RESEARCH PAPER #19

RAPPORT DE RECHERCHE #19

The Unhealthy Canadian Workplace

by
Andrew Jackson

November 2002

Canadian Labour Congress

Congrès du travail du Canada

Kenneth V. Georgetti, President/Président

opeiu-/siepb-225

The Unhealthy Canadian Workplace

Andrew Jackson, Senior Economist
Canadian Labour Congress

Introduction and Summary

The purpose of this paper is to provide a broad overview of the state of employment and working conditions so as to set a context for an analysis of the impacts of the working environment on health. The focus is on the quality of work as opposed to wider conditions in the labour market, and on working conditions as opposed to wages.

The links from employment to health are not examined here in detail, though they implicitly frame the selection of topics. Suffice to say at the outset that research has established strong links from unemployment and precarious employment to poor health outcomes, and from poor employment conditions to poor physical and mental health. Poor employment conditions include: dirty and dangerous jobs, including exposures to harmful substances which pose risks to physical health in terms of injuries and occupational disease; jobs which are stressful by virtue of the pace, demands or repetitive content of the labour process; jobs which are stressful because of the exercise of arbitrary power in the workplace; jobs which are stressful because they do not meet human developmental needs; and, jobs which are stressful because they are a source of conflict with the lives of workers in the home and in the community.

In recent years, health researchers have increasingly emphasized links from work stress to physical and mental health. Stress can arise from many sources, including job insecurity, the physical demands of work, the extent of support from supervisors and co-workers, work-life conflict, and job strain (Wilkins and Beaudet, 1998). High job strain — a combination of high psychological demands at work combined with a low degree of control of the work process — and other sources of workplace stress have been linked to an increased risk of physical injuries at work, high blood pressure, cardio-vascular disease, depression and other mental health conditions, and increased "lifestyle risks" to health.

The well-established linkage from income and social class to physical and mental health outcomes is probably, in very significant part, a product of the work conditions associated with income level and class position. Work poses physical risks, and is clearly a major source of "psycho-social" stress which has been identified as one major cause of increased morbidity and mortality.

It is ironic, not to say tragic, that the shift to a post-industrial society with an increasingly well-educated and skilled workforce is associated with rising levels of stress rather than increased well-being at work. Research has shown some negative consequences for health to date, but the full impact of current conditions is likely to be slow to appear. It should be borne in mind that many of today's older workers and retirees were workers in the "Golden Age" of post-War capitalism when working conditions were more closely regulated, and conditions were improving. Many of the health impacts of 21st Century work may just be appearing.

The focus of this paper is empirical, notwithstanding the fact that data on working conditions and the work environment are relatively limited, and that working conditions vary tremendously between different groups of workers, making generalizations somewhat suspect. The paper seeks to provide a general overview of current conditions and the overall direction of change, to look at some important cleavages among workers in terms of access to good jobs, and to place the situation in Canada in a comparative context. Comparisons are made with the European Union because of the existence of a very useful European survey of working conditions, and because better working conditions in the EU along some dimensions do suggest that improvement of the quality of the Canadian work environment is not incompatible with having a highly productive economy.

What is a "Good Job"?

An appropriate starting point is to consider what is a "good job" from the perspective of workers.

For all of the emphasis which is (rightly) placed on the fundamental importance of waged employment as the critical source of working class income and well-being in a capitalist society, other dimensions of employment are at least as important to workers. On the economic front, non-wage benefits, job security, and opportunities for advancement are as important as immediate money wages. The content of work and the nature of the labour process are less tangible and measurable, but count for a lot as well. A major international survey in 1989 found that having an interesting job and being allowed to work independently rank very high as desirable features of employment in all countries (Andrew Clark. "What Makes a Good Job?" www.csls.ca). The recent EKOS/CPRN survey of changing employment relationships in Canada confirmed that a large majority of workers place a high value on having interesting and personally rewarding work, enjoying some autonomy on the job, and having the ability to exercise and develop their skills and capacities. Jencks (1988) found that here is much more unequal distribution of quality jobs along valued dimensions

other than pay, indicating that even large pay differences are an imperfect proxy for large class differences in the quality of employment.

The statement that quality of employment involves much more than pay will come as a surprise only to neo-classical economists who have read neither Adam Smith nor Karl Marx, and have been trained to view work as a "disutility" endured in order to gain income. Work is better seen as a potential sphere for self-actualization and the development of individual human capacities and potentials. Production is also a social process. Good workplaces are those in which there are valued relationships with co-workers and some degree of active participation and democratic control of the work process. Bad workplaces, by contrast, are alienating and authoritarian.

For the purposes of this paper, and recognizing that there is considerable overlap between categories, seven key dimensions of employment with relevance to well-being and health are considered:

- Job and Employment Security
- Physical Conditions of Work
- Work Pace and Stress
- Working Time
- Opportunities for Self-Expression and Individual Development at Work
- Participation at Work
- Work-Life Balance

Before these dimensions are considered in detail, it is useful to briefly summarize some of the wider economic and social forces impacting upon Canadian workplaces.

Forces Shaping Workplace Change in Canada

In a capitalist labour market, the terms of employment — wages and benefits, hours, working conditions— reflect the relative bargaining power of workers and employers, and the related willingness of governments to establish minimum rights and standards. Over the 1980s and 1990s, the general Canadian context has been one of high unemployment and underemployment, increased employer ability to shift production and new investments to lower cost regions and countries, and an ideologically-driven retreat from state intervention on behalf of workers.

There has been a pervasive and ongoing restructuring of the labour market and of employment relationships intended to promote productivity and competitiveness, as opposed

to promotion of a worker-centred agenda of "good jobs" (Lowe, 2000). The basic direction of change is best understood as a simultaneous intensification and casualization of work by employers. The most common forms of organizational change have been downsizing, contracting-out of non-core functions, and securing greater flexibility of time worked through a combination of increased overtime and increased part-time and contract work.

In the (shrinking) core job market provided by large firms and the direct public sector, workers who have survived repeated rounds of layoffs, privatization and contracting-out are generally working longer and harder. The major driving force of change in the corporate sector has been greatly increased competitive pressures as the result of domestic deregulation and increased exposure to international trade (partly the result of the FTA and NAFTA). In the public sector, program budgets have been squeezed to eliminate deficits and finance tax cuts.

Employers have tried to maintain and increase profitability or to contain budget costs by boosting labour productivity (output per worker). Higher productivity has come in large measure from increasing workloads. The speed of assembly lines has been increased. Workers have been "multi-tasked." Nurses must deal with more patients, and social workers with more clients. Old fashioned speed-up as portrayed by Charlie Chaplin in the 1930s film classic *Modern Times* is very much with us.

Productivity has also been boosted by investment in new labour-saving capital equipment, new information-based technologies, and experimentation with new forms of work organization, such as team work, quality circles, and elimination of lower level supervisors. Much has been made of the supposed transformation of work in a "post-Fordist era" in which routinized work has allegedly been replaced by work processes featuring higher skilled and more autonomous "empowered" workers.

Generalizations are dangerous, but research suggests that the overall skill content of jobs in at least core workplaces has been gradually rising (as in the past); that information technology has led to neither dramatic de-skilling nor dramatic up-skilling; and, that some workplaces have become less hierarchical, authoritarian, and alienating with the elimination of lower level supervisors and expanded job content. However, the overall incidence of genuinely innovative "new work practices" such as self-directed work groups and flexible job designs is very low (Betcherman, McMullen and Davidman,1998; Applebaum, 1997). Data from the *Workplace and Employee Survey* (WES) for 2000 shows that only 10% of Canadian workplaces have adopted self-directed work groups, and just 32% have adopted flexible job designs (and this does not mean that all workers in these workplaces have been affected by organizational changes).

Case studies indicate that new technology and new forms of work organization, in combination with "knowledge-based" competitive strategies on the part of firms, can produce more interesting and challenging work. That said, investment in worker skills and joint labour control of work re-organization are needed to improve the quality of jobs by giving workers more control over the pace and content of work. Management and labour objectives are not the same when it comes to work reorganization. The key management objective is higher productivity and "lean production:" intensification of the pace of work through speed-ups and multi-tasking, as well as some multi-skilling of workers. Studies of working conditions in Canadian auto sector plants show a deterioration of working conditions under lean production as a result of the drive for higher productivity, even in a context where workers have had some influence on the direction of change (Lewchuk and Robertson, 1996).

In a major survey of the limited literature on the impacts of new forms of work organization on workers, Appelbaum (1997) concludes that, while there has been some increase in worker discretion and in capacity to exercise skills in a limited number of "high performance" workplaces, this has generally been accompanied by increased work demands, a faster pace of work, and much higher levels of stress.

Workers in core firms, particularly professionals and managers, but also unionized and skilled workers, typically enjoy a measure of job security (which is far from absolute) as well as access to benefits, training and structured career ladders. They often enjoy a degree of control over work by virtue of their skills and/or bargaining power. These are "good jobs" which have tended to become worse mainly because of longer hours and work intensification. The core job market also includes professional and highly skilled workers in small firms, mainly those providing specialized services to corporations and governments (e.g., health services, financial services, business services). The core workforce typically works full-time on permanent contracts, though a minority have stable part-time hours with benefits.

In the (expanding) peripheral job market which has grown through contracting-out to smaller firms and the growth of more contingent employment relationships in some larger firms, work has become more precarious. Job insecurity is high, particularly in small firms in the highly competitive consumer services sector (retail, accommodation and food services) and in the expanding social services sector (elder care, child care, home care) which may be partly funded by government contracts, but is not part of the direct state sector. Contracting-out by large firms and governments has been designed to reduce costs and to increase "flexibility," shifting the costs of adjustment to changing market conditions onto smaller contractors and suppliers.

In the peripheral job market, there are many self-employed, own account workers and temporary workers, and many part-time workers with insecure access to hours of work.

Typically, the skills and bargaining power of workers are low, and there is limited access to collective bargaining, to training, and to developmental career ladders. Many precarious low-wage jobs are traps rather than avenues to opportunities. Work is often highly routinized and boring. Students, younger workers with limited education, women and workers of colour, particularly recent immigrants, make up a large share of employment in the peripheral labour market. It accounts for perhaps one-quarter to one-third of total adult employment.

Change in the labour market and employment relationships has also been driven by structural change in the economy, notably the long-standing shift from large-scale industrial production in manufacturing and the resource sectors to private and social services. "De-industrialization" of employment has mainly been driven by rapid productivity growth (i.e. the job share of resources and manufacturing has been shrinking faster than its share of output).

The nature of employment in "post-industrial" societies is profoundly shaped by the extent to which "caring services," such as child care and elder care, are well-developed and delivered publicly (paid for through taxes) or under-developed and delivered privately (paid for out of wages, and mainly provided by smaller private firms) (Esping-Anderson, 1999). High tax countries with high levels of public services have a lot of stable jobs in the social welfare sector, and fewer precarious jobs in consumer services. Canada, to a lesser extent than the US, but quite unlike social democratic countries, such as Sweden and Denmark, tilts to a combination of low taxes and high employment in private services, as opposed to high taxes and lots of jobs in public services. This has profound implications for the overall quality of employment, particularly for women.

Canada also stands at the liberal as opposed to the social-democratic end of the labour market regulation continuum. Minimum wages and the employment standards are minimal to modest, and collective bargaining covers only about one-in-three workers. By contrast, in much of northern Europe, the great majority of workers are still covered by collective agreements which create a relatively high floor of pay, benefits and working conditions for workers who would be part of the peripheral job market in the Canadian context. State policy in Canada here has been predicated on the false assumption that "flexible" labour markets with lots of low-wage workers are needed to secure high employment along with international competitiveness and low inflation. While this view has driven policy, the high labour standards and wage floors which survive in some successful social-democratic countries have proved, in practice, to be no barrier to high levels of employment and productivity (Jackson, 2000).

Overlaying structural change in the economy has been profound change in the workforce. The participation rate of women is now almost equal to that of men, and the two-earner family has become the dominant norm. While women remain far from equality in the workforce, they have benefited from the expansion of skilled jobs in the social sector of the economy, broadly defined, and, to a lesser extent, in the economy as a whole. In this context, the quality of employment clearly includes the ability of working families to balance domestic and work responsibilities, recognizing that much of the "double burden" falls on working women.

The workforce has also become much more highly educated, and has justifiably higher expectations of what work will provide. Canada has the most highly educated generation of young adults in the world, many of whom are seriously under-employed (Livingstone, 2002; Lowe, 2000). Under-employment in peripheral jobs also affects many highly educated and skilled workers of colour, particularly recent immigrants.

The restructuring of work has been driven by employers. Governments mainly have been, at best, passive bystanders. But, it is important to note that some countervailing forces do exist. The unionization rate in Canada has been remarkably steady in the 1990s at about 30% of paid workers, though it has been modestly declining in the private sector. Bargaining has helped shape working conditions in the core sector, holding the line on employer demands, promoting more flexible work arrangements from the perspective of workers, as well as some control of workloads and access to training. Further, there is no doubt that the bargaining strength of workers as individuals and in unions increases in periods of low unemployment, and falls in periods of high unemployment. For much of the 1990s, high unemployment and high underemployment in involuntary part-time and temporary jobs gave employers a greatly enhanced ability to increase workloads and introduce workplace changes as they saw fit. There was little incentive to train or to offer rewarding working conditions when skilled applicants were readily available for any job that opened up. But, working conditions in Canada likely benefited from strong job growth and the emergence of some modest skills shortages in the late 1990s. For example, own account self-employment stopped growing as employers found they had to offer permanent jobs to meet their needs. There is evidence that jobs became more stable in the 1990s recovery, and that the most precarious forms of work began to shrink. In short, macro-economic conditions make a big difference to the work environment.

Dimensions of Job Quality

Job Security

In considering the linkages from labour market conditions to health, researchers have studied both the availability of work and the nature of work. It is well-established from studies of laid-off workers that the state of unemployment is bad for health for both material and psychological reasons. However, the relatively well-studied transition from stable employment to long-term unemployment is less frequent than alternation between short-term unemployment and precarious employment. Frequent short-term unemployment is also a source of stress and anxiety due to lack of income, uncertain prospects for the future, and its potential to undermine social support networks (World Health Organization, 1999). Workers who must move from short-term job to short-term job are also likely to derive less satisfaction and meaning from their paid work.

Most Canadians are familiar with the national unemployment rate, which is reported monthly and stood at just above 7% in the Fall of 2002. Taken at face value, this number considerably understates the true extent of employment insecurity. To be counted as employed, one need only have worked for a few hours in the reference week, so employment includes many precariously employed workers, such as temporary employees, part-time workers who want more hours, and people working in low-wage survival jobs while looking for regular jobs matching their skills. To be counted as unemployed, a person has to have been unable to find any work at all, and to have been actively seeking work even if they knew that no suitable jobs were available.

Today, about one-in-five employed Canadians are self-employed, the majority of whom work on their own account (i.e. with no employees) for low incomes, and another one-in-six are in temporary paid jobs. Only two-thirds of the employed workforce are in "standard" paid jobs with no defined end date. Among women part-time workers, about one-in-three would work full-time if they could.

In 1999, when the national unemployment rate averaged 7.6%, just 71% of persons aged 16 to 69 in the workforce were employed all year, and 12% of men and 13% of women who worked at some time in the year were unemployed at least once in the same year. The others worked for part of the year and were not in the work force for another part of the year. (Data from *Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics*.) Earlier in the 1990s, about one-in-five workers were unemployed at least once in any year. And, Statistics Canada reports that no less than one-in-three Canadian families had at least one member of the family unemployed each year in the 1980s and 1990s (*The Daily*. September 6, 2000).

Long-term unemployment in Canada is much lower than in other advanced industrial countries. In 2001, just 17% of unemployed workers had been out of work for more than six months compared to a 42% average in OECD countries, and 60% in the European Union (EU). However, a lot of Canadians cycle between precarious jobs and unemployment, and precariously employed workers tend to be trapped in low-wage jobs. One recent study found that only one-in-five low-wage workers in 1993 were earning significantly more in 1995 (Drolet, Marie and Rene Morrissette. "The Upward Mobility of Low-Paid Canadians, 1993-1995." Statistics Canada *SLID Working Paper 98-07.* 1998). Finnie (2000) finds that working poor families tend to stay that way, moving above and below the poverty line as they find and lose jobs, but rarely finding long-term job or income security.

As one would expect from the unemployment data, many working Canadians worry about losing their jobs. The Personal Security Index (PSI) of the Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD) tracks the proportion of persons who think there is a good chance they could lose their job over the next two years. This stood at 28% in 2001, down from a recent high of 37% in 1998. Fear of job loss is slightly higher among men than women, and much higher in lower income households. The PSI also tracks the proportion of workers who are confident could find an equivalent job within six months if they lost their current job. Thirty per cent were not confident in 2001, down from 38% in 1998. Confidence declines significantly with age.

Precarious work in Canada is not only widespread, it is much more precarious than in many other countries. In the EU, a binding policy directive establishes that there should be limits on renewals of temporary contracts and notification of vacancies to temporary workers. National laws in EU countries commonly provide for non-discrimination against temporary and part-time workers in terms of pay, benefits coverage, and access to training (EIRO #2). Minimum pay laws and widespread collective bargaining provide a wage and benefit floor to the job market. As a result, there are far larger pay gaps between precarious and core workers in Canada than in most EU countries, though gaps here are somewhat smaller than in the US (Jackson, 2000). For example, one-in-five Canadians work in low-paid jobs compared to one-in-four Americans, but just one-in-twenty Swedish workers. (Low pay is defined as working for less than two-thirds the national median wage.)

Job insecurity in the precarious labour market is heightened by lack of supports and services to promote access to better employment. The dominant ethos is that heavy sticks are needed to drive the unemployed into available low-wage jobs. Hence our minimal and deeply punitive social welfare system which makes even minimum wages look attractive. And, hence, recent cuts to the EI program in the form of higher qualifying hours requirements which effectively cut-off the precariously employed workers who need income support the most.

Positive employment measures are undertaken under the EI program and by provincial governments, but the overall training effort is low and has been falling. State labour market training programs for unemployed workers and those at risk amount to just 0.2% of GDP, a fraction of the level spent in some countries. Despite unemployment rates which are lower than in Canada, training spending is 6% of GDP in Denmark and 4% in Sweden (*OECD Employment Outlook.* 2001. Table 9).

A key difference between core and peripheral workers is access to employer-sponsored health benefits. As shown in Table 1, less than half of non-union workers have access to medical, dental and disability coverage compared to about 80% of unionized workers. Access to health-related benefits is much lower for non-professional/managerial non-union workers, particularly in smaller private sector firms. Under the current health care system in most provinces, lack of employer coverage generally means that the costs of prescription drugs outside of hospitals, of dental care, and of many disability-related supports and services must be paid for from family budgets. There are also large gaps between core and peripheral workers in terms of access to paid sick leave, though here there is at least entitlement to a modest floor through the EI program. Many precariously employed workers thus face directly higher risks to health because of the quality of their employment.

Table 1
Benefits Coverage - Union vs. Non-Union

	Medical Plan	Dental Plan	Life/Disability Insurance	Pension Plan
All Employees	57.4%	53.1%	52.5%	43.3%
Unionized	83.7%	76.3%	78.2%	79.9%
Non-Union	45.4%	42.6%	40.8%	26.6%

Source: Ernest Akyeampong. "Unionization and Fringe Benefits," *Perspectives*. August 2002.

Lack of employer-sponsored pension coverage for many precarious workers combined with a relatively ungenerous public pension system implies longer working lifetimes. Many low-wage older workers are significantly better off after they retire at 65 and qualify for the combined Old Age Security pension and Guaranteed Income Supplement, which at least provides an income close to the poverty line.

To summarize, a large minority of workers experience continuing precarious employment and high risks of unemployment. The risks of precarious employment in terms of low income, stress and anxiety are compounded by lack of access to benefits.

Physical Conditions of Work

One might have thought that dirty and dangerous work was a thing of the past, banished along with the dark satanic mills of the Industrial Revolution. But, occupational diseases and injuries rooted in the physical conditions of work are very much a feature of the contemporary workplace.

In 1998, there were 793,000 officially recorded workplace injuries, more than three times the total number of traffic injuries. There were 375,000 injuries involving time-loss reported to Workers Compensation Boards, and 798 workplace fatalities. For every 100 workers in 1998, there were 5.5 injuries, and 2.6 time-loss injuries: 3.4 for men; 1.5 for women; and, 2.9 for young workers. (Data from Human Resource Development Canada Labour Program. *Statistical Analysis of Occupational Injuries and Fatalities*. 2000.) The incidence of accidents and injuries is modestly falling, but still very high. And, there has been a disturbing upward trend in repetitive strain and other soft tissue injuries associated with highly repetitive machine and keyboard work. These account for an upward trend in the proportion of workplace injuries reported by women.

As one would expect, physical injuries — sprains and strains to backs and hands, cuts, punctures, lacerations, fractures, and contusions — are associated with physically-demanding jobs. Manufacturing and construction account for 20% of employment but about 40% of injuries, explaining the gap between injury rates among men and women. But, injury rates are also high in sectors such as retail trade, and health and social services.

Sullivan (2000) argues that workers' compensation practices, which were designed to address physical trauma in a world of manual, blue-collar, male work, have not changed to sufficiently recognize the growing reality of less visible physical injuries which develop over a period of time. Soft tissue injuries, such as repetitive strain injuries affecting women clerical and service workers, are under-reported and under-compensated.

Table 2 provides some data on exposure to physical hazards at work from the *General Social Survey* of 1991. Astonishingly, no comparable recent information is available. As shown, one-in-three (34.1%) of workers reported some negative health impacts from a workplace hazard exposure, and a significant minority of workers were exposed to dust, dangerous chemicals, loud noise, and poor quality air.

Worry over suffering a workplace injury appears to be increasing. The proportion of respondents to the *General Social Survey* reporting stress in the work environment from risk of accident or injury rose from 7.5% in 1991, to 14% in 1994, and remained stuck at 13% in

2000. Men felt slightly more exposed than women: 15% compared to 11%. (See www.jobquality.ca for 2000 data.)

Table 2
Physical Work Environment

	Experienced Negative Health Impact from Workplace Health Hazard Exposure	Experienced Workplace Injury in Past Year	Risk of Injury Caused Worry	Exposure to Dust in Air Most of the Time	Exposure to Dangerous Chemicals Most of the Time	Exposure to Loud Noise Most of the Time	Exposure to Poor Quality Air Most of the Time	Negative Health Impacts from Exposure to Computer Screen
All	34.1	9.2	7.6	18.8 (45.0)*	7.5 (48.4)*	15.7 (42.1)*	15.3 (70.7)*	8.5
Men	36	11.9	9.6	23	10.6	22.9	14	6.7
Women	31.3	5.9	5.1	13.8	3.8	7.1	16.8	10.6
Union	41.2	11.5	12.7	24.4	9.7	23.1	20.8	9.1
Non-union	30	8	4.8	15.9	6.4	11.8	12.5	8.1
Managerial/Professional	35.4	5.8	5.9	14	5	8.3	17.6	12
Skilled/Seim-skilled	33.1	10.5	7.8	20.9	8.8	20.4	14.6	6.7
Unskilled	34	11.1	10.2	21.5	9.4	17.7	14	6.8

*Figure in brackets is % of those exposed (most of the time or sometimes) reporting a negative impact on health.

Source: *General Social Survey* 1991.

Occupational diseases are, of course, also related to workplace risks and exposures. Lung diseases and cancers are linked to physical risks, including inhalation of toxic fumes, handling of hazardous chemicals, and exposure to carcinogens. In a very limited number of cases, there is a very clear causal linkage from occupational exposure to disease onset which has been recognized by workers' compensation boards. For example, boards recognize that occupational exposure causes asbestosis among asbestos mine workers, and a range of lung diseases among other miners. A handful of highly specific cancers have been demonstrably linked to exposure to specific carcinogens at work. But, the overall incidence of occupational disease compared to workplace injuries is extremely low, *if* we go by the official data.

However, a wide range of conditions have been linked to occupational exposures. The workers' compensation system, run by governments and funded by employers, demands high standards of scientific proof of cause-and-effect in order to keep down costs. But, many carcinogens are present in the general environment as well as in the workplace. Experts estimate that anywhere from 10% to 40% of cancers may be caused primarily by workplace exposures, but only a tiny proportion of cancer victims qualify for workers' compensation. Similarly, workplace stress and heavy physical exertion are associated with heart conditions, but only a tiny proportion of heart attack victims (e.g., firemen) qualify. The key point is that occupational diseases due to the physical hazards of work are prevalent, but largely unrecognized. Somewhat ironically, employers end up bearing a large share of the costs anyway through employer-funded, long-term disability plans.

An EU institution, the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, regularly conducts surveys on European working conditions. The third survey, for 2000, followed surveys for 1990 and 1995. It found that "(e)xposure to physical hazards at the workplace and conditions such as musculo-skeletal disorders and fatigue caused by intensification of work and flexible employment practices are on the increase" (p. 10).

In 2000 — defining significant exposure as exposure at least one-quarter of the time — 29% of European workers were exposed to noise; 22% to inhalation of vapours, fumes and dust; 37% reported having to move or carry heavy loads; and, no less than 47% reported having to work in painful or tiring positions. In each case, a little under half of those reporting the hazard were exposed all of the time. Fortunately, given increasing rather than declining exposure to all of these risks (except inhalation exposure), 76% of European workers reported that they had been well-informed of hazards. As one would expect, exposure is greatest in occupations such as machine operators, but the EU data also indicate quite widespread exposure to physical hazards.

The European survey also provides data on the incidence of repetitive work, for which no general Canadian information is available. In the EU, 31% of workers report continuous, repetitive, hand/arm movements, and 23% report working at short, repetitive tasks with cycle times of less than one minute. One-in-four (24%) workers report continuously working at high speed, with the level being highest among machine operators (35%), but still high among clerical workers (20%) and service workers (23%). The incidence of high speed work due to tight deadlines has been modestly increasing, though there is variation between countries and between different categories of workers. The survey found that those working at high speed were much more likely to report negative health effects, such as muscular pain, stress and anxiety.

To summarize, despite the transition to a "post-industrial society," the risks of occupational injury and disease are still high. Regrettably, little hard data are available on the physical hazards of work in Canada. One aspect of work re-organization has likely been the intensification of physical demands on some groups of workers. Highly repetitive work with short cycle times is likely just as prevalent as in the EU, explaining the sharply rising incidence of repetitive strain injuries among clerical and industrial workers.

Work Pace, Control and Stress

Sources of stress at work include the pace and demands of work, and the degree of control which workers have over the labour process. Karasek and others have stressed that jobs are particularly stressful if high demands on workers are combined with a low level of decision latitude with respect to the use of skills and discretion on how to do the job. Stress from high

strain jobs (high demands, low control) is greater among women than men, primarily because of lower levels of job control (Wilkins and Beaudet, 1998).

High stress jobs have been found in epidemiological studies to be a significant contributing factor to high blood pressure, cardio-vascular diseases, mental illness, and long onset disability, but the link from stressful work conditions to health is all but unrecognized by workers' compensation boards (Sullivan (Ed.) 2000). There is a link from low levels of control over working conditions, not only to stress, but also to higher rates of work injuries. Even where work is physically demanding, there is less risk of injury if workers can vary the pace of work, take breaks when needed, and have some say in the design of work stations.

While there have been case studies pointing to high levels of stressful work in many Canadian workplaces, general data are limited. Statistics Canada's *General Social Survey* provides some information. In 2000, 35% of workers reported experiencing stress at work from "too many demands or too many hours," up slightly from 33% in 1994, and up from 27.5% in 1991. Stress from this source is highest among professionals and managers, at 49% and 48% respectively, but is still high among blue-collar workers (28%) and sales and service workers (29%). By industry, the incidence of stress from "too many demands or hours" is highest in education, health and social services at over 40%. (For 2000 data, see www.jobquality.ca.) As one would expect, there is a strong relationship between working long hours and working in jobs which impose high demands.

Women are more likely than men to report high levels of stress from "too many hours or too many demands:" 37% compared to 32%. This partly reflects work-life balance issues considered below. But, it also reflects the high proportion of women working in the high stress educational, health and social services sectors, as well as in clerical positions which involve highly routinized, fast-paced work.

The CPRN/EKOS survey on employment relationships asked respondents if they had difficulty keeping up with workloads. The proportion responding "often" or "very often" was 18% overall, with little difference between men and women, and with onerous workloads being highest among managers (28%), health and social services workers (26% and 23%), and in larger workplaces.

With respect to job control, data from the *General Social Survey* indicate that, in 1994, just 40% of Canadian workers reported that they had "a lot of freedom over how to work," down sharply from 54% in 1989. Men generally exercise more control than women (43% compared to 38% in 1994). Professionals and managers predictably report that they exercise much more control than skilled workers who, in turn, have more freedom than unskilled workers (51% vs. 35% vs. 31%, respectively). The same survey indicates that about half of all working

Canadians believe that their jobs involve a high degree of skill, with self-reported levels of exercising a high level of skill being a bit higher among women than men.

Data from the *National Population Health Survey* for 1994/95 have been used to construct a measure of decision latitude based on responses to two questions: "I have a lot to say about what happens in my job;" and, "My job allows me the freedom to decide how I do my job." This response is now being used as an official population health indicator. In 1994/95, 48.8% of all respondents, 52.3% of men and 44.5% of women, reported high decision latitude, while 36.6% - 30.7% of men and a full 44.0% of women reported low or medium decision latitude (Statistics Canada Cat. 82-221-XIE *Health Indicators*. December 2001).

Wilkins and Beaudet (1998) developed a measure of job strain based on demands of work and degree of control using the *National Population Health Survey*. They found statistically significant links to psychological distress, particularly among women.

The EU survey provides a much richer source of data on work stress arising from lack of control of the labour process. Roughly one-in-three workers report no influence over the pace of work (33%), the order in which tasks are performed (35%), and the speed of work (30%). Thirty-nine per cent have no ability to take a break when desired. On all these dimensions, there were some modest improvements in conditions from 1990 to 1995, but a deterioration from 1995 to 1990.

Boring and monotonous jobs, while perhaps less stressful than high demand jobs, are hardly likely to be good for physical and mental health. Forty per cent of EU workers say that their work mainly involves monotonous tasks, ranging from a high of 57% among machine operators, to a low of 25% among professionals, technicians and managers.

To summarize, while we lack detailed information on changes in the overall incidence of work involving high demands and low-worker control, high stress work is common and likely on the increase.

Opportunities for Self-Development

As noted, a valued characteristic of work is the opportunity it provides for the exercise and development of skills and capacities. Most of us welcome the chance to work in interesting, challenging jobs, and the opportunity to learn new things. The data presented above suggest that skilled workers, particularly professionals, are usually able to utilize their skills on the job, and enjoy a fair degree of control over the labour process. Educational credentials are, increasingly, the major requirement to enter these kinds of good jobs. Access to training on the job is also an important determinant of well-being over the course of a working lifetime,

since it provides opportunities for further skills development, and for advancement to more challenging and rewarding work.

As a country, we have done relatively well in terms of education of youth through the public and higher educational systems. About one-quarter of 25-29 year olds have graduated from university, and another quarter have graduated from college. By some measures, we have the most highly educated generation of young workers in the world, and one of the most well-educated workforces. However, one-in-five workers, particularly highly educated, younger workers, report that their education exceeds the real skill requirements of the jobs they hold. This exceeds by a significant margin the 7% of EU workers who report that they feel overqualified for their jobs.

There is abundant evidence that many jobs are structured so as to minimize the need for skills rather than to further develop the capacities of workers. The fact that four-in-ten working-age Canadians have limited literacy skills reflects the fact that the capacities developed in the public educational system are often not drawn upon and developed in the workplace, and atrophy from lack of use (Livingstone, Lowe). The skills and credentials of many new immigrants are routinely overlooked by employers with the result that they are sidelined into low-pay, dead-end jobs.

Our workplace training system is much less developed than in the Scandinavian countries and Germany, which have long emphasized a "training culture." A survey by the OECD ("Training of Adult Workers in OECD Countries," *Employment Outlook*, 1999) shows that the Canadian annual participation rate in adult worker training is, at less than 30% of the employed adult workforce, about 10 percentage points lower even than in the US. Not only do less than one-in-three employed Canadian workers (excluding regular, full-time students) participate annually in job-related learning activities, the rate has been declining in the 1990s (*Learning a Living. A Report on Adult Education and Training in Canada*. Statistics Canada Cat. 81-586-XIE).

Employer support for training of employed workers on the job or through paid courses and leaves goes disproportionately to managers and professionals with relatively high levels of formal education. The participation rate of those with a university education is five times higher than those with less than high school education. Access to employer-sponsored training thus increases rather than minimizes inequality of developmental opportunities based on class background and educational attainment. This pattern exists in all countries, but is less marked where there are more structured training systems in place. Access to training is extremely limited for those employed in smaller firms and in non-standard jobs (part-time, contract and temporary jobs, and self- employment).

In summary, employer-provided training is highly concentrated on the "core" workforce in larger firms and in parts of the public sector, while the growing ranks of precarious workers — including many women workers and recent immigrants — are largely excluded. Lack of investment in training, in turn, tends to perpetuate routinized, low- skill employment and poor working conditions. This is because investment in skills is needed to support forms of production and work organization which are less alienating, and are also associated with the production of high quality goods and services.

Working-Time

An historic goal of the organized labour movement has been to expand free time. Important breakthroughs were the ten- and then the eight-hour working day, the five-day working week and the advent of the weekend, the negotiation of paid days off, and pensioned retirement at progressively earlier ages. By the 1950s, the healthy norm of the standard five-day, 40-hour week with paid annual vacation, and retirement with a decent pension was firmly entrenched.

While progress was made through the 1970s and into the 1980s in terms of reduction of weekly hours, annual hours, and the length of a working lifetime, the past decade and more have seen an increase in daily, weekly and annual hours for many "core" workers in full-time jobs. Long hours are most prevalent among salaried professional and managerial workers, and among skilled blue-collar workers who frequently work paid overtime. From an employer perspective, overtime helps adjust production to changing market demand, and provides a particularly high-cost saving if the extra hours are not paid for. Even overtime pay premiums are often cheaper than the costs of hiring, training, and providing non-wage benefits to additional workers. Unpaid overtime is increasingly required not just of managers and professionals, but also of public and social services workers attempting to cope with increased workloads. Self-employed workers also tend to work very long hours.

While some workers want to work overtime for higher pay or out of commitment to the job or a career, most have limited ability to refuse demands for longer hours under employment standards legislation and under collective agreements. In most provinces, overtime in excess of 40 hours can be required up to varying maximum levels of up to 50 hours or so, provided an overtime premium is paid. Only 25% of unionized workers have some right (usually conditional) to refuse overtime.

The *Workplace and Employee Survey* found that 9% of all workers and 12% of workers in firms of more than 500 in 1999 would have preferred to work fewer hours for less pay. This can be considered an underestimate of involuntary long hours to the extent that many other workers would choose to take part of a compensation increase in compensation in the form of reduced hours. Reduced work time has recently been emphasized by several major

industrial unions. For example, the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers' Union (CEP) have limited overtime in pulp and paper mills, and the CAW have increased paid days off in the auto assembly sector. (On working time issues see, *Report of the Advisory Group on Working Time and Distribution of Work*, Human Resources Development Canada, 1997, and Andrew Jackson. *Creating More and Better Jobs Through Reduction and Redistribution of Working Time.* www.clc-ctc.ca.)

There has been a strong trend to long (and short) working hours for both men and women in the 1980s and 1990s at the expense of the 40-hour work week norm. ("The Changing Work Week: Trends in Weekly Hours of Work". Statistics Canada. *Canadian Economic Observer*, September 1996.) The proportion of men working more than 50 hours per week in their main job rose steadily from 15% in the early 1980s to about 20% in 1994, and has continued at that level through 2000. Over the same period, the proportion of women working more than 50 hours per week has risen from 5% to about 7% (*Labour Force Survey* data from www.jobquality.ca). About one-in-three men and one-in-eight women in paid jobs now work more than 40 hours per week.

A major survey-based study of core workers in public sector jobs and larger private sector firms has found that the incidence of work weeks of more than 50 hours rose from 10% to 25% between 1991 and 2001. The increase in hours was pervasive across occupational groups and industrial sectors (Duxbury and Higgins, 2001). These core workers now average an astonishing equivalent of one day per week of unpaid overtime. Average commuting time in Canadian cities is about one hour per day, further extending the working day. And, even when at home, work is not left behind. Technological changes from e-mail and personal computers to cell phones have definitively blurred the line. According to the *Workplace and Employee Survey*, almost one-in-five working Canadians now regularly work at home in addition to their normal hours.

As noted above, working long hours is closely associated with working in high demand jobs. While these jobs may be interesting and challenging and give rise to opportunities for advancement, long hours and high demands can be harmful to both physical and mental health. Studies suggest that very long hours are linked to high blood pressure and cardio-vascular disease. Statistics Canada has found that moving to longer working hours has some negative impacts on health risks, such as smoking, drinking and poor diet ("Longer Working Hours and Health". *The Daily*. November 16, 1999). Long hours also create a high risk of stress in terms of balancing work with domestic and community life.

The shift of core workers to long daily and weekly hours of work is much more characteristic of liberal labour markets such as the US, Canada and the UK than the more regulated job markets of continental Europe. The usual weekly hours of full-time paid workers in the EU

are below 40, and falling (EIRO #1). Some countries, notably France, the Netherlands and Germany, are now close to a 35-hour norm. The proportion of men working long weekly hours is generally very low. For example, just 2% of Dutch men and 8% of German men work more than 45 hours per week (*OECD Employment Outlook*. 1998. Chart 5.2).

The counterpart to longer hours of work among core workers is unpredictable hours among precarious and contingent workers. Part-time work is often thought of as a good way of balancing work time with time for family or for education, and stable part-time jobs with decent pay and benefits are indeed desirable for many workers. But, the majority of part-timers work non-regular day shifts, at nights and on weekends, and as many as one-third have unpredictable shifts. It is not just long hours, but also lack of control over hours, which is a source of stress.

While recent data are lacking, there has been a shift in recent years to less social hours of work and more shift working. Many workers unavoidably worked shifts even in the heyday of the "standard" work week because services such as health care and many industrial processes have to be continuous, 24 hours per day and seven days per week. But, in the 1980s and 1990s, there has been an expansion of continuous operations in industrial sectors in which it was not commonplace, such as commercial printing, and the hours of many retail and service operations have been extended into the evenings, nights and weekends.

Currently, three-out-of-ten employed Canadians (30% of men and 26% of women) have non-standard work schedules, meaning they work other than a regular day shift. Of them, about one-third work irregular hours, including on an on-call basis, and two-thirds work regular non-day shifts (*The Daily*. July 24, 2002; "Institute for Work and Health Fact Sheet on Shift Work"). Data from the *Survey of Work Arrangements* for 1995 showed that, of the 32% working other than a regular daytime shift, about half (14%) worked an irregular schedule, 5% worked regular evenings, 1% worked regular nights, and 10% worked rotating or split shifts involving night work. The incidence of shift work is well above average in manufacturing (25% of workers) and health care and social assistance (25.8%). Unionized workers are more likely to be working shifts than other workers.

Shift work has been linked to sleep disturbances, digestive problems, cardio-vascular disease, unhealthy behaviours, and stress from work/family conflict (Institute for Work and Health Fact Sheet on Shift Work, www.iwh.on.ca).

Weekend working appears to be increasing rapidly. The incidence has gone from 11% in 1991, to 15% in 1995, to 25% in 2000 (1991 and 1995 data from the *Survey of Work Arrangements*. 2000 data from the *Workplace and Employee Survey* (WES)). Women are more likely to work on weekends than men (28% compared to 21%), reflecting high employment

rates in retail and health services. More than one-in-three production workers work on weekends, reflecting the rising incidence of continuous industrial production.

As noted, regular hours are shorter and jobs are less precarious in most European countries. These countries also provide much more generous paid time off work. In Canada, the minimum vacation entitlement under provincial employment standards is two weeks after a minimum length of service of about one year. (Saskatchewan alone provides for three weeks, after five years.) In collective agreements, the norm is three weeks of paid vacation, rising to four weeks after 10 years. (Seventy per cent of unionized workers qualify for four weeks after 10 years, and 28% qualify after five years.) By contrast, in the EU, the minimum statutory entitlement to paid vacation leave is 20 days or four weeks, and the average provided in collective agreements is 25.7 days, or more than five weeks. German, Danish and Dutch workers get six weeks of paid vacation per year (EIRO). Statutory paid holidays on top of paid vacation entitlements are comparable between Canada and European countries.

The average age of retirement in Canada has been steadily falling, but there is generally very limited provision for a phased-in retirement process which would allow older workers to voluntarily reduce their hours of work. Indeed, most defined pension plans create an incentive to maximize earnings (and, therefore, hours) just before retirement. By contrast, most European countries rely more heavily on public than on private pensions, and the tendency in many continental European countries has been to provide more flexible options for older workers. In both Germany and the Netherlands, workers have a qualified right to voluntarily reduce their hours of work from age 55. Public disability plans are also typically much more generous in the EU, and were commonly used in the 1980s and well into the 1990s to subsidize early retirement programs intended to cushion the impacts of industrial restructuring. In short, the quality of employment and public programs surrounding employment is a determinant of the nature of worker transitions into retirement, with important implications for the health and well-being of older workers.

To summarize, there is a strong trend to longer hours for core workers, as well as to more unsocial hours, and more variable hours. Vacation entitlements and phased-in retirement provisions in Canada are quite limited compared to many European countries. These all have direct implications for stress and for physical and mental health.

Work-Life Balance

Longer and more unpredictable hours combined with high and rising job demands are particularly likely to cause stress and anxiety in families where both partners work, and for single-parent families. In both cases, women bear the brunt of the burden.

Increased family working-time has been a critical factor in maintaining real incomes in a labour market marked by more precarious employment and stagnating wages. Family work hours obviously determine both income and the time potentially available to spend with family, children and in the community. While long hours may result in higher incomes, work/family time conflict may affect the physical and mental health of parents and also influence the well-being of children. Much of the burden of caring for elderly parents as well as children is borne by working families. These pressures in terms of balancing work and family are greater than in many other countries because of the relative under-development of publicly financed and delivered early childhood, elder care and home care programs.

There has been a very large increase in the total working hours of two-person families with children since the mid-1970s. This has come through increased work hours for many men, the increased entry of women into the workforce, and the shift of women into full-time jobs. About three-in-four (73%) of two-person families with children have two earners today compared to one-in-three in 1975, and three-in-four (73%) of working women in two-parent families are full-time. Thus the majority of women in two-person families with children now work full-time. Six-in-ten women single parents (63%) with children work, 77% of whom work full-time. Full-time employment rates for women are only slightly lower for those with pre-school children, reflecting maternity and parental leaves taken after the birth of a child. (Data from Statistics Canada, Cat. 71-535 MPB #8, *Work Arrangements in the 1990s*, Tables 3.1, 3.2. Data are for paid workers.)

Recent data from the *General Social Survey* show that time pressures are steadily increasing. Between 1992 and 1998, 25-44 year old parents employed full-time put in an average of two hours more per week in paid work activities. In 1998, fathers averaged 48.3 hours and mothers averaged 38.5 hours per week of paid work and related activities — up 5% for fathers and 4% for mothers from 1992. Lone-parent mothers increased their time in paid work even more than married mothers.

Work/family conflicts arise not just from longer and longer hours, but also from the frequent incompatibility of work schedules with the schedules and needs of children. While a minority of employers do offer flextime arrangements which are responsive to the needs of employees, the great majority of part-time jobs do not offer comparable pay, benefits and career opportunities.

Reported levels of time stress and work/family stress among parents with children are extremely high. More than one-third of 25-44 year old women who work full-time and have children at home report that they are severely time-stressed, and the same is true for about one-in-four men. Twenty-six per cent of married fathers, 38% of married mothers and 38% of single mothers report severe time stress, with levels of severe stress rising by about one-fifth between 1992 and 1998. About two-thirds of full-time employed parents with children also report that they are dissatisfied with the balance between their job and home life. Fathers and mothers alike blamed their dissatisfaction on not having enough time for family, which tends to lose out in the event of conflict (Statistics Canada. *The Daily*. November 9, 1999).

A major study of core employees in the public sector and in medium and large private sector firms by Duxbury and Higgins has revealed a disturbing deterioration of work-life balance in the 1990s. Between 1991 and 2001, the proportion of respondents reporting high role overload — i.e. too much to do in too little time — jumped from 47% to 59%, and the proportion reporting high work/family conflict (incompatibility of schedules and commitments) increased more modestly from 29% to 31%. Levels of high satisfaction with work fell sharply from 62% to 45%. Meanwhile, the data showed no incidence in flextime provisions, covering just 20% of the sample.

The extent of work/family conflict is highly dependent, not just upon employment conditions and public supports, but also upon informal community supports. But, a collective lack of time also limits the social supports available in the community. Few Canadians volunteer time to community organizations. Less than one-in-three adult Canadians volunteer at all, and just 10% contribute 81% of all hours (*National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*). Participation in voluntary activities is on the decline.

Esping-Anderson (1999) has drawn attention to the fundamental cleavage among advanced industrial countries which runs through the way in which caring responsibilities are divided between families, the market and the public sector. In social democratic countries, like Sweden and Denmark, these responsibilities have been socialized, in the process creating many good job opportunities for women (albeit within very gender-segregated labour markets). In some "traditional" countries in Southern Europe, caring needs are still taken care of mainly by the family, and women tend not to work in the paid workforce in large numbers. In liberal countries, like Canada, women participate in the workforce in large numbers, but families must purchase most caring services on the market. This militates against good wages and working conditions for the (mainly women) workers in the caring sector, and intensifies conflicts between paid work and domestic work.

To summarize, there is strong evidence of mounting work-life conflict and stress. This is driven by mounting demands from work, the still largely unchanged division of domestic labour between men and women, and the failure of the Canadian state to provide caring services on a sufficient scale.

Social Relations and Participation at Work

Work is a social process, and the social relations of production are an important aspect of the quality of jobs and of working life. But, little hard information is available on this relatively intangible dimension. In 2000, 15% of workers reported stress in the workplace from "poor interpersonal relations," down slightly from 18.5% in 1994, but up from 13% in 1991 (*General Social Survey* data). Women report higher levels of stress from this cause than do men.

About one-in-three paid workers in Canada are covered by the provisions of a collective agreement. Coverage is highest by far in the public sector and in large private sector firms, particularly in primary industries, manufacturing, transportation, and utilities. By definition, collective agreements give access to a formal statement of conditions of employment, such as hours and working conditions, and access to a formal grievance and arbitration process. A formal grievance system militates against the exercise of arbitrary managerial authority, and against harassment by co-workers. Collective agreements also often provide for joint processes to govern working conditions over the life of a contract, such as labour-management, training, and health and safety committees. While the great majority of agreements contain a management rights clause clarifying the power of management to assign and direct work, the majority also provide for some advance notification of, and consultation over, technological and organizational change. Many collective agreements also feature detailed job descriptions, meaning that changes in tasks are subject to joint agreement.

Most Canadian unions have adopted formal policies relating to workplace health and safety, work/family balance, work reorganization and access to training, and have paid some attention to all of these quality of work-life issues in bargaining. Improvement of the work environment has been on the agenda, and some unions have made gains. However, there are continuous pressures to increase productivity to maintain employment and wages, which tend to militate against an agenda of humanizing work and creating more healthy workplaces.

While some non-union workers also enjoy access to formalized (if non-binding) processes of dispute resolution and collective consultation, worker "voice" in the Canadian workplace is much weaker than in countries where unionization rates are much higher, such as the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands and Germany. Moreover, many European countries have legislation providing for joint works councils with powers to at least discuss working

conditions. The EU survey shows that 78% of workers believe they have the possibility to discuss working conditions and 71% the possibility to discuss organizational change, most frequently on a formal basis.

John O'Grady (Sullivan, 2000) shows that effective workplace health and safety committees effectively reduce rates of injuries and disability, but are largely absent from the precarious labour market.

To summarize, institutions of collective representation are relatively weakly implanted in Canadian workplaces, undercutting the ability of workers to shape working conditions.

Concluding Observations

This overview suggests many grounds for concern over the potential health impacts of trends in Canadian workplaces. Workplace threats to physical health remain significant. Pervasive job insecurity is a source of stress to many peripheral workers. In "core" workplaces, the pace and intensity of work are on the rise, and many are working very long hours in very demanding jobs. The incidence of high-strain jobs which combine high demands and limited control is quite high, particularly among women.

One key conclusion is that we need much more and better information about the level and trends of workplace determinants of health. We lack systematic evidence of the kind collected in Europe. This could and should be remedied by providing sufficient funding to Statistics Canada to conduct regular surveys on the quality of the work environment and working conditions. The new *Workplace and Employee Survey* (WES) provides only very limited information in this area, and the *National Population Health Survey* provides only very limited information on working conditions.

A second key conclusion is that governments must intervene to help shape and improve workplace conditions. A wide range of relevant recommendations have been made over the years, most recently in the 1990s by two Human Resource Development Canada initiated consultations. These were the Donner Task Force (*The Report of the Advisory Group on Working Time and Redistribution of Work*, 1997) and the *Report of the Collective Reflection on the Changing Workplace*. The thrust of the first was to regulate working time by limiting long hours and by making precarious work more secure. The thrust of the second — which included a very wide range of options — was to propose changes to employment standards and forms of collective representation. At the end of the day, it is unlikely that there will be significant positive changes in the workplace if everything is left to employers, and if governments do not help equalize bargaining power between workers and employers.

A Note on Sources of Data

This paper draws quite heavily on data from Statistics Canada and other sources compiled in Andrew Jackson and David Robinson, *Falling Behind: The State of Working Canada 2000*. (Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2000.) When possible, data from this source have been updated from the appropriate Statistics Canada sources. Provisions of collective agreements are available form the Workplace Information Directorate of the Labour Program at Human Resources Development Canada. See the "Is Work Working For You?" sub-site of the Canadian Labour Congress Web site, www.clc-ctc.ca, for data on work and working conditions. Another very useful source of data on working conditions, including data from the EKOS/CPRN survey on employment relationships, is www.jobquality.ca, which is maintained by the Canadian Policy Research Networks.

References

Applebaum, Eileen. *The Impact of New Forms of Work Organization on Workers*. Economic Policy Institute. 1997.

Betcherman, Gordon; Kathryn McMullen; and Katie Davidman. *Training for the New Economy: A Syntheis Report*. Canadian Policy Research Networks. 1998.

Duxbury, Linda and Chris Higgins. *The 2001 National Work-Life Conflict Study.* Health Canada. 2002. www.hc-sc..gc.ca.

Esping-Anderson, Gosta. *Social Foundations of Post-Industrial Economies*. Oxford University Press. 1999.

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. *Third European Survey on Working Conditions*, 2000. www.eurofound.ie.

European Industrial Relations Observatory (EIRO). 1.) Working Time Developments: Annual Update 2001. 2.) *Non-Permanent Employment, Quality of Work and Industrial Relations*. 3.) *Working Time Developments and the Quality of Work*. www. eiro.eurofound.eu.int.

Finnie, Ross. *The Dynamics of Poverty in Canada.* C.D. Howe Institute. 2000.

Jackson, Andrew and Pradeep Kumar. *Measuring and Monitoring the Quality of Jobs and the Work Environment in Canada*. 1998. www.csls.ca.

Jackson, Andrew. *Why We Don't Have to Choose Between Social Justice and Economic Growth: The Myth of the Equity-Efficiency Trade-Off.* Canadian Council on Social Development. 2000. www.ccsd.ca.

Jencks, C, L. Perlman and L. Rainwater. "What is a Good Job? A New Measure of Labour Market Success". *American Journal of Sociology*. 93 May, 1988.

Karasek, Robert and Tores Theorell. *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. New York. Basic Books. 1990.

Lewchuk, Wayne and David Robertson. "Working Conditions Under Lean Production: A Worker-based Benchmarking Study." *Asia Pacific Business Review*. Summer, 1996.

Livingstone, D.W. *Working and Learning in the Information Age: A Profile of Canadians.* Canadian Policy Research Networks. 2002.

Lowe, Graham. *The Quality of Work: A People Centred Agenda*. Oxford University Press. 2000.

Sullivan, Terrence (Ed.). *Injury and the New World of Work*. UBC Press. Vancouver and Toronto. 2000.

Sussman, Deborah. "Barriers to Job-Related Training." Statistics Canada. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*. Summer, 2002.

Wilkins, Kathryn and Marie P. Beaudet. "Work Stress and Health." *Health Reports*. Winter, 1998. Vol. 10 #3 .

World Health Organization. *Labour Market Changes and Job Insecurity*. Regional Publications/European Series No. 81. 1999.

AJ:mcc:jc*opeiu-225 ● November 4, 2002
G:\AJ\Papers, Articles, Fact Sheets\2002\The Unhealthy Canadian Workplace.wpd