

**Mapping the Care Workforce:
supporting joined-up thinking**

**Secondary analysis of the Labour Force Survey
for childcare and social care work**

**Antonia Simon, Charlie Owen, Peter Moss and
Claire Cameron**

**Thomas Coram Research Unit
Institute of Education University of London**

Acknowledgements

This work was undertaken by the Thomas Coram Research Unit, which receives support from the Department of Health; the views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Department of Health.

Material from the Labour Force Survey is Crown Copyright; has been made available by the Office for National Statistics through the UK Data Archive and has been used with permission. Neither the ONS nor the UK Data Archive bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretation of the data reported here.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Chapter One

- This report maps the care workforce in England at the end of the 1990s, including numbers, characteristics, employment conditions and regional comparisons. It does this by secondary analysis of the Labour Force Survey (LFS). The care workforce covers childcare and social care, but also compares occupations within these broad sectors with occupations in education and nursing, as well as other non-care occupations with a high percentage of women workers.
- In addition to mapping the care workforce, including comparison between the childcare and social care workforces, the objectives of the report are to evaluate the occupational groups used in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC); and to identify gaps in information.
- The work has been undertaken in the context of increasing concern in childcare and social care, but also in related areas of education and health, about recruitment and retention. Roles and responsibilities of occupations are being questioned, which raises questions about the future shape and structure of care work and the relationship between care, health and education work.

Chapter Two

- The Labour Force Survey, and the occupational categories used in the secondary analysis, are introduced.
- Detailed tables are provided in Appendix Two.
- The care workforce has been defined in this study as consisting of five occupational groups making up the social care workforce and three occupational groups making up the childcare workforce. There are 754,000 social care workers, and 348,000 childcare workers, making a total of 1.1 million. This care workforce has been compared with two other 'human services' workforces - education workers (785,000) and nursing workers (576,000) – together with four occupational groups with high percentages of women workers and all women workers.
- The care workforce is extremely gendered. It is characterised by a high proportion of female workers, who account for 1 million out of the 1.1 million total. *Social*

Workers/Probation Officers is the only occupation group with a sizeable minority of male workers.

- The care workforce is homogeneous in terms of age. With the important exception of the *Nursery Nurses* (who have the youngest age profile of all care workers), the care workforce has a middle-aged profile, with a mean age of between 37 and 45 years. Unlike the high percentage female jobs group, which visibly has two age peaks (possibly indicating a movement out of employment to have children and then a return to employment), the care workforce has a different life course pattern, one in which there is only one age peak – occurring between 35 and 49 years for both the childcare and social care workers.
- A high proportion of childcare workers, 58 percent, live with children. The proportion is lower among social care workers, 40 percent, similar to all women workers.
- The care workforce has a homogeneous ethnic profile. The great majority are of white ethnic origin. However, social care has rather more minority ethnic workers than does childcare, or all women workers, in particular *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers*.
- Social care workers have higher proportions with a work-limiting disability than the average (i.e. compared to the all women workers group) and also compared to the childcare workers group.
- The care workforce has low annual and hourly earnings, compared to other ‘human services’ workers (i.e. nursing and education workers) and to all women workers. This is especially true for the childcare workers, whose hourly pay is two-thirds of the average for all women workers.
- Social care workers on average work 32 hours a week, similar to all women workers, compared to 22 hours among childcare workers. Social care workers are more likely than childcare workers to work full time. Full-time work varies from 80 percent of *Social Workers/Probation Officers* to less than 25 percent of *Playgroup leaders* and *Other Childcare occupations*.
- The qualification level of social care workers is similar to that for all women workers, but is lower among childcare workers. Just over a third of social care workers and just under a quarter of childcare workers are qualified at NVQ level 3 or higher. The qualification level of both groups is, however, far lower than

nursing or education workers, while within both social care and childcare there are occupational groups with very low qualification levels, in particular *Care Assistants/Attendants, Cleaners and domestics* and *Other Childcare Occupations*.

- Social care workers are more likely to have undergone recent work-related training than childcare workers. The proportions are particularly high for *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and *Welfare/Community/Youth workers*, and particularly low for *Cleaners/domestics* and *Other childcare occupations*.
- Just over half of both social care workers and childcare workers are in the private sector, the proportion being lower than for all women workers. The distribution for individual occupations varies considerably, from 17 percent of *Social Workers/Probation Officers*, to 83 percent of *Playgroup leaders*.
- Average hourly earnings were generally higher in the public sector than in the private sector.
- There are a number of regional variations. Among social care workers, Inner London stands out for having the highest proportion of male workers and graduates and the highest rates of pay. Among childcare workers, Inner London is not so distinctive, although it has relatively high rates of pay.

Chapter Three

- The Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) is shown to have a number of deficiencies. However, it is better way of defining the care workforce than is the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC), since many care workers work outside of the social work ‘industry’.
- SOC also allows a better level of detail. Because of the broad classifications in SIC, examination of the care workforce using SIC includes many other occupations that appear to be only indirectly related to care work, or quite unconnected.
- The Chapter reviews and compares other sources on the social care and childcare workforces.

Chapter Four

- A cluster analysis was conducted to compare occupations in the four main human services sectors – social care, childcare, nursing and education. Occupations

cluster into three groups, cutting across sectors: a professional group, a low skilled group and a middle group. There is much greater difference between the professional group and the other two groups than between the low skilled and middle groups.

- This concluding chapter reviews a number of issues including: multiple competitors for a limited pool of workers; the highly gendered workforce; the care responsibilities of the care workforce; and ethnicity, including why some occupations attract more minority ethnic workers than others.
- A number of inadequacies in the SOC are identified and discussed, including the impossibility of identifying important occupational groups such as home helps, nannies and childminders
- Information gaps that might be filled through large-scale data sets such as the LFS include care responsibilities of workers and job movement between different occupations and sectors.
- The report argues for a joined-up approach to the future direction of care work, involving not only a number of government departments but also a range of other partners. This will need to address several critical questions concerning the nature, structuring and conditions of care work, should take account of the relationship between care, education and health work, as well as covering paid and unpaid care work.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
Chapter One.....	ii
Chapter Two.....	ii
Chapter Three.....	iv
Chapter Four.....	iv
CONTENTS	1
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	3
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	5
The problem with ‘Care’.....	5
Objectives and scope.....	7
Defining the Care Workforce.....	8
Why take a joined-up approach?.....	10
What follows?.....	14
CHAPTER TWO: MAIN FINDINGS	16
Occupations in the Care Workforce.....	16
The Labour Force Survey.....	18
Data Findings.....	19
Comparisons.....	34
Summary.....	38
CHAPTER THREE: CRITICAL EVALUATION	41
Industry.....	41
Comparing two approaches to defining the care workforce.....	41
Comparability to other data sources.....	46
Summary.....	51
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSIONS	58
Getting an overview.....	58
Recruitment and retention.....	61
Gender and care responsibilities.....	62
Ethnicity.....	65
Adequacy of the LFS coding.....	66
REFERENCES	71

Appendix One	74
Technical note.....	74
Appendix Two	82
Data Tables.....	82

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 2: Workers in social care occupations or childcare occupations who are coded within the social work industry and coded outside the social work industry	42
Table 3: Proportions of social work industry made up of care occupations and other occupations.....	44
Table 4: Industries (other than 'Social Work') in which social care workers are found.....	52
Table 5a: Data available on the social care workforce.....	53
Table 5b: Data available on the childcare workforce.....	56
Figure 1: Dendrogram for hierarchical cluster analysis of occupations.	59
Table 6: Age profiles of the occupation groups.....	83
Table 7: Ethnic composition of the occupation groups.....	84
Table 8: Gender of the occupation groups.....	85
Table 9: Marital status of the occupation groups.....	86
Table 10: NVQ levels of the occupation groups.....	87
Table 11: Highest Qualification of the occupation groups.....	88
Table 12: Age at which the occupation groups completed their full-time education.....	89
Table 13: Proportions co-residing with children.....	90
Table 14: Proportions that are enrolled on an education course.....	91
Table 15: Proportions that have taken up work related training.....	92
Table 16: Proportions with a work limiting disability.....	93
Table 17: Proportions working in the public and private sectors.....	94
Table 18: Proportions working in different organisations within the Public sector.....	95
Table 19: Hourly pay in the public and private sectors.....	96
Table 20: Proportions in a permanent and temporary job.....	97
Table 21: Proportions in full-time and part-time employment.....	98
Table 22: Annual pay, hours worked, hourly pay and Months continuously employed for the occupation groups.....	99
Table 23a: Gender breakdown of the Social Care Workers by the regions of England.....	100

Table 23b: Gender breakdown of the Childcare Workers by the regions of England.....	101
Table 24a: Highest Qualification breakdown of the Social Care Workers by the regions of England.....	102
Table 24b: Highest Qualification breakdown of the Childcare Workers by the regions of England.....	103
Table 25a: Proportions of Social Care Workers in the private/public sectors by the regions of England.....	104
Table 25b: Proportions of Childcare Workers in the private/public sectors by the regions of England.....	105
Table 26a: Proportions of Social Care Workers working full-time/part-time by the regions of England.....	106
Table 26b: Proportions of Childcare Workers working full-time/part-time by the regions of England.....	107
Table 27: Annual gross pay, hours worked and hourly pay of the ‘Care Workforce’ by the regions of England.....	108

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The problem with 'Care'

“Care is at one and the same time a growing concern for welfare states and an ever more frequent object of social policy. To grasp why care is becoming increasingly problematic for states and societies, one must only note that there has been a change in the context of care.....[D]emographic and financial factors have acted as pressures increasing the demand for care whereas the social factors, in particular changing norms about family and kin responsibilities and the role of women, have contributed to a transformation of the conditions under which care has been traditionally organised. All of these together have acted to effectively decrease the supply of care at a time when demand is rising”

Mary Daly and Jane Lewis (2000): 288

There is an increasing problem surrounding care work, whether that work is provided within the family or outside by paid care workers, and whether that work is with young children, frail elderly people or any other group. Given ‘the transformation of the conditions under which care has been traditionally organised’ – basically increases in demand and decreases in traditional sources of supply – one question is ‘*who* will do care work in the future?’ But a related question emerges as increasing amounts of care are undertaken outside the home and by paid, non-familial carers: ‘what is the nature of paid care work?’ Is it simply an attempt to replicate or substitute care in the home or family? Or does it become another sort of activity – for which, in some cases, ‘care’ may not even be an adequate description?

At present, this is most clearly seen in the field of childcare for children of working parents. Increasing numbers of children receive institutional or other forms of non-familial care as mothers join fathers in the labour market. However, since 1998 responsibility for that care has been moved from the welfare, or social care, system to the education system, and increasing attention is paid to the educational role of services providing such care. Indeed, in some countries, most of the work in what in Britain are still referred to as ‘childcare’ services (whether nurseries or out-of-school care services) is undertaken by professions who do not define themselves only in terms of care: teachers (Spain, Sweden) or social pedagogues (Denmark).

This report is part of a series of studies being conducted at the Thomas Coram Research Unit (TCRU) into care work and the care workforce, examining the present situation and exploring possible future directions. The work reported on here, together with a linked literature review, focuses on the present situation. Work on future directions adopts a European perspective, and includes a five nation study of social pedagogy as a profession in residential care for children (also funded by the Department of Health, and undertaken in the first half of 2001), and a pan-European study of care work, both with children and adults (funded by the European Commission, which commenced in Summer 2001).

The TCRU studies are mainly conducted at national or cross-national levels, although this report does contain some information at regional level. It is, however, relevant at a more local level, with messages for policy-makers, managers, trainers and practitioners. For, ultimately, the problems and issues identified in this study play themselves out as matters arising locally in the recruitment and retention of Care Workers. If the future of Care Work is a strategic issue of major national import, requiring a joined-up approach, as we believe it to be, local experience has a large role to play in informing strategy: the success of that strategy will be judged by its ability to provide satisfactory answers locally. The local has to be understood in a national context, while the national has to be aware of the diversity of local conditions and needs.

Objectives and scope

This is a report on the first stage of a two-stage study titled a *Review of the Care Workforce: Supporting Joined-up Thinking*. The focus of the study is the current situation of two broad groups of care workers - childcare workers and social care workers – referred to below as the care workforce. We will define and discuss these groups in more detail later in this chapter and in subsequent chapters, but, for the moment, confine ourselves to noting that they constitute a substantial workforce – over a million workers in England alone – providing care in many settings, in both public and private sectors and for all ages, from babies to elderly people. They are also the responsibility of different national government Departments, in England, for example, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and the Department of Health (DH).

The main objectives of the study are five fold:

1. *To map the care workforce*, both in childcare and social care, to include: (i) estimates of the numbers employed in the different occupational groups; (ii) the characteristics of the workforce in each occupation, including gender, age, ethnicity, parental status, education and qualifications; (iii) status and conditions of employment, including if employed in the public or private sector, contractual status, hours and pay; and (iv) regional comparisons.
2. *To evaluate critically the occupational groups* used in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) with respect to their relevance to policy making and planning.
3. *To review research and other evidence on the care workforce*, both in childcare and social care, with respect to a range of key issues, including: (i) staff recruitment, retention, loss, movement and turnover, including reasons for entering and leaving the work; (ii) gender issues in ‘Care Work’, including the reasons for and consequences of the work being highly gendered; (iii) job attitudes, including job commitment and satisfaction, perceived status and stigma attaching to the work, understandings of the work, and views about formal care in relation to informal care; (iv) how workers experience and manage the relationship between doing care work and having their

own care responsibilities; and (v) future training and employment expectations and aspirations.

4. *To identify gaps in information*, which may merit further investigation in further research.

5. *To make comparisons between childcare and social care* overall, and between individual occupations within these broad fields, with respect to 1 and 3 above.

This report is concerned with the first two objectives: mapping the care workforce and critically evaluating occupational groupings used in the SOC. This work draws mainly on secondary analysis of the Labour Force Survey (LFS), conducted at the Thomas Coram Research Unit. Later in the report, we compare our approach to mapping the care workforce with that adopted in other major quantitative studies.

The second stage of the study is a review of the literature and in particular addresses the third objective. Both stages of this study are concerned with the fourth and fifth objectives, identifying gaps in information and taking a comparative approach. However, the division of labour is not quite so clear as this might imply. The mapping exercise provides a framework for the review, both providing information and raising issues. While the review may add some details to the large-scale mapping undertaken in the first stage, and throw more light on to some of the findings from this stage.

A final point by way of introduction concerns geographical coverage. This report is based on LFS data for England. While there may be many similarities with Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, these cannot be automatically assumed. Our findings and conclusions therefore apply only to England.

Defining the Care Workforce

As we shall explain in more detail in the next chapter, our definition of the care workforce has been based on occupational classifications in use in the Labour Force Survey – and, as we shall discuss, these are not ideal either for research or policy purposes. On this basis, the childcare workforce consists of three groups from the SOC: *Nursery Nurses*, *Playgroups Leaders* and *Other Childcare Occupations*.

Broadly speaking, these occupations cover: people working with children up to around the age of 14 years (the upper age limit of the National Childcare Strategy) in group settings, such as nurseries, playgroups, out-of-school centres and play services; as well as people working individually, in private home settings, as childminders, nannies and so on. This workforce is mainly situated in what the Children Act 1989 refers to as ‘day care services’, or in the kind of services now encompassed by the National Childcare Strategy – rather than in ‘child care’ work as the term is often used within the child welfare system, to include children who are looked after or who are considered to be at risk or in need¹.

Broadly speaking, childcare workers as defined in this stage of the study come under the purview of the DfES in England, since the transfer of responsibility for day care services from the DH in 1998. Social care workers, in contrast, are the responsibility of the DH, and work in a range of settings and jobs: as social workers and probation officers, in community and youth work, in residential establishments for children and adults, in day centres, and as domiciliary workers, supporting elderly people in particular in their own homes. For our purposes, the social care workforce is drawn from five groups in the SOC: *Social Workers/Probation Officers, Matrons/Houseparents, Welfare/Community/Youth Workers, Care Assistants/Attendants and Cleaners/Domestics*².

To help place these two workforces (childcare and social care, referred to collectively here as the care workforce) in occupational context, we have also looked at four other groups of workers: (a) in education services; (b) in nursing services; (c) in a selection of occupations with high levels of female workers; and (d) all women workers. The first two have been included to see whether other occupational groups in ‘human services’ have similar profiles to the childcare workers and the social care workers, and because, as we argue below, a ‘joined-up’ approach might need to encompass health and education workers as well as care workers. The last two groups, which cover other female-dominated jobs and all female workers, are relevant because

¹ ‘Childcare’ (one word) is used here (as well as by others such as the DfES) to refer to nurseries, childminders and similar provision for children, mainly used while parents are at work; ‘child care’ (two words) is used to refer to residential and other social welfare provisions for children who are ‘looked after’ or ‘in need’.

² As explained in more detail in Chapter Two, only those *Cleaners/Domestics* who work within ‘Social Work’ are included in the analysis.

childcare work and social care work are both, in large measure, gendered employment, with high levels of female workers: mapping them constantly raises the question of how similar or different they look to the generality of women workers. All four of these groups are defined and described in more detail in the next chapter.

Having dwelled on whom we have included, it is important to emphasise two important exclusions. Foster Carers have not been included, as these were not identified as an occupation in the SOC³. Perhaps more importantly, much care work, whether involving children or adults, is unpaid and undertaken by neighbours, friends and, in particular, relatives (Deven, Inglis, Moss, & Petrie, 1998; Mooney, Moss & Owen, 2001). Because this care work is not paid employment, it does not figure in the Labour Force Survey, nor therefore in this study. Although there may be a gradual secular trend increasing the proportion of care work that is paid, this is not well documented and much care work remains in the informal, unpaid sector. A strategic, joined-up approach to care and care work will need to include not only the public and private sectors, but also this major sector of unpaid caring.

Why take a joined-up approach?

As we discuss in Chapter Three, major data sources on the care workforce (other than the LFS) cover one part only – either the social care workforce *or* the childcare workforce. The same is true of most research, as the second stage of our study shows. Our approach in this study has been to take a joined-up approach to care work, in the sense that we have looked at both childcare workers *and* social care workers, as well as relating these occupational groups to occupations in the wider ‘human services’ field, in education and health. The approach therefore is cross-occupational, cross-sectoral and cross-departmental. What is the rationale for taking this approach? At least three linked reasons can be offered.

First, there is a growing demand for workers in both the childcare and social care sectors, in response to demographic and economic trends and to policy initiatives, and evidence in both of recruitment and retention problems. The numbers of employed mothers, especially with children under 5 years, has grown rapidly since the late 1980s (Brannen, Moss, Owen & Wale, 1997; Bower, 2001; Twomey, 2001: Table C).

³ Foster Carers are discussed in more detail in chapter 4, under ‘Adequacy of the LFS coding’.

Over the last 10 years, the number of places in private nurseries increased nearly five fold (DfEE, 2000: Table 2), while the need to stimulate yet more childcare provision is a central objective of the National Childcare Strategy. DfES planning guidance for 2001-2 sets a target for Early Years Development and Childcare Partnerships (EYDCPs) in England of providing childcare places for 1 million extra children by 2004 (DfEE, 2001).

More places mean more staff. The same EYDCP planning guidance sets a further target of boosting 'recruitment at national and local level so as to expand significantly the workforce for early years, childcare and play services to meet the demand of expanding services' (*ibid.*: 40). It also sets targets for the composition of this expanding workforce - covering men (6 percent), ethnic minorities (also 6 percent), people with disabilities (15 percent), and people aged 40 years and over (40 percent) (*ibid.*: 40)

At the same time, demand for social care services is also growing, in response to an increasing elderly population and a range of government policies emphasising community care and improved child welfare services. The result again has been a need for more workers: 'social care has been one of the fastest growing employment sectors in recent years' (DH, 1998: para.5.1).

However, finding and keeping staff is proving difficult. There is evidence in both childcare and social care of recruitment and retention problems, with the word 'crisis' increasingly used. In the childcare field, heads of nurseries frequently report recruitment problems (Cameron, Owen & Moss, 2001), while between 1996 and 2000 the number of childminders fell by more than a quarter (26 percent) (DfEE, 2000). A recent article has referred to 'a recruitment crisis of endemic proportions' in the staffing of nurseries attributed to several factors: rapid expansion of childcare provision putting extreme pressure on the supply of suitably qualified staff; private nurseries competing with higher salaries and better conditions of work available in publicly funded services; and regional difficulties in areas of high cost housing (Thomson, 2001).

A recent newspaper report speaks of ‘a dramatic staffing crisis in social care’ (Inman, 2000), taking its lead from the 9th annual report of the Social Services Inspectorate which paints a stark picture: “there do not appear to be enough people working in the (social care) service, many posts in social care offering less pay than less demanding jobs in supermarkets” (SSI, 2000). The 10th annual report also pays attention to issues of staff recruitment and retention: “These issues are of increasing concern, especially for areas in the south which are at or near full employment...A buoyant economy with full employment and many attractive employment alternatives to the care sector, along with high housing costs in some areas, are proving to be significant barriers to recruitment and retention of social care and health care staff” (SSI, 2001: para.5.5).

The Report of the King’s Fund Care and Support Enquiry received evidence of widespread problems in recruiting social care staff. It also speaks of “an impending sense of crisis in the situation of the social care workforce”, concluding that “it is becoming increasingly difficult to recruit staff, and in some areas this has reached a crisis point” (Henwood, 2001: para.3.101, 3.86). Submissions to the Inquiry identified various reasons: an overall labour market shortage due to a strong economy; multiple competitors for a limited pool of workers; shortages of people with the right skills and/or qualities; the apparent low status of care work, reflected in poor pay and conditions; and no career pathways or security.

So the first reason for a joined up approach concerns *recruitment and retention* at a time of increasing demand for both childcare workers and social care workers (and we could add to this equation, increasing demand for health and education staff, and the evidence in both cases of recruitment and retention problems). To what degree are childcare and social care services (as well as health and education services) seeking to recruit the same kinds of workers? Do they want to take increasing supplies from the same pool? What is that pool, and are the numbers in it rising or falling? Will childcare and social care increasingly compete for staff? For example, might this be one consequence of the DfEE planning guidance setting EYDCPs the target of increasing the number of childcare workers over 40?

The second reason for a joined-up approach concerns the potential value of taking a *common approach to shared issues*. We can give a few examples of such issues, over

and above the recruitment and retention problems outlined above: but many more could be provided. Childcare work and social care work is, as we shall see, highly gendered: many constituent occupations are almost entirely undertaken by women. Much care work (whether social care or childcare) has low status (for example, the main source of dissatisfaction expressed by childminders about their work is the low esteem in which their job is held: Mooney *et al.*, 2001). In both cases, gender and status, similar questions arise. What are the reasons? What are the consequences? Can or should anything be done to change the situation?

Then there is the nature of the care work and its position in the wider 'human services' framework. Perhaps most fundamental and challenging, what is care work? The word 'care' is much used in policy and in everyday usage. But what meanings does it have? What is childcare and social care, and is 'care' understood in the same way in both contexts? Few, if any, policy documents address such fundamental issues.

Furthermore, changes are occurring in the roles and responsibilities of care workers. Within childcare services, there is now official recognition of the close relationship between the care and education of young children (Department for Education and Employment, 1998). In health and social care, there is a process underway involving the downward substitution of professional tasks. Social care staff, for example, "are increasingly undertaking personal care tasks that until recently would have been viewed as the responsibility of the district or community nurse" (Henwood, 2001: para.3.73). Such shifts raise questions not only about the nature of care work itself, but also about how care work relates to work in health and education.

Leading from this is the third reason for a joined-up approach. The term 'care' itself is unclear. The distinction for example between childcare and social care is uncertain. New relations are forming between Care and other areas of social policy. 'Day care' has moved from health and welfare to education, and become 'childcare', while government policy increasingly emphasises the close relationship between childcare and education, both of which fields are now within the DfES (similarly, international organisations, such as the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, refer to 'early childhood education and care'). This is paralleled by social care (or at least large parts of it) being brought into a closer relationship with the health service.

Recent reorganisation of the DH's Social Care regions makes them coterminous with the eight NHS regions, while there is now a single management board including health and social services chiefs: 'this amalgamation at the top mirrors the plan for much greater integration of health and social services at grassroots level' (Carvel, 2001). In Scotland, the Scottish Executive now locates social care for children within the same department as deals with education and childcare, and some local authorities have also reformed their structures to bring together these areas.

This raises questions about *the future shape and structure of care work*, and the relationship between care, health and education work. Does modernising childcare, social care and other services require modernising the staffing of these services? Do we need to reconfigure the care workforce as well as administrative structures? Is there a case for defining new types of worker, perhaps cutting across existing boundaries as, for example, the social pedagogue does in Denmark? Such questions can only be addressed through taking a broad view of the existing field, and taking a joined-up approach not only to recruitment, retention and key issues, but also to the future of what is now called care work.

What follows?

The rest of this report is made up of four chapters. Chapter Two presents the main findings from the first stage of the study, the exercise in mapping the care workforce (and associated occupations) based on secondary analysis of the LFS. It begins with more detailed discussion of the LFS and of the occupations from the SOC included in the mapping exercise.

Taking 'occupation' as the basis of our analysis of the LFS was a choice we have made: others interested in the care workforce have chosen to use 'industry' as the basis for their analysis. In Chapter Three we consider the consequences of choosing occupation over industry. We do this in the context of looking at some other quantitative studies that have been undertaken on the childcare and social care workforces, and at how our results compare with this other work. What are the consistencies and inconsistencies? Can other work fill some of the gaps in our work?

In Chapter Four, we draw some conclusions and make some recommendations. In particular, we explore the adequacy of the existing occupational groups used in the SOC for research and policy purposes; identify some of the gaps in information which leave some important areas unmapped; and consider what our findings from this stage of the study contribute to a joined-up approach to the care workforce and to the sort of issues identified above as benefiting from this type of approach.

The report finishes with two Appendices. Appendix One is a technical note on the LFS variables with which we have worked, covering definitions and categories. Appendix Two is a comprehensive set of tables, to which the reader wanting more detailed information than the text supplies can turn.

CHAPTER TWO: MAIN FINDINGS

This chapter begins with a detailed discussion of the occupations included in the analyses that follow. The main data findings from the secondary analysis of the government's Labour Force Survey (LFS) are presented, and the results are summarised in a number of key points. Data from three years of the LFS have been combined (spring quarters, 1997-1999) and weighted to give population estimates (see Appendix One for more detail).

Occupations in the Care Workforce

The LFS provides information about occupations using the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) (OPCS, 1990, Volumes 1 and 2). The SOC is a detailed classification of occupations – with nine major groups, 87 minor groups and hundreds of unit groups. Unit groups are sets of specific occupations, grouped together on the basis of tasks performed, qualifications, training, skills and experience commonly associated with those tasks.

This study has focussed on those *unit groups* (referred to below as ‘individual occupations’) that make up our two main occupational groups, social care and childcare. These individual occupations are: *Social Workers/Probation Officers*⁴; *Matrons/Houseparents*; *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers*; *Care Assistants/Attendants*; *Cleaners/Domestics*; *Nursery Nurses*; *Playgroup Leaders*; and *Other Childcare Occupations*

The *Cleaners/Domestics* occupation above needs more explanation. In the SOC there is a job title of 'Home help', and we wanted to include this job within the care workers. However, this job is coded in the SOC with the group *Cleaners/Domestics*, which is a large group of workers that can be found in many settings. So, to get as close as possible to the home helps we selected only those *Cleaners/Domestics* in the social work industry and ‘not in accommodation’ within that industry. This definition was thought to be the nearest we could get. However, some people not employed as

⁴ Social Workers cannot be separated from Probation Officers in SOC 1990.

home helps may have wrongly been included, and some home helps may have been excluded: as discussed in Chapter Four, some home helps might also be coded within the occupation *Care Assistants/Attendants*.

The occupations listed above are, taken together, what will be referred to throughout this report as the care workforce. Other occupations are also involved in the care process, such as various managers and clerical staff. However, these other occupations are not involved in the *direct* provision and delivery of care. They have not therefore been included in the definition of the care workforce for the purposes of this study.

This care workforce has also been compared, in this report, with some other occupations. Two of the comparison groups are made up of nursing workers (comprised of four occupational groups: *Nurses*, *Midwives*, *Nursing Assistants/Auxiliaries* and *Hospital Ward Assistants*) and education workers (comprised of another four groups: *Primary/Nursery Teachers*, *Secondary Teachers*, *Special Education Teachers* and *Educational Assistants*). A further comparison group, ‘High Percentage Female Jobs’, is comprised of *Hairdressers*, *Beauticians*, *Sales* and *Clerical Staff*. These occupations were chosen because, like the care workforce, they have very high percentages of female workers. The final group, ‘All Female Workers’, includes all females in employment: this last group will help to set the care workforce in context.

All of the occupation groups that have been analysed for this study are given in greater detail in Table 1. Appendix One includes descriptions of each occupation as given in the SOC codes (OPCS, 1990).

Table 1: The population sizes of the six occupation groups examined in the study

Occupation Group	Individual occupations within the groups	SOC codes⁵	Population Numbers⁶
1. social care workers⁷	<i>a. Social Workers/Probation Officers</i>	293	97,000
	<i>b. Matrons/Houseparents</i>	370	61,000
	<i>c. Welfare/Community/Youth Workers</i>	371	144,000
	<i>d. Care Assistants/Attendants⁸</i>	644	427,000
	<i>e. Cleaners/Domestics (in social work industry without accommodation)</i>	958	26,000
	Total in group		754,000
2. Childcare Workers	<i>a. Nursery Nurses</i>	650	94,000
	<i>b. Playgroup Leaders</i>	651	24,000
	<i>c. Other Childcare Occupations</i>	659	230,000
	Total in group		348,000
3. Nursing Workers	<i>a. Nurses</i>	340	404,000
	<i>b. Midwives</i>	341	28,000
	<i>c. Assistant Nurses/Auxiliaries</i>	640	120,000
	<i>d. Hospital Ward Assistants</i>	641	24,000
	Total in group		576,000
4. Education Workers	<i>a. Primary/Nursery Education Teachers</i>	233	309,000
	<i>b. Secondary Education Teachers</i>	234	296,000
	<i>c. Special Education Teachers</i>	235	38,000
	<i>d. Educational Assistants</i>	652	142,000
	Total in group		785,000
5. High % Female Jobs	<i>a. Hairdressers</i>	660	
	<i>b. Beauticians</i>	661	
	<i>c. Sales Workers</i>	720,721,722	
	<i>d. Clerical Staff</i>	420,421,430,450-459,460-463	
	Total in group		3,093,000
6. All female workers	<i>N/A</i>	All SOC codes	
	Total in group		10,178,000

The Labour Force Survey

The LFS is the largest of the government's regular household surveys (Owen, 1999).

It is a national survey of private households in the United Kingdom. It collects data

⁵ SOC codes are taken from the Standard Occupational Classification 1990, ONS publications.

⁶ Numbers taken from LFS population estimates for each occupation group as defined above. Numbers are rounded to the nearest thousand.

⁷ Within the LFS, managers form a large group of the total workforce, and obviously some are involved in social work activities. However, it was not possible using occupations to distinguish what types of work these managers are involved in. Therefore, we have not been able to identify the proportion of managers in social work, and these are excluded from our analysis.

⁸ Using occupations leads us to exclude some groups that may be involved in the care workforce – the pros and cons of this method are discussed more fully in chapter three. However, here we would like to point out one such group – nurses. Nurses (SOC 340) are not included in our definition because the SOC 1990 description for nurses includes only medical activities. We felt that qualified nurses in social work would instead be classified as Care Assistants (SOC 644).

from approximately 60,000 households per quarter. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) conducts the survey on behalf of the government. Full details of the survey methodology are given in the LFS User Guide (ONS, 1999). Results are published in the LFS Quarterly Supplement to *Labour Market Trends*.

When people in a household agree to take part in the LFS, they are interviewed five times at quarterly intervals. Most questions are repeated each quarter, but income questions are not asked every quarter. In addition to income, data are collected on a wide range of subjects, including occupation, training, age, qualifications and hours of work.

Data Findings

In the section that follows, an *overview* of each occupational group is presented. In addition, key points about each of the *individual* occupations that make up our four ‘human services’ groups are discussed. *Regional variations* were also looked at for the social care workers and childcare workers: these, however, are presented only as overall figures for these main occupational groups because the numbers are insufficient to make regional comparisons for individual occupations. For those readers requiring more detail than that given here, Appendix Two contains a selection of data tables on each of the variables used to examine the demographic and working conditions of the groups in Table 1. A technical note about each of the variables that has been analysed in this study is presented in Appendix One.

Social Care Workers

There are approximately 754,000⁹ persons classified within the social care workers occupational group. This group is comprised of five individual occupations. Approximately 97,000 are *Social Workers/Probation Officers*, 61,000 are *Matrons/-Houseparents*, 144,000 are *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers*, 427,000 are *Care Assistants/Attendants* and 26,000 are *Cleaners/Domestics* in the social work industry.

⁹ The King’s Fund Report (Henwood, 2001) quotes a figure of 902,600 total “care workers” (excluding childcare workers). The discrepancy between this figure and the one offered here (using the LFS), may be attributed to the fact that we do not include any managers or support staff. Also, the King’s Fund report has figures for a number of groups, such as wardens in sheltered housing, which cannot be distinguished within the LFS.

Welfare, Community and Youth Workers is a large group that includes a variety of occupations which “organise and co-ordinate group social activities for youth and community groups” as well as performing “other welfare tasks not elsewhere specified” (see SOC descriptions, Appendix One). Some of these workers might be officers from various charity/voluntary organisations concerned with the welfare of children and people with disabilities (deafness, blindness).

The Social Care Workers Group Overall

The mean age of the group is 40 years - few (14 percent) are aged under 25 years and over a quarter (26 percent) are aged 50 years or over (Table 6). Eighty-four percent of this group are female, 93 percent are of white ethnic origin, 40 percent live with children¹⁰, 56 percent are married and 19 percent are single. The mean age at which the group completed their full-time education is 17 years (Table 12). This group is varied in terms of highest qualifications¹¹: 13 percent of the group have a degree, 12 percent have qualifications above A-level, 21 percent have A-levels, 19 percent have O-levels and 21 percent have some other qualification. Fourteen percent said they had no qualifications at all (Table 11). In NVQ¹² terms, just over half of the social care workers group is qualified to level 2 or above (51 percent) and a third (35 percent) have level 3 or above. (Table 10). As shown in Table 14, a minority of the social care workers are enrolled on an educational course¹³ (15 percent) and 39 percent have undertaken work related training¹⁴ (Table 15). Ten percent have a work limiting disability¹⁵. The proportion with a work limiting disability is above the average of all female workers (Table 16).

¹⁰ This refers to co-resident children, rather than own children (see Appendix One, technical note).

¹¹ This variable has been re-grouped according to LFS guidelines (Appendix One, technical note). In addition, another category, above A-level, was included. These are qualifications that are considered to be higher than A-level but lower than degree level, such as any teaching or nursing qualification or GNVQ advanced. Please refer to Appendix 1.

¹² This variable was also re-grouped according to LFS guidelines (Appendix One, technical note). It takes into consideration the number of A-levels and O-levels respondents have.

¹³ This refers to the proportions that are in employment (in this case, a care job) *and* also enrolled on a course that is full-time or part-time (see Appendix One, technical note).

¹⁴ This applies to all working people and asks if they have taken part in any work related training in the three months prior to the survey.

¹⁵ This definition is based on only those respondents who say they have a disability that limits their ability to carry out their work duties (Appendix One; Cousins, Jenkins and Laux, 1998).

The mean gross pay for the group overall is £9,741 per annum (£5.86 per hour¹⁶): this is somewhat below the average pay for all female workers. On average, the group works 32 hours in total per week and has been working continuously with their current employer for 69 months (almost 6 years)¹⁷. The majority of the group (92 percent) are also in a permanent job, but the group is almost equally divided between those working full time (54 percent) and part time (46 percent) in their main job (Table 21).

Fifty-two percent are working in the private sector and 48 percent are working in the public sector (Table 17). Of those working in the public sector, most (39 percent) are employed within local government (Table 18). Pay differs for social care workers according to whether they work in the public or private sector: social care workers earn on average £6.74 per hour in the public sector but only £4.94 per hour in the private sector (Table 19).

Regional Variation for the Social Care Workers Group Overall

There are no significant regional variations to note for age and the numbers are too small to comment on the variation of ethnicity across the regions of England¹⁸. However, it is possible to observe sizeable differences between the regions on qualifications (Table 24a) and working conditions. In most cases, Inner London and Outer London stand out from the rest of England. Gender is a good example of this. As mentioned above (in the description of the social care workers group overall), about 16 percent of social care workers are men (Table 23a), but this proportion rises to 27 percent in Inner London and 22 percent in Merseyside.

Both inner London and outer London also have the highest proportions of social care workers with degrees (29 percent and 19 percent for each region respectively) - the East Midlands and Greater Manchester stand out as having the highest proportion of social care workers with no qualifications (19 percent respectively).

¹⁶ Hourly pay was derived for this report from gross annual earnings and hours worked. Refer to technical note in Appendix 1.

¹⁷ This refers to the length of time respondents have been employed continuously with their *current* employer. This is given as a mean figure throughout the report. See Appendix 1, technical note.

¹⁸ Analysis was conducted using an ONS variable that looks at 16 regions in England. See Appendix One for tables 23a-27. Caution should be applied when looking at these tables, as the numbers are very small when analysing regions.

The proportion of social care workers employed within the private and public sectors also varies significantly between the regions of England. For instance, Tyne and Wear, S. Yorkshire, W. Yorkshire, E. Midlands, Outer London, W. Midlands and Greater Manchester all have higher proportions working in the public sector, whereas the Rest of North Region, Rest of Yorkshire and Humberside, E. Anglia, Inner London Rest of South East, S. West, Rest of W. Midlands, Merseyside and Rest of North West have higher proportions working in the private sector (Table 25a).

The proportions working full time/part time varies to some degree across the regions (Table 26a). West Yorkshire, E. Midlands, South West and W. Midlands are the regions with higher proportions working part-time. Finally, gross pay per hour also varies between the regions – with London (inner and outer) and East Anglia being at the highest end of the pay range (Table 27).

Individual Occupations within the Social Care Workers Group

Although it is possible to present a picture of this occupational group as a whole, it is also important to look at the individual occupations that make up this group. This is because there are some important variations within the group that need consideration. For instance, the *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and *Welfare/Community/ Youth Workers* both tend to be younger (aged between 25 and 49 years) than either the *Matrons/Houseparents* or the *Care Assistants/Attendants* (aged between 35 and 50 plus years), whilst the *Cleaners/Domestics* are the oldest (with nearly half of people in this occupation being over 50 years) (Table 6). Also, as shown in Table 8, whilst social care workers as a whole are largely female, *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and *Welfare/ Community/Youth Workers* each contain a sizeable minority of male workers (31 percent and 29 percent respectively).

As mentioned previously, the social care workers group has higher than average proportions with a work limiting disability. It is the *Social Workers/Probation Officers* (along with the *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* and the *Cleaners// Domestics*) that account for these high proportions. The *Matrons/House-parents* have the lowest proportion with a work limiting disability in the group (Table 16).

When it comes to work related training (in the past 3 months), clear differences are noticeable between the occupations. The *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and the *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* have higher proportions that have undergone work related training than the *Matrons/Houseparents*, *Care Assistants/Attendants* and *Cleaners/Domestics* (Table 15).

Most *Social Workers/ Probation Officers* (80 percent), *Matrons/Houseparents* (71 percent) and *Welfare/Community/ Youth Workers* (62 percent) work full time. But the majority of *Care Assistants/Attendants* and *Cleaners/Domestics* are in part-time jobs (55 percent and 84 percent respectively) (Table 21).

There are also noticeable differences in other working conditions (Table 22). The *Social Workers/Probation Officers* have been continuously working with their current employer for the longest time and the *Care assistants/attendants* for the least amount of time. When it comes to income, the group divides into three. *Social Workers/ Probation Officers* are the highest paid (with an average gross annual income of £17,586). *Matrons/Houseparents* together with *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* earn almost identical annual gross incomes (£12,026 and £12,289 respectively). In comparison, the *Care Assistants/Attendants* together with the *Cleaners/Domestics* are the least well paid (£6,856 and £6,265 gross per annum respectively). This income discrepancy can, in part, be explained by the differences already observed within the group associated with the total number of hours worked (*Matrons/Houseparents* work the longest hours of 40 per week on average, *Cleaners/Domestics* work the least number of hours at 21 per week on average). However, even when hours are taken into consideration, large differences in income still remain, the hourly rate for *Social Workers/Probation Officers* being double that for *Care Assistants/Attendants*.

Along with income, the largest divide to be noted here is that associated with qualifications (Tables 10 and 11). *Social Workers/Probation Officers* are the most qualified within the group (43 percent have a degree as their highest qualification and 52 percent are qualified to NVQ level 4). *Care Assistants/Attendants* together with the *Cleaners/Domestics* are the least qualified within the group, with 63 percent and 78 percent not reaching NVQ level 2.

The proportions working in the public and private sector varies within the group (Table 17). Whilst 83 percent of *Social Workers/Probation Officers*, 56 percent of *Welfare/ Community/ Youth Workers* and 69 percent of *Cleaners/Domestics* in ‘Social Work’ are in the public sector, the majority of *Matrons/Houseparents* and *Care Assistants/Attendants* are in the private sector (65 percent and 62 percent respectively).

Hourly pay differences between the public and private sectors are more apparent for some occupations within this group than others. *Social Workers/Probation Officers* reveal the biggest differences for this group, with those working within the public sector earning on average £9.31 per hour but those working within the private sector earning on average £8.11 per hour (Table 19).

Childcare Workers

There are approximately 348,000 persons classified within the childcare workers occupational group. This group is comprised of three individual occupations. Approximately 94,000 are *Nursery Nurses*, 24,000 are *Playgroup Leaders* and 230,000 are in a SOC group called *Other Childcare Occupations*. This last group is made up of a range of childcare occupations that includes nannies, childminders, out-of-school staff and playworkers.

The Childcare Workers Group Overall

The mean age of the group is 37 years (Table 6). Although almost half (42 percent) of this group are aged between 35 and 49 years, nearly a quarter of the group (22 percent) are much younger (25 years or under). The group is overwhelmingly female (98 percent). Although mostly white (96 percent), this is the same percentage as for all female workers (95 percent). Sixty-two percent of the group are married (Table 9), and slightly more than half (58 percent) live with children.

The mean age of this group at completing their full-time education was 17 years (Table 12). Almost half have no qualifications (15 percent) or O-levels (32 percent) as their highest qualification; only 3 percent have a degree (Table 11). In NVQ terms, almost half are qualified at Level 2 or above (44 percent) and a quarter have Level 3 or above (23 percent) (Table 10). Sixteen percent are enrolled on an education course,

25 percent have undergone some form of work-related training in the past three months.

Seven percent have a work limiting disability. The proportions with a work limiting disability are fairly evenly spread between the occupations – *Nursery Nurse/Playgroup Leaders* are below the average for all women workers and the *Other Childcare Occupations* are exactly the same as the average (Table 16).

Childcare workers as a group have very low earnings (Table 22) – approximately £4,423 gross per annum for an average of 22 hours per week (£4.19 per hour). This hourly rate is only two-thirds of the female average. Overall, this group have been continuously working with their current employer for 60 months (approximately 5 years). Eighty-eight percent are in a permanent job and two-thirds work part-time.

The group is split almost evenly between those working in the private sector and those working in the public sector (57 percent and 43 percent respectively). Of those working in the public sector, the majority (65 percent) are employed within local government (Table 18). Earnings for this group are not too dissimilar between the public and private sectors – the childcare workers earn on average £4.91 per hour in the public sector and £3.27 per hour in the private sector (Table 19).

Regional Variations For The Childcare Workers Group Overall

There are no marked regional variations to note for gender or age, and the numbers are again too small to comment on the ethnic variations by region. There are also very few variations between the regions associated with qualifications to note – the majority of childcare workers in each region are educated up to O-levels (or equivalent). However, Merseyside and the Rest of Yorkshire/Humberside have the highest proportions of childcare workers with no qualifications compared to the rest of England (Table 24b).

As with the social care workers, the proportions working in the private/public sector varies by region (Table 25b). A majority of childcare Workers in Tyne and Wear, Rest of N. Region, S. Yorkshire, W. Yorkshire, W. Midlands and Merseyside work in the public sector; while a majority in Rest of Yorkshire/Humberside, E. Midlands,

London (Inner and Outer), Rest of S. East, S. West, Rest of W. Midlands and Rest of North West are in the private sector. The childcare workers are predominantly working part-time irrespective of the region they are in (Table 26b). However, when the total hours per week are looked at (Table 27), it is apparent that childcare workers in London work longer hours compared to the rest of England (28 hours for Inner London and 26 hours for Outer London).

Although childcare workers in inner and outer London are similar in terms of the hours they work, those in Inner London earn more than Outer London (£6.33 per hour compared with £4.35 per hour).

Individual Occupations within the Childcare Workers Group

There are variations between the occupations within the childcare workers group. The *Nursery Nurses* are considerably younger than either the *Playgroup Leaders* or the *Other Childcare Occupations*. Thirty-five percent of the *Nursery Nurses* are aged 25 years or younger (Table 6). Their age distribution is also unique within the care workforce, with two peaks – under 25 and 35-49. In other individual occupations, there is one peak – usually 35-49. The only other group in the study to show a similar distribution is ‘high proportion female jobs’, suggesting both share a propensity for women to leave the labour market when they have younger children, returning as their children get older.

The *Other Childcare Occupations* are the least qualified, with almost a quarter (21 percent) having no qualifications (Table 11). The *Other Childcare Occupations* are also the least likely to have undergone work related training (Table 15).

Whilst the childcare workers group overall are more likely to be living with children than not (Table 13), this pattern only applies to the *Playgroup Leaders* and the *Other Childcare Occupations* (75 percent and 60 percent respectively): just under half of *Nursery Nurses* live with children (47 percent), consistent with their younger age profile.

There is a noticeable divide within the group on the proportion of time worked. The *Playgroup Leaders* and the *Other Childcare Occupations* are mostly in part-time jobs

(87 percent and 76 percent respectively), whereas the *Nursery Nurses* are mostly in full-time jobs (63 percent). The *Playgroup Leaders* earn the least (£2,845 gross per annum compared to £7,508 earned by the *Nursery Nurses* or £3,011 earned by the *Other Childcare Occupations*). There is a similar ranking when hours are taken into account (*Nursery Nurses* earn £4.85 per hour, *Playgroup Leaders* earn £3.20 per hour and the *Other Childcare Occupations* earn £3.96 per hour), although the differences are not so great.

The group as a whole are mostly working in the private sector (Table 17) and this is particularly true of the *Playgroup Leaders* – 83 percent are employed within the private sector compared to 52 percent of the *Nursery Nurses* or 56 percent of the *Other Childcare Occupations*. *Nursery Nurses* and the *Other Childcare Occupations* employed within the public sector are mostly found within local government (39 percent and 40 percent respectively).

Earnings between the public and private sectors are very similar for this group as a whole (Table 19). However, two of the occupations, *Nursery Nurses* and *Playgroup Leaders*, show more noticeable differences. For instance, *Nursery Nurses* earn on average £5.88 per hour in the public sector but only earn on average £3.66 per hour in the private sector.

Nursing Workers

There are approximately 576,000¹⁹ persons classified within the nursing workers occupational group. This group is comprised of four individual occupations. The large majority of these (404,000) are *Nurses*; there are also 120,000 are *Assistant Nurses/Auxiliaries*, 28,000 *Midwives* and 24,000 *Hospital Ward Assistants*.

The Nursing Workers Group Overall

The mean age of the nursing workers group is 40 years – almost half (43 percent) are aged between 35 and 49 years, 26 percent are aged between 25 and 34 years, 22

¹⁹ The Department of Health (2001) *NHS hospital & community health services non-medical staff in England (1990-2000)* bulletin gives a figure of 585,000. This breaks down as approx. 431,000 Nursing, Midwifery & health visiting staff, 25,470 health care assistants and 128,290 scientific, therapeutic and technical staff. This figure is larger than that given here (using the LFS) because we do not count health visitors (no distinct category in LFS) and their category of “scientific, therapeutic and technical staff” is likely to be much broader than whom we are calling hospital ward staff.

percent are aged 50 years or over and less than one percent are aged 25 years or younger (Table 6). The great majority (89 percent) of this group are female. Whilst almost all are of white ethnic origin (92 percent), this is fewer than the average for all female workers (95 percent). Most are married (62 percent).

This group are well qualified (Tables 10 and 11), 76 percent having a qualification that is above A-level as their highest form of qualification. In terms of NVQ levels, most nursing workers are qualified to level 4 (74 percent: Table 10). The average age of completing full-time education for this group is approximately 17 years (Table 12), 22 percent of this group are enrolled on an education course (Table 14) and 54 percent have undergone some form of work-related training in the three months prior to the survey. Just over half of this group (54 percent) are living with children. The proportion with a work limiting disability is the same as the average for all women workers (7 percent) (Table 15).

The majority of this group (78 percent) works in the public sector – 76 percent of these are employed within the health service (Table 18). The Nursing workers group earn on average £7.88 per hour in the public sector compared with £6.97 in the private sector (Table 19).

Over 92 percent are in permanent jobs (Table 20), with just over half (59 percent) working full-time in their main job (Table 21). The mean annual income of the nursing workers is £13,411 – approximately £7.69 per hour (Table 22): this is 22 percent above the average for women workers. The nursing workers group have been working continuously with their current employer for over 102 months (approximately 8 years).

Individual Occupations Within The Nursing Workers Group

The group has a largely homogeneous age and ethnicity profile, although there are fewer young nurses and midwives and the midwives are more likely to be from a minority ethnic group than are the other nursing workers. However, there are important variations within the group when it comes to qualifications, income and hours worked.

The high level of qualifications noted above for the group as a whole is largely associated with *Nurses* and *Midwives* who are much better qualified than the *Assistant Nurses/Auxiliaries* and the *Hospital Ward Assistants*. Whilst 94 percent of *Nurses* and 98 percent of *Midwives* hold qualifications that are degree or above A-level, only 15 percent of *Nursing Assistant/Auxiliaries* and 14 percent of *Hospital Ward Assistants* are educated to the same level. Of all the occupations in this group, *Nurses* are most likely to be enrolled on a course (one quarter of nurses are enrolled on an education course) and, along with the *Midwives*, have the highest proportions within the group that have undergone some form of work related training (Tables 14 and 15).

The majority of *Nurses* (53 percent), *Nursing Assistants/Auxiliaries* (60 percent) and *Hospital Ward Assistants* (56 percent) do not live with children (Table 13). However, the majority of *Midwives* (62 percent) do live with children. In addition, the *Hospital Ward Assistants* have a higher proportion with a work limiting disability (12 percent) compared to the rest of the occupations in the nursing workers group and to all female workers (Table 16).

Although, as a group, the nursing workers work full-time, this pattern is largely associated with the *Nurses* and *Midwives* (63 percent and 59 percent respectively work full time). The same division applies with income (Table 22). *Nurses* and *Midwives* earn almost double the gross annual earnings of the *Assistant Nurses/Auxiliaries* and the *Hospital Ward Assistants*. *Midwives* earn £9.32 per hour, which is over £4.00 per hour more than the *Hospital Ward Assistants* (£5.17 per hour).

More than three-quarters (78 percent) work in the public sector, with the proportion particularly high for *Midwives*. Nursing workers in the public sector earn, on average, more per hour (£7.88) than do those in the private sector (£6.97).

Education Workers

There are about 785,000 persons classified within the education workers occupational group. This group is comprised of four individual occupations. Approximately 309,000 are *Secondary Education Teachers*, 296,000 are *Primary/Nursery Teachers*, 38,000 are *Special Education Teachers* and 142,000 are *Educational Assistants*.

The Education Workers Group Overall

The mean age of education workers is 42 years – over half of the education workers (52 percent) are aged between 35 and 49 years and the rest are mostly older in the 50 years and over category (24 percent). Although the majority of education workers (75 percent) are female, a quarter of this group are male (Table 8). Ninety-six percent are of white ethnic origin, 70 percent are married and over half (51 percent) live with their own children. As previously mentioned, the education workers are highly qualified - 59 percent have a degree and a further 23 percent have qualifications above A-levels, as their highest qualification (Table 11). Most of the education workers are qualified to NVQ Level 4 (Table 10). The mean age at which they completed their full-time education was 20 years (Table 12). Relatively few in this group are enrolled on an education course (13 percent) but 52 percent have undergone some form of work related training in the last three months (Table 15). Also 6 percent of the education workers group has a work limiting disability (lower than the average for all women workers).

Whilst the majority (81 percent) are in a permanent job, a sizeable minority (19 percent) are in a temporary job (Table 20). Collectively, the education workers earn approximately £18,020 per annum (£8.95 per hour), work on average a total of 38 hours per week and are working mostly full-time (70 percent). This group has been working continuously with their current employer for over 109 months (approximately 9 years).

Unsurprisingly, the majority of education workers (89 percent) are in the public sector, with 79 percent employed within local government (Table 18). The Education workers group earn on average £8.97 per hour in the public sector, which is almost identical to what they earn per hour in the private sector (£8.67: Table 19).

Individual Occupations within the Education Workers Group

The main differences within this occupational group are between *Educational Assistants* and the three *Teacher* groups. Few *Educational Assistants* are male (4 percent). But the three teacher groups have more sizeable male minorities, particularly noticeable for the *Secondary Education Teachers* (45 percent are male). A similar split applies to qualifications. Whilst *Secondary Education Teachers*, *Primary/*

Nursery Education Teachers and *Special Education Teachers* are all highly qualified, the *Educational Assistants* are much less well qualified (Tables 10 and 11). Eighty-three percent of the *Secondary Education Teachers*, 60 percent of the *Primary/Nursery Education Teachers* and 56 percent of the *Special Education Teachers* have a degree as their highest qualification, compared to only 7 percent of *Educational Assistants*. A third of *Educational Assistants* have the equivalent of NVQ 3 as their highest education level (34 percent), almost the same as for all women workers (37 percent).

There is also a marked difference in the 'co-resident children' variable (Table 13). Less than half of *Secondary Education Teachers*, *Primary/Nursery Teachers* and *Special Education Teachers* live with children, compared to more than two-thirds of *Educational Assistants*.

The same divide occurs with working conditions. For instance, whilst the majority of *Secondary Education Teachers* (82 percent), *Primary Education Teachers* (77 percent) and *Special Education Teachers* (66 percent) work full time, the majority (68 percent) of *Educational Assistants* work part time (Table 18). Although most of the group are in a permanent job, a third of the *Educational Assistants* are in a temporary job (Table 20). On income, the *Secondary Education Teachers* (£21,957 gross per annum; £10.14 per hour), the *Primary/Nursery Education teachers* (£19,788 gross per annum; £9.61 per hour) and the *Special Education Teachers* (£18,613 gross per annum; £10.08 per hour) all earn well above the *Educational Assistants* (£5,669 gross per annum; £4.76 per hour). *Educational Assistants* have been working continuously with their current employer for the least amount of time (65 months) (Table 22), and are least likely to have undergone some form of work related training (Table 15).

High Percentage Female Jobs

This group is made up of approximately 3,093,000 persons. Eighty-two percent are female. This is almost identical to the social care workers (84 percent) but less than the childcare workers (98 percent).

We have looked at the last four occupational groups (social care workers, childcare workers, nursing workers and education workers) in terms of the overall picture and within group variations. But this group will only be analysed overall.

The mean age of this group is 36 years, with peaks at under 25 years and 35-49 years (Table 6). Ninety-four percent of this group are of white ethnic origin, 50 percent are married, 32 percent are single and 32 percent live with children. This group is slightly less well qualified than all women workers: 35 percent have O-levels as their highest qualification (compared to 25 percent for all women) and 5 percent have a degree (compared to 14 percent); 14 percent of this group have no qualifications at all (compared to 15 percent of all women: Table 11). In terms of NVQ levels, 52 percent of those in this high percentage female jobs group are qualified to level 2 or above, compared to 56 percent for all women (Table 10). The average age for completing full-time education for this group is 17 years (Table 12). Approximately 7 percent of this group have a work limiting disability (identical to the average for all women workers). As with all the other groups examined previously, the majority are not enrolled on an education course (82 percent).

They earn on average £7,978 per annum (£5.18 per hour), working on average a total of 28 hours per week and have been employed continuously in their current job for 63 months (approximately 5 years). Approximately 50 percent work full time and 50 percent work part time (Table 21). Ninety-three percent are in a permanent job (Table 20).

This group works mainly in the private sector (86 percent: Table 17). Of the 14 percent in the public sector, most are found within local government (5 percent), health (5 percent) or education (1 percent: Table 18). Those working in the public sector earn only very slightly more per hour than those working in the private sector (£5.98 per hour compared with £5.02 per hour in the private sector: Table 19).

All Female Workers

According to the LFS, approximately 22,788,000 people are employed within England (selecting only those with a SOC code and using an estimate of three years

data averaged). Of the total employed, 10,178,000 are female workers and 12,610,000 are male workers.

The mean age of women workers is 39 years: 17 percent (1,746,725) are aged below 25 years, 24 percent (2,379,339) are aged between 25 and 34 years, 37 percent (3,782,952) are aged between 35 and 49 years and 22 percent (2,268,685) are aged 50 years and over (Table 6). The general female workforce is very largely white (95 percent), 2 percent are black, 2 percent of Asian origin and 1 percent of some other ethnic origin (Table 7). Fifty-seven percent of the female workforce is married and 21 percent are single (Table 9). Thirty-eight percent of the female workforce lives with children (Table 13) and 7 percent of all women workers have a work limiting disability (Table 16).

Fourteen percent have a degree, 12 percent have qualifications above A-level, 18 percent have A-levels, 25 percent have O-levels and 15 percent have some other qualification as their highest level of qualification. Fifteen percent of the female workforce has no qualifications at all (Table 11). In terms of NVQ levels, 56 percent of the female workforce is qualified to level 2 or above (Table 10). The mean age for completing full-time education is 17 years (Table 12).

Ninety-two percent (8,543,152) are in a permanent job and over half (55 percent) are working full time in their main job. The mean annual income for the female workforce is approximately £10,685 (£6.29 per hour) and the mean total hours worked per week is 31 (Table 22). The female workforce has been working continuously (on average) with their current employer for 80 months (approximately 7 years).

Approximately 70 percent of female workers (7,077,394) work in the private sector and 30 percent (3,069,902) in the public sector (Table 17). Of those working in the public sector, most are working within local government (15 percent) or health (8 percent). Those working in the public sector are earning more than those working in the private sector (£8.56 per hour compared with £7.79 in the private sector: Table 19).

Comparisons

Within the 'Care Workforce'; Social Care Workers and Childcare Workers

In addition to mapping out the demographics and working conditions of the care workforce, this study has also aimed to compare social care workers with childcare workers.

It is apparent from the previous section that the social care workers are very different to the childcare workers on a number of key areas: income, age, gender, qualifications, children, proportion with a work limiting disability, hours worked and the general permanency of their jobs.

Both groups overall are predominantly female (Table 8), but the social care workers do include a larger percentage of males. Men are most likely to be *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* and *Social Workers/Probation Officers*. The childcare workforce has a slightly lower percentage of minority ethnic workers than the average for the female workforce (4 percent and 5 percent respectively), whilst the social care workforce has a slightly higher percentage (7 percent). This is particularly marked for *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* (10 percent and 11 percent respectively), where there are more black workers than the average (6 percent each, compared to 2 percent for all female workers).

Whilst childcare workers overall are only 3 years younger than the social care workers, a noticeable minority of the childcare workers are aged under 25 years (Table 6), these are mostly *Nursery Nurses*. Childcare workers (58 percent) are more likely than social care workers (40 percent) to be living with children (Table 13).

Social care workers overall are better qualified than the childcare workers. Thirteen percent of social care workers have a degree as their highest level of qualification, compared to only 3 percent of childcare workers (Table 11). Overall, however, the proportions with no qualifications are almost identical (14 percent and 15 percent respectively). In terms of NVQ levels (Table 10), about half of social care workers and childcare workers are qualified to level 2: 51 percent and 45 percent respectively. However, it is also noticeable that more social care workers are qualified to NVQ level 3 than the childcare workers (35 percent and 24 percent respectively). These

educational differences reflect the higher educational levels of the *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and the *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* compared to the rest of the social care and childcare workers.

A higher proportion of social care workers have a work limiting disability. Whilst the childcare workers are average for all women workers (7 percent), the social care workers are above the average (10 percent). This particularly applies to the *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and the *Cleaners/Domestics* (Table 16).

Perhaps the most striking differences between the childcare and social care workers concern working conditions (Table 21). Overall, the average annual income of social care workers is more than double that earned by the childcare workers (£9,741 compared to £4,423). However, when considering the individual occupations that make up the care workforce, it is apparent that the *Care Assistants/Attendants* and *Cleaners/Domestics* (who themselves earn half the annual income of the remaining social care workers) are on a comparable annual salary to the *Nursery Nurses*. Whilst overall the social care workers work full time, on average 32 hours in total per week, the childcare workers mainly work part time (on average 22 hours per week).

Despite these differences, the care workforce also has a number of notable similarities. The most obvious similarity is the almost identical proportions of social care and childcare workers found in the public sector (in local government predominately) and private sector (Table 17).

The social care workers and the childcare workers also both earn more per hour in the public sector than they do in the private sector – this is particularly apparent for *Social Workers/Probation Officers, Nursery Nurses and Playgroup Leaders* (Table 19). In addition, there were no notable variations within the care workforce (between Social Care Workers and Childcare Workers) between the private and public sectors in their level of qualifications.

Similar proportions of childcare and social care workers are enrolled on an education course (16 percent and 15 percent respectively). The two groups of workers also

completed their full-time education at almost identical ages (18 years for social care workers and 19 years for childcare workers).

Overall, the social care workers and childcare workers are evenly matched on marital status (Table 9) – with only slightly more of the childcare workers being married. However, out of all the individual occupations that make up the care workforce, the *Nursery Nurses* are most likely to be single.

Between the Care Assistants/Attendants and the Nursing workers

The individual occupation, *Care Assistants/Attendants*, (who belong to the social care workers group) and the occupational group, nursing workers, are compared here for two reasons. Firstly, both are highly gendered. Secondly, some of the occupations within the nursing workers group appear to perform similar tasks in their jobs to the *Care Assistants/Attendants* (OPCS: SOC 1990, Volume 1).

Although the *Care Assistants/Attendants* are similar to the nursing workers on a number of key variables, they are most closely matched to the individual occupation *Nursing Assistants/Auxiliaries*. They are very similar in terms of age (the largest age group in both cases is 35 and 49 years - 35 percent and 39 percent respectively), ethnicity (most are white – 94 percent and 93 percent respectively), qualifications (Table 11) and living with children (39 percent and 40 percent respectively). In addition, almost identical proportions of *Care Assistants/Attendants* and *Nursing Assistants/Auxiliaries* are working full-time and part-time (Table 21) – the average total hours worked per week is 30 and 31 respectively (Table 22). However, despite working similar hours per week (as mentioned above), *Nursing Assistants/Auxiliaries* earn less per annum than the *Care Assistants/Attendants* (£8,618 and £6,856 respectively).

Care Assistants/Attendants also work in a completely different sector to the nursing workers (Table 17). Sixty-two percent of the *Care Assistants/Attendants* work in the private sector whereas; 75 percent of the *Assistant Nurses/Auxiliaries* work in the public sector (predominantly health).

Between the Childcare Workers and the Education Workers

Both the childcare workers *overall* and the education workers *overall* are compared here for the same two reasons as the above comparison - the education workers group is also highly gendered and some of the occupations within the education workers group appear to perform similar tasks in their jobs to the childcare workers group (OPCS: SOC 1990, Volume 1).

The two groups are almost identical when it comes to their ethnic profile (Table 7) – 96 percent of childcare workers are white, 97 percent of the education workers. They are also alike in terms of marital status (although slightly higher proportions of the childcare workers are single – Table 9). The two groups have similar proportions enrolled on an education course (16 percent of childcare workers and 13 percent of education workers) and living with children (58 percent of childcare workers and 51 percent of education workers). The *Education Assistants* and *Other Childcare Occupations* are particularly likely to be living with children (Table 13).

However, the childcare workers are also dissimilar from the education workers on a number of points. As mentioned previously, the childcare workers have a younger age profile than the social care workers (Table 6). This pattern also applies when comparing the childcare workers with the education workers. Twenty-two percent of childcare workers are aged less than 25 years, but only 6 percent of the education workers. The childcare workers are also different from the education workers in terms of qualifications: 75 percent of education workers have a highest qualification above A-level, compared to just 15 percent of childcare workers (Table 11).

Perhaps most striking are the variations between the groups on working conditions (Table 17). Whilst 57 percent of childcare workers are in the private sector, 89 percent of the education workers are in the public sector. Although similar proportions of both groups overall are in permanent jobs (Table 19), slightly more of the education workers are in temporary jobs (19 percent compared with 12 percent of the childcare workers).

The group is also split in terms of the hours worked and earnings (Table 22). Whilst childcare workers overall are in part-time employment (66 percent), the education

workers mostly are in full-time employment (70 percent) – working 22 and 38 hours respectively. Within the childcare workers group, however, the *Nursery Nurses* are similar to the education workers, in terms of being in full-time employment and working a total of 30 hours per week (Tables 21 and 22).

Childcare workers have low earnings of £4,423 per annum overall. Education workers earn three times this amount (£13,411 per annum). However, within the education workers group, the *Education Assistants* have very similar annual earnings to the childcare workers – *Nursery Nurses* actually earn more than the *Education Assistants* (Table 22).

We shall return in Chapter Four to comparisons across the social care, childcare, education and nursing workforces. In particular, we shall examine the 16 individual occupational groups that constitute these four main workforce groupings, to consider which occupational groups have most in common with each other and whether these occupations can be clustered in different ways according to these similarities.

Summary

The key points from the data findings are that:

- The care workforce has been defined in this study (using the LFS) as consisting of five occupational groups making up the social care workforce; and three occupational groups making up the childcare workforce. There are 754,000 social care workers, and 348,000 childcare workers, making a total of 1.1 million. This care workforce has been compared with two other ‘human services’ workforces - education workers (785,000) and nursing workers (576,000) – together with four occupational groups with high percentages of women workers and all women workers.
- The care workforce is extremely gendered. It is characterised by a high proportion of female workers, who account for 1 million out of the 1.1 million total. *Social Workers/Probation Officers* is the only occupation group with a sizeable minority of male workers.

- The care workforce is homogeneous in terms of age. With the important exception of the *Nursery Nurses* (who have the youngest age profile of all care workers), the care workforce has a middle-aged profile, with a mean age of between 37 and 45 years. Unlike the high percentage female jobs group, which visibly has two age peaks (possibly indicating a movement out of employment to have children and then a return to employment), the care workforce has a different life course pattern, one in which there is only one age peak – occurring between 35 and 49 years for both the childcare and social care workers.
- A high proportion of childcare workers, 58 percent, live with children. The proportion is lower among social care workers, 40 percent, similar to all women workers.
- The care workforce has a homogeneous ethnic profile. The great majority are of white ethnic origin. However, social care has rather more minority ethnic workers than does childcare, or all women workers, in particular *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers*.
- Social care workers have higher proportions with a work-limiting disability than the average (i.e. compared to the all women workers group) and also compared to the childcare workers group.
- The care workforce has low annual and hourly earnings, compared to other ‘human services’ workers (i.e. the nursing workers/education workers) and all women workers. This is especially true for the childcare workers, whose hourly pay is two-thirds of all women workers.
- Social care workers on average work 32 hours a week, similar to all women workers, compared to 22 hours among childcare workers. Social care workers are more likely than childcare workers to work full-time. Full-time work

varies from 80 percent of *Social Workers/Probation Officers* to less than 25 percent of *Playgroup leaders* and *Other Childcare occupations*.

- The qualification level of social care workers is similar to that for all women workers, but is lower among childcare workers. Just over a third of social care workers and just under a quarter of childcare workers are qualified at NVQ level 3 or higher. The qualification level of both groups is, however, far lower than nursing or education workers, while within both social care and childcare there are occupational groups with very low qualification levels, in particular *Care Assistants/Attendants, Cleaners and domestics* and *Other Childcare Occupations*.
- Social care workers are more likely to have undergone recent work-related training than childcare workers. The proportions are particularly high for *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers*, and particularly low for *Cleaners/Domestics* and *Other Childcare Occupations*.
- Just over half of both social care workers and childcare workers are in the private sector, the proportion being lower than for all women workers. The distribution for individual occupations varies considerably, from 17 percent of *Social Workers/Probation Officers*, to 83 percent of *Playgroup leaders*.
- Average earnings per hour within the care workforce were generally higher in the public sector than in the private sector – with *Social Workers/Probation Officers, Nursery Nurses and Playgroup Leaders* having the most notable differences.
- There are a number of regional variations. Among social care workers, Inner London stands out for having the highest proportion of male workers and graduates and highest rates of pay. Among childcare workers, Inner London is not so distinctive, although it has relatively high rates of pay.

CHAPTER THREE: CRITICAL EVALUATION

This study has chosen to define the care workforce through occupations (SOC). However, other users of the LFS have chosen to focus on ‘industry’. This chapter begins by considering how the care workforce might be defined using industry, and then compares these two approaches. Details are given about what information is lost when occupations are used to examine the care workforce and what information is lost when industry is used. A brief overview is then given of how the analysis used in this study compares to other main data sources that are available on the care workforce.

Industry

In addition to SOC, the LFS also classifies each person’s employment using the *Standard Industrial Classification* (SIC) (Central Statistical Office, 1992). According to the ONS (UK SIC 1992 Methodological Guide), SIC is used for “classifying business establishments and other statistical units by the type of economic activity in which they are engaged...(providing) a framework for the collection, tabulation, presentation and analysis of economic data”.

Within the SIC, one industry is the social work industry. This is sub-divided into ‘With Accommodation’ (85.31) and ‘Without Accommodation’ (85.32). One approach to defining the social care workforce might be to include all workers within the social work industry: this is the approach that has been taken by the local government Employers Organisation.

Comparing two approaches to defining the care workforce

The two different methods of defining the care workforce (SOC and SIC) lead to somewhat different conclusions. For example, the LFS indicates that approximately 22,788,000 people are employed in England (1997-1999); if the care workforce is defined using SOC, 1,102,172 of this total are employed in care occupations. However, if the SIC is used to define the care workforce, as those employed in the

social work industry, we end up with only 986,085. This difference indicates immediately that *not all* of the same people are being counted by the two methods.

Consequences of using SOC

The discrepancy arises because not everyone with a care occupation, as defined on the basis of the SOC, is *also* coded as being in the social work industry. Many people whom we are calling social care workers or childcare workers are in not in the social work industry. Table 2 shows social care and childcare workers, broken down into individual occupations, coded within and outside of the social work industry.

Table 2: Workers in social care occupations or childcare occupations who are coded within the social work industry and coded outside the social work industry ²⁰

	Industry			
	Social Work		Other Industries	
	%	N	%	N
Social Workers/Probation Officers	85	82,000	15	14,000
Matrons/Houseparents	79	48,000	21	13,000
Welfare/Community/Youth workers	51	73,000	49	71,000
Care assistants/Attendants	70	297,000	30	130,000
Nursery Nurses	33	32,000	66	62,000
Playgroup Leaders	81	19,000	19	5,000
Other Childcare occupations	37	84,000	63	145,000
Cleaners/Domestics	100	26,000	0	0
Total	60	661,000	40	441,000

Source: LFS (1997-1999), Spring Quarter

Taken overall, 70 percent (526,055) of the workers in social care occupations are coded as being within the social work industry, leaving 228,185 under some other industrial classification. Only 39 percent (135,326) of the childcare workers group are coded as being within the social work industry, leaving 212,605 to be accounted for by other industries. So, whilst most of the social care workers are also in the social work industry, the majority of childcare workers are working outside of the social work industry.

²⁰ Cleaners/domestics are only from the social work industry, without accommodation. This was to ensure only those cleaners/domestics that are working in Social Work are included in any analysis. Therefore, we expect (by default) not to find any of them in any other industry (those in the social work industry should =100%).

In which other major industries are the social care workers found? Counting only those industries with 10,000 or more cases in them, there are 6 other main industries where social care workers are found:

- Real Estate and Property (26,848)
- Law, Security, Advertising and Recruitment (12,948)
- Government (31,219)
- Education (14,775)
- Health (115,738)
- Trade Unions, Professional and other Membership Organisations (10,768)

More detail about these industries can be found in Table 4 at the end of this chapter.

Clearly, those in the social care workers group who are not in the social work industry are mostly found in the ‘Health Industry’ (51 percent), and most of those are *Care Assistants/Attendants* (42 percent). Some industrial locations are difficult to understand – e.g. the large number of social care workers found in the ‘Real Estate and Property Industry’.

Within the childcare workers group, 81 percent of the *Playgroup Leaders* are classified as working within the social work industry (Table 2 above). However, only 34 percent of the *Nursery Nurses* and 37 percent of the *Other Childcare Occupations* are classified as being in the social work industry. In which other major industries are members of this occupational group to be found? Most are found in education - 53 percent of *Nursery Nurses* and 39 percent of the *Other Childcare Occupations*. Some way behind comes Health, which accounts, for example, for 7 percent of *Nursery Nurses*.

Consequences of using SIC

We now turn to looking at how many cases we lose and who we lose if we define the care workforce by SIC. If we identify care workers on the basis of people working in the social work industry, how many of the care workers we have identified on the basis of occupation are accounted for?

As Table 3 shows, 67 percent (661,382) of the social work industry is made up of our care occupations, although 33 percent (324,703) of this industry is made up of other occupations.

Table 3: Proportions of social work industry made up of care occupations and other occupations

Social Work Industry	Occupation	
	Care occupations	Other Occupations
%	67	33
N	661,382	324,703

Source: LFS, 1997-1999, Spring Quarters

Aside from the social care and childcare workers, the major²¹ individual *occupations* in the social work industry are:

- Trade Union Officials (SOC Code 190) (16,070)
- Clerical and Secretarial Staff, Receptionists and Telephone Operators (SOC Codes 400, 401, 410, 412, 420, 430, 441, 450, 459, 460, 461, 462) (68,740)
- Nurses, Assistant Nurses/Auxiliaries, Hospital Ward Assistants and Ambulance Staff (SOC Codes 340, 640, 641, 642) (40,280)
- Porters and Catering Assistants (SOC Codes 931, 952, 953) (12,562)

In addition, a proportion of those in the social work industry are managers. These include all types of manager, but most of them (18,080) are managers in local government.

Example of using SIC

The local government Employers Organisation/Improvement and Development Agency (EO/IDeA) has used the SIC as part of an audit of Personal Social Services in England. Commissioned by TOPSS (the Training Organisation for Personal Social Services)²², the EO/IDeA conducted secondary analysis on the Labour Force Survey. The aim of this labour market analysis was to produce “projections to inform the

²¹ Only those occupations that have 10,000 or more cases were noted.

²² Documented within the Workforce Audit, EO/IDeA, 1999

consideration of the future supply of labour” (EO/IDeA Workforce Audit, 1999). The EO/IDeA focused on industry and compared the numbers leaving and entering the social work industry in relation to other industries and the economy as a whole. The focus of this work was defined as ‘Personal Social Services’.

The EO/IDeA analysis:

- took two winter quarters of the LFS²³;
- defined the workforce as those in the social work industry (code 85.3);
- analysed the total workforce so defined using a number of variables, including: gender; age; ethnicity; full-time/part-time employment; private/ public sector; permanent/temporary job; the proportions with a health problem, NVQ qualifications held (level not specified); enrolment in an education course; take up of job-related training; and highest qualification (in NVQ equivalents).

The EO/IDeA analysis was similar to this study in terms of *some* of the variables used to characterise the workforce, i.e. age, gender, full-time/part time, sector, permanent /temporary, enrolment on a course and highest qualification. There are, however, some important differences in the variables covered, for example the EO/IDeA analysis did not include pay or hours of work.

There are other important differences. The first, as already indicated, is defining the workforce by industry as opposed to occupation. Second is the occupations studied. With an explicit focus on personal social services and confining themselves only to workers within the social work industry, the EO/IDeA further focused on seven occupations:

- Social worker
- Welfare/youth/community worker
- Local Government clerical
- Care Assistants
- Other childcare

²³ This study by contrast took 3 Spring Quarters for the LFS analysis

- Cleaners/helps²⁴
- Other

The list does not include some of the childcare workers (*Nursery Nurses* and *Playgroup Leaders*) or social care workers (*Matrons/Houseparents*) that we have identified and included within this report.

Comparability to other data sources

Tables documenting sources of data on the social care workforce or the childcare workforce can be found at the end of this chapter. Table 5a covers the social care workforce and Table 5b covers the childcare workforce. What follows is a brief discussion of the comparability of these other sources of data to the LFS.

The Department of Health's *Staffing Return*²⁵ data is an employers' record of who is employed within Social Services Departments (for England). It records this information using its own, more detailed, classification system based on job setting, client groups and occupation types. The LFS, by contrast, is an employee source, which asks employees what jobs they do and in what industries they work. The staffing return covers only local government employees, whereas the LFS includes *all* those doing care work, whether in the public or private sectors.

The ONS SOC and SIC classifications are very different structurally from the staffing return. This makes direct comparisons between the two sources difficult. The staffing return is a useful source because it should be exhaustive and it can offer more detailed breakdowns of the social care workers in local government than that afforded by SOC. However, it is more limited in its coverage than the LFS. The private or independent sector is just as important to consider as the public sector when taking a more global approach to examining the care workforce.

²⁴ The EO/IDeA classification says 'helps' rather than domestics (which is part of the 1990 SOC definition).

²⁵ The questionnaire is contained within the publication: *Social Services Analysis Handbook* (EO/IDeA, 4th Edition, 1997). This gives details about how the staffing return is collected and how LA's are to complete the questionnaire.

As its name suggests, the *Key Indicators Graphical System (KIGS)* is a database of indicators on *key* issues, including information on staffing data. This information on staffing is a computerised record of the staffing return data mentioned above. However, unlike the staffing return, it gives staffing numbers as whole time equivalents and not actual numbers. This means any comparative analysis with the LFS requires some conversion work. To make the KIGS data comparable to the LFS, cases in the LFS must be restricted to England and the KIGS data must be converted into whole numbers.

The *Employers Organisation (EO/IDeA)* has conducted a series of *Local Authority Workforce Surveys* and *Independent Workforce Surveys*. These are in addition to the workforce audit referred to above. Although the EO/IDeA Local Authority surveys look at children's services, they focus on staff involved in the *social care* of children. Therefore, they are not the same as the people whom we are calling childcare workers (*Nursery Nurses, Playgroup Leaders, Other Childcare*). However, the EO/IDeA *Independent* surveys do look at childcare workers as we have defined them (with publications on playgroups, the nursery workforce, childminders, etc.). Although the EO/IDeA also looks at both the public and private sectors, as in this study, it does not treat them as one workforce as we have tried to do.

The EO workforce surveys use the same classification as the staffing return, and the data is presented in actual counts. Therefore they also offer more detail than the LFS occupation codes by looking at job settings and job titles. The level of detail provided on the independent sector is also larger than that given in the LFS, so it is possible to compare the characteristics of those working in the public sector with those working in the private sector. Unfortunately, the LFS is only able to provide broad figures about the public and private sectors, such as the proportions of each occupational group working in each sector. These differences mean that the EO survey data cannot easily be compared directly to the LFS.

The National Institute for Social Work (NISW) Research Unit has conducted extensive surveys of the social care workforce, including work histories and training (see e.g. Balloch et al., 1999). However, the *NISW Work History Data* are restricted to Social Service Department (SSD) staff and cover only *certain* occupation types

(managers, social work staff, home care workers, residential workers). They therefore exclude childcare workers as we have defined them, as well as social care workers in the private sector. The occupations looked at by NISW are derived from SSD job titles rather than by structured classification systems like SOC or SIC, which makes it difficult to compare directly to the LFS. However, for the occupations it does cover, it provides a unique source of information, in particular work histories and more detailed information on workers' characteristics.

The *Training Organisation of the Personal Social Services (TOPSS)* has a publication - *Modernising the Social Care Workforce* - that examines the care workforce, using information collated from various sources. Although it looks at children's services, this again refers to staff that provide social care for children and not those we have defined as childcare workers. It presents tables of data and sets out a framework for improving the social care workforce. However, the figures mostly come from the EO and cannot be compared directly with those from the LFS, as they are classified differently.

The Thomas Coram Research Unit has conducted a number of surveys that cover childcare workers, including childminders and day nursery workers (e.g. Moss et al., 1995; Cameron, Owen and Moss, 2001; Mooney, Moss and Owen, 2001). The data from these surveys look at specific occupations within the childcare workforce, using job titles rather than a structured classification like SOC. They exclude the social care workers and are not directly comparable to this study. They do offer, however, like the NISW studies, a more detailed examination of some of the individual occupations within the childcare workforce than is possible with the LFS. These are especially useful sources to consider when looking *within* the broad SOC category of the *Other Childcare Occupations*.

The King's Fund Care and Support Inquiry Report details the result of a collection of evidence that had been supplied to the inquiry from a variety of individuals and organisations that have some kind of involvement in care and support. The focus of the inquiry committee has been "...on the quality of physical and emotional support to adults in need of help...". The report therefore emphasises the care and support received by *adults* and does not mention children. The inquiry committee have used

this collection of information to pinpoint to policy makers and practitioners the areas that require further, internal, review – from the quality of services associated with care and support to the recruitment and retention of staff.

The evidence that had been received by the inquiry committee mostly consisted of interviews. However, some quantitative material was also been supplied to them and appears intermittently within the main text and particularly within the appendix sections. This data is mostly taken from other sources that are referenced within the report but there is also an additional piece of quantitative analysis that has been conducted for the inquiry. This extra piece of work, which was commissioned by the inquiry to provide a quantitative profile of the workforce, was undertaken by the Personal Social Services Unit (PSSRU, university of Kent and LSE).

The PSSRU team used the LFS (1998) to obtain a workforce total (900,000) and then compared this total to an independent total (902,600) that was made up from adding together several key data surveys. The LFS analysis conducted by PSSRU used a similar methodology to this study in that they chose to pick out the ‘key’ occupations (rather than using the social work industry) to obtain their workforce total. However, the PSSRU analysis defined the care workforce differently to that mentioned within our report. The PSSRU study included the occupations: Care assistants/attendants, Social Workers/Probation Officers, Nurses, Occupational therapists, Nursing Assistants/Auxiliaries and Cleaners/ Domestic. In other words, the PSSRU analysis consisted of some ‘health’ occupations and some ‘care’ occupations. In our study, the nurses and assistant nurses were used as a comparative group, rather than part of the workforce itself. PSSRU probably used a combination of ‘health’ and ‘care’ occupations because the inquiry heard from both fields, with the focus being on the social care of adults.

The *United Kingdom Home Care Association Limited* commissioned a study entitled ‘Who cares? A Profile of the Independent Sector Care Workforce in England. This study aimed to provide information about the independent sector home care workforce - an area about which little is known. The report that came out of the study, is based on the results of two postal surveys – the first of which was sent to over 2,800 home care outlets (of which 275 returned valid forms, representing 325 outlets)

and the second of which was sent to 3,995 home care workers (of which 1,292 returned valid forms).

Within the report, it is difficult to determine if the work that is being carried out is for adults and/or children. However, from the surveys, the report does inform the reader about what the home care workforce actually does. For instance, before the introduction of community care policies these people were “untrained home helps” and now, home carers are people who provide care that would have previously been provided by qualified nurses. Indeed, many of the respondents had second paid jobs doing care work (one third of all those with second jobs), for instance, as a care assistant in a home or as an auxiliary worker in a hospital. Some of the respondents with second jobs were also registered nurses or worked in a related field such as occupational therapy. However, the report excluded nursing care and anyone whose job title was “nurse”.

Home care workers do not have a separate occupational coding within the LFS. Therefore, we have been unable to directly refer to these workers within our report. However, we have been able to determine within which occupational category the home care workers have been coded. Within SOC the home care workforce are coded within the cleaners and domestics. The cleaners and domestics form part of the social care workers in this study and, as mentioned in chapter 2, we have indirectly included the home care workers.

The surveys that were conducted for the UKHCA report provide new information about the hours of home care provision and the qualifications of home care workers. The surveys also shed light on the factors that might be affecting the ability and willingness of home care workers to undertake training. However, the information supplied on workforce numbers is not new and has been taken from other sources – DH staffing return, LGMB independent survey and the DH HCHC Staffing statistical bulletin. The UKHCA report estimates that the total home care workforce is 202, 500 (including those on providers’ books but not working in the survey week, and management and administrative staff) - 60 percent of which are working in the independent sector. This workforce appears to include live-in workers as well as workers without accommodation.

Summary

We have acknowledged previously in this chapter that the classification for occupations in the LFS (SOC) is less than perfect. However, we conclude that this approach is better than using SIC to investigate the care workforce. The two main advantages of SOC (over SIC) are:

- SOC allows a better level of detail. SIC, as we have demonstrated, has very broad industry categories, containing a variety of occupations. Because of the broad classifications in SIC, examination of the care workforce using SIC includes many other occupations that appear to be only indirectly related to care work, or quite unconnected. Using SOC, it is possible to select the range of occupations we require. For instance, whilst the broad category of the social work industry includes by default field staff and support staff, SOC allows us to keep in or exclude much more easily workers like managers or clerical staff from any analysis.
- SOC aids joined up thinking. When we examined the proportion of childcare workers in the social work industry, it was clear that the *Nursery Nurses* and the *Other Childcare Occupations* are not well represented – being coded mainly within the Education Industry. Had we chosen to look at the care workforce using SIC, we would have missed a very important section of the workforce.

Table 4: Industries (other than ‘Social Work’) in which social care workers are found

Industry	Industry descriptions	SIC codes	What occupations?
Real Estate and Property	Development and sale of real estate; buying and selling of real estate; letting own property; real estate agency; management of real estate	70.11 70.12 70.20 70.30-70.32	Mostly: <i>Welfare/community/youth workers and Matrons/Houseparents.</i>
Law, Security, Advertising, recruitment	Legal activities; business management consultancy; advertising; labour; personnel recruitment; investigation, security services; other business activities	74.11 74.14 74.40 74.50 74.60 74.84	Mostly: <i>Care Assistants/- Attendants.</i>
Government	General public service activities; regulation of activities of agencies that provide health care, education etc; development of government agencies; foreign affairs; defence; justice and judicial activities; public security, law and order; compulsory social security activity	75.11 75.12 75.13 75.21-75.24 75.30	Mostly: <i>Welfare/community/ youth workers and care assistants/attendants.</i>
Education	Primary education (state maintained and private non-maintained); Secondary education (state maintained and private non-maintained); Special education (state maintained and private non-maintained); sub-degree level education; first and post-degree level education; driving school activities; adult, other education	80.10 80.21 80.22 80.31 80.32	Mostly: <i>Nursery nurses and Other Childcare.</i>
Health	Hospital activities; medical practice activities; other human health activities	85.11 85.12 85.14	Mostly: <i>care assistants/ attendants</i>
Trade Unions, professional and other organisations	Professional organisations; trade unions; religious organisations; other membership organisations	91.12 91.20 91.31 91.33	Mostly: <i>welfare/community/ youth workers</i>

Table 5a: Data available on the social care workforce

Data Source	Description (if any)	Date	Coverage	Notes
Department of Health	Staffing Return SSDS001	30th September per annum	<u>Public Sector:</u> Staff in the Personal Social Services Full Count of LAs	<u>Annual count of SSD staff within Local Authorities:</u> classifying staff by Job setting, Client groups and Occupation type (job title). Includes managers and clerical staff. Data obtained by questionnaire. <i>Published annually under the title of 'Personal Social Services Staff of Social Services Departments (year)'.</i>
Department of Health	Key Indicators Graphical System (KIGS)	Annual	<u>Public Sector:</u> Staff in the Personal Social Services (only selected coverage of staffing data)	<u>Key Local Authority indicators:</u> a wide range of indicators including data on LA staffing of adult services. The data on staffing is taken directly from the staffing return.
Employers Organisation /IDeA	Local Authority Social Services Workforce Surveys (Series)	1997 1998 1999	<u>Public Sector:</u> Social Service Staff in England and Wales. 116 out of 171 total LAs sampled responded. Data grossed to 100% response rate. Data is social care only.	<u>Social Service Staff Survey:</u> a three-year rolling programme of surveys conducted on the local authority social services workforce in England and Wales. Looks at vacancies, turnover and recruitment, destinations of leavers and origins of starters, gender, ethnicity, qualifications and training of the Local Authority workforce. <i>Published within three reports (1997-1999) entitled: Social Services Workforce Analysis Main Report. The EO/IDeA also produced an executive summary to accompany the data.</i>
Employers Organisation /IDeA	Independent Sector Workforce Surveys series on Adult services	1997 1998 1999	<u>Independent sector workforce:</u> – including voluntary in England, Scotland, Wales and N. Ireland. Varying coverage depending on the type – residential and day centers covered.	<u>Survey of the Independent sector.</u> Questionnaires sent to a sample in the UK. The reports in the series are: Residential and Nursing Homes for Adults (1996 version available, 1998 pending) and Independent Sector Day Centres for Adults (1996 version available, 1998 pending). Independent Sector Children's Residential Homes Survey (1998) Information about workforce number, recruitment and retention, demographics. Some comparisons made between the public and private sectors.

Data Source	Description (if any)	Date	Coverage	Notes
EO/IDeA	Workforce Audit of the Personal Social Services, England	June 1999	<u>Public and Private sectors:</u> Those in the social work industry as defined by ONS Standard Industrial Classification. Secondary analysis of the LFS offers only overall numbers in the industry.	<u>LFS Survey analysis of social work industry:</u> restricted data analysis of a few key variables. Only a few social care Occupations are mentioned: total Social Workers, Welfare/ Community/Youth Workers, Care Assistants and Cleaners/helps. No analysis or mention of income. Report was commissioned and prepared for TOPSS to primarily examine the existing sources of workforce data for England. Description title given here is the publication containing the data findings.
NISW	Work Histories of Social Services Staff	1997	<u>Public Sector:</u> Social Service department staff. Random sample. Selected occupations only but includes managers.	<u>Longitudinal study carried out on a random sample of social service staff:</u> (managers, social work staff, home care worker, residential worker) in five English Local Authority Social Service departments. This work began in 1992. 2031 staff were interviewed in 1993/4 and 1577 staff in 1995/6. Data findings include tables on demographics, current job, years in employment, transfers into and out of social care and the career development of social service staff.
ONS	Labour Force Survey (LFS)	Quarterly per annum	<u>Public and private sectors:</u> Data about employees. Covers the entire workforce for England, Scotland, Wales and N. Ireland.	<u>Household survey:</u> <i>Data is collected from approx. 60,000 households per quarter.</i> It provides information about the general workforce, on things such as age, qualifications, ethnicity, hours of work and earnings. Information about industry and occupations are given.
TOPSS	Modernising the Social Care Workforce	April 2000	<u>Public and Private sectors:</u> Collates information from other sources e.g. EO and some extra tables. Examines the social care of Adults and Children in day care and residential settings.	<u>Social care workforce:</u> Examines the skills and qualification base of the workforce to provide a training and workforce strategy. The general report looks at both the child care and social care. The most relevant supplementary guides are those looking at: Child Care Domiciliary Care Residential Care Registration and Inspection

Data Source	Description (if any)	Date	Coverage	Notes
UKHCA	Who cares? A Profile of The Independent Sector Home Care Workforce in England	September 2000	<u>Public and Private sectors:</u> Workforce figures are not new. They are taken from other sources, EO (formerly LGMB) and the Department of Health. Main report findings are from two new surveys, looking into the home care that is being provided to adults.	<u>Home care workforce:</u> Information is supplied from two postal surveys sent to home care providers and home care workers. The report provides information about the hours of home care provision to adults and the levels of qualifications of home care workers. It also examines the factors that might be affecting the ability and willingness of home care workers to undertake training.

Table 5b: Data available on the childcare workforce

Data Source	Description (if any)	Date	Coverage	Notes
Department of Health	Staffing Return SSDS001	30th September per annum	<u>Public sector:</u> Staff in the Personal Social Services Full Count of LAs	<u>Annual count of SSD staff within Local Authorities:</u> classifying staff by Job setting, Client groups and Occupation type (job title). Includes managers and clerical staff. Data obtained by questionnaire. <i>Published annually under the title of 'Personal Social Services Staff of Social Services Departments (year)'.</i>
Department of Health	Key Indicators Graphical System (KIGS)	Annual	<u>Public Sector:</u> Staff in the Personal Social Services (only selected coverage of staffing data)	<u>Key Local Authority indicators:</u> a wide range of indicators including data on LA staffing of adult services. The data on staffing is taken directly from the staffing return.
Employers Organisation /IDeA	Independent Sector Workforce Surveys series on children's services	1997 1998 1999	<u>Independent sector workforce:</u> – incl. Voluntary. Mixed coverage – some England and other the UK. Childcare staff covered.	<u>Survey of the Independent sector:</u> Questionnaires sent to a sample of services in the UK. The series reports are: Independent Sector Children's Residential Homes Survey (1998) Independent Day Nursery Workforce Survey England (1998) Registered Pre-School/Playgroup Workforce Survey England (1998) Registered Out of Schools Clubs England (1998) Registered Childminders Workforce Survey England (1998) Agency Nannies Training Survey (1999). Survey of Education Support Staff and Volunteers in Nursery and Primary Schools in England (1999) Survey of Education Support Staff and Volunteers in Secondary and Special Schools in England (1999) Information about workforce number, recruitment and retention, demographics. Some also look at working conditions and regional comparisons.

Data Source	Description (if any)	Date	Coverage	Notes
EO/IDeA	Workforce Audit of the Personal Social Services, England	June 1999	<u>Public and Private sectors:</u> Those in the social work industry as defined by ONS Standard Industrial Classification. Secondary analysis of the LFS offers only overall numbers in the industry.	<u>LFS Survey analysis of social work industry:</u> restricted data analysis of a few key variables. Covers limited childcare occupations: Other childcare. No analysis or mention of income. Report was commissioned and prepared for TOPSS to primarily examine the existing sources of workforce data for England. Description title given here is the publication containing the data findings.
ONS	Labour Force Survey (LFS)	Quarterly per annum	<u>Public and private sectors:</u> Data about employees. Covers the entire workforce for England, Scotland, Wales and N. Ireland.	<u>Household survey: employees</u> Data is collected from approx. 60,000 households per quarter. It provides information about the general workforce, on things such as age, qualifications, ethnicity, hours of work and earnings. Information about industry and occupations are given.
TCRU	Entry, retention and Loss: A Study of Childcare Students and Workers	2001	<u>Independent Sector:</u> Covers England only.	<i>Sample Survey: childcare students and staff in day nurseries</i> Commissioned by the DfEE. Three elements to the study: secondary analysis of the LFS, survey sample of further education colleges, a survey sample of heads and other staff working in registered day nurseries in England.
TCRU	Childminding in the 1990s	Forthcoming	<u>Independent Sector:</u> Covers England only.	<i>Sample Survey: Childminders</i> Commissioned by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
TCRU	Survey of Day Care Providers in England and Wales	1995	<u>Independent Sector:</u> Covers England and Wales.	<i>Sample Survey: Day nursery managers, playgroup leaders and childminders</i> Funded by the Department of Health and Welsh Office.

CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSIONS

In this report, we have mapped and compared the care workforce, which we have defined as two broad occupational groups - childcare and social care - and the eight individual occupations that make up these broad groups. We have also compared the care workforce with two other main occupational groups: nursing workers and education workers (which are comprised of a further eight individual occupations), as well as comparing the care workforce with a group of four high percentage female non-care occupations and with all women workers. This mapping has provided estimates of numbers employed in the different occupational groups and individual occupations mentioned above. In addition, it has provided information on the characteristics of each occupation and on the status and conditions of employment, with some regional comparisons.

In this final chapter, we will draw some conclusions from this wide-ranging material, as well as make some evaluations of our main source, the Labour Force Survey. We identify some gaps in current information. The filling of such gaps would assist in developing a more strategic and joined-up approach to the care workforce and related areas of employment. Finally we come back to the theme of a joined-up approach towards the care workforce.

Getting an overview

In order to compare occupations in the four main human services sectors – social care, childcare, nursing and education – a cluster analysis was conducted using some summary variables for each of the 16 occupations, plus the group of *High percentage female jobs*. The variables included were average hourly pay, average hours worked per week, average age, percentage with qualifications at NVQ level 3 or above, percentage in the public sector, percentage female and percentage white. The result of the cluster analysis is shown diagrammatically in the form of a dendrogram in Figure 1. The longer the arm of the dendrogram that links two occupations, the more

Clusters of occupations derived from cluster analysis

Professional	Middle	Low-skilled
Secondary teacher	Nursery nurse	Cleaner/domestic
Primary teacher	Playgroup leader	Nurse assistants
Special education teacher	Other childcare	Ward assistants
Social worker	Care assistant	Education assistants
Nurse	Matron/houseparent	
Midwife	Welfare/community/youth worker	
	High percentage female occupations	

These groups form a hierarchy in terms of two important variables indicative of status: qualifications and pay (see tables 10, 11 and 22). The professional group occupies the top position in this hierarchy: on average, over 90 percent have qualifications at NVQ level 3 or above (although *Social workers* are lower, at 75 percent) and the average hourly pay rate is over £9, with only *Nurses* paid below this, at £8.31. For the middle group, about one third have NVQ 3 or above (although the *Welfare/Community/Youth workers* are higher at 59 percent). This group is also paid less per hour, at just over £5 on average: the *Matrons/Houseparents* and the *Welfare/Community/Youth workers* are paid more (£6.47 and £7.33 respectively) and the *Playgroup leaders* much less (£3.20). The low-skilled group have the lowest qualifications: on average, 20 percent of this group have qualifications at NVQ level 3 or above (only *Education assistants* are above: 35 percent). However, their pay is much the same as the middle group (average £5.11 per hour).

As well as having relatively high qualifications and pay, the professional group of occupations are largely in the public sector and mostly work full time (see tables 17 and 21). This group also works long hours, with an average of 38 hours per week. Altogether, these six occupations account for about 1.17 million workers. They form a large majority of the nursing workers group and the education workers group. Less than 10 percent of these are in the social care workers group and there are none at all in the childcare workers group. In other words, the care workforce (as made up of the

social care workers and the childcare workers) has few professional workers based on criteria of qualifications and pay.

The middle group are the least likely to be in the public sector (average 36 percent) - although all of the care occupations in this group have a higher participation in the public sector than the average for the *High percentage female occupations* (14 percent). Just less than half of *Nursery nurses* and *Other childcare occupations* are in the public sector (48 and 44 percent respectively), with few *Playgroup leaders* (17 percent). On average, this group works 28 hours per week, with only the *Matrons/Houseparents* working an average of 40 hours per week. However, the *Playgroup leaders* and the *Other childcare occupations* work much shorter hours (18 and 19 hours per week respectively). Altogether, these occupations account for almost a million workers (nearly half being *Care assistants*), not including the *High percentage female jobs*. They make up the entire childcare workforce, and also a large majority of the social care workforce. However, this group does not include any nursing workers or education workers.

The third group of occupations, like the professionals, mostly work in the public sector (80 percent). They work on average 26 hours per week. These four occupations account for less than a third of a million, almost half of them *Education assistants*. This group has an almost identical profile to the middle group: they have the same pay, work the same hours and are a similar age (except for the *Nursery nurses*), although the middle group are more likely to be in the private sector. What most distinguishes the two sub-groups is the higher level of qualifications in the middle group. But those qualifications have not managed to raise their level of pay towards the even more highly qualified professional group.

Recruitment and retention

This overview suggests that the lower status occupations in social care, childcare, nursing and education work may be in potential competition with each other for recruits – as well as with the high percentage female occupations (such as shop and office workers) where educational and pay levels are rather similar. Nor is competition likely to be confined to these lower status occupations. Henwood (2001) points out that recruitment difficulties in social care are “made worse by a very

similar recruitment problem in teaching, nursing and related professions, which are all competing for the same potential recruits” (para. 3.89). This competition for workers will be further intensified at a time when employment in other non-care service occupations is also increasing. This possibility – of “multiple competitors for a limited pool of workers” (Henwood, 2001: para. 3.86) – is supported by anecdotal observations, such as that by the Chief Social Services Inspector, referred to in Chapter One, that social carers may move out of social care into retail work (in supermarkets), attracted by less demanding work and better conditions.

What we cannot glean from the LFS is the actual extent of movement between occupational areas, either within care work or the wider service sector; nor how far women with lower levels of education regard childcare, social care, retail and other high percentage female occupations as one potential labour market, equally accessible to them. We also cannot tell from the LFS where workers in these occupations come from occupationally, why they enter, what range of jobs they considered or applied for, nor why they leave and where they go – i.e. into a related area (from one type of care job to another, for example) or into something quite different (from care work into retail, for example). These are issues on which the literature review, which forms the second stage of this study, may be able to throw some light.

One demographic feature may have reduced competition up to now. *Nursery Nurses*, within the childcare workforce, are, as we have shown in Chapter Two, significantly younger than any other individual care occupation, with many entering the work straight from school via a two-year training in the further education sector. However, as noted on Chapter One, the DfES has set a target of increasing the proportion of older workers in childcare work. If this is successful, then it will raise the average age of nursery workers and bring them more into line with other low status care occupations, such as *Care Assistants/Attendants* or *Educational Assistants* – so potentially opening the way to more competition for staff.

Gender and care responsibilities

Chapter one argued for a joined-up approach across occupations because of the potential common issues. One such issue we have already noted: the low levels of education and pay across a range of occupations in childcare, social care, nursing and

education work. This raises, as just noted, questions about recruitment and retention if the proportion of women with low levels of education is falling while, at the same time, increasing employment opportunities arise for them in other parts of the service sector. But it also raises more fundamental questions about the appropriateness of low qualifications and pay for the work being undertaken.

A second issue concerns the gendered nature of the care workforce, as well as the nursing and education workforces. Three-quarters or more of the workers in each of these four main groupings are women, ranging from 75 percent of education workers to 98 percent of childcare workers. Within three of these broad groupings, there is some variance in the gendering of individual occupations (the exception is childcare workers, where women account for 98 percent or 99 percent of all three individual occupations). The largest variation is within Education, mainly due to the relatively high proportion of male teachers in secondary schools (45 percent compared to just 14 percent in primary and nursery education, and 4 percent of educational assistants). In social care, 30 percent or more of the workers in *Social Work/Probation Work* and in *Welfare/Community/Youth Work* are men, compared to less than 10 percent of *Care Assistants/Attendants*. In nursing work, the highest proportions of male workers are found among *Hospital Ward Assistants* (21 percent), with 11 percent among both *Nursing Assistants/Auxiliaries* and *Nurses*.

With the exception of the *Nursing Assistants/Auxiliaries* and the *Hospital Ward Assistants*, occupations with higher proportions of male workers fall either in the higher status group or in the intermediate group (of *Matrons/Houseparents* and *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers*). Again with the exception of the two nursing groups, the group of lower status occupations are over 90 percent female.

As with qualifications and pay, the highly gendered nature of these occupations raises questions about recruitment and retention – since, in effect, many occupations are drawing all or most of their recruits from only half the population. It also raises issues about the appropriateness of the work itself for employing such high proportions of women (for a fuller discussion of possible explanations and consequences in the childcare field, see Cameron, Moss & Owen, 1999). Some concerns are being expressed at policy level with respect to the low levels of men in childcare work and

primary school teaching, and the DfES has set a target to increase men's representation in childcare work - although the target itself is modest (6 percent).

But the policy response so far is partial and fragmented. The issue of 'gender in care work' (or more broadly, work in 'human services') should, in our view, be a central part of any 'joined-up' and strategic approach to care work. This would need to cover men's participation both in paid and unpaid care work – connecting, for example, the caring role of fathers with men workers in childcare services, as well as the caring role of male relatives in eldercare with men workers in social care.

There is another significant implication of the highly gendered nature of care work, about which the LFS provides very limited insights. Women largely staff the occupations we have been studying; and women assume the greater part of informal, unpaid and family-based care work (as mothers, partners or female relatives). What then are the care responsibilities of the paid carers (or nurses or teachers)? The LFS only tells us which workers have dependent, co-resident children, which is an important but by no means comprehensive indicator of care responsibilities. This indicator of care responsibilities shows some variations, from 60 percent or more with 'co-resident children' among *Playgroup Leaders*, *Other Childcare Occupations*, *Midwives* and *Educational Assistants*, to 40 percent or less among *Matrons/Houseparents*, *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* and *Nursing Assistants/Auxiliaries* – as well as only 32 percent among occupants of other high percentage female jobs.

Other questions arise - does having care responsibilities lead women to enter some occupations but to leave other occupations? For example, research on childminding (employment located within *Other Childcare Occupations*) shows that most childminders enter the work when and because they have children, as a means of combining employment with working at home and caring for their own child (Mooney *et al.*, 2001). It may be that other occupations are similarly sought because they seem to offer working conditions that make employment more compatible with care work.

But there may also be some occupations which women are more likely to leave when they have children or other care responsibilities, because of their perceived

incompatibility. Most childcare students, for example, say that they will stop work, or seek part-time or home-based work, when they have their own children because they do not believe their own children should be cared for by others (Cameron *et al.*, 2001). If followed through, these intentions would mean many nursery nurses leaving nursery work on becoming mothers.

Last, but not least, the LFS can tell us nothing about how care workers (or people in the other occupations we have covered) manage the relationship between employment and care responsibilities, nor how much support and help they get from their employers, partners or others. The relationships between care responsibilities on the one hand and entry, retention and loss in the care workforce (as well as in education and nursing work), and what conditions mediate the relationship, seems of the utmost importance. Again, we shall be looking to see whether the second stage literature review can provide some understanding of this relationship.

Ethnicity

Although all the main occupational groups and the individual occupations that constitute them are overwhelmingly white, reflecting the general population, there are some variations. Thus, three individual occupations – *Social Workers/Probation Officers, Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* and *Midwives* – each have 11 percent of minority ethnic workers: these proportions are more than three times the levels among the three teacher groups, where only 3 percent of workers are minority ethnic, and more than twice the level among childcare workers, where minority ethnic workers make up 4-5 percent of the care workforce. Nor, it should be noted, is this divide simply one of job status: both *Social Workers/Probation Officers* and *Midwives* are alongside the teachers in the higher status occupations group identified above, while *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* are one of the intermediate occupations. There are also some variations among the low qualifications occupations but the differences are smaller.

The main problem in exploring this issue further arises from the relatively small numbers of minority ethnic workers in the LFS sample in the occupations we are examining. Even given the large overall sample size in the LFS and the combining data from three years, the numbers remain too small to support any more detailed

scrutiny. For example, it is not possible to break down the very broad ethnic categories used in our analysis or to undertake more detailed comparison of the characteristics of different ethnic groups in similar occupational groups.

In any case, the LFS cannot explain why certain occupations attract more minority ethnic workers, while others attract less. Why, for example, are there proportionately 6 or 7 times as many black workers within *Social Work/Probation Officers* or within the *Midwives* as there are within the *Secondary/Primary/Nursery/Special Education Teachers*? Or why there are three times as many black *Nursery Nurses* as there are black workers in the *Other Childcare Occupations*? We flag this up now to mark another issue for which the literature review may be able to offer some explanations.

Adequacy of the LFS coding

The use and manipulation of both the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) and the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) in this study has led us to reflect upon the adequacy of these classification systems for examining the care workforce.

As previously mentioned, this study chose to look at the care workforce using occupations (SOC). We decided to focus on two broad groups of care workers, childcare workers and social care workers, and constituted these broad groups from individual occupations classified by the SOC. When we looked at these individual occupations, including descriptions of the tasks undertaken by people allocated by SOC to these occupations (cf. Appendix One for these SOC descriptions), it was apparent that these individual occupations classified in the SOC in practice often cover more than one occupation and, in some cases, a considerable variety of care work. The most obvious examples of this are the *Other Childcare Occupations*, the *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* and the *Cleaners/Domestics*.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the *Cleaners/Domestics* in social work were included in our definition of the care workforce, since the occupation of 'Home help' was grouped there. However, we could not include all of the *Cleaners/Domestics* as they are found in a variety of settings, with only a small proportion involved in social work. To get as close as possible to the *Home helps* we chose to look at only those

Cleaners/Domestics found to be working within the social work industry. This meant using SOC and SIC *together*.

The *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers* are another example of difficult coding/categorisation. This is an occupation group that seems to encompass a range of occupations, which may not be well served by being coded together. As with the *Welfare/Community/Youth Workers*, there is also a clear case for separating the *Social Workers* from the *Probation Officers*, who differ in several significant ways, including most *Social Workers* being employed by local authorities, while the Home Office employs most *Probation Officers*. Unfortunately, the SOC does not allow these composite occupational groups to be disaggregated further by users.

The largest of these composite occupational groups we have considered within the care workforce is the *Other Childcare Occupations*. This occupation contains a variety of jobs and tasks – including ‘Nannies’, ‘Childminders’, ‘Playworkers’ and ‘Out-of-School Staff’. It is most unfortunate that as the coding currently stands, we are unable to analyse any of these jobs separately. For those interested specifically in the childcare workforce this presents a major problem, as these are very distinctive jobs that need to be analysed and recognised in their own right within any discussion of the childcare workforce.

The new SOC 2000, compiled for the 2001 census, will be used for the LFS in future. We have compared it to the SOC 1990. A table showing how they compare can be found in Appendix One. The comparing has revealed that some of the problems have been addressed – but not all. For instance, in SOC 2000, the *Social Workers* have been separated from the *Probation Officers*, the *Matrons/Houseparents* have a new title (*Houseparents and Residential Wardens*), the *Welfare Workers* have been separated from the *Youth and Community Workers* and the *Care Assistants/Attendants* have a new title of *Care Assistants/Home Carers*, which includes *Home helps*. Within SOC 2000, the home care workers have become a little more obvious in the coding and are split between the care assistants/attendants (if they are home carers) and cleaners/domestics (if they are domestic carers). In SOC 2000, within the childcare workforce, ‘Playgroup Assistants’ have been added to the *Playgroup leaders*.

As mentioned in Chapter one, Foster Carers are not identified within the SOC 1990 as an occupation. For the SOC 2000 (the update to the SOC 1990), Foster Carers are included as a job title, but it does not have a unique occupation code and therefore cannot be separately identified within the LFS. Furthermore, Foster Carers may also have another occupation besides being a Foster Carer, which they consider to be their main occupation. As the LFS only codes main occupations, there is likely to be an undercount of Foster Carers within the LFS.

However, some of the other SOC codes still leave room for improvement. For instance, although the *Other Childcare Occupations* code of SOC 1990 has a new title in SOC 2000 that acknowledges childminders are within it (now called *Childminders and Related Occupations*), it has still not been separated from the other individual job titles included within this code. Given the large numbers of registered childminders (75,000 in England in 2000: DfEE, 2001), this occupation would seem to merit separate coding. Aggregating together disparate care occupations in this way reduces the value of the LFS for monitoring and understanding the care workforce.

Although the classification for SOC 2000 is now complete, there is a case for those government departments involved with the care workforce to begin to consider what classifications might be most useful for the next version of the SOC.

Gaps in current information

We will confine ourselves here to gaps that might be filled through large-scale data sets, such as the LFS or specially commissioned surveys. Other gaps, which perhaps are more appropriately met through other forms of data collection, will be considered in the second stage of this study, which is reviewing the literature on the care workforce.

Unfortunately, the relatively small numbers of minority ethnic workers make it difficult to develop a better understanding of their position in the care workforce through the LFS. This will require complementary and focused research.

An important gap in our knowledge concerns the care responsibilities people have outside of their jobs, e.g. for children or for elderly relatives. This is true for all

workers, not just care workers. However, the LFS could provide useful information on care responsibilities. Limited questioning might enquire about care responsibilities and about the availability of workplace policies to support such responsibilities – and, indeed, to what extent these care responsibilities influence choice of job and working hours.

The other major gap concerns movement into, out of and between care occupations, and related fields such as education and nursing. This needs to cover both those who do enter the care workforce, and those who do not – why do some enter, and others not? When and why do people leave? Is there much movement between different types of care work? Do potential workers look at a range of care work, or do different care occupations draw from different pools of potential labour?

Answers to these types of questions are needed to assess to what extent there is an emerging crisis concerning the future of care work, how far it is a general one or specific to certain areas and what solutions might be considered. The LFS, however, cannot be expected to absorb such a wide range of issues. Other large-scale surveys will be needed to meet this task.

Who will do the caring in the future?

This report cannot provide short-term answers to the pressing issues of recruitment and retention confronting policy makers and managers in childcare, social care and related areas, here and now: it was never intended to do so. Instead, we hope that this report, with the subsequent literature review, will contribute to a longer-term, wide-ranging and securely based policy response, involving rethinking and restructuring. This contribution involves mapping a wide terrain of care work, bringing together childcare and social care, the responsibilities respectively of DfES and DH, as well as related occupations in the health and education sectors. By so doing, the report encourages border crossing, not only between occupations but between sectors.

This mapping exercise has shown similarities between occupations in different sectors (social care, childcare etc), enabling us to organise them into three cross-sectoral groups. It has also emphasised a great similarity across nearly all the occupations

considered: they are highly gendered. These similarities again support the value of taking a broad view, occupationally and sectorally.

Our mapping work has been done within a common context: widespread questioning of the nature of a variety of occupations, and widespread concern about the recruitment and retention of staff. In the words of the quotation with which we started: “care is becoming increasingly problematic for states and societies...(with a decreasing) supply of care at a time when demand is rising”. We say ‘common context’ because it is apparent that there are similar types of questioning and similar types of concerns across different sectors: childcare, social care, education, nursing. But so far the response has been sectoral rather than common, departmental rather than cross-departmental.

What is needed, we believe, is a joined-up approach to the future direction of care work, involving not only a number of government departments but also a range of other partners. This will need to address several critical questions. What do we mean by childcare and social care, indeed ‘care’ itself? How does paid care work relate to work in education and health? How should we structure future work in the areas of care, education and health? Do we need fewer but broader occupations, for example the pedagogue trained to work across a wide range of children’s services? What education and employment conditions are needed? Who will do the caring in the future?

While our focus in this report has been on paid work, a truly joined-up approach would have to take a wider perspective, including unpaid as well as paid work, since the same forces which may be creating a crisis in paid work are also affecting the provision of unpaid care. At the heart of the dilemma facing both types of care lies the gendered nature of care (and related work), and the unsustainability of this division of work if gender equity is a social and political value. Related to this is the question of value: will British society be prepared to revalue care work either because it believes this to be just or because it deems it necessary?

REFERENCES

- Balloch, S., McLean, J. and Fisher, M. (eds) (1999). *Social Services: Working Under Pressure*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Bower, C. (2001). Trends in female employment. *Labour Market Trends*, 109 (2), 107-118.
- Brannen, J., Moss, P., Owen, C. and Wale, C. (1997). *Mothers, Fathers and Employment: Parents and the labour market in Britain 1984-1994*. London, DfEE Research Report 10.
- Cameron, C., Moss, P. and Owen, C. (1999). *Men in the Nursery*. London, Paul Chapman.
- Cameron, C., Owen, C. and Moss, P. (2001) *Entry, Retention and Loss: A Study of Childcare Students and Workers*. London, DfEE.
- Carvel, J. (2001). Two become one. *Guardian* 7 February 2001.
- Central Statistical Office (1992) *Standard Industrial Classification of Economic Activities, 1992*, London, HMSO.
- Cousins C, Jenkins J, Laux R. (1998) Technical Report - Disability data from the LFS: comparing 1997-98 with the past. *Labour Market Trends*, 321, June.
- Daly, M. and Lewis, J. (2000). The concept of social care and the analysis of contemporary welfare states, *British Journal of Sociology*, 51 (2), 281 – 298
- Department for Education and Employment (1998) *Meeting the Childcare Challenge (Cmnd.3959)*. London: DfEE/DSS/Ministers for Women
- Department for Education and Employment (2000). *Statistics of Education: Children's day care facilities at 31 March 2000, England*. London, DfEE Statistical Bulletin 08/00.
- Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (2001) *Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership Planning Guidance 2001-2002*.
- Department of Health (1998) *Modernising Social Services (Cm 4169)*. London: Stationery Office
- Department of Health (1999). Personal Social Services Staff of Social Services Departments at 30 September 1999. England.
- Department of Health (2001). *NHS Hospital and Community Health Services Non-Medical Staff in England, 1999-2000*. London: ONS/GSS.

- Deven, F., Inglis, S., Moss, P and Petrie, P. (1998) *State of the Art Review of the Reconciliation of Work and Family Life and the Quality of Care Services*, London, DfEE, Research Report 44
- Employers Organisation/ Improvement and Development Agency (1999) *Workforce Audit of the Personal Social Services*. England. London, EO/IDeA.
- Employers Organisation/Improvement and Development Agency (1999) *Independent Sector Children's Homes Survey 1998*. London, EO/IDeA.
- Ginn, J., McLean, J., Andrew, T. and Balloch, S. (1997) *Work Histories of Social Services Staff*. London, National Institute For Social Work Research Unit.
- Henwood, M. (2001) *Future Imperfect? Report of the King's fund Care and Support Inquiry*. London: King's Fund Publishing
- Howe, L., Steele, P., Whiting, G. (ed.) (1999). *Health and Personal Social Services Statistics for England*. London, The Stationery Office.
- Inman, K. (2000) 'What a mesh', *The Guardian*, September 27 2000, 107-108
- Labour Force Survey (1999) LFS User Guide (Volume 2 and 3). PDF Files.
- Local Government Management Board & Association of Directors of Social Services (1997) *Social Services Workforce Analysis Handbook*. 4th Edition.
- Mathew, D. (2000). *Who Cares? A profile of the independent sector home care workforce in England*. Carshalton Beeches, UK Home Care Association.
- Mooney, A., Knight, A., Moss, P. and Owen, C. (2001) *Who Cares? Childminding in the 1990s*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Moss, P., Owen, C., Statham, J., Bull, J., Cameron, C. and Candappa, M. (1995). *Survey of Day Care Providers in England and Wales*. London, Thomas Coram Research Unit.
- Office for National Statistics (2000). *Standard Occupational Classification 2000: Volumes 1 and 2*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (1990). *Standard Occupational Classification*, London, HMSO
- Owen, C. (1999). Government household surveys. In D. Dorling and S. Simpson (eds) *Statistics in Society*. London, Arnold, 19-28.
- Social and Health Care Workforce Group (1999) *Social Services Workforce Analysis Main Report*. EO/IDeA.
- Social and Health Care Workforce Group (1998) *Social Services Workforce Analysis Main Report*. EO/IDeA.

- Social Services Inspectorate (2000) The 9th Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Social Services, London, Department of Health
- Social Services Inspectorate (2001) The 10th Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Social Services, London, Department of Health
- Thomson, R. (2001) Nursery Nurses' Pay: pay up! *Nursery World*, 14 March
- TOPSS (2000) *Modernising the Social Care Workforces – the first national training strategy for England*. England.
- Twomey, B. (2001) Women in the labour market: results from the spring 2000 LFS. *Labour Market Trends*, 109 (2), 93-106.

Appendix One

Technical note

Population Estimates

All population figures quoted in the tables and throughout the data findings chapter in the main text are based on estimates. The LFS is a sample survey with sample numbers but it provides a means of ‘weighting’ up these sample cases to accurately represent population numbers. However, even when this is done, the numbers for a single year are often too small to be able to establish some relationships. For this study, three years worth of data (1997-1999) was combined in order to maximize the number of cases we considered. The actual sample numbers were then weighted (using the LFS data variable *weight1* which was divided by three to provide an average population weight for the three years).

Variables

A number of variables have been used in this report to map the demographics and working conditions of the ‘Care Workforce’. Some of these variables have been taken directly from the LFS and some of these have been derived based on existing LFS variables. The following is a brief note of what information the variables cover and any details worth noting relating to the variables when examining the tables contained within appendix two.

The variables used in this report are:

- **Age Groups**

For this report, age was grouped into four categories:

- under 25 years
- 25-34 years
- 35-49 years
- 50 plus years

This is also given as a mean figure in this report.

- ***Ethnicity***

This was grouped into fewer categories than the original LFS variable. In this report, Whites are compared with ‘Blacks’ and ‘Asians’ and ‘others’.

- ***Gender***

No changes to the original variable were made.

- ***Marital Status***

No changes to the original variable were made.

- ***NVQ level***

Within the LFS literature that accompanies the data files, there are guidelines on how to convert ‘highest qualification’ into the equivalent NVQ levels (ONS: Volume 5: LFS classifications, page 108, 1999). All you get from the *actual* data files are variables asking if respondents have any NVQ qualifications and also how many NVQ qualifications respondents have. Thus, the guidelines on converting highest qualification must be followed if NVQ level information is sought. However, these guidelines are not straightforward and some computing is required to *properly* convert the equivalent qualifications to NVQ levels. This is because the NVQ level variable needs to include information on the exact number of various qualifications held (for A levels and O levels). However, this is *NOT* given in the highest qualification variable, so other variables in the questionnaire need to be looked at *in addition* to the highest qualification variable (hiqual). In this report, the necessary computing steps were taken to create this variable to give more accurate NVQ levels.

- ***Highest Qualification***

This is a derived variable in the LFS data files. This variable uses the information from a series of questions that note down ALL qualifications held by respondents. It uses this information to assign the *highest qualification* to respondents. For this report, this LFS derived variable was re-grouped. Instead of containing 32 separate categories, it is presented within the report as a summary variable containing 6 categories. Five of the categories were based on the re-grouping suggested within

the guidelines set out in the LFS User Guide (ONS: Volume 5: LFS classifications, page 107, 1999). However, the types and number of qualifications suggested for ‘degree level’ was divided into two groups for this report. Thus, the summary variable in this report has an additional category: above A level. This better distinguishes the ‘Care Occupations’ for the purpose of this report.

- **Age completed education**

This is the age at which respondents completed their *continuous full-time education*. This is given as a mean figure in this report.

- **Co-resident children**

The LFS does not present an easy means of finding out if people have their own children. Indeed, there is no question that asks this within the LFS. The LFS does offer however, an opportunity of finding out if there are any children who are co-residing with adults. In other words, the children counted are those in the same household but not necessarily the offspring of any of the adults in the household (they might be siblings for instance). This must be borne in mind when looking at these figures.

- **Enroll on education course**

According to the LFS, this question looks at “all persons in employment and all other men aged 16-64 and women aged 16-59 who are enrolled on an education course”. This variable therefore indicates all those who are working in the care workforce *and* who are also undertaking some kind of formalised training.

- **Work Related Training**

This is any job related training or education that respondents have taken up in the past three months. According to the LFS guidelines, this applies to “All men aged 16-64 and women aged 16-59 who are not still at school. It excludes those on government training programmes who are on ‘college based programmes’ and those still at school.”

- ***Disability***

There are several ways of defining disability. However, we followed the LFS recommendations in one of their technical reports (Labour Market Trends, June 1998) on disability, which suggested for “analyses of topics related to the labour market, ONS recommends using the work-limiting disability definition.” We used the LFS variable ‘Discurr’ and selected only those who said they were work limited disabled (categories 1 and 3 of Discurr). According to the same Labour Market trends, work-limiting disability can be defined as “a long term problem which affects the kind or amount of work which they might do.”

- ***Sector***

This variable reveals the proportions that are working in the public and private sectors. No changes have been made to the original variable for this report.

- ***Proportion in the Public sector***

This gives a more detailed look at the public sector. It gives the proportions of those *within* the public sector that are in various types of non-private organisations. Each percentage given in this table is therefore a proportion out of the total (for each occupation) percentage working in the public sector (given in the previous table, Sector: table 17).

- ***Permanent/temporary***

This gives the proportions of respondents in a permanent job and the proportions of respondents in a temporary job. No changes have been made to the original variable for this report.

- ***Work status***

This gives the proportions of respondents in a full-time job and the proportions of respondents in a part-time job. No changes have been made to the original variable for this report.

- **Mean gross annual pay**

Employee gross pay before deductions – supplied in this report as an annual period. This is given as a mean figure in this report.

- **Hourly Pay**

Derived for this report, hourly pay is calculated by dividing the gross pay by the total usual hours worked per week.

- **Total usual hours in main job**

This includes, according to the LFS, “paid and unpaid overtime”. This is given as a mean figure in this report.

- **Months continuously employed**

This refers to the length of time respondents have been continuously employed (in months) with their *current employer*. This is given as a mean figure in this report.

Cluster Analysis

Cluster analysis is a data analytical technique that attempts to separate a set of items into groups or clusters, because they are similar on some specified characteristics. Similarity is taken to mean how close the items are on some set of measures. In hierarchical cluster analysis, all the items (e.g. occupations) start as single entities. The two most similar, on some defined metric, are then combined into one group as a single entity. This process is repeated, at each stage combining the most similar entities (single items or groups), until all the items are combined into a single cluster. A diagram showing these successive combinations, and their levels of similarity, is known as a *dendrogram*. This tries to represent the analysis graphically. As single items are joined together to form clusters, they are linked together. The length of the horizontal line which first joins two items together is a measure of how similar they are: the longer the arm, the more dissimilar the items. A *cluster* is made up of items that are similar to each other (i.e. joined by short lines), but dissimilar to other items (i.e. joined by longer lines). (For a more detailed description, see, for example, Brian Everitt, 1993, *Cluster Analysis*, London, Edward Arnold.) In our analysis, we used income (hourly pay), hours worked, qualifications (those above NVQ level 3), percent

in the public sector, percent female and percent white to group the cases. The computer package SPSS was used for the analysis.

SOC descriptions of Social Care and Childcare Workers: Changes between 1990 and 2000

SOC 1990 Code	SOC 1990 Description	SOC 2000 Code	SOC 2000 Description
293	<p>Social workers/probation officers: Social workers and probation officers provide information, advice and support for individuals or groups on emotional, financial, health, housing and other social issues and supervise, counsel and help rehabilitate offenders</p>	<p>2442</p> <p>2443</p>	<p>Social workers: Social workers provide information, advice and support to protect the welfare of vulnerable groups including children, young people, families under stress, people with disabilities, elderly people and people who are mentally or physically ill. Probation officers: Probation officers supervise, counsel and help offenders before trial, during any prison or community sentence and on release from prison.</p>
370	<p>Matrons/houseparents: Matrons and houseparents organize and control the work of day or residential nurseries and residential homes for children or the elderly and supervise the care and control of young people in homes, schools or institutions for young offenders.</p>	6114	<p>Houseparents and residential wardens: Houseparents and residential wardens are responsible for the care and supervision of children, young offenders and the elderly within residential homes and nurseries, schools or institutions for young offenders.</p>
371	<p>Welfare, community, youth workers: Welfare, community and youth workers organize and co-ordinate group social activities for youth and community groups, assist the blind, deaf, sick, elderly, physically handicapped and mentally ill with problems relating to their condition, investigate cases of child neglect or ill treatment and perform other welfare tasks not elsewhere classified</p>	<p>3231</p> <p>3232</p>	<p>Youth and community workers: Youth and community workers provide support to individuals or groups of individuals through a range of activities or services that aim to encourage participation in social, political and community activities. Housing and welfare officers: Housing and welfare officers assess and address housing needs of particular localities and individuals, assist blind deaf, sick, elderly, physically handicapped and mentally ill with problems relating to their condition, investigate cases of child neglect or ill treatment and perform other welfare tasks not elsewhere classified</p>

SOC 1990 Code	SOC 1990 Description	SOC 2000 Code	SOC 2000 Description
644	Care Assistants/attendants: Care assistants and attendants attend to the personal needs and comforts of residents in establishments for the elderly and infirm.	6115	Care assistants/home carers: Care assistants and attendants attend to the personal needs and comforts of residents of the elderly and infirm, either within residential establishments or at home.
650	Nursery Nurses: <i>Nursery Nurses care for children in day or residential nurseries, children's homes, maternity units and similar establishments</i>	6121	Nursery Nurses: <i>Nursery Nurses care for children in day or residential nurseries, children's homes, maternity units and similar establishments</i>
659	Other Childcare and related occupations: Workers in this unit group perform a variety of childcare and related occupations not elsewhere classified.	6122	Childminders and related occupations: Childminders and related occupations perform a variety of domestic activities in the day-to-day care of children, and supervise and participate in their play, educational and other activities.
651	Playgroup Leaders: <i>Playgroup leaders supervise play and other activities for pre-school age children</i>	6123	Playgroup Leaders/Assistants: <i>Playgroup leaders/assistants deliver and facilitate play opportunities for children in a range of formal and informal settings including play groups, play schemes, free play locations and after-school activities</i>

NB:

1. The above descriptions are quoted from Volume 1 of the Standard Occupational Classification descriptions: OPCS 1990 and ONS 2000.
2. Cleaners/Domestics are missing from the above list as they have a broad description and can be found in many settings. As they are not confined to the 'Care Workforce', there is not much benefit from looking at the description for them.

Appendix Two

Data Tables

Table 6: Age profiles of the occupation groups

Occupation Group	Age groups										Mean age
	Age Under 25 years		Age 25-34 years		Age 35-49 years		Age 50+ years		Total		
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
1. Social Care Workers:											
Social workers/P. Officers	4	4	22	21	51	49	23	22	100	97	41
Matrons/Houseparents	7	4	14	8	43	26	36	22	100	61	44
Welfare/comm./youth workers	9	13	26	38	42	61	23	32	100	144	40
Care assistants/attendants	19	80	20	86	35	149	26	111	100	427	39
Cleaners/domestics	5	1	15	4	37	10	43	11	100	26	45
Total	14	103	21	157	39	294	26	199	100	754	40
2. Child Care Workers:											
Nursery nurses	35	33	23	22	33	31	9	8	100	94	32
Playgroup leaders	3	<1	17	4	65	15	15	4	100	24	41
Other childcare occupations	19	42	20	46	43	99	18	41	100	230	38
Total	22	76	21	72	42	146	15	53	100	348	37
3. Nursing workers											
Nurses	8	32	27	109	44	178	21	85	100	404	40
Midwives	5	1	31	9	49	14	15	4	100	28	39
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	13	15	22	27	39	46	26	31	100	119	40
Hospital ward assistants	11	3	19	4	49	12	21	5	100	24	40
Total	9	52	26	148	43	249	22	126	100	576	40
4. Education workers:											
Secondary teachers	5	16	19	59	52	159	24	74	100	308	42
Primary/nursery teachers	6	20	20	58	48	142	26	76	100	296	42
Special ed teachers	3	<1	10	4	52	20	35	13	100	38	46
Educational Assistants	6	9	15	21	59	84	20	28	100	142	41
Total	6	47	18	141	52	405	24	192	100	785	42
5. High % female jobs:											
Total	30	931	21	633	29	906	20	622	100	3,093	36
6. All Women workers:											
Total	17	1,747	24	2,379	37	3,783	22	2,269	100	10,177	39

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 7: Ethnic composition of the occupation groups

Occupation Group	Ethnicity									
	White		Black		Asian		Other		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:										
Social workers/P. Officers	90	86	6	6	2	2	2	2	100	96
Matrons/Houseparents	94	57	3	2	1	<1	2	1	100	61
Welfare/comm./youth workers	89	127	6	8	3	5	2	3	100	143
Care assistants/attendants	94	402	4	16	1	3	1	4	100	425
Cleaners/domestics	95	25	4	<1	1	<1	0	0	100	26
Total	93	698	4	33	2	12	1	10	100	753
2. Child Care Workers:										
Nursery nurses	95	89	3	3	1	1	1	<1	100	94
Playgroup leaders	96	23	1	<1	2	<1	1	<1	100	24
Other childcare occupations	96	220	1	3	2	4	1	2	100	229
Total	96	333	2	6	2	6	1	3	100	348
3. Nursing workers										
Nurses	92	373	4	16	1	4	3	10	100	404
Midwives	89	24	7	1	2	<1	2	<1	100	28
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	93	111	4	5	1	<1	2	3	100	119
Hospital ward assistants	93	22	5	1	*	<1	1	<1	100	24
Total	92	531	4	25	1	6	2	14	100	576
4. Education workers:										
Secondary teachers	97	298	1	3	1	4	1	3	100	308
Primary/nursery teachers	97	287	1	3	1	4	1	2	100	296
Special ed teachers	97	37	*	<1	1	<1	2	<1	100	38
Educational Assistants	95	135	2	3	2	3	1	1	100	142
Total	97	757	1	9	1	11	1	7	100	784
5. High % female jobs:										
Total	94	2,907	2	51	3	83	2	51	100	3,092
6. All Women workers:										
Total	95	9,632	2	182	2	208	1	154	100	10,175

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 8: Gender of the occupation groups

Occupation Group	Gender					
	Males		Females		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:						
Social workers/P. Officers	31	30	69	66	100	97
Matrons/Houseparents	16	10	84	51	100	61
Welfare/comm./youth workers	29	42	71	102	100	144
Care assistants/attendants	9	38	91	389	100	427
Cleaners/domestics	6	2	94	25	100	26
Total	16	121	84	633	100	754
2. Child Care Workers:						
Nursery nurses	1	<1	99	93	100	94
Playgroup leaders	*	<1	99	24	100	24
Other childcare occupations	2	5	98	225	100	230
Total	2	60	98	342	100	348
3. Nursing workers						
Nurses	11	43	89	361	100	404
Midwives	0	0	100	28	100	28
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	11	13	89	106	100	119
Hospital ward assistants	21	5	79	19	100	24
Total	11	61	89	515	100	576
4. Education workers:						
Secondary teachers	45	139	55	169	100	308
Primary/nursery teachers	14	42	86	254	100	296
Special ed teachers	24	9	76	29	100	38
Educational Assistants	4	6	96	135	100	142
Total	25	197	75	587	100	785
5. High % female jobs:						
Total	18	564	82	2,528	100	3,093
6. All Women workers:						
Total	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 9: Marital status of the occupation groups

Occupation Group	Marital status													
	Married		Living together		Single		Widowed		Divorced		Separated		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:														
Social workers/P. Officers	56	54	12	12	19	18	1	<1	9	9	3	3	100	97
Matrons/Houseparents	68	41	7	4	11	6	2	1	8	5	3	2	100	61
Welfare/comm./youth workers	54	78	13	18	21	30	1	3	7	9	4	5	100	144
Care assistants/attendants	54	231	10	43	21	89	2	10	9	38	3	14	100	427
Cleaners and domestics	67	18	10	3	11	3	4	1	5	1	3	<1	100	26
Total	56	423	11	80	19	147	2	17	8	63	3	25	100	754
3. Child Care Workers:														
Nursery nurses	49	46	12	11	31	29	1	<1	5	5	1	1	100	94
Playgroup leaders	84	20	2	<1	5	1	*	<1	6	1	3	<1	100	24
Other childcare occupations	65	149	6	14	19	44	1	3	6	14	2	5	100	230
Total	62	216	7	26	21	75	1	4	6	20	2	7	100	348
4. Nursing workers														
Nurses	61	246	9	4	17	7	2	8	7	27	3	14	100	404
Midwives	72	20	6	1	13	3	1	<1	5	1	3	<1	100	28
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	61	73	10	12	17	20	2	2	6	7	3	3	100	119
Hospital ward assistants	66	16	10	2	13	3	4	1	4	1	2	<1	100	24
Total	62	355	9	54	17	98	2	12	6	37	3	19	100	578
4. Education workers:														
Secondary teachers	68	209	9	26	17	17	1	3	5	13	2	5	100	308
Primary/nursery teachers	70	207	8	24	13	40	1	3	5	16	2	5	100	296
Special ed teachers	69	26	7	2	10	4	2	<1	10	4	2	<1	100	38
Educational Assistants	77	109	4	6	8	12	2	3	5	7	3	4	100	142
Total	70	552	7	59	14	107	1	10	5	40	2	16	100	785
5. High % female jobs:														
Total	50	1,534	10	301	32	1,001	1	46	5	144	2	66	100	3,093
6. All Women workers:														
Total	57	5,815	11	1,107	21	2,158	2	203	6	634	3	261	100	10,178

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 10: NVQ levels of the occupation groups

Occupation Group	NVQ level													
	NVQ5		NVQ4		NVQ3		NVQ2		NVQ1		NVQ0		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:														
Social workers/P. Officers	12	11	52	49	11	11	8	7	15	14	2	2	100	95
Matrons/Houseparents	1	<1	27	16	15	8	14	8	34	14	8	5	100	59
Welfare/comm./youth workers	5	7	39	55	15	21	15	21	21	20	5	6	100	141
Care assistants/attendants	0	<1	7	27	10	43	20	82	43	29	20	83	100	415
Cleaners and domestics	0	0	3	<1	7	2	11	3	37	179	41	11	100	26
Total	3	21	20	149	12	86	17	122	34	252	15	106	100	735
3. Child Care Workers:														
Nursery nurses	*	<1	20	17	13	11	28	25	35	31	4	3	100	88
Playgroup leaders	1	<1	24	5	14	3	15	3	43	10	3	1	100	23
Other childcare occupations	*	<1	8	19	10	23	19	42	41	93	21	48	100	226
Total	*	1	12	41	11	38	21	70	40	134	16	52	100	337
4. Nursing workers														
Nurses	1	6	93	374	1	5	1	6	2	10	*	<1	100	402
Midwives	2	<1	96	26	0	0	1	<1	*	<1	0	0	100	28
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	0	<1	10	11	12	13	22	25	36	40	19	22	100	112
Hospital ward assistants	*	<1	8	2	14	3	15	3	39	9	23	5	100	22
Total	1	69	73	414	4	21	6	35	10	59	5	28	100	565
4. Education workers:														
Secondary teachers	45	140	52	159	1	2	*	1	2	6	0	0	100	307
Primary/nursery teachers	20	58	77	227	1	3	1	21	2	5	0	<1	100	295
Special ed teachers	23	9	66	25	2	1	2	<1	6	2	1	<1	100	38
Educational Assistants	1	2	18	25	15	21	21	29	33	46	11	15	100	139
Total	27	209	56	435	3	27	4	33	8	59	2	16	100	780
5. High % female jobs:														
Total	*	17	9	259	16	494	26	779	34	1,037	14	419	100	3,006
6. All Women workers:														
Total	4	363	21	2,121	12	1,214	19	1,850	29	2,875	15	1,528	100	9,951

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 11: Highest Qualification of the occupation groups

Occupation Group	Highest Qualification													
	Degree		Above A levels		A levels		O levels		Other		No quals.		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:														
Social workers/P. Officers	43	41	22	21	15	15	12	12	6	6	2	2	100	96
Matrons/Houseparents	7	4	23	14	21	13	18	11	22	13	8	5	100	60
Welfare/comm./youth workers	27	38	19	28	22	31	16	23	11	16	5	6	100	143
Care assistants/attendants	3	11	7	28	22	94	21	90	28	117	20	83	100	423
Cleaners and domestics	1	<1	3	<1	13	3	15	4	28	7	40	11	100	26
Total	13	95	12	92	21	156	19	140	21	160	14	106	100	749
3. Child Care Workers:														
Nursery nurses	2	2	23	21	23	21	37	35	11	10	4	3	100	94
Playgroup leaders	7	2	21	5	20	5	27	7	21	5	3	<1	100	24
Other childcare occupations	3	6	7	16	16	37	29	67	24	54	21	48	100	228
Total	3	10	12	43	18	63	32	108	20	69	15	52	100	346
4. Nursing workers														
Nurses	10	42	84	34	2	8	1	6	2	7	0	<1	100	40
Midwives	11	3	87	24	1	<1	*	<1	*	<1	0	0	100	28
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	2	2	13	15	26	31	19	23	21	25	19	22	100	118
Hospital ward assistants	4	<1	10	2	20	5	25	6	19	4	22	5	100	24
Total	8	48	67	382	8	43	6	35	6	37	5	28	100	573
4. Education workers:														
Secondary teachers	83	255	14	45	1	2	1	1	1	4	0	0	100	308
Primary/nursery teachers	60	178	36	107	1	3	1	3	1	3	*	<1	100	296
Special ed teachers	56	22	33	13	3	1	1	<1	5	2	1	<1	100	38
Educational Assistants	7	10	13	19	22	31	31	44	15	21	11	16	100	141
Total	59	465	23	183	5	38	6	49	4	32	2	16	100	783
5. High % female jobs:														
Total	5	146	7	214	24	736	35	106	16	484	14	419	100	306
6. All Women workers:														
Total	14	1,423	12	1,250	18	1,827	25	2,566	15	1,501	15	1,528	100	10,101

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 12: Age at which the occupation groups completed their full-time education

Occupation Group	Age completed education
1. Social Care Workers:	
Social workers/P. Officers	18
Matrons/Houseparents	16
Welfare/comm./youth workers	18
Care assistants/attendants	16
Cleaners/domestics	16
Total	17
2. Child Care Workers:	
Nursery nurses	17
Playgroup leaders	17
Other childcare occupations	16
Total	17
3. Nursing workers	
Nurses	18
Midwives	18
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	16
Hospital ward assistants	16
Total	17
4. Education workers:	
Secondary teachers	21
Primary/nursery teachers	21
Special ed teachers	20
Educational Assistants	17
Total	20
5. High % female jobs:	
Total	17
6. All Women workers:	
Total	17

Table 13: Proportions co-residing with children

Occupation Group	Co-resident children					
	No		Yes		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:						
Social workers/P. Officers	58	56	42	40	100	95
Matrons/Houseparents	60	36	40	24	100	61
Welfare/comm./youth workers	60	86	40	57	100	142
Care assistants/attendants	61	258	39	168	100	425
Cleaners and domestics	65	17	35	9	100	26
Total	60	453	40	297	100	751
2. Child Care Workers:						
Nursery nurses	52	49	48	45	100	94
Playgroup leaders	25	6	75	18	100	24
Other childcare occupations	40	92	60	138	100	230
Total	42	147	58	200	100	348
3. Nursing workers						
Nurses	53	213	47	190	100	402
Midwives	38	11	62	17	100	28
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	60	72	40	48	100	119
Hospital ward assistants	56	13	44	11	100	24
Total	54	308	46	265	100	574
4. Education workers:						
Secondary teachers	53	164	47	144	100	308
Primary/nursery teachers	51	150	49	145	100	296
Special ed teachers	55	21	45	17	100	38
Educational Assistants	31	45	69	97	100	142
Total	49	380	51	403	100	784
5. High % female jobs:						
Total	68	2,093	32	996	100	3,089
6. All Women workers:						
Total	62	6,280	38	3,884	100	10,016

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 14: Proportions that are enrolled on an education course

Occupation Group	Enroll on education course					
	Yes		No		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:						
Social workers/P. Officers	20	19	80	77	100	97
Matrons/Houseparents	13	8	87	52	100	61
Welfare/comm./youth workers	22	31	78	112	100	144
Care assistants/attendants	12	52	88	374	100	426
Cleaners and domestics	6	1	94	25	100	26
Total	15	112	85	642	100	754
2. Child Care Workers:						
Nursery nurses	17	16	83	78	100	94
Playgroup leaders	23	5	77	18	100	24
Other childcare occupations	15	35	85	195	100	230
Total	16	56	84	291	100	348
3. Nursing workers						
Nurses	25	100	75	304	100	404
Midwives	29	8	71	20	100	27
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	15	18	85	101	100	119
Hospital ward assistants	10	2	90	22	100	24
Total	22	129	78	447	100	575
4. Education workers:						
Secondary teachers	11	35	89	273	100	308
Primary/nursery teachers	10	30	90	266	100	296
Special ed teachers	15	6	85	32	100	38
Educational Assistants	19	27	81	114	100	142
Total	13	98	87	686	100	784
5. High % female jobs:						
Total	18	562	82	2,530	100	3,092
6. All Women workers:						
Total	14	1,410	86	8,765	100	10,175

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 15: Proportions that have taken up work related training

Occupation Group	Work Related Training In Past 3 Months					
	Yes		No		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:						
Social workers/P. Officers	59	57	41	39	100	96
Matrons/Houseparents	35	21	65	39	100	61
Welfare/comm./youth workers	50	72	50	71	100	144
Care assistants/attendants	33	138	67	286	100	424
Cleaners/domestics	19	5	81	21	100	26
Total	39	294	61	457	100	751
2. Child Care Workers:						
Nursery nurses	38	36	62	58	100	94
Playgroup leaders	44	11	56	13	100	24
Other childcare occupations	18	40	82	184	100	224
Total	25	86	75	256	100	342
3. Nursing workers						
Nurses	59	239	41	165	100	404
Midwives	66	18	34	10	100	27
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	38	46	61	73	100	119
Hospital ward assistants	34	8	66	16	100	24
Total	54	311	46	263	100	574
4. Education workers:						
Secondary teachers	50	153	50	155	100	308
Primary/nursery teachers	59	174	41	122	100	296
Special ed teachers	56	21	44	17	100	38
Educational Assistants	39	56	61	86	100	141
Total	52	404	48	379	100	783
5. High % female jobs:						
Total	25	742	75	2,240	100	2,982
6. All Women workers:						
Total	29	2,905	71	7,126	100	10,031

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 16: Proportions with a work limiting disability

Occupation Group	Disability					
	Work Limiting disability		Other/none		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:						
Social workers/P. Officers	12	11	88	83	100	94
Matrons/Houseparents	7	4	93	52	100	56
Welfare/comm./youth workers	10	14	90	124	100	139
Care assistants/attendants	9	35	91	360	100	395
Cleaners/domestics	14	3	86	20	100	23
Total	10	67	90	640	100	707
2. Child Care Workers:						
Nursery nurses	5	5	95	87	100	92
Playgroup leaders	5	1	95	21	100	22
Other childcare occupations	7	16	93	202	100	218
Total	7	22	93	310	100	332
3. Nursing workers						
Nurses	7	26	93	360	100	386
Midwives	9	2	91	25	100	27
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	7	8	93	104	100	112
Hospital ward assistants	12	3	88	20	100	23
Total	7	39	93	509	100	548
4. Education workers:						
Secondary teachers	6	18	94	283	100	301
Primary/nursery teachers	5	16	95	273	100	288
Special ed teachers	7	3	93	33	100	36
Educational Assistants	6	8	94	128	100	137
Total	6	44	94	718	100	762
5. High % female jobs:						
Total	7	368	93	2,731	100	2,926
6. All Women workers:						
Total	7	669	93	8,912	100	9,581

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 17: Proportions working in the public and private sectors

Occupation Group	Sector					
	Private		Public		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:						
Social workers/P. Officers	17	17	83	80	100	97
Matrons/Houseparents	65	39	35	21	100	60
Welfare/comm./youth workers	44	63	56	80	100	143
Care assistants/attendants	62	264	38	162	100	426
Cleaners and domestics	31	8	69	185	100	26
Total	52	392	48	361	100	753
2. Child Care Workers:						
Nursery nurses	52	49	48	44	100	94
Playgroup leaders	83	20	17	4	100	24
Other childcare occupations	56	129	44	100	100	229
Total	57	199	43	148	100	347
3. Nursing workers						
Nurses	22	9	78	31	100	404
Midwives	2	<1	98	27	100	27
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	25	29	75	90	100	119
Hospital ward assistants	18	4	82	20	100	24
Total	22	125	78	450	100	576
4. Education workers:						
Secondary teachers	12	36	88	273	100	308
Primary/nursery teachers	11	32	89	264	100	296
Special ed teachers	19	7	81	31	100	38
Educational Assistants	8	11	92	130	100	141
Total	11	86	89	698	100	784
5. High % female jobs:						
Total	86	2,661	14	419	100	3,081
6. All Women workers:						
Total	70	7,077	30	3,070	100	10,175

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 18: Proportions working in different organisations within the Public sector

Occupation Group	Proportion in Public Sector: breakdown by organisation													
	Public industry		Central Gov.		Local Gov.		Education		Health		Other orgs.		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:														
Social workers/P. Officers	*	<1	9	9	70	68	1	<1	2	2	1	<1	83	80
Matrons/Houseparents	0	0	0	0	32	19	*	<1	*	<1	2	1	35	21
Welfare/comm./youth workers	*	<1	1	1	45	63	1	1	8	11	1	2	56	79
Care assistants/attendants	*	<1	*	<1	29	124	*	<1	8	33	1	4	38	162
Cleaners and domestics	0	0	*	<1	68	178	0	0	*	<1	*	<1	69	180
Total	*	<1	1	11	39	292	*	2	6	49	1	7	48	361
3. Child Care Workers:														
Nursery nurses	*	<1	*	<1	39	36	3	3	6	6	*	<1	48	44
Playgroup leaders	0	0	*	<1	8	2	*	<1	*	<1	*	<1	17	4
Other childcare occupations	0	0	*	<1	40	91	1	3	*	<1	2	4	44	100
Total	*	<1	*	1	37	129	2	6	2	6	1	5	43	148
4. Nursing workers														
Nurses	*	<1	*	2	1	4	*	<1	76	304	*	1	78	312
Midwives	*	<1	0	0	*	<1	0	0	98	27	*	<1	98	27
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	*	<1	*	<1	2	3	0	0	72	87	0	0	75	90
Hospital ward assistants	*	<1	*	<1	*	<1	0	0	78	19	*	<1	82	20
Total	*	<1	*	2	*	2	*	<1	76	436	*	2	78	444
4. Education workers:														
Secondary teachers	*	<1	*	<1	72	223	14	45	0	0	1	4	88	273
Primary/nursery teachers	*	<1	*	1	85	250	3	10	0	0	1	2	89	263
Special ed teachers	0	0	*	<1	76	29	3	1	0	0	*	<1	81	31
Educational Assistants	0	0	*	<1	86	121	6	8	*	<1	*	<1	92	130
Total	*	<1	*	2	79	623	8	65	*	<1	1	7	89	698
5. High % female jobs:														
Total	*		*	51	5	148	1	40	5	140	1	28	14	419
6. All Women workers:														
Total	*	55	3	297	15	1,550	2	230	8	845	1	94	30	3,070

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 19: Hourly pay in the public and private sectors.

Public Sector		Private Sector	
Occupation Group	Hourly pay	Occupation Group	Hourly pay
1. Social Care Workers:		1. Social Care Workers:	
Social workers/P. Officers	£9.31	Social workers/P. Officers	£8.11
Matrons/Houseparents	£6.16	Matrons/Houseparents	£7.01
Welfare/comm./youth workers	£7.77	Welfare/comm./youth workers	£6.81
Care assistants/attendants	£5.19	Care assistants/attendants	£4.08
Cleaners/domestics	£5.11	Cleaners/domestics	£4.61
Total	£6.74	Total	£4.94
2. Child Care Workers:		2. Child Care Workers:	
Nursery nurses	£5.88	Nursery nurses	£3.66
Playgroup leaders	£4.67	Playgroup leaders	£2.89
Other childcare occupations	£4.47	Other childcare occupations	£3.12
Total	£4.91	Total	£3.27
3. Nursing workers		3. Nursing workers	
Total	£7.88	Total	£6.97
4. Education workers:		4. Education workers:	
Total	£8.97	Total	£8.67
5. High % female jobs:		5. High % female jobs:	
Total	£5.98	Total	£5.02
6. All Women workers:		6. All Women workers:	
Total	£8.56	Total	£7.79

Table 20: Proportions in a permanent and temporary job

Occupation Group	Perm/temp					
	Permanent		Temporary		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:						
Social workers/P. Officers	93	89	7	6	100	95
Matrons/Houseparents	93	40	7	3	100	43
Welfare/comm./youth workers	86	119	14	19	100	138
Care assistants/attendants	93	384	7	27	100	412
Cleaners and domestics	96	22	4	1	100	23
Total	92	655	8	57	100	712
2. Child Care Workers:						
Nursery nurses	89	80	11	9	100	90
Playgroup leaders	93	19	7	1	100	20
Other childcare occupations	86	142	14	23	100	165
Total	88	242	12	34	100	275
3. Nursing workers						
Nurses	93	369	7	29	100	398
Midwives	97	27	3	<1	100	28
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	89	106	11	12	100	118
Hospital ward assistants	95	23	5	1	100	24
Total	92	524	8	43	100	567
4. Education workers:						
Secondary teachers	88	270	12	37	100	307
Primary/nursery teachers	82	239	18	52	100	291
Special ed teachers	79	29	21	7	100	37
Educational Assistants	65	91	35	49	100	140
Total	81	630	19	145	100	775
5. High % female jobs:						
Total	93	2,739	7	218	100	2,958
6. All Women workers:						
Total	92	8,543	8	753	100	9,296

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 21: Proportions in full-time and part-time employment

Occupation Group	Work status					
	Full-time		Part-time		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Social Care Workers:						
Social workers/P. Officers	80	77	20	19	100	96
Matrons/Houseparents	71	43	29	17	100	60
Welfare/comm./youth workers	62	90	38	54	100	144
Care assistants/attendants	45	190	55	236	100	43
Cleaners and domestics	16	4	84	22	100	26
Total	54	404	46	349	100	754
2. Child Care Workers:						
Nursery nurses	63	59	37	35	100	94
Playgroup leaders	13	3	87	21	100	24
Other childcare occupations	24	56	76	174	100	230
Total	34	118	66	230	100	348
3. Nursing workers						
Nurses	63	253	37	151	100	404
Midwives	59	16	41	11	100	28
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	49	58	51	61	100	119
Hospital ward assistants	49	12	51	12	100	24
Total	59	340	41	236	100	576
4. Education workers:						
Secondary teachers	82	253	18	56	100	308
Primary/nursery teachers	77	227	23	68	100	296
Special ed teachers	66	25	34	13	100	38
Educational Assistants	32	46	68	96	100	142
Total	70	551	30	233	100	784
5. High % female jobs:						
Total	50	1,533	50	1,559	100	3,092
6. All Women workers:						
Total	55	5,591	45	4,585	100	10,176

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

*=< than 1%

Table 22: Annual pay, hours worked, hourly pay and Months continuously employed for the occupation groups

Occupation Group	Mean gross annual pay	Total usual hours in main job (mean)	Hourly pay	Months continuously employed (with current employer)
1. Social Care Workers:				
Social workers/P. Officers	£17,586	37	£9.08	97
Matrons/Houseparents	£12,026	40	£6.47	90
Welfare/comm./youth workers	£12,290	32	£7.33	74
Care assistants/attendants	£6,856	30	£4.53	57
Cleaners/domestics	£6,266	21	£4.99	89
Total	£9,741	32	£5.86	69
2. Child Care Workers:				
Nursery nurses	£7,508	30	£4.85	61
Playgroup leaders	£2,845	18	£3.20	77
Other childcare occupations	£3,012	19	£3.96	58
Total	£4,423	22	£4.19	60
3. Nursing workers				
Nurses	£14,718	34	£8.31	101
Midwives	£17,011	35	£9.32	141
Nursing assistants/Auxiliaries	£8,618	31	£5.53	99
Hospital ward assistants	£8,927	30	£5.17	88
Total	£13,411	34	£7.69	102
4. Education workers:				
Secondary teachers	£21,957	43	£10.14	125
Primary/nursery teachers	£19,788	41	£9.61	114
Special ed teachers	£18,613	35	£10.08	103
Educational Assistants	£5,669	22	£4.76	65
Total	£18,020	38	£8.94	109
5. High % female jobs:				
Total	£7,978	28	£5.18	63
6. All Women workers:				
Total	£10,685	31	£6.29	80

N=thousands (rounded to nearest whole number)

Table 23a: Gender breakdown of the Social Care Workers by the regions of England

Occupational Group	Region	Gender				Total	
		Male		Female		%	N
		%	N	%	N		
Social Care Workers	Tyne and Wear	20	4	80	16	100	20
	Rest of N. Region	15	5	85	29	100	34
	S. Yorkshire	18	3	82	16	100	19
	W. Yorkshire	17	6	83	31	100	37
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	12	3	88	24	100	27
	E. Midlands	12	7	88	53	100	60
	E. Anglia	13	5	87	32	100	37
	Inner London	27	10	73	27	100	37
	Outer London	18	8	82	38	100	47
	Rest of SE	14	23	86	140	100	163
	South West	15	13	85	71	100	83
	W. Midlands (met County)	18	6	82	30	100	36
	Rest of W. Midlands	15	6	85	36	100	42
	Greater Manchester	18	7	82	34	100	41
	Merseyside	22	6	78	22	100	29
R. North West	16	6	84	34	100	40	

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

Table 23b: Gender breakdown of the Childcare Workers by the regions of England

Occupational Group	Region	Gender				Total	
		Male		Female		%	N
		%	N	%	N		
Childcare Workers	Tyne and Wear	0	0	100	6	100	6
	Rest of N. Region	1	<1	99	12	100	12
	S. Yorkshire	2	<1	98	8	100	8
	W. Yorkshire	2	<1	98	16	100	16
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	2	<1	98	12	100	13
	E. Midlands	3	<1	97	28	100	29
	E. Anglia	0	<1	100	14	100	14
	Inner London	4	1	96	19	100	20
	Outer London	2	1	98	36	100	36
	Rest of SE	2	1	98	80	100	82
	South West	2	<1	98	32	100	32
	W. Midlands (met County)	1	<1	99	17	100	17
	Rest of W. Midlands	1	<1	99	17	100	18
	Greater Manchester	1	<1	99	20	100	20
	Merseyside	4	<1	96	7	100	7
R. North West	1	<1	99	17	100	17	

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

Table 24a: Highest Qualification breakdown of the Social Care Workers by the regions of England

Occupation	Region	Highest Qualification													
		Degree		Above A level		A Levels		O Levels		Other		No Quals.		Total	
		%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Social Care Workers	Tyne and Wear	10	2	13	2	19	4	20	4	21	4	18	3	100	20
	Rest of N. Region	9	3	13	4	24	8	16	5	21	7	17	6	100	34
	S. Yorkshire	11	2	10	2	21	4	18	3	29	6	11	2	100	19
	W. Yorkshire	17	6	12	4	18	7	16	6	21	8	16	6	100	37
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	10	3	15	4	20	6	20	5	18	5	17	5	100	27
	E. Midlands	9	5	9	6	23	14	19	12	20	12	19	11	100	59
	E. Anglia	8	3	10	4	14	5	19	7	35	13	13	5	100	37
	Inner London	29	11	13	5	19	7	13	5	18	7	9	3	100	37
	Outer London	19	9	13	6	18	9	15	7	22	10	12	6	100	47
	Rest of SE	12	20	11	18	18	33	23	36	20	33	12	20	100	162
	South West	10	9	14	12	21	18	23	19	19	16	12	10	100	83
	W. Midlands (met County)	12	4	13	4	22	8	12	4	24	8	16	6	100	36
	Rest of W. Midlands	12	5	14	6	23	7	18	7	20	8	18	7	100	41
	Greater Manchester	12	5	12	5	18	9	13	5	21	9	19	8	100	41
Merseyside	10	3	15	4	22	8	17	5	19	6	11	3	100	29	
R. North West	11	4	12	5	27	8	20	8	22	9	13	5	100	40	

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

Table 24b: Highest Qualification breakdown of the Childcare Workers by the regions of England

Occupation	Region	Highest Qualification														
		Degree		Above A level		A Levels		O Levels		Other		No Quals.		Total		
		%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
Social Workers	Care	Tyne and Wear	4	<1	19	1	11	1	28	2	16	1	20	1	100	6
	Rest of N. Region	3	<1	16	2	18	2	31	4	15	2	17	2	100	12	
	S. Yorkshire	0	0	5	<1	13	1	27	2	36	3	18	1	100	8	
	W. Yorkshire	2	<1	13	2	20	3	29	5	17	3	19	3	100	16	
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	3	<1	13	2	9	1	27	3	26	3	22	3	100	13	
	E. Midlands	5	1	11	3	17	5	34	10	17	5	15	4	100	29	
	E. Anglia	4	<1	5	1	20	3	34	5	22	3	14	2	100	14	
	Inner London	2	<1	14	3	19	4	19	4	31	6	15	3	100	20	
	Outer London	3	1	12	4	22	8	26	9	24	8	12	4	100	36	
	Rest of SE	3	2	13	11	16	13	35	28	19	16	14	11	100	81	
	South West	2	<1	13	4	22	7	33	10	17	5	13	4	100	32	
	W. Midlands (met County)	3	<1	12	2	16	3	29	5	22	4	18	3	100	17	
	Rest of W. Midlands	0	0	14	2	18	3	33	6	24	4	11	2	100	18	
	Greater Manchester	4	1	9	2	20	4	33	7	15	3	18	4	100	20	
Merseyside	0	0	12	1	11	1	38	3	14	1	25	2	100	7		
R. North West	4	<1	14	2	26	4	33	5	10	2	12	2	100	16		

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

Table 25a: Proportions of Social Care Workers in the private/public sectors by the regions of England

Occupational Group	Region	Private/Public				Total	
		Private		Public		%	N
		%	N	%	N		
Social Care Workers	Tyne and Wear	35	7	65	13	100	20
	Rest of N. Region	52	17	48	16	100	34
	S. Yorkshire	41	8	59	11	100	19
	W. Yorkshire	44	16	56	21	100	37
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	60	16	40	11	100	27
	E. Midlands	48	29	52	31	100	60
	E. Anglia	59	22	41	15	100	37
	Inner London	51	19	49	18	100	37
	Outer London	46	22	54	25	100	47
	Rest of SE	57	93	43	70	100	16
	South West	62	52	38	31	100	83
	W. Midlands (met County)	42	15	58	21	100	36
	Rest of W. Midlands	54	22	46	19	100	41
	Greater Manchester	41	17	59	24	100	41
	Merseyside	52	15	48	14	100	29
R. North West	52	21	48	19	100	40	

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

Table 25b: Proportions of Childcare Workers in the private/public sectors by the regions of England

Occupational Group	Region	Private/Public				Total	
		Private		Public		%	N
		%	N	%	N		
Childcare Workers	Tyne and Wear	45	3	55	3	100	6
	Rest of N. Region	39	5	61	8	100	12
	S. Yorkshire	41	3	59	5	100	8
	W. Yorkshire	41	6	59	9	100	16
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	52	7	48	6	100	13
	E. Midlands	54	16	46	13	100	29
	E. Anglia	59	9	41	6	100	14
	Inner London	56	11	44	9	100	20
	Outer London	64	23	36	13	100	36
	Rest of SE	68	56	32	26	100	82
	South West	64	20	36	11	100	32
	W. Midlands (met County)	39	7	61	11	100	17
	Rest of W. Midlands	57	10	43	7	100	18
	Greater Manchester	50	10	50	10	100	20
	Merseyside	41	3	59	4	100	7
R. North West	62	10	38	6	100	17	

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

Table 26a: Proportions of Social Care Workers working full-time/part-time by the regions of England

Occupational Group	Region	Work Status				Total	
		Full-time		Part-time		%	N
		%	N	%	N		
Social Care Workers	Tyne and Wear	64	13	36	7	100	20
	Rest of N. Region	51	17	49	17	100	34
	S. Yorkshire	54	10	46	9	100	19
	W. Yorkshire	47	17	53	20	100	37
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	51	14	49	13	100	27
	E. Midlands	48	30	52	31	100	60
	E. Anglia	52	20	48	18	100	37
	Inner London	67	25	33	12	100	37
	Outer London	61	29	39	18	100	47
	Rest of SE	55	90	45	73	100	163
	South West	46	38	54	45	100	83
	W. Midlands (met County)	49	18	51	18	100	36
	Rest of W. Midlands	55	23	45	19	100	41
	Greater Manchester	60	25	40	16	100	41
	Merseyside	57	16	43	13	100	29
R. North West	51	20	49	20	100	40	

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

Table 26b: Proportions of Childcare Workers working full-time/part-time by the regions of England

Occupational Group	Region	Work Status				Total	
		Full-time		Part-time		%	N
		%	N	%	N		
Childcare Workers	Tyne and Wear	34	2	66	4	100	6
	Rest of N. Region	35	4	65	8	100	12
	S. Yorkshire	32	2	68	5	100	8
	W. Yorkshire	34	6	66	11	100	16
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	20	3	80	10	100	13
	E. Midlands	37	11	63	18	100	3
	E. Anglia	26	4	74	11	100	14
	Inner London	48	10	52	10	100	20
	Outer London	41	15	59	21	100	36
	Rest of SE	28	23	72	59	100	82
	South West	26	8	74	24	100	32
	W. Midlands (met County)	33	6	67	12	100	17
	Rest of W. Midlands	43	8	57	10	100	18
	Greater Manchester	36	7	64	13	100	20
	Merseyside	48	3	52	4	100	7
R. North West	41	7	59	10	100	17	

N=thousands (rounded to nearest thousand)

Table 27: Annual gross pay, hours worked and hourly pay of the ‘Care Workforce’ by the regions of England

Occupation Group	Region	Mean gross annual pay	Total Usual Hours in main job (mean)	Hourly pay
Social Care Workers	Tyne and Wear	£8,989	33	£4.99
	Rest of N. Region	£9,551	32	£5.51
	S. Yorkshire	£9,726	32	£5.93
	W. Yorkshire	£9,005	30	£5.91
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	£8,507	30	£5.43
	E. Midlands	£8,515	31	£5.53
	E. Anglia	£11,182	31	£5.95
	Inner London	£13,397	33	£7.91
	Outer London	£12,291	33	£7.30
	Rest of SE	£9,845	32	£5.84
	South West	£8,006	30	£5.10
	W. Midlands (met County)	£10,245	31	£5.89
	Rest of W. Midlands	£10,007	31	£6.09
	Greater Manchester	£9,297	33	£5.47
	Merseyside	£9,357	32	£5.31
R. North West	£8,304	31	£5.31	
Childcare Workers	Tyne and Wear	£6,109	22	£4.15
	Rest of N. Region	£4,633	21	£4.40
	S. Yorkshire	£2,723	19	£7.00
	W. Yorkshire	£5,197	22	£4.57
	Rest of Yorkshire & Humberside	£3,789	17	£4.40
	E. Midlands	£4,221	23	£3.53
	E. Anglia	£5,055	18	£4.11
	Inner London	£7,897	28	£6.33
	Outer London	£5,035	26	£4.35
	Rest of SE	£3,517	21	£3.82
	South West	£3,929	21	£3.84
	W. Midlands (met County)	£4,341	20	£4.34
	Rest of W. Midlands	£4,742	25	£3.83
	Greater Manchester	£4,244	22	£4.08
	Merseyside	£4,729	26	£4.62
R. North West	£4,778	25	£3.52	

NB: It is noticeable that the childcare workers in South Yorkshire stand out at as earning more than inner and outer London, on an average £7.00 per hour. However, this may not be a true reflection of actual hourly pay for these childcare workers. The numbers are very small for this regional analysis, making the data in this table less reliable. Also, the hours question in the LFS is answered better than that income question, which is only asked in two of the four quarters of the LFS.