

Controlling the clock: Working hours in the UK hotel sector

Annemarie Piso 

School of Events, Tourism and Hospitality Management, Headingley Campus, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK
Correspondence: annemarie.piso@ntlworld.com

ABSTRACT: The hotel sector is synonymous with working hours that are long, unpredictable and result in poor outcomes for employees. Arguably, they constitute one of the most significant features of the employment relationship, yet little research exists to explore the factors influencing the scheduling of hours and the degree of control employees can exert on their pattern of work. This article aims to help fill this gap by exploring what shapes employee working hours and the extent to which each side of the employment relationship exercises control. Qualitative research was conducted with purposive sampling used to identify and interview employees in the UK hotel sector, combined with managers responsible for budgetary control over labour and for setting work schedules. The findings suggest that a combination of customer demand patterns and the choice by employers to minimise labour costs effectively reduce employees' ability to control or challenge work schedules. The lack of employee voice is structured into the employment relationship, depriving workers of a healthy work-life balance, their ability to take breaks and legally entitled pay.

KEYWORDS: employee relations, employee voice, hotels, work schedules, working time control

Introduction

The ability of employees to regulate the duration and pattern of their working hours is paramount in shaping their experience both in and outside the workplace. Numerous studies have indicated that absence of control is strongly correlated with detrimental impacts on employees' work-life balance and physical and mental well-being (see, for example, Spurgeon, 2003; Albrecht et al., 2017; Albrecht et al., 2020). More specifically, evidence from several countries indicates that lack of control over working hours by workers in the hotel sector contributes to some of the highest incidence of work/family conflicts in the economy (Van Wanrooy et al., 2013; Swanberg et al., 2014) and is positively associated with interpersonal conflict and even violence (McNamara et al., 2011).

There is little, if any, evidence, however, to suggest that workers in hotels are able to exercise any significant control over their working time. Long working hours have for many years been synonymous with the sector (Houtman et al., 2002; Cullen & McLaughlin, 2006; Messenger et al., 2007; Dienstbühl et al., 2008; Chiang et al., 2010; Lawson et al., 2013). Indeed, a number of studies indicate that hotel employees view long working hours as *the* means of securing job security and promotion (Van Wanrooy et al., 2013; Wong & Ko, 2009). In addition, the erratic scheduling and variable patterns associated with hotel work (Bohle et al., 2004; Cleveland et al., 2007; Deery & Jago, 2015) can further exacerbate such problems. Early mornings, late nights, weekends and split shifts all form part of the common work experience in hotels and may contribute to a number of

factors associated with poor lifestyles such as disturbed sleep patterns, unhealthy and irregular meals, lack of exercise and disruption in family and social life (Bohle et al., 2004). Research by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation indicates that UK hospitality workers work the most unpredictable shift patterns of any industrial sector in the UK, with just under a quarter of workers notified about changes to their shift patterns no more than one week in advance (Hay, 2015). It is hardly surprising then that hotel employees are likely to view their working time as one of the most pressing issues of their employment (Gamor et al., 2014) and that, combined with pay, time features strongly in hotel employees' perception of what makes for good or bad employment (Hay, 2015).

For employers, however, many of the features of working time discussed above incur significant advantages. For example, a study exploring the link between productivity and flexible use of labour in the hotel sector found that effective utilisation of employees was significantly correlated with lowering labour costs (Park et al., 2016). A study on employment casualisation in the Australian hotel sector illustrates the contradictory effect of employer practices more clearly. Whereas for employees the impact of unpredictable work schedules and low wages resulted in a high degree of powerlessness and a deleterious effect on self-esteem, the impact on employers provided significant advantages by helping them to respond more successfully to the ebbs and flows of demand (McGann et al., 2016).

This suggests that working hours are not an abstract phenomenon, but a feature of the employment relationship that is likely to be heavily contested (Rubery et al., 2005; Blyton, 2011).

Arrowsmith and Sisson (2000) argue that, combined with pay, they form the most fundamental component of an employee's contract and play a key role in defining their relationship with management. As illustrated above, the importance of working hours for employers and employees therefore is likely to be different. For employers, working time is not only crucial in the delivery of goods and services, but is a key variable in making labour as productive as possible (Rubery et al., 2005). According to Thompson (1967), this creates a distinct meaning of time for employers; time does not simply pass in the context of work but becomes a "currency" that is spent, thus creating monetary value for the employer. For productive labour to occur, working time therefore needs to be measured and regulated.

In contrast to employers, the significance of working time to employees is important not only in terms of the work/pay bargain struck, but is likely to be a more subjective experience forming the boundary between work and non-work time (Rubery et al., 2010). Personal factors external to the work domain are likely to have a significant influence in how individual employees view their working hours. With one of the lowest average earnings rates in the UK economy (People 1st, 2015) hotel workers face significant pressures to work long hours and to accept the fluctuations in scheduling, limiting their ability to control starting and finishing times (Wong & Ko, 2009; Swanberg et al., 2014).

Control over working patterns is therefore fundamental in determining to what extent the interests of either management or workers are served. Indeed, evidence suggests that the ability of employees to gain a degree of control over working hours may be key to reducing risks to health and well-being and assist work-life balance (McNamara et al., 2011; Näswall et al., 2015; Albrecht et al., 2017). This may be particularly problematic in industries such as hospitality where casualisation is such a common feature of employment.

Despite the central importance of working hours to hotel employees, there has been little examination of the factors that shape working time arrangements and the subsequent control employers, or employees, are able to exert over this process. Several studies have focused on the issue of work-life balance for hotel employees and, though not directly focusing on how employees and employers interact to shape working patterns, they indicate that hotel employees tend to exhibit little control. For example, an in-depth study by Lambert et al. (2012) on scheduling patterns of low wage workers in America, including those in the hospitality sector, suggests that any control employees may seek to exert on work schedules both compromises their earning potential, places their employment at risk and causes insecurity among fellow workers. Similar findings have been noted by Bohle et al. (2004) and Wong and Ko's (2009) studies on employees' work-life balance issues in the Hong Kong and New Zealand hotel sectors respectively, indicating an implicit acceptance by hotel employees of long working hours as a way of keeping their job. A more generalised examination of the ability of hospitality employees to exercise control over work shows that this can both help employees prosper at work and positively affect family relations (Xu et al., 2020).

The aim of this research is to add to this literature by focusing more explicitly on the employment relationship. Its central aim is to explore the factors shaping working hours and scheduling practices in the hotel sector. It examines the extent to which employers and employees are able to exercise control over working hours as well as understanding the context in which this

takes place. The focus of the study is the UK hotel sector. This context is important to understand as research clearly illustrates that context matters when understanding the variations in employees working hours. Several factors have been proposed to explain the variation in working time arrangements and the extent to which these pass control to either employers or workers, and these will now be explored.

Literature review

Drivers that shape the reality and control over working time arrangements

Rubery et al. (2005) argue that, where possible, employers will always attempt to maximise workers' effort in relation to wage costs and increase control over the actual deployment of employees' time, but that this can be mitigated against by a number of influences. According to a number of different studies (see, for example, Arrowsmith & Sisson, 2000; Berg et al., 2004; Messenger et al., 2007; Rubery et al., 2010), three broad areas come together to determine the pattern of working time arrangements and help explain variations in control: management and trade union strategies, the level of state regulation, and specific sectoral product and labour market conditions.

The most important of these historically appears to be the impact of effective trade union action and collective bargaining. According to Messenger et al. (2007), unions have played a pivotal role in both rephrasing the debate towards the social cost of long hours and establishing collective agreements that have simultaneously regulated employees' working time and pushed the case for legal control measures. In particular, collective-based agreements based on maximum hours have been instrumental in that they cover both unionised but also unorganised employees. State regulation has often come as a result of union intervention. The nature of the product market and the management strategies deployed clearly add to this dynamic. The highly variable nature of customer demand for hotel services provides specific challenges for management in both deploying and scheduling the precise number of workers at specific times (Cauthen, 2011).

Rubery et al. (2005) argue that the specific configuration of these factors has created three models of organising working time in Europe: the employer-led model, the European industrial relations model, and the traditional UK industrial relations model. The latter two are both shaped by the intervention of trade unions and to some extent legal regulation, but they differ in their acceptance or rejection of recognised free time and the existence of part-time employment. Whereas the European model makes a clear distinction between work and non-work time, by setting maximum hours where any extra time worked is taken as time off in lieu, as opposed in the UK where excess hours are worked as overtime, with the UK model less likely to offer workers protection on these issues. The employer-led model, however, is the one that appears to most closely match the arrangement of working time in the UK hotel sector. Rubery et al. (2005) argue that this model presents employers with an almost perfect setting. Unrestrained by trade union and legal intervention, they can tailor working hours around the needs of the business with the expectation that workers will be entirely flexible and therefore lacking in any voice. Research carried out by Berg et al. (2014) on the range of working-time practices

that exist internationally provides further support for these models. Their study indicates that differences in working time arrangements arise out of the "contested terrain" (Berg et al., 2014, p. 807) of the employment relationship and that variations across the globe stem from three potential configurations: the strength of bargaining between employer and employee representatives, the level of control employers exercise over working-time practices, and the degree of state intervention in regulating working time.

Trade unions and employee voice

According to Berg et al.'s (2014) study, effective trade union intervention provides employees with both reliability in working hour arrangements and the ability to adapt working hours more effectively to suit individual needs. Scant evidence, however, exists to demonstrate that union regulation or even union existence has had much, if any, impact, either in the UK's hotel sector or internationally. According to the most recent UK Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS) (Van Wanrooy et al., 2013), trade union membership in the UK hotel sector stands at just 3%, the lowest of any industrial sector, and both formal and informal mechanisms for employee representation and communications between line managers and employees rank among the worst in the economy (Van Wanrooy et al., 2013). Indeed, according to Wood (2020), employer hostility to trade unions is a persistent feature of the hospitality sector. In addition, the UK sector is less likely than any other to have formal procedures in place to deal with individual grievances (Van Wanrooy et al., 2013). This has arguably contributed to a style of management which has traditionally been associated with "unbridled individualism" (Lucas, 2004, p. 226) where employment is vulnerable and where management are able to exercise the "whip hand" over their workforce (Lucas, 2009, p. 42). According to Lucas (2009) and Marchington and Suter (2013), certain characteristics of the hospitality industry's product and labour market conditions connected to how working time is organised, such as the existence of shift patterns, can prohibit any sense of collectivism, despite evidence among employees of a "hidden desire" for unionisation (Lucas, 2009, p. 51).

The absence of formal mechanisms that would otherwise enable employees to exercise at least an element control over their working time suggests a very high level of dissatisfaction among hotel employees. However, this is not necessarily the case. Data from the 2011 WERS, for example, reports very high levels of satisfaction among hotel employees over decision-making, particularly in smaller enterprises, combined with the highest satisfaction levels over employee management relationships in the economy as a whole (Van Wanrooy et al., 2013). In addition, research by Marchington and Suter (2013) into the restaurant industry suggests a strong preference among management and employees for more informal style of communication, such as one-to-one discussion between managers and staff. Their research indicates that the very hands-on nature of management and their close working proximity with employees facilitates this approach. Similar findings are reported in Townsend et al.'s (2013) study into formal and informal employee voice channels in a non-unionised Australian luxury hotel, where a combination of factors, employees' unease at raising issues in a public forum, the reality of shift patterns and 24-hour opening, combined with different nationalities' language and cultural factors, inhibit more formal mechanisms, with employees reporting a

preference for dealing with managers directly. The focus of these studies, however, is too general to indicate that such informal mechanisms might provide hotel employees with a greater degree of control over the allocation and scheduling of their hours. Indeed, where studies focus more specifically on understanding both the input of employers and employees in working patterns, they indicate that having a greater say in such matters is likely to jeopardise future earnings and employment (see, for example, Lambert et al., 2012).

Though the evidence is extremely slim, there are instances where trade union presence and activism has resulted in meaningful differences to employment conditions for hotel workers. For example, workers in New York experience wage levels and conditions that far exceed those of their counterparts in other parts of America and the UK (Gladstone & Fainstein, 2003; Chakraborty, 2014). More specifically, Lambert et al.'s (2012) study of hotel scheduling practices in Chicago found that union presence in some Chicago hotels ensures that casually employed housekeeping staff are paid for a full eight-hour day for any day worked, therefore minimising at least some of the insecurity associated with such contracts. Mere union presence, however, does not necessarily guarantee more effective intervention on issues around working hours. For example, Farrell's (2012) study on work-life balance issues in Irish hotels indicates that unions either do not or cannot always actively intervene around such issues, in part at least, where union density levels are relatively low.

The nature of the hotel product market and management strategies

Rubery et al. (2010) point out that service sector employers are more likely to resort to greater flexibility in scheduling workers' hours as they are unable to store the product of their labour. This is particularly problematic for hotel employers as those employees in customer-facing roles are only financially productive when engaging with guests.

In hotels, such demand patterns are complex and, according to Lai and Baum (2005), necessitate accurate forecasting by managers that circumvent major problems in scheduling workers hours. This is likely to be challenging as different levels of demand will vary not just across the hotel, but also between different departments. Therefore, management are faced with the challenging task of organising working hours not only across time, but also because of distinct patterns of consumer demand during the week and day. Research by Guerrier and Lockwood (1989) illustrates that customer segmentation, for example, catering for both business and leisure guests, is likely to result in different mid-week and weekend demand patterns as well as creating distinct patterns of demand for different departments in the same hotel. Additionally, guests may book a room, but predicting whether or when they might use other hotel services is more difficult. Scheduling patterns are therefore likely to vary considerably even within the same hotel. A study on working arrangements in Sydney hotels found that long and irregular work patterns were not uniform, but depended on the type of operation, with housekeeping and food and beverage subjected to much greater levels of unpredictability and stress than the typically 9-to-5 operations of the HR and accounting departments (Cleveland et al., 2007).

Management's response to such fluctuations therefore is typically to create working patterns that are flexible and can

work around the needs of the business. According to Rubery et al. (2010), responding to the variable nature of customer demand is much simpler for employers where a large number of workers work non-standard hours, as they do in the hotel sector, than where work is contracted as full-time and permanent, as this allows employers to respond to consumer demand more flexibly. Rubery et al. (2005) therefore argue that the use of such flexible scheduling becomes an important means by which management can restructure the relationship between workers' pay and productivity. A study exploring the relationship between demand, productivity and flexible working in UK hotels found that between 6 and 13% of productivity was linked to effectively deploying staff (Park et al., 2016). Hotels will therefore typically use a combination of full-time, casual, agency and outsourced staff to control labour costs. However, matching the demand on hotels service exactly to the supply of its workers is, according to Riley et al. (2003), not without its problems, as drives to increase worker productivity are limited by the need to keep a core number of employees to meet service requirements, regardless of customer demand levels. The response to this in many hotels is to combine the use of numerical flexibility, varying the quantity of labour deployed through different contracts, with functional flexibility, deploying staff between different departments.

Research indicates that this configuration of working patterns creates different control issues for hotel workers on different contracts. Research by Lambert et al. (2014) describes three defining features attributed to service sector employees' working hours that are more or less likely to be experienced dependent on the nature of an individual worker's contract: rigidity; unpredictability of working hours; and instability. Therefore, whereas full-time employees' concerns are more likely to centre around the volume of hours worked (McNamara et al., 2011), casual workers are more prone to report greater variability in their scheduling (Bohle et al., 2004; Lambert et al., 2014; Swanberg et al., 2014) as well as receive less advance notice of rotas that are likely to be subject to change (Cauthen, 2011). Interestingly, Head and Lucas's (2004) research into employee relations in non-unionised hotels demonstrates how employees on different contracts may also be subject to different managerial approaches, with core employees more likely to experience a more lenient approach by management than those on zero-hour contracts.

State intervention — the law

Legal intervention is a key mechanism by which employees can constrain the control employers are able to exercise over their working lives (Supiot & Casas, 2001) and arguably may offer hotel workers a last line of defence against unscrupulous employers in the absence of rigorous employee voice mechanisms. In the UK, the Working Time Regulations (WTR) exists to protect employees from excessive and demanding work schedules. Key elements include limits on the average working week, the right to paid leave, entitlement to weekly and daily rest periods as well as specific regulations for young and night workers. However, according to Ram et al. (2001), the WTR, which was introduced by the Labour government in 1998 as part of the European Union Working Time Directive, was specifically designed to allow employers to adjust the terms of implementation. For example, one of the most well-known elements of the legislation, limiting the working week to 48 hours, was diluted in the UK to allow employers to opt individual employees out of the limit as well

as allowing them to calculate employees' hours over an average 17-week period. Research by Barnard et al. (2003) in five UK industrial sectors uncovered widespread use of this clause. Interestingly, they found that the practice of opt outs in the hotel sector was restricted to supervisory and managerial staff, where the take-up was almost 100%, with only very limited use for lower-level employees

The only study to specifically examine the impact of the WTR in the hospitality industry demonstrates that this weakness in design combined with the flexible nature of work in the industry has made the legislation virtually irrelevant (Hurrell, 2005). Indeed, the need to maximise flexibility and keep labour costs low are the very factors that, according to Head and Lucas (2004), drive hotel management to ignore employees' basic employment rights.

Research approach

A qualitative research design was adopted for this exploratory study, enabling a more nuanced and richer set of findings unconstrained by researcher-imposed variables. Purposive and snowball sampling were used to identify two groups of appropriate participants: managers and employees. Managers in chain hotels were chosen as they are more representative of the work experience of employees and more likely to adopt formalised HR practices to manage their employees. Of the management group, a total of eight were interviewed, located in four hotels in the north of England. In each hotel, the senior manager with overall responsibility for budgeting and scheduling of labour was interviewed. In three of the hotels, this was the general manager, and in the remaining hotel, the HR manager. In addition, the food and beverage manager of each hotel was also interviewed. With closer day-to-day supervision over employees and closer involvement in the shaping and scheduling of rotas, they were able to comment on the interaction and involvement of employees and managers in determining working hours. Food and beverage (F&B) is a department that is associated with the most typical patterns of work in the hotel sector, and that most accurately reflects the problems identified by Riley et al. (2003) in matching labour supply to demand.

Given the potentially sensitive nature of the topic, and the challenge in seeking participants that would be prepared to comment on their own employers, university students were deemed to be a suitable sample set. The sector tends to have a clear preference for employing younger workers (Curtis & Lucas, 2001; Economic Insight, 2019) and students have for many years featured significantly in UK hotel employment (Canny, 2002). Jobs in the sector are readily available to students (Lashley, 2013) and the specific nature of demand in the sector simultaneously allows students to shape their work requirements around that of their studies, while offering employers a readily available, relatively skilled and flexible supply of labour (Curtis & Lucas, 2001).

All students were enrolled in either a tourism or hospitality course and had either experienced work as a placement student and/or were currently employed, or had worked in hotels on a zero-hour contract. Twenty students were interviewed, with six having had experience of work in more than one hotel, and therefore providing an employment account of twenty-six workplaces. The vast majority, eighteen in total, were employees on zero-hour contracts and are reflective of a sector that at 20%

records the second highest usage of such contracts of any UK sector (Pyper & McGuinness, 2018). The remaining eight work experiences were carried out by students on a full-time basis while on a year's placement. The UK hotels in which they had been or were employed ranged from mainly three- or four-star UK inner-city chain hotels, with a small number also having worked in privately owned hotels.

All hotels have been anonymised and coded as follows:

- Hotel Blue — three-star UK chain hotel
- Hotel Green — three-star international chain hotel
- Hotel Red — four-star UK chain hotel
- Hotel Orange — four-star international chain hotel

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with questions exploring both the context in which decisions over scheduling were made and an understanding of the input of both employers and employees in the decision-making process. Opening questions were informed by the drivers shaping working hours identified by the literature and discussed above. This approach allowed for rich data to emerge by encouraging respondents to elaborate on their answers and where applicable provide detailed examples (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Data were analysed thematically. As all data collection was carried out by one person and a relatively small number of participants was involved, data familiarisation, coding and generation of themes was undertaken without the assistance of computer software.

Findings and discussion

Predicting demand, shaping hours and maximising employee use: the employers' perspective

In each of the hotels, management adopts several strategies to simultaneously maximise revenue and minimise labour costs. Central to this is the ability to be able to predict demand with relative accuracy. Such demand forecasting is pivotal both to successful hotel decisions around pricing and operations (Wu et al., 2017) and, combined with employee scheduling practices, key to maximising employees' productivity (Park et al., 2016). Each hotel follows a relatively similar model of forecasting, with historical patterns regarded as the base line point from which to start predicting demand. This is supplemented by significant additional information, gathered either informally or via a sales team. Three of the hotels subscribe to a local hotel database which supplies daily (anonymised) occupancy figures for other benchmarked hotels in the city, thereby allowing for a greater understanding of daily fluctuations. This is supplemented by local knowledge, obtained in the case of both four-star hotels through a specialist sales team, or as in the case of the three-star hotels informally gathered, for example, by checking the events listing of local venues — e.g. the sports arena and local rugby league fixtures, etc.

The most significant variant in understanding consumption patterns in all hotels is understanding the nature of the guest and the specific patterns of demand this triggers. Due to their city location, all four hotels have an identical complement of customers. From Monday to Friday, the majority customer type is corporate. Their demand patterns tend to be more predictable, buying into packages that include meals and drinking less, but maybe keeping the hotel bar open for longer in the evenings. However, from Friday to Sunday, the main guest type is the leisure customer whose patterns of consumption fluctuate more. They are less likely to eat in the restaurant but drink more and at

earlier times in the hotel bar before going out. The combination of such understanding enables each hotel to manage its costs more effectively. According to Hotel Blue,

we know exactly who's coming, exactly what market they're coming from, how many corporates, flexible bookings, direct bookings, leisure bookings. Your corporate guests, their packages (package deals), are so indicative of how they will behave. If they get B&B and dinner is being paid by the company, then you know these guys will be with us for dinner. This type of business model is so much more predictable and therefore cost effective. The predictability is that good (General manager, Hotel Blue).

Where consumption patterns are less predictable, hotels tend to respond to this by managing consumer demand (Guerrier & Lockwood, 1989). Hotel Blue, for example, offers meal discounts via the online booking system. These discounts are only available prior to arrival, with three emails sent if the initial take-up fails. This not only adds revenue, but simultaneously allows for greater efficiencies in scheduling employees.

The combination of forecast modelling and demand management therefore allows each hotel to match staffing requirements with a relative degree of accuracy. Consequently, all four hotels reported a degree of accuracy in anticipating demand and with relatively consistent labour costs throughout the year. Seasonal fluctuations, however, clearly do exist, with demand peaking just before Christmas and dipping in January. This was managed by the greater use of zero-hour staff in the case of the former and encouraging full- and part-time staff to take annual leave during the latter period. In addition, Hotel Orange's employee contracts contain a clause stipulating that staff should take the bulk of their leave during the first quarter of the year.

In addition, labour costs are controlled by adopting a flexible approach to labour usage. Each of the hotels relies on a mixture of full-time, part-time and in all but one case, casual (zero-hour) staff, with varying degrees of multiskilling and, in two of the cases, outsourcing of housekeeping. Such a strategy allows the employer to lower the fixed costs associated with employment (Lambert et al., 2012) as well as create the potential to restructure the wage effort relationship by increasing the rate at which workers are productive (Rubery et al., 2005). Several different factors, such as the specific pattern of demand, the degree of customer interaction and the level of skills required, can impose limits on the employers' ability to achieve such savings. For example, in HR and sales departments, skills are relatively complex and scheduling hours is not dependant on the presence of the customer, therefore employees here tend to be full-time, and hours are rigid, working 9-to-5, Monday to Friday. In contrast, the requirement for housekeeping staff, whose skill needs are relatively basic and routine, and whose demand is not reliant on the physical presence of the customer, will vary according to daily room occupancy rates. Hotels Red and Green outsource their housekeeping operations to make efficiency gains. This allows them to exactly match demand to supply as labour costs are *only* incurred for actual rooms cleaned. Such precision staffing, however, is clearly not feasible where operations, such as reception and F&B are open all day. As Hotel Red's manager states, "*there's a service level we have to maintain. Even in a dead hotel, even if we only sold 50 [as opposed to 260] rooms, there's a minimum [of employees] we have to have*".

The ability for efficiency savings here is more complex and productivity gains may be limited by the degree of service on offer (Park et al., 2016). For example, Hotel Orange provides a full restaurant service and a bar, open to the public, which serves cocktails. Numerical flexibility still occurs, with full-time staff supplemented by employees on zero-hour contracts, but the direction in which multiskilling takes place tends to be into other hotel departments rather than the other way round.

Different types of just-in-time (JIT) practices were also commonly reported by managers. These practices, common to the hotel sector (Cauthen, 2011), allow management to react more effectively to variable consumer demand by making last minute changes to working hours (Lai & Baum, 2005). For example, in Hotels Red, Orange and Blue, employee rotas are issued just two to five days before the start of the working week. The more standardised operations of Hotel Green allow for rotas that are issued two weeks in advance. In addition, staff may either be phoned on a scheduled day not to come in or be sent home early and therefore not paid for their allotted shift. Management are also widely used in each of the hotels to step in and respond to sudden surges in demand. Each of the managers interviewed recorded significantly more hours than those reported by students.

Furthermore, tight budgetary control is asserted by senior management over line managers by close monitoring of the weekly payroll system. Most hotels hold several payroll meetings a week, adjusting staffing based both on predicted and past demand. For example, the F&B manager in Hotel Blue was instructed to claw back an overspend of £130 from the previous Saturday at the Monday meeting by sending staff home early that day. Daily adjustments are also made depending on sudden spikes or troughs in consumer demand. Employees are either phoned on the day or the day before to come in for extra shifts or in many cases stay later than anticipated. In most hotels, there was also an expectation that managers would fill in at the last minute with time off in lieu offered. Hours can also be suddenly cut if demand on a particular day is lower than anticipated and staff in most hotels may be sent home early. The F&B manager of Hotel Red also reported being instructed, without explanation, to suddenly cut her employees' hours.

The practices described above clearly benefit employers and enable them to adjust the use of staff in response to variable demand. However, as research indicates, and is confirmed by employees' responses below, the impact on staff is far less favourable, wreaking havoc on their lives (Cauthen, 2011; Lambert et al., 2012).

Working hours: the employees' perspective

Despite the prominence of long hours in much of the literature, there is very little evidence of this in the research. Placement students generally recorded a maximum of 40 hours, with those on zero-hour contracts reporting between 8 and 35 hours. The most extreme example, interestingly, came from the latter group where one student, employed in a city centre chain hotel, reported regular 60 to 70-hour weeks that would include late evening and early morning finish/start times, often working seven days, including one prolonged period of 32 days, without a day off.

Similarly, once scheduled, hours did not change substantially. Predictability in shift patterns, however, was a major problem and appeared linked to different patterns of availability. As

research on low wage work in the US has indicated, the ability to partially restrict availability, as was the case with students who combined work with university, affords those workers an element of control over both work and non-work lives (Henley & Lambert, 2005; Lambert et al., 2014). However, claiming open availability, as was the case with placements students, restricts such control by the employee. A very limited degree of control was afforded by the ability to submit rota request forms, but their use was almost entirely restricted to requests for days off or holidays. The late notice of shift patterns compounded this lack of control. Although a small number received their rotas about a week in advance, the more common experience was between two or three days before the start of the working week, with several claiming that they were given as little as one day's notice. In addition, mechanisms to communicate shift patterns exacerbated the problem. Though many reported receiving texts or communication via Facebook, some reported needing to physically be at work as rotas were only posted on noticeboards.

Accordingly, feelings of powerlessness, with severe constraints on work-life balance, were common grievances among the respondents. In addition, many complained about the hard, physical nature of the work, with little chance to sit down during a shift, recording recurring fatigue as well as hunger and weight loss. Rather than challenging such conditions though, a more common response was resignation — "*we generally just accepted whatever we got*" was a typical response. Uncertainty in finishing times was a common experience, with many reporting a case of "*staying until you're all done*". Shift times might be scheduled to until about 23:00, but could easily stretch into the early hours of the morning. The impact of such uncertainty was compounded for a small number who were regularly scheduled to work an early shift the following morning. This could mean finishing as late as midnight, or even later, and being required to start the morning shift again at 07:00.

All these factors had a significant, detrimental effect, with the following comments commonly expressed, particularly by those employees on student placements.

It was terrible, by the time I'd get back home and by the time I'd wind down and get to sleep I'd probably get maximum three to four hours. I was always tired; I couldn't remember not being tired. It's quite a straining shift, you're always on your feet, there's a lot of pressure, the safe, the money. You have a lot of responsibility. There were times due to tiredness that I didn't do much outside of work...didn't see my family. I'd be sleeping, they were up (Female placement student on reception in low-cost chain hotel).

I hated it. I literally had to take a day off if I wanted a haircut. That's how bad it was as you couldn't plan anything. Like friends would say, "do you want to do such and such next week?" and I'd like, "well I'm going to have to wait until I get my rota". You haven't got a structure, can't plan anything. (Female placement student working across departments in inner-city hotel).

A very significant problem highlighted was the inaccuracies in the recording of hours worked. Just over half interviewed reported regularly recording the hours they had worked against those recorded by the hotel, with many being advised to do so by existing colleagues who had worked there for longer.

Systems to record hours, such as management recording hours or clocking-in often failed to work and, as noted below, pay based on rotas failed to accurately indicate the hours worked. Where there was a discrepancy, most people recorded taking this issue to management to have their pay amended.

A small number of employees also recorded working arrangements that were fundamentally unsafe. This was most likely for those working in the reception of low-cost hotels where they could be one of a few if not the only employee scheduled to be on duty in the entire hotel. In most cases, the hotel provided a panic button in the reception area, but this seemed entirely inadequate as it did not guarantee an immediate response with the call being referred to the police. One female employee, who worked in an "aparthotel", highlighted the dangers that this could pose. She would regularly be scheduled to work a 12-hour shift on her own at night, and only at the weekends did the hotel employ an extra person for security. This meant that not only were breaks impossible as there was no one around to replace her, but it also made the employee much more vulnerable to potentially dangerous encounters.

There were people getting rowdy or throwing food when they got in or trying to bring people in round the back. People having domestic fights. You could get anything, absolutely anything. It was quite dangerous, but you had a door you could lock. You could lock the main door to keep them out...There was also a prostitute working in the hotel who would bring clients in. The guys [who were brought in by the prostitute] were pretty rough, but they didn't make eye contact. They didn't really speak to you...I just chose to ignore that as I obviously wasn't going to acknowledge that on my own... (Female placement student working in reception).

The absence of regulation

Most employees had little awareness of their entitlements under the WTR. Only one claimed to have been informed about their rights by their employer via a training session. Most knowledge tended to be gained informally, for example, via colleagues or in one case through concerned comments by customers. The most common infringement of the WTR was around the issue of breaks and pay deduction for breaks. Legislation requires employers to provide a structured 20-minute break after six continuous hours of work; however, only three of the workplaces reported on provided regular and structured breaks. Overwhelmingly employees recorded very little formality around the structuring of breaks, with a management attitude of "*catch it when you can*" prevailing. Indeed, for many, the lack of ability to take breaks appeared to be structured into management deployment strategies. Insufficient staff on duty to cope with continuing customer demand was the most cited reason. The case of reception highlighted above further indicates that for low-cost hotels, breaching the WTR is structured into employees' work schedules. Here, any respite from work meant "*sneaking a break*" in a back room while remaining vigilant for any guests arriving at the reception desk. Such non-compliance is common across the sector. A report commissioned by the UK government into employee relations in the hospitality sector indicates that not respecting legally entitled breaks appears to be "usual practice" (López-Andreu et al., 2019, p. 32).

The lack of breaks, however, does not seem to have deterred many employers from making wage deductions. Most employees

reported that an automatic reduction of 20 or 30 minutes was made for each six-hour period of continuous work, regardless of whether they had taken the breaks. A small but significant number claimed that not being awarded a break and yet having pay deducted was a regular occurrence. Ironically therefore, not only did their employer breach the WTR, but significant cost savings will have been made. The underpayment of staff is one of the features regularly reported on by the UK government, with the hospitality sector often topping the list of named and shamed employers (see, for example, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2018).

Interestingly, there was some recognition among the managers interviewed of the difficulty of granting breaks. The general manager at Hotel Blue acknowledged that taking breaks in the food and beverage department was particularly challenging during busy times and with staff deployed across the bar and restaurant areas.

Employee voice

All hotels involved in the research reported varying levels of both formal and informal employee voice mechanisms. The former included consultative forums, team meetings, anonymised phone lines or online forums, and the latter involved discussions between employees and their immediate supervisors. In theory at least, the existence of consultative forums, present in Hotels Red and Orange, might provide the most effective platform as involvement by employees was collective and based on representation from different departments. In addition, management attendance was either not stipulated or, as in the case of Hotel Red, in the guise of "guest" participation. However, the content reported by managers focused almost exclusively on operational issues, for example, concern over a shortage of cutlery, or staff facilities, such as the availability of lockers. Indeed, no manager interviewed was able to recollect *any* formal employee voice mechanism ever used to raise issues around working hours. Given the centrality of working hours to employees' experience of work, this might be surprising. In a rare study on employee resistance in the sector, around a quarter of surveyed employees reported disagreement with their employer around work scheduling (Lundberg, 1994). However, the failure to use formal systems to record such concerns appears far from unique. Evidence suggests not only that their focus is often almost exclusively on the business perspective (Wilkinson et al., 2004; Butler, 2005), but that any intention to provide effective voice to employees, particularly in a non-union setting (Gollan & Xu, 2014; McCloskey & McDonnell, 2018), often fails to match reality (Upchurch et al., 2006).

Although there was some awareness among employees of the existence of some of the formal mechanisms noted above, any meaningful consultation around working hours, even at an informal level, appeared almost entirely absent. As is reflected in several studies (Golden et al., 2011), control over schedules appeared dependent on contractual status. Placement students, for example, appeared to have the least say over their schedules as those on zero-hour contracts were at least able to seek agreement with their line managers to allocate hours that would allow them to work around any university commitments. Overwhelmingly though, most felt inhibited to raise concerns about any aspect of their hours. Indeed, the very use of an informal mechanism was almost invariably perceived as exacerbating rather than solving problems around working

hours. For many, complaining about their hours was regarded as "stepping over the line", risking either the insecure contracts they were on, their financial commitments and/or the need for future references. Keeping quiet and acquiescing to poor practice were typical reactions.

No, I don't really want to [complain]. I just want to get on with it. I just don't want to annoy them. I don't think I'll get sacked, but I just don't want to be in their bad books. I want to be a good employee (Female zero-hour employee in three-star inner-city chain hotel).

It's a year. They're going to write a report about me, and I want the experience. This is the industry; I've got to grin and bear it. It's a year, just do it, get it done (Female reception employee on year placement in low-cost chain hotel).

Fear of raising issues is of course not unusual among employees and can be seen as "risky and futile" behaviour (Milliken et al., 2003, p. 1466), appearing more likely when employees perceive that the benefits of speaking up are greater than the cost of doing so (Milliken et al., 2003; Detert & Treviño, 2010). The precarious nature therefore of much of hotel employment is likely to exacerbate this.

A compounding factor for some was that by raising an issue, this could in turn create negative consequences for colleagues, affecting both the camaraderie, well-being and loyalty in the team and, consequently, the work environment for the individual. As indicated elsewhere, allowing one employee to have more control over work schedules, for example, can intensify restrictions for others (Lambert et al., 2012). Camaraderie among colleagues, however, could also be used positively. For example, by warning and sharing awareness of poor management practices with newer team members, such as the lack of reliability in recording hours, discussion around the unfairness of no breaks or the unpredictable shift patterns. Sharing the need to record hours clearly benefited employees; however, only rarely were such collective "gripes" used to confront management.

For several reasons, raising any concern, whether collectively or individually, seemed to be perceived as a fruitless exercise. The very supervisors with whom problems might be raised were often seen to be in the same predicament: working without breaks and with the same unpredictable shift patterns and, as a consequence of perceived staffing shortages, lacked the control to address staff concerns. Their response was typically "we're all in the same boat". Interviews with the F&B managers corroborated this; their working hours were often very long and the control they had over their staffing budgets was centrally determined.

The most common concerns reported by students revolved around the erratic and late scheduling of hours, the lack of breaks, and breaks untaken but with pay deducted. The reaction was either to internalise any problems for fear of retribution or to raise it individually with a supervisor. Breaks could be given as a result of this, but the change would never last beyond a shift. More typically, the response from supervisors would be "what do you expect in this industry". Only in rare cases was collective concern taken up with management. But even these were unlikely to lead to any change. For example, a student who had worked in a hotel for two years (both on a part-time basis and one year [placement] contract) reported that neither she

nor her colleagues had ever been awarded a break, something that was regularly discussed among the shift team workers and brought to the attention of management.

It was raised in a jokey fashion with supervisors like 'well we haven't had any breaks again this week', and they'd say 'yes I know, I know' but nothing happened (Female employee in the restaurant of an independently owned hotel).

Not providing breaks and then deducting that time from employees' pay is something that can only be resolved by employers rather than more junior managers. However, there were clearly problems raised by employees that could potentially be resolved by greater involvement of employees in scheduling practices. For example, the practice of announcing rotas at the last minute and then subjecting these to constant change, without consultation, was something that — as a student on a year's placement in reception noted — *could* have been planned more effectively by involving team shift workers.

We could have all sat down as a reception team and said "I wouldn't mind working so and so" as we all worked different shifts. But this never happened. The rota appeared on the wall and that was it (Female reception employee on year placement in low-cost chain hotel).

Allowing for meaningful employee involvement in scheduling working hours also has the advantage of benefitting not only the workforce but employers as well. A study on employee engagement in Turkish hotels demonstrates that where employee voice is encouraged and workers are more engaged in their work, higher levels of job satisfaction are reported, with workers less likely to leave and record less work-life conflict (Burke et al., 2013).

Conclusion

The assertion that the terrain of working hours is one that is heavily contested is clearly in evidence in this study. However, the manifestation of this for employers and employees appears to differ. For employers, the struggle to precisely match employee hours with the fluctuating demands of consumers is open and visible and manifests itself in the tight control over labour costs, the just-in-time scheduling of employees and the use of varying levels of contracts. Hotels in the study structure and schedule hours in a such a manner that it ensures optimum labour productivity. It is apparent that a considerable degree of management time and scrutiny both at line manager but particularly at senior level is devoted to making sure that hours and therefore labour costs closely match the varying customer demand patterns.

It is also apparent therefore that the nature of employee relations in relation to the determination of working hours exposes employees to a system that fits within the employer-led model of organising working hours, espoused by Rubery et al. (2005). The absence of union intervention and an almost complete disregard for legal protection in many of the workplaces results in control that is almost absolute for employers.

For employees, any conflict around working hours is structured into both the contractual and day-to-day employment relationship with management. The contested terrain of working arrangements asserted by several authors (Blyton, 2011; Rubery et al., 2005) expresses itself in ways that are both visible but

also largely hidden. Formal channels that could provide a visible focus for discontent around working hours are in evidence, but the focus seems almost uniquely operational, and employees have little awareness of their existence.

Visible aspects are expressed through an almost total lack of control in shaping individual working patterns, breaks not given but still deducted from pay, combined with for some, risks to health and safety. The ability to exert control and the resistance to these patterns is, however, much more likely to be hidden and out of view. To challenge management is seen as jeopardising employment prospects, alienating colleagues and/or is met with a resigned acceptance that this is just what hotel work involves, and makes raising concerns either formally or informally seem futile or not worth the risk. Only rarely does this conflict express itself openly and when it does, it is almost exclusively individualised. The approach is informal via requests to line managers for a more reasonable approach around the organisation of rotas or to simply be allowed a break that is a legal entitlement during a long and exhausting shift. Where the requests are met with change, this often is limited and short-lived. The findings suggest some limited evidence of collectivising issues, but this tends to be restricted to information sharing or warning colleagues of poor management practices to watch out for.

And yet there are signs that an alternative approach is possible and it is one that is not difficult for management to adopt. The view expressed, for example, that work colleagues could be collectively involved in deciding how rotas are distributed could enable a process that is fairer and more transparent and based less on management prerogative. However, the absence of strong and active trade union intervention that interacts with and monitors a strong legislative framework is perhaps likely to leave UK hotel workers largely powerless in their ability to effectively challenge and therefore exert meaningful and lasting control over their work schedules.

Further research could more specifically focus on whether labour management practices adopted by low-cost hotels almost implicitly lead to breaching legal guidelines around working hours and therefore make it impossible for employees to challenge the lack of structured breaks or the hazardous working environment. Understanding whether female employees are more exposed to potentially serious risks needs highlighting. There is also a dearth of literature more generally on the reality or lack of employee voice in the hotel sector. More research is clearly needed on how and indeed whether hotels, particularly in the absence of trade union intervention, can facilitate more effectively the use of formal and informal channels to give their employees a voice.

As Baum and Hai (2019) assert, it is important to call out the type of unethical labour practices cited in this study, particularly when, as their evidence suggests, they form part of the norm of tourism and hospitality work. Without a voice in how work schedules are constructed or where legal safeguards are simply ignored and breaks not given but pay deducted, the findings reported here expose a reality around working hours that is exclusively employer-centred and based on cost savings, depriving workers of their pay entitlements and any semblance of a work-life balance.

ORCID iD

Annemarie Piso — <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0657-0146>

References

- Albrecht, S. C., Kecklund, G., & Leineweber, C. (2020). The mediating effect of work-life interference on the relationship between work-time control and depressive and musculoskeletal symptoms. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 46(5), 469-479. <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3887>
- Albrecht S. C., Kecklund G., Rajaleid K., & Leineweber C. (2017). The longitudinal relationship between control over working hours and depressive symptoms: Results from SLOSH, a population-based cohort study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 215, 143-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.03.010>
- Arrowsmith, J., & Sisson, K. (2000). Managing working time. In S. Bach & K. Sisson (Eds), *Personnel Management — A Comprehensive Guide to Theory and Practice* (3rd edn, pp. 354-380). Blackwell.
- Barnard, C., Deakin, S., & Hobbs, R. (2003). Opting out of the 48-hour week: Employer necessity or individual choice — An empirical study of the operation of Article 18(1)(b) of the Working Time Directive in the UK. *Industrial Law Journal*, 32(4), 223-252. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/32.4.223>
- Baum, T., & Hai, N. T. T. (2019). Applying sustainable employment principles in the tourism industry: righting human rights wrongs? *Tourism Recreation Research*, 44(3), 371-381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0250828.1.2019.1624407>
- Berg, P., Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2004). Contesting time: International comparisons of employee control of working time. *International and Labor Relations Review*, 57(3), 331-349. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4126655>
- Berg, P., Bosch, G., & Charest, J. (2014). Working-time configurations: A framework for analyzing diversity across countries. *International and Labor Relations Review*, 67(3), 805-837. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793914537452>
- Blyton, P. (2011). Working time, work-life balance, and the persistence of inequality. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 27(2), 129-138.
- Bohle, P., Quinlan, M., Kennedy, D., & Williamson, A. (2004). Working hours, work-life conflict and health in precarious and "permanent" employment. *Revista de Saúde Pública*, 38, 19-25. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-89102004000700004>
- Burke, R. J., Koyuncu, M., Fiksenbaum, L., & Tekin, Y. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of work engagement among frontline employees in Turkish hotels. *Journal of Transnational Management*, 18(3), 191-203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475778.2013.817243>
- Butler, P. (2005). Non-union employee representation: exploring the efficacy of the voice process. *Employee Relations*, 27(3), 272-288. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450510591602>
- Canny, A. (2002). Flexible labour? The growth of student employment in the UK. *Journal of Education and Work*, 15(3), 277-301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1363908022000012058-2>
- Cauthen, N. K. (2011). Scheduling hourly workers, how last minute "just-in-time" scheduling practices are bad for workers, families and business. *Demos*. https://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/Scheduling_Hourly_Workers_Demos.pdf
- Chakraborty, A. (2014). Poverty pay isn't inevitable. *The Guardian*, 8 September. <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/sep/08/poverty-pay-isnt-just-about-economics-new-york>
- Chiang, F. F., Birch, T. A., & Kwan, H. K. (2010). The moderating roles of job control and work-life balance practices on employee stress in the hotel and catering industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 25-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.04.005>

- Cleveland, J. N., O'Neill, J. W., Himelright, J. L., Harrison, M. M., Crouter, A. C., & Drago, R. (2007). Work and family issues in the hospitality industry: Perspectives of entrants, managers, and spouses. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 31(3), 275-298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348007299919>
- Cullen, J., & McLaughlin, A. (2006). What drives the persistence of presenteeism as a managerial value in hotels?: Observations noted during an Irish work-life balance research project. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 25(3), 510-516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2004.09.006>
- Curtis S., & Lucas R. (2001). A coincidence of needs? Employers and full time students. *Employee Relations*, 23(1), 38-54. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450110366264>
- Deery, M., & Jago, L. (2015). Revisiting talent management, work-life balance and retention strategies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(3), 453-472. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2013-0538>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage.
- Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. (2018). National living wage and national minimum wage: Government evidence on compliance and enforcement 2017/2018. Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/742668/nmw-nlw-enforcement-compliance-report-2018.pdf
- Detert J. R., & Treviño L. K. (2010). Speaking up to higher-ups: How supervisors and skip-level leaders influence employee voice. *Organization Science*, 21(1), 249-270. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0405>
- Dienstbühl, I., Michaelis, R., Scharmentke, M., Buffet, M. A., Roskams, N., Van Herpe, S., Karjalainen, K., Koukoulaki, T., Gervais, R., Stabile, S., & Karanika, M. (2008). *Protecting workers in hotels, restaurants and catering*. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Economic Insight. (2019). *Hospitality and Tourism Workforce Landscape. A research report mapping the sector workforce landscape for the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/827952/Hospitality_and_Tourism_Workforce_Landscape.pdf
- Farrell, K. (2012). Work-home balance: A management perspective. *Hospitality & Society*, 2(3), 273-291. https://doi.org/10.1386/hosp.2.3.273_1
- Gamor, E., Amisah, E., & Boakye, K. (2014). Work-family conflict among hotel employees in Sekondi-Takoradi Metropolis, Ghana. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 12, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2014.06.001>
- Gladstone, D. L., & Fainstein, S. S. (2003). Regulating hospitality: tourism workers in New York and Los Angeles. In L. M. Hoffman, S. S. Fainstein, & D. R. Judd (Eds), *Cities and visitors: regulating people, markets, and city space*, (pp. 145-166). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470773673.ch8>
- Golden, L., Wiens-Tuers, B., Lambert, S. J., & Henly, J. R. (2011). Working time in the employment relationship: Working time, perceived control and work-life balance. In K. Townsend, & A. Wilkinson (Eds), *Research handbook on the future of work and employment relations* (Ch. 10). ElgarOnline. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9780857936363.00018>
- Gollan, P. J., & Xu, Y. (2014). Re-engagement with the employee participation debate: Beyond the case of contested and captured terrain. *Work, Employment and Society*, 62(2), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017014522722>
- Guerrier, Y., & Lockwood, A. (1989). Core and peripheral employees in hotel operations. *Personnel Review*, 18(1), 9-15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483488910133341>
- Hay, C. (2015). *What do low paid workers think would improve their lives?* Joseph Rowntree Foundation. <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/workers-improved-lives.pdf>
- Head, J., & Lucas, R. (2004). Employee relations in the non-union hotel industry: a case of "determined opportunism"? *Personnel Review*, 33(6), 693-710. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480410561565>
- Houtman, I. L. D., Andries, F., van den Berg, R., & Dhondt, S. (2002). *Sectoral profiles of working conditions*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Hurrell, S. A. (2005). Dilute to taste? The impact of the working time regulations in the hospitality industry. *Employee Relations*, 27(5), 532-546. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450510612040>
- Lai, C., & Baum, T. (2005). Just-in-time labour supply in the hotel sector: The role of agencies. *Employee Relations*, 27(1), 86-102. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450510569328>
- Lambert, S. J., Fugiel, P. J., & Henly, J. R. (2014). *Precarious work schedules among early-career employees in the US: A national snapshot*. Research brief. University of Chicago, Employment Instability, Family Well-Being, and Social Policy Network. https://crownschool.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/lambert.fugiel.henly_precarious_work_schedules.august2014_0.pdf
- Lambert, S., Haley-Lock, A., & Henly, J. (2012). Schedule flexibility in hourly jobs: unanticipated consequences and promising directions. *Community, Work & Family*, 15(3), 293-315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2012.662803>
- Lashley, C. (2013). Student employment in hospitality and tourism: insights from a recent study. *Research in Hospitality Management*, 3(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22243534.2013.11828297>
- Lawson, K. M., Davis, K. D., Crouter, A. C., & O'Neill, J. W. (2013). Understanding work-family spillover in hotel managers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 273-281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.09.003>
- López-Andreu, M., Papadopolous, O., & Jamalain, M. (2019). How has the UK hotels sector been affected by the fissuring of the worker-employer relationship in the last 10 years?. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/814594/UK_Hotels_Sector_Director_of_labour_market_enforcement_July_2019.pdf
- Lucas, R. (2004). *Employment relations in the hospitality and tourism industries*. Routledge.
- Lucas, R. (2009). Is low unionisation in the British hospitality industry due to industry characteristics?. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 42-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.03.002>
- Lundberg, C. C. (1994). Forms of resistance by temporary hospitality employees. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 18(2), 127-135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109634809401800209>
- Marchington, M., & Suter, J. (2013). Where informality really matters: Patterns of employee involvement and participation (EIP) in a non-union firm. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 52, 284-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/irel.12004>
- Messenger, J. C., Lee, S., & McCann, D. (2007). *Working time around the world: Trends in working hours, laws, and policies in a global comparative perspective*. Routledge.
- McCann, M., White, K. & Moss, J. (2016). Labour casualization and the psychosocial health of workers in Australia. *Work, Employment & Society*, 30(5), 766-782. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017016633022>
- McCloskey, C., & McDonnell, A. (2018). Channels of employee voice: complementary or competing for space? *Industrial Relations Journal*, 49(2), 174-193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/irj.12209>
- McNamara, M., Bohle, P., & Quinlan, M. (2011). Precarious employment, working hours, work-life conflict and health in hotel work. *Applied Ergonomics*, 42(2), 225-232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2010.06.013>
- Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453-1476. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/1467-6486.00387>
- Näswall, K., Burt, C., & Pearce, M. (2015). The moderating effect of control over work scheduling and overtime on the relationship between workload demands and perceived job risk. *Work*, 51(3) 571-577. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-141885>

- Park, S., Yaduma, N., Lockwood, A. J., & Williams, A. M. (2016). Demand fluctuations, labour flexibility and productivity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 59, 93-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.04.006>
- People 1st. (2015). *Seasonal hospitality and tourism employment*. <http://www.people1st.co.uk/getattachment/Research-policy/Research-reports/Monthly-insights-reports/Insights-report-March-15-Seasonal-workers.pdf>
- Pyper, D., & McGuinness, F. (2018). *Zero-hour contracts*. House of Commons Library Briefing Paper No. 06553, House of Commons Library. <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/sn06553/>
- Ram, M., Edwards, P., Gilman, M., & Arrowsmith, J. (2001). The dynamics of informality: employment relations in small firms and the effects of regulatory change. *Work, Employment and Society*, 15(4), 845-861. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095001701400438233>
- Riley, M., Ladkin, A., & Szivas, E. (2003). *Tourism employment: Analysis and planning (Vol. 6)*. Channel View Publications.
- Rubery, J., Grimshaw, D., Collign, T., & Terry, M. (2010). Pay and working time: Shifting contours of the employment relationship. In Colling, T., & Terry, M. (Eds), *Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice* (pp. 349-377). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Rubery, J., Ward, K., Grimshaw, D., & Beynon, H. (2005). Working time, industrial relations and the employment relationship. *Time & Society*, 14(1), 89-111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X05050300>
- Spurgeon, A. (2003). *Working time: Its impact on safety and health*. International Labour Office.
- Supiot, A., & Casas, M. E. (2001). *Beyond employment : changes in work and the future of labour law in Europe*. Oxford University Press.
- Swanberg, J., Watson, E., & Eastman, M. (2014). Scheduling challenges among workers in low-wage hourly jobs: Similarities and differences among workers in standard- and nonstandard-hour jobs. *Community, Work & Family*, 17(4), 409-435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2014.931837>
- Thompson, E. P. (1967). Time, work-discipline, and industrial capitalism. *Past & Present*, 38, 56-97. <https://doi.org/10.1093/past/38.1.56>
- Townsend, K., Wilkinson, A., & Burgess, J. (2013). Filling the gaps: Patterns of formal and informal participation. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 34(2), 337-354 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X12448442>
- Upchurch, M., Richardson, M., Tailby, S., Danford, A., & Stewart, P. (2006). Employee representation and partnership in the non-union sector: a paradox of intention? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(4), 393-410. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2006.00027.x>
- Van Wanrooy, B., Bewley, H., Bryson, A., Forth, J., Freeth, S., Stokes, L., & Wood, S. (2013). *The 2011 workplace employment relations study: First findings*. Department for Business, Innovation & Skills.
- Wilkinson, A., Dundon, T., Marchington, M., & Ackers, P. (2004). Changing patterns of employee voice. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46(3), 298-322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-1856.2004.00143.x>
- Wong, S. C. K., & Ko, A. (2009). Exploratory study of understanding hotel employees' perception on work-life balance issues. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(2), 195-203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.07.001>
- Wood, R. C. (2020). Perspectives on hospitality industry trade unionism in the UK and beyond. *Research in Hospitality Management*, 10(2), 137-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22243534.2020.1869456>
- Wu, D. C., Song, H., & Shen, S. (2017). New developments in tourism and hotel demand modeling and forecasting. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 507-529. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2015-0249>
- Xu, A. J., Loi, R., & Chow, C. W. (2020). Can taking charge at work help hospitality frontline employees enrich their family life? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 89, 102594. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102594>

