



**Discussion Paper No. 19**

**May 2008**

**Do Employee Perspectives Of Employee Relations Vary  
Across The Regions Of Great Britain? A Research Note**

**John Sutherland**

**Centre for Public Policy for Regions  
University of Glasgow  
Ivy Lodge  
63 Gibson Street  
Glasgow G12 8LR**

**Email: [j.sutherland@lbss.gla.ac.uk](mailto:j.sutherland@lbss.gla.ac.uk)**

# **Do Employee Perspectives Of Employee Relations Vary Across The Regions Of Great Britain? A Research Note <sup>1</sup>**

## **1. CONTEXT AND MOTIVATION**

What constitutes ‘good’ employee relations is problematical, and varies according to the perspective adopted (Purcell, 1981). Often for reasons of expositional expediency, the non radical literature assumes two dominant perspectives, a unitary perspective and a pluralist perspective. Use is made of both to examine issues relating to employment relationships (Burchill, 2008).

In the unitary perspective, the root metaphor is the ‘team’, where all parties are united, pursuing a common set of objectives, with management constituting the single source of authority. Conflict is attributable either to deviant behaviour on the part of some employees (and/or their union representatives) or ignorance, attributable to employee misunderstanding of managerial motives or methods. Whereas sanctions – administered within the formal processes of the organisation and/or legislated for by the apparatus of the state - address the issue of conflict, ‘communication’ is the human resource management policy paradigm used to address problems of employee ignorance and misunderstanding. In the pluralist perspective, the root metaphor is the ‘coalition’. The pursuit of alternative objectives on the part of management and workers, the latter often supported by external organisations such as trade unions, is deemed legitimate. Conflict, therefore, is inevitable. Consequently, management’s policy imperative is to recognise means whereby conflict may be resolved effectively and efficiently – for example by bargaining and/or negotiation – and, more strategically, to implement processes by means of which the likelihood of conflict may be minimised – for example joint consultation and/or the incorporation of employees and/or their representatives into the decision-making processes within the organisation. Generically, if somewhat ambiguously, this more sophisticated managerial strategy is referred to as a policy of employee participation and

---

<sup>1</sup> The author acknowledges the (former) Department of Trade and Industry, the Economic and Social Research Council, the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service and the Policy Studies Institute as the originators of the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey data, and the Data Archive at the University of Essex as the distributor of the data. The National Centre for Social Research was commissioned to conduct the field work on behalf of the sponsors. None of these organisations bears any responsibility for the author’s analysis and interpretations of the data.

involvement (Butler and Glover, 2007; Gennard and Judge, 2005; Marchington and Wilkinson, 2005).

Studies of employment relationships tend to ignore the spatial dimension. Place is assumed to function as no more than a stage for social actions (Rainnie et al, 2007). However, workplaces do not exist and operate in a geographical vacuum. Geography, like the economic and political processes, produces locations where “meanings, values and relationships” (Hudson, 2001, p 267) are created and sustained, or otherwise (Peck, 1996).

Although Beaumont and Harris’ (1988) invitation to researchers to “more fully define, measure and explain” the notion of spatially based sub-systems of industrial relations (p. 405) has been declined, it is possible to identify important research which has focussed upon the spatial dimension of the system’s actors, processes and outputs. For example, Martin et al (1996) examine the impact of economic restructuring on the structure and strategies of unions across the regions of the UK; Beaumont and Harris’ own study investigates the possibility of spatial variation in the extent of the coverage of collective bargaining; and there have been a myriad of studies by economists on inter-regional differences in earnings, both for ‘standard’ regions (e.g. Blackaby and Manning, 1987) and composites of the same, such as the ‘north’ and ‘south’ (e.g. Blackaby and Murphy, 1995)

This note reports comparable research which investigates inter-regional differences in employee perspectives of workplace employee relations. Multivariate analysis is used, and the model estimated controls for possible important determinants of an individual’s perspective of employee relations at his/her place of work, such as personal characteristics, structural characteristics of the workplace and the human resource management policies and practices in operation there.

## **2. THE DATA SET AND THE MODEL**

The research makes use of a matched workplace-employee data set with origins in two elements of the Cross Section 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS 2004) (Kersley et al, 2006). The initial unit of analysis is workplaces, defined as “the activities of a single employer at a single set of premises” employing at least five workers (Kersley et al, 2006, p. 3). The population of workplaces sampled is drawn randomly from the International Departmental Business Register maintained by the Office for National Statistics and constitutes 700,000 workplaces (33 percent of the GB total) and 22.5 million employees (89 percent of the GB total). The sample selected is stratified by workplace size and industry, with workplaces being randomly selected from within size bands and industries.<sup>2</sup>

The first element of WERS 2004 used is the ‘Cross Section Survey of Managers’, the interview responses of the senior manager at the workplace responsible for employment relations on a day-to-day basis. In the original survey, this generated 2,295 observations. At each of the workplaces which participated in the survey of managers, self completion questionnaires were distributed to a random selection of up to 25 employees. This ‘Survey of Employees’ constitutes the second element of WERS 2004 used. In the original survey, this generated 22,451 observations.

Given the assumptions integral to the unitary and pluralist perspectives, there are four questions of relevance to the issue of employee perspectives of workplace employee relations in the Survey of Employees viz. B6, B8, B9 and C3.

In question B6, respondents are asked: “In general, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about the following?” Four issues are subsequently identified: (i.) Changes to the way the organisation is run; (ii.) Changes in staffing; (iii.) Changes in the way you do your job; and (iv.) Financial matters, including budgets or profits. To each, six responses are offered: ‘very good’, ‘good’, ‘neither good nor poor’, ‘poor’, ‘very poor’ and ‘don’t know’. In question B8, respondents are asked: “Overall, how good would you say managers at

---

<sup>2</sup> Although this paper makes use of a regional identifier (viz. the Government Office Regions), WERS2004 was not designed to be representative of geographical areas within Great Britain.

this workplace are at....”, where three issues are subsequently raised: (i.) Seeking the views of employees or employee representatives; (ii.) Responding to suggestions from employees or employee representatives; and (iii.) Allowing employees or employee representatives to influence final decisions. To each, individuals are again offered the same six response options identified above. In question B9, individuals are asked: “Overall, how satisfied are you with the amount of involvement you have in decision-making at this workplace?” There are five possible responses: ‘very satisfied’, ‘satisfied’, ‘neither satisfied nor dissatisfied’, ‘dissatisfied’ and ‘very dissatisfied’. In this instance, there is no ‘don’t know’ option. Finally, in question C3, individuals are asked: “In general, how would you describe relations between managers and employees here?”. Again, there are five possible responses to this question: ‘very good’, ‘good’, neither ‘good nor poor’, ‘poor’ and ‘very poor’. Once again, there is no ‘don’t know’ option.

The nominal, multiple responses to these nine questions are re-structured to create the dependent variable in the model estimated. In question B6, the ‘very good’ and ‘good’ responses are merged and constitute a ‘positive response =1’ in a binomial logit estimation. Similarly, in question B8, the ‘very good’ and ‘good’ responses are merged to constitute a ‘positive response =1’ in a binomial logit estimation. In B9, the ‘very satisfied’ and ‘satisfied’ responses are merged, again to create a ‘positive response =1’ in a binomial logit estimation. And in C3, the ‘very good’ and ‘good’ responses are merged to produce the same ‘positive response =1’ in a binomial logit estimation. For each question, all the other responses, including the ‘don’t knows’ in questions B6 and B9, are also merged to constitute a ‘positive response = 0’ throughout.

The binomial logit model is as follows:

$$y_{iw} = X_{iw}\beta + \varepsilon_{iw}$$

where  $y_{iw}$  is the response of an individual in a workplace, with  $y_{iw} = 1$  if the response to the question posed is the ‘positive response’ outcome described above and  $y_{iw} = 0$  otherwise,  $X$  a vector of values for the  $iw$  observation,  $\beta$  a vector of parameters to be estimated and  $\varepsilon_{iw}$  an error term. (Long and Freese, 2006).

The vector of independent variables is of four distinct types, reflecting the personal characteristics of the individual, related to and unrelated to work; the structural characteristics of the workplace at which the individual is employed; selected human resource management policies and practices in operation at the workplace at which the individual is employed; and the region in which the workplace is located. (Full details are to be found in the Data Appendix.)<sup>3</sup> Data for these variables are taken from responses to other questions in the Survey of Employees and selected questions in the Survey of Managers.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Almost three in every five employees view relationships between managers and employees at their workplaces as ‘good’. However, less than half describe management’s communication policies, for example with respect to keeping employees informed about changes in the way the organisation is being run or changes to staffing, as ‘good’. And the proportion expressing positive sentiments about their involvement/participation or that of their representatives in the workplace issues identified is even less (cf. Table1). The statistical significance of the two way association between the nine dependent variables is evident from Table 2. The varying value of Kendal’s tau b statistic demonstrates considerable inter personal differences in responses to each of the questions.

---

<sup>3</sup> In the regressions, the data are weighted using *emptnr* in the WESRS 2004 data set. Also, the observations are clustered by workplace, making use of *serno*.

The results of Wald tests for the nine estimations illustrate the joint significance (at  $p < 0.05$ ) of the sets of variables associated with personal characteristics and workplace structural characteristics throughout (cf. Tables A1 through to A9). In contrast, the sets of variables associated with the human resource management policies and practices in operation at the workplace and the regions are not always jointly significant at the same level of significance.

Table 3 is a composite table, which collates the statistical output relating to the marginal effects for each region in each of the nine estimations undertaken. Two observations are made. The first is in the context of the signs of these marginal effects, relative to the reference region category of the South East. Whereas the East of England is associated with negative signs across all nine estimations, the North West and the East Midlands are associated with only one negative ('finance' in both instances) and the South West and Wales are associated with positive values throughout. The second observation is in the context of the statistical significance (at  $p < 0.1$ ) of these marginal effects. Most results are not statistically significant. However, they are on seven of the nine occasions for Wales.

There is no immediately apparent explanation of these inter-regional differences in employee perceptions of workplace management- employee relations, particularly given the nature of the manifold independent variables in the model used for purposes of the estimations. Nor is it evident that these differences correlate with the variables usually employed to examine and explain inter-regional differences.

There was a time when industrial disputes were seen to reflect the image of industrial relations, with the incidence of strikes assumed to measure the 'efficiency' – or otherwise – of the system (Hyman, 1972). Knowles (1952) observed inter-regional differences in strikes, although he had no regional data *per se* and argued that the observed differences were attributable more to industrial structure. The later study by Smith et al (1978) did find some evidence of spatial – although not necessarily 'regional'- differences in strike patterns, having controlled for industrial structure.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Durcan et al (1983) opted not to examine inter-regional differences in strikes because the data possessed "severe interpretational problems" (p. 17). The regional incidence of stoppages of work

However, the industrial dispute tends to be a geographically isolated phenomenon, part of a process of accommodation between the parties involved. The research reported here has its origins in a systematic survey of employee perceptions of work-related issues at their places of work.

More research is needed to explain both the apparent relative discontent with workplace employee relations perceived by those employed at workplaces across the East of England and the relative accord voiced by those employed at workplaces located in the South West and, especially, Wales.

## REFERENCES

- Beaumont, P.B. and Harris, R.I.D. (1988) 'Sub-systems of industrial relations; the spatial dimension in Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 26:3, pp 397 -407.
- Blackaby, D. H. and Manning, D.N (1987) 'Regional earnings revisited', *The Manchester School*, 55:2, pp 158 -183.
- Blackaby, D.H. and Murphy, P.D. (1995) 'Earnings, unemployment and Britain's North-South divide: real or imaginary?', *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 57:4, pp 487 -512.
- Bryson, A., Forth, J. and Kirby, S. (2005) 'High-involvement management practices, trade union representation and workplace performance in Britain', *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 52:3, pp 451-491.
- Burchill, F. (2008) *Labour Relations* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Butler, P. and Glover, L. (2007) 'Employee participation and involvement'. In Beardwell, J. and Claydon, T. (eds.) *Human Resource Management: A Contemporary Approach* (5<sup>th</sup> edition). Harlow, Pearson Education.
- Durcan, J.W., McCarthy, W.E. and Redman, G.P. (1983) *Strikes in post war Britain: a study of stoppages of work due to industrial disputes, 1948 -1973*. London, Allen and Unwin.
- Gennard, J. and Judge, G. (2005) *Employee Relations* (4<sup>th</sup> edition), London, Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.

---

arising from industrial disputes is reported regularly, although controlling only for population (cf. Monger, 2005).



- Godard, J. (2004) 'A critical assessment of the high-performance paradigm', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42: 2, pp 349 -378.
- Hudson, R. (2001) *Producing Places*, New York, the Guildford Press.
- Hyman, R. (1972) *Strikes*. London, Fontana Press.
- Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J, Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix, S. and Oxenbridge, S. (2006) *Inside the workplace: findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*. London, Routledge.
- Knowles, K.G.J.C. (1952) *Strikes: a study in industrial conflict, with special reference to the British experience between 1911 and 1947*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Long, J.S. and Freese, J. (2006) *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata, (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)*. College Station, Texas, USA, The Stata Press.
- Marchington, M. and Wilkinson, A. (2005) 'Direct participation'. In Bach, S. (ed.) *Personnel management: a comprehensive guide to theory and practice*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Martin, R., Sunley, P. and Wills, J. (1996) *Union Retreat And The Regions: The Shrinking Landscape Of Organised Labour*, London, Jessica Kingsley.
- Monger, J. (2005) 'Labour disputes in 2004.' *Labour Market Trends* (June), pp 239 - 252.
- Peck, J. (1996) *Work-place: The Social Regulation Of Labor Markets*, New York, the Guildford Press.
- Purcell, J. (1981) *Good Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rainnie, A., Herod, A. and McGrath Champ, S. (2007) 'Spatialising industrial relations', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 38:2, pp 102 -118.
- Smith, C.T.B., Clifton, R., Makeham, P. Creigh, S.W. and Burn, R.W. (1978) *Strikes in Britain*. London, Department of Employment, Manpower Paper No. 15.
- Wood, S., Holman, D. and Stride, C. (2006) 'Human resource management and performance in UK call centres', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44: 1, pp 99 -124.
- Wood, S. and de Menezes, L.M. (2008) 'Comparing perspectives on high involvement management and organisational performance across the British economy', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19:4, pp 639 -683.

**Table 1. The Dependent Variables, Nine Perspectives of Employee Relations, proportions**

<b>Dependent Variable</b>	<b>Proportion</b>
Managers are 'good' at keeping employees informed about changes to the way the organisation is being run ('orgchange')	.497
Managers are 'good' at keeping employees informed about changes to staffing ('staffchange')	.440
Managers are 'good' at keeping employees informed about changes to the way you do your job ('jobchange')	.473
Managers are 'good' at keeping employees informed about changes to financial matters ('finance')	.369
Managers are 'good' at seeking the views of employees or their representatives ('views')	.443
Managers are 'good' at responding to suggestions from employees or their representatives ('suggestions')	.389
Managers are 'good' at allowing employees or their representatives to influence final decisions ('decisions')	.261
'Satisfied' with the amount of involvement in decision-making at the workplace ('involvement')	.373
Relations between managers and employees described as 'good' ('relations')	.593

**Table 2. The Dependent Variables, Nine Perspectives of Employee Relations, Two Way Associations, Kendal's tau b, (Asymptotic Standard Error)**

	<b>'orgchange'</b>	<b>'staffchange'</b>	<b>'jobchange'</b>	<b>'finance'</b>	<b>'views'</b>	<b>'suggestions'</b>	<b>'decisions'</b>	<b>'involvement'</b>	<b>'relations'</b>
<b>'orgchange'</b>		.653 (.006)	.615 (.006)	.506 (.007)	.516 (.007)	.469 (.007)	.401 (.007)	.375 (.007)	.461 (.007)
<b>'staffchange'</b>			.610 (.006)	.464 (.007)	.493 (.007)	.462 (.007)	.402 (.007)	.386 (.007)	.441 (.007)
<b>'jobchange'</b>				.458 (.007)	.495 (.007)	.486 (.007)	.408 (.007)	.394 (.007)	.472 (.007)
<b>'finance'</b>					.398 (.007)	.376 (.007)	.352 (.008)	.343 (.008)	.342 (.007)
<b>'views'</b>						.677 (.006)	.559 (.006)	.479 (.007)	.530 (.006)
<b>'suggestions'</b>							.644 (.006)	.496 (.007)	.509 (.006)
<b>'decisions'</b>								.505 (.007)	.407 (.005)
<b>'involvement'</b>									.425 (.006)

**Table 3. Marginal Effects of the ‘Region’ Dummy Variables, by the (named) nine binomial logit estimations**

<b>Region/aspect</b>	<b>‘orgchange’</b>	<b>‘staffchange’</b>	<b>‘jobchange’</b>	<b>‘finance’</b>	<b>‘views’</b>	<b>‘suggestions’</b>	<b>‘decisions’</b>	<b>‘involvement’</b>	<b>‘relations’</b>
<b>North East</b>	.018	-.013	-.000	.008	-.027	-.029	-.011	-.026	-.032
<b>North West</b>	.016	.015	.008	-.024	.008	.017	.003	.005	.020
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	-.000	.008	-.002	-.014	.011	.007	.004	.017	.013
<b>East Midlands</b>	.003	.014	.031	-.008	.020	.028	.018	.036	.013
<b>West Midlands</b>	.010	.001	-.005	.004	-.013	.008	.005	.006	-.004
<b>East of England</b>	-.047	-.026	-.045	-.067***	-.030	-.055**	-.018	-.034	-.038
<b>London</b>	.009	.021	.016	.003	-.018	.020	-.006	-.003	.011
<b>South West</b>	.013	.015	.002	.002	.012	.015	.018	.034	.037
<b>Scotland</b>	.001	-.003	-.012	-.033	.001	.003	-.004	.000	-.016
<b>Wales</b>	.069**	.070***	.074***	.036	.051*	.051*	.036	.059**	.072***

## DATA APPENDIX

Full details of the same set of independent variables used in each binomial logit estimated are as follows:

**PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS:** tenure, by means of 5 dummy variables; employment contract held, by means of 3 dummy variables; the log of the numbers of hours usually worked each week <sup>5</sup>; the number of days of training received in the past year, by means of 6 dummy variables; union/staff association membership, by means of 3 dummy variables; female; age, by means of 9 dummy variables; marital status, by means of 4 dummy variables; whether or not there was a dependent child at home; whether or not the individual had a long term health/disability problem; whether or not the individual had no academic qualifications; whether or not the individual had no vocational/professional qualifications; whether or not the individual supervised others at work; colour (i.e. whether or not the individual was ‘not white’); and the hourly pay received, by means of 4 dummy variables.

**STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORKPLACE:** the log of the numbers employed at the workplace; the log of the percentage of women employed at the workplace; the log of the percentage of employees working part time at the workplace; the log of the percentage of employees classified as ‘administrative workers’ employed at the workplace; the nature of the establishment (e.g. whether it was a single plant organisation, one plant within a multi-plant organisation etc.), by means of 3 dummy variables; the corporate status of the workplace (e.g. whether it was in the public sector, or the private sector etc.), by means of 3 dummy variables; the log of the number of years the workplace had been in operation at the given address; and the SIC of the workplace, by means of 12 dummy variables.

**THE HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN OPERATION AT THE WORKPLACE** <sup>6</sup>: whether or not there is a strategic plan in operation at the workplace; whether or not the workplace is Investors in People accredited; whether or not regular meetings take place between senior management and all employees; whether or not regular meetings take place between employees and their immediate supervisors/managers; whether or not there is a consultative committee constituted to have members of management and employees; whether or not quality circles operate at the workplace; whether or not a system of job evaluation is in operation at the workplace; whether or not there is a formal procedure in operation at the workplace to address collective disputes; whether or not there is an individual grievance procedure in operation in the workplace; whether or not there is an equal opportunities policy in operation at the workplace; and whether or not recruitment and selection are monitored at the workplace.

**REGIONS:** (i.e. Government Office Regions), by means of 11 dummy variables (with the South East of England constituting the reference region category).

---

<sup>5</sup> Throughout, before logs are taken, all ‘0.00’s) are converted to ‘0.05’.

<sup>6</sup> The working assumption is that these policies and practices may matter, given the dependent variables in question, not that they may be associated with engendering particular outcomes, such as commitment, on the part of the worker (Bryson et al, 2005; Godard, 2004; Wood et al, 2006).

**Table A1. Selected Output From the Binomial Logit: ‘In general, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about changes to the way the organisation is being run?’ (‘orgchange’)**

Number of observations: 16,242  
Wald chi(2) (77): 742.31  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000  
Psuedo R2: 0.0440

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to Personal Characteristics:

chi2 (35): 477.47  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Structural Characteristics of the Workplace:

chi2 (20): 72.90  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Human Resource Management Policies and Practices in Operation at the Workplace:

chi2 (11): 20.56  
Prob> chi2: 0.0383

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Government Office Regions:

chi2 (10): 14.76  
Prob> chi2: 0.1409

<b>Region</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Marginal Effect</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>North East</b>	.0750	.1365	.018	
<b>North West</b>	.0661	.0866	.016	
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	-.0009	.1075	-.000	
<b>East Midlands</b>	.0123	.1148	.003	
<b>West Midlands</b>	.0406	.0924	.010	
<b>East of England</b>	-.1896	.1006	-.047	*
<b>London</b>	.0398	.1039	.009	
<b>South West</b>	.0530	.0964	.013	
<b>Scotland</b>	.0066	.0948	.001	
<b>Wales</b>	.2792	.1227	.069	*

Footnotes to the above and subsequent tables:

1. Marginal effects are calculated at the means and for a discrete change for the dummy variables from 0 to 1.
2. The reference category region is South East.
3. \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* statistically significant at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.01, respectively.

**Table A2. Selected Output From the Binomial Logit: ‘In general, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about changes to staffing?’ (‘staffchange’)**

Number of observations: 16,224  
Wald chi(2) (77): 775.11  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000  
Psuedo R2: 0.0488

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to Personal Characteristics:

chi2 (35): 429.55  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Structural Characteristics of the Workplace:

chi2 (20): 118.58  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Human Resource Management Policies and Practices in Operation at the Workplace:

chi2 (11): 13.86  
Prob> chi2: 0.2410

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Government Office Regions:

chi2 (10): 14.08  
Prob> chi2: 0.1693

<b>Region</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Marginal Effect</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>North East</b>	-.0553	.1272	-.013	
<b>North West</b>	.0629	.0812	.015	
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	.0337	.1006	.008	
<b>East Midlands</b>	.0585	.1097	.014	
<b>West Midlands</b>	.0044	.0899	.001	
<b>East of England</b>	-.1088	.0993	-.026	
<b>London</b>	.0888	.1037	.021	
<b>South West</b>	.0629	.0993	.015	
<b>Scotland</b>	-.0154	.0876	-.003	
<b>Wales</b>	.2836	.1060	.070	***

**Table A3. Selected Output From the Binomial Logit: ‘In general, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about changes to the way you do your job?’ (‘jobchange’)**

Number of observations: 16,224  
Wald chi(2) (77): 903.88  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000  
Psuedo R2: 0.0561

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to Personal Characteristics:

chi2 (35): 537.77  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Structural Characteristics of the Workplace:

chi2 (20): 102.95  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Human Resource Management Policies and Practices in Operation at the Workplace:

chi2 (11): 26.12  
Prob> chi2: 0.0062

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Government Office Regions:

chi2 (10): 21.72  
Prob> chi2: 0.0166

<b>Region</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Marginal Effect</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>North East</b>	.0000	.1237	-.000	
<b>North West</b>	.0192	.0759	.004	
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	-.0094	.0948	-.002	
<b>East Midlands</b>	.1259	.0999	.031	
<b>West Midlands</b>	-.0213	.0857	-.005	
<b>East of England</b>	-.1838	.0917	-.045	**
<b>London</b>	.0650	.0928	.016	
<b>South West</b>	.0106	.0855	.002	
<b>Scotland</b>	-.0504	.0797	-.012	
<b>Wales</b>	.2982	.1036	.074	***



**Table A4. Selected Output From the Binomial Logit: In general, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about changes to financial matters including budgets?’ (‘finance’)**

Number of observations: 16,224  
Wald chi(2) (77): 853.50  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000  
Psuedo R2: 0.0516

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to Personal Characteristics:

chi2 (35): 532.71  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Structural Characteristics of the Workplace:

chi2 (20): 144.82  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Human Resource Management Policies and Practices in Operation at the Workplace:

chi2 (11): 48.02  
Prob> chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Government Office Regions:

chi2 (10): 19.90  
Prob> chi2: 0.0302

<b>Region</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Marginal Effect</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>North East</b>	.0081	.1451	.001	
<b>North West</b>	-.1085	.0910	-.024	
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	-.0621	.1118	-.014	
<b>East Midlands</b>	-.0367	.1163	-.008	
<b>West Midlands</b>	.0178	.1000	.004	
<b>East of England</b>	-.3067	.1024	-.067	***
<b>London</b>	.0139	.1048	.003	
<b>South West</b>	.0087	.1000	.002	
<b>Scotland</b>	-.1463	.0972	-.033	
<b>Wales</b>	.1569	.1295	.036	

**Table A5. Selected Output From the Binomial Logit: ‘Overall, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at seeking the views of employees or employees’ representatives ?’ (‘views’)**

Number of observations: 16,224  
Wald chi(2) (77): 823.69  
Prob > chi2: .0000  
Psuedo R2: 0.0532

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to Personal Characteristics:

chi2 (35): 550.51  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Structural Characteristics of the Workplace:

chi2 (20): 127.76  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Human Resource Management Policies and Practices in Operation at the Workplace:

chi2 (11): 19.25  
Prob> chi2: 0.0567

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Government Office Regions:

chi2 (10): 12.42  
Prob> chi2: 0.2576

<b>Region</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Marginal Effect</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>North East</b>	-.1119	.1273	-.027	
<b>North West</b>	.0327	.0832	.008	
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	.0479	.1005	.011	
<b>East Midlands</b>	.0839	.1053	.020	
<b>West Midlands</b>	-.0562	.0903	-.013	
<b>East of England</b>	-.1235	.0916	-.030	
<b>London</b>	-.0740	.1023	-.018	
<b>South West</b>	.0492	.0954	.012	
<b>Scotland</b>	.0040	.0879	.001	
<b>Wales</b>	.2058	.1134	.051	*

**Table A6. Selected Output From the Binomial Logit: ‘Overall, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at responding to suggestions from employees or employees’ representatives?’ (‘suggestions’)**

Number of observations: 16,224  
Wald chi(2) (77): 917.25  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000  
Psuedo R2: 0.0590

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to Personal Characteristics:

chi2 (35): 498.56  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Structural Characteristics of the Workplace:

chi2 (20): 162.44  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Human Resource Management Policies and Practices in Operation at the Workplace:

chi2 (11): 14.05  
Prob> chi2: 0.2300

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Government Office Regions:

chi2 (10): 21.97  
Prob> chi2: 0.0153

<b>Region</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Marginal Effect</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>North East</b>	-.1292	.1215	-.029	
<b>North West</b>	.0733	.0854	.017	
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	.0321	.1031	.007	
<b>East Midlands</b>	.1178	.1118	.028	
<b>West Midlands</b>	.0374	.0945	.008	
<b>East of England</b>	-.2410	.0974	-.055	**
<b>London</b>	.0842	.1019	.020	
<b>South West</b>	.0650	.0981	.015	
<b>Scotland</b>	.0159	.0928	.003	
<b>Wales</b>	.2126	.1136	.051	*

**Table A7. Selected Output From the Binomial Logit: Overall, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at allowing employees or employees' representatives to influence final decisions?' ('decisions')**

Number of observations: 16,224  
Wald chi(2) (77): 833.90  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000  
Psuedo R2: 0.0611

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to Personal Characteristics:

chi2 (35): 489.74  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Structural Characteristics of the Workplace:

chi2 (20): 161.88  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Human Resource Management Policies and Practices in Operation at the Workplace:

chi2 (11): 25.76  
Prob> chi2: 0.0070

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Government Office Regions:

chi2 (10): 8.33  
Prob> chi2: 0.5968

<b>Region</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Marginal Effect</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>North East</b>	-.0617	.1359	-.011	
<b>North West</b>	.0213	.0882	.003	
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	.0268	.1135	.004	
<b>East Midlands</b>	.1003	.1166	.018	
<b>West Midlands</b>	.0308	.0968	.005	
<b>East of England</b>	-.1017	.1029	-.018	
<b>London</b>	-.0342	.1031	-.006	
<b>South West</b>	.0973	.1088	.018	
<b>Scotland</b>	-.0251	.0995	-.004	
<b>Wales</b>	.1902	.1176	.036	

**Table A8. Selected Output From the Binomial Logit: ‘Overall, how satisfied are you with the amount of involvement you have in decision-making at this workplace?’ (‘involvement’)**

Number of observations: 16,224  
Wald chi(2) (77): 1326.31  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000  
Psuedo R2: 0.0742

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to Personal Characteristics:

chi2 (35): 1019.69  
Prob > chi2: 0.000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Structural Characteristics of the Workplace:

chi2 (20): 136.54  
Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Human Resource Management Policies and Practices in Operation at the Workplace:

chi2 (11): 15.25  
Prob> chi2: 0.1715

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Government Office Regions:

chi2 (10): 20.61  
Prob> chi2: 0.0240

<b>Region</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Marginal Effect</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>North East</b>	-.1155	.1207	-.026	
<b>North West</b>	.0243	.0783	.005	
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	.0742	.0939	.017	
<b>East Midlands</b>	.1545	.0981	.036	
<b>West Midlands</b>	.0270	.0871	.006	
<b>East of England</b>	-.1542	.0980	-.034	
<b>London</b>	-.0161	.0982	-.003	
<b>South West</b>	.1468	.0924	.034	
<b>Scotland</b>	.0006	.0843	.000	
<b>Wales</b>	.2492	.1040	.059	**

**Table A9. Selected Output From the Binomial Logit: ‘In general, how would you describe relations between managers and employees here?’ (‘relations’)**

Number of observations: 16,224

Wald chi(2) (77): 1080.67

Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Pseudo R2: 0.0782

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to Personal Characteristics:

chi2 (35): 621.08

Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Structural Characteristics of the Workplace:

chi2 (20): 128.34

Prob > chi2: 0.0000

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Human Resource Management Policies and Practices in Operation at the Workplace:

chi2 (11): 16.33

Prob> chi2: 0.1293

Wald Test for the exclusion of the set of independent variables relating to the Government Office Regions:

chi2 (10): 22.71

Prob> chi2: 0.0119

<b>Region</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>Marginal Effect</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>North East</b>	-.1338	.1357	-.032	
<b>North West</b>	.0866	.0893	.020	
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	.0558	.1104	.013	
<b>East Midlands</b>	.0559	.1209	.013	
<b>West Midlands</b>	-.0190	.1019	-.004	
<b>East of England</b>	-.1595	.1000	-.038	
<b>London</b>	.0461	.1118	.011	
<b>South West</b>	.1601	.1063	.037	
<b>Scotland</b>	-.0696	.0948	-.016	
<b>Wales</b>	.3155	.1239	.072	***