



Non-standard employment in the management and professional workforce: training, consultation and gender implications

■ **Kim Hoque**

Nottingham University Business School, UK

■ **Ian Kirkpatrick**

Leeds University Business School, UK

ABSTRACT

Over the past decade, important changes have occurred in the occupational mix of the non-standard workforce, with a rising number of professionals and managers entering part-time and temporary forms of employment. However, while this shift is widely acknowledged, there remains some confusion regarding its consequences. One strand in the literature argues that, at higher occupational levels, the tendency for non-standard employees to experience marginalization at work will be far less pronounced or non-existent. A second strand argues that, regardless of occupational level, workers on part-time and temporary contracts will be treated unequally in various ways. In this article our aim is to explore this matter; drawing on data from the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey. The analysis reveals that managers and professionals on non-standard contracts do become marginalized in terms of training opportunities and consultation at work, and that these outcomes are especially strong in the case of women. Finally, the managerial, national-level training policy and legal implications of the findings are discussed.

KEY WORDS

consultation / gender / managers / non-standard employment / professionals/ training

Introduction

Over the last decade, most European economies witnessed a steady growth in atypical or 'non-standard' forms of employment (Felstead and Jewson, 1999). In the UK, for example, recent Labour Force Survey statistics indicate that in 1999 just over a quarter of those employed worked part time, compared with 21 percent in 1984. The proportion of the workforce employed on temporary contracts also rose from about 5 percent in the early 1990s to 6.7 percent in 1999 (Cam, Purcell and Tailby, 2000: 12). In addition to these broad trends, key changes occurred in the composition of the non-standard workforce. In particular, the 1990s witnessed a marked expansion in the number of professional and managerial workers entering temporary or part-time contracts (Millward et al., 2000). According to Heery and Salmon (2000: 4) this has led to a situation in which 'previously secure groups' are now increasingly 'finding themselves in a precarious position'.

Although these changes in the occupational mix of the non-standard workforce have been widely acknowledged, there remains considerable debate regarding the consequences. In particular, there is ambiguity over how far the marginalizing effects of non-standard employment, such as unequal pay, training, career opportunities and access to intrinsically satisfying work (Arulampalam and Booth, 1998; Booth et al., 2000; Dex and McCulloch, 1997; Gallie et al., 1998; Warren and Walters, 1998), will apply as strongly to professional and managerial occupations as to non-management occupations. One strand in the literature argues that these consequences of contingent work are likely to be less pronounced or even non-existent where managers and professionals are concerned (Cam et al., 2000; Tilly, 1992; Tregaskis, 1997). Wider benefits are said to accrue from non-standard employment at this level, such as greater opportunity to balance work and life commitments, increased remuneration and the prospect of more flexible 'boundaryless careers' (Albert and Bradley, 1997). By contrast, others suggest that for managers and professionals, the shift to part-time and flexible contracts will not be entirely cost-free and that these groups are likely to be marginalized and treated unequally at work (Edwards and Robinson, 1999; Mallon and Duberley, 2000).

In this article, our objective is to shed light on this debate using data from the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey (Department of Trade and Industry, 1999). Specifically, our approach will be to test the extent to which managerial and professional and also non-managerial non-standard employees experience differential treatment within the workplace relative to their full-time permanent counterparts. The focus will be on two key areas acknowledged as important within the literature. The first concerns non-standard employees' access to training and development opportunities (see, for example, Arulampalam and Booth, 1998; Felstead et al., 1999). The second concerns the extent to which non-standard employees are consulted over a range of matters within the workplace (Gallie et al., 1998; Mallon and Duberley, 2000).

The article is divided into five sections. The first section examines the current literature on non-standard employment among the managerial/professional workforce. The subsequent sections discuss the data to be used, the methods of analysis, the results achieved, and a series of conclusions.

The nature and consequences of non-standard employment for managers and professionals

During the 1990s, a combination of supply- and demand-side pressures led to a growing number of managers and professionals entering into non-standard employment (Forde and Slater, 2001). The Labour Force Survey (1998: 36), for example, shows an increase between 1991 and 1998 in the proportion of the part-time and temporary workforce accounted for by the top three occupations in the Standard Occupational Classification (managers and senior administrators, professionals and associate professionals and technical). The proportion of part-time work accounted for by these three higher occupations rose from 18 percent to 21 percent. In the case of temporary employment, the change was even more dramatic, rising from 26 percent in 1991 to 34 percent in 1998. As Purcell (2000) notes, these changes are heavily gendered, with females comprising the vast majority of the part-time and temporary workforce at higher occupational levels.

As noted above, there remains some confusion in the literature regarding the consequences of non-standard employment for managers and professionals. A number of scholars have argued that the marginalizing effects of such employment are likely to be less pronounced or even absent at higher occupational levels (Gallie et al., 1998; Tilly, 1992; Tregaskis, 1997; Walsh, 1999). In relation to part-time work, for example, Tilly (1992: 330–31) distinguishes between 'retention part-time jobs' and 'secondary part-time jobs'. The former are 'located in primary labour markets, and are designed by employers to retain or attract valued workers who prefer to work part-time'. The latter, by contrast, are 'located in secondary labour markets' and used 'to gain advantage of lower compensation and greater scheduling flexibility'. According to Tilly, employers will apply different standards to the management of these two groups. Importantly, retention part-time staff will be treated in similar ways to permanent employees, with equal (pro rata) levels of pay, access to benefits, career opportunities and 'high levels of skill, training and responsibility' (Tilly, 1992: 335).

Similar points have been made about divisions within the temporary or 'contingent' workforce. Cam et al. (2000: 33), for instance, point to a 'bifurcation of contingent employment in the UK', with low-paid and poorly trained workers at one extreme and professional occupations on fixed-term or temporary contracts at the other, 'where pay is higher than average and there are high levels of human capital'. This workforce comprises highly qualified professionals working through temporary employment agencies and attracting high levels of pay and benefits, sometimes in excess of those of permanent staff (Peck and

Theodore, 1998). It also comprises other professionals, notably in the public sector, on fixed-term contracts that act as a probationary bridge into permanent employment. In such situations, levels of training, benefits and perceived career prospects may be no different from those of full-time permanent employees (Gallie et al., 1998).

Against this view, a second strand of argument suggests that, regardless of occupational level, there will be a tendency for non-standard employees to be marginalized at work. A growing number of empirical studies (Cohen and Mallon, 1999; Edwards and Robinson, 1999; Mallon and Duberley, 2000) point to how professional and managerial employees on non-standard contracts – women in particular – are treated differently, especially with regard to training opportunities, career advancement and processes of consultation.

This marginalization has been attributed to three main factors. Firstly, there are growing pressures on managers – especially those at lower levels – to control expenditure (Ward et al., 2001). According to Legge (1998: 290), this has led to more instrumental approaches towards the management of temporary employees and ‘minimal investment by agency or client organization in training’.

Secondly, organizational cultures and value systems are thought to be a factor leading to marginalization. Hunter et al. (1993: 394), for example, note how management decision-making is often influenced by stereotypes of non-standard employees as less committed, less reliable and – in the case of part-time employees – unsuitable for promotion. This, in turn, can result in these employees – women in particular – being treated unequally at work. In the UK such tendencies may be especially pronounced, given the culture of ‘presenteeism’ and the idea that working long hours represents a proxy for commitment (Simpson, 1998).

Finally, operational difficulties involved in managing professional and managerial employees on non-standard contracts may have a marginalizing effect. In the police service, for example, Edwards and Robinson (1999) note how routines structured around full-time working hours created difficulties for managers in accommodating the minority of staff (usually women) who worked part-time. Under these conditions, ‘rather than reorganize work, managers tend to marginalize part-timers by restricting access to opportunities for training, development and promotion’ (Edwards and Robinson, 1999: 14–15).

Data

To some extent, the confusion regarding the consequences of non-standard employment for higher occupational groups is fuelled by the limited empirical research that has been undertaken in the area. Indeed, as Mallon and Duberley (2000: 33) suggest ‘there is little research available which considers workers’ experiences of contingent work, particularly those at managerial and professional levels’. The aim of this article is therefore to investigate this matter using the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey of employees. This

survey comprises 28,240 observations, constituting a response rate of 64 per cent. Once weighted, the data are designed to be representative of the UK economy by industry, with survey questionnaires having been distributed to a random selection of 25 employees employed in 1880 of the 2191 workplaces surveyed within the main WERS 98 management questionnaire.¹ The design of the WERS 98 survey of employees has the additional advantage that it can be linked with data relating to workplace-level characteristics from the WERS 98 main management questionnaire, thus allowing for a range of factors such as industrial classification and workplace size – that might otherwise bias the results obtained – to be controlled for. In total, 23,504 observations from the WERS 98 survey of employees are used here, once missing data are taken into account.

This dataset will enable the point raised by Walsh and Deery (1999: 54) – that ‘a major problem in conducting research on non-standard employees is obtaining large enough numbers to allow for meaningful subgroup comparisons’ – to be addressed. With there being 23,504 observations within the subsample to be used here, it will be possible to conduct a meaningful subgroup investigation of the impact of non-standard employment at managerial and professional level as well as non-management level.

Method of analysis

The analysis to be conducted here aims to test firstly, the impact of non-standard employment on training and consultation among managerial and professional (hereafter referred to as ‘professional’) employees; secondly, whether the impact of non-standard employment is any different at this level than at non-professional levels; and thirdly, whether female non-standard professionals experience a greater degree of marginalization than do their male counterparts. In conducting the analysis, survey probit or survey ordered probit modelling techniques are used throughout. These techniques enable the relationships between contract type and levels of training and consultation to be analysed while a range of workplace and individual level characteristics are held constant. They also enable the probability of respondents’ selection into the sample and the survey design, which involves the clustering of individuals into primary sampling units (workplaces),² to be taken into account.

Dependent variables

The impact of non-standard employment is evaluated in relation to the following two areas:

Access to training and development activity

As discussed earlier, a key area where non-standard employees are likely to experience marginalization concerns training, development and learning

opportunities (Arulampalam and Booth, 1998; Booth et al., 2000). To evaluate this, four dependent variables are identified. Specifically we focus on whether, in the 12 months prior to the survey, the respondent has discussed the following with their supervisor or line manager: (1) how they are getting on with their job (dichotomous variable, mean 57.99%); (2) their chances of promotion (dichotomous variable, mean 19.95%); and (3) their training needs (dichotomous variable mean 47.03%). A fourth variable evaluates the amount of training the respondent received in the 12 months prior to the survey being undertaken, either paid for or organized by their employer (on a scale of 1 to 6 where 1 = 'none' and 6 = 'ten days or more'; mean score 2.73).

Levels of consultation

A further way in which marginalization might occur with regard to temporary and part-time work concerns communication and involvement in decision-making (Barling and Gallagher, 1996; Edwards and Robinson, 1999; Mallon and Duberley, 2000). To investigate this, four dependent variables are used. These relate to the frequency with which respondents are asked by managers for their views on: (1) future plans for the workplace (scale of 1 to 4 where 1 = never and 4 = frequently; mean score 2.3); (2) staffing issues, including redundancy (scale of 1 to 4 where 1 = never and 4 = frequently; mean score 1.9); (3) changes to work practices (scale of 1 to 4 where 1 = never and 4 = frequently; mean score 2.54); and (4) health and safety at work (scale of 1 to 4 where 1 = never and 4 = frequently; mean score 2.64).

Evaluating the impact of non-standard employment at professional levels

The first two aims of this article are to evaluate the impact of non-standard employment on professional employees, and to assess whether professionals on non-standard contracts are any more or less likely to experience marginalization than are their non-professional counterparts. These two aims are addressed simultaneously by the creation of an eight-part categorical variable, as described within Table 1. Within the categorization, part-time employees are classified as employees working fewer than 30 hours per week. The short-term category comprises respondents that report themselves as either temporary or fixed-term. 'Professional' employees are classified as those reporting themselves as falling within the 'managers and senior administrators', 'professional' and 'associate professional' standard occupational classification major groups.³

The equations are firstly calculated using full-time permanent non-professionals as the reference category. The coefficients on the non-professional non-standard contract dummies will demonstrate the treatment of these groups relative to their full-time permanent counterparts. The procedure is then repeated using full-time permanent professionals as the reference category, thus allowing an evaluation of the treatment of professionals on non-standard contracts. This will demonstrate not only whether professionals on non-standard

contracts receive poorer treatment than their full-time permanent counterparts, but also whether the degree of marginalization they experience is any different from that experienced by non-professionals on non-standard contracts.

As can be seen from Table 1, there is a clear justification for evaluating the experiences and treatment of non-standard employees within different occupational groups. The column percentages demonstrate that, within the WERS 98 employee data, 17.5 percent of professionals are employed on a non-standard contract of some sort. As high a proportion of professional employees have short-term contracts as do non-professionals. While part-time working is more pronounced within non-professional grades, it nevertheless remains the case that thirteen percent of professionals are employed on such contracts.

Evaluating the impact of non-standard contracts at professional levels by gender

If there is any evidence of marginalization among non-standard professionals within the analysis outlined above, the third aim of this article will be to evaluate whether these effects vary by gender. The variable used to conduct this analysis is presented in Table 2. The equations are firstly calculated using female full-time permanent professionals as the reference category. The coefficients for the female non-standard categories will demonstrate the extent to which female professionals employed under these contract arrangements experience marginalization relative to their full-time permanent counterparts. This procedure is then repeated using male full-time permanent professionals as the reference category, in order to evaluate the extent to which non-standard male professionals experience marginalization relative to their full-time permanent counterparts. Variables for female non-professionals and male non-professionals are included within both sets of equations as a further point of reference in terms of assessing the treatment of non-standard professionals.

In interpreting the results that emerge from this analysis, it will be important to keep in mind the proportion of women that are employed on

Table 1 Professionals and non-professionals by contract type

	<i>Non-professional</i>	<i>Professional</i>
Full-time short-term	449 (2.7)	288 (4.1)
Part-time short-term	688 (4.2)	239 (3.4)
Part-time permanent	4405 (26.8)	706 (10.0)
Full-time permanent	10867 (66.2)	5862 (82.6)
Weighted base	16409 (100)	7095 (100)

Note: Weighted frequencies reported (column percentages in brackets – these do not add up to 100 due to rounding to one decimal place).

Base: All employees (observations omitted as a result of missing data from the equations in Appendix tables 1 and 2 are also omitted here).

Table 2 Non-standard professionals by gender

	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>
Full-time short-term	133 (4.4)	155 (3.8)
Part-time short-term	163 (5.4)	76 (1.9)
Part-time permanent	600 (19.8)	106 (2.6)
Full-time permanent	2131 (70.4)	3730 (91.7)
Weighted base	3027	4067

Notes: Weighted frequencies reported (column percentages in brackets).
Base: All employees (observations omitted as a result of missing data from the equations in Appendix tables 3 and 4 are also omitted here).

non-standard contracts. For example, as shown by Table 2, where professionals are concerned, 19.8 percent have part-time permanent contracts compared with only 2.6 percent of men. Women clearly form the bulk of non-standard employment among professional grades. As such, the gender implications will be particularly pronounced if the relationship between non-standard employment and training or consultation is more highly negative among women than among men.

Control variables

In evaluating the relationship between non-standard employment and levels of training and development and consultation, it is necessary to control for a range of both individual and workplace-level factors. By way of example, levels of training tend to be inversely correlated with tenure, as a great deal of induction and basic skills training occurs at the start of a contract (Green, 1999). Unless tenure is controlled for, the results may be positively skewed in terms of the extent to which short-term employees are in receipt of training. It is necessary, therefore, to control for such factors in order that any residual ‘contract effect’ can be identified. Table 3 contains a full listing of the control variables used.

Results

The impact of non-standard employment at different occupational levels

Training and development

Table 4 reports the predicted probabilities and marginal effects for the relationship between contract type and the dependent variables concerning training and development. Where professionals are concerned, these are calculated from the coefficients reported in columns 2, 4, 6 and 8 of Appendix Table 1 (within which the reference category is full-time permanent professionals). For reasons

Table 3 Controls for individual and workplace-level characteristics

<i>Individual level characteristics</i>	
Tenure	Dummy variables for employees with tenure of less than 1 year; 1 to less than 2 years; 2 to less than 5 years; 5 to less than 10 years; 10 years or more.
Trade union membership	Dummy variables for employees that are currently a member of a trade union, are past members, or have never been a member.
Qualifications	Dummy variables for highest educational qualification: CSE or equivalent (GCSE grades D–G); O levels or equivalent (GCSE grades A–C); A level or equivalent; degree or equivalent; postgraduate degree or equivalent; or none of these. A separate dichotomous variable for employees with any recognized vocational qualifications (e.g. trade apprenticeship, NVQ, City and Guilds).
Pay	Dummy variables for employees with weekly earnings of less than £50; £51–£80; £81–£140; £141–£180; £181–£220; £221–£260; £261–£310; £311–£360; £361–£430; £431–£540; £541–£680; or £681 or more.
Age	Dummy variables for employees that are less than 20 years old; 20–24; 25–29; 30–39; 40–49; 50–59; or 60 years old or older.
Marital status	Dummy variables for employees that are single; widowed; divorced/separated; or living with spouse/partner.
Dependants	Dichotomous variable for employees that have dependent children.
Gender	Dichotomous variable where 1 = female.
Ethnicity	Dichotomous variable where 1 = ethnic minority.
<i>Workplace level characteristics</i>	
Workplace size (no. of employees)	Dummies for employees in workplaces with 10–24; 25–49; 50–99; 100–199; 200–499; 500–999; or 1000 or more employees.
Standard Industrial Classification major division	Dummies for employees in workplaces within manufacturing; electricity, gas and water supply; construction; wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles, motor cycles and personal and household goods; hotels and restaurants; storage, transport and communication; financial intermediation, real estate, renting and business activities; public administration, defence and compulsory social security; education; health and social work and other community, social and personal service activities.
Sector	Dichotomous variable for employees within the private or public sector.
Ownership	Dummy variables for employees within workplaces that are UK; North American; European or Rest of World owned.

Table 3 continued

Market	Dummies for employees that are employed in workplaces operating within the non-trading sector; within local markets; regional markets; national markets or international markets.
Unionization	Dichotomous variable for union recognition.
Independent workplace	Dichotomous variable for employees in workplaces that are a single independent workplace not belonging to another body/ workplace belonging to another body.
Workplace age	Dummy variables for workplaces that are between 0–4; 5–9; 10–19; or 20 or more years old.

of length, the Appendix tables are not presented here, but are available at <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/~lizdkh/Wes.doc>. Probabilities are firstly calculated for the likelihood of a ‘benchmark’ full-time permanent professional having discussed how they are getting on with their job, their chances of promotion and their training needs, and of having had five or more days training (Table 4 contains a full description of the benchmark individuals’ characteristics). In order to evaluate the impact of different contract types, the probabilities are then recalculated keeping all the characteristics the same, except that the full-time permanent category is replaced by each of the non-standard contract categories in turn.

By way of example, the first column of Table 4 demonstrates that the probability that individuals within the benchmark full-time permanent professional category have discussed how they are getting on with their job is 0.764. When the probability is recalculated for individuals with exactly the same characteristics (with regard to age, tenure, qualifications, ethnicity, marital status, pay, union membership and workplace characteristics), with the exception that they have a short-term full-time contract as opposed to a full-time permanent contract, the probability of having discussed how they are getting on with their job falls by 5 percent to 0.721.

For non-professionals, this procedure is repeated based on the coefficients reported in columns 1, 3, 5 and 7 of Appendix Table 1 (within which the reference category is full-time permanent non-professionals).

Turning to the results, Table 4 demonstrates, where non-professionals are concerned, considerable evidence that all three categories of non-professionals on non-standard contracts have received fewer training and developmental opportunities than have their full-time permanent counterparts.

Where professionals are concerned, there is equally strong evidence pointing to the marginalization of non-standard employees with regard to training and development activity. Firstly, full-time short-term professionals are 31 percent less likely to have discussed their chances of promotion, and are 13 percent less likely to have discussed their training needs than are full-time permanent

Table 4 The relationship between occupational level, contract type and training and development: predicted probabilities and marginal effects (marginal effect [% change] given, followed by predicted possibility)

	Discussions with supervisor during the last 12 months on:						Five or more days training either paid for or organized by employer	
	How you are getting on with job		Chances of promotion		Training needs			
Professionals								
Benchmark								
Full-time permanent professionals ^a	–	0.764	–	0.337	–	0.618	– 0.238	
Change to benchmark								
contract type								
Short-term f.t. prof.	–5	0.721	–31	0.233***	–13	0.54**	–14 0.204	
Short-term p.t. prof.	–7	0.711	–44	0.189***	–23	0.473***	–48 0.124***	
Permanent p.t. prof.	–7	0.708**	–41	0.198***	–9	0.564*	–23 0.183***	
Non-professionals								
Benchmark								
Full-time permanent non-professionals ^a	–	0.67	–	0.254	–	0.464	– 0.169	
Change to benchmark								
contract type								
Short-term f.t. non-prof.	+3	0.69	–29	0.18***	–17	0.383***	–17 0.14*	
Short-term p.t. non-prof.	–3	0.648	–34	0.168**	–13	0.403	–37 0.106***	
Permanent p.t. non-prof.	+5	0.702	–17	0.21**	+10	0.512**	–18 0.138**	

Notes:

^a benchmark individuals' characteristics: permanent f.t. professional; 30–39 yrs old; less than 1 year's tenure; qualified to A level; living with partner; dependent children; £361–£430 p.w.; male; white; not a union member. Benchmark individual's workplace characteristics: 100–199 employees; manufacturing; UK owned; national market; non-union; part of a larger organization; 10–19 years old.

Predicted probabilities and significance levels calculated from coefficient estimates in appendix table 1.

*** significant at 1 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; * significant at 10 percent.

employees. Secondly, part-time short-term professionals are 44 percent less likely to have discussed their chances of promotion, 23 percent less likely to have discussed their training needs and 48 percent less likely to have received five days training or more. Finally, part-time permanent professionals are seven percent less likely to have discussed how they are getting on with their job, 41 percent less likely to have discussed their chances of promotion, and 23 percent less likely to have received five days training or more. There is also weak evidence (at the 10% significance level) that they are less likely to have

Table 5 The relationship between occupational level, contract type and consultation: predicted probabilities/marginal effects (marginal effect [% change] given, followed by predicted probability)

<i>'Frequently' asked for views on the following:</i>									
<i>Future plans for the workplace</i>			<i>Staffing issues including redundancy</i>		<i>Changes to work practices</i>		<i>Health and safety</i>		
Professionals									
Benchmark									
Full-time permanent professionals ^a	–	0.208	–	0.082	–	0.218	–	0.208	
Change to benchmark contract type									
Short-term f.t. prof.	–22	0.162**	–21	0.065	–33	0.147***	–10	0.188	
Short-term p.t. prof.	–7	0.193	–6	0.077	–2	0.213	–25	0.157**	
Permanent p.t. prof.	–18	0.171**	–16	0.069	–20	0.175**	–24	0.158***	
Non-professionals									
Benchmark									
Full-time permanent non-professionals ^a	–	0.123	–	0.041	–	0.143	–	0.151	
Change to benchmark contract type									
Short-term f.t. non-prof.	–17	0.102*	+22	0.05*	–6	0.134	+9	0.164	
Short-term p.t. non-prof.	+20	0.148	+110	0.086***	+28	0.183*	+18	0.178	
Permanent p.t. non-prof.	+8	0.133	+27	0.052**	+8	0.155	+11	0.168	
<i>Notes:</i>									
^a benchmark individuals' characteristics: 30–39 yrs old; less than 1 year's tenure; qualified to A level; living with partner; dependent children; £361–£430 p.w.; male; white; not a union member. Benchmark individual's workplace characteristics: 100–199 employees; manufacturing; UK owned; national market; non-union; part of a larger organization; 10–19 years old.									
Predicted probabilities and significance levels calculated from coefficient estimates reported in appendix table 2.									
*** significant at 1 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; * significant at 10 percent.									

discussed their training needs with their supervisor. Overall, therefore, there is considerable evidence to suggest that non-standard professionals receive poorer access to training and development opportunities than do their full-time permanent counterparts.

Taken together, these results confirm the findings of other studies concerning the negative impact of non-standard employment on training and development opportunities (Arulampalam and Booth, 1998; Booth et al., 2000). More specifically, they lend support to the argument developed elsewhere (Edwards and Robinson, 1999; Mallon and Duberley, 2000) that the marginalization of

non-standard employees within the workplace will occur *regardless* of occupational level.

Consultation

The predicted probabilities and marginal effects for the relationship between occupational level, non-standard employment and consultation are reported in Table 5 (the co-efficients from which these calculations are derived can be found in Appendix Table 2). Where non-professionals are concerned, the results do not provide any evidence that non-standard employees are less likely to be consulted than are their full-time permanent counterparts. Indeed, they are *more* likely to have been consulted in relation to staffing issues. This may be explained by the nature of the contracts themselves. Consultation may well occur because managers will need to ascertain information regarding the availability or employment plans of these groups when carrying out human resource planning activities.

However, the results in Table 5 suggest a different picture for professionals. Firstly, full-time short-term professionals are 22 percent less likely to be frequently asked for their views on future plans for the workplace and 33 percent less likely to be frequently asked for their views on changes to work practices than are their full-time permanent counterparts. Secondly, part-time short-term professionals are 25 percent less likely to be frequently asked for their views on health and safety. Finally, part-time permanent professionals are 18 percent less likely to be frequently asked for their views on future plans for the workplace, 20 percent less likely to be frequently asked about changes to work practices and 24 percent less likely to be frequently asked about health and safety.

There is therefore considerable evidence to suggest that non-standard professionals *are* less likely to be consulted than their full-time permanent counterparts. This is perhaps testimony to the role played by stereotypes and organizational culture in leading to the marginalization of these groups (Hunter et al., 1993). As has been widely suggested, employees on non-standard contracts may be consulted less frequently precisely because they are viewed as being transitory, less committed and less involved in the organization.

The impact of non-standard contracts by gender

This section considers the extent to which the marginalizing effects of non-standard employment are gendered. Tables 6 and 7 report the results of the analysis when male and female professionals are examined separately.

Training and development

Where females are concerned, Table 6 demonstrates firstly, that female short-term professionals are 29 percent less likely to have discussed their chances of promotion, 31 percent less likely to have discussed their training needs and 24

Table 6 The relationship between occupational level, contract type and training and development by gender: predicted probabilities/marginal effects (marginal effect [% change] given, followed by predicted probability)

	Discussions with supervisor during the last 12 months on:			Five or more days training either paid for or organized by employer
	How you are getting on with job	Chances of promotion	Training needs	
Females				
Benchmark				
Full-time permanent professionals ^a	– 0.775	– 0.3	– 0.665	– 0.251
Change to benchmark contract type				
Short-term f.t. prof.	–6 0.731	–29 0.214**	–31 0.456**	–24 0.19**
Short-term p.t. prof.	–5 0.736	–34 0.198**	–26 0.492***	–43 0.142***
Permanent p.t. prof.	–7 0.722*	–46 0.161***	–8 0.614	–17 0.209*
Males				
Benchmark				
Full-time permanent professionals ^a	– 0.772	– 0.339	– 0.619	– 0.239
Change to benchmark contract type				
Short-term f.t. prof.	–5 0.737	–32 0.23**	–6 0.581	–3 0.233
Short-term p.t. prof.	–10 0.696	–53 0.158	–14 0.53	–33 0.16
Permanent p.t. prof.	–2 0.756	–5 0.323	–12 0.542	–24 0.182
Female non-prof.	0.714	0.226	0.529	0.178
Male non-prof.	0.663	0.243	0.452	0.164

Notes:
^a benchmark individuals' characteristics: permanent f.t. professional; 30–39 yrs old; less than 1 year's tenure; qualified to A level; living with partner; dependent children; £361–£430 p.w.; male; white; not a union member. Benchmark individual's workplace characteristics: 100–199 employees; manufacturing; UK owned; national market; non-union; part of a larger organization; 10–19 years old.
Predicted probabilities and significance levels calculated from coefficient estimates in appendix table 1.
*** significant at 1 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; * significant at 10 percent.

percent less likely to have had five or more days training, than are their full-time permanent counterparts. Indeed, they are no more likely to have discussed these matters with their supervisor, and have received no more days training than female non-professionals. Secondly, female part-time short-term professionals are 34 percent less likely to have discussed their chances of promotion, 26 percent less likely to have discussed their training needs and 43 percent less likely

to have had five or more days training. They too are no more likely to have discussed these matters with their supervisor, and have received no more days training than female non-professionals. Thirdly, female part-time permanent professionals are 46 percent less likely to have discussed their chances of promotion, and are *less* likely to have held such discussions than are female non-professionals. There is also evidence at the 10 percent significance level that they are less likely to have discussed with their supervisor how they are getting on with their job, and have received fewer days training. The overall pattern of marginalization found within the full sample therefore holds where women are concerned.

By contrast, there is far less evidence of marginalization with regard to training and development opportunities where male professionals on non-standard contracts are concerned. The only disadvantaged group are male full-time short-term professionals who are 32 percent less likely to have discussed their chances of promotion than are their full-time permanent counterparts.

Consultation

Table 7 demonstrates that female non-standard professionals are less likely to be consulted in relation to a range of matters than are their full-time permanent counterparts. Firstly, those on full-time short-term contracts are 37 percent less likely have been frequently consulted on changes to work practices, and are no more likely to have been consulted than are female non-professionals. There is also evidence at the 10 percent significance level that they are less likely to be consulted on future plans for the workplace. Secondly, female part-time short-term professionals are 32 percent less likely to have been consulted on health and safety, and are no more likely than female non-professionals to have been consulted on this matter. Thirdly, female part-time permanent employees are less likely to have been consulted across all four measures, being 25 percent less likely to have been consulted on future plans for the workplace, 25 percent less likely to have been consulted on staffing issues, 20 percent less likely to have been consulted on changes to work practices and 29 percent less likely to have been consulted on health and safety. In the last of these cases, they are no more likely to have been consulted than female non-professionals.

Turning to male professionals, a different picture emerges. Again, evidence for marginalization relative to full-time permanent employees is much more limited. Firstly, male short-term professionals are 37 percent less likely to have been frequently consulted on staffing issues and 28 percent less likely to have been frequently consulted on changes to work practices. They are no more likely to have been consulted on either of these matters than non-professional employees. There is also evidence at the 10 percent significance level that male part-time permanent professionals are less likely to have been consulted on changes to work practices. There is no evidence, however, that male part-time short-term professionals are less likely to have been consulted on any of the four matters asked about.

Table 7 The relationship between occupational level, contract type and consultation by gender: predicted probabilities/ marginal effects (Marginal effect [% change] given, followed by predicted probability)

	'Frequently' asked for views on the following:			
	Future plans for the workplace	Staffing issues including redundancy	Changes to work practices	Health and safety
Females				
Benchmark				
Full-time permanent professionals ^a	– 0.243	– 0.093	– 0.259	– 0.193
Change to benchmark contract type				
Short-term f.t. prof.	–24 0.185*	–4 0.089	–37 0.163***	–6 0.182
Short-term p.t. prof.	–21 0.191	–29 0.066	–20 0.208	–32 0.131**
Permanent p.t. prof.	–25 0.182***	–25 0.07**	–20 0.206**	–29 0.137***
Males				
Benchmark				
Full-time permanent professionals ^a	– 0.207	– 0.083	– 0.216	– 0.206
Change to benchmark contract type				
Short-term ft prof.	–19 0.167	–37 0.052**	–28 0.156**	–14 0.178
Short-term pt prof.	+18 0.244	+6 0.088	+25 0.271	–23 0.158
Permanent pt prof.	+18 0.244	–7 0.077	–29 0.154*	–21 0.162
Female non-prof.	0.14	0.047	0.172	0.138
Male non-prof.	0.12	0.043	0.145	0.154

Notes:
^a benchmark individuals' characteristics: 30–39 yrs old; less than 1 year's tenure; qualified to A level; living with partner; dependent children; £361–£430 p.w.; male; white; not a union member. Benchmark individual's workplace characteristics: 100–199 employees; manufacturing; UK owned; national market; non-union; part of a larger organization; 10–19 years old.
Predicted probabilities and significance levels calculated from coefficient estimates in appendix table 2.
*** significant at 1 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; * significant at 10 percent.

The results therefore demonstrate strong gender effects with regard to the extent to which non-standard employment results in marginalization at professional level. Where women are concerned, there is widespread evidence that non-standard contracts are associated with marginalization. Where men are concerned, these effects are considerably weaker.

Although not reported here, a similar gender analysis was conducted on the non-professional sub-sample. Here too, female employees on non-standard contracts experience a greater degree of marginalization than men relative to

their full-time permanent counterparts. As such, our study confirms other research that points to the more generally gendered consequences of part-time and temporary employment (see for example, Gallie et al., 1998; Warren and Walters, 1998). However, our results also indicate that this pattern occurs irrespective of occupational level.

Discussion and conclusions

The main conclusion to draw from the results presented here is that, overall, the marginalizing consequences of non-standard employment do apply regardless of occupational level. As such, one might question Tilly's (1992) notion of 'dualism' within part-time employment, whereby professionals form a distinct 'retention' part-time workforce that is treated no differently from the full-time, permanent workforce. The findings also point to the marginalization of professional employees on temporary contracts, contrary to the results of other studies (for example, see Gallie et al., 1998).

Of course, when drawing these conclusions it is important to recognize that the non-standard workforce, even at higher occupational levels, is far from 'homogeneous and uniform' (Walsh and Deery, 1999: 51). Turning to our own data, the diversity of experience is quite startling, especially where gender is concerned. For female professionals (the vast majority of the professional non-standard workforce), non-standard employment is strongly associated with marginalization at work, above all with regard to training and development opportunities. By contrast, for male professionals, the negative consequences of temporary or part-time employment are far less severe and in some instances virtually non-existent.

One explanation for these findings is that female professionals tend to occupy the 'lower level and least secure occupational niches of their professions' (Purcell, 2000: 120). The negative consequences of part-time and temporary employment can therefore be linked to a wider tendency for women to become ghettoized and segregated within male dominated professions (Scott, 1994). Closely related to this is the strong 'gender dimension' of the stereotypes that shape management preconceptions of temporary and part-time employees (Hunter et al., 1993; Rubery et al., 1994). While any individual entering into a non-standard contract may be viewed as 'untrustworthy' or as lacking in commitment, these assumptions are likely to be especially strong where female professionals are concerned (Walsh, 1999: 179).

Caveats

In interpreting the results presented here, it is necessary to bear several caveats in mind. The first relates to the broad 'professional' category used in the analysis, comprising Standard Occupational Classifications 1 to 3 (managers and senior administrators, professionals and associate professionals). This category,

in itself, is heterogeneous – incorporating occupations as diverse as general managers, bank managers, teachers, nurses and lawyers – and it is possible that the consequences of non-standard employment will vary between these sub-groups. In this article we were unable to test for this in greater depth as the WERS 98 employee survey only provides SOC data at the major group level. The second caveat concerns the fact that the analysis does not take industry differences into account, other than as a control variable. Again, it was difficult to test for this using the WERS 98 data because of the relatively low number of observations that fall into the non-standard contract categories within each industry major group. A final caveat concerns the notion of employee work orientation. Other research shows that there are differences between contingent and full-time permanent employees in terms of their work-related demands and expectations (Barling and Gallagher, 1996; Walsh, 1999), differences which could impact on responses to work-related survey questions. It is not possible, however, to control for such differences within the WERS 98 employee survey data.

Implications of the findings

The remainder of this article focuses on the more general implications of the findings. The first concerns the wider costs and benefits of non-standard contracts for professional employees. As suggested earlier, much of the recent literature has focused on the benefits that accrue to part-time and temporary employees at this level. Part-time employment, for example, is seen as a way in which individuals can balance work/life interests without necessarily sacrificing their careers (Tilly, 1992). Some forms of temporary work are also viewed as being advantageous, not only in financial terms, but in allowing individuals to pursue flexible ‘portfolio’ or ‘boundaryless careers’ (Harvey and Kanwal, 2000: 129).

Although the findings described in this article do not completely refute this account, they do suggest a need to recognize that, for many professionals, non-standard employment is far from cost-free. While there may be real and ‘abstract gains’ in terms of wider careers and work experiences, such employment is also associated with ‘tangible losses’ (Cohen and Mallon, 1999: 346; Dex et al., 2000). For women in particular, the decision to enter into a part-time or temporary contract is likely to mean reduced opportunities for training and development and also greater exclusion from decision-making processes. This, in turn, may have longer-term implications for careers (especially for those working on part-time contracts), leading to further ghettoization and the loss of valued organizational assets.

The second implication concerns management strategies relating to the use of non-standard contracts. In the practitioner literature it is frequently argued that the costs of non-standard employment could outweigh the benefits unless organizations implement radical changes in their human resource management practice (Sparrow, 1998). Such change, it is suggested, requires a more ‘strate-

gic' approach towards the management of these employees, or a 'new deal' in which employment security is traded in for greater 'employability' (Herriot and Pemberton, 1997). The implication of this is that non-standard employees should be treated no differently from their full-time permanent counterparts.

The findings reported in this article suggest that the majority of organizations in the UK have not yet developed these strategies. Even where professionals are concerned – women in particular – the pattern seems to be one in which non-standard employees are marginalized rather than offered new opportunities to enhance their 'employability'. As Mallon and Duberley (2000: 43) suggest, most organizations appear to be rooted in a more 'traditional view of HR practice which assumes that training and development, communication practices, feedback, etc. are issues for bona fide employed members of the organization . . . '.

Thirdly, our findings have implications for national-level training and skill development policies in the UK. As noted earlier, there is likely to be a 'trade-off between expanding the more marginal forms of employment and expanding the proportion of the workforce getting work-related training' (Arulampalam and Booth, 1998: 522). The implication of this is that any expansion in the non-standard workforce could have negative consequences for skill development within the economy as a whole and, ultimately, for macro-economic performance (Heery and Salmon, 2000).

The findings described in this article not only lend support to this interpretation, but also suggest that the problems may be more acute than previously recognized. It is often argued that the inadequacies of the UK's training systems lie primarily (if not exclusively) at intermediate levels and below. Generally speaking, it is assumed that higher occupational groups have better access to training provision (Green, 1999). Indeed, management development – an area that not so long ago represented a key area of concern – is now thought to be in a 'more robust state' (Storey and Tate, 2000: 195). However, our findings suggest that even this limited success may be undermined if more managers and professionals continue to enter non-standard employment.

Finally, the results reported in this article have possible legal implications. Firstly, the Part-time Workers (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000 make it unlawful to treat part-time workers less favourably than comparable full-time workers in respect of all their terms and conditions of employment, unless such treatment can be objectively justified. The Department for Trade and Industry has stated that denying part-time employees access to training will be construed as less favourable treatment (Industrial Relations Services, 2001). Secondly, the Fixed-Term Employees (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations, aim to prevent fixed-term employees from being treated less favourably than similar permanent employees. While the data used in this article were collected prior to the introduction of these regulations, they nevertheless demonstrate the extent to which change will have been necessary if organizations are to be in compliance with the law. Whether such change has occurred remains very much open to question.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Department of Trade and Industry, the Economic and Social Research Council, the Advisory Conciliatory and Arbitration Service and the Policy Studies Institute as the originators of the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey data, and the Data Archive at the University of Essex as the distributor of the data. None of these organizations bears any responsibility for our analysis and interpretation of the data. We would also like to thank Chris Forde, Ed Heery, Paul Stewart and three anonymous referees for their helpful comments and suggestions.

Notes

- 1 A full description of the design of the WERS 98 survey can be found in Cully et al. (1999: 6–8).
- 2 The data within the probit and ordered probit analyses are weighted by the inverse of each workplace's probability of selection into the sample. This is essential if unbiased population estimates are to be obtained, as large workplaces are over-represented within the WERS 98 sample design. This allows for the probability of selection of the respondent's workplace into the main management sample; the respondent's own probability of selection from the employee population at the workplace; and bias introduced as a result of employee non-response, to be taken into account. It is also necessary to take into account the clustering of the employee data into primary sampling units (in this case, workplaces). Setting the PSU to the identifier variable 'SERNO' allows for greater confidence in the standard errors achieved.
- 3 The categorizations here are based on the 1990 Standard Occupational Classification. This classification has since been superseded.

References

- Albert, S. and Bradley, K. (1997) *Managing Knowledge: Experts, Agencies and Organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arulampalam, W. and Booth, A.L. (1998) 'Training and Labour Market Flexibility: Is There A Trade Off?', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 36(4): 521–36.
- Barling, J. and Gallagher, D.G. (1996) 'Part-time Employment', in C.L. Cooper and I.T. Robertson (eds) *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology* pp. 243–77. Chichester: Wiley.
- Booth, A., Franesconi, M. and Frank, J. (2000) *Contingent Jobs: Who Gets Them, What are They Worth and Do They Lead Anywhere?*. Essex: Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- Cam, S., Purcell, J. and Tailby, S. (2000) *Contingent Employment in the UK, NUEWO project*, draft report.
- Cohen, L. and Mallon, M. (1999) 'The Transition from Organisational Employment to Portfolio Work: Perceptions of "Boundarylessness"', *Work Employment and Society* 13(2): 329– 52.

- Cully, M., Woodland, S., O'Reilly, A. and Dix, G. (1999) *Britain at Work: as Depicted by the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey*. London: Routledge.
- Department of Trade and Industry (1999) *Workplace Employee Relations Survey: Cross-Section, 1998* [Computer File], Fourth edition. Colchester: The Data Archive [distributor], 22 December 1999, SN: 3955.
- Dex, S. and McCulloch, A. (1997) *Flexible Employment*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Dex, S., Wills, J., Paterson, R. and Sheppard, E. (2000) 'Freelance Workers and Contract Uncertainty: The Effects of Contractual Changes in the Television Industry', *Work Employment and Society* 14(2): 283–305.
- Edwards, C. and Robinson, O. (1999) 'Managing Part-Timers in the Police Service: A Study of Inflexibility', *Human Resource Management Journal* 9(4): 5–18.
- Felstead, A. and Jewson, N. (eds) (1999) *Global Trends in Flexible Labour*. London: Macmillan.
- Felstead, A., Krahn, H. and Powell, M. (1999) 'Young and Old at Risk: Comparative Trends in "Non-Standard" Patterns of Employment in Canada and the United Kingdom', *International Journal of Manpower* 20(5): 277–96.
- Forde, C. and Slater, G. (2001) 'Just a temporary phenomenon? The rise and fall of temporary work in the UK', paper presented at the European Work and Employment Research Centre, Manchester School of Management, March.
- Gallie, D., White, M., Cheng, Y. and Tomlinson, M. (1998) *Restructuring the Employment Relationship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Green, F. (1999) 'Training the Workers', in P. Gregg and J. Wadsworth (eds) *The State of Working Britain*, pp. 127–46. Manchester University Press.
- Harvey, C. and Kanwal, S. (2000) 'Self Employed IT Knowledge Workers and the Experience of Flexibility: Evidence from the United Kingdom', in K. Purcell (ed.), *Changing Boundaries in Employment*. Bristol: Bristol Academic Press.
- Heery, E. and Salmon, J. (eds) (2000) *The Insecure Workforce*. London: Routledge.
- Herriot, P. and Pemberton, C. (1997) 'Facilitating New Deals', *Human Resource Management Journal* 7(1): 45–56.
- Hunter, L., McGregor, A., MacInnes, J. and Sproull, A. (1993) 'The "Flexible Firm": Strategy and Segmentation', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 31(3): 383–407.
- Industrial Relations Services (2001) 'Part-time Working Options and Arrangements', *IRS Employment Trends*, 735, September.
- Labour Force Survey (1998) *LFS Historical Supplement: Spring Quarters 1984–1998*. London: Office for National Statistics.
- Legge, K. (1998) 'Flexibility: The Gift-wrapping of Employment Degradation?', in P. Sparrow and M. Marchington (eds), *Human Resource Management: The New Agenda*, pp. 286–95. London: Pitman.
- Mallon, M. and Duberley, J. (2000) 'Managers and Professionals in the Contingent Workforce', *Human Resource Management Journal* 10(1): 33–47.
- Millward, N., Bryson, A. and Forth, J. (2000) *All Change at Work: British Employment Relations 1980–98*. London: Routledge.
- Peck, J. and Theodore, N. (1998) 'The Business of Contingent Work: Growth and Restructuring in Chicago's Temporary Employment Industry', *Work Employment and Society* 12(4): 655–74.
- Purcell, K. (2000) 'Gendered employment insecurity?', in E. Heery and J. Salmon (eds), *The Insecure Workforce*, pp. 112–39. London: Routledge.

- Rubery, J., Horrell, S. and Burchell, B. (1994) 'Part-Time Work and Gender Inequality in The Labour Market', in A. MacEwen Scott (ed.) *Gender Segregation and Social Change*, pp. 205–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, A. (1994) *Gender Segregation and Social Change*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, R. (1998) 'Presenteeism, Power and Organisational Change: Long Hours as a Career Barrier and the Impact on the Working Lives of Women Managers', *British Journal of Management*, 9: S37–50.
- Sparrow, P. (1998) 'New Organisational Forms, Processes, Jobs and Psychological Contracts: Resolving HRM Issues', in P. Sparrow and M. Marchington (eds), *Human Resource Management: The New Agenda*, pp. 117–41. London: Pitman.
- Storey, J. and Tate, W. (2000) 'Management Development', in S. Bach and K. Sisson (eds) *Personnel Management*, pp. 195–217. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tilly, C. (1992) 'Dualism in Part-time Employment', *Industrial Relations* 31(2): 330–47.
- Tregaskis, O. (1997) 'The "Non-permanent" Reality!', *Employee Relations* 19(6): 535–54.
- Walsh, J. (1999) 'Myths and Counter-Myths: An Analysis of Part-time Female Employees and their Orientations to Work and Working Hours', *Work Employment and Society* 12(2): 179–203.
- Walsh, J. and Deery, S. (1999) 'Understanding the Peripheral Workforce: Evidence from the Service Sector', *Human Resources Management Journal* 9(2): 50–63.
- Ward, K., Grimshaw, D., Rubery, J. and Beynon, H. (2001) 'Dilemmas in the Management of Temporary Work Agency Staff', *Human Resource Management Journal* 11(4): 3–21.
- Warren, T. and Walters, P. (1998) 'Appraising a Dichotomy: A Review of "Part-time/Full-time" in the Study of Women's Employment in Britain', *Gender Work and Organisation* 5(2): 102–18.

Kim Hoque

Kim Hoque is a senior lecturer in Human Resource Management at Nottingham University Business School. His current research interests include gender and race disadvantage, training, the nature and influence of the personnel/HR function and small and medium sized enterprises. He has published widely in several prestigious journals. Address: Nottingham University Business School, Jubilee Campus, Wollaton Road, Nottingham, NG8 1BB, UK.
E-mail: kim.hoque@nottingham.ac.uk

Ian Kirkpatrick

Ian Kirkpatrick is a senior lecturer in Human Resource Management at Leeds University Business School. His current research interests include the new public management, changes in professional work organization and the development of equal opportunities policies and practices in Spain. He has published widely in several prestigious journals.

Address: Leeds University Business School, Maurice Keyworth Building, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK.

E-mail: ik@lubs.leeds.ac.uk

Date submitted July 2002

Date accepted January 2003