date: 15 October 2014
embargo: 17 October 2014

## TUC

## Executive Excess

The gap between executive and employee pay within companies

## Introduction

'I don't understand why people need a million quid a year. I've asked one or two of the more sympathetic bankers to explain it to me. The response has been: "It's not that I need the money, it is because others get it so I should, too. " That is a ludicrous mindset. What on earth do these people think they are doing?'
Vince Cable, the Observer 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ March 2014
'...it is difficult to persuade the public that profits are no more than the necessary lifeblood of a successful business if they see a small cohort at the top reaping such large rewards.

If leaders of big companies seem to occupy a different galaxy from the rest of the community, they risk being treated as aliens.'

Richard Lambert, then CBI Director General, 30 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ March 2010
'You have to realise: if I had been paid 50\% more, I would not have done it better. If I had been paid $50 \%$ less, then I would not have done it worse.'

Jeroen van der Veer, former CEO of Royal Dutch Shell

The scale of executive remuneration - in other words, the sheer size of the pay packets that many company directors take home - has long been of concern to the general public and the trade union movement. Of particular concern to the TUC is the gap between the pay of company directors and ordinary employees in the same companies and throughout the economy as a whole. As the quote from Richard Lambert shows, some business representatives have also recognised the damage that the enormity of the gap between executive pay and the pay of other employees has done to the reputation of business. But this recognition has not prevented the executive-employee pay gap from continuing to grow ${ }^{1}$.

The gap between the pay of company directors and what they pay their staff has fuelled public disillusionment and lack of trust in business and tarnished the corporate sector's reputation to an extent that now threatens its license to operate. High intra-company pay differentials have contributed to inequality across the economy as a whole.

[^0]However, high pay gaps within companies are also bad for business. They over-value the contribution of those at the top in relation to other company workers, which can affect employee morale and motivation. High differentials can make it harder to achieve agreements on workforce pay, as company workers will understandably feel aggrieved when pay restraint for ordinary company workers goes hand in hand with pay rises at the top.

Academic research shows clearly that companies with high pay gaps do less well on a range of performance measures than those with lower wage differentials:

- A study of 4,735 companies between 1991 and 2000 found that within-firm pay inequality is significantly associated with lower firm performance ${ }^{2}$.
- A second study that used compensation data from Standards and Poor's ExecuComp (covering around 1,500 companies per year) found that firm productivity is negatively correlated with pay disparity between top executive and lower level employees ${ }^{3}$.
- A third study of over 100 companies found that low pay differentials were associated with higher product quality ${ }^{4}$.

The negative impact of high pay differentials on company performance makes this an issue that should be of significant concern to shareholders. However, companies and shareholders both report that while executive pay forms a major part of their discussions, the issue of the relationship between directors' pay and the pay of ordinary company workers is rarely raised.

To summarise, high pay differentials damage employee morale, are detrimental to firm performance, contribute to inequality across the economy as a whole and have fuelled the public's lack of trust in business. Addressing this is an issue of clear interest to company employees, to shareholders and to the public more broadly. It is therefore a matter of public interest that information that allows pay differentials within companies to be monitored is publicly available.

[^1]
## Company wage gaps in public policy

## Companies required to take into account pay elsewhere in the company since 1995

Ever since the introduction of the Greenbury Code in 1995, remuneration committees have been required to take into account pay and conditions elsewhere in the company, especially when setting annual salary increases. This remains part what has now become the Corporate Governance Code today ${ }^{5}$. However, this provision has been roundly ignored by the vast majority of companies in their approach to executive remuneration, and the gap between executive pay and the pay of ordinary employees has soared since the introduction of the Greenbury Code in 1995.

The Corporate Governance Code (and the Greenbury Code before it) has always applied on a 'comply or explain' basis, meaning that companies should either comply with the requirement or explain why they have not done so. Over the years since 1995, companies have not only ignored the provision in terms of setting executive remuneration, but have also failed properly to report why they have chosen to do this.

## Reporting regulations strengthened in 2008

In 2008, in response to the lack of information given in remuneration reports on this issue, the then Labour government introduced regulations requiring that "The directors' remuneration report must contain a statement of how pay and employment conditions of employees of the company and of other undertakings within the same group as the company were taken into account when determining directors' remuneration for the relevant financial year. ${ }^{6 "}$

However, the majority of companies continued to ignore or at best paid pay lip service to the 2008 regulations and indeed the Corporate Governance Code requirement itself. A High Pay Centre report in 2013 found that 84 of the FTSE 100 companies provided no evidence for how employee pay was taken into account when setting executive pay, while the remaining 16 companies complied in relation to annual salary increases only ${ }^{7}$.

## October 2013 reporting requirements

The current government has introduced new reporting requirements for directors' remuneration that came into force in October 2013. Under the 2013

[^2]regulations, companies have to report for the first time a figure for total remuneration for each executive director. The regulations have also strengthened the reporting requirements on the relationship between employee pay and executive pay. They include the requirement that was part of the 2008 regulations for a 'statement of how pay and employment conditions of employees...were taken into account when setting the policy for directors' remuneration'. In addition, the 2013 regulations require information on:

- 'whether, and if so, how, the company consulted with employees when drawing up the directors' remuneration policy;
- the percentage change in total remuneration in comparison with the previous year for the CEO and the average percentage change for employees of the company as a whole; and
- 'an explanation of the differences (if any) in the company's policy on the remuneration of directors from the policy on the remuneration of employees generally ${ }^{8}$.

There are indications that some companies are flouting the spirit if not the letter of the regulations ${ }^{9}$, but it is too early to make a full assessment at this time. This is an issue the TUC will return to in the months ahead.

[^3]
## About this report: research on executive and employee pay in FTSE 350 companies

It is in this context of growing wage inequality within companies and across the economy as a whole that the TUC has commissioned data from Incomes Data Services (IDS) ${ }^{10}$ on executive remuneration and average employee pay within the same companies.

The research uses company reports for FTSE 350 companies (excluding investment trusts) for the year ending $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2013. It is therefore providing a snapshot of the situation before the introduction of the October 2013 regulations, which will be a useful comparator for assessing the impact of these regulations ${ }^{11}$.

Figures on the total remuneration of the company's highest paid director have been calculated by IDS on the basis of the information provided in company remuneration reports.

It is possible to calculate an approximate figure for average (mean) employee wages from annual reports, although these figures may not be fully accurate (the reasons for this are set out below). Company annual reports (not remuneration reports) are required to include a figure for total staff numbers and for the total wage bill. The latter can be divided by the former to give a figure for average employee pay. This is the only way of calculating a figure for average employee pay within companies and thus comparing the pay of company directors with the pay of their own staff from publicly available sources.

## Caveats about the data

However, calculating average employee pay in this way may not generate a fully accurate figure; there are a number of reasons for this set out below. It is worth noting that these issues are not addressed in the reporting requirements introduced in October 2013.

- Part-time workers who are paid less than their full-time equivalents (FTEs) because of the lower number of hours worked will nonetheless count as one worker in the figure for the number of workers within the company. Thus a company with a large number of part-time workers will generate an artificially low figure for average employee pay. To correct for this, additional information on the numbers of FTEs would be required. This information is not a requirement for annual reports and is often not included. This is a particular issue in the retail sector, where many companies employ large numbers of part-time workers (see table 17).

[^4]- The figure for total wage costs includes all company employees, including those working in other countries. Depending on the sector and country, overseas workers may be paid much lower rates than UK workers. This does not actually make the figure for average employees inaccurate. How companies treat their overseas workers is as important as how they treat their UK workers - and paying lower rates of pay is one of the reasons that companies choose to base activities overseas. But when making comparisons between companies it is important to remember that you may be comparing pay rates across very different economies, as the average employee pay figure for some companies will include a majority of employees from non-UK economies, whereas some companies employ all their staff within the UK.
- The total wage bill figure used to create the 'average employee pay' figure includes the wages of executive directors, which - as the average employee pay is a mean, not a median - will pull the average employee figure upwards, sometimes considerably, depending on the size of the company and how much its top executives are paid. This means that median employee pay will generally be lower than mean employee pay.
- There are variations in how contractors employed by the company are accounted for, as some companies include contractors in their employee numbers and total wage figures, while others do not. This is a particular issue in the mining sector, where operations are based largely overseas and generally employ large numbers of workers. In many cases, these workers are employed via contractors. Whether or not workers employed via contractors are included in the figures for employee numbers and wages in the company's annual report can make a significant difference to the figure that will be derived for average employee pay. If contractors are included, the average employee pay figure will be generally be lower than if they are excluded (reflecting the lower pay rates of miners working overseas in comparison with head office staff). Because of this, stark variations in average employee pay figures can reflect reporting variations rather than actual pay differences. As already noted, this is a particular issue for mining companies (see table 14).
- Employee numbers may represent average employee numbers over the year, or employee numbers at the end of the year. Which figure is used may affect the average employee pay figure produced (although this is unlikely to make a significant difference in most cases).
- Incentive payments are sometimes included within the figure for wages and salaries and sometimes accounted for separately. It is often not clear from company reports whether or not the wages figure includes incentive pay or not and also not clear how incentive pay, if included, is allocated among staff.
- Finally, there are a number of other employment related costs that are sometimes included in the total wages figures, such as redundancy payments, costs for discontinued operations, pension costs, social security costs and so on. These are not actually wage costs as such but will all inflate the figure derived for average employee pay.
- These inconsistencies in reporting mean that the figures derived from company reports for average employee pay may not be fully accurate or comparable.


## Invitation to companies to provide accurate data

In order to address these issues, the TUC wrote to every FTSE 350 company included in this report inviting them to provide a figure for median employee remuneration, expressed as a full-time equivalent for part-time workers. The text of this letter is included at appendix one. To address the issue of overseas workers, we invited companies to provide information on average employee pay in each country in which it employed a significant number of workers, or at least for the country in which it employed the largest number of workers, in addition to a figure for UK workers.
Out of the 288 companies included in our sample ${ }^{12}$, we received responses of some kind from 39 companies, a $14 \%$ response rate. The TUC is very grateful to all these companies for their responses. Of these, around a third said that they were happy for us to use the publicly available information in their annual reports to calculate average employee pay for their company (sometimes directing us to the right page or sending a copy of the report) and/or declined to provide any additional information.

The majority of companies who responded provided information of some kind to be used in the report. In some instances this was contextual: for example, information about the location of their employees. Some companies with large numbers of part-time workers provided a 'full-time equivalent' number of employees to enable a more accurate figure for average (mean) pay to be calculated. A small number of companies included detailed information on mean employee pay. Two companies provided us with information on median employee pay as requested. In a small number of cases, the information provided was not compatible with the information we had requested and therefore could not be included in the report.

Where usable, all the company specific information has been included in the tables below where that company is mentioned, either in the table itself or in the footnotes or both.

To allow the scale of executive remuneration to be fully understood we have included a ratio of each highest paid director to the annual non-London living wage for a full-time worker ( $£ 13,923$ ). While not all the companies in the sample will employ workers on the living wage, this information provides a useful way to understand pay inequality in the UK.

But despite our best efforts, because of the variations in company disclosure described above, it is impossible to be certain that figures for average employee pay generated from the data in company reports are fully accurate and

[^5]comparable. The TUC's view is that this point to significant deficiencies in the current reporting regime. For this reason, the TUC is happy to invite any company who wishes to do so to provide us with a more accurate figure for average employee earnings for as long as the report remains on our website.

Where the figures below for average employee pay have been generated by IDS using data in annual reports, the figures for average number of employees and total wages have been used to maximise comparability between companies. This does mean that average employee pay at companies that have large numbers of part-time workers that have not provided us with their full-time equivalent number of workers will appear lower than is actually the case.

As argued above, the gap between executive pay and the pay of other employees in the same companies has a direct impact on company performance and is an issue of widespread public concern. The TUC regards it as unacceptable that disclosure on employee pay rates within companies is so poor and believes that is a matter of public interest that this is addressed. This is returned to below.

## Key research findings: FTSE 100 and FTSE 250

The information on directors' remuneration is for the highest paid director (HPD) (usually the Chief Executive but not always) in the company.

Information on the ratio between HPD remuneration and the average employee pay within the same company is included (please see the caveats set out on page 9).

Information on the ratio between HPD remuneration and the annual nonLondon living wage for a full-time worker $(£ 13,923)$ is also included.

The company information is taken from annual reports for the year ending $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2013.

## Key findings for the FTSE 100

- Median total earnings for highest paid director across the FTSE 100 were £3,195,353.
- Mean total earnings for highest paid director across the FTSE 100 were £4,080,851.
- Median basic salary for highest paid director across the FTSE 100 was £815,000.
- Mean basic salary for highest paid director across the FTSE 100 was £823,655.
- The median ratio of highest paid director total earnings to average employee pay across the FTSE 100 was 85 .
- The mean ratio of highest paid director total earnings to average employee pay across the FTSE 100 was 138.
- The median ratio of highest paid director basic salary to average employee pay across the FTSE 100 was 20.
- The mean ratio of highest paid director basic salary to average employee pay across the FTSE 100 was 30.
- The median ratio of highest paid director total earnings to living wage across the FTSE 100 was 230.
- The mean ratio of highest paid director total earnings to living wage across the FTSE 100 was 293.
- The median ratio of highest paid director basic salary to living wage across the FTSE 100 was 59.
- The mean ratio of highest paid director basic salary to living wage across the

FTSE 100 was 59.

- Median employee earnings across the FTSE 100 were $£ 37,140$.
- Mean employee earnings across the FTSE 100 were $£ 40,763$.


## Key findings for the FTSE 250

- Median total earnings for highest paid director across the FTSE 250 were £1,284,361.
- Mean total earnings for highest paid director across the FTSE 250 were £1,621,637.
- Median basic salary for highest paid director across the FTSE 250 was £452,426.
- Mean basic salary for highest paid director across the FTSE 250 was £470,267.
- The median ratio of highest paid director total earnings to average employee pay across the FTSE 250 was 34 .
- The mean ratio of highest paid director total earnings to average employee pay across the FTSE 250 was 53.
- The median ratio of highest paid director basic salary to average employee pay across the FTSE 250 was 13.
- The mean ratio of highest paid director basic salary to average employee pay across the FTSE 250 was 17.
- The median ratio of highest paid director total earnings to living wage across the FTSE 250 was 92.
- The mean ratio of highest paid director total earnings to living wage across the FTSE 250 was 116.
- The median ratio of highest paid director basic salary to living wage across the FTSE 250 was 32.
- The mean ratio of highest paid director basic salary to living wage across the FTSE 250 was 34.
- Median employee earnings across the FTSE 250 were $£ 37,028$.
- Mean employee earnings across the FTSE 250 were $£ 47,223$.


## Comparative company information

Table 1: Top $\mathbf{2 0}$ companies in FTSE 100 directors by HPD basic salary pa. Plus HPD total earnings pa, average employee salary pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio \& HPD basic salary to living wage pa ratio

| Highest to lowest | Company | Sector | FTSE 100 by <br> HPD <br> basic <br> salary <br> pa | HPD <br> total earnings pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD <br> basic <br> salary to <br> living wage pa ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Antofagasta | Oil, gas \& minerals | 2,167,383 | 2,212,896 | 42,988 | 50 | 156 |
| 2 | Vedanta | Oil, gas \& minerals | 1,404,000 | 2,010,000 | 9,275 | 151 | 101 |
| 3 | BHP Billiton | Oil, gas \& minerals | 1,401,331 | 6,441,480 | 85,376 | 16 | 101 |
| 4 | EVRAZ | Oil, gas \& minerals | 1,313,715 | 1,316,790 | 9,833 | 134 | 94 |
| 5 | WPP Group | Media, marketing \& telecommunications | 1,300,000 | 9,499,480 | 37,468 | 35 | 93 |
| 6 | Royal Dutch Shell | Oil, gas \& minerals | 1,297,442 | 6,341,064 | 78,703 | 16 | 93 |
| 7 | HSBC <br> Holdings | Finance | 1,250,000 | 4,420,000 | 36,298 | 34 | 90 |
| 8 | SABMiller | Food, drink \& tobacco | 1,245,000 | 9,350,505 | 17,890 | 70 | 89 |
| 9 | BG | Utilities | 1,233,000 | 5,027,921 | 85,401 | 14 | 89 |
| 10 | Anglo American | Oil, gas \& minerals | 1,217,000 | 5,210,192 | 26,238 | 46 | 87 |
| 11 | Diageo | Food, drink \& tobacco | 1,217,000 | 6,307,658 | 42,610 | 29 | 87 |
| 12 | Royal Bank of Scotland ${ }^{13}$ | Finance | 1,200,000 | 1,646,000 | 34,000 | 35 | 86 |
| 13 | Tesco | Retail \& distribution | 1,114,000 | 1,604,761 | 11,120 | 100 | 80 |
| 14 | Vodafone | Media, marketing \& telecommunications | 1,099,000 | 6,779,928 | 36,562 | 30 | 79 |
| 15 | BP | Oil, gas \& minerals | 1,061,553 | 3,180,203 | 74,328 | 14 | 76 |
| 16 | Lloyds Banking Group | Finance | 1,061,000 | 1,894,000 | 30,022 | 35 | 76 |
| 17 | Eurasian Natural Resources | Oil, gas \& minerals | 1,051,000 | 2,663,000 | 6,831 | 154 | 75 |
| 18 | Reed Elsevier | Media, marketing \& telecommunications | 1,050,625 | 2,228,930 | 50,590 | 21 | 75 |
| 19 | Rio Tinto | Oil, gas \& minerals | 1,046,789 | 2,565,310 | 70,383 | 15 | 75 |
| 20 | British American Tobacco | Food, drink \& tobacco | 1,037,500 | 6,452,278 | 21,798 | 48 | 75 |

[^6]Table 2: Top 20 companies in FTSE 100 by HPD total earnings pa. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa., HDP total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio \& HPD total earnings to living wage pa ratio

| Highes <br> t to <br> lowest | Company | Sector | FTSE 100 <br> companies <br> by total <br> earnings pa | Basic salary <br> pa | Average <br> employee <br> salary pa. | HPD total <br> earnings <br> to average <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> earnings <br> to living <br> wage pa <br> ratio |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Melrose | Engineering, <br> electrical and other <br> manufacture | $31,157,399$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Burberry | Retail \& distribution |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3: Top 20 companies in FTSE 250 by HPD basic salary pa. Plus their total earnings pa, average employee salary pa, HPD basic earnings to average employee salary pa ratio and HPD basic salary to living wage fpa ratio

| Highes <br> t to <br> lowest | Company | Sector | HPD basic <br> salary pa | HPD total <br> earnings pa | Average <br> employee <br> salary pa. | HPD basic <br> salary to <br> average <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> ratio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^7]Table 4: Top 20 companies in FTSE 250 by HPD total earnings pa. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HDP total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio and HPD total earnings to living wage fpa ratio

| Highest to lowest | Company | Sector | HPD total earnings pa. | HPD basic salary pa. | Average employee salary pa | HDP total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings to living wage pa ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mondi | Engineering, electrical and other manufacture | 7,228,725 | 821,548 | 22,521 | 321 | 519 |
| 2 | Imagination Technologies | E-business, software \& computer services | 6,533,012 | 352,000 | 37,550 | 174 | 469 |
| 3 | Investec | Finance | 6,077,589 | 391,378 | 87,717 | 69 | 437 |
| 4 | Telecity | E-business, software \& computer services | 6,013,319 | 533,000 | 50,252 | 120 | 432 |
| 5 | Rightmove | Property | 5,883,960 | 318,240 | 47,018 | 125 | 423 |
| 6 | Euromoney Institutional Investor | Media, marketing \& telecommunications | 4,855,645 | 198,418 | 61,953 | 78 | 349 |
| 7 | Oxford Instruments | Engineering, electrical and other manufacture | 4,823,272 | 346,000 | 39,531 | 122 | 346 |
| 8 | J ardine Lloyd Thompson | Finance | 4,427,222 | 650,000 | 55,871 | 79 | 318 |
| 9 | Restaurant Group | Retail \& distribution | 4,409,425 | 590,000 | 13,288 | 332 | 317 |
| 10 | Bodycote International | Engineering, electrical and other manufacture | 3,621,185 | 458,000 | 33,775 | 107 | 260 |
| 11 | Menzies (John) | Retail \& distribution | 3,390,531 | 336,000 | 17,945 | 189 | 244 |
| 12 | Synthomer | Engineering, electrical and other manufacture | 3,327,028 | 472,500 | 31,159 | 107 | 239 |
| 13 | WH Smith ${ }^{15}$ | Retail \& distribution | 3,297,835 | 525,000 | 19,336 | 171 | 237 |
| 14 | Berkeley | Construction \& building materials | 3,289,728 | 780,000 | 77,881 | 42 | 236 |
| 15 | Afren ${ }^{16}$ | Oil, gas \& minerals | 3,273,086 | 625,000 | 91,377 | 36 | 235 |
| 16 | Howden Joinery | Retail \& distribution | 3,253,253 | 555,000 | 31,936 | 102 | 234 |
| 17 | Informa | Media, marketing \& telecommunications | 3,230,734 | 823,497 | 42,411 | 76 | 232 |
| 18 | Tullett Prebon | Other services | 3,153,000 | 650,000 | 200,491 | 16 | 226 |
| 19 | Henderson Group | Finance | 3,012,635 | 350,000 | 117,608 | 26 | 216 |
| 20 | Provident Financial | Finance | 2,921,194 | 650,000 | 30,190 | 97 | 210 |

${ }^{15}$ WH Smith provided a figure for FTEs, allowing us to calculate a more accurate figure for average (mean) employee pay.
${ }^{16}$ Afren provided information on employee numbers and average pay for Afren's locations in the UK, US and Africa. These have been used to create a weighted average used in the report. The average (mean) pay of its UK employees was $£ 144,372$, average (mean) pay of its US employees was $£ 155,283$ and average (mean) pay of its African employees was $£ 47,103$.

Table 5: Top 20 companies in FTSE250 by HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio. Plus HPD total earnings pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio, HPD basic salary pa, and average employee salary pa

| Highest to lowest | Company | Sector | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings pa | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Restaurant Group | Retail \& distribution | 332 | 4,409,425 | 44 | 590,000 | 13,288 |
| 2 | Mondi | Engineering, electrical and other manufacture | 321 | 7,228,725 | 36 | 821,548 | 22,521 |
| 3 | Centamin | Oil, gas \& minerals | 271 | 1,181,263 | 104 | 451,851 | 4,356 |
| 4 | Ferrexpo | Oil, gas \& minerals | 250 | 1,225,157 | 87 | 424,511 | 4,894 |
| 5 | Kazakhmys | Oil, gas \& minerals | 250 | 1,676,000 | 158 | 1,062,000 | 6,711 |
| 6 | Menzies (John) | Retail \& distribution | 189 | 3,390,531 | 19 | 336,000 | 17,945 |
| 7 | Imagination Technologies | E-business, software \& computer services | 174 | 6,533,012 | 9 | 352,000 | 37,550 |
| 8 | WH Smith ${ }^{17}$ | Retail \& distribution | 171 | 3,297,835 | 27 | 525,000 | 19,336 |
| 9 | New World Resources | Oil, gas \& minerals | 166 | 2,436,667 | 38 | 552,765 | 14,642 |
| 10 | Mitie Group | Other services | 166 | 2,245,400 | 38 | 510,000 | 13,545 |
| 11 | Dunelm | Retail \& distribution | 158 | 1,762,457 | 24 | 265,000 | 11,176 |
| 12 | William Hill | Transport \& leisure | 150 | 2,415,765 | 40 | 650,000 | 16,099 |
| 13 | Halfords | Retail \& distribution | 128 | 1,500,000 | 44 | 513,000 | 11,684 |
| 14 | Petropavlovsk | Oil, gas \& minerals | 128 | 1,102,411 | 69 | 596,667 | 8,637 |
| 15 | Rightmove | Property | 125 | 5,883,960 | 7 | 318,240 | 47,018 |
| 16 | Oxford Instruments | Engineering, electrical and other manufacture | 122 | 4,823,272 | 9 | 346,000 | 39,531 |
| 17 | Telecity | E-business, software \& computer services | 120 | 6,013,319 | 11 | 533,000 | 50,252 |
| 18 | Morgan Crucible | Engineering, electrical and other manufacture | 116 | 2,767,243 | 20 | 480,000 | 23,841 |
| 19 | Bodycote International | Engineering, electrical and other manufacture | 107 | 3,621,185 | 14 | 458,000 | 33,775 |
| 20 | Ted Baker | Retail \& distribution | 107 | 1,983,408 | 18 | 338,000 | 18,515 |

[^8]Table 6: Top $\mathbf{2 0}$ companies in FTSE 100 by HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio. Plus HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio, HPD basic salary pa, and average employee salary pa

| Highest to lowest | Company | Sector | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings pa. | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Melrose | Engineering, electrical and other manufacture | 1607 | 31,157,399 | 21 | 409,800 | 19,393 |
| 2 | SABMiller | Food, drink \& tobacco | 523 | 9,350,505 | 70 | 1,245,000 | 17,890 |
| 3 | Burberry | Retail \& distribution | 472 | 16,018,324 | 29 | 990,000 | 33,963 |
| 4 | Next | Retail \& distribution | 444 | 4,154,973 | 76 | 714,000 | 9,358 |
| 5 | Old Mutual | Finance | 400 | 8,928,080 | 39 | 870,000 | 22,348 |
| 6 | Eurasian Natural Resources | Oil, gas \& minerals | 390 | 2,663,000 | 154 | 1,051,000 | 6,831 |
| 7 | Compass Group | Other services | 349 | 4,435,578 | 74 | 945,000 | 12,714 |
| 8 | British American Tobacco | Food, drink \& tobacco | 296 | 6,452,278 | 48 | 1,037,500 | 21,798 |
| 9 | Unilever | Food, drink \& tobacco | 257 | 6,214,345 | 39 | 948,000 | 24,200 |
| 10 | WPP Group | Media, marketing \& telecommunicatn | 254 | 9,499,480 | 35 | 1,300,000 | 37,468 |
| 11 | Sainsbury | Retail \& distribution | 247 | 3,224,000 | 72 | 940,000 | 13,064 |
| 12 | Randgold Resources | Oil, gas \& minerals | 230 | 4,301,243 | 50 | 925,926 | 18,682 |
| 13 | Kingfisher | Retail \& distribution | 230 | 3,813,931 | 49 | 816,000 | 16,571 |
| 14 | Associated British Foods | Food, drink \& tobacco | 226 | 3,210,503 | 65 | 918,000 | 14,184 |
| 15 | Standard Chartered | Finance | 223 | 7,761,079 | 21 | 716,516 | 34,801 |
| 16 | Vedanta | Oil, gas \& minerals | 217 | 2,010,000 | 151 | 1,404,000 | 9,275 |
| 17 | Intertek Group | Other services | 204 | 4,469,063 | 31 | 687,000 | 21,922 |
| 18 | Experian | Transport \& leisure | 203 | 9,491,418 | 20 | 936,768 | 46,779 |
| 19 | Anglo American | Oil, gas \& minerals | 199 | 5,210,192 | 46 | 1,217,000 | 26,238 |
| 20 | Reckitt Benckiser ${ }^{18}$ | Chemicals \& pharmaceuticals | 195 | 5,001,400 | 31 | 800,000 | 25,710 |

[^9]Table 7: Chemical and pharmaceutical companies by HPD total earnings pa. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio and HPD total earnings to living wage $£ \mathrm{fpa}$ ratio

| Highest to lowest | Chemical and Pharmacy company | HPD total earnings pa | HPD basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings to living wage $\mathbf{f p a}$ ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Reckitt Benckiser | 5,001,400 | 800,000 | 25,710 | 195 | 31 | 359 |
| 2 | Johnson Matthey | 3,881,982 | 768,000 | 35,944 | 108 | 21 | 279 |
| 3 | GlaxoSmithKline | 3,771,591 | 1,033,000 | 58,761 | 64 | 18 | 271 |
| 4 | AstraZeneca | 3,446,241 | 740,000 | 48,191 | 72 | 15 | 248 |
| 5 | Smith \& Nephew ${ }^{19}$ | 2,676,642 | 851,447 | 45,603 | 59 | 19 | 192 |
| 6 | Hikma Pharmaceuticals ${ }^{20}$ | 2,035,368 | 461,276 | 27,029 | 105 | 24 | 146 |
| 7 | Croda International | 1,780,985 | 350,208 | 38,172 | 47 | 9 | 128 |
| 8 | PZ Cussons | 1,404,569 | 472,875 | 13,809 | 102 | 34 | 101 |
| 9 | Victrex | 1,138,976 | 445,538 | 52,718 | 22 | 8 | 82 |
| 10 | Elementis | 1,084,459 | 468,000 | 40,444 | 27 | 12 | 78 |
| 11 | United Drug | 1,072,157 | 453,360 | 31,572 | 34 | 14 | 77 |
| 12 | BTG | 988,413 | 458,000 | 65,863 | 15 | 7 | 71 |
| 13 | Dechra | 959,564 | 374,491 | 29,556 | 32 | 13 | 69 |
| Sector mean |  | 2,249,411 | 590,477 | 39,495 | 65 | 17 | 162 |
| Sector median |  | 1,780,985 | 468,000 | 38,172 | 59 | 15 | 128 |

[^10]Table 8: Construction and building material companies by HPD total earnings. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employees salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio and HPD total earnings to living wage $£ \mathbf{f}$ a ratio

| Highest to lowest | Construction and building material company | HPD total earnings pa | HPD basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings to living wage £pa ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Berkeley | 3,289,728 | 780,000 | 77,881 | 42 | 10 | 236 |
| 2 | Galliford Try | 2,572,000 | 475,000 | 36,883 | 70 | 13 | 185 |
| 3 | CRH | 2,223,886 | 932,537 | 31,127 | 71 | 30 | 160 |
| 4 | Bellway | 2,055,047 | 544,000 | 42,815 | 48 | 13 | 148 |
| 5 | Wolseley | 1,966,600 | 814,200 | 37,202 | 53 | 22 | 141 |
| 6 | Persimmon Group | 1,933,483 | 678,800 | 38,608 | 50 | 18 | 139 |
| 7 | Barratt Developments | 1,843,453 | 643,000 | 46,304 | 40 | 14 | 132 |
| 8 | Taylor Wimpey | 1,837,000 | 731,000 | 41,111 | 45 | 18 | 132 |
| 9 | Kentz | 1,557,884 | 318,588 | 28,133 | 55 | 11 | 112 |
| 10 | Balfour Beatty | 1,118,056 | 678,000 | 44,904 | 25 | 15 | 80 |
| 11 | Travis Perkins | 1,027,000 | 652,000 | 24,741 | 42 | 26 | 74 |
| 12 | Kier | 912,000 | 460,000 | 31,010 | 29 | 15 | 66 |
| 13 | SIG | 864,000 | 549,000 | 26,926 | 32 | 20 | 62 |
| 14 | Carillion | 853,029 | 560,000 | 24,459 | 35 | 23 | 61 |
| 15 | Bovis Homes Group | 844,000 | 430,000 | 42,684 | 20 | 10 | 61 |
| 16 | Redrow | 620,939 | 385,000 | 34,540 | 18 | 11 | 45 |
| Sector mean |  | 1,594,882 | 601,945 | 38,083 | 42 | 17 | 115 |
| Sector median |  | 1,697,442 | 601,500 | 37,042 | 42 | 15 | 122 |

Table 9: E-business, software \& computer service companies by HPD total earnings pa. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage $£$ pa ratio

| Highest to lowest | E-business, software \& computer company | HPD total earnings pa. | HPD basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD <br> total <br> earning <br> sto <br> living <br> wage <br> £ра <br> ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Imagination Technologies | 6,533,012 | 352,000 | 37,550 | 174 | 9 | 469 |
| 2 | Telecity | 6,013,319 | 533,000 | 50,252 | 120 | 11 | 432 |
| 3 | Sage Group | 2,383,712 | 708,000 | 38,389 | 62 | 18 | 171 |
| 4 | Computacenter | 1,664,354 | 500,000 | 41,351 | 40 | 12 | 120 |
| 5 | Micro Focus International | 1,291,000 | 490,000 | 74,671 | 17 | 7 | 93 |
| 6 | Fidessa | 992,941 | 553,000 | 68,928 | 14 | 8 | 71 |
| 7 | SDL | 944,978 | 316,667 | 40,907 | 23 | 8 | 68 |
| 8 | Aveva | 900,096 | 365,000 | 63,784 | 14 | 6 | 65 |
| 9 | Anite | 763,381 | 334,000 | 64,687 | 12 | 5 | 55 |
| Sector mean |  | 2,387,421 | 461,296 | 53,391 | 53 | 9 | 171 |
| Sector median |  | 1,291,000 | 490,000 | 50,252 | 23 | 8 | 93 |

Table 10: Engineering, electrical and other manufacture companies by HPD total earnings pa. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage fpa ratio

| Highest to lowest | Engineering, electrical \& manufacturing | HPD total earnings pa | HPD basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings to living wage $\mathbf{f p a}$ ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Melrose | 31,157,399 | 409,800 | 19,393 | 1607 | 21 | 2238 |
| 2 | Mondi | 7,228,725 | 821,548 | 22,521 | 321 | 36 | 519 |
| 3 | Arm Holdings | 6,340,330 | 490,000 | 71,429 | 89 | 7 | 455 |
| 4 | Oxford Instruments | 4,823,272 | 346,000 | 39,531 | 122 | 9 | 346 |
| 5 | Smiths Group | 4,514,857 | 820,000 | 31,918 | 141 | 26 | 324 |
| 6 | Rolls-Royce ${ }^{21}$ | 4,108,253 | 896,000 | 48,233 | 85 | 19 | 295 |
| 7 | Weir Group | 4,053,528 | 687,500 | 37,078 | 109 | 19 | 291 |
| 8 | Bodycote International | 3,621,185 | 458,000 | 33,775 | 107 | 14 | 260 |
| 9 | Synthomer | 3,327,028 | 472,500 | 31,159 | 107 | 15 | 239 |
| 10 | IMI | 3,106,299 | 405,000 | 34,745 | 89 | 12 | 223 |
| 11 | BAE Systems | 2,942,568 | 963,000 | 54,119 | 54 | 18 | 211 |
| 12 | Morgan Crucible | 2,767,243 | 480,000 | 23,841 | 116 | 20 | 199 |
| 13 | Dialight | 2,262,745 | 325,968 | 21,161 | 107 | 15 | 163 |
| 14 | Rexam | 2,153,000 | 738,000 | 27,889 | 77 | 26 | 155 |
| 15 | Inchcape | 1,935,172 | 790,400 | 27,004 | 72 | 29 | 139 |
| 16 | Meggitt | 1,755,637 | 639,000 | 38,981 | 45 | 16 | 126 |
| 17 | Halma | 1,722,051 | 435,000 | 29,274 | 59 | 15 | 124 |
| 18 | GKN | 1,703,088 | 726,000 | 32,453 | 52 | 22 | 122 |
| 19 | Spectris | 1,690,820 | 271,000 | 44,369 | 38 | 6 | 121 |
| 20 | Senior | 1,675,512 | 440,000 | 29,222 | 57 | 15 | 120 |
| 21 | Filtrona ( Essentra) | 1,570,000 | 564,000 | 31,239 | 50 | 18 | 113 |
| 22 | Qinetiq | 1,495,284 | 580,000 | 52,825 | 28 | 11 | 107 |
| 23 | Spirax-Sarco | 1,402,668 | 490,000 | 38,893 | 36 | 13 | 101 |
| 24 | Inmarsat | 1,357,764 | 615,000 | 74,215 | 18 | 8 | 98 |
| 25 | DS Smith | 1,320,000 | 561,000 | 19,153 | 69 | 29 | 95 |
| 26 | Pace | 1,291,978 | 472,347 | 38,108 | 34 | 12 | 93 |
| 27 | Fenner | 1,233,730 | 382,824 | 41,026 | 30 | 9 | 89 |
| 28 | Rotork | 1,211,651 | 400,000 | 37,172 | 33 | 11 | 87 |

[^11]| 29 | Spirent | 1,147,822 | 430,524 | 65,046 | 18 | 7 | 82 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | Cobham | 1,057,005 | 441,000 | 46,757 | 23 | 9 | 76 |
| 31 | Invensys | 990,769 | 650,000 | 40,031 | 25 | 16 | 71 |
| 32 | Renishaw | 969,000 | 572,000 | 36,336 | 27 | 16 | 70 |
| 33 | Keller | 951,000 | 433,000 | 39,485 | 24 | 11 | 68 |
| 34 | CSR | 893,084 | 405,030 | 65,300 | 14 | 6 | 64 |
| 35 | Laird Group | 724,000 | 336,000 | 12,293 | 59 | 27 | 52 |
| 36 | AZ Electronic Materials | 655,626 | 360,410 | 52,298 | 13 | 7 | 47 |
| 37 | Ultra Electronics | 481,000 | 420,000 | 44,492 | 11 | 9 | 35 |
| 38 | RPC Group | 471,000 | 282,000 | 26,099 | 18 | 11 | 34 |
| 39 | Chemring | 295,558 | 200,000 | 38,031 | 8 | 5 | 21 |
| Sector mean |  | 2,882,247 | 518,201 | 38,382 | 102 | 15 | 207 |
| Sector median |  | 1,675,512 | 472,347 | 37,172 | 52 | 15 | 120 |

Table 11: Finance companies by HPD total earnings. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage fpa ratio

| Highest to lowest | Finance company | HPD total earnings pa | HPD basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings to living wage £pa ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Old Mutual | 8,928,080 | 870,000 | 22,348 | 400 | 39 | 641 |
| 2 | Prudential Corporation | 8,197,894 | 360,000 | 43,593 | 188 | 8 | 589 |
| 3 | Standard Chartered | 7,761,079 | 716,516 | 34,801 | 223 | 21 | 557 |
| 4 | Investec | 6,077,589 | 391,378 | 87,717 | 69 | 4 | 437 |
| 5 | ICAP | 5,506,487 | 360,000 | 175,000 | 31 | 2 | 395 |
| 6 | Schroders | 4,870,000 | 400,000 | 159,111 | 31 | 3 | 350 |
| 7 | Aberdeen Asset Management ${ }^{22}$ | 4,815,727 | 500,000 | 51,454 | 93 | 10 | 346 |
| 8 | J ardine Lloyd Thompson | 4,427,222 | 650,000 | 55,871 | 79 | 12 | 318 |
| 9 | HSBC Holdings | 4,420,000 | 1,250,000 | 36,298 | 122 | 34 | 317 |
| 10 | Barclays ${ }^{23}$ | 3,669,497 | 800,000 | 42,967 | 85 | 19 | 264 |
| 11 | Henderson Group | 3,012,635 | 350,000 | 117,608 | 26 | 3 | 216 |
| 12 | Provident Financial | 2,921,194 | 650,000 | 30,190 | 97 | 22 | 210 |
| 13 | Close Brothers Group | 2,856,816 | 450,000 | 67,053 | 43 | 7 | 205 |
| 14 | Standard Life | 2,790,224 | 775,000 | 59,943 | 47 | 13 | 200 |
| 15 | Intermediate Capital | 2,729,954 | 328,000 | 256,296 | 11 | 1 | 196 |
| 16 | Legal \& General | 2,679,260 | 653,000 | 35,077 | 76 | 19 | 192 |
| 17 | Beazley | 2,420,296 | 420,000 | 73,848 | 33 | 6 | 174 |
| 18 | London Stock Exchange | 2,397,000 | 675,000 | 60,438 | 40 | 11 | 172 |
| 19 | Jupiter Fund Management ${ }^{24}$ | 2,140,547 | 239,423 | 135,648 | 16 | 2 | 154 |
| 20 | SVG Capital | 2,101,275 | 373,000 | 140,902 | 15 | 3 | 151 |
| 21 | Hiscox | 1,925,499 | 453,000 | 62,887 | 31 | 7 | 138 |

[^12]| 22 | Ashmore | 1,909,832 | 100,000 | 71,713 | 27 | 1 | 137 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | Paragon | 1,902,974 | 422,000 | 36,684 | 52 | 12 | 137 |
| 24 | Lloyds Banking Group | 1,894,000 | 1,061,000 | 30,022 | 63 | 35 | 136 |
| 25 | Amlin | 1,834,400 | 358,000 | 68,673 | 27 | 5 | 132 |
| 26 | Direct Line | 1,826,380 | 671,000 | 28,600 | 64 | 23 | 131 |
| 27 | Resolution | 1,814,334 | 600,000 | 44,289 | 41 | 14 | 130 |
| 28 | RSA | 1,803,947 | 800,000 | 39,120 | 46 | 20 | 130 |
| 29 | Aviva | 1,770,492 | 720,000 | 42,421 | 42 | 17 | 127 |
| 30 | St James's Place Capital | 1,738,834 | 465,000 | 53,864 | 32 | 9 | 125 |
| 31 | Hargreaves Lansdown | 1,670,707 | 450,000 | 52,122 | 32 | 9 | 120 |
| 32 | Royal Bank of Scotland ${ }^{25}$ | 1,646,000 | 1,200,000 | 34,000 | 48 | 35 | 118 |
| 33 | Phoenix Group | 1,442,605 | 700,000 | 104,348 | 14 | 7 | 104 |
| 34 | $3 i$ Group | 1,308,000 | 550,000 | 152,542 | 9 | 4 | 94 |
| 35 | F\&C Asset Management | 1,120,000 | 275,000 | 82,629 | 14 | 3 | 80 |
| 36 | Alliance Trust | 1,098,284 | 425,250 | 74,243 | 15 | 6 | 79 |
| 37 | Rathbone Brothers | 977,840 | 340,000 | 72,560 | 13 | 5 | 70 |
| 38 | Admiral Group | 816,849 | 424,725 | 22,035 | 37 | 19 | 59 |
| 39 | International Personal Finance | 802,999 | 432,000 | 12,795 | 63 | 34 | 58 |
| 40 | Hansteen Holdings | 733,000 | 375,000 | 89,672 | 8 | 4 | 53 |
| 41 | Man Group | 643,652 | 615,939 | 130,347 | 5 | 5 | 46 |
| 42 | RIT Capital Partners | 560,519 | 430,165 | 124,324 | 5 | 3 | 40 |
| 43 | Brewin Dolphin Holdings | 557,000 | 311,000 | 57,159 | 10 | 5 | 40 |
| 44 | Caledonia Investments | 550,209 | 466,000 | 46,386 | 12 | 10 | 40 |
| 45 | IP Group | 218,000 | 214,000 | 79,412 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
| Sector mean |  | 2,606,425 | 534,898 | 73,111 | 54 | 12 | 187 |
| Sector median |  | 1,902,974 | 450,000 | 59,943 | 33 | 8 | 137 |

[^13]Table 12: Food, drink and tobacco companies by HPD total earnings. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary ratio pa to average employee salary and HPD total earnings to living wage $£ \mathbf{f}$ a ratio

| Highest to lowest | Food, drink and tobacco company | HPD total earnings pa | HPD basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings to living wage £pa ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SABMiller | 9,350,505 | 1,245,000 | 17,890 | 523 | 70 | 672 |
| 2 | British American Tobacco | 6,452,278 | 1,037,500 | 21,798 | 296 | 48 | 463 |
| 3 | Diageo | 6,307,658 | 1,217,000 | 42,610 | 148 | 29 | 453 |
| 4 | Unilever | 6,214,345 | 948,000 | 24,200 | 257 | 39 | 446 |
| 5 | Tate \& Lyle | 5,773,667 | 700,000 | 48,063 | 120 | 15 | 415 |
| 6 | Associated British Foods | 3,210,503 | 918,000 | 14,184 | 226 | 65 | 231 |
| 7 | Imperial Tobacco | 3,029,643 | 655,000 | 24,973 | 121 | 26 | 218 |
| 8 | Booker | 1,505,500 | 275,000 | 17,579 | 86 | 16 | 108 |
| 9 | Cranswick | 1,420,000 | 684,000 | 22,165 | 64 | 31 | 102 |
| 10 | Domino's Pizza | 1,334,276 | 270,000 | 28,630 | 47 | 9 | 96 |
| 11 | Britvic | 1,285,776 | 507,359 | 37,579 | 34 | 14 | 92 |
| 12 | A.G. Barr | 1,085,148 | 345,000 | 33,384 | 33 | 10 | 78 |
| 13 | Dairy Crest | 904,000 | 512,000 | 32,486 | 28 | 16 | 65 |
| 14 | Devro | 459,000 | 425,000 | 28,557 | 16 | 15 | 33 |
| Sector mean |  | 3,452,307 | 695,633 | 28,150 | 143 | 29 | 248 |
| Sector median |  | 2,267,572 | 669,500 | 26,765 | 103 | 21 | 163 |

Table 13: Media, marketing \& telecommunications companies by HPD total earnings pa. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage $£$ pa ratio

$\left.$| Highest <br> to <br> lowest |  <br> telecommunications <br> company | HPD total <br> earnings <br> pa | HPD <br> basic <br> salary <br> pa | Average <br> employee <br> salary pa | HPD total <br> earnings <br> to average <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> ratio | HPD basic <br> salary to <br> average <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> ratio |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | HPD total <br> earnings <br> to living <br> ratio |
| :--- |
| $\mathbf{\text { fpa }}$ | \right\rvert\,

Table 14: Oil, gas and minerals companies by HPD total earnings pa. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage $£ \mathbf{f}$ a ratio

| Highest <br> to lowest | Oil, gas and <br> minerals <br> company | HPD total <br> earnings <br> pa | HPD <br> basic <br> salary pa | Average <br> employee <br> salary pa | HPD total <br> earnings <br> to average <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> ratio | HPD basic <br> salary to <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> ratio |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

[^14]| 28 | Polymetal <br> International $^{27}$ | 615,122 | 281,717 | 17,245 | 36 | 16 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 29 | Petra Diamonds | 566,800 | 261,752 | 22,924 | 25 | 44 |  |
| 30 | Lonmin | 549,863 | 325,850 | 14,626 | 38 | 41 |  |
| Sector <br> mean |  | $\mathbf{2 , 3 7 4 , 3 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 4 , 4 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 , 5 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ | 22 |  |
| Sector <br> median |  | $\mathbf{2 , 1 0 1 , 2 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 7 , 8 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 9 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 1}$ |

[^15]Table 15: Other services companies by HPD total earnings pa. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage fpa ratio

| Highest <br> to lowest | Other services <br> company | HPD total <br> earnings <br> pa | HPD <br> basic <br> salary <br> pa | Average <br> employee <br> salary pa | HPD total <br> earnings <br> to average <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> ratio | HPD basic <br> salary to <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> ratio |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## TUC

| 32 | Big Yellow Group | 461,035 | 267,900 | 27,258 | 17 | 10 | 33 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 33 | NMC Health | 338,657 | 251,174 | 13,573 | 25 | 19 | 24 |
| Sector <br> mean |  | $\mathbf{1 , 9 7 0 , 6 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 0 , 2 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 , 9 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 2}$ |
| Sector <br> median |  | $\mathbf{1 , 2 9 9 , 2 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 4 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 , 2 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 3}$ |

Table 16: Property companies by HPD total earnings pa. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage £pa ratio

| Highest to lowest | Property company | HPD total earnings pa | HPD <br> basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings to living wage $£ \mathbf{~ p a}$ ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Rightmove | 5,883,960 | 318,240 | 47,018 | 125 | 7 | 423 |
| 2 | British Land ${ }^{28}$ | 3,527,228 | 800,000 | 75,086 | 47 | 11 | 253 |
| 3 | Land Securities ${ }^{29}$ | 2,928,885 | 663,000 | 53,400 | 55 | 12 | 210 |
| 4 | Hammerson | 2,322,712 | 400,000 | 55,774 | 42 | 7 | 167 |
| 5 | Derwent London | 2,275,210 | 567,000 | 148,193 | 15 | 4 | 163 |
| 6 | Great Portland Estates | 1,895,422 | 490,000 | 151,765 | 12 | 3 | 136 |
| 7 | Savills | 1,534,903 | 225,000 | 17,869 | 86 | 13 | 110 |
| 8 | Shaftesbury | 1,365,874 | 430,000 | 131,818 | 10 | 3 | 98 |
| 9 | St Modwen Properties | 1,282,945 | 446,000 | 52,083 | 25 | 9 | 92 |
| 10 | Intu Properties | 1,233,351 | 513,750 | 36,207 | 34 | 14 | 89 |
| 11 | Capital \& Counties Properties | 1,220,661 | 450,000 | 60,736 | 20 | 7 | 88 |
| 12 | Segro | 1,129,440 | 520,000 | 82,937 | 14 | 6 | 81 |
| 13 | Unite | 871,660 | 401,333 | 33,954 | 26 | 12 | 63 |
| 14 | Grainger | 792,946 | 420,000 | 45,423 | 17 | 9 | 57 |
| 15 | Workspace | 772,300 | 337,400 | 50,610 | 15 | 7 | 55 |
| 16 | Daejan | 770,000 | 750,000 | 36,417 | 21 | 21 | 55 |
| 17 | London \& Stamford Property | 629,962 | 303,400 | 204,500 | 3 | 1 | 45 |
| Sector mean |  | 1,790,439 | 472,654 | 75,517 | 33 | 9 | 129 |
| Sector median |  | 1,282,945 | 446,000 | 53,400 | 21 | 7 | 92 |

${ }^{28}$ British Land provided the figure used for average employee pay.
${ }^{29}$ Land Securities pointed out a figure in their annual report for average employee salary excluding directors, which has been used. For information, if calculated from total wage divided by the number of employees (as set out on page 9) average employee salary is $£ 77,439$, giving a HPD total earnings and HPD basic salary ratio of 38 and 9 respectively.

Table 17: Retail and distribution companies by HPD total earnings. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage $£ \mathbf{f} \mathbf{p}$ ratio

| Highest to lowest | Retail and distribution company | HPD total earnings pa | HPD <br> basic salary pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic <br> salary to <br> average <br> employee <br> salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings to living wage $\mathbf{f p a}$ ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Burberry | 16,018,324 | 990,000 | 33,963 | 472 | 29 | 1150 |
| 2 | Restaurant Group | 4,409,425 | 590,000 | 13,288 | 332 | 44 | 317 |
| 3 | Next | 4,154,973 | 714,000 | 9,358 | 444 | 76 | 298 |
| 4 | Kingfisher | 3,813,931 | 816,000 | 16,571 | 230 | 49 | 274 |
| 5 | Menzies (John) | 3,390,531 | 336,000 | 17,945 | 189 | 19 | 244 |
| 6 | WH Smith ${ }^{30}$ | 3,297,835 | 525,000 | 19,336 | 171 | 27 | 237 |
| 7 | Howden Joinery | 3,253,253 | 555,000 | 31,936 | 102 | 17 | 234 |
| 8 | Sainsbury | 3,224,000 | 940,000 | 13,064 | 247 | 72 | 232 |
| 9 | Wm Morrison ${ }^{31}$ | 2,288,851 | 570,000 | 19,398 | 118 | 29 | 164 |
| 10 | Marks \& Spencer | 2,013,000 | 975,000 | 13,069 | 154 | 75 | 145 |
| 11 | Ted Baker | 1,983,408 | 338,000 | 18,515 | 107 | 18 | 142 |
| 12 | Dunelm | 1,762,457 | 265,000 | 11,176 | 158 | 24 | 127 |
| 13 | Tesco | 1,604,761 | 1,114,000 | 11,120 | 144 | 100 | 115 |
| 14 | Home Retail ${ }^{32}$ | 1,543,813 | 836,000 | 22,626 | 68 | 37 | 111 |
| 15 | Halfords | 1,500,000 | 513,000 | 11,684 | 128 | 44 | 108 |
| 16 | N Brown | 1,397,577 | 542,000 | 20,529 | 68 | 26 | 100 |
| 17 | Diploma | 1,042,080 | 385,000 | 38,317 | 27 | 10 | 75 |
| 18 | Debenhams | 969,361 | 599,243 | 11,160 | 87 | 54 | 70 |
| 19 | Greggs ${ }^{33}$ | 585,030 | 469,397 | 20,969 | 28 | 22 | 42 |
| 20 | Carpetright | 522,000 | 482,000 | 28,065 | 19 | 17 | 37 |
| 21 | Ocado | 455,000 | 350,000 | 23,592 | 19 | 15 | 33 |
| 22 | Supergroup | 419,463 | 400,000 | 25,479 | 16 | 16 | 30 |
| 23 | Sports Direct International | 150,000 | 150,000 | 13,941 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Sector mean |  | 2,599,960 | 584,984 | 19,352 | 145 | 36 | 187 |
| Sector median |  | 1,762,457 | 542,000 | 18,515 | 118 | 27 | 127 |

[^16]Table 18: Transport and leisure companies by HPD total earnings. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage fpa ratio

| Highest to lowest | Transport and leisure company | HPD total earnings pa | HPD <br> basic <br> salary pa | Average employee salary pa | HPD total earnings to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD basic salary to average employee salary pa ratio | HPD total earnings to living wage $\mathbf{f p a}$ ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Experian | 9,491,418 | 936,768 | 46,779 | 203 | 20 | 682 |
| 2 | TUI Travel | 4,480,402 | 850,000 | 26,105 | 172 | 33 | 322 |
| 3 | InterContinental Hotels | 3,941,436 | 474,000 | 42,153 | 94 | 11 | 283 |
| 4 | BBA Aviation | 2,473,919 | 558,000 | 27,845 | 89 | 20 | 178 |
| 5 | William Hill | 2,415,765 | 650,000 | 16,099 | 150 | 40 | 174 |
| 6 | Whitbread | 2,011,718 | 425,250 | 14,901 | 135 | 29 | 144 |
| 7 | Millennium \& Copthorne Hotels ${ }^{34}$ | 2,005,031 | 650,000 | 21,945 | 91 | 30 | 144 |
| 8 | EasyJ et | 1,986,000 | 712,000 | 46,186 | 43 | 15 | 143 |
| 9 | Bwin Party Digital Entertainment | 1,888,675 | 445,483 | 30,857 | 61 | 14 | 136 |
| 10 | National Express | 1,715,673 | 420,000 | 16,584 | 103 | 25 | 123 |
| 11 | IG Group | 1,679,000 | 414,000 | 82,022 | 20 | 5 | 121 |
| 12 | International Airlines Group | 1,362,000 | 650,000 | 44,197 | 31 | 15 | 98 |
| 13 | Playtech | 1,347,723 | 298,770 | 28,531 | 47 | 10 | 97 |
| 14 | 888 Holdings | 1,251,373 | 338,269 | 49,079 | 25 | 7 | 90 |
| 15 | Greene King | 1,231,000 | 516,000 | 11,506 | 107 | 45 | 88 |
| 16 | Ladbrokes | 1,222,000 | 580,000 | 16,515 | 74 | 35 | 88 |
| 17 | Stagecoach Group | 1,126,000 | 581,000 | 26,469 | 43 | 22 | 81 |
| 18 | Enterprise Inns | 1,106,000 | 640,000 | 41,750 | 26 | 15 | 79 |
| 19 | First Group | 1,055,000 | 846,000 | 20,943 | 50 | 40 | 76 |
| 20 | Go-Ahead Group ${ }^{35}$ | 1,022,000 | 503,000 | 31,608 | 32 | 16 | 73 |
| 21 | Fisher (James) \& Sons | 805,751 | 300,000 | 38,385 | 21 | 8 | 58 |
| 22 | JD Wetherspoon | 802,299 | 434,000 | 11,359 | 71 | 38 | 58 |
| 23 | Marstons | 747,490 | 480,000 | 11,376 | 66 | 42 | 54 |
| 24 | Betfair Group | 625,220 | 445,333 | 48,866 | 13 | 9 | 45 |

[^17]| 25 | Mitchells \& Butlers $^{\mathbf{3 6}}$ | 462,036 | 404,000 | 12,553 | 37 | 32 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sector <br> mean |  | $\mathbf{1 , 9 3 0 , 1 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 2 , 0 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 , 5 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ |  |
| Sector <br> median |  | $\mathbf{1 , 3 4 7 , 7 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 3 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 , 8 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ |  |

Table 19: Utilities companies by HPD total earnings. Plus HPD basic salary pa, average employee salary pa, HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio pa, HPD basic salary to average employee salary ratio pa and HPD total earnings to living wage fpa ratio

| Highest <br> to lowest | Utilities company | HPD total <br> earnings <br> pa | HPD <br> basic <br> salary pa | Average <br> employee <br> salary pa | HPD total <br> earnings <br> to average <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> ratio | HPD basic <br> salary to <br> average <br> employee <br> salary pa <br> ratio | HPD total <br> earnings <br> to living <br> wage $\mathbf{\text { fpa }}$ <br> ratio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | BG | $5,027,921$ | $1,233,000$ | 85,401 | 59 | 14 | 361 |
| 2 | Centrica | $4,456,027$ | 950,000 | 41,690 | 107 | 23 | 320 |
| 3 | National Grid ${ }^{37}$ | $3,175,460$ | 971,000 | 59,936 | 53 | 16 | 228 |
| 4 | United Utilities | $1,420,600$ | 650,000 | 38,206 | 37 | 17 | 102 |
| 5 | Drax Group ${ }^{38}$ | $1,335,097$ | 523,000 | 40,171 | 33 | 13 | 96 |
| 6 | Scottish \& Southern <br> Energy (SSE) ${ }^{39}$ | $1,169,500$ | 940,000 | 31,541 | 37 | 30 | 84 |
| 7 | Severn Trent | $1,034,920$ | 530,100 | 33,139 | 31 | 16 | 74 |
| 8 | Pennon | 647,000 | 359,000 | 28,903 | 22 | 12 | 46 |
| Sector <br> mean |  | $\mathbf{2 , 2 8 3 , 3 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 9 , 5 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 , 8 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 4}$ |
| Sector <br> median |  | $\mathbf{1 , 3 7 7 , 8 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 , 1 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 9}$ |

[^18]Table 20: HPD total earnings pa - sector medians

| Highest to <br> lowest | Sector | HPD total earnings - sector <br> median |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Food, drink \& tobacco | $£ 2,267,572$ |
| 2 |  <br> telecommunications | $£ 2,242,465$ |
| 3 | Oil, gas \& minerals | $£ 2,101,249$ |
| 4 | Finance | $£ 1,902,974$ |
| 5 |  <br> pharmaceuticals | $£ 1,780,985$ |
| 6 | Retail \& distribution | $£ 1,762,457$ |
| 7 | Construction \& building <br> materials | $£ 1,697,442$ |
| 8 | Engineering, electrical and <br> other manufacture | $£ 1,675,512$ |
| 9 | Utilities | $£ 1,377,849$ |
| 10 | Transport \& leisure | $£ 1,347,723$ |
| 11 | Other Services | $£ 1,299,289$ |
| 12 |  <br> computer services | $£ 1,291,000$ |
| 13 | Property | $£ 1,282,945$ |

Table 21: HPD total earnings to living wage fpa ratio - sector medians

| Highest <br> to <br> lowest | Sector | HPD total earnings to living wage £pa <br> ratio - sector median |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Food, drink \& tobacco | 163 |
| 2 |  <br> telecommunications | 161 |
| 3 | Oil, gas \& minerals | 151 |
| 4 | Finance | 137 |
| 5 |  <br> pharmaceuticals | 128 |
| 6 | Retail \& distribution | 127 |
| 7 | Construction \& building <br> materials | 122 |
| 8 | Engineering, electrical and <br> other manufacture | 120 |
| 9 | Utilities | 99 |
| 10 | Transport \& leisure | 97 |
| 11 | Other Services | 93 |
| 12 |  <br> computer services | 93 |
| 13 | Property | 92 |

Table 22: HPD total earnings to average employee salary ratio sector medians

| Highest <br> to <br> lowest | Sectors | HPD total earnings to <br> average employee <br> salary ratio - sector <br> median |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Retail \& distribution | 118 |
| 2 | Food, drink \& tobacco | 103 |
| 3 | Oil, gas \& minerals | 61 |
| 4 | Transport \& leisure | 61 |
| 5 | Chemicals \& pharmaceuticals | 59 |
| 6 | Engineering, electrical and <br> other manufacture | 52 |
| 7 | Other Services | 51 |
| 8 |  <br> telecommunications | 49 |
| 9 | Construction \& building <br> materials | 42 |
| 10 | Utilities | 37 |
| 11 | Finance | 33 |
| 12 |  <br> computer services | 23 |
| 13 | Property | 21 |

## Conclusion

This report shows that the gap between the pay of top directors and ordinary employees remains extremely high in the UK. The median ratio between total remuneration of top company directors and average employee pay at their own companies in the FTSE 100 is 85 , while the mean ratio is 138 . At the FTSE 250 , the median and mean ratios between highest paid director total remuneration and average employee pay are 34 and 53 respectively.

As set out in this report, high pay gaps within companies are detrimental to firm performance, can harm employee morale and motivation, contribute to wider inequality and are a matter of widespread public and political concern. It is therefore clearly in the public interest that high pay differentials are addressed and that companies are required to disclose clear and comparable information about pay gaps to allow meaningful comparisons between companies and over time.

The TUC believes that worker representation on remuneration committees has a vital role to play in addressing pay differentials and ensuring that remuneration committees fulfil their existing requirement to take into account pay and conditions elsewhere in the company when setting directors' pay. The Labour Party has committed to introducing mandatory worker representation on remuneration committees and the TUC calls on other political parties to match this commitment.

It is important that at least two members of the remuneration committee should be worker representatives in order to avoid the 'lone voice' phenomenon. As has been clearly documented in research, it is much harder for one person acting alone to challenge successfully a dominant group view.

It is also essential that disclosure is substantially improved. Companies have been required by law since 2008 to state how they have taken employee pay into account when setting executive pay and this requirement is also included in the 2013regulations. However, as the High Pay Centre report cited earlier sets out, this legal requirement has not been adhered to by companies, and has been largely ignored or at best paid lip service to ${ }^{40}$. It is at present too easy for remuneration reports simply to state that they have taken employee pay into account, even though this is roundly contradicted by the facts.

Given the significance of intra-company pay gaps, it is unacceptable that disclosure on this area is so poor. As set out above, it is currently not possible to produce fully robust figures for the ratio between executive remuneration and average employee pay within companies. Without this information, it is not possible to track developments over time or make meaningful comparisons

[^19]between companies. It is a matter of urgency that this gap in disclosure is addressed.

This will require companies to disclose information on employee pay and numbers in a standardised format to address the many variations that currently exist in reports. There are a variety of different ways in which this could be done and the TUC calls on the government to consult on the different options and then implement reform to require companies to report clearly on employee pay levels.

In addition to average employee pay, the TUC believes that meaningful information on low pay within companies should also be disclosed.

In conclusion:

- Executive pay levels in the UK remain excessive.
- The gap between executive pay and employee pay within the same companies is far too high and is damaging firm performance, employee morale and social cohesion.
- Current reporting requirements are inadequate and do not allow fully accurate and comparable figures on employee pay and therefore pay gaps within companies to be produced.
- This weakness in disclosure must be addressed as a matter of urgency. The government should consult on, and introduce, a legal requirement for company reporting on employee pay in a standardised format.
- Worker representation on remuneration should be implemented. This should be mandatory and remuneration committees should include a minimum of two worker representatives.

Appendix one
Dear

## Request for information on average employee pay for inclusion in TUC report on company pay ratios

The TUC is planning to publish a report on company pay ratios in the FTSE 350 in the near future. We will be focussing on the ratio between top director pay and average employee pay within the same company. We have commissioned Incomes Data Services to provide us with information from annual reports on top director pay and average employee pay to create the ratio.

We will be using the information in reports in the range 31/3/2012 to 28/2/2013 to calculate total remuneration for lead director (generally the Chief Executive) to provide the figure for the top part of the ratio.

We will, if necessary, also use information in your annual report to derive a figure for average employee pay for the bottom part of the ratio. We will do this by taking the total wage bill and dividing it by the number of employees, as both of these pieces of information are required disclosures in annual reports for listed companies.

This is the most accurate way that we can calculate average employee pay with the information that is publicly available, but we wish to offer you the opportunity to provide a more accurate figure on average employee pay to use in the report. We would ideally like information on both median and mean employee pay, but will probably use the median employee pay figure to create the pay ratio in recognition of the recommendations of, for example, the Hutton Review of Fair Pay. However, if this presents any problems we will use whichever figure you provide and make clear in the report whether this is a mean or median figure.

If you employ staff overseas, we would welcome the provision of separate figures for average employee pay on a country by country basis for all countries in which you employ over 100 workers. However, if this presents difficulties, please provide a figure for average employee pay for the country in which you employ the largest number of workers, in addition to a figure for your UK workers (and if the UK is the country where you employ the largest number of workers, it would be helpful to have this information for the country where you employ the second largest number). It would also be helpful if you could let us know
roughly how many workers you employ in the countries for which you provide us with information on average employee pay.

We will make it clear in the report whether the figure we use for average employee pay has been derived from your annual report or provided by you. We will also make it clear that we have invited all companies included in the report to provide us with an accurate figure on average employee pay for utilisation in the report.

If you wish to provide us with a figure/s for average employee pay for our report, please could you do so by Friday $19^{\text {th }}$ July. Please can you send it either by e-mail to xxxx or by post to the TUC for attention of xxxx. If this deadline causes you difficulties, please do not hesitate to contact us to discuss this further. While we cannot guarantee that any information provided after this date will be used in the report, we will keep it on file and make sure that it is used in any subsequent revisions.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Thank you in advance for your assistance and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Frances O'Grady<br>General Secretary

Trades Union Congress
Congress House
Great Russell Street
London WC1B 3LS
www.tuc.org.uk
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