



Working Paper 27

Job Attribute Preferences in Scotland

John Sutherland

**Centre for Public Policy for Regions
University of Glasgow
Adam Smith Building
Glasgow G12 8RT**

email: john.sutherland@glasgow.ac.uk

Job Attribute Preferences in Scotland

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the job attribute preferences of workers resident in Scotland, by which is meant the extent to which individuals attach or desire a variety of specific qualities and outcomes from their paid work. Having identified 15 job attribute preferences and categorised them as being either extrinsic or intrinsic, the job attribute preferences are ranked. Then possible personal work and non-work characteristics with which they are statistically associated are identified using both bivariate and multivariate analysis. Finally, the possibility that the job attribute preferences of workers resident in Scotland differ from those of workers resident elsewhere in the United Kingdom is explored. The data set used in the examination is the 2006 Employees' Skills Survey.

Intrinsic job attributes are relatively more important than extrinsic job attributes. Four of the top five ranked job attribute preferences reflect intrinsic job attributes viz. 'work you like doing' at 1; 'the ability to use your abilities' at 3; 'friendly people to work with' at 4; and 'a job where you can use your initiative' at 5. The exception is 'a secure job', which is ranked 2. Conversely, four of the bottom five job attribute preferences reflect extrinsic job attributes viz. 'good fringe benefits' at 14; 'good promotion prospects' at 13; 'choice in the hours of work' at 12; and 'convenient hours of work' at 11. The exception is 'an easy work load', which is ranked 15.

Gender, family circumstances, educational qualifications and employment status are seen to be the more salient influences on worker job attribute preferences, much in accord with expectations. For example: males relative to females are less likely to value more highly job attributes such as 'convenient hours', 'choice of hours' and 'good working conditions'; those with financially dependent children, relative to those who do not have the same, are more likely to value more highly job attributes such as 'good pay', a 'secure job' and 'choice of hours'; those with level 4 or level 5 as their highest qualification level, relative to those with no qualifications, are more likely to value more highly job attributes such as a job which makes 'use of initiative' and work they 'like to do'; and those working full time, relative to those not working full time, are more likely to value more highly job attributes such as 'good promotion prospects' and 'good training provision'.

Intra United Kingdom differences in worker job attribute preferences are more likely than not. Generally, with respect to most job attribute preferences, workers resident in England – and, sometimes, Wales and Northern Ireland – relative to workers resident in Scotland, are more likely to value more highly job preferences such as 'convenient hours', 'choice of hours' and 'good fringe benefits'.

Job Attribute Preferences in Scotland ¹

1. CONTEXT AND MOTIVATION

The problematical role of ‘work’ in individuals’ lives remains central to many of the continuing controversies in the social science disciplines of economics and sociology.

According to writers associated with the Classical School of Economic Thought, such as, for example, Smith, Malthus, Bentham, and McCulloch, work was a ‘bad’, “by its very nature a pain”, whereas, in contrast, “idleness was associated with pleasure” (Spencer, 2009, p. 4). Some contemporaneous writers, notably Marx, challenged this assumption. Potentially, work could be a ‘good’, a fulfilling, rewarding and uplifting activity. It was the capitalist system which had alienated workers from their work, turning it into a “loathsome activity” (Spencer, 2009, p. 5). ‘Economic Man’, however, was the product of the Neo- Classical School of Economic Thought. According to this perspective, work was assumed to be a ‘disutility’. Consequently, the isolated individual, motivated only by self interest and seeking to maximise his utility required monetary compensation in order to sacrifice his time to work, thereby ensuring the supply of his labour, if not necessarily his effort (Marsden, 1986). Although ‘work’ was not uniform in its quality, variants on Smith’s original theory of compensating wage differentials ensured that the market produced a match between the different characteristics of jobs and the job preferences of workers (Becker, 1965: Kennedy, 2008). It was assumed that there existed a locus of wage and job characteristics. As a consequence, workers’ marginal willingness to pay for job attributes could be calculated by means of an appropriately specified wage equation using hedonic wage methodology (Manning, 2003).²

¹ The 2006 Employee Skills Survey was deposited by Francis Green, University of Kent, Department of Economics. Crown copyright is held jointly with the ESRC Centre for Skills, Knowledge and Organisational Performance (SCOPE) and the University of Kent. Crown copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen’s Printer for Scotland. The data were collected by BMRB, Social Research. The funders of the survey were the Economic and Social Research Council, the Department for Education and Skills, the Department of Trade and Industry, the Learning and Skills Council, the Sector Skills Development Agency, Scottish Enterprise, the Learning and Skills Observatory for Wales, the East Midlands Development Agency, Highlands and Islands Enterprise and the Northern Ireland Department for Employment and Learning. The data were distributed by the UK Data Archive, University of Essex, Colchester. The original data creators, the depositors, the copyright holders, the funders and the UK Data Archive bear no responsibility for the analysis or interpretation of the data made in this paper.

² For example, Bender and Elliott (2002) use a variant of this approach – what they call a ‘hybrid approach’ - to examine wage differences between the private and public sectors in the UK, arguing that to explain sectoral wage differences requires cognisance to be made not only of differences in

Much of the early developments in Industrial Sociology were associated with criticising the neo-classical economists' perspective of 'economic man' and attempting to construct an alternative viz. 'social man'. Towards this end, writers associated with the Human Relations movement made alternative assumptions: individuals were not isolated but members of social groups. Moreover, individuals responded to the social norms of these groups, formed by life experiences derived from both inside and outside the workplace, often to their personal disadvantage (Mayo, 1949). Certain human needs were assumed to be met by paid work. In publications which were to come to inform much of the management literature of later decades, Maslow (1943) argued that these human needs were organised into a hierarchy of prepotency; and Herzberg (1966) identified the factors which determined job satisfaction, the five motivators of achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement. As advanced societies shifted from an 'industrial' to a 'post industrial' structure, so work experience was seen to be a major source of personal enrichment (Bell, 1974). However, this generally optimistic perspective of work was challenged by Braverman (1974). In the re-emergence of a Marxian analysis of work, Braverman's thesis was that the ever increasing division of labour for both manual and non-manual workers would lead inexorably to the de-skilling of work tasks and tighter managerial control of work processes.

An assumption common to both writers associated with the Human Relations movement and Braverman was the deterministic nature of the work situation, producing either well-being or degradation, respectively. The fundamental assumption of the 'action frame of reference' perspective was that the intrinsic characteristics of work situations were indeterminate and that workers' attitudes and behaviours were dependent upon the prior expectations that workers brought to their places of work (Goldthorpe et al, 1968). Whereas writers associated with the Human Relations movement had argued that an individual's social and psychological needs were realised through employment, writers associated with the action frame of reference maintained that employment was an instrumental activity. As consumer values and family replaced work as the central element within individuals' identities, workers acted like 'economic man', in a manner little different from the neo-classical paradigm in Economics. Further, as typified by the affluent worker studies, the locus

individuals' human capital but also differences in what they do, manifest in terms of sets of job attributes.

of empirical research shifted from the closed system of the workplace to the external labour market.

Subsequent writers were to be critical of the single, fundamental assumption of the predominance of work orientations within the action frame of reference perspective.

Daniel (1969) argued that note had to be made of the contexts within which workers operated because work orientations could neither be examined nor explained outwith the totality of individuals' social experiences; Blackburn and Mann (1979) argued that workers' job orientations were neither strong nor fixed but were subject to modification with changes in life cycles and life styles, and that workers possessed multiple often complex job preferences; and Fox (1980) argued that many individuals often experienced limited choice with respect to jobs, and that as a consequence their work expectations had to be adjusted to conform with the realities they confronted (Silverman, 1970: Brown, 1992: Watson, 1994 and 2003). It is less than appropriate, therefore, to view the action frame of reference as providing a wholly appropriate account of the employment relationship (Brown, 1988). Nonetheless, the element within it which emphasises the socially constructed and socially constrained nature of employee expectations and priorities regarding work is of relevance to the subject matter of this paper.

On the assumption that individuals have values and work orientations which they bring to the workplace, *ceteris paribus*, they will aspire to select types of work which are congruent with these values and orientations. However, there are two distinct dimensions to work attitudes viz. work commitment and job attitude preferences (Gallie et al, 1998). Work commitment is about the importance an individual voluntarily chooses to attach to employment, something which will be influenced, *inter alia*, by family and schooling; competition from out of work commitments, for example to family, dependents and pastimes; and changes in the labour market, notably the number and nature of job opportunities available. By job attribute preferences is meant the extent to which individuals attach or desire a variety of specific qualities and outcomes from their paid work. Conventionally, job attribute preferences are categorised as being either 'extrinsic' i.e. fulfilling – or facilitating the fulfilment of – material needs or 'intrinsic' i.e. fulfilling – or facilitating the fulfilment

of - other, often higher order needs, such as self determination, self expression etc. (Konrad et al, 2000).

Accepting the premise of the salience of individual heterogeneity, therefore, this paper examines workers' job attribute preferences in Scotland. First, job attribute preferences are ranked. Then possible personal characteristics with which they are statistically associated are examined using both bivariate and multivariate analysis.

The data set used in these explorations is the Scottish sub population of the 2006 Employees' Skills Survey. Finally, the possibility of intra- United Kingdom (UK) differences in workers' job attribute preferences is examined, for which exercise recourse is made to the full UK-wide data set.

2. THE DATA SET

The data source used is the 2006 Employee Skills Survey. The core sample for the survey was based on a multi-stage design, with addresses being drawn from a random starting point within the 297 geographical boundaries (i.e. post codes) selected. 4,800 productive interviews of individuals aged 20 – 65 in employment were undertaken during a seven month period during 2006. There were five areas within the UK where this core sample was boosted viz. East Midlands, Wales, the Scottish Enterprise Area, the Highlands and Islands (of Scotland) and Northern Ireland, with the boosts being achieved using the same sampling methodology. As a consequence, the total number of observations available within the data set is 7,787. For the particular purpose of the first two components of this working paper, the sub population of those living in Scotland is extracted from the full data set. The working data set in this instance has, nominally, 2,000 observations.

The 2006 Employee Skills Survey has its origins in the surveys associated with the innovative Social Change and Economic Life Initiative (SCELI) of 1986. Subsequent to the SCELI surveys, other employee skills surveys have been undertaken, part designed to establish a degree of continuity with respect to the nature and content of certain questions about skills possessed and required by individuals in their current jobs. Information is collected also about the context (e.g. the working environment) in which these skills are acquired, developed and applied (Felstead et al, 2007). More recently, other related questions have come to be included, for example seeking to

elicit employee perspectives on factors such as job quality, job satisfaction and task discretion (Green, 2008).

A novel feature of the 2006 survey was the inclusion of a series of questions designed to explore employee attitudes to skills use and skills development (Felstead et al, 2007). These attitudes, however, are dependent upon the individual's latent values about work and his/her, sometimes explicit sometimes not, job attribute preferences. Accordingly, following a strategy employed in the 1992 Employment in Britain survey (Gallie et al, 1998), respondents were asked about their job attribute preferences, the relative importance they attached to 15 job attributes. The interviewer showed a card and said: "I am going to read out a list of some things people may look for in a job and I would like you to tell me how important you feel each is for you...". For each job attribute preference, interviewees were offered four degrees of relative importance by way of response viz. 'essential', 'very important', 'fairly important' and 'not very important'.³

The 15 job attribute preferences are identified in Table 1, and categorised (by the author) as to whether they reflect extrinsic or intrinsic job attributes.⁴

3. JOB ATTRIBUTE PREFERENCES: A RANKING EXERCISE

The percentage frequency distribution of all the responses given, by job attribute preference and by category, is reported in columns 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Table 2.

Looking at the percentage who respond 'essential', 'work you like doing' (at 44.60 percent), 'a secure job' (at 38.02 percent), 'friendly people to work with (at 30.60 percent) and 'good pay' (at 30.55 percent) are the four job attribute preferences cited most frequently. 'An easy work load' (at 4.02 percent), 'good fringe benefits' (at 6.98 percent), 'good promotion prospects' (at 9.92 percent) and 'choice in the hours you work' (at 11.36) are the four job attribute preferences cited least frequently.

³ There is a literature (e.g. Williamson et al, 2002) which considers survey methodology to be inappropriate to elicit this type of information, advocating 'policy capturing' as an alternative.

⁴ The categorisation used in the paper, therefore, is both arbitrary and subjective. It is used primarily for the convenience of exposition, presentation and argument. It is better to examine specific job attribute preferences separately. Consequently, dependent upon the reader's own preferences, a particular job attribute preference could be re-categorised to suit or the whole exercise of categorisation may be dismissed and attention focussed instead upon the particular job attribute preference/s in question.

One feature of the frequency distribution of the responses is that the percentage who respond ‘very important’ is greater than the percentage who respond ‘essential’, without exception across the 15 job attribute preferences. Looking at the ranking from the perspective of the percentage reporting ‘essential’ combined with the percentage reporting ‘very important’, the four job attribute preferences deemed most consequential change: ‘work you like doing’ remains first (at 90.08 percent); ‘opportunities to use your abilities’ (at 85.1 percent) is now second (from a position of being ranked fifth in terms of the percentage responding ‘essential’); ‘a secure job’ (at 83.74 percent) drops from second place to third; and ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ (at 81.95 percent) is now fourth (from a position of being ranked seventh in terms of the percentage responding ‘essential’). ‘Good pay’ (at 73.8 percent) drops from the top four and is now ranked seventh. The job attribute preferences cited least frequently – and their ranking – does not change, with ‘an easy work load’ at 19.4 percent, ‘good fringe benefits’ at 37.65 percent, ‘good promotion prospects’ at 41.5 percent and ‘choice in the hours you work’ at 42.63 percent.

The nature of these rankings are partially confirmed by looking, conversely, at the percentages responding ‘not very important’. ‘Work you like doing’ (at 0.90 percent), ‘opportunities to use your abilities’ at (1.95 percent), ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ (at 2.10 percent) and ‘friendly people to work with’ (at 2.25 percent) are the four job attribute preferences cited least frequently. In contrast, ‘an easy work load’ (at 45.13 percent), ‘good promotion prospects’ (at 27.17 percent), ‘good fringe benefits’ (at 26.26 percent) and ‘choice in your hours of work’ (at 21.61 percent) are the four job attribute preferences cited most frequently.

By means of an heroic assumption, these ordinal responses may be re-interpreted as cardinal responses – assuming ‘essential’ = 4; ‘very important’ = 3 etc. – and their mean values (and standard deviations) calculated. Taking these mean values, the 15 job attribute preferences may be ranked in terms of their relative importance. The ranking appears as the final column of Table 2. From this alternative perspective, in this order, ‘work you like doing’, ‘a secure job’, ‘opportunities to use your abilities’ and ‘friendly people to work with’ are the four highest ranked job attribute preferences, whereas, again in this order, ‘an easy work load’, ‘good fringe benefits’, ‘good promotion prospects’ and ‘choice in your hours of work’ are the four lowest

ranked job attribute preferences. There would appear to be, therefore, some congruence between the ordinal and cardinal perspectives of the ranking of the 15 job attribute preferences.

Using ranking as the more expedient criterion as the basis for direct comparison, intrinsic job attributes are relatively more important than extrinsic job attributes.⁵ Four of the top five ranked job attribute preferences are associated with intrinsic job attributes viz. ‘work you like doing’ at 1; ‘opportunities to use your abilities’ at 3; ‘friendly people to work with’ at 4; and ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ at 5. The exception is ‘a secure job’, which is ranked 2. Conversely, four of the bottom five job attribute preferences are associated with extrinsic job attributes viz. ‘good fringe benefits’ at 14; ‘good promotion prospects’ at 13; ‘choice in the hours of work’ at 12; and ‘convenient hours of work’ at 11. The exception is ‘an easy work load’, which is ranked 15.

4. JOB ATTRIBUTE PREFERENCES: SOME CROSS TABULATIONS

The results reported in the previous section relate to an examination of all respondents within the Scottish sub population data set. As the literature suggests (e.g. Gallie et al, 1998) , it is possible that the nature of the responses made on the relative importance of each of the 15 job attribute preferences will vary by the characteristics of the individuals interviewed. Accordingly, for the same sub population, each job attribute preference is cross tabulated with the following 16 variables, deemed to be salient differentiating characteristics of individuals in employment, both personal characteristics and characteristics associated with the nature of their employment viz.

- Gender;
- Age, via four dummy variables denoting the following categories: aged 20 – 25, aged 26 - 45, aged 46 - 55 and aged 56 – 65;
- Marital status, whether married or living together as a couple, or otherwise;
- Whether with a financially dependent child (or children) under the age of 15, or otherwise;

⁵ This outcome differs from the original in Gallie et al (1998), where, for their UK data set, respondents placed equal emphasis on extrinsic and intrinsic job attributes.

- Highest qualification held, in levels, via five dummy variables denoting the following categories: has no qualifications, level 1, level 2, level 3 and level 4 or 5 ⁶;
- Work experience, via five dummy variables denoting the following categories: between 1 and 2 years, between 3 and 6 years, between 7 and 10 years, between 11 and 25 years and over 25 years;
- Whether working full time, or otherwise;
- Whether in a permanent job, or otherwise;
- Whether working in a supervisory or managerial capacity, or otherwise;
- Tenure, via five dummy variables denoting the following categories: less than 1 year, between 1 and 2 years, between 3 and 5 years, between 6 and 10 years and over 10 years;
- Whether has more than 1 job, or otherwise;
- Whether a member of a union or staff association, or otherwise;
- Sector of employment, via three dummy variables denoting private sector, public sector and non-profit making sector;
- Employment status i.e. whether working as an employee or self employed;
- Occupation, via nine dummy variables, denoting the following broad occupational groupings: managers, professional, associate professional, administrative and secretarial, skilled trades, personal services, sales, operatives and elementary; and
- Whether seeking a better job, or otherwise

For each cross tabulation, two statistical tests are undertaken and their results reported:

- The Pearson chi-squared test, identifying independence between the two variables in question ⁷

⁶ Qualifications levels are as follows, broadly: level 1 equates with lower school leaving qualifications; level 2 equates with higher school leaving qualifications and their professional and vocational equivalents; level 3 equates with professional and vocational qualifications which are sub-degree, usually obtained in colleges of further education; level 4 equates with first degrees and their professional equivalents; and level 5 equates with higher degrees.

⁷ The value of the Pearson chi-squared statistic and its associated significance level determine whether two categorical variables are independent. In this exercise, when the reported significance level of the statistic is ($p < 0.05$) the null hypothesis that the two variables are independent is rejected. Conventionally, this is interpreted as the two variables being associated with each other.

- Cramer's V , measuring the strength of association between the two variables in question ⁸

These results are reported in Tables A1 through to A15 in Statistical Appendix A.

The results of the cross tabulations of the 15 job attribute preferences and the 16 variables identified above which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$) are reported in detail in the complementary tables, identified as Table A1A, A1B etc.. A short verbal note on the more salient results is also produced.

The essence of the outcome of this exercise is reported in Tables 3 and 4 which identify the statistically significant results, for the cross tabulation of the extrinsic job attribute preferences and the intrinsic job attribute preferences, respectively, by the variables identified. Tables 5 and 6, respectively, report the corresponding values of Cramer's V .

The variable gender is statistically significant five times in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences and four times in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences. Most, if not all the statistically significant associations are in accord with expectations, with, for example, 'good pay', 'convenient hours', 'choice of hours' and 'good training provision' in the context of the former and 'work like doing' and 'friendly people' in the context of the latter. Furthermore, the values of Cramer's V are relatively large on a number of occasions, notably 'convenient hours' (at .2381) and 'choice of hours' (at 0.1539) in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences and 'good relations with supervisor' (at 0.1888), 'good working conditions' (at 0.1888) and 'friendly people' (at 0.1838) in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences.

The variable age is relatively more consequential in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences, where it is statistically significant six times, in contrast to the three occasions when it is statistically significant in the context of intrinsic job

⁸ Cramer's V is an imperfect measure of the extent of association between two categorical variables, which is based upon the chi-square statistic. The statistic is used to compare different strengths of association between variables in different cross tabulations, although the exact magnitude of the extent of any difference cannot be quantified. In 2 X 2 tables $-1 \leq V \leq 1$. In larger tables (i.e. all those associated with this exercise) $0 \leq V \leq 1$.

attribute preferences. The statistically significant results in the context of the former accord with expectations e.g. ‘good promotion prospects’, ‘good pay’, ‘secure job’ etc., although, notably, only the first has a relatively high value for Cramer’s V (at 0.1542).

In contrast, neither marital status nor dependent child would appear to be of consequence. In the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences, marital status is statistically significant twice – with the job attribute preferences of ‘good promotion prospects’ and ‘choice of hours’, both in accordance with expectations. In the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences, it is again statistically significant twice – with the job attribute preferences of ‘good relations with supervisor’ and ‘friendly people’.

In total, the variable dependent child is statistically significant five times, three times in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences – with the job attribute preferences being ‘good pay’, ‘convenient hours’ and ‘choice of hours’ – and twice in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences – with the two job attribute preferences in question being ‘use abilities’ and ‘friendly people’. The former results especially accord with expectations. Notably, the values of Cramer’s V for ‘convenient hours’ and ‘choice of hours’ are relatively high for the exercise, at 0.1103 and 0.1504, respectively.

The variable highest qualification held is statistically significant on five occasions in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences, where these job attribute preferences are: ‘good promotion prospects’, ‘good pay’, ‘secure job’, ‘choice of hours’ and ‘good training provision’. Notably, the value of Cramer’s V for the job preference ‘secure job’ is 0.1044. The intrinsic job attribute preferences which are associated with statistically significant results are: ‘use initiative’, ‘work like doing’, ‘use abilities’, ‘easy work load’ and ‘variety in work’, several of which accord with *a priori* expectations. The value of Cramer’s V for four of these five results is relatively high for the exercise in that the values exceed 0.1000. The exception is the job attribute preference ‘work like doing’.

The variable work experience would appear to be of relatively more consequence in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences. Five results in the context of

extrinsic job attribute preferences are statistically significant, being ‘good promotion prospects’, ‘good pay’, ‘convenient hours’, ‘choice of hours’ and ‘good training provision’. The value of Cramer’s V for the first of these is relatively large at 0.1605. In contrast, only two results in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences are statistically significant viz. ‘work like doing’ and ‘friendly people’.

Similarly, the variable working full time would appear to be of relatively more consequence in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences, where six results are statistically significant. Moreover, for five of the six results, the value of Cramer’s V is relatively large. The six extrinsic job attribute preferences in question (and the value of the corresponding Cramer’s V) are as follows: ‘good promotion prospects’ (0.1481), ‘good pay’ (0.1682), ‘secure job’ (0.1036), ‘convenient hours’ (0.2072), ‘choice of hours’ (0.1766) and ‘good fringe benefits’ (0.0695). Several of these statistically significant results would accord with *a priori* expectations. There are four statistically significant results in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences. However, the values of the corresponding Cramer’s V are lower. The four intrinsic job attribute preferences in question are: ‘good relations with supervisor’, ‘use initiative’, ‘variety in work’ and ‘friendly people’. Only the last of these has a value for Cramer’s V which (at 0.1015) exceeds 0.1000.

The variable in a permanent job is statistically significant on four occasions – and none of the corresponding values of Cramer’s V exceeds 0.1000. Three of the four are in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences, being ‘good pay’, ‘secure job’ and ‘choice of hours’, each as expected. The fourth statistically significant result is for the intrinsic job attribute preference of ‘good relations with supervisor’.

The variable working in a supervisory or managerial capacity is relatively more important in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences than extrinsic job attribute preferences, with five statistically significant results as opposed to three. The five intrinsic job preferences are: ‘use initiative’, ‘work like doing’, ‘use abilities’, ‘easy work load’ and ‘variety in work’. The respective values of Cramer’s V for ‘use initiative’, ‘use abilities’ and ‘easy work load’ are 0.1503, 0.1450 and 0.1401. The three statistically significant results with extrinsic job attribute preferences are for

‘good promotion prospects’, ‘convenient hours’ and ‘choice of hours’. The value of Cramer’s V for the first two is relatively high, at 0.1533 and 0.1257, respectively.

The variables tenure and having more than one job would appear to be of little consequence. Tenure is statistically significant only once, in the context of the extrinsic job attribute preference ‘good promotion prospects’, an outcome perhaps in accordance with expectations although this is not reflected in the value of Cramer’s V . The variable having more than one job is statistically significant on three occasions, twice in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences (viz. ‘good pay’ and ‘secure job’) and once in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences (viz. ‘friendly people’).

The variable a member of a trade union or staff association is statistically significant three times in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences: ‘good promotion prospects’, ‘secure job’ and ‘good training provision’, outcomes much in accord with expectations. The value of Cramer’s V for the last of these is relatively high at 0.1639. This variable is statistically significant in the context of four intrinsic job attribute preferences. The job attributes in question are ‘good relations with supervisor’, ‘use abilities’, ‘good working conditions’ and ‘variety in work’. Only one of these results (‘good working conditions’ at 0.1086) has a value of Cramer’s V which exceeds 0.1000.

The variable sector is statistically significant on four occasions in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences, where the job attribute preferences in question are: ‘good pay’, ‘secure job’, ‘good fringe benefits’ and ‘good training provision’. The value of Cramer’s V for ‘good pay’ is 0.1161. None of the other values of the statistic exceeds 0.1000. It is statistically significant five times in the context on intrinsic job attribute preferences, although the values of Cramer’s V never exceed 0.1000. The five job attribute preferences in question are ‘work like doing’, ‘use abilities’, ‘easy work load’, ‘good working conditions’ and ‘variety in work’.

The variable employment status would appear to be of some consequence, perhaps as expected. In the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences it is statistically significant six times, with the job attribute preferences ‘good promotion prospects’,

‘secure job’, ‘convenient hours’, ‘choice of hours’, ‘good fringe benefits’ and ‘good training provision’. The values of Cramer’s V for ‘good promotion prospects’, ‘secure job’, ‘convenient hours’ and ‘good training provision’ are 0.1154, 0.1984, 0.1183 and 0.1322, respectively. The variable is statistically significant in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences five times, where the job attribute preferences in question are: ‘good relations with supervisor’, ‘use initiative’, ‘work like doing’, ‘use abilities’ and ‘good working conditions’. The values of Cramer’s V for ‘good relations with supervisor’ and ‘use abilities’, at 0.3191 and 0.1090, respectively, are relatively high for the exercise as a whole.

There is no instance in the 15 cross tabulations in which the variable occupation is not statistically significant, reflecting the salience of this variable, which accords with expectations. The salience of the variable is further reflected in some of the values of the Cramer’s V statistic, although this is relatively more evident in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences. In the context of the extrinsic job attribute preferences, the value of Cramer’s V for ‘good pay’ is 0.1020; for ‘convenient hours’ it is 0.1007; and for ‘good training provision’ it is 0.1025. In the context of the intrinsic job attribute preferences, the values of Cramer’s V for ‘use initiative’ is 0.1326; for ‘work like doing’ it is 0.1261; for ‘use abilities’ it is 0.1605; for ‘easy work load’ it is 0.1281; and for ‘variety in work’ it is 0.1121.

Finally, and somewhat in contrast to occupation, the variable seeking a better job is statistically significant only three times. Two of these occasions are in the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences, being ‘secure job’ and ‘good training provision’, where the value of Cramer’s V for the latter is relatively high at 0.1079. The single occasion in which it is statistically significant in the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences is for the job attribute preference ‘use initiative’.

5. JOB ATTRIBUTE PREFERENCES: SOME ORDERED PROBITS

Although frequently undertaken and reported in examinations of data sets, cross tabulating two variables and seeking to identify statistically significant associations between the variables in question is a less than perfect method of statistical analysis. Bivariate analysis of this type is undertaken for two variables only. All the other variables are ignored and no note is made of their potential impact.

Multivariate analysis is preferable, therefore, whereby cognisance is made of (at least some of) the additional variables of potential consequence. Given the intention of examining the relationship between ordered response outcomes (such as ‘not very important’, ‘fairly important’, ‘very important’ and ‘essential’ and other such Likert scale configurations) within a multi-variate framework, the most appropriate estimation strategy is to make use of the ordered probit model (Long and Freeze, 2006).⁹

Frequently, the ordered probit model is presented as a latent variable model.

Defining y^* as the latent variable whose values range from $-\infty$ through to ∞ , the structural model is:

$$y^*_i = \mathbf{X}_i\beta + \varepsilon_i$$

where \mathbf{X} is a vector of variables for individual observation ‘i’, β a set of corresponding coefficients to be estimated and ε a random error term.

The measurement model divides y^* into J ordinal categories,

$$y_i = m \quad \text{if} \quad \tau_{m-1} \leq \tau_m \quad \text{from} \quad m = 1 \text{ to} J$$

where threshold points τ_1 through to τ_{j-1} are estimated.

Accordingly, the measurement model for this exercise is as follows, where the individual observation ‘i’ may take the following values:

$$1 \text{ ---> 'not very important' if } \tau_0 = -\infty \leq y^*_i < \tau_1$$

$$2 \text{ ---> 'fairly important' if } \tau_1 \leq y^*_i < \tau_2$$

⁹ In this respect, this methodology differs from that applied by Gallie et al (1998). Gallie et al began by grouping the job attribute preferences using factor analysis. This produced three outcomes viz. job attribute preferences which had an ‘intrinsic’ dimension (such as ‘work you like doing’); job attribute preferences which had an ‘extrinsic or instrumental’ dimension (such as ‘good pay’) and job attribute preferences which had a ‘convenience’ dimension (such as ‘hours of work’). They then proceeded to undertake OLS regressions to identify the factors which affected these three ‘dimensions’, where the explanatory variables in their model were little different from the ones included in the estimations reported in this paper. Gallie et al found that the relative importance of the factors differed across the three estimations, with education tending to influence the ‘intrinsic dimension’, age (or life cycle effects) tending to influence the ‘extrinsic’ dimension, and gender and family circumstances tending to influence the ‘convenience’ dimension.

3 ---> ‘very important’ if $\tau_2 \leq y^*_i < \tau_3$

4 ---> ‘essential’ if $\tau_3 \leq y^*_i < \tau_4 = \infty$

The ordered probit model which is estimated contains 15 of the 16 variables identified and used in the cross tabulation exercise reported in the previous section.¹⁰ Several of these (e.g. age, highest qualification, labour market experience) are de-constructed and discrete dummy variables generated to reflect the individual categories identified. The detail is presented in column 1 of Table B1.¹¹

In the ordered probit model, coefficients on the explanatory variables have a qualitative interpretation, with a positive sign being interpreted as meaning that an individual, relative to the appropriate reference counterpart, has a higher value of the importance of the job attribute preference in question and is, therefore, more likely to report a higher category of that job attribute preference. (And *vice versa*.)¹² Accordingly, only the signs of the respective variables and whether the coefficients of the variables are statistically significant (again at $p < 0.05$) are reported in Tables B1 through to B15 in Statistical Appendix B. The essence of the detailed results presented in these tables is encapsulated in Tables 7 and 8, which identify the signs of those explanatory variables which are statistically significant in the context of extrinsic and intrinsic job attribute preferences, respectively.¹³

The first observation to be made from these tables is the paucity of variables which are statistically significant.¹⁴ The second is the relative absence from the variables which are statistically significant of sets of dummy variables associated with age and

¹⁰ In the ordered probit estimations, the variable employment status proved to be collinear. Consequently, to obviate this problem, those who were not employees i.e. the self employed were dropped from the estimations. The results of the ordered probit estimations, therefore, are not for individuals in employment, as was the case for the cross tabulations, but only for employees in employment. One implication of this is that it removes the problem of the potentially ambiguous responses associated with the self-employed’s replies to certain job attribute preference questions, such as ‘good promotion prospects’ or ‘good relations with supervisor’.

¹¹ No attempt is made to incorporate additional variables. Quite legitimately, therefore, the model estimated may be criticised as being mis-specified.

¹² In contrast to bivariate analysis, however, the nature of multivariate analysis is such that the reported coefficients for each variable take cognisance of the impact of the other variables within the model.

¹³ These results are to be interpreted as follows, using the extrinsic job attribute preference ‘good promotion prospects’ as an illustrative example: individuals who are married or living together, relative to those who are not, are *less* likely to have a higher value of the importance of ‘good promotion prospects’: those who have level 1 as their highest qualification, relative to the reference category of those who have no qualifications, are *more* likely to have a higher value of the importance of ‘good promotion prospects’: and those who are working full time, relative to those who are not working full time, are *more* likely to have a higher value of the importance of ‘good promotion prospects’.

tenure.¹⁵ The third is that when certain dummy variables are seen to be statistically significant, such as those associated with labour market experience, they relate only to certain job attribute preferences, such as ‘good promotion prospects’ or ‘good fringe benefits’, but not, for example, ‘secure job’ or ‘convenient hours’ or ‘work like doing’ or ‘good working conditions’. The fourth is that when certain variables are seen to be statistically correlated with specific job attribute preferences, the nature of their correlation may differ. For example, whereas the statistically significant dummy variables associated with labour market experience are *positively* related to ‘good promotion prospects’, they are *negatively* related to ‘good fringe benefits’.

However, it is possible to identify certain statistically significant correlations, several of which do accord with expectations.

In the context of extrinsic job attribute preferences:

- Males (relative to females): are less likely to value more highly ‘convenient hours’, ‘choice of hours’ and ‘good training provision’;
- Those with financially dependent children (relative to those who do not have financially dependent children): are more likely to value more highly ‘good pay’, a ‘secure job’, ‘convenient hours’ and a ‘choice of hours’; and
- Those working full time (relative to those who do not work full time): are more likely to value more highly ‘good promotion prospects’, ‘good pay’, a ‘secure job’ and ‘good training provision’, but are less likely to value more highly ‘convenient hours’ and ‘choice of hours’

In the context of intrinsic job attribute preferences:

- Males (relative to females): are less likely to value more highly ‘good relations with the supervisor’, a job which makes ‘use of abilities’, ‘good working conditions’ and ‘friendly people’ to work with; and

¹⁴ This MAY be attributable to the relatively small number of observations, given the number of independent variables in the ordered probit model. OR, it may merely reflect the absence of any statistical significance for the variables in the model.

¹⁵ This is established further when, rather than examining the statistical significance of individual variables the joint significance of several are examined. The results of the joint significance tests undertaken are reported as supplementary notes to Tables B1 through to B15.

- Those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification (relative to those with no qualifications, the reference category); are more likely to value more highly a job which makes ‘use of initiative’, work that they ‘like doing’ and work which make ‘use of abilities’. On the other hand, they are less likely to value more highly an ‘easy work load’ and ‘good working conditions’.

6. JOB ATTRIBUTE PREFERENCES: ARE WORKERS IN SCOTLAND ‘DIFFERENT’?

To establish whether inter ‘country/province’ differences in worker job attribute preferences exist within the UK, the 15 ordered probits are re-estimated using the full i.e. UK-wide data set, with the addition of dummy variables for England, Wales and Northern Ireland, with Scotland as the excluded, reference, category. The signs of the coefficients of the additional dummy variables only are reported in Tables 9 and 10, again by job attribute preference, by extrinsic and intrinsic categories.¹⁶

Intra UK differences are more likely than not. There are only two extrinsic job attribute preferences where no statistically significant differences are reported: ‘good pay’ and ‘good training provision’. Workers in England – and, sometimes, Wales and Northern Ireland – relative to workers in Scotland, are more likely to have higher values of the importance of the four extrinsic job attribute preferences ‘good promotion prospects’, ‘convenient hours’, ‘choice of hours’ and ‘good fringe benefits’. In this category, the job attribute preference ‘secure job’ is the exception. With respect to this job attribute preference, workers in England, relative to workers in Scotland, are less likely to have higher values of its importance. Again, there are only two intrinsic job attribute preferences where no statistically significant differences are reported: ‘good relations with supervisor’ and ‘good working conditions’. Once again, workers in England, relative to workers in Scotland, are more likely to have higher values of the importance of the five intrinsic job attribute preferences of ‘use initiative’, ‘work like doing’, ‘use abilities’, ‘variety in work’ and ‘friendly people’. In this instance, however, there are proportionately more negative

¹⁶ A positive sign for the coefficient of the country/province in question, therefore, indicates that a higher value of the importance of the job attribute preference in question is *more* likely, relative to Scotland, the reference category; and, conversely, a negative sign for the coefficient, that a higher value of the importance of the job attribute preference in question is *less* likely, again relative to Scotland.

signs – not always statistically significant – associated with Wales and Northern Ireland.

There is an extensive literature which seeks to explain cross country differences in employment behaviour (e.g. Sorge, 2004). One perspective within this emphasises the role of culture, with its origin in the psyche of populations, producing a value system which influences worker attitudes and behaviour. Consequently, when cultures differ, so do worker attitudes and behaviour. A second perspective emphasises the role of institutions, codes and standards of behaviour and legal systems, for example. These produce conformity with accepted norms for worker attitudes and behaviour. Consequently, when institutions differ, so too do worker attitudes and behaviour. A third perspective seeks to integrate culture and institution. Within this holistic, societal perspective, actors and institutions interact to produce the outcomes in question.

Conventionally, there are central elements within the societal perspective:

- the organisation of work, for example the size structure of firms and their ownership patterns;
- human resources, for example the systems of education and training
- the industrial and sectoral balance within the economy, such as the role and relative importance of the private, public and not-for-profit sectors; and
- the labour market, such as patterns and modes of participation.

Just as changes over time in these central elements within a nation state may influence changes in worker attitudes and behaviour (Watson, 2003), so identifying cross country differences in these same factors facilitates possible explanation of cross country differences in worker attitudes and behaviour.

So where are the differences between Scotland and the other constituent parts of the UK, more especially England, which may (part) explain the different outcomes in job attribute preferences identified above, not only in terms of the 12 occasions on which

the England coefficient is positively signed but also in terms of the particular three occasions (viz. 'secure job', 'good training provision' and 'good working conditions') when the England coefficient is negatively signed? In a Scottish economy dominated by large, often externally owned, organisations with the relative absence of small, owner managed concerns, perhaps? In the Scottish education system, if not the training system, perhaps? In the predominance of a public sector in Scotland, perhaps?

7. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has examined worker job attribute preferences in Scotland, using the 2006 Employee Skills Survey. In a ranking exercise, intrinsic job attributes were found to be relatively more important than extrinsic job attributes. Four of the top five ranked job attribute preferences were associated with intrinsic job attributes viz. 'work you like doing' at 1; 'the ability to use your abilities' at 3; 'friendly people to work with' at 4; and 'a job where you can use your initiative' at 5. Conversely, four of the bottom five job attribute preferences were associated with extrinsic job attributes viz. 'good fringe benefits' at 14; 'good promotion prospects' at 13; 'choice in the hours of work' at 12; and 'convenient hours of work' at 11. Worker job attribute preferences, however, differed by the characteristics of the worker. Gender, family circumstances, educational qualifications and employment status were identified as having salient influences on several worker job attribute preferences, much in accord with expectations. Males relative to females were less likely to value more highly job attributes such as 'convenient hours', 'choice of hours' and 'good working conditions'; those with financially dependent children, relative to those who did not have financially dependent children, were more likely to value more highly job attributes such as 'good pay', a 'secure job' and 'choice of hours'; those with level 4 or level 5 as their highest qualification level, relative to those with no qualifications, were more likely to value more highly job attributes such as a job which makes 'use of initiative' and work they 'like to do': and those working full time, relative to those who were not working full time, were more likely to value more highly job attributes such as 'good promotion prospects' and 'good training provision'.

In economic theory, it is the function of omnipresent efficient markets to match heterogeneous individuals with jobs which have complicated bundles of complex

characteristics. In organisations, however, it is the task of those who manage the recruitment and selection process to ensure that effective procedures operate both to identify likely candidates and to predict who from this list is/are most likely to fit the requirements of the job and the organisation. An insight into job attributes and worker job attribute preferences facilitates this task. Making explicit the attributes of jobs; targeting the sources of individuals who prefer these job attributes; using the same job search channels employed by these individuals; and re-emphasising the salient job attributes in job previews are all more likely to make for a more efficacious hiring process. In (private and public) employment agencies, it is the task of careers advisers and employment counsellors to facilitate the search process of job seekers. An insight into job attributes and worker job attribute preferences is advantageous in this context too. Job seekers are different in their personal characteristics and job aspirations; jobs and job vacancies (and the organisations associated with these jobs and vacancies) consist of different bundles of job attributes. *Ceteris paribus*, the problematical task of the agent is to effect a match which is to the mutual satisfaction of those who are seeking work and those who are seeking workers. Other things are not necessarily equal, however. In times when employment opportunities are constrained, the job seeker's aspirations are too frequently compromised. The job attribute preferences of workers which will be reported in the 2010 Employee Skills Survey, for example, are most likely to be very different from those examined in this paper.

A novel finding within the paper was that intra UK differences in worker job attribute preferences were more likely than not. Generally, with respect to both extrinsic and intrinsic job attribute preferences, workers in England – and, sometimes, Wales and Northern Ireland – relative to workers in Scotland, were more likely to value their importance more highly. Possible cross cultural differences were explored which might explain these differences. Further research rather than further speculation, however, is needed to pursue this interesting finding further. Are the differences to be explained by differences in the objective reality of the jobs, for example; or differences in the subjective dispositions of the job holders?

REFERENCES

- Becker, G. (1965) A Theory of the allocation of time. *Economic Journal*, **75**, pp 493-517.
- Bell, D. (1974) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. London: Heinemann.
- Bender, K.A. and Elliott, R.F. (2002) The Role of job attributes in understanding the public-private wage differential. *Industrial Relations*, **41**, pp 407 – 421.
- Blackburn, R.M. and Mann, M. (1979) *The Working Class in the Labour Market*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Braverman, H. (1974) *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York, USA.: Monthly Review Press.
- Brown, R. (1988) The Employment relationship in Sociological theory. In Gallie, D (ed.) *Employment in Britain*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Brown, R. (1992) *Understanding Industrial Organisations: Theoretical Perspectives in Industrial Sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Daniel, W.W. (1969) Industrial behaviour and orientation to work: a critique. *Journal of Management Studies*, **6**, pp 366 -375.
- Felstead, A., Gallie, D., Green, F. and Zhou, Y. (2007) *Skills at Work, 1986 -2006*. Oxford and Cardiff: ESRC Centre on Skills, Knowledge and Organisational Performance (SCOPE).
- Fox, A. (1980) The Meaning of work. In Elstrand, G and Salaman, G. (eds.) *The Politics of Work and Organisations*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Gallie, D., White, M., Cheng, Y. and Tomlinson, M. (1998) *Restructuring the Employment Relationship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldthorpe, J., Lockwood, D. Bechhofer, F. and Platt, J. (1968) *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviours*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Green, F. (2008) Leeway for the Loyal: a Model of Employee Discretion. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, **46**, pp 1 – 32.
- Hertzberg, F. (1966) *Work and the Nature of Man*. New York, USA.: World Publishing Company
- Kennedy, G. (2008) *Adam Smith*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Konrad, A.M., Corrigan, E., Lieb, P. and Ritchie, J.E. (2000) Sex differences in job attribute preferences among managers and business students. *Group & Organisational Management*, **25**, pp 108 -131.

- Long, J.S. and Freese, J. (2006) *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata*. College Station, Texas, USA: Stata Press.
- Manning, A. (2003) The Real thin theory: monopsony in modern labour markets. *Labour Economics*, **10**, pp 105 -131.
- Marsden, D. (1986) *The End of Economic Man? Custom and Competition in Labour Markets*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943) A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, **50**, pp 370 -396.
- Mayo, E. (1949) *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilisation*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Silverman, D. (1970) *The Theory of Organisations: A Sociological Framework*. London: Heinemann
- Sorge, A. (2004) Cross national differences in human resources and organisation. In Harzing, A.W. and Ruysseveldt, J.V. (eds.) *International Human Resource Management*. 2nd edition. London: Sage Publishing.
- Spencer, D.A. (2009) *The Political Economy of Work*. London: Routledge.
- Watson, T.J. (1994) *In Search of Management: Culture, Chaos and Control in Managerial Work*. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Watson, T. J. (2003) *Sociology, Work and Industry*. 4th edition. London: Routledge.
- Williamson, C.L., Cope, J.B., Thompson, L.F. and Wuensch, K.L. (2002) Policy capturing as a tool to enhance recruitment. *Career Development International*, **7**, pp 159 -166.

Table 1. Job Attribute Preferences, by Category

Job Attribute Preference
<i>Extrinsic</i>
Good promotion prospects
Good pay
A secure job
Convenient hours of work
Choice in your hours of work
Good fringe benefits
Good training provision
<i>Intrinsic</i>
Good relations with your supervisor or manager
A job where you can use your initiative
Work you like doing
The opportunities to use your abilities
An easy work load
Good physical working conditions
A lot of variety in the type of work
Friendly people to work with

Table 2. Percentage Frequency Distribution of Responses, Their Mean (and Standard Deviation) and Ranking, by Job Attribute Preferences, all Respondents

Job Attribute Preference	Essential	Very important	Fairly important	Not very important	Mean (SD)	Number of observations	Ranking
<i>Extrinsic</i>							
Good promotion prospects	9.92	31.58	31.33	27.17	2.24 (0.9623)	1,995	13
Good pay	30.55	43.25	23.15	3.05	3.01 (0.8118)	2,000	7
A secure job	38.02	45.72	12.76	3.05	3.18 (0.7840)	1,999	2
Convenient hours of work	18.65	44.10	27.75	9.50	2.71 (0.8748)	2,000	11
Choice in your hours of work	11.36	31.27	35.77	21.61	2.32 (0.9373)	1,999	12
Good fringe benefits	6.98	30.67	36.09	26.26	2.18 (0.9027)	1,992	14
Good training provision	21.77	43.04	24.22	10.96	2.75 (0.9161)	1,998	10
<i>Intrinsic</i>							
Good relations with your supervisor/manager	28.80	51.98	14.40	4.82	3.04 (0.7891)	1,993	6
A job where you can use your initiative	27.40	54.55	15.85	2.10	3.07 (0.7150)	2,000	5
Work you like doing	44.60	46.20	8.30	0.90	3.34 (0.6679)	2,000	1
The opportunity to use your abilities	29.60	55.50	12.95	1.95	3.12 (0.6982)	2,000	3
An easy work load	4.02	15.38	35.48	45.13	1.78 (0.8479)	1,990	15
Good physical working conditions	22.90	52.05	21.90	3.15	2.94 (0.7559)	2,000	8
A lot of variety in the type of work	19.31	48.52	25.86	6.30	2.80 (0.8169)	1,999	9
Friendly people to work with	30.60	51.25	15.90	2.25	3.10 (0.7381)	2,000	4

Table 3. Cross Tabulation of Extrinsic Job Attribute Preferences, By Variable: Statistically Significant Associations at (p < 0.05)

Variable/Job attribute preference	Good promotion prospects	Good pay	Secure job	Convenient hours	Choice of hours	Good fringe benefits	Good training provision
Gender	X	X		X	X		X
Age	X	X	X		X	X	X
Marital status	X				X		
Dependent child		X		X	X		
Highest qualification	X	X	X		X	X	
Work experience	X	X		X	X		X
Working full time	X	X	X	X	X	X	
In a permanent job		X	X		X		
A supervisor/manager	X			X	X		
Tenure	X						
In more than 1 job		X	X				
Member of union/staff association	X		X				X
Sector		X	X			X	X
Employment status	X		X	X	X	X	X
Occupation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Seeking a better job			X				X

Table 4. Cross Tabulation of Intrinsic Job Attribute Preferences, By Variable: Statistically Significant Associations at ($p < 0.05$)

Variable/Job attribute preference	Good relations with supervisor	Use initiative	Work like doing	Use abilities	Easy work load	Good working conditions	Variety in work	Friendly people
Gender	X		X			X		X
Age	X			X				X
Marital status	X							X
Dependent child				X				X
Highest qualification		X	X	X	X		X	
Work experience			X					X
Working full time	X	X					X	X
In a permanent job	X							
A supervisor/manager		X	X	X	X		X	
Tenure								
In more than 1 job								X
Member of union/staff association	X			X		X	X	
Sector			X	X	X	X	X	
Employment status	X	X	X	X		X		
Occupation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Seeking a better job		X						

Table 5. Extrinsic Job Attribute Preferences, By Variable: Value of Cramer's *V*

Variable/Job attribute preference	Good promotion prospects	Good pay	Secure job	Convenient hours	Choice of hours	Good fringe benefits	Good training provision
Gender	.0956	.0986	.0311	.2381	.1539	.0569	.0678
Age	.1542	.0763	.0663	.0527	.0752	.0803	.0783
Marital status	.0809	.0326	.0448	.0118	.0704	.0353	.0513
Dependent child	.0517	.0643	.0501	.1103	.1504	.0407	.0439
Highest qualification	.0856	.0818	.1044	.0536	.0688	.0773	.0538
Work experience	.1605	.0780	.0593	.0654	.0934	.0558	.0697
Working full time	.1481	.1682	.1036	.2072	.1766	.0695	.0607
In a permanent job	.0548	.0770	.1885	.0429	.0739	.0333	.0241
A supervisor/manager	.1533	.0613	.0543	.1257	.0782	.0185	.0433
Tenure	.0721	.0385	.0305	.0540	.0524	.0536	.0431
In more than 1 job	.0206	.0820	.0798	.0511	.0179	.0344	.0441
Member of union/staff association	.0862	.0442	.0701	.0504	.0395	.0337	.1639
Sector	.0542	.1161	.0634	.0398	.0233	.0747	.0746
Employment status	.1154	.0436	.1984	.1183	.0631	.0706	.1322
Occupation	.0836	.1020	.0856	.1007	.0810	.0782	.1025
Seeking a better job	.0589	.0302	.0799	.0217	.0416	.0437	.1079

Table 6. Intrinsic Job Attribute Preferences, By Variable: Value of Cramer's V

Variable/Job attribute preference	Good relations with supervisor	Use initiative	Work like doing	Use abilities	Easy work load	Good working conditions	Variety in work	Friendly people
Gender	.1888	.0169	.0904	.0385	.0322	.1888	.0257	.1838
Age	.0579	.0478	.0393	.0592	.0338	.0493	.0361	.0689
Marital status	.0665	.0309	.0441	.0347	.0361	.0546	.0220	.0922
Dependent child	.0385	.0155	.0506	.0628	.0350	.0487	.0365	.0698
Highest qualification	.0361	.1089	.0957	.1324	.1279	.0592	.1115	.0578
Work experience	.0546	.0485	.0628	.0559	.0458	.0499	.0530	.0735
Working full time	.0853	.0861	.0577	.0596	.0363	.0165	.0722	.1015
In a permanent job	.0755	.0360	.0664	.0493	.0349	.0274	.0600	.0610
A supervisor/manager	.0405	.1503	.0760	.1450	.1401	.0425	.0909	.0602
Tenure	.0499	.0529	.0466	.0401	.0362	.0349	.0253	.0359
In more than 1 job	.0609	.0459	.0575	.0596	.0532	.0342	.0315	.0661
Member of union/staff association	.0991	.0169	.0480	.0700	.0290	.1086	.0810	.0526
Sector	.0341	.0529	.0720	.0806	.0628	.0629	.0703	.0379
Employment status	.3191	.0851	.0878	.1090	.0486	.0753	.0360	.0533
Occupation	.0979	.1326	.1261	.1605	.1281	.0968	.1121	.0819
Seeking a better job	.0533	.0711	.0575	.0649	.0313	.0321	.0638	.0400

Table 7. Ordered Pobit Results: Extrinsic Job Attribute Preferences, by Variable: Statistically Significant Correlations at (p < 0.05)

Variable	Good promotion prospects	Good pay	Secure job	Convenient hours	Choice of hours	Good fringe benefits	Good training provision
Male				-	-		-
Age							
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category							
Aged 26 – 45							
Aged 46 – 55							
Aged 56 – 65							
Married or living together	-		-		+	-	-
With financially dependent child		+	+	+	+		
Highest Qualification							
No qualifications, the reference category							
Level 1	+						
Level 2		+					
Level 3		+					
Level 4 or 5		+	-			-	
Labour Market Experience							
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category							
Between 3 and 6 years						-	
Between 7 and 15 years	+					-	
Between 16 and 25 years	+					-	
Over 25 years	+					-	
Working full time	+	+	+	-	-		+
In a permanent job			+				
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+			-			
Looking for a better job			+				

Table 7. cont.

Variable	Good promotion prospects	Good pay	Secure job	Convenient hours	Choice of hours	Good fringe benefits	Good training provision
Tenure							
Less than 1 year, the reference category							
Between 1 and 2 years							
Between 3 and 5 years							-
Between 6 and 10 years							-
Over 10 years						+	-
In more than 1 job							
Member of a union or staff association		+					+
Sector of Employment							
Private sector, the reference category							
Public sector		-					
Not for profit sector		-					
Occupation							
Manager			-				
Professional						-	+
Associate professional and technical							+
Administrative and secretarial							
Skilled trades							+
Personal services							+
Sales							
Operatives							
Elementary, the reference category							

Table 8. Ordered Probit Results: Intrinsic Job Attribute Preferences, by Variable : Statistically Significant Correlations at (p < 0.05)

Variable	Good relations with supervisor	Use initiative	Work like doing	Use abilities	Easy work load	Good working conditions	Variety in work	Friendly people
Male	-			-		-		-
Age								
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category								
Aged 26 – 45								
Aged 46 – 55								
Aged 56 – 65								
Married or living together		+						-
With financially dependent child				+				
Highest Qualification								
No qualifications, the reference category								
Level 1					-	-		
Level 2					-	-		
Level 3					-	-		
Level 4 or 5		+	+	+				
Labour Market Experience								
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category								
Between 3 and 6 years								
Between 7 and 15 years								
Between 16 and 25 years					-		-	
Over 25 years					-		-	
Working full time		+					+	
In a permanent job	-		-					
In a supervisory or managerial capacity					-	+		
Looking for a better job				+				

Table 8. cont.

Variable	Good relations with supervisor	Use your initiative	Work like doing	Use abilities	Easy work load	Good working conditions	Variety in work	Friendly people
Tenure								
Less than 1 year, the reference category								
Between 1 and 2 years								
Between 3 and 5 years						-		
Between 6 and 10 years						-		
Over 10 years								
In more than 1 job								
Member of a union or staff association						+	+	+
Sector of Employment								
Private sector, the reference category								
Public sector								
Not for profit sector					-			
Occupation								
Manager				+	-			
Professional			+	+		-	+	
Associate professional and technical		+	+	+			+	
Administrative and secretarial								
Skilled trades								
Personal services			+					
Sales								
Operatives								
Elementary, the reference category								

Table 9. Pobit Results: Extrinsic Job Attribute Preferences, by Variable

Variable	Good promotion prospects	Good pay	Secure job	Convenient hours	Choice of hours	Good fringe benefits	Good training provision
England	+	(+)	-	+	+	+	(-)
Wales	(+)	(+)	(+)	+	+	+	(-)
Northern Ireland	+	(+)	(-)	+	+	+	(+)

Footnote to Tables 9 and 10:

1. The signs in brackets are where the coefficients on the country/province dummy variables are not statistically significant at ($p > 0.05$)

Table 10 Ordered Probit Results: Intrinsic Job Attribute Preferences, by Variable

Variable	Good relations with supervisor	Use initiative	Work like doing	Use abilities	Easy work load	Good working conditions	Variety in work	Friendly people
England	(+)	+	+	+	(+)	(-)	+	+
Wales	(+)	(-)	(+)	(-)	+	(-)	(+)	+
Northern Ireland	(+)	(-)	-	(-)	+	(+)	-	(+)

STATISTICAL APPENDIX A: DETAILS OF THE CROSS TABULATIONS

Table A1. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Good Promotion Prospects’

Variable	Value of Pearson chi-squared statistic	Statistical significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 18.2222	0.000	0.0956
Age	(9) 142.2914	0.000	0.1542
Marital status	(3) 12.9885	0.005	0.0809
Financially dependent child	(3) 5.3026	0.151	0.0517
Highest qualification held	(12) 43.8199	0.000	0.0856
Work experience	(12) 153.0539	0.000	0.1605
Working full time	(3) 43.7603	0.000	0.1481
In a permanent job	(3) 5.3219	0.150	0.0548
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 40.8909	0.000	0.1533
Tenure	(12) 31.1546	0.002	0.0721
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 0.8442	0.839	0.0206
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 14.7922	0.002	0.0862
Sector of employment	(6) 10.4169	0.108	0.0542
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 26.5714	0.000	0.1154
Occupation	(24) 41.7913	0.014	0.0836
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 5.8364	0.120	0.0589

Note to Table A1 and all corresponding tables reporting results of the cross tabulation of each of the 15 job attribute preferences by the variables identified within Statistical Appendix A:

1. The number in brackets (x) in column 2, denotes the degrees of freedom associated with each cross tabulation.

The tables which follow present the detail of the cross tabulations for the job attribute preference ‘good promotion prospects’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A1, 11 of the cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being gender, age, marital status, highest qualification, work experience, whether in full time employment, whether in a job with a supervisory/managerial role, tenure, whether a member of a union/staff association, employment status and occupation.

Table A1A: GENDER

	Female	Male	Total
Essential	82	116	198
	41.41	58.59	100.00
	8.26	11.58	9.92
Very important	289	341	630
	45.87	54.13	100.00
	29.10	34.03	31.58
Fairly important	348	277	625
	55.68	44.32	100.00
	35.05	27.64	31.33
Not very important	274	268	542
	50.55	49.45	100.00
	27.59	26.75	27.17
Total	993	1002	1995
	49.77	50.23	100.00
	100.00	100.0	100.00
		0	

Note to Table A1A and all corresponding ones presenting details of the cross tabulation between ‘good promotion prospects’ and the variable identified:

1. Key to table:

- Frequency
- Row percentage
- Column percentage

Whereas ‘good promotion prospects’ are considered to be ‘essential’ by 11.58 percent of males, they are only considered to be ‘essential’ by 8.26 percent of females. Similarly, whereas ‘good promotion prospects’ are considered to be ‘very important’ for 34.03 percent of males, they are only considered to be ‘very important’ for 29.10 percent of females. By way of contrast, whereas ‘good promotion prospects’ are only seen to be ‘fairly important’ for 35.05 percent of females, they are only ‘fairly important’ for 27.64 percent of males.

Table A1B: AGE

	Aged 20 – 25	Aged 26 - 45	Aged 46 - 55	Aged 56 - 65	Total
Essential	32	111	32	23	198
	16.16	56.06	16.16	11.62	100.00
	21.62	11.09	6.15	7.06	9.92
Very important	63	350	142	75	630
	10.00	55.56	22.54	11.90	100.00
	42.57	34.97	27.31	23.01	31.58
Fairly important	43	319	187	76	625
	6.88	51.04	29.92	12.16	100.00
	29.05	31.87	35.96	23.31	31.33
Not very important	10	221	159	152	542
	1.85	40.77	29.34	28.04	100.00
	6.76	22.08	30.58	46.63	27.17
Total	148	1001	520	326	1995
	7.42	50.18	26.07	16.34	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good promotion prospects’ are considered to be ‘essential’ for 21.62 percent of those in the youngest age band (20 – 25 years of age), a percentage much higher than the corresponding percentages for the other age bands. Similarly, ‘good promotion prospects’ are ‘very important’ for 42.57 percent of those in the youngest age band, again a percentage higher than the corresponding percentages for the other age bands. In contrast ‘good promotion prospects’ are ‘not very important’ for 46.63 percent of those in the oldest age band (56 – 65 years of age), a percentage much lower than the corresponding percentages for the other age bands.

Table A1C: MARITAL STATUS

	Single	Married or living together	Total
Essential	80 40.61 11.99	117 59.39 8.87	197 100.00 9.92
Very important	232 37.00 34.78	395 63.00 29.95	627 100.00 31.57
Fairly important	195 31.51 29.39	426 68.49 32.30	622 100.00 31.32
Not very important	159 29.44 23.84	381 70.56 28.89	540 100.00 27.19
Total	667 33.59 100.0 0	1319 66.41 100.00	1986 100.00 100.00

‘Good promotion prospects’ are considered to be ‘essential’ and ‘very important’ more by those who are single than those who are married or living together as a couple: 11.99 percent and 34.78 percent, respectively, for the former against 8.87 percent and 29.95 percent, respectively, for the latter. By contrast, whereas 28.89 percent of those who are married or living together consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘not very important’, the corresponding percentage for those who are single is 23.84.

Table A1D: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	24	20	27	55	72	198
	12.12	10.10	13.64	27.78	36.36	100.00
	8.42	14.60	9.28	9.96	9.88	9.93
Very important	71	45	86	174	253	629
	11.29	7.15	13.67	27.66	40.22	100.00
	24.91	32.85	29.55	31.52	34.71	31.54
Fairly important	75	34	88	192	236	625
	12.00	5.44	14.08	30.72	37.76	100.00
	26.32	24.82	30.24	34.78	32.37	31.34
Not very important	115	38	90	131	168	542
	21.22	7.01	16.61	24.17	31.00	100.00
	40.35	27.74	30.93	23.73	23.05	27.18
Total	285	137	291	552	729	1994
	14.29	6.87	14.59	27.68	36.56	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good promotion prospects’ are considered to be ‘essential’ for 14.60 percent of those holding level 1 as their highest qualification, a percentage higher than the corresponding percentages for those in the other highest qualification level categories. For example, the percentage of those holding level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification who consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘essential’ is only 9.88. However, 34.71 percent of those holding level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘very important’, a percentage which contrasts with that of those with no qualifications where only 24.91 percent consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘very important’. Similarly, whereas 40.35 percent of those with no qualifications consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘not very important’, only 23.05 percent of those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification are of this opinion.

Table A1E: WORK EXPERIENCE

	1 – 2 years	3 – 6 years	7 – 10 years	11 – 25 years	Over 25 years	Total
Essential	10 5.15 27.78	26 13.40 20.80	54 27.84 16.17	38 19.59 7.48	66 34.02 6.75	194 100.00 6.75
Very important	16 2.56 44.44	53 8.48 42.40	126 20.16 37.72	176 28.16 34.65	254 40.64 25.97	624 100.00 31.55
Fairly important	8 1.29 22.22	38 6.12 30.40	103 16.59 30.84	171 27.54 33.66	301 48.47 30.78	621 100.00 31.35
Not very important	2 0.37 5.56	8 1.48 6.40	51 9.43 15.27	123 22.74 24.21	357 65.99 36.50	541 100.00 27.31
Total	36 1.82 100.00	125 6.31 100.00	334 16.86 100.00	508 25.64 100.00	978 49.37 100.00	1981 100.00 100.00

The percentages of those who consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be both ‘essential’ and ‘very important’ declines with years of work experience. For example, whereas 27.78 percent of those with between 1 and 3 years experience within the labour market consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘essential’ only 6.75 percent of those with over 25 years of experience are of the same opinion. Whereas 42.40 percent of those with between 3 and 6 years of labour market experience consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘very important’, only 34.65 percent of those with between 10 and 25 years experience are of this opinion. Conversely, the percentages of those who consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘not very important’ increases with years of work experience. Whereas only 5.56 percent of those with the least work experience are of this opinion, 36.50 percent of those with the greatest amount of work experience are of this opinion.

Table A1F: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working full time	Working full time	Total
Essential	28	170	198
	14.14	85.86	100.00
	5.82	11.23	9.92
Very important	112	518	630
	17.78	82.22	100.00
	23.28	34.21	31.58
Fairly important	171	454	625
	27.36	72.64	100.00
	35.55	29.99	31.33
Not very important	170	372	542
	31.37	68.63	100.00
	35.34	24.57	27.17
Total	481	1514	1995
	24.11	75.89	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good promotion prospects’ are ‘essential’ and ‘very important’ for proportionately more of those working full time than for those not working full time. For example, whereas 34.21 percent of those working full time consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘very important’, the corresponding percentage for those not working full time is 23.28. In contrast ‘good promotion prospects’ are considered to be only ‘fairly important’ and ‘not very important’ by proportionately more of those who are not working full time. For example, whereas 35.34 percent of those not working full time consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘not very important’, only 24.57 percent of those working full time hold this opinion.

Table A1G: IN A SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL ROLE

	Not in a supervisory/ managerial role	In a supervisory/ managerial role	Total
Essential	93	84	177
	52.54	47.46	100.00
	8.91	12.05	10.17
Very important	287	275	562
	51.07	48.93	100.00
	27.49	39.45	32.28
Fairly important	363	200	563
	64.48	35.52	100.00
	34.77	28.69	32.34
Not very important	301	138	439
	68.56	31.44	100.00
	28.83	19.80	25.22
Total	1044	697	1741
	59.97	40.03	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good promotion prospects’ are ‘essential’ and ‘very important’ for proportionately more of those working in a supervisory or managerial role than for those not working in this capacity. For example, whereas 39.45 percent of those working as supervisors or managers consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘very important’, the corresponding percentage for those not working in this capacity is 27.49. In contrast ‘good promotion prospects’ are considered to be only ‘fairly important’ and ‘not very important’ by proportionately more of those who are not working as supervisors or managers. For example, whereas 28.83 percent of those not working in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘not very important’, only 24.57 percent of those who do work in a supervisory or managerial capacity are of this opinion.

Table 1AH: TENURE

	Less than 1 year	Between 1- 3 years	Between 3- 6 years	Between 6- 10 years	Over 10 years	Total
Essential	28 14.14 11.91	45 22.73 13.47	43 21.72 10.80	36 18.18 9.18	46 23.23 7.23	198 100.00 9.92
Very important	72 11.43 30.64	121 19.21 36.23	137 21.75 34.42	127 20.16 32.40	173 27.46 27.20	630 100.00 31.58
Fairly important	75 12.00 31.91	90 14.40 26.95	124 19.84 31.16	126 20.16 32.14	210 33.60 33.02	625 100.00 31.33
Not very important	60 11.07 25.53	78 14.39 23.35	94 17.34 23.62	103 19.00 26.28	207 38.19 32.55	542 100.00 27.17
Total	235 11.78 100.00	334 16.74 100.00	398 19.95 100.00	392 19.65 100.00	636 31.88 100.00	1995 100.00 100.00

‘Good promotion prospects’ tend to be of less consequence for those with longest tenure. For example, 7.23 percent of those with over 10 years tenure consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘essential’, a percentage which is lower than that of any other of the tenure categories. Similarly, 27.20 percent of those with the same tenure consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘very important’, again a percentage which is lower than that of any of the other tenure categories. By contrast, the percentage of those in the longest tenure category who consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘fairly important’ (33.02 percent) and ‘not very important’ (32.55 percent) is greater than the corresponding percentages for any of the other tenure categories.

Table 1AI: UNION/STAFF ASSOCIATION MEMBER

	Not a member	Member of union/ staff association	Total
Essential	142	56	198
	71.72	28.28	100.00
	10.78	8.30	9.94
Very important	419	210	629
	66.61	33.39	100.00
	31.81	31.11	31.58
Fairly important	378	246	624
	60.58	39.42	100.00
	28.70	36.44	31.33
Not very important	378	163	541
	69.87	30.13	100.00
	28.70	24.15	27.16
Total	1317	675	1992
	66.11	33.89	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 10.78 percent of those who are not members of a union or staff association consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘essential’, only 8.30 percent of those who are members of a union or staff association are of this opinion. Whereas 36.44 percent of those who are members of a union or staff association consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘fairly important’ the corresponding percentage of those who are not members of a union or staff association is only 28.70. However, whereas 28.70 percent of those who are not members of a union or staff association consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘not very important’, the corresponding percentage for those who are members of a union or staff association is 24.15.

Table 1AJ: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	177	21	198
	89.39	10.61	100.00
	10.17	8.27	9.92
Very important	562	68	630
	89.21	10.79	100.00
	32.28	26.77	31.58
Fairly important	563	62	625
	90.08	9.92	100.00
	32.34	24.41	31.33
Not very important	439	103	542
	81.00	19.00	100.00
	25.22	40.55	27.17
Total	1741	254	1995
	87.27	12.73	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 32.28 percent of those who are employees consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘very important’, only 26.77 percent of those who are self employed are of this opinion. Further, whereas 40.55 percent of those who are self employed consider ‘good promotion prospects’ to be ‘not very important’, only 25.22 percent of employees are of this opinion.

Table A1K: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & Secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	37	22	31	13	23	14	19	15	24	198
	18.69	11.11	15.66	6.57	11.62	7.07	9.60	7.58	12.12	100.00
	14.29	8.80	10.95	5.56	8.30	8.28	14.96	9.04	10.43	9.92
Very important	103	80	92	73	85	47	35	47	68	630
	16.35	12.70	14.60	11.59	13.49	7.45	5.56	7.46	10.79	100.00
	39.77	32.00	32.51	31.20	30.69	27.81	27.56	28.31	29.57	31.58
Fairly important	65	84	90	85	82	60	41	57	61	625
	10.40	13.44	14.40	13.60	13.12	9.60	6.56	9.12	9.76	100.00
	25.10	33.60	31.80	36.32	29.60	35.50	32.28	34.34	26.52	31.33
Not very important	54	64	70	63	87	48	32	47	77	542
	9.96	11.81	12.92	11.62	16.05	8.86	5.90	8.67	14.21	100.00
	20.85	25.60	24.73	26.92	31.41	28.40	25.20	28.31	33.48	27.17
Total	259	250	283	234	277	169	127	166	230	1995
	12.98	12.53	14.19	11.73	13.88	8.47	6.37	8.32	11.53	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good promotion prospects’ are considered to be ‘essential’ proportionately more by individuals working as sales personnel (at 14.96 percent) and managers (at 14.29 percent). ‘Good promotion prospects’ are considered to be ‘very important’ proportionately more by individuals working as managers (at 39.77 percent). In contrast, ‘good promotion prospects’ are considered to be ‘not very important’ proportionately more by those working in elementary occupations (at 33.48 percent).

Table A2. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Good Pay’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 19.4337	0.000	0.0986
Age	(9) 34.9379	0.000	0.0763
Marital status	(3) 2.1205	0.548	0.0326
Financially dependent child	(3) 8.2467	0.041	0.0643
Highest qualification held	(12) 40.0859	0.000	0.0818
Work experience	(12) 36.2385	0.000	0.0780
Working full time	(3) 56.5754	0.000	0.1682
In a permanent job	(3) 10.5237	0.015	0.0770
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 6.5591	0.087	0.0613
Tenure	(12) 8.8872	0.713	0.0385
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 13.4382	0.004	0.0820
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 3.892	0.273	0.0442
Sector of employment	(6) 47.8332	0.000	0.1161
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 3.7993	0.284	0.0436
Occupation	(24) 62.3823	0.000	0.1020
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 1.5347	0.674	0.0302

The tables which follow present the detail of the cross tabulation results for the job attribute preference ‘good pay’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As identified in Table A2, 10 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being gender, age, whether there is a financially dependent child, highest qualification, work experience, whether working full time, whether working in a permanent job, whether having more than 1 job, sector of employment and occupation.

Table A2A: GENDER

	Female	Male	Total
Essential	264	347	611
	43.21	56.79	100.00
	26.51	34.56	30.55
Very important	438	427	865
	50.64	49.36	100.00
	43.98	42.53	43.25
Fairly important	258	205	463
	55.72	44.28	100.00
	25.90	20.42	23.15
Not very important	36	35	61
	59.02	40.98	100.00
	3.61	2.49	3.05
Total	996	1004	2000
	49.80	50.02	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones which relate to the cross tabulation of the job preference of 'good pay' and the variable identified:

1. Key:

Frequency

Row percentage

Column percentage

Whereas 'good pay' is considered to be 'very important' by 34.56 percent of males, it is considered to be 'very important' by only 26.51 percent of females. Conversely, whereas 20.42 percent of males consider 'good pay' be to only 'fairly important', 25.90 percent of females have this opinion.

Table A2B: AGE

	Aged 20 – 25	Aged 26 - 45	Aged 46 - 55	Aged 56 - 65	Total
Essential	57 9.33 38.51	315 51.55 31.41	153 25.04 29.37	86 14.08 26.22	611 100.00 30.55
Very important	65 7.51 43.92	454 52.49 45.26	211 24.39 40.50	135 15.61 41.16	865 100.00 43.25
Fairly important	24 5.18 16.22	217 46.87 21.64	135 29.16 25.91	87 18.79 26.52	463 100.00 23.15
Not very important	2 3.28 1.35	17 27.87 1.69	22 36.07 4.22	20 32.79 6.10	61 100.00 3.05
Total	148 7.40 100.00	1003 50.15 100.00	521 26.05 100.00	328 16.40 100.00	2000 100.00 100.00

‘Good pay’ is considered to be ‘essential’ for 38.51 percent of the youngest age category (those aged 20 – 25), a percentage which is higher than the corresponding percentages for the other age categories. Partially confirming the salience of ‘good pay’ for young workers, only 16.22 percent of the youngest age category considered ‘good pay’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a percentage which is lower than the corresponding percentages for the other age categories.

Table A2C: DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	With no financially dependent children	With financially dependent children	Total
Essential	362	243	605
	59.83	40.17	100.00
	29.62	31.56	30.37
Very important	513	352	865
	59.31	40.69	100.00
	41.98	45.71	43.42
Fairly important	305	157	462
	66.02	33.98	100.00
	24.96	20.39	23.19
Not very important	42	18	60
	70.00	30.00	100.00
	3.44	2.34	3.01
Total	1222	770	1992
	61.35	38.65	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 45.71 percent of those who have a financially dependent child (or children) consider ‘good pay’ to be ‘very important’, only 41.98 percent of those without financially dependent children are of this opinion. Conversely, whereas 20.39 percent of those who have financially dependent children consider ‘good pay’ to be only ‘fairly important’, 24.96 percent of those without financially dependent children are of this opinion.

Table A2D: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No Qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	110	53	88	173	186	610
	18.03	8.69	14.43	28.36	30.49	100.00
	38.33	38.69	30.24	31.34	25.41	30.52
Very important	115	64	126	247	313	865
	13.29	7.40	14.57	28.55	36.18	100.00
	40.07	46.72	43.30	44.75	42.76	43.27
Fairly important	54	17	65	123	204	463
	11.66	3.67	14.04	26.57	44.06	100.00
	18.82	12.41	22.34	22.28	27.87	23.16
Not very important	8	3	12	9	29	61
	13.11	4.92	19.67	14.75	47.54	100.00
	2.79	2.19	4.12	1.63	3.96	3.05
Total	287	137	291	552	732	1999
	14.36	6.85	14.56	27.61	36.62	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

38.33 percent of those with no qualifications consider ‘good pay’ to be ‘essential’. The corresponding percentage for those with level 1 as their highest qualification is 38.69. In contrast, only 25.41 percent of those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘good pay’ to be ‘essential’. 27.87 percent of those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘good pay’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a percentage which is higher than the corresponding percentages for the other highest qualification level categories. For example, only 13.11 percent of those with no qualifications are of this opinion.

Table A2E: WORK EXPERIENCE

	1 – 2 years	3 – 6 years	7 – 10 years	11 – 25 years	Over 25 years	Total
Essential	14 2.30 38.89	46 7.57 36.80	110 18.09 32.93	143 23.52 28.04	295 48.52 30.07	608 100.00 30.61
Very important	13 1.51 36.11	48 5.57 38.40	163 18.93 48.80	237 27.53 46.47	400 46.46 40.77	861 100.00 43.35
Fairly important	8 1.75 22.22	30 6.55 24.00	57 12.45 17.07	123 26.86 24.12	240 52.40 24.46	458 100.00 23.06
Not very important	1 1.69 2.78	1 1.69 0.80	4 6.78 1.20	7 11.86 1.37	46 77.97 4.69	59 100.00 2.97
Total	36 1.81 100.00	125 6.29 100.00	334 16.82 100.00	510 25.68 100.00	981 49.40 100.00	1986 100.00 100.00

38.89 percent of those who have between 1 and 3 years experience in the labour market consider ‘good pay’ to be ‘essential’ and 36.80 of those who have between 3 and 6 years experience in the labour market share this opinion. Both percentages are greater than the corresponding percentages for other work experience categories. However, 48.80 percent of those who have been in the labour market for between 7 and 10 years consider ‘good pay’ to be ‘very important’. 46.47 percent of those who have been in the labour market for between 10 and 25 years share this opinion. Again, both percentages are greater than the corresponding percentages for the other work experience categories.

Table A2F: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working full time	Working full time	Total
Essential	104	507	611
	17.02	82.98	100.00
	21.53	33.42	30.55
Very important	200	665	865
	23.12	76.88	100.00
	41.41	43.84	43.25
Fairly important	148	315	463
	31.97	68.03	100.00
	30.64	20.76	23.15
Not very important	31	30	61
	50.82	59.18	100.00
	6.42	1.98	3.05
Total	483	1517	2000
	24.15	75.85	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 33.42 percent of those working full time consider ‘good pay’ to be ‘essential’, only 21.53 percent of those not working full time are of this opinion. Conversely, whereas 20.76 percent of those working full time consider ‘good pay’ to be only ‘fairly important’, 30.64 of those not working full time are of this opinion.

Table A2G: IN A PERMANENT JOB

	Not in a permanent job	In a permanent job	Total
Essential	33	522	555
	5.95	94.05	100.00
	35.11	31.03	31.25
Very important	30	733	763
	3.93	96.07	100.00
	31.91	43.58	42.96
Fairly important	24	382	406
	5.91	94.09	100.00
	25.53	22.71	22.86
Not very important	7	45	52
	13.46	86.55	100.00
	7.45	2.68	2.93
Total	94	1682	1776
	5.29	94.71	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 43.58 percent of those in permanent employment consider ‘good pay’ to be ‘very important’, only 31.91 percent of those not in permanent employment are of this opinion. Conversely, whereas 22.71 percent of those in permanent employment consider ‘good pay’ to be only ‘fairly important’, 25.53 of those not in permanent employment are of this opinion.

Table A2H: WITH MORE THAN 1 JOB

	With 1 job	With more than 1 job	Total
Essential	577 94.44 31.02	34 5.56 24.29	611 100.00 30.55
Very important	814 94.10 43.76	51 5.90 36.43	865 100.00 43.25
Fairly important	414 89.42 22.26	49 10.58 35.00	463 100.00 23.15
Not very important	55 90.16 2.98	6 9.84 4.29	61 100.00 3.05
Total	1860 93.00 100.00	140 7.00 100.00	2000 100.00 100.00

31.02 percent and 43.76 percent, respectively, of those who have one job consider 'good pay' to be 'essential' and 'very important'. The corresponding percentages for those who have more than one job is 24.29 and 36.43, respectively. In contrast, whereas 35.00 percent of those who have more than one job consider 'good pay' to be only 'fairly important, only 22.26 percent of those who have only one job consider it to be 'fairly important'.

Table A2I: SECTOR OF EMPLOYMENT

	Private Sector	Public sector	Not for profit sector	Total
Essential	352 63.54 34.48	190 34.30 27.70	12 2.17 18.18	554 100.00 31.25
Very important	446 58.45 43.68	296 38.79 43.15	21 2.75 31.82	763 100.00 43.03
Fairly important	197 48.76 19.29	182 45.05 26.53	25 6.19 37.88	404 100.00 22.79
Not very important	26 50.00 2.55	18 34.62 2.62	8 15.38 12.12	52 100.00 2.93
Total	1021 57.59 100.00	686 38.69 100.00	66 3.72 100.00	1773 100.00 100.00

Only 18.18 percent of those working in the non-profit sector consider ‘good pay’ to be ‘essential’, a much lower percentage than reported by individuals working in the other sectors. Further, only 31.82 percent in the same sector consider ‘good pay’ to be ‘very important’, again a percentage lower than the corresponding percentages for those working in the other sectors. In contrast, 37.88 percent of those working in the non profit sector consider ‘good pay’ to be only ‘fairly important’, this time a percentage greater than the corresponding percentages reported by respondents working in the other sectors.

Table A2J: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & Secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	71	60	83	60	104	43	46	72	72	611
	11.62	9.82	13.58	9.82	17.02	7.04	7.53	11.78	11.78	100.00
	27.41	24.00	29.23	25.53			35.94	43.37	31.30	30.55
Very important	125	102	126	108	116	72	49	65	102	865
	14.45	11.79	14.57	12.49	13.41	8.32	5.66	7.51	11.79	100.00
	48.26	40.80	44.37	45.96	41.73	42.35	38.28	39.16	44.35	43.25
Fairly important	58	82	70	55	50	50	24	26	48	463
	12.53	17.71	15.12	11.88	10.80	10.80	5.18	5.62	10.37	100.00
	22.39	32.80	24.65	23.40	17.99	29.41	18.75	15.66	20.87	23.15
Not very important	5	6	5	12	8	5	9	3	8	61
	8.20	9.84	8.20	19.67	13.11	8.20	14.75	4.92	13.11	100.00
	1.93	2.40	1.76	5.11	2.88	2.94	7.03	1.01	3.48	3.05
Total	259	250	284	235	278	170	128	166	230	2000
	12.95	12.50	14.20	11.75	13.90	8.50	6.40	8.30	11.50	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good pay’ is considered to be ‘essential’ by 43.37 percent of those working as operatives. The corresponding percentage for those working as professionals is 24.00. ‘Good pay’ is considered to be ‘very important’ by 48.26 percent of those working as managers, but only 38.28 percent of those working as sales persons. Whereas only 15.66 percent of those working as ‘operatives’ consider ‘good pay’ to be only ‘fairly important’, 32.80 of those working as professional hold this opinion.

Table A3. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘A Secure Job’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 1.9275	0.538	0.0311
Age	(9) 26.3754	0.002	0.0663
Marital status	(3) 3.9882	0.263	0.0448
Financially dependent child	(3) 5.0065	0.171	0.0501
Highest qualification held	(12) 65.3499	0.000	0.1044
Work experience	(12) 20.9513	0.051	0.0593
Working full time	(3) 21.4394	0.000	0.1036
In a permanent job	(3) 63.1805	0.000	0.1885
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 5.1411	0.162	0.0543
Tenure	(12) 5.5951	0.935	0.0305
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 12.7375	0.005	0.0798
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 9.8179	0.020	0.0701
Sector of employment	(6) 14.2487	0.027	0.0634
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 78.6512	0.000	0.1984
Occupation	(24) 43.9747	0.008	0.0856
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 10.7481	0.013	0.0799

The tables which follow present the detail of the cross tabulations for the job attribute preference ‘a secure job’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A3, 10 cross tabulations produced statistically significant results, being age, highest qualification, whether working full time, whether in a permanent job, whether having more than 1 job, whether a member of a union or staff association, sector of employment, employment status, occupation and whether seeking another job.

Table A3A: AGE

	Aged 20 - 25	Aged 26 - 45	Aged 46 - 55	Aged 56 - 65	Total
Essential	75 9.87 50.68	402 52.89 40.12	173 22.76 33.21	110 14.47 33.54	760 100.00 38.02
Very important	60 6.56 40.54	450 49.23 44.91	251 27.46 48.18	153 16.74 46.65	914 100.00 45.72
Fairly important	12 4.71 8.11	119 46.67 11.88	76 29.80 14.59	48 18.82 14.63	255 100.00 12.76
Not very important	1 1.43 0.68	31 44.29 3.09	21 30.00 4.03	17 24.29 5.18	70 100.00 3.50
Total	148 7.40 100.00	1002 50.13 100.00	521 26.06 100.00	328 16.41 100.00	1999 100.00 100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones associated with the cross tabulation of 'a secure job' and the identified variable:

1. Key:

Frequency

Row percentage

Column percentage

50.68 percent of those in the youngest age category (aged 20 -25) consider 'a secure job' to be 'essential'. The corresponding percentages for all of the other age categories are lower. However, 40.54 percent of those in the youngest age category consider 'a secure job' to be 'very important' and, on this occasion, the corresponding percentages for all the other age categories are greater. Only 8.11 percent of those in the youngest age category consider 'a secure job' to be only 'fairly important', a percentage less than the other corresponding percentages for all the other age categories.

Table A3B: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No Qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	124	60	114	236	225	759
	16.34	7.91	15.02	31.09	29.64	100.00
	43.21	43.80	39.18	42.75	30.78	37.99
Very important	131	61	148	245	329	914
	14.33	6.67	16.19	26.81	36.00	100.00
	45.64	44.53	50.86	44.38	45.01	45.75
Fairly important	25	11	24	56	139	255
	9.80	4.31	9.41	21.96	54.51	100.00
	8.71	8.03	8.25	10.14	19.02	12.76
Not very important	7	5	5	15	38	70
	10.00	7.14	7.14	21.43	54.29	100.00
	2.44	3.65	1.72	2.72	5.20	3.50
Total	287	137	291	552	731	1998
	14.36	6.86	14.56	27.63	36.59	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

43.80 percent of those with level 1 as their highest qualification and 43.21 percent of those with no qualification consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘essential’, percentages which contrast with the corresponding 30.78 percent of those who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification. In contrast, whereas 19.02 percent of those who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘a secure job’ as only ‘fairly important’, the corresponding percentages for those with no qualifications and level 1 as their highest qualification are 8.71 and 8.03, respectively.

Table A3C: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working full time	Working Full time	Total
Essential	159	601	760
	20.92	79.08	100.00
	32.92	39.64	38.02
Very important	214	700	914
	23.41	76.59	100.00
	44.31	46.17	45.72
Fairly important	85	170	255
	33.33	66.67	100.00
	17.60	11.21	12.75
Not very important	25	45	70
	35.71	64.29	100.00
	5.18	2.97	3.50
Total	483	1516	1999
	24.16	75.84	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 39.64 of those working full time consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘essential’, only 32.94 percent of those not working full time are of the same opinion. Further, whereas 46.17 percent of those working full time consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘very important’, only 44.31 percent of those not working full time have this same opinion. Whereas 11.21 percent of those working full time consider ‘a secure job’ to be only ‘fairly important’, the corresponding percentage for those not working full time is higher, at 17.60.

Table A3D: IN A PERMANENT JOB

	Not in a permanent Job	In a permanent Job	Total
Essential	22	677	699
	3.15	96.85	100.00
	23.40	40.25	39.36
Very important	33	790	823
	4.01	95.99	100.00
	35.11	46.97	46.34
Fairly important	30	180	210
	14.29	85.71	100.00
	31.91	10.70	11.82
Not very important	9	35	44
	20.45	79.55	100.00
	9.57	2.08	2.48
Total	94	1682	1776
	5.29	94.71	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

40.25 percent of those working in a permanent job consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘essential’. Only 23.40 percent of those not in a permanent job hold this opinion. Further, 46.97 percent of those in a permanent job consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘very important’, whereas only 35.11 percent of those not in a permanent job subscribe to this view. 10.70 percent of those in a permanent job consider ‘a secure job’ to be only ‘fairly important’. However, 31.91 percent of those not in a permanent job have this opinion.

Table A3E: WITH MORE THAN 1 JOB

	With 1 job	With more than 1 job	Total
Essential	702 92.37 37.76	58 7.63 41.43	760 100.00 38.02
Very important	866 94.75 46.58	48 5.25 34.29	914 100.00 45.72
Fairly important	231 90.59 12.43	24 9.41 17.14	255 100.00 12.76
Not very important	60 85.71 3.23	10 14.29 7.14	70 100.00 3.50
Total	1859 93.00 100.00	140 7.00 100.00	1999 100.00 100.00

41.43 percent of those with more than 1 job consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘essential’. Only 37.76 percent of those who hold only one job share this opinion. However, whereas 34.29 percent of those who hold more than 1 job consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘very important’, the corresponding percentage for those who have only 1 job on this occasion is greater, at 46.58. 17.14 percent of those who have more than 1 job consider ‘a secure job’ to be only ‘fairly important’. The corresponding percentage for those who have only 1 job is less, at 12.43.

Table A3F: UNION/STAFF ASSOCIATION MEMBER

	Not a member	Member of union/ staff association	Total
Essential	480	280	760
	63.16	36.84	100.00
	36.34	41.48	38.08
Very important	606	306	912
	66.45	33.55	100.00
	45.87	45.33	45.69
Fairly important	181	73	254
	71.25	28.74	100.00
	13.70	10.81	12.73
Not very important	54	16	70
	77.14	22.86	100.00
	4.09	2.37	3.51
Total	1321	675	1996
	66.18	33.82	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 41.48 percent of those who are members of a union or staff association consider 'a secure job' to be 'essential', only 36.34 percent of those who are neither a member of a union nor a staff association hold this opinion. Although the percentages of both groups with respect to considering 'a secure job' to be 'very important' are very much the same, the percentage of those who consider 'a secure job' to be only 'fairly important' is greater for those who are not members of a union or staff association, at 13.70 as against 10.81, respectively.

Table A3G: SECTOR OF EMPLOYMENT

	Private sector	Public sector	Not for profit sector	Total
Essential	389 55.81 38.10	288 41.32 41.98	20 2.87 30.30	697 100.00 39.31
Very important	481 58.52 47.11	312 37.96 45.48	29 3.53 43.94	822 100.00 46.36
Fairly important	121 57.62 11.85	76 36.19 11.08	13 6.19 19.70	210 100.00 11.84
Not very important	30 68.18 2.94	10 22.73 1.46	4 9.09 6.06	44 100.00 2.48
Total	1021 57.59 100.00	686 38.69 100.00	66 3.72 100.00	1773 100.00 100.00

30.30 percent of those employed in the not for profit sector consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘essential’, a rate less than the corresponding percentages for those employed in the other sectors. 19.70 percent of those employed in the same sector consider ‘a secure job’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate greater than the corresponding percentages for those employed in the other sectors.

Table A3H: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	690	70	760
	90.79	9.21	100.00
	39.59	27.34	38.02
Very important	809	105	914
	88.51	11.49	100.00
	46.41	41.02	45.72
Fairly important	204	51	255
	80.00	20.00	100.00
	11.70	19.92	12.76
Not very important	40	30	70
	57.14	42.86	100.00
	2.29	11.72	3.50
Total	1743	256	1999
	87.19	12.81	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

39.59 percent of employees consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘essential’. Only 27.34 percent of the self employed subscribe to this view. Similarly, 46.41 percent of employees consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘very important’, whereas only 41.02 percent of the self employed have this opinion. Whereas 19.92 percent of the self employed consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘fairly important’, the corresponding percentage of employees who have this opinion is less, at 11.70.

Table A3I: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & Secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	78	84	113	86	111	71	49	70	98	760
	10.26	11.05	14.87	11.32	14.61	9.34	6.45	9.21	12.89	100.00
	30.12	33.60	39.79	36.60	40.07	41.76	38.28	42.17	42.61	38.02
Very important	128	111	122	107	124	83	57	78	105	914
	14.00	12.04	13.35	11.71	13.57	9.08	6.24	8.53	11.49	100.00
	49.42	44.00	42.96	45.53	44.77	48.82	44.53	46.99	45.65	45.72
Fairly important	41	46	35	39	30	12	14	16	22	255
	16.08	18.04	13.73	15.29	11.76	4.71	5.49	6.27	8.63	100.00
	15.83	18.40	12.32	16.60	10.83	7.06	10.94	9.64	9.57	12.76
Not very important	12	10	14	3	12	4	8	2	5	70
	17.14	14.29	20.00	4.29	17.14	5.71	11.43	2.86	7.14	100.00
	4.63	4.00	4.93	1.28	4.33	2.35	6.25	1.20	2.17	3.50
Total	259	250	284	235	277	170	128	166	230	1999
	12.95	12.51	14.21	11.76	13.86	8.50	6.40	8.30	11.51	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

42.61 percent of those employed in elementary occupations consider ‘a secure job’ to be essential’. 42.17 percent of those employed as operatives are of the same opinion. These percentages are higher than the corresponding percentages for all the other occupational classifications. Only 30.12 percent of managers consider ‘a secure job’ to be ‘essential’. 18.40 percent of those employed in professional occupations, 16.60 percent of those employed in administrative and secretarial occupations and 15.83 percent of those employed as managers consider ‘a secure job’ to be only ‘fairly important’, rates higher than the corresponding percentages for all the other occupational classifications.

Table A3J: SEEKING A BETTER JOB

	Not seeking a better job	Seeking a better job	Total
Essential	380 57.06 41.76	286 42.94 36.95	666 100.00 39.55
Very important	421 54.32 46.26	354 45.68 45.74	775 100.00 46.02
Fairly important	92 45.10 10.11	112 54.90 14.47	204 100.00 12.11
Not very important	17 43.59 1.87	22 56.41 2.84	39 100.00 2.32
Total	910 54.04 100.00	774 45.95 100.00	1684 100.00 100.00

42.61 percent of those not seeking a better job consider 'a secure job' to be 'essential'. The corresponding percentage for those who are seeking a better job is 38.02. Whereas only 9.57 percent of those who are not seeking a better job consider 'a secure job' to be only 'fairly important', the corresponding percentage for those seeking a better job is 12.76.

Table A4. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Convenient Hours of Work’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 113.3844	0.000	0.2381
Age	(9) 16.6474	0.055	0.0527
Marital status	(3) 0.2758	0.965	0.0118
Financially dependent child	(3) 24.2424	0.000	0.1103
Highest qualification held	(12) 17.2407	0.141	0.0536
Work experience	(12) 25.4658	0.013	0.0654
Working full time	(3) 85.8533	0.000	0.2072
In a permanent job	(3) 3.2676	0.352	0.0429
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 27.5570	0.000	0.1257
Tenure	(12) 17.4826	0.132	0.0540
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 5.2257	0.156	0.0511
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 5.0777	0.166	0.0504
Sector of employment	(6) 5.6220	0.467	0.0398
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 28.0033	0.000	0.1183
Occupation	(24) 60.8329	0.000	0.1007
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 0.7954	0.851	0.0217

The tables which follow present the detail of the results of the cross tabulations of the job attribute preference ‘convenient hours’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A4, 7 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being gender, whether there is a financially dependent child, work experience, whether working full time, whether working in a supervisory or managerial capacity, employment status and occupation.

Table A4A: GENDER

	Female	Male	Total
Essential	241	132	373
	64.61	35.39	100.00
	24.20	13.15	18.65
Very important	494	388	882
	56.01	43.99	100.00
	49.60	38.65	44.10
Fairly important	203	352	555
	36.58	63.42	100.00
	20.38	35.06	27.75
Not very important	58	132	190
	30.53	69.47	100.00
	5.82	13.15	9.50
Total	996	1004	2000
	49.80	50.20	100.00
	100.00	100.0	100.00
		0	

Note to this table and all corresponding ones cross tabulating ‘convenient hours’ with the variable identified:

1. Key:

Frequency

Row percentage

Column percentage

Whereas 24 percent of females consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘essential’, only 13.15 percent of males are of this opinion. Furthermore, whereas 49.60 percent of females consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘very important’, only 38.65 percent of males are of this view. 35.06 percent of males consider ‘convenient hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’. Only 20.38 percent of females are of this view.

Table A4B: DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	With no financially dependent children	With financially dependent children	Total
Essential	187	183	370
	50.54	49.46	100.00
	15.30	23.77	18.57
Very important	547	331	878
	62.30	37.70	100.00
	44.76	42.99	44.08
Fairly important	363	192	555
	65.41	34.59	100.00
	29.71	24.94	27.86
Not very important	125	64	189
	66.14	33.86	100.00
	10.23	8.31	9.49
Total	1222	770	1992
	61.35	38.65	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

23.77 percent of those who have financially dependent children consider ‘convenient hours’ to be essential. The corresponding percentage for those who do not have financially dependent children is less, at 15.30 percent. However, the percentage of those with financially dependent children who consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘very important’ (i.e. 42.99 percent) is less than the corresponding percentage of those who do not have financially dependent children (i.e. 44.76). The percentage of those who consider ‘convenient hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’ is greater for those without financially dependent children than it is for those with financially dependent children, being 29.71 and 24.94 percent, respectively.

Table A4C: WORK EXPERIENCE

	1 – 2 years	3 – 6 years	7 – 10 years	11 – 25 years	Over 25 years	Total
Essential	4	15	68	118	164	369
	1.08	4.07	18.43	31.98	44.44	100.00
	11.11	12.00	20.36	23.14	16.72	18.58
Very important	14	49	136	224	456	879
	1.59	5.57	15.47	25.48	51.88	100.00
	38.89	39.20	40.72	43.92	46.48	44.26
Fairly important	15	44	96	123	271	549
	2.73	8.01	17.49	22.40	49.36	100.00
	41.67	35.20	28.74	24.12	27.62	27.64
Not very important	3	17	34	45	90	189
	1.59	8.99	17.99	23.81	47.62	100.00
	8.33	13.60	10.18	8.82	9.17	9.52
Total	36	125	334	510	981	1986
	1.81	6.29	16.82	25.68	49.40	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Convenient hours’ is considered to be ‘essential’ by 23.14 percent of those who have 10 – 25 years of experience in the labour market, a rate which contrasts with the corresponding percentage for those who have the least experience of working in the labour market (i.e. 11.11 percent). 46.48 percent of those who have been working in the labour market for over 25 years consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘very important’, again a rate which contrasts with the corresponding percentage for those in the least experienced category (which is 38.89 percent). 41.67 percent of those in the least experienced category consider ‘convenient hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate which is higher than the corresponding rates for all the other work experience categories.

Table A4D: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working full time	Working full time	Total
Essential	140 37.53 28.99	233 62.47 15.36	373 100.00 18.65
Very important	240 27.21 49.69	642 72.79 42.32	882 100.00 44.10
Fairly important	83 14.95 17.18	472 85.05 31.11	555 100.00 27.75
Not very important	20 10.53 4.14	170 89.47 11.21	190 100.00 9.50
Total	483 24.15 100.00	1517 75.85 100.00	2000 100.00 100.00

Whereas 28.99 percent of those not working full time consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘essential’, only 15.36 percent of those working full time hold this opinion. Further, whereas 49.69 percent of those who do not work full time consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘very important’, only 42.32 percent of those who do work full time are of this opinion. 31.11 percent of those who work full time consider ‘convenient hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’. The corresponding percentage for those who do not work full time is less than this, at 17.18 percent.

Table A4E: IN A SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL ROLE

	Not in a supervisory/ managerial role	In a supervisory/ managerial role	Total
Essential	227	95	323
	70.28	29.72	100.00
	21.72	13.75	18.53
Very important	478	315	793
	60.28	39.72	100.00
	45.74	45.13	45.50
Fairly important	273	210	483
	56.52	43.48	100.00
	26.12	30.09	27.71
Not very important	67	77	144
	46.53	53.47	100.00
	6.41	11.03	8.25
Total	1045	698	1743
	59.95	40.05	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 21.72 percent of those not working in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘essential’, only 13.75 percent of those working in supervisory or managerial capacities are of this opinion. Although the percentage in both categories who consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘very important’ is about the same (at 45.00 percent), the percentage of those who are working in a supervisory or managerial capacity who consider ‘convenient hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’ is greater than the corresponding percentage for those who are not working in this capacity, at 30.09 percent as opposed to 26.12 percent, respectively.

Table A4F: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	323	50	373
	86.60	13.40	100.00
	18.53	19.46	18.65
Very important	793	89	882
	89.91	10.09	100.00
	45.50	34.63	44.10
Fairly important	483	72	555
	87.03	12.97	100.00
	27.71	28.02	27.75
Not very important	144	46	190
	75.79	24.21	100.00
	8.26	17.90	9.50
Total	1743	257	2000
	87.15	12.85	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

The percentages of those working as employees who consider ‘convenient hours’ to be both ‘essential’ and only ‘fairly important’ are very similar to the corresponding percentages for those who are self employed, at (approximately) 18 percent and 28 percent, respectively. However, whereas 5.50 percent of those who are employees consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘very important’, the corresponding percentage for those who are self employed is less, at 34.63 percent. 17.90 percent of the self employed consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘not very important’. The corresponding percentage for employees is 8.26.

Table 8G: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & Secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	34	40	56	50	32	39	31	35	56	373
	9.12	10.72	15.01	13.40	8.58	10.46	8.31	9.38	15.01	100.00
	13.13	16.00	19.72	21.28	11.51	22.94	24.22	21.08	24.35	18.65
Very important	106	117	123	116	114	76	66	62	102	882
	12.02	13.27	13.95	13.15	12.93	8.62	7.48	7.03	11.56	100.00
	40.93	46.80	43.31	49.36	41.01	44.71	51.56	37.35	44.35	44.10
Fairly important	88	68	75	58	98	40	26	48	54	555
	15.86	12.25	13.51	10.45	17.66	7.21	4.68	8.65	9.73	100.00
	33.98	27.20	26.41	24.68	35.25	23.53	20.31	28.92	23.48	27.75
Not very important	31	25	30	11	34	15	5	21	18	190
	16.32	13.16	15.79	5.79	17.89	7.89	2.63	11.05	9.47	100.00
	11.97	10.00	10.56	4.68	12.23	8.82	3.91	12.65	7.83	9.50
Total	259	250	284	235	278	170	128	166	230	2000
	12.95	12.50	14.20	11.75	13.90	8.50	6.40	8.30	11.50	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

24.35 percent of those working in elementary occupations and 24.22 percent of those working in sales occupations consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘essential’, rates which contrast with the corresponding percentages for managers (13.13 percent) and those in the skilled trades (11.51 percent). 51.56 percent of those working in sales consider ‘convenient hours’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which contrasts with the corresponding rates for managers (at 40.93 percent) and operatives (at 37.35 percent). 35.25 percent of those in the skilled trades and 33.98 percent of managers consider ‘convenient hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, rates which are greater than the corresponding percentages for the other occupational classifications.

Table A5. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Choice In Your Hours Of Work’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 47.3732	0.000	0.1539
Age	(9) 33.9345	0.000	0.0752
Marital status	(3) 9.8746	0.020	0.0704
Financially dependent child	(3) 45.0187	0.000	0.1504
Highest qualification held	(12) 28.3672	0.005	0.0688
Work experience	(12) 51.9371	0.000	0.0934
Working full time	(3) 62.3479	0.000	0.1766
In a permanent job	(3) 9.7015	0.021	0.0739
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 10.6638	0.014	0.0782
Tenure	(12) 16.4827	0.170	0.0524
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 0.6422	0.887	0.0179
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 3.1064	0.376	0.0395
Sector of employment	(6) 1.7672	0.940	0.0233
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 7.9595	0.047	0.0631
Occupation	(24) 39.3591	0.025	0.0810
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 2.9059	0.406	0.0416

The tables which follow present the detail of the results for the cross tabulations of the job attribute preference ‘choice in hours’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A5, 11 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being gender, age, marital status, whether there is a financially dependent child, highest qualification, work experience, whether working full time, whether in a permanent job, whether with a supervisory or managerial role, employment status and occupation.

Table A5A: GENDER

	Female	Male	Total
Essential	147	80	227
	64.76	35.24	100.00
	14.77	7.97	11.35
Very important	345	280	625
	55.20	44.80	100.00
	34.67	27.89	31.27
Fairly important	329	386	715
	46.01	53.99	100.00
	33.07	38.45	35.77
Not very important	174	258	432
	40.28	59.72	100.00
	17.49	25.70	21.61
Total	995	1004	1999
	49.77	50.23	100.00
	100.00	100.0	100.00
		0	

Note to this table and all corresponding ones reporting the cross tabulations for 'choice of work hours' with the variable identified:

1. Key:

Frequency

Row percentage

Column percentage

14.77 percent of females consider 'choice in hours' to be 'essential'. In comparison, only 7.97 percent of males do. Further, 34.77 of females consider 'choice in hours' to be 'very important'. Only 27.89 percent of males have this view. Whereas 38.45 percent of males consider 'choice in hours' to be only 'fairly important', the corresponding percentage for females is less, at 33.07.

Table A5B: AGE

	Aged 20 - 25	Aged 26 - 45	Aged 46 - 55	Aged 56 - 65	Total
Essential	12 5.29 8.11	127 55.95 12.66	52 22.91 10.00	36 15.86 10.98	227 100.00 11.36
Very important	24 3.84 16.22	317 50.72 31.61	178 28.48 34.23	106 16.96 32.32	625 100.00 31.27
Fairly important	60 8.39 40.54	363 50.77 36.19	185 25.87 35.58	107 14.97 32.62	715 100.00 35.77
Not very important	52 12.04 35.14	196 50.77 36.19	185 25.87 35.58	107 14.97 32.62	715 100.00 35.77
Total	148 7.40 100.00	1003 50.18 100.00	520 26.01 100.00	328 16.41 100.00	1999 100.00 100.00

12.66 percent of those aged 26 – 45 consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than that of any of the other age categories. 34.23 percent of those aged 46 -55 consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘very important’, a rate greater than that of any of the other age categories. 40.54 percent of those aged 20 – 25 consider ‘choice in hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate higher than that of any of the other age categories.

Table A5C: MARITAL STATUS

	Single	Married or living together	Total
Essential	64 28.32 9.60	162 71.68 12.24	226 100.00 11.36
Very important	190 30.60 28.49	431 69.40 32.58	621 100.00 31.21
Fairly important	249 34.92 37.33	464 65.08 35.07	713 100.00 35.83
Not very important	164 38.14 24.59	266 61.86 20.11	430 100.00 21.61
Total	667 33.52 100.00	1323 66.48 100.00	1990 100.00 100.00

Whereas 12.24 percent of those who are married or living together consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘essential’, the corresponding percentage for those who are single is lower, at 9.60. Further, whereas 32.58 percent of those who are married or living together consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘very important’, only 28.49 percent of those who are single share this opinion. 24.59 percent of those who are single consider ‘choice in hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate higher than that for the corresponding percentage (i.e. 20.11 percent) for those who are married or living together.

Table A5D: DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	With no financially dependent children	With financially dependent children	Total
Essential	102	124	226
	45.13	54.87	100.00
	8.35	16.10	11.35
Very important	360	261	621
	57.97	42.03	100.00
	29.48	33.90	31.19
Fairly important	456	258	714
	63.87	36.13	100.00
	37.35	33.51	35.86
Not very important	303	127	430
	70.47	29.53	100.00
	24.82	16.49	21.60
Total	1221	770	1991
	61.33	38.67	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

16.10 percent of those who have financially dependent children consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘essential’. 33.30 percent of the same group consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for those who do not have financially dependent children are less, at 8.35 and 29.48 percent, respectively. Whereas 37.35 percent of those who do not have financially dependent children consider ‘choice in hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, 33.51 percent of those who do have financially dependent children are of this opinion.

Table A5E: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	47	25	28	56	71	227
	20.70	11.01	12.33	24.67	31.28	100.00
	16.43	18.25	9.62	10.14	9.70	11.36
Very important	85	34	99	173	234	625
	13.60	5.44	15.84	27.68	37.44	100.00
	29.72	24.82	34.02	31.34	31.97	31.28
Fairly important	90	42	101	193	288	714
	12.61	5.88	14.15	27.03	40.34	100.00
	31.47	30.66	34.71	34.96	39.34	35.74
Not very important	64	36	63	130	139	432
	14.81	8.33	14.58	30.09	32.18	100.00
	22.38	26.28	21.65	23.55	18.99	21.62
Total	286	137	291	552	732	1998
	14.31	6.86	14.56	27.63	36.64	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

18.25 percent of those with level 1 as their highest qualification and 16.43 of those with no qualifications consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘essential’, rates greater than the corresponding percentages for the other highest qualification categories. 34.02 percent of those with level 2 as their highest qualification and 31.97 percent of those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘very important’, rates greater than the corresponding percentages for the other highest qualification categories. 39.34 percent of those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘choice in hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate greater than the corresponding percentages for all the other highest qualification categories.

Table A5F: WORK EXPERIENCE

	1 – 2 years	3 – 6 years	7 – 10 years	11 – 25 years	Over 25 years	Total
Essential	3	4	41	75	101	224
	1.34	1.79	18.30	33.48	45.09	100.00
	8.33	3.20	12.28	14.71	10.31	11.28
Very important	5	21	101	171	325	623
	0.80	3.37	16.21	27.45	52.17	100.00
	13.89	16.80	30.24	33.53	33.16	31.39
Fairly important	20	57	116	180	336	709
	2.82	8.04	16.36	25.39	47.39	100.00
	55.56	45.60	34.73	35.29	34.29	35.72
Not very important	8	43	76	84	218	429
	1.86	10.02	17.72	19.58	50.82	100.00
	22.22	34.40	22.75	16.47	22.24	21.61
Total	36	125	334	510	980	1985
	1.81	6.30	16.83	25.69	49.37	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

14.71 percent of those who have between 11 -25 years of labour market experience consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which contrasts with that of those who have between 3 -6 years of labour market experience (i.e. 3.20 percent). 33.53 percent of those with the same years of labour market experience consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which contrasts with the 13.89 percent associated with those with least labour market experience. Those with least labour market experience have the highest percentage of all work experience categories in the context of considering ‘choice in hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, at 55.56 percent.

Table A5G: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working full time	Working full time	Total
Essential	93 40.97 19.25	134 59.03 8.84	227 100.00 11.36
Very important	175 28.00 36.23	450 72.00 29.68	625 100.00 31.27
Fairly important	148 20.70 30.64	567 79.30 37.40	715 100.00 35.77
Not very important	67 15.51 13.87	365 84.49 24.08	432 100.00 21.61
Total	483 24.16 100.00	1516 75.84 100.00	1999 100.00 100.00

19.25 percent of those not working full time consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘essential’. Further, 36.25 percent of the same group consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for those who do work full time are less, at 8.84 percent and 29.68 percent, respectively. Whereas 37.40 percent of those who do work full time consider ‘choice in hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 30.64 percent of those who do not work full time have this opinion.

Table A5H: IN A PERMANENT JOB

	Not in a permanent Job	In a permanent Job	Total
Essential	15	179	194
	7.73	92.27	100.00
	15.96	10.65	10.93
Very important	19	533	552
	3.44	96.56	100.00
	20.21	31.71	31.10
Fairly important	43	590	633
	6.79	93.21	100.00
	45.74	35.10	35.66
Not very important	17	379	396
	4.29	95.71	100.00
	18.09	22.55	22.31
Total	94	1681	1775
	5.30	94.70	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

15.96 percent of those who are not in a permanent job consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘essential’. The corresponding percentage for those who are in a permanent job is less, at 10.65 percent. However, 20.21 percent of those who are not in a permanent job consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘very important’, and on this occasion the corresponding percentage for those who are in a permanent job is greater, at 31.71 percent. Whereas 45.74 percent of those who are not in a permanent job consider ‘choice in hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 35.10 percent of those who are in a permanent job are of this opinion.

Table A5I: IN A SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL ROLE

	Not in a supervisory/ managerial role	In a supervisory/ managerial role	Total
Essential	130	57	187
	69.52	30.48	100.00
	12.45	8.17	10.73
Very important	315	227	542
	58.12	41.88	100.00
	30.17	32.52	10.73
Fairly important	357	267	624
	57.21	42.79	100.00
	34.20	38.25	35.82
Not very important	242	147	389
	62.21	37.79	100.00
	23.18	21.06	22.33
Total	1044	698	1742
	59.93	40.07	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

12.45 percent of those who are not in some supervisory or managerial capacity consider 'choice in hours' to be 'essential'. The corresponding percentage for those who are in this capacity is less, at 8.17 percent. However, whereas 30.17 percent of those who are not in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider 'choice in hours' to be 'very important' is 30.17, the corresponding percentage for those in such a capacity is higher, at 32.52 percent. Whereas 34.20 percent of those who are not in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider 'choice in hours' to be only 'fairly important', 38.25 percent who are in this capacity are of this opinion.

Table A5J: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	187	40	227
	82.38	17.62	100.00
	10.73	15.56	11.36
Very important	542	83	625
	86.72	13.28	100.00
	31.11	32.30	31.27
Fairly important	624	91	715
	87.27	12.73	100.00
	35.82	35.41	35.77
Not very important	389	43	432
	90.05	9.95	100.00
	22.33	16.73	21.61
Total	1742	257	1999
	87.14	12.86	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

15.56 percent of those who are self employed consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘essential’. 32.30 percent of the same group consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for those who are employees are less, at 10.73 and 31.11 percent, respectively. Whereas 22.23 percent of employees consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘not very important’, only 16.73 percent of the self employed are of this opinion.

Table A5K: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & Secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	27	20	31	31	19	25	18	18	38	227
	11.89	8.81	13.66	13.66	8.37	11.01	7.83	7.93	16.74	100.00
	10.42	8.00	10.92	13.19	6.83	14.79	14.06	10.84	16.52	11.36
Very important	93	77	101	74	78	48	40	45	69	625
	14.88	12.32	16.16	11.84	12.48	7.68	6.40	7.20	11.04	100.00
	35.91	30.80	35.56	31.49	28.06	28.40	31.25	27.11	30.00	31.27
Fairly important	93	101	94	86	97	58	42	63	81	715
	13.01	14.13	13.15	12.03	13.57	8.11	5.87	8.81	11.33	100.00
	35.91	40.40	33.10	36.60	34.89	34.32	32.81	37.95	35.22	35.77
Not very important	46	52	58	44	84	38	28	40	42	432
	10.65	12.04	13.43	10.19	19.44	8.80	6.48	9.26	9.72	100.00
	17.76	20.80	20.42	18.72	30.22	22.49	21.88	24.10	18.26	21.61
Total	259	250	284	235	278	169	128	166	230	1999
	12.95	12.51	14.21	11.76	13.91	8.45	6.40	8.30	11.51	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

16.52 percent of those in elementary occupations consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which contrasts with that for those in professional occupations, where the corresponding percentage is 8.00. 35.91 percent of managers and 35.56 percent of associate professionals consider ‘choice in hours’ to be ‘very important’, rates which are higher than the corresponding percentages for all the other occupational classifications. 40.40 percent of professionals consider ‘choice in hours’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate higher than the corresponding percentages for the other occupational classifications.

Table A6. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Good Fringe Benefits’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 6.4593	0.091	0.0569
Age	(9) 38.5210	0.000	0.0803
Marital status	(3) 2.4723	0.480	0.0353
Financially dependent child	(3) 3.2925	0.349	0.0407
Highest qualification held	(12) 35.7192	0.000	0.0773
Work experience	(12) 18.4571	0.102	0.0558
Working full time	(3) 9.6284	0.022	0.0695
In a permanent job	(3) 1.9589	0.581	0.0333
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 0.5956	0.897	0.0185
Tenure	(12) 17.1991	0.142	0.0536
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 2.3580	0.501	0.0344
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 2.2646	0.519	0.0337
Sector of employment	(6) 19.7002	0.003	0.0747
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 9.9232	0.019	0.0706
Occupation	(24) 45.4608	0.005	0.0782
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 3.2021	0.362	0.0437

The tables which follow present the detail of the results of the cross tabulations for the job attribute preference ‘good fringe benefits’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A6, 6 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being age, highest qualification, whether working full time, sector of employment, employment status and occupation.

Table A6A: AGE

	Aged 20 - 25	Aged 26 - 45	Aged 46 - 55	Aged 56 - 65	Total
Essential	12 8.63 8.16	72 51.80 7.20	36 25.90 6.92	19 13.67 5.85	139 100.00 6.98
Very important	52 8.51 35.37	326 53.36 32.60	141 23.08 27.12	92 15.06 28.31	611 100.00 30.67
Fairly important	58 8.07 39.46	376 52.29 37.60	192 26.70 36.92	93 12.93 28.62	719 100.00 36.09
Not very important	25 4.78 17.01	226 43.21 22.60	151 28.87 29.04	121 23.14 37.23	523 100.00 26.26
Total	147 7.38 100.00	1000 50.20 100.00	520 26.10 100.00	325 16.32 100.00	1992 100.00 100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones reporting the results of cross tabulations of ‘good fringe benefits’ and the variable identified:

1. Key:

- Frequency
- Row percentage
- Column percentage

8.16 percent of those in the youngest age category consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding percentages for the other age categories. Further, 35.37 percent of those in this same age category consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘very important’, again a rate greater than the corresponding percentages for the other age categories. 39.46 percent of the youngest age category consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate which is greater than the corresponding percentages for the other age categories.

Table A6B: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	24	17	24	37	37	139
	17.27	12.23	17.27	26.62	26.62	100.00
	8.45	12.59	8.28	6.70	5.07	6.98
Very important	103	50	93	174	191	611
	16.86	8.18	15.22	28.48	31.26	100.00
	36.27	37.04	32.07	31.52	26.16	30.69
Fairly important	87	38	106	208	279	718
	12.12	5.29	14.76	28.97	38.86	100.00
	30.63	28.15	36.55	37.68	38.22	36.06
Not very important	70	30	67	133	223	523
	13.38	5.74	12.81	25.43	42.64	100.00
	24.65	22.22	23.10	24.09	30.55	26.27
Total	284	135	290	552	730	1991
	14.26	6.78	14.57	27.72	36.66	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

12.59 percent of those who have level 1 as their highest qualification consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which compares with the corresponding 5.07 percent of those who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification. Also, 37.04 percent of those who have level 1 as their highest qualification consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘very important’, again a rate which compares with the corresponding 26.16 percent of those who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification. 38.22 percent of those who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate which is greater than the corresponding percentages for the other highest qualification categories.

Table A6C: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working full time	Working full time	Total
Essential	29 20.86 6.03	110 79.14 7.28	139 100.00 6.98
Very important	128 20.95 26.61	483 79.05 31.97	611 100.00 30.67
Fairly important	175 24.34 36.38	544 75.66 36.00	719 100.00 36.09
Not very important	149 28.49 30.98	374 71.51 24.75	523 100.00 26.26
Total	481 24.15 100.00	1511 75.85 100.00	1992 100.00 100.00

7.28 percent of those working full time consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘essential’. 31.97 percent of the same category consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘very important’. Both these rates are greater than the corresponding percentages for those who are not working full time, which are 6.03 and 26.61 percent, respectively. Whereas 30.98 percent of those not working full time consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘not very important’, only 24.75 percent of those working full time have this opinion.

Table A6D: SECTOR OF EMPLOYMENT

	Private sector	Public sector	Not for profit Sector	Total
Essential	79 63.20 7.76	44 35.20 6.45	2 1.60 3.03	125 100.00 7.08
Very important	337 62.64 33.10	182 33.83 26.69	19 3.53 28.79	538 100.00 30.46
Fairly important	379 57.86 37.23	250 38.17 36.66	26 3.97 39.39	655 100.00 37.09
Not very important	223 49.78 21.91	206 45.98 30.21	19 4.24 28.79	448 100.00 25.37
Total	1018 57.64 100.00	682 38.62 100.00	66 3.74 100.00	1766 100.00 100.00

7.76 percent of those employed in the private sector consider 'good fringe benefits' to be 'essential', a rate which is higher than the corresponding percentages for those employed in the other sectors. Further, 33.10 percent of those working in the private sector consider 'good fringe benefits' to be 'very important', again a rate which is higher than the corresponding percentages for those employed in the other sectors. 39.39 percent of those employed in the not for profit sector consider 'good fringe benefits' to be only 'fairly important', a rate which is greater than the corresponding percentages for those employed in the other sectors.

Table A6E: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	124	15	139
	89.21	10.79	100.00
	7.14	5.88	6.98
Very important	527	84	611
	86.25	13.75	100.00
	30.34	32.94	30.67
Fairly important	646	73	719
	89.85	10.15	100.00
	37.19	28.63	36.09
Not very important	440	83	523
	84.13	15.87	100.00
	25.33	32.55	26.26
Total	1737	255	1992
	87.20	12.89	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 7.14 of employees consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be essential, only 5.88 percent of the self employed are of this opinion. Whereas 30.34 percent of employees consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘very important’, 32.94 percent of the self employed are of this opinion. Whereas 37.19 percent of employees consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 28.63 percent of the self employed are of this opinion.

Table A6F: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	23	6	21	17	20	10	8	13	21	139
	16.55	4.32	15.11	12.23	14.39	7.19	5.76	9.35	15.11	100.00
	8.88	2.41	7.42	7.23	7.27	5.95	6.25	7.83	9.17	6.98
Very important	83	62	74	66	99	51	43	54	79	611
	13.58	10.15	12.11	10.80	16.20	8.35	7.04	8.84	12.93	100.00
	32.05	24.90	26.15	28.09	36.00	30.36	33.59	32.53	34.50	30.67
Fairly important	96	91	101	99	96	55	51	55	75	719
	13.35	12.66	14.05	13.77	13.35	7.65	7.09	7.65	10.43	100.00
	37.07	36.55	35.69	42.13	34.91	32.74	39.84	33.13	32.75	36.09
Not very important	57	90	87	53	60	52	26	44	54	523
	10.90	17.21	16.63	10.13	11.47	9.94	4.97	8.41	10.33	100.00
	22.01	36.14	30.74	22.55	21.82	30.95	20.31	26.51	23.58	26.26
Total	259	249	283	235	275	168	128	166	229	1992
	13.00	12.50	14.21	11.80	13.81	8.43	6.43	8.33	11.50	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

9.17 percent of those employed in the elementary occupations consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which contrasts with the corresponding 2.41 percent employed in the professional occupations. 36.00 percent of those employed in the skilled trades consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘very important’, again a rate which contrasts with the corresponding 24.90 percent of those employed in the professional occupations. 36.14 percent of those who are employed in the professional occupations consider ‘good fringe benefits’ to be ‘not very important’. Only 20.31 percent of those employed in sales, however, share this opinion.

Table A7. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Good Training Provision’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 9.1838	0.027	0.0678
Age	(9) 36.7507	0.000	0.0783
Marital status	(3) 5.2381	0.155	0.0513
Financially dependent child	(3) 3.8323	0.280	0.0439
Highest qualification held	(12) 17.3261	0.138	0.0538
Work experience	(12) 28.8791	0.004	0.0697
Working full time	(3) 7.3699	0.061	0.0607
In a permanent job	(3) 1.0316	0.794	0.0241
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 3.2631	0.353	0.0433
Tenure	(12) 11.1483	0.516	0.0431
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 3.8920	0.273	0.0441
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 53.5658	0.000	0.1639
Sector of employment	(6) 19.6978	0.003	0.0746
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 34.8966	0.000	0.1322
Occupation	(24) 62.9245	0.000	0.1025
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 19.5973	0.000	0.1079

The tables which follow present the detail of the results of the cross tabulations for the job attribute preference ‘good training provision’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A7, 8 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being gender, age, work experience, whether a member of a union or staff association, sector of employment, employment status, occupation and whether seeking a better job.

Table A7A: GENDER

	Female	Male	Total
Essential	227	208	435
	52.18	47.82	100.00
	22.81	20.74	21.77
Very important	444	416	860
	51.63	48.37	100.00
	44.62	41.48	43.04
Fairly important	234	250	484
	48.35	51.65	100.00
	23.52	24.93	24.22
Not very important	90	129	219
	41.10	58.90	100.00
	9.05	12.86	10.96
Total	995	1003	1998
	49.80	50.20	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones reporting the results of cross tabulations of 'good training provision' and the variable identified:

1. Key:

- Frequency
- Row percentage
- Column percentage

'Good training provision' is relatively more important for females than males. For example, whereas 44.62 percent of females consider 'good training provision' to be 'very important', only 41.48 percent of males do. Conversely, whereas 12.86 percent of males consider 'good training provision' to be 'not very important', only 9.05 percent of females share this view.

Table A7B: AGE

	Aged 20 - 25	Aged 26 – 45	Aged 46 - 55	Aged 56 - 65	Total
Essential	45 10.34 30.41	199 45.75 19.84	125 28.74 24.04	66 15.17 20.18	435 100.00 21.77
Very important	62 7.21 41.89	451 52.44 44.97	219 25.47 42.12	128 14.88 39.14	860 100.00 43.04
Fairly important	35 7.23 23.65	257 53.10 25.62	119 24.59 22.88	73 15.08 22.32	484 100.00 24.22
Not very important	6 2.74 4.05	96 43.84 9.57	57 26.03 10.96	60 27.40 18.35	219 100.00 10.96
Total	148 7.41 100.00	1003 50.20 100.00	520 26.03 100.00	327 16.37 100.00	1998 100.00 100.00

‘Good training provision’ is considered to be ‘essential’ by 30.41 percent of those in the youngest age category (aged 20 -25), a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other age categories. ‘Good training provision’ is considered to be ‘very important’ by 44.97 percent of those in the second youngest age category (aged 26 – 45), a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other age categories.

Table A7C: WORK EXPERIENCE

	1 – 2 years	3 – 6 years	7 – 10 years	11 – 25 years	Over 25 years	Total
Essential	15 3.48 41.67	30 6.96 24.00	69 16.01 20.66	100 23.20 19.61	217 50.35 22.17	431 100.00 21.72
Very important	12 1.41 33.33	55 6.44 44.00	153 17.92 45.81	226 26.46 44.31	408 47.78 41.68	854 100.00 43.04
Fairly important	6 1.24 16.67	36 7.47 28.80	88 18.26 26.35	126 26.14 24.71	226 46.89 23.08	482 100.00 24.29
Not very important	3 1.38 8.33	4 1.84 3.20	24 11.06 7.19	58 26.73 11.37	128 58.99 13.07	217 100.00 10.94
Total	36 1.81 100.00	125 6.30 100.00	334 16.83 100.00	510 25.71 100.00	979 49.34 100.00	1984 100.00 100.00

‘Good training provision’ is considered to be ‘essential’ by 41.67 percent of those with the least work experience (i.e. 1 – 2 years), a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other work experience categories. In contrast, ‘good training provision’ is considered to be only ‘fairly important’ by those who have between 3 – 6 years of experience in the labour market, a rate which is greater than the corresponding rates for the other work experience categories.

Table A7D: UNION/STAFF ASSOCIATION MEMBER

	Not a member	Member of union/ staff association	Total
Essential	246	189	435
	56.55	43.45	100.00
	18.64	28.00	21.80
Very important	548	310	858
	63.87	36.13	100.00
	41.52	45.93	43.01
Fairly important	344	139	483
	71.22	28.78	100.00
	26.06	20.59	24.21
Not very important	182	37	219
	83.11	16.89	100.00
	13.79	5.48	10.98
Total	1320	675	1995
	66.17	33.83	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good training provision’ is relatively more important to those who are members of a trade union or staff association. For example, 28 percent in this category consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘essential’, in contrast to only 18.64 percent of those who are not members of a union or staff association. Further, 45.93 percent of those in this category consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘very important’. Only 41.52 percent of those who are not members of a trade union or staff association share this view.

Table A7E: SECTOR

	Private sector	Public sector	Not for profit sector	Total
Essential	203 51.13 19.90	179 45.09 26.09	15 3.78 22.72	397 100.00 22.40
Very important	447 57.98 43.82	303 39.30 44.17	21 2.72 31.82	771 100.00 43.51
Fairly important	259 60.09 25.39	153 35.50 22.30	19 4.41 28.79	431 100.00 24.32
Not very important	111 64.16 10.88	51 29.48 7.43	11 6.36 16.67	173 100.00 9.76
Total	1020 57.56 100.00	686 38.71 100.00	66 3.72 100.00	1772 100.00 100.00

‘Good training provision’ is relatively more important to those employed within the public sector. 26.09 percent of those employed within this sector consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for those employed in the other sectors. Further, 44.17 percent of those employed in this sector consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘very important’, again a rate which is greater than the corresponding rates for those employed in the other sectors.

Table A7F: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	390	45	435
	89.66	10.34	100.00
	22.38	17.65	21.77
Very important	766	94	860
	89.07	10.93	100.00
	43.95	36.86	43.00
Fairly important	423	61	484
	87.40	12.60	100.00
	24.27	23.92	24.22
Not very important	164	55	219
	74.89	25.11	100.00
	9.41	21.57	10.96
Total	1743	255	1998
	87.24	12.76	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good training provision’ is relatively more important to those who are employees. 22.38 percent of employees consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘essential’; 43.95 percent consider it to be ‘very important’. By way of contrast, 21.57 percent of the self employed consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘not very important’.

Table A7G: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & Secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	39	62	82	41	65	46	20	38	42	435
	8.97	14.25	18.85	9.43	14.94	10.57	4.60	8.74	9.66	100.00
	15.12	24.80	28.87	17.45	23.47	27.06	15.63	22.89	18.26	21.77
Very important	113	104	118	98	115	84	61	66	101	860
	13.14	12.09	13.72	11.40	13.37	9.77	7.09	7.67	11.74	100.00
	43.80	41.60	41.55	41.70	41.52	49.41	47.66	39.76	43.91	43.04
Fairly important	75	65	50	71	68	31	34	46	44	484
	15.50	13.43	10.33	14.67	14.05	6.40	7.02	9.50	9.09	100.00
	29.07	26.00	17.61	30.21	24.55	18.24	26.56	27.71	19.13	24.22
Not very important	31	19	34	25	29	9	13	16	43	219
	14.16	8.68	15.53	11.42	13.24	4.11	5.94	7.31	19.63	100.00
	12.02	7.60	11.97	10.64	10.47	5.29	10.16	9.64	18.70	10.96
Total	258	250	284	235	277	170	128	166	230	1998
	12.91	12.51	14.21	11.76	13.86	8.51	6.41	8.31	11.51	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

28.87 percent of those employed as associate professionals consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘essential’. 27.06 percent of those employed in personal services share this opinion. In contrast, only 15.12 percent of managers hold this view. 49.41 percent of those employed in personal services consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which is greater than the corresponding rates for the other occupational classifications. 18.70 percent of those employed in elementary occupations consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘not very important’, a view shared by 12.02 percent of those employed in as managers.

Table A7H: SEEKING A BETTER JOB

	Not seeking a better job	Seeking a better job	Total
Essential	234	141	375
	62.40	37.60	100.00
	25.74	18.22	22.28
Very important	399	332	731
	54.58	45.42	100.00
	43.89	42.89	43.43
Fairly important	196	215	411
	47.69	52.31	100.00
	21.56	27.78	24.42
Not very important	80	86	166
	48.19	51.81	100.00
	8.80	11.11	9.86
Total	909	774	1683
	54.01	45.99	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good training provision’ is relatively less important to those seeking a better job. Only 18.22 percent in this category consider ‘good training provision’ to be ‘essential’. Only 42.89 percent in this category consider it to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for those not seeking a better job are 25.74 and 43.89, respectively.

Table A8. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Good Relations with your Supervisor’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 71.0484	0.000	0.1888
Age	(9) 20.0545	0.018	0.0579
Marital status	(3) 8.7775	0.032	0.0665
Financially dependent child	(3) 2.9487	0.400	0.0385
Highest qualification held	(12) 7.7817	0.802	0.0361
Work experience	(12) 17.6907	0.125	0.0546
Working full time	(3) 14.5035	0.002	0.0853
In a permanent job	(3) 10.1089	0.018	0.0755
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 2.8618	0.413	0.0405
Tenure	(12) 14.9091	0.246	0.0499
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 7.3935	0.060	0.0609
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 19.5282	0.000	0.0991
Sector of employment	(6) 4.1208	0.660	0.0341
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 202.9521	0.000	0.3191
Occupation	(24) 57.3615	0.000	0.0979
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 5.1414	0.162	0.0533

The tables which follow present the detail of the cross tabulation results which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$) for the job attribute preference ‘good relations with your supervisor’. As reported in Table A8, 8 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being gender, age, marital status, whether working full time, whether in a full time job, whether a member of a union or staff association, employment status and occupation.

Table A8A: GENDER

	Female	Male	Total
Essential	328	246	574
	57.14	42.86	100.00
	33.03	24.60	28.80
Very important	544	492	1036
	52.51	47.49	100.00
	54.78	49.20	51.98
Fairly important	100	187	287
	34.84	65.16	100.00
	10.07	18.70	14.40
Not very important	21	75	95
	21.88	78.13	100.00
	2.11	7.50	4.82
Total	993	1000	1993
	49.82	50.18	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones which report the results of cross tabulations of 'good relations with your supervisor' and the variable identified:

1. Key:

Frequency

Row percentage

Column percentage

Whereas 33.03 percent of females consider 'a good relationship with your supervisor' to be 'essential', only 24.60 percent of males hold this opinion. Further, whereas 54.78 percent of females consider 'a good relationship with your supervisor' to be 'very important', only 49.20 percent of males hold this opinion. In contrast, whereas 18.70 percent of males consider 'a good relationship with your manager' to be only 'fairly important', only 10.07 percent of females hold this opinion.

Table A8B: AGE

	Aged 20 - 25	Aged 26 - 45	Aged 46 - 55	Aged 56 - 65	Total
Essential	42 7.32 28.38	287 50.00 28.79	151 26.31 29.04	94 16.38 28.66	574 100.00 28.80
Very important	78 7.53 52.70	514 49.61 51.55	263 25.39 50.58	181 17.47 55.18	1036 100.00 51.98
Fairly important	27 9.41 18.24	156 54.36 15.65	72 25.09 13.85	32 11.15 9.76	287 100.00 14.40
Not very important	1 1.04 0.68	40 41.67 4.01	34 35.42 6.54	21 21.88 6.40	96 100.00 4.82
Total	148 7.43 100.00	997 50.03 100.00	520 26.09 100.00	328 16.45 100.00	1993 100.00 100.00

Whereas 55.18 percent of those aged between 56 – 65 consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘very important’, only 50.58 percent of those aged 46 -55 subscribe to this opinion. Whereas only 9.76 of the oldest age category (aged 56 – 65) consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be only ‘fairly important’, 18.24 percent of the youngest age category (aged 20 – 25) are of this same opinion.

Table A8C: MARITAL STATUS

	Single	Married or living together	Total
Essential	215 37.65 32.23	356 62.35 27.02	571 100.00 28.78
Very important	333 32.37 49.93	699 67.73 53.08	1032 100.00 52.02
Fairly important	96 33.57 14.39	190 66.43 14.43	286 100.00 14.42
Not very important	23 24.21 3.45	72 75.79 5.47	95 100.00 4.79
Total	667 33.62 100.00	1317 66.38 100.00	1984 100.00 100.00

32.23 percent of those who are single consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘essential’. The corresponding percentage for those who are married or living together is less, at 27.03. 49.93 percent of those who are single consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘very important’. However, on this occasion, the corresponding percentage for those who are married or living together is greater, at 53.08 percent.

Table A8D: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working Full time	Working Full time	Total
Essential	151	423	574
	26.31	73.69	100.00
	31.33	27.99	28.80
Very important	267	769	1036
	25.77	74.23	100.00
	55.39	50.89	51.98
Fairly important	48	239	287
	16.72	83.28	100.00
	9.96	15.82	14.40
Not very important	16	80	96
	16.67	83.33	100.00
	3.32	5.29	4.82
Total	482	1511	1993
	24.18	75.82	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 55.39 percent of those not working full time consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘very important’, only 50.89 percent of those working full time subscribe to this opinion. Conversely, whereas 9.96 percent of those not working full time consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be only ‘fairly important’, 15.82 percent of those working full time are of the same opinion.

Table A8E: IN A PERMANENT JOB

	Not in a permanent Job	In a permanent Job	Total
Essential	39	482	521
	7.49	92.51	100.00
	41.47	28.67	29.35
Very important	46	909	955
	4.82	95.18	100.00
	48.94	54.07	53.80
Fairly important	6	250	256
	2.34	97.66	100.00
	6.38	14.87	14.42
Not very important	3	40	43
	6.98	93.02	100.00
	3.19	2.38	2.42
Total	94	1681	1775
	5.30	94.70	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

41.49 percent of those not working in a permanent job consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘essential’. Only 28.67 percent of those working in a permanent job have the same view. However, whereas 48.94 percent of those not working in a permanent job consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘very important’, the corresponding percentage for those working in a permanent job is greater, at 54.07 percent. Whereas 14.87 percent of those working in a permanent job consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 6.38 percent not working in permanent jobs have this same opinion.

Table A8F: UNION/STAFF ASSOCIATION MEMBER

	Not a member	Member of union/ staff association	Total
Essential	376	198	574
	65.51	34.49	100.00
	28.59	29.33	28.84
Very important	687	347	1034
	66.44	33.56	100.00
	52.24	51.41	51.96
Fairly important	171	115	286
	59.79	40.21	100.00
	13.00	17.04	14.37
Not very important	81	15	96
	84.38	15.63	100.00
	6.16	2.22	4.82
Total	1315	675	1990
	66.08	33.92	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

The percentages of those who are not members of a union or staff association who consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘essential’ and ‘very important’ are not too dissimilar from the corresponding percentages of those who are members of a union or staff association (at 28.50 percent approximately and 52.00 percent approximately, respectively). However, whereas 17.05 percent of those who are members of a union or staff association consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be only ‘fairly important’ only 13.00 percent of those who are not members of a union or staff association are of this same opinion.

Table A8G: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	512	62	574
	89.20	10.80	100.00
	29.39	24.70	28.80
Very important	940	96	1036
	90.73	9.27	100.00
	53.96	38.25	51.98
Fairly important	251	36	287
	87.46	12.54	100.00
	14.41	14.34	14.40
Not very important	39	57	96
	40.63	59.38	100.00
	2.24	22.71	4.82
Total	1742	251	1993
	87.41	12.59	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

29.39 percent of those who are employees consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘essential’. The corresponding percentage for those who are self employed is 24.70 percent. Further, 53.96 percent of those who are employees consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘very important’. Only 38.25 percent of the self employed subscribe to this same opinion. In contrast, whereas 22.71 percent of the self employed consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘not very important’, only 2.24 percent of employees hold this view.

Table A7H: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & Secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	81	81	79	63	62	55	42	41	70	574
	14.11	14.11	13.76	10.98	10.80	9.58	7.32	7.14	12.20	100.00
	31.52	32.53	27.82	26.92	22.46	32.54	32.81	24.70	30.43	28.80
Very important	121	128	149	132	141	97	70	83	115	1036
	11.68	12.36	14.38	12.74	13.61	9.36	6.76	8.01	11.10	100.00
	47.08	51.41	52.46	56.41	51.09		54.69	50.00	50.00	51.98
Fairly important	34	31	44	31	46	15	14	37	35	287
	11.85	10.80	15.33	10.80	16.03	5.23	4.88	12.89	12.20	100.00
	13.23	12.45	15.49	13.25	16.67	8.88	10.98	22.29	15.22	14.40
Not very important	21	9	12	8	27	2	2	5	10	96
	21.88	9.38	12.50	8.33	28.13	2.08	2.08	5.21	10.42	100.00
	8.17	3.61	4.23	3.42	9.78	1.18	1.56	3.01	4.35	4.82
Total	257	249	284	234	276	169	128	166	230	1993
	12.90	12.49	14.25	11.74	13.85	8.48	6.42	8.33	11.54	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

32.81 percent of those occupied in sales, 32.54 percent of those occupied in personal services, 32.53 percent of those in professional occupations and 31.52 percent of managers consider ‘a good relationship with your manager’ to be ‘essential’. However, only 22.46 percent of those in the skilled trades are of this opinion. 57.40 percent of those occupied in personal services, 56.41 percent of those occupied in administrative and secretarial services and 52.46 percent of those employed in associate professional occupations consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be ‘very important’. However, only 47.08 percent of managers are of this opinion. Whereas 22.29 percent of those employed as operatives consider ‘a good relationship with your supervisor’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 8.88 percent of those employed in the personal services are of this opinion.

Table A9. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘A Job Where You Can Use Your Initiative’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 0.5743	0.902	0.0169
Age	(9) 13.7295	0.132	0.0478
Marital status	(3) 1.8983	0.594	0.0309
Financially dependent child	(3) 0.4759	0.924	0.0155
Highest qualification held	(12) 72.2705	0.000	0.1089
Work experience	(12) 13.9908	0.301	0.0485
Working full time	(3) 14.8379	0.002	0.0861
In a permanent job	(3) 2.3033	0.512	0.0360
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 39.3842	0.000	0.1503
Tenure	(12) 16.8060	0.157	0.0529
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 4.2120	0.239	0.0459
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 0.5701	0.903	0.0169
Sector of employment	(6) 9.9209	0.128	0.0529
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 14.4841	0.002	0.0851
Occupation	(24) 105.5073	0.000	0.1326
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 8.5214	0.036	0.0711

The tables which follow present the detail of the results of cross tabulations for the job attribute preference ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A9, 6 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being highest qualification, whether working full time, whether in a supervisory or managerial role, employment status, occupation and whether seeking a better job.

Table A9A: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	67	35	66	121	258	547
	12.25	6.40	12.07	22.12	47.17	100.00
	23.34	25.55	22.68	21.92	35.25	27.36
Very important	149	76	163	314	391	1093
	13.63	6.95	14.91	28.73	35.77	100.00
	51.92	55.47	56.01	56.88	53.42	54.68
Fairly important	57	20	59	104	77	317
	17.98	6.31	18.61	32.81	24.29	100.00
	19.86	14.60	20.27	18.84	10.52	15.86
Not very important	14	6	3	13	6	42
	33.33	14.29	7.14	30.95	14.29	100.00
	4.88	4.38	1.03	2.36	0.82	2.10
Total	287	137	291	552	732	1999
	14.36	6.85	14.56	27.61	36.62	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones reporting the results of cross tabulations of ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ and the variable identified:

1. Key:

- Frequency
- Row percentage
- Column percentage

35.25 percent of those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which contrasts with the 21.92 percent of those who have level 3 as their highest qualification. However, 56.88 percent of those who have level 3 as their highest qualification consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be very important, although the average rate across all qualification levels is 54.68 percent. 20.27 percent of those who have level 2 as their highest qualification and 19.86 percent of those who have no qualifications consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be only ‘fairly important’, rates which contrast with the 10.52 percent of those who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification.

Table A9B: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working full time	Working full time	Total
Essential	111 20.26 22.98	437 79.74 28.81	548 100.00 27.40
Very important	266 24.34 55.07	827 75.66 54.52	1093 100.00 54.65
Fairly important	88 27.76 18.22	229 72.24 15.10	317 100.00 15.85
Not very important	18 42.86 3.73	24 57.14 1.58	42 100.00 2.10
Total	483 24.15 100.00	1517 75.85 100.00	2000 100.00 100.00

Whereas 28.81 percent of those who work full time consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be ‘essential’, only 22.98 of those not working full time are of this opinion. Although the percentages of both groups who consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be ‘very important’ are approximately the same (at 55.00 percent), whereas 18.22 percent of those who are not working full time consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 15.10 percent of those working full time are of this opinion.

Table A9C: IN A SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL ROLE

	Not in a supervisory/ managerial role	In a supervisory/ managerial role	Total
Essential	244	216	460
	53.04	46.96	100.00
	23.35	30.95	26.39
Very important	558	393	951
	58.68	41.32	100.00
	53.40	56.30	54.56
Fairly important	207	85	292
	70.89	29.11	100.00
	19.81	12.18	16.75
Not very important	36	4	40
	90.00	10.00	100.00
	3.44	0.57	2.29
Total	1045	698	1743
	59.95	40.05	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

30.95 percent of those working in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be ‘essential’. The corresponding percentage who are not working in this capacity is 23.35. Whereas 19.81 percent of those not working in a managerial capacity consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 12.18 percent of those working in a supervisory or managerial capacity are of this opinion.

Table A9D: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	460	88	548
	83.94	16.06	100.00
	26.39	34.24	27.40
Very important	951	142	1093
	87.01	12.99	100.00
	54.56	55.25	54.65
Fairly important	292	25	317
	92.11	7.89	100.00
	16.75	9.73	15.85
Not very important	40	2	42
	95.24	4.76	100.00
	2.29	0.78	2.10
Total	1743	257	2000
	87.15	12.85	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Although the percentages of those who consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be ‘very important’ are approximately the same for both employees and the self employed (at 54.50 percent), whereas 34.24 percent of the latter consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be ‘essential’, only 26.39 percent of the former have this opinion. Whereas 16.75 percent of employees consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 9.73 percent of the self employed are of this opinion.

Table A9E: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	92	98	94	58	55	41	23	33	54	548
	16.79	17.88	17.15	10.58	10.04	7.48	4.20	6.02	9.85	100.00
	35.52	39.20	33.10	24.68	19.78	24.12	17.97	19.88	23.48	27.40
Very important	139	128	154	136	162	101	73	85	115	1093
	12.72	11.71	14.09	12.44	14.82	9.24	6.68	7.78	10.52	100.00
	53.67	51.20	54.23	57.87	58.27	59.41	57.03	51.20	50.00	54.65
Fairly important	27	24	32	38	55	24	28	42	47	317
	8.52	7.57	10.09	11.99	17.15	7.57	8.83	13.25	14.83	100.00
	10.42	9.60	11.27	16.17	19.78	14.12	21.88	25.30	20.43	15.85
Not very important	1	0	4	3	6	4	4	6	14	42
	2.28	0.00	9.52	7.14	14.29	9.52	9.52	14.29	22.33	100.00
	0.39	0.00	1.41	1.28	2.16	2.35	3.13	3.61	6.09	2.10
Total	259	250	284	235	278	170	128	166	230	2000
	12.95	12.50	14.20	11.75	13.90	8.50	6.40	8.30	11.50	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

39.20 percent of those in professional occupations and 35.52 percent of managers consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be ‘essential’. These rates contrast with the corresponding rates for individuals employed in sales occupations and the skilled trades where only 17.97 percent and 19.78 percent, respectively consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be ‘essential’. 25.30 percent of those employed as operatives and 21.88 percent of those employed in sales occupations consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be only ‘fairly important’. The corresponding rates for those employed as managers and in professional occupations are 10.43 and 9.60, respectively.

Table A9F: SEEKING A BETTER JOB

	Not seeking a better job	Seeking a better job	Total
Essential	255 58.09 28.02	184 41.91 23.77	439 100.00 26.07
Very important	498 53.95 54.73	425 46.05 54.91	923 100.00 54.81
Fairly important	143 50.18 15.71	142 49.82 18.35	285 100.00 16.92
Not very important	14 37.84 1.54	23 62.16 2.97	37 100.00 2.20
Total	910 54.04 100.00	774 45.96 100.00	1684 100.00 100.00

Whereas 28.02 percent of those not seeking a better job consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be ‘essential’, only 23.77 percent of those who are seeking a better job are of this opinion. Whereas 18.35 percent of those not seeking a better job consider ‘a job where you can use your initiative’ to be only ‘fairly important’, the corresponding percentage for those seeking a better job is only 15.71.

Table A10. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Work You Like Doing’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 16.3340	0.001	0.0904
Age	(9) 9.2554	0.414	0.0393
Marital status	(3) 3.8673	0.276	0.0441
Financially dependent child	(3) 5.1090	0.164	0.0506
Highest qualification held	(12) 54.8902	0.000	0.0957
Work experience	(12) 23.5327	0.024	0.0628
Working full time	(3) 6.6508	0.084	0.0577
In a permanent job	(3) 7.8194	0.050	0.0664
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 10.0662	0.018	0.0760
Tenure	(12) 13.0252	0.367	0.0466
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 6.6115	0.085	0.0575
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 4.6047	0.203	0.0480
Sector of employment	(6) 18.3954	0.005	0.0720
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 15.4121	0.001	0.0878
Occupation	(24) 95.3598	0.000	0.1261
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 5.5753	0.134	0.0575

The tables which follow present the detail of the cross tabulation results for the job attribute preference ‘work you like doing’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A10, 7 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being gender, highest qualification, work experience, whether in a supervisory or managerial role, sector of employment, employment status and occupation.

Table A10A: GENDER

	Female	Male	Total
Essential	458	434	892
	51.53	48.65	100.00
	45.98	43.23	44.60
Very important	467	457	924
	50.54	49.46	100.00
	46.89	45.52	46.20
Fairly important	69	97	166
	41.57	58.43	100.00
	6.93	9.66	8.30
Not very important	2	16	18
	11.11	88.89	100.00
	0.20	1.59	0.90
Total	996	1004	2000
	49.80	50.20	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones which report the results of cross tabulations between 'work you like doing' and the variable identified:

1. Key:

- Frequency
- Row percentage
- Column percentage

Whereas 45 percent of females consider 'work you like doing' to be 'essential', only 43.23 percent of males hold this opinion. Whereas 9.66 percent of males consider 'work you like doing' to be only 'fairly important', only 6.93 percent of females are of the same opinion.

Table A10B: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	104	53	111	233	390	891
	11.67	5.95	12.46	26.15	43.77	100.00
	36.24	38.69	38.14	42.21	53.28	44.57
Very important	144	75	150	255	300	924
	15.58	8.12	16.23	27.60	32.47	100.00
	50.17	54.74	51.55	46.20	40.98	46.22
Fairly important	34	9	25	58	40	166
	20.48	5.42	15.06	34.94	24.10	100.00
	11.85	6.57	8.59	10.51	5.46	8.30
Not very important	5	0	5	6	2	18
	27.78	0.00	27.78	33.33	11.11	100.00
	1.74	0.00	1.72	1.09	0.27	0.90
Total	287	137	291	552	732	1999
	14.36	6.85	14.56	27.61	36.62	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

53.28 percent of those who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘work you like doing’ to be ‘essential’, a rate higher than the corresponding percentages for all the other highest qualification categories. However, 54.74 percent of those who have level 1 as their highest qualification consider ‘work you like doing’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which contrasts with the corresponding percentage (viz. 40.98) for those who hold level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification. 11.85 percent of those with no qualifications consider ‘work you like doing’ to be ‘fairly important’, a rate which is higher than the corresponding percentages for all the other highest qualification categories.

Table A10C: WORK EXPERIENCE

	1 – 2 years	3 – 6 years	7 – 10 years	11 – 25 years	Over 25 years	Total
Essential	22 2.49 61.11	56 6.35 44.80	158 17.91 47.31	242 27.44 47.45	404 45.80 41.18	662 100.00 44.41
Very important	11 1.19 30.56	51 5.53 40.80	145 15.73 43.41	228 24.73 44.71	487 52.82 49.64	922 100.00 46.42
Fairly important	2 1.22 5.56	18 10.98 14.40	27 16.45 8.08	34 20.73 6.67	83 50.61 8.46	164 100.00 8.26
Not very important	1 5.56 2.78	0 0.00 0.00	4 22.22 1.20	6 33.33 1.18	7 38.89 0.71	18 100.00 0.91
Total	36 1.81 100.00	125 6.29 100.00	334 16.82 100.00	510 25.68 100.00	981 49.40 100.00	1986 100.00 100.00

61.11 percent of those with the least experience in the labour market (i.e. between 1 - 3 years) consider 'work you like doing' to be 'essential', a rate much higher than the corresponding percentages for the other work experience categories. These average in the ~ 40 percent levels. 14.40 percent of those with between 3 – 6 years of experience in the labour market consider 'work you like doing' to be only 'fairly important', a rate higher than the corresponding percentages for the other work experience categories. For example, the corresponding percentage for those in the category with least experience in the labour market is 5.56.

Table A10D: IN A SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL ROLE

	Not in a supervisory/ managerial role	In a supervisory/ managerial role	Total
Essential	421	328	749
	56.21	43.79	100.00
	40.29	46.99	42.97
Very important	513	318	831
	61.73	38.27	100.00
	49.09	45.56	47.68
Fairly important	100	46	146
	68.49	31.51	100.00
	9.57	6.59	8.38
Not very important	11	6	17
	64.71	35.29	100.00
	1.05	0.86	0.98
Total	1045	698	1743
	59.95	40.05	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 46.99 percent of those working in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider ‘work you like doing’ to be ‘essential’, only 40.29 percent of those who do not work in this capacity hold this view. However, whereas 45.56 percent of those who work in a managerial capacity consider ‘work you like doing’ to be ‘very important’, the corresponding percentage for those who do not work in this capacity is higher, at 49.09 percent. Whereas 6.59 percent of those who work in a managerial capacity consider ‘work you like doing’ to be only ‘fairly important’, more of those who do not work in this capacity i.e. 9.57 percent have this view.

Table A10E: SECTOR OF EMPLOYMENT

	Private sector	Public sector	Not for profit sector	Total
Essential	404 52.95 39.57	324 42.46 47.23	35 4.59 53.03	763 100.00 43.03
Very important	504 59.93 49.36	313 37.22 45.63	24 2.85 36.36	841 100.00 47.43
Fairly important	104 68.42 10.19	42 27.63 6.12	6 3.95 9.09	152 100.00 8.57
Not very important	9 52.94 0.88	7 41.18 1.02	1 5.88 1.52	17 100.00 0.96
Total	1021 57.59 100.00	685 38.69 100.00	66 3.72 100.00	1773 100.00 100.00

53.03 percent of those who work in the not for profit sector consider ‘work you like doing’ to be ‘essential’, a rate higher than the corresponding percentages for those employed in the other sectors. For example, only 39.57 percent of those employed in the private sector are of this opinion. However, 49.36 percent of those employed in the private sector consider ‘work you like doing’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which is higher than the corresponding percentages for those employed in the other sectors. 10.19 percent of those employed in the private sector consider ‘work you like doing’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate which is higher than the corresponding percentages for those employed in the other sectors.

Table A10F: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	749	143	892
	83.97	16.03	100.00
	42.97	55.64	44.60
Very important	831	93	924
	89.94	10.06	100.00
	47.68	36.19	46.20
Fairly important	146	20	166
	87.95	12.05	100.00
	8.38	7.78	8.30
Not very important	17	1	18
	94.44	5.56	100.00
	0.98	0.39	0.90
Total	1743	257	2000
	87.15	12.85	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 55.64 percent of those self employed consider ‘work you like doing’ to be ‘essential’, only 42.97 percent of employees are of this opinion. However, whereas 47.68 of employees are of the opinion that ‘work you like doing’ to be ‘very important’, only 36.19 percent of the self employed are of this opinion. The difference between the two groups in terms of the percentages who consider ‘work you like doing’ to be only ‘fairly important’ is marginal.

Table A10G: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	115	150	160	88	107	87	43	63	79	892
	12.89	16.82	17.94	9.87	12.00	9.75	4.82	7.06	8.86	100.00
	44.40	60.00	56.34	37.45	38.49	51.18	22.59	37.95	34.35	44.60
Very important	122	89	109	124	134	73	70	81	122	924
	13.20	9.63	11.80	13.42	14.50	7.90	7.58	8.77	13.20	100.00
	47.10	35.60	38.38	52.77	48.20	42.94	54.69	48.80	53.04	44.60
Fairly important	20	10	11	22	34	9	15	17	28	166
	12.05	6.02	6.63	13.25	20.48	5.42	9.04	10.24	16.87	100.00
	7.72	4.00	3.87	9.36	12.23	5.29	11.72	10.24	12.17	8.30
Not very important	2	1	4	1	3	1	0	5	1	18
	11.11	5.56	22.22	5.56	16.67	5.56	0.00	27.78	5.56	100.00
	0.77	0.40	1.41	0.43	1.08	0.59	0.00	3.01	0.43	0.90
Total	259	250	284	235	278	170	128	166	230	2000
	12.95	12.50	14.20	11.75	13.90	8.50	5.40	8.30	11.50	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

60 percent of those employed in the professional occupations and 56.34 percent of those employed in the associate professional occupations consider 'work you like doing' to be essential. 44.40 of managers are of the same opinion. Only 33.59 percent of those working in sales are of this opinion. However, 54.69 percent of those working in sales consider 'work you like doing' to be 'very important'. The corresponding percentage for managers is 47.10. 3.87 percent of those employed in the associate professional occupations and 4.00 of those employed in professional occupations consider 'work you like doing' to be only 'fairly important'.

Table 11. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Opportunities To Use Your Abilities’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 2.9613	0.398	0.0385
Age	(9) 21.0253	0.013	0.0592
Marital status	(3) 2.4033	0.493	0.0347
Financially dependent child	(3) 7.8456	0.049	0.0628
Highest qualification held	(12) 105.1426	0.000	0.1324
Work experience	(12) 18.6243	0.098	0.0559
Working full time	(3) 7.1044	0.069	0.0596
In a permanent job	(3) 4.3185	0.229	0.0493
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 36.6297	0.000	0.1450
Tenure	(12) 9.6293	0.648	0.0401
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 7.1135	0.068	0.0596
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 9.7891	0.020	0.0700
Sector of employment	(6) 23.0232	0.001	0.0806
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 23.7517	0.000	0.1090
Occupation	(24) 154.6224	0.000	0.1605
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 7.0905	0.069	0.0649

The tables which follow present the detail of the results of the cross tabulations for the job attribute preference ‘opportunities to use abilities’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A11, 8 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being age, whether there is a financially dependent child, highest qualification, whether working in a supervisory or managerial capacity, whether a member of a union or staff association, sector of employment, employment status and occupation.

Table A11A: AGE

	Aged 20 - 25	Aged 26 - 45	Aged 46 - 55	Aged 56 - 65	Total
Essential	37 6.25 25.00	297 50.17 29.61	159 26.86 30.52	99 16.72 30.18	592 100.00 29.60
Very important	85 7.66 57.43	572 51.53 57.03	291 26.22 55.85	162 14.59 49.39	1100 100.00 55.50
Fairly important	26 10.04 17.57	119 45.95 11.86	58 22.39 11.13	56 21.62 17.07	259 100.00 12.95
Not very important	0 0.00 0.00	15 38.46 1.50	13 33.33 2.50	11 28.21 3.35	39 100.00 1.95
Total	148 7.40 100.00	1003 50.15 100.00	521 26.05 100.00	328 16.40 100.00	2000 100.00 100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones reporting the cross tabulations of ‘opportunities to use your abilities’ and the variable identified:

1. Key:

Frequency

Row percentage

Column percentage

30.52 percent of those aged 46 -55 consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding percentages for the other age categories. 57.43 percent of those aged 20 – 25 consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘very important’, a rate greater than the corresponding percentages for the other age categories. 11.13 percent of those aged 46 – 55 consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate lower than the corresponding percentages for the other age categories.

Table A11B: DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	With no financially dependent children	With financially dependent children	Total
Essential	351 59.69 28.72	237 40.31 30.78	588 100.00 29.52
Very important	668 60.29 54.66	440 39.71 57.14	1108 100.00 55.62
Fairly important	176 68.22 14.40	82 31.78 10.65	258 100.00 12.95
Not very important	27 71.05 2.21	11 28.95 1.43	38 100.00 1.91
Total	1222 61.35 100.00	770 38.65 100.00	1992 100.00 100.00

Of those who have financially dependent children, 30.78 percent consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘essential’ and 57.14 percent consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘very important’, both rates greater than the corresponding percentages for those who have no financially dependent children, which are 28.72 and 54.66 percent, respectively. Whereas 14.40 percent of those without financially dependent children consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be only ‘fairly important’, 10.65 percent of those with financially dependent children are of this opinion.

Table A11C: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	64	33	61	145	288	591
	10.83	5.58	10.32	24.53	48.73	100.00
	22.30	24.09	20.96	26.27	39.34	29.56
Very important	151	79	170	326	384	1100
	13.60	7.12	15.32	29.37	34.59	100.00
	52.61	57.66	58.42	59.06	52.46	55.53
Fairly important	56	23	56	71	53	259
	21.62	8.88	21.62	27.41	20.46	100.00
	19.51	16.79	19.24	12.86	7.24	12.96
Not very important	16	2	4	10	7	39
	41.03	5.13	10.26	25.64	17.95	100.00
	5.57	1.46	1.37	1.81	0.96	1.95
Total	287	137	291	552	732	1999
	14.36	6.85	14.56	27.61	36.62	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

39.34 percent of those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding percentages for the other highest qualification categories. 59.06 percent of those with level 3 as their highest qualification consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which is greater than the corresponding percentages for the other highest qualification categories. 7.24 percent of those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate which is lower than the corresponding percentages for the other highest qualification categories.

Table A11D: IN A SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL ROLE

	Not in a supervisory/ managerial role	In a supervisory/ managerial role	Total
Essential	260	226	486
	53.50	46.50	100.00
	24.88	32.38	27.88
Very important	583	400	983
	59.31	40.69	100.00
	55.79	57.31	56.40
Fairly important	171	70	241
	70.95	29.05	100.00
	16.36	10.03	13.83
Not very important	31	2	33
	93.94	6.06	100.00
	2.97	0.29	1.89
Total	1045	698	1743
	59.95	40.05	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

32.38 percent of those who work in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘essential’. Additionally, 57.38 percent of the same group consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘very important’. Both rates are higher than those of the corresponding percentages for those not working in a supervisory or managerial capacity, which are 24.88 and 55.79 percent, respectively. Whereas 16.36 percent of those not working in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 10.03 percent of those who do work in such a capacity are of this opinion.

Table A11E: UNION/STAFF ASSOCIATION MEMBER

	Not a member	Member of union/ staff association	Total
Essential	368	224	592
	62.16	37.84	100.00
	27.84	33.19	29.64
Very important	749	358	1107
	67.66	32.34	100.00
	56.66	53.04	55.43
Fairly important	173	86	259
	66.80	33.20	100.00
	13.09	12.74	12.97
Not very important	32	7	39
	82.05	17.95	100.00
	2.42	1.04	1.95
Total	1322	675	1997
	66.20	33.80	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

27.84 percent of those who are not members of a union or staff association consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘essential’, a rate lower than that for those who are members of a union or staff association (which is 33.19 percent). 56.66 percent of the former category consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘very important’, a rate higher than that for the latter category (which is 53.01 percent). Whereas 13.09 percent of those who are not members of a union or staff association consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be only ‘fairly important’, 12.74 percent who are members of a union or staff association are of this opinion.

Table A11F: SECTOR OF EMPLOYMENT

	Private sector	Public sector	Not for profit Sector	Total
Essential	250 50.10 24.49	219 43.89 31.92	30 6.01 45.45	499 100.00 28.14
Very important	597 59.94 58.47	370 37.15 53.94	29 2.91 43.94	996 100.00 56.18
Fairly important	153 62.96 14.99	83 34.16 12.10	7 2.88 10.61	243 100.00 13.71
Not very important	21 60.00 2.06	14 40.00 2.04	0 0.00 0.00	35 100.00 1.97
Total	1021 57.59 100.00	686 38.69 100.00	66 3.72 100.00	1773 100.00 100.00

45.45 percent of those who work in the not for profit sector consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which compares with the 24.49 percent who work in the private sector who share this opinion. However, 58.47 percent of those who work in the private sector consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which compares with the 43.94 percent of those who work in the not for profit sector and share this opinion. Proportionately more (i.e. 14.99 percent) in the private sector than in the other sectors consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be only ‘fairly important’.

Table A11G: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	486	106	592
	82.09	17.91	100.00
	27.88	41.25	29.60
Very important	983	127	1100
	88.56	11.44	100.00
	56.40	49.42	55.50
Fairly important	241	18	259
	93.05	6.95	100.00
	13.83	7.00	12.95
Not very important	33	6	39
	84.62	15.38	100.00
	1.89	2.33	1.95
Total	1743	257	2000
	87.15	12.85	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

27.88 percent of employees consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which is lower than the corresponding percentage for those who are self employed, which is 41.25 percent. However, 56.40 percent of those who are employees consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which is higher than the corresponding percentage for those who are self employed (which is 49.42 percent). Whereas 13.83 percent of those who are employees consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 7.00 percent of those who are self employed share this opinion.

Table A11H: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & Secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	90	117	108	53	73	44	26	30	51	592
	15.20	19.76	18.24	8.95	12.33	7.43	4.39	5.07	8.61	100.00
	34.75	46.80	38.03	22.55	26.26	25.88	20.31	18.07	22.17	29.60
Very important	150	120	156	143	161	100.00	68	93	119	1100
	13.51	10.81	14.05	12.88	14.50	9.01	6.13	8.38	10.72	100.00
	57.92	48.00	54.93	60.85	57.91	58.82	53.13	56.02	51.74	55.50
Fairly important	17	12	17	37	39	23	31	36	47	259
	6.56	4.63	6.56	14.29	15.06	8.88	11.97	13.90	18.15	100.00
	6.56	4.80	5.99	15.74	14.03	13.53	24.22	21.69	20.43	12.95
Not very important	2	1	3	2	5	3	3	7	13	39
	5.13	2.56	7.69	5.13	12.82	7.69	7.69	17.95	33.33	100.00
	0.77	0.40	1.06	0.85	1.80	1.76	2.34	4.22	5.65	1.95
Total	259	250	284	235	278	170	128	166	230	2000
	12.95	12.50	14.20	11.75	13.90	8.50	6.40	8.30	11.50	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

46.80 percent of those in professional occupations, 38.03 percent of those in associate professional occupations and 34.75 percent of managers consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘essential’. In contrast, only 18.07 percent of operatives share this opinion. 60.85 percent of those employed in administrative and secretarial occupations, 58.82 percent of those employed in personal services and 57.92 percent of managers consider ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be ‘very important’. Again in contrast, only 48.00 percent of those employed in professional occupations share this opinion. At 4.80 percent, those who are employed in professional occupations have the lowest rate of all occupational classifications in the context of considering ‘opportunities to use abilities’ to be only ‘fairly important’.

Table A12. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘An Easy Work Load’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer's <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 2.0637	0.559	0.0322
Age	(9) 6.8347	0.654	0.0338
Marital status	(3) 2.5818	0.461	0.0361
Financially dependent child	(3) 2.4284	0.488	0.0350
Highest qualification held	(12) 97.6704	0.000	0.1279
Work experience	(12) 12.4363	0.411	0.0458
Working full time	(3) 2.6257	0.453	0.0363
In a permanent job	(3) 2.1545	0.541	0.0349
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 34.0375	0.000	0.1401
Tenure	(12) 7.8224	0.799	0.0362
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 5.6342	0.131	0.0532
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 1.6759	0.642	0.0290
Sector of employment	(6) 13.8966	0.031	0.0628
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 4.7077	0.194	0.0486
Occupation	(24) 98.0343	0.000	0.1281
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 1.6452	0.649	0.0313

The tables which follow present the detail of the results of the cross tabulation for the job attribute preference ‘easy work load’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A12, 4 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being highest qualification, whether working in a supervisory or managerial role, sector of employment and occupation.

Table A12A: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	28	9	11	18	14	80
	35.00	11.25	13.75	22.50	17.50	100.00
	9.76	6.72	3.81	3.28	1.92	4.02
Very important	70	29	46	79	82	305
	22.88	9.48	15.03	25.82	26.80	100.00
	24.39	21.64	15.92	14.39	11.23	15.38
Fairly important	95	47	95	229	240	705
	13.46	6.66	13.46	32.44	33.99	100.00
	33.10	35.07	32.87	41.71	32.88	35.50
Not very important	94	49	137	223	394	897
	10.48	5.46	15.27	24.86	43.92	100.00
	32.75	36.57	47.40	40.62	53.97	45.10
Total	287	134	289	549	730	1989
	14.43	6.74	14.53	27.60	36.70	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones reporting the results of cross tabulations between ‘an easy work load’ and the variable identified:

1. Key:

- Frequency
- Row percentage
- Column percentage

9.76 percent of those with no qualifications consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which contrasts with the 1.92 percent who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification and who share this sentiment. 24.39 percent of those who have no qualifications consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘very important’, again a rate which contrasts with the 11.23 percent of those who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification and who share this sentiment. By way of contrast, 53.97 of those who have level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘not very important’, a rate greater than the corresponding percentages for the other highest qualification categories, where the lowest (at 32.75 percent) relates to those who have no qualification.

Table A12B: IN A SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL ROLE

	Not in a supervisory/ managerial role	In a supervisory/ managerial role	Total
Essential	50	24	74
	67.57	32.43	100.00
	4.82	3.45	4.27
Very important	191	80	271
	70.48	29.52	100.00
	18.40	11.49	15.63
Fairly important	392	228	620
	63.23	36.77	100.00
	37.76	32.76	35.75
Not very important	405	364	769
	52.67	47.33	100.00
	39.02	52.30	44.35
Total	1038	696	1734
	59.86	40.14	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

4.82 percent of those not working in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘essential’. 18.40 percent of the same consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘very important’. Both percentages are higher than the corresponding percentages for those who are working in a supervisory or managerial capacity, where the appropriate percentages are 3.45 and 11.49 percent, respectively. Whereas 52.39 percent of those working in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘not very important’, only 39.02 percent who are not working in either of these capacities are of this opinion.

Table A12C: SECTOR OF EMPLOYMENT

	Private sector	Public sector	Not for profit Sector	Total
Essential	52	23	0	75
	69.33	30.67	0.00	100.00
	5.10	3.38	0.00	4.25
Very important	162	102	10	274
	59.12	37.23	3.65	100.00
	15.90	15.00	15.38	15.53
Fairly important	368	249	15	632
	58.23	39.40	2.37	100.00
	36.11	36.62	23.08	35.83
Not very important	437	306	40	783
	55.81	39.08	5.11	100.00
	42.89	45.00	61.54	44.39
Total	1019	680	65	1764
	57.77	38.55	3.68	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Whereas 5.10 percent of those working in the private sector consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘essential’ no-one working in the not for profit sector subscribes to this sentiment. The percentages who consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘very important’ are broadly similar across the three sectors, at 15.00 percent, approximately. However, 61.54 percent of those employed within the not for profit sector consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘not very important’, a rate which is greater than the corresponding percentages for those employed in the other sectors.

Table A12D: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	11	4	7	7	10	3	9	9	20	80
	13.75	5.00	8.75	8.75	12.50	3.75	11.25	11.25	25.00	100.00
	4.25	1.61	2.47	2.98	3.60	1.79	7.09	5.49	8.77	4.02
Very important	31	33	29	32	46	33	27	32	43	306
	10.13	10.78	9.48	10.46	15.03	10.78	8.82	10.46	14.05	100.00
	11.97	13.31	10.25	13.62	16.55	19.64	21.26	19.51	18.86	15.38
Fairly important	64	72	103	88	121	64	54	62	78	705
	9.07	10.20	14.59	12.46	17.14	9.07	7.65	8.78	11.05	100.00
	24.71	29.03	36.40	37.45	43.53	38.10	42.52	37.80	34.21	35.48
Not very important	153	139	144	108	101	68	37	61	87	898
	17.04	15.48	16.04	12.03	11.25	7.57	4.12	6.79	9.59	100.00
	59.07	56.05	50.88	45.96	36.33	40.48	29.13	37.20	38.16	45.13
Total	259	248	283	235	278	168	127	164	228	1990
	13.02	12.46	14.22	11.81	13.97	8.44	6.38	6.24	11.46	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

7.09 percent of those employed in sales occupations consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which contrasts with the corresponding rate of 1.61 percent for those who are employed in professional occupations. Further, 21.26 of those employed in sales occupations consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which contrasts this time with the corresponding rate of 10.25 percent for those who are employed in associate professional occupations. 59.07 percent of managers, 56.05 percent of those who work in professional occupations and 50.88 percent of those who work in associate professional occupations consider ‘an easy workload’ to be ‘not very important’, rates which are higher than the corresponding percentages for the other occupational classifications.

Table A13. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Good Physical Working Conditions’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 71.0484	0.000	0.1888
Age	(9) 14.5921	0.103	0.0493
Marital status	(3) 5.9274	0.115	0.0546
Financially dependent child	(3) 4.7280	0.193	0.0487
Highest qualification held	(12) 20.9872	0.051	0.0592
Work experience	(12) 14.8541	0.250	0.0499
Working full time	(3) 0.5460	0.909	0.0165
In a permanent job	(3) 1.3345	0.721	0.0274
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 3.1478	0.369	0.0425
Tenure	(12) 7.3181	0.836	0.0349
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 2.3424	0.504	0.0342
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 23.5397	0.000	0.1086
Sector of employment	(6) 14.0244	0.029	0.0629
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 11.3355	0.010	0.0753
Occupation	(24) 56.2333	0.000	0.0968
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 1.7367	0.629	0.0321

The tables which follow present the detail of the results of the cross tabulations for the job attribute preference ‘good physical working conditions’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A13, 5 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being gender, whether a member of a union or staff association, sector, employment status and occupation.

Table A13A: GENDER

	Female	Male	Total
Essential	328	246	574
	57.14	42.86	100.00
	33.03	24.60	28.80
Very important	544	492	1036
	52.51	47.49	100.00
	54.78	49.20	51.98
Fairly important	100	187	287
	34.84	65.16	100.00
	10.07	18.70	14.40
Not very important	21	75	96
	21.88	78.13	100.00
	2.11	7.50	4.82
Total	993	1000	1993
	49.82	50.18	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones which report the results of cross tabulations between 'good physical working conditions' and the variable identified :

1. Key:

- Frequency
- Row percentage
- Column percentage

'Good physical working conditions' are relatively more important to females than males. For example, 33.03 percent of females consider 'good physical working conditions' to be 'essential' and 54.78 percent of them consider this to be 'very important'. The corresponding percentages for males are 24.60 and 49.20, respectively.

Table A13B: UNION/STAFF ASSOCIATION MEMBER

	Not a member	Member of union/ staff association	Total
Essential	275	183	458
	60.04	39.96	100.00
	20.80	27.11	22.93
Very important	678	361	1039
	65.26	34.74	100.00
	51.29	53.48	52.03
Fairly important	317	120	437
	72.54	27.46	100.00
	23.98	17.78	21.88
Not very important	52	11	63
	82.54	17.46	100.00
	3.93	1.63	3.15
Total	1322	675	1997
	66.20	33.80	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good physical working conditions’ are relatively more important to those who are members of a trade union or a staff association. 27.11 percent of those in this category consider ‘good physical working conditions’ to be ‘essential’; 53.48 percent in this category consider this to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for those who are not members of a trade union or staff association are 20.80 and 51.29, respectively.

Table A13C: SECTOR

	Private sector	Public sector	Not for profit sector	Total
Essential	215 52.57 21.06	175 42.79 25.51	19 4.65 28.79	409 100.00 23.07
Very important	539 57.40 52.79	372 39.62 54.23	28 2.98 42.42	939 100.00 52.96
Fairly important	232 62.87 22.72	122 33.06 17.78	15 4.07 22.73	369 100.00 20.81
Not very important	35 62.50 3.43	17 30.36 2.48	4 7.14 6.06	56 100.00 3.16
Total	1021 57.59 100.00	686 38.69 100.00	66 3.72 100.00	1773 100.00 100.00

28.79 percent of those employed in the not for profit sector consider ‘good physical working conditions’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for those employed in the other sectors. 54.23 percent of those employed in the public sector consider ‘good physical working conditions’ to be ‘very important’, a rate higher than the corresponding rates for those employed in the other sectors. 22.73 percent of those employed in the not for profit sector consider ‘good physical working conditions’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate which is greater than the corresponding rates for those employed in the other sectors.

Table A13D: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Employee	Self-employed	Total
Essential	403	55	458
	87.99	12.01	100.00
	23.12	21.40	22.90
Very important	925	116	1041
	88.86	11.14	100.00
	53.07	45.14	52.05
Fairly important	363	75	438
	82.88	17.12	100.00
	20.83	29.18	21.90
Not very important	52	11	63
	82.54	17.46	100.00
	2.98	4.28	3.15
Total	1743	257	2000
	87.15	12.85	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Good physical working conditions’ are relatively more important to employees. 23.12 percent of employees consider ‘good physical working conditions’ to be ‘essential’; 53.07 percent consider them to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for the self employed are 21.40 and 45.14, respectively. By contrast, whereas 29.18 percent of the self employed consider ‘good physical working conditions’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 20.83 percent of employees are of this same opinion.

Table A13E: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & Secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	42	59	76	55	57	46	26	34	63	458
	9.17	12.88	16.59	12.01	12.45	10.04	5.68	7.42	13.76	100.00
	16.22	23.60	26.76	23.40	20.50	27.06	20.31	20.48	27.39	22.90
Very important	120	123	149	120	144	101	74	89	121	1041
	11.53	11.82	14.31	11.53	13.83	9.70	7.11	8.55	11.62	100.00
	46.33	49.20	52.46	51.06	51.80	59.41	57.81	53.61	52.61	52.05
Fairly important	84	55	51	56	70	20	27	37	38	438
	19.18	12.56	11.64	12.79	15.98	4.57	6.16	8.45	8.68	100.00
	32.43	22.00	17.96	23.83	25.18	11.76	21.09	22.29	16.52	21.90
Not very important	13	13	8	4	7	3	1	6	8	63
	20.63	20.63	12.70	6.35	11.11	4.76	1.59	9.52	12.70	100.00
	5.02	5.20	2.82	1.70	2.52	1.76	0.78	3.61	3.48	3.15
Total	259	250	284	235	278	170	128	166	230	2000
	12.95	12.50	14.20	11.75	13.90	8.50	6.40	8.30	11.50	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

32.43 percent of those employed in elementary occupations consider ‘good physical working conditions’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other occupational classifications. 59.41 percent of those employed in personal services consider ‘good physical working conditions’ to be ‘very important’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other occupational classifications. In contrast, 32.43 percent of those employed as managers consider ‘good physical working conditions’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other occupational classifications.

Table 14. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘A Lot Of Variety In The Type Of Work’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 1.3249	0.723	0.0257
Age	(9) 7.8329	0.551	0.0361
Marital status	(3) 0.9605	0.811	0.0220
Financially dependent child	(3) 2.6493	0.449	0.0365
Highest qualification held	(12) 74.5725	0.000	0.1115
Work experience	(12) 16.6987	0.161	0.0530
Working full time	(3) 10.4179	0.015	0.0722
In a permanent job	(3) 6.3906	0.094	0.0600
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 14.4068	0.002	0.0909
Tenure	(12) 3.8521	0.986	0.0253
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 1.9857	0.575	0.0315
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 13.0850	0.004	0.0810
Sector of employment	(6) 17.5383	0.007	0.0703
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 2.5918	0.459	0.0360
Occupation	(24) 75.3045	0.000	0.1121
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 6.8560	0.077	0.0638

The tables which follow present the detail of the results of the cross tabulations for the job attribute preference ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A14, 6 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being highest qualification, whether working full time, whether in a supervisory or managerial capacity, whether a member of a union or staff association, sector and occupation.

Table A14A: HIGHEST QUALIFICATION

	No qualifications	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Total
Essential	62	22	35	95	172	386
	16.06	5.70	9.07	24.61	44.56	100.00
	21.68	16.06	12.03	17.21	23.50	19.32
Very important	113	81	141	250	385	970
	11.65	8.35	14.54	25.77	39.69	100.00
	39.51	59.12	48.45	45.29	52.60	48.55
Fairly important	78	27	89	171	152	517
	15.09	5.22	17.21	33.08	29.40	100.00
	27.27	19.71	30.58	30.98	20.77	25.88
Not very important	33	7	26	36	23	125
	26.40	5.60	20.80	28.80	18.40	100.00
	11.54	5.11	8.93	6.52	3.14	6.25
Total	286	137	291	552	732	1998
	14.31	6.86	14.56	27.63	36.64	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones reporting the results of cross tabulations between ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ and the variable identified:

1. Key:

- Frequency
- Row percentage
- Column percentage

23.50 percent of those with level 4 or 5 as their highest qualification consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other highest qualification categories. 59.12 percent of those with level 1 as their highest qualification consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘very important’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other highest qualification categories. Only 19.71 percent of those with level 1 as their highest qualification consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate lower than the corresponding rates for the other highest qualification categories.

Table A14B: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working full time	Working full time	Total
Essential	80 20.73 16.56	306 79.27 20.18	386 100.00 19.31
Very important	224 23.09 46.38	746 76.91 49.21	970 100.00 48.52
Fairly important	137 26.50 28.36	380 73.50 25.07	517 100.00 25.86
Not very important	42 33.33 8.70	84 66.67 5.54	126 100.00 6.30
Total	483 24.16 100.00	1516 75.84 100.00	1999 100.00 100.00

‘A lot of variety in the type of work’ is relatively more important to those working full time. 20.18 percent of those working full time consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘essential’; 49.21 percent consider this to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for those not working full time are 16.56 and 46.38, respectively. In contrast, 8.70 of those not working full time consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be only ‘fairly important’, whereas only 5.54 percent of those in full time employment are of this opinion.

Table A14C: IN A SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL ROLE

	Not in a supervisory/ managerial role	In a supervisory/ managerial role	Total
Essential	181	147	328
	55.18	44.82	100.00
	17.34	21.06	18.83
Very important	489	357	846
	57.80	42.20	100.00
	46.84	51.15	48.56
Fairly important	296	162	458
	64.63	35.37	100.00
	28.35	23.21	26.29
Not very important	78	32	110
	70.91	29.09	100.00
	7.47	4.58	6.31
Total	1044	698	1742
	59.93	40.07	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘A lot of variety in the type of work’ is relatively more important to those working in a supervisory or managerial capacity. 21.06 percent working in such a capacity consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘essential’; 51.15 of the same group consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for those not working in a supervisory or managerial capacity are 17.34 and 46.84, respectively. In contrast 7.47 percent of those not working in a supervisory or managerial capacity consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘not very important’. Only 4.58 percent of those working in a supervisory or managerial capacity are of this opinion.

Table A14D: UNION/STAFF ASSOCIATION MEMBER

	Not a member	Member of union/ staff association	Total
Essential	241	145	385
	62.44	37.56	100.00
	18.23	21.51	19.34
Very important	625	344	969
	64.50	35.50	100.00
	47.28	51.04	48.55
Fairly important	359	156	515
	69.71	30.29	100.00
	27.16	23.15	25.80
Not very important	97	29	126
	76.98	23.02	100.00
	7.34	4.30	6.31
Total	1322	674	1996
	76.98	33.77	100.00
	7.34	100.00	100.00

‘A lot of variety in the type of work’ is relatively more important to those who are members of a trade union or staff association. 21.51 percent of those in this category consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘essential’. The corresponding percentage for those who are not members of a union or staff association is 18.23. 51.04 percent of those who are members of a union or staff association consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentage for those who are not in this category is 47.08. Whereas 27.16 percent of those who are not members of a trade union or staff association consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 23.15 percent of those who are share this opinion.

Table A14E: SECTOR

	Private sector	Public Sector	Not for profit sector	Total
Essential	171 51.04 16.75	151 45.07 22.04	13 3.88 19.70	335 100.00 18.91
Very important	485 56.53 47.50	346 40.33 50.51	27 3.15 40.91	858 100.00 48.42
Fairly important	292 62.53 28.60	154 32.98 22.48	21 4.50 31.82	467 100.00 26.35
Not very important	73 65.18 7.15	34 30.36 4.96	5 4.46 7.58	112 100.00 6.32
Total	1021 57.62 100.00	685 38.66 100.00	66 3.72 100.00	1772 100.00 100.00

22.04 percent of those employed in the public sector consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for those employed in the other sectors. Further, 50.51 percent of those employed in this same sector consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘very important’, again a rate greater than the corresponding rates for those employed in the other sectors. 31.82 percent of those employed in the not for profit sector consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for those employed in the other sectors.

Table A14F: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	54	63	77	32	43	31	19	30	37	386
	13.99	16.32	19.95	8.29	11.14	8.03	4.92	7.77	9.59	100.00
	20.85	25.20	27.11	13.62	15.47	18.34	14.84	18.07	16.09	19.31
Very important	134	136	138	108	130	86	64	67	107	970
	13.81	14.02	14.23	11.13	13.40	8.87	6.60	6.91	11.03	100.00
	51.74	54.40	48.59	45.96	46.76	50.89	50.00	40.36	46.52	48.52
Fairly important	56	45	56	82	88	40	38	52	60	517
	10.83	8.70	10.83	15.86	17.02	7.74	7.35	10.06	11.61	100.00
	21.62	18.00	19.72	34.89	31.65	23.67	29.69	31.33	26.09	25.86
Not very important	15	6	13	13	17	12	7	17	26	126
	11.90	4.76	10.32	10.32	13.49	9.52	5.56	13.49	20.63	100.00
	5.79	2.40	4.58	5.53	6.12	7.10	5.47	10.24	11.30	6.30
Total	259	250	284	235	278	169	128	166	230	1999
	12.96	12.51	14.21	11.76	13.91	8.45	6.40	8.30	11.51	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

27.11 percent of those employed as associate professionals consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘essential’, a rate which contrasts with the corresponding rate for those employed in administrative and secretarial occupations, which is 13.62 percent. 54.40 percent of those employed in professional occupations consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be ‘very important’, a rate which contrasts with the corresponding one for those employed as operatives, which is 40.36 percent. 34.89 percent of those employed in administrative or secretarial occupations consider ‘a lot of variety in the type of work’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate which is greater than the corresponding rates for those employed in the other occupational classifications.

Table A15. Results of the Cross Tabulation of ‘Friendly People To Work With’

Variable	Value of Pearson Chi-squared Statistic	Statistical Significance	Value of Cramer’s <i>V</i>
Gender	(3) 67.5649	0.000	0.1838
Age	(9) 28.4573	0.001	0.0689
Marital status	(3) 16.9374	0.001	0.0922
Financially dependent child	(3) 9.7080	0.021	0.0698
Highest qualification held	(12) 20.0100	0.067	0.0578
Work experience	(12) 32.1589	0.001	0.0735
Working full time	(3) 20.6178	0.000	0.1015
In a permanent job	(3) 6.6130	0.085	0.0610
Working in a supervisory/managerial capacity	(3) 6.3262	0.097	0.0602
Tenure	(12) 7.7434	0.805	0.0359
Whether has more than 1 job	(3) 8.7245	0.033	0.0661
Whether a member of a union or staff association	(3) 5.5226	0.137	0.0526
Sector of employment	(6) 5.0979	0.531	0.0379
Whether working as an employee or self employed	(3) 5.6717	0.129	0.0533
Occupation	(24) 40.2441	0.020	0.0819
Whether seeking a better job	(3) 2.7010	0.440	0.0400

The tables which follow present the detail of the results of the cross tabulations for the job attribute preference ‘friendly people to work with’ which are statistically significant at ($p < 0.05$). As reported in Table A1, 8 cross tabulations produce statistically significant results, being gender, age, marital status, whether there is a financially dependent child, work experience, whether working full time, whether holding more than 1 job and occupation.

Table A15A: GENDER

	Female	Male	Total
Essential	357	255	612
	58.33	41.67	100.00
	35.84	25.40	30.60
Very important	516	509	1025
	50.34	49.66	100.00
	51.81	50.70	51.25
Fairly important	119	199	318
	37.42	62.58	100.00
	11.95	19.82	15.90
Not very important	4	41	45
	8.89	91.11	100.00
	0.40	4.08	2.25
Total	996	1004	2000
	49.80	50.20	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note to this table and all corresponding ones which report the results of the cross tabulations between 'friendly people to work with' and the variable identified:

1. Key:

- Frequency
- Row percentage
- Column percentage

'Friendly people to work with' is relatively more important for females than males. For example, whereas 35.84 percent of females consider 'friendly people to work with' to be 'essential', only 25.40 percent of males are of this opinion. Whereas 19.82 percent of males consider 'friendly people to work with' to be only 'fairly important', only 11.95 percent of females are of this opinion.

Table A15B: AGE

	Aged 20 - 25	Aged 26 - 45	Aged 46 - 55	Aged 56 - 65	Total
Essential	68 11.11 45.95	292 47.71 29.11	157 25.65 30.13	95 15.52 28.96	612 100.00 30.60
Very important	53 5.17 35.81	509 49.66 50.75	281 27.41 53.93	182 17.76 55.49	1025 100.00 51.25
Fairly important	26 8.18 17.57	176 55.35 17.55	73 22.96 14.01	43 13.52 13.11	318 100.00 15.90
Not very important	1 2.22 0.68	26 57.78 2.59	10 22.22 1.92	8 17.78 2.44	45 100.00 2.25
Total	148 7.40 100.00	1003 50.15 100.00	521 26.05 100.00	328 16.40 100.00	2000 100.00 100.00

45.95 percent of those aged 20 – 25 consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other age categories. 55.49 percent of those aged 56 -65 consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘very important’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for the other age categories. 13.11 percent of those in this oldest age category consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate which is lower than the corresponding rates for the other age categories.

Table A15C: MARITAL STATUS

	Single	Married or living together	Total
Essential	238 39.08 35.63	371 60.92 28.04	609 100.00 30.59
Very important	326 31.93 48.80	695 68.07 52.53	1021 100.00 51.28
Fairly important	97 30.60 14.52	220 69.40 16.63	317 100.00 15.92
Not very important	7 15.91 1.05	37 84.09 2.80	44 100.00 2.21
Total	668 33.55 100.00	1323 66.45 100.00	1991 100.00 100.00

Whereas 35.63 percent of those who are not married or living together consider 'friendly people to work with' to be 'essential', only 28.04 percent of those who are married or living together share this opinion. However, whereas 52.53 percent of those who are married or living together consider 'friendly people to work with' to be 'very important', only 48.80 percent not in this category share this opinion. Whereas 16.63 percent of those married or living together consider 'friendly people to work with' to be only 'fairly important', only 14.52 percent of those who not married or living together are of this same opinion.

Table A15D: DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	With no financially dependent children	With financially dependent children	Total
Essential	395	214	609
	64.86	35.14	100.00
	32.32	27.79	30.57
Very important	628	393	1021
	61.51	38.49	100.00
	51.39	51.04	51.26
Fairly important	176	141	317
	55.52	44.48	100.00
	14.40	18.31	15.91
Not very important	23	22	45
	51.11	48.89	100.00
	1.88	2.86	15.91
Total	1222	770	1992
	61.35	38.65	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

‘Friendly people to work with’ is relatively more important for those who do not have financially dependent children. For example, 32.32 percent in this category consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘essential’. 51.39 percent in the same category consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for those who have financially dependent children are 27.79 and 51.04, respectively.

Table A15E: WORK EXPERIENCE

	1 – 2 years	3 – 6 years	7 – 10 years	11 – 25 years	Over 25 years	Total
Essential	19 3.14 52.78	52 8.60 41.60	114 18.84 34.13	144 23.80 28.24	276 45.62 28.13	605 100.00 30.46
Very important	12 1.18 33.33	46 4.51 36.80	165 16.19 49.40	260 25.52 50.98	536 52.60 54.64	1019 100.00 51.31
Fairly important	4 1.26 11.11	26 8.20 20.80	48 15.14 14.37	90 28.39 17.65	149 47.00 15.19	317 100.00 15.96
Not very important	1 2.22 2.78	1 2.22 0.80	7 15.56 2.10	16 35.56 3.14	20 44.44 2.04	45 100.00 2.27
Total	36 1.81 100.00	125 6.29 100.00	334 16.82 100.00	510 22.68 100.00	981 49.40 100.00	1986 100.00 100.00

52.78 percent of those with the least work experience (i.e. of between 1 – 2 years) consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘essential’, a rate (much) greater than the corresponding rates for the other work experience categories. 54.64 percent of those with most experience of work (i.e. of over 25 years) consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘very important’. 11.11 percent of those in the least work experience category consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be only ‘fairly important’, a rate lower than the corresponding rates for the other work experience categories.

Table A15F: WORKING FULL TIME

	Not working full time	Working full time	Total
Essential	168 27.45 34.78	444 72.55 29.27	612 100.00 30.60
Very important	259 25.27 53.62	766 74.73 50.49	1025 100.00 51.25
Fairly important	52 16.35 10.77	266 83.65 17.53	318 100.00 15.90
Not very important	4 8.89 0.83	41 91.11 2.70	45 100.00 2.25
Total	483 24.15 100.00	1517 75.85 100.00	2000 100.00 100.00

‘Friendly people to work with’ is relatively more important to those who are not working full time. 34.78 percent of those not working full time consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘essential’. 53.62 percent of those in this category consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘very important’. The corresponding percentages for those who do work full time are 29.77 and 50.49, respectively.

Table A15G: WITH MORE THAN 1 JOB

	With 1 job	With more than 1 job	Total
Essential	555 90.69 29.84	57 9.31 40.71	612 100.00 30.60
Very important	961 93.76 51.67	64 6.24 45.71	1025 100.00 51.25
Fairly important	303 95.28 16.29	15 4.72 10.71	318 100.00 15.90
Not very important	41 91.11 2.20	4 8.89 2.86	45 100.00 2.25
Total	1860 93.00 100.00	140 7.00 100.00	2000 100.00 100.00

40.71 percent of those who have more than one job consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘essential’. The corresponding percentage for those who have only one job is 29.84. 45.71 percent of those who have more than one job consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘very important’. However, more (i.e. 51.67 percent) of those who do not have more than one job have this same opinion. Whereas 16.29 percent of those who do not have more than one job consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be only ‘fairly important’, only 10.71 percent of those who have more than one job have this same opinion.

Table A15H: OCCUPATION

	Manager	Professional	Associate Professional	Administrative & secretarial	Skilled trades	Personal services	Sales	Operatives	Elementary	Total
Essential	71	88	95	64	65	62	46	44	77	612
	11.60	14.38	15.52	10.46	10.62	10.13	7.52	7.19	12.58	100.00
	27.41	35.20	33.45	27.23	23.38	36.47	35.94	26.51	33.48	30.60
Very important	127	122	138	133	147	87	71	85	115	1025
	12.39	11.90	13.46	12.98	14.34	8.49	6.93	8.29	11.22	100.00
	49.03	48.80	48.59	56.60	52.88	51.18	55.47	51.20	50.00	51.25
Fairly important	53	37	43	32	59	19	10	32	33	318
	16.67	11.64	13.52	10.06	18.55	5.97	3.14	10.06	10.38	100.00
	20.46	14.80	15.14	13.62	21.22	11.18	7.81	19.28	14.35	15.90
Not very important	8	3	8	6	7	2	1	5	5	45
	17.78	6.67	17.78	13.33	15.56	4.44	2.22	11.11	11.11	100.00
	3.09	1.20	2.82	2.55	2.52	1.18	0.78	3.01	2.17	2.25
Total	259	250	284	235	278	170	128	166	230	2000
	12.95	12.50	14.20	11.75	13.90	8.50	6.40	8.30	11.50	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

36.47 percent of those working in personal services occupations consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘essential’, a rate greater than the corresponding rates for those working in the other occupational classifications. 56.60 percent of those working in administrative and secretarial occupations consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be ‘very important’. Only 7.81 percent of those working in sales occupations, a rate lower than the corresponding rates for those working in the other occupational classifications, consider ‘friendly people to work with’ to be only ‘fairly important’.

STATISTICAL APPENDIX B: DETAILS OF THE ORDERED PROBITS

Table B1. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘Good Promotion Prospects’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p < 0.05)
Male	+	
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	+	
Aged 46 – 55	+	
Aged 56 – 65	-	
Married or living together	-	*
With financially dependent child	+	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	+	*
Level 2	+	
Level 3	+	
Level 4 or 5	+	
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	*
Between 16 and 25 years	-	*
Over 25 years	-	*
Working full time	+	*
In a permanent job	-	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+	*
Looking for a better job	+	*
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	+	
Between 3 and 5 years	+	
Between 6 and 10 years	+	
Over 10 years	-	
Double job holding	-	
Member of a union or staff association	+	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	+	
Not for profit sector	-	
Occupation		
Manager	+	
Professional	-	
Associate professional and technical	-	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	-	
Personal services	+	
Sales	+	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634
Wald chi(2) = 262.62
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.0606

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:
Chi2 (3) = 9.97 : prob > chi2 = 0.0189

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:
Chi2 (4) = 6.79 : prob > chi2 = 0.1473

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:
Chi2 (4) = 32.13 : prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:
Chi2 (4) = 4.88 : prob > chi2 = 0.2994

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:
Chi2 (2) = 3.03 : prob > chi2 = 0.2203

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:
Chi2 (8) = 10.12 : prob > chi2 = 0.2568

Table B2. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘Good Pay’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p < 0.05)
Male	+	
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	-	
Aged 46 – 55	-	
Aged 56 – 65	-	
Married or living together	-	
With financially dependent child	+	*
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	-	
Level 2	-	*
Level 3	-	*
Level 4 or 5	-	*
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	+	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	-	
Over 25 years	-	
Working full time	+	*
In a permanent job	-	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+	
Looking for a better job	+	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	-	
Between 6 and 10 years	-	
Over 10 years	-	
Double job holding	-	
Member of a union or staff association	+	*
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	-	*
Not for profit sector	-	*
Occupation		
Manager	-	
Professional	-	
Associate professional and technical	+	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	+	
Personal services	-	
Sales	-	
Operatives	+	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634

Wald chi(2) = 160.82

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Pseudo R2 = 0.0416

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 4.78 : prob > chi2 = 0.1888

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 20.62 : prob > chi2 = 0.0004

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 2.91 : prob > chi2 = 0.5727

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 2.44 : prob > chi2 = 0.6556

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 14.97 : prob > chi2 = 0.0006

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 9.57 : prob > chi2 = 0.2962

Table B3. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘A Secure Job’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p < 0.05)
Male	-	
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	-	
Aged 46 – 55	-	
Aged 56 – 65	-	
Married or living together	-	*
With financially dependent child	+	*
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	-	
Level 2	-	
Level 3	-	
Level 4 or 5	-	*
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	+	
Between 7 and 15 years	+	
Between 16 and 25 years	+	
Over 25 years	+	
Working full time	+	*
In a permanent job	+	*
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	-	
Looking for a better job	+	*
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	-	
Between 6 and 10 years	-	
Over 10 years	+	
Double job holding	+	
Member of a union or staff association	+	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	+	
Not for profit sector	-	
Occupation		
Manager	-	*
Professional	-	
Associate professional and technical	-	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	-	
Personal services	+	
Sales	-	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634
Wald chi(2) = 161.74
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.0480

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:
Chi2 (3) = 3.90 : prob > chi2 = 0.2722

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:
Chi2 (4) = 34.11 : prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:
Chi2 (4) = 6.61 : prob > chi2 = 0.1579

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:
Chi2 (4) = 2.54 : prob > chi2 = 0.6369

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:
Chi2 (2) = 4.86 : prob > chi2 = 0.0882

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:
Chi2 (8) = 9.49 : prob > chi2 = 0.3027

Table B4. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘Convenient Hours of Work’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at ($p < 0.05$)
Male	-	*
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	+	
Aged 46 – 55	+	
Aged 56 – 65	+	
Married or living together	+	
With financially dependent child	+	*
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	+	
Level 2	-	
Level 3	-	
Level 4 or 5	-	
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	+	
Between 7 and 15 years	+	
Between 16 and 25 years	+	
Over 25 years	+	
Working full time	-	*
In a permanent job	-	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	-	*
Looking for a better job	-	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	-	
Between 6 and 10 years	-	
Over 10 years	-	
Double job holding	-	
Member of a union or staff association	+	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	+	
Not for profit sector	+	
Occupation		
Manager	-	
Professional	-	
Associate professional and technical	-	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	-	
Personal services	-	
Sales	+	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634
Wald chi(2) = 182.39
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.0453

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 3.56 : prob > chi2 = 0.3135

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 3.46 : prob > chi2 = 0.4836

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 5.73 : prob > chi2 = 0.2202

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 3.20 : prob > chi2 = 0.5244

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 1.41 : prob > chi2 = 0.4945

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 11.47 : prob > chi2 = 0.1764

Table B5. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘Choice In Your Hours of Work’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p < 0.05)
Male	-	*
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	+	
Aged 46 – 55	+	
Aged 56 – 65	+	
Married or living together	+	*
With financially dependent child	+	*
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	-	
Level 2	-	
Level 3	-	
Level 4 or 5	-	
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	+	
Over 25 years	-	
Working full time	-	*
In a permanent job	-	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	-	
Looking for a better job	-	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	+	
Between 6 and 10 years	+	
Over 10 years	+	
Double job holding	-	
Member of a union or staff association	+	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	-	
Not for profit sector	-	
Occupation		
Manager	+	
Professional	-	
Associate professional and technical	-	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	-	
Personal services	-	
Sales	-	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1633

Wald chi(2) = 152.85

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Pseudo R2 = 0.0360

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 2.73 : prob > chi2 = 0.4355

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 2.68 : prob > chi2 = 0.6129

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 5.05 : prob > chi2 = 0.2827

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 3.75 : prob > chi2 = 0.4403

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 0.27 : prob > chi2 = 0.8729

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 9.36 : prob > chi2 = 0.3126

Table B6. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘Good Fringe Benefits’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at ($p < 0.05$)
Male	+	
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	+	
Aged 46 – 55	-	
Aged 56 – 65	-	*
Married or living together	+	
With financially dependent child	-	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	+	
Level 2	-	
Level 3	-	
Level 4 or 5	-	*
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	*
Between 7 and 15 years	-	*
Between 16 and 25 years	-	*
Over 25 years	-	*
Working full time	+	
In a permanent job	+	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	-	
Looking for a better job	+	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	+	
Between 3 and 5 years	+	
Between 6 and 10 years	+	
Over 10 years	+	*
Double job holding	-	
Member of a union or staff association	+	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	-	
Not for profit sector	-	
Occupation		
Manager	-	
Professional	-	*
Associate professional and technical	-	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	-	
Personal services	-	
Sales	-	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1630
Wald chi(2) = 108.79
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.0251

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:
Chi2 (3) = 17.17 : prob > chi2 = 0.0007

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:
Chi2 (4) = 16.67 : prob > chi2 = 0.0022

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:
Chi2 (4) = 6.48 : prob > chi2 = 0.1660

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:
Chi2 (4) = 5.64 : prob > chi2 = 0.2274

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:
Chi2 (2) = 3.39 : prob > chi2 = 0.1835

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:
Chi2 (8) = 11.82 : prob > chi2 = 0.1594

Table B7. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘Good Training Provision’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p < 0.05)
Male	-	*
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	-	
Aged 46 – 55	-	
Aged 56 – 65	-	*
Married or living together	-	
With financially dependent child	+	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	-	
Level 2	-	
Level 3	-	
Level 4 or 5	-	
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	-	
Over 25 years	-	
Working full time	+	*
In a permanent job	+	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+	
Looking for a better job	+	*
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	-	*
Between 6 and 10 years	-	*
Over 10 years	-	*
Double job holding	-	
Member of a union or staff association	+	*
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	-	
Not for profit sector	-	
Occupation		
Manager	+	
Professional	+	*
Associate professional and technical	+	*
Administrative and secretarial	+	
Skilled trades	+	*
Personal services	+	*
Sales	+	
Operatives	+	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634
Wald chi(2) = 131.77
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.0327

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:
Chi2 (3) = 11.20 : prob > chi2 = 0.0107

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:
Chi2 (4) = 4.66 : prob > chi2 = 0.3237

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:
Chi2 (4) = 2.43 : prob > chi2 = 0.6575

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:
Chi2 (4) = 16.78 : prob > chi2 = 0.0021

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:
Chi2 (2) = 0.47 : prob > chi2 = 0.7894

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:
Chi2 (8) = 22.77 : prob > chi2 = 0.0037

Table B8. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘Good Relations with your Supervisor/Manager’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p < 0.05)
Male	-	*
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	+	
Aged 46 – 55	+	
Aged 56 – 65	+	
Married or living together	-	
With financially dependent child	+	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	+	
Level 2	+	
Level 3	-	
Level 4 or 5	-	
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	-	
Over 25 years	-	
Working full time	+	
In a permanent job	-	*
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+	
Looking for a better job	+	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	-	
Between 6 and 10 years	-	
Over 10 years	-	
Double job holding	+	
Member of a union or staff association	-	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	+	
Not for profit sector	+	
Occupation		
Manager	+	
Professional	+	
Associate professional and technical	+	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	+	
Personal services	+	
Sales	+	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634

Wald chi(2) = 74.78

Prob > chi2 = 0.0001

Pseudo R2 = 0.0203

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 1.18 : prob > chi2 = 0.7584

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 2.93 : prob > chi2 = 0.5692

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 2.61 : prob > chi2 = 0.6256

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 4.24 : prob > chi2 = 0.3739

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 1.37 : prob > chi2 = 0.5044

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 9.93 : prob > chi2 = 0.2699

Table B9. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘A Job Where You Can Use Your Initiative’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p < 0.05)
Male	-	
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	-	
Aged 46 – 55	-	
Aged 56 – 65	-	
Married or living together	-	*
With financially dependent child	+	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	+	
Level 2	+	
Level 3	-	
Level 4 or 5	+	*
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	+	
Between 16 and 25 years	-	
Over 25 years	-	
Working full time	+	*
In a permanent job	-	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+	
Looking for a better job	+	*
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	+	
Between 3 and 5 years	+	
Between 6 and 10 years	+	
Over 10 years	+	
Double job holding	+	
Member of a union or staff association	-	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	-	
Not for profit sector	+	
Occupation		
Manager	+	
Professional	+	*
Associate professional and technical	+	
Administrative and secretarial	+	
Skilled trades	-	
Personal services	+	
Sales	-	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634
Wald chi(2) = 108.47
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.0313

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:
Chi2 (3) = 0.98 : prob > chi2 = 0.8057

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:
Chi2 (4) = 11.90 : prob > chi2 = 0.0181

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:
Chi2 (4) = 4.47 : prob > chi2 = 0.3460

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:
Chi2 (4) = 3.79 : prob > chi2 = 0.4353

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:
Chi2 (2) = 0.88 : prob > chi2 = 0.6442

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:
Chi2 (8) = 16.79 : prob > chi2 = 0.0323

Table B10. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘A Job You Like Doing’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at ($p < 0.05$)
Male	-	*
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	-	
Aged 46 – 55	-	
Aged 56 – 65	-	
Married or living together	-	
With financially dependent child	-	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	+	
Level 2	+	
Level 3	+	
Level 4 or 5	+	*
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	-	
Over 25 years	-	
Working full time	+	
In a permanent job	-	*
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+	
Looking for a better job	+	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	-	
Between 6 and 10 years	-	
Over 10 years	+	
Double job holding	+	
Member of a union or staff association	+	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	-	
Not for profit sector	+	
Occupation		
Manager	+	
Professional	+	*
Associate professional and technical	+	*
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	-	
Personal services	+	*
Sales	-	
Operatives	+	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634

Wald chi(2) = 92.42

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Pseudo R2 = 0.0297

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 2.88 : prob > chi2 = 0.4098

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 7.70 : prob > chi2 = 0.1034

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 5.57 : prob > chi2 = 0.2340

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 5.59 : prob > chi2 = 0.2320

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 0.06 : prob > chi2 = 0.9728

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 25.19 : prob > chi2 = 0.0014

Table B11. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘The Opportunities To Use Your Abilities’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p < 0.05)
Male	-	*
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	+	
Aged 46 – 55	+	
Aged 56 – 65	+	
Married or living together	-	
With financially dependent child	+	*
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	+	
Level 2	+	
Level 3	+	
Level 4 or 5	+	*
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	-	*
Over 25 years	-	*
Working full time	+	*
In a permanent job	-	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+	
Looking for a better job	+	*
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	+	
Between 3 and 5 years	+	
Between 6 and 10 years	+	
Over 10 years	+	
Double job holding	+	
Member of a union or staff association	+	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	-	
Not for profit sector	+	*
Occupation		
Manager	+	*
Professional	+	*
Associate professional and technical	+	*
Administrative and secretarial	+	
Skilled trades	+	
Personal services	+	
Sales	-	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634

Wald chi(2) = 157.96

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Pseudo R2 = 0.0473

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 2.22 : prob > chi2 = 0.5278

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 13.58 : prob > chi2 = 0.0088

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 6.22 : prob > chi2 = 0.1835

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 1.42 : prob > chi2 = 0.8415

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 5.71 : prob > chi2 = 0.0574

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 29.78 : prob > chi2 = 0.0002

Table B12. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘An Easy Work Load’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p < 0.05)
Male	-	
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	+	
Aged 46 – 55	+	
Aged 56 – 65	+	
Married or living together	+	
With financially dependent child	+	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	-	
Level 2	-	*
Level 3	-	*
Level 4 or 5	-	*
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	+	
Over 25 years	-	
Working full time	+	
In a permanent job	-	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	-	*
Looking for a better job	+	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	+	
Between 3 and 5 years	+	
Between 6 and 10 years	+	
Over 10 years	+	
Double job holding	-	
Member of a union or staff association	+	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	+	
Not for profit sector	-	*
Occupation		
Manager	-	*
Professional	-	
Associate professional and technical	-	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	+	
Personal services	-	
Sales	+	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1626

Wald chi(2) = 113.66

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Pseudo R2 = 0.0318

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 0.71 : prob > chi2 = 0.8720

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 18.85 : prob > chi2 = 0.0008

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 5.21 : prob > chi2 = 0.2661

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 1.33 : prob > chi2 = 0.8559

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 4.04 : prob > chi2 = 0.1328

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 19.66 : prob > chi2 = 0.0177

Table B13. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘Good Physical Work Conditions’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at ($p < 0.05$)
Male	-	*
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	-	
Aged 46 – 55	-	
Aged 56 – 65	-	
Married or living together	-	
With financially dependent child	-	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	-	
Level 2	-	*
Level 3	-	*
Level 4 or 5	-	*
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	-	
Over 25 years	-	
Working full time	+	
In a permanent job	+	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+	*
Looking for a better job	+	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	-	*
Between 6 and 10 years	-	*
Over 10 years	-	
Double job holding	-	
Member of a union or staff association	+	*
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	+	
Not for profit sector	+	
Occupation		
Manager	-	*
Professional	-	
Associate professional and technical	-	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	-	
Personal services	-	
Sales	-	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634

Wald chi(2) = 84.88

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Pseudo R2 = 0.0243

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 2.37 : prob > chi2 = 0.4999

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 10.97 : prob > chi2 = 0.0269

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 2.39 : prob > chi2 = 0.6642

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 7.74 : prob > chi2 = 0.1017

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 0.19 : prob > chi2 = 0.9097

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 21.27 : prob > chi2 = 0.0065

Table B14. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘A Lot Of Variety In The Type Of Work’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at ($p < 0.05$)
Male	-	
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	+	
Aged 46 – 55	+	
Aged 56 – 65	+	
Married or living together	-	
With financially dependent child	+	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	+	
Level 2	-	
Level 3	-	
Level 4 or 5	-	
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	-	*
Over 25 years	-	*
Working full time	+	*
In a permanent job	-	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	+	
Looking for a better job	+	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	-	
Between 6 and 10 years	-	
Over 10 years	-	
Double job holding	+	
Member of a union or staff association	+	*
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	+	
Not for profit sector	-	
Occupation		
Manager	+	*
Professional	+	*
Associate professional and technical	+	
Administrative and secretarial	+	
Skilled trades	+	
Personal services	+	
Sales	+	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1633

Wald chi(2) = 100.94

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Pseudo R2 = 0.0241

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 5.09 : prob > chi2 = 0.1654

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 12.47 : prob > chi2 = 0.0142

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 8.65 : prob > chi2 = 0.0705

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 4.34 : prob > chi2 = 0.3601

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 3.71 : prob > chi2 = 0.1564

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 14.49 : prob > chi2 = 0.0700

Table B15. Ordered Probit Results: Job Attribute Preference: ‘Friendly People To Work With’

Variable	Sign of Coefficient	Statistically Significant at (p > 0.05)
Male	-	*
Age		
Aged 20 – 25, the reference category		
Aged 26 – 45	-	
Aged 46 – 55	-	
Aged 56 – 65	-	
Married or living together	-	*
With financially dependent child	-	
Highest Qualification		
No qualifications, the reference category		
Level 1	+	
Level 2	-	
Level 3	-	
Level 4 or 5	-	
Labour Market Experience		
Between 1 and 2 years, the reference category		
Between 3 and 6 years	-	
Between 7 and 15 years	-	
Between 16 and 25 years	-	
Over 25 years	-	
Working full time	-	
In a permanent job	-	
In a supervisory or managerial capacity	-	
Looking for a better job	+	
Tenure		
Less than 1 year, the reference category		
Between 1 and 2 years	-	
Between 3 and 5 years	-	
Between 6 and 10 years	-	
Over 10 years	-	
Double job holding	+	*
Member of a union or staff association	+	
Sector of Employment		
Private sector, the reference category		
Public sector	-	
Not for profit sector	-	
Occupation		
Manager	-	
Professional	+	
Associate professional and technical	+	
Administrative and secretarial	-	
Skilled trades	-	
Personal services	+	
Sales	+	
Operatives	-	
Elementary, the reference category		

Number of Observations: 1634

Wald chi(2) = 112.73

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Pseudo R2 = 0.0318

Test statistics for the joint significance of age variables:

Chi2 (3) = 2.46 : prob > chi2 = 0.4825

Test statistics for the joint significance of highest qualification variables:

Chi2 (4) = 7.37 : prob > chi2 = 0.1176

Test statistics for the joint significance of the labour market experience variables:

Chi2 (4) = 9.87 : prob > chi2 = 0.0426

Test statistics for the joint significance of the tenure variables:

Chi2 (4) = 4.72 : prob > chi2 = 0.3169

Test statistics for the joint significance of the sector variables:

Chi2 (2) = 3.25 : prob > chi2 = 0.1971

Test statistics for the joint significance of the occupation variables:

Chi2 (8) = 9.38 : prob > chi2 = 0.3110