



**Manchester  
Metropolitan  
University**

---

Atkinson, Carol and Crozier, Sarah (2020) Fragmented Time and Domiciliary Care Quality. *Employee Relations*. ISSN 0142-5455 (In Press)

---

**Downloaded from:** <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/622538/>

**Version:** Accepted Version

**Publisher:** Emerald

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-05-2018-0142>

**Usage rights:** Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0

Please cite the published version

<https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk>



### Fragmented time and domiciliary care quality

Journal:	<i>Employee Relations</i>
Manuscript ID	ER-05-2018-0142.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Domiciliary care, Fragmented time, Care quality, Marketisation

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Fragmented time and domiciliary care quality

### Abstract

Purpose: This article examines the marketization of domiciliary care, its consequences for employment practice, specifically fragmented time, and the implications for care quality.

Design/methodology: Focus groups and face-to-face or telephone interviews were conducted with care commissioners, service providers and care workers across Wales. There were 113 participants in total

Findings: these demonstrate fragmented time's negative consequences for service providers, care workers and, ultimately, care quality.

Research limitations: No care recipients were interviewed and care quality was explored through the perceptions of other stakeholders

Social implications: For policy-makers, tensions are evidenced between aspirations for high quality care and commissioning practice that mitigates against this. Current care commissioning practices need urgent review.

Originality/value: the research extends the definition of fragmented time and integrates it with a model of care quality to demonstrate its negative consequences. Links between employment practice and care quality have only previously been hinted at.

Keywords: domiciliary care, fragmented time, care quality, marketisation

Research article

## Introduction

As Western populations age, so the demand for adult social care increases. Domiciliary care, one form of social care, affords personal care, protection or social support for vulnerable adults in their own homes (Gray and Birrell, 2013) and should improve quality of life for (mainly) older people (Francis and Netten, 2004). Yet high profile UK scandals have raised concerns over care quality (Kingsmill, 2014, Flynn, 2015) and, while the context here is Wales, these concerns are reflected internationally (Cunningham et al., 2014, Broadbent, 2014). Inadequacies in care provision have substantial ramifications. Directly, some of society's most vulnerable adults suffer poor care and thus poor life quality. Indirectly, effective operation of health care systems is compromised by, for example, 'bed-blocking', whereby hospital discharge is delayed due to lack of available social care provision (e.g. Marsh, 2016), to an extent that threatens to de-stabilise health care provision. Delivery of high quality social care is thus an urgent imperative.

Addressing this imperative requires an adequate and skilled workforce (Rainbird et al., 2011), which depends upon effective employment relationships. Yet recently in this journal, Rubery (2015) outlined a series of trends that adversely affect employment practice and are particularly pertinent to domiciliary care. First, fragmentation, where marketisation promoting outsourcing and use of external providers has created a move away from standard forms of employment, with social care being a particular example of resulting insecurity and zero-hours contracts (Rubery and Urwin, 2011). Second, flexibilisation of employment being demand- rather than supply-led, again with resultant workforce insecurity. Finally, feminisation of employment, which is highly relevant given the gender segregation that prevails in social care, and which facilitates insecurity (Moore and Tailby, 2015). These trends have, in combination, degraded working practices and created what Rubery et al. (2015: 753) have recently described as 'fragmented time' in which insecure and highly flexible working patterns dominate. Given that the link between employment practice and service

1  
2  
3 quality in other contexts is well-established (Whyman et al., 2015), the article addresses the  
4  
5 research question, what are the consequences of fragmented time for care quality?  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 The article makes a valuable empirical contribution to the social care employment research base  
12  
13 (Cooke and Bartram, 2015), importantly adding care workers' views (Cunningham, 2010) not just on  
14  
15 their employment situation, but also on care quality. Theoretically, it both confirms Rubery et al.'s  
16  
17 (2015) definition of fragmented time, evidencing an employment offer predicated upon zero-hours  
18  
19 contracts and episodic working, and extends it in adding visit length (Bee et al., 2008). Further, it  
20  
21 integrates fragmented time with Francis and Netten's (2004) dimensions of good care to  
22  
23 demonstrate the detriment to quality that fragmented time brings in reducing continuity, reliability  
24  
25 and flexibility of care. This moves beyond the thus far tentative links proposed in existing domiciliary  
26  
27 care research (Broadbent, 2014, Cunningham, 2016) to evidence that poor employment practice  
28  
29 compromises care quality. For policy-makers, the article demonstrates substantial tensions between  
30  
31 policy's aspirations for high quality care and funding/commissioning practice that mitigates against  
32  
33 good employment practice.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 The article proceeds by outlining the marketization of domiciliary care and the implications for social  
40  
41 care employment relationships. It then theoretically frames fragmented time and care quality,  
42  
43 before presenting research methods and findings/discussion. It concludes with research  
44  
45 contributions and implications.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

## 51 **Marketisation and domiciliary care employment relationships**

52  
53 In many neoliberal economies, there has been marked reduction in state provision of domiciliary  
54  
55 care over recent decades (Cunningham, 2008). A shift to marketised relationships has occurred in  
56  
57 which the state, via local authorities, commissions most domiciliary care from independent (private  
58  
59 and voluntary) sector service providers (Cunningham et al., 2014). Understanding of commissioning  
60

1  
2  
3 is essential to examination of both wider employment practice (Rubery et al., 2013) and, specifically,  
4  
5 fragmented time (Rubery et al., 2015). Marketisation draws on supposedly efficient business  
6  
7 principles and aims to improve care quality. In practice, the external commissioning of care has long  
8  
9 been associated with quality concerns, related in large part to the cost pressures that have  
10  
11 dominated local authority commissioner agendas (Cunningham, 2010). Indeed, Cavendish's (2013)  
12  
13 review of UK care failures argued that local authority monopsony of commissioning suppresses rates  
14  
15 and UK Home Care Association, the employers association for domiciliary care providers (UKHCA,  
16  
17 2015a), reports that care is often commissioned at less than its cost price<sup>i</sup>. Inadequate funding is  
18  
19 compounded by insecure commissioning arrangements, with a move away from block contracts,  
20  
21 where an agreed number of hours are purchased whether used or not, to spot contracts, where  
22  
23 payment is only made if care is taken up (see Knapp et al., 2001 for detailed explanation). Time is the  
24  
25 unit of account adopted (Rubery et al., 2015) and domiciliary care provision is typically measured in  
26  
27 minutes with, in a drive for efficiency, the increased use of short visits of 15 and 30 minutes or less  
28  
29 (Bessa et al., 2013). Using spot contracts, commissioners operate Framework Agreements that  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

This has substantial implications for social care employment relationships (Broadbent, 2014) which, as Framework Agreements rarely address terms and conditions of employment (Burrowes, 2015), have limited protection from market pressures.

Marketisation and associated funding pressures, particularly in times of austerity, have occasioned the erosion of fulltime, permanent domiciliary care jobs (Broadbent, 2014) and, internationally, there has been a convergence of regimes based on low pay, insecure employment and work intensification (Cunningham et al., 2014, Broadbent, 2014). In the UK, poor social care employment

1  
2  
3 practice is widespread in both the private (Rubery and Urwin, 2011) and voluntary sectors, where  
4  
5 Cunningham describes a 'race to the bottom' (2008: 1033). Green and Ayalon (2017) echo this,  
6  
7 arguing that domiciliary care workers are susceptible to various forms of abuse and calling for closer  
8  
9 scrutiny of their working conditions. While their research focuses particularly on migrant labour, the  
10  
11 issues are nevertheless relevant to the predominantly Welsh workforce considered here. This article  
12  
13 explores one important aspect of employment, fragmented time (Rubery et al., 2015), and its  
14  
15 implications for care quality.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 Fragmented Time

24 The paper builds on Rubery et al.'s (2015) argument that time is a critical issue within domiciliary  
25  
26 care. This flows both from commissioning practice, discussed above, that adopts time as a unit of  
27  
28 account and the use of time to frame service scheduling and employment terms and conditions.  
29  
30 Developing this, Rubery et al. (2015: 753) propose the concept of 'fragmented time', that draws on  
31  
32 six indexes including payment for time in work-related activities (e.g. travel), insecurity via zero-  
33  
34 hours contracts, variable and/or extended schedules, time constrained work and work schedules  
35  
36 that meet worker preferences. Broadly, these indexes evidence adoption of zero-hour contracts and  
37  
38 episodic working (Moore and Tailby, 2015), both of which facilitate removal of unproductive time as  
39  
40 demanded in a marketised, cost-constrained context.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Zero-hour contracts describe arrangements where the employer is not obliged to offer, nor the  
49  
50 worker to accept, hours of work (Alakeson and D'arcy, 2014). They are a long-standing form of non-  
51  
52 standard employment relationship:  
53

54  
55 'in the domiciliary care part of the [social care] sector, zero-hour contracts have become  
56  
57 standard and predate the current period of austerity' Alakeson and D'arcy (2014: 9).  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 UK figures suggest that 70-80% of the domiciliary care workforce is employed on zero-hour contracts  
4  
5 (Rubery et al., 2015, Bessa et al., 2013) and they are particularly prevalent in Wales (Burrowes,  
6  
7 2015). Service providers argue that reliance upon them results from spot contracting and income  
8  
9 instability and associated risk is transferred to workers via insecure working arrangements  
10  
11 (Cunningham, 2010). Working hours are not guaranteed and can vary substantially from week to  
12  
13 week, although in practice care workers often work long hours (Bessa et al., 2013).  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 Domiciliary care workers also work episodically, that is, workers are unpaid for time available for  
20  
21 work but not spent delivering care (Moore and Tailby, 2015). Combined with zero-hour contracts,  
22  
23 workers are paid only in the concentrated daily periods where there is care demand and not usually  
24  
25 in-between, even where available for work (Rubery et al., 2015). Strict time-based commissioning  
26  
27 underpins this, as service providers also only receive payment for hours of care delivered (Rubery et  
28  
29 al., 2015). Additionally, workers are not typically paid for travel time between care recipients (Bessa  
30  
31 et al., 2013) which incurs substantial cost for care workers, as UKHCA (2015a) estimates that  
32  
33 approaching 20% of working time is spent travelling. Episodic working thus results in long working  
34  
35 hours, many of which are unpaid.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Following Bee et al. (2008), this article adds visit length to fragmented time's definition. Rubery et al.  
42  
43 (2015) included time constrained work in their fragmented time indexes, but had insufficient data to  
44  
45 include visit length and this is a key contribution of this paper. Commissioner emphasis on cost and  
46  
47 efficiency has increased the incidence of very short visits e.g. 15 to 30 minutes (UKHCA, 2015c). This  
48  
49 further fragments working time, as care workers can spend as much (unpaid) time travelling  
50  
51 between visits as they spend in delivering care. It also results in work intensification, as workers are  
52  
53 pressured to do more in less time (Broadbent, 2014) and are unable to deliver the level of care  
54  
55 required (Atkinson et al., 2016). Short visits are additionally problematic as time allowed often takes  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 little account of the complexity of care needs and actual care delivery may well exceed the time  
4  
5 scheduled for it (Rubery et al., 2015), meaning that workers are unpaid for care delivered.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Marketisation has thus meant that most domiciliary care employment relationships are predicated  
11  
12 on fragmented time practices. This creates difficulties for both care workers and service providers.  
13  
14 For care workers, job dissatisfaction is likely (Rubery et al., 2015). The intrinsic satisfaction that  
15  
16 arises from the relational nature of care, and is widely accepted to be important to service quality  
17  
18 (Huang and Gamble, 2015), can co-exist with dissatisfaction arising from extrinsic factors (Carr, 2014)  
19  
20 but only buffers their detrimental impact to a certain extent (King et al., 2013). Extrinsic  
21  
22 dissatisfaction amongst care workers is thus widespread (Hebson et al., 2015) and associated with  
23  
24 stress (Cooke and Bartram, 2015) and burnout, characterised by emotional exhaustion and a low  
25  
26 sense of personal accomplishment, where pressures prevent deliver of high quality care (Taris et al.,  
27  
28 2003). Such job dissatisfaction and work-related stress are higher in UK social care employees than  
29  
30 other international contexts and related to poorer employment practice (Chen, 2014). While  
31  
32 research on fragmented time is limited, it is likely to be particularly problematic for care worker  
33  
34 (dis)satisfaction. Zero-hour contracts (Burrowes, 2015), episodic working and unpaid travel time  
35  
36 (Rubery et al., 2015) create an unattractive employment proposition and deter entry to the sector.  
37  
38 For example, retail work is perceived to be preferable, having fixed shifts and being less stressful  
39  
40 (Broadbent, 2014). Research in Canada further demonstrates that non-standard hours and casual  
41  
42 employment contracts create dissatisfaction and stress in domiciliary care workers (Zeytinoglu et al.,  
43  
44 2015). Care workers struggle to reconcile the competing demands of management and care  
45  
46 recipients, and, while limited, evidence is emerging of links to increased labour turnover (Taris et al.,  
47  
48 2003). Zeytinoglu et al. (2015) suggest stress increases in shorter visits that create work  
49  
50 intensification as care workers are required to work faster. Interestingly, Brown and Korczynski  
51  
52 (2010) argue that the nature of care means workers continue to offer discretionary effort to deliver  
53  
54 good care to recipients, even when lowering commitment to service providers. The potential for  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 burnout is, however, evident. For workers, these factors have negative consequences for well-being,  
4 which are likely to be reflected in care recipient experiences, as is explored in the following section.  
5  
6 For service providers, fragmented time drives, at least in part, recruitment and retention difficulties  
7  
8 (Cunningham, 2016, Broadbent, 2014) with shortages in both required numbers and standard of  
9  
10 workers (Francis and Netten, 2004). In Wales, 1,100 (6%) domiciliary care jobs were vacant in 2013  
11  
12 (CCW, 2014) and labour turnover ran at 30% in 2015 (UKHCA, 2015c). Service providers thus struggle  
13  
14 to reconcile the competing demands of financial constraints and service delivery in the face of acute  
15  
16 labour shortages.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 Care Quality

26 There are many, contested definitions of care quality (Atkinson et al., 2016) and it is conceptualised  
27  
28 here as the lived, subjective experiences of care recipients (Bee et al., 2008), which is important in  
29  
30 examining facets of care meaningful to care recipients. For example, in social care, Iparraguirre and  
31  
32 Ma (2015) adopt support for retaining control over day-to-day activities. In emergency care, Shankar  
33  
34 et al. (2013) include respect for care recipients' values, preferences and needs and, in mental health,  
35  
36 Bee et al. (2008) focus on length of visit, perceived care worker motivation and continuity of contact.  
37  
38 There is thus a strong case for using subjective experiences and, returning to domiciliary care, this  
39  
40 article draws on Francis and Netten's (2004) core dimensions of care quality, that is, continuity,  
41  
42 reliability and flexibility. Continuity refers to consistency of care worker(s) attending a care recipient  
43  
44 and is critical when delivering an intimate service (Eborall et al., 2010); reliability refers to care  
45  
46 workers fulfilling scheduled visits and arriving punctually; and flexibility describes the ability of a care  
47  
48 worker to deliver beyond the care plan, the document which records care recipient needs. The  
49  
50 research question here is how fragmented time affects this care quality. Despite wider research that  
51  
52 clearly demonstrates employment practice/service quality relationships (Whyman et al., 2015),  
53  
54 there is no research that explicitly links employment practice, and more particularly fragmented  
55  
56 time, to care quality, only research that suggests tentative links (Broadbent, 2014, Cunningham,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2016). This article adopts an inductive approach to examining these relationships and they are later  
4  
5 developed through analysis.  
6  
7

## 8 9 Research Context and Methods

10  
11 The article draws from a Welsh Government-funded project that investigated employment practice  
12  
13 and its implications for recruitment, retention and care quality in Welsh domiciliary care (Atkinson et  
14  
15 al., 2016). Like many Western nations, domiciliary care is a high priority for Welsh Government, as  
16  
17 demand for domiciliary care grows as the population ages (Age\_Cymru, 2015). Reflecting typical  
18  
19 patterns of marketization, 22 Welsh local authorities commission nearly 80% of domiciliary care  
20  
21 (StatsWales, 2015) from around 336 independent (private and voluntary) sector providers (CCW,  
22  
23 2014). Employment is thus mainly in the independent sector, where around two-thirds of the 18,000  
24  
25 strong domiciliary care workforce is based (UKHCA, 2015c).  
26  
27

28  
29 Qualitative data collection was undertaken, which is appropriate to exploration of an under-  
30  
31 researched area and to generating rich understanding. In autumn 2015, using a funder-provided  
32  
33 contact database, the researchers worked with gate-keepers in each local authority to generate  
34  
35 access to participants (Table 1). Gate-keepers sent invitations to attend focus groups to service  
36  
37 providers on their email distribution lists, and service providers circulated care worker specific email  
38  
39 invitations to their workforces. Eight focus groups lasting 60—90 minutes were held, two in each of  
40  
41 the four regions of Wales, four for service providers and four for care workers. Attendance was  
42  
43 voluntary and care worker participation was incentivised via a £20 gift voucher to compensate for  
44  
45 travel expenses and unpaid working time. 10 face-to-face/telephone interviews were also conducted  
46  
47 for those who were unable to attend scheduled focus groups. In total, 32 service providers and 41  
48  
49 care workers participated.  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 Table 1 here  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 For care workers, a demographic data capture form was used and participants across a range of  
4 categories were sought, including gender, age and ethnicity. Thirty-three (80%) of the care worker  
5 participants were female and they were distributed across a full range of age categories (three were  
6 under 21; 10 were 21-30,; seven were 30-40; nine were 40-50; five were 50-60; two were over 60;  
7 and 5 did not specify their age. Ethnic breakdown included 1 black participant, 1 mixed race, 1 who  
8 did not specify and all other participants (38, 93%) described themselves as various combinations of  
9 White British/White Welsh. While not a 'representative' sample, it broadly reflected the Welsh adult  
10 social care workforce (figures are not available for domiciliary care) in which 80% are female, 86%  
11 are white and most are aged over 30 (CCW, 2014). Wales is perhaps unusual in not having  
12 substantial reliance on migrant labour and, while acknowledging the importance of this issue in  
13 many contexts (Green and Ayalon, 2017), it is not a matter that is evidenced in the data nor  
14 developed in the paper. Finally, care workers were asked to specify their contract type and 9 (7 of  
15 whom who worked for local authorities) were on permanent, guaranteed-hours contracts and 2 on  
16 fixed term (not guaranteed-hours) contracts with the remainder (30, 73%) being on zero-hours  
17 contracts. This again reflects the national picture in Wales (StatsWales, 2015).

18  
19 Again using the funder-provided contact database, the research team emailed invitations to  
20 commissioners in all 22 local authorities and in this way arranged seven telephone interviews. This  
21 gave 80 participants in total. Three Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales-led (CSSIW)  
22 workshops that formed part of a domiciliary care review (CSSIW, 2016) were additionally attended.  
23 This added 33 participants, 17 commissioners and 16 service providers, giving 113 participants in  
24 total. All participants worked in domiciliary care, except one care worker based in learning  
25 disabilities, and break down by sector comprised: 8 local authority providers and 10 care workers;  
26 15 private sector providers and 24 care workers; and 9 voluntary sector providers and 7 care  
27 workers. Around three quarters of each group was drawn from the independent sector, which  
28 reflects national patterns of care delivery (StatsWales, 2015). Project time constraints meant that it  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 was not possible to gain ethical approval to interview care recipients, rather participants' views were  
4 elicited as to what constituted good quality care.  
5  
6

7  
8 The article reports a subset of project data related to fragmented time. Full focus groups schedules  
9 are available in the funder report (Atkinson et al., 2016). All interviews/focus groups were recorded  
10 and fully transcribed. Detailed notes were taken and transcribed at the CSSIW workshops. Thematic  
11 data analysis (King, 2004) was undertaken, transcripts being subjected to close reading and excerpts  
12 coded that were relevant to fragmented time, recruitment and retention and care quality and their  
13 inter-relationships. Initially each focus group transcript was analysed, then all service provider and  
14 care worker data were combined into two templates before this data and commissioner interview  
15 data was finally combined into one template. Relationships were inductively developed, integrating  
16 fragmented time, as per Rubery et al. (2015), with Francis and Netton's (2004) dimensions of care  
17 quality (summarised in Table 2). Throughout detailed discussion took place to ensure consistency  
18 and shared researcher understanding. Data is presented by attaching commissioner, service provider  
19 and care worker labels and the focus group from which it was gathered is indicated.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 Findings and Discussion

42  
43 This section first demonstrates the implications of neoliberal structures and marketization for the  
44 employment relationship, exploring in particular fragmented time (Rubery et al., 2015), and then  
45 evidences its detriment to care quality using Francis and Netten's (2004) core dimensions.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 Marketisation and Fragmented Time

53 While a detailed review of external commissioning practice is beyond the scope of this paper, the  
54 impact of marketization was apparent. Local authority practice created substantial instability for  
55 service providers as most commissioners operated Framework Agreements (Bessa et al., 2013),  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 coupled with widespread use of spot contracts (Knapp et al., 2001) using time-based commissioning,  
4 all purchasing the majority of care in short blocks of 30 minutes or less. All commissioners  
5 acknowledged the insecurity for service providers, as income flows were uncertain and would  
6 immediately cease on care recipient hospitalisation or death. Commissioners equally acknowledged  
7 funding constraints (Age\_Cymru, 2015) and some argued that care had '*unfortunately*' become a  
8 business and local authorities were battling austerity and '*there's very little money out there to [fund*  
9 *care at an appropriate level]....'*. Interview 1. Indeed, monopsony pressures suppressed rates (as per  
10 Cavendish, 2013) to around £14-15 per hour, below the UKHCA (2015b) calculated hourly cost of  
11 £16.70.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Commissioners recognised that low and insecure payments could negatively influence the  
28 employment practice of independent service providers (confirming Rubery and Urwin, 2011,  
29 Cunningham, 2008) but budget constraints dominated.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 *It's a challenge, both for the sector... making sure they have got good [care] standards, but*  
35 *also for local authorities because to pay for that comes at a cost. With a shrinking budget.*  
36 *From a local authority perspective, I don't think any of us would ever disagree that there*  
37 *should be appropriate terms and conditions and [care workers] should be paid the*  
38 *appropriate rate. But... [local authorities struggle to influence this]. CSSIW Workshop 2*  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 No local authority regulated care worker employment terms and conditions via their Framework  
51 Agreements (as per Bessa et al., 2013) and monitoring addressed only compliance with standard  
52 employment legislation. Some commissioners expressed a desire to integrate Unison's Ethical Care  
53 Charter into future frameworks but, given funding constraints, this seemed a remote aspiration.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 Marketization thus had substantial implications which are starkly demonstrated in what follows, first  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in respect of fragmented time, where service providers transferred commissioning risk to care  
4 workers and relied almost exclusively upon zero-hour contract arrangements, operated episodic  
5 working practices and were constrained by commissioning in visit length, and second for care  
6 quality.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

#### 14 Zero Hours Contracts

15 While local authority providers operated standard local government terms and conditions and  
16 offered guaranteed hours, in the independent sector zero-hours contracts were explicitly related to  
17 commissioning-led income insecurity (Burrowes, 2015):  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 *There is not a lack of hours [for care workers]...but we can never guarantee them because of*  
24 *the [unstable] nature of the business. Service Provider, Focus Group 2*  
25  
26  
27

28 Two independent providers sought to reduce insecurity by offering (some) guaranteed-hour  
29 contracts, but this was problematic and one noted that *'it's very hard if they lose [care recipients], I*  
30 *end up giving them office work.'* Focus Group 4. Care workers in the independent sector, where  
31 nearly all worked on zero-hour contracts, expressed insecurity and concern:  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 *At the moment, we've got loads of hours but as soon as someone goes into hospital, we lose*  
38 *like four calls a day....then you get hardly anything for the week. Care Worker, Focus Group 3*  
39  
40  
41  
42 *You get the hours. Never, ever have I been without, but still it's just like, what if? You feel like*  
43 *you don't have a leg to stand on. Care Worker, Focus Group 1*  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Most care workers expressed a strong preference for guaranteed-hour contracts, although some,  
49 mainly mothers and students, welcomed the flexibility zero-hour contracts offered (Atkinson et al.,  
50 2016).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Zero hours contracts were strongly associated with difficulties in both recruitment and retention.

4  
5 Independent providers argued it was hard to attract workers into the sector when total flexibility in  
6  
7 working time was demanded:

8  
9  
10 *We are restricted because we expect total flexibility and that narrows down the [labour]*  
11  
12 *market.... when people come on board it's a zero-hour contract.... It doesn't always work in*  
13  
14 *our favour [for recruitment]. Service Provider, Focus Group 4*

15  
16  
17  
18 Tellingly, most of the local authority care workers had previously worked in the independent sector  
19  
20 and suggested that reducing insecurity had been central to their decision to move local authority  
21  
22 employment. Lack of guaranteed hours thus contributed to a highly transient workforce that moved  
23  
24 around independent providers for often minor improvements in terms and conditions. Resulting  
25  
26 labour shortages meant that care packages could remain un-commissioned for lengthy periods,  
27  
28 leading to bed-blocking (Marsh, 2016), and creating a vicious circle of long working hours (Bessa et  
29  
30 al., 2013), resulting in stress and burnout (as per Taris et al., 2003):

31  
32  
33  
34 *We expect a lot from them, they are very tired. Because there is a [shortage]. We are ten*  
35  
36 *care workers down, 250 hours, which is a lot. Service Provider, Focus Group 4*

37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Zero-hours contracts were thus implicated in labour shortages through both sickness absence and  
42  
43 turnover (Rubery and Urwin, 2011). Use of the contracts confirms the insecurity aspect of Rubery et  
44  
45 al.'s (2015) fragmented time index, and findings here also evidence other indexes e.g. variable  
46  
47 schedules due to staff providing additional cover.

#### 51 52 53 Episodic Working

54  
55 Strict time-based commissioning, allowing payment for contact time only, created a high incidence  
56  
57 of episodic working (Moore and Tailby, 2015) for all independent sector workers. Service providers  
58  
59 recognised that care workers resented unpaid waiting time, but argued it was beyond their control:



1  
2  
3 *Trying to get staff to understand is really, really hard.... Our main [calls] are between half-six*  
4 *and half-nine in the morning, then lunchtime.... and then tea to bedtime. But in between,*  
5 *there's nothing. So staff are like, "Well, I'm out for six hours and you've only given me three",*  
6 *but if there's only three hours and nothing in between.... Service Provider Focus Group 3*  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 Most care workers were vocal in their dissatisfaction with episodic working, as non-payment for  
14 waiting time resulted in long hours and low earnings (as per Rubery et al., 2015):  
15  
16  
17

18 *The most frustrating thing is.... you're starting at eight in the morning.... you make it home at*  
19 *ten at night, and if you tally up all the amount of hours that you get [paid for] ... five hours....*  
20  
21  
22 *Care Worker Focus Group 4*  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 This was compounded by non-payment for travel time which, particularly in rural areas and for  
30 numerous short visits some distance apart, could account for a substantial proportion of a care  
31 worker's 'run', or visit schedule (as per UKHCA, 2015a). Care workers were acutely aware of these  
32 pressures and resentful, arguing that they were often doing 'full-time work for part-time pay'.  
33 *Care Worker Focus Group 1*  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Episodic working in the independent sector thus created dissatisfaction with long, demanding  
45 working days that generated high levels of stress (as per Cooke and Bartram, 2015) and burnout  
46 (Taris et al., 2003). Both sickness absence and labour turnover resulted (Rubery et al., 2015) and an  
47 exodus to other low-paid sectors. Retail employment, for example, was seen as more attractive as,  
48 despite frequent use of zero-hour contracts, working time was not episodic and the work was not as  
49 stressful (confirming Broadbent, 2014, Brown and Korczynski, 2010).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Visit length

Commissioning practice also constrained time available for care delivery (Rubery et al., 2015), with short visits prevalent across all providers, both local authority and independent sector. Provider and care worker data evidence that the overwhelming majority of visits were 30 minutes or less and even local authority care workers on guaranteed-hour contracts were required to deliver care via primarily short visits. Commissioners argued that 15 minutes visits were atypical and used only for administering medication but provider and care worker data did not support this. Visits of 30 minutes and even less were deemed inadequate to deliver good quality care and had negative implications for recruitment and retention, as evidenced by one learning disability care worker whose work afforded longer visit times:

*The one thing that drew me to this was, we don't do less than an hour calls. Cos there's no way in the world could I work, well I would work but I'd fight it. You can't do someone's breakfast in half an hour and get them up and dressed. Care Worker, Telephone interview 2*

As this suggests, short visits created substantial pressure and work intensification (Broadbent, 2014).

*If it is only a ten minute call and you are running late already.... you literally have two minutes. It can be quite stressful. Care Worker, Focus Group 1*

*You try and do your best but time restricts you, there's too much pressure. Care Worker, Focus Group 4*

'Tired' was a description frequently used by all care workers (as per Zeytinoglu et al., 2015), and mirrored by service providers who suggested care workers could suffer from physical and emotional exhaustion. Labour shortages also created a vicious circle of long working hours (Bessa et al., 2013) and sickness absence, resulting in stress and burnout (as per Taris et al., 2003):

1  
2  
3 *We expect a lot from them, they are very tired. Because there is a [shortage]. We are ten care*  
4  
5 *workers down, 250 hours which is a lot. Service Provider Focus Group 2*  
6  
7

8  
9 *When I ask them [existing care workers] to do more, like I've had to ask them to at the*  
10  
11 *moment, that can create sickness.... Service Provider Focus Group 3*  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 While most care workers experienced intrinsic job satisfaction derived from caring (Carr, 2014), this  
18 co-existed alongside extrinsic dissatisfaction (King et al., 2013), particularly evident in respect of  
19 fragmented time. Independent providers all questioned the sustainability of current care models  
20 given the stress and burnout occasioned for care workers (Taris et al., 2003) and the resulting  
21 sickness absence, labour turnover and labour shortages (Rubery et al., 2015).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 While local authority care workers were employed on better terms and conditions, they comprise a  
33 small proportion of domiciliary care workers in Wales (CCW, 2014) and nevertheless worked with  
34 primarily short visit times. For the majority, employed in the independent sector, commissioning  
35 practice structured an employment relationship dominated by fragmented time, resulting in  
36 recruitment and retention difficulties and consequent labour shortages. These structural conditions  
37 inform understanding of the care worker/recipient interactions that determine care quality.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

#### 49 **Fragmented time and care quality**

50 *"No one sets out to provide bad care, but you're dragged to it, dragged into the gutter" Service*  
51  
52 *Provider, CSSIW Focus Group 1*  
53  
54

55 This quote powerfully illustrates service provider concerns around marketisation processes that  
56 drive fragmented time and diminish care quality. These concerns were shared by care workers who  
57 argued that time was critical to effective care delivery:  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *You need time to do quality care. You do need the time. Care worker Focus Group 3*  
4  
5

6 Indeed, lack of time was argued to be tantamount to abuse. More specifically, the detriment of  
7  
8 fragmented time to care quality was evident against the dimensions of continuity, reliability and  
9  
10 flexibility (Francis and Netten, 2004). This is summarised in Table 2 and supported below by rich  
11  
12 participant narratives.  
13  
14

15  
16 Table 2 here  
17

18  
19 Continuity, the consistency of care worker visiting a care recipient, was consistently cited as  
20  
21 important and was explicitly required by all commissioners. Care workers also argued its importance  
22  
23 in building relationships with care recipients when providing an intimate service (Eborall et al., 2010)  
24  
25 and expressed dissatisfaction when this was not possible. It underpinned high quality, relational  
26  
27 care (Atkinson and Lucas, 2013):  
28  
29

30  
31 *Continuity is a big part.... she has dementia, sometimes she just forgets to eat. It's little*  
32  
33 *things like that we pick up on because we know her. Other carers will just put the food back*  
34  
35 *in the fridge, they'll assume that she's eaten something earlier on in the day. It takes us who*  
36  
37 *know her well to know that she's just forgotten to eat. Care Worker Focus Group 2*  
38

39  
40 *It's hard to build up that relationship with somebody, to have them naked in front of you so*  
41  
42 *you can put them in the shower and.... you've got that confidence and then they're moving*  
43  
44 *you on now to somebody else." Care Worker Focus Group 1*  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Zero hours contracts mitigated against continuity. First for care workers in creating unstable and  
52  
53 changeable working patterns. Second for service providers, as care workers could and did refuse  
54  
55 shifts offered. These contracts contributed to recruitment and retention difficulties:  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *...we've talked about zero-hours contracts and [their] issues.... people move around, they don't*  
4 *want to stay in that job; that affects [continuity]. It's just like a big circle really. Service*  
5  
6 *Provider CSSIW Focus Group 3*  
7  
8  
9

10 Episodic working practices also risked undermining care worker commitment to care delivery:

11  
12  
13 *You've got to drive here, drive there..... then you start considering the logistical impact,*  
14 *financially and think, what is the point? .... that contradicts every reason you're here.*  
15  
16 *Because you start getting a little bit disgruntled. Care Worker Focus Group 4*  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 This fed both labour turnover and sickness absence through worker dissatisfaction, stress and  
22 burnout (as per Taris et al., 2003). Continuity was thus compromised by both unstable working  
23 patterns and the resulting labour shortages, as independent providers struggled to resource  
24 provision from a highly transient workforce.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Reliability, arriving when scheduled and promptly, was central to positive care recipient experiences:

34  
35  
36 *One of our clients is very time conscious, she won't let you in early, she won't let you in late,*  
37 *and that brings a stress then because.... the constant conversation is, "I don't understand*  
38 *why you're late". Care Worker Focus Group 2*  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Zero-hours contracts and resulting labour shortages could, at the extreme, lead to non-fulfilment of  
44 scheduled care. More commonly, episodic working and insufficient (unpaid) travel time caused late  
45 arrival:  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 *Travel times can be an issue.... we'll have to go from X to X in five minutes, and you just can't*  
52 *do it. It's a fifteen minute trip [so we are] late and for the rest of the day we find ourselves*  
53 *constantly.... catching up with the calls. Care Worker Focus Group 1*  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Short visits compounded these difficulties, as unrealistic time allocations occasioned delays and  
4  
5 reduced visit times further. The work intensification and poor care that resulted for all was  
6  
7 extremely stressful:  
8  
9

10 *We do toileting, food and medication. To do all that in fifteen minutes and do it to the best of*  
11 *your ability, you need more time. Care Worker Focus Group 4*  
12

13 *It is so wrong, but I've heard about times when care workers have had to feed people their*  
14 *lunch as they are on the commode. Service Provider, CCSIW Focus Group 2*  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Attempts to offset these pressures could result in substantially reduced care, by for example,  
24 concurrent scheduling of visits that created extra stress for care workers. Care commitments were  
25 thus difficult to fulfil given labour shortages and high labour turnover. Care recipients experienced  
26 late or missed visits which reduced their capacity to retain control over their lives (Iparraguirre and  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Ma, 2015).

Flexibility, the third dimension related to addressing care recipient needs beyond the care plan, was  
also problematic. (Lack of) flexibility was one of the biggest sources of dissatisfaction for most care  
workers, as it challenged their understandings of good care. Zero-hour contracts meant time was not  
generally made available for staff training, meaning they lacked necessary skills. They further  
created unstable working schedules that left some care workers lacking the knowledge of care  
recipients and their needs required to exercise autonomy. Episodic practices and late arrival  
combined to make already short visits even shorter and rendered care workers unable to meet the  
care plan requirements, let alone go beyond it:

*If it's a half hour with someone who's got dementia, then every time you go in you need to*  
*explain who you are, why you're there, why you've got to do what you've got to do. That can*

1  
2  
3 *take fifteen minutes, and then you've still got to wash them, dress them, do the breakfast,*  
4 *make the bed, empty the commode. It becomes a fifteen-minute call because you've spent so*  
5 *long trying to reassure them that you're there to help them. Care Worker Focus Group 2*  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Visit length, as evidenced here, was frequently not adjusted for complexity of need (as per Rubery et  
14 al., 2015) and so even 30 minute visits, the maximum length of most visits across local authority and  
15 independent sector providers, were insufficient to deliver good care. Care workers argued for longer  
16 visits that offered the flexibility for them to offer 'proper' (flexible) care and promote the  
17 independence espoused by policy:  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 *Doing personal care and things around the house for them is important, but [so is] actually*  
26 *sitting down and just knowing that I haven't got to rush off. Care Worker Focus Group 4*  
27  
28

29 *How can we be promoting independence, doing all the things that we want to be doing, if*  
30 *we're kept to a twenty minute call. It's impossible, it can't be done. Care Worker Focus Group 2*  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 These time pressures were deeply problematic, creating stress and burnout for all care workers:  
40  
41

42 *The last thing they want to feel is rushed, especially if you're a ninety-eight year old who gets a*  
43 *little bit breathless. The last thing he wants is, "Come on now, we've got to go, we've got to do*  
44 *meds now." And he's like, "Hang on a minute, I haven't had my tea yet". Care Worker Focus*  
45 *Group 3*  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Additionally, burnout could lead to disassociation which reduces flexibility still further (Taris et al.,  
53 2003). The delivering of outcomes-based care, central to policy aspirations (e.g.  
54 Welsh\_Government, 2015), was compromised by lack of flexibility.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 It should be noted that most care workers were deeply committed to domiciliary care and described  
4 leaving to work, for example, in retail, as '*going over to the dark side*'. Job satisfaction was widely  
5 linked to exercise of discretionary behaviour (Huang and Gamble, 2015) and there were repeated  
6 examples of care workers doing shopping or returning to offer care in their own time to ensure good  
7 care. Some service providers expressed concern over professional boundaries, but care workers  
8 argued that it was the only way to ensure good care. This effort was maintained despite  
9 dissatisfaction with fragmented time and created a hidden burden of stress and work intensification  
10 (Broadbent, 2014). Yet despite maintaining commitment to care recipients, many did not maintain  
11 commitment to service providers (Brown and Korczynski, 2010). Their dissatisfaction with  
12 constraints on care provision was the biggest factor in care workers leaving the employer, through  
13 both the time pressures that led to both poor care and stress and burnout:

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*If we are expecting care workers to work long hours, to put in extra calls, it is going to have  
an impact on the care that they provide. Not through being neglectful but because they are  
so tired. Service Provider, Focus Group 1*

All participants argued that zero-hours contracts, episodic working and short visits compromised  
continuity, reliability and flexibility of care, both directly and indirectly through the resulting  
instability and work intensification, stress and burnout, sickness absence and labour turnover and  
labour shortages.

Inevitably, this research has limitations. A key one is that it did not include care recipients,  
nevertheless generating a valuable evidence-base from the perspective of commissioners, service  
providers and care workers. In extending the research, it will be important to include care recipient  
views on quality of care received. Further, the research is qualitative, rich perceptual data to identify  
important relationships. Testing these relationships quantitatively will be an important next step,  
using perhaps an index approach similar to Rubery et al.'s (2015) for both fragmented time and care



1  
2  
3 quality. Despite these limitations, the paper evidences that fragmented time creates a dual burden  
4  
5 for two vulnerable groups, the care workers who bear its hidden consequences (Brown and  
6  
7 Korczynski, 2010), and the care recipients who experience reduced care quality.  
8  
9

## 10 11 Conclusions

12  
13  
14 This article explores aspects of employment practice in domiciliary care work to ask: what are the  
15  
16 consequences of fragmented time for care quality? It makes a valuable empirical addition to social  
17  
18 care employment research, particularly in reporting care worker perspectives on this question.  
19

20 Drawing on Rubery's (2015) analysis of employment trends, it demonstrates that fragmentation and  
21  
22 flexibilisation in a highly feminised sector combine to create fragmented time and that this is  
23  
24 detrimental to care quality. Independent providers, who deliver around 80% of domiciliary care,  
25  
26 struggle to recruit and retain the necessary labour (Rubery and Urwin, 2011); care workers suffer  
27  
28 dis-satisfaction, stress and burnout (Taris et al., 2003); and care quality is compromised through lack  
29  
30 of continuity, reliability and flexibility. The research site is Wales, but similar international policy  
31  
32 contexts mean the findings have wider resonance (e.g. Cunningham et al., 2014, Broadbent, 2014).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 The article makes both empirical and theoretical contributions. Empirically, it confirms Rubery et  
41  
42 al.'s (2015) findings that fragmented time creates care worker detriment. It confirms many of the  
43  
44 indexes proposed for fragmented time, including (lack of) payment for work-related activities (e.g.  
45  
46 travel) and fragmented/variable/extended schedules. While Rubery et al. (2015) noted the time-  
47  
48 constrained nature of care work, they had insufficient data to include visit length in that index of  
49  
50 fragmented time. Importantly then, this research provides evidence to extend its definition to  
51  
52 include visit length, noted as important in other care settings (Bee et al., 2008). Short visits were  
53  
54 prevalent and substantially implicated in both work intensification and care worker stress and poor  
55  
56 care for recipients. Rubery et al. (2015) demonstrate tensions arising from fragmented work  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *allocation*, i.e. zero hours contracts and episodic working, but this article evidences that its  
4  
5 fragmented *construction*, i.e. short visit length, is equally problematic. Importantly, this applies not  
6  
7 only to visits of 15 minutes or less, but equally to longer visits that are nevertheless insufficient to  
8  
9 address complex care needs. The extended definition of fragmented time is critical to understanding  
10  
11 the pressures that derive from both employer and care recipient demands and how these mutually  
12  
13 reinforce to create pressure for workers (Taris et al., 2003) and inferior care for recipients.  
14

15  
16 Employers, particularly in the independent sector, also experience substantial pressure. They  
17  
18 grapple with establishing an adequate workforce in the face of financial constraints arising from the  
19  
20 commissioning monopsony of local authorities within marketised social care. These empirical and  
21  
22 theoretical contributions advance research that has hinted at employment/care quality relationships  
23  
24 (Broadbent, 2014, Cunningham, 2016) to evidence how particular features of the employment  
25  
26 relationship are detrimental to care quality.  
27  
28

29  
30  
31  
32  
33 The findings also raise substantial policy concerns that dictate urgent review of commissioning  
34  
35 mechanisms. It is questionable whether market approaches can deliver the employment practice  
36  
37 needed for high quality care (Rubery and Urwin, 2011). Local authority monopsony, both prior to  
38  
39 and during austerity, has suppressed commissioning rates at potentially uneconomic levels and,  
40  
41 coupled with widespread use of spot contracting and strict time-based commissioning, created the  
42  
43 fragmented time practices evidenced here. While it is hardly novel to suggest that domiciliary care is  
44  
45 inadequately funded, this article evidences a clear pathway from commissioning practice to service  
46  
47 provider and care worker struggles to poor care quality. This builds an incontrovertible body of  
48  
49 evidence for policy-makers that high quality domiciliary care will not be delivered without more  
50  
51 secure, better-funded commissioning that drives improved employment practice (Grimshaw et al.,  
52  
53 2015, Rubery et al., 2013). Most domiciliary care is delivered in the independent sector creating, in  
54  
55 many countries, a 'race to the bottom' in employment (Cunningham, 2008). While voluntary  
56  
57 frameworks exist, for example, Unison's Ethical Care Charter, these are unlikely to suffice in creating  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the good work that will underpin high quality care (Rubery and Urwin, 2011). Regulation may be  
4  
5 needed.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 As noted at the outset, demand for domiciliary care is growing as Western populations age and the  
12  
13 offer of good quality employment is fundamental to its effective delivery (Kingsmill, 2014). This  
14  
15 exploration of fragmented time paints an alarming picture of tensions and pressures experienced by  
16  
17 care workers and service providers. Inevitably, negative consequences ensue for care quality in a  
18  
19 sector that both deals with one of society's most vulnerable groups and underpins the effective  
20  
21 functioning of healthcare systems.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 References

- 30 AGE\_CYMRU 2015. Improving domiciliary care for older people in Wales. Age Cymru.  
31 ALAKESON, A. & D'ARCY, C. 2014. Zeroing In: Balancing protection and flexibility in the reform of  
32 zero-hours contracts. London: Resolution Foundation.  
33 ATKINSON, C., CROZIER, S. & LEWIS, E. 2016. Factors that affect the recruitment and retention of  
34 domiciliary care workers. *Government Social Research*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.  
35 ATKINSON, C. & LUCAS, R. 2013. Policy and gender in adult social care work in England. *Public*  
36 *Administration*, 91, 159-173.  
37 BEE, P., PLAYLE, J., LOVELL, K., BARNES, P., GRAY, R. & KEELEY, P. 2008. Service users' views and  
38 expectations of UK registered mental health nurses: a systematic review of empirical  
39 research. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 45, 442-457.  
40 BESSA, I., FORDE, C., MOORE, S. & STUART, M. 2013. The National Minimum Wage, earnings and  
41 hours in the domiciliary care sector.  
42 BROADBENT, K. 2014. 'I'd rather work in a supermarket': privatization of home care work in Japan.  
43 *Work, Employment and Society*, 28, 702-717.  
44 BROWN, K. & KORCZYNSKI, M. 2010. When Caring and Surveillance Technology Meet: Organizational  
45 Commitment and Discretionary Effort in Home Care Work. *Work and Occupations*, 37, 404-  
46 432.  
47 BURROWES, E. 2015. Research into the Use of Zero Hours Contracts in Devolved Welsh Public  
48 Services. *Government Social Research*. Cardiff: Welsh Government  
49 CARR, S. 2014. Pay, conditions and care quality in residential, nursing and domiciliary services.  
50 Joseph Rowntree Foundation.  
51 CAVENDISH, C. 2013. The Cavendish Report: An Independent Review into Healthcare Assistants and  
52 Support Workers in the NHS and social care settings.  
53 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/236212/Cavendish\\_Review.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/236212/Cavendish_Review.pdf).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 CCW 2014. Social Care Workforce Development Partnership (SCWDP) workforce data collection  
59 2013: the findings. Cardiff: Care Council for Wales.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 CHEN, H. 2014. Care workers in long term care for older people: challenges of quantity and quality.  
4 *European Journal of Social Work*, 17, 383–401.
- 5 COOKE, F. & BARTRAM, T. 2015. Guest Editors' Introduction: Human Resource Management in  
6 Health Care and Elderly Care: Current Challenges and Toward a Research Agenda. *Human*  
7 *Resource Management*, 54, 711–735.
- 8 CSSIW. 2016. *National review of domiciliary care in Wales* [Online].  
9 <http://cssiw.org.uk/about/strategic-plan/domiciliary-care-review/?lang=en>. [Accessed 18  
10 April 2016].
- 11 CUNNINGHAM, I. 2008. Reshaping employment relations in the UK voluntary sector: an exploratory  
12 study into the impact of Best Value. *Local Government Studies*, 34, 379-396.
- 13 CUNNINGHAM, I. 2010. The HR function in purchaser–provider relationships: insights from the UK  
14 voluntary sector. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 20, 189–205.
- 15 CUNNINGHAM, I. 2016. Non-profits and the 'hollowed out' state: the transformation of working  
16 conditions through personalizing social care services during an era of austerity. *Work*  
17 *Employment and Society*, 30, 649-668.
- 18 CUNNINGHAM, I., BAINES, D. & CHARLESWORTH, S. 2014. Government funding, employment  
19 conditions and work organization in non-profit community services: a comparative study.  
20 *Public Administration*, 92, 582–598.
- 21 EBORALL, C., FENTON, W. & WOODROW, S. 2010. *The State of the Adult Social Care Workforce 2010*.  
22 Leeds: Skills for Care.
- 23 FLYNN, M. 2015. *In search of accountability. A review of the neglect of older people living in care*  
24 *homes investigated as Operation Jasmine*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
- 25 FRANCIS, J. & NETTEN, A. 2004. Raising the quality of home care: a study of service users' views.  
26 *Social Policy and Administration*, 3, 290-305.
- 27 GRAY, A. & BIRRELL, D. 2013. *Transforming Adult Social Care: Contemporary Policy and Practice*,  
28 Bristol Policy Press.
- 29 GREEN, O. & AYALON, L. 2017. The contribution of working conditions and care recipient  
30 characteristics to work-related abuse and exploitation of migrant home care workers.  
31 *Employee Relations*, 39, 1001-1014.
- 32 GRIMSHAW, D., RUBERY, J. & UGARTE, S. 2015. Does better quality contracting improve pay and HR  
33 practices? Evidence from for-profit and voluntary sector providers of adult care services in  
34 England. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 57, 502–525.
- 35 HEBSON, G., RUBERY, J. & GRIMSHAW, D. 2015. Rethinking job satisfaction in care work: looking  
36 beyond the care debates. *Work, Employment and Society*, 29, 314-330.
- 37 HUANG, Q. & GAMBLE, J. 2015. Social expectations, gender and job satisfaction: Front-line  
38 employees in China's retail sector'. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25, 331–347.
- 39 IPARRAGUIRRE, J. & MA, R. 2015. Efficiency in the provision of social care for older people. A 3 stage  
40 data envelope analysis using self reported quality of life. *Socio-economic Planning Science*,  
41 49, 33-46.
- 42 KING, D., WEI, Z. & HOWE, A. 2013. Work satisfaction and intention to leave among direct care  
43 workers in community and residential aged care in Australia. *Journal of Aging and Social*  
44 *Policy*, 25, 301-319.
- 45 KING, N. 2004. Template Analysis. In: SYMON, G. & CASSELL, C. (eds.) *Essential Guide to Qualitative*  
46 *Research in Organizational Methods*. London: Sage.
- 47 KINGSMILL, D. 2014. *The Kingsmill Review: taking care*  
48 [http://www.yourbritain.org.uk/uploads/editor/files/The\\_Kingsmill\\_Review\\_-\\_Taking\\_Care\\_-\\_](http://www.yourbritain.org.uk/uploads/editor/files/The_Kingsmill_Review_-_Taking_Care_-_Final_2.pdf)  
49 [Final\\_2.pdf](http://www.yourbritain.org.uk/uploads/editor/files/The_Kingsmill_Review_-_Taking_Care_-_Final_2.pdf).
- 50 KNAPP, M., HARDY, B. & FORDER, J. 2001. Commissioning for Quality: Ten Years of Social Care  
51 Markets in England. *Journal of Social Policy*, 30, 283-306.
- 52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 MARSH, B. 2016. *Bed-blocking by elderly patients rises* [Online]. London: Daily Mail. Available:  
4 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-78550/Bed-blocking-elderly-patients-rises.html>  
5 [Accessed 2016].  
6  
7 MOORE, S. & TAILBY, S. 2015. The changing face of employment relations: equality and diversity.  
8 *Employee Relations*, 37, 705-719.  
9 RAINBIRD, H., LEESON, E. & MUNRO, A. 2011. Is regulation good for skill development? *International*  
10 *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22, 3727-3741.  
11 RUBERY, J. 2015. Change at work: feminisation, flexibilisation, fragmentation and financialisation.  
12 *Employee Relations*, 37, 633-644.  
13 RUBERY, J., GRIMSHAW, D. & HEBSON, G. 2013. Exploring the limits to Local Authority social care  
14 commissioning: competing pressures, variable practices and unresponsive providers. *Public*  
15 *Administration*, 19, 419-437.  
16 RUBERY, J., GRIMSHAW, D., HEBSON, G. & UGARTE, S. 2015. 'It's all about time': time as contested  
17 terrain in the management and experience of domiciliary care work in England. *Human*  
18 *Resource Management*, 54, 753-772.  
19 RUBERY, J. & URWIN, P. 2011. Bringing the employer back in: why social care needs a standard  
20 employment relationship. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21, 122-137.  
21 SHANKAR, K., BHAVNIT, K. & SCHUUR, J. 2013. Towards patient-centred care: a systematic review of  
22 older adults' views of quality emergency care. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 63, 529-550.  
23 STATSWALES. 2015. *Home Care by Local Authority* [Online].  
24 [https://statswales.wales.gov.uk/Catalogue/Health-and-Social-Care/Social-Services/Adult-](https://statswales.wales.gov.uk/Catalogue/Health-and-Social-Care/Social-Services/Adult-Services/Service-Provision/HomeCare-by-LocalAuthority-Measure)  
25 [Services/Service-Provision/HomeCare-by-LocalAuthority-Measure](https://statswales.wales.gov.uk/Catalogue/Health-and-Social-Care/Social-Services/Adult-Services/Service-Provision/HomeCare-by-LocalAuthority-Measure): Welsh\_Government.  
26 [Accessed].  
27  
28 TARIS, T., KOMPIER, M., GEURTS, S., SCHREURS, P., SCHAUFELI, W., DE BOER, E. & SEPMEIJER, K.  
29 2003. Stress Management Interventions in the Dutch Domiciliary Care Sector Findings From  
30 81 Organisations. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 10, 297-325.  
31 UKHCA 2015a. *The Homecare Deficit: A report on the funding of older people's homecare across the*  
32 *United Kingdom*. London: UK Homecare Association.  
33 UKHCA 2015b. *A Minimum Price for Homecare*. London: UK Homecare Association.  
34 UKHCA 2015c. *An overview of the domiciliary care sector*. London: UK Home Care Association.  
35 WELSH\_GOVERNMENT. 2015. *Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act* [Online].  
36 <http://gov.wales/topics/health/socialcare/act/?lang=en>: Welsh Government. [Accessed].  
37  
38 WHYMAN, P., BAIMBRIDGE, M., BURAIMO, B. & PETRESCU, A. 2015. Workplace Flexibility Practices  
39 and Corporate Performance: Evidence from the British Private Sector. *British Journal of*  
40 *Management*, 26, 347-364.  
41 ZEYTINGLU, I., DENTON, M., PLENDERLEITH, J. & CHOWHAN, J. 2015. Associations between  
42 workers' health and non standard hours and insecurity: the case of home care workers in  
43 Ontario. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26, 2503-2522.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1: Participants**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Total number</b>	<b>Interview - telephone</b>	<b>Interview -face to face</b>	<b>Focus group - CSSIW</b>	<b>Focus group - project</b>
Local authority commissioners	24	7	0	17	0
Provider managers	48	2	4	16	26
Care workers	41	0	4	0	37
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>63</b>

**Table 2: The implications of fragmented time for care work and care quality**

Implications for Fragmented time	Care workers and service providers	Continuity	Reliability	Flexibility
Zero hours contracts	Care workers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instability</li> <li>• Work intensification</li> <li>• Dissatisfaction</li> <li>• Stress and burnout</li> </ul>	Highly variable working patterns; substantial labour turnover  Outcome: many different care workers visit care recipient	Highly variable working patterns; substantial labour turnover  Outcome: visits unfulfilled or care workers arrive late	Highly variable working patterns; limited access to training  Outcome: care workers lack both knowledge of care recipient and skills to deliver flexible care
Episodic working	Service providers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment</li> </ul>	Substantial labour turnover  Outcome: many different care workers visit care recipient	Inadequate travel time and scheduling of concurrent visits  Outcome: care workers arrive late and call times are reduced	Inadequate time with care recipient

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

	difficulties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High labour turnover</li> <li>• Sickness absence</li> <li>• Labour shortages</li> </ul>			Outcome: care workers struggle to fulfil care plan and cannot go beyond it
Visit length		Inadequate time with care recipient Work intensification, stress and burnout, sickness absence  Outcome: many different care workers visit care recipient	Inadequate time with care recipient Work intensification, stress and burnout, sickness absence  Outcome: care workers arrive late and call times are shortened	Inadequate time with care recipient Work intensification, stress and burnout, sickness absence  Outcome: disassociation creates reduced flexibility

---

<sup>i</sup> The UKHCA’s minimum price of domiciliary care includes: payment of National Minimum/Living Wage, unsocial hours payments, travel time and costs, staff on-costs, training time, general running costs (e.g. office staff, equipment and premises costs) and net profit/surplus of 3% p.a.