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Introduction

Zero-hours contracts entered the public debate in 2013 almost from nowhere (Figure 1). \(^1\)

**Figure 1: Mentions of zero-hours contracts in parliamentary proceedings, 2010–2021**
References to ‘zero-hours contract’, Commons and Lords combined

Since then, they have been at the centre of the debate on job quality and insecurity. This report takes stock of the state of zero-hours contracts. It explores how and why employers use them and how satisfied zero-hours workers are with their jobs and working arrangements.

Zero-hours contracts are working arrangements where there is no guaranteed minimum number of hours that must be worked (or paid for). \(^2\)

There is no formal legal definition of a zero-hours contract, but the CIPD defines it as:

\[\text{… an agreement between two parties that one may be asked to perform work for the other but there is no set minimum number of hours. The contract will provide what pay the individual will get if he or she does work and will deal with the circumstances in which work may be offered (and, possibly, turned down).}\] \(^3\)

In 2013, at the same time as zero-hours contracts began to be discussed, a CIPD press release sparked greater interest in zero-hours working arrangements, suggesting that official statistics grossly underestimated the number of zero-hours contract workers. \(^4\) This made
he headlines and led to a widespread debate over their use, paving the way for a consultation on zero-hours contracts in September 2013.\(^5\)

The CIPD’s first report on zero-hours contracts helped to inform the CIPD’s response to the consultation and highlighted that zero-hours workers had comparable job satisfaction with other workers.\(^6\) They also reported better work–life balance and less exposure to excessive pressure. However, a significant minority of zero-hours workers said they were under pressure to accept work if it was offered and many had their shifts cancelled with little or no notice. There was also evidence that a minority of zero-hours workers were not allowed to work for another organisation when not working for their primary employer.

The UK Government’s consultation led to a ban on the use of exclusivity clauses in zero-hours contracts (that prevent workers from doing work for another employer) in 2015.\(^7\)

Even though interest appears to have diminished since the 2015 general election, awareness of zero-hours contracts has not faded entirely.

The CIPD published a follow-up report in 2015 which showed further growth in the use of zero-hours contracts.\(^8\)

Commentary often presents zero-hours contracts as part of a rising tide of insecurity and precariousness, even though the evidence doesn’t seem to support this assertion.\(^9\) And the public appear not to like them (Figure 2).

**Figure 2: Attitudes to zero-hours contracts, 2019–2022**

UK, adults aged 18 and over

![Zero-hour contracts attitudes](image)

Source: YouGov tracker surveys.

This report draws on a new survey of employers which backs up the message from official statistics: the number of people on zero-hours contracts is small and has changed little since 2015. Zero-hours contracts occupy a niche role in the labour market, accounting for about
3% of total employment. Yet for a few industries and sections of the workforce, such as young students and home-based care workers, their role is greater.

We also examine quality-of-work issues in greater depth than previously. Zero-hours contracts are more likely than other types of job to come with low numbers of hours and low pay. However, some aspects of zero-hours contract work appear to bring offsetting benefits, especially around lower levels of stress and better work–life balance. This might explain why employees with zero-hours contracts are overall as satisfied with their jobs as other employees.

**Zero-hours contract trends**

According to official data from the Labour Force Survey (LFS) (see Appendix A), less than 1% of people in employment had zero-hours contracts from 2000 until late 2012. Recorded numbers then increased rapidly, doubling between 2012 and 2013 (Figure 3).

**Figure 3: Zero-hours contract employment, 2000–2021**
UK, October–December, not seasonally adjusted

Note: Figures for 2020 and 2021 are not strictly comparable with earlier years because of a change in how often the questions were asked. It is unlikely to have made a difference to how these estimates compare with earlier years.

Source: Labour Force Surveys.

The rapid growth in recorded zero-hours contracts between 2012 and 2015 may have been due, at least in part, to greater awareness of them (Figure 4).
Coverage triggered a wave of internet searches. In some cases, people might have realised that their current working arrangement could be considered a zero-hours contract. Indeed, an academic study concluded that ‘growth in public awareness of ZHCs [zero-hours contracts] contributed substantially to recent growth in reported ZHCs, particularly over the period 2013/14’.

Since 2016, growth in their numbers has been much more modest, including during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**A fresh employer perspective on zero-hours contracts**

To inform this report, questions were added to the [spring 2021 CIPD Labour Market Outlook survey](#) (see Appendix A) to gain up-to-date insight on what employers thought. In many cases, they were similar to questions asked in 2013 and 2015.

**Use of zero-hours contracts**

Almost a fifth (18%) of employers made some use of zero-hours contracts (Figure 5) but more than three-quarters (77%) did not use them. The remaining 5% did not know if they used them; this response was more common in large organisations, where respondents may have had less knowledge of the staffing practices used in all parts of the organisation.
In line with previous surveys, the hospitality and entertainment industries and the voluntary sector stood out for their use of zero-hours contracts.

Most employers who used zero-hours contracts used them for a small percentage of their workforce (Figure 6).
Figure 6: Proportion of workforce covered by zero-hours contracts where they were used, 2021
UK, employers with two or more employees that made use of zero-hours contracts and could estimate the proportion of their workforce covered by them (n=132)

A small proportion of employers appeared to use them for the majority of their workforce. In a minority of cases, employers were able to identify particular occupations as being associated with zero-hours contracts. Bar staff, waiters/waitresses and care workers were most often mentioned.

There has been little change since 2013 in how widespread employers’ use of zero-hours contracts has been (Table 1).

Table 1: Employer use of zero-hours contracts in 2013, 2015 and 2021
UK, employers with two or more employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
<th>Spring 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers using zero-hours contracts</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (mean) % of workforce covered by zero-hours contracts</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPD estimate of number of zero-hours contract workers</td>
<td>1 million</td>
<td>1.3 million</td>
<td>1.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CIPD spring 2021 Labour Market Outlook surveys.

Almost two-thirds (65%) of employers typically employed zero-hours contract workers for up to 30 hours a week – hours that usually would be regarded as part-time (Figure 7). Almost a fifth of employers didn’t know the typical working week of their zero-hours contract workforce.
Reasons for using zero-hours contracts

The most common reason for using zero-hours contracts was to manage fluctuations in demand, with 64% of employers reporting this. This was followed by ‘providing flexibility to individuals’, which was cited by 46% of organisations. Only a sixth of employers who used zero-hours contracts said it was to keep costs down (Figure 8).
Almost half of employers that use zero-hours contracts said that they largely dictate working hours; however, 19% said that working hours were driven by individual zero-hours workers. In all, 19% of respondents said the working hours of zero-hours workers varied greatly each week, while 11% said working days varied greatly each week. In all, 9% of employers thought the working hours of their zero-hours workers were impossible to predict.

However, just under a third (31%) of employers said that zero-hours contract working hours are broadly the same each week, while about a fifth said that working days are broadly the same each week (Figure 9). The working patterns of some zero-hours workers are in reality quite stable.
Patterns of zero-hours contract work

About a million employees said their main job involved a zero-hours contract, which was one in thirty (3.3%) of all employees. Appendix B shows where zero-hours contract employees were most likely and least likely to be found in the fourth quarter of 2021, based on data from the October–December 2021 LFS.

Young people – students especially – and older people were most likely to have zero-hours contracts. Zero-hours contracts were most common in the hospitality industry (accommodation and food), in arts, entertainment and recreation, in routine, low-skill occupations and in small workplaces. Although generally a niche form of employment, there are a few areas where zero-hours contract work is more common.

Zero-hours contracts and insecure work

The lack of a guaranteed minimum number of hours worked arguably makes zero-hours contracts automatically insecure. The Trades Union Congress (TUC) definition of insecure work, for example, includes everybody on zero-hours contracts.

While employees with zero-hours contracts are more likely to have jobs with insecure characteristics, some zero-hours contract jobs have the attributes of secure work, such as permanent status, regular hours and regular earnings.
### Job security

Employees with zero-hours contracts were more likely to describe their job as not being permanent in some way (36%) than other employees (5%) according to the LFS.

Just over a quarter (27%) of non-permanent zero-hours contract employees said they were in a non-permanent job because they could not find a permanent position, less than the 39% who said they did not want a permanent job. However, because zero-hours contracts are such a small proportion of the workforce, it was still the case that over four-fifths of all employees with non-permanent jobs did not have zero-hours contracts.

In addition, the concentration of zero-hours contracts in younger age groups and in high-turnover industries like hospitality and social care means that voluntary, as well as involuntary, staff turnover is higher among zero-hours contract workers. Over half of employees with zero-hours contracts had been with their employer for under two years – the length of service required for protection from unfair dismissal – compared with a quarter of other employees (Figure 10).

**Figure 10: Breakdown of employees by length of time with their current employer by zero-hours contract status, 2021**

UK, all in employment excluding the self-employed

![Bar chart showing the breakdown of employees by length of time with their current employer by zero-hours contract status, 2021.](chart.png)


Even so, almost a fifth of employees with zero-hours contracts said they had been with their current employer for at least five years. This does not necessarily mean that they had been on zero-hours contract jobs all that time; employees could have changed their working arrangement without changing their employer. However, this data does suggest there may
be many zero-hours contract workers who have continued to work in this way for many years.

**Hours worked**

Over two-thirds (70%) of zero-hours contract employees worked part-time hours, whereas over three-quarters (78%) of employees without a zero-hours contract worked full-time hours.

As a result, average hours worked with zero-hours contracts were much lower than for employees without zero-hours contracts (Figure 11).

**Figure 11: Distribution of usual hours worked of employees by zero-hours contract status, 2021**

UK, % of all in employment excluding the self-employed

![Distribution of usual hours worked of employees by zero-hours contract status, 2021](chart.png)


More than two-thirds (67%) of zero-hours contract employees said their weekly hours varied, compared with just over a quarter (29%) of other employees. Nevertheless, almost a third of employees with zero-hours contracts worked a similar number of hours each week. And the vast majority (93%) of employees whose hours did vary did not have a zero-hours contract.

The consequence of employees with zero-hours contracts having both shorter hours and more variable hours was that they were more likely to be underemployed, that is, wanting to work more hours at the current wage rate (22% versus 7% of employees without zero-hours contracts).
Higher rates of underemployment among zero-hours contract employees are to be expected given these contracts are often used to cope with variable demand and/or absences. Employers need a pool of available employees prepared to supply extra hours at short notice. Where this is the case, employers are unlikely to assign all employees with all the hours they want initially, as they might then find insufficient employees willing to work additional hours. Nonetheless, previous CIPD research *Has work become less secure* (2021) found that while zero-hours workers are more likely to want more hours than other workers (24.5% vs 7.4%), three-quarters of zero-hours workers are not looking for more hours, based on analysis of the ONS Labour Force Survey.

**Pay**

On average, the hourly pay of zero-hours contract employees was 57% of the hourly pay of employees without zero-hours contracts (Figure 12).

**Figure 12: Distribution of hourly pay of employees by zero-hours contract status, 2021**

UK, % of all in employment excluding the self-employed

![Figure 12: Distribution of hourly pay of employees by zero-hours contract status, 2021](image)

*Note: Trimmed means exclude all cases where hourly earnings were below the 5th percentile or above the 95th percentile.*


Zero-hours contracts were more likely to be associated with low pay: just 40% of employees with zero-hours contracts had hourly earnings that matched (or were higher than) the 2021 Living Wage.16

However, when allowance was made for the types of people with zero-hours contracts and the types of jobs done by them, the difference in hourly pay was much smaller – an average differential of 6%.17 Indeed, the presence (or not) of any wage penalty seems quite sensitive to the measure of pay used, meaning that "ZHCs may be inferior jobs in numerous respects,"
but lower hourly wages may not be one of them’. This is consistent with evidence that most employers offer similar rates of pay for the same job to their zero-hours contract staff as other employees. Pulling these together, we can define a job with secure characteristics as being one with all three of the following:

- stable and secure employment (permanent status)
- stable number of hours (that do not vary from week to week)
- stable pay (that does not vary from week to week).

Using this definition, just under one sixth (16%) of zero-hours contract employees had jobs with secure characteristics – permanent jobs where the number of hours worked and the weekly pay didn’t vary in practice (Table 2).

**Table 2: Job stability by zero-hours contract status, 2021**

UK, excluding self-employed and people not giving an answer to one or more of these questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-zero-hours contract employees (n=33,747)</th>
<th>Zero-hours contract employees (n=1,025)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable job (permanent status)</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable hours</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable pay</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs with secure characteristics</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs with one or more insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Furthermore, because so few employees had zero-hours contracts, just 6% of jobs with insecure characteristics involved a zero-hours contract. Zero-hours contracts appear to be, at most, peripheral to issues of labour market insecurity.

**Quality of zero-hours contract work**

This section goes beyond contractual status and the extrinsic characteristics of work that are measured in the LFS (such as pay and hours worked) to look at some of the intrinsic characteristics of job quality (such as whether work is pleasant, meaningful or makes good use of one’s abilities). Most people think both types of attribute are important in a job.

The material in this section is based on the CIPD/YouGov UK Working Lives survey (see Appendix A). In order to have a reasonable number of zero-hours contract employees, the data from the 2019, 2020 and 2021 surveys have been combined.

The CIPD Good Work Index (GWI) provides a quantified overview of the quality of work. It covers seven important dimensions of a job:

1. employment contracts
2. pay and benefits
3. job design and the nature of work
4. relationships at work
Each dimension has a score between 0 (worst job quality) and 1 (best job quality).

On average, zero-hours contract employees had a lower GWI score on five of the seven dimensions of good work – employment contracts especially. Zero-hours contracts were superior for health and wellbeing and work–life balance (Figure 13, which shows the differences in GWI scores between zero-hours contract employees and other employees).

**Figure 13: Differences in average GWI scores, 2019–2021**
UK, mean scores, excluding self-employed, owner-proprietors and those in a business partnership

The big difference on the employment contracts dimension probably reflects the shorter hours worked by those on zero-hours contracts. Zero-hours contract employees were also less likely to get non-wage benefits such as employer-provided pension contributions.

However, health and wellbeing was marginally better for zero-hours work, probably because zero-hours jobs were much less likely to be stressful (12% of zero-hours contract employees said they always or often felt under excessive pressure at work, compared with 24% of other employees). And zero-hours jobs were better for work–life balance, largely because employees with zero-hours contracts were less likely to find work concerns spilling over into their lives outside work.
Just over three-fifths (62%) of zero-hours contract employees were satisfied (or better) with their jobs, a slightly lower fraction than for other employees (66%). These differences in job satisfaction, though, were not quite statistically significant.

The case for and against abolition of zero-hours contracts

Unsurprisingly, given their general opinion on zero-hours contracts, the adult population supports a ban on zero-hours contracts (Figure 14).

**Figure 14: Attitudes towards the abolition of zero-hours contracts, 2019–2022**

UK, adults aged 18 and over

Support for a ban was weakest among those aged 18–24 – the very age group most likely to have a zero-hours contract. In February 2022, just 40% of them supported a ban, compared with 22% who opposed a ban.

A ban on zero-hours contracts would not be straightforward. Supporters advocate a right for workers to change their contract into one with minimum guaranteed hours – the minimum being set externally or based upon past hours worked. In this way, anyone who didn’t want a zero-hours contract could not be made to accept one on a long-term basis. The beneficiaries of this type of measure would presumably be people for whom the lack of a guaranteed income from work causes particular problems, such as people with dependants and high or regular outgoings.

Against this would be people for whom the lack of guaranteed hours is a strength rather than a weakness. The archetypal case would be students wanting to fit work in around study. Other examples include people with intermittent health conditions and those caring for them, as well as those with other unpredictable caring responsibilities. Zero-hours contracts can also suit some older workers who are looking for maximum flexibility as they move towards retirement. For these groups, the ability to turn down all work offered for a set period is vital. For this reason, advocates of a ban tend to suggest making the right to change contracts
voluntary, so that individuals who thought a zero-hours contract was better than guaranteed hours could keep it.

Potential take-up of a right to change contract is uncertain. Appendix C shows that four-fifths of zero-hours contract employees were satisfied with their contracts, but that does not mean they wouldn’t prefer one offering guaranteed hours. According to the TUC, as many as 66% of zero-hours contract workers would prefer a contract (full- or part-time) with guaranteed hours, with just 25% preferring a zero-hours contract.20 However, when McDonald’s offered their UK workforce a choice of contracts with either flexible or guaranteed hours, a majority of those with flexible contracts chose to remain on them.21

A right to a guaranteed minimum number of hours would, in most cases, set a minimum based on the current or previous number of hours worked. However, for a significant proportion of zero-hours contract employees, the big problem is that the number of hours they are currently offered isn’t enough.

There is also an assumption that restrictions on zero-hours contracts would produce a shift towards employment in more secure forms of work. This may be correct in some cases.22 Our employer survey suggests there is a degree of predictability to working patterns in some situations where zero-hours contracts are used. In such cases, employers may be able to get enough cover by using their existing workforce differently. However, some employers may instead shift towards using less secure forms of work, such as taking people on as casual labour or agency temporary workers when needed.23

The difficulties associated with a ban mean that the CIPD advocates improvement in the ways in which zero-hours contracts operate, including, where necessary, through further regulation.

One-sided flexibility

The Taylor Review used this term to describe those aspects of the employment relationship where apparent flexibility for both employer and individual worked, in practice, very much to the advantage of the employer.24

Eligibility for employment rights

Regardless of how they would be classified under employment law, most people with zero-hours contracts are treated by their employers as employees (Figure 15) and so would be eligible for full employment rights (subject to length of service).
An issue for zero-hours contracts might be where these rights involve a qualification period, such as protection from unfair dismissal. It is harder to demonstrate continuity of service when employment is punctuated by periods where no work is carried out.

**Notice of work schedules**

According to the Living Wage Foundation, in spring 2021 over a third (37%) of full- and part-time workers were given less than a week’s notice of their shifts or work patterns. Among those with variable hours or shift work – likely to include most people with a zero-hours contract – the proportion was over three-fifths (62%).

Furthermore, ‘the experience of cuts to working hours at short notice and anxiety about unexpected changes to hours of work are associated with lower levels of wellbeing as measured by levels of enthusiasm and contentment’.

Just over a fifth (21%) of employers using zero-hours contracts said they typically gave their workforce less than a week’s notice of work schedules (Figure 16). An additional 16% said schedules varied too much to talk about a ‘typical’ schedule, which presumably could also entail adjustments at short notice.
Figure 16: Advance notice of work schedules for zero-hours contract workers, 2021
UK, employers with more than one employee that made use of zero-hours contracts (n=167)

Source: CIPD spring 2021 Labour Market Outlook.

It is difficult to judge whether these responses are reasonable given the circumstances. Attempts to set a minimum notice period where this isn’t feasible – because, say, labour needs are subject to the vagaries of the weather – may push some employers into only offering arrangements that get round any such requirement. In addition, previous CIPD research into one-sided flexibility suggests there is significant demand from some zero-hours contract workers to be offered work at short notice because of their individual circumstances.

Cancellation or curtailment of scheduled work

As troublesome for some employees is when scheduled work is cancelled at the last minute or the shift is finished early. It could be argued this is the risk inherent in zero-hours contract work. But the individual may well have incurred costs such as travel or childcare in trying to honour their side of the bargain. However, nearly half of employers of zero-hours contract workers provide no compensation in the event of a shift cancelled at short notice (Figure 17).
The CIPD’s view is that employers should pay for the full value of any shift and any other costs if shifts are cancelled with less than 24 hours’ notice.

**Freedom to turn work down**

For many, the appeal of zero-hours contracts lies in the ability to turn work down – it’s the flexibility that makes them more two-sided. However, in some cases, that ability may be an illusion, with those who turn down work not being offered enough of it in future.

There was some evidence that a minority of employers are in practice making it difficult for zero-hours contract workers to turn down work. Over three-quarters (76%) of employers using zero-hours contracts in 2021 said their zero-hours contract workforce was not under any contractual obligation to accept work if offered. However, when probed on what happened in practice, just 57% said they were free to turn work down.28 Almost a quarter of employers giving people the right to turn down offers of work in theory thus denied it to them in practice.
Conclusions and recommendations

This report reviews the use of zero-hours contracts since 2013 from the perspectives of employers and the individuals using them. Used in the right way, zero-hours contracts can provide benefits to both employers and workers. Zero-hours contract workers are, overall, as satisfied with their jobs and report better health and wellbeing and work–life balance than other workers.

Students, people with fluctuating health conditions, those with varying and unpredictable caring responsibilities and older workers downshifting towards retirement are among the groups that can benefit most from the flexibility provided by zero-hours contracts. Used in the right way, they can provide workforce flexibility to employers and employment opportunities to people who otherwise might struggle to work at all.

However, what is equally clear is that these working arrangements don’t work for a sizeable minority of people on zero-hours contracts, where the flexibility is one-sided in favour of the employer. Overall, zero-hours workers are less likely to be satisfied with their contractual arrangement than other workers, and are more likely to want more hours.

Our employer research also shows that about half of organisations provide no compensation to zero-hours workers if they cancel shifts at very short notice. In addition, a significant minority of employers of zero-hours workers appear to be putting pressure on them to accept work when it is offered.

There is also evidence that the working patterns of some zero-hours workers in reality vary little each week in terms of hours and days worked. This suggests it would be easy for those employers to move these workers to more stable, typical working arrangements and contracts.

Furthermore, many zero-hours contract workers receive little advance notice of their work schedules, which can create difficulty over planning finances and managing childcare and other responsibilities.

However, the issue of notice for zero-hours contract workers is not straightforward. Often it is people working on zero-hours arrangements who want to be contacted at short notice about work availability as they may not know if they can or want to work from week to week or day to day.

Hence the debate about the pros and cons of zero-hours contracts is more nuanced than is often portrayed. The individual circumstances of workers and the conduct of employers will decide whether they are regarded as providing much-needed flexibility or an exploitative working practice.

A ban on zero-hours contracts would disadvantage many people who benefit from them and could actually reduce employment opportunities for key groups. A ban could also have negative unintended consequences, where employers that genuinely need the flexibility provided by zero-hours contracts would resort to using more casual labour and agency workers if they could not use zero-hours arrangements. This could result in more insecure work being created, particularly as most people on zero-hours contracts are treated as employees and are likely to have full employment rights subject to their length of service.

Consequently, the CIPD would support the right for variable hours workers (such as those on zero-hours contracts) to request a more stable contract after they have been in employment for six months. Six months would provide sufficient time for workers to
demonstrate that their working patterns in practice change very little from week to week. The creation of a right to request a more stable contract after 26 weeks was a measure that the UK Government had said it would introduce as part of its Employment Bill but was omitted from the Queen’s Speech in May 2022.

It is to be hoped that the UK Government finds the parliamentary time to move forward with this legislative change before the next election.

The UK Government should also establish a statutory code of practice for employers that would set out best practice in the management of zero-hours contract workers, including the need to provide full compensation to the value of any shift cancelled with less than 24 hours’ notice plus any costs incurred. It would also provide guidance on the use of notice periods and the importance of regularly reviewing working arrangements to ensure there is clarity over employment status and rights. The CIPD’s guidance on managing atypical workers would provide a good starting point for such a code. 29

Perhaps the most important change to protect the rights and job quality of zero-hours workers would be to address the UK’s inadequate labour market enforcement system. This would involve the UK Government pushing forward with its plan to create a Single Enforcement Body, boosting the number of labour market inspectors and increasing the amount of advice and support available to employers to improve compliance. The CIPD’s report on revamping labour market enforcement sets out detailed recommendations on improving the system. 30

The other substantive change required to clarify and enhance employment rights for zero-hours workers and other insecure workers would be to abolish worker status. This would mean that all zero-hours workers would have access to full employment rights subject to length of service criteria. This would also simplify employment status and align it for both tax and employment purposes – something the UK Government had previously pledged to do. 31

Summary of recommendations

• Introduce a right for variable hours workers to request a more stable contract or working arrangement after they have been employed for six months.
• Create a statutory code of practice on the responsible management of zero-hours workers that would include the requirement to pay compensation if workers’ shifts are cancelled at short notice.
• Improve labour market enforcement, including through the creation of a Single Enforcement Body and a stronger focus on supporting employer compliance.
• Abolish ‘worker status’ to help clarify and enhance employment rights for zero-hours workers and more widely.
Appendix A: Data sources

All survey results in this report have been weighted to make them more representative of the underlying population. All cell sizes, however, indicated by (n=xxx), are unweighted.

Labour Force Survey
The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is a unique source of articulated information using international definitions of employment and unemployment and economic inactivity, together with a wide range of related topics such as occupation, training, hours of work and personal characteristics of household members aged 16 years and over.

The LFS is now the sole source of official estimates of zero-hours contract employment. There is a degree of subjectivity to these estimates. The Office for National Statistics guidance says that: ‘As part of the survey the LFS asks people in employment if their main job has flexible working and, if so, to choose from a list of employment patterns those which best describe their situation. Only those people who select “zero-hours contract” as an option will be included in this analysis. The number of people who are shown as on a zero-hours contract will therefore be affected by whether people know they are on a zero-hours contract and also by how aware they are of the concept.’

Changes over time in awareness of zero-hours contracts may therefore have affected estimates of change over time in the number of jobs with these arrangements. In particular, ‘[t]he increased coverage of zero-hours in the latter half of 2013 may have affected the response to this question.’

LFS-based figures for 2020 and 2021 are not strictly comparable with those for earlier years because of a change in how often the questions were asked. It is unlikely to have made a difference to how these estimates compare with earlier years – see Changes to how we estimate the number of people in employment on zero-hours contracts.

Labour Market Outlook
The total sample size for the spring 2021 survey was 1,045 senior HR professionals and decision-makers in the UK. Fieldwork took place during 2–18 April 2021. The survey was carried out online. The figures have been weighted and are representative of UK employment by organisation size and sector.

CIPD/YouGov UK Working Lives survey
Since 2018, the CIPD has been measuring job quality in the UK through a comprehensive survey of around 6,000 workers across different sectors. The survey is carried out by YouGov, using its UK panel of adults in work, is run annually and forms the basis of the CIPD’s Good Work Index.

All working adults were asked the following question:

Which one of the following best describes your main job?

<1> Work as a permanent employee (full-time or part-time)
<2> Temporary employment you have found yourself (fixed-term contracts, seasonal or casual work)
<3> Temporary work via an employment agency
<4> Zero-hours contract work (where no guaranteed minimum number of hours is offered by the employer)
<5> Short-hours contract work (where up to 8 hours’ work each week is guaranteed, with a possibility of working longer hours)
<6> Running my own business
<7> Working as a freelancer or an independent contractor for one single client
<8> Working as a freelancer or an independent contractor for two or more clients
<9> Other (please specify)
<98> Don’t know

Those who answered <4> are counted here as zero-hours contract employees (minus also those who, in answer to a separate question, said they were owner-proprietors or members of a business partnership).

The analysis of zero-hours contract employees in this report uses a combined sample from the 2019, 2020 and 2021 surveys. Duplicate cases (where the same person was surveyed more than once) have been removed.

**YouGov tracker survey**
YouGov’s biannual tracker survey involves between 1,619 and 1,801 respondents taken from YouGov’s panel of over 1 million members. The final data were weighted to the national profile of all adults aged 18+ by age, gender, social class, region and level of education.

**Appendix B: Supplementary analysis of Labour Force Survey**

About a million employees said their main job involved a zero-hours contract, which was about one in thirty (3.3%) of all employees. This appendix shows where zero-hours contract employees were most likely and least likely to be found in the fourth quarter of 2021, based on data from the October–December Labour Force Survey (LFS).

**People with zero-hours contracts**

Women (4.0%) were more likely than men (2.7%) to have zero-hours contracts. As a result, almost three-fifths of all employees with zero-hours contracts were women.

Older and (especially) younger age groups were most likely to have zero-hours contracts (Figure B.1).
Zero-hours contracts were particularly common for young students. Almost a quarter (23%) of full-time students aged 16–24 who had a job said it involved a zero-hours contract, whereas the figure for young people who were not full-time students was 7%.

Zero-hours contracts were also more common for employees with disabilities (4.3%) than employees without disabilities (3.2%).

There was some variation in the prevalence of zero-hours contracts by ethnic background (Figure B.2). Some groups – such as those from an Indian or Chinese background – were less likely to have zero-hours contracts than white employees, whereas other groups were more likely to have a zero-hours contract.
Figure B.2: Zero-hours contracts by ethnic group, 2021

UK, all in employment excluding the self-employed


International migrants – employees born outside the UK – were more likely than those born in the UK to have a zero-hours contract (Table B.1).37

Table B.1: Zero-hours contracts by country of birth, 2021

UK, all in employment excluding the self-employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>% with a zero-hours contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK (n=30,182)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside UK (international migrants),</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union (excluding UK) (n=1,798)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe (n=164)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia (n=1,324)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the world (n=1,396)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There was relatively little variation in the prevalence of zero-hours contracts across the UK, except for them being less common in Northern Ireland (Figure B.3).38
**Figure B.3: Zero-hours contracts by nation/region of residence, 2021**

UK, all in employment excluding the self-employed

![Graph showing percentage of employees on zero-hours contracts by region in the UK.](image)


**The jobs done by people with zero-hours contracts**

The LFS data are consistent with CIPD surveys of employers. Zero-hours contracts were most common in hospitality and entertainment (Figure B.4).
Within these industries, zero-hours contracts were sometimes more widespread. Most strikingly, in social care, ‘Zero-hour contracts have not been used sparingly, but instead have become the new normal in many settings.’\(^3^9\) In 2020/21, over half (55%) of care workers in domiciliary (home-based) care services were employed on a zero-hours contract.\(^4^0\)

Employees in small workplaces – those with fewer than 50 employees – were also most likely to have zero-hours contracts, whereas those in large workplaces – with 250 or more employees – were least likely to have zero-hours contracts (Figure B.5).
Figure B.5: Zero-hours contracts by size of workplace (number of employees), 2021

UK, all in employment excluding the self-employed

![Bar chart showing zero-hours contracts by size of workplace, 2021](image)

**Note:** Figures for the [small numbers of] employees who could not say into which size band their workplace belonged are not reported.


On the face of it, this contradicts the employer data, which found zero-hours contracts were used more by large organisations. However, the employer survey recorded any use of zero-hours contracts. It is possible that a higher proportion of large employers used them, but for minute fractions of their workforce.

Zero-hours contracts were most likely for employees in low-skill, routine occupations (Figure B.6)."
Figure B.6: Zero-hours contracts by occupation, 2021
UK, all in employment excluding the self-employed

Unsurprisingly, employees who said they had a managerial role were much less likely to have a zero-hours contract (0.6%) than employees without any management or supervisory responsibilities (4.4%).

Appendix C: Supplementary analysis of the CIPD/YouGov UK Working Lives survey

This Appendix looks at each of the dimensions of good work that are summarised in the CIPD Good Work Index.

CIPD Good Work Index

On average, zero-hours contract employees had a lower GWI score on five of the seven dimensions of good work – employment contracts especially (Figure C.1). Zero-hours contracts were only superior for health and wellbeing (marginally) and work–life balance (more clearly).

Figure C.1: Average GWI scores by zero-hours contract status, 2019–21

UK, excluding self-employed, owner-proprietors and those in a business partnership

Employment contracts

Over a fifth (21%) of employees with zero-hours contracts thought their contract did not suit their personal circumstances, whereas almost all employees without zero-hours contracts thought their contracts suited them at least fairly well (Figure C.2).
A large part of the dissatisfaction with zero-hours work is due to the mismatch often seen between the number of hours actually worked and the number of hours that people wanted to work. The majority (54%) of zero-hours contract employees were underemployed, that is, they wanted to work longer hours. And whereas two-thirds (68%) of underemployed zero-hours contract employees thought their contract suited them very well or fairly well, nine-tenths (91%) of zero-hours contract employees who received enough hours (or more) thought their contract suited them very well or fairly well.

As well as being more likely to want additional hours, zero-hours contract employees felt they had less job security than other employees (Figure C.3).
This perception extended to voluntary, as well as involuntary, job loss, although this could reflect the market situation in the industries and the types of employees that make most use of zero-hours contracts.

**Pay and benefits**

Zero-hours contract employees were slightly less likely than other employees to agree that they were paid appropriately (42% vs 48% – Figure C.4).
Zero-hours contract employees were also less likely to receive non-wage benefits. For example, just 37% of zero-hours contract employees were saving through an employer-provided pension plan, whereas the figure for other employees was 75%.

Nor were zero-hours contract employees as likely to receive any of a wide range of employee benefits (Figure C.5) – either because they were excluded from availability or (more likely) because they tended to work for employers who didn’t offer these benefits to anybody.
Figure C.5: Availability of non-wage benefits by zero-hours contract status, 2019–21

UK, excluding self-employed, owner-proprietors and those in a business partnership

Unsurprisingly given their preponderance in hospitality, the most common benefits made available to zero-hours contract employees were free or subsidised food (30%) and employer-organised social events (27%).

Job design and nature of work

Like other employees, the majority of zero-hours contract employees thought they received the training and information they needed to do their jobs well (Figure C.6). However, zero-hours contract employees were less likely to think there was scope in their job to develop their skills and much less likely to think it gave them opportunities for career advancement (although, of course, zero-hours contract employees may have been less likely to want a career in the same field as their zero-hours contract job).
**Figure C.6: Attitudes towards training and development by zero-hours contract status, 2019–21**

UK, excluding self-employed, owner-proprietors and those in a business partnership


Zero-hours contract employees had very similar levels of commitment to their employers as other employees (Figure C.7).
However, they were more likely to see their work as useful to society (60% agree vs 51%), a feature of jobs that tends to be valued highly by employees. This is consistent with zero-hours contract employees having been more likely to be key workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Relationships at work

Qualitative studies highlight the scope that zero-hours contract work appears to offer for exploitative or abusive management behaviour, especially regarding scheduling and offers of work.

Most zero-hours contract employees had a good relationship with their line manager (Figure C.8). Indeed, there was no noticeable difference in the opinions that zero-hours contract employees and other employees had about the competence and trustworthiness of their line managers. All jobs, it would seem, have the potential to be managed badly or well.
Zero-hours contract employees were less likely to say they had good relationships with colleagues or team-mates. This was mainly because some zero-hours contract employees were less likely to have regular colleagues to develop a relationship with. This makes sense if we remember that a reason for using zero-hours contract labour is to cover for absence or periods of unusual demand. People who may be dropped into work groups at short notice might not have the time or opportunity to develop meaningful working relationships.

Work–life balance

On the face of it, zero-hours contract jobs involve features that might be expected to work against work–life balance, such as being required to work at short notice, something that happened at least some of the time for around four-fifths of zero-hours contract employees (Figure C.9).
Figure C.9: Frequency of working at short notice by zero-hours contract status, 2019–21

UK, excluding self-employed, owner-proprietors and those in a business partnership

Similarly, nearly a third (32%) of zero-hours contract employees thought it would be difficult (or very difficult) to take an hour off work at short notice, compared with nearly a quarter (24%) of other employees.

Nor did zero-hours contract employees tend to have greater access to flexible working arrangements (Figure C.10).46
Figure C.10: Availability of flexible working arrangements by zero-hours contract status, 2019–21

UK, excluding self-employed, owner-proprietors and those in a business partnership

However, zero-hours contract employees were also less likely to experience any conflict between time spent working and time spent on other matters (Figure C.11). For example, 19% of zero-hours contract employees found it difficult to relax in their personal time because of work, whereas the proportion was 25% for other employees.

Evidently, work time meant something slightly different for zero-hours contract employees. The more explicit link between hours worked and reward means that the hours not worked (and hence not paid for) can be more clearly set aside for non-work purposes with less risk of negative repercussions.

Voice

Zero-hours contract employees were more likely than other employees not to have any channels for employee voice available to them (28% of zero-hours contract employees vs 18% for other employees). In addition, zero-hours contract employees were less likely than other employees to say that the main channels for representative and individual voice were available at their workplace (Figure C.12).
Zero-hours contract employees had very similar opinions to other employees about management’s ability to keep them informed. However, they were slightly less positive than other employees about management’s ability and willingness to consult employees and take account of employee views when making decisions.

Of course, the high rate of turnover for zero-hours contract work could mean that voice is less important to them with, if problems emerge, voting with their feet being the preferred way to show discontent.47

Health and wellbeing

Zero-hours contract employees were more likely than other employees to think their work had a positive effect on their physical and mental health (Figure C.13). For example, nearly half (45%) of zero-hours contract employees thought their work had a positive (or strongly positive) effect on their mental health, compared with just over a third (34%) of other employees.48
Figure C.13: Effects of work on physical and mental health by zero-hours contract status, 2019–21
UK, excluding self-employed, owner-proprietors and those in a business partnership

The likely root cause is that zero-hours contract employees were less than half as likely as other employees to consider their workload excessive (Figure C.14).

Figure C.14: Workload by zero-hours contract status, 2019–21

UK, excluding self-employed, owner-proprietors and those in a business partnership

“In a normal week, is the workload in your job …”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far too much</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too little/ far too little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero-hours contract employees (n=259)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non zero-hours contract employees (n=11202)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Just 12% of zero-hours contract employees said they always or often felt under excessive pressure at work, compared with 24% of other employees (Figure C.15).
Figure C.15: Frequency of feeling excessive pressure (stress) by zero-hours contract status, 2019–21
UK, excluding self-employed, owner-proprietors and those in a business partnership


This lack of workload pressure may also help explain why zero-hours contract employees were less likely to experience work–life conflict.

Endnotes

1 There was some concern during the late 1990s – occasionally raised in Parliament – that zero-hours contracts were being used by some employers to minimise their wage bills (such as in fast-food restaurants). However, the National Minimum Wage Act 1998 contained provisions which prevented employers using zero-hours contracts to circumvent the requirement to pay the National Minimum Wage, after which interest in these contracts quickly faded.

2 In general, there is no single ‘zero-hours contract’ category in UK employment law (see the opening sections of Adams, A. and Pressl, J. (2018) Zero-hours work in the United Kingdom. ILO Conditions of Work and Employment Series No 101.)


4 Zero hours contracts cover more than 1m UK workers. Guardian. 5 August 2013.


7 Exclusivity terms unenforceable in zero hours contracts.


The latest spike in searches, in March 2020, was probably caused by people wanting to find out how zero-hours contract work interacted with the furlough scheme. This spike, however, should have had little or no effect on the statistics because public awareness of zero-hours contracts, built on the back of previous publicity, was already high.


Status may not match status under employment law, which can only be established definitively by an employment tribunal. In particular, like other social surveys, the LFS does not include the category of worker.


In 2020/21, turnover rates were higher for care workers on zero-hours contracts (32.1%) than for care workers without zero-hours contracts (22.6%). (Skills for Care. (2021) The state of the adult social care sector and workforce in England.)

To quote the relevant LFS user guide: ‘Applies particularly to self-employed people or shift workers. It also includes respondents working flexible hours in a flexi-time system if they said that their hours varied. It may also be due to the respondent working varying amounts of paid or unpaid overtime.’

Set by the Living Wage Foundation at £9.50 per hour outside London and £10.85 per hour in London.

Finding from a semi-logarithmic earnings equation where log (hourly pay) was regressed on a selection of personal and job-related characteristics (sex, age, tenure with employer, disability, ethnic origin, country of birth, whether student, highest qualification held, region, public/private status, industry, occupation, managerial status, workplace size, full-/part-time status, permanent/non-permanent status) plus zero-hours contract status (n=8,122, R2=0.4433).


This result was also suggested by a recent study that applied micro-simulation techniques to the low-paying labour market in the UK (Dolado, J.J., Lalé, E. and Turon, H. (2022) Zero hours contracts in a frictional labor market. IZA Discussion Paper No 14979. Bonn: Institute of Labor Economics.)

‘In countries with bans on contracts offering no or few guaranteed hours, there is evidence that some employers switch to using other forms of insecure employment, such as agency workers or self-employment.’ D’Arcy, C. and Rahman, F. (2019) Atypical approaches: options to support workers with insecure incomes. London: Resolution Foundation.


Living Wage Foundation. (2021) Almost two-fifths of working adults given less than a week’s notice of working hours.


Q: ‘Regardless of what the contract says, are staff on zero-hours contracts within your organisation expected to accept work in practice?’


32 EMP17: People in employment on zero-hours contracts.

33 EMP17: People in employment on zero-hours contracts.


35 Status may not match status under employment law, which can only be established definitively by an employment tribunal. In particular, like other social surveys, the LFS does not include the category of worker.

36 Equality Act disabled (harmonised government statistical service definition).

37 Labelled ‘international migrants’ because *at some point in their lives* they made the journey (at least once) from their country of birth to the UK.

38 The lower estimated prevalence of zero-hours contracts may in part reflect different (lower) public awareness of zero-hours contracts in Northern Ireland relative to awareness in the rest of the UK. Although the legal framework in Northern Ireland has tended to be very similar to that in Great Britain, similar working arrangements in the Republic of Ireland tended to have a different label (if-when arrangements, counted as part of casual work) and were ostensibly abolished in 2019. The term ‘zero-hours contract’ may therefore be less familiar to people whose awareness of employment is shaped to a greater extent by developments outside the UK.


42 Workers may not be covered by pension auto-enrolment either because their earnings are too low (less than £10,000 in a single job) or because of their age (less than 22 years old). And even if they were covered by auto-enrolment, zero-hours contract employees may have chosen to opt out more frequently, for example, if they didn’t see their zero-hours contract job as being their chosen career.


44 See, for example, Ball, M., Hampton, C., Kamerāde, D. and Richardson, H. (2017) *Agency workers and zero hours – the story of hidden exploitation*.

45 A line management sub-index measuring the competence and trustworthiness of line managers was calculated as an input to the GWI. The mean value of the index for zero-hours contract employees in 2019–21 was virtually identical to that for non-zero-hours contract employees.

46 The two working arrangements reportedly available more often to zero-hours contract employees – working reduced hours and working term times only – are ones that could be easy for a zero-hours contract employee to implement themselves, simply by turning down certain offers of work.

