

# Online Research @ Cardiff

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 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8851-4289>, 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 file

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Manuscript Number:</b>                            | JOHS-D-13-00322R3  |
| <b>Full Title:</b>                                   | Job-Related Well-Being Through the Great Recession   |
| <b>Article Type:</b>                                 | Original Research  |
| <b>Keywords:</b>                                     | effort; insecurity; downsizing; performance-related pay; organisational participation; job-related well-being; task discretion; skill  |
| <b>Corresponding Author:</b>                         | Francis Green<br>Institute of Education<br>London, UNITED KINGDOM  |
| <b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>   |  |
| <b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>           | Institute of Education   |
| <b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b> |  |
| <b>First Author:</b>                                 | Francis Green  |
| <b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>           |  |
| <b>Order of Authors:</b>                             | Francis Green  |
|  | Alan Felstead  |
|  | Duncan Gallie  |
|  | Hande Inanc  |
| <b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>       |  |
| <b>Abstract:</b>                                     | <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<sup>†</sup>, Alan Felstead<sup>‡</sup>, Duncan Gallie<sup>††</sup> and Hande Inanc<sup>‡‡</sup>

† 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 *Skills challenge*

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

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

### 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 *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 **Data and indicators**

27  
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).<sup>3</sup> 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 <sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 <sup>4</sup> 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 relates to macro-level events.  
6

7  
8 Nevertheless, it needs to be remembered that respondents in nationally-representative  
9 samples of workplaces will differ in many ways. Some variables may have varying meanings  
10 according to their setting, while other determining characteristics remain unobserved. This last  
11 point leads to the chief limitation of our analyses, which is that they have been conducted with  
12 successive *cross-sections*. One step we have taken in this paper to reduce potential endogeneity  
13 biases is to include a wide array of variables and controls, even though there are ultimate limits  
14 to how many determinants can be captured in a survey. Our most notable innovation, however,  
15 is that in the latest wave we have included controls for personality traits, the 'Big Five'  
16 measured in short form, since it could be held that these would influence the allocation to jobs  
17 as well as being strongly correlated with subjective well-being. Reassuringly, the estimated  
18 associations of our baseline model variables with well-being showed no or only small changes,  
19 when family background and personality controls were introduced. Nevertheless, given that  
20 there are likely to be other unobserved person-specific factors affecting the allocation of labour  
21 none of the estimates can be regarded as unbiased estimates. In the absence of nationally-  
22 representative panel data with equally rich job quality data, our findings summarised above  
23 should be regarded as showing consistency with the hypotheses, rather than proving causal  
24 effects.  
25  
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](http://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><br><u>Mean</u> | <u>2006</u><br><u>Mean</u> | <u>2012</u><br><u>Mean</u> | <u>Pooled</u><br><u>sd</u> | <u>Change</u><br><u>01-06</u> | <u>Change</u><br><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 <sup>DV+</sup>  | 0.599 | 0.576 | 0.539 | 0.494 | -0.023**  | -0.037*** |
|                         | Promoted <sup>DV+</sup>  | .     | 0.379 | 0.354 | 0.483 | .         | -0.025**  |
|                         | Increased choice over way job done <sup>DV+</sup>                      | .     | 0.414 | 0.363 | 0.490 | .         | -0.051*** |
|                         | Decreased choice over way job done <sup>DV+</sup>                      | .     | 0.117 | 0.153 | 0.334 | .         | 0.036***  |
|                         | Changed employer <sup>DV+</sup>  | .     | 0.430 | 0.393 | 0.473 | .         | -0.037*** |
|                         | Introduction of new technology <sup>DV++</sup>                         | 0.616 | 0.632 | 0.579 | 0.487 | 0.016     | -0.053*** |
|                         | Change in work organisation <sup>DV++</sup>                            | 0.489 | 0.535 | 0.553 | 0.499 | 0.046***  | 0.018     |
|                         | Downsizing <sup>DV++</sup>   | 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 <sup>2</sup>                                 | 0.198     | 0.151     | 0.184     | 0.204     |
| chi <sup>2</sup> (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<br>(0.0268)    | 0.00562<br>(0.0296)   | 0.00437<br>(0.0273)   | -0.0413<br>(0.0293)   |
| Promotion                         | 0.0727***<br>(0.0272) | -0.0282<br>(0.0300)   | -0.0292<br>(0.0268)   | -0.0738**<br>(0.0288) |
| Increased choice                  | -0.00232<br>(0.0291)  | 0.0397<br>(0.0322)    | 0.0771***<br>(0.0286) | 0.0402<br>(0.0307)    |
| Decreased choice                  | -0.136***<br>(0.0400) | -0.170***<br>(0.0442) | -0.176***<br>(0.0403) | -0.171***<br>(0.0432) |
| Changed employer                  | -0.0371<br>(0.0392)   | -0.118***<br>(0.0433) | 0.0280<br>(0.0376)    | -0.103**<br>(0.0403)  |
| Introduction of new<br>technology | -0.0476<br>(0.0354)   | -0.0708*<br>(0.0391)  | 0.0481<br>(0.0341)    | -0.0233<br>(0.0365)   |
| Change in Work Org.               | -0.0674*<br>(0.0349)  | -0.114***<br>(0.0385) | -0.0801**<br>(0.0330) | -0.0715**<br>(0.0354) |
| Downsizing                        | -0.137***<br>(0.0329) | -0.0913**<br>(0.0363) | -0.175***<br>(0.0331) | -0.173***<br>(0.0355) |
| CONTROLS                          | YES                   | YES                   | YES                   | YES                   |

|                        |       |       |       |       |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Number of Observations | 3,825 | 3,825 | 4,227 | 4,227 |
| R <sup>2</sup>         | 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).