1988 Survey of Worker Co-operatives: Summary Report

Other

1988 SURVEY OF WORKER CO-OPERATIVES

SUMMARY REPORT

Prepared January 1989

Preliminary Analysis:

Subject to Modification

Phil Hobbs

Co-operatives Research Unit, Faculty of Technology, Open University, Walton Hall,

Milton Keynes. MK7 6AA

CONTENTS

PREAMBLE

Project Team

Phil Hobbs
Alan Thomas
Christine Thomas
Teri Walton

Acknowledgements

In conducting this survey we have relied upon the goodwill and assistance of a great many people. To them a debt of thanks is owed. In particular we are mindful of the time taken by co-operators in responding to our questionnaire.

This research has been partly funded by generous grants from the Co-operative Development Agency (CDA) and the Open University Technology Faculty.

We are particularly grateful for the patience shown to us by the CDA. The absence of strict time deadlines has permitted us to pursue this research in a more rigorous manner than might otherwise have been the case.

Comments and Observations

We would welcome any comments and observations on the survey, and in particular on its results. These should be sent to Phil Hobbs, Co-operatives Research Unit, Faculty of Technology, Open University, Milton Keynes. MK7 6AA.

1988 Directory of Worker Co-operatives

This publication, listing all known worker co-operatives trading at the time of the Survey (mid to late 1988), will be available from the end of February 1989 from the Co-operatives Research Unit, at the address given above. Price £25 (including postage and packing).

Requests for Information

It is possible for specific information (for example, listings of co-operatives by certain predefined criteria) from the results of the 1988 Survey of Worker Co-operatives to be provided to interested parties. Enquires should be directed to the address above.

Author's Note

The results presented in this report represent the initial analysis of the survey data. In this respect all the figures quoted should be treated with caution.

The views expressed in this report are those of the author, and do not necessarily represent those of the Co-operative Development Agency or of other members of the Co-operatives Research Unit.

SURVEY OBJECTIVES

Introduction

Every two years, since 1980, a survey of worker co-operatives has been undertaken to gauge the extent and development of the worker co-operative sector in the U.K., and in preparation for the publication of a Directory. On this occasion the survey work has been undertaken by the Co-operatives Research Unit at the Open University with the assistance and support of the Co-operative Development Agency and the Industrial Common Ownership Movement (ICOM).

As in past years the objectives of the survey have been, essentially, to monitor the growth in numbers and employment as well as the distribution by sector and region. The 1988 Survey has also looked at some broader issues in the co-operative movement such as the level of unionisation, the proportion of women in co-operatives, the number of ethnic businesses, and many other mainly employment-related data. The survey questionnaire was in two distinct parts. The results of Part Two, including most of this additional information, are primarily intended for use in ongoing research at the Co-operatives Research Unit. In this report we present some of the information, in summary form, gained through both parts of the survey. However, it should be emphasised that this is based on only a preliminary analysis of the data and the results should be treated cautiously.

In contrast to the 1986 survey conducted by the national CDA, we restricted the coverage of our survey to those businesses meeting a strict definition of "Worker Co-operative". This definition, based on the model rules used by co-operatives, excluded Community and Neighbourhood Co-operatives, Instant Muscle schemes, and Actors Agencies and the like. Where there was uncertainty we tried as far as possible to include co-operatives if they appeared to aim to provide employment for their members through their own activities. This contraction of the survey's coverage reflected two considerations. Firstly, at a practical level it is clear that the inclusion of other types of co-operative and "Near Co-operatives" significantly increases the numbers involved. In particular we were concerned that at the margins the distinction between "Near Co-operatives" and, say, charities and other voluntary organisations is very unclear. Secondly, despite the increase in various other types of co-operative, we felt that it was important, from the perspective of consistency with other CRU research, to restrict the survey to worker co-operatives, these being organisations that adhere strictly to the principles of industrial co-operation and social ownership.

Objectives of Report

This summary report presents a brief introduction to some of the key information this survey produced. Clearly it is not possible to present all the information we have collected, nor to show the many possible inter-relations. Rather, we have concentrated on answering some of the most common questions and enquires we have received.

As we begin to investigate the patterns and implications of the data in more detail we shall endeavour to publish this analysis as widely as possible.

We are conscious that many of the issues we are addressing in this report require a more careful investigation and interpretation of the data, especially on the question of sample bias. As we note below, we make the assumption in this report that the data we have collected is representative of the whole worker co-operative movement. Thus we have taken the simple figure for, say, employment from the survey responses and assumed, perhaps optimistically, that this figure may be scaled up to give the total employment in the U.K. co-operative sector. Whilst this may be a strong assumption to make, alternative methods of estimation involve far greater complexity than is necessary at this preliminary stage, particularly since the magnitude of the results is unlikely to change greatly.

SURVEY DETAILS

Introduction

This section describes, briefly, the process by which we conducted our survey. Unfortunately, the survey design has partly been driven by factors outside our control. In a more predictable world we would have liked a longer lead in time to the work and consequently a more concentrated survey period. However, given that all the project team have contributed on a part-time basis, the converse has been the case. Whilst this may not have seriously altered the results, it has drawn out the length of the project considerably.

Method

Our initial mailing list of co-operatives was based on the Worker Co-operative Database operated by London ICOM and information obtained from ICOM in Leeds. From these two databases we carefully edited out duplicate entries, co-operatives known to have ceased trading, and community, instant muscle, secondary and marketing co-operatives. The result of this work was an initial database containing 1813 worker co-operatives thought to be trading in the U.K.

Our first mailing to co-operatives took place at the beginning of July 1988. Whilst this generated a great number of replies (a lot of which were, unfortunately, questionnaires returned by the Post Office as undeliverable) it was clear that the response rate, as a percentage of the total number of questionnaires mailed, was fairly low. 1100 reminder postcards were mailed out in the last week of July and prompted perhaps an extra 100 replies.

Survey of Local Co-operative Development Agencies

A number of factors suggested that our mailing list contained a number of co-operatives that had ceased trading and under-represented newly formed co-operatives. Furthermore, evidence in the form of undeliverable questionnaires suggested that a large number of co-operatives had changed address. To help overcome these problems, local Co-operative Development Agencies were surveyed. They were sent a printout of co-operatives listed in the database as trading within their geographic area, and asked for corrections and additions. This element of the survey project produced an extremely good response with significantly more new information than we had expected.

However, whilst a significant proportion of co-operatives operate in areas or regions covered by a local CDA, a large number are outside these areas. Obviously this limits the reliability of the revised database.

On the basis of information derived from the CDA survey we undertook a third mailing to co-operatives where a CDA informed us either of a change of address or of a co-operative that had started trading. Additionally the database was corrected where a CDA provided information that a co-operative was not known, had ceased trading or was a community, secondary or marketing co-operative. Where a CDA answered our survey but did not include any such negative information about a particular co-operative, we were able to assume that even though there was "no response" there was a strong likelihood that that particular co-operative was still trading.

The position of the survey in September 1988 compared to that at January 1989 (the survey's completion date) is summarised in Table One. Note that the figures given represent a static picture of a fluid process. For example, co-operatives listed as "Address Changed" are those co-operatives identified by the survey as having changed address, in response to which a new set of questionnaires was forwarded. A reply to this enquiry would reduce the "Address Changed" category by one and increase the number of "Questionnaire[s] Returned" accordingly. Fuller details of the interpretation of the headings in Table One are provided in the notes to the table.

Telephone Survey

Having conducted three separate mailings it was clear that to improve the response rate further it would be necessary to contact co-operatives individually by telephone. A telephone survey was commenced on the 27th September and completed on the 8th October.

Of the 890 co-operatives that had failed to respond to the mailings, and for which we had no evidence to suggest that they had ceased trading or changed address, only 598 had telephone numbers listed in the database. Co-operatives that were contacted through the telephone survey were asked only the questions contained in Part One of the survey, for two reasons. Firstly it was thought more likely that we would obtain a positive response if we were able to promise the questions would take only "a couple of minutes". Secondly, we felt that the information required to answer some of the questions in Part Two was unlikely to be at hand.

Because of the constraints of time it was not possible to re-contact those co-operatives where no reply was obtained, except in limited circumstances. Therefore it was decided to undertake a saturation telephone survey of three geographic areas (North West, East

Midlands and East Anglia). This consisted of telephoning each co-operative on a further three occasions, at various times and days. This method, although providing some improvement, did not significantly alter these areas' response rates.

In conducting the telephone survey we were careful only to assign a co-operative to the "Ceased Trading" category when we had positive evidence that this was the case. It was felt that, say, an unobtainable tone did not necessarily mean that the co-operative had ceased trading. Indeed the evidence, that is, the number of Post Office returned questionnaires, suggested that the most likely explanation was inaccuracies in our starting information.

Response Rate

Overall the survey yielded "information" on 70% of the co-operatives originally identified (i.e of the original database of 1813). Actual positive responses to the survey questionnaire give a response rate of 36%. However, one should note that many of the "negative responses", for example, a report that a co-operative had ceased trading, provide a great deal of data for analysis (in this instance on survival rates for co-operatives). Therefore, we would conclude, slightly immodestly, that the survey generated a very high response rate.

The response rate to the survey of local CDAs is slightly more straightforward. Of the 84 requests sent out we received 64 replies. This represents a 77% response rate, which bearing in mind that a significant proportion of the CDAs contacted are unfunded, is higher than we anticipated at the outset.

Whilst our reporting of response rates may in part reflect a degree of introspection, it should be noted that a high response rate is generally consistent with a "good" representation of the total population in the data sample.

SURVEY RESULTS

Introduction

As mentioned above, the results presented in this report are very much a preliminary analysis of the survey data. For this reason all the figures should be treated with the utmost caution. However, we believe that the underlying picture we present is an accurate one.

The reader should also note that our information only reflects the situation in the middle to end of 1988. The overwhelming impression that we have derived from this survey is of rapid change within the sector. As is the nature of such "snap-shot" surveys, there are obviously a number of co-operatives that have, by now, moved from one category to another.

In presenting these results we have made the assumption that the simple, average figure may be taken from the survey results and scaled up to imply a picture of the whole sector. For example, the average number of workers per co-operative in the data sample is around six. In this report we assume that this average holds for those co-operatives not replying. Thus, if we assume that there were 1497 co-operatives in the U.K. in 1988 then the total number of employees was around 9000. This clearly makes very strong assumptions about the characteristics of those co-operatives not responding to the survey. However, given our desire to publish some of the results of the survey at the earliest date it is necessary for some assumptions to be made. One should note, by way of justification, that the comparison of our results with other, earlier, datasets suggests that they are of the correct magnitude.

Size of the Worker Co-operative Movement in 1988

One of the key questions that this survey addressed was an estimation of the size of the co-operative sector in 1988. This estimate depends critically on the assumptions made.

In Table Two we summarise the information contained in Table One into four categories: No Response, Survey Replies, Newly Identified Co-operatives, and "Over-Counts". Clearly the Survey Replies and the Newly Identified Co-operatives all count towards the total figure. Equally, by definition the "Over-Counts" do not. As pointed out above, because of the high response rate from local CDAs in terms of negative information on co-ops not known, known to have ceased trading, etc. most of the "No Response[s]" can be assumed to be trading and should be included in the total. The question is, what proportion of them should be taken to give the best estimate?

Making the assumption that only 15% of the "No Response" category have in fact ceased trading, we arrive at an estimate for the total co-operative population of 1497.

This assumption is based on the following considerations: Out of those co-operatives on our original mailing list for which we obtained some positive or negative information, approximately 20% had ceased trading. Taking into account the above point about local CDA returns, we should expect a slightly lower proportion of the "No Response[s]" to have ceased trading. Hence the estimate of 15%. However, we should be cautious with this figure. If 25% of the "No Response[s]" have in fact ceased trading, there would be only 1432 co-operatives in total; if the figure were 50%, the total population would reduce to 1268. We can say with confidence, however, that the worker co-operative movement has now well surpassed the 1200 figure. The assumption of a 15% failure rate amongst "No Response[s]" is carried through to all subsequent analysis.

These calculations are also laid out in Table Two.

We go on to compare these figures with those for other survey dates, using data previously calculated on a similar basis (i.e. after removing community and neighbourhood co-operatives, duplications, etc. from the 1986 survey data) and summarised in Cornforth, C. et al (1988) "Developing Successful Worker Co-operatives" (London: Sage Publications).

Table Three shows that the growth in the co-operative sector has continued in the period 1986-1988, at a rate of between 10% and 13% per annum. The absolute increase in the stock of co-operatives appears to be much as one might expect based upon the recent historical data. This continuing stability appears to suggest that the co-operative movement has attained a degree of equilibrium with new registrations exceeding deregistrations by about 150 each year.

Employment and Membership

The role of worker co-operatives in employment creation is one that has been subject to a great deal of debate. The findings of our survey, whilst indicating that employment in absolute terms has increased by about 13%, suggest that the ratio of employment to the number of co-operatives has remained static. Table Four shows that the average number of workers per co-operative (when measuring part-time workers as half full-time) is just over five, the same figure as that for 1986.

Adding together full and part-time employment for 1988 gives a total estimate of 9131 workers. This compares to a figure of 11826 for membership. In the "average co-operative" one would expect to find around four or five full-time workers, one or two part-time workers and a membership of eight. That membership should exceed employment is perhaps not unexpected. There are, of course, certain legal requirements for a minimum membership. Furthermore, it is known that founder members often contribute to a co-operative though not included as full or part-time workers.

This optimistic picture is partly confirmed by the information gained in the survey of the proportion of full-time and part-time workers who are members. Summarising this data we find:

Average Number of Member Workers Per Co-operative	= 4.6
Average No. of Full-Time Member Workers Per Co-operative	= 3.5
Average No. of Part-Time Member Workers Per Co-operative	= 0.9

Clearly there is a proportion of non-member workers in many co-operatives. Some of these workers may be undergoing a probationary period, or a less satisfactory explanation may be that the excess of non-member workers represents casual labour. Alternatively it is possible that co-operatives are moving away from full participation. Clearly this question is a vexed one, and we would wish to see a more detailed picture including changes over time before drawing even tentative conclusions.

Regional Distribution

The summary data that we are presenting here is based on an extrapolation of the 647 survey replies (222 of which were only partially completed questionnaires). When presenting the aggregate national picture anomalies tend to be ironed out; however, at the regional level one large local CDA questionnaire return may skew the results. We would urge that the data we present for the regional distribution be treated as a rough pattern rather than an absolute picture.

As one might expect, Table Five shows that Greater London has the largest number of co-operatives - though one notes that this is a lower absolute figure than was the case in 1986. This observation aside, the distribution between regions appears to have remained reasonably constant - though the South West and East Anglia have shown notable proportional increases.

A question for future analysis is the correlation between the existence of local CDAs or other co-operative support organisations and the relative performance of regions and sub-regions. Existing work suggests that local CDAs etc. do positively contribute to the formation rate of co-operatives, and indeed to their survival rates. Intuitively, therefore, one might suggest that the decline of the co-operative population in London is related to the retrenchment of co-oprative support organisations. These detailed questions are, however, outside the scope of this summary report. As mentioned above, it is our intention to publish more detailed analysis of specific questions at a future date.

Industrial Distribution

Classification of co-operatives by sector is a cumbersome process. Not least of the problems is that co-operatives frequently operate in more than one industrial sector. For example, retail outlets may also be involved in wholesaling. Therefore in this section of the report we confine our analysis to "main", or primary, industrial sectors.

In Table Six we produce comparable information for the industrial distribution of co-operatives in 1986 and 1988. From this we note that there appears to have been a quite dramatic realignment of co-operatives by industrial classification. In particular one notes the move away from "manufacturing" and into "services" (though this may partly be explained by changes in the classification of certain co-operatives). It should also be noted that the absolute numbers have fallen in manufacturing. One might conclude that the advantage of services over manufacturing has resulted from the failure of co-operatives in manufacturing as well as the formation of proportionately more new co-operatives in services.

ADDITIONAL SELECTED STATISTICS

Introduction

The database that has been constructed from the results of this survey has over 100 variables for each co-operative. Thus to attempt to summarise all of them is beyond the scope of this report. In this concluding section we present a selection only of the additional information available.

Women Workers and Women Members

On these two questions we found a somewhat disappointing apparent under representation of women in the worker co-operative movement - or an over representation of men, depending on how one looks at the issue. Our analysis of the database suggests that the average number of women workers per co-operative was 2.5. This compares to an average co-operative size of 6.1 workers. Women are also under represented, in fact more so, in terms of co-operative membership. We find an average of 2.1 women members compared to an overall average of 6.9 members. Thus one might argue, assuming an expectation of equality, that women are around 15% under represented in co-operatives. In fact this figure may be overly optimistic when one considers the effect of women-only co-operatives, which suggests that the average number of women workers or members in non-women-only co-operatives might be lower than the above figures.

Co-operatives With Special Employment Policies

Above we have touched on the question of women-only co-operatives. In addition the survey asked questions concerning co-operatives describing themselves as "ethnic minority" and co-operatives with a special policy of employing people with disabilities. Clearly these are not simply categories for co-operators to place themselves in. Indeed it may well be the case that some simply did not wish to be categorised in this fashion or felt that neither "yes" or "no" was an appropriate response. Therefore we again argue for caution in interpreting our data, which only provide a rough indication of the extent of special employment policies in co-operatives.

Of the 425 co-operatives that responded to this part of the survey the following numbers identified themselves:

62 Women-Only Co-operatives
36 Ethnic Minority Co-operatives
32 Co-operatives with a Special Policy of Employing People With Disabilities

Assuming that this distribution holds for the whole country then we would expect there to be 217 women only co-operatives, 126 ethnic minority co-operatives and 112 with a special policy of employing people with disabilities. Without being certain of the degree of overlap, one can say this means between 20% and 30% of co-operatives are in at least one of these special categories.

Unionisation of Member and Non-Member Workers

We have discussed above the existence of a gap between member and non-member workers. A further question in the survey attempted to find out if there were differences in the unionisation rate between these two groups. If this gap represents a decline in co-operative participation then one might expect to find that unionisation was higher amongst non-member workers. In fact we find the converse to be true. Unionisation amongst member workers is 25% whilst that for non-member workers is 18%. However, it should be noted in this context that non-members are far more likely to be part-time workers (71% compared to 57%) and are possibly less likely to be union members for this reason.

Reasons for Formation

In this section we draw together the answers to two separate questions. In the first part of the questionnaire we asked the reasons for the co-operative being established. In the second part a question was asked about the role of outside agencies, such as local CDAs, in the formation of the co-operative, and if that support continues today.

In investigating the reasons behind formation we find that the predominant origin is "New Start". 72% of co-operatives trading in 1988 were "New Starts", that is, they were formed as an original idea rather than, for example, out of the closure of a previous employer. However, the importance of defensive and endowed co-operatives (i.e. those formed from conventional firms) should not be underestimated. 20% of co-operatives classify themselves in these two categories, including 11% formed out of the failure of conventional firms. The remaining 8% include conversions from job creation or other special projects, and "other" modes of formation.

Turning now to the role of external agencies, we find that of the 425 responses to this question, 278 co-operatives claimed that they received "substantial" start-up advice from an outside body. This figure of 65% may underestimate the real impact of external agencies given that there have been, and still are, areas that are not covered by local CDAs etc. The comparable figure for ongoing support is slightly lower at 50%. Furthermore, we note, from casual observation, that the sources of advice appear to change, with a shift from local CDAs etc. more prominent at start up towards non-governmental groups such as accountants and banks becoming more important later - though this may not be a statistically significant feature.

It would appear that external agencies are indeed an extremely important source of advice and assistance to the co-operative sector. This conclusion is one that should be seen, in part, as strengthening the arguments in favour of funding for specific co-operative orientated development agencies.

Financial Performance

There were two questions about a co-operative's interpretation of its past and current turnover.

When asked how the figure for turnover in the last financial year compared with the previous year (i.e. 1986) the following responses were noted:

Significantly Better = 63%
Much The Same = 32%
Significantly Worse = 5%

Expectations for turnover in the current financial year, compared to 1987, are summarised below:

Significantly Better = 59%
Much The Same = 37%
Significantly Worse = 4%

Taking these results at face value would seem to indicate both an improving financial position and an optimism for the future. There is, of course, likely to be a degree of self-selection that skews the results in favour of a positive financial position. Those co-operatives that might have reported a "significantly worse" financial performance are those, intuitively, most likely to have ceased trading and hence not replied at all. Additionally it should be noted that only around two-thirds of co-operatives replying to the survey included answers to these two questions. To a certain extent this may be explained by the age distribution of co-operatives surveyed. New co-operatives may not have reliable turnover figures for 1987. However, it is also possible that there is a significant amount of under-reporting of stable or declining financial performance.

Despite this note of caution, the balance of the results in favour of improving financial performance is so strong as to suggest that, even if the sample is significantly biased, there is some underlying basis for this optimism.

CONCLUSION

The picture that we draw of the worker co-operative sector in 1988 appears to be a quite optimistic one. We have found little, if any, evidence to suggest that the "inevitable decline" of the co-operative movement has taken hold. Of course, aggregate data is capable of hiding a great many exceptions and anomalies, and the results are subject to possible revision after more detailed analysis.

Even with our reported growth rate, the co-operative movement is unlikely ever to be more than a marginal player in the economy. However, it must be remembered that the co-operative movement represents much more than can be captured in statistics. We have discussed in this report the contribution of co-operatives to employment but we have not discussed the contribution that co-operatives make to industrial democracy, participation and social ownership. Yet these are perhaps the areas in which the importance of co-operatives is greatest.

TABLES

Table One: Summary of Responses September 1988 and January 1989

Category of Response	September		January	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No Reply	890	42	557	26
Qre Returned by P.O	88	4	96	5
Qre Completed	364	17	425	20
Duplicate Entry	25	2	50	2
Address Changed	94	4	72	3
Ceased Trading	211	10	252	3
Not a Worker Co-op	58	3	143	8
Not Known by CDA	83	4	86	4
New Co-op Entry	295	14	223	10
Telephone Reply	0	0	222	10
Total	2108	100	2126	100

Note: Explanation of certain categories.

No Reply - this includes a large number of cases where a local CDA has made a very full return, including negative information on other co-ops. We might infer that the local CDA believes these co-ops to be trading, though they did not reply themselves. This category also includes co-ops in areas without a local CDA about which we have no information at all.

Duplicate Entry - where a CDA or co-op told us that the database contained a duplicate entry, one of the entries was assigned to this category.

Address Changed - this category covers those co-ops for which we were notified of a change of address. These co-ops were remailed. Those not replying remain in this category.

Not a Worker Co-op - covers instances where we discovered that the "co-op" was outside the definition we employed.

Not Known by CDA - instances where a CDA had not heard of a co-op listed as trading in their geographic area. In most cases one would assume these to be "phantom" entries.

New Co-op Entry - refers to co-ops identified by a CDA as trading but not on our starting list. "New" refers to the relationship to the database; the co-ops might be established ones. Those co-ops still listed in this category are those not replying to our mailing.

Telephone Reply - in this class of reply, separate from Qre Completed, only the first part of the survey was completed.

Table Two: Estimation of Co-operative Population

Summarised Category	Total	Percent
No Response	653	31
Newly Identified Co-ops	295	14
Survey Replies	647	30
"Over-counts"	531	25
Total	2126	100

Estimated Population under different assumptions

Proportion of "No Response[s]" assumed to have ceased trading:	Estimated population:
15%	1497
25%	1432
0%	1595
50%	1268

Note:

"No Response" = No Reply + Qre Returned by P.O.

"Newly Identified Co-ops" = New Co-op Entries + Address Changed

"Survey Reply" = Qre Completed + Telephone Replies

"Over-counts" = Not Known by CDA + Duplicate Entry + Ceased Trading + Not a Worker Co-op

Table Three: Comparative Growth Rates

Year end	No.of co-ops	Annual Growth	Absolute Change
1976	105	--	--
1977	144	37%	39
1978	221	53%	77
1979	279	26%	58
1980	355	27%	76
1981	420	18%	65
1982	567	35%	147
1983	733	29%	166
1984	915	24%	182
1985	1103	20%	188
1986	1234	11%	131
1988 (mid-year; high estimate)	1497	13%	263
1988 (mid-year; low estimate)	1432	10%	198

Notes:

1975-86 figures from 1986 Directory, modified in similar way to 1988 figures but not precisely comparable.

1988 figure assumed to be approx. 20 months later than figure for end of 1986.

Table Four: Employment and Membership 1988

	mid-1988		end-1986	
	Total	Per co-op	Total	Per co-op
Numbers Employed	9131	6.1		
Full/Time Workers	6376	4.5		
Part/Time Workers	2395	1.6		
Full-time Equivalents	7574	5.1	6691	5.3
Membership	11826	7.9		

Notes:

No. of Full-Time Equivalents is estimated as the number of Full-Time Workers plus half the number of Part-Time Workers.

1986 figure includes co-ops for which nos. employed were not known as though they had no jobs, so the real employment figure at that time must have been greater than given here.

Table Five: Regional Distribution 1988 and 1986

	mid-1988		end-1986	
Region	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Greater London	390	26	401	32
South East	77	5	52	4
East Anglia	88	6	46	4
South West	99	7	52	4
Wales	82	5	92	7
West Midlands	105	7	94	8
East Midlands	144	10	94	8
Yorkshire/Humberside	141	9	127	10
North West	167	11	126	10
North	95	6	79	6
Scotland	99	7	81	6
N. Ireland	10	1	7	1
Total	1497	100	1251	100

Table Six: Industrial Distribution 1988 and 1986

	mid-1988		end-1986	
Sector	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture	30	2	18	2
Building	60	4	77	7
Manufacturing	269	18	307	27
Services	809	54	501	45
Retail/Wholesale	299	20	196	17
Transport	30	2	22	2
Total	1497	100	1121	100

Note to Tables 5 and 6:

Totals may not agree due to co-operatives with region or sector not known being excluded from the 1986 figures.