women, 11 per cent for young men).

Discussion of incidence of problems in one Job

The first stage of this analysis identified the problems which occur most frequently in a job. Having mapped this, it is clear that there is a complex pattern of vulnerability to each type of problem. Men and ethnic minorities, for example, are more likely to report pay problems than women and White workers, while women and ethnic minorities are more likely to report workload problems. On the other hand, there are some areas, such as work relations, where there are few differences in terms of workers' demographic background. Employment type and sector appear to produce different associations with problems, with some evidence that the public sector, where unionisation and collective bargaining is greater, is associated with fewer problems than the private sector in pay, job security, working hours and taking

time off and health and safety. However, it is the site of a higher percentage of workload problems than the private sector. Private services to the public sector show a pattern close to the private sector, but not identical: job security concerns, for example, are worst here, as are work relations problems, while the incidence of most other kinds of difficulties lies somewhere between the private and the public sectors – suggesting, perhaps, an influence from the public sector (which could arguably occur through mechanisms which maintain public sector conditions, such as the Transfer of Undertakings legislation).

The association of workplace size is ambiguous, but it appears that mid-range workplaces (50-249 workers) often have a slightly lower problem response rate than others, suggesting that this size might be associated with better management practices and/or industrial relations. On the other hand, small workplaces of 25-49 workers appear to have a higher incidence of problems – and higher than very small workplaces below this size – as do large workplaces above 250 workers, especially those above 500. So, apart from micro-workplaces, there is some evidence that problems are associated with extremes of the size range.

Problems at work and the presence of formal management procedures on grievances, discipline and consultation

The survey of unrepresented workers sought information on workers' workplace institutional background in terms of whether there was any formal disciplinary and grievance procedure, and whether there was any procedure for regular communication and/or consultation between managers and workers or their representatives. Unlike the Workplace Employment Relations Surveys (WERS), which use the management questionnaire to map workplace characteristics, information here was entirely dependent on worker respondents' knowledge or understanding of the existence of such procedures

and/or mechanisms.⁷ There are thus limitations to the reliability of this information. Nevertheless, only 4.8 per cent of respondents replied that they did not know whether there were any set rules for how problems between employer and staff should be dealt with, and 3.2 per cent did not know if there were regular meetings between staff or their representatives to meet regularly with management to discuss workplace issues, which suggests we can have reasonable confidence in the responses. However, while the first question relates clearly to disciplinary and grievance procedures, the second is much broader: it can include joint consultative committees, but equally, it may mean regular forms of direct communication, such as team briefings, rather than representative bodies. Nevertheless, since the question asked about *regular discussion*, some form of regular consultation, rather than only downward communication, is implied. Both of these reported forms of procedure provide a broad indication of the degree of formalisation of individual workplace conflict resolution and management consultation process. It is thus worth exploring whether there is any difference in the incidence of different types of problems in workplaces with, or without, these different institutional workplace forms. Of course, associations only can be commented upon. In general, though, formal institutional provision suggests more developed personnel or HRM procedures, and these may be of relevance to 'problems' as expressions of unresolved conflicts.

The literature on grievance and disciplinary (GD) procedures is primarily focused on the discipline area, particularly in employer dismissals and unfair dismissal claims in Employment Tribunals (Knight and Latreille, 2000, Earnshaw, *et al.*, 2000: 64, Hayward *et al.*, 2004: 20). Research has also highlighted the difference between the high presence of formal procedures but low practical usage (Earnshaw *et al.* 1998: ii). The Workplace Employment Relations Surveys confirm that arrangements are more prevalent in larger workplaces, the public sector and in unionised workplaces (Cully *et al.*, 1999:

⁷ The questions asked were 'In the workplace where you were/are having problems, if a problem came up between you and your employer, are there set rules for how they should be dealt with? (Prompt if necessary: for example, the making of a written statement or warning, or a formal meeting), and: 'In the workplace where you had the problems, could/can staff or their representatives meet regularly with management to discuss workplace issues?'

77, Kersley *et al.* 2006: 215). In 2004, workplace coverage by formal grievance procedures was 88 per cent (similar to the 86 per cent in 1998), but for disciplinary procedures, had risen to 91 per cent from 85 per cent in 1998 (*ibid.* 216). Much of the latter increase was found to be in small, non-unionised private sector firms and thought to be associated with new statutory disciplinary procedures. However, there was a far lower level of usage of procedures in practice (*ibid.* 217). In the current study, the low usage of GD procedures is confirmed: only 12 per cent of the sample used the grievance procedure in their routes to resolution of their problem. However, our data also allow analysis of whether there is any association between the existence of such procedures and the frequency of types of problems.

The literature on joint consultation (JC) is also only tangentially relevant to our purposes of exploring any association between the existence of communication/consultation procedures and levels of different types of workplace problems. There has been case-study research - much now over 20 years old – on JC in non-union firms (Cressey *et al.*, 1985, McLoughlin and Gourlay, 1994, Broad, 1994, Lloyd, 2001). Much of this debate addresses whether these bodies are substitutes for union-forms of representation, and their impact on unionisation. Kelly (1996), for example, argues that they are part of a management strategy to shift to non-unionism, while Hyman (1996) posits that they can, nevertheless, provide employees with a ‘voice’. Terry (1999) takes up both contentions, in that non-union forms of representation may be double-edged – they may serve to undermine trade unionism, but they may also stimulate demands for unionisation, when their confinement to management-dictated terms becomes apparent. Lloyd’s (2001) case study of a joint consultative committee in a union derecognised firm found opposition to it by all but office employees and that it did not give employees an effective ‘voice’. However, some research casts doubt on the difference between unionised and non-unionised forms of representation, in terms of the general weakening of trade unionism. Brown *et al.* (1998) find little variation in collective representation between 13 derecognised and matched unionised

firms, since the scope of union bargaining, as of information and consultation, has narrowed.

The Information and Consultation of Employees Regulations 2004,⁸ following the European Directive (2002/14/EC) and mandatory from April 2005, requires consideration in terms of whether it is likely to impact on 'voice' for the vulnerable, unorganised. Firstly, since it applies to organisations with 150 or more employees, it will cover fewer unorganised workers, particularly the low paid, who are more concentrated in small companies. Secondary analysis of the Workplace Employment Relations Survey 2004 (Pollert and Li, 2007) found that 12.6 per cent of low paid, non-unionised workers (earning below the median) worked in organisations with less than 150 employees, as did 10.6 per cent of higher paid non-unionised workers, but only 0.4 per cent of lower and higher paid unionised workers.

Secondly, there had surprisingly been no increase in JC committees in 2004 in anticipation of this legislation, according to WERS 2004. On the contrary, along with the decline in union representation, JC committees were present in only 14 per cent of workplaces with 10 or more employees in 2004, compared with 20 per cent in 1998. The decline was greatest in workplaces without union recognition, falling from 14 to 8 per cent between 1998 and 2004. Overall, 42 per cent of employees worked in workplaces with a workplace-level JC committee in 2004, compared with 46 per cent in 1998 (Kersley *et al.*,

⁸ Organisations with 100 or more employees will come within the scope of the legislation in April 2007, and ones with 50 or more employees in April 2008. The requirements in the legislation do not apply automatically. Employers can initiate the process themselves, or an employee request must be made by at least 10 per cent of employees in the organisation (subject to a minimum of 15 employees and a maximum of 2500 employees). Existing agreements on information and consultation may continue where they enjoy the support of the workforce. The new law is designed to encourage employers, employees and their representatives to agree information and consultation arrangements that suit their particular circumstances – it does not spell out the subjects, method, timing or frequency of the arrangements that are allowed. Agreed arrangements may cover more than one company, or establish different processes in different parts of an organisation. Standard provisions based on the Directive apply as a fallback in situations where no agreement is reached on information and consultation arrangements. These require the employer to inform employee representatives about the organisation's activities and economic situation, and consult them on employment issues and major changes in work organisation or employees' contractual relations.

2006: 127).⁹ However, they were much more common in larger workplaces than smaller ones, which was previously the case but may also be reinforced by the legislation.

The evidence from the WERS series suggests these committees provide little voice for employees, and in the non-union context are 'effective' primarily for management communication. However, their occurrence among this sample of Unrepresented Workers remains of interest, both in terms of mapping their existence among the low paid vulnerable workforce with problems at work, and in identifying any association between lower or higher reporting of different problems.

⁹ The downward trend on joint consultative committees in view of the 2005 Information and Consultation Regulations requires further investigation. One possibility is that many companies use direct, rather than representative forms of participation, as Marginson suggests: 'Under the UK Regulations, however, it is open to employers and employees to agree arrangements based on direct forms of employee involvement - phenomena which are now widespread across workplaces. Alternatively, the 2004 survey might have been conducted before the parties at most workplaces had begun to contemplate the implications of the ICE Regulations. The sixth survey in the WERS series - due towards the end of this decade - will be in a position to reveal the answer (personal discussion with Paul Marginson, IRRU, June 2005 and see EIRO, 2005).

Mapping procedures among the unrepresented worker sample

Table 2: The unrepresented worker survey, grievance and disciplinary procedures, and regular meetings with management, by employer type and establishment size

	Total	Employer type				Establishment size					
		Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 - 499	500 or more	250 or more
Total	501	65	321	88	24	207	73	141	30	40	70
% Total (row)	100 %	(13.0 %)	(64.0 %)	(17.6 %)	(4.8 %)	(41.3 %)	(14.6 %)	(28.1 %)	(6.0 %)	(8.0 %)	(14.0 %)
Formal grievance/disciplinary procedures											
Yes	309	50	172	64	20	101	50	99	21	31	52
	62 %	77 %	54 %	73 %	83 %	49 %	68 %	70 %	70 %	78 %	74 %
No	168	13	133	18	4	99	20	34	7	6	13
	34 %	20 %	41 %	20 %	17 %	48 %	27 %	24 %	23 %	15 %	19 %
Regular consultation with management											
yes	299	41	180	59	17	111	43	93	17	29	46
	60 %	63 %	56 %	67 %	71 %	54 %	59 %	66 %	57 %	73 %	66 %
No	186	22	132	24	7	89	26	45	13	10	23
	37 %	34 %	41 %	27 %	29 %	43 %	36 %	32 %	43 %	25 %	33 %

As Table 2 shows, less than two thirds of workers (62 per cent) reported the existence of grievance/disciplinary procedures, and slightly fewer than this reported regular meetings with management (60 per cent). Thus, provision is lower than for employees as a whole according to WERS 2004, which showed that 96 per cent of had a grievance procedure, 97 per cent a disciplinary procedure, and 71 per cent an arrangement for employee representation (Kersley *et al.* 2006: 213, 133). Secondary analysis of WERS highlighting the experience of the low-paid unorganized (Pollert and Li, forthcoming 2007) found 92 per cent of the latter had disciplinary and grievance procedures compared with 100 per cent of the higher paid and organized. The sample of the low paid unorganized with problems – arguably the more vulnerable – clearly has poorer provision for resolving conflict than the wider population of the lower-paid, non-unionised, as well as the better paid and the organised.

Reflecting the wider pattern in WERS 2004 (Kersley *et al.*, 2006: 213) the incidence of formal disciplinary and grievance procedures was higher in our sample among those working in larger workplaces and in the public sector (Table 3). Compared with 62 per cent of all respondents having formal grievance and disciplinary procedures, 73 per cent of those in the public sector had them, compared with 54 per cent in the private sector and 78 per cent in workplaces with 500 or more employees compared with 49 per cent of those with fewer than 25 employees. It should be recalled that 41 per cent of the sample worked in this small-size workplace range. A similar comparison can be made in terms of employee representation, where WERS 2004 found that 40 per cent of employees in workplaces of 10-24 employees had an arrangement compared with 92 per cent of those in workplaces with above 500 workers, and 61 per cent in the private sector compared with 98 per cent in the public (Kersley *et al.* 2006: 133). In the Unrepresented Worker survey, while an average 60 per cent of all respondents had an employee representation/management consultation procedure, 73 per cent had one in workplaces of over 500 employees, but only 54 per cent of those in workplaces with below 25 workers and 67 per cent of those in the public sector compared with 56 per cent in the private sector.

Association of Formal Procedures with Problems.

Table 3 shows the percentages of employees with and without formal grievance and disciplinary procedures and forums for regular discussion between employees and managers at work in relation to types of problems.

Table 3: Problems in one job (per cent) with and without formal grievance/disciplinary procedures and employee representation/management consultation procedures

	Total	Formal grievance/disciplinary procedures		Regular consultation with management	
		Yes	No	yes	No
Total	501	309	168	299	186
Pay-Related	181	95	75	98	79
	36 %	31 %	45 %	33 %	42 %
Job Security	124	60	56	62	58
	25 %	19 %	33 %	21 %	31 %
Opportunities	102	64	33	58	43
	20 %	21 %	20 %	19 %	23 %
Discrimination (inc. victimisation)	76	42	30	34	36
	15 %	14 %	18 %	11 %	19 %
Discrimination (justiciable)	49	28	18	19	25
	10 %	9 %	11 %	6 %	13 %
Victimisation	31	17	13	16	13
	6 %	6 %	8 %	5 %	7 %
Taking Time-Off	109	59	45	53	51
	22 %	19 %	27 %	18 %	27 %
Working Hours	127	73	48	60	65
	25 %	24 %	29 %	20 %	35 %
Workload	143	94	43	82	58
	29 %	30 %	26 %	27 %	31 %
Health And Safety	109	67	38	58	50
	22 %	22 %	23 %	19 %	27 %
Contract / Job Description	114	72	37	61	50
	23 %	23 %	22 %	20 %	27 %
Work Relations	172	113	51	99	70
	34 %	37 %	30 %	33 %	38 %

It shows that where unrepresented employees *do not* have GD procedures, they are much more likely to report problems with pay, job security and taking time off, and slightly more likely to have problems with discrimination and working hours. The same pattern holds for JC procedures for pay, job security and taking time off, but is stronger for discrimination and working hours problems – which suggests that the latter procedures make more of a difference. There are some problems where having a JC procedure is associated with lower frequency of problems, but having a GD procedure works in the opposite direction: this occurs for workload, health and safety contract, opportunities and work relations problems. In brief, the existence of GD procedures among Unrepresented workers, as a sign of formalisation, is associated with fewer problems only in certain personnel areas but not in workplace issues such as job intensity, whereas consultative processes are associated with reduced incidence of problems more widely. Considering the very high percentage of vulnerable workers with problems in small workplaces in this survey (41 per cent) and the low proportion among these with either type of procedure, the poor development of personnel and HR institutions

must be considered as a major factor contributing to the incidence of problems. This is of some concern in view of the dual government concerns of protecting vulnerable workers (DTI, 2006b) and the 2002 Employment Act, which legislated to press workplace conflict resolution back into the workplace (Pollert, 2005).

Details of problems in the screened job

The details of the problems experienced provide further insight into what are very broad areas. There are, of course, limitations to the types of information available in a quantitative survey, but precision was improved by providing prompts for multiple answers within each problem, although unprompted responses were also allowed. From the nature of the problem, some information is gleaned as to whether or not the problem might involve legal employment rights, although this was not the exclusive focus. Possibilities for collective organisation and action were part of the analysis, particularly as respondents were later asked whether they tried to do anything together, and many issues, such as workload, which the previous analysis has shown were not improved by the presence of formal grievance procedures, are historically shown to be negotiated by collective, not legal, action. The following analysis identifies the proportion of the whole sample in each problem area, but subsequent figures refer to proportions *within each problem area, and not to proportions of the whole sample*.

Pay problems

It has already been shown that this was the main problem reported. Because of its significance, it is important to emphasise that the initial screening for the sample selection steered away from mere dissatisfaction with pay levels, with the prompt: *'Pay, such as not being paid the correct amount, not being paid regularly, or not receiving pay for holidays or overtime'*. Having defined pay as a *difficulty, concern or problem*, rather than mere dissatisfaction, interviewees were asked about particular aspects.

One major area was *'pay being less than what others in your type of job earn'*, which was reported by 41 per cent of the pay-problem sample group (Table 4 n.b. not all variables discussed can be shown in the table). This suggests some sense of low pay, as well as injustice or inequity, and is predicated on an awareness of others in a similar labour market. Where there is labour market segmentation, members of a segment are unlikely to compare themselves with those outside it, since there are no similar jobs to compare with. There was no gender difference in this aspect of pay problems, although the *gender composition of the workplace* had a strong effect. Of those working in mainly male workplaces, regardless of their own sex, 59 per cent reported this problem, compared with just 36 per cent working in mainly female workplaces, while just 28 per cent reported this where there was an equal mix. When the sex of the respondent was taken into account, a mainly male workforce raised the propensity for both men *and women* to report this (61 per cent of men and 54 per cent of women), which can be compared with 40 per cent of women working with women, and 11 per cent of men working with women (although gender labour market segregation meant that most respondents worked with the same sex).¹⁰ The higher pay in male dominated workplaces opens a wider horizon for comparison with similar jobs, and hence the possibility of greater perceived problems.

Far fewer part-timers (16 per cent) than full-timers (50 per cent) reported this pay comparison problem. Segregation between full- and part-time jobs ghettoises part-time workers into certain low-paying, low status jobs, leaving them with few opportunities to compare themselves with higher ranking ones (Bruegel and Perrons, 1998, EOC, 2005a and b)¹¹.

Ethnic minority workers were slightly more likely to report this problem (44 per cent) than white workers (41 per cent). However, ethnic minorities working

¹⁰ Of the 181 people with pay problems, 41 were men working with men, 9 men working with women, 57 women working with women and 13 women working with men.

¹¹ The EOC studies of part-time work confirmed previous research finding that part-time workers are confined to low-paid, low status jobs, often below their potential in terms of experience and qualifications.

with mainly other ethnic minorities were *less likely* (36 per cent) to report problem,¹² a finding which again suggests the operation of workforce segregation in lowering pay comparisons, which echoes that for female and part-time enclaves. A particularly large group at risk were the disabled¹³, of whom 60 per cent reported being paid less than others in their type of job. Others who were more likely than average to experience pay inequity were those over 50 years old (51 per cent), those working in the voluntary sector¹⁴ (60 per cent), those working in either small (25-49 people) or large (over 500 workers) workplaces (47 per cent), workers in construction (80 per cent), financial intermediation (57 per cent) and public administration (67 per cent). Those in skilled trades (64 per cent), managers¹⁵ (52 per cent), associated professionals (45 per cent), and those with over 1 year's tenure when the problem started, were also more likely to have this problem (50 per cent). The high representation of older workers, managers, and those with 2- 3 years of service or over 10 years suggests that lack of pay rewards to seniority and experience are a serious problem among lower paid, unrepresented workers.

¹² There were only 18 non-white workers in this sub-sample of those with pay problems, and since 14 worked with other ethnic minorities, the remaining 4 worked with other white workers. The composite 'non-white' conflates different ethnic groups (Asian, Black and Mixed are identified in the survey), but although these are significant differences, the sample is too small to comment on each group separately.

¹³ 56 people or 11 per cent of the total sample.

¹⁴ Note a very small cell size of 5.

¹⁵ Managers in this sample are likely to be middle or lower managers, because of the sample earnings ceiling of the median wage.

Table 4: Pay problem by types of employer, establishment size, tenure, gender, ethnicity and disability

Pay problem	Total	Employer type				Establishment Size					Tenure		Gender		Ethnicity		Disability	
		Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 - 499	500 or more	Less than 1 yr	1 or more yrs	M	F	White	Non-white	Yes	No
Total	181	23	126	26	5	89	24	40	9	15	100	80	79	102	163	18	20	159
Pay less than what others in type of job earn	75	9	53	10	3	37	11	16	3	7	35	40	34	41	67	8	12	61
	41 %	39 %	42 %	38 %	60 %	42 %	46 %	40 %	33 %	47 %	35 %	50 %	43 %	40 %	41 %	44 %	60 %	38 %
Not clear how pay determined	37	5	27	4	1	21	1	11	1	3	15	22	16	21	32	5	4	33
	20 %	22 %	21 %	15 %	20 %	24 %	4 %	28 %	11 %	20 %	15 %	28 %	20 %	21 %	20 %	28 %	20 %	21 %
Pay incorrect	75	11	47	14	2	32	13	18	2	9	38	36	30	45	67	8	8	67
	41 %	48 %	37 %	54 %	40 %	36 %	54 %	45 %	22 %	60 %	38 %	45 %	38 %	44 %	41 %	44 %	40 %	42 %
Pay withheld	30	4	22	2	2	15	5	5	1	3	12	18	17	13	27	3	6	24
	17 %	17 %	17 %	8 %	40 %	17 %	21 %	13 %	11 %	20 %	12 %	23 %	22 %	13 %	17 %	17 %	30 %	15 %
Not getting paid for overtime	49	7	34	3	4	26	6	7	3	6	25	24	24	25	45	4	5	44
	27 %	30 %	27 %	12 %	80 %	29 %	25 %	18 %	33 %	40 %	25 %	30 %	30 %	25 %	28 %	22 %	25 %	28 %
Not getting paid for holidays	33	4	20	6	3	17	5	8	1	2	18	15	16	17	29	4	6	26
	18 %	17 %	16 %	23 %	60 %	19 %	21 %	20 %	11 %	13 %	18 %	19 %	20 %	17 %	18 %	22 %	30 %	16 %
Not getting paid for sick days	31	2	21	5	3	15	7	4	2	3	16	15	14	17	27	4	3	28
	17 %	9 %	17 %	19 %	60 %	17 %	29 %	10 %	22 %	20 %	16 %	19 %	18 %	17 %	17 %	22 %	15 %	18 %
Not getting paid for maternity/paternity leave	3	-	2	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	3	3	-	2	1	1	2
	2 %	- %	2 %	- %	20 %	2 %	- %	- %	- %	7 %	- %	4 %	4 %	- %	1 %	6 %	5 %	1 %
Pay late	39	5	23	7	4	24	7	5	-	3	20	19	19	20	35	4	10	29
	22 %	22 %	18 %	27 %	80 %	27 %	29 %	13 %	- %	20 %	20 %	24 %	24 %	20 %	21 %	22 %	50 %	18 %

The other major area of pay problems was 'pay being incorrect' (41 per cent of those with pay problems), which has legal redress.¹⁶ This affected 44 per cent of women, but 'only' 38 per cent of men and 44 per cent of non-white workers compared with 41 per cent of white workers. The young – especially those between 22 and 29 – were more at risk to having this problem (47 per cent) and age and gender combined showed that younger women (those below 40) were most likely (47 per cent) and older men (over 40 years) least likely to report this. Incorrect pay was also more likely to be reported by those working in private companies contracted to the public sector (48 per cent), but also in the public sector itself (54 per cent), where health and social work (63

¹⁶ Where this is a deduction in pay, the major legislation is the Employment Rights Act 1996, especially s.13, and Part II. The National Minimum Wage Act 1998 covers the right to a minimum wage.

per cent) and public administration (56 per cent) were the main problem sectors. Workplace size was also a factor: small workplaces (25-49), but also very large ones (over 500) were more likely to have problems of incorrect pay (54 per cent and 60 per cent respectively) than very small workplaces (below 25) and large ones (250-499) (36 per cent and 22 per cent respectively).

'Not getting paid for overtime', 'pay being late' and 'being unclear about how the pay packet was determined' were further important problems for 27, 22 and 20 per cent of workers with pay problems, while not getting paid holidays or sick-pay affected a further 18 and 17 per cent. Lack of overtime pay was an overwhelming issue among the voluntary sector respondents with pay problems (80 per cent) – although this can only be interpreted as a qualitative finding, with 5 in a cell size, but had a low occurrence in the public sector (12 per cent), and just above average in the private sector and contractors to the public sector sub-contractors (30 per cent). Interestingly, large establishments were most likely to have this problem (33 per cent of workers in establishments of over 250 workers and 40 per cent over those is establishments of 500 or more workers). Men rather than women reported this (30 per cent and 25 per cent respectively), and white rather than non-white workers (28 per cent and 22 per cent).

Pay being late was widespread among voluntary sector and disabled workers (80 per cent and 50 per cent), and above average in the public sector (27 per cent) and small workplaces (27-29 per cent) and slightly more likely among men than women (24 per cent and 20 per cent). There were fewer variations in frequency of lack of clarity about how the pay packet was determined, although the public sector and larger workplaces were less likely. Not being paid for holidays (18 per cent on average) was widespread in the voluntary sector (60 per cent), but also – surprisingly – worse in the public than the private sector (23 per cent compared with 16 per cent). As one might anticipate, it was more of a problem in small rather than large workplaces. Men were more likely than women to report holiday pay problems (20 per cent and 17 per cent), non-white rather than white workers (22 per cent and 18 per

cent), and the disabled (30 per cent compared with 16 per cent without a disability).

The association of management conflict resolution and consultation procedures with pay problems was intriguing. Workers in establishments with disciplinary and grievance were *more* likely to report problems with 'pay being less than others' (43 per cent) than those without (40 per cent), to report pay not being 'clear' (23 per cent compared to 19 per cent without) and to have pay being incorrect (47 per cent compared with 33 per cent without). Having formal grievance/disciplinary procedures only seemed to have a positive association with *fewer* pay problems in the following areas: 'pay being withheld' (14 per cent with procedures against 20 per cent without) and 'not getting holiday pay' (13 per cent with procedures, 27 per cent without) – areas with clear legal implications.¹⁷ Problems of not being paid for overtime, not getting sick pay and pay being late were only minimally improved where procedures existed, although these too are illegal. This suggests that only in areas covered by well known employment laws, such as the Wages Act and the 1998 Working Time Regulations, do internal procedures appear associated with fewer pay problems.

The existence of consultation procedures had a slightly clearer positive association with reduced pay problems. 'Pay being less than others in my type of job' was reported by 35 per cent of those with regular consultation, compared with 49 per cent without, and it not being 'clear how pay is determined', by 19 per cent of those with procedures against 23 per cent without. They also had a strong association with 'pay being withheld' (9 per cent compared to 27 per cent without procedures), not getting paid for overtime (23 per cent compared with 32 per cent without procedures) and pay being late (18 per cent compared with 25 per cent without). However, unlike the role of disciplinary/grievance procedures, consultation *was not associated with fewer* holiday pay problems (19 per cent with and 16 per cent without consultation), or sick pay problems (17 per cent of those with and 16 per cent

¹⁷ Employment Rights Act 1996 and the Working Time Regulations 1998 (covering paid holidays).

of those without consultation). In sum, pay problems were serious difficulties for a large proportion of the sample, and although several had legal implications, the existence of formal procedures for developed human resource management practices for unrepresented workers had an uneven association.

Work relations problems

‘Work relations’ problems were narrowed in the questionnaire to experiences such as stress or bullying, so as to eliminate the connotation of simply not getting along with others. As noted, it was the second most significant area of problems. The overwhelming form of this problem was stress (70 per cent), followed by ‘management taking advantage or bullying’ (55 per cent), with a substantial 27 per cent also reporting bullying by other workers (Table 5).

Table 5: Work relations problems by gender, age and ethnicity

Problem	Gender			Age					Gender by Age				Ethnicity				
	Total	Male	Female	Under 22	22 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 or older	Young males	Young females	Older males	Older females	White	Non-white	Mixed	Asian	Black
Total	172	66	106	15	25	42	51	39	29	53	37	53	157	15	4	6	3
Stress	121	48	73	7	20	29	38	27	20	36	28	37	110	11	2	6	2
	70 %	73 %	69 %	47 %	80 %	69 %	75 %	69 %	69 %	68 %	76 %	70 %	70 %	73 %	50 %	100 %	67 %
Management taking advantage or bullying me	94	35	59	11	16	26	23	18	19	34	16	25	83	11	4	5	1
	55 %	53 %	56 %	73 %	64 %	62 %	45 %	46 %	66 %	64 %	43 %	47 %	53 %	73 %	100 %	83 %	33 %
Bullying by other workers	47	20	27	5	7	14	10	11	11	15	9	12	43	4	1	2	-
	27 %	30 %	25 %	33 %	28 %	33 %	20 %	28 %	38 %	28 %	24 %	23 %	27 %	27 %	25 %	33 %	- %

Age had a generally stronger association with work relations problems than other personal variables: 80 per cent of those between 22 and 29 and 75 per cent of those between 40 and 49 reported stress, while ‘only’ 47 per cent of those below 22 years reported this problem. However, the youngest age group had a 73 per cent rate of reporting ‘management taking advantage or bullying’ compared with the average 55 per cent. Men were slightly more likely than women to report stress (73 per cent compared with 69 per cent), and in particular older men (76 per cent). Ethnic minorities were also slightly more likely to report stress (73 per cent) than the average and, like young workers,

much more likely to report management taking advantage or bullying than the average (73 per cent). Other personal characteristics relevant to these difficulties were having a disability, 77 per cent reporting stress and 59 per cent reporting bullying, and having caring responsibilities (73 per cent stress and 59 per cent bullying) compared with those without caring responsibilities (70 per cent and 53 per cent respectively). Bullying by other workers was more likely to be experienced by the young (33 per cent), especially young men below 40 years (38 per cent) the disabled (45 per cent) and men (30 per cent), compared with the 27 per cent average.

The public and private sectors showed different types of work-relations problems (Table 6). Those working in the public sector, or contracted to it as private companies, were more likely to report stress than those in the private sector (76 per cent, 70 per cent and 68 per cent respectively). Bullying, however, was more frequently reported in the private sector than in others, apart from the voluntary sector. The hotels and restaurant sector, manufacturing and health and social work had the highest levels of bullying (not shown in table, but rates were 73 per cent and 58 per cent for the latter two). Mid-size workplaces had higher rates of stress than larger or smaller ones, while management bullying was predictably worse in smaller workplaces, supporting widespread evidence of poor management practice in this enclave.

Table 6: Work relations problems by employer characteristics

Problem	Total	Employer type				Establishment size						Disciplinary procedures		Regular consultation with management	
		Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 - 499	500 or more	250 or more	Yes	No	yes	No
Total	172	30	96	33	13	65	31	50	10	14	24	113	51	99	70
Stress	121	21	65	25	10	46	20	38	7	9	16	84	34	72	47
	70 %	70 %	68 %	76 %	77 %	71 %	65 %	76 %	70 %	64 %	67 %	74 %	67 %	73 %	67 %
Management taking advantage or bullying me	94	16	55	15	8	39	19	25	2	8	10	53	37	48	43
	55 %	53 %	57 %	45 %	62 %	60 %	61 %	50 %	20 %	57 %	42 %	47 %	73 %	48 %	61 %
Bullying by other workers	47	6	26	9	6	15	12	14	2	4	6	31	12	26	20
	27 %	20 %	27 %	27 %	46 %	23 %	39 %	28 %	20 %	29 %	25 %	27 %	24 %	26 %	29 %

The finding that more instances of stress were found among respondents from organizations with disciplinary, grievance, and consultation procedures, than among those without again raises questions about the role of such management institutions for unrepresented workers: 74 per cent reported stress where there were disciplinary/grievance procedures, 67 per cent where there were none, and 73 per cent where there was consultation, compared with 67 per cent where there was none. On the other hand, reduced rates of bullying occurred where there was management consultation than where there was none (48 and 61 per cent respectively).

The growing importance of stress at work has been widely observed by researchers and trade unions. The TUC's study in 2004 of safety representative (TUC 2005) showed that the number of reports of workers suffering from stress had grown to 58 per cent of representatives, an increase of 2 per cent from 2002, the main reasons cited being increased workloads, change at work, staff cuts, long hours and bullying. If this is in unionised workplaces, the rate is likely to be far greater among those in non-unionised workplaces.

Bullying¹⁸, affecting 19 per cent of our entire sample of Unrepresented workers, was similarly found in a study in 2000 of over 5,000 workers, also conducted for the TUC (Rayner *et al.* 2002), which found that one in 10 workers had been bullied in the last six months, and one in four (24.4 per cent) in the last five years. Rayner *et al.* found that in most cases (75 per cent) a manager was identified as the bully. The public-sector trade union, UNISON, attributed high levels of bullying to conflicting demands on middle managers, between constant government 'reforms' and recruitment and retention difficulties (LRD, 2005:23, Chartered Institute of Management, 2005).

¹⁸ Legal redress for bullying requires proof of a breach of 'implied terms' of contract, including duties of 'mutual trust and confidence' to take 'reasonable care not to injure employees' health' and not to put employees 'at risk of psychological stress'.¹⁸ Harassment, under discrimination laws, or Duty of Care under the 1974 Health and Safety at Work Act and Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, as well as the law on stalking might also apply, but difficult to prove for an individual worker without expert legal advice.

Workload problems

Workload problems, the third most frequent, were most likely to be ‘too much work without enough time’ (70 per cent), followed by ‘management took advantage of willingness to work hard’ (57 per cent) and ‘put under pressure to perform too fast’ (45 per cent) (Table 7).

There is considerable variation in the occurrence of different workload problems by employer type. In the public sector, there is a higher than average incidence of ‘management taking advantage of a willingness to work hard’ (63 per cent against 57 per cent), and being asked to do ‘tasks which were never agreed as part of the job’ (46 per cent against 34 per cent) – issues which need to be taken into account in the interpretation of the high stress levels noted in the public sector.

Table 7: Workload problem by employer characteristics

Problem	Total	Employer type				Establishment size						Formal disciplinary procedures		Regular consultation with Management	
		Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 - 499	500 or more	250 or more	Yes	No	yes	No
Total	143	17	81	35	9	51	20	46	8	13	21	94	43	82	58
You were put under pressure to perform too fast	64	10	40	9	5	25	12	18	2	7	9	41	22	30	33
	45 %	59 %	49 %	26 %	56 %	49 %	60 %	39 %	25 %	54 %	43 %	44 %	51 %	37 %	57 %
You were given too much work without enough time	100	14	55	23	8	38	15	29	8	9	17	63	32	56	42
	70 %	82 %	68 %	66 %	89 %	75 %	75 %	63 %	100 %	69 %	81 %	67 %	74 %	68 %	72 %
You were given tasks to do for which you hadn't been trained or did not have the necessary experience	49	6	24	16	3	20	7	16	2	3	5	32	16	23	25
	34 %	35 %	30 %	46 %	33 %	39 %	35 %	35 %	25 %	23 %	24 %	34 %	37 %	28 %	43 %
Your pay was linked to targets and performance	18	4	10	3	1	4	3	7	-	4	4	12	6	12	6
	13 %	24 %	12 %	9 %	11 %	8 %	15 %	15 %	- %	31 %	19 %	13 %	14 %	15 %	10 %
Management took advantage of your willingness to work hard	81	8	44	22	6	33	12	25	3	6	9	51	27	44	36
	57 %	47 %	54 %	63 %	67 %	65 %	60 %	54 %	38 %	46 %	43 %	54 %	63 %	54 %	62 %

Other workload problems tended to occur more frequently in the private sector, and companies contracted to the public sector. Among the latter, 82 per cent reported being 'given too much work without enough time (compared to an average 70 per cent of workload problems), and 59 per cent were 'put under pressure to perform too fast' (against an average 45 per cent). Smaller workplaces with below 50 workers were also associated with a higher frequency of workload problems, while medium ones (up to 259 workers) a lower incidence.

In general, men, workers between 30 and 39 and non-white workers were more likely to report each type of workload problems, although the sample size of the latter is small (Table 8).

Table 8: Workload problems, gender, age and ethnicity.

Problem	Total	Gender		Age bands					White/Non-White	
		Male	Female	Under 22	22 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 or older	White	Non-white
Total	143	52	91	9	20	36	36	42	129	14
You were put under pressure to perform too fast	64	26	38	4	8	20	15	17	56	8
	45 %	50 %	42 %	44 %	40 %	56 %	42 %	40 %	43 %	57 %
You were given too much work without enough time	100	41	59	6	15	27	25	27	89	11
	70 %	79 %	65 %	67 %	75 %	75 %	69 %	64 %	69 %	79 %
You were given tasks to do which were never agreed as part of your job	49	18	31	3	9	13	10	14	44	5
	34 %	35 %	34 %	33 %	45 %	36 %	28 %	33 %	34 %	36 %
You were given tasks to do for which you hadn't been trained or did not have the necessary experience	46	19	27	4	6	17	9	10	41	5
	32 %	37 %	30 %	44 %	30 %	47 %	25 %	24 %	32 %	36 %
Your pay was linked to targets and performance	18	9	9		2	5	6	5	16	2
	13 %	17 %	10 %		10 %	14 %	17 %	12 %	12 %	14 %
Management took advantage of your willingness to work hard	81	29	52	6	9	22	21	23	71	10
	57 %	56 %	57 %	67 %	45 %	61 %	58 %	55 %	55 %	71 %

The sectors in which workers were most likely to experience workload problems were wholesale and retail, hotels and restaurants, finance, real estate and business activities and public administration. The occupations most at risk were managers, professionals, sales, process and plant operatives and elementary.

Regular consultation with management was associated with a drop in being 'put under pressure to perform too fast' from an average of 45 per cent to 37 per cent, but in the much more frequent problem of 'being given too much work without enough time' it declined by only 2 percentage points, from 70 per cent to 68 per cent. The chances of 'management taking advantage of a willingness to work hard' dropped only slightly from 57 per cent to 54 per cent, although without these procedures, it rose to 62 per cent. The patterns associated with having a grievance and disciplinary procedure was similar.

Working hours problems

Working hours problems, likely to be closely associated with both workload and stress, and next in importance showed that those working over 48 hours per week were more at risk and those working between 35 and 40 hours the least. The most frequently cited working-hours problems were unpredictable hours, working more hours than agreed and hours being inflexible. There were few gender differences in this area, but age was important. Young workers under 22 years were almost twice as likely to complain of working more hours than agreed (84 per cent compared with an average of 45 per cent) and 69 per cent compared with an overall 51 per cent had problems with unpredictable hours (Table 9). Public sector workers in this problem group were more likely than average to report working more than agreed, which could be related to the reports of stress (55 per cent compared with the average 45 per cent), while those in companies contracted to the public sector were much more likely than average to report problems with unpredictable hours (77 per cent compared with 51 per cent). Those in very small or large workplaces (below 25 or above 250 workers) were more likely to report difficulties with working more than agreed (50 per cent compared with 45 per cent), and surprisingly this was also more common in large establishments. Working more than agreed was more common in construction, wholesale and retail trades, and public administration, unpredictability was highest in hotels and catering and inflexibility in real estate/renting and other service activities. Having formal disciplinary and consultations procedures was only associated with reduced working hours problems in the area of unpredictability.

Table 9: Respondents with working hours problems

Problem	Total	Establishment size				Gender		Age					Formal disciplinary procedures		Regular consultation with management	
		Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 or more	Male	Female	Under 22	22 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 or older	Yes	No	Yes	No
Total working hour problems	127	56	15	38	16	54	73	13	25	35	29	25	73	48	73	48
More than agreed	57	28	7	14	8	24	33	11	11	17	8	10	32	23	32	23
	45 %	50 %	47 %	37 %	50 %	44 %	45 %	85 %	44 %	49 %	28 %	40 %	44 %	48 %	44 %	48 %
Fewer than agreed	7	1	-	5	1	3	4	-	2	-	2	3	4	2	4	2
	6 %	2 %	- %	13 %	6 %	6 %	5 %	- %	8 %	- %	7 %	12 %	5 %	4 %	5 %	4 %
Unpredictable	65	28	8	19	9	28	37	9	14	13	14	15	34	29	34	29
	51 %	50 %	53 %	50 %	56 %	52 %	51 %	69 %	56 %	37 %	48 %	60 %	47 %	60 %	47 %	60 %
Inflexible	52	20	4	22	6	22	30	6	13	13	12	8	31	19	31	19
	41 %	36 %	27 %	58 %	38 %	41 %	41 %	46 %	52 %	37 %	41 %	32 %	42 %	40 %	42 %	40 %

Job security problems

Job security problems concerned 30 per cent of respondents over 3 years and 25 per cent or 124 workers when focusing on one job, and for the majority (59 per cent), this was ‘a fear that you might lose your job (e.g. be made redundant)’.¹⁹

¹⁹ This question was hardened following cognitive testing, to reduce a general malaise about security, so as to focus on an identifiable period of fear or worry about or in a job.

Table 10: Job security problem by workplace and worker characteristics

	Total	Establishment Size				Employer Type				Tenure		Gender		Age				
		Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 or more	Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Less than 1 yr	1 or more yrs	Male	Female	Under 22	22 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 or older
Total	124	56	16	30	19	18	85	15	5	57	67	61	63	9	23	34	31	27
A worry that you might lose your job (e.g. be made redundant)	73	35	12	11	13	9	50	9	5	30	43	31	42	1	13	21	18	20
	59 %	63 %	75 %	37 %	68 %	50 %	59 %	60 %	100 %	53 %	64 %	51 %	67 %	11 %	57 %	62 %	58 %	74 %
Being threatened unfairly with dismissal	36	19	4	5	7	7	23	5	1	27	9	16	20	4	8	13	7	4
	29 %	34 %	25 %	17 %	37 %	39 %	27 %	33 %	20 %	47 %	13 %	26 %	32 %	44 %	35 %	38 %	23 %	15 %
Actually being dismissed or sacked	19	8	4	6	-	3	14	1	1	10	9	11	8	3	6	4	3	3
	15 %	14 %	25 %	20 %	- %	17 %	16 %	7 %	20 %	18 %	13 %	18 %	13 %	33 %	26 %	12 %	10 %	11 %
Being forced to quit because of changes in your job description	16	12	1	1	2	2	12	2	-	10	6	7	9	1	3	3	4	5
	13 %	21 %	6 %	3 %	11 %	11 %	14 %	13 %	- %	18 %	9 %	11 %	14 %	11 %	13 %	9 %	13 %	19 %
Being forced to quit because of changes in your pay	9	5	-	1	3	2	6	1	-	7	2	4	5	1	2	3	2	1
	7 %	9 %	- %	3 %	16 %	11 %	7 %	7 %	- %	12 %	3 %	7 %	8 %	11 %	9 %	9 %	6 %	4 %
Uncertainty or lack of working hours / issues with contract renewal / temporary or agency staff (unprompted)	13	6	-	4	3	1	9	2	-	4	9	7	6	2	3	2	3	3
	10 %	11 %	- %	13 %	16 %	6 %	11 %	13 %	- %	7 %	13 %	11 %	10 %	22 %	13 %	6 %	10 %	11 %

There was little difference between the private and public sectors at aggregate levels, although redundancy worried all those with job security problems in the voluntary sector (Table 10). Although the public sector as a whole was less likely than others to report job security problems (Table I, Appendix 2), among those who did report this, a worry about redundancy was greatest in health and social work (73 per cent). Workers in Other services, real estate and hotels and restaurants were also heavily over-represented in the redundancy area, as were smaller workplaces – particularly those of between 25 and 49 workers (75 per cent).

Workers in small (25-49 employees) workplace were also most subject to actually being sacked (25 per cent), although medium sized establishments also had above average (15 per cent) reporting of 20 per cent. The most prominent sectors were wholesale and retail (24 per cent) and hotels and

restaurants (25 per cent) – but health and social work also above average susceptibility (18 per cent). Being threatened with unfair dismissal also had a similar preponderance in small workplaces, but also in those with over 250 workers, and in the same sectors as above, with the addition of the transport, storage and communication sector, where 50 per cent compared with 29 per cent had unfair dismissal problems. Being forced to quit because of changes in job description was strikingly over-represented in education (38 per cent of workers compared with the 13 per cent average), followed by hotels and restaurants.²⁰

Those without one year's service qualifying for unfair-dismissal protection were far more likely than those with longer service to fear unfair dismissal (47 per cent compared with 13 per cent), were more likely to be sacked (18 per cent against 13 per cent) and to be forced to leave because of changes in pay or job description. However, redundancy worried longer serving workers more than those with shorter tenure. Although in general white workers reported job security problems more frequently than ethnic minorities (26 per cent compared with 16 per cent), non-white workers' problems were far more concentrated in the two areas of redundancy and unfair dismissal (71 per cent).

Men were more likely to be sacked (18 per cent compared with 15 per cent average and 13 per cent of women), as were young workers (under 22 years, 33 per cent, 22-19 years, 26 per cent). However, women were most likely to have problems with redundancy/job loss (67 per cent against 51 per cent men), unfair dismissal (32 per cent against 26 per cent men), and being forced to quit because of changes in their job description (14 per cent against 11 per cent men). Young women (under 40) were much more likely than young men to suffer problems with being threatened with unfair dismissal (41 per cent compared with 34 per cent) and with actually being sacked (24 per cent compared with 16 per cent).

²⁰ Sectoral disaggregation at this level of detail means small cell sizes which only allow descriptive research suggesting the need for further research: Education n=8; Hotels and Restaurants=12.

Workplace gender composition also had a relationship with security: women with mostly men were *more* likely than women with women to have redundancy worries (77 per cent compared with 69 per cent), while men with other men were 51 per cent likely to have this problem, but when mainly with other women only 29 per cent. Minority sex-status is thus a problem for women when it comes to redundancy, but not for men. On the other hand, women working mostly with men were *less* likely than women working with other women to face unfair dismissal problems (15 per cent against 41 per cent), while men were more likely to face this if working mainly with other men, than mainly with women (31 per cent and 14 per cent). Thus, for both men and women, working with the same sex increased the likelihood of unfair dismissal problems – more so for women than for men.

Contract or Job Description Problems

Job description problems (see Table 1, the sixth in frequency) were spread over four major areas. (Table 11).

Table 11: Problems with contract or job description, employer characteristics and gender.

Problem	Total	Employer type				Establishment size				Formal disciplinary procedures		Regular consultation with Management		Gender	
		Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 or more	Yes	No	yes	No	Male	Female
Total	114	12	74	20	8	42	19	32	19	72	37	61	50	46	68
Not being given a formal contract or written job description	50	7	31	9	3	17	9	14	10	31	18	24	25	24	26
	44 %	58 %	42 %	45 %	38 %	40 %	47 %	44 %	53 %	43 %	49 %	39 %	50 %	52 %	38 %
Not getting a contract renewed	13	1	9	2	1	4	3	6	-	8	5	8	5	3	10
	11 %	8 %	12 %	10 %	13 %	10 %	16 %	19 %	- %	11 %	14 %	13 %	10 %	7 %	15 %
Being asked to undertake tasks not specified in my contract or job description	47	4	30	9	4	16	6	17	7	31	15	25	22	20	27
	41 %	33 %	41 %	45 %	50 %	38 %	32 %	53 %	37 %	43 %	41 %	41 %	44 %	43 %	40 %
Pay or conditions not matching what was agreed (including working hours)	39	3	27	5	4	15	5	12	7	25	13	17	19	14	25
	34 %	25 %	36 %	25 %	50 %	36 %	26 %	38 %	37 %	35 %	35 %	28 %	38 %	30 %	37 %
Things being in my contract or job description that I was not told about at the interview	32	5	19	4	4	11	2	13	6	19	12	20	12	13	19
	28 %	42 %	26 %	20 %	50 %	26 %	11 %	41 %	32 %	26 %	32 %	33 %	24 %	28 %	28 %
Changes have been made to job description / contract (unprompted)	7	2	4	1	-	4	-	1	1	3	2	5	2	1	6
	6 %	17 %	5 %	5 %	- %	10 %	- %	3 %	5 %	4 %	5 %	8 %	4 %	2 %	9 %

The most cited was lack of formal or written contract (44 per cent) – a high percentage, which presupposes some knowledge of its requirement.²¹ Almost as frequent was being asked to do tasks which were not specified in the contract or job description (41 per cent), while related matters, experienced by over a third, were pay or conditions being different from those agreed in the contract, and the associated problem of the job description containing things which were not mentioned at the job interview. Full-time workers, men, and those between 30 and 50 years old were the most likely to report job

²¹ Under Sections 1 and 2 of the Employment Rights Act 1996, a written contract is required no later than two months after beginning employment.

description problems, while young workers were more likely to have problems with being asked to do tasks not specified in their job description, to have pay and conditions not matching what was agreed, and finding that their job differed from what they were told about at interview.

Not being given a formal contract or job description was more likely to be reported by workers in companies contracted to the public sector (although as a whole this employer-type had a lower reporting frequency in this general area than the public and private sector). It was also more likely in small (25 – 49 workers) although not the smallest workplaces and also in large (over 250 people) workplaces – a pattern which reproduces the occurrence of the general area of contract problems. Those in the public and voluntary sectors were more likely to report problems with being asked to do tasks not specified in their job description, and medium-sized workplaces (50-249 workers) had an above-average rate of problems with non-renewal of contracts, being asked to do jobs not specified in job description, and pay and conditions not matching what was agreed or contracts not matching what was described at interview.²²

Having regular consultation with management was associated with reduced reporting of job description problems to 39 per cent (compared with a 44 per cent average and 50 per cent where there was none), but formal disciplinary and grievance procedures had a marginal association. In other areas, formal managerial procedures had little association with reduced incidence of contractual problems, except for consultation with management with lower occurrence of pay or conditions not matching what was agreed (28 per cent with, 38 per cent without procedures, compared with a 34 per cent average). It thus seems, as noted earlier, that it is the existence of some form of joint consultation, as a form of formalised personnel management, rather than grievance and disciplinary procedures, that suggests a form of workplace institutional background associated with fewer problems of job descriptions or contractual agreement.

²² Sectoral analysis is not feasible because of small cell sizes.

Health and safety problems

Details of the types of health and safety problems, experienced by 22 per cent of the sample, indicate that over half felt that the working environment was unsafe or dangerous, half that there was inadequate health and safety training and managerial negligence, and a further 42 per cent reported they were asked to do unsafe or dangerous tasks (Table 12).

Workplace health and safety is regulated by the Health and Safety at Work Act (1974) and enforced by the Health and Safety at Work (Enforcing Authority) Regulations 1998. However, workplace breaches of the law require workplace inspection, either from the Health and Safety Executive, or the local authority, and without the existence of safety representatives, who are much more likely to exist where there is a recognised union, action by an individual, unrepresented worker is hampered. Where an individual worker is concerned, the common law *duty of care* must be invoked to cover problems ranging from stress and bullying to repetitive strain injury and vibration. This is complex and contentious area, especially for unrepresented workers, which requires expert legal advice.

Table 12: Health and safety problems by employer characteristics

Problem	Total	Employer type				Establishment size				Formal disciplinary procedures		Regular consultation with management	
		Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 or more	Yes	No	yes	No
Total	109	13	76	14	5	40	21	30	17	67	38	58	50
Managerial negligence	53	5	35	9	4	22	12	14	5	33	19	21	32
	49 %	38 %	46 %	64 %	80 %	55 %	57 %	47 %	29 %	49 %	50 %	36 %	64 %
Being asked to do unsafe or dangerous jobs or tasks	46	6	30	7	3	24	8	9	5	25	19	24	22
	42 %	46 %	39 %	50 %	60 %	60 %	38 %	30 %	29 %	37 %	50 %	41 %	44 %
The work environment in general was unsafe or dangerous	59	5	42	8	3	24	13	16	6	35	24	24	34
	54 %	38 %	55 %	57 %	60 %	60 %	62 %	53 %	35 %	52 %	63 %	41 %	68 %
There was inadequate health and safety training	55	9	36	7	3	22	12	15	6	35	18	27	28
	50 %	69 %	47 %	50 %	60 %	55 %	57 %	50 %	35 %	52 %	47 %	47 %	56 %

A key issue is whether there was any health and safety representative or committee among those who reported problems. Although a specific question was not included on this, some indication of such representation and institutions and their effectiveness can be inferred from the presence or absence of regular consultation with management. Among those who said that there was such an institution, there appeared to be an association with a reduction in some, but not all, health and safety problems. An 'unsafe or dangerous' work environment was reported by 41 per cent rather than 54 per cent (but 68 per cent where there was none), and managerial negligence by 36 per cent rather than 49 per cent (but 64 per cent where there was none). In these cases, it is possible that health and safety was raised during these meetings. But there was almost no association with greater health and safety training or being asked to do unsafe or dangerous things. Where there were formal disciplinary and grievance procedures, there was a reduced response-rate about being asked to do unsafe or dangerous tasks, but a higher one regarding there being inadequate training in this area. There was only minimal improvement to the average occurrence of problems around the working environment, although absence of such procedures was associated with a higher probability of poor environment.

Workplace size had a clear association with these problems - the smaller the workplace, the higher the reporting of health and safety problems (Health and Safety Commission, 2001). While the public sector is less prevalent in this area as a whole than the private (see above), among those who did report problems here, there was a higher incidence of difficulties concerning managerial negligence than from the private sector (64 per cent compared with 46 per cent) and being asked to do unsafe or dangerous things (50 per cent compared with 39 per cent in the private sector). Although it is impossible to judge how far these responses reflect a higher level of health and safety awareness among public sector than private sector workers – a possibility in view of the wider environment of stronger unionisation here – the data suggest that although public sector workers were less likely to produce reports

of health and safety problems, among those who did, there was a greater concentration of serious problems than among private sector workers.

In terms of men general reporting of these problems more than women (Table II, Appendix 2), it is not surprising that in each detailed concern, they would have a higher response rate too. This is most marked in the area of being asked to do unsafe or dangerous things, reported by 48 per cent of men with these problems, compared with 37 per cent of women. Age was also associated with different health and safety problems: the 24 workers in the 30-39 year age group reported most about managerial negligence (58 per cent) and being asked to do unsafe tasks, while an unsafe working environment was reported most by the 33 in the 40-49 year age group (64 per cent) – perhaps suggesting a greater awareness of collective problems among older workers. Ethnic minorities were more likely to report being asked to do unsafe tasks (50 per cent compared with 41 per cent white), but white workers were more likely to report managerial negligence (51 per cent compared with 30 per cent non-white) and an unsafe working environment (56 per cent compared with 40 per cent).

Taking time off problems

Two issues dominated problems with taking time off: holidays (for 46 per cent) and sickness (for 44 per cent). A further quarter also had problems with taking time off for family issues (Table 13).

Table 13: Time-off problems by employer characteristics

Problem	Total	Employer type				Establishment size						Formal grievance disciplinary procedures		Regular meetings with management	
		Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 - 499	500 or more	250 or more	Yes	No	yes	No
Total	109	12	81	9	6	49	15	22	11	10	21	59	45	53	51
Holiday	50	7	34	4	5	21	7	11	4	5	9	26	23	28	20
	46 %	58 %	42 %	44 %	83 %	43 %	47 %	50 %	36 %	50 %	43 %	44 %	51 %	53 %	39 %
Sickness	48	5	36	3	3	19	8	11	5	5	10	28	17	20	24
	44 %	42 %	44 %	33 %	50 %	39 %	53 %	50 %	45 %	50 %	48 %	47 %	38 %	38 %	47 %
Maternity or paternity leave	4	-	3	1	-	2	-	1	1	-	1	2	2	1	3
	4 %	- %	4 %	11 %	- %	4 %	- %	5 %	9 %	- %	5 %	3 %	4 %	2 %	6 %
Taking care of family members or relatives	27	4	19	4	-	12	4	8	1	2	3	13	14	15	12
	25 %	33 %	23 %	44 %	- %	24 %	27 %	36 %	9 %	20 %	14 %	22 %	31 %	28 %	24 %
Training	10	1	7	1	1	5	2	2	-	1	1	3	5	2	7
	9 %	8 %	9 %	11 %	17 %	10 %	13 %	9 %	- %	10 %	5 %	5 %	11 %	4 %	14 %

All these forms of leave have statutory entitlements (the first under the Working Time Regulations, 1998, the second under a right to Statutory Sick Pay, although this excludes those earning below £82 per week) and the third has a number of rights for parental and dependency leave.

Although the private sector is most strongly represented in this group of problems (Table I), holiday problems were slightly less frequently reported than in other employer types, although this may be an artefact of the possibility of more possible types of time-off problems among a much larger number of respondents than in the other groups. Industry breakdowns suggest that hotels and catering, and health and social work are the main sites of difficulties here. A very high 83 per cent of voluntary sector and 58 per cent of workers in contractors to the public sector also report holiday problems (but cell sizes are small).

Holiday problems were cited more by men than by women (51 per cent compared with 43 per cent), as was time off for sickness (49 per cent and 41 per cent), but predictably, more women reported problems for care of family or dependents, although the percentage is lower than for the other problems (28 per cent of women compared with 20 per cent of men). Non-white workers

were much more likely than white workers to have problems in all these areas: for example 69 per cent compared with 40 per cent of white workers had the sickness leave problems, and 38 per cent compared with 23 per cent problems with taking care of dependents. Age patterns were varied. Holiday problems were reported most by workers aged over 30 years, especially over 50 years, while time off for sickness was more of a problem for the youngest and oldest respondents. Problems with time-off for dependents peaked among 30-39 year olds. Full-time workers reported holiday problems more frequently than part-time workers, although the latter had more difficulties with time-off for dependents.

Opportunities problems

This problem displayed the greatest concentration in *one* form: that of 'limited opportunities for job progression or promotion', reported by 84 per cent of this group (Table 14). Almost two thirds also cited limited training opportunities to help develop a career, and over half, problems with training opportunities to help do a better job.

There is little variation in opportunity problems by employer type, except in the area of limited training for career development, where those employed in companies working for the public sector had a much higher level of difficulty (92 per cent compared with an average 62 per cent). It is difficult to draw conclusions regarding establishment size, since some cell sizes are small, but it appears that at both ends of the size spectrum, opportunities for promotion are more difficult than elsewhere. The presence of management procedures for grievance and discipline and regular meetings had no association with progression chances, but did with training, particularly where this regards improving in the job.

Although only 17 per cent of women compared with 26 per cent of men reported problems here, among those women who did, slightly more had problems with promotion difficulties than men (86 per cent compared with 82 per cent). Women were more likely than men to experience problems with

training for career development (63 per cent and 61 per cent), and this was slightly worse for women working with other men than with mainly women (60 per cent and 58 per cent). Men working with other women, on the other hand, were less likely to have this problem than men with other men (40 per cent compared with 63 per cent).

Ethnic minorities were more likely than white workers to have promotion problems (90 per cent compared with 84 per cent), but white workers were more likely to report problems with training for job improvement and career progression (54 per cent and 40 per cent, 63 per cent and 50 per cent).

While it was noted earlier that full-time workers were almost twice as likely as part-time workers to report opportunities problems (23 per cent and 12 per cent), among the part-timers who did experience this, limited opportunities for promotion were cited by 93 per cent compared with 83 per cent of full-timers, while limited training to do the job better was reported by 64 per cent of part-timers compared with 51 per cent of full-timers. It is thus apparent that their problems were far more concentrated in these areas than full-timers' ones.

Table 14: Opportunities problems by employer and employee

	Total	Employer type				Establishment Size						Formal discipline/ grievance procedures		Regular meetings with management		Full or Part time job	
		Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 - 499	500 or more	250 or more	Yes	No	yes	No	Full time	Part time
Total	102	13	61	22	6	32	19	30	8	11	19	64	33	58	43	88	14
Limited opportunities for job progression or promotion	86	11	50	19	6	28	15	24	8	9	17	54	27	47	38	73	13
	84 %	85 %	82 %	86 %	100 %	88 %	79 %	80 %	100 %	82 %	89 %	84 %	82 %	81 %	88 %	83 %	93 %
Limited opportunities for training to help me do the job better	54	7	33	11	3	18	10	15	6	4	10	30	22	23	31	45	9
	53 %	54 %	54 %	50 %	50 %	56 %	53 %	50 %	75 %	36 %	53 %	47 %	67 %	40 %	72 %	51 %	64 %
Limited opportunities for training to help develop my career	63	12	33	14	4	20	13	16	6	6	12	41	21	33	30	54	9
	62 %	92 %	54 %	64 %	67 %	63 %	68 %	53 %	75 %	55 %	63 %	64 %	64 %	57 %	70 %	61 %	64 %

Discrimination problems

These difficulties were reported least often. Age, for which statutory redress was introduced only after the survey was completed (The Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006) was the foremost problem (28 per cent), followed by sex discrimination (20 per cent), disability (11 per cent), race (8 per cent) and religious discrimination (3 per cent), all of which had legal redress at the time. There were many forms of unprompted 'discrimination' which amounted to victimisation, without statutory protection unless linked to bullying and harassment, which are not included in Table 15.

Age discrimination was most frequent in the voluntary sector, companies working for the public sector, followed by the private and the public sector (57 per cent, 29 per cent, 25 per cent and 21 per cent). Disability or learning-difficulty discrimination was slightly above average in the voluntary and public sectors (14 per cent), but less reported for the private sector (10 per cent). Sex discrimination was twice the average in voluntary organisations and companies working for the public sector (43 per cent), high in the public sector (29 per cent) and lower in the private sector (10 per cent) – a surprising finding, and one begging the question of the role of awareness. Is this higher in voluntary and public sector organisations than in the private? Or is there objectively more discrimination here? Even more striking is the incidence of race discrimination, which was 29 per cent in companies contracted to the public sector, 21 per cent in the public sector and 2 per cent in the private sector – against the average 8 per cent. This cannot be explained by the employment distribution of ethnic minorities, since they were evenly spread across each employer type at 9 per cent.

It also appears that the smallest workplaces reported below-average sex, age and disability discrimination (17 per cent, 24 per cent and 10 per cent), but slightly above average race discrimination (10 per cent). However, in each of the three size-bands between 25 and 499 workers, sex discrimination remained above average for the sample (25 per cent). Race discrimination

appeared most frequently among workers from medium-sized workplaces of 50-249 workers, which may partly reflect the fact that a higher percentage of ethnic minorities worked here - 12 per cent, compared with 9 per cent in the smallest size band and 10 per cent in the 25-49 worker one. Age discrimination rose for the 25-49 employee size-band and declined in large ones above 250 workers. This is a complex picture, with no clear relationship to the spread of the sample in terms of its dimensions of differences across workplaces, and only a clue to management practice in terms of what is known of small and large workplaces in terms of the poorer development of 'human resource management' procedures in the small workplace compared with the large.

Table 15: Discrimination problems by types

Area of Discrimination	Employer Type					Establishment size						Formal discipline/grievance procedures		Regular meetings with management		Gender	
	Total	Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 - 499	500 or more	250 or more	Yes	No	yes	No	Male	Female
	76	7	48	14	7	29	16	17	4	8	12	42	30	34	36	31	45
Sex	15	3	5	4	3	5	4	4	1	-	1	9	4	4	10	3	12
	20 %	43 %	10 %	29 %	43 %	17 %	25 %	24 %	25 %	- %	8 %	21 %	13 %	12 %	28 %	10 %	27 %
Race	6	2	1	3	-	3	1	2	-	-	-	3	3	2	3	2	4
	8 %	29 %	2 %	21 %	- %	10 %	6 %	12 %	- %	- %	- %	7 %	10 %	6 %	8 %	6 %	9 %
Age	21	2	12	3	4	7	8	2	1	1	2	15	5	13	6	7	14
	28 %	29 %	25 %	21 %	57 %	24 %	50 %	12 %	25 %	13 %	17 %	36 %	17 %	38 %	17 %	23 %	31 %
Religion	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	1	1
	3 %	14 %	- %	7 %	- %	- %	- %	12 %	- %	- %	- %	5 %	- %	3 %	3 %	3 %	2 %
Disability or learning difficulty	8	-	5	2	1	3	2	2	1	-	1	4	4	4	3	5	3
	11 %	- %	10 %	14 %	14 %	10 %	13 %	12 %	25 %	- %	8 %	10 %	13 %	12 %	8 %	16 %	7 %

Women experienced greater discrimination not only in the area of sex, but in all the other forms too, except for disability, where men were more than twice as likely as women to report this problem. Sex discrimination was much higher for workers working with mainly the opposite sex – 56 per cent for women and 60 per cent for men, compared to 18 per cent of women working mainly with other women. No men working with other men experienced sex discrimination. The main age groups for sex discrimination problems were those between 30 and 49, while for race they were younger – between 22 and 39 years old (the

same range as for religious discrimination). Race discrimination was ten times higher for those working with a different ethnicity compared with the same one (50 per cent compared with 5 per cent). Age discrimination was predictably most reported by those over 50 years old, but also by some younger workers – especially those below 22 years old. Ethnic minorities were predictably most likely to report race discrimination (44 per cent compared with 8 per cent average and 3 per cent for white workers), religious discrimination, but also sex discrimination (22 per cent of non-white compared with an average 20 per cent and 19 per cent for white respondents). Those with disabilities also reported other forms of discrimination: 29 per cent (compared with 11 per cent average) in disability discrimination, but also 29 per cent in sex discrimination and 14 per cent in age discrimination. Although cell sizes are small (9 non-white and 14 with a disability), these data indicate the existence of multiple-discrimination.

The association of management institutions with discrimination problems is ambiguous. The presence of regular meetings with management was associated with reduced incidence of sex discrimination, a slightly reduced rate of race discrimination, no change from the average in religious discrimination (which is a very small form), but a considerable *increase* in reports of age discrimination and slight increase in disability discrimination reports. Grievance procedures are also associated with a *higher incidence* of age discrimination reports, a slight *increase* in sex discrimination reports – while their absence is associated with a *lower frequency* of problems in this area! Thus the two forms of management procedures have uneven, and in some forms of discrimination, such as sex discrimination, paradoxically negative association. If the explanation is that the *increases* shown are associated with a higher consciousness and/or link between having channels for complaint in these matters, this does not apply in the area of race, where these management institutions are associated with slightly lower response frequency in this area. These issues need exploring at a qualitative level.

Concluding remarks and main specific problems

The foregoing analysis is a complex, mainly descriptive mapping exercise. Both the incidence of problems, and their relationship with workplace and worker characteristics displays many cross-cutting patterns. Are there any further generalisations to be made?

One issue could be whether or not the general *priority* of problems, in order of importance, varies by key variables, such as gender and age. Although workers were not asked to prioritise a main problem at this stage, since they could report multiple problems, the frequency of reporting problem areas can be compared. On this basis, there are, indeed, some variations. For men, the order of frequency was first pay, second work relations and third job security problems. For women it was first work relations, second pay, and third workload. If we compare the 30 – 39 age group with those who were over 50 years old, for the younger group, pay, work relations and working hours problems were the most prominent, while for the older workers, work load came first, followed by work relations and pay. For both white and non-white workers, pay was the most frequently reported problem, but for white workers, work relations and workload were the next most frequent, whereas for non-white workers, taking time-off and work relations come next. For disabled workers, job security was the most pressing problem, followed by health and safety and working hours and work relations. For workers with less than one year's employment, pay problems, work relations and working hours were the most cited ones, while for workers with more than a year's service, work relations problems were the most frequent, followed by workload and pay. Finally, for full-time workers, work relations problems were first, closely followed by pay and then workload, while for part-time workers, pay-related problems were easily the most prominent, followed by working hours and work relations problems. Thus, within the general pattern of problems, there are considerable variations in the order of importance of problems experienced.

It is also possible to single out the incidence of *single, detailed problems* in relation to *the whole sample*, and not just to their representation within a problem area. This provides rather a different picture from the initial one.

Table 16: Major specific problems across whole sample, screened job

Main Problem Area	Specific Problem	N=	% Whole Sample
Work Relation	Stress	121	24.1 %
	Management taking advantage or bullying me	94	18.8 %
Work Load	You were given too much work without enough time	100	20.0 %
	Management took advantage of your willingness to work hard	81	16.1 %
	You were put under pressure to perform too fast	64	12.8 %
Opportunities	Limited opportunities for job progression or promotion	86	17.2 %
	Limited opportunities for training to help develop my career	63	12.6 %
Pay	Pay being less than what others in your type of job earn	75	15.0 %
	Pay being incorrect	75	15.0 %
Job Security	A worry that you might lose your job (e.g. be made redundant)	73	14.6 %
Working Hours	Unpredictable	65	13.0 %
	More than agreed	57	11.4 %
	Inflexible	52	10.4 %
Health and Safety	The work environment in general was unsafe or dangerous	59	11.8 %
	There was inadequate health and safety training	55	11.0 %
	Managerial negligence	53	10.6 %
Contract/Job Description	Not being given a formal contract or written job description	50	10.0 %

Table 16²³ shows that overall, stress was the most prominent problem, followed by being given too much to do without enough time and management taking advantage or bullying me. Work opportunities, pay and job security are further major areas and unpredictable, inflexible hours, working more than agreed, unsafe working, inadequate health and safety training and management negligence are also perceived as problems by substantial numbers, while not being given a formal or written job contract is reported by a tenth of the sample.

This then, is a snapshot of the problems experienced by lower paid, unrepresented workers in Britain. It does present a portrait of what these experiences are among those who do have problems. It shows that institutional provision for grievance and discipline resolution and for employee consultation with management is lower in this sample than within the wider workforce, but where it occurs, it is the latter (joint consultation) which has the

²³ As a rough benchmark, where 50 or more workers (10 per cent of the whole survey sample and above) reported a *specific* problem, this is regarded as substantial and included here.

stronger association with lower levels of problems, although detailed analysis of problems shows wide variation.

Further analysis will assess how workers deal with these problems and the outcomes to action.

Acknowledgements

The research for this ESRC project was conducted while I was at the Working Lives Research Institute, London Metropolitan University. I am grateful to Margaret Fox, formerly at ACAS, for giving me very useful ideas for the research design – although all subsequent mistakes are my own. Thanks also to Dr. Michael Fisher and Dr. Surhan Cam, Research Fellows on the ‘Unorganised Worker’ Project for their contributions. I am also grateful to IFF who performed the survey, worked closely with me in its complicated design, and continue to work with me in subsequent analysis. Thanks to Andy Charwood who provided the comparison of the sample with the Labour Force Survey.

References

- Bishop, K (2004) 'Working time patterns in the UK, France, Denmark and Sweden', *Labour Market Trends*, March 2004, 113-122.
- Broad, G. (1994) 'Japan In Britain: The Dynamics of Joint Consultation', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 24 (1): 26-38.
- Brown, W., Deakin S., Hudson, M., Pratten, C. and Ryan, P. (1998) *The Individualisation of Employment Contracts in Britain*, Employment Relations Research Series, No. 4, London: Department of Trade and Industry.
- Bruegel, I. And Perrons, D. (1998) 'Deregulation and Women Employment: the Diverse Experiences of Women in Britain', *Feminist Economics* 4(1), pp. 103-125.
- Chartered Institute of Managers (2005) *Bullying at work: the experience of managers*, September.
- Cressey, P., Eldridge, J. and MacInnes, J. (1985) *Just Managing: Authority and Democracy in Industrial Relation*, (Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Cully, M, Woodland, S., O'Reilly, A. and Dix, G. (1999) *Britain at Work, As depicted by the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey*, London: Routledge.
- Cunningham, I. (2000) 'Prospects for union growth in the UK voluntary sector: the impact of the Employment Relations Act 1999', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 31 (3): 192-206.
- DTI (1998) *Fairness at Work*, White Paper Cm. 3968, London: HMSO.
- DTI (2006a) *Trade Union Membership 2005*, Employment Market Analysis and Research, London: Department of Trade and Industry.
- DTI (2006b) *Success at Work: Protecting Vulnerable Workers, Supporting Good Employers. A policy statement for this Parliament*. March, London: Department of Trade and Industry.
- Earnshaw, G., Marchington, M. and Goodman, J. (2000) 'Unfair to whom? Discipline and dismissal in small establishments', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 31 (1): 62-74.

- Earnshaw, J., Goodman, J., Harrison, R., and Marchington, M. (1998) 'Industrial tribunals, workplace disciplinary procedures and employment practice', *Department of Trade and Industry Employment Relations Research Series, No. 2*, London: DTI.
- EIRO (2005) *Survey reveals continued erosion of collective representation at the workplace*, at <http://www.eiro.eurofound.ie/2005/09/feature/uk0509105f.html>.
- EOC (2005a) *Part time is no crime so why the penalty?* Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission, February.
- EOC (2005b) *Britain's hidden brain drain – Final report. The EOC's investigation into flexible and part-time working*, Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission, September.
- Felstead, A., Burchell, B. and Green, F. (1998) 'Insecurity at work. Is job insecurity really much worse now than before?', *New Economy*, 5, 3: 100-4.
- Hayward, B., Peters, M. et al., BMRB Research (2004) *Finding from the Survey of Employment Tribunal Applications 2003*, DTI Employment Relations Research Series No. 33, London: Department of Trade and Industry.
- Health and Safety Commission (2001) *Levels and Trends in Workplace Injury: Rates of Injury within Small and Large Manufacturing Workplaces*, Merseyside: Strategic and Analytical Support Directorate, and National Statistics.
- Heery, E. and Salmon, J. (eds. 2000) *The Insecure Workforce*, London: Routledge.
- Hyman, R. (1996) 'Is there a Case for Statutory Works Councils in Britain' in A., McColgan (ed.) *The Future of Labour Law*, (London: Pinter), pp.64-84.
- Kelly, J. (1996) 'Works Councils: Union Advance or Marginalization', in A. McColgan (ed.) *The Future of Labour Law*, (London: Pinter), pp. 46-63.
- Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J., Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix, G. and Oxenbridge, S. (2005) *Inside the Workplace: First Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*, DTI, ESRC, Acas, PSI.

- Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J., Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix, G. and Oxenbridge, S. (2006) *Inside the Workplace: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*, DTI, ESRC, Acas, PSI, London: Routledge.
- Knight, K.G. and Latreille, P. L. (2000) 'Discipline, Dismissals and Complaints to Employment Tribunals', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38 (4): 533-557.
- Pollert, A. and Li, Y. (2007) 'The Unorganised Worker in WERS 2004, socio-demographic attributes, workplace characteristics and job experience' forthcoming *Employment Relations Research Series*, London: BERR/formerly Department of Trade and Industry.
- Lloyd, C. (2001) 'What do employee councils do? The impact of non-union forms of representation on trade union organisation' *Industrial Relations Journal*, 32 (4): 313-327.
- LRD (2005) *Labour Research*, November, November, 'Health and Safety Back-Up: Union take steps to stamp out bullying', p. 23.
- McLoughlin, I. and Gourlay, S. N. (1994), *Enterprise without unions - industrial relations in the non-union firm*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Meager, N., Tyers, C., Perryman, S., Rick, J. and Willison, R. (2002), *Awareness, knowledge and exercise of individual employment rights* Employment Relations Research Series, No. 15, London: Department of Trade and Industry)
- Pollert, A. (2005) 'The Unorganised Worker: The Decline in Collectivism and New Hurdles to Individual Employment Rights', *Industrial Law Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 3, 217-237.
- Rayner, C., Hoel, H. and Cooper, C. (2002) *Workplace Bullying: What we know, who is to blame, and what can we do?*, London: Taylor and Francis.
- Robinson, P. (2000) 'Insecurity and the flexible workforce: Measuring the ill-defined', in E. Heery and J. Salmon (eds. 2000) *The insecure Workforce*, London: Routledge.
- Terry, M. (1999) 'Systems of collective employee representation in non-union firms in the UK', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 30 (1): 16-30).

TUC (2005) Trade Union Trends report *Focus on union safety reps*, fifth biennial survey of safety reps from the TUC, London: Trades Union Congress.

Appendix 1.

Comparison of the characteristics of Low-Paid Unrepresented workers who had Problems with All Low Paid, Unrepresented workers and the Workforce as a whole (comparisons for 2004, Labour Force Survey).#

	Unrepresented workers survey	Low paid, unrepresented workers (LFS)	All workers (LFS)
Individual characteristics			
Male	39.12	42.14	53.77***
Female	60.88	57.86	46.23***
Age			
<25	16.53	29.71***	14.27**
25 - 34	20.36	19.63	21.83
35 - 44	23.79	20.1	26.32
45 - 54	24.4	15.89***	21.91
55+	14.92	14.86	15.67
Highest educational qualification ¹			
None	14.11	14.84	10.13
NVQ level 1 equivalent	5.44	19.69	13.88
GCSE/ NVQ level 2 equivalent	31.05	20.87	15.36
A level/ NVQ level 3 equivalent	24.19	22.72	22.24
Higher education	21.77	13.34	30.25
Other	3.23	-	9.14
Ethnicity			
Non-white ethnic minorities	8.78	6.42***	7.07**
White	91.22	93.58***	92.93**
Job characteristics			
Sector ²			
Public sector	17.67	15.87	24.19***
Private sector	82.33	84.13	75.81***
Industry			
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	1.44	1.61	1.34
Manufacturing	14.43	13.42	13.57
Construction	3.3	6.9***	8.07***
Retail, wholesale and distribution	18.76	25.69***	13.45**
Hotels and restaurants	7.01	8.75	4.35***
Transport and communications	4.95	5.27	6.75
Financial intermediation	3.51	2.7	4.18
Other business services	9.07	8.97	11.46

	Unrepresented workers survey	Low paid, unrepresented workers (LFS)	All workers (LFS)
Public administration	5.98	3.34***	7.04
Education	8.04	6.42	9.09
Health and social services	17.11	11.38***	12.09***
Other community services	6.39	6.52	5.6
Workplace size			
<10 employees	21.76	29.87***	19.01**
10 - 24 employees	20.39	18.23	12.63***
25 – 49 employees	14.87	15.25	12.66*
50 – 249 employees	28.72	21.22***	21.48***
250 – 499 employees	6.11	6.3	7.11
>499 employees	8.15	8.31	15.75***
Occupation			
Managers and senior professionals	6.68	5.8	14.95***
Professionals	4.05	2.22**	12.41***
Associate professional and technical occupations	7.89	5.92*	13.79***
Administrative and secretarial occupations	18.42	17.53	12.62***
Skilled manual occupations	7.49	9.94	11.55***
Personal services occupations	16.40	11.4***	7.61***
Sales and customer services occupations	12.96	16.17	7.85***
Semi-skilled occupations	9.51	8.69	7.48*
Un-skilled occupations	16.60	22.3***	11.67***
Full-time job	78.34	61.97***	76.11
Part-time job	21.66	38.03***	23.89
Non-standard employment contract	11.45	7.77***	5.27***
Job tenure during problems ##			
6 months or less	37.55		
6 months – 1 year	10.84		
1 – 2 years	15.86		
3 – 5 years	20.08		
6 – 10 years	8.63		
11+ years	7.03		

n.b. 'Low-paid' defined as earning below the median pay level in 2004; 'Unrepresented' means non-union members. The LFS pay comparison with the Unrepresented Worker Survey is not perfect, since the pay calculation for the latter referred to any job in the 3 years previous to the survey. The screening pay levels were calculated for London and Rest of Country on the average of the medians for the 3 years 2002, 2003 and 2004. Nevertheless, the differences with the LFS figures are small.

Comparison with LFS not possible since the URWS asks about length of time in post when problems occurred, whereas the LFS asks length of service in current job.

1. Responses here are not strictly comparable as the LFS asks a much more detailed set of questions about qualifications. Because of these differences, no significance tests were performed on these variables

2. Differences between the URWS and LFS here may arise from differences in the questions. The URWS asks if workers work for private contractors in the public sector, respondents who are categorised as being in the private sector. In the LFS workers in these jobs may classify themselves as working in the public sector.

* - Difference compared to the unrepresented workers sample is statistically significant at the 10% level or better.

** - Difference compared to the unrepresented workers sample is statistically significant at the 5% level or better.

*** - Difference compared to the unrepresented workers sample is statistically significant at the 1% level or better.

Results are based on Chi² tests.

Appendix 2.

Table I. Problems in one job by selected employer characteristics.

	Total	Employer type				Establishment size					
		Company working for public sector	Private	Public	Voluntary	Fewer than 25	25 - 49	50 - 249	250 - 499	500 or more	250 or more
Total in sample	501	65	321	88	24	207	73	141	30	40	70
%of total sample	100	13 %	64 %	18 %	5 %	41 %	15 %	28 %	6 %	8 %	14 %
Problems											
Pay-Related	181	23	126	26	5	89	24	40	9	15	24
	36 %	35 %	39 %	30 %	21 %	43 %	33 %	28 %	30 %	38 %	34 %
Job Security	124	18	85	15	5	56	16	30	8	11	19
	25 %	28 %	26 %	17 %	21 %	27 %	22 %	21 %	27 %	28 %	27 %
Opportunities	102	13	61	22	6	32	19	30	8	11	19
	20 %	20 %	19 %	25 %	25 %	15 %	26 %	21 %	27 %	28 %	27 %
Discrimination (inc. victimisation)	76	7	48	14	7	29	16	17	4	8	12
	15 %	11 %	15 %	16 %	29 %	14 %	22 %	12 %	13 %	20 %	17 %
Discrimination (justiciable)	49	5	27	11	6	19	12	11	3	2	5
	10 %	8 %	8 %	13 %	25 %	9 %	16 %	8 %	10 %	5 %	7 %
Victimisation	31	2	22	4	3	10	5	8	2	6	8
	6 %	3 %	7 %	5 %	13 %	5 %	7 %	6 %	7 %	15 %	11 %
Taking Time-Off	109	12	81	9	6	49	15	22	11	10	21
	22 %	18 %	25 %	10 %	25 %	24 %	21 %	16 %	37 %	25 %	30 %
Working Hours	127	13	96	11	5	56	15	38	7	9	16
	25 %	20 %	30 %	13 %	21 %	27 %	21 %	27 %	23 %	23 %	23 %
Workload	143	17	81	35	9	51	20	46	8	13	21
	29 %	26 %	25 %	40 %	38 %	25 %	27 %	33 %	27 %	33 %	30 %
Health And Safety	109	13	76	14	5	40	21	30	7	10	17
	22 %	20 %	24 %	16 %	21 %	19 %	29 %	21 %	23 %	25 %	24 %
Contract / Job Description	114	12	74	20	8	42	19	32	6	13	19
	23 %	18 %	23 %	23 %	33 %	20 %	26 %	23 %	20 %	33 %	27 %
Work Relations	172	30	96	33	13	65	31	50	10	14	24
	34 %	46 %	30 %	38 %	54 %	31 %	42 %	35 %	33 %	35 %	34 %

Table II Problems in one job, by selected worker characteristics.

	Total	Gender		Tenure		Full/Part-time		Gender balance in workplace				Ethnicity	
		Male	Female	Less than 1 yr	1 or more yrs	Full time	Part time	Men with mostly men	Women with mostly women	Women with mostly men	Men with mostly women	White	Non-white
Total	501	196	305	241	257	382	119	110	159	33	22	457	44
Pay-Related	181	79	102	100	80	137	44	41	57	13	9	163	18
	36 %	40 %	33 %	41 %	31 %	36 %	37 %	37 %	36 %	39 %	41 %	36 %	41 %
Job Security	124	61	63	57	67	104	20	35	29	13	7	117	7
	25 %	31 %	21 %	24 %	26 %	27 %	17 %	32 %	18 %	39 %	32 %	26 %	16 %
Opportunities	102	51	51	45	57	88	14	30	26	10	5	92	10
	20 %	26 %	17 %	19 %	22 %	23 %	12 %	27 %	16 %	30 %	23 %	20 %	23 %
Discrimination (inc. victimisation)	76	31	45	42	34	58	18	13	22	9	5	67	9
	15 %	16 %	15 %	17 %	13 %	15 %	15 %	12 %	14 %	27 %	23 %	15 %	20 %
Discrimination (justiciable)	49	15	34	25	24	35	14	7	18	6	3	42	7
	10 %	8 %	11 %	10 %	9 %	9 %	12 %	6 %	11 %	18 %	14 %	9 %	16 %
Victimisation	31	16	15	17	14	24	7	6	7	4	2	27	4
	6 %	8 %	5 %	7 %	5 %	6 %	6 %	5 %	4 %	12 %	9 %	6 %	9 %
Taking Time-Off	109	41	68	63	46	86	23	25	40	9	5	93	16
	22 %	21 %	22 %	26 %	18 %	23 %	19 %	23 %	25 %	27 %	23 %	20 %	36 %
Working Hours	127	54	73	68	59	92	35	35	43	5	4	113	14
	25 %	28 %	24 %	28 %	23 %	24 %	29 %	32 %	27 %	15 %	18 %	25 %	32 %
Workload	143	52	91	61	81	121	22	25	55	7	8	129	14
	29 %	27 %	30 %	25 %	32 %	32 %	18 %	23 %	35 %	21 %	36 %	28 %	32 %
Health And Safety	109	52	57	51	58	91	18	36	27	6	6	99	10
	22 %	27 %	19 %	21 %	23 %	24 %	15 %	33 %	17 %	18 %	27 %	22 %	23 %
Contract / Job Description	114	46	68	55	59	87	27	30	36	7	3	104	10
	23 %	23 %	22 %	23 %	23 %	23 %	23 %	27 %	23 %	21 %	14 %	23 %	23 %
Work Relations	172	66	106	78	93	141	31	38	52	8	9	157	15
	34 %	34 %	35 %	32 %	36 %	37 %	26 %	35 %	33 %	24 %	41 %	34 %	34 %