

Dr Elizabeth Henry Report

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank: Dr Coretta Phillips (London School of Economics) and Victoria Hobart M.P.H, for helping to make the data 'come alive. Many thanks to enumerators; Sandra Johnson, Allan Clarke, Carl Case, Mariam Bartlett, Eleanor Hobart, Dixie-Ann Joseph & Jenny Bailey.

Additional thanks to the GMB National Race Committee for their support, with special thanks to Alan Black for his support, and encouragement and Dawn Butler for her enthusiasm and prompt responses to my requests for information.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
INTRODUCTION	3
ORGANISATION OF THE REPORT	5
METHODOLOGY	4
SURVEY OF ORDINARY MEMBERS.....	4
SURVEY OF CONFERENCE DELEGATES	5
FOCUS GROUPS	6
INTERVIEWS WITH SENIOR UNION OFFICIALS.....	6
SOME LIMITATIONS	7
I RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION	8
GENERAL RECRUITMENT EFFORTS: MOTIVATION AND MEANS OF JOINING.....	8
RECRUITING FROM BLACK & MINORITY ETHNIC GROUPS.....	8
RETENTION.....	9
II PROGRESSION IN GMB	11
WHITE, BLACK & ETHNIC MINORITY PROGRESSION	11
III BARRIERS TO INCLUSION	13
GMB's IMAGE AND CULTURE	13
FOCUSING ON RACE EQUALITY	14
NEGATIVE EFFECTS	15
IV CONCLUSION: PROMOTING INCLUSION	16
CONCLUSION	16
V RECOMMENDATIONS	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY/ BACKGROUND MATERIALS	19
ADDENDUM: RESEARCH TOOLS	26
SENIOR OFFICERS INTERVIEW GUIDE.....	26
FOCUS GROUP GUIDE	28
GENERAL SURVEY	29
TELEPHONE SURVEY - ORDINARY GMB MEMBERS	30

INTRODUCTION

In 1999, the Macpherson Inquiry into the investigation of Stephen Lawrence's murder, concluded that some major institutions in British society, including the police service, were 'institutionally racist'. MacPherson defined institutional racism as:

The collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racial & stereotyping which disadvantages minority ethnic people (Macpherson 1999: 6..34)

After measuring the findings in the report against their own institutions, senior officials within the criminal justice system admitted to the presence of institutional racism in their organisations. Macpherson also suggested that the problem of institutional racism was one that affected other public agencies in society. The report reflects the assertions of the Commission for Racial Equality, that:

It is incumbent on every institution to examine their policies and the outcome of their policies and practice to guard against disadvantaging any section of our communities... There must be an unequivocal acceptance of the problem of institutional racism and its nature before it can be addressed, as it needs to be, in full partnership with members of minority ethnic communities. (ibid)

In the aftermath, many institutions have chosen to audit their employment practices and service delivery to assess any weaknesses, which may adversely impact ethnic minorities.

In this vein, in May 2002, the Task Group invited Dr Elizabeth Henry to undertake a comprehensive race equality audit of the GMB union. The aims of the audit were as follows;

- To provide a demographic profile of GMB officers, employees and lay activists;
 - To understand the ways in which GMB relates to ethnic minority workers;
 - To assess the impact of recruitment and retention efforts-on ethnic minority workers;
- and

METHODOLOGY

To meet these aims, the race equality audit comprised four elements, which are outlined below.

Survey of ordinary members

Regional race officers were asked to identify 25 ordinary members from across their region who had agreed to participate in the survey. The survey was conducted via a 1-1 telephone interview with each participant. The interviewers asked questions regarding: recruitment into the GMB, use of GMB services, relationship between GMB and members, views on opportunities for progression and barriers to inclusion in GMB, perceptions on black and minority ethnic representation and inclusion in GMB.

In total 47 completed survey questionnaires were analysed from respondents in four regions. Table 1 presents region and level of participation in the survey. Roughly similar numbers of men (55%) and women (45%) were interviewed in each region except South Western which was predominantly men (75% men to 25% women). According to self-defined ethnicity, the majority of survey participants were white (51%), black and minority ethnic participants made up 47% of the sample, 2% of participants did not state ethnicity

Table 1: Region and level of participation of ordinary Members

Region	Complete	Incomplete	Refusals	Unobtainable
South Western	12 (26%)			
Northern	11 (24%)			
West Midlands	8 (17%)	1	2	
London (North)	14 (30%)			
Not Given	2(3%)			
Total	47 (100%)			

To provide recommendations which will ensure that GMB's employment practices are a model of best practice in the area of race relations.

Organisation of the Report¹

The report is divided into five sections. The first section discusses the analysis of research data collected and the profile of participants. The second section deals with recruitment and retention in GMB. The third section examines the channels for progression in GMB, while the fourth section considers the way in which GMB relates to black and ethnic minority workers and explores potential barriers to inclusion. The final section concludes the report with a discussion of the main findings along with a number of recommendations to ensure the GMB follows best practices in relation to race equality.

¹ The data collection for this audit was overseen by Dr Elizabeth Henry (ERAH Training and Consultancy). Dr Coretta Phillips (London School of Economics) analysed the survey's of conference delegates and the focus groups (both using SPSS), and the senior union officials' interview dat. (using Atlas-ti). Victoria Hobart MPH analysed the Ordinary members survey {using SPSS}. The remaining data were analysed by Dr Henry.

Survey of conference delegates

A survey form and an ethnicity monitoring form were distributed to all attendees of the 2002 section conferences. Both sets of forms were also completed by attendants at a black activist course and an equal rights conference. It requested demographic information from delegates (their ethnicity, gender and age), before asking a series of questions concerned with membership in GB. The questionnaire covered length of membership, motivation for joining and staying a GMB member, channels and opportunities for progression within the region, and views on ethnic minority representation and inclusion in GMB.

In total, 328 questionnaires were completed, with an overall response rate of 51%. Of these, 54% were lay activists, 33 % were members, and 13% were employees. For information, Table 1 presents the gender and ethnicity of conference delegates who completed the survey form, showing that the vast majority were white. There was a 5% representation of black and Asian delegates in the sample, with a further 5% of delegates from other ethnic origins.

Table 2: Gender and Ethnicity Profile of Conference Delegates

	Male %	Female %	Total
White	67	22	90
Black	2	1	3
Asian	2	<1	2
Other	4	1	5
Total	75	25	100

Focus Groups

To explore the issues raised in the questionnaire in more depth, 15 focus groups were conducted with groups of conference attendees. Focus group facilitators attended each section conference, a GMB black activists course, and a equalities conference. After explaining the purpose and process to be followed, facilitators asked for volunteers for the focus group sessions. The focus groups were predominantly white, but included men and women. The facilitator prompted the groups to discuss and compare, white, and minority ethnic recruitment into GMB, retention, and opportunities for progression within the union.

Interviews with senior union officials

In order to incorporate the perspectives of senior union officials within GMB, some individual interviews were undertaken in November and December 2002. Five Regional Secretaries were interviewed, as were the Deputy General Secretary, the General Secretary and the Head of Equal Rights. Interviewees were asked about the qualities individuals need to be successful in

GMB, mentoring, training, visibility and profile, barriers to progression, and barriers to the inclusion of ethnic minorities.

Some limitations

It was not possible for the race equality audit to provide an accurate demographic profile of GMB officers, employees and lay activists. This was because, at a national level, GMB does not have information on the ethnicity of its activists (or indeed, members). Neither does it have an ethnic monitoring system in place for employees, although some information is available from a voluntary exercise which was carried out in 1995 and 1996, with approximately only a 50% return rate (Personnel, personal communication). This indicated a 2% representation of ethnic minorities among GMB staff in 1995, although this had increased to 6% in 1996, which is roughly proportionate to the representation of ethnic minorities in the general population. The special report on Representation of Black and Ethnic Minority Members (2001) estimated membership to be 4-5%. However, because of the absence of comprehensive ethnic monitoring data, it is impossible to examine whether the current recruitment practices are encouraging white and ethnic minority workers to join GMB to the same extent. The implications of this is discussed in more detail at end of this report.

It should also be noted that the research findings in this audit report are based on relatively small samples of those attending GMB conferences in 2002 and of GMB members. This means that the perspectives of only a minority can be commented upon. There is no way of knowing whether these views are representative of all conference delegates, or indeed, all GMB activists, and members this needs to be borne in mind when considering the findings from this research. Moreover, because of the tiny numbers of minority ethnic people completing the survey form at the conferences, findings are not broken down according to the ethnicity of the respondent.

Perhaps somewhat inevitably, co-operation with research exercises of this kind is likely to be variable, particularly when it involves individuals who are frequently very busy with their everyday duties. There was evidence of a reluctance to participate in the research conducted for this audit (either completely or by refusing to answer certain questions in interview), among ordinary members, conference delegates and senior union officials. Whether this was genuinely due to time constraints or was due to resistance because of the sensitive nature of the research is difficult to ascertain. That said, the General Secretary demonstrated his wholehearted commitment to this research, and recognised it might expose some areas requiring further development to promote race equality and social inclusion.

I RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

General recruitment efforts: motivation and means of joining

Conference delegates noted a multitude of reasons for joining GMB. The primary ones referred to by a quarter, were the need for protection and support, either through making improvements to working conditions or pay, or by providing a voice for members. Another 25% noted the links between the workplace and the union (13%), and encouragement from colleagues, union representatives and family members (13%). For 12%, the tradition of being a trade union member or having a belief in the benefits of union membership was the reason given for joining GMB. A further 7% cited their desire to join GMB in order to become an officer or shop steward or to help others-. The other reasons included: GMB being a closed shop; GMB having progressive campaigns and a strong negotiating record; union membership being a condition of employment, or occurring as the result of a merger or a previous union being taken over by GMB.

The majority of respondents in the ordinary members survey were recruited to the GMB by union officials (57%), with shop stewards being key to this (40%), recruitment through friends (9%) or self-referral (23%). Activists and ordinary members appear to join GMB for similar reasons; protection and representation, union merger, recommendation from friends or family, perception that GMB is an effective union in representation members interests. Interestingly members cited services and benefits as a main reason for joining GMB, with 95% of respondents being aware of the services that GMB provided to its members. Just over half (55%) of respondents had taken up any of these services, 11% of respondents indicated that they had needed union assistance in a matter but had not taken up services, no reasons were given for this.

The focus group participants also underlined the role of union representatives, particularly shop stewards, but also other work colleagues in encouraging individuals to join the union. In addition, membership was sometimes promoted at induction, union meetings, or through information boards in the workplace.

Since encouragement to join GMB is very much influenced by union representatives and colleagues (who are predominately white), the rate of joining among ethnic minorities will probably depend on the nature and quality of relationships between white workers, union officials, black and minority ethnic workers in the workplace.

Recruiting from Black & Minority Ethnic groups

The ordinary members survey revealed that half of the respondents did not think there are differences in recruitment and advancement of black and minority ethnic members. The majority of these indicated that the benefits of membership are the same for all, and one

suggested that:

"GMB bends over backwards to recruit where it can"

However a large number of the ordinary members surveyed (70%) felt that there were not enough black and minority ethnic members or activists.

Reasons cited for this included: Limited allocation of resources to support targeted work to recruit from black and minority ethnic communities, and a limited number of black and minority ethnic activists to support this work. Relatively slow progression of black and minority ethnic activists within the GMB compared to their white counterparts. Several respondents claimed that particular black and minority ethnic communities were especially difficult to recruit from, with the example of conflicting cultural norms being cited as a reason why recruitment of Asian women to the GMB is perceived as difficult.

Overall, the research found few people surveyed believed there to be any differences in the way in which white workers and ethnic minority workers were recruited into GMB.

However, in the focus groups, there was a perception that there were few ethnic minorities represented in the union, and a view by some that little targeted effort had been made to recruit ethnic minorities, and that few ethnic minorities were in positions of influence within GMB. Similarly, a senior union official noted that GMB strategies to encourage ethnic minority membership and activism tended to operate at a local level:

"I know there are particular activities like in London with black workers and refugees, but generally we don't have a national strategy. It happens in pockets."

Language and communication is noted as a barrier by another senior union official:

"You can go into a workplace and see multiple languages and the recruiter cannot communicate."

Mention was also made of an advertising campaign with materials being sent to workplaces instead of branches. Some cynicism was expressed by one senior union official who claimed that GMB was failing to target ethnic minorities, because "the union is not encouraging black and ethnic minority people to join except on paper." However, without a demographic profile of GMB membership and employment, it is not possible to see the extent to which GMB is inclusive of ethnic minorities.

Retention

The main reasons given for staying a member of GMB were similar to the reasons for joining GMB in the first place. A significant minority (44%) of those completing the survey form mentioned the good track record and policies of GMB, and 34% said they remained in GMB because of their need for security, support and better working conditions.

The information collected on length of membership showed that 52% had been in GMB for 16 or more years, suggesting a significant proportion did not leave the union until retirement. It did not appear to be the case that retention was a general problem, although of course, those attending the conference were likely to be among those most active in the union. Nonetheless the focus groups and the ordinary members similarly reported that there were no specific retention difficulties associated with ethnic minority workers.

II PROGRESSION IN GMB

Several questions were asked in the survey focus group- discussions and ordinary members interviews concerning progression in GMB. Being active in the branch or union as a whole was considered to be the main way in which individuals progressed in GMB. This enabled them to move through the ranks of the union hierarchy. The role of training courses was also noted, as was the quality and commitment of individuals, indicating that hard work and ambition were likely to be key qualities for progressing within the union.

The focus group discussions also emphasised the importance of networking and interacting with officials to get on in the union, particularly in receiving nominations or being encouraged by branch secretaries to stand for more senior positions. Whilst common to many employment situations, it should be noted that ethnic minorities are likely to fare less well than white people in contexts where informal mechanisms assist in advancement, as opposed to formal procedures that depend exclusively on equal opportunity principles. In the Denman Inquiry (2001) into the Crown Prosecution Service, for example, it was found that ethnic minorities experienced unequal treatment from managers, in that they were more often denied support for career advancement, including 'acting up' opportunities. This may be an issue for GMB, and unions more generally, to consider.

Similar views were echoed in the interviews the senior union officials, although two also referred to being "lucky" in advancing to their senior positions. Whilst some senior officials considered particular colleagues as instrumental in their careers and as having mentored them, there was also a view that being supported or mentored was considered a sign of weakness or reflected an inability to lead. For many, their individual success resulted from hard work, commitment, energy, and qualities such as understanding, determination, caring, and self-belief. Being outspoken in defense of members' interests was also regarded as a key quality.

Only 5% of survey respondents said that progression resulted from patronage or "knowing the right people" or "crawling", and a further 5% observed that progression was slow or difficult in GMB.

White, Black & Ethnic Minority progression

Overall, there was a perception that the opportunities for progression were open to all, including ethnic minorities, and resulted largely from individual commitment and effort, by being active, and having a high profile which brought individuals to the attention of branch secretaries. That said, many of those attending the black activists' course and a number of the focus group participants believed that black and ethnic minorities were held back in the union or were less likely to progress than their white counterparts. Reference was made to a glass ceiling and the lack of ethnic minority role models in influential positions within the union, low confidence, as well as a speculation that the level of education might also be an obstacle holding back ethnic minorities' progression. Conversely, a senior union official commented on the fairness of union principles that allowed a person to progress 'to the top' without formal qualifications. Awareness of a lack of progression was noted by one senior

union official who said:

"... there are not many black faces in the organisation at senior level... They seem to stay at organiser level."

Another referred to his own efforts to encourage participation:

"... race committee at regional and national level, these are advisory so no real teeth. There's room for improvement. I noticed that we didn't have any different languages on our recruitment leaflets - I changed that. We are trying to encourage more black and minority ethnic members and activists to go on committees.

We need them to push the agenda. I have approached people personally."

"Toeing the party line" was also mentioned as a criterion for advancement for all groups. One senior union official also commented on the use of the rulebook "as a force to prevent people progressing." However, most senior union officials felt they had received considerable organisational support from GMB to advance their careers. Training courses, for example on management law, negotiation, communication, and equality were recalled as providing key skills, which assisted progression in GMB. Examples were given of other types of training, which might have assisted individuals, but the responses were largely positive.

Members raised a number of issues that they felt contributed to lack of progression of black and minority ethnic members, for example: Officials who are predominantly white, male and over 40 and as such, do not represent a diverse organisation. Black and minority ethnic members are not involved in the informal networks and therefore not nominated for opportunities. Tokenistic efforts that are scanty and unsustainable, as opposed to action at all levels.

III BARRIERS TO INCLUSION

GMB's image and culture

Among those attending the conferences, only a minority (43%) of delegates could say something about the image of GMB. References were made to GMB being seen as a modern, open, knowledgeable and friendly union which demonstrated solidarity.

Conversely a few respondents referred to GMB's image as being that of "working men and working class" or as "male, white, overweight and over 40", suggesting it may be less receptive to women and ethnic minorities, while one senior union official said:

"The committees are usually made of white middle-aged men. Could be off-putting to females, black and ethnic minorities".

Linked to this was a view that the knowledge of union rules and procedures could only be gained from those within the union culture. One senior union official referred to the "need to understand the culture of the organisation", access to which, could only be gained by being "one of the lads", again suggesting informal barriers to inclusion may be in operation. A senior union official also speculated that one uninviting aspect of the union was the way in which branch meetings were conducted "in code", making them somewhat inaccessible to those who were not activists.

The general consensus among the ordinary members survey was that the image of the GMB is an open, responsive union. However that image was contradicted by cynicism about the GMB's commitment to race equality. 43% of ordinary members surveyed think that there are barriers to inclusion for black and minority ethnic members. Some of the reasons cited were:

- Lack of understanding within GMB of black and minority ethnic issues, both general and specific, and the need for capacity within GMB to take this work forward.
- Limited understanding of the trade union movement by some black and minority ethnic communities.

40% of respondents did not think that there are barriers to inclusion for black and minority ethnic members.

While no senior union officials could give any instances where individuals had failed to advance because of racial discrimination, one interviewee did recall that:

"There have been instances where staff members have used unacceptable language, there is even covert racism in workplaces. We have to be prepared to face this. Be brave to take on the issues."

Similarly, in the focus groups, a comment was made referring to a colleague being called names because of his 'colour'.

Focusing on race equality

Respondents in the ordinary members survey generally welcomed a focus on black and minority ethnic issues. The majority of respondents did not have any personal concerns with a GMB focus on this area, one respondent stated:

"everyone knows it is for the right reasons"

Many stated that the basic principle that GMB represents all of its members should be retained, respecting equality and balance. Others emphasised that black and minority ethnic communities should be part of the GMB 'mainstream', and not a separate grouping. Suggestions as to the effects of such a focus included;

- Opportunities to address the imbalance in representation and ensuring a collective voice.
- Creation of a modern and more diverse trade union that is responsive and ready to tackle a range of issues.
- Some respondents argued very strongly for GMB action to promote black and minority ethnic issues through the union as one means of combating the rise of the far right and BNP in parts of England.
- Many respondents stated that there was much work to do to build trust between the GMB and black and minority ethnic workers.

Furthermore, concern was voiced that by pushing race to the forefront you run the risk of jeopardising progress that has already been made and that the GMB may lose sight of other union issues. This seemed more related to perceptions that focusing on black and ethnic minority issues could marginalise others and result in 'backlash'.

Several respondents highlighted that the GMB must make sure members understand why it is focusing on black and minority ethnic issues, particularly in areas where minority communities are not acknowledged or visible.

Encouragingly nearly all respondents (94%) claimed that they were personally ready to address black and minority ethnic issues in GMB. In contrast only 72% of respondents felt that the GMB is ready to address these issues, citing the presence of race committees but their lack of authority as one example of this. According to several participants, there is top-down commitment, but this is not translated into grass roots commitment and ownership.

Survey respondents were asked whether GMB should focus on ethnic minority issues: 29% felt that the union should not do so, with a further 8% preferring a focus on all individuals, and only 58% agreeing that GMB should focus on ethnic minority issues.

This helps to explain Table 2 which shows what respondents saw as the possible effects of such a focus by GMB.

	%
Positive Effects	
More Members	26
Equality for Ethnic Minority members	20
A better, more inclusive union	7
Raise awareness	5
Negative Effects	
Disaffection and division	21
Forgetting day-to-day issues	7
Other, e.g. no effect, education	15

Notes

1. 33% of survey respondents did not answer this question.

More encouragingly, among focus group participants, there was almost universal support for GMB tackling race equality in its procedures and practices. The groups emphasised the importance of fairness, equality, and challenging ignorance and racism. However, some concerns were expressed about institutionalised racism and the possibility of its existence being denied, and the problem of ensuring accountability. In addition, some of the focus group discussions queried the value of a minority ethnic section, instead favouring a more integrated approach. In part this appeared to be linked to a perception of favouring one ethnic group over another and polarising positions within the union.

Overall senior union officials were committed to focusing on the diverse needs of a multicultural society. However, they felt that a sole focus on "the race issue" was wrong. Ethnic minorities should not be separated out as a "special case"; instead the focus should be on equality for all. Many interviewees referred to the need to increase the representation of ethnic minorities within the union, and saw this as the main way of focusing on ethnic minority issues. A campaign to examine the effects of BNP activity on working relationships was mentioned as one way in which GMB was focused on ethnic minority issues.

IV CONCLUSION: PROMOTING INCLUSION

Conclusion

As the introduction to this report noted, many public sector organisations are currently facing the possibility that their service delivery is not as socially inclusive as it could be. Organisational procedures and practices are being audited in the 'post Macpherson' policy environment, and in the wake of the newly legislated Race Relations Amendment Act (2000). In addition to extending coverage of the 1976 Race Relations Act to the police, it introduces a new statutory duty to "promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups". Public authorities, including trade unions need to take account of racial equality in the day-to-day work of policy-making, service delivery, employment practice and other relevant functions.

In terms of current GMB practices, on a very positive note, the research findings discussed in the previous sections of this report reveal that GMB is largely viewed as an open, modern, and supportive union progressing well into the 21st century. The North London Region was most often cited as an example of good practice. Multiple references were made about this regions' diversity in membership, activism and operations on the issue of race equality. Nevertheless, alongside this predominant view, which was prevalent among all groups who participated in the research, some concerns were expressed on the issue of racial equality.

There was no evidence to suggest that overt racism exists in the GMB at any level. However, there was evidence that institutional racism is at work in GMB; the low numbers of black and minority ethnic people in this research raises questions regarding proportionality, representation and who gets heard. Are the numbers a reflection of the way GMB looks, thinks and behaves? At one focus group respondents gave the following reasons for the low numbers of black and minority ethnic activists:

"...they're not like us, they do not mix, they will not do the jobs we do. It's not us, its them, they do not volunteer"

At times we faced hostile reactions to questions in the surveys that were perceived as suggestive of differential treatment in GMB processes, the responses appeared to be ultra-sensitive, most often consisting of protests that, 'GMB has never discriminated . . . open to everyone'. We heard these and similar sentiments throughout the course of this research, with little demonstration that the respondents had some understanding of the potentially detrimental effects of such beliefs.

The absence of even the most basic monitoring system means that GMB has no way of assessing fairness in recruitment, progression or operations. Without information about outcomes, it is impossible for GMB to have an accurate picture of racial inequality and discrimination. The CRE says that,

Whether or not it is required by law, monitoring and analysis of the impact on different ethnic groups of the way an organisation works is an essential first step in preventing discrimination

With regards to the image of GMB, there were numerous referrals made to, 'the old boy network'. A comment made by a white senior activist summed up what we observed to be a generally held belief;

"How can we claim to be representative, when they (senior officials) are all white men?"

It was alarming that only 50% of the regional secretary group and 40% of the regional race officer group responded proactively to our requests for their participation in the audit. These are key leadership positions with the opportunity for significant influence on race issues.

This seeming lack of involvement could be perceived by some as an indication that GMB does not have any problems in this area. Alternatively, others may consider the inaction confirmation that race equality is not a priority for the GMB.

Other concerns included the minimal efforts specifically targeted at recruiting ethnic minorities, the absence of ethnic minorities in high-profile positions of influence in GMB (who could also act as role models), and a perception that ethnic minorities were held back in the union compared with their white counterparts.

However, somewhat disappointingly, the research suggested that a significant minority of activists were not convinced of the need to focus on ethnic minority issues, perhaps perceiving this as preferential treatment. Therefore, educating GMB members about the differences between promoting race equality and engaging in positive discrimination seems an essential first step in any changes which GMB intends to make, particularly if it wishes to avoid polarisation along ethnicity lines. At the same time, GMB would do well to address the concerns expressed by ethnic minority members.

In conclusion this report provides a platform for the GMB to lead by example in confronting the skeletons in the cupboard; to have the courage, temerity and determination to be rigorous in tackling and eliminating race inequalities wherever they exist.

Before moving onto the recommendations, it is worth noting that survey respondents themselves provided some suggestions for improving ethnic minority representation in GMB. These included a targeted recruitment drive, better publicity, and efforts to increase the participation of ethnic minorities. Among focus group participants, the suggestions for improving the participation of ethnic minorities centered on education and a better understanding of minority cultures and workers' needs; as well as using publicity (in community languages) to widen membership. The use of high-profile ethnic minority role models was also proposed as a way of improving representation and promoting inclusion. Senior union officials responses noted that seats had been reserved on the Central Executive Council for women and ethnic minorities. Other proposals included setting targets to make the union accountable, and ensuring a greater visibility in ethnic minority communities.

V RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

The remainder of this report provides some recommendations to assist GMB in becoming a fully inclusive union, and one which operates as a model of good practice in the area of race equality.

- Ethnicity monitoring - employee, membership and activist levels. Publish and communicate figures annually - **ESSENTIAL**
- Race Equality Strategy - that meets the minimum requirements set by the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000: (General Duty to) Promote equality of opportunity, good race relations and prevent unlawful discrimination - **ESSENTIAL**
- National Recruitment Strategy- to include targets for black and minority ethnic membership that reflect the local demographic composition - **ESSENTIAL**
- Membership Development Strategy that encourages member involvement and activism and includes targets and specific actions to improve and support black and minority ethnic representation - **ESSENTIAL**
- A comprehensive training programme for all activists, that includes; increasing awareness and education about what race equality/relations is and isn't. Additional training for senior officials and dedicated race officers on leadership in this area - **ESSENTIAL**
- A positive action programme that includes; expanding and promoting opportunities for black and minority ethnic groups to participate at all levels of the GMB. May involve, shadowing, mentoring and support, training, proactive consultation with black and minority ethnic groups to understand needs and barriers faced in becoming members and/or activists. Sets targets for inclusion, monitors and reports progress - **ESSENTIAL**
- Commit at least 1 FTE (full time equivalent) at a senior level and with sufficient resources to lead and champion this initiative - **ESSENTIAL**
- Communications plan that conveys a distinct message that GMB values the contributions of all of its members and activists. Demonstrates top-down commitment. Includes sharing and promotion of good practice between regions and provides regular updates on progress -**ESSENTIAL**
- High profile Race Task Group that has the authority to oversee implementation and commitment to race equality. - **ESSENTIAL**

BIBLIOGRAPHY/ BACKGROUND MATERIALS

1. The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report (1999)
2. Racial Equality Means Quality - Commission for Racial Equality (1999)
3. Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000)
4. Modernising Government - White Paper (1999)