

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/71606/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Green, Francis, Felstead, Alan , Gallie, Duncan and Inanc, Hande 2016. Job-related well-being through the Great Recession. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 17 (1) , pp. 389-411. 10.1007/s10902-014-9600-x

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9600-x>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Journal of Happiness Studies

Job-Related Well-Being Through the Great Recession

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	JOHS-D-13-00322R3
Full Title:	Job-Related Well-Being Through the Great Recession
Article Type:	Original Research
Keywords:	effort; insecurity; downsizing; performance-related pay; organisational participation; job-related well-being; task discretion; skill
Corresponding Author:	Francis Green Institute of Education London, UNITED KINGDOM
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Institute of Education
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Francis Green
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Francis Green
	Alan Felstead
	Duncan Gallie
	Hande Inanc
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	<p>We study how job-related well-being (measured by Warr's 'Enthusiasm' and 'Contentment' scales) altered through the Great Recession, and how this is related to changing job quality. Using nationally representative data for Britain, we find that job-related well-being was stable between 2001 and 2006, but then declined between 2006 and 2012. We report relevant changes in job quality. In modelling the determinants of job-related well-being, we confirm several previously-studied hypotheses and present some new findings: downsizing, work re-organisation, decreased choice, and linking pay to organisational performance each reduce well-being; indicators of skills challenge in jobs have more of a positive association with Enthusiasm than with Contentment, while effort has a more negative association with Contentment than with Enthusiasm. Our estimates are largely orthogonal to the effects of personality traits and demographic controls on well-being. Using a standard decomposition, we find that the 2006-2012 fall in job-related well-being is partly accounted for by accelerations in the pace of workplace change, rising job insecurity, increased effort and changing participation.</p>

Many thanks to the referee for noting these remaining points, which have now been attended to as follows:

page 14, line 27: "self-employed" should be replaced by "employee". DONE

"PRP" should be explained both page 15 (if I am not mistaken it is the first time it is mentioned in the text) and in tables NOW JUST IN THE TABLES; WITH FOOTNOTE ADDED

P.18 line 23: replace "association" by "associated" DONE

Job-Related Well-Being Through the Great Recession

Francis Green[†], Alan Felstead[‡], Duncan Gallie^{††} and Hande Inanc^{‡‡}

† Corresponding author: LLAKES Centre, Institute of Education, 20 Bedford Way, London WC1H
OAL; 0207 9115530; f.green@ioe.ac.uk.

‡ Cardiff University

†† Nuffield College, Oxford University.

‡‡ OECD

Key words: effort; job insecurity; downsizing; performance-related pay; organisational participation; job-related well-being; task discretion; skill.

PsycINFO Classification code: 3600, 3650.

JEL Classification codes: J53 I00 J0.

Abstract

We study how job-related well-being (measured by Warr's 'Enthusiasm' and 'Contentment' scales) altered through the Great Recession, and how this is related to changing job quality. Using nationally representative data for Britain, we find that job-related well-being was stable between 2001 and 2006, but then declined between 2006 and 2012. We report relevant changes in job quality. In modelling the determinants of job-related well-being, we confirm several previously-studied hypotheses and present some new findings: downsizing, work re-organisation, decreased choice, and linking pay to organisational performance each reduce well-being; indicators of skills challenge in jobs have more of a positive association with Enthusiasm than with Contentment, while effort has a more negative association with Contentment than with Enthusiasm. Our estimates are largely orthogonal to the effects of personality traits and demographic controls on well-being. Using a standard decomposition, we find that the 2006-2012 fall in job-related well-being is partly accounted for by accelerations in the pace of workplace change, rising job insecurity, increased effort and changing participation.

Job-Related Well-Being Through the Great Recession

Introduction

This paper is concerned with what happens to the job-related well-being of those in employment in a major recession. Periods of economic crisis and stagnation are typically seen as occasions for accelerated changes in employment and production relations. Whether through Schumpeterian creative destruction or through a shift in the balance of power, the opportunity may be taken to renew working methods, relationships and pay bargains, with consequences for both employers and their employees. Major economic downturns are known to generate falls in general well-being (as manifested in overall life satisfaction and health indicators) which extend beyond those rendered involuntarily unemployed to the broader workforce who feel less secure and to their dependants (Burchell 1994; Di Tella et al. 2003; Green 2011). The focus here, however, is on how indicators of *job-related* well-being (feelings about one's job) are changed over a recession, and on how this is related to changing job quality. To investigate this, we examine the specific instance of employees in Britain before and after the 'Great Recession' of 2008-9.

Since job-related well-being is an end in itself, studying it needs no additional motivation. Nevertheless, there is evidence that job-related well-being is associated with productivity, absenteeism and labour turnover (e.g. Böckerman and Ilmakunnas 2012; De Neve et al. 2013; Warr 2007; Zelenski et al. 2008) – even if much remains to be done to determine the magnitude of the causal effects. In recent years well-being -- including in the domain of work -- has been assigned a place in the 'beyond GDP' agenda (Stiglitz et al. 2009). A better understanding of various dimensions of well-being at an aggregate level are relevant to this agenda, and should also prove helpful in the analysis of labour markets. Britain's experience of the Great Recession was fairly typical among many other countries, with falling GDP and rising unemployment. Between 2008(Q1) and 2009(Q3) the fall in GDP (6.03%) was somewhat larger than the average among OECD countries (4.15%) (OECD 2010). The fall in employment over the same period being (at 1.92%) a little lower than for the OECD as a whole (2.30%), Britain's aggregate

1
2
3
4 productivity fell more than the average. Nevertheless, it is plausible to suppose that the
5 findings for Britain might generalise to many other developed countries.
6
7

8
9 This paper contributes in four ways. First, we show what has been happening to the economy-
10 wide average level of job-related well-being in Britain. Since 2001 we have collected three
11 cross-sections of large-scale nationally-representative data, with which we can document the
12 trend in two dimensions of job-related well-being, using indicators devised by Warr (1990a;
13 2007). Our second contribution is to decompose the differences in job-related well-being over
14 time, showing the proportions of these differences that can be modelled or 'explained' by
15 variation in observed measures of job quality, and how much is left unexplained. Our third new
16 contribution arises through this modelling of job-related well-being. Economics, psychology and
17 sociology all provide theory as to how job characteristics are expected to be related to well-
18 being. We fit models derived from core theories, concerning the effects of effort (work intensity
19 and duration), participation, skills challenge and insecurity. In so doing we provide tests of
20 hypotheses concerning the non-linearity of effort's effect on well-being, the effects of
21 performance-related pay, the effects of workplace change, and some variations in effects
22 between different dimensions of well-being. Finally, this modelling also incorporates several
23 better-established findings in the literature on the study of work. Most of these findings have
24 been established in relatively small-scale, focussed, studies of particular work settings or
25 occupations. Our fourth contribution is to examine whether these findings can be confirmed in
26 the context of a nationally-representative survey, covering a wide variety of workers and jobs.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The paper proceeds, first, by clarifying the concept of job-related well-being, outlining the core
45 theories to be incorporated into our model, and noting the existing evidence. The following
46 section describes our data and all the relevant indicators, and this leads into our presentation
47 of a picture of changing well-being and of changing job quality in Britain, comparing before and
48 after the onset of the Great Recession. Model findings are then presented, culminating in the
49 decomposition analysis.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 **Theory and prior evidence linking job characteristics and job-related well-being**

1
2
3
4 Psychological research has suggested that there are two substantive, if not exhaustive,
5 orthogonal dimensions to the structure of feelings, namely 'arousal' and 'pleasure' (Warr
6 1990a; 2007). Within the 'arousal'/'pleasure' plane there are two correlated dimensions,
7 namely Depression-Enthusiasm and Anxiety-Contentment. This structure for subjective well-
8 being has the advantage that it can apply to feelings arising from both work and non-work
9 settings. In this paper we use a shortened nomenclature, namely 'Enthusiasm' and
10 'Contentment'. Enthusiasm is positively correlated with the arousal and pleasure axes.
11 Contentment, by contrast, is correlated positively with the 'pleasure' dimension and negatively
12 with the 'arousal' dimension. Applied to the job, employees with high Enthusiasm – with high
13 pleasure and stimulation from their work -- are said to have feelings central to the model of
14 "thriving" (Spreitzer et al. 2005), while conversely those with low Enthusiasm express feelings
15 of depression, who take no pleasure from their work and are passive. Those with high
16 Contentment find their jobs acceptable but are said to have a "resigned satisfaction", while
17 conversely those with low Contentment express feelings of anxiety, being both aroused by and
18 experiencing displeasure from their work (Grebner et al. 2005; Warr 2007: 22). These two
19 dimensions have been found to affect behaviour, including quitting and absenteeism (Green
20 2010; Warr 2007: 427-434). As Warr notes (2007: 19-60), both dimensions are positively related
21 to mental health indicators (but in subtle ways involving varying thought processes) and to
22 other constructs such as organisational commitment and job satisfaction.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Warr (1990a) has examined and validated instruments (to be described below) that tap these
42 dimensions. Other concepts of job-related well-being are also sometimes available for analysis.
43 Not least, job satisfaction might be considered as an indicator of well-being along the 'pleasure'
44 dimension, even though its interpretation depends a great deal on workers' expectations of
45 potential alternative work settings (Brown et al. 2012). In recent years other researchers have
46 developed subjective well-being scales which incorporate cognitive evaluative dimensions
47 alongside affective-emotional aspects (for example, Tennant et al. 2007). We chose Warr's
48 scales of Enthusiasm and Contentment when planning the 2001 Skills Survey, given that these
49 were available in the public domain, and had been well validated and already widely cited at
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the time (Mullarkey et al. 1999). Continuity then became essential for the identification of
5 changes over time in successive, nationally representative, samples.
6
7

8
9 We draw on core literatures to formulate hypotheses about the links between job quality and
10 subjective well-being. One can think of the determination of each dimension (*i*) of job-related
11 well-being JWB_i as:
12
13

$$14 \quad JWB_i = f_i(JQ_j, X_k)$$

15
16
17
18 In this equation JQ_j is a vector of job quality, defined as in the literature as that subset of job
19 characteristics which meet people's needs from work (Green 2006; Kalleberg 2011; Körner et al
20 2011). X_k is a vector of personal and environmental characteristics which might directly affect
21 subjective well-being or moderate the relationship between job quality and the expression of
22 subjective well-being. The psychology, sociology and economics literatures point to several sets
23 of determinants as important determinants of well-being, which may have been significantly
24 changed through the recession: effort, participation, skills challenge, insecurity and workplace
25 change.¹ A major recession directly affects insecurity and the pace of workplace change;
26 through the pressures of heightened competition, rising unemployment and the shifting
27 balance of power in the employer-worker bargain, recession may also affect worker effort and
28 moderate the long-term evolutions of skills utilisation and forms of participation (Green, 2007;
29 van Wanrooy, 2013). We discuss each of these sets of determinants in turn below. This simple
30 framework enables us to model the findings of previous studies, and to highlight some
31 hypotheses not previously tested with nationally representative data. Considering these
32 hypotheses together helps frame our expectation about how recession may have affected job-
33 related well-being.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ¹ While our included sets of determinants are broad-ranging, another set of characteristics which affect
56 well-being concern work-life balance, which might also have changed somewhat through the recession
57 (Beham and Drobnič, 2011); unfortunately we cannot include this in our study owing to lack of data.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Effort

Effort is comprised of both work intensity and work duration. Sometimes work intensity is termed as "intensive work effort", and duration as "extensive work effort" (Green 2001; 2006). The former is complex, entailing a mix of physical, mental and emotional demands at work, and involves added measurement issues due to its lack of a standard metric.²

Economics has evolved the view that intensive and extensive work effort are each a disutility at the margin, a 'bad', something that has to be experienced in order to earn a wage (Spencer 2009), and in this it parallels modern psychology (Warr 2007; Wichert 2002). Both economics (with its fundamental assumption of increasing marginal disutility of work) and psychology take the theoretical relationship of effort with well-being to be non-linear, with increasing negative marginal effects. These propositions underpin labour supply theory in economics, and as such are indirectly attested by the voluminous empirical literature on labour supply (e.g. Ashenfelter et al. 2010; Hamermesh 1993). Direct psychological studies using measures of work intensity have varied findings: some report that high effort is associated with lower levels of job satisfaction and/or Contentment, while others find a very low correlation between job satisfaction and work intensity (Warr 2007: 165-170; Wood and de Menezes 2011). Cottini and Lucifora (2013) report that higher work intensity is a source of increased mental health problems. Since the stimulation of work affects the arousal dimension, it is also expected that work intensity's effect on Enthusiasm is less negative than its effect on Contentment (Warr 1990b). However, we are not aware of any direct evidence in favour or against this expectation. These hypotheses surrounding work effort may be summarised as:

- H1: effort has an overall negative association with well-being.
- H2: the magnitude of the marginal negative effect is greater at higher effort levels
- H3: the marginal effect of work intensity on well-being is less negative in respect of Enthusiasm than in respect of Contentment.

² In the psychological literature the phrase "job demands" is, in some cases, used to mean work intensity in the sense of this paper (e.g. Hakanen et al., 2008), but more commonly job demands is used more broadly to embrace both work intensity and role conflict (Warr, 2007), even though six out of the seven items used to measure job demands by Karasek (1979) focus on work intensity.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *Participation*

10
11 In several complementary literatures from psychology, management, sociology and economics,
12 participation is assumed to have usually beneficial effects on job-related well-being (e.g.
13 Böckerman et al. 2012; Kalleberg et al. 2009; Karasek 1979). Yet participation is a broad concept
14 and it is useful to distinguish between two types -- decision-making participation (at various
15 levels) and financial participation in outcomes – and also between levels of participation (that
16 is, individual, work team and wider organisation). ‘Task discretion’ (over various aspects of the
17 tasks to be performed) refers to decision-making participation at the level of workers' own jobs.
18 From the economic perspective, the task discretion afforded to individual workers will depend
19 on workers' preferences (organisational commitment) and the monitoring structure (Green
20 2008), while from the sociological perspective workers' preferences are also determined by the
21 level of trust (Fox 1980). There is much evidence that task discretion enhances well-being (e.g.
22 Cottini and Lucifora 2013). There is also evidence that well-being is enhanced where the teams
23 through which work is organised are granted some influence over tasks, choice of team
24 members and team leader (Böckerman et al. 2012; Gallie et al. 2012). According to the
25 'demand-control' model, the impact of task discretion on well-being is greater where work
26 intensity is high, because higher task discretion allows workers to partially counter the stressful
27 effects of high-intensity work (Karasek 1979; Karasek and Theorell 1990). From the
28 management theorists' perspective, task discretion is just one element in the model of ‘high
29 involvement management (HIM)’ which is advanced as delivering higher organisational
30 effectiveness (Wood and de Menezes 2011). Another element in the HIM model, also stressed
31 within the sociological literature, is participation in decision-making about the organisation.
32 Indicators typically cover both upward and downward information flows, including suggestion
33 schemes, consultative meetings and the use of quality circles. Involvement through
34 representative consultation, through recognised trade unions, is also included here. These
35 types of organisational involvement are also found to be beneficial for well-being. However, the

1
2
3
4 size of the effect has been found to be less than for task discretion (Gallie 2013), and the recent
5 evidence for an interaction between organisational involvement and work effort on health is
6 equivocal (Eller et al. 2009).
7
8
9

10 These effects apply to both dimensions of well-being, with no expectation of having stronger
11 effects for one or other. Thus we have further hypotheses:
12
13

- 14 • H4: Decision-making participation in terms of task discretion is positively related to well-
15 being.
16
- 17 • H5: The effect of decision-making participation in terms of task discretion on well-being
18 is greater at high levels of work intensity.
19
- 20 • H6: Well-being is also enhanced by organisational participation
21
22
23
24

25 The anticipated effects of financial participation on well-being are, by contrast, ambivalent.
26 Financial participation refers to the presence of economic incentives through schemes that link
27 rewards with performance. On one hand, the uncertainty of performance outcomes introduces
28 an element of risk which, except for risk lovers, could be expected to lower well-being (similar
29 to the stressor effects of job insecurity, discussed below). The uncertainty may be greater for
30 pay linked to organisational rather than individual performance. Yet it is also hypothesised that
31 individual piece rates may induce overworking in some jobs and hence greater physical risk-
32 taking (Bender et al. 2012; Roy 1952). There is some evidence suggesting that performance pay
33 raises injury rates (e.g. Bender et al. 2012; Saha et al. 2004) while Freeman and Kleiner (2005)
34 find a positive association with compensation costs. Performance pay is also found to have
35 negative effects on general health (Bender and Theodossiou 2013; Foster and Rosenweig 1994).
36 On the other hand, performance pay might attract workers with a preference for risk and
37 reward. Wood and de Menezes (2011) also hypothesised that offering collective financial
38 participation might stimulate commitment, increasing the value that workers attach to being
39 part of the organisation; in the event, however, they found no significant impact from either
40 individual or group performance-related pay on Contentment. Similarly, employee discounted
41 share-purchase plans have been interpreted within the framework of a gift exchange of effort
42 for reward (Bryson and Freeman 2010). The association of financial participation with both
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 well-being domains depends on which if either of these opposing effects predominates. These
5 arguments may be posed as competing hypotheses:

- 6 • H7: financial participation is positively related to well-being.
- 7 • H8: financial participation is negatively related to well-being.

8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 *Skills challenge*

17
18 By the umbrella concept "skills challenge" we refer here to the extent to which the work itself
19 challenges employees to use their skills. The idea that a good degree of challenge can make
20 people happier has a long lineage. A substantial amount of psychological evidence establishes
21 that work which better enables people to use their abilities is associated with greater well-
22 being (e.g. Kornhauser 1965; O'Brien 1980). In a similar vein, labour economists have reported
23 a significant negative association between either overeducation or skill underutilisation and job
24 satisfaction (e.g. Allen and van der Velden 2001; Green and Zhu 2010). Because of the putative
25 link between skill use and the emotion of arousal as well as pleasure, Warr (2007) proposes in
26 addition the hypothesis that opportunity for skill use is more strongly associated with
27 Enthusiasm than with Contentment, though we are aware of no evidence in favour or against
28 this proposition. A related aspect of the skill challenge is the variety encountered in a job and
29 the need to learn new things, both of which would be expected to have the same differential
30 effects on well-being. Finally, the extent to which jobs involve carrying out repetitive tasks
31 might be expected to have negative effects on Enthusiasm, but less of a detrimental effect on
32 Contentment. All these ideas may be summed up in the hypotheses:

- 33 • H9: Greater use of workers' skills is associated with higher well-being.
- 34 • H10: The effect of skills challenge on Enthusiasm is stronger than its effect on
35 Contentment.

36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 *Insecurity*

1
2
3
4 The fourth set of theories we incorporate concern insecurity, which is seen as a stressor with
5 detrimental effects on well-being, stemming from the associated loss of control (Greenhalgh
6 and Rosenblatt 1984). The impact of insecurity has also been interpreted as contributing to a
7 repudiation of the implicit 'psychological contract' (Mauno et al. 2005) or as part of a shift in
8 power relations (Scott 2004). Our primary focus is on the risk of job loss, which is expected to
9 affect both Enthusiasm and Contentment. For this there is already robust and voluminous
10 evidence from studies of ex-ante job insecurity (e.g. Burchell 1994; Cheng and Chan 2008;
11 Green 2011; Nolan et al. 2000; Wichert 2002) and indirectly from studies of ex-post indicators
12 such as job loss and unemployment (e.g. Di Tella et al. 2003; Theodossiou 1998). Insecurity can
13 also entail uncertainty over valued job features within the current job, including fears of unfair
14 treatment or loss of job status, though for lack of data in successive waves of our data series we
15 are unable to test whether such fears may add to an explanation for changing well-being (Gallie
16 et al. 2013). The main hypothesis is therefore:
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

- 30 • H11: Job insecurity is negatively related to well-being.

31 32 33 34 35 *Workplace change*

36
37 Workplace change may have an indirect effect on well-being, through its effects on any of the
38 above aspects of job quality. Yet change may also have a direct effect.
39
40

41
42 A direct negative impact on well-being is to be expected from the disruptions of restructuring --
43 employment downsizing, pay cuts, new technologies and work re-organisation. For example, it
44 is held that, for those employees who 'survive' it without losing their jobs, downsizing is a
45 rupture in the 'psychological contract' which reduces their organisational commitment and
46 well-being. There are a few studies to support this. Bryson et al. (2013), for example, report
47 that changes in work organisation are associated with lower Contentment, but that this effect is
48 ameliorated where unions with bargaining rights are consulted over the reorganisation. Datta
49 et al. (2010) review evidence that downsizing tends to lower job satisfaction and organisational
50 commitment. Typically, studies report greater negative direct effects on survivors of downsizing
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the nearer they are to being involved, and the less fair are the perceived processes (Pepper et
5 al. 2003). A counter-argument sometimes posed, however, is that if job-related well-being is
6 assessed relative to those made redundant, there could be a positive survivor effect among
7 those in work during a recession – a feeling of relief that their jobs have not been lost. There
8 may also be direct effects (positive or negative) on well-being from changing jobs.
9

- 14 • H12: Disruptive workplace changes are negatively associated with well-being,
15 conditional on their indirect effects via changing job characteristics.
16
- 17 • H13: Surviving downsizing could be associated with relative relief, hence greater well-
18 being.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 *The Expected Effect of Recession*

26
27 These hypotheses enable us to frame an expectation about the impact of economic downturns
28 on job-related well-being. While it is well-established that downturns are detrimental for
29 general well-being, we are concerned here with the effect on job-related well-being.
30 Recessions, which are expected to be a time of accelerated restructuring and workplace
31 change, could affect the job-related well-being of those remaining in work. In part, recessions'
32 expected effects hinge on H12 and H13. In addition, however, other job characteristics are
33 likely to alter during recessions. Overall, the potential effects are also uncertain. On one hand,
34 in a recession employers' bargaining power is increased, thus enabling them to enforce a
35 greater level of work intensity; recession and stagnation could also be expected to elevate both
36 the fear of both job loss and anxiety about unfair treatment (Gallie et al. 2013). On the other
37 hand labour hoarding in recessions implies lower work intensity and hours. There could also be
38 a selection effect, with surviving workers more likely to have higher productivity than those laid
39 off, and greater well-being.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Given the depth of the Great Recession, our prior expectation was that a rising prevalence of
54 insecurity, restructuring and other deteriorations in job quality would lead to a reduction in job-
55 related well-being in both dimensions. In what follows our aim is, not to test whether the Great
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Recession *caused* changes in job-related well-being, but to investigate what happened and how
5 far factors associated with recession, such as restructuring and rising insecurity, were present
6 and are associated with job-related well-being. Specifically, we ask: what happened to the two
7 dimensions of job-related well-being between 2006 (before the recession) and 2012? How far
8 was the pace of restructuring and workplace change heightened in this interval? How did core
9 elements of job quality change between these two dates? In the light of our estimates of the
10 association of job characteristics and of workplace change with job-related well-being, we then
11 decompose the observed change into a part that can be 'accounted for' by accelerated
12 workplace change and by changes in job quality, and a residual that cannot be linked to
13 observed variables.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Data and indicators**

28
29 To examine these questions, together with the hypotheses derived from the core theories, we
30 use data from the British Skills and Employment Surveys, a series of periodic nationally
31 representative sample surveys of individuals in employment which we have collected. Sample
32 sizes were 4,470 in 2001, 7,787 in 2006 and 3,200 in 2012; the full survey details are reported in
33 Felstead et al. (2002; 2007) and, for 2012, at <http://www.llakes.org/>. The surveys collected
34 responses from working adults interviewed in their own homes. Interviews lasted less than one
35 hour on average, no evidence of tiredness was observed and no interviews were abandoned
36
37 The samples were drawn using random probability principles subject to stratification based on
38 socio-economic indicators, and only one eligible respondent per address was randomly selected
39 for interview. Weights were computed to take into account the differential probabilities of
40 sample selection, the over-sampling of certain areas and some small response rate variations
41 between groups (defined by sex, age and occupation); all of the analyses that follow use these
42 weights.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 We focus in our analyses only on employees, because some of the key variables under study are
56 likely to be interpreted somewhat differently by the self-employed. We collected data on job-
57 related well-being using Warr's scales in the 2001, 2006 and 2012 surveys. To measure the two
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 dimensions of job-related well-being – Enthusiasm and Contentment – a series of items was
5 introduced with the words: ‘Thinking of the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job
6 made you feel each of the following...?’, each followed by an adjective describing a different
7 feeling. For the Enthusiasm scale, the adjectives were ‘depressed’, ‘gloomy’, ‘miserable’,
8 ‘cheerful’, ‘enthusiastic’ and ‘optimistic’. For the Contentment scale the adjectives were ‘tense’,
9 ‘uneasy’, ‘worried’, ‘calm’, ‘contented’ and ‘relaxed’. Possible responses were ‘never’,
10 ‘occasionally’, ‘some of the time’, ‘much of the time’, ‘most of the time’ and ‘all of the time’.
11 Both scales are constructed by averaging the responses, having reversed the negative items,
12 ranged from 1 to 6. In our samples the Cronbach's alpha statistic was 0.81 for both Enthusiasm
13 and Contentment, suggesting that it is reasonable to regard the elements of each scale as
14 capturing an underlying dimension.
15

16 Work duration is indicated by the number of hours usually worked per week. We derived a
17 Work Intensity Index that includes multiple facets, constructed from the following elements: a)
18 the perception of required hard work; b) the frequency of working to tight deadlines; c) the
19 frequency of having to work at very high speeds; d) the frequency of experiencing difficulty to
20 complete tasks in time; e) the frequency of returning home from work exhausted; f) the
21 perception of putting in additional effort beyond requirements; g) average task demands
22 (derived from 40 items).³ These seven items were combined, after standardising, into a single
23 scale, with a Cronbach's alpha statistic of 0.72. Our findings described below are not sensitive
24 to reasonable alternative methods of constructing this index.
25

26 We generated the Task Discretion Index from four items which assess how much personal
27 influence people report over specific aspects of their jobs: how hard they work, deciding what
28 tasks they are to do, how the tasks are done and the quality standards to which they work. The
29 response options ranged from ‘a great deal’, ‘a fair amount’ to ‘not much’ and ‘not much at all’.
30 A summary index was constructed, by taking the average of responses of the four items. The
31 Cronbach's alpha coefficient is 0.77. We also include a measure of whether employees have
32 some influence over tasks through the teams they work in. We asked whether they worked in a
33

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59 ³ These indicators of the importance of tasks in jobs are described fully elsewhere, e.g. Green (2012).
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 group, and if so how much influence the team had over the same aspects of the team's work.
5
6 We generated a dummy variable indicator for 'semi-autonomous' team, equal to one if the
7
8 employee worked in a team where the average amount of team influence was at least 'a fair
9
10 amount', zero otherwise. Our measures of participation are then supplemented by a dummy
11
12 variable indicating whether the worker has 'a great deal' of say in decisions that change the
13
14 way the job is done. Organisational involvement is indicated, first, by a dummy variable for
15
16 participation in quality circles. Second, we computed an indicator (range 0-8) for organisational
17
18 communications via meetings with management: the sum of the number of issues (finance,
19
20 investment, working practices, company products, health and safety, training plans and other
21
22 matters) that can be raised in consultative meetings and a dummy for information-giving
23
24 meetings. We also included an indicator for union voice: a dummy variable for whether unions
25
26 are present in the establishment and reported to have a 'fair amount' or 'a great deal' of
27
28 influence over work organisation.

29
30 Financial participation is captured by three dummy variables indicating whether the respondent
31
32 receives, as part of pay, a bonus linked to individual, team or organisational performance (the
33
34 latter including the facility to participate in a share ownership or option scheme).

35
36 To capture skills challenge we used four indicators. Two were dummy variables covering
37
38 whether the job required them to keep learning new things, and whether it never involved
39
40 carrying out short, repetitive tasks. The third indicator is how much variety there is in the job.
41
42 The fourth indicator captures how far respondents agreed with the statement 'I have enough
43
44 opportunity to use the knowledge and skills that I have'.

45
46 To capture job insecurity respondents were asked whether there was any chance of them
47
48 becoming unemployed and losing their job in the next twelve months, and if so how likely this
49
50 was on a five-point scale ranging from 'very unlikely' to 'very likely'. In previous studies it has
51
52 been shown that expectations of job loss are well-informed (Dickerson and Green 2009;
53
54 Stephens 2004).

55
56 Several measures of workplace change are also included. We ascertained whether skills used
57
58 had changed, respondents had been promoted or their choice over work methods had changed

1
2
3
4 since a recent reference point.⁴ While some will have changed employer since the reference
5 point, among those that did not do so we ascertained whether new technology (specifically,
6 new computerised or automated equipment) had been introduced, whether work had been
7 reorganised, and whether there had been some downsizing (specifically, a reduction in the
8 number of people doing the job). We would also liked to have included an indicator of wage
9 cuts, but this was not available in the data.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **A picture of job-related well-being and (non-pay) job quality in Britain, 2001-2012.**

20
21 The first question we address is whether job-related well-being has risen, fallen, or remained
22 stable through the recession. To set this in context, we also include the 2001 picture for this
23 description. Pooling the data from all three waves, and using a consistent base across years
24 (employees aged 20-60, living in England, Scotland or Wales) the Enthusiasm index has a mean
25 of 4.27 while Contentment has a mean of 3.72. Table 1 shows that there was no significant
26 change in job-related well-being between 2001 and 2006, but that in the next six years well-
27 being fell significantly in both dimensions. The change was quite substantial, amounting to
28 around 7% and 20% of the standard deviations of Contentment and Enthusiasm respectively.
29 Thus, while in theory the direction of change in job-related well-being for those still in
30 employment in a recession could not be predicted, in practice the direction of change through
31 the Great Recession was downwards.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The two indices can each be divided into sub-indices covering just the positive or just the
44 negative items. This is of interest because other studies using these scales may focus on just the
45 positive or the negative items. Table 1 reveals that declines in the Contentment index over
46 2006 to 2012 occur for both negative and positive items, though the negative items decline
47 somewhat more (0.24 compared with 0.11). With the Enthusiasm index only the negative items
48 decline.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 ⁴ We asked respondents if they were in work 5 years prior to interview, and if so this would become their
57 reference point for subsequent change questions. If not employed then, they were asked the same question about
58 4 years, then if not employed at that point, again about 3 years. This device enabled us to heighten the number of
59 responses with qualitative information about recent workplace change.
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Differences can also be observed between the changes in the well-being of males and females.
5
6 In the case of Contentment the index falls further for males than for females (0.24 compared
7
8 with 0.11), while with Enthusiasm the index falls for males but not at all for females.
9

10 Having established that job-related well-being declined in the 2006-2012 period, we now
11
12 examine what happened to the pace of workplace change and to our indicators of job quality.
13
14 As can be seen in Table 1, there was an increase in the Work Intensity Index, especially between
15
16 2006 and 2012 – a work intensification. Meanwhile working hours came down by a small
17
18 amount from 2001. Individuals' task discretion remained largely stable overall through the
19
20 decade. Starting in 2006 there was an increase in the prevalence of semi-autonomous
21
22 teamworking (from 14% to 18%), coupled by a small rise in the prevalence of team-based
23
24 performance-related pay (16% to 18%). Communication between management and workers
25
26 rose between 2001 and 2006 but thereafter stabilised. After 2006, the use of quality circles
27
28 declined by a small amount, and there was also a more substantial reduction in the share
29
30 reporting influence on changes in work methods (from 31% to 26%), while union voice and non-
31
32 team forms of performance-related pay were unchanged.
33

34 Skills challenges also went through small changes between 2006 and 2012, the most notable
35
36 being a rise in repetitiveness (a fall from 23% to 20% in the prevalence of jobs which never
37
38 entailed repetitive tasks), and a rise in the availability of opportunities for skill use.
39

40
41 There has been a rise in perceptions of the probability of job loss which accelerated after 2006:
42
43 whereas in 2006 83% of employees felt that there was no chance of losing their job, or it was
44
45 very unlikely, in 2012 the figure was down to 78%. Gallie et al. (2013) show that this rise was
46
47 complemented by a rise between 2000 and 2012 in fears of unfair treatment in the workplace.
48

49 As the table shows, rising insecurity after 2006 is also accompanied by alterations in the pace of
50
51 workplace change. Most notably, the proportion of employees reporting that there had been
52
53 some downsizing in their job rose from 30% in 2006 to 41% in 2012. There were also falls in the
54
55 prevalence of skill rises (58% to 54%), promotion (38% to 35%), workplaces with increasing job
56
57 choice (41% to 36%), job mobility to another employer (43% to 39%), and the introduction of
58
59

1
2
3
4 new technology (63% to 58%). These are the unsurprising accoutrements of the Great
5
6 Recession in Britain.

7
8
9 The relevance of these job characteristics and the altered pace of change for our understanding
10
11 of the changes in well-being depends on their associations with well-being, as implied by the
12
13 core theories outlined above. We now therefore turn to an empirical model of these
14
15 associations.

16 17 18 19 **The determinants of well-being.**

20
21
22 Table 2 presents our baseline model implied by core theories. We use the pooled nationally
23
24 representative data for 2006 and 2012, in order to focus on the period in which well-being fell
25
26 and because this enables us to use the full range of explanatory variables. This restriction allows
27
28 us to expand the base to all employees aged 20-65. Males and females are treated separately,
29
30 since different domestic circumstances (including labour market participation), preferences or
31
32 opportunities may condition the effects of job quality indicators in distinct ways according to
33
34 gender; also, as we have seen, their experiences differed through the recession. We use the
35
36 Seemingly Unrelated Regression estimator to allow for potential correlation of the residuals in
37
38 the regressions for the two well-being dimensions.

39
40 The findings confirm previous studies showing the negative association of work intensity with
41
42 well-being (H1). Concerning the non-linearity hypothesis (H2) the evidence is mixed. There is a
43
44 negative coefficient on the square of work intensity in all four cases, but this is significant (at
45
46 1%) only in the case of females' Contentment index. Another new finding is that the estimates
47
48 support the hypothesis (H3) that work intensity impinges more on Contentment than on
49
50 Enthusiasm. Evaluated at its mean (zero) the standardised effect of work intensity for females is
51
52 -0.55 on Contentment and -0.25 on Enthusiasm; for males, the equivalents are -0.39 and -0.27.
53
54 These differences are each significant at 1%.

55
56 As regards work hours the relationship with Enthusiasm is U-shaped, supporting H1 only up to a
57
58 point and H2 not at all: the working week at which Enthusiasm is at a minimum is estimated to
59
60

1
2
3
4 be 40 hours for men, 53 hours for women. This result is similar to previous findings in the
5 literature which have found somewhat high levels of job satisfaction among those working very
6 long hours (Benz 2005): this association is interpretable as reflecting the endogenous
7 determination of work hours, in that some of those work long hours are choosing to do so
8 because they enjoy the work.
9

10
11
12
13
14 The findings also confirm a substantive positive effect of individual task discretion on the two
15 dimensions of well-being (H4). Moreover, the interaction with work intensity is positive and
16 significant in three cases, consistent with previous evidence concerning hypothesis H5 that the
17 detrimental effects of work intensity are moderated by higher levels of task discretion.
18
19

20
21
22
23 Indicators of organisational participation are also positively associated with well-being (H6). The
24 strongest is 'influence on change in work method', which is significant for both dimensions and
25 sexes; as an example, for females having 'a great deal' of say in organisational decisions that
26 change the way work is done and has an effect on Enthusiasm of 0.26 (31% of its standard
27 deviation). Semi-autonomous team-working (with high levels of team influence over tasks) has
28 lower coefficients, yet these are significant in 3 out of 4 cases. Quality circle participation is
29 associated with greater Enthusiasm for males, while the Organisational Communications
30 indicator is linked with Enthusiasm for both sexes. Union voice is beneficial in raising
31 Contentment for males.
32
33

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Unlike earlier studies which report negative effects of individual-based financial participation,
42 we find that receipt of individual or team-based pay is found to be insignificant. Financial
43 participation through organisation-level performance schemes, however, is associated with
44 significantly lower Contentment for males, weakly supporting H8 rather than H7.
45
46
47

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4 in that the estimated link with Enthusiasm is greater than the link with Contentment. The
5 coefficients differ significantly: thus, for 'Great Deal' of variety $p=0.00$ for both sexes; for
6 'Strongly disagree' about enough opportunity for skill use, $p=0.00$ for females, $p=0.08$ for males.
7
8
9

10 In respect of the requirement to learn new things ('Learning'), the estimates show the expected
11 positive association with Enthusiasm (significant for females), but for males the association with
12 Contentment is significantly negative. Avoidance of repetitive tasks in a job is associated with
13 greater Enthusiasm for males and, for both sexes, lower Contentment. Thus, with both these
14 indicators, H10 may need amendment to a stronger version: the effect of skills challenge on
15 Contentment is not only less than its positive effect on Enthusiasm, it may become negative.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Finally, as predicted job insecurity is associated with lower well-being in both dimensions (H11).
23 This effect is large: for example, those females who think that they are 'quite likely' or 'very
24 likely' to be losing their jobs in the coming year have a Contentment level of 0.31 (35% of sd)
25 less than the reference category of secure employees.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 **A robustness issue: controlling for personality**

34 Table 2 shows that, taken together, the job characteristics account for between 15% and 20%
35 of the variation in our measures of job-related well-being. Since these are cross-sections,
36 however, the estimates do not establish causation. For the usual reasons, many of the job
37 characteristics could be argued to be partially affected by other variables which also affect well-
38 being, of which a prime candidate is personality; there could also be reverse causation.
39 Moreover, it could be that the selection of individuals into employment is related to their well-
40 being, which would also make for potential bias. Nevertheless, one could have greater
41 confidence that the estimates are worth taking seriously as showing consistency with theory
42 where it is possible to control for personality and other relevant personal characteristics. We
43 therefore investigated whether the addition of such controls substantially altered the pattern
44 of findings just described. To do this, our analysis was confined to the 2012 data, which
45 contained indicators of the 'Big Five' personality traits – Extraversion, Agreeableness,
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability and Openness. We included the scales derived from the
5 short form version of these scales, designed and validated for use where interview time was
6 scarce in large-scale surveys (Gosling et al. 2003; Muck et al. 2007).
7
8
9

10 The full results of this exercise are given in an Appendix, available on request to the first author.
11 As expected, the introduction of the personality variables substantially increases the amount of
12 well-being variation that is accounted for, for females reaching 37% for Enthusiasm and 30% for
13 Contentment. Emotional Stability is especially strongly associated with both dimensions of well-
14 being. The key observation, however, is that the estimated effects of the job quality variables
15 do not greatly differ from those using the same specifications used in Table 2. The same
16 observation holds for the further inclusion of demographic controls, which include age,
17 ethnicity, education level, childhood financial security and parental interest in their school
18 progress. Thus, despite the power of the personality variables to influence well-being, their
19 effects and those of other controls appear to be largely orthogonal to the job quality variables
20 of interest.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 34 35 **Extension: workplace change and well-being**

36
37 Table 3 extends the basic model of well-being to incorporate workplace change. In addition to
38 the job quality variables entered into Table 2, we introduced dummy variables for changes in
39 respondents' jobs, whether the respondent changed employer, and if not whether he/she
40 experienced the various workplace changes noted in Table 1. These additions are subject to
41 the same issue of endogeneity discussed above; in particular, individuals who in their past
42 employment had a higher well-being (which could persist into the present) might be less likely
43 to change jobs. We therefore look only for associations, not proof of causation.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The table shows no significant associations with rising skills requirements, but promotion is
52 associated with greater Enthusiasm for males, and lower Contentment for females. Decreased
53 choice has detrimental effects for both dimensions for both sexes, while increased choice is
54 beneficial for the Enthusiasm of females. Having changed employer is associated with lower
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Contentment. Among workplace changes, work re-organisation and (strongly) downsizing each
5 have significant negative associations with well-being for both dimensions for both sexes. Males
6 who report downsizing, for example, have an Enthusiasm index that is 0.14 (17% of sd) lower
7 than that of others where there is no downsizing. Since these models also contain, as controls,
8 the same variables that were included in Table 2, these effects are supplementary to any links
9 that workplace change may have had with job characteristics and thence with well-being.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Decomposing changes in well-being.**

20
21 We are now in a position to present, in Table 4, a conventional decomposition of the 2006-2012
22 falls in well-being into those that can be 'accounted for' by changes in the job quality variables
23 and the workplace change variables, and those that remain unaccounted for by our observed
24 variables. We use a simple pooled model of the 2006 and 2012 waves, with the same covariates
25 as in Table 3.
26
27
28
29
30

31 For the Enthusiasm index we focus on males only since for females there was no significant
32 decline to account for. Of the fall of 0.108 in the Enthusiasm index for males just over a fifth
33 (21%) is accounted for by the effort and participation variables combined, while another equal
34 proportion is down to workplace change. Overall, the model accounts for 37% of the decline,
35 and the rest can only be put down to unobserved variables.
36
37
38
39
40

41 With the Contentment index, nearly a fifth (19%) of the 0.219 decline for males is accounted for
42 by changing effort and participation. This share is added to by workplace change and insecurity,
43 but partly counterbalanced by an improvement in skills challenge. As a result, overall nearly a
44 quarter (24%) of the decline is accounted for. For females, nearly a quarter (24%) of the smaller
45 decline of 0.115 is accounted by effort and participation; workplace change and insecurity
46 together add a similar amount; however, skills challenge provides a substantial counterbalance.
47 Overall, 37% of the fall is accounted for.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Thus overall, while some of the declines in well-being are accounted for by observed workplace
57 change and changing job quality, only a minority share is 'explained' in this way. The
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 'unexplained' parts of the declines can be attributable to unobserved variables with predicted
5 high influence on well-being, about which one can speculate. One possibility is the wider forms
6 of insecurity (fear of unfair treatment and unwanted role alteration) which are known to have
7 risen substantially between 2000 and 2012 (Gallie et al. 2013). Another is pay cuts: with median
8 real wages falling since 2008, there will have been a substantial rise between 2006 and 2012 in
9 the number of employees experiencing reductions.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Conclusion.**

20
21 In this paper, we have applied a model derived from several core theories of job-related well-
22 being to a large nationally-representative sample of Britain's workers, and examined how job-
23 related well-being changed between 2006 and 2012, that is, before and after the deepest
24 recession to affect capitalist countries since at least the 1930s.
25
26
27
28

29
30 Our first substantive new finding is that there was a substantial fall in average job-related well-
31 being over the 2006-2012 period surrounding the Great Recession, while over the same period
32 there were some significant changes in job quality (increases in work intensity, insecurity and
33 the pace of workplace change). For males, both Enthusiasm and Contentment fell, while for
34 females only Contentment fell. These findings contribute to our understanding of
35 macroeconomic and societal change, and attest to the potential benefit for national statistical
36 offices to collect valid data and incorporate measures of well-being in their national
37 assessments.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Tests using the model showed some new findings concerning the determinants of job-related
47 well-being:
48

- 49
50 • We found that there is only weak evidence that the marginal effect of effort on well-
51 being is increasingly negative (H2); the hypothesis could only be supported in the case
52 of the effect of work intensity on females' Contentment.
53
- 54 • We also report new findings concerning the effects of financial participation (where
55 theory suggests either positive or negative effects). Our estimates implied that practices
56
57
58
59

1
2
3
4 that connect organisational performance with rewards are linked with lower
5 Contentment for males (H8, rejecting H7). However, the receipt of other forms of
6 performance-related pay has no significant association with job-related well-being. For
7 these other forms one can conclude, either that the effects are weak, or that opposing
8 effects are balanced.
9

- 10 • We found that downsizing, work re-organisation and decreased choice are each
11 associated directly with lower job-related well-being (H12).
12
- 13 • As predicted, we also found that some effects on job-related well-being differed
14 according to the dimension of well-being. Work intensity has a more (negative)
15 association with Contentment than with Enthusiasm (H3). Job variety and opportunities
16 for skills use have more of a positive association with Enthusiasm than with
17 Contentment (H9 and H10). Moreover, we find that some indicators of skills challenge
18 (learning requirements, non-repetitiveness of tasks) are associated with higher levels of
19 Enthusiasm but lower levels of Contentment (H9 and H10).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Our findings also confirmed results from previous studies, many of which have been obtained
33 using non-nationally-representative data. Thus we found that task discretion has a large
34 positive association with job-related well-being. Moreover, this link interacts with work
35 intensity as predicted, so that, while high work intensity is associated with low job-related well-
36 being (H1), task discretion is more effective at higher levels of work intensity (H5). Decision-
37 making organisational participation is found to be associated with higher well-being (H6), the
38 main channels being through having an influence on changes in work methods, and through the
39 influence obtained in semi-autonomous teams. We also re-confirmed the well-established
40 negative association between job insecurity and lower well-being (H11).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The model estimates accounted for a minority part of the decline between 2006 and 2012 in
51 both dimensions of well-being. The variables that were driving this 'explained' decline were
52 those typically associated with recession: downsizing of establishment size, rising job insecurity
53 and work intensification not accompanied by rises in task discretion or organisational
54 participation in decision-making. The opportunity to utilise skills increased and improved well-
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 being slightly, and this appears to have contributed a little to the observed gender difference in
5 declining well-being. Nevertheless, there remains a substantial part of the decline that is
6
7
8 'unexplained', which has to be put down to unobserved factors.
9

10 While in most instances the association of job quality variables with job-related well-being is
11 the same for males and females, we draw attention to two differences of note for further
12 research. First, while being promoted is, unsurprisingly, associated with greater Enthusiasm for
13 males, for females there is no such effect; indeed, promotion appears to bring significantly
14 lower Contentment. Whether this negative effect on Contentment is induced by the
15 enhancement of job roles at a lifecourse stage when women are also bearing major domestic
16 responsibilities deserves further examination. It may be especially relevant in the context of
17 findings that gender gaps in job quality appear to be negligible at the start of working life, but
18 to open out as careers develop (Manning and Swaffield 2008). Second, working in a good
19 learning environment is positively associated with Enthusiasm, in the case of females; for
20 males, however, not only is there no significant relationship with Enthusiasm, it is associated
21 with lower Contentment. Whether this is due to different aspects of learning environments in
22 the jobs typically done by men and women, or whether to gender-based differences in learning
23 dispositions, also merits further investigation.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 When analysing job quality and well-being, surveys of individuals (who are, after all, the job-
39 holders and therefore best-placed informants on what happens in their jobs) are preferable to
40 surveys of employers. Individuals are, of course, sometimes open to social esteem bias, so
41 questionnaires have to be designed with care to minimise its occurrence. Moreover large,
42 representative, samples taken at successive timepoints have the merits that findings are
43 generalisable and that valid descriptions can be developed about how a nation, region or other
44 aggregate entity is changing. While the results in this paper apply to Britain, the hypotheses are
45 relevant everywhere. It seems quite possible that job-related well-being may have followed
46 similar patterns in other countries experiencing the recession, even if each experience may be
47 modified by country-specific institutions. If the data could be collected elsewhere, the same
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 methods could be used to track and account for job-related well-being over time, and how this
5
6 relates to macro-level events.
7

8
9 Nevertheless, it needs to be remembered that respondents in nationally-representative
10 samples of workplaces will differ in many ways. Some variables may have varying meanings
11 according to their setting, while other determining characteristics remain unobserved. This last
12 point leads to the chief limitation of our analyses, which is that they have been conducted with
13 successive *cross-sections*. One step we have taken in this paper to reduce potential endogeneity
14 biases is to include a wide array of variables and controls, even though there are ultimate limits
15 to how many determinants can be captured in a survey. Our most notable innovation, however,
16 is that in the latest wave we have included controls for personality traits, the 'Big Five'
17 measured in short form, since it could be held that these would influence the allocation to jobs
18 as well as being strongly correlated with subjective well-being. Reassuringly, the estimated
19 associations of our baseline model variables with well-being showed no or only small changes,
20 when family background and personality controls were introduced. Nevertheless, given that
21 there are likely to be other unobserved person-specific factors affecting the allocation of labour
22 none of the estimates can be regarded as unbiased estimates. In the absence of nationally-
23 representative panel data with equally rich job quality data, our findings summarised above
24 should be regarded as showing consistency with the hypotheses, rather than proving causal
25 effects.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Economic downturns are to be avoided if possible through macroeconomic management, and
43 the effects of rising insecurity and accelerated disruptive workplace change on job-related well-
44 being provide yet more reasons to do so. But if downturns occur it may be suggested that the
45 control of work intensity and a better design of jobs could ameliorate some of the detrimental
46 effects on well-being. The estimates, if taken at face value as deriving from causal effects, point
47 to the need for more individual or team-level task discretion, greater variety (while controlling
48 the level of required effort), more efficient use of skills, and a say in matters of work
49 organisation. Organisational participation at a higher level, for example through better
50 communication or a union voice, is also found to be valuable though of lesser import. By
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 contrast, attempts to foster better performance through broadening the use of economic
5 incentives would appear, on this evidence, to be neutral when applied at individual or team
6 levels, but at organisational level to come at a small cost of lower well-being.
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Acknowledgements**

13
14
15 The Skills and Employment Survey 2012 was funded by the ESRC/UKCES Strategic Partnership
16 (RES-241-25-0001), with additional support from the Wales Institute of Social and Economic
17 Research, Data and Methods. For the 2006 Skills Survey we acknowledge support from the
18 Economic and Social Research Council, the Department for Education and Skills, the
19 Department of Trade and Industry, the Learning and Skills Council, the Sector Skills
20 Development Agency, Scottish Enterprise, Futureskills Wales, Highlands and Islands Enterprise,
21 East Midlands Development Agency. The 2001 Skills Survey was funded by the UK Department
22 for Education and Skills. The survey data can be accessed from the UK Data Archive (2012 data
23 from 2014).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Allen, J. and R. van der Velden (2001). Educational mismatches versus skill mismatches: effects on wages, job satisfaction, and on-the-job search. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 53(3): 434-452.
- Ashenfelter, O., K. Doran & B. Schaller (2010). A Shred of Credible Evidence on the Long-run Elasticity of Labour Supply. *Economica*, 77 (308): 637-650.
- Beham, B. and S. Drobnič (2011). "Job Demands and Work-Home Interference: Empirical Evidence from Service Sector Employees in Eight European Countries". In S. Drobnič and A. M. Guillén (eds.) *Work-Life Balance in Europe: The Role of Job Quality*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 95-119.
- Bender, K.A., Green, C.P., & Heywood, J.S. (2012) Piece rates and Workplace injury: Does survey evidence support Adam Smith? *Journal of Population Economics*, 25(2): 569 - 590.
- Benz, M. (2005). Not for the Profit, but for the Satisfaction? – Evidence on Worker Well-Being in Non-Profit Firms. *Kyklos*, 58:2, 155-76.
- Bender, K.A. & Theodossiou, I. (2013). The unintended consequences of the rat race: The detrimental effects of performance pay on health. Working Paper, Department of Economics, University of Aberdeen.
- Böckerman, P., Bryson, A. & Ilmakunnas, P. (2012). Does high involvement management improve worker wellbeing? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 84, 660-80.
- Böckerman, P. & Ilmakunnas, P. (2012). The Job Satisfaction-Productivity Nexus: A Study Using Matched Survey and Register Data. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 65:2, 244-62.
- Brown, A., Charlwood, A. & Spencer, D. A. (2012). Not all that it might seem: why job satisfaction is worth studying despite it being a poor summary measure of job quality. *Work Employment and Society*, 26(6): 1007-1018.
- Bryson, A. & Freeman, R. B. (2010). To join or not to join? Factors influencing employee share plan membership in a multinational corporation", in T. Kato (ed.) *Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory & Labor-Managed Firms*, Volume 11. (pp.1-22). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Bryson, A., Barth, E. & Dale-Olsen, H. (2013). The effects of organizational change on worker well-being and the moderating role of trade unions. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 66:4, 990-1011.
- Burchell, B (1994) 'The effects of labour market position, job insecurity and unemployment on psychological health', in D. Gallie, Marsh, C., and Vogler, C (eds.) *Social Change and the Experience of Unemployment*. (pp.188-212) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cheng, G. H. L. & Chan, D. K. S. (2008). Who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology-an International Review-Psychologie Appliquee-Revue Internationale*, 57 (2): 272-303.
- Cottini, E. & Lucifora, C. (2013). Mental Health and Working Conditions in Europe. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 66:4, 958-88.
- Datta, D. K., Guthrie, J. P., Basuil, D. & Pandey, A. (2010). "Causes and Effects of Employee Downsizing: A Review and Synthesis." *Journal of Management*, 36: 281-348.

- 1
2
3
4 De Neve, J.-E., Diener, E., Tay, L. & Xuereb, C. (2013). *The Objective Benefits of Subjective Well-Being*. Discussion Paper No 1236, London, LSE, Centre for Economic Performance.
5
6 Retrieved at <http://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/dp1236.pdf>.
7
8 Dickerson, A., & Green, F. (2009). Fears and Realisations of Employment Insecurity. *Labour Economics*, 19(2): 198-210.
9
10 Di Tella, R., MacCulloch, R.J., & Oswald, A.J. (2003). The macroeconomics of happiness. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85 (4), 809–827.
11
12 Eller, N.H., Netterstrom, B., Gyntelberg, F., Kristensen, T. S., Nielsen, F., Steptoe, A., & Theorell, T. (2009). Work-Related Psychosocial Factors and the Development of Ischemic Heart Disease A Systematic Review. *Cardiology in Review*, 17(2): 83-97.
13
14 Felstead, A., Gallie, D., Green, F. & Zhou, Y. (2007). *Skills At Work, 1986 to 2006*. University of Oxford, SKOPE.
15
16 Felstead, A., Gallie, D. & Green, F. (2002). *Work Skills In Britain 1986-2001*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.
17
18 Foster A.D., & Rosenzweig, M.R. (1994). A Test for Moral Hazard in the Labor Market: Contractual Arrangements, Effort, and Health. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 74(2): 213 – 227.
19
20 Fox, A. (1980). 'The meaning of work,' in G. Esland and G. Salaman (Eds.), *The politics of work and occupation* (pp.131-191). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
21
22 Freeman, R.D. & Kleiner, M. (2005). The Last American Shoe Manufactures: Decreasing Productivity and Increasing Profits in a Shift from Piece Rates to Continuous Flow Production. *Industrial Relations*, 44(2): 307 – 330.
23
24 Gallie, D. (2013). 'Direct participation and the quality of work.' *Human Relations*, 66:4, 453-73.
25
26 Gallie, D., Zhou, Y., Felstead, A. & Green, F. (2012). Teamwork, Skill Development and Employee Welfare. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50(1): 23-46.
27
28 Gallie, D., Felstead, A., Green, F. & Inanc, H. (2013). *Fear At Work In Britain*. London: Centre for Learning and Life Chances in Knowledge Economies and Societies, Institute of Education.
29
30 Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J. & Swann Jr. W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37: 504-528.
31
32 Grebner, S., Semmer, N. & Elfering, A. (2005). Working conditions and three types of well-being: A longitudinal study with self-report and rating data. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10: 31-43.
33
34 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): 53-80.
35
36 Green, F. (2006). *Demanding Work. The Paradox of Job Quality in the Affluent Economy*. Woodstock: Princeton University Press.
37
38 Green, F. (2009). "Subjective Employment Insecurity Around The World." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 2(3): 343-363.
39
40 Green, F. (2008). Leeway for the Loyal: A Model of Employee Discretion. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46:1, 1-32.
41
42 Green, F. (2010). Well-being, job satisfaction and labour mobility. *Labour Economics*, 17:6, 897-903.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Green, F. (2011). Unpacking the misery multiplier: how employability modifies the impacts of
5 unemployment and job insecurity on life satisfaction and mental health. *Journal of*
6 *Health Economics*, 30:2, 265–76.
- 7
8 Green, F. (2012). Employee Involvement, Technology and Evolution in Job Skills: A Task-Based
9 Analysis. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 65:1, 35-66.
- 10
11 Green, F. & Y. Zhu (2010). Overqualification, Job Dissatisfaction, and Increasing Dispersion in
12 the Returns to Graduate Education. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 62(2): 740-763.
- 13
14 Greenhalgh, L. & Rosenblatt, Z. (1984). Job Insecurity: Toward Conceptual Clarity. *Academy of*
15 *Management Review*, 9(3): 443-448.
- 16
17 Hakanen, J. J., W. B. Schaufeli and K. Ahola (2008). "The Job Demands-Resources model: A
18 three-year cross-lagged study of burnout, depression, commitment, and work
19 engagement." *Work & Stress* 22(3): 224-241.
- 20
21 Hamermesh, D. (1993). *Labor Demand*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 22
23 Kalleberg, A. L. (2011). *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs: The Rise of Polarized and Precarious Employment*
24 *Systems in the United States, 1970s to 2000s*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- 25
26 Kalleberg, A. L., Nesheim, T. & Olsen, K. M. (2009). Is Participation Good or Bad for Workers?
27 Effects of Autonomy, Consultation and Teamwork on Stress among Workers in Norway.
28 *Acta Sociologica*, 52(2): 99-116.
- 29
30 Karasek, R., (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude and mental strain: Implications for job
31 design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24: 285-308.
- 32
33 Karasek, R. & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy work: stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of*
34 *working life*. New York: Basic Books.
- 35
36 Körner, T., Puch, K. & Wingerter, C. (2011). *Quality of employment. Earning money and what*
37 *else counts*. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt (Federal Statistical Office).
- 38
39 Kornhauser, A. W. (1965). *Mental health of the industrial worker: a Detroit study*. New York:
40 Wiley.
- 41
42 Manning, A. & Swaffield, J. (2008). The gender gap in early-career wage growth. *The Economic*
43 *Journal*, 118(530): 983-1024.
- 44
45 Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., Makikangas, A. & Natti, J. (2005). Psychological consequences of fixed-
46 term employment and perceived job insecurity among health care staff. *European*
47 *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 14(3): 209-237.
- 48
49 Muck, P. M., Hell, B. & Gosling, S. D. (2007). Construct validation of a short five-factor model
50 instrument - A self-peer study on the German adaptation of the Ten-Item Personality
51 Inventory (TIPI-G). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 23(3): 166-175.
- 52
53 Mullarkey, S., Wall, T., Warr, P., Clegg, C. & Stride, C. (1999). *Measures of Job Satisfaction,*
54 *Mental Health and Job-Related Well-being: A Benchmarking Manual*. Sheffield: Institute
55 of Work Psychology.
- 56
57 Nolan, J. P., Wichert, I. C. & Burchell, B. J. (2000). *Workers on the edge: Job insecurity,*
58 *psychological well-being and family life*. Washington DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- 59
60 O'Brien, G. E. (1980). The centrality of skill utilization for job design. In K. D. Duncan, M. M.
61 Gruneberg & D. Wallis (Eds.) *Changes in working life*. Chichester: Wiley.
- 62
63 OECD (2010), *OECD Factbook 2010: Economic, Environmental and Social Statistics*, OECD
64 Publishing. doi: [10.1787/factbook-2010-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/factbook-2010-en)
65

- 1
2
3
4 Pepper, L., Messinger, M., Weinberg, J. & Campbell, R. (2003). Downsizing and health at the
5 United States Department of Energy. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 44(5):
6 481-491.
7
8 Roy, D (1952). Quota restriction and goldbricking in a machine shop, *American Journal of*
9 *Sociology*, 57(5): 427-442.
10
11 Saha, A., Tamnath, T., Chaudhuri, R. & Saiyed, H. (2004). An Accident-Risk Assessment Study of
12 Temporary Piece Rated Workers. *Industrial Health*, 42(3):240 –45.
13
14 Scott, H. K. (2004). Reconceptualizing the nature and health consequences of work-related
15 insecurity for the new economy: The decline of workers' power in the flexibility regime.
16 *International Journal of Health Services*, 34 (1): 143-153.
17
18 Spencer, D. (2009). *The Political Economy of Work*. Abingdon: Routledge.
19
20 Spreitzer, G., Sutcliffe, K., Dutton, J., Sonenshein, S. & Grant, A.M. (2005). A socially embedded
21 model of thriving at work. *Organization Science*, 16, 537-549.
22
23 Stephens, M. Jr. (2004). Job loss expectations, realizations and household consumption
24 behaviour. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1): 253-269.
25
26 Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A. & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2009). *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of*
27 *Economic Performance and Social Progress*. Retrieved on www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr.
28
29 Theodossiou, I. (1998). The effects of low-pay and unemployment on psychological well-being:
30 a logistic regression approach. *Journal of Health Economics*, 17 (1): 85-104.
31
32 Tennant, R., Hiller, L., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., Weich, S., Parkinson, J., Secker, J., &
33 Stewart-Brown, S. (2007). The Warwick-Edinburgh mental well-being scale (WEMWBS):
34 development and UK validation. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 5.
35
36 van Wanrooy, B., H. Bewley, A. Bryson, J. Forth, S. Freeth, L. Stokes and S. Wood (2013).
37 *Employment Relations In The Shadow Of Recession*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
38
39 Warr, P. (1990a). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of*
40 *Occupational Psychology*, 63: 193-210.
41
42 Warr, P. (1990b). Decision latitude, job demands and employee well-being. *Work and Stress*, 4:
43 285-294.
44
45 Warr, P. (2007). *Work, Happiness, and Unhappiness*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
46
47 Wichert, I. (2002). Job insecurity and work intensification: the effects on health and well-being.
48 in B. Burchell, D. Ladipo, & F. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Job Insecurity and Work Intensification*
49 (pp. 92-111). London and New York, Routledge.
50
51 Wood, S. & de Menezes, L. M. (2011). High involvement management, high performance work
52 systems and wellbeing. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*,
53 22(7):1586–610.
54
55 Zelenski, J. M., Murphy, S. A. & Jenkins, D. A. (2008). The Happy-Productive Worker Thesis
56 Revisited. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(4): 521-537.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 1
Job-Related Well-Being and Job Characteristics in 2001, 2006 and 2012.

<u>Concept</u>	<u>Indicators</u>	<u>2001</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>2006</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>2012</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>Pooled</u> <u>sd</u>	<u>Change</u> <u>01-06</u>	<u>Change</u> <u>06-12</u>
<u>Job-Related Well-being</u>	Enthusiasm	4.29	4.27	4.22	0.83	-0.02	-0.06***
	Contentment	3.76	3.75	3.58	0.89	0.00	-0.18***
	Enthusiasm (positive items)	3.35	3.31	3.32	1.12	-0.04	0.01
	Contentment (positive items)	2.85	2.84	2.73	1.13	-0.01	-0.11***
	Enthusiasm (negative items)	5.23	5.23	5.12	0.88	0.00	-0.12***
	Contentment (negative items)	4.67	4.67	4.42	0.95	0.00	-0.24***
	Enthusiasm (males)	4.25	4.24	4.12	0.83	0.00	-0.12***
	Contentment (males)	3.78	3.80	3.56	0.88	0.02	-0.24***
	Enthusiasm (females)	4.34	4.30	4.32	0.82	-0.03	0.01
	Contentment (females)	3.74	3.71	3.59	0.89	-0.03	-0.11***
<u>Effort</u>	Work Intensity Index	-0.042	-0.015	0.050	0.634	0.027**	0.065***
	Hours per week	37.217	36.704	36.205	12.498	-0.513*	-0.499*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

	Strongly agree)	0.484					
	Agree						
	Disagree	0.146	0.122	0.100	0.331	-0.024***	-0.022***
	Strongly disagree	0.040	0.045	0.031	0.197	0.005	-0.014***
<u>Job insecurity</u>	Job insecurity (chance of job loss): (Ref. no chance or very unlikely)						
	Quite unlikely/evens	0.095	0.116	0.158	0.323	0.021***	0.042***
	Quite likely/very likely	0.062	0.058	0.066	0.239	-0.004	0.008
<u>Workplace change</u>	Skill increase ^{DV+}	0.599	0.576	0.539	0.494	-0.023**	-0.037***
	Promoted ^{DV+}	.	0.379	0.354	0.483	.	-0.025**
	Increased choice over way job done ^{DV+}	.	0.414	0.363	0.490	.	-0.051***
	Decreased choice over way job done ^{DV+}	.	0.117	0.153	0.334	.	0.036***
	Changed employer ^{DV+}	.	0.430	0.393	0.473	.	-0.037***
	Introduction of new technology ^{DV++}	0.616	0.632	0.579	0.487	0.016	-0.053***
	Change in work organisation ^{DV++}	0.489	0.535	0.553	0.499	0.046***	0.018
	Downsizing ^{DV++}	0.286	0.300	0.408	0.466	0.014	0.108***

Notes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

- i. The base is all employees Aged 20-60.
- ii. DV: 0-1 dummy variable. All variables are defined in theData and Indicators section of the text.
- iii. PRP: performance-related pay.
- iv. + Applies to those in employment at a past reference point; ++ applies to those who remained in the same job since the reference point. (The reference point is 5 yrs previously or, if not in employment then, 4 years previously or, if not in employment then, 3 years previously) .
- v. Changes significantly different from zero at levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table 2

The Association of Job Quality with Job-Related Well-Being.

	Males		Females	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Enthusiasm	Contentment	Enthusiasm	Contentment
Work Intensity	-0.348***	-0.542***	-0.329***	-0.763***
	(0.0679)	(0.0752)	(0.0628)	(0.0669)
Work Intensity squared	-0.0351	-0.0307	-0.0381	-0.0742***
	(0.0252)	(0.0279)	(0.0236)	(0.0251)
Hours per week	-0.0137***	-0.00726	-0.0203***	-0.0112***
	(0.00439)	(0.00487)	(0.00359)	(0.00382)
Hours squared	0.000169***	6.10e-05	0.000191***	-1.61e-05
	(5.09e-05)	(5.64e-05)	(5.41e-05)	(5.77e-05)
Task Discretion	0.0995***	0.105***	0.106***	0.101***
	(0.0209)	(0.0232)	(0.0192)	(0.0204)
Work Intensity times Task Discretion	0.110***	0.0402	0.0941***	0.131***
	(0.0289)	(0.0321)	(0.0271)	(0.0289)
Semi-autonomous Team	0.0806**	0.103***	0.0140	0.0981***
	(0.0330)	(0.0366)	(0.0330)	(0.0351)
Influence on change in work method	0.266***	0.240***	0.257***	0.258***
	(0.0278)	(0.0308)	(0.0268)	(0.0285)
Quality circle participation	0.0445*	0.0258	0.0184	-0.0104

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

	(0.0261)	(0.0289)	(0.0254)	(0.0271)
Organisational Communications	0.0177***	0.00750	0.0194***	0.00538
	(0.00469)	(0.00520)	(0.00479)	(0.00510)
Union Voice	0.0129	0.0877**	-0.00708	-0.00662
	(0.0315)	(0.0349)	(0.0288)	(0.0307)
Individual PRP	-0.0226	-0.0215	-0.0112	0.0233
	(0.0300)	(0.0333)	(0.0330)	(0.0352)
Team PRP	0.0313	0.0423	-0.0507	-0.0264
	(0.0359)	(0.0397)	(0.0424)	(0.0452)
Organisation PRP	-0.000112	-0.0663**	-0.0405	-0.00290
	(0.0302)	(0.0335)	(0.0323)	(0.0344)
Learning	0.0392	-0.114***	0.0701**	-0.0181
	(0.0352)	(0.0390)	(0.0337)	(0.0359)
Variety (Ref. Some, little or none)				
'Quite a lot'	0.138***	0.0482	0.234***	0.128***
	(0.0316)	(0.0350)	(0.0296)	(0.0316)
'Great deal'	0.347***	0.200***	0.372***	0.151***
	(0.0344)	(0.0381)	(0.0345)	(0.0367)
Non-repetitive tasks	0.0576**	-0.0907***	-0.0420	-0.0832***
	(0.0286)	(0.0317)	(0.0295)	(0.0315)
Enough opportunity for skill use?				
(Ref. Strongly agree)				
Agree	-0.123***	-0.138***	-0.115***	-0.0763***

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

	(0.0271)	(0.0301)	(0.0262)	(0.0280)
Disagree	-0.254***	-0.277***	-0.439***	-0.331***
	(0.0424)	(0.0470)	(0.0400)	(0.0426)
Strongly disagree	-0.396***	-0.290***	-0.382***	-0.231***
	(0.0664)	(0.0735)	(0.0628)	(0.0669)
Job insecurity (chance of job loss):				
(Ref. no chance or very unlikely)				
Quite unlikely/evens	-0.204***	-0.317***	-0.0851**	-0.203***
	(0.0335)	(0.0371)	(0.0381)	(0.0406)
Quite likely/very likely	-0.418***	-0.289***	-0.348***	-0.313***
	(0.0493)	(0.0547)	(0.0498)	(0.0530)
Number of Observations	3,853	3,853	4,285	4,285
R ²	0.198	0.151	0.184	0.204
chi ² (independence of error terms)		1549		1646

Notes.

- i. SURE estimates are presented, with standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.
- ii. Based on pooled data from 2006 and 2012 employees aged 20 to 65.
- iii. PRP: performance-related pay.

Table 3

The Association of Workplace Changes with Job-Related Well-Being.

VARIABLES	Males		Females	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Enthusiasm	Contentment	Enthusiasm	Contentment
Skill increase	0.0391 (0.0268)	0.00562 (0.0296)	0.00437 (0.0273)	-0.0413 (0.0293)
Promotion	0.0727*** (0.0272)	-0.0282 (0.0300)	-0.0292 (0.0268)	-0.0738** (0.0288)
Increased choice	-0.00232 (0.0291)	0.0397 (0.0322)	0.0771*** (0.0286)	0.0402 (0.0307)
Decreased choice	-0.136*** (0.0400)	-0.170*** (0.0442)	-0.176*** (0.0403)	-0.171*** (0.0432)
Changed employer	-0.0371 (0.0392)	-0.118*** (0.0433)	0.0280 (0.0376)	-0.103** (0.0403)
Introduction of new technology	-0.0476 (0.0354)	-0.0708* (0.0391)	0.0481 (0.0341)	-0.0233 (0.0365)
Change in Work Org.	-0.0674* (0.0349)	-0.114*** (0.0385)	-0.0801** (0.0330)	-0.0715** (0.0354)
Downsizing	-0.137*** (0.0329)	-0.0913** (0.0363)	-0.175*** (0.0331)	-0.173*** (0.0355)
CONTROLS	YES	YES	YES	YES

Number of Observations	3,825	3,825	4,227	4,227
R ²	0.211	0.166	0.203	0.215

Notes.

- i. SURE estimates are presented, with standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.
- ii. Pooled data from 2006 and 2012 employees aged 20 to 65.
- iii. Controls include all variables included in Table 2, plus a dummy for whether employed at the past reference point (see note (iii) to Table 1).

Table 4.

Decomposition of the Fall in Job-Related Well-Being.

	<u>Males</u>		<u>Females</u>
	<u>Enthusiasm</u>	<u>Contentment</u>	<u>Contentment</u>
Fall, 2006-2012	0.108 ***	0.219 ***	0.115***
<i>'Explained' by (% of fall):</i>			
Effort & Participation	21.3 ***	18.9***	24.0**
Skills Challenge	-11.1	-6.9***	-11.9***
Insecurity	5.5	4.5**	11.8***
Workplace change	21.2 ***	7.9***	12.9***
Total	37.0 ***	24.4***	36.8***

Note.

The asterisks indicate whether the changes and 'explained' changes differ significantly from zero: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. 'Explained' differences are those associated with between-year differences in the explanatory variables (those used in Table 3).