



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Anderson, T., Millward, N. & Forth, J. (2004). Equal Opportunities Policies and Practice at the Workplace: Secondary Analysis of WERS98. London, UK: Department of Trade and Industry.

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://city-ref-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/20912/>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).



**EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS
RESEARCH SERIES NO.30**

**Equal opportunities policies
and practices at the workplace:
secondary analysis of WERS98**

**TRACY ANDERSON, NEIL MILLWARD
AND JOHN FORTH**

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL
RESEARCH**

Published in May 2004 by the Department of Trade and Industry.

URN 04/836

ISBN 0 85605 329 5

© Crown Copyright 2004

This and other DTI publications can be ordered at: www.dti.gov.uk/publications. Click the 'Browse' button, then select 'Employment Relations Research Series'. Alternatively call the DTI Publications Orderline on 0870 1502 500 (+44 870 1502 500) and provide the URN, or email them at: publications@dti.gsi.gov.uk

This document can be accessed online at: www.dti.gov.uk/er/emar

Postal enquiries should be addressed to:

Employment Market Analysis and Research
Department of Trade and Industry
1 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0ET
United Kingdom

Email enquiries should be addressed to: emar@dti.gov.uk

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Trade and Industry or the Government.

Foreword

The Department of Trade and Industry's aim is to realise prosperity for all. We want a dynamic labour market that provides full employment, flexibility and choice. We want to create workplaces of high productivity and skill, where people can flourish and maintain a healthy work-life balance.

The Department has an ongoing research programme on employment relations and labour market issues, managed by the Employment Market Analysis and Research branch (EMAR). Details of our research programme appear regularly in the ONS journal *Labour Market Trends*, and can also be found on our website: <http://www.dti.gov.uk/er/emar>

DTI social researchers, economists, statisticians and policy advisors devise research projects to be conducted in-house or on our behalf by external researchers, chosen through competitive tender. Projects typically look at individual and collective employment rights, identify good practice, evaluate the impact of particular policies or regulations, or examine labour market trends and issues. We also regularly conduct large-scale UK social surveys, such as the Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS).

We publicly disseminate results of this research through the DTI Employment Relations Research series and Occasional Paper series. All reports are available to download at <http://www.dti.gov.uk/er/inform.htm>

Anyone interested in receiving regular email updates on EMAR's research programme, new publications and forthcoming seminars should send their details to us at: emar@dti.gov.uk

The views expressed in these publications do not necessarily reflect those of the Department or the Government. We publish them as a contribution towards open debate about how best we can achieve our objectives.



Grant Fitzner
Director, Employment Market Analysis and Research

Acknowledgements

The research reported here was funded by the Department of Trade and Industry. The authors acknowledge the Department of Trade and Industry, the Economic and Social Research Council, the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service and the Policy Studies Institute as the originators of the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey data and the UK Data Archive as its distributor. None of these organizations bears any responsibility for the authors' analysis and interpretations of the data.

Contents

Summary	8
1. Introduction	9
2. Prevalence and coverage of equal opportunities policies and practices	11
Prevalence of equal opportunities policies	11
Coverage of equal opportunities policies	14
Prevalence of monitoring practices	19
3. Recruitment practices	21
Age as a factor in recruitment	21
Special procedures to encourage applications from ethnic minorities and older workers	24
4. Workforce concentration	29
Ethnic minority concentration.....	29
Concentrations of younger workers	31
Concentrations of older workers.....	33
5. Job satisfaction and perceived fairness	36
Job satisfaction	36
Employee characteristics	36
Workplace characteristics	39
Relative satisfaction of workers from different age and ethnic minority groups.....	39

Perceived fairness.....	41
Employee characteristics	41
Workplace characteristics	44
Relative satisfaction of workers from different age and ethnic minority groups.....	45
6. Workplace well-being	49
Absenteeism	49
Voluntary resignation	49
Dismissals	49
Employment tribunal cases.....	54
7. Conclusions	56
Technical Appendix.....	57
Notes regarding the analysis.....	57
Section 5.....	57
Table A.1: Cases excluded in the relative job satisfaction analysis	57
Section 6.....	57
Table A.2: Outliers removed in the calculation of workplace well-being indicators	58
Table A.3: Cases excluded due to data inconsistencies or missing data.....	58
Data Appendix	59

Table Conventions

Symbol/text	Interpretation
0	Less than 0.5 per cent, excluding none
Blank cell	None
()	Unweighted base is between 20 and 50 observations: number should be treated with caution.
*	Unweighted base is less than 20 observations and so is too low to produce a reliable estimate.

Summary

The European Union Employment and Race Directives have required amendments to be made to existing equality legislation in the UK and have required new legislation to tackle discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, religion and age in employment. This paper provides evidence on the scope of workplaces' equal opportunities policies and practices prior to the introduction of such legislative amendments, and aims to shed further light on linkages between such policies/practices and patterns of job satisfaction and workplace well-being. The evidence presented here clearly suggests that there is scope for the extension of equal opportunities among workplaces in Britain, particularly in the areas covered by the Directives.

1.

Introduction

In December 2001, the Department of Trade and Industry published a consultation document *Towards Equality and Diversity: Implementing the Employment and Race Directives*. The consultation document was concerned with new legislation that would be required to implement the European Union Employment and Race Directives. These Directives required amendments to be made to existing equality legislation and, for the first time, required legislation to tackle discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, religion and age in employment.

The consultation led to a number of changes, or planned changes, in employment legislation. Changes to the Race Relations Act 1976 came into force in July 2003, followed by new legislation – the Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation) Regulations 2003 and the Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Regulations 2003 – which came into force in December 2003. Amendments to the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 will come into force in October 2004 and new legislation outlawing discrimination on grounds of age will follow by the end of 2006.

As part of the process of developing the legislation – and to inform the regulatory impact assessment – the Department commissioned the National Institute of Economic and Social Research to undertake secondary analysis of the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey. The aims of the analysis were to provide new evidence on the existing scope of workplaces' equal opportunities policies and practices and to shed further light on linkages between such policies/practices and patterns of job satisfaction and workplace well-being.

The 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey (hereafter WERS98) is a nationally representative sample survey of workplaces in Great Britain with 10 or more employees, covering all sectors except agriculture and coal-mining and including both private and publicly-owned establishments. We use two linked elements of the survey for our analysis.

The first is the management interview, carried out face-to-face with the most senior workplace manager responsible for personnel or employee relations. Interviews were conducted in 2,191 workplaces between October 1997 and June 1998 with a response rate of 80.4 per cent. With appropriate weighting to compensate for the complex probability sampling used in the design, the data obtained from the management interview can be generalised with confidence to the population of workplaces in Great Britain employing 10 or more employees, numbering about 340,000 establishments.

The second main element was a survey of employees within workplaces where a management interview had been achieved. This short, anonymous self-completion

questionnaire was distributed to a simple random sample of 25 employees (or all employees in workplaces having 10-24) in the 1,880 workplaces (85 per cent) where management permitted it; of the 44,283 questionnaires distributed 28,237 (64 per cent) usable ones were returned. With appropriate weighting, the data obtained from the employee survey can be generalised with confidence to the population of around 18.5 million employees in workplaces employing 10 or more employees, amounting to around 82 per cent of all employees in Britain.¹

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we examine the nature of workplaces' equal opportunities policies, investigating the overall prevalence of such policies and also focusing on the extent to which they already cover those areas addressed by the new Directives. In Section 3, we examine the extent to which age is used as a factor in recruitment, and also identify workplaces with special procedures to attract applicants from ethnic minority groups or older members of the labour force. Section 4 then investigates the degree of concentration of ethnic minorities and younger/older workers within establishments' workforces. Section 5 examines patterns of job satisfaction and employees' perceptions of fair treatment, whilst Section 6 looks at various other measures of workplace well-being. Section 7 briefly concludes.

A Technical Appendix highlights issues relating to the conduct of the analysis which may be of interest to the reader. A separate Data Appendix provides a record of the variables used in the analysis and lists the syntax files which have been supplied to the Department for the purposes of replicating or extending the analysis presented in the paper.

¹ Unlike the main management interview data, where sample non-response bias was not detected, the employee survey did exhibit non-response bias. A logistic regression model identified certain industries and sizes of workplace and a number of individual employee characteristics as significant predictors of non-response. The weighting scheme developed, and used in this paper, compensates for these biases (Airey, C., Hales, J., Hamilton, R., Korovessis, C., McKernan, A., and Purdon, S. (1999) "The Workplace Employee Relations Survey (WERS) 1997-8: Technical Report. Cross-Section and Panel Surveys", London: National Centre for Social Research).

2.

Prevalence and coverage of equal opportunities policies and practices

Prevalence of equal opportunities policies

Equal opportunities policies are often used within workplaces to guard against discriminatory practices and formalise what is acceptable in terms of the treatment of members of minority groups, or other groups which have been historically associated with discriminatory practice. While some policies may only be general statements about being not unfairly discriminating, others specifically make provision for the fair treatment of individuals on the basis of particular characteristics. The named categories may reflect current equal opportunities legislation covering sex, race and disability, or move beyond this to include additional categories. Two-thirds (67 per cent) of all workplaces in Great Britain with 10 or more employees had some form of equal opportunities (EO) policy in 1998.

Policies were more commonly found in larger establishments and organisations (Table 2.1). This may be due to the increased likelihood of larger organisations to employ human resources specialists with greater knowledge of the legal requirements placed upon an employer. EO policies were found in 86 per cent of establishments where there was a designated personnel specialist, compared with 60 per cent of establishments without a specialist.²

In some organizations, policies are also passed down the organizational hierarchy. The overall incidence of EO policies among workplaces that form part of multi-site organizations is 86 per cent. EO policies are almost universal among the 75 per cent of these workplaces which say that they must follow EO policies/procedures that are set at a higher level in the organisation (92 per cent have an EO policy). But among the 25 per cent that don't have to follow higher-level policies or procedures, the incidence is appreciably lower at 68 per cent.

² A personnel specialist was defined as someone with the job title of Employee Relations Manager, Industrial Relations Manager, Human Resources Manager or Personnel Manager, or a manager who spent more than half of their time on employee relations issues.

Table 2.1: Percentage of workplaces with an EO policy (by workplace characteristics)

		EO Policy	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	64	1077	259
	25 to 49 employees	65	575	396
	50 to 99 employees	70	271	390
	100 to 199 employees	82	134	387
	200 to 499 employees	87	84	456
	500 or more employees	92	29	296
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	30	748	311
	100-999	66	347	427
	1,000-9,999	89	433	617
	10,000+	98	441	644
Broad sector	Private	57	1626	1507
	Public	97	544	677
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	34	285	298
	Electricity, gas and water	98	5	80
	Construction	56	92	112
	Wholesale and retail	61	414	320
	Hotels and restaurants	71	164	126
	Transport and communication	65	99	136
	Financial services	78	68	101
	Other business services	63	247	227
	Public administration	100	104	183
	Education	92	283	244
	Health	83	299	247
	Other community services	51	111	110
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	90	847	1224
	No recognition	53	1308	920
All workplaces		67	2155	2144

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

EO policies are more common in the public sector, where they were reported in 97 per cent of workplaces compared with only 57 per cent in the private sector. This was further reflected in the variation in the proportion of workplaces with EO policies between industries, with the level being particularly high in the Public Administration (100 per cent), Education (92 per cent) and Health (83 per cent) sectors, in addition to the Electricity, Gas and Water industry (98 per cent) which contains many establishments formerly under public ownership.

The association of union representation with the fair treatment of employees was also reflected, with EO policies being more common among workplaces with union recognition (90 per cent compared with 53 per cent). This pattern remains when one focuses solely on the private sector, although the relationship becomes slightly weaker (Table 2.2). EO policies were also more common among workplaces with higher levels of female and ethnic minority employees, and those

Table 2.2: Percentage of private sector workplaces with an EO policy (by union recognition)

		EO policy	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Union recognition for collective bargaining purposes	Union recognised	76	341	589
	No recognition	52	1272	885
All workplaces		57	1614	1474

Base: All private sector establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 2.3: Percentage of workplaces with an EO policy (by workforce characteristics)

		EO policy	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Percentage female employees in the workplace	0-24.9%	48	541	565
	25-74.9%	69	895	1094
	75%+	81	714	499
Percentage part-time employees in the workplace	None	52	391	281
	0.1-24.9%	62	725	1021
	25%+	78	1033	856
Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace	None	62	1328	839
	0.1-4.9%	74	335	772
	5-9.9%	71	217	204
	10-19.9%	74	140	147
Percentage disabled employees in the workplace	20% or more	89	129	156
	None	66	1694	1170
	Below/equal to 2 per cent	84	159	632
Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace	Above 2 per cent	66	298	322
	None	72	956	670
	0.1-4.9%	67	366	809
	5-9.9%	59	266	238
	10-19.9%	58	275	219
Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace	20% or more	69	292	214
	None	78	289	135
	0.1-4.9%	74	185	256
	5-9.9%	70	381	396
	10-19.9%	69	636	715
All workplaces		67	2154	2147

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

with some disabled employees compared to those with none (Table 2.3). Given the purpose of EO policies, this may be an indicator of policy effectiveness. However, it may be that workplaces with higher minority representations are simply more aware of the issue of discrimination and thus more likely to have a policy to guard against it.

Generally, workplaces which engaged in other favourable employment practices were more likely to have an equal opportunities policy. Eighty per cent of those

workplaces that engaged in workforce monitoring practices had an EO policy compared with 54 per cent of those that did not (Table 2.4).³ Furthermore, almost all 'good employers' (those who provided pensions, sick pay, job security and off-the-job training) had such a policy, compared with 66 per cent of those who did not offer all of these benefits.

Table 2.4: Percentage of workplaces with an EO policy (by other favourable practices)

Rows	EO policy	Total	
	Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Any of the workforce monitoring practices	80	1095	1528
None of the workforce monitoring practices	54	1074	653
Good employer	66	2074	2002
Yes	99	68	144
All workplaces	67	2141	2146

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Coverage of equal opportunities policies

While 67 per cent of workplaces had EO policies, it is important to examine which groups these policies explicitly cover as this may vary between workplaces. In line with existing legislation, the most commonly covered are sex, ethnic origin and disability for which 58, 58 and 56 per cent of workplaces, respectively, had EO policies (Table 2.5). Religion was covered in almost half of all workplaces, with age and sexual orientation being covered in only 41 per cent and 38 per cent of workplaces. Table 2.5 shows the variation by workplace characteristics. The patterns are the same as those found with regard to the existence of any EO policy: higher incidence in larger establishments and organisations, the public sector (and the associated industries) and in workplaces with a recognised union.

As already mentioned, one may expect some association between the groups of workers covered by EO policies and those present in the workforce. Table 2.6 shows the incidence of EO policies covering different categories among workplaces with different workforce compositions. A similar pattern was present for all types of policy coverage across varying gender, ethnic, disability and age compositions.

³ These workforce monitoring practices comprised: keeping employee records with ethnic origin identified; collecting statistics on posts held by men and women; monitoring promotions by gender or ethnicity; reviewing employment procedures to identify indirect discrimination; reviewing the relative pay rates of different groups; and making adjustments to accommodate disabled employees.

Table 2.5: Percentage of workplaces with EO policies covering different categories (by workplace characteristics)

		EO policy covers gender/sex	EO policy covers ethnic minorities	EO policy covers disability	EO policy covers religion	EO policy covers age	EO policy covers sexual orientation	Total	
		Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	54	54	53	44	39	34	1073	256
	25 to 49 employees	56	56	54	49	40	36	570	393
	50 to 99 employees	60	61	56	52	41	40	265	383
	100 to 199 employees	75	74	69	64	47	48	134	385
	200 to 499 employees	82	83	80	70	53	54	83	452
	500 or more employees	91	90	86	69	58	62	29	295
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	22	21	19	16	15	13	746	309
	100-999	57	57	55	48	43	39	345	424
	1,000-9,999	80	81	79	71	56	50	426	610
	10,000+	90	90	87	77	63	63	437	639
Broad sector	Private	47	47	45	38	32	28	1610	1488
	Public	92	90	87	81	67	66	543	676
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	28	27	23	21	16	15	282	293
	Electricity, gas and water	96	97	86	56	49	41	5	80
	Construction	42	38	35	23	17	17	90	110
	Wholesale and retail	47	49	48	44	39	31	409	315
	Hotels and restaurants	57	61	60	44	39	41	164	126
	Transport and communication	59	59	58	51	40	46	99	136
	Financial services	64	63	62	56	39	37	68	100
	Other business services	54	55	53	47	34	30	246	223
	Public administration	98	98	96	88	79	86	104	183
	Education	87	84	80	71	57	44	282	243
	Health	73	75	72	64	60	58	297	246
	Other community services	40	39	39	32	21	23	109	109
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	82	81	79	71	59	59	844	1220
	No recognition	42	43	41	34	29	24	1295	905
All workplaces		58	58	56	49	41	38	2140	2125

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 2.6: Percentage of workplaces with EO policies covering different categories (by workforce composition)

		EO policy covers gender/sex	EO policy covers ethnic minorities	EO policy covers disability	EO policy covers religion	EO policy covers age	EO policy covers sexual orientation	Total	
		Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Percentage female employees in the workplace	0-24.9%	39	38	36	31	23	26	533	558
	25-74.9%	60	61	59	51	44	39	888	1083
	75%+	70	71	68	61	51	45	711	497
Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace	None	53	52	50	44	37	34	1315	829
	0.1-4.9%	65	65	62	54	43	42	334	769
	5-9.9%	57	63	62	51	40	35	215	201
	10-19.9%	64	66	63	60	50	49	140	146
Percentage disabled employees in the workplace	20% or more	88	88	87	73	74	55	129	156
	None	56	56	54	47	40	35	1678	1156
	Below/equal to 2 per cent	77	78	73	65	50	50	159	630
	Above 2 per cent	59	59	58	52	44	45	298	321
Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace	None	66	65	63	55	46	43	952	665
	0.1-4.9%	56	57	53	48	41	37	361	802
	5-9.9%	49	49	47	43	33	33	261	234
	10-19.9%	43	42	38	31	26	19	273	216
Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace	20% or more	59	63	62	52	46	42	291	213
	None	69	71	70	61	51	49	289	135
	0.1-4.9%	64	63	56	57	45	44	182	252
	5-9.9%	59	62	58	50	40	33	376	391
	10-19.9%	58	58	56	47	43	39	632	708
	20% or more	52	50	48	43	34	33	658	641
All workplaces		58	58	56	49	41	38	2137	2127

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

One third of all workplaces (almost half of workplaces with EO policies) had a policy/policies which covered all six of the categories (ie. gender, ethnic origin, disability, age, religion and sexual orientation. Table 2.7). This was more common in larger establishments and organisations (Table 2.8). Policies covering all six categories were also very common in the Public Administration sector, where three-quarters of the workplaces had one. One fifth of workplaces (19 per cent) had a policy which covered sex, race, disability and one or two of the other three areas, whilst four per cent of workplaces had policies which covered sex, ethnicity and disability alone. In nine per cent of workplaces (12 per cent with an EO policy) it was not clear from the WERS98 data what areas were covered, since the respondent did not provide any/sufficient details about the coverage of their workplace's policy.

Table 2.7: Percentage of workplaces with different types of EO policy

		Workplaces with EO policy	All workplaces
EO policy coverage	No policy		33
	Details unknown	1	1
	None of the six categories	11	8
	One of age, religion & sexual orientation only	0	0
	One of sex, race and disability only (1)	2	1
	(1) plus one of age, religion & sexual orientation	0	0
	Two of sex, race and disability only (2)	2	1
	(2) plus one of age, religion & sexual orientation	2	2
	(2) plus two of age, religion & sexual orientation	0	0
	(2) plus age, religion & sexual orientation	0	0
	Sex, race and disability only (3)	5	4
	(3) plus one of age, religion or sexual orientation	14	10
	(3) plus two of age, religion or sexual orientation	13	9
	All six categories	48	32
	Total	100	100
Weighted		1461	2170
Unweighted		1772	2184

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 2.8: Percentage of workplaces with different EO policy coverage (by workplace characteristics)

		Sex, Race and disability only (1)	(1) plus one other	(1) plus two others	All 6 categories	Not known	Total		
		Row%	Row%	Row%	Row%	Row%	%	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	4	9	8	31	9	100	1073	256
	25 to 49 employees	2	9	10	30	7	100	570	393
	50 to 99 employees	2	12	8	34	9	100	265	383
	100 to 199 employees	4	12	14	38	5	100	134	385
	200 to 499 employees	6	14	17	42	3	100	83	452
	500 or more employees	11	10	16	47	1	100	29	295
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	2	3	3	11	8	100	746	309
	100-999	3	9	9	34	8	100	345	424
	1,000-9,999	2	16	13	44	5	100	426	610
	10,000+	8	11	13	54	7	100	437	639
Broad sector	Private	4	9	8	24	9	100	1610	1488
	Public	4	13	14	57	5	100	543	676
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	2	6	3	13	5	100	282	293
	Electricity, gas and water	25	12	16	33	1	100	5	80
	Construction	12	5	3	15	13	100	90	110
	Wholesale and retail	1	7	10	29	11	100	409	315
	Hotels and restaurants	7	9	6	34	10	100	164	126
	Transport and communication	3	8	11	35	5	100	99	136
	Financial services	5	16	10	32	14	100	68	100
	Other business services	1	17	11	23	8	100	246	223
	Public administration	4	7	10	75	2	100	104	183
	Education	6	19	15	39	5	100	282	243
	Health	4	5	12	49	7	100	297	246
	Other community services	5	10	3	20	9	100	109	109
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	5	11	12	51	7	100	844	1220
	No recognition	3	9	7	20	8	100	1295	905
	All workplaces	4	10	9	32	8	100	2140	2125

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey – Management interview

Prevalence of monitoring practices

One way in which employers can assess their performance, in terms of providing equal opportunities, is through monitoring their workforce. In WERS98, managers are asked specifically whether they hold employee records with ethnic origin details. They are also asked about a range of other monitoring activities which are more general and may or may not include some degree of analysis by ethnicity. Table 2.9 shows the prevalence of these practices across different workplace types.

As with equal opportunities policies, ethnic monitoring is more common in larger workplaces and establishments, as is monitoring more generally. It is also more common in the public sector, with almost half of all workplaces undertaking ethnic monitoring compared with under one quarter in the private sector.

Ethnic monitoring is also more common in workplaces with union recognition and workplaces with a higher proportion of staff from ethnic minorities.

Table 2.9: Incidence of workforce monitoring (by workplace characteristics)

		Ethnicity monitoring practices			Total	
		Hold employee records with ethnic origin	Undertake some monitoring but not employees by ethnic origin	No monitoring	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	24	18	57	1095	262
	25 to 49 employees	30	21	49	575	396
	50 to 99 employees	33	23	44	273	390
	100 to 199 employees	41	27	32	134	387
	200 to 499 employees	61	26	13	84	456
	500 or more employees	63	29	8	29	296
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	8	17	74	756	313
	100-999	30	27	43	347	427
	1,000-9,999	49	20	31	434	617
	10,000+	48	20	32	447	643
Broad sector	Private	24	18	59	1646	1510
	Public	48	29	23	544	677
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	17	17	67	287	299
	Electricity, gas and water	76	15	8	5	79
	Construction	11	19	70	92	112
	Wholesale and retail	35	11	54	421	322
	Hotels and restaurants	38	4	58	169	127
	Transport and communication	23	27	49	99	136
	Financial services	32	24	44	67	99
	Other business services	29	24	47	247	227
	Public administration	48	34	18	104	183
	Education	38	27	35	283	244
	Health	28	30	42	305	248
	Other community services	19	19	62	111	111
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	41	28	31	847	1222
	No recognition	23	15	62	1328	924
Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace	None	23	23	54	1342	841
	0.1-4.9%	39	19	42	336	772
	5-9.9%	30	19	51	218	205
	10-19.9%	45	14	41	145	147
	20% or more	55	11	34	129	156
All workplaces		30	20	50	2169	2121

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

3.

Recruitment practices

Age as a factor in recruitment

The factors considered when making a recruitment decision can be numerous and may be of varying importance. The age of an employee may be of interest to an employer if they require staff to be of a certain age to meet legislative requirements or when they are intending to dedicate substantial resources to training and therefore wish to employ someone who is likely to stay with the firm after training rather than retire, for example. Employers may also be interested in age if it is believed to have some bearing, rightly or wrongly, on the ability of an individual to do a job. However, it may also be of interest to an employer for other more dubious reasons, for example if they do not think that older workers are attractive to customers and that this will impact adversely upon their business. Within the WERS98 management interview, respondents were asked about which factors they considered important when recruiting new employees. Within 21 per cent of workplaces age was considered to be one of the important factors. Table 3.1 shows how this varies across types of workplace.

Differences were apparent between industries. Within the manufacturing sector, age was an important factor in one third of workplaces. This higher than average incidence may reflect age being a consideration within those industries which have had apprentice-type training and have historically recruited young people with a view to training them over the course of a number of years. Age was also a more popular recruitment factor within the Hotel and Restaurant, and Transport and Communication industries compared with the other industry categories. It was less commonly a factor among the Public Administration and Education sectors, these being largely associated with the public sector where a much smaller proportion of workplaces view age as important (11 per cent compared with 24 per cent of private sector workplaces).

For many vacancies, placing importance on the age of an applicant can be unfairly discriminatory. One may expect that workplaces which show an awareness of equal opportunities and discrimination to be less likely to view age as a recruitment factor. Indeed, this was the case. Regarding age as an important factor is much more common among those workplaces without an equal opportunities policy with around one third of the workplaces doing so, compared with 15 per cent of those workplaces with an equal opportunities policy (Table 3.2). This is unsurprising, given that EO policies are less common among those types of workplaces where age is viewed as important (the private sector, in small establishments and organisations, and within manufacturing industry). Similarly, as EO policies are more common in workplaces where unions are recognised, age was less likely to be considered in recruitment among such establishments. Those workplaces with equal EO policies which specifically covered age were least likely to view age as a factor. Furthermore,

age was less commonly viewed as a recruitment factor among workplaces reporting a number of EO-related monitoring activities than those without such initiatives (16 per cent compared with 25 per cent).

Table 3.1: Percentage of workplaces where age is an important recruitment factor (by workplace characteristics)

		Age as a recruitment factor	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	25	1088	260
	25 to 49 employees	20	573	394
	50 to 99 employees	14	274	393
	100 to 199 employees	10	134	387
	200 to 499 employees	14	84	454
	500 or more employees	9	29	297
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	29	756	313
	100-999	18	347	425
	1,000-9,999	22	433	618
	10,000+	11	439	642
Broad sector	Private	24	1639	1510
	Public	11	543	675
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	32	287	299
	Electricity, gas and water	9	5	80
	Construction	19	92	111
	Wholesale and retail	19	421	321
	Hotels and restaurants	29	169	127
	Transport and communication	26	99	136
	Financial services	19	60	98
	Other business services	18	247	227
	Public administration	12	102	182
	Education	9	283	244
	Health	22	305	249
	Other community services	23	111	111
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	14	838	1220
	No recognition	25	1328	924
All workplaces		21	2166	2144

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 3.2: Percentage of workplaces where age is an important recruitment factor (by EO policy coverage)

		Age as a recruitment factor	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers age	No policy	33	709	412
	Policy not covering age	18	565	673
	Policy covering age	13	870	1073
Any EO policy	Yes	15	1452	1766
All workplaces		21	2160	2178

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 3.3: Percentage of workplaces where age is an important recruitment factor (by workforce composition)

		Age as a recruitment factor	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace	None	19	950	668
	0.1-4.9%	18	367	809
	5-9.9%	23	265	238
	10-19.9%	21	275	220
	20% or more	25	311	217
Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace	None	28	294	135
	0.1-4.9%	22	186	257
	5-9.9%	21	381	396
	10-19.9%	18	643	718
	20% or more	19	664	643
All workplaces		21	2168	2149

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

If age is regarded as an important factor in recruitment, one may expect this to have some association with the age composition of the workforce within such establishments. Unsurprisingly Table 3.3 shows that the proportion of workplaces where age was regarded as important varied by the age composition of the workforce. Those establishments where more than five per cent of employees are aged under 21 were more likely to regard age as an important factor, whereas those with no employees over 50 were more likely to consider age in their recruitment than those workplaces that do have employees over 50. This may suggest that employers who view age as a recruitment factor do so in favour of younger workers and at the expense of older applicants.

However, it is important to remember that age is not the only factor which is considered within these workplaces when making a recruitment decision. Every workplace which considered age in making their recruitment decisions also considered at least one ability-related factor to be important. Skills, qualifications, references, experience and motivation were individually cited as

important factors within three-quarters or more of the workplaces which also cited age (Table 3.4).

Experience and motivation were important within almost 90 per cent of such workplaces. However, the relative weight placed on age compared with these other factors is unknown.

Table 3.4: Other recruitment factors considered in those workplaces where age is/is not important

	Per cent of workplaces where age is/is not a factor		All workplaces
	Consider age	Do not consider age	
Recruitment factor: References	73	75	74
Recruitment factor: Availability	48	66	52
Recruitment factor: Recommendation	31	59	37
Recruitment factor: Skills	89	84	88
Recruitment factor: Qualifications	64	75	66
Recruitment factor: Experience	90	89	90
Recruitment factor: Motivation	85	88	86
Total	100	100	100
Weighted	1735	447	2182
Unweighted	1891	294	2185

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Special procedures to encourage applications from ethnic minorities and older workers

In order to increase the representation of certain groups within their workforce, some employers have special procedures to encourage applications from members of these groups. In WERS98, managers were asked whether their workplace operated special procedures relating to ethnic minorities and older workers. The nature of such procedures was not specified in the questioning, nor were respondents asked to give examples, but the most obvious might be to advertise in targeted media. Table 3.5 shows the variation in the prevalence of special procedures by type of workplace.

Eleven per cent of workplaces have special procedures to encourage applications from ethnic minorities. Such schemes are more common within large establishments with 500+ employees, within the public sector and some of the associated industry sectors (Public Administration and Health) and within workplaces with recognised unions – those types of workplaces which are more likely to have an equal opportunities policy. Special procedures to attract ethnic minorities were also more common among workplaces with equal opportunities policies which covered ethnic minorities, among workplaces engaged in ethnicity monitoring and among those with higher representations of ethnic minority employees (Table 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8). However, whether the latter is testament to the success of such schemes or whether the presence of ethnic minority staff prompted such initiatives cannot be discerned.

Special procedures for older workers were less common, with only six per cent of workplaces reporting such procedures. These were more commonly found in the public sector than in the private, and in establishments that had an EO policy which specifically addressed age (Tables 3.9 and 3.10). However, there was little variation in their existence by size of workplace or workforce composition. Unlike with ethnic minorities, the incidence of such schemes did not vary much with different proportions of younger or older workers. Although those establishments with a high proportion of employees under 21 were slightly less inclined to have a scheme to encourage older workers, there was no discernible pattern in line with the proportion of employees over 50 (Table 3.11).

Table 3.5 Percentage of workplaces with special procedures for ethnic minorities (by workplace characteristics)

		Special procedures for ethnic minorities	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	8	1088	260
	25 to 49 employees	13	575	396
	50 to 99 employees	13	274	392
	100 to 199 employees	13	134	387
	200 to 499 employees	15	84	455
	500 or more employees	23	29	297
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	4	756	313
	100-999	9	347	426
	1,000-9,999	16	434	619
	10,000+	19	440	642
Broad sector	Private	6	1640	1510
	Public	26	544	677
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	7	287	299
	Electricity, gas and water	7	5	80
	Construction	4	92	111
	Wholesale and retail	6	421	322
	Hotels and restaurants	8	169	127
	Transport and communication	11	99	136
	Financial services	9	60	98
	Other business services	9	247	227
	Public administration	22	104	183
	Education	12	283	244
	Health	20	305	249
	Other community services	16	111	111
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	20	840	1222
	No recognition	5	1328	924
All workplaces		11	2167	2146

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 3.6: Incidence of special procedures for ethnic minorities (by EO policy coverage)

		Special procedures for ethnic minorities	Total	
			Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers ethnic minorities	No policy	2	709	412
	Policy not covering ethnic minorities	4	190	138
	Policy covering ethnic minorities	17	1247	1611
All workplaces		11	2162	2180

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 3.7: Incidence of special procedures for ethnic minorities (by monitoring practices)

		Special procedures for member of ethnic minorities	Total	
			Weighted	Unweighted
Ethnicity monitoring practices	Hold employee records with ethnic origin	20	654	1010
	Undertake some monitoring but not employees by ethnic origin	13	448	519
	No monitoring	5	1081	655
All workplaces		11	2183	2184

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 3.8: Incidence of special procedures for ethnic minorities (by ethnic composition of workforce)

		Special procedures for ethnic minorities	Total	
			Weighted	Unweighted
Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace	None	9	1337	841
	0.1-4.9%	11	336	773
	5-9.9%	10	218	205
	10-19.9%	19	145	147
	20% or more	24	127	155
All workplaces		11	2168	2150

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 3.9: Percentage of workplaces with special procedures for older workers (by workplace characteristics)

		Special procedures for older workers	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	6	1088	260
	25 to 49 employees	5	575	396
	50 to 99 employees	8	274	392
	100 to 199 employees	8	134	387
	200 to 499 employees	6	84	455
	500 or more employees	9	29	297
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	4	756	313
	100-999	9	347	426
	1,000-9,999	9	434	619
	10,000+	6	440	642
Broad sector	Private	5	1640	1510
	Public	11	544	677
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	2	287	299
	Electricity, gas and water		5	80
	Construction	9	92	111
	Wholesale and retail	6	421	322
	Hotels and restaurants	3	169	127
	Transport and communication	14	99	136
	Financial services	5	60	98
	Other business services	5	247	227
	Public administration	4	104	183
	Education	7	283	244
	Health	10	305	249
	Other community services	6	111	111
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	8	840	1222
	No recognition	5	1328	924
All workplaces		6	2167	2146

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 3.10: Incidence of special procedures for older workers (by EO policy coverage)

		Special procedures for older workers	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers age	No policy	6	709	412
	Policy not covering age	3	565	673
	Policy covering age	9	872	1076
All workplaces		6	2162	2180

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 3.11: Incidence of special procedures for older workers (by age composition of workforce)

		Special procedures for older workers	Total	
		Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace	None	7	950	669
	0.1-4.9%	8	367	810
	5-9.9%	7	265	237
	10-19.9%	3	275	220
	20% or more	4	311	217
Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace	None	6	294	135
	0.1-4.9%	8	186	257
	5-9.9%	7	380	395
	10-19.9%	6	643	718
	20% or more	5	665	645
All workplaces		6	2168	2150

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

4.

Workforce concentration

Ethnic minority concentration

Ethnic minorities – treated as a whole here, although they would clearly exhibit differences if analysed separately – are sparsely distributed through the population of employees in Britain, reflecting their minority status in the population as a whole. Overall, only six per cent of employees covered by WERS98 belonged to an ethnic minority group, but ethnic minorities were present in 38 per cent of workplaces. In only six per cent of all workplaces did ethnic minorities account for at least a fifth of the workforce. Table 4.1 gives a summary measure of the ethnic concentration in workplaces: the percentage of employees in the workplace, split into five bands (none, 0-4.9%, 5-9.9%, 10-19.9% and 20% or more).⁴ In the following commentary we mostly highlight results for the two extreme categories when describing the patterns.

Concentrations of ethnic minority workers were much more common in larger than in smaller workplaces. In 12 per cent of the largest workplaces (500 or more employees) at least a fifth of employees were from ethnic minorities; this was the case in only five per cent of the smallest workplaces in the survey. There was a similar but less marked relationship with respect to the size of the organisation to which workplaces belonged.

There were no clear differences between the two broad ownership sectors: private and public. Individual industries, however, did show clear differences. High concentrations of ethnic minority employees were particularly common in 'other business services' and health, while they were notably absent in construction, in electricity, gas and water and in 'other community services'. There was no association between ethnic minority concentration and the presence of recognised trade unions.

⁴ An alternative measure which showed the proportion of workplaces in the lowest two quartiles, the second highest quartile and the top quartile showed similar patterns with respect to the main descriptive variables.

Table 4.1: Ethnic concentration in the workplace

		Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace					Total	
		None	0.1-4.9%	5-9.9%	10-19.9%	20% or more	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	72	4	12	8	5	1089	261
	25 to 49 employees	67	16	6	5	7	571	393
	50 to 99 employees	45	31	12	6	6	270	385
	100 to 199 employees	35	45	9	5	6	132	380
	200 to 499 employees	16	57	9	9	9	82	434
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	500 or more employees	12	56	10	10	12	27	272
	Less than 100	74	10	10	4	2	756	313
	100-999	56	21	7	10	6	337	415
	1,000-9,999	50	18	13	8	11	427	588
Broad sector	10,000+	56	21	9	7	7	444	627
	Private	61	16	11	7	5	1632	1471
	Public	65	14	7	5	9	539	654
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	58	24	7	8	2	284	295
	Electricity, gas and water	55	39	3	2	0	4	73
	Construction	81	13	5	0	0	92	108
	Wholesale and retail	57	17	12	7	7	414	316
	Hotels and restaurants	64	12	11	10	3	169	127
	Transport and communication	59	14	19	3	5	98	130
	Financial services	68	12	9	5	7	67	97
	Other business services	52	16	10	12	9	245	214
	Public administration	62	22	5	2	9	100	172
	Education	72	13	6	5	5	283	241
	Health	60	10	11	8	11	305	244
	Other community services	69	9	20	1	1	111	108
	Union recognised	62	17	7	6	7	840	1186
	No recognition	62	14	12	7	5	1315	901
All workplaces		62	15	10	7	6	2155	2087

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

There was a positive association between the presence of ethnic minorities in the workplace and policies and practices specifically relating to ethnicity (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Ethnic concentration in the workplace (by related policies/practices)

		Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace					Total	
		None	0.1-4.9%	5-9.9%	10-19.9%	20% or more	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers ethnic minorities	No policy	72	12	9	5	2	700	397
	Policy not covering ethnic minorities	68	16	10	6	1	190	137
	Policy covering ethnic minorities	55	18	11	7	9	1242	1567
Special procedures for member of ethnic minorities	No	63	15	10	6	5	1927	1803
	Yes	51	16	9	12	13	236	318
Ethnicity monitoring practices	Hold employee records with ethnic origin	49	20	10	10	11	647	979
	Undertake some monitoring but not employees by ethnic origin	68	14	9	5	3	442	493
	No monitoring	67	13	10	5	4	1081	649
All workplaces		62	15	10	7	6	2169	2121

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Concentrations of younger workers

Younger employees, defined in WERS98 and in some legislation as those under 21 years of age, accounted for six per cent of all employees in workplaces with 10 or more employees (the WERS98 population). Nearly one half (44 per cent) of all workplaces employed none of them. At the other extreme, there were 14 per cent of workplaces where younger workers comprised at least one fifth of the workforce.

Workplaces in sectors dominated by white-collar and professional occupations, where most entrants would have gone through higher education while under 21, tended to have very few or no young workers (Table 4.3). Thus 73 per cent of public sector workplaces had no young employees at all. Hotels and restaurants, and wholesale and retail were two industries in which younger employees were prevalent, however. Most workplaces in these industries employed at least some young employees and, in many, at least 20 per cent of the workforce was under 21 years of age.

Sector of ownership and industry were far more closely related to the employment of young workers than size of workplace or organisation. Small workplaces were somewhat more likely than large ones to be extreme cases, either employing no young workers or employing a high proportion of them. Neither small nor large organisations were particularly distinctive in these respects. But workplaces with recognised trade unions were very distinctive: they were much less likely to employ many young workers and much more likely to employ none of them.

Table 4.3: Concentration of employees aged under 21 in the workplace

		Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace					Total	
		None	0.1-4.9%	5-9.9%	10-19.9%	20% or more	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	54	4	10	14	18	1089	261
	25 to 49 employees	40	21	15	13	12	571	392
	50 to 99 employees	32	28	16	11	12	273	392
	100 to 199 employees	26	45	12	10	7	133	383
	200 to 499 employees	16	52	11	10	11	82	439
	500 or more employees	8	74	10	4	4	28	287
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	39	12	17	20	13	755	312
	100-999	48	22	13	12	5	337	418
	1,000-9,999	46	22	10	7	15	431	605
	10,000+	45	16	8	7	24	446	635
Broad sector	Private	34	16	15	16	19	1636	1493
	Public	73	19	5	2	0	540	661
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	31	33	22	13	2	286	297
	Electricity, gas and water	58	39	2	0		5	79
	Construction	43	19	16	20	2	91	107
	Wholesale and retail	18	16	15	15	37	414	318
	Hotels and restaurants	16	2	8	22	52	169	127
	Transport and communication	54	29	9	6	2	98	133
	Financial services	56	16	19	10		68	100
	Other business services	61	11	10	12	6	246	221
	Public administration	65	24	4	7	0	100	174
	Education	78	13	4	2	3	283	242
	Health	50	15	14	13	8	304	246
	Other community services	41	10	11	21	18	111	110
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	62	23	6	5	4	842	1200
	No recognition	33	13	16	18	21	1318	913
All workplaces		44	17	12	13	14	2160	2113

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Those workplaces with an EO policy specifically covering age were more likely to have no young workers, whilst workplaces which monitored or reviewed practices relating to workforce composition were less likely to have higher concentrations of young workers (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4: Workplace concentration of employees aged under21 (by related policies/practices)

		Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace					Total	
		None	0.1-4.9%	5-9.9%	10-19.9%	20% or more	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers age	No policy	38	17	15	17	13	701	404
	Policy not covering age	44	17	12	15	12	562	661
	Policy covering age	50	17	10	8	15	875	1065
Any of the workforce monitoring practices		46	21	10	11	12	1094	1498
None of the workforce monitoring practices		42	12	15	15	16	1082	655
All workplaces		44	17	12	13	14	2175	2153

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Concentrations of older workers

Older employees, defined in WERS98 as those over 50 years of age, accounted for 16 per cent of all employees in workplaces with 10 or more employees (the WERS98 population). A mere eighth (14 per cent) of all workplaces employed none of them. At the other extreme, there were 31 per cent of workplaces where older workers comprised at least one fifth of the workforce (Table 4.5).

Although it was relatively common for small workplaces to have no older workers, high concentrations of older workers were spread across all sizes of workplaces, with no marked tendency for them to be more common in larger workplaces. There were, however, somewhat higher concentrations in workplaces belonging to small organisations and in the public sector. The health sector stood out as the industry with particularly high concentrations of older workers, while financial services and hotels and catering had especially low proportions.

Table 4.5: Concentration of employees aged over 50 in the workplace

		Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace					Total	
		None	0.1-4.9%	5-9.9%	10-19.9%	20% or more	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	19	3	18	28	32	1089	261
	25 to 49 employees	13	14	15	30	29	571	392
	50 to 99 employees	5	17	21	30	28	273	392
	100 to 199 employees	1	11	18	39	31	133	383
	200 to 499 employees	2	12	18	36	31	82	439
	500 or more employees	1	7	20	37	34	28	287
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	10	7	13	30	40	755	312
	100-999	13	10	17	36	24	337	418
	1,000-9,999	16	11	18	25	30	431	605
	10,000+	18	9	18	28	25	446	635
Broad sector	Private	15	9	18	29	29	1636	1493
	Public	9	8	15	32	37	540	661
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	6	5	18	27	43	286	297
	Electricity, gas and water	3	9	24	24	40	5	79
	Construction	4	17	9	40	29	91	107
	Wholesale and retail	20	6	28	27	19	414	318
	Hotels and restaurants	37	11	16	17	20	169	127
	Transport and communication	7	8	15	39	31	98	133
	Financial services	27	23	15	20	15	68	100
	Other business services	22	11	19	21	27	246	221
	Public administration	15	10	23	24	29	100	174
	Education	8	8	14	38	33	283	242
	Health	1	5	9	41	43	304	246
	Other community services	9	12	11	26	41	111	110
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	10	8	19	29	34	842	1200
	No recognition	16	9	17	30	28	1318	913
All workplaces		14	9	18	30	31	2160	2113

Workplaces with no equal opportunities policy were somewhat more likely to have higher than average proportions of older workers, but those with an EO policy that specifically mentioned age were not distinctive in their proportions of older workers (Table 4.6). Similarly, workplaces which undertook some workforce monitoring were no less or more likely to have high or low concentrations of older workers.

Table 4.6: Workplace concentration of employees aged over 50 (by related policies/practices)

		Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace					Total	
		None	0.1-4.9%	5-9.9%	10-19.9%	20% or more	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers age	No policy	9	7	16	28	40	701	404
	Policy not covering age	14	9	20	29	28	561	659
	Policy covering age	17	9	17	31	26	875	1064
Special procedures for older workers	No	14	8	17	30	31	2039	2010
	Yes	13	11	20	29	27	129	140
Any of the workforce monitoring practices		13	9	19	31	29	1094	1496
None of the workforce monitoring practices		14	8	16	28	33	1081	654
All workplaces		14	9	17	30	31	2175	2150

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

5.

Job satisfaction and perceived fairness

Job satisfaction

In the WERS98 employee survey, respondents were asked about their satisfaction with the amount of influence they have over their job, the amount of pay they receive and the sense of achievement derived from their job. Respondents chose from one of five categories: 'Very satisfied'; 'Satisfied'; 'Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'; 'Dissatisfied'; or 'Very dissatisfied'. In the first part of this section, we look at the proportions of employees that were either 'Very satisfied' or 'Satisfied' on each of the three dimensions. Subsequently, we look at the extent to which individual employees' responses deviated from the median score within their workplace, using all five categories.

Employee characteristics

As other studies have shown, older workers were more likely to be satisfied with their level of influence and sense of achievement than younger workers (Table 5.1). Around half of employees aged less than 20 were satisfied with these aspects compared with over three-quarters of employees aged 60 or over. Satisfaction with the amount of pay received was generally lower than satisfaction with the level of influence and sense of achievement (overall 36 per cent of employees were satisfied with the former) but this also differed with the age of the employee. Workers aged under 20 or aged 60 or more were most satisfied, with those in their twenties least so: 43-44 per cent of the former were satisfied compared with 31-32 per cent of the latter. This may be related to differing financial demands at different life stages, but other explanations are explored later in this section.

Compared with white employees, a similar proportion of workers from ethnic minority groups were satisfied with their level of influence and sense of achievement but, with respect to pay, a greater proportion of white workers were satisfied (36 per cent compared with 29 per cent). However, these broad categories hide differences between ethnic minority groups. Generally employees in the Black Caribbean, African and Black Other group were less satisfied than Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi employees.

Satisfaction was higher among female employees than male employees. Forty per cent of managers and administrators were satisfied with all three aspects of their job. Operative and assembly, and craft and skilled service workers were least satisfied, with only 16 and 17 per cent respectively being satisfied with all three aspects. One third of operative and assembly workers were not satisfied with any aspect.

Table 5.1: Employee satisfaction (by employee characteristic)

		Satisfied with influence over job	Satisfied with pay	Satisfied with a sense of achievement from work	Satisfied with no aspect	Satisfied with all three	Total	
		Row%	Row%	Row%	Row%	Row%	Weighted	Unweighted
How old are you?	Less than 20 years	53	43	51	23	22	1337	1041
	20-24	58	32	60	22	21	2070	2028
	25-29	57	31	59	22	19	3422	3554
	30-39	56	36	61	23	23	7549	7602
	40-49	58	35	66	20	23	6692	7127
	50-59	63	36	70	18	27	4976	4995
	60 or more	76	44	80	9	36	1154	975
Ethnic minority?	White	59	36	64	21	24	26060	26153
	Ethnic minority	60	29	64	22	21	1051	1069
Ethnic group	White	59	36	64	21	24	26060	26153
	Black Caribbean, African and Black other	55	23	62	27	14	333	382
	Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi	66	32	67	18	24	415	376
	Chinese and others	57	31	63	21	23	302	311
Are you male or female?	Male	57	32	60	23	21	13863	13509
	Female	61	39	68	18	26	13349	13822
Which of the following groups best describes your job at present?	Managers and senior administrators	78	52	74	9	40	2382	2951
	Professionals	62	38	71	16	26	3505	4608
	Associate professionals & technical	57	31	65	21	20	2437	2780
	Clerical and secretarial	58	33	59	23	21	4281	5541
	Craft and skilled service	59	25	65	22	17	2777	2114
	Personal and protective service	58	37	75	15	26	2212	1947
	Sales	58	41	60	20	25	2559	1987
	Operative and assembly	45	31	48	33	16	3386	2251
	Other occupations	59	37	63	21	26	3185	2583
All employees		59	36	63	21	24	26703	26762

Base: All employees within establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey – Employee Questionnaire

Table 5.2: Employee satisfaction (by workplace characteristics)

		Satisfied with amount of influence over job	Satisfied with amount of pay received	Satisfied with sense of achievement from work	Satisfied with no aspect	Satisfied with all three aspects	Total	
		Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	65	36	70	16	27	3449	2158
	25 to 49 employees	60	36	68	19	26	3878	5232
	50 to 99 employees	59	34	65	20	23	4021	5314
	100 to 199 employees	58	35	62	22	23	3977	5178
	200 to 499 employees	57	35	61	22	22	5450	5704
	500 or more employees	57	37	61	22	23	6483	3784
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	65	36	70	18	29	4041	3501
	100-999	61	33	65	19	22	5269	5308
	1,000-9,999	58	35	64	22	23	7068	8094
	10,000+	56	37	60	22	23	8679	8081
Broad sector	Private	60	36	62	21	24	18720	17840
	Public	57	35	68	19	23	8537	9530
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	59	35	58	23	23	6331	3886
	Electricity, gas and water	59	49	63	16	28	175	1152
	Construction	62	34	66	19	25	809	1318
	Wholesale and retail	57	39	58	22	23	3967	3441
	Hotels and restaurants	64	33	66	18	24	1157	1134
	Transport and communication	48	31	56	29	18	1632	1685
	Financial services	57	41	59	22	26	1106	1530
	Other business services	65	36	67	18	26	2282	2495
	Public administration	56	35	62	21	21	2448	2796
	Education	63	38	75	14	28	2831	3383
	Health	59	34	72	18	25	3629	3306
	Other community services	57	34	65	21	24	890	1244
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	57	36	62	22	23	16175	16698
	No recognition	62	35	66	19	25	10554	10142
All employees		59	36	64	21	24	26728	26840

Base: All employees within establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Employee Questionnaire

Workplace characteristics

Turning to the workplace characteristics, employees in smaller establishments and organisations were also more satisfied with their level of influence compared with those in larger establishments and organisations (Table 5.2). A similar pattern was apparent for satisfaction with their sense of achievement. One possible explanation might be that, within a smaller establishment, the role of one individual may be more likely to encompass a greater range of duties and have a more direct impact on the workplace.

Generally there was little difference between industries in the proportion of satisfied employees. However, there were some notable results. Employees within the Transport and Communication industries were least satisfied on each of the three dimensions. Workers in the Education and Health sectors, on the other hand, reported particularly high levels of satisfaction with their sense of achievement: 75 and 72 per cent were satisfied compared with 64 per cent of all employees. This may reflect the nature of this work and/or different motivating factors among these workers (as it is often suggested that employees in these sectors have a greater sense of altruism) such that they have greater stake in the outcome of their work. Union recognition appeared to be unrelated to the level of satisfaction with pay in our simple tabulations.

Relative satisfaction of workers from different age and ethnic minority groups

Given that the satisfaction of employees differs with certain workplace characteristics, this begs the question of whether employees from different age and ethnic minority groups report different levels of satisfaction due to working in different types of workplace (rather than age and ethnicity being influential factors). To examine this, one must look at the satisfaction levels of employees relative to the satisfaction levels of other employees at their workplace. In order to do this, the median satisfaction level was determined for each workplace and then the satisfaction level of each individual employee compared to this median (or average) level for the establishment within which they work.

Looking at employees of different age groups, Table 5.3 shows similar patterns on each of the three dimensions as were evident from Table 5.1. This suggests that the positive association shown in Table 5.1 between age and the degree of satisfaction with sense of achievement, to take one example, is not primarily a function of employees' distribution across 'high' and 'low satisfaction' workplaces.

Different patterns emerge among ethnic minority employees, however. Under the relative measures presented in Table 5.3, the scores of the Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi group become more positive on each of the three dimensions when compared with the scores of other groups. This suggests that the aggregate satisfaction levels among these employees, shown in Table 5.1, are to some degree depressed by the fact that they are disproportionately employed in 'low satisfaction' workplaces. The same is true for employees in the Black Caribbean/African/Other group in respect of their satisfaction with

Table 5.3: Employee satisfaction relative to the workplace median

		Relative satisfaction with amount of influence over the job			Relative satisfaction with amount of pay received			Relative satisfaction with sense of achievement from the job			Total	
		Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Weighted	Unweighted
How old are you?	Less than 20 years	16	53	31	33	41	26	17	49	34	1371	1071
	20-24	16	52	31	27	38	35	18	51	31	2110	2066
	25-29	20	49	31	26	36	37	18	49	33	3451	3586
	30-39	20	48	31	29	38	33	21	47	32	7597	7668
	40-49	22	47	31	31	39	30	22	50	29	6807	7220
	50-59	23	48	28	31	38	31	26	50	25	5079	5091
Ethnic group	60 or more	31	51	18	37	41	23	34	50	16	1192	1004
	White	21	49	30	30	38	32	22	49	29	26433	26498
	Black Caribbean, African and Black other	20	47	33	25	35	40	19	49	32	353	398
	Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi	24	54	22	26	36	37	27	50	23	421	389
	Chinese and others	18	52	30	28	44	28	19	52	29	307	317
All employees		21	49	30	30	38	32	22	49	29	27515	27602

Base: All employees within establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Employee Questionnaire

pay. The low aggregate levels of satisfaction with pay among this group are therefore to some degree related to their over-representation in low-paying workplaces. Nevertheless, on our relative measures, we see that ethnic minorities are still more likely to be less satisfied with their pay than their White colleagues.

Perceived fairness

In addition to the levels of satisfaction examined above, employees were asked about their satisfaction with the level of respect from supervisors and line managers and about their perceived fairness of the treatment of staff by management. These differed by employee and workplace characteristics.

Employee characteristics

A higher proportion of younger (under 25) and older (50+) workers were satisfied with the level of respect from supervisors/managers and thought that managers were good at treating employees fairly (Table 5.4). Over two-thirds of Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi employees were satisfied with the level of respect they received from line managers and supervisors compared with only 51 per cent of Black employees and 58 per cent of white and 'Chinese and other' employees. With regard to the fair treatment of staff by managers, only 44 per cent of Black employees thought managers were good at this compared with 50 per cent or more among the other groups.

Unsurprisingly, given their own roles, managers and senior administrators were most likely to be satisfied with the amount of respect received by line managers and think that management were good at treating staff fairly, with over two-thirds reporting each of these.⁵ However, among operative and assembly workers and craft and skilled service workers only 44 to 51 per cent were satisfied with the level of respect and 37 to 40 per cent thought that managers were good at treating staff fairly.

⁵ Analysis was undertaken excluding managers and administrators but the results were not significantly different.

Table 5.4: Employee satisfaction with the level of respect and perceived fairness of treatment (by employee characteristics)

		Satisfied with respect from supervisors/ managers	Managers treat employees fairly	Not satisfied with level of respect & managers not good at treating employees fairly	Satisfied with level of respect or managers treat employees fairly	Satisfied with level of respect and managers treat employees fairly	Total	
		Row%	Row%	Row%	Row%	Row%	Weighted	Unweighted
Age	Less than 20 years	60	65	24	25	51	1344	1047
	20-24	58	59	29	26	45	2064	2020
	25-29	55	50	34	28	39	3360	3489
	30-39	54	49	35	27	38	7449	7506
	40-49	58	50	32	27	41	6609	7014
	50-59	64	53	29	25	46	4862	4883
	60 or more	75	62	19	24	56	1137	960
Ethnic group	White	58	52	31	27	42	25715	25790
	Black Caribbean, African and Black other	51	44	41	25	34	328	372
	Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi	69	53	27	24	50	403	365
	Chinese and others	58	50	33	26	40	292	298
Sex	Male	53	49	36	27	38	13692	13335
	Female	64	56	27	26	47	13140	13590
Occupational group	Managers and senior administrators	71	67	18	25	57	2296	2878
	Professionals	60	54	29	29	43	3384	4483
	Associate professionals & technical	55	50	34	28	38	2381	2726
	Clerical and secretarial	60	52	30	29	42	4203	5430
	Craft and skilled service	51	40	40	29	31	2747	2095
	Personal and protective service	63	59	27	24	49	2222	1939
	Sales	62	59	26	25	48	2542	1977
	Operative and assembly	44	37	46	26	27	3398	2265
	Other occupations	63	57	30	22	49	3170	2576
	All employees	58	52	32	27	42	26344	26369

Base: All employees within establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey – Employee Questionnaire

Table 5.5: Employee satisfaction with the level of respect and perceived fairness of treatment (by workplace characteristics)

		Satisfied with respect from supervisors/managers	Managers treat employees fairly	Not satisfied with level of respect & managers not good at treating employees fairly	Satisfied with level of respect or managers treat employees fairly	Satisfied with level of respect and managers treat employees fairly	Total	
		Row%	Row%	Row%	Row%	Row%	Weighted	Unweighted
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	65	61	25	24	51	3393	2112
	25 to 49 employees	63	58	28	24	48	3816	5148
	50 to 99 employees	59	53	30	27	42	3985	5251
	100 to 199 employees	57	50	33	27	40	3918	5092
	200 to 499 employees	56	48	35	27	39	5379	5634
	500 or more employees	55	48	35	28	37	6381	3727
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	63	57	27	25	47	3971	3446
	100-999	59	51	31	27	41	5197	5225
	1,000-9,999	59	51	32	27	41	6974	7977
	10,000+	56	51	34	26	40	8575	7963
Broad sector	Private	58	52	32	27	41	18499	17611
	Public	60	54	31	26	44	8374	9353
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	52	42	39	28	33	6305	3875
	Electricity, gas and water	56	46	32	33	35	171	1135
	Construction	56	49	35	26	39	799	1293
	Wholesale and retail	58	55	31	26	44	3914	3402
	Hotels and restaurants	67	66	22	24	54	1147	1122
	Transport and communication	49	42	43	23	34	1613	1672
	Financial services	60	57	27	29	44	1083	1493
	Other business services	64	56	26	29	45	2233	2453
	Public administration	58	51	31	29	40	2425	2760
	Education	67	61	24	23	53	2756	3287
	Health	61	56	29	25	46	3546	3244
	Other community services	61	58	27	27	46	880	1228
	Union recognised	57	50	34	27	40	15942	16435
	No recognition	61	56	28	26	45	10399	10001
Equal Opportunities policy	No	58	50	33	26	41	5144	4551
	Yes	59	53	31	26	42	21660	22378
All employees		58	52	32	26	42	26804	26929

Base: All employees within establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey – Employee Questionnaire

Workplace characteristics

Both satisfaction with the level of respect from line managers/supervisors and the belief that managers are good at treating staff fairly declined with establishment and organisation size (Table 5.5). This may reflect differences in the quality of the relationship between an employee and his/her manager. A closer relationship may be more likely in a smaller organisation. This may afford managers a greater understanding of individual employees and allow them to take a more individual approach to dealing with their staff, which may influence the employee's perception of respect and fairness. Interestingly, employees whose workplace had an equal opportunities policy appeared to be no more satisfied with the level of respect or think that managers treat staff fairly than those whose workplace does not have such a policy. Also, those in workplaces without union recognition were more likely to be satisfied and think that management treatment was fair than those in a workplace with a recognised union. Given that an equal opportunities policy and union representation are usually associated with fair treatment, this is unexpected. However, it could be that these two factors serve to make employees more aware of fair treatment, such that they have higher expectations.

Differences in perceived fairness were also apparent between industries. Compared with all others, greater proportions of employees in the Hotels and Restaurants and Education industries were satisfied with the level of respect (67 per cent compared with 58 per cent across all industries) and similarly greater proportions thought that managers were good at treating staff fairly (61-66 per cent compared with 52 across all). On the other hand, in the Manufacturing and Transport and Communication industries the proportions were the lowest with 52 per cent and 49 per cent reporting satisfaction with the level of respect and 42 per cent in each reporting that the managers were good at treating staff fairly.

Tables 5.6 to 5.8 examine the association between the presence of policies relating to certain groups and the levels of satisfaction/perceived fairness among employees from those groups. However, there is little evidence of any relationship.

Table 5.6: Proportion of ethnic minority employees who are satisfied with the level of respect and think managers treat staff fairly

		Satisfied with respect from supervisors/managers	Managers treat employees fairly	Total	
		Row %	Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers ethnic minorities	No policy	54	47	152	152
	Policy not covering ethnic minorities	74	56	55	55
	Policy covering ethnic minorities	55	46	844	844
Special procedures for member of ethnic minorities	No	57	47	807	807
	Yes	53	45	245	245
All employees		56	47	1052	1052

Base: All employees from ethnic minorities within establishments with 10 or more employees
Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Employee Questionnaire

Table 5.7: Proportion of older employees who are satisfied with the level of respect and think managers treat staff fairly

		Satisfied with respect from supervisors/managers	Managers treat employees fairly	Total	
		Row %	Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers age	No policy	63	52	1173	1173
	Policy not covering age	66	56	1846	1846
	Policy covering age	66	56	2866	2866
Special procedures for older workers	No	65	55	5536	5536
	Yes	69	59	409	409
All employees		65	55	5945	5945

Base: All employees aged 50 or more within establishments with 10 or more employees
Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Employee Questionnaire

Table 5.8: Proportion of young employees who are satisfied with the level of respect and think managers treat staff fairly

		Satisfied with respect from supervisors/managers	Managers treat employees fairly	Total	
		Row %	Row %	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers age	No policy	60	63	245	245
	Policy not covering age	62	67	304	304
	Policy covering age	58	65	499	499
All employees		60	65	1061	1061

Base: All employees aged less than 20 within establishments with 10 or more employees
Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Employee Questionnaire

Relative satisfaction of workers from different age and ethnic minority groups

When the satisfaction of employees with the level of respect from line managers and supervisors is examined relative to the workplace average, it can be seen that older workers still tend to be more satisfied than employees in the middle of the age distribution. But the relatively high aggregate levels of satisfaction seen among young workers in Table 5.4 have disappeared, suggesting that these are primarily related to the types of establishment in which young people work. However, when we considering relative levels of satisfaction with the degree of fair treatment, the U-shaped association between age and satisfaction remains intact.

Examining the patterns across different ethnic groups, we see that the comparatively low levels of satisfaction among Black Caribbean/African/Other employees evident from Table 5.4 appear to be largely workplace-related. In Table 5.9, once we control for the relative degree of satisfaction at the employee's workplace, the patterns of relative satisfaction among Black employees are much closer to those of White employees.

Looking at the relative levels for particular groups, it appears that employees from ethnic minorities are less likely to report below average levels of satisfaction with the degree of respect received from supervisors or managers if there is an EO policy which specifically covers ethnic minorities (Table 5.10). The pattern is much less clear in respect of fair treatment, however. Similarly, there are no clear associations between the relative scores of younger/older workers and the presence of EO policies/practices (Tables 5.11 and 5.12).

Table 5.9: Employee satisfaction with the level of respect and perceived fairness of treatment relative to the workplace median

		Relative satisfaction with respect from supervisors/managers			Relative perception of fairness of staff treatment			Total	
		Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Weighted	Unweighted
How old are you?	Less than 20 years	22	46	32	30	44	26	1355	1059
	20-24	22	45	33	28	42	29	2075	2031
	25-29	22	43	35	24	42	33	3380	3509
	30-39	21	43	36	24	43	33	7480	7553
	40-49	23	45	32	24	43	33	6690	7095
	50-59	27	45	28	27	42	31	4922	4949
	60 or more	38	44	19	33	45	22	1164	984
Ethnic group	White	24	44	32	26	43	31	25943	26027
	Black Caribbean, African and Black other	24	41	35	26	34	40	338	384
	Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi	25	51	24	30	36	34	404	373
	Chinese and others	21	47	32	20	46	34	293	299
All employees		24	44	32	26	43	32	26977	27083

Base: All employees within establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Employee Questionnaire

Table 5.10: Ethnic minority employee satisfaction with the level of respect and perceived fairness of treatment relative to the workplace median

		Relative satisfaction with respect from supervisors/managers			Relative perception of fairness of staff treatment			Total	
		Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers ethnic minorities	No policy	24	39	37	34	33	34	151	152
	Policy not covering ethnic minorities	30	44	26	36	35	30	49	54
	Policy covering ethnic minorities	23	48	29	24	40	37	830	844
Special procedures for ethnic minorities	No	23	46	31	26	38	36	788	806
	Yes	26	48	27	24	40	36	245	245
All employees		23	46	30	26	38	36	1033	1051

Base: All ethnic minority employees within establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Employee Questionnaire

Table 5.11: Older employee satisfaction with the level of respect and perceived fairness of treatment relative to the workplace median

		Relative satisfaction with respect from supervisors/managers			Relative perception of fairness of staff treatment			Total	
		Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers age	No policy	29	43	29	30	41	30	1397	1170
	Policy not covering age	29	45	26	29	42	29	1950	1836
	Policy covering age	30	45	25	27	44	29	2672	2862
Special procedures for older workers	No	29	45	26	28	43	29	5577	5523
	Yes	30	44	26	29	38	33	505	405
All employees		29	45	26	28	43	29	6081	5928

Base: All employees aged 50 or more within establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Employee Questionnaire

Table 5.12: Young employee satisfaction with the level of respect and perceived fairness of treatment relative to the workplace median

		Relative satisfaction with respect from supervisors/managers			Relative perception of fairness of staff treatment			Total	
		Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Above workplace median	At workplace median	Below workplace median	Weighted	Unweighted
EO Policy which covers age	No policy	25	46	29	32	43	25	337	245
	Policy not covering age	16	52	32	29	48	24	411	303
	Policy covering age	24	42	34	30	42	28	583	496
All employees		22	46	32	30	44	26	1331	1044

Base: All employees aged less than 20 within establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Employee Questionnaire

6.

Workplace well-being

Workplace well-being reflects the level of contentment of the workforce. The treatment of employees at work is a contributory factor and can affect employees' desire to remain in their job, their workplace behaviours and their health. Consequently the relative levels of absenteeism, injury and illness and numbers of dismissals, resignations and employment tribunal cases may be used to examine workplace well-being. Tables 6.1 to 6.5 show how these rates differ across different types of workplace.

Absenteeism

The average number of absentees per 100 employees in the 12 months prior to the survey was 4.0 across all workplaces but varied little by establishment or organisation size (Table 6.1). On average the absenteeism rate was slightly higher among public sector workplaces (4.8 per cent compared with 3.8 in the private sector) and higher among workplaces in the Public Administration and Health industries (4.8 per cent and 5.2 per cent respectively). The absenteeism rate was also high in the Transport and Communication industry, standing over two percentage points above the average. These patterns may reflect higher levels of disaffection within these industries. The rate was low in the Construction industry (2.3 per 100 employees).

The absenteeism rate was slightly higher among workplaces with an EO policy (4.4 per cent) than among those without (3.2 per cent). However, this may simply reflect the higher prevalence of policies in areas such as the public sector. The absenteeism rate was also slightly higher in workplaces with 20 per cent or more workers from ethnic minority groups and those with no employees aged over 50. There was little variation across different proportions of female and disabled employees.

Voluntary resignation

The average rate of voluntary resignations over the 12 months prior to the survey was 14.2 per cent. However, the rate was lower among larger establishments, ranging from 15.7 per cent among the smallest establishments to 9.9 per cent among the largest (Table 6.2). Within smaller establishments, the resignation of one employee represents a greater proportion of the workforce and, therefore, this is to be expected. Additionally, one may expect the resignation rate to be higher in smaller establishments as they are likely to offer fewer opportunities for career progression, obliging workers to take jobs elsewhere in order to develop. Resignation rates were also higher in the private sector than in the public sector (16.9 per cent compared with 7.4) and within establishments with no union recognition. This may reflect a weaker sense of security within the private sector and poorer terms and conditions in workplaces without union recognition: both of which may encourage employees to look elsewhere for employment. Resignation rates were particularly low in Public Administration and the Electricity, Gas and Water

industries. However, the average resignation rate was much higher within the Hotel and Restaurant industry (35.1 per cent). This sector is renowned for having high staff turnover. The resignation rate also increased with the proportion of workers aged under 21 and declined with the proportion over 50.

Dismissals

On average, workplaces dismissed 1.6 individuals per 100 employees in the 12 months prior to the survey date. This rate declined with establishment and organisation size. This may reflect better human resource procedures within larger establishments and organisations such that they make better recruitment decisions and/or are better placed to deal with disciplinary issues without resorting to dismissal. The dismissal rate also varied by sector and industry, with the average number of dismissals per 100 employees standing at 2.1 in the private sector compared with 0.2 in the public sector. This was also reflected in the industry differences, with public sector related industries (Public Administration, Education and Health) having particularly low rates. The dismissal rate was particularly high in the Construction industry (3.9 per cent).

Table 6.1: Average workplace absenteeism rates

		Absenteeism rate: average number per 100 employees		
		Mean	Count	Unweighted Count
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	3.9	886	203
	25 to 49 employees	4.0	496	330
	50 to 99 employees	4.2	222	318
	100 to 199 employees	4.1	111	312
	200 to 499 employees	4.6	70	375
	500 or more employees	4.6	25	242
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	3.6	678	273
	100-999	4.0	266	326
	1,000-9,999	4.9	345	495
	10,000+	4.2	361	542
Broad sector	Private	3.8	1361	1237
	Public	4.8	450	543
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	4.0	261	274
	Electricity, gas and water	3.2	4	72
	Construction	2.3	71	93
	Wholesale and retail	4.1	322	267
	Hotels and restaurants	3.0	138	90
	Transport and communication	5.6	86	107
	Financial services	3.8	40	79
	Other business services	3.5	205	172
	Public administration	4.8	83	144
	Education	3.8	238	192
	Health	5.2	269	201
	Other community services	2.7	95	89
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	4.4	697	1019
	No recognition	3.7	1101	735
Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace	None	4.0	1165	703
	0.1-4.9%	3.8	264	646
	5-9.9%	4.0	176	169
	10-19.9%	3.2	114	118
	20% or more	6.0	88	120
Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace	None	4.2	829	550
	0.1-4.9%	4.1	323	682
	5-9.9%	3.5	199	187
	10-19.9%	3.1	232	185
	20% or more	4.6	227	168
Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace	None	5.0	224	103
	0.1-4.9%	4.0	148	197
	5-9.9%	3.3	302	317
	10-19.9%	4.1	527	606
	20% or more	3.9	608	547
All workplaces		4.0	1809	1770

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 6.2: Average workplace resignation rates

		Resignation rate: average number per 100 employees		
		Mean	Count	Unweighted Count
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	15.7	797	192
	25 to 49 employees	13.3	456	318
	50 to 99 employees	13.1	219	315
	100 to 199 employees	12.1	100	285
	200 to 499 employees	10.7	56	300
	500 or more employees	9.9	21	209
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	15.0	569	248
	100-999	14.6	262	321
	1,000-9,999	14.3	316	454
	10,000+	13.7	330	452
Broad sector	Private	16.9	1211	1112
	Public	7.4	438	507
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	13.1	225	249
	Electricity, gas and water	4.3	4	64
	Construction	8.6	54	75
	Wholesale and retail	17.6	289	216
	Hotels and restaurants	35.1	169	127
	Transport and communication	8.1	72	90
	Financial services	9.8	41	68
	Other business services	13.6	173	141
	Public administration	6.6	73	125
	Education	10.1	250	206
	Health	15.5	222	182
	Other community services	13.2	75	76
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	8.8	629	907
	No recognition	18.0	1008	687
Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace	None	13.4	1034	671
	0.1-4.9%	13.4	243	571
	5-9.9%	15.4	162	146
	10-19.9%	19.9	114	104
	20% or more	17.5	90	101
Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace	None	10.1	767	547
	0.1-4.9%	10.2	294	602
	5-9.9%	14.8	183	169
	10-19.9%	22.4	182	150
	20% or more	31.1	223	147
Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace	None	22.8	217	102
	0.1-4.9%	11.5	144	195
	5-9.9%	17.9	252	271
	10-19.9%	14.5	501	534
	20% or more	10.0	533	512
All workplaces		14.2	1648	1614

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Table 6.3: Average workplace dismissal rates

		Dismissal rate: number per 100 employees		
		Mean	Count	Unweighted Count
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	1.9	746	176
	25 to 49 employees	1.4	438	305
	50 to 99 employees	1.2	206	296
	100 to 199 employees	1.3	98	275
	200 to 499 employees	1.1	56	297
	500 or more employees	1.0	21	209
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	2.1	548	237
	100-999	1.9	256	313
	1,000-9,999	1.9	308	440
	10,000+	.6	305	431
Broad sector	Private	2.1	1127	1053
	Public	.2	438	505
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	2.2	226	250
	Electricity, gas and water	.1	4	64
	Construction	3.9	54	75
	Wholesale and retail	2.4	289	216
	Hotels and restaurants	2.3	82	61
	Transport and communication	2.2	72	90
	Financial services	.7	41	68
	Other business services	1.7	174	144
	Public administration	.1	73	125
	Education	.1	250	206
	Health	.9	223	183
	Other community services	2.1	75	76
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	.6	628	903
	No recognition	2.2	924	630
Percentage female employees in the workplace	0-24.9%	2.4	377	427
	25-74.9%	1.7	632	751
	75%+	.8	554	376
Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace	None	1.4	981	642
	0.1-4.9%	1.3	236	559
	5-9.9%	2.0	157	141
	10-19.9%	2.8	98	96
	20% or more	2.6	87	94
Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace	None	.7	765	542
	0.1-4.9%	1.2	292	600
	5-9.9%	2.0	172	160
	10-19.9%	5.0	168	139
	20% or more	2.4	168	113
Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace	None	2.4	184	83
	0.1-4.9%	.9	133	180
	5-9.9%	2.3	238	257
	10-19.9%	1.6	486	526
	20% or more	1.1	523	507
Equal Opportunities policy	No	2.6	526	299
	Yes	1.1	1031	1255
All workplaces		1.6	1556	1554

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

The dismissal rate was also found to be higher among workplaces without union recognition and without an equal opportunities policy. This may suggest that these factors afford employees some protection from dismissal, partly due

to the greater incidence and use of formal disciplinary procedures. (These are also more common among public sector establishments, where the dismissal rate is low. Yet, looking at private sector workplaces only, it can be seen that having an EO policy is still associated with a lower dismissal rate, Table 6.4.) Dismissal rates were also lower in workplaces with a greater proportion of female workers, which may relate to the lower rates found in the industries associated with the public sector, where higher concentrations of women are found.

Table 6.4: Average workplace dismissal rates by sector and EO policy

			Equal Opportunities policy						All workplaces		
			No			Yes			Mean	Count	Unweighted Count
			Mean	Count	Unweighted Count	Mean	Count	Unweighted Count			
Broad sector	Private	Dismissal rate: number per 100 employees	2.6	512	283	1.7	607	766	2.1	1119	1049
	Public		*	14	16	.2	424	489	.2	438	505
All workplaces			2.6	526	299	1.1	1031	1255	1.6	1556	1554

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

Employment tribunal cases

With regard to the average number of employment tribunal cases (Table 6.5), there was no pattern with establishment size but the average was lower in very large organisations with 10,000+ employees (0.6 per 1000 employees compared with around 2.0 in smaller organisations). This may reflect better treatment of employees or the ability of very large organisations to resolve issues before they go to a tribunal. The average employment tribunal rate was also slightly higher in workplaces with union recognition; this is likely to reflect the support which a union can provide in pursuing complaints in a tribunal. The average rate of tribunal cases was highest in the Transport and Communication, and Other Business Services industries (3.6 and 4.4 per 1000 employees respectively).

The employment tribunal rate tended to be lower the greater the proportion of part-time employees in the workplace, but increased with the proportion of employees from ethnic minority groups. The patterns with respect to the proportion of women, younger workers and older workers were not linear, however.

Employment tribunal rates were lower in workplaces with an EO policy than in workplaces without, but the difference was not substantial (1.6 per thousand compared with 1.9 per thousand).

Table 6.5: Average number of employment tribunal cases per 1000 employees

		Employment tribunals: average number per 1000 employees		
		Mean	Count	Unweighted Count
Size of establishment	10 thru 24 employees	1.3	1061	250
	25 to 49 employees	2.2	561	381
	50 to 99 employees	2.1	260	372
	100 to 199 employees	2.2	128	365
	200 to 499 employees	1.6	78	416
	500 or more employees	1.6	28	278
Size of organization (no. of emps.)	Less than 100	2.2	744	305
	100-999	1.9	334	410
	1,000-9,999	2.1	418	576
	10,000+	.6	426	597
Broad sector	Private	1.7	1589	1436
	Public	1.7	526	626
SIC 1992 code of main activity of establishment	Manufacturing	1.4	285	295
	Electricity, gas and water	1.0	5	74
	Construction	2.1	87	105
	Wholesale and retail	1.1	408	305
	Hotels and restaurants	.4	147	113
	Transport and communication	3.6	95	123
	Financial services	1.3	63	92
	Other business services	4.4	239	215
	Public administration	2.1	95	159
	Education	.6	281	238
	Health	1.7	301	237
	Other community services	.9	110	106
Union recognition for collective bargaining	Union recognised	1.9	813	1139
	No recognition	1.6	1286	886
Percentage female employees in the workplace	0-24.9%	1.9	530	545
	25-74.9%	2.4	860	1026
	75%+	.6	708	480
Percentage part-time employees in the workplace	None	2.6	378	269
	0.1-24.9%	2.2	705	962
	25%+	1.0	1015	820
Percentage ethnic minority employees in the workplace	None	1.1	1318	814
	0.1-4.9%	1.3	324	732
	5-9.9%	1.9	210	191
	10-19.9%	1.6	131	137
Percentage employees aged 20 or less in the workplace	20% or more	8.3	124	149
	None	1.4	939	644
	0.1-4.9%	1.8	358	773
	5-9.9%	2.6	260	227
Percentage employees aged over 50 in the workplace	10-19.9%	2.3	262	206
	20% or more	1.0	294	203
	None	.2	285	127
	0.1-4.9%	1.5	179	240
	5-9.9%	2.2	371	374
	10-19.9%	2.8	621	682
	20% or more	1.0	657	628
All workplaces		1.7	2113	2051

Base: All establishments with 10 or more employees

Source: 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey - Management Interview

7.

Conclusions

The European Union Employment and Race Directives have required amendments to be made to existing equality legislation in the UK and have required new legislation to tackle discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, religion and age in employment. This paper provides evidence on the scope of workplaces' equal opportunities policies and practices prior to the introduction of such legislative amendments, and aims to shed further light on linkages between such policies/practices and patterns of job satisfaction and workplace well-being.

Two-thirds (67 per cent) of all workplaces in Great Britain with 10 or more employees had some form of equal opportunities (EO) policy in 1998. Policies are more commonly found in larger establishments and organisations, and are more common in the public sector. Union recognition is also found to be positively associated with the presence of EO policies.

In line with longer-standing legislation, the areas most commonly covered in EO policies are sex, ethnic origin and disability for which 58, 58 and 56 per cent of workplaces, respectively, have EO policies. Religion was covered in almost half of all workplaces in 1998, with age and sexual orientation being covered in 41 per cent and 38 per cent of workplaces. Just one third of all workplaces had a policy which covers all of these six areas.

These figures suggest that there is clearly scope for the extension of equal opportunities among workplaces in Britain, particularly in the areas covered by the Directives. This is not to say that the presence of an EO policy, or associated practices such as workforce monitoring, provides any guarantee of equal treatment. Nor is it true to say that unequal treatment inevitably takes place where such policies and procedures are absent. However, the evidence presented in the latter sections of this paper suggests that EO policies and practices may have some positive effects, potentially reducing workforce segregation and improving certain aspects of workplace well-being.

Within the descriptive framework adopted in this paper, it is clearly difficult to disentangle associations between overlapping characteristics. Further research, adopting a multivariate approach, would help to establish the nature of any independent associations between EO policies/practices and employee and workplace outcomes.

Technical Appendix

Notes regarding the analysis

The following notes detail our treatment of particular data-related issues in the production of the tables contained in this paper. Primarily, they outline the numbers of cases excluded from specific pieces of analysis as a result of missing data or outliers. The reader should note that we have made no attempt to account for any possible non-response biases which may have arisen through such exclusions.

Section 5

In the analysis of relative levels of satisfaction and perceived fairness, in order to ensure a meaningful workplace median, employees were excluded where less than three employees within their workplace had responded to the question. This led to the exclusion of the following:

Table A.1: Cases excluded in the relative job satisfaction analysis

Variable	Number of cases excluded
Relative level of satisfaction with the amount of influence over the job	68
Relative level of satisfaction with the amount of pay received	62
Relative level of satisfaction with the sense of achievement from the job	62
Relative level of satisfaction with the respect from line managers/supervisors	71
Relative perceived level of ability of managers to treat employees fairly relative to the workplace median	72

Section 6

A number of outliers were removed prior to calculation of average rates. These observations were both unusual for the sample as a whole and for their particular industries.

Table A.2: Outliers removed in the calculation of workplace well-being indicators

Variable	Number of workplaces removed
Absenteeism rate	5
Resignation rate	5
Injury rate	2
Illness rate	1
Tribunal rate	3

Furthermore, in the calculation of workplace resignation and dismissal rate, cases were only included if the data was consistent with the changes in employee numbers reported in the Employee Profile Questionnaire. For establishments with 100 or less employees, cases were excluded if the difference between reported and calculated employee numbers was greater than 15 per cent. For establishments with more than 100 employees, a 10 per cent margin of error was allowed. Furthermore, for each of the variables used in calculating these rates, there were a considerable number of cases with missing data. The number of unweighted cases excluded as a result of inconsistencies or missing data are as follows:

Table A.3: Cases excluded due to data inconsistencies or missing data

Variable	Number of workplaces excluded (% of whole sample)
Absenteeism rate	406 (18.5%)
Resignation rate	633 (28.9%)
Dismissal rate	633 (28.9%)
Injury rate	203 (9.3%)
Illness rate	260 (11.9%)
Tribunal rate	126 (5.8%)

Data Appendix

Tabulation syntax

The complete syntax required to produce the tables presented in this paper is contained in two syntax files. Ftabdti1.sps produces those tables arising from the Management Interview data, whilst Ftabdti2.sps produces tables arising from the Survey of Employees data.

These four syntax files have been supplied to the Department along with this paper.

Derived variables

The derived variables used in our analysis are detailed in Table A.4. The SPSS syntax used to generate these variables can be found in Getdti1.sps (variables arising from the Management Interview data) and Getdti2.sps (variables arising from the Survey of Employees data).

Table A.4: Variables used in analysis

Name	Description	Variables used in derivation	Syntax file
Workplace break variables			
asic	Industry (12 categories)		
nempsize	Workplace size in terms of number of employees (6 bands)		
norgsize4	Size of organisation in terms of number of employees (4 bands)	asingle, auktot, zallemps	getdti1.sps
nrecog2	Union recognition for collective bargaining purposes (Dichotomous)	nrecog	getdti1.sps
sector	Broad sector (Private/Public)	astatus	getdti1.sps
neperspec	Whether the respondent was a designated personnel specialist (Dichotomous)	btitle2, bproport	getdti1.sps
<i>Equal Opportunities policy variables</i>			
eoabove	Whether the workplace must follow policy/procedures set at a higher level in the organisation (Dichotomous)	bpolic01 to bpolic 09, eoabove	getdti1.sps
eo	Equal Opportunities policy (Dichotomous)	ipolicy	getdti1.sps
eo1	No Equal Opportunities policy (Dichotomous)	ipolicy	getdti1.sps
eo2	EO policy covering sex, race and disability (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps

eo3	EO policy covering sex, race, disability and sexual orientation (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps
eo4	EO policy covering sex, race, disability and religion (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps
eo5	EO policy covering sex, race, disability and age (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps
eo6	EO policy covering sex, race and disability only (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01, eo2 to eo5	getdti1.sps
eo7	EO policy covering sex, race, disability and one of sexual orientation, religion and age (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01, eo3 to eo5	getdti1.sps
eo8	EO policy covering sex, race, disability and two of sexual orientation, religion and age (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01, eo3 to eo5	getdti1.sps
eo9	EO policy covering sex, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion and age (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01, eo3 to eo5	getdti1.sps
eo10	EO policy covering sexual orientation, religion and age only (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09, eo9	getdti1.sps
eoage	EO policy covering age (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps
eoethnic	EO policy covering ethnic minorities (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps

eosex	EO policy covering sex/gender (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps
eorel	EO policy covering religion (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps
eodisab	EO policy covering disability (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps
eoso	EO policy covering sexual orientation (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09	getdti1.sps
eonone	EO policy covers none of the six categories (Dichotomous)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09, eosex, eoethnic, eodisab, eoso, eoage, eorel	getdti1.sps
combeo	EO policy coverage (18 categories)	ipolicy, igroun01 to igroun09, eosex, eoethnic, eodisab, eoso, eoage, eorel	getdti1.sps
agepol	EO policy which covers age (No policy, policy not covering age, policy covering age)	eo1, eoage	getdti1.sps
empol	EO policy which covers ethnic minorities (No policy, policy not covering ethnic minorities, policy covering ethnic minorities)	eo1, eoethnic	getdti1.sps
<i>Workforce monitoring variables</i>			
pract1	Workforce monitoring practices: keep employee records with ethnic origin identified (Dichotomous)	ipracti1 to ipracti6	getdti1.sps

pract2	Workforce monitoring practices: collect statistics on posts held by men and women (Dichotomous)	ipracti1 to ipract6	getdti1.sps
pract3	Workforce monitoring practices: monitor promotions by gender, ethnicity etc (Dichotomous)	ipracti1 to ipract6	getdti1.sps
pract4	Workforce monitoring practices: review selection and other procedures to identify indirect discrimination (Dichotomous)	ipracti1 to ipract6	getdti1.sps
pract5	Workforce monitoring practices: review the relative pay rates of different groups (Dichotomous)	ipracti1 to ipract6	getdti1.sps
pract6	Workforce monitoring practices: make adjustment to the workplace to accommodate disabled employees (Dichotomous)	ipracti1 to ipract6	getdti1.sps
monitor1	Workforce monitoring practices: any of pract1, pract2 or pract3 (Dichotomous)	ipracti1 to ipract6	getdti1.sps
monitor2	Workforce monitoring practices: any of pract1 to pract6 (Dichotomous)	ipracti1 to ipract6	getdti1.sps
monitor3	Workforce monitoring practices: none of pract1 to pract6 (Dichotomous)	ipracti1 to ipract6	getdti1.sps
moniteth	Workforce monitoring regarding ethnicity (Employee monitoring by ethnicity, monitoring but not by ethnicity, no monitoring)	ipracti1, pract1, monitor2	getdti1.sps
<i>Recruitment factor variables</i>			
factor1	Whether references are important when recruiting new employees (Dichotomous)	cfactor1 to cfactor9	getdti1.sps

factor2	Whether availability is important when recruiting new employees (Dichotomous)	cfactor1 to cfactor9	getdti1.sps
factor3	Whether being recommended by another employee is important when recruiting new employees (Dichotomous)	cfactor1 to cfactor9	getdti1.sps
factor4	Whether skills are important when recruiting new employees (Dichotomous)	cfactor1 to cfactor9	getdti1.sps
factor5	Whether age is important when recruiting new employees (Dichotomous)	cfactor1 to cfactor9	getdti1.sps
factor6	Whether qualifications are important when recruiting new employees (Dichotomous)	cfactor1 to cfactor9	getdti1.sps
factor7	Whether experience is important when recruiting new employees (Dichotomous)	cfactor1 to cfactor9	getdti1.sps
factor8	Whether motivation is important when recruiting new employees (Dichotomous)	cfactor1 to cfactor9	getdti1.sps
<i>Variables for special recruitment procedures</i>			
special2	Whether have special procedures to encourage applications from members of ethnic minorities (Dichotomous)	cspecia1 to cspecia5	getdti1.sps
special2	Whether have special procedures to encourage applications from older workers (Dichotomous)	cspecia1 to cspecia5	getdti1.sps

<i>Workforce composition variables</i>			
nfempcb2	Proportion of employees who are female (3 bands)		
disab	Proportion of employees who have a disability (3 bands)	ndispc	getdti1.sps
ethnic	Proportion of employees who are from an ethnic minority (5 bands)	nethpc	getdti1.sps
under21	Proportion of employees who are aged 20 or less (5 bands)	nund20pc	getdti1.sps
over50	Proportion of employees who are aged over 50 (5 bands)	novr51pc	getdti1.sps
nptpcb2	Proportion of employees who work part-time (3 bands)		
conceth	Workplace concentration of ethnic minority workers: quartile position (3 categories)	nethpc	getdti1.sps
concu21	Workplace concentration of workers aged under 21: quartile position (3 categories)	nund20pc	getdti1.sps
conco50	Workplace concentration of workers aged over 50: quartile position (3 categories)	novr51pc	getdti1.sps
<i>Recruitment and promotion practice variables</i>			
recpol	Whether there is a policy or procedure for recruitment or selection of employees set by higher-level managers (Dichotomous)	bpolic01 to bpolic09	getdti1.sps
recons	Whether a manager can make a decision of the recruitment or selection of employees without consulting higher-level managers (Dichotomous)	bconsu01 to bconsu09	getdti1.sps

recrep	Whether manager reports on the recruitment or selection of employees to higher-level managers (Dichotomous)	brep01 to brep09	getdti1.sps
recsup	Whether the recruitment or selection of employees forms part of a supervisor's job - asked where non-managerial workers supervise other workers (Dichotomous)	blnej01 to blnej09	getdti1.sps
bauthor1	Whether supervisors have the authority to make final decisions on taking on people who work for them - asked where non-managerial workers supervise other workers (Dichotomous)		
bsuptra1	Proportion of supervisors who have been trained in people management skills - asked where non-managerial workers supervise other workers (7 bands)		
catests	Whether any type of personality or attitude test is conducted when filling vacancies (Dichotomous)		
cptests	Whether any type of performance or competency test is conducted when filling vacancies (Dichotomous)		
cfillvac	Approach to filling vacancies (Internal applicants only, internal applicants given preference, internal and external applicants treated equally)		
cpropor	Proportion of vacancies in the last 12 months that have been filled by employees from within the organisation (7 bands)		

<i>Good employer indicator</i>			
nloggood	Whether workplace provides pension, sick pay, job security and off the job training [Variable amended from a similar variable employed in Forth J and Millward N (2002) The Growth of Direct Communication, London: CIPD.]	nlogpen, nlogsick, nilogjs, ntrain60 (all intermediate variables which use fothtit1 to fothtit6, nintlog, jobsec01 to jobsec09, coffjob)	getdti1.sps
<i>Workplace well-being variables</i>			
absence	Absenteeism rate: average number of absent employees per 100 employees	zabsence	

resign	Resignation rate: average number of resignations per 100 employees in one year	zallemps, zemp1ago, zresigne, zdismiss, zredund, zother, zcommwor, diffpc2 (intermediate variable using same variables)	getdti1.sps
dismiss	Dismissal rate: average number of dismissed employees per 100 employees in one year	zallemps, zemp1ago, zresigne, zdismiss, zredund, zother, zcommwor, diffpc2 (intermediate variable using same variables)	getdti1.sps

tribunal	Tribunal rate: average number of complaints made to an industrial tribunal per 1000 employees in one year	zemp1ago, zallemps, itnum (intermediate variable using hcomplai, hcomnum)	getdti1.sps
<i>Employee characteristics break variables</i>			
d1	Gender (2 categories)		
d2	Age (7 bands)		
d9	Occupational group (9 categories)		
d8	Ethnic origin (9 categories)		
emblem1	Ethnic origin – broad (White, Ethnic Minority)	d8	getdti2.sps
emblem2	Ethnic origin (4 categories)	d8	getdti2.sps
<i>Employee job satisfaction variables (absolute)</i>			
satis1	Whether the employee is satisfied with the amount of influence they have over their job (Dichotomous)	a10a	getdti2.sps
satis2	Whether the employee is satisfied with the amount pay they receive (Dichotomous)	a10b	getdti2.sps
satis3	Whether the employee is satisfied with the sense of achievement they get from their work (Dichotomous)	a10c	getdti2.sps
satis4	Whether the employee is satisfied with none of the three aspects of their job (influence, pay and achievement) (Dichotomous)	satis1 to satis3	getdti2.sps

satis5	Whether the employee is satisfied with only one of the three aspects of their job (influence, pay and achievement) (Dichotomous)	satis1 to satis3	getdti2.sps
satis6	Whether the employee is satisfied with two of the three aspects of their job (influence, pay and achievement) (Dichotomous)	satis1 to satis3	getdti2.sps
satis7	Whether the employee is satisfied with all three aspects of their job (influence, pay and achievement) (Dichotomous)	satis1 to satis3	getdti2.sps
satis8	Whether the employee is satisfied with the respect that they get from supervisors/line managers (Dichotomous)	a10d	getdti2.sps
satis9	Whether the employee thinks that managers are good at treating staff fairly (Dichotomous)	b8e	getdti2.sps
satis10	Whether the employee is neither satisfied with the level of respect nor thinks that managers are good at treating staff fairly (Dichotomous)	satis8, satis9	getdti2.sps
satis11	Whether the employee is either satisfied with the level of respect or thinks that managers are good at treating staff fairly (Dichotomous)	satis8, satis9	getdti2.sps
satis10	Whether the employee is satisfied with the level of respect and thinks that managers are good at treating staff fairly (Dichotomous)	satis8, satis9	getdti2.sps
<i>Employee job satisfaction variables (relative)</i>			
relsat1	Level of satisfaction with the amount of influence over the job relative to the workplace median (Above the median, at the median, below the median)	a10a, wprespa, medcata (latter two are intermediate variables which also use a10a)	getdti2.sps

relsat2	Level of satisfaction with the amount of pay received relative to the workplace median (Above the median, at the median, below the median)	a10b, wprespb, medcatb (latter two are intermediate variables which also use a10b)	getdti2.sps
elsat3	Level of satisfaction with the sense of achievement from the job relative to the workplace median (Above the median, at the median, below the median)	a10c, wprespc, medcatc (latter two are intermediate variables which also use a10c)	getdti2.sps
relsat4	Level of satisfaction with the respect from line managers/supervisors relative to the workplace median (Above the median, at the median, below the median)	a10d, wprespd, medcatd (latter two are intermediate variables which also use a10d)	getdti2.sps
relsat5	Level of ability of managers to treat employees fairly relative to the workplace median (Above the median, at the median, below the median)	b8e, wprespe, medcate (latter two are intermediate variables which also use b8e)	getdti2.sps

The DTI Employment Relations Research Series

Reports published to date in the DTI Employment Relations Research Series are listed below. Adobe PDF copies can be downloaded from the DTI website: www.dti.gov.uk/er/inform.htm This and other DTI publications can be ordered at: www.dti.gov.uk/publications

Click the 'Browse' button, then select 'Employment Relations Research Series'. Alternatively call the DTI Publications Orderline on 0870 1502 500 (+44 870 1502 500) and provide the URN. Or email them at: publications@dti.gsi.gov.uk with your details.

Libraries, research centres, organisations and academics wishing to be added to our mailing list for printed copies of this series should email their details to DTI at: emar@dti.gov.uk

- No. 1 *Involving employees in Total Quality Management: employee attitudes and organisational context in unionised environments.* Margaret Collinson, Chris Rees, Paul Edwards with Linda Inness. URN 98/507. June 1998
- No. 2 *Industrial Tribunals, workplace disciplinary procedures and employment practice.* Jill Earnshaw, John Goodman, Robin Harrison and Mick Marchington. URN 98/564. February 1998
- No. 3 *The dynamics of union membership in Britain – a study using the Family and Working Lives survey.* Richard Disney, Amanda Gosling, Julian McCrae and Stephen Machin. URN 98/807. January 1999
- No. 4 *The individualisation of employment contracts in Britain.* William Brown, Simon Deakin, Maria Hudson, Cliff Pratten and Paul Ryan. URN 98/943. February 1999
- No. 5 *Redundancy consultation: a study of current practice and the effects of the Regulations.* Jill Smith, Paul Edwards and Mark Hall. URN 99/512. July 1999
- No. 6 *The employment status of individuals in non-standard employment.* Brendan Burchell, Simon Deakin and Sheila Honey. URN 99/770. July 1999
- No. 7 *Partnership at work.* John Knell. URN 99/1078. September 1999

- No. 8 *Trends in earnings inequality and earnings mobility 1977-1997: the impact of mobility on long-term inequality.* Abigail McKnight. URN 00/534. February 2000
- No. 9 *Costs and benefits of European Works Councils Directive.* Tina Weber, Peter Foster and Kursat Levent Egriboz. URN 00/630. February 2000
- No. 10 *Explaining the growth in the number of applications to Industrial Tribunals, 1972-1997.* Simon Burgess, Carol Propper and Deborah Wilson. URN 00/624. April 2001
- No. 11 *Implementation of the Working Time Regulations.* Fiona Neathey and James Arrowsmith. URN 01/682. April 2001
- No. 12 *Collective bargaining and workplace performance: an investigation using the Workplace Employee Relations Survey 1998.* Alex Bryson and David Wilkinson. URN 01/1224. November 2001
- No. 13 *Findings from the 1998 Survey of Employment Tribunal Applications (Surveys of Applicants and Employers).* URN 03/999. February 2004
- No. 14 *Small firms' awareness and knowledge of individual employment rights.* Robert Blackburn and Mark Hart. URN 02/573. August 2002
- No. 15 *Awareness, knowledge and exercise of individual employment rights.* Nigel Meager, Claire Tyers, Sarah Perryman, Jo Rick and Rebecca Willison. URN 02/667. February 2002
- No. 16 *Working long hours: a review of the evidence. Volume 1 – Main report. Volume 2 – Case studies (and appendices).* J Kodz et al. URN: 03/1228. November 2003
- No. 17 *Evaluation of the Partnership at Work Fund.* Mike Terry and Jill Smith. URN 03/512. May 2003
- No. 18 *Retirement ages in the UK: a review of the literature.* Pamela Meadows. URN 03/820. July 2003
- No. 19 *Implementation of the Working Time Regulations: follow-up study.* Fiona Neathey. URN03/970. July 2003
- No. 20 *The impact of employment legislation on small firms: a case study analysis.* Paul Edwards, Monder Ram and John Black. URN 03/1095. September 2003
- No. 21 *Employee voice and training at work: analysis of case studies and WERS98.* Helen Rainbird, Jim Sutherland, Paul Edwards, Lesley Holly and Ann Munro. URN 03/1063. September 2003
- No. 22 *The Second Work-Life Balance Study: Results from the Employer Survey.* Stephen Woodland, Nadine Simmonds, Marie Thornby, Rory Fitzgerald and Alice McGee. URN 03/1252. October 2003

- No. 23 *The business context to long hours working.* T, Hogarth, W.W. Daniel, A.P. Dickerson, D. Campbell, M. Wintherbotham, D. Vivian. URN 03/833. November 2003
- No. 24 *Age matters: a review of the existing survey evidence.* Dr. Peter Urwin. URN 03/1623. February 2004
- No. 25 *How employers manage absence.* Stephen Bevan, Sally Dench, Heather Harper and Sue Hayday. URN 04/553. March 2004
- No. 26 *The content of new voluntary trade union recognition agreements 1998-2002: report of preliminary findings.* Dr Sian Moore and Helen Bewley. URN 04/597. February 2004
- No. 27 *The Second Work-Life Balance Study: Results from the Employees' Survey.* Jane Stevens, Juliet Brown and Caroline Lee. URN04/740. March 2004
- No. 28 *2003 Compendium of Regulatory Impact Assessments.* Employment Market Analysis and Research. URN 04/743. April 2004
- No. 29 *Trade union recognition: statutory unfair labour practice regimes in the USA and Canada.* John Godard. URN 04/855. March 2004