

Transcript: Exploring Work, Employment and Income through National and European Datasets



[0:00:00]

Pierre Walthéry: Hello, and welcome to this presentation by the UK Data Service about the data that we hold on work, employment and earnings. My name is Pierre Walthéry, I am a researcher with the UKDS, and I'm really happy to take you through this short journey on employment and the labour market. To start with, I will just say a few words about this presentation, which is going to be mostly about really bread and butter, essential data that is very commonly used by researchers in academia and elsewhere. The plan that will be following is basically, I will say a few words about who we are and what we do as UK Data Service. I will spend a little bit of time talking about definitions of work and employment, and then focus the core of what I'm going to say on the Labour Force Survey. I will finish by providing a few tips about how to find data on our website. Okay, so who are we? What do we do? The UK Data Service, very briefly, is the main repository of UK secondary social science data. It is a provider of support, training, and individual guidance to users. All of this is freely accessible and funded by the Economic and Social Research Council. In terms of the data curation side of what we do, we hold and we provide access to major UK surveys, which is large scale cross-sectional government survey series. The Labour Force Survey being a case in point, but also major longitudinal studies. Typically things such as Understanding Society, or one of the academic studies. We also provide access to all our other data, multinational data, census, business and administrative macro data, as well as qualitative and multimedia data. We provide, and that's the other side of our business, training and user support via a helpdesk - which any of you are most welcome to use - via webinar drop-ins, workshops, and also online learning material that is available at any time for users. Also, we do not only work with or provide training with survey data, but also with new forms of

data, computational social science. Okay, now to focus on a few definitions that are probably good to know when thinking about labour market data or employment and work. It's precisely about clarifying a little bit what we mean by work and employment, and maybe labour, which are the three words that the English language holds for basically what we do in relation to work, and sometimes these are used interchangeably. Employment is at its core a form of economic activity and a legal contractual relationship between two or more parties. It has a formal definition, and as a result of this formal definition, there is a wide availability or wide supply of standardised statistics across the industrial world, so it's something that's relatively straightforward to find data about. On the other hand, work, even if it's sometimes used as a synonym of employment, work has to be either understood as a specific form of employment that is a job, or, and that's maybe the more scientifically adequate understanding of the word, as the activities and the circumstances that take place as part of the employment relationship. Basically the final characteristics of what happens in this contractual employment arrangement, and of course it follows from this that all work is not employment. All work does not necessarily take place within an employment relationship. Finally, beyond this dichotomy distinction between work and employment, there's also broader aspects that are usually also examined when looking at work. I'm thinking about the really finer, nitty gritty examination or analysis of what happens every day, every hour, in people's activities when they are at work. It's the field of ergonomics, and there is data about that. I'm thinking also about broader views about people's thoughts and representations about their job, or aspects of their job, so either therefore about their employment or their work. Then other research on aspects of work and employment, such as for example research on data therefore on job quality. Okay, so now looking and focusing on the first concept, that is employment. We can say a few things. Employment as an economic activity is part or is the object of an internationally agreed definition that is, or the keeper of it, so to speak, is the International Labour Office, which is a branch of the United Nations. There are different variations of this, but the bottom line of this distinction is the distinction between paid work, unemployment, and economic inactivity. Part of it maybe also brings

about the distinction between employment as self-employed or employment as an employee. In some data, this is part of the same variable... as I've just mentioned, or employment status being a distinction between self-employed and employees. Beyond this really basic set of characteristics, there are a number of contractual aspects that have to do with work that are also very commonly recorded in surveys. I'm having in mind things such as whether the employment contract is full-time or part-time.

[0:08:39]

Pierre Walthéry: These are really common variables that you can find, of course in the Labour Force Survey, but also in most social surveys, these are part of the socioeconomic control variables that people use in their analysis. For those of you interested in further exploring the distinction between work, employment, and different aspects of work, I have added this picture here, this plot, coming from the International Labour Office. If you are interested in exploring more, have a look at this and follow the link to the ILO. Now I'm going to focus on really what is the main interest of this presentation, which is the Labour Force survey. The Labour Force Survey really is the workforce of labour market analysis in the UK. It was first collected in 1973 and then maybe 1975 as a series of one-off, and then it began to be a regular survey from 1981, a yearly survey, and since 1991 began as what is called a continuous survey. It began as a requirement of the UK becoming a member of the EU. It is required, indeed, from members of the EU to collect data on their labour market for Eurostat. The data collection was carried out, and still is, by the Office for National Statistics. As I said really, the LFS is the mainstay of most labour market statistics in the UK. When you hear about the labour market, employment, etc., numbers, it's most likely coming from the LFS. There are about 30,000 - sorry for the typo here - 30,000 respondents interviewed at each quarter, because indeed now the LFS is a quarterly survey. These 30,000 respondents, some of these respondents are interrogated at four subsequent quarters, which provides short-term longitudinal data. From this survey organisation follows or derives four products. The first one, and the most commonly used, is the quarterly Labour Force Survey. Cross-sectional data,

large sample, 30,000, and the broader supply or the larger supply of variables about the labour market. In addition to that there is also the longitudinal data set, so either two or five quarters of longitudinal data, which by definition is a smaller sample and provides fewer variables than the quarterly LFS dataset. At the other end we also have the annual population survey, which is a collation of several quarterly datasets. It has a very large sample, so allows researchers to create very accurate estimates, but on the other hand has fewer variables, and then there's a household level series of dataset. Okay, so now I'm going to focus in the next slides on really key LFS variables that most researchers of the labour market use very frequently. The first one is working time. When we talk about working time in the context of mainstream labour market analysis, it mostly is weekly working time. Actually, this refers to two slightly distinct definitions or variables. One is about the working time during a period of reference, usually last week or the week before people are interviewed, or the usual working time during, a stylised typical week, people are asked about. These are the two very common, and of course we use usual working time when actual working time is not available. For example, in the case of people who are temporarily sick or on leave. In addition to this core measure of weekly working time, additional variables or additional questions are asked about whether people are on flexible or atypical work patterns, such as flexi time, on-call work, or others. Another aspect of it is also whether people work unsocial hours, which is work at the weekend or in the evenings. The downside of such variables is that they provide little information about daily or monthly working time, and also we don't know much about the daily or weekly rhythms and cycles for people who do not work the same amount of hours every day. Another key variable for the study of the labour market is occupation. Occupation in a nutshell is the formalisation of the notion of job. We could say it's the task or duties that one carries out as part of the employment relationship. These are usually defined formally around, on the one hand, the levels of skills required to carry out these duties, and the degree of specialisation that is also required. All of that is summarised or recorded in nomenclature that's called the Standard Occupational Classification, or SOC, who was latest revised in 2020. SOC is basically a list of occupations, and that

comes in four different flavours. A really summarised one which only includes nine occupations, or nine major groups, one digit occupation, and more detailed ones up to the unit level, unit group, which are a four-digit list of occupations, and of which there are a few hundred. To give you a small idea of what it looks like, on the left hand side we have the least detailed occupations, so the seven here is an example, or six, even if it's not visible. Then we have two-digit, three-digit, up to the four-digit detailed definition of occupation. Another key LFS variable or labour market variable is industry sector. This is not anymore an individual level variable, but it's about the economic activity of the business or organisation where the respondents are employed. There's also nomenclature internationally agreed, which is the Standard Industrial Classification, and the latest revision of this dates from 2007.

[0:17:20]

Pierre Walthéry: Similarly to SOC, we have four levels of detail, ranging from sections which are I think 13, which is the one-digit list, up to class, which are the most detailed version. To give an overview here as well, so we have the letter that describes the one-digit, agriculture, forestry, and fishing, up to the four-digit. Here we can see growing of grapes, growing of tropical and subtropical fruit, as an example. Okay, and now maybe another kind of commonly looked at variable in the LFS, we have earnings. Earnings can be recorded as hourly or monthly, and less often yearly or weekly. In the specific case of the LFS, people are asked to provide an amount of money they make, and then the period of time that this money is earned for. Usually it's hourly and monthly, but sometimes it's not, and actual hourly and monthly amounts are derived by the Office for National Statistics. These questions are asked separately for gross and net earnings, as well as for main and second jobs. Variable pay, whether it's variable over time, and for those who are interested in categorical version, pay bands are available, which is also a way of recording people who are reluctant to provide a precise amount of money they make. In most of the surveys, the information that's recorded about earnings is much simpler and usually focuses on net monthly pay or a single figure. Of course, it's important to keep in mind that earnings are distinct from

income, and income also includes benefits and incomes from capital, for example, rent and investment. Broadly speaking, what kind of other survey data is available on employment and work? Looking at job satisfaction, there's the European Working Conditions Survey, which was collected in the last time with UK data in 2015, unfortunately not anymore because of Brexit. There's the Time Use Survey that allows for really precise and detailed availability of daily or weekly work rhythms, so literally every ten minutes. If you're interested in the broader picture of people's incomes, then the Family Resource Survey, as well as the annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, provide more detailed information, on the one hand about other sources of income, on the other about work-related earnings. For people interested in longer term than five quarter employment trajectories, Understanding Society is the place to go. You can not only follow people's labour market trajectories for several years, but look at associations with a wide range of other variables. Finally, if you're interested in attitudinal data, then the British Social Attitudes Survey is the place to go. Something to always be careful about when working with survey data - oops, sorry, I'm getting wrong with the slide here. Another type of data basically that's available is qualitative and deposited survey research data. These are research data deposited by people whose project was funded by the SSRC, and is increasingly a treasure trove of lesser known and lesser accessible kind of data, all of which are accessible via ReShare on the UKDS website. Just to show the outcome of a research I did on the website using ReShare and work as keywords, you can see there are all sorts of interesting studies or data that you can use for your project. That's the slides I wanted to talk about before. Something really essential to consider when looking at survey data is to make sure that you understand what the phrasing of the question behind the variable was. Always look at the actual question in the documentation. Then consider the sample size of the data you work with. Is it large enough, and also, what was the population of reference? The time in which the data was collected may be important for your research question, so does it make sense for you to work with data that was collected a long time ago? Survey design and weights and how they need to be used also is something that needs to be looked at, as well as the application process

required to access the data. Which leads me to the next and final topic, how to find and access data from the UK Data Service. I will really go quickly here. There are basically three main entries to our data, so either via the data catalogue, which is along with the search tool, or browse the data pages; Variable and Question Bank; and Quali Bank for qualitative data. There's also HASSET Thesaurus, which is about looking for keywords. Searching the catalogue, very straightforward, with the larger search box on the main page of our website. That gives you, for example, climate change, a list of words that deals with it. In terms of data access policy, that's important because not all data is freely or easily accessible. We have four levels of access, ranging from open data which can be freely downloaded, to control data which requires a lengthier process of application, and also can only be used in a secure lab or a safe network. If you want to register to access data and you are affiliated with public sector or academic organisations in the UK, you can log in via OpenAthens or Shibboleth. If you're not, you can simply create your own UK Data Archive account and apply for access to the data from there. You will find here on the slides a series of references to the resources I've mentioned. Thank you very much for your attention. I hope this will help your research, and I am looking forward to your questions and comments.

[0:25:56]

Van Phan: Hello everyone, my name is Van Phan. I'm from the Wage and Employment Dynamics project, and we are excited to present the insights from our work using the newly linked ASHE and HMRC dataset, to better understand the dynamics of income and employment in the UK. Now let's dive in. Let's start with the ASHE data. ASHE data is the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings. It is one of the UK's most important sources for official statistics on earnings and working hours. It plays an important role in monitoring policies such as the impact of the national living wage, the national minimum wage, and also in analysing pensions reform. The ASHE data represents a 1% sample of the employee jobs, taken randomly from the PAYE register, and it is completed by their employer of their work in an average year. Completion of the surveys is mandatory, however in practice,

some, not all, employers respond to the surveys, or maybe they do not respond quickly enough by the time the surveys end. Therefore the annual yield from the issue sample of ASHE is around 66%. ONS grew a cross-sectional way to make it representative of the population of the employee jobs. However, one of our methodology papers considered about the employer non-random response in ASHE, so that we enhance the cross-sectional weight. From that we also estimate of the longitudinal weight as well, because originally ASHE is desired for cross-sectional study, not for the longitudinal study, therefore the attrition in ASHE tends to be higher compared to other surveys. We move to the HMRC data. HMRC dataset provides another perspective, covering a broader range of income throughout the PAYE data and the self-assessment data. The data we have is for 1% of employee jobs in the UK who should be represented in the ASHE sample. In the PAYE, we have for those who has employee jobs or occupational pensions, and we have a very detail of their employment and their payment submissions record weekly or monthly, and the data is coverage from tax year 2015 to 2019. For the self-assessment data, it includes self-employment and all the income, and that's for those who make the self-assessment returns form. The data expands from the tax year 2011 to 2018, but it has some limitations. Just say they miss some key personal characteristics. We move on to discuss more detail about the newly linked ASHE and HMRC data. On the left hand side you see that's the PAYE data, and on the right hand side you can see the SA data, the self-assessment data. They are able to link straight directly to each other by the HMRC ID. Take a step back, and then we look at the PAYE data itself. From all the source files provided by ONS, we turn it into the output files, including PAYE Weekly Clean. That's the payslip record for those who pay weekly only, and then the PAYE Monthly Clean, so that's the payslip record for those who pay monthly only. When we're gathering all the weekly and the monthly pay together and then converting their pay into the monthly, we call that the PAYE Monthly Panel. We combine them all to turn the payment into weekly pay, so we call that the Weekly Panel. Similarly for the ASHE supplements, that's a PAYE ASHE supplement. That's the payslip data by the individuals and the year and sum across all jobs, including information on the number of jobs,

proportion of time in paid employment, labour market activity at the time of the ASHE survey. It's also included data from the employment files and end of year file, and of course some of which do not have any payslip associated with them. Now we're taking on this self-assessment data. We've got all different source files from the self-assessment data, who is making the self-assessment return. It's including the main tax returns file and the short tax return schedule files, additional information schedule, self-employment especially partnership schedule, self-employment including sole trader schedule, employment schedule, tax calculation schedule and summary files, and also some demographic information file at the end. We are gathering all of them together and make it as the output files. We call that as a master, and then from those we are collapsed by the individuals and by year to create it as a sub master. In the PAYE data supplied to the web project, they don't have any information on someone's age or gender, but we can recover these from the ASHE data, as long as the people appear in ASHE at least once in the period 1997 to 2022. We try to recover the hidden age and gender into the HMRC data. Here is the number of individuals in the HMRC dataset that we have. For the weekly pay in the PAYE data, around 100,000 people in each year from 2015 to 2019, and for the monthly pay it's three times the number as the weekly pay. When we combine them all together, we've got around 350,000 people in each year. For our assessment data, we've got around 100,000 people in each year 2011 to 2019. We were curious about the linkage rates between ASHE and PAYE data, so here is the summary, and here is the figure to show the match rate between the ASHE and the PAYE data.

[0:34:37]

Van Phan: Overall, the match subsets include 725,000 observations, and the match rate is varied from 77% in 2014 to around 80%, 81% in 2018, and similarly for the self-assessment data. We expect a quite a low rate between ASHE and the self-assessment data, because ASHE is for the employee jobs, and self-assessment for those who make self-assessment returns. The match rate between the ASHE and the self-assessment observations include around 122,000 observations, and

the match rate varies from around 7.5% to around 9% across the year. The question is how well the data is, so we just take one example. We compare the weekly pay between ASHE and the PAYE data for people who have only one job at the point in time of the ASHE survey, and we chose that sub sample because like we don't have specific identifier to merge drop by drop between ASHE and PAYE data. That's why we have to take the subset of the people who have one job at that point in time in ASHE, so that we make sure that that's the right subset between ASHE and the right subset of the PAYE data, to compare their paid. You can see on the figures, the mean and the median weekly wage are almost identical across the whole wage distributions. There ASHE data appears to have slightly more higher pay employees, but the difference is negligible. We go further to investigate the gender pay gap for those people who have one job at the point in time of the ASHE survey. We can see that the gender pay gap for ASHE seems slightly smaller as compared to the PAYE data. At the lower pay distribution the difference seems very, very small, but the difference seems to be getting wider at the top pay distributions. Another example at which we are dealing with the HMRC PAYE data is to look at the number of weeks and the number of jobs people held over the year for those who are in the working age, means 16 to 64, for the whole period. On the left hand side is the number of weeks people work in a year. On average, you can see that in a given tax year over the period tax 2015 to tax year 2019, roughly around three quarters of them had at least one job in paid employment for nearly the whole year. However, only around one in ten of them had paid employment for less than 31 weeks in a year. On the right hand side, you can see the number of the employee jobs held by those people. On average, around three quarters of employees had a single employer, around 20% of women and 17% of men have two employers over the course of the year, and the remainder of 8% to 7% had at least three or more different employers. As we all know that earning can be varied across the industry where people work for, so we try to plot the figures, the average nominal gross hourly wage in ASHE against the average annual gross nominal earnings in HMRC by industry sector, for those who are in working age 16 to 64 in Great Britain. You can see that dashed line shows the implied cross nominal annual

earnings in the industry sector. What does that mean? We mean that we take the average hourly wage for their gender and for their sector they are working on, and then cumulative for the whole year. Approximately around 1950 hours, and the line will give us some indications of which industry sectors tend to be associated with the persons who are going to earn relatively more or less compared to the actual working hours they earn in ASHE. Comparing the male and female plot, we can see many more of the industry level average of the nominal annual gross hourly earnings for women lie well below the dotted line as compared to men, so the result shows the greater relevancy of part-time work among the women. In another data insight published under the ADR UK, we try to use the enhanced ASHE data and the ASHE HMRC data to analyse the gender pay gap in Great Britain. The figure here shows three measurements of the gender pay gap. The dotted line means the unweighted gender pay gap, the dashed line is the gender pay gap using the ONS weight, and then the solid line is the gender wage gap with the adjusted weight. All three series shows the conversions in the gender pay gap over the 20-year period, but there is also a clear rank order in terms of the size of the gender pay gap when it's estimated from ASHE in different ways. The gap in the mean pay is higher than those in median pay. The unweighted gaps are lower than those estimated with weight, but one noticed that the gender pay gap is always larger with the adjusted weight than when it is using the ONS weight, around by one percentage point throughout the series. Now we move on the ASHE PAYE data, because it will provide a new perspective on the gender pay gap by estimating the gap in total earnings across all the jobs that the employees undertake in the given period. In this exercise, we take the tax year 2018/2019 as an example. We can see the top graph is the gender pay gap in week four of the tax year 2015/2016, the bottom left shows the gender pay gap in terms of the monthly pay for the first three months of the tax year 2018/2019, and then the bottom right shows the gender pay gap in the first quarter of the tax year. We can see that the estimations of the gender pay gap do not appear to be sensitive to the length of the periods used. Whether it's weekly or monthly or quarterly, the overall gender pay gap still stays around 30%, 31%. This is three times as large as the gap in the hourly pay derived from the

ASHE for the same year, which is shown in the previous slide. This suggests that the hours of work within the week, rather than weeks of work and the multiple job holdings, are the principal factor explaining the average earning gap, therefore we need a further analysis and a deeper analysis. Looking beyond the average may reveal a different pattern for the gender wage gap. Above are all the illustrations, what we can do with the ASHE and HMRC data, and of course it's great in some certain ways because they've got detailed employment, detailed pay, so we can analyse to study about the volatility in terms of earnings. Also, the data itself have some problems as well. For example the lack of the personal characteristics. We don't have a lot of personal characteristics, except to retrieve back from ASHE in terms of the gender, age. We also lack the matching across the datasets, and lack of the business reference, which is allow us not able to link job by job between ASHE and PAYE data. This issue is under review by ONS at the moment, so hopefully in the future we will have a better match rate between job to job rather than person to person at the moment. Here is some work using the ASHE and HMRC data. The first one is the study of Brewer to measure earnings volatility using the ASHE and the PAYE dataset. The two data insights from the web projects as well, using the ASHE and HMRC data to provide the very first insight, what we can do with the ASHE and HMRC data. How the user will be supported using our data, so we've got a wide range of documentations available for them. They use the guides, the metadata, some methodology papers as well which I mentioned previously, and some code repository to see what we've done with the data, how we admin the data to the research-ready data for the wider researcher. Where you can find them, you can find them on the ONS website or on the WED team website, wagedynamics.com. We're also building the knowledge hub for the user for Q&A as well, so here is the link, and thank you for your listening.

[0:47:32]

Jule Adriaans: Hi, my name is Jule Adriaans, and I'm a researcher at the Faculty of Sociology at Bielefeld University in Germany. Today I would like to showcase some of the research potential that the European Social Survey has to offer.

Based on the ESS frontline data collection, I will focus on subjective evaluations of income, tackling the question, how fair or unfair is the pay of workers in Europe? The motivation behind this is pretty straightforward. There are substantial inequalities in Europe, both within and between countries. On the right hand side, we can see some figures on income inequality in the UK. The bottom half of the population earn about 18% of all income, while the very top 1%, so a tiny fraction of the population, already earn about 12% of all income. In light of such numbers, government and supranational organisations such as the UN or EU have put the reduction of inequalities on their agendas. The need to reduce inequality is usually motivated by the implicit or explicit assumption that ultimately inequality harms societies, so why is it so hard to foster concrete political support for measures that reduce inequality? First, laypeople are notoriously bad at judging the extent of inequality, including misjudging their own position in the distribution, and second, people seem to strive for justice rather than equality. That is distributions that take individuals' needs and contributions into account, rather than allocating everyone the same share. Based on these two observations, I argue that justice considerations offer an important angle on how people make sense of inequality and react to it. In other words, while observed differences in income like we see them on the right hand side are crucial, subjective appraisals of income offer a compelling perspective on inequality as well. Accordingly, I'm going to try to answer the question, how unfair is Europe from the perspective of laypeople, and how do people react to the unfairness they identify? In trying to answer these questions, we built on the two guiding principles of empirical justice research. First, justice lies in the eye of the beholder, meaning that justice perspectives are subjective. Second, justice is multidimensional, meaning that justice evaluations are formed about all kinds of things, distributions, procedures, and behaviour, and from multiple perspectives, taking fairness for self and fairness for others into account. These principles were also important guideposts in developing a rotating question module that featured in round nine data collection of the European Social Survey, ESS. Thirty items on subjective justice evaluations were fielded, with fieldwork spanning from 2018 to 2019. The European Social Survey is a general population survey that offers

high quality country comparative data across a wide range of European countries and topics.

[0:50:39]

Jule Adriaans: In round nine, 29 European countries participated, resulting in a large dataset with more than 49,000 respondents, which included more than 26,000 respondents who reported working for pay. The Special Questionnaire Module on Justice and Fairness in Europe covered a wide range of measures that refer to distributive justice, procedural justice, and the belief in a just world, and detailed documentation on all items and concepts is available on the ESS website. For today, we are focusing on the justice outcomes, in particular the fairness of evaluations of own income. How is this measured? Respondents were asked, would you say that your gross pay is unfairly low, fair or unfairly high? Keep in mind that the ESS round nine data collection took place as face-to-face study, so an interviewer would read the question to the respondent and provide them with the following nine-point response scale. The response scale captures three things. It distinguishes between fairness and unfairness. People who think that pay is fair would choose the scale midpoint, the zero. Secondly, the response scale distinguishes between unfair under-reward, getting less than deserved indicated by the left hand side of the scale and the negative numbers, and unfair over-reward, that is getting more than deserved, on the right hand side. Finally, the scale allows to differentiate the intensity of injustice, with higher absolute numbers indicating a stronger sense of unfairness. Okay, so how do workers in Europe evaluate their own pay? Looking at the answer distribution, we can see that about 43% of all workers in Europe evaluate their pay as fair, displayed in purple. While this sounds like quite a few people are content with their pay, this also implies that the majority of workers in Europe thinks that they are unfairly paid, with 52% feeling unfairly underpaid, and only 5% feeling unfairly overpaid. So far, we have pooled responses across all 29 countries. If we look at the answer distributions for each country separately, we can detect some pretty sizeable country differences. While in Denmark 68% of workers feel they are fairly paid, a large majority of 80% of all workers in Hungary feel that they are

unfairly underpaid. In general, we can see a tendency that the share of unfairly paid workers is larger in low income countries. Okay, we have already seen that the overall state of fairness seems to be rather grim with regard to workers own pay. However, as we already discussed above, people do not only form fairness evaluations about themselves, but also about others. We take this into account by focusing not only on the fairness for self, but also the fairness of others. In particular, we add another perspective, and that is how fair is the pay within a person's occupation? We asked, in general, do you think the pay of people who work in the same occupation as you in Europe or in your country is unfairly low or unfairly high? Combining these two evaluations of own pay and of pay in the occupation captures unique constellations of justice and injustice that have been shown to have unique consequences. To reduce complexity, we only distinguish between fairness and unfairness, yielding a two times two typology. If we fill in the two-by-two table, we can distinguish four different kinds of justice constellations. If both own pay and pay within the occupation are fair, there is no deprivation, all is good. If however one's own pay is evaluated as unfair but pay in the occupation is deemed fair, we may call this constellation egoistic deprivation. On the contrary, if only the occupational pay is unfair, we may refer to this as fraternal deprivation. Building on previous research, we assume that constellations where self is deprived, the corresponding justice consequences would also relate to self. Here we would expect a reduced wellbeing response. At the same time, if one's group is unfairly paid, we would assume justice responses that are more directed at systematic change, that is, a political reaction. Finally, in constellations where both self and group are unfairly paid, people face double deprivation, which given the multiple sources of unfairness, are assumed to show a particularly intense justice response. Now let's see how prevalent these justice constellations are. About half of all workers in Europe face double deprivation. That is, both themselves and the occupational group is paid unfairly. At the same time, only a relatively small fraction thinks it's only them who are being paid unfairly, 6% overall. Some more people think it's only their occupation, but not themselves who faces unfair pay, 13% overall. The remaining 30% face no deprivation at all. If we again take a country comparative

perspective, we see that egoistic deprivation is most prevalent in high income countries, with the largest share of about 11% in Norway, while double deprivation with multiple sources of unfairness is most prevalent in Eastern Europe. Above, I argued that justice consequences map on to the object of evaluation, and double deprivation will show the strongest justice response.

[0:56:33]

Jule Adriaans: If we put this to the test by using a categorical variable that covers the four possible fairness constellations as an explanatory variable for well-being and political reactions, we can see that in fact, double deprivation shows the strongest association with justice outcomes, life satisfaction, subjective health, satisfaction with democracy, and preference for redistribution. Moreover, egoistic deprivation focusing on unfair pay for self is more relevant for wellbeing than fraternal deprivation. At the same time, fraternal deprivation focusing on unfair pay for the occupational group shows a stronger association with preference for redistribution than egoistic deprivation, suggesting that indeed group level injustice relates to system level call for change. What have we learned? Based on ESS round nine data, there is a strong sense of unfair pay among workers in Europe, with the majority of workers evaluating their own pay as unfair. However, the experience of unfairness is not limited to self, but extends to the occupational group as well, with about half of all workers in Europe facing double deprivation, with the highest prevalence in Eastern Europe. This is highly relevant because the experience of unfairness has consequences. While unfairness of own pay is associated with lower wellbeing, fraternal deprivation is linked to a stronger preference for redistribution. While this was only a very first glimpse into the larger question of how workers in Europe evaluate their pay, I hope this showcase was able to emphasise the immense potential that the European Social Survey offers in studying subjective attitudes towards income and unemployment, based on freely available high quality data that, beyond this small exercise, allows to link justice considerations to inequality structures, country level contexts, and a range of justice consequences spanning personal and political responses. Thank you very much for your attention, and I hope you consider using the European

Social Survey, with its wide range of topics and countries covered, as part of your research.

[End of Transcript]