

Human Trade Assessment Report: Sample2 (London City 4th Quarter 2016)



The HTA breaks social support down into 12 aspects in order to provide a numerical measure of social justice in commercial activity.

	Element	Question
Q1	Meritocracy	Fair pay/Decent wages?
Q2	Security	Guaranteed hours/Job security?
Q3	Safety	Safety at work/ Hygiene at work?
Q4	Development(Professional)	Opportunities for professional growth?
Q5	Ecology	Environmental protection?
Q6	Equality	Social equality and prevent bullying?
Q7	Input(Recognition)	Support?
Q8	Health	Health?
Q9	Community(Family)	Community?
Q10	Growth(Personal)	Development?
Q11	Dignity	Dignity?
Q12	Solidarity	Access to unions and collective bargaining?

This sample was collected during the last quarter of 2016.

Results:

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Total	Average	Percent
TR1	1	5	6	3	3	5	3	2	?	X	6	5	39	3.25	54.17
TR2	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	X	10	0.83	13.89
TR3	3	4	4	1	2	2	4	4	4	1	4	5	38	3.17	52.78
TR4	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0.58	9.72
TR5	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	33	2.75	45.83
TR6	2	3	3	3	3	X	5	5	4	X	4	4	36	3.00	50.00
TR7	4	6	5	4	3	5	4	4	5	4	6	4	54	4.50	75.00
TR8	3	1	X	2	3	3	0	2	2	3	3	X	22	1.83	30.56
TR9	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	1.00	16.67
TR10	0	0	5	4	2	X	5	0	4	4	0	0	24	2.00	33.33
TR11	2	2	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	34	2.83	47.22
Set	11	11	10	11	11	9	11	11	10	9	11	9	124	10.33	
Total	22	25	34	24	25	24	27	25	25	19	31	28			
Avg	2.0	2.2	3.4	2.1	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.5	2.1	2.8	3.1		2.49	41.53
	0	7	0	8	7	7	5	7	0	1	2	1			

11 results were collected all together with 6 complete assessments without any missing answers.

The results produced figures that provided a basis for ranking the type and degree of social support. Figures were produced to reflect a mixture of analysis involving basic average; a measure of averages including median and mode; and standard deviation to measure the distribution of results for each element of social justice.

	Meritocracy	Security	Safety	Development	Environment	Equality	Input	Health	Community	Growth	Dignity	Solidarity
Standard Deviation	1.26	2.00	1.84	1.40	1.19	1.80	2.07	1.74	1.90	1.62	2.18	1.69
	Meritocracy	Security	Safety	Development	Environment	Equality	Input	Health	Community	Growth	Dignity	Solidarity
Average	-1.00	-0.73	0.40	-0.82	-0.73	-0.33	-0.55	-0.73	-0.50	-0.89	-0.18	0.11
Grand Average	-1.00	-1.24	0.30	-0.61	-0.24	-0.11	-1.18	-0.91	-1.17	-0.30	-1.06	0.04
	Meritocracy	Security	Safety	Development	Environment	Equality	Input	Health	Community	Growth	Dignity	Solidarity
Median	2	2	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3
Mode	2	1	3	3	3	3	0	2	0	3	0	3

Analysis:

The basic and grand average results matched most in **safety** and **solidarity** with neither having excessive or consolidation or distribution.

Rank	Deviation	Average	Grand Average
1	Environment	Safety	Safety
2	Meritocracy	Solidarity	Solidarity
3	Development	Dignity	Equality
4	Growth	Equality	Environment
5	Solidarity	Community	Growth
6	Health	Input	Development
7	Equality	Heal/Envi/Secu	Health
8	Safety	Heal/Envi/Secu	Meritocracy
9	Community	Heal/Envi/Secu	Dignity
10	Security	Development	Community
11	Input	Growth	Input
12	Dignity	Meritocracy	Security

Meritocracy produced the worst basic average result with strong agreement depicted in the minimal distribution between results. When the median and mode were taken into account it made little difference although the results of other elements were significantly reduced when these factors were accounted.

The worst complex average was in **security**. This element produced the 3rd highest distribution of figures with the most popular answer being 2 out of 7. The average in this case was misleading and further analysis reflects the underlying lack of job security faced by participants in sample 2.

Community(family) and **personal input(recognition)** also saw a significant fall in rank when the complex average was compared with the basic average. **Community(family)** value took the most dramatic numerical fall when compared with **security** and **input**.

The only figures to rise after the complex average measurement were: **professional development, ecology, equality** and **personal growth**. **Environment** and **equality** were relatively good in both average measures. When complex average was measured **personal growth** reflected the most significant rise in general and in rank. Negative results for **personal growth** were generally distributed at 'slightly inadequate' with a few marked as 'completely inadequate' bringing the basic average below the complex average.

The most concerning results were for **dignity**. The basic average was the 3rd highest ranked but this fell 6 points to 9th under complex average. **Dignity** had the highest degree of distribution of all results with those that were satisfied giving this element the highest results. Concerns relate to the numerous results showing complete dissatisfaction with **dignity** at London City with it's most popular answer being the lowest 1 out of 7. These results warrant further investigation to determine the source of dissatisfaction and why **dignity** at London City is so unevenly distributed.



