

**EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES AND WORKING
CONDITIONS IN THE BUILDING SERVICES
INDUSTRY IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA**

A Research Report

by

Bruce Nissen

Center for Labor Research and Studies
Florida International University

June, 2004

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Carmen Figueredo and Steffi Kofi for translating the survey instrument into Spanish and Haitian Creole, and Yuset Cueto and Winnie Cantave for re-translating it back into English, to ensure equivalence of research instruments. I also thank the twenty one dedicated surveyors who did a prompt and thorough survey of condominium workers in the county, against all the odds. I thank Silvana Ianinska for inputting the data into a usable database.

Finally, I acknowledge the Rockefeller Foundation for its financial assistance, without which this study could not have been completed.

Contact information:

Bruce Nissen
Director of Research
Center for Labor Research and Studies
Florida International University
University Park
Miami, FL 33199
Ph: 305-348-2616
Fax: 305-348-2241

E-mail: Bruce.Nissen@fiu.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	five page prior to text of study
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	3
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SURVEY RESPONDENTS	4
Country of Origin.....	4
Age.....	7
Marital status.....	7
Educational attainment.....	7
Family income in past year.....	7
Personal income in past year.....	8
Previous jobs, and jobs aspired to.....	8
EMPIRICAL RESULTS	9
Length of time working for present employer.....	9
Number of days worked per week.....	10
Employee vs. independent contractor status.....	10
Hourly wage.....	10
Pay increase history.....	11
Extra compensation for weekend, more intensive, or replacement work.....	12
Employer paying less than the minimum wage.....	12
Income from tips.....	12
Sharing of tips.....	13
How employer records work time.....	13
Work prior to or after being “on the clock”.....	13
Meal breaks and other breaks.....	14
Work beyond 40 hours per week.....	15
Wage statement issues.....	16
Training.....	17
Uniforms.....	17
Wage deductions for breakage or for poor work performance.....	17
Differential treatment of men and women.....	17
Differential treatment by race or nationality.....	19
Health insurance and pension plans.....	20
Vacation, sickness, or other paid days off.....	21
Safety issues.....	21
Employer provision of housing.....	22
Employer provision of transportation to and from the job.....	22

GENERAL SUMMARY OF PAY AND WORKING CONDITIONS IN THE MIAMI-
DADE CONDOMINIUM EMPLOYMENT SECTOR.....22

A CLOSER LOOK BY JOB CATEGORY.....23
 Valets.....23
 Security workers.....26
 Maintenance workers.....28
 Housekeeping and cleaning.....32
 Concierge and Front Desk workers.....35
 Other categories of workers.....38

COMPARATIVE GENERAL SUMMARY OF PAY AND WORKING CONDITIONS
OF DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF WORKERS IN THE MIAMI-DADE
CONDOMINIUM EMPLOYMENT SECTOR.....38

**DIRECT EMPLOYMENT VS. CONTRACTOR EMPLOYMENT: A FEW
COMPARISONS.....40**

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS.....41

APPENDIX A: Survey instrument in English (7 pp)

APPENDIX B: Survey instrument in Spanish (7 pp)

APPENDIX C: Survey instrument in Haitian Creole (7 pp)

EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES AND WORKING CONDITIONS IN THE BUILDING SERVICES INDUSTRY IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is based on surveys conducted with 696 condominium workers in Miami-Dade County, Florida during the months December 2003 through February 2004. The survey gathered information on wages, benefits, terms and conditions of employment, employers, and employer labor practices. It also collected demographic data and information on the employees themselves: who they are, where they come from, previous and aspiring future employment, family incomes, educational attainment, etc.

The purpose of the study is threefold:

- (1) To gather extensive demographic information about Miami-Dade County condominiums employees;
- (2) To explore wages, benefits, and terms and conditions of employment, both collectively and by various categories of work; and
- (3) To analyze the resulting data with an eye toward understanding potential intervention measures that could improve the condition of these workers.

The sample size is large (estimated to be over 10% of the entire workforce), and is as close to a random sample as it is possible to get, given that we did not start with a data base containing the entire universe of employees. Results from the survey can safely be considered roughly representative of the entire condominium workforce in the area.

Key findings

1. Miami-Dade condominium workers are overwhelmingly immigrants, mostly Hispanic, mostly male, and in their middle thirties.

- Respondents come from 41 different countries
- Forty two percent come from South American countries
- Eighteen percent come from Cuba
- Fourteen percent come from the United States
- Thirteen percent come from Caribbean island nations
- Ten percent come from Central American countries.
- Eighty three percent of respondents are men
- Median age is 35 years old

2. Respondents are well educated, but family and personal incomes are quite low.

- Only approximately 10% have less than a high school degree
- A majority has attended college
- More than a quarter have a college or graduate degree
- Forty six percent have family incomes under \$20,000

- More than three quarters (76%) have family incomes under \$30,000
- Only eight percent have family incomes of \$45,000 or more
- Seventy two percent have personal incomes of \$20,000 or less

5. They come from a wide variety of previous occupations, and a majority aspires to employment in some other sector.

- Previous occupations were extremely varied, from university professor or architect or accountant or financial analyst on the one end, to gas station attendant, cashier, bartender, waiter, house cleaner, hotel worker, cruise line worker, custodian, policeman, or military on the other.
- A majority aspires to different (and better) employment. Most popular goals are to own one's own business, to work in the medical field, to work in the investment or accounting professions, managing an office or maintenance operations, real estate, law enforcement, electronics and computers, teaching, business manager, as well as a number of blue collar positions that pay more money. Many of those with professional positions in their past hope to return to their chosen profession.

6. Most respondents have a relatively short tenure at their present job. This is an indication that job turnover is high. However, most of the work is full-time, not part-time.

- A majority (57.5%) has worked for their present employer less than two years.
- Over a third (36.4%) has worked for their present employer less than one year.
- Only a little over fifteen percent have been with their present employer for five years or more.
- Almost eighty seven percent work full-time, meaning 40 hours or more per week.

7. Hourly pay is quite low, but almost half receive tips on the job, which does raise total compensation somewhat.

- Over ten percent receive less than the minimum wage of \$5.15 per hour.
- Over a third earn less than \$7.00 per hour.
- Median hourly pay is \$7.10 per hour; the average (mean) is \$7.58 per hour.
- However, almost half receive tips on the job.
- Median amount of tips is about \$2.50 per hour, meaning that tipped employees earn approximately one third of their income this way.

8. There are numerous violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) regarding pay and hours of work.

- Between fifteen and twenty percent work before or after their recorded working hours, and a majority are not compensated for this work.

- Almost a fourth of those who work during their meal break are likewise not paid for this, another FLSA violation.
- A slight majority works overtime hours, and over a quarter of these do not receive one and one half times their normal pay for this work, another FLSA violation.

9. Only a minority perceive employer discrimination on either a gender or race or nationality basis, despite statistical evidence of job segregation across these categories.

- Approximately ten percent perceive employer sexual discrimination, both on the issue of equal pay for equal work and discriminatory hiring practices.
- Less than three percent perceive discrimination against women in promotion to supervisory positions.
- Between four and eight percent see discrimination on the basis of race or nationality regarding equal pay for equal work or hiring
- Less than two percent believe the employer denies supervisory promotions on the basis of race or nationality.

10. Benefit levels are quite low.

- Ninety two percent of respondents receive no pension plan from their employer.
- Only forty percent receive health insurance coverage, and when they do, less than a third of the insurance plans cover family members.
- Less than sixty percent receive paid vacation time
- Less than sixty percent receive paid sick leave

11. Different job categories of workers differ in some respects from the general picture given above.

- **Valets** comprise twenty eight percent of all respondents. They are virtually all South Americans, Central Americans, or from the Caribbean. They are 96% male, more educated than the average condo worker, have a lower than average family income, have lower benefits coverage, earn a significant amount of their income from tips, and have a median total compensation (hourly wage plus tips) of \$8.89 per hour.
- **Security workers** comprise twenty two percent of all respondents. Almost a third of them are from the United States, making them the most “American” of any job category. They are 79% male, less educated than the average condo worker, have a higher than average family income, have a mixed record concerning benefits coverage, earn little from tips, and have a median total compensation (hourly wage plus tips) of \$8.00 per hour.
- **Maintenance workers** comprise thirteen percent of all respondents. Almost half of them come from Cuba, making this a very “Cuban niche” of condo employment. They are 100% male, less educated than the average condo

worker, have equal or just slightly higher than average family incomes, have better than average benefits coverage, earn little in tips, and have a median total compensation (hourly wage plus tips) of \$9.07 per hour.

- **Housekeeping workers** comprise 15% of all respondents. Forty four percent come from Cuba or Colombia. Thirty nine percent are female, making this the most “feminine” occupation in the overall sample. They are less educated than the average condo worker, have lower family incomes than average, have slightly worse benefits coverage than average, receive little in tips, and have a median total compensation (hourly wage plus tips) of \$7.00 per hour.
- **Concierge and Front Desk workers** come primarily from the United States (21%) and Cuba (18%). This category also clusters the native English speakers and Europeans. Front desk workers are seventy three percent male, more educated than the average condo worker, have a higher than average family income, have much better benefits coverage than average, receive a fair amount of tips, and have a median total compensation (hourly wage plus tips) of \$9.50 per hour.

12. Differences between job categories reveal several operative forces at work.

- Those categories of employees with a larger percentage of workers from the U.S. (front desk and security) tend to have higher family incomes.
- Women have higher percentages of the jobs in the low end (housekeeping) and high end (front desk) of the compensation scale.
- More education does not necessarily translate into higher pay or family income levels – this is especially apparent for valets, who are highly educated and virtually 100% immigrant.
- There is no one-to-one correlation between family income and hourly compensation. For example, security workers have the second to lowest hourly compensation levels, yet they have higher than average family incomes. This is likely to be true because their country of origin is more likely to be the United States, and they are more likely to have two or more income earners in the family.

13. Direct employees of condominiums are paid better, receive more benefits, and stay with their employers longer than to employees of contractors.

- Direct (condo) employees have a median hourly wage of \$8.00 per hour, compared to \$7.00 for the employees of contractors.
- Direct condo employees are also more likely to receive various benefits. Fifty six percent of direct employees receive health insurance coverage, compared to 33% for contractor employees. Eighty percent receive paid vacation, compared to 49% of contract employees. Seventy three percent receive paid sick days, compared to 49% of contract employees. Almost seven and a half percent receive a pension, compared to 2.6% of contract employees.
- Direct condo employees stay with their employer for longer periods of time. Forty percent of contractor employees have been with their employer for less

than a year compared to just over 28% of direct employees. And almost 30% of direct employees have stayed with their employer for over five years, compared to just over 11% of contractor employees.

INTRODUCTION

Miami-Dade County is home to the city of Miami, which has the dubious distinction of being the poorest large city (population 250,000 or over) in the United States for the past few years.¹ The 2000 Census showed that the city had a poverty rate of 28.5%,² and the numbers have hardly improved since then.

Miami-Dade County has a diverse set of cities and communities, and its poverty rate is not nearly as bad as that of the city. Nevertheless, the county also has a high poverty rate: 18% in the 2000 Census, well above the Florida state average of 12.5% which is itself higher than the national average. The relatively high poverty level of the county is not due to a lack of wealth in the county or low pay for all jobs – it consistently ranks second or third highest of the 67 counties in the state for average (mean) wage paid per job. Rather, the poverty results from the extremely skewed nature of job quality and incomes – the county has many high paying jobs (in international banking, international business, law, accounting, etc.) and many low paying (primarily service) jobs.³

Miami-Dade County is also the destination point for large numbers of migrants from the northern parts of the country and for immigrants, primarily from the Caribbean and Central and South America. The many U.S. retirees and the wealthier immigrants from elsewhere frequently live in condominiums, where they require the services of workers employed as security guards, valets, front desk workers, maintenance workers, and housekeepers. Most of these workers occupy some of the classic low wage service sector jobs that Miami and its surrounding area is famous for.

This study aims to understand the situation of these workers. They are a relatively important segment of the low paid service sector in the area. According to the 1997 Economic Census, two industrial codes cover condominiums: “Residential property managers” (professional companies that manage property for owners - North American Industry Classification System Code # 531311) and “Lessors of residential buildings and dwellings” (owners that lease or manage residential space - North American Industry Classification System Code #531110). Together these two industrial codes had 974 establishments, and employed 5,777 persons in the county in 1997.⁴ In the seven years since that time, condominiums and rental properties have grown rapidly, and it is estimated that employment in this sector is now above 8,000. However, not all of these are condominiums – many are simply rental properties. However, condominiums

¹ For news coverage of Miami’s exceptionally high poverty rate, see Jason Grotto and William Yardley, “Poverty Rate a Distinctive Challenge for Miami”, *Miami Herald*, Nov. 20, 2001. This article is archived on the web at: www.floridacdc.org/articles/011121-1.htm.

² See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 2000, Table DP-3, Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics:2000, Geographic area: Miami City, Florida. (Available on Census web page.) Data on the county and the state of Florida in the next few paragraphs are taken from the same tables for the county and the state.

³ For more information on the state and the county, see Bruce Nissen, *Labor Report on the State of Florida – 2003*, available on the web at: www.fiu.edu/~clrs; click on “publications”.

⁴ See the 1997 Economic Census for Dade County, available on the web at: <http://factfinder.census.gov/>. Click on “Economic Census” and follow the links through a geographic filter for the county to the “Real Estate Rental and Leasing” table.

provide many more services and require much more labor than do rental apartments. So, it is estimated that over 5,000 employees currently work in condominiums in the county. The 1997 Economic survey data show that the average (mean) income in these two industrial codes is \$19,278 and \$19,802. These average (mean) figures include executives and managers and professionals, so the median income would have been considerably lower – perhaps \$13,000 - \$16,000 per year. Since then wages have gone up a little, but there is no doubt that this is a low wage sector.

The high poverty/low wage nature of south Florida can be viewed from a variety of perspectives. Until recently state economic development policies ignored the problem entirely, filling up the state with low wage jobs without regard to quality or pay levels. More recently, the focus has been on attracting high tech and high wage industries, and exclusive concentration on educational reform as a way to elevate living standards. While the new initiatives are laudable, they ignore the fact that key segments, such as the residential market, will remain as large employers in south Florida. Large numbers of workers will remain employed in these jobs no matter what changes are made to the educational system or what new industries are attracted to the area.

Condominium workers in Miami-Dade County exemplify many of the problems endemic to low wage, and low wage service sector work, in the country today. Employment in the United States has clearly undergone a significant change over the last 20 years. The bond of employees to employers has loosened. Employment in the building service industry has clearly seen this trend as workers who were once directly employed by the buildings and who were provided benefits (often including a rent free apartment in the building) are now often employed by professional management companies, contractors, and sub-contractors. The Miami private sector has had few limitations on the impacts of changing market dynamics on workers.

There is virtually no union presence in the private sector and little effort at government regulation of employment practices. While living wage laws have impacted similar job classifications for government employees and direct service contractors with Miami-Dade County and the city of Miami Beach, there has been no regulatory, unionization, or other dynamics that mitigate the impacts of these changing employment practices in most of the private sector.

This project aims to understand the work force, the labor market, and the employment practices of the condominium residential market in Miami-Dade County. It looks at the demographics of the work force: who these workers are, where they come from, and what they aspire to. It was known that a good number of these workers are immigrants but little was previously known of their work history or their trajectories in future employment. This report also reviews working conditions such as pay rates, benefits, and treatment on the job. It researches the extent to which employment practices comply with federal, state, and local laws regulating the industry and employment generally – and compares how that relates to employment status (direct employment, job classifications, etc). Finally, it attempts to analyze employment relationship variations, such as direct employment by the owner (the condo association), or employment for a contractor managing the building or providing a type of service to the owner (e.g., parking).

Our goal is to map the residential building services market in Miami-Dade County and to document the relationships of job classifications and demographics to working conditions. We want to understand how employees' relationships to the building owners impact the working conditions – especially where it seems the conditions have dropped to minimum levels or below. The questions we hope to answer are:

- How many workers and firms are involved in the Miami residential sector?
- What are the demographics of job classifications and how does that correlate with working conditions?
- What are pay levels and benefit coverage? How do these relate to demographic information (immigrant status, minority status, gender, etc.)?
- How do workers obtain their jobs? Also, how high is turnover, and what are preceding and succeeding jobs for workers in this sector?
- What are the relationships of the job classifications to the working conditions –especially using violations of safety, wage and hour laws as key indicators?
- What is the relationship between workers, employers, and the ultimate employer – the building owner?

METHODOLOGY

The author developed a 42-page survey for Miami-Dade condominium workers. The survey gathers demographic data on the workers, their wages and benefits, and a number of working conditions. Working conditions questions cover hours of work and overtime questions, tips, breaks, form of wage payment, training, uniforms, gender and racial disparities, health insurance, pensions, injuries, paid time off, provision of housing, transportation to and from work, etc.

The survey was translated from English into both Spanish and Haitian Creole, and then translated back by different individuals who had not seen the original English. In this way, small discrepancies in meaning were uncovered, and an identical research instrument was thereby created in all three languages. Copies of the survey in all three languages are attached to this report as appendices.

The original intent was to survey approximately 10% of the workforce, and a target of 500-600 workers was originally set. In the end, we were able to survey approximately 700 workers. These individuals were surveyed according to the protocols of Florida International University for research involving human subjects, and all signed informed consent statements prior to the commencement of the survey.

An initial scan of community and immigrant groups likely to have condominium workers in their memberships revealed that the most useful way to reach these workers was directly. A team of 21 surveyors was trained and sent out into the condominiums to find and survey these workers during breaks or before or after work.

We also put a series of advertisements with a phone number to call on Spanish language radio stations and in Spanish and English language newspapers that condominium workers were likely to read. Among the newspapers were the Catholic Diocese's Spanish language newspaper ("La Voz Católica") and a newspaper aimed solely at immigrants ("El Paracaidista"). Although most workers were contacted directly at or just outside a condominium, a good number were also recruited through this media strategy.

Some condominiums made access to their workforce difficult, but a tenacious crew of surveyors was able to get through to the workers in virtually every condominium that was approached. The workers being surveyed were given a small gratuity (\$10) for their cooperation with the survey.

In all, 704 workers at **191 condominiums** were surveyed. Eight surveys were not usable because they were too incomplete or because of failure to properly sign the informed consent form, leaving **696 respondents**. At 75 condos, one worker was surveyed; at 35 two workers were. Thirty two condos had 3-4 workers surveyed; 34 condos had 5-9 workers surveyed, and 15 condos had 10 or more employees surveyed. Both the geographical spread of the condominiums surveyed (concentrated in Miami Beach, the downtown Miami Brickell area, the cities of Aventura, Bal Harbor, Coral Gables, and Key Biscayne, but spread throughout the county in a pattern similar to that of condo location) and the varying sizes of the condos surveyed (from quite small to very large) give us confidence that the results from this survey are representative of the population of condominium workers in the county as a whole. The enormous size of the sample (N = 696) also gives us great confidence about how representative our sample is.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SURVEY RESPONDENTS

The first task was to get data on who these workers are, where they come from, their age, gender, marital status, education, final aspirations for a job, etc. This section will present a picture of the condominium workforce, as uncovered in this survey.

Country of Origin. The 696 respondents come from 41 countries. Over 45% come from just three countries: Cuba (126 - 18%), the U.S. (98 - 14%), and Colombia (92 - 13%). Adding Peru (57 - 8%) shows that over 50% (53.5%) come from just four countries.

Counting Cuba and the United States as separate regions, a regional breakdown of the country of origin of these workers reveals that most come from South America, followed by Cuba, then the United States, then Caribbean Islands, then Central America, with a smattering of Europeans and an even smaller number from Africa or the Indian sub-continent. Table 1 gives the breakdown:

Table 1
Region of Origin of Miami-Dade Condominium Workers

Region	Number	Percentage
SOUTH AMERICA	291	42%
CUBA	126	18%
UNITED STATES	98	14%
CARIBBEAN ISLANDS	88	13%
CENTRAL AMERICA*	68	10%
WESTERN EUROPE	8	1%
EASTERN EUROPE**	8	1%
AFRICA	1	.1%
INDIA	1	.1%
NO ANSWER (LEFT BLANK)	7	1%
Total	696	100.2%***

* Mexico is added to Central America because of its proximity and because its emigrants share many characteristics of those from Central American countries.

**Russia is added to Eastern Europe, even though technically it is in Asia, because of its close proximity and because it shares with Eastern European countries a formerly Communist government.

***Total does not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding of percentages.

Table 2 gives a breakdown of country of origin for all 41 countries:

**Table 2
Country of Origin of Miami-Dade Condominium Workers**

Country	Number	Percentage
CUBA	126	18%
UNITED STATES	98	14%
COLOMBIA	92	13%
PERU	57	8%
HAITI	39	6%
BRAZIL	37	5%
ARGENTINA	36	5%
VENEZUELA	32	5%
NICARAGUA	29	4%
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	17	2%
HONDURAS	16	2%
ECUADOR	16	2%
PUERTO RICO	15	2%
CHILE	13	2%
JAMAICA	7	1%
EL SALVADOR	7	1%
NO ANSWER (LEFT BLANK)	7	1%
TRINIDAD	5	.7%
GUATEMALA	5	.7%
URUGUAY	4	.6%
MEXICO	4	.6%
PARAGUAY	3	.4%
BELIZE	3	.4%
RUSSIA	3	.4%
FRANCE	2	.3%
SWEDEN	2	.3%
POLAND	2	.3%
BAHAMAS	2	.3%
COSTA RICA	2	.3%
PANAMA	2	.3%
ROMANIA	2	.3%
INDIA	1	.1%
HUNGARY	1	.1%
IRELAND	1	.1%
GERMANY	1	.1%
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1	.1%
NIGERIA	1	.1%
WEST INDIES	1	.1%
GUYANA	1	.1%
SPAIN	1	.1%
BARBADOS	1	.1%
ITALY	1	.1%
Total	696	98%*

*Due to rounding, percentages do not add up to exactly 100%

Age. Respondents range in age from 17 to 81. The **average (mean) age is 37.3 years**, while the **median is 35 years**. Only 15 respondents are under 20 years old, and only 16 are over 65 years old. Respondents are primarily male: **83% (576) are men, and 17% (120) are women**.

Marital Status. Most respondents are married, but over a third are single and about one out of seven is divorced, widowed, or separated. Table 3 shows the results.

Table 3
Marital Status of Respondents

Status	Number	Percentage*
MARRIED	367	53%
SINGLE	234	34%
DIVORCED	84	12%
WIDOWED	5	.7%
SEPARATED	1	.1%
NO ANSWER (LEFT BLANK)	5	.7%

*Due to rounding, percentages do not add up to exactly 100%.

Educational Attainment. Respondents are surprisingly well educated for individuals holding such low paying jobs. Over 50% have either some college or a college degree, and only around 10% have not graduated from high school. Table 4 shows results.

Table 4
Educational Attainment of Respondents

Attainment	Number	Percentage*
LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL	28	4%
SOME HIGH SCHOOL (NO DEGREE)	45	6.5%
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	210	30%
POST HIGH SCHOOL VOCATIONAL OR TECHNICAL SCHOOLING	56	8%
SOME COLLEGE (NO DEGREE)	170	24%
COLLEGE OR GRADUATE DEGREE	180	26%
NO ANSWER (LEFT BLANK)	7	1%

*Due to rounding, percentages do not add up to exactly 100%.

Family Income in past year. Fifty two of the 696 respondents refused to answer a question about their family income in the past year. Of the remaining 644, **almost half indicated a family income under \$20,000, and over three fourths indicated that their family had earned less than \$30,000 in the previous year**. At the other end of the income spectrum, 4% claimed a family income of over \$60,000. Table 5 gives details.

Table 5
Respondents' Family Income in Previous Year

Family Income	Number	Percentage
Less than \$20,000	298	46%
\$20,000 to less than \$30,000	196	30%
\$30,000 to less than \$45,000	98	15%
\$45,000 to less than \$60,000	26	4%
More than \$60,000	26	4%
Total	644	99%*

*Due to rounding, percentages do not add up to exactly 100%.

Personal income in past year. Thirty two respondents refused to answer a question about their personal income in the past year. For the remaining 664, personal income ranges from \$0 to \$87,000. The **average (mean) income is \$18,137** and the **median is \$16,000**. If everyone had worked full time for the entire year last year (no part-time work, no overtime, no working for only part of the year), this would have translated into \$7.69 per hour (2080 hours of work in a year).

Almost three fourths of the respondents personally earned \$20,000 or less in the previous year, and over 90% earned \$30,000 or less. Two percent earned \$45,000 or more. Table 6 shows details.

Table 6
Respondents' Personal Income in Previous Year

Personal Income	Number	Percentage
\$10,000 or less	85	13%
\$15,000 or less	296	45%
\$20,000 or less	481	72%
\$25,000 or less	560	84%
\$30,000 or less	626	94%
\$45,000 or more	11	2%

Previous Jobs, and Jobs Aspired to. The survey also asks respondents about any previous jobs they had held that were unrelated to condominiums, and what final job they aspired to, if different from their present job.

A fairly large majority had worked in other fields. The list is much too long to repeat here, but many had held other low paying jobs, such as cashier, bartender, waiter, cleaning houses, gas station attendant, hotel worker, cruise line worker, custodian, floral arranger, etc. A number come from manufacturing or construction jobs, as well as typically “blue collar” male employment like the military or the police or mechanic work. And a number of the more highly educated ones have a “past life” as an architect, an accountant, an economist, a financial analyst, engineer, university professor, etc.

More than half indicate a desire to end up somewhere other than where they were currently employed. Again, the list of desired “final destination” jobs is too long to list here, but some of

the more popular choices are to own one's own business, to work in the medical field, to work in the investment or accounting professions, managing an office or maintenance operations, real estate, law enforcement, electronics and computers, teaching, business manager, as well as a number of blue collar positions that pay more money. Many of those with past professional positions hope to return to their chosen profession.

While a minority indicate that they are happy with their present jobs, both the previous employment histories and future employment aspirations of many working in condominiums indicate that attachment to jobs in this sector is minimal.

In summary, condominium workers in Miami-Dade County are 86% immigrants, largely from South America and Cuba, with sizeable numbers also coming from the Caribbean Islands and Central America. Eighty three percent are men; the average age is in the mid-30s. A slight majority is married. Only 10.5% have less education than a high school diploma, and over 50% have taken some college courses. More than a quarter have a college or graduate degree. Almost half have family incomes of less than \$20,000 per year; and more than three quarters have family incomes below \$30,000. Their personal (as opposed to total family) income is also quite low. Forty five percent earned \$15,000 or less in the past year, while only two percent earned \$45,000 or more. They come from a wide variety of previous occupations, and a majority aspires to employment in some other sector.

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

This section will relate the data obtained on the entire group of condominium workers surveyed. Following sections will convey information on specific sub-groups of employees within the overall group.

Length of time working for present employer. More than a third of the respondents have worked for their present employer less than a year, and over 57% have worked less than two years for their present employer. Only 15.5% have worked for their present employer five or more years. This indicates a fairly high turnover rate among this workforce. Table 7 shows the breakdown.

Table 7
Length of time working for present employer

Length of time	Number	Percentage
LESS THAN ONE MONTH	29	4.2%
ONE MONTH TO < ONE YEAR	224	32.2%
ONE YEAR TO < TWO YEARS	147	21.1%
TWO YEARS TO < FIVE YEARS	188	27.0%
FIVE YEARS TO < TEN YEARS	71	10.2%
OVER TEN YEARS	37	5.3%

Number of days worked per week. Close to three quarters of respondents work five days a week, and over 86% work either five or six or seven days a week. Thus, less than 14% are part time workers. Table 8 shows results.

Table 8
Number of days worked per week

Number of days	Number	Percentage
1	3	.4%
2	15	2.2%
3	23	3.3%
4	51	7.3%
5	499	71.7%
6	80	11.5%
7	21	3%
Blank	4	.6%

These results show that condo employment does not share with some other forms of low paid service sector work a large part time component. Thus, employment in a condominium is likely to be considered more desirable for those seeking stable employment than is employment in e.g., a fast food restaurant.

Employee vs. independent contractor status. The survey also asks about another recent trend in U.S. employment, the tendency to treat employees as “independent contractors” who thereby lose their legal status as employees and lose employer contributions to the social security and Medicare systems. This trend is not very apparent in the condominium sector. Almost 97% indicate that they are treated as an employee. Table 9 gives the details.

Table 9
Treatment of respondents as an employee or independent contractor

Status	Number	Percentage
EMPLOYEE	672	96.6%
INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR	22	3.2%
DON'T KNOW, OR BLANK	2	.2%

Hourly wage. Respondents were asked for their hourly wage. Forty three refused to answer this question, leaving 653 responses. The **lowest wage is \$2.50 per hour**, and the **highest is \$19.00 per hour**. The **median wage is \$7.10 per hour**, and the **average (mean) wage is \$7.58 per hour**.

Over 10% indicate that they make less than minimum wage (\$5.15 per hour), and just over 8% indicate that they make more than \$10 per hour. Table 10 gives a more detailed breakdown of wages.

Table 10
Hourly wages of respondents

Wage	Number	Percentage*
UNDER \$4 PER HOUR	23	3.5%
\$4 TO < \$5.15 PER HOUR	46	7.0%
\$5.15 TO < \$6 PER HOUR	42	6.4%
\$6 TO < \$7 PER HOUR	121	18.5%
\$7 TO < \$8 PER HOUR	151	23.1%
\$8 TO < \$9 PER HOUR	106	16.2%
\$9 TO < \$10 PER HOUR	59	9.0%
\$10 PER HOUR	52	8.0%
OVER \$10 PER HOUR	53	8.1%

* Due to rounding, percentages do not add up to exactly 100%.

It is important to note that some of these occupations (e.g., valet) are tipped positions, so the above hourly wage does not indicate total income for all respondents. Later calculations will take into account tip income.

Pay increase history. Respondents were also asked when they had last gotten a pay increase. Twenty did not respond, making for 676 responses. **Three hundred seventy one (55%) had never gotten a raise.** Most of these had worked for their employer less than a year (58%), but 42% had worked for their present employer a year or more, and 11.5% had been with their present employer for two years or more. Table 11 shows results. (Remember this table refers only to those who have never gotten a raise from their present employer.)

Table 11
Length of time working for present employer for respondents who have never gotten a raise

Length of time	Number	% of Total Number of Responses to this Question	% of Those Who Have Never Gotten a Raise from Present Employer
LESS THAN A MONTH	28	4.1%	7.5%
1 MONTH TO < 1 YEAR	186	27.5%	50.1%
1 YEAR TO < 2 YEARS	79	11.7%	21.3%
2 YEARS TO < 5 YEARS	64	9.5%	17.3%
5 YEARS TO < 10 YEARS	8	1.2%	2.2%
10 YEARS OR MORE	6	.9%	1.6%

As expected, most of those with no raise have a relatively short tenure with the present employer of a year or less, but the fact that 42% have received no raises in over a year indicates how seldom raises are given, and how dependent on their present jobs a number of these workers must be, if they don't change jobs as their real purchasing power drops. The infrequency of raises probably also helps explain the fairly high turnover in the industry.

Extra compensation for weekend, more intensive, or replacement work. Large majorities of respondents receive no extra pay for weekend work, for working harder, or for filling in for another worker. Slightly less than half get paid more for holiday work. Table 12 gives the details.

Table 12
Conditions for which respondents receive extra pay

Condition	% Yes	% No
WEEKEND WORK	9.2%	90.8%
HOLIDAY WORK	46.6%	53.4%
WORKING HARDER	4.5%	95.5%
FILLING IN FOR ANOTHER WORKER	16.2%	83.8%

Employer paying less than the minimum wage. One question asks, “As far as you know, has anybody working for your employer ever made less than \$5.15 per hour?” Sixty nine respondents are themselves receiving less than \$5.15 per hour according to answers detailed in Table 10, yet only 63 are willing to say that they were aware of anyone making that little. In addition, 60 respond with a “don’t know”, or fail to answer the question. In any case, we know that over 10% of respondents are paid less than the minimum wage, as Table 10 shows.

Income from tips. Respondents were asked if they received tips at their job. **Three hundred twenty seven (47%) indicate that they do receive tips.** Of these, 278 answer a question about how much money they receive per day in tips. The lowest amount is \$1 per day and the highest amount is \$100 per day. **The median amount of tips is \$20 per day, and the average (mean) is \$22.40 per day.** Table 13 gives further details.

Table 13
Daily amount of tips, for those respondents receiving tips on the job

Amount per day	Number	Percentage
\$1-\$4 PER DAY	36	12.9%
\$5-\$8 PER DAY	28	10.1%
\$9-\$12 PER DAY	28	10.1%
\$13-\$16 PER DAY	19	6.8%
\$17-\$20 PER DAY	52	18.7%
\$21-\$25 PER DAY	20	7.2%
\$30-\$35 PER DAY*	48	17.3%
\$40-50 PER DAY*	33	11.9%
\$60-\$100 PER DAY*	14	5.0%

*No respondents indicated amounts between \$25-\$30, \$35-\$40, or \$50-\$60.

If we assume that all respondents work a standard eight-hour day (no part-time work, no overtime), these daily tips would translate into hourly income from 9 cents per hour up to \$12.50 per hour. The median is \$2.50 per hour, and the average (mean) is \$2.85 per hour.

Since close to half of all condo workers earn tips, and since those who do get about \$2.50 per hour in tips, it is apparent that tip income is a substantial proportion of their overall income.

With an average wage of about \$7.50 per hour, these employees would be earning in tips an extra 33% beyond their wages. Tips are very important to these categories of condo workers, just as they are to many waiters and bartenders.

Sharing of tips. Those who receive tips were asked if they had to share their tips with other employees or their employer. A little over one third of the 251 who responded answer yes. Table 14 shows results.

Table 14
Numbers and Percentages of Tipped Respondents Who Must Share Tips

Must Share Tips?	Number	Percentage
YES	86	34.3%
NO	165	65.7%

An important piece of information, not captured by the survey, would be how much of the sharing is with the employer, as opposed to with fellow employees. While most sharing is likely with other employees, a recent column in the *Miami Herald* indicates that some employers are taking their employees’ tips without letting the customers know that the tips are not going to the employee. This is not likely to be the norm, but it would have been useful to discover if any of the condo boards or condo contractors engages in this practice.

How employer records work time. Respondents were asked how their employer records their work time. Half punch a time clock, and almost a third sign in and out. Surprisingly, almost five percent claim that nobody checks their time – they operate on the “honor system”. Table 15 shows a detailed breakdown of responses.

Table 15
How employer records work time.

Method	Number	Percentage
PUNCH A CLOCK	348	50.0%
SIGN IN/OUT	225	32.3%
SOMEONE ELSE RECORDS TIMES	69	10.0%
NOBODY/HONOR SYSTEM	33	4.7%
NA, OR BLANK	14	2.0%
SALARIED	7	1.0%

Virtually all of the respondents believe that the recorded working times are accurate. Only eleven respondents indicate that it was not. Two claim that their employer systematically takes away hours. But overall, this does not appear to be an issue for these workers.

Work prior to or after being “on the clock”. Respondents were asked if they ever worked before the recorded starting time or after the recorded finishing time of their job. Approximately 92% answer each question, and of these, 15.4% indicate that they have worked prior to starting time and 17.0% indicate that they have worked after quitting time. Table 16 shows results.

Table 16
Number and percentages of respondents working before or after their recorded work hours

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
WORKED BEFORE STARTING TIME?	98	15.4%	540	84.6%
WORKED AFTER QUITTING TIME?	109	17.0%	533	83.0%

Of those who do work before or after starting and quitting time, more than half are not paid for their additional work, a clear violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). Table 17 gives the details.

Table 17
Compensation for working before or after recorded work shift

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
COMPENSATED FOR WORK BEFORE STARTING TIME?	28	32.6%	58	67.4%
COMPENSATED FOR WORK AFTER QUITTING TIME?	47	46.5%	54	53.5%

The 58 and 54 respondents who have had their legal rights under the FLSA violated for non-payment of work before or after regular work hours represent 9.1% and 8.4% of all those who responded to questions about such work. Thus, **these FLSA violations affect almost 10% of the condominium workforce in the area, a significant number of workers.**

Meal breaks and other breaks. Approximately 70% of respondents receive a meal break, while 30% do not. Neither federal nor Florida state law requires any meal break, so the 30% receiving no meal break are not being treated illegally. Table 18 shows details.

Table 18
Number and percentage of respondents receiving a meal break

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
RECEIVE MEAL BREAK?	486	70.1%	207	29.9%

The shortest meal break reported is 10 minutes, and the longest is 61 minutes. The median length is 30 minutes, and the average (mean) is 32.1 minutes.

Over 70% of those who get a meal break report being paid during that break. A little over 55% report working during this meal break. **Of those who work during their meal break, almost a quarter report that they are not paid for that work, another clear violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).** Table 19 gives details.

Table 19
Respondents' pay and work status during meal breaks

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
PAID DURING MEAL BREAK?	328	72.4%	125	27.6%
WORK DURING MEAL BREAK?	245	55.4%	197	44.6%
IF WORK DURING BREAK, PAID FOR THIS WORK?	139	75.1%	46	24.9%

Of the 245 who work during their meal break, only 185 answered a question about whether they were paid for that work. But if the proportions for those who answered equal the proportions for those who did not, **those who are illegally denied pay when they work during their meal break represent one quarter of those working during a meal break and almost 7% of the entire workforce, evidence that this violation of the law is not uncommon in the condominium sector in Miami-Dade County.**

Aside from meal breaks, slightly over 15% receive another break during their working hours. Again, neither federal nor Florida state law requires any non-meal break, so the slightly less than 85% receiving no such break are not being treated illegally. Table 20 shows details.

Table 20
Number and percentage of respondents receiving a break other than meal break

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
RECEIVE NON-MEAL BREAK?	104	15.5%	565	84.5%

For those receiving a non-meal break, the most likely length is 15 minutes (32 responses), followed by “as needed or on an informal basis” (28 responses), two 15 minute breaks (10 responses), 5-10 minutes (6 responses), 10 minutes (5 responses), 30 minutes (3 responses), two 10 minutes breaks (2 responses), three 15 minute breaks (1 response), 20 minutes (1 response), and 5 minutes (1 response).

Over 85% of those receiving a non-meal break report that they are paid during that break (71 of 83 respondents). A little over 41% report working during this break (30 of 73 respondents). Of those who have worked during their non-meal breaks, the vast majority have been paid for that work (26 of 29 respondents). (NOTE: the number of usable responses regarding pay for work during the break dropped sharply. To a much smaller degree, the same is true for the previous two questions regarding pay during the break and working during the break. Many responses had to be discarded as unusable because they were incompatible with previous responses. An example would be claiming either that you did or did not get paid for work during the break when you had earlier claimed that you have never worked during a break. It could be that many respondents were confused by this part of the survey, so it is not clear how reliable the data are.)

Work beyond 40 hours per week. More than 56% of those who respond indicated that they have worked more than 40 hours in a week. Table 21 shows details.

Table 21

Number and percentage of respondents having worked more than 40 hours in a week

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
HAVE WORKED MORE THAN 40 HOURS IN A WEEK	383	56.3%	297	43.7%

Over 70% indicate that they receive one and one half times their regular pay for hours worked over 40 per week, but a surprisingly high 27% do not. Approximately one eighth indicate that they have received time off rather than overtime for working more than 40 hours in a week. Table 22 shows the details.

Table 22

Pay and compensatory time for overtime work

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
PAID OVERTIME RATE OF 1 ½ REGULAR PAY?	260	73.0%	96	27.0%
PAID IN TIME OFF, RATHER THAN OVERTIME PAY?	40	12.4%	283	87.6%

The 96 respondents who are not paid one and one half times regular pay for hours over 40 per week are being treated illegally under the Fair Labor Standards Act. These respondents represent 27% of all those who work overtime who responded, and they represent 13.8% of the entire workforce, indicating that this violation is fairly widespread in the industry in Miami-Dade County.

Wage statement issues. Over 90% of the respondents receive a wage statement with their wages. And for those who do receive a statement, over 90% get a written wage rate and number of hours worked and an indication if more than 40 hours are worked. Over 95% find their wage statements to be accurate. Table 23 gives the details.

Table 23

Respondents' reception of wage statements, content of those statements, and their accuracy

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no	Total responses
RECEIVE WAGE STATEMENT?	631	91.3%	58	8.7%	691
SHOW WAGE RATE AND HOURS WORKED?	584	97.5%	15	2.5%	599
SHOW IF MORE THAN 40 HOURS WORKED?	477	90.5%	50	9.5%	527
GENERALLY ACCURATE?	585	95.7%	26	4.3%	611

Four of the respondents volunteer the information that they are paid in cash, not a check. There appear to be some irregularities in the manner of payment, but they do not seem to be widespread.

Training. Almost two thirds of the respondents have received training for their current job. Almost 90% of the time the employer require this training. However, in over a quarter of the cases, the respondent is not paid for the training received. Table 24 shows details.

Table 24
Frequency of training, employer requirement of training, and employer payment for training

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
RECEIVED TRAINING FOR PRESENT JOB?	433	64.7%	236	35.3%
TRAINING REQUIRED?	382	88.6%	49	11.4%
PAID WHILE TRAINING?	316	72.1%	122	27.9%

These results show that over half of the time employers require training, but once the training is provided, they pay for it only a little over a quarter of the time.

Uniforms. The vast majority of respondents (92%) are required to wear a uniform at work. Almost nine times out of ten the employer supplies this uniform. However, a little over half the respondents report having to do special cleaning of this uniform out of their own pocket, not at employer expense. Table 25 supplies details.

Table 25
Uniform requirements, employer provision of uniforms, and uniform cleaning expenses

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
UNIFORM REQUIRED?	640	92%	56	8%
EMPLOYER PROVIDES UNIFORM?	546	86.9%	82	13.1%
CLEANED AT OWN EXPENSE?	330	54.5%	275	45.5%

Wage deductions for breakage or for poor work performance. Slightly less than nine percent have deductions from their paycheck because they broke something or were considered underperforming. Table 26 shows the breakdown.

Table 26
Wage deductions for breakage or for poor work performance

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
WAGE DEDUCTIONS FOR BREAKAGE OR POOR WORK PERFORMANCE?	60	8.8%	621	91.2%

Differential treatment of men and women. Almost 70% of respondents say that at least some men and women at their place of work performed the same jobs. Of these, over 75% state that both sexes were paid the same rate for the same job; almost 10% claim they are not, and almost 14% do not know. Table 27 shows details.

Table 27
Workplaces with men and women performing the same job; comparative pay rates

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no	Don't know
MEN AND WOMEN PERFORMING SAME JOB AT YOUR WORKPLACE?	374	69.8%	162	30.2%	NA
IF YES, RECEIVE THE SAME PAY RATE?	270	76.5% (88.8% of yes or no answers)	34	9.6% (11.2% of yes or no answers)	49 (13.9%)

The almost 10% of employers who are paying women less for performing the same job are clearly discriminating against women and are breaking the law, if these respondents are correct in their claims. A second potential indication of discrimination might be the 30% that have no women and men performing the same job. These employers may be discriminating in hiring on the basis of sex.

Three further questions explored this possibility. Respondents were asked if women had ever been denied jobs held by men because they were women; if there were any women supervisors, and if women had ever been denied a supervisory job because they were women. Table 28 shows that only a little over 10% of respondents believe that their employers deny “male” jobs to women because they are women. A little over half have women supervisors, and only a very small percentage (2.6%) believe that women are denied supervisory jobs because of their sex. Table 28 gives the details.

Table 28
Incidence of employer sexual discrimination in hiring or promotions

	Yes	No	Don't Know
DOES EMPLOYER DENY CERTAIN JOBS TO WOMEN BECAUSE THEY ARE WOMEN?	72 (11.6%) (12.3% of yes or no answers)	513 (82.5%) (87.7% of yes or no answers)	37 (5.9%)
ARE THERE ANY WOMEN SUPERVISORS?	337 (52.7%)	296 (46.8%)	6 (.9%)
ARE WOMEN EVER DENIED SUPERVISORY JOBS BECAUSE THEY ARE WOMEN?	15 (2.6%) (2.8% of yes or no answers)	521 (89.2%) (97.2% of yes or no answers)	48 (8.2%)

Although almost half have no women supervisors at their place of work, very few respondents see this as the product of discrimination. Over 10% do perceive broader anti-female discriminatory hiring, however.

Asked to state the different types of jobs held by men and by women, respondents are most likely to mention cleaning/housekeeping/laundry as exclusively female jobs (62 responses) while maintenance is an exclusively male job (41 responses). Others mentioned less frequently, but only for one gender, are valet as an exclusively male job (12 responses) and office work (secretary, clerk, etc.) as an exclusively female job (8 responses). Security is slightly more likely to be seen as a “male” job, and front desk/concierge elicited evenly divided perceptions on gender among the few respondents (14 or 15) who mention these categories of workers.

Differential treatment by race or nationality. Over 90% of respondents say that at least some blacks and/or Hispanics perform the same jobs as white non-Hispanics at their workplace. Of these, over 85% state that the races and nationalities are paid the same rate for the same job; a little under 5% claim they are not, and almost 10% do not know. Table 29 shows details.

Table 29

Workplaces with blacks/Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites performing the same job; comparative pay rates

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no	Don't know
BLACKS/HISIPANICS AND WHITE NON- HISPANICS PERFORMING SAME JOB AT YOUR WORKPLACE?	554	93.9%	36	6.1%	NA
IF YES, RECEIVE THE SAME PAY RATE?	458	85.6% (95% of yes or no answers)	24	4.5% (5% of yes or no answers)	53 (9.9%)

The 4.5% of employers who are paying blacks and/or Hispanics less for performing the same job are clearly discriminating against minorities and are breaking the law, if these respondents are correct in their claims. Another potential indication of discrimination relates to hiring and promotion across the races and nationalities.

Three further questions explore this possibility. Respondents were asked if blacks and/or Hispanics had ever been denied jobs held by white non-Hispanics because of their race or nationality; if there were any black or Hispanic supervisors, and if blacks or Hispanics had ever been denied a supervisory job because of their race or nationality. Table 30 shows that less than 8% of respondents believe that their employers deny jobs to minorities due to their race or nationality. Almost 90% have black or Hispanic supervisors, and only an extremely small percentage (1.6%) believe that minorities are denied supervisory jobs because of their race or nationality. Table 30 gives the details.

**Table 30
Incidence of race or nationality discrimination by employer in hiring and promotion**

	Yes	No	Don't Know
DOES EMPLOYER DENY CERTAIN JOBS TO BLACKS OR HISPANICS BECAUSE OF THEIR RACE OR NATIONALITY?	51 (7.8%) (9% of yes or no answers)	513 (78.0%) (91% of yes or no answers)	94 (14.3%)
ARE THERE ANY BLACK OR HISPANIC SUPERVISORS?	593 (89.4%)	70 (10.6%)	NA
ARE BLACKS OR HISPANICS EVER DENIED SUPERVISORY JOBS BECAUSE OF THEIR RACE OR NATIONALITY?	10 (1.6%) (1.9% of yes or no answers)	511 (81.9%) (98.1% of yes or no answers)	103 (16.5%)

Discrimination on a racial or nationality basis is less of an issue for these workers than is discrimination against women. Almost 90% have at least one minority supervisor at their workplace, and less than 8% perceive any hiring bias against racial or nationality minorities.

Asked to state the different types of jobs held by different ethnicities and races, few give an answer. A few note that non-Hispanic whites are managers and held the better-paid maintenance positions. Two comments noted in the surveyors' field notes indicate that the **visibility** of positions **may be a source of discrimination**. One respondent states, "But people of color work night shifts. Board doesn't want to see them – only wants to see white valets." Another notes that "blacks always work night shift."

Health insurance and pension plans. Only 40% of respondents receive health insurance coverage from their employer, and only 30% of those with coverage have a plan that covers their family. Pension coverage is even worse: only eight percent have any type of pension plan from their employer. Table 31 gives details.

**Table 31
Health insurance and pension coverage of respondents**

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE?	275	40.0%	413	60.0%
IF HEALTH INSURANCE, COVER FAMILY?	71	29.7%	168	70.3%
PENSION PLAN?	54	8.0%	619	92.0%

The low level and low quality of health insurance coverage and the virtually non-existent level of employer pension plans are two major indicators of the poor quality of these jobs, along with the relatively low pay.

Vacation, sickness, or other paid days off. Over 40% of respondents do not get any paid vacation or paid sick days. And almost 85% do not get any other type of paid days off either. Table 32 gives details.

**Table 32
Employer provision of vacation, sickness, or other paid days off**

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
PAID TIME OFF FOR VACATION?	396	58.5%	281	41.5%
PAID TIME OFF FOR SICKNESS?	379	56.0%	298	44.0%
ANY OTHER PAID TIME OFF?	95	15.3%	525	84.7%

Other types of paid time off mentioned are holidays (30 responses), personal days (28 responses), death in the family (19 responses), and jury duty (4 responses).

The high number of employees with no vacation and no sick days is yet one more indication of the poor quality of these jobs.

Safety issues. Less than 10% of respondents felt that there is anything unsafe about the cleaning materials, the equipment, or the building. Table 33 shows details.

**Table 33
Perceptions of safety of cleaning materials, equipment, and buildings worked with**

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
UNSAFE CLEANING MATERIALS?	42	7.6%	502	92.4%
UNSAFE EQUIPMENT?	36	6.2%	542	93.8%
UNSAFE BUILDING?	25	3.7%	656	96.3%

The most frequently mentioned hazard is chemicals (breathing and skin exposure). Also mentioned more than once are electrical work, dust during renovations or repairs, poorly working elevators, malfunctioning carts, slippery floors, malfunctioning security or fire alarms, and carrying overly heavy luggage.

Almost 12% have been injured on the job. Table 34 gives details.

**Table 34
Injuries on the job**

	Number yes	% yes	Number no	% no
EVER BEEN INJURED ON THIS JOB?	80	11.8%	600	88.2%

Respondents mention cuts or injuries to hands (24 responses), slipping and falling on floors or down stairs (14 responses), and falling from a ladder (13 responses). Others mentioned more than once include back injuries or hernias from heavy lifting, being hit on the head, twisting or hurting one's knee, being hit on the back from falling objects, and assault. Only one response mentions inhaling chemicals, despite this being the biggest fear raised previously. This is

probably because respondents realize that the danger from inhaling chemicals usually is a long-term health problem, not an immediate accident problem.

Employer provision of housing. Given the residential nature of the industry, respondents were asked if the employer provided them with housing. Very few (16, or 2.3% of respondents) are given such housing. Those who are given housing are never required to pay for it.

Employer provision of transportation to and from the job. Virtually no employers provide transportation to and from the job. Only 10 (1.5%) percent of respondents indicate that they receive transportation from their employer, and of these, only one has to pay the employer for this transportation.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF PAY AND WORKING CONDITIONS IN THE MIAMI-DADE CONDOMINIUM EMPLOYMENT SECTOR

To summarize the general results concerning the pay and working conditions of this workforce, we can state that they have a relatively short tenure on the job and therefore high turnover. A majority has worked for their present employer less than two years. Most work five or more days a week, meaning that part-time employment is not pervasive. Pay is quite low, and over 10% receive less than the minimum wage of \$5.15 per hour. Over a third earn less than \$7.00 per hour. Median pay is \$7.10 per hour; the average (mean) is \$7.58 per hour. However, almost half receive tips on their job. The median amount of tips is about \$2.50 per hour, meaning that tipped employees earn approximately one third of their income this way.

Between 15-20% work before or after their recorded work hours, and a majority of these are not compensated for this work. This is a clear violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). Almost a fourth of those who work during their meal break are likewise not paid, another FLSA violation. A majority work overtime, and over a quarter of these do not receive one and half times their normal pay, another FLSA violation.

On average, about 10% of respondents perceive employer sexual discrimination, both on the issue of equal pay for equal work and discriminatory hiring practices. But less than 3% perceive discrimination against women in promotion to supervisory positions. Regarding racial or nationality discrimination, between 4-8% see discrimination on equal pay for equal work or hiring, and under 2% believe the employer denies supervisory promotions on the basis of race or nationality.

Sixty percent of respondents receive no health insurance coverage, and of the 40% who do, in less than a third of the cases does it cover family members. Ninety two percent of respondents receive no pension plan from their employer. More than 40% receive no paid vacation time, and the same is true for sick leave.

Less than 10% of respondents see anything dangerous about their work situation. Yet, almost 12% have been injured on the job.

While the pay and conditions are not quite as poor as those of fast food workers, for example, the overall picture is one of relatively poor pay and inferior conditions. Low pay, the almost total lack of pensions, a majority receiving no health insurance, health insurance for the minority receiving it that usually does not cover the family, reliance on tips for many as a significant proportion of their income, and high turnover are indications that this workforce receives less than adequate compensation and terms/conditions of employment.

A CLOSER LOOK BY JOB CATEGORY

To gain greater insight into the pay and conditions of these workers, we break out the workforce into different categories. Most of the workers fall into five categories: valets, security, maintenance, housekeeping, and front desk/concierge. We briefly examine the highlights of the data for each of these categories of workers. In general, to keep the length of this report down, information will be presented on a particular category of worker only if the results indicate something interesting in relation to results already given for the overall sample.

Valets.

One hundred ninety four of the 696 respondents (27.9%) are valets, valet supervisors, valet managers, valet cashiers, etc. A few valets also perform as a security worker, concierge, doorman, etc., but if their main job appears to be as a valet, they are included in this category.

Valets come almost exclusively from South America, Central America, or the Caribbean. Only nine of the 194 respondents come from the U.S. (5 persons) or the European continent (4 persons). Only 10 are from Cuba, meaning that **the U.S., Cuba, and Europe supply less than 10% of the valet workers.** Aside from three Haitians and one person from Belize, all come from Spanish-speaking countries or from Brazil, which is a Portuguese-speaking country. They are **overwhelmingly male (96% vs. 83% for the sample as a whole).**

Valets are slightly less likely to be married than are condominium workers as a whole (46% vs. 53%). They are **better educated than the already quite educated condominium workforce; over a third (35.6%) have a college or graduate degree,** compared to 26% for the overall condominium sample. And only 8.3% have less than a high school education, compared to 10.5% in the overall sample.

Despite the higher educational attainment, they are likely to be poorer than other condominium workers. Fifty six percent had a family income of less than \$20,000 in the previous year, compared to 46% for the sample as a whole. And only 0.6% had a family income of \$45,000 or more, compared to 8% for the sample as a whole. Their median personal income in the previous year was \$15,100, somewhat lower than the \$16,000 for the entire sample.

Almost four fifths of these workers are employed by an outside contractor, not the condominium board or condominium itself. Table 35 shows the details.

Table 35
Type of employer for valet respondents

	# outside contractor	% outside contractor	# condominium	% condominium
EMPLOYER	153	78.9%	41	21.1%

Thirty two percent of valets (62 of 194 respondents) have worked for their employer less than a year, comparable to the slightly over 36% in the same status for the overall sample. Valet employment is somewhat more likely to be part-time than is other condominium employment: 23.2% of valets (45 of 194 respondents) work part-time, while only 13.2% do for the overall sample.

Wages are lower for valets than for the entire sample (although it should be remembered that this is a “tipped” profession). Wages range from \$2.50 per hour to \$12 per hour, with a **median hourly wage of \$6.00 per hour**. The average (mean) is \$5.83 per hour. Table 36 shows details.

Table 36
Hourly wages for valet respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY WAGES	\$12.00	\$2.50	\$6.00	\$5.83

Government statistics indicate that “parking lot attendants” in the Miami SMSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area) earn a median wage of \$7.13 per hour, and an average (mean) wage of \$7.85 per hour (see website: www.labormarketinfo.com/ows/ows.htm). It is unclear how much money in tips has been included in this income reported to the government, however. For the condominium valets, over 90% of these employees receive tips on the job. Table 37 shows details.

Table 37
Numbers and percentages of valet respondents receiving tips on the job

	Yes	No	Don’t know, or blank
RECEIVE TIPS?	180 (92.8%)	9 (4.6%)	5 (2.6%)

The hourly rate of tips received ranges from \$.50 per hour to \$10.00 per hour, with a median of \$3.13 and an average (mean) of \$3.55. Table 38 shows details.

Table 38
Hourly tips for valet respondents who receive tips

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY TIPS	\$10.00	\$.50	\$3.13	\$3.55

If we combine the wages and tips for each valet employee, and eliminate those who failed to respond to one of the two questions (leaving 181 responses), we arrive at a **total hourly compensation** between \$5.00 and \$15.00 per hour. The **median is \$8.89** and the mean is \$9.18. Table 39 gives details.

Table 39
Total hourly compensation for valet respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
TOTAL HOURLY COMPENSATION (WAGES + TIPS)	\$15.00	\$5.00	\$8.89	\$9.18

For those working 40 hours a week for 52 weeks a year, the **median hourly compensation** of \$8.89 per hour translates into an income of **almost \$18,500 per year**. **Over one third of this income comes from tips.**

Valets are somewhat less likely to work before or after their recorded work time period than the entire workforce (approximately 10% and 13% have respectively, vs. 15% and 17%). However, if they do, they are more likely to be paid for it (approximately 53% and 71% respectively, vs. 33% and 46% for the entire workforce). They are also much less likely to receive a meal break (47% vs. 70% for the entire sample), but once again, if they do they are a little more likely to be paid for any work done during that break (84% vs. 75%). Nevertheless, they still have the same FLSA violations found elsewhere, albeit a little less frequently. However, valets experience more overtime pay violations: a little over a third (34.2%) vs. 27% for the entire sample.

Valets appear to have a few more irregularities in form of wage payment than does the sample as a whole. For example, all four respondents who volunteered the information that they were paid in cash are valets, and almost 5% less receive a wage statement than is true for the sample as a whole.

This predominantly male workforce perceives little discrimination against women. Ninety nine percent think women at their workplace receive equal pay for equal work. They share with the overall workforce a belief that women are not denied jobs due to their gender (over 86%), and that women are not denied promotions to supervisory positions in a discriminatory manner (97%).

Only one respondent alleges that his employer does not provide equal pay for equal work across lines of race or nationality. Slightly over 10% claim that their employer hires in a manner that is discriminatory to blacks or Hispanics. And, similar to the entire sample, less than three percent perceive denial of promotions on the basis of race or nationality. Interestingly, workers originally from Brazil are most likely to perceive discrimination, followed by Colombians, Argentinians, and Peruvians.

Valets are considerably worse off than the entire condominium workforce in regards to health insurance, pension coverage, vacation pay, sick pay, or any other paid time off. **Only 24% have health insurance coverage (compared to 40% of the entire sample)**. For those that do, family coverage is similar to that for the entire sample. **Only 4% have a pension plan (compared to 8% for the entire sample.) Slightly under 37% receive any vacation pay (compared to 58.5% of the entire sample.) Only 43% receive any sick pay (compared to 56% of the**

entire sample.) And only seven percent receive any other type of paid time off (compared to 15% of the entire sample.)

Safety is a very minor concern for valets, other than dust from construction work nearby. And valets are injured at an almost identical rate to that of the condominium employee population as a whole.

Security Workers.

One hundred fifty four of the 696 respondents (22.1%) are security guards, security officers, security supervisors, or security specialist. In cases of multiple job duties, if a respondents’ main job appears to be security, they are included in this category.

Almost a third of security workers come from the United States (32.5%). Cuba (14.3%), Haiti (8.4%), and English-speaking Caribbean countries (4.2%) supply an additional 26.9%. With 1.3% coming from Russia or Africa, those coming from South America, Central America, or the Spanish-speaking Caribbean other than Cuba comprise less than 40% of the workforce (37.7%). This is a decidedly less “Latin” and more “American” set of workers than is the valet workforce. It is also less exclusively male. Over a fifth (20.8%) are women, close to the 17% for the overall sample.

Security workers are slightly less likely to be married than are condominium workers as a whole (48% vs. 53%). They have proportionately fewer college or graduate degrees than the overall condominium workforce, but higher high school graduation rates. Just over one in seven (15.6%) has a college or graduate degree, compared to 26% for the overall condominium sample. But over two fifths (41.6%) have graduated from high school, well above the 30% for the entire sample.

Despite the absence of college degrees, security workers are likely to have family incomes somewhat higher than that of other condominium workers. Identical to the sample as a whole, 46% had a family income of less than \$20,000 in the previous year, but a number had relatively high family incomes. Almost 10% had a family income of \$45,000 or more, compared to 8% for the sample as a whole. Their median personal income in the previous year was \$17,000, somewhat above the \$16,000 median personal income of the entire sample.

Over four fifths of these workers are employed by an outside contractor, not the condominium board or condominium itself. Table 35 shows the details.

Table 40
Type of employer for security worker respondents

	# outside contractor	% outside contractor	# condominium	% condominium
EMPLOYER	123	81.5%	28	18.5%

Slightly over 36% of security workers (56 of 154 respondents) have worked for their employer less than a year, comparable to the slightly over 36% in the same status for the overall sample. Approximately 15% of security employees (23 of 153 responses) work part-time, comparable to the 13.2% figure for the entire sample.

Wages are slightly higher for security workers than for the entire sample. Wages range from \$5.25 per hour to \$12.25 per hour, with a **median hourly wage of \$8.00 per hour**. The average (mean) is \$7.96 per hour. The comparable figures for the entire sample are \$7.10 per hour and \$7.58 per hour. Table 41 shows details.

Table 41
Hourly wages for security worker respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY WAGES	\$12.25	\$5.25	\$8.00	\$7.96

This compares with government statistics showing that security guards in the Miami area receive a median wage of \$8.24 per hour, with an average (mean) of \$8.07 per hour. The slightly higher wages that condominium security workers receive than other condominium workers are offset by the fact that fewer security workers receive tips than an average condominium worker, and when they do, they earn less in tips. Less than 30% of security workers receive tips on the job. Table 42 shows details.

Table 42
Numbers and percentages of security worker respondents receiving tips on the job

	Yes	No	Don't know, or blank
RECEIVE TIPS?	45 (29.2%)	109 (70.8%)	0 (0%)

The hourly rate of tips received ranges from \$.09 per hour to \$6.25 per hour, with a median of \$0.63 and an average (mean) of \$1.42. Table 43 shows details.

Table 43
Hourly tips for security worker respondents who receive tips

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY TIPS	\$6.25	\$.09	\$0.63	\$1.42

If we combine the wages and tips for each security employee, and eliminate those who failed to respond to one of the two questions (leaving 130 responses), we arrive at hourly compensation levels between \$5.25 and \$14.75 per hour. The median is \$8.00 and the mean is \$8.25. Table 44 gives details.

Table 44
Total hourly compensation for security worker respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
TOTAL HOURLY COMPENSATION (WAGES + TIPS)	\$14.75	\$5.25	\$8.00	\$8.25

For those working 40 hours a week for 52 weeks a year, the **median hourly compensation** of \$8.00 per hour translates into an income of **\$16,640 per year**. Very little of this income comes from tips.

Security workers are more likely to work before or after their recorded work time period than is the entire workforce (approximately 23% and 20% have respectively, vs. 15% and 17%). If they do, they are likely to be paid for it at approximately the same rate (43% and 44% respectively, vs. 33% and 46% for the entire workforce). They are likely to receive a meal break in comparable proportions to the entire sample (66% vs. 70% for the entire sample) and if they do they are a little more likely to be paid for any work done during that break (83% vs. 75%). Nevertheless, they still have the same FLSA violations found elsewhere, albeit a little less frequently. They are also less likely to experience overtime pay violations: 17% vs. 27% for the entire sample.

Security workers have fewer irregularities in form of wage payment than does the sample as a whole. Only four percent did not receive a wage statement, compared to almost 9% for the sample as a whole. Accuracy of wage statements is also perceived as higher.

Thirteen percent of security workers think women at their workplace do not receive equal pay for equal work, slightly above the 11% for the sample as a whole. They share with the overall workforce a belief that women are not denied jobs due to their gender (88%), and that women are not denied promotions to supervisory positions in a discriminatory manner (98%). Those perceiving sexual discrimination are equally likely to be male as female.

Almost eight and one half percent think that the employer does not provide equal pay for equal work to those of different races and nationalities, somewhat above the 5% figure for the sample as a whole. Over 14% perceive racially or nationally discriminatory hiring practices, well over the 9% figure for the entire sample. But few (1.7%) see denial of promotions on the basis of race or nationality. No nationality patterns are apparent for those alleging discrimination.

Security workers have a mixed record compared to condominium workers as a whole in the areas of health insurance, pension coverage, vacation pay, sick pay, or any other paid time off. Thirty six percent have health insurance coverage (compared to 40% of the entire sample). That insurance is more likely to cover the family, however (39% compared to 30% for the overall sample). Eleven percent have a pension plan (compared to 8% for the entire sample.) Sixty one percent receive vacation pay (compared to 58.5% of the entire sample.) Only 44% receive any sick pay (compared to 56% of the entire sample.) And only 10% receive any other type of paid time off (compared to 15% of the entire sample.)

Safety is a very minor concern for security workers. Approximately 10.5% have been injured on the job, slightly below the sample rate of almost 12%.

Maintenance workers.

Eighty nine of the 696 respondents (12.8%) are maintenance workers. In this category we place all types of skilled and semi-skilled repair workers (air conditioning, electrical, plumbing,

carpentry, etc.), as well as painters, landscaping and outside maintenance, “general handyman”, etc.

Almost half of the maintenance workers come from Cuba (44.4%). Colombia (8.9%) and the U.S. (7.8%) supply almost 17% more. Virtually all the rest come from Central or South America or the Caribbean. This appears to be a “Cuban niche” in the condominium workforce. It is **100% male**.

Maintenance workers are much **more likely to be married** than are condominium workers as a whole (67% vs. 53%). They have **less formal education than the overall condominium workforce**. Almost 16% have not graduated from high school (compared to 10.5% for the entire sample), and just over 32% have attended any college (compared to 50% of the overall sample). Twenty one percent have a college or graduate degree, compared to 26% for the entire sample.

Despite the lesser formal education, maintenance workers are likely to have family incomes equal to or a bit higher than other condominium workers. A slightly smaller percentage have family incomes of less than \$20,000 per year than for the over sample (43% vs. 46%). Almost 6% have a family income of \$45,000 or more, compared to 8% for the sample as a whole. Their median personal income in the previous year was \$18,000, above the \$16,000 median personal income of the entire sample.

Almost half of these workers are employed by an outside contractor, not the condominium board or condominium itself. Table 45 shows the details.

Table 45
Type of employer for maintenance worker respondents

	# outside contractor	% outside contractor	# condominium	% condominium
EMPLOYER	42	48.3%	45	51.7%

Over half of those working for an outside contractor work for one employer, the Continental Group, which appears to be the dominant contractor employer for this type of worker in the condominium sector.

Maintenance workers stay with their employer longer than do condominium workers as a whole. Just over a quarter (26.7%) have been with their employer less than a year, compared to well over a third (36.4%) for all condo workers. And less than half (48.8% have been with their present employer less than two years, compared to almost 60% for the overall sample (57.5%). Over a quarter (26.7%) have more than five years with their current employer, compared to only 15.5% of the entire sample. **They are also considerably less likely to work part-time.** Only 5.6% are part-time workers, compared to 13.2% of the overall sample.

Wages are considerably higher for maintenance workers than for the entire sample. They range from \$5.15 per hour to \$19.00 per hour, with a **median hourly wage of \$9.00 per hour**. The average (mean) is \$9.36 per hour. The comparable figures for the entire sample are \$7.10 per hour and \$7.58 per hour. Table 46 shows details.

Table 46

Hourly wages for maintenance worker respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY WAGES	\$19.00	\$5.15	\$9.00	\$9.36

Government statistics show that general maintenance and repair workers in the Miami area receive a median wage of \$11.35 per hour, with an average (mean) of \$12.22 per hour (www.labormarketinfo.com/ows/ows.htm). Landscaping and groundskeeping workers earn a median \$8.84 per hour wage, with an average (mean) of \$9.48 per hour (www.labormarketinfo.com/ows/ows.htm). The condominium workers considered “maintenance” for the purposes of this study include both categories of workers. However, the vast majority of them are repair/maintenance workers by any definition. This would indicate that the condominium workers are underpaid compared to their counterparts in the area. To eliminate any possible “contamination” from groundskeeping or landscaping workers (or from any possible mis-classification of mere janitors as “maintenance”, all outside groundskeeping/landscaping workers were taken out of the sample, along with four workers whose description of their work was ambiguous enough that they perhaps should be considered simply janitors or housekeepers or house cleaners. Even with these workers eliminated, the condo maintenance workers had an unchanged median wage of \$9.00 per hour. The average (mean) wage rose slightly from \$9.36 to \$9.64 per hour. But \$9 and \$9.64 are still well below \$11.35 and \$12.22, indicating that **these workers are indeed paid well below the level of their counterparts working elsewhere in the area.**

The slightly higher wages that condominium maintenance workers receive than other condominium workers are offset by the fact that far fewer maintenance workers receive tips than an average condominium worker, and when they do, they earn less in tips. Only 18% of maintenance workers receive tips on the job (compared to 47% of the entire sample). Table 47 shows details.

Table 47

Numbers and percentages of maintenance worker respondents receiving tips on the job

	Yes	No	Don’t know, or blank
RECEIVE TIPS?	16 (18%)	72 (80.9%)	1 (1.1%)

For those few receiving tips, the hourly rate of tips received ranges from \$0.25 per hour to \$2.50 per hour, with a median of \$0.69 and an average (mean) of \$0.96. Table 48 shows details.

Table 48

Hourly tips for maintenance worker respondents who receive tips

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY TIPS	\$2.50	\$.25	\$0.69	\$0.96

If we combine the wages and tips for each maintenance employee, and eliminate those who failed to respond to one of the two questions (leaving 75 responses), we arrive at hourly

compensation levels between \$5.15 and \$19.00 per hour. The median is \$9.07 and the mean is \$9.46. Table 49 gives details.

Table 49
Total hourly compensation for maintenance worker respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
TOTAL HOURLY COMPENSATION (WAGES + TIPS)	\$19.00	\$5.15	\$9.07	\$9.46

No matter how one analyzes the data, indications are that maintenance workers in the condominium sector are paid considerably less than comparable workers outside the condominium sector.

For those working 40 hours a week for 52 weeks a year, the **median hourly compensation** of \$9.07 per hour translates into an income of **\$18,866 per year**. Almost none of this income comes from tips.

Maintenance workers are slightly more likely to work before or after their recorded work time period than is the entire workforce (approximately 16% and 20% respectively, vs. 15% and 17%). When they work prior to commencement of their shift, they are never paid for it (0%). When they work past their shift, they are slightly more likely to be paid for it than are condo workers as a whole (57% vs. 46% for the entire workforce). They virtually always get a meal break (98% of respondents, compared to 70% for the entire sample). However, if they work during that break, they are much less likely to be paid for it (49% vs. 75% for the entire sample). Thus, in greater and lesser proportions, they have the same FLSA violations found elsewhere. They are much more likely to experience overtime pay violations: 41% vs. 27% for the entire sample.

Maintenance workers have a few more irregularities in the form of their wage payment than does the sample as a whole. Over 10% do not receive a wage statement, compared to slightly under 9% for the sample as a whole. Wage statements are perceived to be accurate in almost identical proportions (around 96%) in both populations.

Sixteen percent of maintenance workers think women at their workplace do not receive equal pay for equal work, higher than the 11% for the sample as a whole. (Recall that maintenance workers are 100% male.) They share with the overall workforce a belief that women are not denied jobs due to their gender (92.5%), and that women are not denied promotions to supervisory positions in a discriminatory manner (97%).

Almost 15% think that the employer does not provide equal pay for equal work for all races and nationalities, well above the 5% figure for the sample as a whole. Only seven percent perceive racially or nationally discriminatory hiring practices, under the 9% figure for the entire sample. Few (1.6%) see denial of promotions on the basis of race or nationality.

Maintenance workers tend to be better off than condominium workers as a whole in the areas of health insurance, vacation pay, sick pay, or any other paid time off. But their pension coverage is slightly worse, and their health insurance is less likely to cover the entire family. Almost 52%

have health insurance coverage (compared to 40% of the entire sample). That insurance is less likely to cover the family, however (16% compared to 30% for the overall sample). Only five percent have a pension plan (compared to 8% for the entire sample.) Seventy seven percent receive vacation pay (compared to 58.5% of the entire sample.) Seventy two percent receive sick pay (compared to 56% of the entire sample.) And 22% receive some other type of paid time off (compared to 15% of the entire sample.)

Safety is a much more important concern for maintenance workers than it is for other condo workers. In all areas they are more likely to perceive unsafe conditions: cleaning materials (17% vs. 8%), equipment (12% vs. 6%), and the building (8% vs. 4%). Approximately 19% have been injured on the job, well above the entire condo sample rate of almost 12%.

Housekeeping and Cleaning.

One hundred and five of the 696 respondents (15.1%) are housekeeping or cleaning workers. In this category we place all those who describe their work as cleaning, polishing, putting out garbage, supervising housekeepers, cleaning carpets, vacuuming, laundry work, dusting, mopping, or general custodial housekeeping work.

Twenty two percent of housekeeping workers come from Cuba. Another 20% come from Colombia. Virtually all the rest come from Central or South America or the Caribbean. Only nine Haitians (8.6%) and one American (0.95%) are not native speakers of Spanish. Thus, this is an overwhelmingly Spanish “niche” in the condominium workforce. It is **61% male, 39% female.**

Housekeeping workers are slightly more likely to be married than are condominium workers as a whole (58% vs. 53%). They have **less formal education than the overall condominium workforce.** Almost 21% have not graduated from high school (compared to 10.5% for the entire sample), and just over 39% have attended any college (compared to 50% of the overall sample). Twenty three percent have a college or graduate degree, compared to 26% for the entire sample.

Housekeeping workers are likely to have family incomes that are lower than the incomes of other condominium workers. A higher percentage have family incomes of less than \$20,000 per year than for the over sample (54% vs. 46%). Only 1% has a family income of \$45,000 or more, compared to 8% for the sample as a whole. Their median personal income in the previous year was \$13,500, well below the \$16,000 median personal income of the entire sample.

Almost three quarters of these workers (73.1%) are employed by an outside contractor, which is close to the percentage for the entire condo worker sample (78.9%). Table 50 shows the details.

Table 50
Type of employer for housekeeping worker respondents

	# outside contractor	% outside contractor	# condominium	% condominium
EMPLOYER	76	73.1%	28	26.9%

Almost half of those working for an outside contractor work for either the Continental Group or Preferred Building Services. These two appear to be the dominant contractors for this category of employee in the condominium sector.

Housekeeping workers stay with their employer for shorter periods than do condominium workers as a whole. Almost 41% have been with their employer less than a year, compared to 36.4% for all condo workers. Almost 65% have been with their present employer less than two years, compared to almost 57.5% for the overall sample. Well under one in ten (8.6%) have more than five years with their current employer, compared to 15.5% of the entire sample. **They are also considerably less likely to work part-time.** Only 1.9% are part-time workers, compared to 13.2% of the overall sample.

Wages are slightly lower for housekeeping workers than for the entire sample. They range from \$5.15 per hour to \$11.00 per hour, with a **median hourly wage of \$7.00 per hour.** The average (mean) is \$7.24 per hour. The comparable figures for the entire sample are \$7.10 per hour and \$7.58 per hour. Table 51 shows details.

Table 51
Hourly wages for housekeeping worker respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY WAGES	\$11.00	\$5.15	\$7.00	\$7.24

Government statistics show that janitors and cleaners in the Miami area receive a median wage of \$7.88 per hour, with an average (mean) of \$8.23 per hour (www.labormarketinfo.com/ows/ows.htm). **These condominium workers are therefore being paid close to a dollar an hour below the level of their counterparts working elsewhere in the area.**

Compounding the lower wages that these housekeeping workers receive than other condominium workers, they are also less likely to receive tips, and when they do, they earn less in tips. Only 13.3% of housekeeping workers receive tips on the job (compared to 47% of the entire sample). Table 52 shows details.

Table 52
Numbers and percentages of housekeeping worker respondents receiving tips on the job

	Yes	No	Don't know, or blank
RECEIVE TIPS?	14 (13.3%)	91 (86.7%)	0 (0%)

For those few receiving tips, the hourly rate of tips received ranges from \$0.25 per hour to \$12.50 per hour, with a median of \$1.25 and an average (mean) of \$3.21. (The mean is skewed sharply upward by one of thirteen respondents claiming \$12.50 per hour, well above all the others.) Table 53 shows details.

Table 53
Hourly tips for housekeeping worker respondents who receive tips

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY TIPS	\$12.50	\$.25	\$1.25	\$3.21

If we combine the wages and tips for each housekeeping employee, and eliminate those who failed to respond to one of the two questions (leaving 102 responses), we arrive at hourly compensation levels between \$5.15 and \$16.00 per hour. The median is \$7.00 and the mean is \$7.53. Tips are so infrequent that these figures are close to the figures obtained before tips were factored in. Table 54 gives details.

Table 54
Total hourly compensation for housekeeping worker respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
TOTAL HOURLY COMPENSATION (WAGES + TIPS)	\$16.00	\$5.15	\$7.00	\$7.53

No matter how one analyzes the data, indications are that housekeeping workers in the condominium sector are paid less than comparable workers outside the condominium sector.

For those working 40 hours a week for 52 weeks a year, the **median hourly compensation** of \$7.00 per hour translates into an income of **\$14,560 per year**. Very little of this meager income comes from tips.

Housekeeping workers are slightly less likely to work before or after their recorded work time period than is the entire workforce (approximately 9.5% and 14% respectively, vs. 15% and 17%). When they work prior to commencement of their shift, one third of them are paid for it (33.3%), identical to the overall sample. When they work past their shift, they are paid for it 46% of the time, again identical to the entire condo workforce. They are more likely to get a meal break than is the overall sample (84% of respondents, compared to 70% for the entire sample). However, if they work during that break, they are less likely to be paid for it (59% vs. 75% for the entire sample). Thus, in equal and greater proportions, they have the same FLSA violations found elsewhere. They are much more likely to experience overtime pay violations: 43% vs. 27% for the entire sample.

Housekeeping workers are virtually identical to the overall population regarding irregularities in the form of their wage payment. Slightly under 9% do not receive a wage statement, similar to the sample as a whole. Wage statements are perceived to be accurate in almost identical proportions (96%-97%) in both populations.

Over twenty percent of housekeeping workers believe that women at their workplace do not receive equal pay for equal work, almost double the 11% rate for the sample as a whole. (Recall that housekeeping workers are 39% female, over double the 17% rate for the entire sample.) They share with the overall workforce a belief that women are not denied jobs due to their gender (88%, identical to the overall sample), and that women are not denied promotions to supervisory positions in a discriminatory manner (96% vs. 97%).

Slightly over 5% think that the employer does not provide equal pay for equal work for all races and nationalities, equivalent to the 5% figure for the sample as a whole. Less than 6% perceive racially or nationally discriminatory hiring practices, under the 9% figure for the entire sample. Few (2.9%) see denial of promotions on the basis of race or nationality.

Housekeeping workers have a mixed but mostly worse record compared to condominium workers as a whole in the areas of health insurance, vacation pay, sick pay, or any other paid time off. Slightly over 41% have health insurance coverage (compared to 40% of the entire sample). That insurance is much less likely to cover the family, however (6% compared to 30% for the overall sample). Only five percent have a pension plan (compared to 8% for the entire sample.) Fifty three and a half percent receive vacation pay (compared to 58.5% of the entire sample.) Slightly over sixty three percent receive sick pay (compared to 56% of the entire sample.) And just over 12% receive some other type of paid time off (compared to 15% of the entire sample.)

Safety is a more important concern for housekeeping workers than it is for other condo workers. In most areas they are more likely to perceive unsafe conditions: cleaning materials (18% vs. 8%), equipment (12% vs. 6%), and the building (4% vs. 4%). Sixteen and a half percent have been injured on the job, above the entire condo sample rate of almost 12%.

Concierge and Front Desk Workers.

Ninety four of the 696 respondents (13.5%) are concierge or front desk workers. In this category we place all those who described their work as front desk, concierge, front desk manager, receptionist, front desk security officer, or receiving department.

Over twenty one percent of front desk workers come from the United States. Slightly over eighteen percent come from Cuba. Together these two categories comprise almost two of every five workers. Five of the eight surveyed in the entire sample born in a Western European country are front desk workers. English speaking Caribbean nations also contribute eight and a half percent of front desk workers. Thus, this is a much less Spanish “niche” of the condominium workforce, although Cubans are well represented. It is **73% male, 27% female.**

Front desk workers are married in similar proportions to condominium workers as a whole (52% vs. 53%). They generally have **more formal education than the overall condominium workforce.** Only 2% have not graduated from high school (compared to 10.5% for the entire sample), and 34% have a college or graduate degree, compared to 26% for the entire sample.

Front desk workers generally have higher family incomes than the incomes of other condominium workers. A lower percentage have family incomes of less than \$20,000 per year than for the over sample (38% vs. 46%). Over 11% have a family income over \$45,000, compared to 8% for the sample as a whole. Their median personal income in the previous year was \$18,000, above the \$16,000 median personal income of the entire sample.

Less of these workers are employed by an outside contractor than is true for the entire condo worker sample (68.1% vs. 78.9%). Table 55 shows the details.

Table 55
Type of employer for front desk worker respondents

	# outside contractor	% outside contractor	# condominium	% condominium
EMPLOYER	64	68.1%	30	31.9%

Half of those working for an outside contractor work for the Continental Group (32 employees). Miami Management (7) and Elite Security (6) are the second and third largest outside contractors in this sector.

Front desk workers stay with their employer for slightly shorter periods than do condominium workers as a whole. Almost 41% have been with their employer less than a year, compared to 36.4% for all condo workers. Sixty two and a half percent have been with their present employer less than two years, compared to almost 57.5% for the overall sample. Just over fourteen and a half percent have more than five years with their current employer, compared to 15.5% of the entire sample. They are slightly more likely to work part-time. A little over 14.5% part-time workers, compared to 13.2% of the overall sample.

Wages are higher for front desk workers than for the entire sample. They range from \$5.25 per hour to \$15.00 per hour, with a **median hourly wage of \$8.70 per hour**. The average (mean) is \$8.73 per hour. The comparable figures for the entire sample are \$7.10 per hour and \$7.58 per hour. Table 56 shows details.

Table 56
Hourly wages for front desk worker respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY WAGES	\$15.00	\$5.25	\$8.70	\$8.73

Government statistics show that concierges in the Miami area receive a median wage of \$9.09 per hour, with an average (mean) of \$9.46 per hour (www.labormarketinfo.com/ows/ows.htm). Thus, these condominium workers are paid somewhat below the level of their counterparts working elsewhere in the area, if tips are not taken into consideration. (But see later, after tips are considered.)

Front desk workers are very slightly less likely to receive tips than are condo workers as a whole. Almost 44% receive tips on the job, compared to 47% of the entire sample. Table 57 shows details.

Table 57
Numbers and percentages of front desk worker respondents receiving tips on the job

	Yes	No	Don't know, or blank
RECEIVE TIPS?	41 (43.6%)	53 (56.4%)	0 (0%)

For those few receiving tips, the hourly rate of tips received ranges from \$0.13 per hour to \$6.25 per hour, with a median of \$1.25 and an average (mean) of \$1.58. Table 58 shows details.

Table 58
Hourly tips for front desk worker respondents who receive tips

	High	Low	Median	Mean
HOURLY TIPS	\$6.50	\$.13	\$1.25	\$1.58

If we combine the wages and tips for each maintenance employee, and eliminate those who failed to respond to one of the two questions (leaving 85 responses), we arrive at hourly compensation levels between \$5.25 and \$21.25 per hour. The median is \$9.50 and the mean is \$9.31. Table 59 gives details.

Table 59
Total hourly compensation for front desk worker respondents

	High	Low	Median	Mean
TOTAL HOURLY COMPENSATION (WAGES + TIPS)	\$21.25	\$5.25	\$9.50	\$9.31

Total compensation levels actually exceed wage levels given in government figures for concierges in the Miami area, so it is not clear that these workers are paid less than comparable workers outside the condominium sector.

For those working 40 hours a week for 52 weeks a year, the **median hourly compensation** of \$9.50 per hour translates into an income of **\$19,760 per year**.

Front desk workers are roughly equally likely to work before or after their recorded work time period as the entire workforce (approximately 16% and 18.5% respectively, vs. 15% and 17%). When they work prior to commencement of their shift, over 45% of them are paid for it (45.5%), vs. 33% of the overall sample. When they work past their shift, they are paid for it only 25% of the time, much less often than for the entire condo workforce (46%). They are slightly more likely to get a meal break than is the overall sample (75.5% of respondents, compared to 70% for the entire sample). However, if they work during that break, they are less likely to be paid for it (62.5% vs. 75% for the entire sample). Thus, they have the same FLSA violations found elsewhere, in varying proportions. But they are less likely to experience overtime pay violations: 22% vs. 27% for the entire sample.

Front desk workers are less likely than the overall population to have irregularities in the form of their wage payment. Just over 5% do not receive a wage statement, well below the 9% for the sample as a whole. Wage statements are perceived to be accurate in almost identical proportions (97%) in both populations.

Only 9.6% of front desk workers believe that women at their workplace do not receive equal pay for equal work, less than the 11% rate for the sample as a whole. (Recall that front desk workers are 27% female, more than the 17% rate for the entire sample.) They share with the overall workforce a belief that women are not denied jobs due to their gender (84.5%, just under the 88% of the overall sample), and that women are not denied promotions to supervisory positions in a discriminatory manner (97.6% vs. 97%).

Slightly over 4% think that the employer does not provide equal pay for equal work for all races and nationalities, close to the 5% figure for the sample as a whole. Slightly over 5% perceive racially or nationally discriminatory hiring practices, under the 9% figure for the entire sample. Not one respondent perceives employer denial of promotions on the basis of race or nationality.

Front desk workers have much better coverage than condominium workers as a whole in the areas of health insurance, vacation pay, sick pay, or any other paid time off. Almost 56% have health insurance coverage (compared to 40% of the entire sample). That insurance is also more likely to cover the family (almost 42% compared to 30% for the overall sample). Over 13% have a pension plan (compared to 8% for the entire sample.) Over 71% receive vacation pay (compared to 58.5% of the entire sample.) Over 66% receive sick pay (compared to 56% of the entire sample.) And almost 22% receive some other type of paid time off (compared to 15% of the entire sample.)

Safety is much less of a concern for front desk workers than for other condo workers. In all areas they perceive almost no unsafe conditions: cleaning materials (1.4% vs. 8% for the entire sample), equipment (0% vs. 6%), and the building (1% vs. 4%). Almost 11% have been injured on the job, a little below the entire condo sample rate of almost 12%.

Other categories of workers

Respondents also include a number of miscellaneous occupations, including doorman, bellman, spa attendant, pool attendant, tennis court maintenance, supervisor, director of operations, assistant manager, chief engineer, dockmaster, building engineer, key runner, receiving manager, customer service, receiving agent, sales consultant, van driver, guest service agent, and manager. However, the numbers of such respondents are too small to justify a separate analysis here. Because this group includes managers of various types, it includes virtually all of those with family incomes over \$60,000 per year, as well as a number of low paid workers earning well under \$20,000, such as various types of attendants or the van driver.

COMPARATIVE GENERAL SUMMARY OF PAY AND WORKING CONDITIONS OF DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF WORKERS IN THE MIAMI-DADE CONDOMINIUM EMPLOYMENT SECTOR

Table 60 summarizes some of the comparative data on each category of condominium worker contained in the sample.

Table 60
Comparative conditions of different categories of condominium workers

	Valets	Security	Maintenance	Housekeeping	Front Desk
% OF SAMPLE	28%	22%	13%	15%	13.5%
COUNTRY OF ORIGIN	Virtually all South American, Central American, Caribbean	Almost 1/3 U.S., followed by Cuba (14%)	Almost half Cuba (a very “Cuban” niche)	22% Cuba; 20% Colombia	21% U.S. 18% Cuba; more “English speaking”
GENDER (83% male in entire sample)	96% male	79% male	100% male	61% male	73% male
EDUCATION	More educated than average	Less educated than average	Less educated than average	Less educated than average	More educated than average
FAMILY INCOME	Lower than average	Higher than average	Equal to or slightly higher than average	Lower than average	Higher than average
TYPE OF EMPLOYER (70% contractor in entire sample)	79% contractor; 21% condo	81.5% contractor; 18.5% condo	48% contractor; 52% condo	73% contractor; 27% condo	50% contractor; 50% condo
MEDIAN HOURLY COMPENSATION (WAGE + TIPS)	\$8.89	\$8.00	\$9.07	\$7.00	\$9.50
BENEFITS COVERAGE	Worse than average	Mixed compared to average	Better than average	Mixed; mostly worse than average	Much better than average

Table 60 reveals several important things about this workforce. First, those categories of employees with a larger percentage of workers from the U.S. tend to have higher family incomes. Second, the best paid positions (front desk and maintenance work) are least likely to be contracted out to independent contractors. The same is true for positions with the best benefits coverage. Third, women have higher percentages of the jobs in the low end (housekeeping) and high end (front desk) of the compensation scale. Fourth, more education does not necessarily translate into higher pay levels – this is especially apparent for valets, who are highly educated and virtually 100% immigrant. Fifth, there is no necessary correlation between family income and hourly compensation – for example, security workers have the second to lowest hourly compensation levels, yet they have higher than average family incomes. This is likely to be true because their country of

origin is more likely to be the United States, and they are more likely to have two or more income earners in the family.

Numerous other comparisons could be made from the detailed information given in this section, but the most significant comparisons are those detailed in Table 60.

DIRECT EMPLOYMENT VS. CONTRACTOR EMPLOYMENT: A FEW COMPARISONS

The previous section noted that compensation levels tend to be higher for those categories of employees where less of the work is contracted out to outside contractors. This raises the question of whether direct employment is likely to be more beneficial to employees than is employment for a contractor. To test this hypothesis, we broke the respondents into direct (condo) employees and employees of outside contractors and compared them on a few vital measures. **On all measures, direct employment turned out to be more desirable employment.**

Regarding wages, direct (condo) employees are paid better by every conceivable measure. The median hourly wage is a dollar higher, and the average (mean) hourly wage is \$1.22 higher. Even high and low wages are higher for direct employees. Table 61 shows details.

**Table 61
Wage comparisons for direct and outside contractor employees**

	Highest hourly wage	Lowest hourly wage	Median hourly wage	Mean hourly wage
DIRECT EMPLOYEES	\$19.00	\$3.25	\$8.00	\$8.46
CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES	\$18.42	\$2.50	\$7.00	\$7.24

Benefits coverage likewise shows a sharp contrast between the two types of employment. Health insurance coverage, pension coverage, vacation pay, sickness pay, and other paid leave time are all higher for direct condo employees than for the employees of contractors. Table 62 shows the details.

**Table 62
Benefit comparisons between direct condo employees and contractor employees**

	% receiving health insurance	% receiving a pension	% with paid vacation	% with paid sick leave	% with any other paid leave
DIRECT EMPLOYEES	56%	7.4%	80%	73%	18%
CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES	33%	2.6%	49%	49%	14%

It is apparent that condos are “better employers” than are outside contractors, in the sense that they pay better and provide better benefits to their employees. This is not surprising, since contracting out is frequently engaged in to save on costs, which usually translates into inferior pay and benefits for employees of the outside contractor.

Further evidence that direct employment is more desirable than employment for a contractor comes from comparative statistics on how long employees stay with their employer. Forty percent of contractor employees have been with their employer for less than a year compared to just over 28% of direct employees. And almost 30% of direct employees have stayed with their employer for over five years, compared to just over 11% of contractor employees. Table 63 shows details.

Table 63
Length of time with present employer, direct condo employees and contractor employees

	Less than a year	Less than 2 years	Five years or more
DIRECT CONDO EMPLOYEES	28.2%	45.9%	29.7%
CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES	40%	60.2%	11.1%

The heavily “contracted out” nature of condominium employment (70% of jobs contracted out) may also help explain our earlier finding earlier that most categories of the condominium workforce are paid below the average pay levels for each occupation in the local labor market.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The main purpose of this research – to discover in considerable empirical detail the nature and compensation and working conditions of condominium workers in Miami-Dade County – has been amply fulfilled by the data given earlier in this report. We have uncovered a rich tapestry of the condominium workforce. We now know where they come from, their educational attainment, their family income, their personal income, what condominium jobs they occupy, longevity on the job, illegal treatment under the Fair Labor Standards Act regarding pay and working conditions, income from tips, perceived equal treatment of employees, benefits, “niches” of the workforce between nationalities and genders, and differences between job categories on all of the factors enumerated above.

An analysis of the results reveals the following features:

(1) The overwhelmingly immigrant nature of the workforce. Eighty six percent of the employees were born in a foreign land. Forty two percent come from South America. Cuba also is the country of birth for many employees.

(2) The high level of education for a workforce as poorly paid as this one is. Over one quarter have a college- or graduate-degree, and over half have attended college. This indicates that

something is preventing these workers from attaining the higher income that would normally accompany such high levels of education, most likely immigrant status and language barriers.

(3) The low personal and family incomes and low wages of these workers. Almost half of respondents had a family income of less than \$20,000 the previous year, and only eight percent had had a family income of \$45,000 or more. Over seventy percent had a personal (as opposed to family) income of less than \$20,000 the previous year. Ten percent earn less than the minimum hourly wage (\$5.15 per hour), and the median wage is \$7.10 per hour. Only eight percent make more than \$10 per hour.

(4) Importance of tips for this workforce, especially for some categories of workers. Tips often amount to up to a third of total hourly compensation, especially for those occupations with a lot of tipping, such as valet. Similar to the situation with other tipped professions (restaurant waiters and waitresses, airport bell hops, etc.), this makes these workers heavily dependent on cash income rather than regulated forms of payment, such as the paycheck.

(5) Fairly high job turnover, but little part-time employment. Over fifty seven percent have worked for their present employer less than two years. However, one other undesirable characteristic of much low paid service employment is not present: lots of part-time work. Only around thirteen percent of condo employees work part-time.

(6) Numerous violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, if responses are accurate. Many wage-and-hour violations are claimed by some respondents. While a relatively small number of respondents make such claims, they are numerous enough and consistent enough to make it likely that there are a number of such violations in this employment sector.

(7) Only a minority perceive discrimination on either gender or race/nationality lines. Despite a great deal of gender segregation by gender, and also some by nationality, few respondents perceive employer discrimination along these lines. This does not in itself demonstrate that such discrimination does not exist, but it does show that it is not a major issue for the majority of this workforce.

(8) Very poor provision of benefits. Sixty percent of respondents receive no health insurance coverage. When they do, over seventy percent of the plans do not cover one's family. Over forty percent receive no paid vacation. Ninety two percent receive no pension. Forty four percent get no paid sick leave. Thus condominium workers are very much in the category of "few benefits" in addition to their low wages.

(9) Different "niches" of nationalities within the various occupations. Native born U.S. workers are clustered in front desk and security occupations. Valets are virtually 100% South American. Cubans hold almost half of all maintenance positions. Thus, this multinational workforce is not distributed equally across the workforce, but rather "clusters" in different types of work, to some degree.

(10) Type of employer makes a difference. In general, we find that employees are better off in terms of pay and benefit levels if they work directly for a condominium than if they work for an outside contractor. Outside contractors tend to be "worse" employers, from this perspective.

APPENDIX A – SURVEY INSTRUMENT IN ENGLISH

MIAMI WAGE AND WORKING CONDITIONS SURVEY

1. What is the name and address of the building where you work?

Do you work at several buildings for the same employer, where you travel from one building to another during the same day or night?

_____yes _____no

2. What is the title of your job?

3. What do you do in this job?

4. Who is your employer?

(If you have more than one employer, name them all, and explain what is the relationship between them.)

5. How long have you worked for this employer? _____years _____months
_____weeks

6. How many days per week do you usually work? _____days
(If it varies from week to week, explain how.)

7. What are your normal hours of work?
From _____AM or PM (circle one) to _____AM or PM (circle one)
(If it varies from week to week, explain how.)

8. Are you treated as an employee, with taxes deducted from your pay, or are you treated as an “independent contractor”, where you are paid a set amount regardless of the number of hours you work and without taxes deducted from your pay?

____I am treated as an employee _____I am treated as an independent contractor

9. If you are paid on an hourly basis, what is your rate of pay?

\$_____per hour _____not applicable – not paid by the hour

9a. When did you last get a pay increase, and what was your previous rate of pay?

(i) I got my last pay increase _____months/years (circle which) ago.
My pay before I got the increase was \$_____ per hour.

(ii) _____I haven't gotten a pay increase since I started this job

9a. Do you get paid more for weekend work? _____yes _____no

9b. Do you get paid more for holiday work? _____yes _____no

9c. Do you get paid more for working harder? _____yes _____no

9d. Do you get paid more for filling in for someone else? _____yes _____no

10. As far as you know, has anybody working for your employer ever made less than \$5.15 per hour? _____yes _____no _____don't know

11. If you're not paid by the hour, how much are you paid per week, or per day, or per month, or per completed job? \$_____per _____(if it is per completed job, please state what the completed job consists of)

12. Do you receive tips at your job? _____yes _____no

12a. If yes, about how much per day, on average? \$_____ per day

12b. If yes, do you have to share tips with other employees, or with your employer? _____yes _____no

13. How does your employer record your work time?

_____I punch a clock.

_____I sign in and out by hand.

_____Someone else records the time I start and stop work.

14. Are the times that are recorded accurate? _____yes _____no

If "no", why not?

15. Do you ever work before you punch in or before you record that you have started work? _____yes _____no

15a. If "yes", are you paid for this? _____yes _____no

16. Do you ever work after you punch out or after you record that you have finished work?

_____yes _____no

16a. If "yes", are you paid for this? _____yes _____no

17. Do you get a meal break? yes no
 17a. If "yes", how long is the break? _____minutes
 17b. Do you get paid during your meal break? yes no
 17c. Do you ever work during your meal break? yes no
 17d. When you do work during your meal break, are you paid for that time?
yes no not applicable; don't ever work during breaks
18. Do you get any other breaks, other than a meal break? yes no
 18a. If "yes", when, and for how long?

 18b. Are you paid for the time spent on break? yes no
 18c. Do you ever work during the break time? yes no
 If yes, how often, and under what circumstances?

 18d. Are you paid for the time if you work during the break time?
yes no not applicable; don't ever work during breaks
19. Do you ever work more than 40 hours in a week? yes no
 19a. If "yes", do you receive one and one-half times your regular hourly rate for the hours over 40? yes no
 19b. If you receive additional pay for your regular hours during the week for any reason, is it included in calculating your overtime rate? yes no
not applicable
 19c. Are you ever paid in time off rather than money for working more than 40 hours in one week? yes no
20. Do you receive a wage statement with your wages? yes no
 20a. If "yes", does it show your wage rate and number of hours worked?
yes no
 20b. Does it show if you worked more than 40 hours in a week?
yes no
 20c. Is it generally accurate? yes no

 If not, why not?
21. Have you received any training for this job, either before you started work or after?
yes no
 21a. If "yes", were you required to go to it in order to obtain or keep the job?
yes no
 21b. Were you paid for the time spent in the training? yes no
not applicable, did not receive training
22. Are you required to wear a uniform or any kind of special clothing, protective clothing or equipment? yes no

- 22a. If “yes”, did the employer provide it to you? yes no
- 22b. Do you have to clean your uniform in any way other than with the rest of your clothes, at your own expense (that is, not reimbursed by your employer)?
yes no not applicable
23. Does your employer ever deduct money from your wages because you broke something or because they said you had not done a good job? yes no
24. Are there men and women at your place of work who perform the same jobs?
yes no not applicable because we have only men, or only women, working here
- 24a. If “yes” are they paid the same rate? yes no don’t know
- 24 b. If they don’t perform the same jobs, what do the men do, and what do the women do?
- 24c. What is the difference in pay between men and women, if any?
- 24d. Have women ever been denied the jobs held by men because they were women? yes no
- 24e. Are there any women supervisors? yes no
- 24f. Have women ever been denied supervisor jobs because they were women?
yes no
25. Are there blacks and/or Hispanics at your place of work who perform the same jobs as white non-Hispanics? yes no not applicable because we have only blacks and/or Hispanics, or only white non-Hispanics working here
- 25a. If “yes” are they paid the same rate? yes no don’t know
- 25 b. If they don’t perform the same jobs, what do the white non-Hispanics do, and what do the blacks and/or Hispanics do?
- 25c. What is the difference in pay between white non-Hispanics and blacks or Hispanics, if any?
- 25d. Have blacks or Hispanics ever been denied the jobs held by white non-Hispanics because they were black or Hispanic?
yes no don’t know
- 25e. Are there any black or Hispanic supervisors? yes no
- 25f. Have blacks or Hispanics ever been denied supervisor jobs because they were black or Hispanic? yes no don’t know

26. Do you receive any health insurance from your employer? yes no
 26a. If “yes”, does it cover your family? yes no
27. Do you receive any pension from your employer? yes no
 26a. If “yes”, when do you become eligible for it?
28. Do you get any paid time off for:
- Vacation? yes no
 Sickness? yes no
 Any other reason? yes no (If “yes”, what for?)
29. Do you think there is anything unsafe about:
- Cleaning materials you work with? yes no not applicable
 Equipment you work with? yes no not applicable
 The building where you work? yes no
 If “yes” to any of these, would you describe what you see as being unsafe?
30. Has anyone ever been injured on your job? yes no
 29a. If “yes”, when, and how did it happen?
31. Does your employer provide you with any form of housing? yes no
 30a. If “yes”, how many nights a week, and where?
- 31b. Are you required to stay in the housing? yes no not applicable
 31c. Do you pay for the housing? yes no not applicable
 31d. Is this amount deducted from your pay? yes no not applicable
32. Are you provided transportation to your job and back? yes no
 32a. If “yes” who provides it?
- 32b. Are you required to take it? yes no not applicable

- 32 c. Do you pay for the transportation? yes no not applicable
33. Did you pay anything to get your job? yes no
 33a. If "yes", to whom?

NOW, A FEW BRIEF QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU, NOT ABOUT YOUR CURRENT JOB:

34. What is the country and town or village (or closest town or village) where you were born?
35. What is your age? _____years
36. Record the respondent's gender (ask if necessary): male female
37. Did you ever work in a job that had nothing to do with residential building services?
yes no
 37a. If "yes", what was the job, and when did you last work at it?
38. In the long run, what is the final job you would like to have, if it is different from the job you presently have?
39. Are you married, single, or divorced? married single
divorced
40. About what was your total family income last year? \$_____
- PROBE IF NECESSARY: Was it less than \$30,000? yes no
 Was it more than \$45,000? yes no
 Was it more than \$60,000? yes no
 Was it less than \$20,000? yes no
41. About what was your total personal income last year? \$_____

42. What is the highest school grade you have completed?

_____ (Try to get a grade number, but if that does not work, prompt and ask if it was:

____ less than high school (8th grade or less) ____ some high school (9th-12th grade)

____ high school graduate _____ vocation or technical school after high school

____ some college (no degree) _____ college or graduate degree

THANK YOU FOR ANSWERING MY QUESTIONS!

APPENDIX B – SURVEY INSTRUMENT IN SPANISH

ENCUESTA SOBRE LA PAGA Y LAS CONDICIONES LABORALES DE TRABAJO DE MIAMI

- 1.Cuál es el nombre y la dirección del edificio en que usted trabaja?

Trabaja usted en varios edificios para un mismo empleador, viajando usted de un edificio a otro durante el mismo día o la noche?

_____ sí _____ no

2. Cómo se llama su posición o trabajo?

3. Qué hace en este trabajo?

4. Quién es su empleador? _____
(Si tiene más de uno, nómbralos a todos y explique cuál es la relación entre ellos?)

5. Cuánto tiempo ha trabajado para este empleador? ____ años ____ meses
____ semanas

6. Cuántos días por semana suele usted trabajar? ____ días
(Si los días varían de una semana a otra, explique cómo)

7. Cuáles son sus horas normales de trabajo?
Desde _____ AM o PM a _____ AM o PM (haga círculos alrededor de lo correcto)
(Si varía de una semana a otra, explique cómo)

8. Se le trata como a un empleado con los impuestos deducidos de su paga, o le tratan como a un “contratista independiente” en donde se le paga una cantidad fija sin importar el número de horas que trabaje y sin deducir los impuestos de su paga?

_____ Me tratan como a un empleado _____ Me tratan como a un
contratista independiente

9. Si le pagan por hora, cuánto le pagan por hora?

\$ _____ por hora _____ no aplica-no me pagan por hora

9a. Cuándo fue la última vez que le aumentaron el sueldo, y cuál era su paga por hora anterior?

(i) Recibí mi último aumento hace _____
meses/años(haga un círculo alrededor de cuál). Mi
paga antes del aumento era de \$ _____ por hora.

(ii) _____ No he recibido un aumento desde que
comencé este trabajo.

9b. Le pagan más por trabajo en el fin de semana? _____ sí _____ no

9c. Le pagan más por trabajo en día festivo? _____ sí _____ no

9d. Le pagan más por trabajar más duro? _____ sí _____ no

9e. Le pagan más por remplazar a alguien? _____ sí _____ no

10. Por lo que usted sabe, hay algún trabajador bajo su empleador que haya ganado menos de \$ 5.15 por hora? _____ sí _____ no _____ no se

11. Si a usted no le pagan por hora, cuánto le pagan por semana, día, mes, o trabajo completado? \$ _____ por _____ (si es por trabajo completado, diga por favor cuál).

12. Recibe propinas en su trabajo? _____ sí _____ no

12a. Si sí, cuánto de averaje por día? \$ _____ por día

12b. Si sí, tiene usted que compartir las propinas con otros empleados, o con su empleador? _____ sí _____ no

13. Cómo anota su empleador su tiempo de trabajo?

_____ Poncho con el reloj.

_____ Firmo manualmente la entrada y salida.

_____ Otra persona anota la hora en que empiezo y termino de trabajar.

14. Son las horas anotadas correctas? _____ sí _____ no

Si no, por qué no?

15. Trabaja alguna vez antes de ponchar o de anotar que comenzó a trabajar?
 _____ sí _____ no
 15a. Si sí, le pagan por ello? _____ sí _____ no
16. Trabaja alguna vez después que poncho o anotó su hora de salida del trabajo?
 _____ sí _____ no
 16a. Si “sí”, le pagan por ello? _____ sí _____ no
17. Le dan tiempo para su almuerzo o su cena? _____ sí _____ no
 17a. Si sí, cuanto dura la almuerzo o cena? _____ minutos
 17b. Le pagan durante su almuerzo o su cena? _____ sí _____ no
 17c. Trabaja alguna vez durante la almuerzo o la cena? _____ sí _____ no
 17d. Cuando usted trabaja durante su almuerzo o su cena, le pagan por ese tiempo?
 _____ sí _____ no _____ no aplica; no trabajo nunca durante las almuerzos o las cenas.
18. Le dan algunos otros descansos, aparte del de su almuerzo or su cena? ___sí___ no
 18a. Si “sí”, cuándo y por cuánto tiempo?

 18b. Le pagan por el tiempo en el descanso? _____ sí _____ no
 18c. Trabaja alguna vez durante el descanso? _____ sí _____ no
 Si “sí”, cuán a menudo y bajo qué circunstancias?

 18d. Le pagan por ese tiempo si usted trabaja durante el descanso? _____ sí _____ no
19. Trabaja alguna vez más de 40 horas a la semana? _____ sí _____ no
 19a. Si “sí”, recibe pago de una y media vez que por la hora regular de trabajo por las horas que se pase de 40 a la semana? _____ sí _____ no.
 19b. Si recibe paga adicional por sus horas regulares de trabajo durante la semana por alguna razón, está incluida al calcular las horas extra? _____ sí _____ no
 _____ no aplica
 19c. Le pagan algunas veces con tiempo en lugar de dinero por haber trabajado más de 40 horas en una semana? _____ sí _____ no
20. Recibe una declaración con su paga? _____ sí _____ no

- 20a. Si "sí", le muestra su pago por hora y cuántas horas trabajó?
 sí no
- 20b. Muestra ésta si usted trabajó más de 40 horas en la semana?
 sí no
- 20c. Es ésta generalmente exacta? sí no
 Si no, por qué no?
21. Ha recibido algun entrenamiento para este trabajo, antes o después de comenzar en él? sí no
- 21a. Si "sí", le fue requerido que fuera para poder obtener o mantener su trabajo?
 sí no
- 21b. Le pagaron por el tiempo que pasó en el entrenamiento? sí no
 no aplica, no recibí entrenamiento
22. Se le requiere usar un uniforme o algun tipo de vestimenta especial, ropa o equipo protector? sí no
- 22a. Si "sí", se lo proveyó el empleador? sí no
- 22b. Tiene que limpiar su uniforme de otra forma que el resto de sus ropas, a su propio costo (esto es, el empleador no le reembolsa por ello)?
 sí no no aplica
23. Le deduce alguna vez su empleador dinero de su paga porque ha roto algo o porque dijeron que no hizo bien su trabajo? sí no
24. Hay hombres y mujeres en su lugar de trabajo que realizan las mismas tareas?
 sí no no aplica porque sólo hay hombres, o sólo mujeres trabajando aquí.
- 24a. Si "sí", les pagan igual por hora? sí no no se
- 24b. Si no hacen las mismas tareas, qué es lo que hacen los hombres, y qué es lo que hacen las mujeres?
- 24c. Cuál es la diferencia de paga entre los hombres y las mujeres, si hay alguna?
- 24d. Les han negado alguna vez a las mujeres puestos que tienen los hombres por ser mujeres? sí no

- 24 e. Hay algunas mujeres supervisoras? _____ sí _____ no
- 24f. Les han sido negados alguna vez a las mujeres puestos de supervisoras porque eran mujeres? _____ sí _____ no
25. Hay negros y/o hispanos en su lugar de empleo que realizan los mismos trabajos que los blancos no hispanos? _____ sí _____ no _____ no aplica porque solo hay negros y/o hispanos, o sólo trabajan blancos no-hispanos aquí.
- 25a. Si “sí”, se les paga lo mismo por hora? _____ sí _____ no _____ no se
- 25b. Si no realizan los mismos trabajos, qué hacen los blancos no hispanos, y qué hacen los negros y/o hispanos?
- 25c. Cuál es la diferencia de paga entre blancos no-hispanos y negros o hispanos, si alguna?
- 25d. Se les ha negado alguna vez a los negros o hispanos trabajo que tienen los blancos no hispanos porque son negros o hispanos?
_____ sí _____ no _____ no se
- 25e. Hay algunos supervisores negros o hispanos? _____ sí _____ no
- 25f. Se les han negado alguna vez puestos de supervisores a negros o hispanos porque lo son? _____ sí _____ no _____ no se
26. Recibe algun seguro de salud de su empleador? _____ sí _____ no
- 26a. Si “sí”, le cubre a su familia? _____ sí _____ no
27. Recibe alguna pensión de sus empleadores? _____ sí _____ no
- 27a. Si “sí”, cuándo será elegible para ella?
28. Recibe algun tiempo libre pagado por:
- Vacaciones? _____ sí _____ no
- Enfermedad? _____ sí _____ no
- Alguna otra razón? _____ sí _____ no (Si “sí”, para qué?)
29. Usted cree que hay algo que no provee seguridad con respecto a:
- Los materiales de limpieza con que trabaja? _____ sí _____ no _____ no aplica
- El equipo con que trabaja? _____ sí _____ no _____ no aplica
- El edificio en donde trabaja? _____ sí _____ no

(Si "sí" a cualquiera de estas preguntas, puede describir lo que considera no es seguro?)

30. Alguna vez ha resultado alguien herido en su trabajo? _____ sí _____ no
30a. Si "sí", cuándo y cómo pasó?
31. Le provee su empleador algún tipo de vivienda? _____ sí _____ no
31a. Si "sí", por cuántas noches a la semana, y en dónde?
31b. Se le requiere hospedarse allí? _____ sí _____ no _____ no aplica
31c. Paga usted por su transportación? _____ sí _____ no _____ no aplica
31d. Se le deduce esta cantidad de su paga? _____ sí _____ no _____
32. Se le provee transportación a y desde su trabajo? _____ sí _____ no
32a. Si "sí", quién la provee?
32b. Se le requiere usarla? _____ sí _____ no _____ no aplica
32c. Paga usted por la transportación? _____ sí _____ no _____ no aplica
33. Pagó usted algo por obtener su trabajo? _____ sí _____ no
33a. Si "sí", a quién?

AHORA, UNAS BREVES PREGUNTAS SOBRE USTED, NO SOBRE SU TRABAJO:

34. En qué país y pueblo o villa (o la villa o pueblo más cercano) nació usted?
- 35.Cuál es su edad? _____ años
36. Anote el género del contestante (pregunte si es necesario): _____ hombre _____ mujer.

37. Trabajó usted alguna vez en algo que no tenía nada que ver con servicios a edificios residenciales? _____ sí _____ no
37a. Si "sí", en qué tipo de trabajo y cuándo fue que trabajó en ello la última vez?

38. A la larga, cuál sería el trabajo que le gustaría tener, si es diferente del que tiene ahora?

39. Es casado, soltero o divorciado? _____ casado _____ soltero _____ divorciado

40. Cuáles fueron las entradas totales de su familia el año pasado? \$ _____

SONDEE SI ES NECESARIO:

Fue menos que \$ 30,000? _____ sí _____ no

Fue más de \$ 45,000? _____ sí _____ no

Fue más de \$ 60,000? _____ sí _____ no

Fue menos de \$ 20,000? _____ sí _____ no

41. Alrededor de cuánto fue su entrada personal el año pasado? \$ _____

42. Cuál fue el mayor nivel de escuela que completó? _____
(Trate de obtener el número del grado, pero si no funciona, trate y pregunte si fue:

_____ Menos que secundaria (8° grado o menos)

_____ Alguna secundaria (9° a 12 grado)

_____ Graduado de secundaria

_____ Escuela técnica o vocacional después de secundaria

_____ Algunos estudios universitarios pero sin terminar

_____ Título de preuniversitario o graduado universitario.

GRACIAS POR CONTESTAR MIS PREGUNTAS!

APPENDIX C – SURVEY INSTRUMENT IN HAITIAN CREOLE

Etid sou Pèman ak kondisyon travay nan Mayami

1. Ki kote E ki non kote ke wap travay la?

È se ke wap travay nan plizyè kote pou menm chèf la ou è se ke wap travay nan de a twa konstriksyon nan menm jou ak nwit.

_____ wi _____ non

2. Sou ki non ke yo reprezante ou nan travay la?

3. Ki sa wap fè nan travay la?

4. Se ki moun ki chèf ou nan travay la? _____
(Si ou genyen de o twa chèf bay non yo tout E eslike ki sa yo reprezante nan travay la).

5. Sa fè konbyen tan ke wap travay kote sa-a? _____ ane _____ mwa _____ semèn

6. Konbyen jou nan semèn ke ou travay? _____ pa jou
(Si ou pa genyen menm jou de travay chak semèn, eslike kòman ou travay chak semèn).

7. A ki lè ke ou kòmanse travay ak ki lè ou kite travay la?
De _____ A.M. O P.M.(sikile yon repons) jiska _____ AM o PM (sikile yon repons)
(Si ou pa genyen menm lè de travay chak jou, eslike kòman ou travay ak ki lè ke ou genyen).

8. È se ke yo konsidere ou kòm yon moun kap travay pou de bon se la vle di si yo pwan lajan leta nan chèk ou o è se ke yo peye ou sou kantite lè ke ou travay san yo pa pran lajan leta nan chèk ou?

_____ yo konsidere mwen kòm yon moun nòmal nan travay la?

_____ yo konsidere mwen kòm yon moun kap travay pou kont li.

9. Si yo peye ou sou lè travay ou, se konbyen kòb ke yo ba ou pa lè?

\$_____ pa lè _____ se pa pou mwen pa se ke yo pa peye mwen pa lè.

9a. Sa fè konbyen tan ke yo te mete yon kòb anplis sou chèk ou. È se ke ou sonje konbyen kòb yo te peye ou semèn pase?

(i) Yo te mete plis lajan sou chèk mwen sa gen _____ mwa/ane pase (sikile bon repòns lan). Anvan ke yo te vini mete yon ti kòb sou chèk mwen, yo te konnen peye mwen \$_____ pa lè.

(ii) _____ yo pa janm mete plis kòb sou chèk mwen depi lè ke mwen kòmanse travay.

9b. È se ke yo peye ou plis lè ou travay le samdi ak lè dimanch _____ wi _____ non

9c. È se ke yo peye ou plis lè ou travay jou fèt? _____ wi _____ non

9d. È se ke yo peye ou plis lè ou travay di? _____ wi _____ non

9e. È se ke yo peye ou plis lè ou travay pou yon lòt moun ki pa vini nan travay? _____ wi _____ non.

10. È se ke ou te konnen yon moun nan travay ou ye an ke yo peye mwens ke \$5.15 pa lè _____ wi _____ non _____ mwen pa konnen.

11. Si yo pa peye ou pa lè, konbyen kòb ke yo peye ou pa semèn, pa jou, pa mwa o pa kantite travay ke ou fè pa jou? \$_____ pa _____ (si yo peye ou pa kantite travay ou fè, ou bezwen di nou ki travay ke ou te genyen pou fè)?

12. È se ke yo fè ou kado ti lajan nan travay la? _____ wi _____ non.

12a. Si ou di wi, konbyen lajan ke yo ba ou? \$_____ pa jou.

12b. Si ou di wi, lajan ke yo ba ou sou kote pou jan ou travay di, È se ke ou pataje lajan sa-a ak moun kap travay avèk ou o È se ke ou bay chèf ou nan lajan sa-a? _____ wi _____ non

13. Kòman chèf ou konnen lè ke ou kòmanse travay?

_____ È se ke ou mete lè travay ou nan revèy

_____ È se ke ou siyen lè ou kòmanse travay ak lè ou kite.

_____ È se ke se yon moun ki mete lè ke ou kòmanse travay ak lè ke ou fini travay.

14. È se ke lè ke yo antre pou nònm de tan ou travay la korèk?

_____ wi _____ non

si ou di non, pou ki sa.

15. è se ke dè fwa ou kòmanse travay anvan lè?

_____ wi _____ non

15a. Si ou kòmanse travay anvan lè ke ou sipòze, è se ke yo peye ou pou sa?

_____ wi _____ non

16. è se ke ou kontinye travay nan lè ke ou sipòze kite?

_____ wi _____ non

16a. si ou di non, pou ki sa?

17. è se ke yo ba ou tan pou manje nan travay la?

_____ wi _____ non

17a. Si ou di wi, ki lè ke yo ba ou pou manje ak konbyen tan ke ou genyen? _____ pa minit

17b. è se ke yo peye ou pou tan ke yo ba ou pou manje? _____ wi _____ non

17c. è se ke ou janm travay sou lè yo ba ou pou manje? _____ wi _____ non

17d. Lè ou travay pandan lè manje ou, è se ke yo peye ou pou sa?

_____ wi _____ non _____ li pa aplike pou mwen pase ke mwen pa janm travay pandan lè manje mwen.

18. è se ke yo ba ou ti tan de detant ke lè pou manje? _____ wi _____ non

18a. si ou di wi, ki lè ke yo te ba ou li e pou konbyen tan?

18b. è se ke yo peye ou lè yo ba ou ti tan pou detann ou? _____ wi _____ non

18c. è se ke ou travay pandan lè de detann ou? _____ wi _____ non

si ou repònn wi nan ki kondisyon?

18d. è se ke yo peye pou tan ke ou travay pandan tan detann ou? _____ wi _____ non _____ li pa aplike pou mwen pa se ke mwen pa janm travay pandan tan de detann mwen.

19. è se ke ou janm travay plis ke 40 tè pa semèn? _____ wi _____ non

19a. si ou di wi, è se ke ou resevwa menm kantite lajàn lè ou travay plis ke 40 tè _____ wi _____ non

19b. si ou resevwa plis lajan pou lè ke ou abitye o pou lòt rezòn, yo mete lajàn sa-a lè yap kalkile plis è de tan ke ou fè? _____ wi _____ non _____ li pa aplike pou mwen.

19c. è se ke yo peye ou nan lè ke yo ba ou pou manje lè yo mande ou fè yon travay anplis o è se ke yo peye ou plis ke 40 tè pase ke ou te travay nan lè ou te sipòze manje?

_____ wi _____ non.

20. è se ke ou resevwa souvan yon papye ki pou infòmè ou sou salè ou?

_____ wi _____ non

- 20a. Si, ou repòn wi pou premye kesyon an, è se ke nan papye ke ou resevwa an, yo infòmme ou sou salè ak konbyen lè de tan ke ou travay pandan semèn nan?
 _____ wi _____ non
- 20b. è se ke nan papye ki akonpanye chèk ou a, yo mete ke ou travay plis ke 40 tè nan yon semèn? _____ wi _____ non
- 20c. è se ke yo antre lè ke ou travay la?
 _____ wi _____ non
21. è se ke yo te antrene ou anvan ke ou kòmanse travay la o aprè?
 _____ wi _____ non
- 21a. Si, yo te antrene pou travay sa-a, è se ke ou te oblije patisipe nan antrènman pou te genyen o pou te kenbe travay la?
 _____ wi _____ non
- 21b. è se ke yo te peye ou pou tan ke ou te pase nan antrènman an? _____ wi _____ non
 _____ li pa aplike pou mwen, pase ke yo pa janm antrene mwen.
22. è se ke ou dwe pòte inifòm nan travay la o rad ki kapab proteje ou? _____ wi _____ non
- 22a. Si ou repòn wi, è se ke se chèf travay la ki bay inifòm o rad pou travay la?
 _____ wi _____ non
- 22b. è se ke ou sipòze lave inifòm la pou kont li san lòt rad yo avèk pwop lajan ou (sa vle di ke chèf travay la pa peye pou rad ke wap lave yo? _____ wi _____ non
 _____ sa pa aplike pou mwen.
23. è se ke chèf nan travay ou retire lajan nan salè ou pase ke ou kraze yon bagay nan travay la o pase ke ou pa fè yon bon travay? _____ wi _____ non
24. è se ke fanm ak gasòn fè menm bagay nan travay la? _____ wi _____ non _____ li pa aplike, pase ke nou genyen sèlman gasòn nan travay la o sèlman fanm nan travay la.
- 24a. Si, genyen fanm ak gasòn kap travay menm kote an, è se ke yo peye yo menm salè an? _____ wi _____ non _____ mwen pa konnèn.
- 24b. Si fanm ak gasòn pa fè menm travay la, ki sa gasòn fè ak ki sa fanm fè?
- 24c. Ki diferans ki genyen antre fasòn yo peye gasòn ak fanm nan travay la si genyen diferans?

- 24d. è se ke genyen sèten travay yo pa bay fanm fè pase ke yo se fanm?
 _____ wi _____ non
- 24e. è se ke genyen fanm ki chèf nan travay la? _____ wi _____ non
- 24f. è se ke yo refize bay fanm travay kòm chèf pase ke yo se fanm?
 _____ wi _____ non
25. è se ke genyen moun nwa ak panyòl nan travay ou a ki fè menm travay ke yon blan ki pa panyòl? _____ wi _____ non _____ li pa aplike pase ke nou genyen sèlman moun nwa ak panyòl kap travay o sèlman blan ki pa panyòl nan travay la.
- 25a. Si ou repònn wi pou premye kesyon an, è se ke yo peye ni moun nwa, panyòl ak blan menm kantite lajan an? _____ wi _____ non _____ mwen pa konnèn.
- 25b. Si moun nwa, blan ak panyòl pa pèfòme menm travay, ki sa blan ki pa panyòl fè kòm travay ak ki sa moun nwa ak panyòl fè?
- 25c. Ki diferans ki genyen nan jan yo peye blan ki pa panyòl ak jan yo peye moun nwa ak panyòl si gen diferans?
- 25d. è se ke yo pa bay moun nwa ak panyòl menm travay ke blan yo ap fè pase ke yo se moun nwa oswa panyòl?
 _____ wi _____ non _____ mwen pa konnen
- 25e. è se ke genyen moun nwa ak panyòl ki se chèf nan travay la? _____ wi _____ non
- 25f. è se ke souvan yo refize bay moun nwa ak panyòl plas chèf nan travay la pase ke yo nwa oswa panyòl? _____ wi _____ non _____ mwen pa konnen
26. è se ke yo bay asirans lavi nan travay la? _____ wi _____ non
- 26a. Si ou di wi, è se ke asirans lavi ke ou genyen an kouvri fanmi ou? _____ wi _____ non
27. è se ke yo ba ou pansyon leta nan travay la? _____ wi _____ non
- 27a. Si ou repònn wi, ki lè ke ou kòmanse resevwa pansyon sa-a?
28. è se ke yo peye ou pou:
 vakans? _____ wi _____ non
 maladi? _____ wi _____ non
 pou lòt rezòn? _____ wi _____ non (si ou repònn wi, pou ki rezòn)?
29. è se ke ou panse genyen yon danje nan:

netwaye bagay ke wap travay avèk ___ wi ___ non ___ li pa aplike
bagay ke wap travay avèk yo? ___ wi ___ non ___ li pa aplike
konstriksyon kote wap travay la? ___ wi ___ non

Si ou repònn wi pou kesyon sa yo, è se ke ou ka di ki danje ou wè nan sèten
Bagay ke yo dekri nan kesyon sa-a?

30. è se ke kònn genyen moun ki frape o blese nan travay la? ___ wi ___ non
30a. Si ou repònn wi, ki lè ak kòman sa te pase?

31. è se ke chèf travay ou ba ou kote pou rete? ___ wi ___ non
31a. Si ou di wi, konbyen fwa pa nwit nan yon semèn ak ki kote?

31b. è se ke ou oblije rete nan kay chèf ou ba ou an? ___ wi ___ non ___ li pa
aplike.

31c. è se ke ou peye pou kay la? ___ wi ___ non ___ li pa aplike

31d. è se ke yo retire kòb kay la nan salè ke yo peye ou? ___ wi ___ non ___ li
pa aplike.

32. è se ke yo ba ou transpotasyon pou vini nan travay la? ___ wi ___ non
32a. Si ou repònn wi, ki moun ki ba ou transpotasyon an?

32b. è se ke ou oblije pran transpotasyon an? ___ wi ___ non ___ li pa aplike.

32c. è se ke ou peye pou transpotasyon an? ___ wi ___ non ___ li pa aplike.

33. è se ke ou te peye lajan pou yo te pran ou nan travay la? ___ wi ___ non
33a. Si ou di wi, ki moun ke ou bay lajan an?

Kounye ya, nou prale poze ou kesyon sou vi ou, men pa sou travay ou:

34. Nan ki peyi o vil ke ou te fèt?

35. Ki laj ke ou genyen? _____ tan.

36. è se ke ou se yon _____ gason o _____ fanm

37. è se ke ou te travay anvan nan yon kote ki pate genyen anyen an kòmen ak travay
konstriksyon?
___ wi ___ non

- 37a. Si ou repònn wi, ki sa travay late ye e ki dènye fwa ke ou ale nan travay sa a?
38. Nan lane kap vini an, è se ke ou ta renmen genyen yon travay ki diferan de travay Ke wap fè kounye an?
39. è se ke ou marye, wap viv pou kont ou o ou divòse? _____ marye _____ wap viv pou kont ou _____ divòse
40. Konbyen kòb leta ke fanmi ou fè an tou lane pase? \$ _____
- Si ou vle mete korèk lajan an: Mwens ke \$30,000? ___ wi ___ non
 Plis ke \$45,000? ___ wi ___ non
 Plis ke \$60,000? ___ wi ___ non
 Mwens ke \$20,000? ___ wi ___ non
41. Konbyen lajan ke ou fè antou lane pase? \$ _____
42. Nan ki lane ke ou te rive lekòl?
 (mande yon nimerò, si sa pa mache, di yo si sete:
 _____ mwens ke lekòl sekòndè (8 ane o mwens)
 _____ fini lekòl sekòndè
 _____ ou te fè kèk kolèj (ou pa resevwa diplòm)
 _____ kèk ane nan lekòl sekòndè (9-12ane)
 _____ lekòl teknik aprè lekòl sekòndè
 _____ kolèj o inivèsite

Mèsi anpil pou tan ke ou mete pou te repònn kesyon sa yo!