



WORKING PAPER NO. 15

MAY 2008

Inside the Scottish Workplace: Employee

Perspectives from WERS 2004

Dr. John Sutherland

Centre for Public Policy for Regions
University of Glasgow
Ivy Lodge
63 Gibson Street
Glasgow G12 8LR
Email: j.sutherland@lbs.gla.ac.uk

Inside the Scottish Workplace: Employee Perspectives from WERS 2004

ABSTRACT

This paper examines some work related perspectives of those employed in workplaces located in Scotland, making use of matched employee-workplace data sets extracted from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey. Five sets of worker perspectives are examined viz. about their jobs; about the extent of the influence they have over their jobs; about the different types of satisfactions derived from their jobs; about their managers; and about workplace management-employee relations. Two issues are examined in particular. One is the manner in which differences in employee perspectives reported are associated with work related and non-work related characteristics of the individual employee and structural characteristics of the workplace at which he/she is employed. The other is the extent to which perspectives reported by those employed in workplaces located in Scotland differ from those employed in workplaces located elsewhere in Great Britain.

Individual characteristics such as age, earnings, educational qualifications, gender and, especially, training are seen to explain many of the differences in the perspectives examined. Evidence of perceived inequalities is observed, where these are attributable to colour, disability and type of employment contract. The perspectives held by those in employment in workplaces which are part of multi-plant organisations are seen to be negative with respect to both management and workplace management-employee relations. With the exception of two important outcomes relating to job security and satisfaction over the wage received, there is no significant difference between the perspectives of those employed at workplaces located in Scotland and individuals employed elsewhere in Great Britain.

Inside the Scottish Workplace: Employee Perspectives from WERS 2004 ¹

1. INTRODUCTION

There has been increasing interest on the part of economists in recent years in the analysis of subjective measures of individual well-being making use of data obtained from large scale surveys. In so doing, economists have been analysing what Freeman (1978) describes as “variables that measure ‘what people say’ rather than ‘what people do’” (p. 135). There are two reasons for this increasing interest. One is associated with Freeman himself: “.. the answers to questions about how people feel...convey useful information about economic life that should not be ignored” (p. 135). The other is associated with arguments which seek to question the legitimacy of conventional measures of economic performance and the fundamental rationale underpinning traditional economic policy objectives, such as growth. Bell and Blanchflower (2007) and Oswald (1997) offer complementary illustrations of this latter point. “Growth is ... a means to an end. It permits levels of consumption, which in turn leads to higher levels of well-being among the population” (Bell and Blanchflower p. 166/7): “The relevance of economic performance is that it is a means to an end”, where that end is the “enrichment of mankind’s feeling of well-being. Economic things matter only in as far as they make people happy” (Oswald, p. 1815).²

Economic analyses of subjective measures of well-being have been undertaken at two levels. At one level, empirical studies seek to examine ‘happiness’, the degree to which an individual judges the overall quality of his/her life to be favourable, and/or ‘life satisfactions’, which require a more balanced and reflective assessment of what constitutes the ‘good life’ (Helliwell, 2006). At the second level, empirical studies

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

² Layard (2005:2006) offers an extended exposition of one possible alternative policy agenda, which focuses upon ‘happiness’, although his agenda is not without its critics (Steele, 2006).

focus upon an individual's well-being at work, for example analysing the extent and determinants of 'job satisfaction' (e.g. Clark, 1996), an important if not necessarily comprehensive indicator of well-being at work.

The focus of this paper is the workplace, in particular individuals employed at workplaces located in Scotland. Although seeking to examine worker perspectives about job satisfaction, other, equally important, work related issues are also investigated and analysed, namely their perspectives about the jobs they do, and the manner in which these jobs generate feelings of anxiety/contentment; their perspectives about the nature and extent of their task discretion; their perspectives about their managers; and their perspectives about the nature of management-employee relations at the workplaces at which they are employed.

The paper uses two matched workplace-employee data sets which have their origin in the Cross Section of Managers Survey and the Survey of Employees associated with the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS 2004) (Kersley et al, 2006). The dependent variables in the multinomial logit and ordered logit models estimated are the responses to nine questions in the Survey of Employees (viz. A6, A7, A8, A9, B6, B8, B9, C2 and C3). The independent variables come from both the Cross Section of Managers Survey and the Survey of Employees. Of the two data sets constructed and analysed, one relates only to individuals employed in workplaces located in Scotland. The other relates to all respondents, irrespective of workplace location.

The paper has three aims. The first aim is to describe the distribution of responses to these nine questions for those employed at workplaces located in Scotland. For example, how many agree with the statement that 'my job requires that I work very hard'; how many are satisfied with the sense of achievement they get from their jobs; how many would describe management-employee relations where they work as 'good'. The second aim is to identify the determinants of these responses, for example seeking to examine the extent to which they may be explained by an individual's personal characteristics or the structural characteristics of the workplace at which he/she is employed. To address these two aims, the paper makes use of the Scotland subset of the full data set. The third aim of the paper is to examine the extent to which

responses to these nine questions made by individuals employed at workplaces in Scotland differ from those made by individuals in workplaces located elsewhere in Great Britain. In their investigation of happiness and life satisfaction, Bell and Blanchflower (2007) conclude that “the Scots are less happy and less satisfied with life than is the case for the British population as a whole” (p. 189). May the same be said about their perspectives of work related issues? To address this third aim, the full data set is used.

The structure of the paper is as follows. The next section reviews some literature of relevance to provide a context to the study. Section Three describes the data sets analysed. Section Four outlines the models used to examine the two data sets and the estimation strategy adopted. Section Five describes the results. Section Six highlights and discusses the principal issues which emanate from these results. Section Seven concludes.

2. CONTEXT

Although economists have made major contributions to the study of topics such as life happiness, well-being and job satisfaction since the late 1990s, many remain reluctant to make use of the wealth of statistical data which exists on these topics (and which are used extensively by researchers from other disciplines) (Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004). Conventional economic theory adopts an objectivist perspective, based on observable choices made by individuals. According to this perspective, individual utility depends upon tangible goods and services and leisure, and is inferred from either observed behaviour or revealed preferences. By contrast, a subjectivist perspective of an individual’s utility recognises that everyone has their own ideas about what constitutes happiness or satisfaction, and maintains that observed behaviour is an inadequate measure of both. Further, the subjectivist perspective assumes that measures of well-being are both cardinally measurable and interpersonally comparable, claims unacceptable to most economists (Frey and Stutzer, 2000; 2002). Therefore, available survey data are regarded with suspicion by economists on grounds of their consistency, reliability and validity (Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004).

The early, seminal work on life happiness is that of Easterlin (1974) who studied time series statistics on reported levels of happiness in the USA. Since then, research on this issue has been of three types. The first type is time series studies, comparable to that of Easterlin. These studies have two objectives. One is to identify trends over time. For example, according to Blanchflower and Oswald (2004), reported happiness has been dropping over time in the USA, despite increases in GDP. The other objective has been to integrate happiness-type variables into macroeconomic models. Di Tella et al (2003) do this and demonstrate that movements in macroeconomic variables have “marked and statistically robust” (p. 809) effects on people’s feelings of well-being. Hence, they argue, recessions are costly to society, more in accordance with Keynesian theory rather than real-business-cycle theory. The second type is cross country comparisons, where such are possible by making use of a common data set. The Bell and Blanchflower (2007) paper is one example of this type. The Blanchflower and Oswald (2004) paper another. The third type is micro-econometric in its methodology, seeking to establish relationships between happiness-type variables and other variables such as employment status or individual personal characteristics. For example, Clark and Oswald (1995) examine the relationship between unhappiness and unemployment, and find that the unemployed show relatively higher levels of mental distress, from which they proceed to argue that unemployment is more likely to be involuntary than voluntary.³ Di Tella et al find “strong microeconomic patterns” (p. 809) in their results, indicative of associations between life satisfaction and variables such as age and income. Blanchflower and Oswald (2007) pursue the relationship between life satisfaction type variables and age further, by investigating whether well-being is U-shaped over the life cycle.^{4 5}

Investigations into job satisfaction follow a similar three type pattern.⁶ The Green and Tsitsianis study (2005) combines types one and two by seeking to compare, contrast and explain national trends in job satisfaction in Britain and Germany. Modest, yet

³ Winkelmann and Winkelmann (1998) undertake equivalent research with very similar findings making use of German panel data.

⁴ Clark and Oswald (2007) pose the same question in another way, examining the ‘curved relationship between subjective well-being and age.’

⁵ Research of these three types is well surveyed in Blanchflower (2008).

⁶ As will be discussed later, job satisfaction may be considered only one aspect within a broader concept of worker well-being. Consequently, in addition to the studies cited in this paragraph, there have been several important studies which seek to investigate measures of well-being at work (e.g. Wood, 2008).

significant falls in job satisfaction are reported for both countries. Although the decline in job satisfaction in the latter country “remains a puzzle” (p. 423), in Britain it is attributed to work effort intensification (Green, 2001: 2004) and declining task discretion (Gallie et al, 2004). The papers by Clark (1996) and Gazioglu and Tansel (2006) exemplify the application of micro-econometric methodology, using ordered logit models to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and variables such as age, education levels, gender, income and union status. Both papers produce similar results e.g. “job satisfaction is higher for women, older workers and those with lower levels of education” (Clark, 1996, p. 207). In a subsequent paper, Clark (1997) pursues the gender issue further, examining why women are so happy at work. Bryson et al (2004) seek to examine a paradox in the findings of both Gazioglu and Tansel and Clark, namely that union membership and job satisfaction, counter intuitively, are negatively correlated.

This paper adopts the micro-econometric methodology of, *inter alia*, Clark (1996) and Gazioglu and Tansel (2006). However, there are two important differences associated with this paper.

The first is that job satisfaction – or rather several aspects of this – is only one part of a wider array of employee perspectives of the workplace which are examined. Additionally, the paper investigates and analyses four other sets of perspectives. The first of these is associated with the nature of the job undertaken, the demands it puts upon the individual and the feelings it generates, such as anxiety or contentment. In so doing, the paper addresses, if only in part, the issue of worker well-being from the perspective of the psychologist (Karasek, 1979: Warr, 1990).⁷ Secondly, it examines the nature and extent of the influence individuals have over the job they do, their task discretion (Gallie et al, 2004: Green, 2008). ‘Worker autonomy’ is central to Sociology’s class analysis of work.⁸ The early seminal work is that of Braverman (1974) who argues, *inter alia*, that the implementation of Taylorist-type management practices brought about a deterioration in the quality of working life, engendering an

⁷ For example, Warr (1990) identifies three axes for measuring worker well-being viz. from feeling good to bad, measured via indicators of job satisfaction; anxiety to contentment; and depression to enthusiasm.

⁸ It is also integral to Psychology’s demand-control model of job satisfaction and stress. Furthermore, it may also be seen as a feature of the principal-agent problem in Economics and, therefore, central to efficiency wage models in Labour Economics (Green, 2008).

‘alienation’ (e.g. Blauner, 1964) less than conducive to personal self development. Accordingly, job redesign, job enrichment etc., and processes such as employee participation in task related decision-making to facilitate their introduction, came to assume a prominence in the human resource management policy literature. Initially, this was in the context of what constitutes ‘good’ industrial relations (Purcell, 1981). More recently, it is in the context of what constitutes ‘high commitment management’ (Walton, 1985).⁹ However, what constitutes ‘good’ employee relations (or industrial relations) – and the institutions and processes necessary and sufficient to generate such outcomes – is problematical, and depends upon the perspective adopted (Blyton and Turnbull, 2004; Burchill, 2008). According to the ‘unitary’ perspective, good communication is central to the management process (ACAS, 1995), as is the trust workers repose in management. Accordingly, worker perspectives of both the nature of management communications and management itself are examined in this paper. By contrast, the ‘pluralist’ perspective of employee relations emphasises the salience of procedures and processes by which employees and/or their representatives are consulted with/are involved/participate in decision-making.¹⁰ Accordingly – and finally – this paper also examines individual worker perspectives of the manner of his/her input into decision-making (or that of their representatives) and the quality of management-employee relations at the workplace.

The second difference associated with this paper is the nature of the models estimated. Attempts are made to control for what may be described as corporate governance type variables, within a vector of variables denoting the structural characteristics of the workplace, and, in a further vector of variables, variables identifying whether some human resource management policies and practices are in operation at the workplace.

Corporate governance addresses issues such as who owns and controls the firm; in whose interests the firm is governed; and the various direct and indirect ways in which control is exercised. *A priori*, it is to be expected that these will impact upon employee perspectives of issues such as their well-being at work, their managers and

⁹ The extent to which such policies and practices have an existence beyond the rhetoric is problematical (Argis, 1998). Delbridge and Whitfield (2001) find evidence of increasing influence on the part of some employees with meaningful employee involvement in decision making. Gallie et al (2004) report a decline in task discretion over time.

¹⁰ Butler and Glover (2007) describe this as ‘employee participation and involvement’ and detail the manifold ways by which this strategy may be implemented within the workplace.

workplace employee relations (Gospel and Pendelton, 2003; Pendelton and Deakin, 2007). For example, it may be hypothesised that there will be response differences attributable to whether an individual is employed at a public sector workplace (as opposed to a workplace which is privately owned); or to whether an individual is employed at a workplace which is part of a multi-plant organisation (as opposed to a single plant firm).

Some of the previous studies of job satisfaction cited above find response differences attributable to variables such as ethnicity and gender, differences in several ways comparable to other studies which evidence unequal treatment at the workplace (e.g. Noon and Hoque, 2001). However, policies towards equality, diversity and the work-life balance have been important features of the post 1998 New Labour administrations. Often legislation has required organisations/workplaces to modify their human resource management practices to take cognisance of policies such as these (Walsh, 2007). One may hypothesise, therefore, that some response differences hitherto attributable to ethnic grouping or gender may disappear when the workplace presence of these policies is controlled for. Further in this context of human resource management policies and practices, it is necessary to be mindful of a literature (e.g. Bryson et al, 2005; Godard, 2004; Guest et al, 2003; Wood et al, 2006) on the putative efficacious relationship between high commitment management policies and practices and individual employee well-being. The intent of the paper is not to participate in this controversy. Rather the explicit assumption in the models constructed and estimated is that human resource management policies and practices matter. Consequently, it is necessary to control for these by incorporating into the models a series of dummy variables identifying whether some pertinent policies are present at the workplace.

3. DATA

This paper makes use of two matched employee-workplace data sets which have their origin in two elements of the Cross Section 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS 2004) (Kersley et al, 2006). The initial unit of analysis in this survey is workplaces, defined as “the activities of a single employer at a single set of premises” employing at least five workers (Kersley et al, 2006, p. 3). The population of workplaces sampled is drawn randomly from the International Departmental Business Register maintained by the Office for National Statistics and constituted 700,000 workplaces (33 percent of the GB total) and 22.5 million employees (89 percent of the GB total). The sample selected is stratified by workplace size and industry, with workplaces being randomly selected from within size bands and industries.¹¹

The first element of WERS 2004 used is the ‘Cross Section Survey of Managers’, the questionnaire responses of the senior manager at the workplace responsible for employment relations on a day-to-day basis. In the original survey this generated 2,295 observations, 223 of which are associated with the Scotland subset of the data. At each of the workplaces which participated in the survey of managers, self completion questionnaires were distributed to a random selection of up to 25 employees. This ‘Survey of Employees’ constitutes the second element of WERS 2004 used. In the original survey this generated 22,451 observations, 2,295 of which are associated with the Scotland subset of the data.

¹¹ Although this paper makes use of the regional identifier (viz. the standard statistical region) in the original data set to produce a Scottish subset of the data, WERS2004 was not representative of geographical areas within Great Britain.

4. MODELS AND ESTIMATION STRATEGY

In the two models estimated, the dependent variables are responses to selected questions from the survey of employees. For purposes of this paper, the dependent variables are categorised as follows: (i) perspectives about the job; (ii) perspectives about the influence over the job; (iii) perspectives about the satisfaction derived from the job; (iv) perspectives about managers at the workplace; and (v) perspectives about management-employee relations at the workplace.

The responses to the questions/statements from the survey of employees which constitute the dependent variables are multiple, nominal and, sometimes, ordered. The majority are of the form where five options are offered by way of response to a question/statement, (excluding the ‘don’t know’ option, responses to which are treated as ‘missing’, to ensure that only definite responses to the questions/statements are analysed). Two possible responses are positive viz. ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’; two further possible responses are negative viz. ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’; and there is a fifth possible response viz. ‘neither agree nor disagree’. For purposes of the estimations, the two positive responses are merged and the two negative responses are merged, thereby eliminating the qualifying adverb in both instances.

A multinomial logit model of the following generic form is used to examine responses of this type:

$$\ln \Omega_{m|b}(\mathbf{y}_{iw}) = \mathbf{X}_{iw} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{m|b} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$$

where \mathbf{y}_{iw} denotes the response of an individual within a workplace; m is the number of responses (i.e. 3); b is the base response category (or comparison group), in this instance those who elected to respond ‘neither agree nor disagree’; \mathbf{X} is a vector of independent variables; $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ a set of coefficients to be estimated; and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$ is an error term.

The remainder of the responses to the questions/statements examined are ordered, for example of the form: “Thinking of the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel each of the following”, where five possible response options are

offered viz. ‘never’; ‘occasionally’; ‘some of the time’; ‘most of the time’; and ‘all of the time’. Again, those responding ‘don’t know’ are treated as ‘missing’ for the reason noted above.

To examine responses of this type, an ordered logit model of the following generic type is used:

$$y^*_{iwm} = X_{iwm}\beta + \varepsilon_i$$

such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} y_{iw} = 1 \text{ (i.e. 'never')} & \text{if } \tau_0 = -\infty \leq y^*_i < \tau_1 \\ y_{iw} = 2 \text{ (i.e. 'occasionally')} & \text{if } \tau_1 \leq y^*_i < \tau_2 \\ y_{iw} = 3 \text{ (i.e. 'some of the time')} & \text{if } \tau_2 \leq y^*_i < \tau_3 \\ y_{iw} = 4 \text{ (i.e. 'most of the time')} & \text{if } \tau_3 \leq y^*_i < \tau_4 \\ y_{iw} = 5 \text{ (i.e. 'all of the time')} & \text{if } \tau_4 \leq y^*_i < \tau_5 = \infty \end{array}$$

where τ is some threshold point where, when crossed by the latent variable y^* , the observed category changes; and X_{iwm} , β and ε_i are as described above. (cf. Baum, 2006; Long and Freese, 2006; Verbeek, 2004).

The detail of each dependent variable is to be found in the questions identified in Tables 2a through to 6e. These tables also provide the percentage distribution by response for two subsets of the full Great Britain (GB) data set viz. Scotland and the Rest of Britain; the Pearson chi-squared statistic for association between these two subsets; and the output for the ‘Rest of Great Britain’ dummy variable, obtained from the multinomial/ordered logit estimations, as appropriate, when the full GB data set is examined.

The independent variables in the two models estimated are responses to some further questions from the survey of employees together with responses to selected questions from the survey of managers. Full details of the independent variables are to be found

in Table 1, which also reports means (and standard deviations) or proportions for the two samples examined, after deletion of cases from the original WERS 2004 sample with missing information on variables relevant to the estimations.¹²

The vector of independent variables contains three distinct types of variables viz. individual personal characteristics unrelated to and related to the workplace (such as age and tenure, respectively, where the information comes from the survey of employees); structural characteristics of the workplace (such as size and corporate status, where the information comes from the survey of managers); and selected human resource management policies in operation at the workplace (such as whether the workplace is IIP credited, whether it has a grievance policy, whether it has an equal opportunities policy, where the information comes from the survey of managers).^{13 14 15}

¹² Ultimately, less than half of the original number of observations remain in the two data sets examined. The loss of observations is attributable principally to two factors. First, the decision to classify all 'don't know' responses as missing. Secondly, the attempt to integrate corporate governance type variables and human resource management policy variables into the model. Both prove to constitute potential sources of missing information for many observations. Inspection (if not detailed analysis) of the means/proportions of the some of the variables suggests little difference between the minority who remain in the data set and the majority who are eliminated.

¹³ The 'colour' variable in the context of individual personal characteristics is a somewhat unsatisfactory expedient. In the original survey of employees, question E16 invites respondents to identify the 'group' to which they belong. These include 'White' groups, such as 'White British', 'White Irish' and 'White', but from any other background, as well as several 'Mixed' groups, 'Asian or Asian British' groups 'Black or Black British' groups etc.. In terms of numbers, the 'white' groups dominate, whereas all the remaining 'non-white' groups total to a small minority, thereby precluding a more meaningful categorisation by race/ethnicity.

¹⁴ The need to control for some of these three distinct types of variables is immediately apparent from a cursory study of some of the means/proportions reported in Table 1. Although there are few differences in terms of most of the individual personal characteristics, in the Scotland subset of the data the individual is more likely to be a member of a union/staff association, whereas in the full GB data set the individual is more likely to have never been a member of a union/staff association. More differences are to be observed in the context of the structural characteristics of the workplace. In the Scotland subset of the data, the individual is more likely to be employed at a workplace which is within the public sector; a workplace which is one of several within a multi establishment organisation; a workplace within which more than 60 percent of the workforce have their wages determined by union negotiation. By contrast, in the full GB data set the individual is more likely to be employed within a private sector workplace; which is a single establishment of a domestically or foreign owned organisations. That the incidence of the human resource management policies and practices incorporated into the model would appear to be relatively higher in Scotland may be a reflection of these differences in the structural characteristics of the workplace.

¹⁵ Both models, therefore, make some heroic assumptions about exogeneity. In this respect, the models are similar to those found in most of the papers cited above. Indeed, only Bryson et al (2004) consider the likelihood of endogeneity, the very essence of their paper on the relationship between job satisfaction and union membership being to "account for endogenous selection induced by sorting workers into unionised jobs controlling for both individual as well as establishment characteristics" (p. 440).

Throughout, Wald tests are used to examine the joint significance of these three distinct sets of variables. These results are reported in Tables 2a through to 6e. Marginal effects of the β coefficients for the both the multinomial and ordered logit models are calculated and reported selectively in the same set of tables.¹⁶ Their interpretation in the context of the former requires taking cognisance of the base outcome response category and the reference group for the variable in question. Their interpretation in the context of the latter requires taking cognisance of the reference group for the variable in question.

To compare and contrast the results of responses of those employed at workplaces located within Scotland with those employed elsewhere in Great Britain, all estimations are repeated making use of the full data set and creating a ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) dummy variable with ‘Scotland’ as the reference category. As noted above, the calculated marginal effects of this variable are reported throughout as integral elements of the accompanying sets of tables.

5. RESULTS

The sequence in which the description of the results proceeds accords with the manner in which the five themes have been introduced above viz. (i) perspectives about the job; (ii) perspectives about the influence over the job; (iii) perspectives about the satisfaction derived from the job; (iv) perspectives about managers at the workplace; and (v) perspectives about workplace management-employee relations. Each theme constitutes a subsection of this section of the paper. The material in each sub section is complemented by a series of statistical tables, which are identified as appropriate.

For each subsection, first the percentage distribution of responses are reported for the Scotland subset of the data. Then the results of the Wald tests examining the joint significance of the three distinct sets of variables are given. Following this, the impact of salient independent variables is examined and results reported. This is done by focussing primarily on the set of variables associated with individual personal characteristics, as identified in Table 1. However, the impact of variables reflecting

¹⁶ Throughout, marginal effects are calculated at the mean for continuous variables and for a discrete change from 0 to 1 for dummy variables.

two important yet different structural characteristics of the workplace identifying the possible impact of corporate governance are also investigated. The first denotes whether the workplace is one of a number of different workplaces within the UK belonging to the same organisation (i.e. multi-plant) and whether the workplace is the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation (i.e. a single plant but owned by a multinational enterprise (MNE)). The second denotes the corporate status of the workplace i.e. whether it is a public sector type of workplace or whether it is some other type of workplace, such as a charity. (Again, see Table 1 for the detail.) Throughout, more attention is given to those results where the variables are statistically significant at ($p < 0.1$). Finally, when the 'Rest of Great Britain' dummy variable is statistically significant in the estimation of full GB data set, the detail is reported.

1. Perspectives about the job (Tables 2a – 2j)

An individual's perspective about his/her job is examined making use of two questions posed in the survey of employees viz. questions A6 and A9. The first question asks: "Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your job?", where the statements in question are as follows: "My job requires that I work very hard"; "I never seem to have enough time to get my work done"; "I feel my job is secure in this workplace"; "I worry a lot about my work outside working hours". (See Tables 2a through to 2d for full details.) Five possible (positive) responses are offered: 'strongly agree', 'agree'; 'neither agree nor disagree'; 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree'. For purposes of analysis, the 'strongly agree' and 'agree' responses are merged; similarly, the 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' responses are merged; and the 'neither agree nor disagree' responses are treated as the base outcome category. The (negative) 'don't know' responses are treated as 'missing'. The second question makes use of Warr's (1990) scale of anxiety-contentment, a psychology-based measure of well-being (and a novel addition to the survey of employees questionnaire in 2004). This question invites the respondent to think of the past few weeks, and consider how the job has produced feelings such as: "Tense"; "Calm"; "Relaxed"; "Worried"; "Uneasy"; and "Content" (See Tables 2e through to 2j for the detail.) Here, the possible (positive) responses are: 'never'; 'occasionally'; 'some of the time'; 'most of the time'; and 'all of the time'. Again, the (negative) 'don't know' responses are treated as 'missing' for purposes of the analysis.

Although three in every four employed in workplaces located in Scotland believe that their jobs require them to work very hard (Table 2a), nevertheless, two in every three feel that their job is secure (Table 2c). Almost half claim that they never seem to have enough time to get their work done (Table 2b). Nonetheless, about the same proportion of the workforce do not worry about their job outside working hours (Table 2d). In the context of identifying positive feelings about their job in the weeks prior to the survey, 25.37 percent of those working in workplaces located in Scotland felt relaxed most/all of the time (Table 2g); 30.87 percent felt calm most/all of the time (Table 2f); and 35.70 percent felt content most/all of the time (Table 2j). Conversely, this time thinking about more negative feelings during the same period, only 7.64 percent felt uneasy most/all of the time (Table 2i); only 10.73 percent felt worried most/all of the time (Table 2h); although 18.56 percent felt tense most/all of the time (Table 2e).

For all 10 estimations related to the questions in this section, the set of variables associated with the personal characteristics of the employee are jointly significant (at $p < 0.05$). However, the set of variables associated with the structural characteristics of the workplace are jointly significant (again at $p < 0.05$) in estimations associated with only three questions viz. ‘my work requires that I work very hard’; ‘I never seem to have enough time to get my work done’; and ‘I feel my job is secure at this workplace’ (Tables 2a, 2b and 2c, respectively); and the set of variables associated with the human resource management policies and practices in operation at the workplace are jointly significant in only one estimation viz. ‘I feel my job is secure at this workplace’ (Table 2c).

The impact of specific variables on response outcomes varies across the estimations associated with both sets of questions, depending upon the issue raised. This may be seen when the marginal effects calculated from the estimations are examined. Selected marginal effects are reported in Tables 2a – 2j.

Disability impacts across the majority of the questions, perhaps not unexpectedly, and all of those which question feelings. Most frequently, the impact of this variable is to reflect the relative disadvantage of those in this category. For example, those with a disability of the sorts identified are 8 percent less likely than those without disability

to agree with the statement that their job is secure (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing) (Table 2c). They are 8 percent more likely to report that they feel tense at work most of the time (Table 2e); and they are 7 percent less likely to report that they feel calm at work most of the time, in both instances relative to those with no disability.

Possessing no academic qualifications, relative to those with some qualification of this sort, is of some consequence. Although the nature of the impact of this variable belies the stereotypical perspective of the work situation of those of this type, its effect accords with previous studies noted above. For example, those without academic qualifications are 10 percent more likely to agree with the statement that they feel that their job is secure (relative to those possessing some sort of academic qualification, the reference category, and to the base outcome category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing) (Table 2c). In the context of feeling relaxed and content, they are 9 and 10 percent, respectively, more likely to report feeling this way most of the time than those who have some academic qualifications (Tables 2g and 2i). The outcomes tend to be very similar in the few instances where the impact of possessing no vocational/professional qualifications relative to having some qualification of this nature is of some consequence. For example, those without vocational/professional qualifications are 10 percent more likely to disagree with the statement that they worry a lot about their work outside working hours (relative both to the reference category of possessing this type of qualification and to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the statement). They are more likely to report never and only occasionally feeling tense at work (again relative to the reference category of possessing vocational/professional qualifications (Table 2e).

Tenure has an effect on only two issues viz. time to get work done and job security, and its impact is limited to those with the longest tenure spell. Relative to the tenure reference category (of being employed at the workplace for between two and five years), those who have been employed at the workplace for 10 years or more are 7 percent more likely to agree with the statement that they never have enough time to get work done (Table 2b); and are 7 percent more likely to agree with the statement that they feel their job to be secure (Table 2c) (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing to the two statements in question).

In the context of the variables pertaining to type of employment contract held (where the reference category is the worker on a permanent contract), the most significant – if not the most unexpected – result relates to job security. Those on temporary and fixed period contracts are 50 percent and 38 percent, respectively, less likely to agree with the statement that they feel their jobs to be secure (relative to the aforementioned reference category and relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the statement) (Table 2c).

Perhaps the most notable impact of the age variable is the manner in which this is almost limited to those in the oldest age category of being 60 years or over. For example, those in this age category (relative to the reference age category of being 40 – 49 years of age) are 24 percent less likely to agree with the statement that they worry a lot about work outside working hours (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with this statement) (Table 2d). Furthermore, for those in the oldest age category (again relative to the aforementioned reference age category) age brings with it both reductions in the propensity to feel tense (Table 2e), to worry (Table 2h) and to feel uneasy (Table 2i); and increases in the propensity to feel calm (Table 2f), relaxed (Table 2g) and content (Table 2j).

An individual's earnings frequently impact on response outcomes, with the manner of the impact varying between those earning in excess of £15 per hour and those earning less than £5 per hour (relative to the reference category of earning between £5 and £15 per hour). Relative to those in the reference earnings category, those earning the relatively higher rate are more likely to disagree with statements relating to never having enough time to get the work done (Table 2b); and worrying a lot about work outside working hours (Table 2d) (in both instances, relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the statements in question). In contrast, those earning less than £5 per hour are less likely to agree with the statement about never having enough time to get work done (again relative both to the reference earnings category and base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing) (Table 2b). Comparable differences are to be seen in the context of feeling tense (Table 2e), worried (Table 2h) and uneasy (Table 2i). In the context of these three negative feelings, whereas those in the relatively higher earnings category (relative to the reference earnings category) are less likely to experience these feelings never or only

occasionally, those in the relatively lower earnings category (again relative to the reference earnings category) are less likely to experience these feelings some of the time/most of the time/all of the time.

Variables relating to an individual's current or previous union/staff association membership are of little consequence in this context, with one exception. Individuals who are not members of a union/staff association now but have been members in the past (relative to the reference category of never having been members at any time) are 5 percent less likely to agree with the statement about having to work very hard (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing with this statement) (Table 2a).

The impact of training on the responses given to an individual's perspective of his/her job is examined by means of a series of five dummy variables, reflecting differing amounts of training received relative to a reference category of where the individual received no training during the past 12 months. The impact of having received training is not unambiguously positive, from the perspective of the individual. Individuals who have received 10 days or more training (relative to the reference training category of having received no training) are 15 percent more likely to agree with the statement that they feel their jobs to be secure (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with this statement) (Table 2c). Further, the same category of individuals (relative to the same reference category) are 11 percent more likely to feel content some of the time (Table 2j). On the other hand, they are 7 percent more likely to agree with the statement that their job requires them to work very hard (relative to the reference training category of having received no training and the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the statement) (Table 2a). Moreover, those who have received between 5 and 10 days of training (relative to those who have received no training) are 18 percent more likely to agree with the statement that they never seem to have enough time to do the work (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with this statement) (Table 2b). Those in this same training category (relative to those who have received no training) are 6 percent and 3 percent more likely to feel worried some of the time and more of the time, respectively (Table 2h).

Variables reflecting gender, 'colour' and marital status are of no consequence in this context of the individual's perspective of the job and the feelings of anxiety/contentment it generates.

The impact of variables reflecting the structural characteristics of the workplace at which the individual is employed on an individual's perception about his/her job is notable in a number of instances, although rarely in the context of the set of questions which relate to an individual's feelings of anxiety/contentment.

The perspectives of individuals employed at workplaces which are part of multi-plant organisations are sometimes positive, sometimes negative, relative that is to those in the reference category of being employed at a workplace which is a single independent establishment. Relative to the specified reference category, those employed at multi-plant workplaces are 9 percent more likely to disagree with the statement about worrying a lot about the job outside working hours (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with this statement) (Table 2c). And they are 7 percent less likely to feel content most of the time (relative to the reference category of being employed in a single independent establishment) (Table 2j).

In contrast, the perspectives of those employed at workplaces which are the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation are predominantly negative, relative that is to the same reference category of being employed at a workplace which is a single independent establishment. For example, individuals employed in these workplaces are 25 percent more likely to agree with the statement about their job requiring them to work very hard (Table 2a); they are 58 percent less likely to agree with the statement that they feel their job to be secure (Table 2c); and they are 20 percent more likely to agree with the statement about worrying a lot about the job outside working hours (Table 2d) (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the statement throughout).

Equivalent similarities and dissimilarities are also to be found in the context of the second set of structural characteristics associated with the workplace which focuses upon corporate status. Individuals employed in public sector workplaces, relative to

those in the reference category of being employed in a private sector workplace, are 4 percent more likely to disagree with the statement about their job requiring them to work very hard (Table 2a); 12 percent less likely to agree with the statement about never having enough time to do the work (Table 2b); and 7 percent less likely to agree with the statement about worrying a lot about the job outside working hours (Table 2d) (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the statement in each instance). Those who work in other types of workplaces (such as charities, for example), again relative to the reference category of those employed in private sector type workplaces, are 22 percent less likely to feel that their job is secure (Table 2c); and 3 percent more likely to worry about the job outside working hours (Table 2d) (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the two statements in question).

In the estimations using the full GB data set to examine the extent to which there are differences in perceptions about the job done between those employed in workplaces located in Scotland and those employed at workplaces located elsewhere, four results are statistically significant. Those employed elsewhere, relative to those employed at workplaces located in Scotland, the reference category, are 2 percent less likely to agree with the statement about job security and 1 percent less likely to disagree with the statement about worrying about the job outside of working hours (in both instances relative to the appropriate base outcome category). In the context of the question relating to the anxiety-contentment scale, those employed elsewhere in GB, again relative to those employed in workplaces located in the Scotland, are 1 percent less likely to report feeling tense occasionally and 1 percent more likely to report feeling worried. However, these latter statistically significant results may be seen as quantitatively insignificant.

II. Perspectives about the influence over the job (Tables 3a - 3e)

In the 2004 WERS survey of employees, the number of facets of a job used to determine how much influence employees have over their jobs was increased to five. It is examined in one question viz. A7. The question asked: “How much influence do you have” over (i) “what tasks you do in your job?”; (ii) “The pace at which you work?”; (iii) “How you do your work?”; (iv) “The order in which you carry out tasks?”; and (v) “The time you start or finish your working day?”. In each instance,

four responses were possible viz. ‘None’; ‘A little’; ‘Some’; and ‘A lot’. (See Tables 3a to 3e for details.) (‘Don’t know’ responses were treated as ‘missing’ observations.)

Approximately three in every four individuals working in Scottish based workplaces have at least some influence over what tasks they do (Table 3a); the pace at which they work (Table 3b); how the work is done (Table 3c); and the order in which it is done (Table 3d). However, one in three have no control over the time at which work starts and finishes (Table 3e).

For each of the five estimations related to the questions in this section, the set of variables associated with the personal characteristics of the employee are jointly significant (at $p < 0.01$). The set of variables associated with the structural characteristics of the workplace are similarly jointly significant (at $p < 0.05$) in four out of the five occasions (Tables 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3e), the exception being the estimation associated with the order in which tasks are done (Table 3d). The set of variables associated with the human resource management policies and practices in operation at the workplace are jointly significant (at $p < 0.05$) for estimations relating to two questions in this context viz. how the work is done (Table 3c) and the order in which the tasks are done (Table 3d).

Again, the impact of specific variables on the response outcomes varies across the estimations associated with the questions, depending upon the facet of influence examined. This is manifest in the context of the reported marginal effects, details of which are to be found in Tables 3a – 3e.

In the context of the issues raised in this sub section, gender is of consequence on two occasions. Females are 5 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over both the pace at which work is done (Table 3b) and how the work is done (Table 3c), relative to males, the reference category.

Academic qualifications are of consequence only in the context of how the job is done, where those without academic qualifications (relative to the reference category of those who possess qualifications of this sort) are, perhaps somewhat surprisingly, 7 percent more likely to have a lot of influence (Table 3c). Vocational/professional

qualifications are of consequence in the context of both the tasks done and the pace of work. In results which are more compatible with expectations, those without vocational/professional qualifications are 4 percent less likely to have a lot of influence over the tasks to be done (Table 3a); and 5 percent less likely to have a lot of influence over how the work is done (Table 3c) (where both results are relative to those who do possess qualifications of this sort, the reference category).

Tenure is of some consequence, but only for those who have been at the workplace for long periods of time. Those who have been at the workplace for between 5 and 10 years are 7 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over how the work is done (Table 3c); and those who have been at the workplace for longer than 10 years are 8 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over the order in which tasks are undertaken (Table 3d) (results in both instances relative to those who have been employed at the workplace for between 2 – 5 years, the reference category).

Those on temporary contracts (relative to the reference category of those on permanent contracts) are 14 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over matters pertaining to the order in which work is done (Table 3d). Otherwise, the type of contract held is of no consequence.

A priori, the expectation is that age would be somewhat like tenure, with task discretion increasing with years. This does not prove to be the case. Age, in general, has only a limited statistical impact on the five facets of job influence. In the context of the pace at which the work is done, those aged 30 – 39 and those aged 60 and over are 7 percent and 16 percent, respectively, more likely to have a lot of influence, relative to those aged 40 – 49, the reference age category (Table 3b). In the context of how the work is done, somewhat surprisingly, those aged 16 – 21 are 14 percent more likely to have a lot of influence (Table 3c), again relative to the same reference group as before.

The *a priori* expectation is that earnings and influence are positively related, with those on relatively higher earnings tending to have more influence over job related matters and *vice versa*. This proves to be the case in four instances out of the five for those on relatively higher earnings. Relative to the reference category of earning

between £5.01 and £14.99 per hour throughout, those earning above £15 per hour are 17 percent, 18 percent, 14 percent, and 13 percent, respectively, more likely to have a lot of influence over the tasks done (Table 3a); how the job is done (Table 3c); the order in which the work is done; and the time at which work starts and finishes (Table 3e). By way of contrast, there is no similarly statistically significant result for those in the lowest earnings category (i.e. those earning less than £5 per hour), although, generally, the signs on the respective coefficients of this variable are negative, in accordance with expectations.

Training is of consequence throughout, if not uniformly so. In the context of tasks done (Table 3a), those who have received between 2 – 5 days training are 12 percent more likely to have a lot of influence, whereas those who have received 5 – 10 days training are only 9 percent more likely to have a lot of influence. (Both results relative to those who have received no training, the reference category in these cases, and subsequently.) In the context of the pace at which work is done (Table 3b), those who have received between 5 – 10 days training are 11 percent more likely to have a lot of influence. In the context of how the job is done (Table 3c), those who have received between 2 – 5 days training are 9 percent more likely to have a lot of influence. In the context of the order in which tasks associated with the job are done (Table 3d), those who have received 2 – 5 days training are 8 percent more likely to have a lot of influence. Were matters of statistical significance to be ignored, increased discretion over all five facets of job influence tends to be given not to those who have received training, relative to those who have not received training, but only to those who have received between 2 – 5 days or more of training.

In the context of influence over the job, disability and colour are of no consequence. Marital status and union status are of limited consequence, if surprisingly so for the latter.

Again, the impact of selected variables reflecting the structural characteristics of the workplace at which the individual is employed is not without consequence, although in this context of influence on facets of the job, this is more especially so for the corporate status variables.

Whereas individuals employed at multi-plant workplaces are 8 percent less likely to have a lot of influence over matters pertaining to the nature of the tasks done, those employed at the sole UK establishment of a foreign owned firm are 21 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over this (Table 3a), both results relative to the reference category of individuals employed at single, independent establishments. Those employed at the sole UK establishment of a foreign owned form are also 14 percent less likely to have a lot of influence over their start/finish times (Table 3e), again relative to the same reference category.

Employment at a public sector type workplace is of consequence in four instances, start/finish times being the exception. Relative to those employed in private sector type workplaces, the reference category, those employed within public sector workplaces are 18 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over the tasks done (Table 3a); 13 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over the pace at which the work is done (Table 3b); 15 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over how the job is done (Table 3c); and 13 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over the order in which tasks associated with the work are sequenced (Table 3d).

Employment at an other type of workplace is also of consequence in four instances. Here, the exception is influence over the task done. Again, the evidence suggests more discretion being accorded to individuals employed in these workplaces relative to those employed within private sector type workplaces, the reference category. Relative to those employed in this reference category, those employed in other types of workplaces are 17 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over the nature of the tasks done (Table 3a); 11 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over the pace at which the work is done (Table 3b); 12 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over how the job is done (Table 3c); and 13 percent more likely to have a lot of influence over the times at which they start and finish their work (Table 3e).

In the estimations using the full GB data set to examine the extent to which there are differences in perceptions relating to the extent of the influence over the job done between those employed in workplaces located in Scotland and those employed at workplaces located elsewhere, only in the context of having some influence over start and finish times is there a statistically significant outcome. Those employed at

workplaces located elsewhere in GB, relative to those employed at workplaces located in Scotland are 2 percent more likely to have a lot more control over this matter.

III. Perspectives about the satisfaction derived from the job (Tables 4a - 4g)

An individual's perspective about the satisfaction derived from his/her job is examined making use of one question from the survey of employees (viz. A8). The question asks: "How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job?" There are seven aspects in question viz. (i) "The sense of achievement you get from your work"; (ii) "The scope for using your own initiative"; (iii) "The amount of influence you have over your job"; (iv) "The training you receive"; (v) "The amount of pay you receive"; (vi) "Your job security"; and (vii) "The work itself". In each instance, five possible responses are offered, excluding the response 'don't know', which responses are treated as 'missing' for the reason noted above. These are: 'very satisfied'; 'satisfied'; 'neither satisfied nor satisfied'; 'dissatisfied' and 'very dissatisfied'. For purposes of the multivariate analysis, the 'very satisfied' and 'satisfied' are merged into one response; as are the 'very dissatisfied' and 'dissatisfied' responses. The 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied' responses constitute the base response category in the multinomial logit estimation.

Seven in 10 individuals employed in workplaces located in Scotland are satisfied with the sense of achievement got from their jobs (Table 4a); the scope for using their initiative while at work (Table 4b); and the work itself (Table 4g). Although the level of satisfaction drops in both instances, nonetheless a majority are satisfied with the amount of influence they have over their jobs (Table 4c) and their job security (Table 4f). Less than half are satisfied with the training they receive. Indeed, almost one in four voice dissatisfaction (Table 4d). Less than four in 10 are satisfied with the amount of pay received, a proportion not too dissimilar from those who voice dissatisfaction about the same issue (Table 4e).

For each of the seven estimations which relate to the questions in this section, the set of variables associated with the personal characteristics of the employee are jointly significant (at $p < 0.01$). The set of variables associated with the structural characteristics of the workplace are jointly significant (at $p < 0.05$) in five out of the seven occasions (Tables 4b, 4d, 4e, 4f and 4g), the two exceptions being the

estimations associated with the sense of achievement got from the job (Table 4a) and the amount of influence over the job (Table 4c). The set of variables associated with the human resource management policies and practices in operation at the workplace are jointly significant (at $p < 0.05$) for estimations relating to four of the seven questions viz. the training received (Table 4d); the amount of pay received (Table 4e); job security (Table 4f); and the work itself (Table 4g), perhaps indicative of the potential potency of such policies and practices in these particular contexts.

Again, the impact of specific variables on the response outcomes varies across the estimations relating to the seven questions, depending upon the aspect of job satisfaction examined. This is manifest in the context of the calculated marginal effects, which are reported in Tables 4a – 4g.

Gender is of consequence in the context of achievement (Table 4a) and pay (Table 4e). Females are 7 percent more likely to be satisfied in both instances, relative to males, the reference category, and relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Disability is of consequence in the context of two issues viz. pay (Table 4e) and the work itself (Table 4g). Those with a disability of some sort (relative to those without, the reference category) are 8 percent less likely to be satisfied with the pay they receive and 6 percent less likely to be satisfied with the job itself (relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied in each instance).

Academic qualifications are of consequence in the context of four issues, where those without academic qualifications (relative to those who have some qualification of this sort, the reference category) again do not appear to be as disadvantaged as conventional wisdom suggests. In the context of having scope to make use of their own initiative, they are 12 percent more likely to be satisfied (Table 4b); in the context of the influence they have over their work, they are 8 percent less likely to be dissatisfied (Table 4c); in the context of training received, they are 16 percent more likely to be satisfied (Table 4d); and in the context of job security, they are 11 percent more likely to be satisfied (relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied/dissatisfied throughout). By way of contrast, vocational/professional

qualifications are of consequence only in the context of training, where those without qualifications of this sort, relative to those who do possess these qualifications, the reference category, are 6 percent less likely to be dissatisfied (relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied/dissatisfied).

For the first time, colour impacts upon the response outcomes. Colour impacts on five of the seven aspects of job satisfaction, each to the perceived disadvantage of those identified as not white, relative to white, the reference category. Those who are not white are 16 percent, 19 percent, 17 percent, and 21 percent, respectively, more likely to be dissatisfied about the scope available to make use of their own initiative (Table 4b); the influence they have over their job (Table 4c); the training they receive (Table 4d); and their pay (Table 4e). Furthermore, again relative to the white reference category, they are 14 percent less likely to be satisfied about the work itself (Table 4g). (In each instance, these outcomes are relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the aspects questioned.)

The impact of the tenure variable varies across all aspects of job satisfaction, although the nature and magnitude of this varies by the duration of tenure. Generally, more favourable responses are voiced by those with relatively shorter and longer periods of tenure. Those who have been employed at the workplace for less than one year, relative to those who have been at the workplace for between 2 and 5 years, the reference category, are 3 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the issue of job security (Table 4f) (relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied). The perspectives of those who have been at the workplace for between 1 and 2 years, relative to the reference category noted, are more positive with respect to three aspects. They are 5 percent more likely to be satisfied with the sense of achievement to be got from the job (Table 4a); they are 4 percent more likely to be satisfied with the work itself (Table 4g); and they are 8 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with pay (Table 4e), where all these results are relative to the usual base outcome category. Those with tenure of between 5 and 10 years, relative to the reference tenure category noted, are 4 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the scope they have to take their own initiative (Table 4b) (relative to the base outcome category). Finally, those with 10 years of more tenure at the workplace, relative to the same reference tenure category, are 5 percent more likely to be satisfied with the

sense of achievement they derive from their job (Table 4a) and 3 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the work itself (Table 4g) (both outcomes relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the aspect posed).

Not unexpectedly, the nature of the contract of employment held is not without consequence in explaining some response outcomes in the context of the seven aspects of job satisfaction. Those who are on temporary contracts, relative to those on normal, permanent contracts, the reference category, are 13 percent more likely to be dissatisfied with the sense of achievement they get from their jobs (Table 4a); they are 10 percent less likely to be satisfied with the scope they have to make use of their own initiative (Table 4b); and 47 percent less likely to be satisfied with their job security (Table 4f) (where all these outcomes are relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied/dissatisfied). Those who are on fixed term contracts voice similar disquiet in the context of influence and job security, again relative to the reference category of individuals who are on permanent contracts of employment. Those on fixed terms contracts are 22 percent less likely to be satisfied with the influence they have over the job being done (Table 4c); and 49 percent less likely to be satisfied with job security (Table 4f) (where both outcomes are relative to the base outcome category of neither being satisfied nor dissatisfied).

The age variable impacts upon six of the seven issues relating to job satisfaction – the surprising exception is that of pay – although the impact on the aspects in question varies across age categories. The description of the outcomes which follows proceeds by age bands, where all the outcomes reported are relative both to the reference age category (viz. 40 – 49 years of age) and the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied about the job satisfaction aspect in question. Those aged 16 – 21 are 8 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the influence they have over their work (Table 4c); and 9 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the aspect of job security (Table 4f). Those aged 22 – 29 are 12 percent more likely to be satisfied with the scope they have to make use of their initiative in their work (Table 4b); and are 8 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with both the training they receive (Table 4d) and their job security (Table 4f). However, they are 3 percent more likely to be dissatisfied with the achievement they get from their work (Table 4a). Those aged 30 – 39 are 7 percent more likely to be satisfied with the achievement they get from their

work (Table 4a); and 12 percent more likely to be satisfied with the scope to make use of their own initiative (Table 4b). Those aged 50 – 59 are 6 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the training they receive (Table 4d). Finally, those in the oldest age category, over 60, would appear to be the least dissatisfied/most satisfied in the matter of job satisfaction. They are 6 percent, 8 percent and 7 percent, respectively, less likely to be dissatisfied with regard to training received (Table 4d); job security (Table f); and the work itself (Table 4g). Furthermore, they are 15 percent more likely to be satisfied with the achievement they get from the job (Table 4a) and 17 percent more likely to be satisfied with the influence they have when doing it (Table 4c).

Whereas earning less than £5 per hour is (again) of no consequence, earning more than £15 per hour is of consequence in the context of six of the seven aspects of job satisfaction – job security is the exception. Moreover, the perspectives of those in this relatively higher earnings category are uniformly more favourable. Relative to those earning between £5.01 and £14.99 per hour, the reference earnings category and the base outcome categories in question of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, those earning over £15 per hour are 13 percent, 13 percent, 16 percent, 31 percent and 10 percent, respectively, more likely to be satisfied with issues pertaining to the achievement to be got from the job (Table 4a); the scope to make use of their own initiative (Table 4b); the influence over what they do (Table 4c); the pay received (Table 4e); and the work itself (Table 4g). Further, they are 8 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the training they receive (Table 4d).

Individuals who are currently members of either a union or a staff association are 3 percent, 7 percent and 3 percent, respectively, more likely to be dissatisfied with the scope they have to make use of their own initiative (Table 4b); the influence they have over their jobs (Table 4c); and the work itself (Table 4g) (in each instance relative to those who have never been a member of either a union or a staff association, the reference category, and the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the aspect in question). Further, they are 6 percent less likely to be satisfied with the training received (Table 4d) (again relative to the aforementioned reference and base outcome categories). On the other hand, they are 7 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the pay they receive (Table 4e) (again relative to both the aforementioned reference and base outcome categories). Those who are now no

longer members of either a union or staff association are 7 percent more likely to be dissatisfied with the influence they have over their jobs (Table 4c); but they are 7 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the pay received (Table 4e) (relative to both the reference category of never having been a member of a union/staff association and the base outcome category of being neither satisfied/dissatisfied).

Training impacts across six of the seven aspects of job satisfaction – the exception is pay, surprisingly- and, once again, the nature and magnitude of the impact of the variable varies both by the aspect in question and the extent of the training received in the past 12 months. However, it has no impact for those who have received less than 1 days training, relative both to the reference category of those who have received no training and the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor satisfied. Relative to the reference training category of never having received any training and the base outcome category of being neither satisfied/dissatisfied for the aspect in question, those who have received between 1 -2 days of training are 16 percent and 9 percent, respectively, more likely to be satisfied with the training received (Table 4d) and their job security (Table 4f). Further, they are 6 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with the influence they have over their jobs (Table 4c). Again relative to both the same reference training category and the base outcome categories in question, those who have received between 2 – 5 days of training are 13 percent, 11 percent, 13 percent, 27 percent and 10 percent, respectively, more likely to be satisfied with the achievement derived from work (Table 4a); the scope to make use of their own initiative (Table 4b); the influence over their jobs (Table 4c); the training received (Table 4d); and the work itself (Table 4g). For those who have received 5 – 10 days training, the corresponding percentages for these same five aspects of job satisfaction are: 13, 16, 15, 34, and 10 (again relative to the aforementioned reference and base outcome categories). Finally, for those who have received more than 10 days training, the corresponding percentages for these same five aspects are 13, 15, 20, 43, and 12 (again relative to the reference and base outcome categories noted above). Also, those receiving 10 or more days training are 15 percent more likely to be satisfied with their job security (Table 4f) (relative to the same observations relating to reference category and base outcome category). In this context of job satisfaction, therefore, training is very significantly associated with positive outcomes from the perspective of the workforce. Furthermore, almost uniformly across five of the seven

aspects, the extent of satisfaction voiced increases with the amount of training received.

Marital status has no impact upon the aspects of job satisfaction examined.

The impact of selected variables reflecting the characteristics of the workplace at which the individual is employed is not without consequence in the context of the seven aspects of job satisfaction, more especially so in the specific context of establishment type.

Those employed at multi-plant workplaces are 17 percent less likely to be satisfied with job security (Table 4f) and 7 percent less likely to be satisfied with the work itself (Table 4g), relative to those employed in single, independent establishments, the reference category, and those identifying neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with the aspects in question, the base outcome category. Furthermore, they are 6 percent, 9 percent, and 17 percent, respectively, more likely to be dissatisfied with the scope to make use of their own initiative (Table 4b); the influence over their work (Table 4c); and their pay (Table 4e), again relative to the reference category noted and the base outcome categories in question. Those employed at workplaces which are the sole establishments of foreign owned firms are 50 percent less likely to be satisfied with their job security (Table 4f), again relative to those employed in single, independent establishments, the reference category, and those identifying neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with this aspect of job satisfaction, the base outcome category.

The role of the corporate status variables are of less salience. Those employed at public sector workplaces are 10 percent more likely to be satisfied with the achievement they get from their work (Table 4a), whereas those employed at other types of workplaces are 12 percent less likely to be satisfied with the training received (Table 4d), both outcomes relative to those employed in private sector type workplaces, the reference category, and the base outcome categories of those identifying neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with the two aspects in question.

From the estimations making use of the full data set, differences between those employed in workplaces located in Scotland, the reference category, and those employed in workplaces based elsewhere in GB are apparent in three aspects of job satisfaction. In terms of scope for using your own initiative, those employed elsewhere within GB are 1 percent less likely to be dissatisfied (relative to the base category of feeling neither satisfied or dissatisfied). In terms of the amount of pay received, those employed elsewhere within GB are 6 percent less likely to be satisfied (relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied). And in terms of job security, those employed elsewhere are 3 percent less likely to be satisfied (again relative to the same base outcome category as before). The results pertaining to pay and job security may be considered especially noteworthy.

IV. Perspectives about management (Tables 5a - 5j)

Employee perspectives about management are examined making use of two questions from the survey of employees viz. B6 and C2. The first is addressed in the context of communication within the workplace and asks: “In general how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about the following.” Four issues are then identified: (i) “Changes in the way the organisation is being run”; (ii) “Changes in staffing”; (iii) “Changes in the way you do your job”; and (iv) “Financial matters, including budgets and profits”. Five response options are offered to each (excluding ‘don’t know’, which responses are treated as ‘missing’ for the reason noted) viz. ‘very good’, ‘good’, ‘neither good nor poor’, ‘poor’ and ‘very poor’. For the purposes of analysis, the ‘very good’ and ‘good’ responses are merged, as are the ‘poor’ and ‘very poor’. In the multinomial logit, the response ‘neither good nor poor’ is treated as the base outcome category.

The second question asks: “Now thinking about the managers at this place, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following”. Six issues are identified viz. (i) “Can be relied upon to keep their promises”; (ii) “Are sincere in attempting to understand employees’ views”; (iii) “Deal with employees honestly”; (iv) “Understand about employees having to meet responsibilities outside work”; (v) “Encourage people to develop their skills”; and (vi) “Treat employees fairly”. Again five response options are offered to each, excluding the ‘don’t know’, which responses are again treated as missing viz. ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘neither agree nor

disagree’, ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’. For purposes of the analysis, responses are merged, the ‘strongly agree’ with ‘agree’; and the ‘disagree’ with the ‘strongly disagree’. In the multinomial logit, the response ‘neither agree nor disagree’ is treated as the base outcome category.

In the context of the question relating to how good managers are at keeping employees informed in each of the four instances identified, only a minority of the individuals employed at workplaces located in Scotland consider them to be good. In matters pertaining to changes in the way the organisation is run, whereas 49.42 percent consider management to be good, 26.21 percent consider them to be poor (Table 5a). In matters pertaining to changes in staffing, the respective percentages are 42.68 and 29.53 (Table 5b); in matters pertaining to changes in the way you do your job, 46.59 and 20.05 (Table 5c); and in matters pertaining to finance and budgets, 37.27 and 32.53 (Table 5d). Responses to the second question are generally more favourably disposed towards management. Although only a minority (i.e. 45.34 percent) agree that management can be relied upon to keep their word (Table 5e), 50.42 percent agree that they are sincere in attempting to understand employees’ views (Table 5f); 51.50 percent agree that they deal with employees honestly (Table 5g); 56.57 percent agree that management understand about employees’ responsibilities outside work (Table 5h); 57.74 percent agree that management encourage people to develop their skills (Table 5i); and 53.99 percent agree that they treat employees fairly (Table 5j). Nonetheless, for each issue raised, approximately 1 in 5 disagree with the statement put.

For eight of the nine estimations which relate to the questions in this section, the set of variables associated with the personal characteristics of the employee are jointly significant at ($p < 0.05$). The exception is the estimation relating to the question about management understanding employees’ out of work responsibilities (Table 5h). The set of variables associated with the structural characteristics of the workplace are similarly jointly significant at ($p < 0.05$) in eight of the nine occasions. In this instance, the exception is the estimation relating to the question about management treating employees fairly (Table 5j). The set of variables associated with the human resource management policies and practices in operation at the workplace are jointly significant (at $p < 0.05$) for estimations relating to three questions, those relating to

management keeping employees informed about changes to the way the organisation is being run (Table 5a); management keeping employees informed about changes in the way individuals do their jobs (Table 5c); and management being relied upon to keep their word (Table 5e).

Again, the impact of specific variables on the response outcomes varies across the nine estimations, depending upon the issue under examination. This is manifest in the context of the calculated marginal effects some of which are reported in Tables 5a – 5j.

Gender is of consequence in four instances. Females, relative to males, the reference category, are 8 percent less likely to consider management to be poor at informing employees about changes in the way jobs are to be done (Table 5c); and 10 percent less likely to consider management to be poor at informing employees about financial matters (Table 5d) (both outcomes relative to the base outcome category of considering management to be neither poor nor good, given the issue in question). Additionally, females, again relative to males, are 4 percent less likely to agree with the statement that managers deal with their employees honestly (Table 5h); and are 7 percent more likely to agree with the statement that managers are understanding about employees' out of work responsibilities (Table 5h) (both results relative to the appropriate base outcome category).

Disability is of consequence on one occasion, but in the context of a very salient issue for the disabled viz. whether managers treat their employees fairly. In this instance, individuals with disabilities, relative to those who are not so handicapped, the reference category, are 7 percent less likely to agree with this statement, relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement (Table 5j).

Those who have no academic qualifications, relative to those who have this type of qualification, the reference category, are 10 percent more likely to consider management good at informing employees about changes in the way jobs are to be done (Table 5c) (relative to the base outcome category of considering management to be neither good nor poor at this). Additionally, they are 10 percent more likely to

agree that managers encourage the development of skills (Table 5i); and 3 percent less likely to disagree that managers treat their employees fairly (Table 5j) (both results relative to the reference category noted and the appropriate base outcome category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statements in question). Whether individuals possess vocational/professional qualifications is of consequence only in the context of management's treatment of their employees, where individuals who do not possess these qualifications, relative to those who do, the reference category, are 4 percent more likely to agree that management treat their employees fairly (relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing with this statement) (Table 5j).

Colour is of consequence in four instances. Those who are not white, relative to those who are, the reference category, are 21 percent more likely to consider management to be poor at informing employees about changes in the way the organisation is run (Table 5a); and 11 percent more likely to consider management to be poor at informing employees about changes in staffing (Table 5b) (both results relative to the base outcome category of considering management to be neither good nor poor with respect to the issues in question). Further, those who are not white, relative to the same reference category, are 7 percent less likely to agree that managers treat their employees honestly (Table 5g); and 9 percent more likely to disagree with the statement about managers encouraging skills development (Table 5i) (both results again relative to the base outcome category, in this instance neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statements in question).

In the context of the tenure variable, those with tenure of 10 years or more, relative to those with tenure of between 2 – 5 years, the reference category, are 7 percent more likely to consider management to be good at informing employees about financial matters (relative to the base outcome category of considering management to be neither good nor poor in this matter) (Table 5d). Those with tenure of less than 1 year are 9 percent less likely to disagree with the statement that managers keep their word (Table 5e); those with tenure of between 1 -2 years are 6 percent more likely to disagree with the statement that managers encourage employees to develop skills (Table 5i); those with tenure of 5 – 10 years are less likely to agree with the statement that managers deal with their employees honestly (Table 5g); and those with tenure of 10 years or more are 10 percent more likely to disagree with the statement that

management are understanding about employees' out of work responsibilities (Table 5h) (where all these results are relative to the reference category of tenure of between 2 – 5 years and the base outcome category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statements in question). There is, therefore, some evidence of a tendency for some cynicism towards management to emerge as tenure at the workplace lengthens.

Somewhat surprisingly given the nature of the issues under examination, contract type is of consequence only in the instance of management's treatment of their employees. Those on temporary contracts of employment, relative to those on normal full time contracts, the reference category, are 25 percent more likely to disagree with the statement that management treat their employees fairly (relative to the base category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing with this statement) (Table 5j).

Again, as with tenure, there is some evidence of a cynicism towards management emerging with age. Those aged 16 – 21 are 14 percent more likely to disagree with the statement that managers are sincere in their attempts to understand employees' views (Table 5f); and those aged 30 – 39 are 8 percent more likely to agree that management treat their employees fairly (Table 5j). However, those aged 50 – 59 are 8 percent less likely to agree with this statement (Table 5j); and, furthermore, are 10 percent less likely to agree with the statement about managers understanding employees' out of work responsibilities (Table 5h). (All these results are relative to the reference age category of 40 – 49 years and the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the statements in question).

Earnings are of consequence, but once again only in the context of those in the relatively higher earnings category where those in this earnings category are generally favourably disposed towards management. Those earning above £15 per hour, relative to those earning between £5.01 and £14.99 per hour, the reference earnings category, are 15 percent, 11 percent and 18 percent, respectively more likely to consider management good at informing employees about staffing changes (Table 5b); informing employees about changes in how to do the job (Table 5c); and informing employees about financial matters (Table 5e) (relative that is to the base outcome category of considering management to be neither good nor poor in these matters). Furthermore, those in this higher earnings category, again relative to the same

reference category, are 13 percent more likely to agree that managers keep their word (Table 5e) and are understanding about employees' out of work responsibilities (Table 5h); although they are 7 percent more likely to disagree with the statement that managers encourage skills development on the part of their employees (Table 5i) (where all these results are relative to the appropriate base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the statements in question).

Training is of consequence across each of the issues questioned, although more so in the context of individuals who have received more extensive periods of training. The following results are relative to the training reference category of having received no training in the past 12 months and the base outcome category of considering management to be neither good/bad for the statements posed: those who received between 1 and 2 days of training are 11 percent less likely to consider management to be poor in the context of informing employees about changes in the way jobs are to be done (Table 5c); those who have received between 2 – 5 days training are 14 percent more likely to consider management to be good at informing employees of changes in the way the organisation is run (Table 5a); 16 percent less likely to consider management to be poor at informing employees of changes in the way jobs are to be done (Table 5c); and 16 percent less likely to consider management to be poor at informing employees about financial matters (Table 5d); those who have received between 5 – 10 days of training are 17 percent less likely to consider management to be poor with respect to informing employees about changes in the way the organisation is run (Table 5a); 20 percent more likely to consider that management is good about informing employees about changes in staffing (Table 5b); 22 percent more likely to consider management to be good in the context of informing employees about changes in the way jobs are to be done (Table 5c); and 19 percent less likely to consider management to be poor at informing employees about financial matters (Table 5d); and those who have received more than 10 days training are 24 percent, 24 percent, 26 percent and 29 percent, respectively, are more likely to consider management to be good at the following: informing employees about changes in the way the organisation is run (Table 5a); informing employees about changes in staffing (Table 5b); informing employees about changes in the way the job is to be done (Table 5c); and providing information about financial matters (Table 5d).

Furthermore, again relative to the same training reference category although this time relative to a base outcome category in which individuals neither agree/disagree with the statements in question: (i.) those who have received between 1 – 2 days of training are 5 percent more likely to agree that management are understanding about employees' responsibilities outside work hours (Table 5h); and are 15 percent more likely to agree that managers encourage their employees to develop their skills (Table 5i); (ii.) those who have received between 2 – 5 days of training are 14 percent, 15 percent, 17 percent, 10 percent and 27 percent, respectively, more likely to agree with statements to the effect that managers keep their word (Table 5e); are sincere in attempting to understand employees' views (Table 5f); deal with their employees honestly (Table 5g); are understanding about employees' out of work responsibilities (Table 5h); and encourage skills development on the part of their employees (Table 5i). Also, this same group are 10 percent less likely to disagree that managers treat their employees unfairly (Table 5j); (iii.) those who have received between 5 – 10 days of training are 21 percent, 10 percent and 27 percent, respectively, more likely to agree that managers are sincere in attempting to understand employees' views (Table 5f); are understanding about their employees out of work responsibilities (Table 5h); and encourage skills development on the part of their employees (Table 5i). Further, the same group are 3 percent and 11 percent, respectively, less likely to disagree that managers keep their word (Table 5e); and treat employees fairly (Table 5j); and (iv.) those who have received more than 10 days training are 18 percent, 21 percent, 14 percent and 28 percent, respectively, more likely to agree that managers keep their word (Table 5e); are sincere when attempting to understand employee views (Table 5f); are understanding about the out of work responsibilities of their employees (Table 5h); and encourage skills development on the part of their employees (Table 5i). Finally, the same group are 11 percent less likely to disagree with the statement that managers deal with their employees honestly (Table 5g).

There is, therefore, very strong evidence that training engenders very positive perspectives about management at the workplace.

In the context of the 'management' issues addressed in this sib section, marital status is of little consequence and union/staff association is of no consequence whatsoever, if somewhat surprisingly so.

The impact of selected variables reflecting structural characteristics of the workplace at which the individual is employed on an individual's perception of management is limited but, nonetheless, are of some note.

Individuals employed in multi-plant workplaces, relative to those employed in single, independent establishments, the reference category, are 12 percent more likely to consider that management is poor when informing employees about staffing changes (Table 5b) (relative to the base outcome category of considering management to be neither poor/good in this matter). Further, this same group of employees, again relative to the same reference category, are 15 percent, 11 percent, 13 percent and 10 percent, respectively, more likely to disagree with the statements that managers keep their word (Table 5e); are sincere when attempting to understand employee views (Table 5f); deal with employees honestly (Table 5g); and are understanding about their employees' out of work responsibilities (Table 5h) (where each of these results are relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing/disagreeing with the statements in question). The impact of being employed at the single workplace of a foreign owned firm is of no consequence.

Those employed in public sector type workplaces, relative to those employed in workplaces within the private sector, the reference category, are 10 percent more likely to agree both that management seek to develop the skills of their employees (Table 5i) and treat their employees fairly (Table 5j) (both results relative to the base outcome category of neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the two statements in question). The impact of being employed at a workplace of some other type is of no consequence.

When the models are re-estimated using the full GB data set to identify whether there are differences between those employed at workplaces located in Scotland, the reference category, and those employed at workplaces located elsewhere in GB, in each of these four issues associated with management keeping employees informed, the perspectives of employees in workplaces located in Scotland do not differ from those in workplaces located elsewhere in GB. In the context of perspectives of the six attitudes and behaviours of management at the workplace, only in the context of feeling that they treat employees fairly, is there a statistically significant difference in

the responses between those employed in workplaces located in Scotland and those employed in workplaces located elsewhere in GB. Those employed at workplaces elsewhere in GB are 2 percent less likely to agree with the statement, relative to the reference category noted and the base outcome category of those who neither agreed/disagreed with the statement.

V. Perspectives about management-employee relations (Tables 6a – 6e)

Employee perspectives about management-employee relations at the workplace are examined making use of three questions from the survey of employees viz. B8, B9 and C3. The first of these questions asks: “Overall, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at..”, and three issues are identified viz. (i) “Seeking the views of employees or employee representatives”; (ii) “Responding to suggestions from employees or employee representatives”; and (iii) “Allowing employees or employee representatives to influence final decisions”. To each, there is a fivefold response option, excluding the ‘don’t knows’, the responses to which are again treated as missing for purposes of the statistical analysis viz. ‘very good’, ‘good’, ‘neither good nor poor’, ‘poor’ and ‘very poor’. For purposes of the multinomial logit estimations, the ‘very good’ and ‘good’ responses are merged, as are the ‘poor’ and ‘very poor’. The ‘neither good nor poor’ response is made the base outcome category.

The second of these questions asks: “Overall, how satisfied are you with the amount of involvement you have in decision-making at this workplace?”. To which there is a fivefold response viz. ‘very satisfied’, ‘satisfied’, ‘neither satisfied nor dissatisfied’, ‘dissatisfied’ and ‘very dissatisfied’ – in this instance there is no ‘don’t know’ option. For purposes of the multinomial logit estimations, the ‘very satisfied’ and ‘satisfied’ responses are merged as are the ‘dissatisfied’ and ‘dissatisfied’ responses. Again, the ‘neither satisfied nor dissatisfied’ response is treated as the base outcome category.

The final question asks: “In general, how would you describe relations between managers and employees here?”. To which, there is a five fold response option – again with no ‘don’t know’ option – viz. ‘very good’, ‘good’ ‘neither good nor poor’, ‘poor’ and ‘very poor’. As before, for purposes of the multinomial logit estimations, the ‘very good’ and ‘good’ responses are merged; the ‘poor’ and ‘very poor’

responses are merged; and the response ‘neither good nor bad’ is treated as the base outcome category.

45.17 percent of those employed at workplaces located in Scotland consider management to be good at seeking the views of employees or employee representatives. 29.20 percent consider them to be poor at this (Table 6a). 39.18 percent consider management to be good at responding to suggestions from employees or employee representatives. 29.95 percent consider them to be poor (Table 6b). Only 27.70 percent consider management to be good at allowing employees or employee representatives to influence final decisions. Even more, 37.94 percent, consider management to be poor in this respect (Table 6c). 37.77 percent of those employed at workplaces located in Scotland are satisfied with the amount of involvement they have in decision-making, although 25.12 percent are dissatisfied (Table 6d). And 55.74 percent describe relations between managers and employees to be good. Less than 1 in 5 consider them to be poor (Table 6e).

The set of variables associated with the personal characteristics of the employee are jointly significant (at $p < 0.01$) in each instance. The set of variables associated with the structural characteristics of the workplace are also jointly significant throughout, although at ($p < 0.05$). On no occasion is the set of variables associated with the human resource management policies and practices in operation at the workplace jointly significant.

The impact of specific variables on the response outcomes varies across the estimations relating to the five questions on management-employee relations, depending upon the issue under examination. This is manifest in the context of the calculated marginal effects, selected details of which are reported in Tables 6a – 6e.

In the context of variables reflecting an individual’s personal characteristics, possessing vocational/professional qualifications and – yet again, and again very surprisingly – union/staff association membership are of no consequence in the context of explaining responses to issues relating to management-employee relations. Gender, disability, possessing academic qualifications, tenure and marital status are of some consequence, but in a limited, effectively *ad hoc*, manner.

Colour and employment contract are of some consequence, and have some notable results. Those who are not white, relative to those who are white, the reference category, are 17 percent and 13 percent, respectively, more likely to consider management to be poor at seeking the views of employees or their representatives (Table 6a) and allowing employees or their representatives to influence final decision making (Table 6c). Further, they are 21 percent more likely to be dissatisfied about their involvement in decision making (Table 6d) (where all results are relative to the appropriate base outcome category). By way of contrast, the nature of the employment contract is of consequence only in the context of the final question on management-employee relations. In this specific context, those on temporary contracts, relative to those on permanent contracts, the reference category, are 18 percent less likely to consider management-employee relations at the workplace to be good, relative to the base outcome category of considering them to be neither good/poor (Table 6e).

The age variable is of consequence across all five issues, although not necessarily for each of the five age categories. The general – if less than systematic - tendency is for the positive perspective towards management observed in the two youngest age categories to disappear with age. Relative to both the age reference category of being 40 - 49 years of age and the appropriate base outcome category throughout: (i.) those aged 16 – 21 are 12 percent less likely to consider management’s attempts to seek the views of employees and representatives to be poor (Table 6a); 17 percent less likely to consider management’s willingness to allow employees or their representatives to influence final decision making to be poor (Table 6c); and 15 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with their involvement in decision making (Table 6d); (ii.) those aged 22-29 are 8 percent less likely to consider management’s willingness to respond to suggestions from employees or their representatives to be good (Table 6b); and 4 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with respect to their involvement in decision making (Table 6d); (iii.) those aged 30 – 39 are 6 percent less likely to consider management’s willingness to respond to suggestions from employees and their representatives to be good (Table 6b); and are 6 percent less likely to be dissatisfied with their involvement in decision making (Table 6d); and (iv.) those aged 50 – 59 are 7 percent less likely to consider management’s willingness to respond to the

suggestions of employees and their representatives to be good (Table 6b); and are 5 percent less likely to consider management-employee relations to be good (Table 6e).

The earnings variable is again of some consequence, if only, once again, for those in the highest earnings category, whose perspectives on management-employee relations are consistently positive. Relative to those earning between £5.01 and £14.99 per hour, the reference earnings category and the appropriate base outcome category, those earning over £15 per hour are 13 percent and 11 percent, respectively, less likely to consider management to be poor at seeking the views of employees and their representatives (Table 6a) and in responding to suggestions from employees (Table 6b). They are 9 percent more likely to consider management to be good at allowing employees or their representatives to influence final decision making (Table 6c). Further, they are 15 percent more likely to be satisfied with their involvement in decision making (Table 6d).

The training variable is of consequence across all five issues pertaining to management-employee relations at the workplace, although not necessarily for each of the five training categories. Once again, there is considerable evidence of the manner in which investing in human capital is associated with a positive perspective on the part of employees. Relative to the reference training category of having received no training in the past year and the appropriate base outcome categories throughout: (i.) those who have received some training but less than 1 day are 9 percent more likely to consider management to be good at seeking the views of employees and their representatives (Table 6a); (ii.) those who have received between 1 and 2 days of training are 5 percent less likely to consider management to be poor at responding to suggestions from employees (Table 6b); (iii.) those who have received between 2 – 5 days training are 16 percent less likely to consider management to be poor at seeking the views of employees and their representatives (Table 6a); 15 percent less likely to consider management to be poor at responding to suggestions from employees and their representatives (Table 6b); 15 percent more likely to consider management to be good at allowing employees or their representatives to influence final decision making (Table 6c); 19 percent more likely to be satisfied with their involvement in decision making (Table 6d); and 16 percent more likely to consider management-employee relations to be good (Table 6e); (iv.) those who have

received between 5 and 10 days of training are 31 percent, 23 percent and 20 percent, respectively, more likely to consider management to be good at seeking the views of their employees and their representatives (Table 6a); responding to suggestions made by employees and their representatives (Table 6b); and allowing employees or their representatives to influence final decision making (Table 6c); they are 26 percent more likely to be satisfied with their involvement in decision making (Table 6d); and are 16 percent more likely to consider workplace management-employee relations to be good (Table 6e): and (v.) those who have received more than 10 days of training are 28 percent, 36 percent and 33 percent, respectively, more likely to consider management to be good at seeking the views of their employees and their representatives (Table 6a); responding to suggestions made by employees and their representatives (Table 6b); and allowing employees or their representatives to influence final decision making (Table 6c); they are 30 percent more likely to be satisfied with their involvement in decision making (Table 6d); and are 24 percent more likely to consider workplace management-employee relations to be good (Table 6e).

The impact of selected variables reflecting the structural characteristics of the workplace at which the individual is employed is not without some consequence in this context of workplace management-employee relations and some important results emerge.

In the context of workplace type, those employed in multi-plant workplaces, relative to those employed at single independent workplaces, the reference category, are 13 percent less likely to consider management to be good at allowing employees to influence final decision making (Table 6c); they are 15 percent less likely to be satisfied with their involvement in decision making (Table 6d); and they are 8 percent more likely to consider management-employee relations to be poor (Table 6e) (where each result is relative to the appropriate base outcome category). Those employed at the sole UK workplace of a foreign owned firm, again relative to being employed at a single independent workplace, are 32 percent less likely to be satisfied with their involvement in decision making (relative to the base outcome category of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Table 6d).

In the context of the corporate status of the workplace, those employed at public sector type workplaces, relative to those employed at private sector ones, the reference category, and relative also to the appropriate base outcome category, are 17 percent and 16 percent, respectively, more likely to consider management to be good at seeking the views of employees and their representatives (Table 6a); and allowing employees to influence final decision making (Table 6c). They are also 12 percent more likely to be satisfied with their involvement in decision making (Table 6d). Those employed at other types of workplaces, such as charities, again relative to being employed at a private type of workplace, are 8 percent more likely to consider management-employee relations to be good at the workplace, relative to the base outcome category of being neither good nor poor (Table 6e).

When the models are re-estimated using the full data set to identify possible differences between individuals employed at workplaces located in Scotland and those employed at workplaces located elsewhere in GB, none are to be found which are statistically significant in the context of the issues relating to management-employee relations addressed in this final sub section.

6. DISCUSSION

This section relates more specifically to the second and third aims of the paper, to the issue of the more salient determinants of the responses to the nine questions identified and to their collective significance in terms of the five themes examined; and the manner in which responses from employees in workplaces located in Scotland differ from those at work elsewhere in Great Britain.

Previous, comparable, micro-econometric studies of job satisfaction, for example those of Clark (1996) and Gazioglu and Tansel (2006) report statistically significant correlations between job satisfaction and variables such as age, earnings and educational qualifications, with the older, those earning relatively more and those with fewer/no educational qualifications being more likely to report that they derive satisfaction from their work. The paper re-affirms these findings, not only in the context of ‘the work itself’ aspect of job satisfaction but also in the context of the six other aspects of job satisfaction associated with this data set, although, with reference to the latter, (old) age tends to be of less consequence than the other two variables.

Furthermore, the significance of these three variables extends beyond the issue of job satisfaction *per se* into the four other issues of employee workplace perspectives examined, although the nature of their precise impact varies according to the issue in question. In the context of perspectives of the nature of the job, whereas those in the older age categories and those without educational qualifications are associated with positive feelings, such as being relaxed and content in terms of Warr's anxiety-contentment score, those in the higher earnings category are associated with agreeing with statements such as their work requires them to work very hard, and worrying a lot about the work outside working hours. In the context of perspectives of management and perspectives of management-employee relations at the workplace, whereas the perspectives of those without educational qualifications and those in the higher earnings category are positive towards management, the perspectives of those in the older age categories tend to be more negative, as if age tends to bring with it a cynicism towards management attitudes and behaviours, what may be perhaps described as the rhetoric of managers?¹⁷

Clark (1996) and Gazioglu and Tansel (2006) also report similar findings with respect to union membership viz. that there is a negative correlation between this and job satisfaction, although this finding is contested by Bryson et al (2005). In the specific context of the seven aspects of job satisfaction associated with this data set (and, notably, making use of estimation models comparable to those of Clark and Gazioglu and Tansel but not Bryson et al), union/staff association membership is associated with dissatisfaction in the context of: scope to make use of own initiative; influence over jobs; training received; and the work itself. In contrast, it is associated with satisfaction over pay received. Union/staff association membership is of no consequence whatsoever in what is traditionally most closely associated with this labour market institution viz. management at the workplace and workplace management-employee relationships. At best, it is of limited consequence in the context of the other themes of employee perspectives investigated.

¹⁷ Similar outcomes are to be observed in the context of the tenure variable, where those who have been at the workplace for longer durations voice similar sentiments to the older respondents.

Clark (1997) expands on the relationship between job satisfaction and gender, explaining why women are so (unexpectedly) happy at work in terms of their “relative utility” i.e. “because their jobs have been so much worse in the past, they have lower expectations” (p. 365.) Although the coefficient is positively signed for six of the seven aspects of satisfaction – notably, job security is the exception – gender (i.e. ‘female’) is statistically significant in the context of only two viz. the sense of achievement to be got from the job and pay. Clark (1997) observed that “women’s higher job satisfaction may be a transitory phenomenon, caused by women’s improved position in the labour market relative to their expectations” (p. 365). Either, this short run situation must be continuing onwards into the long run or, perhaps more plausibly, Clark’s explanation of gender differences in the context of job satisfaction warrants re-visiting. In the context of other issues addressed in the paper, females are more likely to have a lot of influence over both the pace of their work and how this work is done. Although they have no influence over their start/stop times, in the context of the other traditional work-life balance issue, women are more likely to agree with the statement that managers are understanding about employees’ out of work responsibilities. That said, they are less likely to agree with the statement that managers treat their employees honestly.

Labour market outcomes for other groups identified as contingent labour (viz. the disabled, ethnic minorities and those working on part time/fixed term contracts) have tended to be inferior, reflected in Noon and Hoque’s (2001) phrase “the persistence of unequal treatment at work” (p. 105). Despite some legislation post 1998 which seeks to address and remedy this, there is considerable evidence of perceptions of inequality continuing to exist on the part of these individuals, not only in the context of job satisfaction but also in the context of most of the other issues investigated. Furthermore, manifest in the values of the marginal effects quoted in the previous section, the magnitude of the perceptions of ‘inequality’ or ‘disadvantage’ is considerable.

Those with some form of disability are less likely to consider their jobs to be secure; are more likely to feel tense; and less likely to feel calm. They are less likely to be satisfied with the job they do and the pay they get from doing it. They are less likely to agree with the statement that managers treat their employees fairly. Individuals who

are not 'white', are more likely to be dissatisfied with the scope they are given to make use of their own initiative; the influence they have over their job; the training they receive; and their pay. They are less likely to be satisfied with the work itself. Furthermore, individuals who are not white are more likely to consider their managers to be poor at seeking the views of employees or their representatives; and to be poor at allowing either of these same parties to have some influence in decision-making. They are also more likely to be dissatisfied with their own involvement in decision-making. Those on temporary contracts are less likely to feel that their jobs are secure, sentiments shared with those on fixed term contracts. Additionally, they are more likely to be dissatisfied with the sense of achievement they get from their jobs; and are more likely to be dissatisfied with the scope they are given to make use of their own initiative, once again sentiments also held by those on fixed term contracts. Finally, those on temporary contracts are more likely to disagree with the statement that managers treat their employees fairly and are less likely to agree that workplace management-employee relations are good.

Given the nature and magnitude of these perceived inequalities, either companies/workplaces are not actively complying with post 1998 legislation or this legislation requires strengthening to mitigate the continuing inequalities perceived by members of these increasingly important groups within the labour market in Scotland.

One notable feature of the 1998 and 2004 WERS data sets is the scope they offer to examine the impact of potentially important variables frequently not addressed in most other data sets and, therefore, in many other empirical studies. This is especially evident in the context of one personal characteristic variable i.e. training, and the set of variables associated with corporate governance, in this paper an integral element within the set of variables associated with the structural characteristics of the workplace.

The training variable is almost omnipresent in terms of its statistical significance across the five themes examined, especially so for those who have received more than 2 – 5 days training in the past year. Although there are some negative perspectives reported – such as that their job requires them to work very hard; they never have enough time to get the job finished; and they tend to worry about the job outside

working hours – generally, responses are positive. In the context of the influence over the job, relatively more task discretion is to be observed over all facets identified. In the context of six of the seven aspects of job satisfaction, satisfaction is positively associated with greater investments in training – the important exception is with respect to pay received. With occasional exceptions – such as informing employees about financial matters or informing employees about changes to the job to be done – the perspectives about managers held by those who have received training are positive. They are uniformly positive in the context of workplace management-employees relations, notably so on matters relating to individual involvement in decision-making.

What policies among the bundle of human resource management policies available to management may engender high commitment on the part of employees is problematical. Furthermore, equally problematical, are the subsequent and consequential effects of implementing these policies, for example on individual worker well-being or on organisational performance (Godard, 2004; Wood et al, 2006). However, there is evidence within this paper which supports the argument that investing in human capital is an example of a potentially effective high commitment management policy. Training is seen to be associated with positive perspectives, not only with regard to personal work situations but also with regard to managers and management-employee relations at their places of work.

By way of contrast, the impact of the variables associated with corporate governance is both more selective and variable. Nonetheless, some important results may be observed.

Individuals who are employed at workplaces which are part of multi-plant enterprises are less likely to be satisfied over issues of job security and the job itself. They are more likely to be dissatisfied over matters relating to the scope they have to make use of their own initiative and their pay. Perhaps most important of all, however, is their indictment of management. Individuals who are employed at multi-plant workplaces are more likely to disagree with statements such as: managers keep their word; managers are sincere when attempting to understand employees' views; managers deal with employees honestly; and managers are understanding about employees' out

of work responsibilities. This carries over into their perspectives of workplace management-employees relations, where individuals employed in workplaces which are part of multi-plant organisations are critical of their (lack of) involvement in decision-making and consider management-employee relations at their places of work to be poor.

This result may reflect the findings of other studies which examine the different processes and procedures which operate in single establishment organisations, often small, owner managed companies (Harris, et al, 2004a: 2004b).

Those employed at workplaces which are the sole UK establishment of foreign owned firms are more likely to agree with statements about their jobs requiring them to have to work very hard and to worrying a lot about the job outside working hours. They also voice concerns over job security.

Individuals employed at public sector workplaces are less likely to agree with statements such as that their job requires them to work very hard or that they never seem to have enough time to finish their job. However, they have more task discretion, over the tasks to be done, the pace at which it is done, how it is to be done and the order in which it is to be done, if not their start and finishing times. They are generally indifferent in their perspectives of workplace managers. However, they are positive in their perspectives of most aspects of workplace management – employee relations. Individuals employed at other types of workplaces, such as within the not for profit sector, are less likely to agree with statements about job security. However, they have considerable task discretion, if not over the nature of the task to be done.

The third aim of the paper is to examine the extent to which responses made by those employed at workplaces located in Scotland differ from the responses made by individuals at work in establishments located elsewhere in Great Britain. In this instance, the particular context is that of Bell and Blanchflower (2007), who report that “the Scots are less happy and less satisfied with life..” (p. 189).

Statistically significant results for the ‘Rest of Great Britain’ dummy variable from the 37 estimations have been reported in the previous section. They are brought

together in Table 7. By way of a preliminary to the discussion, the ‘Rest of Great Britain’ dummy variable is statistically significant (at $p < 0.1$) in only eight of the estimations. Furthermore, in four of these, its value (at 1 percent) is quantitatively insignificant.

Two of these results are considered to be worthy of particular comment viz. that individuals employed in workplaces located outwith Scotland, relative to those employed in workplaces located in Scotland, the reference category, and the appropriate base outcome category, are 2 percent less likely to agree with the statement that ‘I feel my job is secure in this workplace’ and 6 percent less likely to be satisfied with the amount of pay received. Some literature suggests a relationship between job insecurity and wages (Campbell et al, 2007; Nickell et al, 2002). Nickell et al conclude (for men) that the perception of increasing job insecurity during the 1990s is associated more with the rise in the costs of losing a job than with any change in the probability of losing a job. Campbell et al find (again for men) that job insecurity is linked to current expectations of unemployment and that, in turn, high fears of unemployment are related to lower rates of wages growth. However, there appears to be little of substance in the aggregate statistics on gross weekly pay and claimant count unemployment rates (and the percentage point change in the latter) which legitimises these perspectives of relative disadvantage on the part of those in employment in workplaces outside Scotland (Table 8).¹⁸

The ultimate outcome of the comparison, however, if only in this very specific context of the perspectives of individuals in work about their work, is contrary to that of Bell and Blanchflower. In the main for the issues examined, very few differences are to be

¹⁸ These relatively negative perspectives, however, may reflect circumstances prevailing in more spatially disaggregated labour markets e.g. travel to work areas.

observed between those employed in Scotland and those employed elsewhere in Great Britain. Furthermore, when differences are to be seen, it is not those who are employed in workplaces located in Scotland who are ‘not content’.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has examined five sets of work-related perspectives of individuals employed at workplaces located in Scotland: viz. perspectives about their jobs; about the extent of the influence they have over several facets of their jobs; about the satisfaction they derive from different aspects of their jobs; about their managers; and about workplace management-employee relations. It has done so by creating two matched individual-workplace data sets which have their origin in two elements of the 2004 Cross Section Workplace Employment Relations Survey, one relating to individuals employed at workplaces located in Scotland, the other relating to all employed individuals in Great Britain. The data sets were examined using multinomial and ordered logit models, both of which had the same set of independent variables, reflecting individual personal characteristics, structural characteristics of the workplace – including corporate governance-type characteristics – and human resource management policies in operation at the workplace.

The paper had three aims: the first to report the frequency distribution of responses to the questions associated with these five set of perspectives for individuals at work in Scottish based establishments; the second, making use of the same data set, to identify the determinants of these responses; and the third, using the full Great Britain data set, to examine the extent to which responses of those employed at workplaces located in Scotland differed from those employed at workplaces located elsewhere in Great Britain.

The paper, therefore, has three novelties associated with its outcomes. The first is associated with its description of the responses made to the questions posed in the WERS 2004 Survey of Employees, reporting the perspectives individuals employed at workplaces located in Scotland have about their jobs; the influences they have over these jobs; the satisfactions they derive from their jobs; and their views both on management at the workplace and workplace management-employee relations. To

paraphrase Freeman (1978, p. 135), this conveys ‘useful information’, some of which ‘should not be ignored’. The second is associated with the following: the identification of the manner in which certain variables such as age, earnings, educational qualifications, gender and, especially, training impact upon the responses made: the identification of issues where perspectives of unequal outcomes/treatments exist within workplaces located in Scotland, where these are attributable to disability, race and employment contract if not gender: and the identification of the manner in which the structural characteristics of the workplace – especially matters pertaining to corporate governance issues – are also not without some significance in explaining response outcomes.

The third novelty of the paper is associated with the outcomes of the comparison made between the perspectives of individuals employed in workplaces located in Scotland with those of individuals employed in workplaces located elsewhere in Great Britain, outcomes which are altogether different from the “relatively depressing picture of Scotland” presented by Bell and Blanchflower (2007, p. 192). In only two estimations are there statistically significant results which evidence quantifiably meaningful differences of matters of substance between individuals employed in workplaces in Scotland and individuals employed in workplaces situated elsewhere in Great Britain viz. relating to pay received and job security. Moreover, in both instances, it is those who are employed in workplaces outwith Scotland who are the parties who voice relative discontent with their lot. Accordingly, in the context of the policy implications which motivate the Bell and Blanchflower paper, perhaps the potential impact of employment is due more credit than they give. Although not necessarily reducing or eliminating individual differences in well-being at work, being employed would appear to eliminate many of the spatial differences in well-being they observe.

These results, however, like all others, are contingent upon the data set available, how this data set has been modified to meet the purposes of the investigation, and the structure of the models applied to analyse the modified data set.

WERS 2004 is ideal for purposes of examining issues such as those addressed in this paper, much more suited than the British Household Panel Survey data set, for

example, not least because of its scope to incorporate details about the characteristics of the workplaces at which individuals are employed and the human resource management policies and practices in operation at these workplaces.

Nevertheless, the inclusion of details about some structural characteristics of the workplace (and the prevailing human resource management policies and practices) in the paper has been at the expense of a number of potential observations. Even more potential observations have been lost consequential of the strategic decision made to classify all those who responded 'don't know' to the 37 questions put as 'missing'. Merging many of the responses – for example 'satisfied' with 'very satisfied' – has destroyed some information. By contrast, not merging some of the ordered responses has created a problem of small numbers of observations in some response categories – for example the few who responded 'a lot' to the five questions about the extent of their job influence in the Scotland sub set of the full data set. Whether the responses were merged or not, all the resulting dependent variables are 'subjective' rather than 'objective', making assumptions about inter-personal comparability. Reducing the multinomial dependent variables to binomials (and categorising the 'don't knows' as '0's) would go some way to obviate some of these problems. And this appears to be the strategy adopted in many other papers. In the context of the comparison of the response differences between those employed in workplaces located in Scotland and those employed in workplaces located elsewhere in Great Britain, this has been accomplished by incorporating a simple shift dummy into the model – effectively adopting the strategy employed by Bell and Blanchflower (2007), although in some their analyses they often disaggregate Great Britain (and Scotland) into regional divisions. The implications of interacting this shift dummy with some of the other qualitative variables in the model may warrant investigation.

Finally, throughout, the models applied make heroic assumptions about exogeneity. Only Bryson et al (2004) identify and seek to address the more probable presence of endogeneity, in their particular instance the sorting of workers into unionised jobs. But where else may endogenous selection be observed? *A priori*, one may suspect a similar process of sorting as individuals self select into workplaces which are in the private/public/not for profit sector. And/or into workplaces which are small, owner-managed/large, part of a multinational enterprise.

REFERENCES

- Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS), (1995) *Employee Communication and Consultation*, London, ACAS.
- Argiris, C. (1998) Empowerment: the emperor's new clothes. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, pp 98 – 105.
- Baum, C.F. (2006) *An Introduction to modern econometrics using Stata*. College Station, Texas, USA, The Stata Press.
- Bell, D. and Blanchflower, D.G. (2007) The Scots may be brave but they are neither healthy nor happy. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 54:2, pp 166 -194.
- Blanchflower, D.G. (2008) International evidence on well-being. IZA Discussion Paper No. 3354.
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Oswald, A.J. (2004) Well-being over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, pp 1359 -1386.
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Oswald, A.J. (2007) Is well-being U-shaped over the life cycle? IZA Discussion Paper No. 3075
- Blauner, R. (1964) *Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry*. Chicago, USA, Chicago University Press.
- Blyton, P. and Turnbull, P. (2004) *The Dynamics of Employee Relations (3rd edition)*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Braverman, H. (1974) *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the 20th Century*. New York, USA, Monthly Review Press.
- Bryson, A., Cappellari, L. and Lucifora, C. (2004) Does union membership really reduce job satisfaction? *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42:3, pp 439 - 459.
- Bryson, A., Forth, J. and Kirby, S. (2005) High-involvement management practices, trade union representation and workplace performance in Britain. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 52:3, pp 451-491.
- Burchill, F. (2008) *Labour Relations (3rd edition)*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Butler, P. and Glover, L. (2007) Employee participation and involvement. In Beardwell, J. and Claydon, T. *Human Resource Management: a contemporary approach (5th edition)*. Harlow, Pearson Education.
- Campbell, D., Carruth, A., Dickerson, A. and Green, F. (2007) Job insecurity and wages. *Economic Journal*, 117 (March), pp 544 -566.

- Clark, A.E. (1996) Job satisfaction in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 34:2, pp 189 -217.
- Clark, A.E. (1997) Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work? *Labour Economics*, 4, pp 341 -372.
- Clark, A.E. and Oswald, A.J. (1995) Unhappiness and unemployment. *Economic Journal*, 104, May, pp 648 -659.
- Clark, A.E. and Oswald, A.J. (2007) The Curved relationship between subjective well-being and age. Unpublished paper, the University of Warwick.
- Delbridge, R. and Whitfield, K. (2001) Employee perceptions of job influence and organisational participation. *Industrial Relations*, 40:3, pp 472 -489.
- Di Tella, R., MacCulloch, R.J. and Oswald, A.J. (2003) The Macroeconomics of happiness. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85: 4, pp 809 -827.
- Easterlin, R. (1974) Does economic growth improve the human lot? Some empirical evidence. In David, P.A. and Reder, M.W. (eds.) *Nations and Households in Economic Growth: Essays in Honour of Moses Abramowitz*. London and New York, USA, Academic Press.
- Freeman, R.B. (1978) Job satisfaction as an economic variable. *American Economic Review*, 68:2, pp 135 -141.
- Frey, B.S. and Stutzer, A. (2000) Happiness, economy and institutions. *Economic Journal*, 110 (October), pp 918 -938.
- Frey, B.S. and Stutzer, A. (2002) What can economists learn from happiness research? *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. XL (June), pp 402 -435.
- Gallie, D., Felstead, A. and Green, F. (2004) Changing patterns of task discretion in Britain. *Work, Employment and Society*, 18: 2, pp 243 -266.
- Gazioglu, S. and Tansel, A. (2006) Job satisfaction in Britain: individual and job related factors. *Applied Economics*, 38 (June) pp 1163 -1171.
- Godard, J. (2004) A critical assessment of the high-performance paradigm. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42: 2, pp 349 -378.
- Gospel, H. and Pendleton, A.D. (2003) Corporate governance and labour management: a conceptual and comparative analysis. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41: 3, pp 557 -583.
- Green, F. (2001) It's been a hard day's night: the concentration and intensification of work in late 20th century Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 39:1, pp 53 -80.

- Green, F. (2004) Why has work effort become more intense? *Industrial Relations*, 43:4, pp 709 -740.
- Green, F. (2008) Leeway for the loyal: a model of employee discretion. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46:1, pp 1 – 32.
- Green, F. and Tsitsianis, N. (2005) An Investigation of national trends in job satisfaction in Britain and Germany. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43:3, pp 401 -429.
- Guest, D, Michie, J., Conway, N. and Sheehan, M. (2003) Human resource management and corporate performance in the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41: 2, pp 291 -314.
- Harris, R., McAdam, R. and Reid, R. (2004a) Employee involvement in family and non-family-owned businesses in Great Britain. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, vol. 10: 1-2, pp. 49-58.
- Harris, R., McAdam, R. and Reid, R. (2004b) Consultation and communication in family businesses in Great Britain. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15: 8, pp. 1424-1444.
- Helliwell, J.F. (2006) Well-being, social capital and public policy: what's new? *Economic Journal*, 116 (March) pp C34 –C45.
- Karasek, R.A. (1979) Job demands, job decision latitude and mental strain: implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24: 2, pp 285 -308.
- Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J, Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix, S. and Oxenbridge, S. (2006) *Inside the workplace: findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*. London, Routledge.
- Layard, P.G.R. (2005) *Happiness: Lessons from a New Science*. New York, USA, Penguin.
- Layard, R. (2006) Happiness and public policy: a challenge to the profession, *Economic Journal*, 116 (March), pp C24 –C33.
- Long, J.S. and Freese, J. (2006) *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata, (2nd edition)*. College Station, Texas, USA, The Stata Press.
- Nickell, S., Jones, P. and Quintini, G. (2002) A Picture of job insecurity facing British men. *Economic Journal*, 112 (January), pp 1 – 27.

- Noon, M. and Hoque, K. (2001) Ethnic minorities and equal treatment: the impact of gender, equal opportunity policies and trade unions. *National Institute Economic Review*, No 176 (April) p 105 -116.
- Oswald, A.J. (1997) Happiness and economic performance. *Economic Journal*, 107, (November), pp 1815 -1831.
- Pendelton, A. and Deakin, S. (2007) Corporate governance and workplace employment relations: the potential of WERS 2004. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 38:4, pp 338 -355.
- Purcell, J. (1981) *Good Industrial Relations*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Steele, G.R. (2006) Richard Layard's *Happiness*: worn Philosophy, weak Psychology, wrong method and just plain bad Economics. *The Political Quarterly*, 77:4, pp 485 -492.
- Verbeek, M. (2004) *A Guide to modern econometrics, (2nd edition)*. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons.
- Walsh, J. (2007) Equality and diversity in British workplaces: the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 38:4, pp 303 - 319.
- Walton, R.E. (1985) From control to commitment in the workplace. *Harvard Business Review*, 85: 2, pp 77 -84.
- Warr, P. (1990) The Measurement of well being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63:3, pp 193 -210.
- Winkelmann, L. and Winkelmann, R. (1998) Why are the unemployed so unhappy? Evidence from panel data. *Economica*, 65, pp. 1 – 15.
- Wood, S. (2008) Job characteristics, employee voice and well-being in Britain. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 39: 2, pp 153 -168.
- Wood, S., Holman, D. and Stride, C. (2006) Human resource management and performance in UK call centres. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44: 1, pp 99 -124.

Table 1. Independent Variables in the Regressions

Variable	Scotland Subset	Full GB data set
	Mean (SD) or proportion	Mean (SD) or Proportion
Characteristics of the Employee		
Female (=1)	0.523	0.500
With a long term illness/health problem/disability (=1)	0.114	0.134
With no academic qualifications (=1)	0.165	0.137
With no vocational or professional qualifications (=1)	0.339	0.338
Not 'White' (=1)	0.043	0.076
With tenure of less than 1 year (=1)	0.111	0.128
With tenure of between 1 and 2 years (=1)	0.108	0.119
With tenure of between 2 and 5 years (the reference category)	0.263	0.282
With tenure of between 5 and 10 years (=1)	0.207	0.193
With tenure of 10 years or more (=1)	0.308	0.275
With a permanent contract of employment (the reference category)	0.930	0.942
With a temporary contract of employment (=1)	0.036	0.031
With a fixed period contract of employment (=1)	0.032	0.026
Log of the number of hours usually worked each week	3.524 (0.459)	3.534 (0.474)
Aged 16 – 21 (=1)	0.037	0.049
Aged 22 – 29 (=1)	0.143	0.155
Aged 30 – 39 (=1)	0.262	0.265
Aged 40 – 49 (the reference category)	0.276	0.272
Aged 50 – 59 (=1)	0.242	0.218
Aged 60 and over (=1)	0.038	0.036
Married, or living with a partner (=1)	0.693	0.698
Earning less than £5.00 per hour (=1)	0.083	0.092
Earning between £5.01 and £14.99 per hour (the reference category)	0.766	0.737
Earning over £15.00 per hour (=1)	0.150	0.169
A member of a union/staff association (=1)	0.495	0.372
Not a member now, but have been in the past (=1)	0.141	0.167
Have never been a member of a union/staff association (the reference category)	0.360	0.459

Table 1. (cont.)

Variable	Scotland Subset	Full GB data set
	Mean (SD) or Proportion	Mean (SD) or Proportion
Characteristics of the Employee (cont.)		
Has received no training in the last 12 months (the reference category)	0.323	0.325
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day (=1)	0.096	0.089
Has received between 1 and 2 days training in last 12 months (=1)	0.135	0.150
Has received between 2 and 5 days training in the last 12 months (=1)	0.246	0.235
Has received between 5 and 10 days training in the last 12 months (=1)	0.123	0.108
Has received 10 or more days of training in the last 12 months (=1)	0.074	0.090
Structural Characteristics of the Workplace		
More than 60 percent of employees have their wages determined via union negotiation (=1)	0.618	0.500
Log of the percentage of women employed	3.630 (1.083)	3.584 (0.999)
Log of the percentage of part time employees employed	2.048 (2.027)	2.037 (2.069)
One of a number of different workplaces in the UK belonging to the same organisation (i.e. a multi-plant workplace) (=1)	0.835	0.404
A single independent workplace not belonging to another body (i.e. a single plant, domestically owned workplace/organisation) (the reference category)	0.148	0.385
Sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation (i.e. the single GB plant of a multinational national enterprise) (=1)	0.016	0.153
Log of the number of years the establishment/workplace has been in operation, at this address and elsewhere	3.324 (1.186)	3.252 (1.136)
11 dummy variables to capture Standard Industrial Classification		
Log of the number of employees at the workplace	4.927 (1.639)	4.874 (1.587)
A 'private sector' type workplace (the reference category)	0.520	0.636
A 'public sector' type of workplace (=1)	0.396	0.293
Some 'other type' of workplace (e.g. charity) (=1)	0.083	0.069

Table 1 (cont.)

Variable	Scotland Subset	Full GB Data set
	Mean (SD) or proportion	Mean (SD) or Proportion
Human Resource Management Policies		
A formal strategic plan exists (=1)	0.929	0.862
Workplace is Investors in People (IIP) accredited (=1)	0.515	0.524
Internal candidates are preferred when filling vacancies (=1)	0.368	0.306
More than 60 percent of the dominant occupational group have received training in the last 12 months (=1)	0.633	0.582
Meetings between managers and the whole workplace (e.g. in groups) take place (=1)	0.801	0.787
Meetings between line managers/supervisors and the workers for whom they are responsible (=1)	0.877	0.862
Formal job evaluation schemes operate (=1)	0.459	0.371
Formal procedures exist for dealing with collective disputes (=1)	0.688	0.616
A formal equal opportunities policy exists (=1)	0.930	0.899
Recruitment and selection are monitored (=1)	0.535	0.492
Regional Dimension		
Rest of Great Britain (=1)		0.887
Number of Observations	1,202	10,655

Note to Table 1.

Before taking logs, all observations with '0' were changed to '0.05'.

PERSPECTIVES ABOUT THE JOB:

Table 2a. Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement about your job: “My work requires that I work very hard.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	4.91	5.27	0.0081	.1611	.00	
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	17.72	18.30	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	77.37	76.43	-0.0094	.3184	.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 0.5842 Pr = 0.747					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 230.00

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.146

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	74.02	54	0.037
Structural characteristics of the workplace	74.78	40	0.001
Human resource management policies	17.21	20	0.639

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	-.01 **	.04
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.00 *	.03
With no academic qualifications	.00	.01
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.00 *	.01
Not 'white'	.01	-.09
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.00	.01
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.00	.05
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	-.01
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.00	.03
With a temporary contract of employment	.00	-.09
With a fixed period contract of employment	.00	-.00
Aged 16 -21	.02 *	.06
Aged 22 – 29	.00	.00
Aged 30 – 39	.00	-.02
Aged 50 – 59	.00	-.05
Aged 60 or over	.03 *	-.05
Married or living with partner	-.00	-.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.00	-.03
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.00	.06 *
A member of a union/staff association	.00	-.03
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.00 *	-.05 *
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01 **	.02
Has received between 1 -2 days training	.00	.03
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	.00	.07 **
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.00	.05
Has received 10 or more days training	-.00	.07 **
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	-.01	.02
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	-.02	-.25 **
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	.04 ***	-.05
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.00	-.07

Note:

1. *, **, *** denotes statistical significance at .1, .05, and .01, respectively, in the above and subsequent tables

Table 2b. Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement about your job: “I never seem to have enough time to get my work done.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	27.95	27.01	-0.1164	.0843	-.02	
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	28.87	30.82	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	43.18	42.18	0.0009	.0776	.01	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 1.9260 Pr = 0.382					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 284.46

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.109

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	125.91	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	56.91	40	0.040
Human resource management policies	27.90	20	0.112

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	-.02	-.01
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.06	.09
With no academic qualifications	.07	-.14 ***
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.04	-.07 *
Not 'white'	.16	-.12
With tenure of less than 1 year	.06	-.09
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.03	.03
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	.03
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.03	.07 *
With a temporary contract of employment	.02	-.15
With a fixed period contract of employment	.06	.05
Aged 16 -21	.13	-.22 *
Aged 22 – 29	-.02	-.09 **
Aged 30 – 39	-.00	-.09 ***
Aged 50 – 59	.03	-.08 *
Aged 60 or over	.12	-.29 ***
Married or living with partner	.00	.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.12	-.20 **
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.17 ***	.12
A member of a union/staff association	.00	-.04
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.03	.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01	.01
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.04	.05
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	.01	.11 ***
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.05	.18 ***
Has received 10 or more days training	.10 **	.01
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	-.01	.05
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.26	-.16
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	.04	-.12 *
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.10	-.07

Table 2c. Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement about your job: “I feel my job is secure in this workplace.”?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	16.97	17.05	-0.0219	.1089	.01	
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	16.89	18.82	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	66.14	64.13	-0.1475	.0865	-.02	*
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 2.8123 Pr = 0.245					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 373.39

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.177

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	113.18	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	138.33	40	0.000
Human resource management policies	35.35	20	0.018

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	.01	-.02
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.01	-.08 *
With no academic qualifications	-.02	.10 **
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.00	.03
Not 'white'	-.01	-.02
With tenure of less than 1 year	.01	.01
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.03	.03
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	.04
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.00	.07 **
With a temporary contract of employment	.46 ***	-.50 ***
With a fixed period contract of employment	.27	-.38 ***
Aged 16 -21	-.10 *	.13
Aged 22 – 29	-.03	.06
Aged 30 – 39	-.02	.02
Aged 50 – 59	-.03	-.00
Aged 60 or over	-.07	.04
Married or living with partner	-.04	.07
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.00	.04
Earning over £15.00 per hour	.00	.03
A member of a union/staff association	.03	-.05
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-.05 **	.02
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.06 **	.03
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.09 **	.11
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.08 **	.10
Has received 10 or more days training	-.09	.15 *
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.09	-.18 ***
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.18	-.58 ***
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.08	.12
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.08	-.22 ***

Table 2d. Question: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement about your job: “I worry a lot about my work outside working hours.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	49.83	48.79	-0.1616	.0822	-.01	**
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	21.05	24.05	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	29.12	27.17	-0.1626	.0906	-.01	*
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 5.7624 Pr = 0.056					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 201.96

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.081

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	91.72	54	0.001
Structural characteristics of the workplace	48.97	40	0.156
Human resource management policies	14.84	20	0.785

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	-.03	.03
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.08	.08
With no academic qualifications	.03	-.06
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.10 **	-.06
Not 'white'	.16	-.14
With tenure of less than 1 year	.03	.00
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.03	-.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.03	.03
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.03	.05
With a temporary contract of employment	-.04	-.00
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.07	.13 *
Aged 16 -21	.03	-.13
Aged 22 – 29	-.01	-.06
Aged 30 – 39	.05	-.06
Aged 50 – 59	.07	-.05
Aged 60 or over	.32 **	-.24 *
Married or living with partner	.01	-.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.11	-.09
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.16 ***	.08
A member of a union/staff association	.02	-.01
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.01	-.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.02	.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.07	.04
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.07	.06
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.09	.07
Has received 10 or more days training	.01	.01
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.09 **	.01 *
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.20 *	-.06
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.02	-.07 *
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.07 **	.03 **

Table 2e. Question: Thinking about the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel: “Tense” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.1058	.0584		
‘Never’	11.90	9.88				-.00	
‘Occasionally’	26.46	27.42				-.01	*
‘Some of the time’	43.09	43.88				.00	
‘Most of the time’	15.81	15.51				.01	*
‘All of the time’	2.75	3.31				.00	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 5.9146 Pr = 0.206		/cut 1	0.2931	.2274		
			/cut 2	2.0362	.2277		
			/cut 3	4.0957	.2304		
			/cut 4	6.0520	.2359		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 125.35

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.038

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	80.07	27	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	22.87	20	0.295
Human resource management policies	5.57	10	0.850

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Never'</i>	<i>'Occasion-ally'</i>	<i>'Some of the time'</i>	<i>'Most of the time'</i>	<i>'All of the time'</i>
Female	-0.00	-0.00	.00	.00	.00
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.04 ***	-.08 ***	.03 ***	.08 ***	.01 ***
With no academic qualifications	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.02 **	.03 **	-.02 **	-.02 **	-.00 **
Not 'white'	.04	.05	-.04	-.04	-.00
With tenure of less than 1 year	.01	.02	-.02	-.02	-.00
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.00	.01	-.00	-.01	-.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	.00	.01	-.00	-.01	-.00
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.00	-.01	.00	.01	.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.01	.01	-.01	-.01	-.00
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.00	-.00	.00	.00	.00
Aged 16 -21	.02	.03	.02	-.02	-.00
Aged 22 – 29	-.02	-.03	.02	.03	.00
Aged 30 – 39	.01	.01	-.01	-.01	-.00
Aged 50 – 59	.02 *	.03 *	-.02 *	-.03 *	-.00 *
Aged 60 or over	.16 ***	.11 ***	-.06 ***	-.09 ***	.01 ***
Married or living with partner	.00	.01	-.00	-.01	-.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.03	.04	-.04	-.03	-.00
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.03 ***	-.06 ***	.03 ***	.05 ***	.01 ***
A member of a union/staff association	-.00	-.01	.00	.01	.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.03 *	.04 *	-.03 *	-.03 *	-.00 *
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01	.01	-.01	-.01	-.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.02	-.04	.02	.03	.00
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.01	-.02	.01	.02	.00
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.01	-.01	.01	.01	.00
Has received 10 or more days training	.02	.03	-.02	-.02	-.00
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.02	.03	-.01	-.02	-.00
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	.04	.05	-.04	-.04	-.00
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	.02	.03	-.02	-.02	-.00
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.02	.03	-.02	-.02	-.00

Table 2f. Question: Thinking about the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel: “Calm” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.0122	.0572		
‘Never’	12.40	10.48				-.00	
‘Occasionally’	27.29	28.59				-.00	
‘Some of the time’	29.45	30.05				.00	
‘Most of the time’	28.87	28.57				.00	
‘All of the time’	2.00	2.30				.00	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 4.8686 Pr = 0.301		/cut 1	-3.5574	.2262		
			/cut 2	-1.8384	.2243		
			/cut 3	-0.5438	.2236		
			/cut 4	2.4781	.2306		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 115.83

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.034

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	50.03	27	0.004
Structural characteristics of the workplace	24.56	20	0.218
Human resource management policies	10.79	10	0.374

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Never'</i>	<i>'Occasion-ally'</i>	<i>'Some of the time'</i>	<i>'Most of the time'</i>	<i>'All of the time'</i>
Female	-0.00	-0.00	.00	.00	.00
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.04 **	.05 **	-.02 **	-.07 **	-.00 **
With no academic qualifications	-.05 ***	.08 ***	.00 ***	.12 ***	.01 ***
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-0.00	-0.00	.00	.00	.00
Not 'white'	.01	.02	-0.00	-.02	-0.00
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.01	-.02	.00	.03	.00
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.01	.01	-0.00	-.02	-0.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.01	-.02	.00	.02	.00
With tenure of 10 years or more	.01	.01	-0.00	-.02	-0.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.00	.00	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
With a fixed period contract of employment	.02	.03	-.01	-.04	-0.00
Aged 16 -21	-.02	-.04	.00	.06	.00
Aged 22 – 29	-.02	-.03	.00	.04	.00
Aged 30 – 39	-.01	-.02	.00	.03	.00
Aged 50 – 59	-.03 ***	-.05 ***	.00 ***	.07 ***	.00 ***
Aged 60 or over	-.07 ***	-.14 ***	-.04 ***	.23 ***	.03 ***
Married or living with partner	-0.00	-0.00	.00	.00	.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-0.00	-.01	.00	.01	.00
Earning over £15.00 per hour	.00	.00	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
A member of a union/staff association	.00	.00	-0.00	-.01	-0.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.00	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01	.01	-0.00	-.02	-0.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-0.00	-0.00	.00	.00	.00
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.01	-.01	.00	.02	.00
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.01	-.02	.00	.03	.00
Has received 10 or more days training	-.01	-.01	.00	.02	.00
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.01	.02	-0.00	-.03	-0.00
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	-.05	-.09	-.01	.14	.01
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.02	-.02	.00	.03	.00
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.01	.01	-0.00	-.02	-0.00

Table 2g. Question: Thinking about the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel: “Relaxed” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.0033	.0573		
‘Never’	20.05	17.95				-.00	
‘Occasionally’	30.28	30.74				-.00	
‘Some of the time’	24.29	27.97				.00	
‘Most of the time’	23.71	21.45				.00	
‘All of the time’	1.66	1.88				.00	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 10.6643 Pr = 0.031		/cut 1	-3.1091	.2234		
			/cut 2	-1.6068	.2220		
			/cut 3	-0.3366	.2214		
			/cut 4	2.5067	.2305		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 99.02

Prob > chi2 : 0.0005

Pseudo R2 : 0.028

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	48.07	27	0.007
Structural characteristics of the workplace	17.11	20	0.646
Human resource management policies	8.97	10	0.534

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Never'</i>	<i>'Occasion-ally'</i>	<i>'Some of the time'</i>	<i>'Most of the time'</i>	<i>'All of the time'</i>
Female	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.04 *	.02 *	-.02 *	-.04 *	-.00 *
With no academic qualifications	-.07 ***	-.05 ***	.02 ***	.09 ***	.00 ***
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.01	-.01	.00	.02	.00
Not 'white'	-.00	-.00	.00	.00	.00
With tenure of less than 1 year	.01	.00	-.00	-.01	-.00
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.01	.00	-.00	-.01	-.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	-.00	.00	.00	.00
With tenure of 10 years or more	.00	.00	-.00	-.01	-.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.03	.01	-.01	-.03	-.00
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.01	-.01	.00	.02	.00
Aged 16 -21	.01	.01	-.00	-.01	-.00
Aged 22 – 29	-.03	-.02	.01	.04	.00
Aged 30 – 39	-.01	-.01	.00	.02	.00
Aged 50 – 59	-.05 **	-.03 **	.02 **	.06 **	.00 **
Aged 60 or over	-.13 ***	-.15 ***	-.00 ***	.25 ***	.03 ***
Married or living with partner	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.01	.00	-.00	-.01	-.00
Earning over £15.00 per hour	.01	.00	-.00	-.01	-.00
A member of a union/staff association	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.00	-.00	.00	.00	.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.00	-.00	.00	.01	.00
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.02	-.01	.01	.02	.00
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.03	-.02	.01	.03	.00
Has received 10 or more days training	-.04	-.03	.01	.05	.00
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.02	.01	-.01	-.03	-.00
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	-.07	-.06	.02	.11	-.01
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.01	-.01	.00	.01	.00
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.02	.01	-.01	-.02	-.00

Table 2h. Question: Thinking about the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel: “Worried” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.0957	.0576		
‘Never’	19.38	18.14				-.01	*
‘Occasionally’	31.28	32.19				-.00	
‘Some of the time’	38.60	37.66				.01	*
‘Most of the time’	9.15	9.99				.00	
‘All of the time’	1.58	2.02				.00	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 3.2235 Pr = 0.521		/cut 1	0.6378	.2263		
			/cut 2	2.2312	.2272		
			/cut 3	4.2985	.2292		
			/cut 4	6.2158	.2381		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 112.94

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.035

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	66.91	27	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	25.68	20	0.176
Human resource management policies	2.40	10	0.992

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Never'</i>	<i>'Occasionally'</i>	<i>'Some of the time'</i>	<i>'Most of the time'</i>	<i>'All of the time'</i>
Female	-.02	-.01	.03	.01	.00
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.05 **	-.05 **	.06 **	.03 **	.00 **
With no academic qualifications	.01	.01	-.01	-.00	-.00
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.02	.01	-.02	-.01	-.00
Not 'white'	.05	.02	-.06	-.02	-.00
With tenure of less than 1 year	.01	.01	-.01	-.00	-.00
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.01	-.00	.01	.00	.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.00	-.00	.00	.00	.00
With a temporary contract of employment	-.01	-.00	.01	.00	.00
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.03	-.02	.03	.01	.00
Aged 16 -21	.08	.03	-.08	-.02	-.00
Aged 22 – 29	-.02	-.02	.03	.01	.00
Aged 30 – 39	.01	.00	-.01	-.00	-.00
Aged 50 – 59	.03	.01	-.03	-.01	-.00
Aged 60 or over	.12 **	.04 **	-.12 **	-.04 **	-.00 **
Married or living with partner	.02	.01	-.02	-.01	-.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.06 *	.03 *	-.06 *	-.02 *	-.00 *
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.06 ***	-.05 ***	.07 ***	.04 ***	.00 ***
A member of a union/staff association	-.01	-.01	.01	.00	.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.04	.02	-.04	-.01	-.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-.00	-.00	.00	.00	.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.03	-.03	.04	.02	.00
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.03	-.02	.03	.01	.00
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.05 ***	-.05 ***	.06 ***	.03 ***	.00 ***
Has received 10 or more days training	.02	.01	-.02	-.01	-.00
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.01	.01	-.02	-.00	-.00
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	.01	.00	-.01	-.00	-.00
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	.01	.00	-.01	-.00	-.00
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	-.00

Table 2i. Question: Thinking about the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel: “Uneasy” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.0532	.0566		
‘Never’	26.12	27.30				-.01	
‘Occasionally’	34.78	33.21				-.00	
‘Some of the time’	31.20	29.47				.00	
‘Most of the time’	6.14	8.08				.00	
‘All of the time’	1.50	1.94				.00	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 7.2859 Pr = 0.122		/cut 1	0.5651	.2249		
			/cut 2	2.0330	.2257		
			/cut 3	3.8688	.2280		
			/cut 4	5.6091	.2370		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 100.95

Prob > chi2 : 0.0003

Pseudo R2 : 0.031

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	55.37	27	0.001
Structural characteristics of the workplace	16.29	20	0.698
Human resource management policies	9.40	10	0.495

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Never'</i>	<i>'Occasionally'</i>	<i>'Some of the time'</i>	<i>'Most of the time'</i>	<i>'All of the time'</i>
Female	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.06 **	-.02 **	.06 **	.02 **	.00 **
With no academic qualifications	.04	.00	-.03	-.01	-.00
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.03	.00	-.02	-.00	-.00
Not 'white'	-.01	-.00	.01	.00	.00
With tenure of less than 1 year	.03	.00	-.03	-.00	-.00
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.02	.00	-.02	-.00	-.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.00	-.00	.00	.00	.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.01	.00	-.01	-.00	-.00
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.01	-.00	.01	.00	.00
Aged 16 -21	.02	.00	-.02	-.00	-.00
Aged 22 – 29	-.03	-.01	.03	.01	.00
Aged 30 – 39	.04	.00	-.04	-.01	-.00
Aged 50 – 59	-.01	-.00	.01	.00	.00
Aged 60 or over	.16 **	-.00 **	-.11 **	-.02 **	-.00 **
Married or living with partner	.00	.00	-.01	-.00	-.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.00 **	.00 **	-.07 **	-.02 **	-.00 **
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.02 **	-.02 **	.06 **	.02 **	.00 **
A member of a union/staff association	-.00	-.00	.02	.00	.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.00	.00	-.02	-.00	-.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.00	-.00	.02	.00	.00
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.01	-.01	.04	.01	.00
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.01 *	-.01 *	.03 *	.01 *	.00 *
Has received 10 or more days training	.00	.00	-.02	-.00	-.00
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.00	.00	-.02	-.00	-.00
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	-.00	-.00	.02	.00	.00
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	.00	.00	-.02	-.00	-.00
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.00	.00	-.02	-.00	-.00

Table 2j. Question: Thinking about the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel: “Content” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.0446	.0573		
‘Never’	12.06	10.47				-.00	
‘Occasionally’	23.29	22.62				-.00	
‘Some of the time’	28.95	30.56				-.00	
‘Most of the time’	32.95	32.50				.00	
‘All of the time’	2.75	3.85				.00	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 7.2191 Pr = 0.125		/cut 1	-3.1384	.2257		
			/cut 2	-1.6629	.2242		
			/cut 3	-0.3515	.2236		
			/cut 4	2.4142	.2274		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 120.12

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.035

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	53.72	27	0.001
Structural characteristics of the workplace	25.54	20	0.181
Human resource management policies	15.48	10	0.115

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Never'</i>	<i>'Occasionally'</i>	<i>'Some of the time'</i>	<i>'Most of the time'</i>	<i>'All of the time'</i>
Female	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	.00	.00
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.05 ***	.06 ***	-0.01 ***	-0.09 ***	-0.00 ***
With no academic qualifications	-0.04 ***	-0.06 ***	-0.01 ***	.10 ***	.01 ***
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.00	.00	-0.00	-0.01	-0.00
Not 'white'	.07 **	.07 **	-0.02 **	-.11 **	-.01 **
With tenure of less than 1 year	-0.01	-0.01	-0.00	.02	.00
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-0.00	-0.01	-0.00	.01	.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-0.01	-0.01	-0.00	.02	.00
With tenure of 10 years or more	.01	.01	-0.00	-0.02	-0.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.04	.05	-0.01	-0.08	-0.00
With a fixed period contract of employment	.00	.00	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
Aged 16 -21	-0.01	-0.02	-0.00	.04	.00
Aged 22 – 29	-0.01	-0.01	-0.00	.02	.00
Aged 30 – 39	-0.01	-0.02	-0.00	.03	.00
Aged 50 – 59	-0.00	-0.01	-0.00	.02	.00
Aged 60 or over	-0.07 ***	-0.12 ***	-0.06 ***	.22 ***	.04 ***
Married or living with partner	-0.01	-0.01	.00	.02	.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-0.01	-0.02	-0.00	.04	.00
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	.01	.00
A member of a union/staff association	.01	.01	.00	-0.02	-0.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.00	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	.00	.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-0.02	-0.03	-0.00	.05	.00
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-0.02	-0.03	-0.00	.05	.00
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-0.04 **	-0.06 **	-0.01 **	.10 **	.01 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-0.04 **	-0.06 **	-0.01 **	.11 **	.01 **
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.03 *	.04 *	.00 *	-.07 *	-.00 *
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	-0.02	-0.04	-0.00	.07	.00
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-0.04 *	-0.05 *	-0.00 *	.08 *	.01 *
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	.00	.00

PERSPECTIVES ABOUT THE INFLUENCE OVER THE JOB

Table 3a. Question: In general, how much influence do you have over: “What tasks you do in your job.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.0225	00586		
‘None’	12.15	10.57				-.00	
‘A little’	15.14	14.45				-.00	
‘Some’	38.19	39.45				-.00	
‘A lot’	34.53	35.53				.00	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 3.5602 Pr = 0.313		/cut 1	-1.7110	.2285		
			/cut 2	-0.6200	.2277		
			/cut 3	1.2056	.2279		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 146.01

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.0476

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	72.45	27	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	60.08	20	0.000
Human resource management policies	9.21	10	0.512

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'None'</i>	<i>'A little'</i>	<i>'Some'</i>	<i>'A lot'</i>
Female	.00	.00	.00	-.00
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.01	-.01	-.00	.04
With no academic qualifications	-.01	-.01	-.00	.04
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.02 *	.02 *	.00 *	-.04 *
Not 'white'	.02	.02	.00	-.05
With tenure of less than 1 year	.01	.01	.00	-.03
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.02	.02	.00	-.05
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.01	-.01	-.00	.03
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.02	-.02	-.00	.05
With a temporary contract of employment	.03	.03	.00	-.07
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.02	-.02	-.01	.06
Aged 16 -21	-.01	-.01	-.00	.02
Aged 22 – 29	.00	.00	.00	-.00
Aged 30 – 39	-.00	-.00	-.00	.00
Aged 50 – 59	.01	-.01	-.00	-.04
Aged 60 or over	-.00	-.01	-.00	.02
Married or living with partner	-.00	-.00	-.00	.01
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.00	.00	.00	-.00
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.05 ***	-.06 ***	-.04 ***	.17 ***
A member of a union/staff association	-.00	-.00	-.00	.01
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.00	.00	-.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.00	.00	.00	-.01
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.00	-.00	-.00	.01
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.04 ***	-.04 ***	-.02 ***	.12 ***
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.03 **	-.03 **	-.02 **	.09 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-.02	-.03	-.01	.08
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.03 *	.03 *	.01 *	-.08 *
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.20 ***	.10 ***	-.09 ***	-.21 ***
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.07 ***	-.07 ***	-.03 ***	.18 ***
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.05 ***	-.06 ***	-.05 ***	.17 ***

Table 3b. Question: In general, how much influence do you have over: “The pace at which you work.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.0189	.0575		
‘None’	11.23	10.94				-.00	
‘A little’	15.81	15.35				-.00	
‘Some’	38.02	35.96				-.00	
‘A lot’	34.94	37.76				.00	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 3.7372 Pr = 0.291		/cut 1	-1.9187	.2265		
			/cut 2	-0.8284	.2256		
			/cut 3	0.7626	.2256		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 94.83

Prob > chi2 : 0.0012

Pseudo R2 : 0.031

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	47.27	27	0.009
Structural characteristics of the workplace	35.09	20	0.019
Human resource management policies	14.96	10	0.133

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'None'</i>	<i>'A little'</i>	<i>'Some'</i>	<i>'A lot'</i>
Female	-.02 *	-.02 *	-.00 *	.05 *
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.00	-.00	-.00	.01
With no academic qualifications	-.01	-.02	-.00	.05
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.00	.00	.00	-.00
Not 'white'	.00	.00	.00	-.01
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.00	-.01	-.00	.02
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.00	-.00	-.00	.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	-.00	-.00	.01
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.01	-.01	-.00	.04
With a temporary contract of employment	-.02	-.03	-.01	.07
With a fixed period contract of employment	.01	-.01	-.00	-.03
Aged 16 -21	-.03	-.03	-.02	.09
Aged 22 – 29	-.02	-.02	-.01	.05
Aged 30 – 39	-.02 **	-.03 **	-.01 **	.07 **
Aged 50 – 59	-.01	-.01	-.00	.04
Aged 60 or over	-.04 **	-.06 **	-.05 **	.16 **
Married or living with partner	-.00	-.00	-.00	.01
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.01	-.01	-.00	.02
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.04	-.05	-.03	.14
A member of a union/staff association	.00	.00	.00	-.01
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.00	.00	-.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.02	.02	.00	-.05
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.00	-.00	-.00	.00
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.04 ***	-.04 ***	-.02 ***	.11 ***
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.02	-.02	-.01	.05
Has received 10 or more days training	-.02	-.02	-.01	.06
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.01	.01	.00	-.02
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.03	.03	.00	-.07
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.05 **	-.05 **	-.02 **	.13 **
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.03 *	-.04 *	-.02 *	.11 *

Table 3c. Question: In general, how much influence do you have over: “How you do your work.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.0486	.0606		
‘None’	4.49	3.65				-.00	
‘A little’	11.23	10.90				-.00	
‘Some’	35.27	34.38				-.00	
‘A lot’	48.00	51.07				.01	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 5.2184 Pr = 0.156		/cut 1	-2.9391	.2412		
			/cut 2	-1.4184	.2376		
			/cut 3	0.4013	.2371		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 116.55

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.043

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	56.05	27	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	38.52	20	0.007
Human resource management policies	20.76	10	0.022

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'None'</i>	<i>'A little'</i>	<i>'Some'</i>	<i>'A lot'</i>
Female	-0.00 *	-0.01 *	-0.02 *	.05 *
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	.00
With no academic qualifications	-0.01 *	-0.02 *	-0.04 *	.07 *
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.00 *	.01 *	.02 *	-.05 *
Not 'white'	.00	.01	.02	-.04
With tenure of less than 1 year	.00	.00	.00	-.00
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-0.00 *	-0.02 *	-0.03 *	.07 *
With tenure of 10 years or more	-0.00	-0.01	-0.01	.03
With a temporary contract of employment	-0.00	-0.01	-0.03	.05
With a fixed period contract of employment	-0.01	-0.02	-0.05	.08
Aged 16 -21	-0.01 *	-0.04 *	-0.08 *	.14 *
Aged 22 – 29	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	.00
Aged 30 – 39	-0.00	-0.01	-0.03	.05
Aged 50 – 59	.00	.00	.00	-.01
Aged 60 or over	-0.01	-0.02	-0.04	.08
Married or living with partner	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.00	.01	.02	-.05
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-0.02 ***	-0.05 ***	-.10 ***	.18 ***
A member of a union/staff association	-0.00	-0.00	-0.01	.02
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.00	.00	-.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01	.02	.03	-.06
Has received between 1 -2 days training	.00	.00	.00	-.01
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-0.01 **	-.03 **	-0.05 **	.09 **
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-0.00	-0.02	-0.03	.07
Has received 10 or more days training	-0.01	-0.02	-0.04	.08
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.00	.00	.00	-.01
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.02	.04	.04	-.11
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-0.02 **	-.05 **	-0.08 **	.15 **
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-0.01 *	-0.03 *	-0.07 *	.12 *

Table 3d. Question: In general, how much influence do you have over: “The order in which you carry out tasks.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.0146	.0606		
‘None’	6.74	5.18				-.00	
‘A little’	9.48	11.05				-.00	
‘Some’	35.27	33.66				-.00	
‘A lot’	48.50	50.10				.00	
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 8.5968 Pr = 0.035		/cut 1	-1.7433	.2348		
			/cut 2	-0.4710	.2328		
			/cut 3	1.2677	.2329		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 113.56

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.042

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	56.21	27	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	24.47	20	0.222
Human resource management policies	18.88	10	0.041

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'None'</i>	<i>'A little'</i>	<i>'Some'</i>	<i>'A lot'</i>
Female	-.00	-.01	-.02	.04
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.00	-.01	-.02	.04
With no academic qualifications	.01	.01	.02	-.04
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.01	.01	.02	-.04
Not 'white'	.01	.01	.02	-.04
With tenure of less than 1 year	.01	.02	.03	-.07
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.00	.00	.01	-.02
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	-.00	-.00	.00
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.01 **	-.02 **	-.04 **	.08 **
With a temporary contract of employment	-.02 *	-.03 *	-.08 *	.14 *
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.02	-.02	-.06	.11
Aged 16 -21	-.02	-.03	-.06	.12
Aged 22 – 29	-.00	-.00	-.01	.02
Aged 30 – 39	-.00	-.00	-.01	.01
Aged 50 – 59	.00	.00	.00	-.00
Aged 60 or over	.00	.00	.00	-.00
Married or living with partner	-.01 *	-.01 *	-.02 *	.05 *
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.01	.01	.02	-.05
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.02 ***	-.03 ***	-.08 ***	.14 ***
A member of a union/staff association	.00	.01	.01	-.03
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.00	.00	-.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.02	.02	.03	-.07
Has received between 1 -2 days training	.00	.00	.00	-.00
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.01 **	-.02 **	-.04 **	.08 **
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.01	-.01	-.02	.05
Has received 10 or more days training	-.01	-.01	-.03	.06
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.00	.00	.01	-.02
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.02	.02	.03	-.08
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.02 **	-.03 **	-.07 **	.13 **
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.01	-.02	-.05	.10

Table 3e. Question: In general, how much influence do you have over: “The time you start or finish your working day.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from ordered logit estimation				
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)		Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
				0.1422	0.0583		
‘None’	37.35	33.70				-.03	**
‘A little’	14.98	16.04				-.00	
‘Some’	22.05	24.10				.01	**
‘A lot’	25.62	26.16				.02	**
Total	1,202	9,453					
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 6.9207 Pr = 0.074		/cut 1	0.6109	.2267		
			/cut 2	1.3409	.2271		
			/cut 3	2.4864	.2279		

Selected Output from the Ordered Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (57) : 209.62

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.065

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	57.94	27	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	100.91	20	0.000
Human resource management policies	13.15	10	0.215

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Ordered Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'None'</i>	<i>'A little'</i>	<i>'Some'</i>	<i>'A lot'</i>
Female	.02	.00	-.00	-.01
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.04	-.00	-.01	.04
With no academic qualifications	.01	.00	-.00	-.00
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.02	-.00	.00	.01
Not 'white'	-.00	-.00	.00	.00
With tenure of less than 1 year	.01	.00	-.00	-.01
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.01	-.00	.00	.01
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	.00	.00	-.00	-.00
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.02	-.00	.00	.02
With a temporary contract of employment	.06	.00	-.02	-.04
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.07	-.01	.02	.06
Aged 16 -21	.06	.00	-.02	-.04
Aged 22 – 29	.03	.00	-.01	-.02
Aged 30 – 39	-.00	-.00	.00	.00
Aged 50 – 59	-.03	-.00	.00	.02
Aged 60 or over	.00	.00	-.00	-.00
Married or living with partner	.01	.00	-.00	-.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.09	.00	-.03	-.06
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.14	-.02	.03	.13
	***	***	***	***
A member of a union/staff association	.06 *	.00 *	-.02 *	-.05 *
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.00	-.00	-.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.00	.00	-.00	-.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.06 *	-.00 *	.01 *	.05 *
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.06 *	-.00 *	.02 *	.05 *
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.08 **	-.01 **	.02 **	.07 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-.09 *	-.01 *	.02 *	.08 *
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.04	.00	-.01	-.03
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	.28 **	-.03 **	-.11 **	-.14 **
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.07	-.00	.02	.05
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.03	-.02	.03	.13
	***	***	***	***

PERSPECTIVES ABOUT THE SATISFACTION DERIVED FROM THE JOB

Table 4a. Question: How satisfied are you with: “The sense of achievement you get from your work.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Dissatisfied’	12.65	10.41	-0.1317	.1160	-.01	
Neither ‘satisfied’ nor ‘dissatisfied’	19.13	19.06	The base outcome			
‘Satisfied’	68.22	70.53	0.0351	.0834	.01	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 5.8123 Pr = 0.055					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 208.16

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.103

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	95.47	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	55.53	40	0.052
Human resource management policies	19.357	20	0.499

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Dissatisfied'</i>	<i>'Satisfied'</i>
Female	-.02	.07 **
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.04	-.09
With no academic qualifications	-.05	.07
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.00	.00
Not 'white'	.07	-.11
With tenure of less than 1 year	.01	.04
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.00	.05 *
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.02	.01
With tenure of 10 years or more	.00	.05 *
With a temporary contract of employment	.13 **	-.07
With a fixed period contract of employment	.01	-.01
Aged 16 -21	.08	-.06
Aged 22 – 29	.03 *	.02
Aged 30 – 39	-.01	.07 **
Aged 50 – 59	.02	.02
Aged 60 or over	-.02	.15 ***
Married or living with partner	.01	.02
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.05	.07
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.06	.13 **
A member of a union/staff association	.01	-.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.00	.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01	-.02
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.00	.01
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.02	.13 ***
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.01 **	.13 ***
Has received 10 or more days training	-.02	.13 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.04	-.05
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	-.01	-.01
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.01	.10 *
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.05	-.00

Table 4b. Question: How satisfied are you with: “The scope for using your own initiative.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Dissatisfied’	12.40	9.98	-0.2059	.1186	-.01	*
Neither ‘satisfied’ nor ‘dissatisfied’	18.22	18.11	The base outcome			
‘Satisfied’	69.39	71.91	0.0111	.0844	.01	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 7.0549 Pr = 0.029					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 217.58

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.110

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	101.18	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	67.48	40	0.004
Human resource management policies	16.10	20	0.710

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Dissatisfied'</i>	<i>'Satisfied'</i>
Female	-.00	.01
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.01	.01
With no academic qualifications	-.05	.12 **
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.01	-.00
Not 'white'	.16 *	-.21
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.00	-.04
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.03	-.07
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.04 **	.01
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.03	.05
With a temporary contract of employment	-.00	-.10 *
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.00	-.00
Aged 16 -21	-.02	.09
Aged 22 – 29	-.06	.12 **
Aged 30 – 39	-.05	.12 **
Aged 50 – 59	-.00	.00
Aged 60 or over	-.03	.07
Married or living with partner	.00	.01
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.04	.07
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.05	.13 **
A member of a union/staff association	.03 *	-.01
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.02	-.02
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.00	.05
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.02	.04
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.06	.11 *
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.05 *	.16 ***
Has received 10 or more days training	-.05	.15 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.06 *	-.10
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	.16	-.21
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.00	.03
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.00	.02

Table 4c. Question: How satisfied are you with: “The amount of influence you have over your job.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Dissatisfied’	16.72	14.32	-0.0784	.0990	-.01	
Neither ‘satisfied’ nor ‘dissatisfied’	28.45	27.26	The base outcome			
‘Satisfied’	54.83	58.42	0.0631	.0741	.02	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 7.1259 Pr = 0.028					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 179.76

Prob > chi2 : 0.0001

Pseudo R2 : 0.075

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	100.41	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	46.14	40	0.233
Human resource management policies	13.75	20	0.843

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Dissatisfied'</i>	<i>'Satisfied'</i>
Female	-.02	.03
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.03	-.06
With no academic qualifications	-.08 **	.10
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.01	-.01
Not 'white'	.19 **	-.06
With tenure of less than 1 year	.00	.04
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.01	.01
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.04	.05
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.02	.01
With a temporary contract of employment	.00	-.04
With a fixed period contract of employment	.06	-.22 **
Aged 16 -21	-.08 *	.03
Aged 22 – 29	-.03	.05
Aged 30 – 39	-.04	.04
Aged 50 – 59	-.01	.02
Aged 60 or over	-.07	.17 *
Married or living with partner	-.03	.03
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.01	.02
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.06	.16 ***
A member of a union/staff association	.07 ***	.03 **
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.05 *	.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.00	.03
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.06 **	.03
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.10 ***	.13 *
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.09 *	.15 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-.07	.20 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.09 **	-.10
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.10	-.09
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.04	.10
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.04	.00

Table 4d. Question: How satisfied are you with: “The training you receive.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Dissatisfied’	25.96	23.83	-0.1095	.0889	-.01	
Neither ‘satisfied’ nor ‘dissatisfied’	26.41	27.21	The base outcome			
‘Satisfied’	47.84	48.96	-0.0098	.0789	.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) =2.6662 Pr = 0.264					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 331.39

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.130

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	164.45	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	63.68	40	0.010
Human resource management policies	31.49	20	0.049

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Dissatisfied'</i>	<i>'Satisfied'</i>
Female	-.03	.03
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.01	-.02
With no academic qualifications	-.05	.16 ***
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.06 **	.01
Not 'white'	.17 **	-.05
With tenure of less than 1 year	.00	-.00
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.02	-.07
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	.01
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.06	.04
With a temporary contract of employment	.11	-.05
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.00	-.10
Aged 16 -21	-.00	.10
Aged 22 – 29	-.08 *	.04
Aged 30 – 39	-.05	.03
Aged 50 – 59	-.06 **	.01
Aged 60 or over	-.06 *	.18
Married or living with partner	.00	-.00
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.05	.02
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.08 **	.00
A member of a union/staff association	-.01	-.06 *
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.05	.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-.02	.03
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.09	.16 *
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.18 ***	.27 ***
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.23 ***	.34 ***
Has received 10 or more days training	-.23 **	.43 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.08	-.09
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	-.05	.18
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.03	.02
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.09 ***	-.12 ***

Table 4e. Question: How satisfied are you with: “The amount of pay you receive.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Dissatisfied’	39.10	41.37	0.0080	.0851	.04	
Neither ‘satisfied’ nor ‘dissatisfied’	21.38	24.34	The base outcome			
‘Satisfied’	39.52	34.29	-0.2930	.0852	-.06	***
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 13.6017 Pr = 0.001					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 247.77

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.096

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	114.96	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	73.93	40	0.001
Human resource management policies	41.08	20	0.004

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Dissatisfied'</i>	<i>'Satisfied'</i>
Female	-.03	.07 **
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.03	-.08 *
With no academic qualifications	-.03	.02
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.04	.00
Not 'white'	.21 **	-.12
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.08	.08
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.08 **	.00
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	-.01
With tenure of 10 years or more	.02	.00
With a temporary contract of employment	-.00	.06
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.11	.04
Aged 16 -21	-.15	.12
Aged 22 – 29	.04	-.01
Aged 30 – 39	-.03	.03
Aged 50 – 59	.04	-.02
Aged 60 or over	-.02	.00
Married or living with partner	-.05	.04
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.16	-.12
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.24	.31 ***
A member of a union/staff association	-.07 *	.02
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.01	-.05 *
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-.03	.01
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.06	.01
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.10	.10
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.12	.12
Has received 10 or more days training	-.13	.16
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.17 **	-.13
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.04	.02
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.08	.02
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.10	.09

Table 4f. Question: How satisfied are you with: “Your job security.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Dissatisfied’	16.31	15.96	-0.0916	.1071	.00	
Neither ‘satisfied’ nor ‘dissatisfied’	19.22	21.88	The base outcome			
‘Satisfied’	64.48	62.16	-0.1687	.0825	-.03	**
Total	1,202	9,453				

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 361.84

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.168

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	119.93	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	130.35	40	0.000
Human resource management policies	31.77	20	0.046

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Dissatisfied'</i>	<i>'Satisfied'</i>
Female	.02	-.03
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.03	-.07
With no academic qualifications	-.04	.11 **
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.01	.03
Not 'white'	.01	.04
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.03 *	-.02
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.01	.01
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.01	.04
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.03	.03
With a temporary contract of employment	.35 **	-.47 ***
With a fixed period contract of employment	.30	-.49 ***
Aged 16 -21	-.09 **	.14
Aged 22 – 29	-.08 ***	.08
Aged 30 – 39	-.03	.05
Aged 50 – 59	-.02	.00
Aged 60 or over	-.08 *	.08
Married or living with partner	-.04	.04
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	.01	.00
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.04	.06
A member of a union/staff association	.03	-.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.00	.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-.01	.02
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.01 **	.09 **
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.08	.10
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.07	.12
Has received 10 or more days training	-.07	.15 *
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.09	-.17 **
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	.24	-.50 ***
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.08	.14
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.07	-.10

Table 4g. Question: How satisfied are you with: “The work itself.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Dissatisfied’	11.31	9.27	-0.1729	.1204	-.01	
Neither ‘satisfied’ nor ‘dissatisfied’	18.89	19.50	The base outcome			
‘Satisfied’	69.80	71.24	-0.0216	.0829	.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 5.2220 Pr = 0.073					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 202.96

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.103

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	82.14	54	0.008
Structural characteristics of the workplace	61.28	40	0.017
Human resource management policies	35.81	20	0.016

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Dissatisfied'</i>	<i>'Satisfied'</i>
Female	-.04	.07
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.00	-.06 *
With no academic qualifications	-.05	.09
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.00	.01
Not 'white'	.04	-.14 *
With tenure of less than 1 year	.01	.02
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.02 *	.04 *
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	.01	-.01
With tenure of 10 years or more	.03 *	.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.08	-.06
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.04	-.07
Aged 16 -21	-.00	-.03
Aged 22 – 29	-.00	-.00
Aged 30 – 39	-.03	.04
Aged 50 – 59	-.02	.04
Aged 60 or over	-.07 *	.06
Married or living with partner	-.00	.01
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.03	.00
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.02	.10 **
A member of a union/staff association	.03 *	-.01
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.02	-.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-.01	.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.01	.00 *
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.06 **	.11 *
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.04	.10 *
Has received 10 or more days training	-.05	.12 *
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	-.01	-.07 **
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	-.04	.02
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.00	-.00
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.04	-.05

PERSPECTIVES ABOUT MANAGEMENT

Table 5a. Question: In general, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about: “Changes to the way the organisation is being run.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Poor’	26.21	26.40	0.0280	.0895	.00	
Neither ‘good’ nor ‘poor’	24.38	23.53	The base outcome			
‘Good’	49.42	50.07	0.0166	.0788	.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 0.4318 Pr = 0.806					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 209.89

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.083

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	83.85	54	0.006
Structural characteristics of the workplace	67.52	40	0.004
Human resource management policies	31.45	20	0.049

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Poor'</i>	<i>'Good'</i>
Female	-.05	.05
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.00	.00
With no academic qualifications	-.04	.00
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.01	.03
Not 'white'	.21 ***	-.10
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.09	.10
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.00	-.02
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.04	.04
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.03	.01
With a temporary contract of employment	.05	.00
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.02	-.05
Aged 16 -21	-.06	-.00
Aged 22 – 29	.03	-.04
Aged 30 – 39	-.01	-.04
Aged 50 – 59	.01	-.02
Aged 60 or over	-.08	-.07
Married or living with partner	.05	-.06
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.09	.09
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.08	.09
A member of a union/staff association	-.00	-.01
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.04	.06
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.03	.01
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.06	.06
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.12 *	.14 *
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.17 ***	.19
Has received 10 or more days training	-.09	.24 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.03	-.04
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	-.01	-.14
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.03	.07
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.00	.07

Table 5b. Question: In general, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about: “Changes in staffing.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Poor’	29.53	29.06	0.0520	.0842	.00	
Neither ‘good’ nor ‘poor’	27.79	26.15	The base outcome			
‘Good’	42.68	44.79	0.0794	.0781	.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 2.2399 Pr = 0.327					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 226.45

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.087

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	76.60	54	0.023
Structural characteristics of the workplace	87.30	40	0.000
Human resource management policies	23.73	20	0.254

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Poor'</i>	<i>'Good'</i>
Female	-.03	.03
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.03	-.04
With no academic qualifications	-.03	.02
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.03	.04
Not 'white'	.11 **	.01
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.02	.05
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.02	-.03
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	.00	.01
With tenure of 10 years or more	.01	.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.09	-.11
With a fixed period contract of employment	.08	-.01
Aged 16 -21	-.07	.06
Aged 22 – 29	-.03	.01
Aged 30 – 39	.00	-.02
Aged 50 – 59	-.00	-.04
Aged 60 or over	-.06	-.03
Married or living with partner	.03	-.01
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.08	.13
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.11	.15 **
A member of a union/staff association	-.02	-.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.01	.05
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01	-.08
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.08	.08
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.10	.11
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.15	.20 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-.12 *	.24 **
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.12 **	-.08
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.15	-.10
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.10	.09
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.05	.07

Table 5c. Question: In general, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about: “Changes in the way you do your job.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Poor’	20.05	21.13	0.1152	.0903	.01	
Neither ‘good’ nor ‘poor’	33.36	31.75	The base outcome			
‘Good’	46.59	47.13	0.0272	.0728	-.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 1.5239 Pr = 0.457					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 290.31

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.115

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	115.17	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	92.64	40	0.000
Human resource management policies	32.82	20	0.035

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Poor'</i>	<i>'Good'</i>
Female	-.08 ***	.05
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.05	-.03
With no academic qualifications	-.02	.10 *
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.02	.06
Not 'white'	.08	-.01
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.03	.01
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.02	.01
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.03	.02
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.00	.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.06	.03
With a fixed period contract of employment	.07	-.07
Aged 16 -21	-.08	.06
Aged 22 – 29	.00	.02
Aged 30 – 39	.01	-.00
Aged 50 – 59	.00	-.05
Aged 60 or over	-.04	.05
Married or living with partner	.01	-.11 ***
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.05	.10
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.05	.11 *
A member of a union/staff association	.02	-.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.01	.06
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.02	-.05
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.11 ***	.07
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.16 ***	.16
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.14 ***	.22 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-.09	.26 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.03	-.10
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.07	-.20
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.03	.09
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.00	.07

Table 5d. Question: In general, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at keeping employees informed about: “Financial matters, including budgets and profits.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Poor’	32.53	30.39	-0.0773	.0809	-.02	
Neither ‘good’ nor ‘poor’	30.20	29.67	The base outcome			
‘Good’	37.27	39.93	0.0303	.0781	.01	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 3.5970 Pr = 0.166					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 225.14

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.085

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	95.84	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	64.40	40	0.009
Human resource management policies	31.38	20	0.050

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Poor'</i>	<i>'Good'</i>
Female	-.10 **	.07
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.04	.09
With no academic qualifications	-.03	.02
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.03	-.00
Not 'white'	.10	-.04
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.05	.10
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.05	-.05
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.01	.04
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.00	.07 *
With a temporary contract of employment	.08	-.05
With a fixed period contract of employment	.05	-.02
Aged 16 -21	-.02	.12
Aged 22 – 29	.05	-.00
Aged 30 – 39	.04	-.02
Aged 50 – 59	.00	.02
Aged 60 or over	-.01	.00
Married or living with partner	.05	-.03
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.00	-.05
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.13	.18 ***
A member of a union/staff association	.02	-.05
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.01	.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-.02	.05
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.05	.08
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.16 *	.21 ***
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.19 ***	.19 *
Has received 10 or more days training	-.17	.29 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.04	.02
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.16	-.05
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.04	.10
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.02	.03

Table 5e. Question: Thinking about the managers at this workplace, to what extent do you agree or disagree that they: “Can be relied upon to keep their promise.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	25.87	26.62	0.0237	.0865	.01	
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	28.79	28.87	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	45.34	44.51	-0.1070	.0767	-.02	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 0.3872 Pr = 0.824					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 274.09

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.106

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	88.02	54	0.002
Structural characteristics of the workplace	99.30	40	0.000
Human resource management policies	34.63	20	0.022

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	-.03	-.00
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.01	-.05
With no academic qualifications	-.01	.00
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.03	.04
Not 'white'	.11	-.04
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.09 *	.05
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.05	.07
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	.03
With tenure of 10 years or more	.04	-.02
With a temporary contract of employment	.16	-.12
With a fixed period contract of employment	.09	-.01
Aged 16 -21	.02	.06
Aged 22 – 29	.02	.01
Aged 30 – 39	-.00	.00
Aged 50 – 59	.02	-.02
Aged 60 or over	-.08	.13
Married or living with partner	-.00	.01
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.07	.07
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.04	.13 ***
A member of a union/staff association	.09	-.11
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.07	-.05
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.02	-.05
Has received between 1 -2 days training	.00	-.06
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.10	.14 *
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.03 **	.12
Has received 10 or more days training	-.07	.18 **
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.15 ***	-.09
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.17	-.09
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.01	.06
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.02	-.08

Table 5f. Question: Thinking about the managers at this workplace, to what extent do you agree or disagree that they: “Are sincere in attempting to understand employees’ views.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	24.88	23.55	-0.0495	.0905	-.00	
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	24.71	25.23	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	50.42	51.22	-0.0318	.0787	-.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 1.0431 Pr = 0.594					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 234.00

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.093

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	93.02	54	0.001
Structural characteristics of the workplace	72.54	40	0.001
Human resource management policies	22.89	20	0.294

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	-.05	.02
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.08	-.09
With no academic qualifications	-.07	.06
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.01	-.03
Not 'white'	.11	-.16
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.02	.02
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.02	-.05
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	.04	-.07
With tenure of 10 years or more	.06	-.06
With a temporary contract of employment	.14	-.12
With a fixed period contract of employment	.01	.02
Aged 16 -21	-.14 *	.09
Aged 22 – 29	.00	.04
Aged 30 – 39	-.01	.05
Aged 50 – 59	.03	-.03
Aged 60 or over	-.04	.06
Married or living with partner	.02	-.01
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.08	.06
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.04	.08
A member of a union/staff association	.06	-.07
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.00	-.02
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.03	.03
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.03	.05
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.12 **	.15 *
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.09	.21 ***
Has received 10 or more days training	-.13	.21 **
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.11 **	-.04
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.13	-.09
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.01	.05
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.08	-.02

Table 5g. Question: Thinking about the managers at this workplace, to what extent do you agree or disagree that they: “Deal with employees honestly.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	21.88	21.07	-0.0195	.0921	.00	
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	26.62	27.00	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	51.50	51.93	-0.0886	.0766	-.02	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 0.4226 Pr = 0.810					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 203.96

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.082

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	72.67	54	0.046
Structural characteristics of the workplace	70.89	40	0.002
Human resource management policies	15.58	20	0.742

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	-.04 **	-.00
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.00	-.03
With no academic qualifications	-.03	.03
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.01	.02
Not 'white'	.06	-.07 **
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.06	.01
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.04	.02
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	-.09 **
With tenure of 10 years or more	.02	-.07
With a temporary contract of employment	.05	-.10
With a fixed period contract of employment	.01	.05
Aged 16 -21	-.05	-.03
Aged 22 – 29	.03	.00
Aged 30 – 39	.00	.02
Aged 50 – 59	.03	-.06
Aged 60 or over	-.05	.05
Married or living with partner	-.00	.02
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.08	.10
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.03	.07
A member of a union/staff association	.05	-.06
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.01	-.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01	.04
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.01	.04
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.09	.17 ***
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.10	.13
Has received 10 or more days training	-.11 *	.12
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.13 ***	-.11
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.10	-.10
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.05	.02
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.00	-.00

Table 5h. Question: Thinking about the managers at this workplace, to what extent do you agree or disagree that they: “Understand about employees having to meet responsibilities outside work.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	20.72	20.32	-0.0434	.0964	.00	
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	22.71	23.02	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	56.57	56.55	-0.0613	.0796	-.01	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 0.1264 Pr = 0.939					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 229.56

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.096

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	71.24	54	0.058
Structural characteristics of the workplace	78.02	40	0.000
Human resource management policies	28.99	20	0.088

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	-.01	.07 **
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.05	-.07
With no academic qualifications	-.03	.01
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.03	-.01
Not 'white'	.02	.02
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.02	.02
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.04	-.07
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	.05	-.09
With tenure of 10 years or more	.10 *	-.09
With a temporary contract of employment	.13	-.09
With a fixed period contract of employment	.06	-.08
Aged 16 -21	.03	-.12
Aged 22 – 29	.04	-.04
Aged 30 – 39	.00	.01
Aged 50 – 59	.01	-.10 **
Aged 60 or over	-.04	.08
Married or living with partner	-.00	-.02
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.03	.04
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.07	.13 **
A member of a union/staff association	.03	-.07
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.03	-.02
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.03	-.02
Has received between 1 -2 days training	.01	.05 *
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.04	.10 **
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.02	.10 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-.08	.14 *
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.10 **	-.04
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.08	-.13
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.07	.06
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.00	.00

Table 5i. Question: Thinking about the managers at this workplace, to what extent do you agree or disagree that they: “Encourage people to develop their skills.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	18.89	18.61	-0.0353	.0989	-.00	
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	23.38	23.90	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	57.74	57.49	-0.0288	.0799	.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 0.1756 Pr = 0.916					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 318.68

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.136

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	135.44	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	77.71	40	0.000
Human resource management policies	21.34	20	0.377

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	-.03	.06
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.00	-.04
With no academic qualifications	-.02	.10 **
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.01	-.04
Not 'white'	.09 **	.03 *
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.03	.05
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.06 **	.02 *
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.02	.02
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.01	.01
With a temporary contract of employment	.07	-.14
With a fixed period contract of employment	.01	.10
Aged 16 -21	-.05	.05
Aged 22 – 29	-.02	.04
Aged 30 – 39	.01	.03
Aged 50 – 59	.00	-.00
Aged 60 or over	-.05	.05
Married or living with partner	.01	-.03
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.01	-.03
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.07 **	.05
A member of a union/staff association	.03	-.03
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.02	-.03
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-.04	.09
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.09 **	.15 **
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.14 ***	.27 ***
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.14 ***	.27 ***
Has received 10 or more days training	-.13 *	.28 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.07	-.08
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.06	-.22
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	.01	.10 **
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.04	.07

Table 5j. Question: Thinking about the managers at this workplace, to what extent do you agree or disagree that they: “Treat employees fairly.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Disagree’	21.46	20.97	-0.0738	.0940	.00	
Neither ‘agree’ nor ‘disagree’	24.54	25.97	The base outcome			
‘Agree’	53.99	53.06	-0.1399	.0779	-.02	*
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 1.1420 Pr = 0.565					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 233.35

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.096

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	106.96	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	55.53	40	0.052
Human resource management policies	22.00	20	0.340

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Disagree'</i>	<i>'Agree'</i>
Female	-.04	.02
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.00	-.07 *
With no academic qualifications	-.03 *	-.02
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.02 **	.04 **
Not 'white'	.09	-.09
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.06	.04
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.04	-.02
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.00	-.02
With tenure of 10 years or more	.03	-.04
With a temporary contract of employment	.25 ***	-.15
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.02	.10
Aged 16 -21	.00	-.03
Aged 22 – 29	.00	-.01
Aged 30 – 39	-.03	.08 *
Aged 50 – 59	-.01 *	-.08 **
Aged 60 or over	-.05	.09
Married or living with partner	-.00	.01
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.02	.08
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.08	.10
A member of a union/staff association	.07	-.10
Not a member now, but a member in the past	.03	-.02
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.00	.03
Has received between 1 -2 days training	.00	.04
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.10 **	.12
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.11 **	.15
Has received 10 or more days training	-.11	.16
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.08	-.09
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	-.04	-.06
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.01	.10 *
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.04	-.00

PERSPECTIVES ABOUT MANAGEMENT-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

Table 6a. Question: Overall, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at: “Seeking the views of employees or employee representatives.”?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Poor’	29.20	28.56	-0.0552	.0863	.00	
Neither ‘good’ nor ‘poor’	25.62	26.89	The base outcome			
‘Good’	45.17	44.55	-0.0890	.0786	-.01	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 0.8863 Pr = 0.642					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 251.19

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.097

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	103.89	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	72.10	40	0.001
Human resource management policies	22.12	20	0.334

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Poor'</i>	<i>'Good'</i>
Female	-.03	.04
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.04 *	.02
With no academic qualifications	-.02	.04
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.00	-.04
Not 'white'	.17 *	-.11
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.09	.11
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.07	-.02
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.02	-.01
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.01	.01
With a temporary contract of employment	.13	-.06
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.03	.05
Aged 16 -21	-.12 **	-.05
Aged 22 – 29	-.01	.00
Aged 30 – 39	-.00	-.00
Aged 50 – 59	.03	-.07
Aged 60 or over	-.03	.04
Married or living with partner	.01	-.08 **
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.07	.07
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.13 **	.13
A member of a union/staff association	.02	.02
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.00	-.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01 *	.09 **
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.03	.07
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.16 ***	.16
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.14	.21 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-.17	.28 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.12	-.14
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign Organisation	.01	-.20
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.07	.17 **
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.04	.03

Table 6b. Question: Overall, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at: “Responding to suggestions from employees or employee representatives.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Poor’	29.95	29.60	0.0031	.0820	.00	
Neither ‘good’ nor ‘poor’	30.87	30.96	The base outcome			
‘Good’	39.18	39.44	-0.0604	.0770	-.01	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 0.0649 Pr = 0.968					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 253.65

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.096

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	108.27	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	58.75	40	0.028
Human resource management policies	24.84	20	0.207

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Poor'</i>	<i>'Good'</i>
Female	-.09 **	.05
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.00	-.02
With no academic qualifications	-.08	.06
With no vocational/professional qualifications	.00	.00
Not 'white'	.13	-.11
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.05	.08
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.00	-.06
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.01	-.02
With tenure of 10 years or more	.02	-.04
With a temporary contract of employment	.11	-.00
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.04	-.02
Aged 16 -21	-.09	-.00
Aged 22 – 29	-.04 *	-.08 **
Aged 30 – 39	-.03 *	-.06 **
Aged 50 – 59	-.03 **	-.07 **
Aged 60 or over	-.05	.04
Married or living with partner	-.01	-.02
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.03	.09
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.11 **	.06
A member of a union/staff association	.05	-.05
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.02	.00
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.04	-.01
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.05 **	.06
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.15 **	.16 *
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.18	.23 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-.19	.36 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.08	-.06
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	-.00	-.19
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.09	.11
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.04	.05

Table 6c. Question: Overall, how good would you say managers at this workplace are at: “Allowing employees or employee representatives to influence final decisions.” ?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
‘Poor’	37.94	36.23	-0.0266	.0755	-.00	
Neither ‘good’ nor ‘poor’	34.36	35.23	The base outcome			
‘Good’	27.70	28.54	-0.0057	.0814	.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 1.3423 Pr = 0.511					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 245.57

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.093

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	94.36	54	0.001
Structural characteristics of the workplace	74.82	40	0.001
Human resource management policies	28.91	20	0.089

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Poor'</i>	<i>'Good'</i>
Female	-.03	-.01
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.01	-.01
With no academic qualifications	-.01	.08 **
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.01	.01
Not 'white'	.13 *	-.01
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.10	.06
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.10 *	-.01
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.02	.03
With tenure of 10 years or more	.03	-.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.06	.01
With a fixed period contract of employment	.07	.00
Aged 16 -21	-.17 **	.01
Aged 22 – 29	.08	-.02
Aged 30 – 39	.04	-.00
Aged 50 – 59	.03	.00
Aged 60 or over	-.13	.15
Married or living with partner	.00	-.02
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.06	.07
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.07	.09 *
A member of a union/staff association	.02	.00
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.07	.05
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.00	.07
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.08	.05
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.16 **	.15 **
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.14	.20 ***
Has received 10 or more days training	-.24 *	.33 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.12	-.13 *
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	.10	-.15
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.14	.16 *
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	-.01	-.00

Table 6d. Question: Overall, how satisfied are you with the amount of involvement you have in decision-making at this workplace?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable 'Rest of Great Britain' (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
'Dissatisfied'	25.12	23.57	-0.0706	.0831	-.00	
Neither 'satisfied' nor 'dissatisfied'	37.10	37.12	The base outcome			
'Satisfied'	37.77	39.23	-0.0384	.0745	-.00	
Total	1,202	9,453				

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 257.91

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.099

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	130.50	54	0.000
Structural characteristics of the workplace	65.34	40	0.007
Human resource management policies	16.35	20	0.695

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Dissatisfied'</i>	<i>'Satisfied'</i>
Female	-.04	.01
With long term illness/health problem/disability	.05	-.03
With no academic qualifications	-.10 **	.05
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.00	-.00
Not 'white'	.21 **	-.11
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.11	.15 *
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	.05	-.01
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.05	.05
With tenure of 10 years or more	-.02	.00
With a temporary contract of employment	.05	-.06
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.07	-.09
Aged 16 -21	-.15 ***	-.06 ***
Aged 22 – 29	-.04 **	-.13 *
Aged 30 – 39	-.06 **	-.04
Aged 50 – 59	-.00	-.04
Aged 60 or over	-.03	.04
Married or living with partner	.00	.05 *
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.04	.01
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.10	.15 **
A member of a union/staff association	.03	-.06
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.01	.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	-.01	.03
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.07	.06
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.13 **	.19 ***
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.17 **	.26 ***
Has received 10 or more days training	-.12	.30 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.09	-.15 **
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	-.01	-.32 ***
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.04	.12 *
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.04	-.02

Table 6e. Question: In general, how would you describe relations between managers and employees here?

Response	Cross Tabulations		Output for variable 'Rest of Great Britain' (=1) from multinomial logit estimation			
	Scotland (%)	Rest of GB (%)	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal Effect	Significance
'Poor'	18.05	16.59	-0.0319	.0979	-.00	
Neither 'good' nor 'poor'	26.21	24.85	The base outcome			
'Good'	55.74	68.55	0.0425	.0766	.01	
Total	1,202	9,453				
	Pearson chi2 (2) = 3.5893 Pr = 0.166					

Selected Output from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

LR chi2 (114) : 243.43

Prob > chi2 : 0.0000

Pseudo R2 : 0.102

Wald Tests for the Exclusion of Sets of Variables

<i>Set of variables excluded</i>	<i>Chi2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P > Chi2</i>
Characteristics of the employee	91.15	54	0.001
Structural characteristics of the workplace	80.58	40	0.000
Human resource management policies	27.30	20	0.127

Marginal Effects for Selected Variables from the Multinomial Logit Estimation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>'Poor'</i>	<i>'Good'</i>
Female	-.05 *	.03
With long term illness/health problem/disability	-.02 *	-.05 *
With no academic qualifications	-.02	.05
With no vocational/professional qualifications	-.00	.01
Not 'white'	.08	-.12
With tenure of less than 1 year	-.05	.01
With tenure of between 1 – 2 years	-.01	-.04
With tenure of between 5 – 10 years	-.01	-.03
With tenure of 10 years or more	.00	-.04
With a temporary contract of employment	.05	-.18 **
With a fixed period contract of employment	-.03	-.03
Aged 16 -21	-.02	.11
Aged 22 – 29	-.01	.02
Aged 30 – 39	-.02	.04
Aged 50 – 59	-.02 *	-.05 *
Aged 60 or over	-.06	.09
Married or living with partner	.04	-.04
Earning less than £5.00 per hour	-.06	.09
Earning over £15.00 per hour	-.05	.06
A member of a union/staff association	.05	-.09
Not a member now, but a member in the past	-.00	-.01
Has received some training in the last 12 months, but less than 1 day	.01	.00
Has received between 1 -2 days training	-.03	.04
Has received between 2 – 5 days training	-.09 **	.11
Has received 5 – 10 days training	-.07	.16 **
Has received 10 or more days training	-.06	.24 ***
Employed in one of a number of workplaces in the UK, belonging to the same organisation	.08 **	-.04
Employed in the sole UK workplace of a foreign organisation	.14	-.04
Employed in a 'public sector' type workplace	-.03	.11
Employed in some other (e.g. charity) type of workplace	.03 *	.08 **

Table 7.

Multinomial logit estimations in which the coefficient of the variable ‘Rest of Great Britain’ is statistically significant (at $p < 0.1$) and value of the marginal effect

<i>Issue/statement</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Marginal Effect</i>	<i>Significance</i>
I feel my job is secure in this workplace	agree	-.02	*
I worry a lot about my work outside working hours	disagree	-.01	**
The scope for using your own initiative	agree	-.01	*
The amount of pay you receive	dissatisfied	-.01	*
Treat employees fairly	satisfied	-.06	***
	agree	-.02	*

Notes:

In the multinomial logit, the value of the marginal effect is interpreted in the context of the variable reference category (viz. Scotland) and the base outcome category (viz. neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement in question).

*, **, and *** statistically significant at 0.1, 0.05 and 0.01, respectively.

Ordered logit estimations in which the coefficient of the variable ‘rest of great britain’ is statistically significant (at $p < 0.1$) and value of the marginal effect

<i>Question</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Marginal Effect</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Thinking about the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel TENSE	occasionally	-.01	*
	most of the time	.01	*
Thinking about the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel WORRIED	never	-.01	*
	some of the time	.01	*
How much influence do you have over START/FINISH TIMES	none	-.03	**
	some	.01	**
	a lot	.02	**

Notes:

In the ordered logit, the value of the marginal effect is interpreted in the context of the variable reference category (viz. Scotland).

*, **, and *** statistically significant at 0.1, 0.05 and 0.01, respectively.

Table 8.

Gross weekly pay (£) for all employees (2004)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>
United Kingdom	413.6	345.5
Scotland	376.4	321.3

Source: ASHE

The Unemployment Rate (%) (Annual Averages of the Claimant Count, seasonally adjusted)

	<i>All</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
2003			
Great Britain	3.0	4.1	1.6
Scotland	3.8	5.6	1.8
2004			
Great Britain	2.7	3.7	1.5
Scotland	3.3	4.7	1.7
Percentage point change 2003-4			
Great Britain	-0.3	-0.4	0.1
Scotland	-0.5	-0.9	-0.1