

Deprivation arises in different social settings and needs to be understood and explained in relation to these settings. Much of individual life is passed at work, at home and in the immediate environment of the home. The next three chapters, including this chapter, will attempt to show in what senses and to what extent deprivation arises in each of these three.

Conceptions of deprivation at work are ill-developed. The hazards of working in certain industries have been carefully documented for many years,¹ as have hours of work and conditions in which strikes and other conflicts between management and labour have occurred. Theories of management and industrial relations have also been evolved on the basis of specific studies of organizations, such as the assembly line and work-incentive schemes.² But attempts to investigate how far conditions of work in one industry are characteristic of conditions in another, and to develop common standards of comparison, especially in relation to trends over time, have scarcely been made at all, or only fragmentarily.

In the literature on social conditions and in public discussion, people readily *generalize* about diets, clothing, leisure-time pursuits, housing conditions and even environmental conditions. Standards of comparison are readily adopted. For example, defined standards of overcrowding, facilities and amenities are applied

¹ See, for example, *Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Factory and Workshop Acts*, C. 1443, HMSO, London, 1876; *Final Report of the Departmental Committee Appointed to Inquire into and Report upon Certain Miscellaneous Dangerous Trades*, C. 9509, HMSO, London, 1899; *Safety and Health at Work*, Report of the Robens Committee 1970-72, Cmnd 5034, HMSO, London, 1972; Kinnersly, P., *The Hazards of Work: How to Fight Them*, Workers' Handbook No. 1, Pluto Press, London, 1973. Violations of the Factory Acts in the early and mid nineteenth century, as reported by the inspectors, were extensively quoted by Marx in his *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1970-72 edition (from the edition of 1887).

² Walker, C. R., and Guest, R. H., *The Man on the Assembly Line*, Harvard University Press, 1952; Trist, E. L., Higgin, G. W., Murray, H., and Pollock, A. B., *Organizational Choice: Capabilities of Groups at the Coal Face under Changing Technologies*, Tavistock, London, 1963; Woodward, J., *Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice*, Oxford University Press, 1965.

nation-wide to housing of different tenure in different localities. As a result, measures exist of the numbers in the population who live in overcrowded or slum housing, even when those measures are subject to doubt and criticism. Such standards do not really exist for the world of work. There are no measures of the number in employment who have bad or deprived conditions of work, the industries or areas in which they are to be found, and the degree to which they also experience bad housing conditions and low incomes. As a result, we lack adequate means of understanding important changes taking place among the employed and the population generally. Improvements in pay and employer welfare benefits, and improvements in industrial relations or working conditions in particular firms or industries, may distract attention from the disservices introduced by new forms of technology and the insecurities and hazards of new or enlarged forms of marginal employment.

Concepts of deprivation at work are required partly to demonstrate and investigate inequalities among the employed, and partly to compare correspondence or disjunction between conditions at work and conditions outside work. Why have they not been adequately formulated? The reasons would have to be sought in the history of the social sciences, the trade unions, and the social policies of the state. Social scientists have given emphasis in their research, on the one hand, to the social survey based on interviews in the home, and, on the other, to specific places of employment. Comparative studies of the employed would, in any case, be difficult because of the huge range by size and composition of work-forces and the sheer diversity of type of employment. The trade unions have been concerned with better pay, full employment and the protection of working practices rather than the achievement of pleasant as well as safe working conditions.¹ And, in its social policies, the state has been concerned with minimal forms of intervention to reduce accidents, malpractices and industrial diseases rather than guarantee equity and well-being generally among the employed.

The work of the Factory Inspectorates affords an important illustration. At the time of the survey, there were nine separate groups of statutes dealing with safety and health at work. They were separately administered by five central government departments with seven separate central inspectorates. The oldest and largest inspection agency is the Factory Inspectorate within the Department of Employment. Its work dates from the appointment in 1833 of the first four factory inspectors to enforce the 1833 Act to Regulate the Labour of Children and Young Persons in the Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom. In the early 1970s, there

¹ Evidence given to the Donovan Commission suggested that workers were not generally concerned with working conditions, preferring to have money in their pockets. Figures on unofficial strikes, for example, do not suggest that working conditions or arrangements are a common cause of disputes. The commission's report contains no direct reference to physical working conditions. See *Report of the Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations, 1965-1968*, Cmnd 3623, HMSO, London, 1968.

were over 700 inspectors, but they covered some 200,000 establishments under the Factory Act and, with local authority inspectors, 750,000 sets of premises under the Offices, Shops and Railway Premises Act. There are also the Mines and Quarries Inspectorate (Department of Industry), Agricultural Safety Inspectorate (Agriculture Departments), Explosives Inspectorate (Home Office), Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (Department of Industry), Radiochemical Inspectorate (Department of Environment) and Alkali and Clean Air Inspectorate (Department of Environment).

The Robens Committee found that this tangle of jurisdictions' led to a variety of problems.

On the one hand the separately administered statutes, taken together, cover nothing like the whole of the working population. On the other hand, some of them overlap in ways that can create uncertainty and confusion. Worse, the fragmentation of the legislation and its administration makes the task of harmonizing, servicing and updating the various statutory provisions extremely difficult; and it diffuses and compartmentalizes the expertise and facilities that are available to deal with occupational hazards.¹

The committee rejected rigorous enforcement. The criminal courts were concerned more with events in history than with curing the underlying weaknesses that had brought them about. The process of prosecution was lengthy and did not often lead to really effective remedies. The full utilization of legal sanctions was therefore inappropriate and undesirable. But in any case it is not feasible. There are far too many workplaces, and far too many regulations applying to them, for anyone to contemplate anything in the nature of continuous official supervision and vigorous enforcement.² The committee supported the view of the Chief Inspector of Factories that persuasion was more important than a strict application of all the sanctions of the law.³ They believed that the traditional concepts of the criminal law were not readily applicable to employers in their capacity of responsibility for working arrangements. Instead, the watchword was to be self-regulation'. The committee advocated the encouragement of voluntary codes of practice under unified statutory control exercised by a Health and Safety Commission and Executive. Under the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, a Health and Safety Commission was set up in October 1974. A Health and Safety Executive, in which the various Inspectorates were merged, followed in 1975. An estimated extra 5 million people were brought within the scope of safety legislation, but there has been little increase as a consequence in the staffing of the Factory Inspectorate. To some critics, the recommendations of the Robens Committee and the response of the government seemed to be little more than an administrative streamlining of a system aimed at persuading and encouraging industry to observe standards which are both

¹ Report of the Robens Committee, p. 9.

² *ibid.*, p. 64; see also Chapter 9.

³ *Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories for 1969*, Cmnd 4461, HMSO, London.

imprecisely defined as well as limited in scope. Certainly the Robens Committee had not attempted to collect evidence about safety and health in relation to general working conditions. It might also be added that the perspectives of the Factory Inspectorate have become narrower rather than broader with the passage of time. The 1913 report, for example, discusses sanitation, washing facilities, meals facilities, lighting and temperature, and such matters attracted attention especially in the two wars. The Factory Inspectorate was made part of the Health and Safety Executive in 1975, and the wider issues of work conditions and amenities are now less likely to be regarded as priorities in its work.

However, there have been signs within government departments of the need for a broader approach to the quality of working life. For example, a report commissioned by the Department of Employment called attention to the stress created by some features of a variety of modern work systems' such as forced, uniform pacing, especially if the pace is high; repetitiveness and very short time cycles, leading to monotony, triviality and meaninglessness in work; large impersonal structures of organization, working arrangements and relations; objectives which seem distant and unreal to the worker (even if in fact vital to him)'.¹ The report also recommended a survey of workers' occupational circumstances, expectations and subjective reactions on the lines of a 1970 study by the US Department of Labor.²

The changing problems of statutory control of exposure to accidents and industrial disease also suggest how the problems of deprivation at work in general may be changing and have to be understood in a broader context. The Robens Committee took the view that, although there had been a fall in the annual rate of fatal accidents per 100,000 people employed in factories from 17.5 in the first decade of the century to 4.5 in the 1960s, the recent evidence was not encouraging. 'If we look at the annual figures for work fatalities over the decade 1961-1970, no unequivocally clear trend is discernible; and the number of all reported accidents rose steadily during the first half of the decade.' The committee suggested that we may have reached some sort of plateau in occupational safety and health performance', and that the increasing scale and complexity of modern industry may be creating new hazards. They gave, as examples, the rapid increase in the use of toxic substances, and materials with explosive or flammable properties. In 1968 alone there were 112 deaths from asbestosis.³ But the committee were unable to compile a complete picture of work fatalities, because 5 to 6 million workpeople, or 20 per cent of the workforce, did not fall within the scope of any occupational safety and health legislation. Neither did they attempt to pursue the interrelationship between fatal accidents, non-fatal accidents, deaths and injuries arising from prescribed industrial

¹ Wilson, N. A. B., *On the Quality of Working Life*, A Report Prepared for the Department of Employment, Manpower Papers No. 7, HMSO, London, 1973, p.43.

² Herrick, N. Q., and Quinn, R. P., 'The Working Conditions Survey as a Source of Social Indicators', *Monthly Labor Review*, April 1971.

³ Report of the Robens Committee, pp. 3-4.

diseases and occupational mortality and morbidity - for each of which independent sets of statistics exist. In evaluating developments, they neglected, above all, to take account of the changing distribution of non-manual and manual employees in the workforce, and hence failed to perceive the scale of the risks to which the *diminishing* proportion of employees with manual jobs are exposed. The importance of reports on occupational mortality to a better understanding of the work situation as well as to the circumstances outside work remains to be plumbed. Thus, in the five years 1959-63, *more* men in unskilled occupations died at every age than in the five years 1949-53, from cancer of the lung, vascular lesions of the central nervous system, arteriosclerotic and degenerative heart disease, motor-vehicle accidents and other accidents. 'The most disturbing feature of the present results when compared with earlier analyses is the apparent deterioration in social class V ... Whilst the mortality of all men fell at all ages except 70-74, that for social class V ... men rose at all ages except 25-34.'¹ One measure of differential exposure to death is that if men and women aged 15-64 of unskilled occupational status had experienced the same chances of death as those of professional status during the five years 1959-63, 40,000 would not have died.

From the official mortality tables sharp differences can be shown for individual occupations. Thus, for men in the prime of life (aged 35-44), the mean annual death rate per 100,000 in 1959-63 was as follows² for selected occupations:

High rates

Electrical engineers	828
Kitchen hands	553
Deck and engine-room ratings	544
Labourers in textiles	493
Labourers in engineering	432
Labourers in chemical trades	345
Railway porters	339
Coal miners (face workers)	332
Fishermen	327
Surface workers (quarries)	320
Crane and hoist operators	318
Labourers in foundries	318
Machine-tool operators	278
Agricultural workers	221

Low rates

Government ministers, MPs and senior government officials	169
---	-----

¹ The Registrar General's Decennial Supplement, England and Wales, 1961, *Occupational Mortality Tables*, HMSO, London, 1971, p. 25.

² *ibid.*

Roundsmen (milk, bread, etc.)	168
Police officers and men	152
Sales managers	146
Teachers	135
Managers in mining and production	129
Technical and related workers	113
Local authority senior officers	105
Civil service executive officers	104
Managers in building and contracting	83

It must be remembered that occupations so designated were usually the *latest* and not necessarily the *main* occupations in working life, and that factors connected with work were not the only factors explaining these rates.

The Concept of Deprivation

As a consequence of the problems briefly reviewed above, a concept of work deprivation needs to be developed. This would take account of the nature of the work itself and its security, amenities and rewards, including welfare or fringe benefits and not only earnings.

If the hazards to health at work are to be adequately understood, then the question of whether or not minimum levels of safety from exposure to the risk of accident or prescribed industrial disease are satisfied is too restricted. Broad conditions and amenities have to be described and analysed. A satisfactory work situation *prevents* risks of accident or disease. It also *promotes* health, high standards of industrial practice and relations and social integration.

Accordingly, we tried to arrange information from our informants under the following broad headings, keeping the question of pay for the moment separate:

1. The job itself, and especially its relative severity.
2. The security of the job.
3. The conditions and amenities of the work.
4. Welfare or fringe benefits.

It must be remembered that, unlike certain other concepts, like that of deprivation at home, the concept of work deprivation has not attracted sustained study and measurement and our attempts to operationalize it must be treated as preliminary.

Under the first heading, the *job itself*, the indicators adopted in the survey were: whether place of work was mainly indoors or outdoors; the proportion of working time standing or walking about; the number of hours of work; and working early or late hours of the day. These give a limited reflection of the nature and severity of the job, and it would, of course, be possible in subsequent research to attempt to measure degree of physical and mental exertion, dexterity or agility, involved; the length and variability of work shifts; the repetitiveness or variability of the working

process; and pace.

Under the second heading of *job security*, the indicators were the number of weeks of unemployment or short-time employment in the previous year, and the period of entitlement to notice.

Under the third heading of *job amenities*, we developed a ten-point index for those working indoors and an eight-point index for those working outdoors. The former included the following items:

1. Sufficient heating in winter to be warm at work.
2. Tea or coffee (whether charged or not).
3. Indoor flush WC.
4. Facilities for washing and changing, including hot water, soap, towels and mirror.
5. Place to buy lunch or eat sandwiches (whether used or not).
6. Place to keep coat and spare set of clothes without risk of loss.
7. Place for personal articles which can be locked.
8. First-aid box or facilities.
9. Possibility of making at least one personal telephone call a day.
10. Lighting which the individual can increase or reduce (e.g. light over his work).

The latter included:

1. Dry and warm place to shelter in heavy rain.
2. Tea or coffee (whether charged or not).
3. Facilities for washing.
4. Indoor place to eat sandwiches or midday meal.
5. Safe and dry place for coat, spare set of clothes.
6. First-aid box or facilities.
7. Possibility of making at least one personal telephone call a day.
8. Lavatory (including earth closet or chemical closet).

Again, other indicators such as noise, air pollution, excessive heat or light, vibration, isolation from workmates, pressure, exposure to radiation, humidity, might have been added.

Under the fourth heading of *employer welfare benefits*, we obtained as much information from the employee as we could about sick pay, subsidized and free meals, occupational pensions, entitlement to paid holidays and other fringe benefits. Our coverage was more comprehensive than in the case of the character, security and conditions of the job, because we also sought to arrive at estimates of the total value of fringe benefits to relate to levels of remuneration. Our problem was that, while nearly all employees knew whether or not they were entitled to particular benefits, they were sometimes hazy about exact levels, particularly of pensions and sick pay, expected.

Table 12.1 sets out the numbers of employed men and women experiencing

deprivation at work in these four senses. Fewer women than men work outdoors, work long hours or work shifts late in the evening or at night. This is largely a function of their occupations; proportionately more women than men have routine non-manual and lower supervisory occupations, and fewer have skilled and unskilled manual jobs. Large proportions of both men and women are not entitled to different employer welfare or fringe benefits, and many have only limited entitlement. The number of persons subject to only one week's notice, as testified by the employee, may be higher than they in fact are. The Contract of Employment Act

Table 12.1. Percentages of men and women experiencing different kinds of deprivation or difficulty at work.

Type of deprivation or difficulty	Number of base			
	Men	Women	Men	Women
<i>The character of the job</i>				
1. Working mainly or entirely outdoors (incl. transport)	31	4	1,679	726
2. All working time standing or walking about	57	42	1,515	677
3. At work before 8 a.m. or working at night	36	15	1,558	880
4. Working 50 or more hours last week	24	4	1,559	912
<i>Security</i>				
5. Unemployed more than 2 weeks in last 12 months	5	4	1,720	1,048
6. Subject to 1 week's notice or less	44	51	1,395	626
<i>Conditions and amenities</i>				
7. Working conditions very poor or poor	23	15	1,408	665
<i>Welfare or fringe benefits</i>				
8. No wages or salary during sickness	37	35	1,516	679
9. Paid holidays of two weeks or less	56	61	1,706	1,044
10. No meals paid or subsidized by employer	(76)	(69)	1,510	663
11. No entitlement to occupational pension	43	61	1,423	614

NOTE: The base numbers used in calculating percentages vary for the following reasons. Items 5 and 9 cover people who were employed and self-employed for one week or more in the previous year, including people working few hours. Items 3 and 4 are restricted to people working in the previous week (including the self-employed). The remaining items apply only to the employed working at least thirty hours a week for one or more weeks in the previous twelve months.

Table 12.2. Percentages of employed men and women of different occupational class according to various forms of work deprivation.

	<i>A. Men</i>							
	<i>Profes- sional</i>	<i>Mana- gerial</i>	<i>Super- visory - high</i>	<i>Super- visory - tow</i>	<i>Routine non- manual</i>	<i>Skilled manual</i>	<i>Partly skilled manual</i>	<i>Unskilled manual</i>
<i>The character of the job</i>								
1. Working mainly outdoors (incl. transport)	6	8	16	12	20	37	30	63
2. All working time standing or walking about	2	16	27	28	32	69	79	89
3. At work before 8 a.m. or working at night	15	19	15	20	19	46	50	55
<i>Security</i>								
4. Unemployed more than 2 weeks in last 12 months	0	0	2	5	5	4	6	16
5. Subject to 1 week's notice or less	5	2	12	23	33	52	56	77
6. Claimed to have experienced big fall in earnings in working life	13	11	15	14	21	17	20	18
7. Pay varies	26	35	34	36	48	62	64	60
<i>Conditions and amenities</i>								
8. Working conditions very poor or poor	2	12	6	10	11	29	27	40
9. % of those working indoors whose working conditions very poor or poor	2	(12)	7	6	9	27	21	27

<i>A. Men</i>								
	<i>Profes- sional</i>	<i>Mana- gerial</i>	<i>Super- visory - high</i>	<i>Super- visory - tow</i>	<i>Routine non- manual</i>	<i>Skilled manual</i>	<i>Partly skilled manual</i>	<i>Unskilled manual</i>
10. % of those working out- doors whose working conditions very poor or poor	-	-	-	-	-	34	(45)	47
<i>Welfare or fringe benefits</i>								
11. No wages or salary during sickness	3	6	11	14	22	47	50	63
12. % of those entitled to sick pay who receive less than usual earnings	7	8	5	8	12	44	50	41
13. Paid holidays of 2 weeks or less	34	49	28	60	50	77	74	91
14. No meals paid or subsidized by employer	47	49	73	74	84	82	77	81
15. No cover for occupational pension	10	2	18	21	36	54	49	76
16. % with right to occupational pension who cannot expect it until 65 or later	50	(56)	62	61	63	84	86	(84)
17. % with right to occupational pension who expect it to be less than 50% final earnings	36	(45)	48	39	48	67	80	(75)
Highest number on which percentages based ^a	89	78	161	242	106	589	281	171

NOTE: ^aitem 4. Numbers for items 9, 10, 12, 16 and 17 apply only to a sub-sample and are much lower. As elsewhere, a percentage based on a number between 30 and 49 is given in brackets. No percentages are given on a base below 30.

Table 12.2.- contd

	<i>B. Women</i>					
	<i>Supervisory - high</i>	<i>Supervisory - low</i>	<i>Routine non-manual</i>	<i>Skilled manual</i>	<i>Partly skilled manual</i>	<i>Unskilled manual</i>
<i>The character of the job</i>						
1. Working mainly outdoors (incl. transport)	6	4	0	2	10	(0)
2. All working time standing or walking about	43	38	26	50	53	(64)
3. At work before 8 a.m. or working at night	6	18	4	28	25	21
<i>Security</i>						
4. Unemployed more than 2 weeks in last 12 months	3	2	5	3	6	4
5. Subject to 1 week's notice or less	12	26	48	(62)	72	(92)
6. Experienced big fall in earnings in working life	9	12	4	7	8	1
7. Pay varies	25	22	27	42	45	24
<i>Conditions and amenities</i>						
8. % of those working indoors whose working conditions very poor or poor	14	10	13	(18)	20	(27)
<i>Welfare or fringe benefits</i>						
9. No wages or salary during sickness	11	19	25	56	67	(50)
10. Paid holidays of 2 weeks or less	30	59	74	84	81	90
11. No meals paid or subsidized by employer	58	68	77	71	64	(68)
12. No cover for occupational pension	15	41	61	84	82	(93)
Highest number on which percentages based	92	127	357	62	259	133

1963 provides that all employees with a minimum period of service are entitled to notice of dismissal, varying from one week for up to two years' continuous service to four weeks for service of over five years.¹ Soon after this legislation was passed, there were signs of non-manual employees being granted more generous rights and of the legislation providing a floor upon which differentiation between manual and non-manual grades was reasserting itself.² Our data from employees on minimum entitlement to notice suggest, however, that when length of service is taken into account, some employees underestimate their entitlement. Alternatively, there may be more exceptions in practice to the legislation than has so far been publicly appreciated; or some employers may not be communicating these legal rights to their employees, or may not be observing them in their dismissal practices.

Deprivation and Occupational Class

Deprivation at work is broadly related, we found, to occupational class. A major difference in character, security, conditions and fringe benefits of work exists between manual and non-manual grades. That is perhaps the most important conclusion to be drawn from our examination of the conditions and terms of employment. But there are two supplementary conclusions. Among non-manual grades, especially among women, there are in some aspects of conditions and terms of employment, marked differences between the lower grades, especially routine non-manual grades, and professional and managerial grades. And, among manual grades, the unskilled are markedly more disadvantaged in some aspects than the skilled and partly skilled. The findings from the survey are summarized in Table 12.2. Through the eight occupational ranks there is a tendency for the incidence of deprivation to increase. But, in most instances, there is a marked difference between routine non-manual and skilled manual workers. Thus, only 33 per cent of routine non-manual male employees, compared with 70 per cent of skilled manual male employees, spent all or nearly all their working time standing or walking about; 22 per cent, compared with 46 per cent, worked early in the mornings or late in the evenings or at night; 23 per cent, compared with 47 per cent, did not expect to receive payments from the employer during sickness; and 34 per cent, compared with 54 per cent, had no cover for occupational pensions. In these respects there were similar differences between women in routine non-manual and women in skilled manual occupations.

¹ The employee was entitled to one week's notice once he had been employed continuously for twenty-six weeks (later reduced to thirteen weeks by the Industrial Relations Act 1971). But employees normally expected to work less than twenty-one hours a week, and certain categories of employees working longer hours, are excepted.

² Wedderburn, D., 'Workplace Inequality', *New Society*, 9 April 1970, and Craig, C., *Men in Manufacturing Industry*, Department of Applied Economics, Cambridge, 1969.

The significance of these findings rests not so much in their novelty as in their comprehensiveness. They cover all types of employment for a nationally representative sample of both men and women, and cover eight occupational ranks. They confirm other research on manufacturing industry,¹ and for certain aspects of employment, broad categories of manual and non-manual occupations.²

The Character of the Job

Manual work has distinctive features. About a third of skilled and partly skilled and nearly two thirds of unskilled male manual workers spend all or nearly all their working time outdoors. Ten per cent of skilled and partly skilled are engaged in transport - lorries, vans, buses and trains (Table A.32, Appendix Eight, page 1017). A disproportionately large number of male manual workers also spend all or nearly all their working time standing or walking about, not only because more work outdoors, but also because among those working indoors this is a characteristic of manual work. This difference between manual and non-manual grades applies to women as well as men. But while fewer working-class women than men spend all or nearly all of their working time on their feet, more women than men in the upper non-manual grades do so (Table A.33, Appendix Eight, page 1018). This is partly a function of the demands of occupations such as nursing and teaching. Among men, there are two peaks according to age. More young men aged 15-24 and more aged 60 and over than at ages 25-59 spend all or nearly all their working time on their feet. This is, to some extent, due to the disproportionate number of males of these ages engaged in manual work. Among women, the pattern is different, rising from a low proportion in the teens and 'F twenties to a high proportion in the fifties. Over a third of employed women under 30 spend none, or very little, of their working time on their feet, compared with fewer than a fifth in their fifties (Table A.34, Appendix Eight, page 1019).

Manual workers more often work 'unusual' hours. In the survey, we asked for an account of the times in the day people had worked during the previous week. While a majority of non-manual men worked only during the period 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., the figure for skilled manual men was 40 per cent, partly skilled 33 per cent and unskilled 34 per cent. Significantly higher proportions of manual workers started work before 8 a.m., often at 7 a.m., though sometimes sooner, and significantly more of them worked at night, starting work after 6 p.m. Though more women than men worked in the 'usual' period between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m., there was a similar

¹ Craig, *Men in Manufacturing Industry*; Wedderburn, 'Workplace Inequality'; Wedderburn, D., and Craig, C., 'Relative Deprivation in Work', in Wedderburn, D. (ed.), *Poverty, Inequality and Class Structure*, Cambridge University Press, 1974.

² For differences in working hours between manual and non-manual workers, see the reports of the Department of Employment's New Earnings Survey (as illustrated later).

tendency for more manual than non-manual workers to start work before 8 a.m. or after 6 p.m. (Table A.35, Appendix Eight, page 1020). We did not inquire in addition about shift work, but the Department of Employment's New Earnings Survey shows for 1970, for example, that 22 per cent of manual, compared with 4 per cent of non-manual workers, received shift payments.¹ Some workers find social compensations in shift working, but many find they have no choice. Broadly, shift working can be said to interfere with normal family and social life.

Manual workers generally work longer hours. In the sample, 38 per cent of male non-manual employees, compared with 11 per cent of manual employees, had worked fewer than forty hours in the previous week (Table A.36, Appendix Eight, page 1021). The difference is only marginally reduced if the self-employed are included. Far more of the self-employed than of the employed are in non-manual occupations, and a large number of them work relatively long hours. (See, for example, Table A.39, Appendix Eight, page 1024.) They include shopkeepers living on the premises, however, and their conception of 'hours of work' usually incorporates, for example, time spent on call in an adjoining living room.

The difference between manual and non-manual employees in number of hours of work has been documented in successive annual surveys by the Department of Employment. For example, the report of the 1972 New Earnings Survey, covering 175,000 employees throughout Britain, showed that among men over 21 working full time, manual workers averaged 46.0 hours and non-manual workers 38.7 hours per week. Among women over 18 working full time, the respective percentages were 39.9 and 36.8.² The distributions are summarized in Table 12.3.

Much but not all of the difference is due to manual employees working overtime hours. In its surveys, the department has found that more manual than non-manual employees receive overtime pay (in 1972, for example, 57 per cent of male manual workers drew overtime pay for an average of over ten hours' overtime, whereas only 17 per cent of male non-manual workers drew overtime pay, for an average of under six hours' overtime). None the less, the normal basic week was two and a half hours longer for manual than for non-manual workers among both sexes.

Inequality in duration of work between manual and non-manual employees is even greater when any calculations are made of the hours worked in the year. This is because of different entitlement to paid holidays and different practices in permitting employees to take unpaid leave, to be late or take time off in the day. For example, 72 per cent of male and 53 per cent of female non-manual workers were entitled to more than two weeks' paid holiday, compared with 26 per cent and 25 per cent respectively of manual workers. Indeed, 25 per cent of both male and female non-

¹ Department of Employment and Productivity, *New Earnings Survey, 1970*, HMSO, London, 1971.

² Excluding those whose pay was affected by absence. Department of Employment, *New Earnings Survey, 1972*, HMSO, London, 1973, p. 38.

Table 12.3. Percentages of male and female employees according to number of working hours a week (Britain, 1972).

Number of hours	Men			Women		
	Full time over 21 ^a Non- manual	All men ^b Manual	All men ^b	Full time over 18 ^a Non- manual	All women ^c Manual	All women ^c
Not over 39	63.1	7.5	29.0	72.8	28.2	71.9
Over 39, not over 49	32.2	65.8	53.3	26.8	69.1	27.3
Over 49, not over 60	4.1	21.1	14.1	0.4	2.4	0.7
Over 60	0.6	5.5	3.5	0.1	0.4	0.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	29,644	57,330	97,901	22,316	12,265	58,160

NOTES: ^aAll those working thirty hours or fewer are excluded.

^bIncludes young men under 21 employed full time and men aged 21 and over employed part-time.

^cIncludes young women under 18 employed full-time and women aged 18 and over employed part-time.

SOURCE: Table 15, Department of Employment, *New Earnings Survey, 1972*, HMSO, London, 1973.

manual workers were entitled to five weeks' paid holiday or more. As for unpaid holiday, we found that although only 5 per cent of men and 12 per cent of women had as much as one week's unpaid leave, the number of non-manual workers taking three or more weeks leave was 3 per cent among men and 5 per cent among women, compared with 1 per cent and 3 per cent respectively of manual workers. Other studies have shown marked differences between manual and non-manual workers in the extent to which they have to clock in to record attendance or have pay deducted for any lateness.¹

The outcome in working hours for manual and non-manual employees in a full year is difficult to chart, for two reasons. First, the two broad occupational classes are differentially placed with respect to part-time (and seasonal) employment. More women of manual than of non-manual occupational class are working part time.² In

¹ Wedderburn, D., and Craig, C., *Relative Deprivation in Work*, pp. 144 and 146.

² According to the Department of Employment's Report on the New Earnings Survey for 1972, for example, 47 per cent of female manual employees aged 18 and over, compared with 23 per cent of non-manual employees, were employed part time. Moreover, 31 per cent and 23 per cent respectively of these part-time employees were working fewer than 17 hours a week.

the survey, while only 4 per cent of both male non-manual and manual workers had worked fewer than thirty hours in the previous week, the numbers of female workers were 25 per cent and 49 per cent respectively (Table A.36, Appendix Eight, page 1021). Any comprehensive analysis of the relative disadvantages of paid employment would have to include some reference to questions such as children or other dependants in the home, and to what extent women can elect to take paid work or are compelled to do so, and would prefer to take full-time rather than part-time employment if it were available. Judging by the criterion of household composition, substantially more women of non-manual than manual status lacked dependants in the home and were potentially employable. Few expressed any preference for paid employment. And few women of manual class who were working fewer than thirty hours a week said they would work longer hours if they had the opportunity.

Secondly, the two occupational classes are also differentially placed with respect to continuity of employment. More manual than non-manual workers are exposed to the risks of both prolonged unemployment and sickness. A substantial minority of the former have work records characterized by interruption (Table A.37, Appendix Eight, page 1022).

Thirteen per cent of those working in the previous year told us that in their working careers they had experienced at least one spell of eight weeks or more off work because of sickness or disability, and another 5 per cent because of unemployment. The figures were significantly higher for men than for women, and for manual than for non-manual workers. Seventeen per cent of male manual workers had experienced such a spell of sickness, compared with 12 per cent of non-manual workers. These figures are likely to be underestimates, since we were unable to probe this question fully. We also found that previous experience of at least eight weeks' sickness or unemployment was associated with low current earnings - even within broad occupational classes.

Five per cent of the employed population had been off work sick or disabled for a spell of at least eight weeks in the previous twelve months (excluding those not working a single week in the previous year). Among this group, 31 per cent declared that their work was wholly or partly responsible. They comprised forty-two individuals in the sample, all but four of whom were manual workers. The reasons given by most of them were recorded and are listed below. The reasons given by a few more people who were off work for at least six weeks have been added.

Man; 31; textile machinist	Accident while starting machine - causing broken arm.
Woman; 26; boxmaker	All-electric factory dried atmosphere, and increased catarrh.

See *New Earnings Survey, 1972*, pp. 144 and 146.

448 POVERTY IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Man; 47; miner	Because of my chest I had pleurisy and I work in the colliery underground.
Man; 65; steel erector	It was all outside work. You were continually exposed to all the elements, rain, sleet and snow.
Man; 53; builder's labourer	I had a heavy job and was doing a lot of lifting. I slipped a disc and had to have an operation. [Registered disabled]
Man; 34; GPO telephonist	My main job was a strain, and I was also doing another job in my spare time. [He had twenty-three weeks' nervous trouble]
Man; 58; labourer in metal works	I was a foundry worker. The boiler blew up and injured me. [Has since been labourer]
Man; 54; labourer in brewery	I had a bad stomach. The doctor thought the fumes at the brewery caused it.
Man; 47; labourer in biscuit factory	I slipped while working and loading and injured my back.
Man; 22; bus driver	I got ulcers or some kind of stomach trouble through irregular meals.
Man; 55; technical writer	Because of pressure of work I went back too soon after my last illness.
Man; 40; roller, aluminium works	My hand was injured at work.
Man; 45; foreman for council on building sites	My index finger was bent as a result of an and accident I had to have an operation.
Man; 55; cleaner in bakery	Moving large barrels caused a back injury (also chronic asthma and bronchitis).
Woman; 36; worker in dispatch department	I had a nervous breakdown. Maybe it was not really anything to do with the job, except the fact of trying to do a job at all was too much with four children and having to park Tony out and then rush backwards and forwards doing meals. Perhaps it triggered off the breakdown. [Had recently spent several months in a mental hospital and had had a hysterectomy. Husband a polio victim]
Man; 41; railway porter	I had heavy weights to lift. I have thrombosis and the doctor told me not to do any heavy work.
Woman; 21; tarpaulin proofer	The job was going for my nerves. My doctor advised me to leave.

Man; 51; fruit market porter	Very heavy lifting and I might have strained my heart.
Man; 59; acetylene burner in steelworks	Because of the severe heat there.
Woman; 50; school cook	There was a lot of heavy lifting. I was the school cook and worked in the kitchens.
Woman; 48; potato peeler (fish and chip shop)	I was working in water [potato peeler].
Man; 45; bricklayer in steelworks	I walked into a pipe and injured my neck causing a slipped disc.
Woman; 55; textile worker	My doctor said it was because there was poor ventilation at my place of work. I have a weak chest and it brings on a bad cough.
Man; 42; miner	I have sinus trouble and working in coal dust aggravates this.
Man; 55; scaffolder	I slipped at work and injured my back.
Man; 37; foundry engineer	I worked in a foundry. I had a bad chest for seven years previously. Then I got pneumonia and the doctor said I must leave my job.
Man; 58; postal worker	Coal fell on me years ago in the colliery causing a slipped disc. I haven't had a new accident. The old trouble keeps coming back.
Man; 36; labourer in iron foundry	There was a works accident, loose machinery. When I checked it, it fell on my hand.
Man; 59; dock labourer (ship canal)	Heavy work in the docks led to a hernia.
Woman; 53; cleaner in stores	Some water left on the stairs caused my accident.
Man; 43; cable foreman (cable manufacturers)	It was because I was working out of doors for so long in bad weather.
Man; 37; maintenance fitter	It was because I was not used to the pits. Shift work and travelling three hours every day.
Woman; 45; poultry worker	I worked in very old buildings with no heat and kept being ill with lumbago and colds.
Man; 26; labourer in tea factory	I was a paint sprayer, leaving job after recovery from disability. It gave me dermatitis on my hands and later spread to my feet.
Man; 39; docker in harbour	Stomach ulcers, not eating at proper times.
Man; 56; lorry driver	Diesel fumes and long hours affected my health.

450 POVERTY IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Man; 62; assistant storekeeper	I worked all the time with dust from plastic goods which affected my lungs.
Man; 64; superintendent engineer (of corporation)	I was called out during the night to mechanical breakdowns and I got ill.
Man; 38; coach driver	I had concussion and broken arms when a crane in the docks dropped some cases on me.
Man; 61; janitor (general labouring) in a foodstuff packet manufacturing company	There were a lot of chemicals used at work and the fumes got on my chest.
Man; 58; factory odd-job man	I was a road sweeper and I got bronchitis because of the dust.
Man; 48; steel erector	I cracked a rib leaning over a high counter. We were working at high pressure.
Woman; 38; packer in cardboard factory (then factory worker 'stretching alloys')	I slipped and broke my ankle. In my other job I worked shift hours and the strain gave me nervous trouble. [Evidence of consultations with GP and ten visits to hospital out-patients]
Man; 35; electrician for general contractor	I slipped a disc while carrying a tool box.
Man; 49; steel erector	My nylon shirt was caught in some machinery - a moving drill. My chest was burnt and my neck and back muscles wrenched.
Woman; 41; greengrocer's assistant	The draught might have caused my pleurisy.
Man; 60; self-employed property repairer	I got bronchitis working outside so much.
Man; 50; self-employed private hire contractor	I had a car accident while driving my car [for private hire]. The exhaust pipe burnt a hole in my back.
Man; 53; director in family credit clothing business	I had a great deal of worry over SET and too much responsibility. [Had major intestinal operation; in hospital 30 days]
Man; 47; bricklayer	I injured my back from a fall.
Man; 37; electrical welder	A knee cartilage was damaged at work.
Woman; 19; mantle sewer for garment manufacturer	Dermatitis caused by handling chemicals and cloth.
Man; 37; electrical setter and wirer	I lost part of a finger whilst at work. It troubles me and I have to be off work periodically.

Although further information about these instances would have been valuable, they call attention both to the diverse hazards and frequent poor conditions of manual work. They also suggest uncertainty or ignorance on the part of many about the hazards involved with dust, noise and chemicals. And although working conditions may sometimes have been blamed wrongly for ill-health, the tendency to underestimate, or want to underestimate, the seriousness of some conditions is also noticeable. Sometimes from good motives, doctors as well as employers withhold information. When we came to compare two groups of people who had been off work sick for at least eight weeks - those saying the job was wholly or partly responsible and others - more of the former were found to experience work deprivation (in terms of conditions at work, and also job severity, insecurity and lack of fringe benefits). Since the great majority of both groups were manual workers, this was not explicable broadly by occupational class. The total numbers were, however, too few (135) to allow detailed examination.

Table A.38 (Appendix Eight, page 1023) shows the number of weeks worked in the previous twelve months by the employed and self-employed. Among men, more manual than non-manual workers tended to the extremes of the distribution. More had worked for at least forty-nine weeks of the year; more had worked fewer than twenty-six weeks. When the self-employed are excluded, these tendencies become

Table 12.4. Percentages of employed men and women of different occupational class, according to total numbers of hours worked in the previous twelve months.

<i>Men</i>										
<i>Number of hours worked last year</i>	<i>Professional</i>	<i>Managerial</i>	<i>Supervisory high</i>	<i>Supervisory low</i>	<i>Routine non-manual</i>	<i>All non-manual</i>	<i>Skilled manual</i>	<i>Partly skilled manual</i>	<i>Unskilled manual</i>	<i>All manual</i>
2,400 or more	17	18	15	15	16	16	25	21	22	23
2,000-399	21	23	27	30	18	25	47	47	44	46
under 2,000	62	57	58	55	66	59	29	32	34	31
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	58	44	149	148	94	493	515	253	138	906
<i>Women</i>										
2,000 or more	18		16	16	16	(46)	23	10	22	
1,400-999	41		57	53	51	(26)	34	15	27	
under 1,400	42		27	31	32	(28)	42	74	51	
Total	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number	74		79	285	438	(46)	182	106	334	

more marked. Among women, manual and non-manual workers worked roughly similar numbers of weeks.

Estimates of the total hours worked in the previous twelve months are set out in Table 12.4. (The employed are distinguished from the self-employed in Table A.39, Appendix Eight, page 1024.) Despite greater susceptibility to interruptions of employment because of sickness and unemployment, and, at least among women, restriction of opportunity sometimes to work a full week, more manual than non-manual employees had relatively high totals of working hours in the year. Nearly twice as many male non-manual as manual workers worked fewer than 2,000 hours. The difference between male routine non-manual and skilled manual employees is particularly sharp, bearing in mind other data in this chapter relevant to the controversy about the 'embourgeoisement' of the working class.¹

Security of Work

Manual workers are more likely than non-manual workers to be unemployed, and to experience long spells of unemployment in the course of a year. The survey showed that more had experienced a change of job within the last five years, and that of these between twice and three times as many had been made redundant. Significantly more also changed jobs for health reasons.²

Substantially fewer had a right to a reasonable period of notice of dismissal. For example, whereas 75 per cent of non-manual male employees, and 55 per cent of female employees, had the right to at least one month's notice of dismissal, only 24 per cent and 11 per cent respectively of manual employees had a corresponding right. Routine non-manual workers were less likely to have that right than other non-manual workers.

To the risks of inadequate notice of dismissal, redundancy and unemployment have to be added the insecurities flowing from fluctuating hours of work. Because earnings are tied to number of hours of work, earnings will often depend on the number of overtime hours that can be worked. These cannot be predicted much in advance, and depend especially on health and family circumstances. Forty-five per cent of earners told us that their rate of pay varied, including 55 per cent of manual

¹ See, for example, Goldthorpe, J. H., Lockwood, D., Bechhofer, F., and Platt, J., *The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure*, Cambridge University Press, 1969; Runciman, W. G., 'Embourgeoisement, Self-Rated Class and Party Preference', *Sociological Review*, vol. 12, No. 2, July 1964. See also Chapter 10 above, pages 386-8.

² In a national survey covering a period of ten years, more manual than non-manual workers had changed jobs. Among men, the highest proportion was found among unskilled manual workers, 16 per cent of whom had had at least six jobs. Proportionally twice as many male manual as non-manual workers had been sacked or made redundant from their last job. See Harris, A. I., assisted by Clausen, R., *Labour Mobility in Great Britain 1953-1963*, Government Social Survey, SS333 March 1966, pp. 58 and 137.

Table 12.5. Percentages of employed men and women of different occupational class according to period of entitlement to notice.

Period entitled to notice	Men				Women ^a	
	Non-manual		Manual		Non-manual	Manual
	Professional and managerial	Other	Skilled	Other		
1 week or less, or none	4	21	52	63	36	73
2 weeks	0	9	20	20	9	16
Month	45	59	27	15	45	11
More than a month	51	10	2	2	10	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	103	388	527	396	424	231

NOTE: ^aSince there were only seventeen women of professional and managerial class, and forty-two of skilled manual class, they have been combined respectively with other non-manual and manual classes.

workers, compared with only 32 per cent of non-manual workers. We sought details about highest and lowest pay in the preceding twelve months. Altogether 61 per cent had received pay at some point in the year of at least 20 per cent lower than at another. More manual than non-manual employees experienced substantial variation. More of them also experienced a *fall* rather than a rise in pay. (This is discussed more fully in Chapter 18.)

Conditions of Work

Altogether, 20 per cent of the employed population, representing over 4½ million in the population, have poor conditions of work. This assessment is based on the ten indoors and eight outdoors criteria which were applied separately in the survey (page 438). The detailed breakdown, together with population estimates, is set out in Table 12.6. The criteria are provisional, and no doubt could be improved in future research. The self-employed and those employed in transport, many of whom have poor working conditions, were excluded from the assessment. Proportionately more working outdoors than indoors, and more men than women, were found to have poor conditions. Only just over half the employed population enjoyed good conditions.

Some of the items in the work conditions index were more generally available than others. For example, among people working indoors, 3 per cent did not have access to an indoors flush WC, whereas 7 per cent had no facilities for washing or changing, 11 per cent had insufficient heating in winter, 17 per cent had no place to hang a coat or keep other articles without risk of loss, 26 per cent could not make or receive a telephone call and 42 per cent were unable to control the lighting over their work (Table A.40, Appendix Eight, page 1024). In a number of directly comparable respects, more of those working outdoors than indoors lacked facilities. For example, 10 per cent worked without access to a first-aid box or facilities (compared with 4 per cent), 29 per cent had no facilities for washing (compared with 7 per cent)

Table 12.6. Percentages and estimated number of employed men and women working indoors or outdoors (excluding transport) according to their working conditions.

Working conditions (Index score) Out- Indoors doors	Men		Women			
	Outdoors ^a	Indoors	Outdoors and indoors	Outdoors ^a	Indoors	Outdoors and indoors
Very poor (0-3) (0-4)	17	7	10	-	6	6
Poor (4-5) (5-6)	23	10	13	-	9	9
Adequate (6) (7-8) -	14	29	26	-	33	32
Good (7-8) (9-10)	46	53	52	-	51	52
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	341	1,067	1,408	12	653	665
<i>Estimated number in employed population (000s)</i>						
Very poor	620	860	1,480	-	440	460
Poor	860	1,140	2,000	-	660	680
Adequate	500	3,420	3,920	-	2,350	2,350
Good	1,730	6,200	7,930	-	3,660	3,750
Total	3,710	11,620	15,330	130	7,110	7,240

NOTE: ^aIt has been assumed that the conditions of those working outdoors in more than one place of employment are proportionately the same as of those in a single place of employment. Our series of questions were not applied to the former. People employed in transport are excluded from the table.

and 31 per cent could not obtain tea or coffee, whether charged or not, during the day (compared with 8 per cent).

Partly, but not only, because more worked outdoors, significantly more manual than non-manual workers had poor or very poor working conditions: 31 per cent, compared with 8 per cent. Among both male and female employees, significantly fewer routine non-manual than other non-manual employees also enjoyed good conditions (Table A.41, Appendix Eight, page 1025). During individual interviews, our attention was also called to conditions which are not represented in the work conditions index. There were men and women working continuously in dusty conditions, for example, in steel works, cotton factories and brickworks. Some had to endure extremes of noise or temperature.

Welfare and Fringe Benefits

Employers have increasingly augmented earnings by providing benefits in kind at work and cash benefits in sickness or upon termination of employment.¹ Welfare is an increasingly important extension of security and an increasingly important adjunct of cash earnings. Partly this may be because of the developing formalization of collective bargaining to determine wages and conditions of employment: 'fringe benefits, as non-wage remuneration of different kinds, were thus provided within a different framework'.² Partly it may be because of the search for economical methods of conferring benefits upon, and securing the allegiance of, the increasing number of white-collar workers at a time when income taxes have been perceived to be high.

Two thirds of employees (63 per cent of men and 65 per cent of women) expected to be paid when sick. The fraction rises slightly (66 per cent of men and 68 per cent of women) when those working less than thirty hours are excluded. The total for men bears out the trend suggested by two other national surveys carried out at dates before and after our survey, though the total for women is a little higher than that derived from a 1971 survey.³

The period for which employees are entitled to sick pay varies, and we sought only to estimate level of sick pay (including sickness benefit) as a percentage of

¹ For a historical introduction, see Reid, G. L., and Robertson, D. J., *Fringe Benefits, Labour Costs and Social Security*, Allen & Unwin, London, 1965, esp. Chapter 2.

² *ibid.*, p. 27.

³ In a 1961-2 survey in Britain, 57 per cent of men and 59 per cent of women were found to have some cover for pay in sickness. In a 1971 survey, the percentages were 69.6 and 58.2 respectively (or 70.6 and 71.1 for full-time workers). Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance, *Report of an Enquiry into the Incidence of Incapacity for Work, Part I: Scope and Characteristics of Employers' Sick Pay Schemes*, HMSO, London, 1965, p. xiii; OPCS, Social Survey Division, *The General Household Survey, Introductory Report*, London, HMSO, London, 1973, p. 201.

earnings during an initial period of one month's sickness. Statements made in interview were subsequently checked according to amounts normally paid under national insurance, including amounts for dependants.

Table 12.7 shows that rather fewer than half of male employees, though rather more than half of female employees, expected to have an income in the first month

Table 12.7. Percentages of employed men and women of non-manual and manual class according to entitlement to sick pay.

<i>Entitlement to sick pay</i>	<i>Men</i>			<i>Women</i>		
	<i>Non-manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Non-manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>All</i>
No entitlement	12	51	37	23	50	35
Under 50 % earnings ^a	0	4	2	1	2	2
50-99 % earnings ^a	6	19	14	7	12	9
100 % earnings ^a	81	26	46	69	35	54
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	518	934	1,481	350	280	640

NOTE: ^aNational insurance sickness benefit added to sick pay and combined total expressed as percentage of gross earnings.

of sickness, including sickness benefit, equivalent to average gross earnings. The difference between non-manual and manual employees is, however, marked for both sexes. Not only are many more manual than non-manual employees ineligible for sick pay. Fewer of those eligible expect to receive the equivalent of average earnings. Manual workers more commonly have to serve a qualifying period before being entitled to sick pay; are not paid during the first days of sickness; and are ineligible to receive sick pay for longer than three months.¹

There was no pronounced difference between those covered and those not covered by sick-pay arrangements in the numbers off work because of sickness or days illness in the year (Table A.42, Appendix Eight, page 1026). The study in 1961-2 by the Ministry of Pensions found a slightly higher inception rate among men who were not covered than who were covered by sick-pay arrangements, but the same average days of incapacity. Among women who were not covered, inception rates were lower but average number of days of incapacity greater. A 1972 survey found 'that sick pay schemes do not tend to increase the number of days lost from work in a year due to illness or injury'.²

¹ Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance, *Report of an Enquiry in the Incidence of Incapacity for Work*, Part I, pp. xix-xxiii.

² *ibid.*, pp. xxxii-xxxiii; OPCS, *The General Household Survey*, Introductory Report, pp. 307-8.

Substantially more male than female employees were members of an occupational pension scheme, but again the difference in coverage of manual and non-manual workers was marked, fewer than half of male and fewer than a quarter of female manual employees being members. Fewer manual than non-manual workers who were members expected pensions of as much as 30 per cent of final earnings. Only just over a million manual workers, in a total of 13 million, expected to earn an occupational pension of 50 per cent or more of final earnings (Table 12.8). When relating pensions expected by people in the sample to their age, we found that fewer people in their forties and fifties than in their twenties and thirties expected a pension of as much as half of earnings. The present low coverage and amounts of occupational pensions received by the elderly (described in Chapter 24) are therefore unlikely to change materially for many years to come. Indeed, although coverage among the employed population grew during the 1950s and 1960s, there is evidence which suggests that in the late 1960s it actually declined among manual

Table 12.8. *Percentages of employed men and women of non-manual and manual class, according to entitlement to occupational pension.*

<i>Occupational pension as percentage of expected final salary or wage</i>	<i>Men</i>			<i>Women</i>		
	<i>Non-manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>All^a</i>	<i>Non-manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>All^a</i>
No cover for pension	19	56	43	48	76	61
Under 30 %	13	22	19	8	11	8
30-49 %	22	9	14	25	8	18
50-59 %	15	6	9	11	3	8
60%-}-	31	7	15	7	2	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	501	914	1,423	325	280	614
<i>Estimated number in employed population (000s)</i>						
No cover for pension	1,024	5,587	6,632	1,699	2,320	4,084
Under 30%	730	2,189	2,962	294	338	555
30-49%	1,176	926	2,124	882	240	1,186
50-59%	817	599	1,416	403	87	523
60%+	1,710	653	2,363	261	65	338
Total	5,457	9,954	15,497	3,539	3,050	6,686

NOTE: ^aIncludes some not allocated by occupational class.

workers of both sexes, though continuing to rise among non-manual workers.¹ And the rates of inflation experienced in the 1970s mean that, without introducing new policy measures, the real value of occupational pensions paid to existing and prospective pensioners will depreciate rapidly in relation to other forms of income. Although more people now in their forties and fifties will expect to receive an occupational pension than are receiving one today, or will receive a pension of higher initial value than those being paid to existing occupational pensioners, only part of the total value of occupational pensions will be guaranteed against inflation by the contracting-out provisions of the state pension scheme which began in 1978. In payment, small additional pensions are likely to fall drastically in their real value.

A summary account of levels of pensions expected does not exhaust the inequalities which exist between manual and non-manual employees. Whereas 33 per cent of non-manual employees with entitlement to an occupational pension expected to receive a lump sum upon retirement, only 21 per cent of manual employees did so. Since fewer manual than non-manual employees expected to receive a pension in the first place, entitlement to a lump sum is in general rare among manual employees. Altogether, only 9 per cent expected to receive a lump sum upon retirement. Fewer than half of them, compared with nearly two thirds of the equivalent group of non-manual workers, expected to receive a lump sum of as much in value as the final year's earnings. Among men, 17 per cent of non-manual workers (including 27 per cent of professional and managerial workers) said they were entitled to a lump sum equivalent to at least the value of the earnings in their final year before retirement. Among women, the comparable figure was 19 per cent. These benefits are a major source of the accumulation of wealth.

The combined value of lump sum and occupational pension can be very substantial for professional workers and executives in both public services and private industry. When Sir William Armstrong, Head of the Home Civil Service and Permanent Secretary to the Civil Service Department, retired in 1974 at the age of 59, he became entitled to a tax-free lump sum of £25,000 and a pension of £8,500 (or half his final salary) which rises in line with the rise in earnings. These amounts were not affected by his appointment to the chairmanship of the Midland Bank at a salary of £35,000.²

Another inequality is age at which the pension starts. Of men entitled to occupational pensions, 35 per cent of non-manual workers (including 42 per cent of professional and managerial workers) were entitled to them at ages under 65, mostly 60, compared with 13 per cent of manual workers. A substantial minority, or one in six, of male non-manual workers, were expecting to draw a pension at 55. Of

¹ *Occupational Pension Schemes, 1971*, Fourth Survey by the Government Actuary, HMSO, London, 1972.

² *The Times*, 28 June 1974.

women entitled to occupational pensions, the great majority among both manual and non-manual groups expected to draw a pension at 60; however, 13 per cent of non-manual employees expected to draw pensions at 55 compared with 5 per cent of manual employees.

There are other welfare benefits which augment incomes while at work. A large proportion of employees have meals which are subsidized by the employer, 24 per cent of men and 31 per cent of women. The subsidy takes three forms: luncheon vouchers, cheap meals in canteens or restaurants and repayment or payment of some or all of the costs of meals out, usually as a charge against business expenses. In the survey, we asked about all three. Among men, more non-manual than manual workers enjoyed a subsidy, 30 per cent (including more than half professional and managerial workers) compared with 20 per cent. Among women, about the same proportions of both manual and non-manual workers (just under a third) enjoyed a subsidy (Table A.43, Appendix Eight, page 1026). The value of the subsidy was greater on average for non-manual than for manual workers. Among men, for example, 36 per cent of non-manual but only 19 per cent of manual workers estimated the value at more than £1 per week.

Five per cent of all employees, representing 1.2 million in the employed population, had the personal use sometimes or often of a car owned by the employer. Fewer than one in ten of these were women. However, the respective numbers of non-manual and manual workers was 14 per cent and 2 per cent. In nearly all cases, the employer paid road tax, insurance and repairs, and for nearly four fifths also paid petrol. We also explored what value was derived by the individual from other goods and services provided free or cheaply by the employer. Based on the numbers in the sample, we estimated that 5.2 million obtained cheap or free goods; 0.5 million cheap or free travel other than for purposes of work; 0.3 million medical expenses; 0.6 million educational expenses for themselves or their children (mostly themselves); 0.2 million shares or options to purchase shares; 0.8 million life insurance; 0.2 million loans for the purchase of a car; 0.5 million clothing, and 0.9 million other goods and services. These estimates are, of course, subject to considerable sampling errors. Altogether, 32 per cent of employees, representing 7.7 million, received goods and services other than the use of an employer's car. Again, non-manual workers were much more likely than manual employees to experience these advantages, and to receive goods or service, of substantial value, though some large groups of manual workers had specific benefits. Thus, employees of British Rail could secure rail tickets at concessionary prices, and employees of the National Coal Board obtained coal free or cheaply.

Some employees have housing subsidies from their employers. These take three principal forms: loans or grants to purchase a home, subsidized rented accommodation and rent-free accommodation. A small proportion, 3 per cent, of the sample who were living in owner-occupied homes, representing $\frac{3}{4}$ million, said they had benefited from a loan or grant. More searching inquiry might have revealed that

this figure was an underestimate. Loans had usually been made at lower rates of interest than those applied by building societies, and enabled employees more easily to find the deposit on a home, or make up a mortgage to a level they could afford. A substantial proportion of people renting a home, 14 per cent, representing about 1½ million, were living in accommodation owned by an employer. Over four-fifths of them said they rented their homes for less than the rent they would expect to pay elsewhere. Finally, a further small proportion of the entire sample, also representing rather less than 1½ million, were living in rent-free accommodation owned by an employer. In the entire sample, there were therefore nearly 6 per cent, representing over 3 million people, whose accommodation was in different ways subsidized by an employer.

That some manual workers, such as agricultural workers and caretakers of schools and firms, live in homes owned by an employer has been recognized in previous studies,¹ though its extent has not previously been documented. That so many non-manual workers gain help from employers with their housing has not attracted much notice or investigation. Table 12.9 sets out the differences between the population of

Table 12.9. *Percentages of population of non-manual and manual class living in accommodation subsidized by an employer.*

<i>Form of subsidy by employer</i>	<i>Percentage of population</i>			<i>Estimated number (000s)</i>		
	<i>Non-manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>All^a</i>	<i>Non-manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>All^a</i>
Loan or grant for owner-occupation	2.2	0.6	1.3	540	190	740
Rented cheaply from employer	3.0	1.7	2.2	750	560	1,340
Rent-free, owned by employer	2.8	2.1	2.4	690	710	1,410
All forms of subsidy	7.9	4.4	5.8	1,980	1,460	3,490

NOTE: ^aIncluding some not allocated by occupational class.

non-manual and manual class in the extent to which different forms of subsidy are enjoyed. More non-manual than manual workers are helped by employers, and they tend to receive help of greater monetary value. Altogether, about 2 million in the population are helped, compared with 1½ million people of manual class.

¹ It is, of course, by no means always an advantage. The tied cottage has on the whole been a grave disadvantage to the agricultural worker, and legislation in 1976 does not suggest that his problems have been overcome. See Newby, H., 'Tied Cottage Reform', *British Journal of Law and Society*, Summer 1977.

Finally, substantially more non-manual than manual workers had holidays with pay of three weeks or more, 54 per cent of men and 47 per cent of women, compared with 21 per cent and 19 per cent respectively. (Table A.44, Appendix Eight, page 1027). During this century, the entitlement of both non-manual and manual workers has steadily increased (though sharp inequalities between the two groups remain).¹ The period of holiday actually taken in the previous year differed sometimes from actual entitlement (as indicated in Table 12.2), both because periods of entitlement for some types of worker, like schoolteachers, are hard to define and include weeks when work is carried on, and because some employees have changed jobs, and because employees do not always take the holidays to which they are entitled. Among professional and managerial employees, around a fifth had taken five or more weeks' paid holiday.

An Index of Work Deprivation

We have discussed four different forms of work deprivation. They are, of course, correlated, and some attempt must be made to show the groups in the population who are exposed to multiple forms of work deprivation. From the data collected under the four sub-headings, we constructed an index according to which each employee could be ranked. In constructing the index, we sought to be as comprehensive in coverage as possible and to reflect the four component items (severity, security, conditions and fringe benefits of job) about equally. A score was allocated as follows:

Subject to one week's notice or less	= 1
All working time standing or walking about	= 1
Poor (or very poor) working conditions ²	= 1 (or 2)
Working before 8 a.m. or working at night	= 1
No wages or salary during sickness	= 1
No entitlement to occupational pension	= 1
No entitlement to holiday with pay, or less than 2 weeks	= 1
Possible maximum	= 8

Table 12.10 brings out more sharply than most of the individual measures the difference between non-manual and manual employees in exposure to deprivation. Not only is there a big difference between the two groups considered as a whole, but even at the margins the difference is sharp or the overlap small. Thus, 73 per cent of male routine non-manual employees scored 2 or fewer, but 67 per cent of male skilled manual workers scored 3 or more on the index. If a score of 3 or more is

¹ For a historical account, see Cameron, G. C., 'The Growth of Holidays with Pay in Britain', in Reid and Robertson, *Fringe Benefits, Labour Costs and Social Security*.

² Depending on the score on the work conditions index described earlier.

Table 12.10. Percentages of employed men and women of different occupational class according to total work deprivation.

<i>A. Men</i>											
<i>Total deprivation (score)</i>	<i>Profes- sional</i>	<i>Mana- gerial</i>	<i>Supervisory High</i>	<i>Supervisory Low</i>	<i>Routine non- manual</i>	<i>All non- manual</i>	<i>Skilled manual</i>	<i>Partly skilled manual</i>	<i>Unskilled manual</i>	<i>All manual</i>	
None (0)	74	67	40	38	27	44	6	5	6	6	
Slight (1-2)	23	28	46	44	45	41	27	33	16	26	
Substantial (3-4)	3	4	13	17	23	14	45	46	36	44	
Severe (5)	0	2	1	1	2	1	14	15	19	15	
Very severe (6+)	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	5	24	10	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number	62	54	158	155	106	535	584	284	169	1,037	
<i>B. Women</i>											
None (0)	-	-	41	33	36	37	21	23	36	27	
Slight (1-2)	-	-	47	49	40	44	29	40	39	33	
Substantial (3-4)	-	-	12	17	21	18	42	35	20	31	
Severe or very severe (5+)	-	-	0	1	2	1	8	11	4	9	
Total	-	-	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number	5	16	92	89	356	558	62	254	132	448	

taken as representing relative work deprivation, then 16 per cent of non-manual but 69 per cent of manual workers were found to experience such deprivation.

Deprivation and Earnings

The different indices of deprivation which have been described are correlated not just with occupational class but also with level of earnings. First, pay was closely associated with class. In proceeding through the ranks of each occupational class, the proportion of employees with gross earnings below the mean tended to increase. The relatively large proportion of male routine non-manual workers with pay of under 80 per cent of the mean provide a significant exception.¹ Whereas hardly any manual workers had gross earnings of more than twice the mean, 43 per cent of professional men did so (Table 12.11). Manual workers accounted for 75 per cent of those with earnings below the mean and 45 per cent above the mean.

Secondly, within each occupational class, those with lower earnings were more likely to have poor working conditions and security. On our measures of working conditions there was an association, though usually slight, for each sex, among upper and lower non-manual and skilled manual groups; but there was no association among partly skilled and unskilled groups. According to length of entitlement to notice, the association was more consistent and usually strong. Within broad occupational classes, more of those with relatively high than with relatively low earnings were entitled to relatively long notice.

Among the worst instances of deprivation in relation to earnings were those employed at home, especially those who were engaged in piecework. 'Home-workers' are difficult to define. We estimated that, on the broadest definition, the numbers working at home' throughout the United Kingdom were 150,000 employed and 390,000 self-employed men, and 280,000 employed and 330,000 self-employed women - about 150,000 of the total of 1,150,000 doing so as a second job. However, many of these worked on their own account in businesses adjoining, in or over their homes - including general practitioners, shopkeepers, music teachers and publicans. If we consider the employed, they fall into two groups. First, there were those paid to provide services - numbering about 300,000. They included insurance and clothing club agents, many of whom were poorly paid on a stringent commission basis and who were often intermediaries on the one hand in life assurance and property insurance arrangements at extraordinarily high rates of payment, or on the other hand, hire-purchase arrangements at very high rates of interest. There were also housekeepers, home helps, foster-parents, child-minders, caretakers and nurses and attendants. Secondly, there were home-workers who, in the words of the Commission on Industrial Relations, 'receive work and payment directly from a

¹ See the discussion in Chapter 10, pages 386-8.

Table 12.11 . Percentages of employed men and women^a of different occupational class with gross earnings in previous year below and above the mean.

<i>A. Men</i>										
<i>Gross earnings last year as percentage of mean</i>	<i>Profes- sional</i>	<i>Mana- gerial</i>	<i>Supervisory High</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Routine non-</i>	<i>All non- manual</i>	<i>Skilled</i>	<i>Partly skilled manual</i>	<i>Unskilled</i>	<i>All manual</i>
Under 80	4	(4)	15	28	67	26	38	55	76	48
80-99	4	(4)	24	31	20	21	33	27	13	28
100-99	45	(78)	56	39	12	44	28	18	10	23
200 or more	47	(13)	5	2	1	9	1	0	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	55	45	140	139	86	465	523	254	136	913
<i>B. Women</i>										
Under 80	-	-	(12)	18	40	31	(52)	51	(77)	56
80-99	-	-	(6)	23	23	20	(17)	26	(11)	22
100-99	-	-	(57)	57	34	42	(27)	23	(11)	22
200 or more	-	-	(24)	2	2	7	(2)	0	(0)	0
Total	-	-	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	3	8	49	60	223	343	40	135	35	210

NOTE: ^aAll 15 and over working 1,000 hours or more in year (or an average of twenty hours for fifty weeks). Note that self-employed are excluded.

manufacturing establishment and who work in their own homes', and those paid to provide services. They were estimated on the basis of the survey to number between 100,000 and 150,000, and included clothing machinists, dressmakers, lampshade and toy-makers, workers filling and addressing envelopes, or sorting and packing different manufactured articles, and those repairing machines and household gadgets. There may have been supplementary second jobs which we missed - though we did in fact ask for this information from each adult in the household. One of the worst instances was of a slightly disabled man making lampshades for about twelve hours every week for £1.50. A machinist averaged £5 a week for twenty-five hours' work. There is evidence from other sources of the miserable rates of pay of homeworkers and lack of supervision of conditions of work.¹

The Self-Employed

The self-employed comprised 6 per cent of the 'economically active' population in 1971, or 7 per cent of those actually in employment (8 per cent of men and 4 per cent of women).² In the sample, the self-employed comprised 7 per cent of those working at least one week in the preceding twelve months. Thirty-six per cent worked outdoors, and as many as 70 per cent spent all or nearly all their time standing or walking about. Many men worked long hours, 56 per cent claiming to work fifty or more hours a week, including 33 per cent claiming to work sixty hours or more. By contrast, fewer than a quarter of women claimed to work fifty hours or more. (See Table A.39, Appendix Eight, page 1024, which gives data for the year.) The dispersion of earnings was much greater than in the case of the employed. As Table 12.12 shows, proportionately more earned both considerably less and considerably more than the mean. Low earnings were not uniformly correlated with relatively few working hours. A third of the men with low pay worked fifty-five hours or more a week.

There was reliable evidence that proportionately more of the self-employed than of the employed lived in poverty or on the margins (24.5 per cent compared with 14.1 per cent).³ They included poor farmers, smallholders, stallholders, pedlars and shopkeepers, and persons engaged as 'outworkers' in their own homes. However, a substantial proportion were prosperous. Over half (56 per cent) combined home with business in the same dwellings, whether farm, shop, professional practice or other

¹ See, in particular, Brown, M., *Sweated Labour: A Study of Homework*, Low Pay Unit, London, December 1974; and Field, F., '70 Years On: A New Report on Homeworking', *Low Pay Bulletin*, August-October 1976.

² *Social Trends*, No. 4, HMSO, London, 1973, p. 85.

³ Those having an income in the previous year of less than 140 per cent of the supplementary benefit scale rates plus housing cost. Full income data for the year were obtained from 2,242 employed and 171 self-employed persons respectively.

Table 12.12. *Percentages of self-employed and employed men and women,^a according to their gross earnings as percentage of the mean.^b*

<i>Gross earnings as % of mean</i>	<i>Men</i>		<i>Women</i>	
	<i>Self-employed</i>	<i>Employed</i>	<i>Self-employed</i>	<i>Employed</i>
Under 50	19	4	(29)	9
50-59	7	10	(0)	8
60-79	17	29	(26)	23
80-99	12	25	(3)	21
100-19	13	15	(6)	16
120-99	18	14	(10)	18
200-99	6	2	(26)	4
300 +	8	1	(0)	1
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	121	1,270	31	528

NOTES: ^aMen aged 21 and over, women aged 18 and over, working thirty or more hours a week.

^bFor employed and self-employed combined, for each sex separately.

form of business. This enabled many to offset against tax part of the family's accommodation, lighting, heating and telephone charges. The asset value of nearly half these premises was put at £5,000 or more. Over half the self-employed (61 per cent) had a car for their business, and in nearly all instances (57 per cent), the business paid for road tax, insurance, petrol and repairs. About half (48 per cent) said they saved money through getting goods cheaply through their businesses. Relatively few of the self-employed, however, had made private arrangements for welfare benefits. Only 12 per cent had taken out pension cover, and 25 per cent cover for cash benefits during sickness.

Work Deprivation and Poverty

Just as most indices of work deprivation were found to correlate with low earnings, so they correlated with poverty. Employees who were not entitled to much or any notice, or to any holiday with pay, who were working outdoors or working unusual hours, as well as employees receiving low pay, were more likely to be members of households or of income units whose income (or income plus annuity value of assets) was below, or on the margins of, the state's poverty line. For example, 61 per cent of employees living in household poverty, and 32 per cent on the margins of

poverty, had not had a holiday with pay in the previous twelve months, compared with only 17 per cent of other employees (Table A.45, Appendix Eight, page 1027). The situation of those living in poverty is therefore one compounded with deprivation at work and, as we shall discuss later, with other forms of deprivation - in housing, and environmental and social conditions. None the less, poverty and deprivation are by no means mutually inclusive. Many people with high earnings, or high incomes and assets, experience deprivation in certain aspects of life. To pursue the example just quoted, while fewer of the poor than the non-poor in the sample had had holidays with pay, *most* (70 per cent) of those not having a holiday with pay were living in households with incomes markedly higher than the state's poverty line.

Table 12.13 brings together different forms of deprivation experienced at work and relates them to income of the income unit, expressed as a percentage of the

Table 12.13. *Percentages of employed poor and non-poor according to index of total work deprivation.*

<i>Work deprivation (index)</i>	<i>Men</i>					
	<i>Net disposable income last year of income unit as % of the state's poverty standard</i>					
	<i>Under 140</i>		<i>140-99</i>		<i>200+</i>	
	<i>Non-manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>Non-manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>Non-manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>
Little or no deprivation (0-2)	(67)	23	81	31	87	33
Substantial (3-4)	(29)	50	18	44	11	42
Severe deprivation (5 or more)	(4)	27	1	25	1	25
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	24	122	101	245	341	558
	<i>Women</i>					
Little or no deprivation (0-2)	71	(57)	75	62	82	59
Substantial (3-4)	26	(41)	23	26	17	31
Severe deprivation (5 or more)	3	(2)	2	12	1	10
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	58	44	101	103	341	260

supplementary benefit standard. The two are plainly connected, but by no means as strongly as many might suppose. Income units in poverty are more likely to include people experiencing insecurity, poor working conditions and lack of fringe benefits at work. On the other hand, extremes of deprivation at work are sometimes combined, as, for example, in the case of highly paid construction workers, quarrymen, miners and foundry workers, with relatively prosperous living standards.

So the apparent paradox has to be understood and weighed. Many in financial poverty also experience work deprivation; but many experiencing severe work deprivation have incomes substantially in excess of poverty standards. Thus 60 per cent of the men and 62 per cent of the women with severe work deprivation belonged to units with incomes of twice or more than twice the state's poverty standard. Most were manual workers putting up with a great deal in order to make good money.

There are three significant results in comparing poverty with work deprivation. Only 5 per cent of non-manual compared with 13 per cent of manual employees were members of income units in or on the margins of poverty by the state's standards. Secondly, most in poverty were also severely deprived at work. As many as 71 per cent of male (29 per cent of non-manual compared with 79 per cent of manual) employees living in or on the margins of poverty also experienced severe work deprivation. But thirdly, the severely deprived at work included only a small minority with poverty incomes. Only 14 per cent of all men experiencing severe work deprivation were in income units in or on the margins of poverty. So although earnings low enough to make people liable to poverty generally imply that they are also severely deprived at work, the reverse does not hold. Among employees with incomes substantially in excess of poverty levels, there is none the less a high risk of severe work deprivation. This is significantly correlated with occupational class. Nineteen per cent of non-manual employees in units with incomes twice, or more than twice, the poverty standard experienced severe work deprivation, compared with a corresponding figure of 68 per cent of manual employees.

Changes in Work Deprivation

To what extent is the work situation improving for different groups? By historical standards, there have been certain changes affecting all groups. The numbers of working hours in the day, days in the week, and weeks in the year, have diminished, as has the span of working life; and rights to paid holidays, sick pay and other welfare benefits have been extended. But, even by historical standards, there are some contrary trends. Among manual groups, shift working is increasing. 'The underlying trend in the percentage of the manual labour force on shifts in manufacturing has been about 1 per cent per annum.'¹ The extension of shopping hours, the growth of restaurant and holiday facilities, and trends particularly in the construction and power industries suggest that more manual workers may be working unsocial hours. As mentioned earlier, after recording a growth in the number and proportion of both manual and non-manual employees entitled to an occupational pension, the Government Actuary found a *decrease* in the coverage of

¹ National Board for Prices and Incomes, *Hours of Work, Overtime and Shift Working*, Cmnd 4554, HMSO, London, pp. 64-5.

male and female employees between 1966 and 1971, though a continuing small increase in the coverage of non-manual employees.¹ Accident rates have also remained high. During the 1960s, the number of accidents increased, though they diminished in the early 1970s.² The rates are not given separately for manual and non-manual workers. And although factors other than the conditions of work play a large part in explaining trends in mortality rates, the fact that more men in unskilled manual groups at all ages between 35 and 74 died in the five years 1959-63 than in the five years 1949-53 is of major significance.³ There were striking increases, for example, in the numbers dying from arteriosclerotic and degenerative heart disease, motor-vehicle and other accidents and lung cancer. Between 1948-50 and 1968-70, the expectation of life of men aged 45 in the United Kingdom barely changed, from 27.0 years to 27.1 years.⁴ During this period, that is, during the years between 1949-53 and 1959-63, the death rates per 100,000 at all ages declined to a greater proportionate extent among social classes I and II than among III and IV and, as already noted, actually *increased* among most age groups in social class V.⁵

Underlying such trends is the presumption that, although health conditions may have improved for many manual workers in recent years, either they have deteriorated for others, or more manual workers than hitherto are exposed to risks in certain types of new industry.

Other trends may be taking place of a relative kind. Thus, the Contract of Employment Act 1963 conferred certain rights to periods of notice on large numbers of employees, but the Act seems to have resulted in a parallel acceleration in the rights granted to non-manual workers. A similar acceleration in the terms of redundancy of non-manual workers seems to have occurred after the Redundancy Payments Act 1965.⁶ These examples show the care with which the structure of inequality needs to be documented and traced over a span of years. Events which seem to imply a reduction of the differences in working conditions and terms of service between manual and non-manual workers may not have this outcome. Further privileges conferred upon, or gained by, non-manual groups may maintain their advantage over

¹ *Occupational Pension Schemes, 1971.*

² Report of the Robens Committee, pp. 3 and 161-2.

³ The Registrar General's Decennial Supplement, England and Wales, 1961. *Occupational Mortality Tables*, HMSO, London, 1971, p.25.

⁴ Department of Health and Social Security, *Health and Personal Social Services Statistics for England* (with summary tables for Great Britain), HMSO, London, 1973, Table 3.9.

⁵ I am grateful to the Chief Medical Statistician (July 1974) for data supplementing that in the Decennial Supplement published in 1971. The data provides percentage changes in death rates, on a standardized definition of occupational class, for age groups within classes.

⁶ Wedderburn, D., 'Inequality at Work', in Townsend, P., and Bosanquet, N., *Labour and Inequality*, Fabian Society, London, 1972, pp. 181-2.

manual groups, despite general advances in the number and scale of employee rights.

Satisfaction with Work

In the survey, therefore, measures of the character of work, its security, conditions and fringe benefits, were obtained. As already discussed, some fringe benefits, like subsidized meals, are virtually extensions of pay, while others, like sick pay and occupational pensions, are extensions of security. What of employees' attitudes towards their work? An attempt was made to obtain subjective measures parallel to the objective measures of character of work, security, conditions and pay. Ideally, we would have wished to pursue attitudes to the working situation in much greater detail, as, for example, in other recent British studies.¹ For reasons of time we asked four general questions:

- Are you satisfied,
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied,
or dissatisfied,
- (i) with the pay?
 - (ii) with facilities at work (like heating, canteen, etc.)?
 - (iii) with the security of the job (like amount of notice and prospect of keeping the job)?
 - (iv) with the job itself ?

The difficulties of adopting this approach to workers' attitudes can be readily appreciated in considering the general distribution of replies, as set out in Table 12.14. As in other studies, the majority of workers tend to give favourable answers. When asked to rate levels of satisfaction, answers tend to be positive. At first sight, this suggests an inconsistency between the frequencies and degrees of objective and subjective deprivation. But, as argued in the previous chapter,² this can be explained partly as a function of the respective correspondence or specificity of objective and subjective measures. Objective measures which are adopted in surveys, even of the complex kind described here, do not comprehensively represent the material circumstances of any specific work situation. Nor are attitude questions built up in sufficient detail either to cover different aspects of the work situation, towards which attitudes may vary, or ensure consistency of understanding. A worker may express satisfaction with a poor job because it is better than his last job; or because, given his age or disability, he considers himself lucky to have a job at all; or because it is as good as any job someone in his position can expect. And he will

¹ See, in particular, Goldthorpe, J. H., Lockwood, D., Bechhofer, F., and Platt, J., *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour*, Cambridge University Press, 1968.

² See pages 425-6.

Table 12.14. Percentages of employed men and women of non-manual and manual status according to their satisfaction with their jobs.

<i>Aspect of job Degree of satisfaction</i>	<i>Men</i>		<i>Women</i>			
	<i>Non- manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Non- manual</i>	<i>Manual</i>	<i>All</i>
<i>Pay</i>						
Dissatisfied	31	30	30	20	18	19
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	18	19	18	13	14	13
Satisfied	52	51	51	67	68	67
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	507	967	1,474	350	296	646
<i>Facilities</i>						
Dissatisfied	10	16	14	11	13	12
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	9	16	14	10	10	10
Satisfied	82	68	73	79	77	78
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	482	851	1,333	349	282	631
<i>Security</i>						
Dissatisfied	6	16	13	5	8	6
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	8	10	9	9	10	9
Satisfied	86	74	78	87	83	85
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	508	952	1,460	352	289	641
<i>Job itself</i>						
Dissatisfied	7	6	6	8	5	5
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	12	13	13	14	9	9
Satisfied	81	81	81	78	87	85
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	508	962	1,470	257	297	654

tend to convey satisfaction with a job in general - especially in answer to broad questions - but dissatisfaction with features of that job. The very fact that people operate within any particular occupational situation is likely to predispose them in general allegiance towards it. They *want* to believe that that situation is for the best and that there is no easy alternative. There are both social as well as psychological pressures in favour of them expressing general approval of what they are doing. The social pressures exist to ensure order, stability and continuity of work and other behaviour in society. In addition, 'There is considerable psychological pressure upon the individual to say that he finds his job acceptable: to say otherwise may well be tantamount to admitting that he does not find *himself acceptable*.'¹

More manual than non-manual workers were dissatisfied with facilities and security of work, and though rates of satisfaction were greater than the objective data about deprivation seemed to warrant, this subjective difference did at least broadly correspond with objective differences. But as many non-manual as manual workers expressed dissatisfaction with their level of pay, despite their higher levels of pay. In the case of men, as many also expressed dissatisfaction with the job itself and, in the case of women, slightly more expressed dissatisfaction with the job. Among men, the highest rates of job satisfaction were found among professional workers, and the lowest among unskilled manual workers. Altogether, 38 per cent of male non-manual employees, compared with 43 per cent of manual employees, expressed dissatisfaction with at least one of the four matters relating to their jobs which were investigated. The figures for women were 28 per cent and 33 per cent respectively. In general, more women than men expressed satisfaction with their jobs.

A more direct check on the correspondence between objective and subjective deprivation is to find whether those with poor working conditions, security and ¹ levels of pay tended to express dissatisfaction. The indices selected in Table 12.15 show there was such a correlation. A tentative method of comparing indices of total work deprivation and job satisfaction is presented in Table A.46 (Appendix Eight, page 1028), which further supports this result. Therefore there exists evidence of a relationship between poor material conditions and subjective deprivation. But the correlation is by no means uniform. How far this is because our objective measures were partial and our subjective measures too generalized remains problematical. Certainly these matters deserve exploration in further research before too much effort is needlessly invested in explaining disjunction between objective status and subjective feelings which may turn out to be more apparent than real. None the less, the evidence to some extent supports those who have argued both that manual workers tend to adopt *instrumental* attitudes towards their work, in terms of the

¹ Goldthorpe *et al.*, *The Affluent Worker*, p. 11, citing Blauner, R., 'Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society', in Galenson, W., and Lipset, S. M. (eds.), *Labor and Trade Unionism*, New York, 1960.

Table 12.15. Percentages of male and female employees of different occupational class and job characteristics who were dissatisfied with selected characteristics of their jobs.

Job characteristics	Percentage				Total number			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
	Non-manual	Manual	Non-manual	Manual	Non-manual	Manual	Non-manual	Manual
<i>Dissatisfied with facilities</i>								
Indoor facilities good ^a	7	3	(28)	5	307	248	43	243
Indoor facilities poor or very poor ^a	(27)	36	(34)	7	26	137	44	80
<i>Dissatisfied with pay</i>								
Gross earnings 120 % or more of mean	24	24	21	(17)	157	85	112	24
Gross earnings under 80% mean	35	32	15	22	119	426	106	106
<i>Dissatisfied with job security</i>								
Subject to notice of more than month	6	(0)	3	-	93	18	39	1
Subject to week's notice or less	11	18	9	5	83	503	146	156

NOTE: ^aAs defined in work conditions index. See page 438.

rewards they seek to enrich life outside work, rather than take intrinsic satisfaction in the job and the conditions in which it is performed; and that the attitudes brought to work are shaped substantially by such workers' experiences, and needs, in the home and the family, which for many are of greater emotional significance.¹ Many manual workers have low expectations of their work situation and feel less able to control that situation than they do their lives outside work. Not expecting much, they are less likely to demand the kind of equality of treatment they expect as members of a household or a local community, or as citizens, patients or even consumers. Despite membership of trade unions, many feel powerless (except in bargaining for pay) in *this* situation, by comparison with many other situations. With the qualifications already made about the *validity* of some favourable responses to general questions about job satisfaction, this is the best interpretation that can be offered to explain both the relatively low number of negative responses and the rather greater dissatisfaction expressed about pay than other aspects of the work situation.

Summary and Conclusion

This chapter calls attention to the importance of the concept of 'occupational hierarchy' in explaining work deprivation. Much of human life is lived at work, and deprivation can be experienced in the work situation even when it is not experienced in other social situations. This chapter argues that social conceptions of deficiencies in the work situation tend to be restricted to questions of industrial ill-health or hazards, the characteristics of particular types of industry or forms of employment, and specific rather than interconnected features of employment. As a consequence, society fails to perceive certain kinds of problem or how severe they are, and is insufficiently aware of the possibilities of systematic causation. Despite differences in the kind of products, services rendered, size, organization and locality of plant and type of technology, there are social forces which reproduce the same kinds of inequality or deprivation in the work situation in a variety of different contexts.

The chapter sought to assess the severity and nature of the job itself; its security; its conditions and amenities; and the welfare or fringe benefits often associated with it. In each instance, manual workers were found to be at a marked disadvantage compared with non-manual workers. The dichotomy between non-manual and manual work is clearly the most important fact to emerge from this analysis of the work situation of the employed population. Manual workers work longer hours and more weeks of the year, have shorter holidays, are more likely to work outdoors and to have poor amenities at work, are more likely to spend all their working time

¹ Goldthorpe *et al.*, *The Affluent Worker*, Chapter 8. much less likely to receive sick pay, occupational pensions and other fringe benefits.

standing or walking about, are more liable to unemployment, redundancy and very short periods of notice of dismissal, and are much less likely to receive sick pay, occupational pensions and other fringe benefits.

Within these two broad non-manual and manual sections of the employed population, there are other differences to which attention has been called. Among non-manual employees, especially women, considerably more professional and managerial than other workers, especially than routine non-manual workers, have certain privileges. And among manual workers, considerably more skilled and partly skilled than unskilled workers have certain privileges.

A number of indices of the work situation have been described. They include period of entitlement to notice, 'usual' hours of work, fraction of working time spent standing or walking about, entitlement to sick pay, paid holidays and occupational pensions, and poor conditions and amenities at work. When these different factors are combined, we found that 12 per cent of the employed population could be said to be very deprived, and another 30 per cent deprived, in their work situation. Deprivation was correlated with occupational class. None of those in professional and managerial groups, but 43 per cent of unskilled male manual workers, were very deprived. Within occupational classes, those with low pay tended to be more deprived.

Fewer employees expressed dissatisfaction with the security of work, its conditions and the job itself than the objective facts seemed to warrant, though this may have been partly a function of general instead of specific questioning during our interviews. Employees expressed dissatisfaction with level of pay more than they did other aspects of their work situation. There was a strong, but by no means uniform, correspondence between objective and subjective deprivation.

The quality of the work situation has to be assessed not just in relation to past but also present employment. Changes in legislation and improvements in employer provisions encourage commentators to reach complacent conclusions about progress. Analyses which depend only on comparisons with past standards fail to take account of differential advances that may have been taking place, particularly between non-manual and manual grades, within the employed population. Evidence of trends in mortality, accidents and the distribution of fringe benefits suggests that inequalities in the work situation may in recent years not have narrowed, and in some respects have widened, as between manual and non-manual groups.