

Well-Being, Insecurity and the Decline of American Job Satisfaction

David G. Blanchflower
Dartmouth College, USA
and
National Bureau of Economic Research

Andrew J. Oswald
University of Warwick, UK

April 1999

To be presented at a Cornell University conference May 1999

Abstract

The paper studies job satisfaction levels in the advanced nations. There are five main findings. First, the great majority of workers in the industrial democracies appear to be remarkably content with their jobs. The old Dickensian idea that work subjugates people is apparently not supported by the data. Second, job satisfaction is slowly trending down over time in the United States (among the over-30s, from approximately 56% very satisfied in the 1970s to 48% by the mid 1990s). Third, we show this fall is not explained by the decline of unions, nor by, as we document, the existence of a slowly growing job-insecurity in the US. Fourth, the cross-section patterns in job satisfaction are similar from one nation to another. Reported well-being is higher among women, the self-employed, the young and the old (not the middle-aged), supervisors, and particularly those with secure jobs. Fifth, after controlling for personal characteristics, we produce a ranking of job satisfaction across nations. Satisfaction is highest in one of the poorest countries in our sample, Ireland, and lowest in the Mediterranean nations. These findings raise many puzzles. It seems we are a long way from a full understanding of well-being at work.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, labor markets, well-being, job security.

JEL Classification: J28

* Corresponding author: Andrew Oswald, Economics Department, University of Warwick, CV4 7AL, UK, a.j.oswald@warwick.ac.uk. For advice and helpful discussions about the area, we thank Andrew Clark, Jonathan Gardner, Dan Hamermesh, Mark Stewart, Peter Warr, and numerous Irish journalists ('it's the drink' was one theory). The authors are grateful to the Leverhulme Trust and Nuffield Foundation for research support.

Nicholas was about to descend when he was arrested by a loud noise of scolding in a woman's voice. "You good-for-nothing brute" cried the woman, stamping on the ground, "why don't you turn the mangle?" "So I am, my life and soul!" replied a man's voice. "I am always turning, I am perpetually turning, like a demd old horse in a mill. My life is one demd horrid grind!" Charles Dickens, Nicholas Nickleby, LXIV.

I. Introduction

Most of us spend around a quarter of our lives at work. Understanding people's well-being in the workplace, therefore, is likely to be important to economists and other social scientists. Yet the study by labor economists of job satisfaction is still in its infancy. This may be, in part, because economists are suspicious of the usefulness of data on reported well-being. However, it is known that satisfaction levels are strongly correlated with observable phenomena (such as quit behavior). Moreover, it seems difficult to believe that economists have a more acute understanding of the limitations of well-being statistics than do the thousands of psychologists who use such data in their own research.

This paper attempts to examine the factors that shape well-being at work. It uses data from three sources – the International Social Survey Programme, the Eurobarometer Surveys, and the US General Social Surveys. While the literature by economists is small, it has begun to grow recently with the work of, among others, Andrew Clark and Daniel Hamermesh. Useful introductions to the psychology literature concerned with well-being data are Campbell (1981) and Argyle (1987). An overview paper from the economist's perspective is Oswald (1997). Easterlin (1974) is an early contribution. Two survey papers by Diener (1984, with co-authors 1999), in one of the world's leading psychology journals, are fairly accessible to non-specialists. Warr (1987, 1997) provides a readable account of the links between work and mental health.

Early papers by economists on job satisfaction include Borjas (1979), Freeman (1978) and Hamermesh (1977). Blanchflower (1991) is a recent attempt to use data on feelings of job

insecurity within a conventional wage equation. A fast-growing modern literature on the border between economics and psychology includes Akerlof et al (1988), Birdi et al (1995), Clark (1996, 1998), Clark and Oswald (1994), Clark et al (1995), Curtice (1993), Frey and Stutzer (1999), Judge and Watanabe (1993), Kahheman et al (1997), Levy-Garboua and Montmarquette (1997), Ng (1996, 1997), Pavot et al (1991), Sui and Cooper (1998), and Veenhoven (1991). A slightly earlier empirical paper on relativity effects and utility is Van de Stadt et al (1985). Frank (1985) contains many interesting ideas that cross disciplines. Inglehart (1990) is a large study using the Eurobarometer surveys; it reports data on overall well-being for a range of western countries. Spector (1997) is a new overview of the job satisfaction literature. Parts of his book make unfamiliar reading for an economist. Interesting recent studies of job satisfaction among managers include Worrall and Cooper (1998) for Great Britain, and Spector et al (1999) for a group of twenty-two countries.

II. A Detailed Look at the USA

It is natural to begin with the United States. This is the country for which there is the longest run of randomly-sampled workers. The first data come from the start of the 1970s. Table 1 gives the annual pattern of job satisfaction responses from 1973 to 1996 drawn from the annual General Social Surveys. Here the question is

On the whole how satisfied are you with the work you do – would you say you are very satisfied, moderately satisfied, a little dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

While the size of sample is not large (at just under 1000 American workers per year), and these are cross-sections rather than a longitudinal sample, the GSS reveals some useful patterns. Two conclusions follow from Table 1, in part A. First, the great majority of US workers express themselves as rather content with their work. Approximately half say they are very satisfied, and forty per cent moderately satisfied. Only a tiny fraction of the population put themselves in the

very-dissatisfied category. This appears to allow us to reject any simple version of the idea -- found in Dickensian and Marxian accounts of capitalist markets -- that work exploits people. It also makes less plausible the commonly heard journalistic view that stress at work is overwhelming modern Americans. This is not to imply that such numbers should be accepted uncritically, but that the first pass through the data seems to reveal a good degree of happiness at work.

Labor economists -- raised on data and theories of rationality -- are perhaps more likely than some social scientists to expect workers to express satisfaction with their jobs. It is known people move around a great deal early in their careers. They sort themselves into jobs they like and out of jobs they dislike. To sample the well-being levels of a cross-section of employees, therefore, is to sample a group of individuals who are already heavily self-selected into different occupations.

Having established the current pattern, the next question is what is happening over time. Table 1 shows there is a small but systematic downward trend in the satisfaction numbers reported in American workplaces (a formal test is reported later in the paper). Through the 1990s, for example, approximately 46% of workers gave the top answer 'very satisfied' to the satisfaction question. Yet in the 1970s, 51% of workers said very satisfied. A reason to find this unusual is that by objective standards the safety and cleanliness (and probably physical arduousness) of working life in America have been improving through the decades. Table 1B explores this a little more. It breaks down the time movements by different sections of the population. For people over age 30, the trend towards lower reported well-being at work is more marked. Here the average proportions giving the top score are:

1970s: 56% of over-30s Americans were very satisfied

1980s: 52% were very satisfied

1990s: 48% were very satisfied.

The trends are not very different between men and women (which might be viewed as unexpected because of a presumption that gender discrimination has dropped over the last few decades).

There is essentially no satisfaction time-trend among young workers in the US. This is shown in the penultimate column of Table 1B. Relatively, therefore, the young in the 1990s are doing better than the old, but not better than the equivalent young people did in the 1970s. Earlier work on life satisfaction and well-being levels, in Blanchflower and Oswald (1999), also found evidence that younger Americans are gaining over older groups. However, the possible links between the two findings -- on job satisfaction and life satisfaction -- remain largely unexplored and are not pursued further in this paper.

It appears from Table 1B that the proportion of non-whites saying they are very satisfied with their jobs has declined similarly to the trend for whites. Although figures are given for non-white men and women, there are not enough observations to allow confident statements on race broken down by gender.

Our finding of falling American job satisfaction is consistent with a small amount of earlier research. Blanchflower et al (1993) documented at best flat well-being levels through time in Britain and the US. Oswald (1997) describes earlier literature. A classic reference is Easterlin (1974). Although not his primary concern, interesting new work by Hamermesh (1998) documents signs of diminishing job satisfaction among young workers in the 1978-88 and 1984-1996 periods of the NLSY for the United States, and in the 1984-96 SOEP for Germany.

Hamermesh is actually fairly sceptical of his results (p.21: “difficult to believe...at a time when real earnings were rising”).

If the next twenty-five years make clear that the trend is not a fluke of recent decades, it will become important to understand the reason for a downward spiral in reported well-being. One mechanical possibility is that Americans now use words differently: they are no less content with work than their parents but they put things in more vehement language when asked. On such a view, the trend down in the satisfaction scores is an illusion, and modern workers simply express themselves more critically about everything (including their own lives) than their fathers and mothers. Such an eventuality cannot be discounted. It does not seem natural, however, to believe that use of language has changed in this way in a short space of time. Moreover, if this were true, it would presumably mean that the younger sample (the under 30s) would show up as having the largest ‘decline’ in job satisfaction. The older sample could be expected to be disproportionately made up of individuals using language as they did when they were young men and women in the 1970s. As the data show that it is the older workers who have become particularly less content, the hypothesis that declining satisfaction is an artefact of our surveys -- caused by a changed use of language -- is less compelling.

If the trend is real, its roots need to be uncovered. One potential explanation is that satisfaction in the workplace is closely connected with feelings of job security and insecurity. Table 2 looks at the simple correlation between reported well-being and people’s views about how likely they are to lose their job or be laid off. It can be seen that those who say they are “not at all likely” to be pushed out of their jobs have a much greater probability of giving the top satisfaction response. The lower half of Table 2 inquires about the ease with which a person could, if necessary, find a new job of the same quality. People who think it “very easy” to find a

similarly good position with another employer are the ones most likely to say they are very satisfied with their job.

To pursue this in a multivariate way, a simple ordered logit regression equation is given in Table 3. The sample size changes as we move across the columns, because some of the variables are only available in a subset of years. One purpose is to answer the question of how well the satisfaction answers can be explained by a small number of personal and workplace characteristics, pay, job security, and area dummies. The second is to provide a more formal test for the existence of a negative time trend in reported contentment in the American workplace. The broad answer to the first is that not a great deal of the variation in satisfaction answers is explicable this way. Even so, there are microeconomic patterns. Satisfaction is higher among the old, females, the self-employed, whites, those in non-union plants, the highly educated (except when income is controlled for in the regressions), those with high perceived job security, those who feel it would be easy to get a comparable job elsewhere, and those on high earnings. Some of these correlations are compatible with the hypothesis that employees have an expected utility function that is increasing in income and declining in risk. Demographic variables work strongly – as in other areas of labor economics.

The time-trend variable in Table 3's regressions is consistent with the simple downward movement observed in the raw numbers of Table 1. Knowing the appropriate units in order to interpret this is not straightforward, but it can be seen that time enters with a coefficient of approximately -0.013 (t of 6.37) in the short specification of column 1 of Table 3. This drops only slightly to -0.11 (t of 4.66) when, in column 2, variables are included for union status and job security. In columns 6 and 7, the coefficient comes up somewhat, in absolute size, once a variable for pay is incorporated.

Other features of Table 3 are relevant. It is not immediately clear how to read the size of the coefficients. However, working out the effects quantitatively, particularly large effects on well-being are found from being black and having a secure job (negative and positive, respectively). Surprisingly, there appears to have been no attempt to use the former to explore racial discrimination from an angle different from the conventional focus on levels of pay.

In exploring the reasons for declining well-being at work, two testable hypotheses come to mind:

- Is US job satisfaction falling because of the decline of trade unions and worker representation?
- Is satisfaction falling because of increasing job insecurity?

There is reason to take the first of these seriously: there has been a strong fall in union density in the United States over the period studied here. On the second, it seems to be believed in the press that Americans' sense of job security has declined in recent years. Academic evidence has been largely missing. Henry Farber's work (1990, 1999), for example, does not find evidence of greatly heightened unemployment durations. Gregg and Wadsworth (1995) and Burgess and Rees (1996) paint a broadly similar picture for Britain.

The Appendix shows that, in the General Social Surveys studied here, respondents do seem to have become systematically less confident over the last quarter of a century. These data are not well known. At the end of the 1970s, 66% of people in the US thought it was not at all likely they would lose their jobs. By the middle of the 90s, this had dropped to 60%. More revealingly, in Table A2, a regression equation for 'perceived likelihood of job loss' finds a statistically significant upward time trend. Perceived ease of finding another comparable job has also moved in the direction of increased insecurity: in Table A2 its time trend is down.

Column 2 of Table 3 tests and appears to dispose of two possible explanations for America's declining job satisfaction – unions and insecurity. Column 2 enters a trade union membership dummy, Union, which enters strongly negatively. The regression in column 2 enters also a set of job security and insecurity proxies. These capture people's perceptions, recorded in GSS, of whether they are likely or unlikely to lose their job; they capture too the ease with which each individual feels he or she could get another job. Workers who answer "it is not at all likely I will lose my job" are much more satisfied at work. Similarly people saying "it would be easy for me to find another job", which is the omitted base variable, are statistically much more likely to declare themselves satisfied.

Moving from column 1 to column 2 of Table 3 makes little difference to the coefficient on Time, the annual time trend from 1973 to 1996. In other words, controlling for union status and job insecurity makes little substantive difference to the conclusion that perceived well-being at work is falling. Americans must be experiencing – or more precisely reporting – declining job satisfaction for different reasons.

Finally, in columns 6 and 7 of Table 3 a control for workers' pay (measured annually) is introduced. As might be expected, it enters strongly positively. Well-paid people tend to be satisfied. Interestingly, years of education then change from being significantly positive to being negative and insignificantly different from zero. The finding that the positive education effect disappears once income is entered as a control – in column 6 of Table 3 – is somewhat similar to a result of Clark and Oswald (1996) in which in British data the impact of years of education on satisfaction is negative. Clark and Oswald view this as a kind of curse of high aspirations. Schooling apparently does not directly buy happiness at work; it procures a larger salary and also

raises expectations of what someone thinks they should receive. An early econometric treatment of this kind of idea is in Hamermesh (1977).

III. International Evidence

What of job satisfaction levels in other advanced nations? Table 4 presents cross-sectional information from the International Social Survey Programme of 1989, and from the Eurobarometers of 1995-6.¹ It can be seen from parts A and B of Table 4 that, as for the US General Social Survey, there is strong bunching of answers at the high end of the satisfaction scale. Again the old idea that the drudgery of work exploits human beings is -- at least at face value -- apparently not true.

On both parts of Table 4, individuals in Southern Ireland appear to record the greatest job satisfaction. Another highly satisfied nation is Denmark. By contrast, Hungary and the Mediterranean countries (Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Portugal) show up far down on the job satisfaction world league table. According to Eurobarometer data, 38% of Greek employees say they are dissatisfied.

Because the surveys asked questions in different languages in different countries, there exists the chance that the Greek and other results are illusory. They may be a trick of how words translate. It is not possible to overturn such a view conclusively, but two counter-arguments are worth considering. The first is that psychologists are well aware of such -- translation -- objections. For this reason, there is a preference among researchers for satisfaction questions, rather than happiness questions, because it is believed that the word 'satisfaction' translates with less international error from one language to the next. The second is that large differences are discovered even across nations using the same language, so differences nation-by-nation cannot

¹ For earlier work on job satisfaction using the 1989 International Social Survey Programme data, see Blanchflower and Freeman (1997). Curtice (1993) and Clark (1998) also use ISSP data.

be attributed solely to the language of the survey team. Moreover, Ireland comes out top among the three English-speaking nations here (57% very satisfied). This is despite the fact it is not a rich country: the United Nations Human Development Report estimates Ireland's GDP per head at around half that of the US, and about two thirds of the UK's (all measured at purchasing power parity prices). By contrast, in the United Kingdom, for example, only 38% of workers report themselves as very satisfied. Why the Irish should be so much more satisfied is unclear.

It should be noted that the size of samples continue to be relatively small: approximately 1000 workers are sampled from each country in Eurobarometers and slightly less than this in the International Social Survey Programme. We have no reason to doubt the quality of the sampling, but it would be comforting to have larger numbers of workers. This is another reason to treat the estimates cautiously.

As in the United States, there is a strong connection in the European data between feeling secure and saying one is satisfied with a job. Table 5 summarises the numbers (a recent study of European job insecurity is OECD 1997). People who state their job is secure have a much larger probability of reporting themselves happy with their work. In Eurobarometers, for example, Table 5B shows that of those secure in their jobs approximately 40% say "very satisfied", while the figure is only 20% among the sub-sample saying not secure.

Table 6 reveals that most of the patterns survive multiple regression controls. It presents an ordered logit for the ISSP sample of seven thousand workers. The data are for the single year 1989. Even after personal characteristics are entered, Ireland is top (followed by the US), and Hungary and Italy are bottom. As has been found in many studies, there is a strong U-shape in age. The quadratic minimizes around age 30. Men are much less satisfied; schooling is weak; self-employment is strongly positive; supervisors enjoy their jobs more; unions continue to be

associated with less job satisfaction. The union result goes back at least to Freeman (1978) and continues to puzzle researchers; it may be simply reverse causation led by the tendency of displeased workers to seek union representation.

Most strikingly, job security enters monotonically. As a rule of thumb, its effect is the largest in the data. It is unlikely this finding is known to most labor economists, or even most psychologists.

A range of job characteristics are introduced in Table 7. As would be guessed, human beings like to work independently and in workplaces with high pay and good chances of advancement. They also like to 'help people' and to work in healthy rather than unhealthy conditions. It might be reasonable for an economist to object that some -- perhaps even most -- of these subjective judgments could be close to generating truisms in the data, but we report them because these are the patterns found in our surveys. The result that people enjoy independence is well-known to psychology researchers. It is sometimes referred to as an example of the 'locus of control' hypothesis. Spector et al (1999) is a recent paper looking at a similarly large range of nations. As we found above for the USA, having a secure job increases job satisfaction: the easier it is to find a similar job the higher is satisfaction. In these countries also, job security is an important determinant of work satisfaction.

As a sense of job security plays an influential role in earlier satisfaction equations, it seems sensible to examine the structure of cross-section equations in which job security is the dependent variable. This is what Table 8 does for the countries in the International Social Survey Programme. In the survey interviews, individuals were given the option of replying to the question "How much do you agree or disagree that your job is secure?". Answers were coded as: strongly agree, agree, neither, disagree, strongly disagree. As the lower part of Table 8

shows, numbers were heavily concentrated in the top two categories (the others are omitted in Table 8's lower part). In other words, most individuals do not fear imminent job loss. Across the sample of countries, 72% of people said they either agreed or strongly agreed that their job was secure. Table 8 attempts to uncover the econometric structure of security. It estimates ordered logit equations using as independent variables the following: a set of country dummies, age, gender, education, whether a supervisor, union member, and public sector employee.

Table 8 is based on a simple cross-section rather than longitudinal data, and makes no identifying assumptions. It would therefore be unwise to place strict causal interpretations upon it. Nevertheless, the correlations are such that, in the full specification of column 4, job security is greater among older workers, those who supervise, and those in public sector occupations. Translation of 'job security' in a consistent way across different languages is likely to be imperfect. However, it is worth noting that the United Kingdom performs consistently badly on the security score (see also Turnbull and Wass, 1999), and that this is true judged against also the other English-speaking countries of the US and Ireland.

The large and well-determined impact from being a public sector employee is notable. Such workers are a lot less fearful for their jobs. This means that job satisfaction equations that omit job-security measures may tend to generate upwardly-biased coefficients on public-sector dummy variables. This may conceivably change over time and country: Gardner and Oswald (1999) show that in the UK the size of the public-sector satisfaction premium seems to have fallen sharply through the 1990s.

Job satisfaction equations for the Eurobarometer Surveys data in the mid-1990s are reported in Tables 9 and 10. As in the tables of means, Ireland is comfortably top of the satisfaction ranking, and Greece bottom. The same microeconomic patterns are found as on

other data sets. There is a well-determined U-shape in age; men are less satisfied; the self-employed, public sector people and supervisors are more satisfied; education enters here positively. It should be noted that there is no income variable; this data set does not provide it. In the first column of Table 9, long job tenure is associated with high satisfaction. This disappears, however, when three other variables are included -- commuting time and two perceived job-security measures. The U-shape in age minimizes, in Table 9, in a person's 40s.

More detailed job-satisfaction equations, done separately for male and female subsamples, are contained in Table 10. This is to enable variables to be included that capture quality of the job. For example, Table 10 reveals that job satisfaction is greater in quiet workplaces, ones with no gaseous vapours, ones where workers say 'no painful or tiring positions', where employees control the equipment, their work pace, where they do not have to carry move loads or work at high speed. Working at home appears to be associated with raised satisfaction for women but not men. The ability to control the temperature and ventilation is correlated with satisfaction. Employees who identify a health and safety risk at their workplace are much more likely to say they are dissatisfied. Unsurprisingly, women appear to value equal opportunities at work. We find no significant evidence that the gender of one's boss has an effect on job satisfaction for either men or women.

IV. Conclusions

This paper documents the patterns in job satisfaction data on approximately 50,000 randomly sampled people across eighteen countries. The main purpose of the analysis is to describe the facts and point out that labor economists have had remarkably little to say about why these features exist in international data. Although it could be argued that economists should not concern themselves with workers' well-being, we find it hard to see a cogent case for

such a position. ‘Utility levels’ are implicitly studied in most published work in labor economics; there are systematic patterns in these data sets; satisfaction scores are correlated with observable behavior; psychologists ought to know more than economists about how to measure well-being, and their research journals have for years used such statistics.

Our data are simple. They come in the form of responses to questions such as “How satisfied are you with your job as a whole?”. People’s answers, the paper shows, are strongly correlated with personal characteristics.

There are five main conclusions from our work. Partly because of the lack of longitudinal data, it is not always straightforward to draw causal inferences.

- Job satisfaction levels seem remarkably high in the western democracies. Only a small minority of workers say they are dissatisfied with their work.
- Nevertheless, the data suggest a slow but steady decline in job satisfaction in the US between 1973 and today. This is especially true among those employees greater than thirty years old: in the 1970s 56% were very satisfied while by the mid-1990s the proportion had fallen to 48%. This downward trend appears to be statistically significant (even after we control for changing demographics and other factors).
- The downward movement is not because of the falling proportion of unions to represent workers, nor because of a drop in Americans’ feelings of job security (even though we present new data to suggest there has been a fall in perceived security).
- There are strong microeconomic patterns in satisfaction, and these are approximately the same in all countries. Expectations of possible job loss have one of the largest discernible negative effects on reported job satisfaction. We document other correlates. Satisfaction is U or J shaped in age, minimizing in the 30s. It is greater

among women, whites, those on high pay, supervisors, public sector employees, the self-employed, and those who commute short distances. Once pay is held constant, education and job tenure have small or negative effects.

- In a ranking of job satisfaction levels across our 18 nations, Southern Ireland comes top. This is despite the fact that it is one of the poorest countries.

These patterns in international job satisfaction present economists with many puzzles. It seems we will be back.

Table 1. Job Satisfaction in the USA, 1973-96

A) Proportions (Current Workers Only)

Question: On the whole how satisfied are you with the work you do – would you say you are very satisfied, moderately satisfied, a little dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

All	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982	1983	1984
Very satisfied	49%	50	50	56	53	49	52	47	48	53	47
Moderately satisfied	37	37	38	33	33	39	37	37	39	35	35
A little dissatisfied	11	8	8	8	9	10	8	12	9	8	12
Very dissatisfied	3	4	4	3	5	2	4	4	5	4	6
N	864	775	737	748	741	867	850	821	1009	897	875
All	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	1994	1996	All
Very satisfied	49	49	46	48	48	48	46	44	47	46	48
Moderately satisfied	38	40	38	40	38	39	42	42	40	40	38
A little dissatisfied	10	9	11	10	10	10	8	10	11	11	10
Very dissatisfied	3	2	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
N	903	838	1132	889	911	847	882	975	1903	1935	20399

Weighted to control for over-sampling of blacks in 1982 and 1987
 Source: General Social Surveys

Table 1 continued

B) The Percentage Very Satisfied by Different Demographic Characteristics

% very satisfied with work

	All	Men	Women	Whites	Non-whites	Non-white Men	Non-white women	Age <30	Age >=30
1972	49%	48	50	51	38	39	35	34	54
1973	50	50	51	50	47	41	56	36	55
1974	50	51	49	52	34	39	28	41	54
1975	55	56	55	57	44	51	37	42	61
1976	53	54	52	54	40	38	42	40	59
1977	49	48	51	50	45	53	35	36	54
1978	52	51	53	54	34	31	36	44	55
1980	47	46	48	48	37	40	46	37	51
1982	48	48	48	49	40	43	43	37	53
1983	53	51	56	54	45	43	45	42	58
1984	47	44	49	47	43	44	43	37	50
1985	49	46	53	49	48	52	36	37	53
1986	49	53	46	50	45	47	31	40	53
1987	47	48	45	49	35	34	34	35	50
1988	48	50	46	50	39	49	40	39	51
1989	49	47	50	50	35	37	26	37	52
1990	48	46	50	49	43	46	40	39	51
1991	46	49	43	49	32	39	26	40	48
1993	44	43	46	45	41	39	43	33	47
1994	47	47	47	49	35	37	33	36	49
1996	46	47	45	47	41	42	40	39	47
<i>Average</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>53</i>
N	21138	11221	9917	17863	3275	1532	1743	5480	15658

Note: average is simply the unweighted average of the year estimated reported in the table. Weights are used to control for statistical over-sampling of minorities in some years. Source: General Social Surveys

Table 2. Job Satisfaction and Job Security in the USA, 1977-1996 (Source: General Social Surveys).

A) Prospects of job loss

Question: *Thinking about the next twelve months, how likely do you think it is that you will lose your job or be laid-off – very likely, fairly likely, not too likely, or not at all likely?*

Job satisfaction	Job loss					All
	Very likely	Fairly likely	Not too likely	Not at all likely	Don't know	
Very satisfied	37%	33	39	54	42	48
Moderately satisfied	39	45	47	36	42	39
A little dissatisfied	15	16	11	8	13	9
Very dissatisfied	9	6	3	3	3	3
N	559	657	2793	7138	162	11309

B) Prospects of finding another job

Question: *About how easy would it be for you to find a job with another employer with approximately the same income and fringe benefits you now have? Would you say very easy, somewhat easy, or not easy at all?*

Job satisfaction	Ease of finding a job				All
	Very easy	Somewhat easy	Not easy at all	Don't know	
Very satisfied	56%	44	46	52	48
Moderately satisfied	33	43	40	38	39
A little dissatisfied	7	11	10	8	9
Very dissatisfied	4	3	4	3	3
N	2826	3489	4755	228	11298

Table 3. Job Satisfaction in the USA, 1972-1996: Ordered logit (Current workers only)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Age	.0267 (23.98)	.0261 (19.78)	.0272 (17.40)	.0253 (12.58)	.0261 (12.52)	.0224 (10.11)	.0251 (14.99)
Male	-.0697 (2.53)	-.0488 (1.49)	-.0810 (2.18)	-.0891 (1.83)	-.0845 (1.72)	-.1844 (3.36)	-.1634 (3.92)
Self-employed	.5243 (12.17)	.5016 (9.85)	.4205 (7.16)	.5174 (6.88)	.4298 (5.59)	.4581 (5.54)	.4352 (6.84)
Black	-.4086 (9.63)	-.4281 (8.38)	-.3151 (5.38)	-.5236 (6.49)	.4524 (5.55)	-.4973 (5.77)	-.3452 (5.59)
Other non-white	-.1732 (2.14)	-.1963 (2.08)	-.1835 (1.74)	-.2522 (1.82)	-.2295 (1.65)	-.2290 (1.53)	-.1793 (1.60)
Time	-.0128 (6.37)	-.0113 (4.66)	-.0158 (4.98)	-.0151 (3.37)	-.0124 (2.76)	-.0199 (4.01)	-.0224 (6.44)
Years of Schooling	.0417 (8.37)	.0380 (6.45)	.0277 (4.02)	.0321 (3.59)	.0217 (2.38)	-.0049 (0.49)	.0098 (1.28)
Union		-.1823 (4.21)		-.0619 (0.91)	-.0075 (0.10)	-.0835 (1.15)	
Lose job fairly likely		-.0841 (0.75)			-.0630 (0.42)	-.0823 (0.52)	-.1129 (0.95)
Lose job not too likely		.2016 (2.23)			.1255 (1.04)	.0416 (0.32)	.1350 (1.40)
Lose job not at all likely		.6608 (7.62)			.6028 (5.21)	.4963 (3.98)	.5873 (6.33)
Lose job – go OLF		-1.5729 (2.02)			n/a	n/a	-1.1800 (1.31)
Lose job – DK likely		.2489 (1.42)			.3325 (1.43)	.6152 (2.30)	.3369 (1.71)
Find job somewhat easy		-.2835 (5.60)			-.2545 (3.85)	-.2698 (3.89)	-.2834 (5.33)
Find job not easy at all		-.3084 (6.29)			-.2805 (4.31)	-.3276 (4.77)	-.3549 (6.85)
Find job dk how easy		-.2569 (1.83)			-.3599 (1.90)	-.1869 (0.87)	-.1731 (1.07)
Log of annual pay						.1885 (6.31)	.1475 (6.52)
State dummies	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Cut_1	-2.1502	-2.2746	-2.1539	-2.5027	-2.4406	-1.5441	-1.3562
Cut_2	-.7319	-.9024	-.6647	-1.1038	-1.0355	-.1291	.13839
Cut_3	1.2803	1.0953	1.4482	.9774	1.0818	2.0220	2.2701
Chi-Squared	1139.2	817.0	934.0	393.9	542.0	515.6	879.1
Pseudo R ²	.0266	.0263	.0394	.0286	.0394	.0414	.0409
N	20077	14571	11186	6573	6558	5964	10161

Notes: losing and finding a job variables not available in years 1972-1976, 1980, 1984 and 1987. Union status not available in 1972, 1974, 1977 & 1982. Column 4 is the same sample period as columns 5 and 6. Excluded categories are lose job very likely and find job – very easy.

t-statistics in parentheses

Table 4. Job Satisfaction by Country (%)

A) International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), 1989

	Completely satisfied	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	N
W. Germany	9%	34	41	11	4	605
UK	12	27	46	7	8	984
USA	15	35	37	6	7	797
Austria	17	29	39	11	4	814
Hungary	6	7	63	19	6	564
Netherlands	10	30	45	10	5	650
Italy	17	17	47	10	10	581
S. Ireland	18	33	41	5	4	474
Norway	14	28	43	12	4	1057
Israel	11	26	49	9	5	678
All	13	27	45	10	6	7204

Table 4. Job Satisfaction by Country (%) (continued)

B) Eurobarometers, 1995-1996

	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	A little dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	N
Belgium	44%	49	6	1	1011
Denmark	50	45	3	2	997
W. Germany	34	51	11	4	1025
Greece	11	50	29	9	1003
Italy	26	56	15	4	1028
Spain	23	57	16	4	996
France	22	60	14	5	999
S. Ireland	57	38	4	1	1004
Luxembourg	40	53	5	2	494
Netherlands	46	46	7	1	1064
Portugal	21	62	13	3	998
UK	38	49	9	5	1064
E. Germany	34	56	9	2	1047
Finland	31	62	6	2	1059
Sweden	39	53	5	2	1055
Austria	44	45	9	1	1070
All	35	52	10	3	15914

Notes: Results are weighted

Table 5A. Job Security and Job Satisfaction in Nine Countries

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree**	All
Completely satisfied	20	10	9	8	13
Very satisfied	32	28	21	19	27
Fairly satisfied	38	49	47	45	45
Neither	7	8	17	14	10
Dissatisfied*	3	5	6	14	6
All					
Unweighted N	2196	2852	1029	951	7028

Notes: * dissatisfied includes fairly dissatisfied, very dissatisfied and completely dissatisfied

** disagree includes disagree and strongly disagree.

Countries are UK, USA, Austria, Hungary, Netherlands, Italy, Eire, Norway, Israel. Source: ISSP 1989.

Table 5B. Job Security and Job Satisfaction in Sixteen Countries

	Secure	Not secure	DK secure	All	Unweighted N
Very satisfied	40	20	27	35	5559
Fairly satisfied	51	53	60	52	8291
Not very satisfied	7	19	11	10	1588
Not at all satisfied	2	8	3	3	476
All	70	22	8	100	15914
Unweighted N	11133	3451	1330	15914	

Notes: countries are Belgium, Denmark, W Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Great Britain, E Germany, Finland, Sweden, Austria.

Source: Eurobarometer, 1995-96

Table 6. Job Satisfaction Ordered Logit Equations (Source: ISSP 1989) – t-statistics in parentheses)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
UK	-.1889 (2.00)	-.2108 (2.20)	-.2026 (1.95)	-.0121 (0.12)	-.0202 (0.19)
USA	.2227 (2.50)	.1854 (1.78)		.2497 (2.38)	
Austria	.1530 (1.72)	.2135 (2.35)	.3024 (3.17)	.0572 (0.62)	.1454 (1.50)
Hungary	-.9846 (10.16)	-.9053 (9.14)	-.8989 (8.32)	-.8455 (8.47)	-.7548 (6.89)
Netherlands	-.0825 (0.87)	-.0457 (0.46)	.0199 (0.19)	.0298 (0.30)	.0812 (0.77)
Italy	-.3182 (3.17)	-.3744 (3.25)	-.3402 (2.87)	-.4767 (4.11)	-.4160 (3.49)
Eire	.3862 (3.73)	.4350 (4.07)	.5403 (4.77)	.5553 (5.14)	.6570 (5.75)
Norway	-.0466 (0.56)	.0309 (0.36)	.1029 (1.13)	.1347 (1.55)	.2028 (2.21)
Israel	-.2006 (2.16)				
Age	.0188 (10.42)	-.0284 (2.18)	-.0323 (2.25)	-.0216 (1.65)	-.0227 (1.58)
Age ²		.0005 (3.57)	.0006 (3.55)	.0004 (2.92)	.0004 (2.80)
Male	-.1789 (4.04)	-.2665 (5.30)	-.2348 (4.30)	-.2391 (4.73)	-.2251 (4.10)
Self-employed		.4630 (5.38)	.1774 (1.24)	.4879 (5.64)	.1426 (0.99)
Years schooling		.0053 (0.62)	.0014 (0.14)	-.0015 (0.17)	-.0010 (0.10)
Supervisor		.3456 (6.32)	.3211 (5.33)	.3037 (5.52)	.2755 (4.55)
Union member		-.1517 (2.93)	-.1679 (3.01)	-.2110 (4.05)	-.1886 (3.36)
Public sector			.1213 (1.98)		-.0402 (0.64)
Strong agree secure job				1.2182 (9.79)	1.2976 (9.46)
Agree secure job				.6735 (5.53)	.7626 (5.70)
Neither agree/disagree				.2595 (1.96)	.3593 (2.47)
Disagree secure job				-.1023 (0.73)	-.0009 (0.00)
Cut_1	-4.716	-5.4801	-5.4795	-4.8655	-4.7252
Cut_2	-3.691	-4.5248	-4.5907	-3.9061	-3.8325
Cut_3	-2.382	-3.1884	-3.2490	-2.5576	-2.4783
Cut_4	-1.243	-2.0151	-2.0235	-1.3594	-1.2269
Cut_5	.946	.1907	.2108	.9259	1.0851
Cut_6	2.481	1.7753	1.7637	2.5558	2.6785
LR Chi ²	339.2	417.6	331.4	728.6	578.2
Pseudo R ²	0.017	.0249	.0232	.0428	.0404
N	7202	5942	5086	5942	5086

Table 7. Job Satisfaction Ordered Logit Equations (Source: ISSP 1989) – t-statistics in parentheses

	All	Men	Women
UK	-.0417 (0.41)	-.0872 (0.67)	-.0050 (0.03)
USA	.1754 (1.60)	-.0688 (0.47)	.4899 (2.85)
Austria	.0097 (0.10)	-.1164 (0.95)	.1773 (1.17)
Hungary	-.5703 (5.38)	-.4289 (3.01)	-.7761 (4.76)
Netherlands	.0673 (0.66)	.0004 (0.00)	.0893 (0.51)
Italy	-.0849 (0.69)	-.0351 (0.22)	-.1621 (0.83)
Eire	.5761 (5.13)	.4498 (3.18)	.8213 (4.35)
Norway	.2093 (2.32)	.1524 (1.30)	.2433 (1.69)
Age	-.0120 (0.89)	-.0250 (1.39)	-.0058 (0.28)
Age ²	.0003 (2.27)	.0005 (2.35)	.0003 (1.28)
Male	-.2618 (4.84)		
Self-employed	.2692 (2.93)	.2694 (2.48)	.3060 (1.67)
Years schooling	-.0446 (4.93)	-.0329 (2.95)	-.0650 (4.11)
Supervisor	-.0698 (1.21)	-.0669 (0.93)	-.0520 (0.52)
Union member	-.0826 (1.53)	.0102 (0.14)	-.2034 (2.36)
Strong agree secure job	.6028 (4.46)	.5510 (3.07)	.7474 (3.54)
Agree secure job	.4521 (3.42)	.4330 (2.46)	.5134 (2.50)
Neither agree/disagree	.2442 (1.72)	.2219 (1.19)	.2723 (1.22)
Disagree secure job	.0819 (0.55)	.0823 (0.42)	.1342 (0.57)
My income is high - agree	-.0938 (0.60)	-.0249 (0.13)	-.1278 (0.42)
My income is high – neither	-.4070 (2.64)	-.4249 (2.33)	-.2921 (0.97)
My income is high – disagree	-.7170 (4.58)	-.7925 (4.26)	-.5465 (1.81)
My income is high – strongly disagree	-1.2423 (7.13)	-1.3210 (6.09)	-1.1090 (3.46)
My income is high – can't choose	.1698 (0.50)	.1930 (0.43)	.2781 (0.51)
My income is high – don't know	.1153 (0.22)	-.1749 (0.27)	.6665 (0.73)
Advancement opportunities high - agree	-.2520 (1.79)	-.3173 (1.86)	-.0987 (0.39)
Advancement opportunities high - neither	-.6472 (4.58)	-.7764 (4.48)	-.3954 (1.59)
Advancement opportunities high - disagree	-.9892 (6.94)	-1.1000 (6.23)	-.7597 (3.07)
Advancement opportunities high – strongly disagree	-1.3324 (8.56)	-1.6090 (8.24)	-.9346 (3.52)
Advancement opportunities high – can't choose	-.5017 (2.26)	-.6809 (2.38)	-.2596 (0.71)
Advancement opportunities high – don't know	-.5603 (1.31)	-.2108 (0.32)	-.6443 (1.09)
Work independently - agree	-.5728 (8.44)	-.6395 (7.29)	-.4689 (4.31)
Work independently – neither	-.9170 (9.45)	-1.0990 (8.71)	-.6747 (4.36)
Work independently – disagree	-1.2114 (11.2)	-1.3940 (9.46)	-1.0000 (6.27)
Work independently – strongly disagree	-1.5986 (8.91)	-1.5600 (6.51)	-1.6690 (6.08)
Work independently – can't choose	-.2053 (0.38)	-.1224 (0.17)	-.5119 (0.64)
Work independently – don't know	-1.1133 (2.58)	-.6500 (0.88)	-1.3900 (2.49)

Help people - agree	-.3277 (4.48)	-.2740 (2.71)	-.4263 (3.92)
Help people - neither	-.5760 (6.68)	-.5660 (4.92)	-.5896 (4.35)
Help people - disagree	-.7467 (7.69)	-.6546 (4.98)	-.8970 (6.03)
Help people – strongly disagree	-1.1038 (7.35)	-1.1560 (5.97)	-1.0640 (4.37)
Help people – can’t choose	-.6142 (2.29)	-.5430 (1.69)	-.8580 (1.68)
Help people – don’t know	.0520 (0.10)	-.1201 (0.18)	-.0831 (0.09)
Unhealthy conditions – often	.0534 (0.34)	.3017 (1.61)	-.5559 (1.93)
Unhealthy conditions – sometimes	.2767 (2.02)	.4399 (2.69)	-.0774 (0.31)
Unhealthy conditions – hardly ever	.3499 (2.56)	.5143 (3.12)	-.0622 (0.25)
Unhealthy conditions – never	.6915 (5.31)	.7532 (4.73)	.4586 (1.98)
Unhealthy conditions – can’t choose	.2369 (0.97)	.6869 (1.88)	-.3310 (0.92)
Unhealthy conditions – don’t know	1.2135 (3.02)	.9471 (1.79)	1.3540 (2.17)
Find a job – fairly easy	-.3699 (3.63)	-.5413 (4.09)	-.1465 (0.90)
Find a job – neither	-.7047 (6.57)	-.9561 (6.89)	-.3867 (2.26)
Find a job – fairly difficult	-.5690 (5.34)	-.7813 (5.61)	-.2573 (1.53)
Find a job – very difficult	-.4334 (3.73)	-.6625 (4.36)	-.0621 (0.34)
Find a job – can’t choose	-.1587 (0.99)	-.2070 (0.98)	-.1040 (0.41)
Find a job – don’t know	-1.0013 (1.87)	-1.483 (11.71)	-.8280 (1.22)
Cut_1	-8.0931	-8.1189	-8.19680
Cut_2	-7.1058	-7.3647	-6.66899
Cut_3	-5.6929	-5.9032	-5.3120
Cut_4	-4.3873	-4.568	-4.03084
Cut_5	-1.7777	-1.9349	-1.38915
Cut_6	.0528	-.10714	.476861
LR Chi ²	1857.0	1208.1	722.4
Pseudo R ²	.1107	.1213	.1062
N	5942	3495	2447

Notes: excluded categories, Germany. In the case of secure job – strongly disagree. For find a job the excluded category is – very easy and for all the other attitudinal variables - strongly agree.

Table 8. Job Security Ordered Logit Equations (Source: ISSP 1989) – t-statistics in parentheses

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
UK	-.7550 (8.09)	-.8053 (8.52)	-.8269 (8.67)	-.7763 (7.54)
USA	-.1419 (1.60)	-.2418 (2.61)	-.2662 (2.54)	n/a
Austria	.7709 (8.45)	.8088 (8.76)	.7845 (8.39)	.8273 (8.52)
Hungary	-.3844 (4.04)	-.3542 (3.67)	-.3795 (3.90)	-.8043 (7.51)
Netherlands	-.2466 (2.62)	-.2835 (2.90)	-.2856 (2.89)	-.2571 (2.47)
Italy	.0931 (0.91)	.0985 (0.96)	.4773 (4.02)	.3319 (2.72)
Eire	-.4414 (4.27)	-.3955 (3.78)	-.4501 (4.23)	-.4155 (3.78)
Norway	-.2829 (3.32)	-.2712 (3.12)	-.3414 (3.87)	-.3169 (3.40)
Israel	-.4633 (4.82)	-.5344 (5.41)	n/a	n/a
Age	.0119 (6.57)	.0115 (6.20)	.0126 (5.95)	.0105 (4.50)
Male	-.0600 (1.34)	-.1192 (2.59)	-.1761 (3.49)	-.0817 (1.48)
Years schooling		.0289 (3.63)	.0357 (3.97)	.0161 (1.62)
Supervisor		.3067 (6.09)	.2368 (4.27)	.2462 (4.01)
Union member			.2697 (5.24)	.0857 (1.52)
Public sector				.7583 (12.05)
Cut_1	-3.201	-2.849	-2.764	-2.846
Cut_2	-1.650	-1.288	-1.164	-1.264
Cut_3	-0.712	-.348	-.225	-.308
Cut_4	1.083	1.464	1.640	1.607
LR Chi ²	356.8	412.7	441.2	550.3
Pseudo R ²	.0187	.0221	.0283	.0413
N	7026	6896	5814	4983

Question: “How much do you agree or disagree that your job is secure?”
 (Choices are strongly agree, agree, neither, disagree, strongly disagree)

	Agree	Strongly agree	N		Agree	Strongly agree	N
UK	47	39	593	Italy	28	43	578
USA	43	19	955	Eire	47	23	473
Austria	48	28	781	Norway	33	33	1011
Hungary	34	53	808	Israel	33	29	639
Netherlands	53	19	563	All	41	31	7028

Table 9. Job Satisfaction Equations - Eurobarometer Survey 44.2, November 1995-January 1996

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Denmark	.2415 (2.69)	.1480 (1.55)	.1521 (1.59)
W. Germany	-.3795 (4.29)	-.4128 (4.43)	-.4249 (4.56)
Greece	-1.8619 (20.67)	-1.7827 (18.68)	-1.8155 (18.96)
Italy	-.9403 (10.62)	-1.003 (10.63)	-1.0055 (10.62)
Spain	-.9184 (10.23)	-.9339 (9.84)	-.9434 (9.91)
France	-.9617 (10.86)	-.8634 (9.22)	-.8602 (9.16)
Ireland	.4382 (4.84)	.3519 (3.60)	.3536 (3.61)
Luxembourg	-.3277 (3.02)	-.4508 (3.94)	-.4544 (3.97)
Netherlands	.0392 (0.45)	-.0498 (0.54)	-.0169 (0.18)
Portugal	-.9500 (10.52)	-.8691 (9.10)	-.8787 (9.19)
GB	-.3331 (3.74)	-.3782 (3.99)	-.3416 (3.58)
E. Germany	-.3511 (4.00)	-.0975 (1.04)	-.1264 (1.34)
Finland	-.4499 (5.17)	-.3730 (4.02)	-.3631 (3.91)
Sweden	-.1859 (2.12)	-.1055 (1.14)	-.0927 (0.99)
Austria	-.0640 (0.72)	-.0796 (0.84)	-.0765 (0.81)
Age	-.0180 (2.10)	-.0264 (2.93)	-.0236 (2.61)
Age ²	.0002 (2.18)	.0003 (13.05)	.0003 (12.74)
Male	-.0914 (2.68)	-.0929 (2.62)	-.0870 (2.45)
Self-employed	.4148 (8.99)	.4120 (7.94)	.3646 (6.06)
16-19 years schooling	.1319 (2.97)	.1169 (2.53)	.1187 (2.56)
>=20 years schooling	.2773 (5.68)	.2833 (5.56)	.2952 (5.78)
Supervisor	.4014 (10.95)	.3576 (9.33)	.3497 (8.87)
Public sector	.1038 (2.34)	.0906 (1.98)	.1436 (3.04)
Job tenure	.0005 (3.10)	.0001 (0.57)	.0001 (0.96)
Commuting time		-.0023 (4.62)	-.0020 (4.09)
Agree secure job		1.0652 (24.86)	1.0688 (24.87)
Secure job DK		.4251 (6.22)	.4256 (6.22)
Industry dummies	10	10	10
Size of establishment dummies	-	-	6
Cut_1	-3.4875	-3.1477	-3.0496
Cut_2	-1.8335	-1.4499	-1.3509
Cut_3	.9234	1.4207	1.5243
LR Chi ²	1719.1	2234.4	2268.9
Pseudo R ²	.0525	.0725	.0736
N	15727	14772	14772

Notes: excluded categories, Belgium, <16 years schooling

Table 10. Job Satisfaction Equations - Eurobarometer Survey 44.2, November 1995-January 1996

	All	Males	Females
Denmark	.2222 (2.18)	.0822 (0.61)	.4120 (2.59)
W. Germany	-.4455 (4.44)	-.5943 (4.53)	-.2497 (1.57)
Greece	-1.4826 (14.11)	-1.3867 (10.31)	-1.6524 (9.60)
Italy	-.9281 (9.27)	-.9027 (7.01)	-.9252 (5.70)
Spain	-.9104 (9.12)	-.8321 (6.57)	-1.0486 (6.31)
France	-.7028 (7.12)	-.6282 (4.75)	-.7341 (4.82)
Ireland	.3744 (3.59)	.4715 (3.49)	.3004 (1.78)
Luxembourg	-.4251 (3.55)	-.3369 (2.21)	-.5296 (2.71)
Netherlands	-.0340 (0.34)	-.2700 (2.13)	.3608 (2.25)
Portugal	-.7932 (7.84)	-.5971 (4.45)	-1.0087 (6.40)
GB	-.3054 (2.96)	-.3796 (2.78)	-.1763 (1.09)
E. Germany	-.1073 (1.05)	-.0401 (0.29)	-.1854 (1.18)
Finland	-.2436 (2.41)	-.3880 (2.88)	-.0698 (0.44)
Sweden	-.0443 (0.44)	.0488 (0.36)	-.1599 (1.01)
Austria	-.0124 (0.12)	-.0106 (0.08)	.0137 (0.08)
Age	-.0224 (2.41)	-.0162 (1.32)	-.0379 (2.57)
Age ²	.0002 (2.04)	.0001 (0.81)	.0004 (2.49)
Male	-.0198 (0.50)	n/a	n/a
Self-employed	.3506 (5.04)	.3968 (4.17)	.3485 (3.15)
16-19 years schooling	.0029 (0.06)	.0132 (0.21)	-.0733 (0.94)
>=20 years schooling	-.0063 (0.11)	-.0274 (0.37)	-.0361 (0.40)
Supervisor	.2707 (6.44)	.3389 (6.35)	.1801 (2.54)
Public sector	.1163 (2.35)	-.0030 (0.04)	.2266 (3.03)
Job tenure	.0003 (2.06)	.0005 (2.07)	.0002 (0.92)
Commuting time	-.0018 (3.54)	-.0013 (2.01)	-.0027 (3.22)
Agree secure job	.9178 (20.86)	.9696 (16.32)	.8516 (12.78)
Secure job DK	.3672 (5.21)	.3847 (4.05)	.3421 (3.22)
No vibrations from hand tools	-.0783 (1.62)	-.0733 (1.16)	-.0751 (0.98)
No noise	.1167 (2.66)	.0688 (1.12)	.2090 (3.25)
No high temperatures	.0481 (1.09)	.0733 (1.27)	.0379 (0.55)
No low temperatures	.0667 (1.52)	-.0277 (0.47)	.1896 (2.78)
No vapors or fumes	.1434 (3.00)	.2448 (3.92)	.0134 (0.17)
No dangerous substances	-.0652 (1.32)	-.0519 (0.83)	-.0858 (1.03)
No radiation	-.0388 (0.72)	-.0080 (0.12)	-.1097 (1.11)
No painful or tiring positions	.2039 (4.79)	.2095 (3.61)	.1951 (3.05)
No carrying or moving loads	.1478 (3.41)	.1631 (2.69)	.1662 (2.59)
No repetitive tasks <10 min	.1047 (2.51)	.1907 (3.41)	-.0062 (0.09)
No repetitive arm movements.	.0045 (0.10)	-.0467 (0.76)	.0457 (0.66)
No protective clothing	-.1690 (3.81)	-.1789 (3.15)	-.1269 (1.73)
No computers	.0362 (0.86)	-.0459 (0.81)	.1079 (1.66)

No work at high speed	.1107 (2.40)	.0868 (1.41)	.1459 (2.05)
No tight deadlines	.1525 (3.41)	.1703 (2.80)	.1043 (1.55)
No dealing with people	-.1482 (3.03)	-.0995 (1.58)	-.2060 (2.59)
Not working at home	-.1328 (3.18)	-.0906 (1.61)	-.2470 (3.84)
No night work	-.0054 (0.11)	-.0116 (0.19)	.0738 (0.85)
No Saturdays	-.0717 (1.45)	-.1288 (2.04)	.0252 (0.31)
No Sundays	.0819 (1.91)	.1259 (2.23)	.0466 (0.68)
Work pace depends colleagues*	-.0055 (0.14)	.0275 (0.55)	-.0609 (1.04)
Work pace depends customers*	.0465 (1.11)	-.0079 (0.14)	.0908 (1.35)
Work pace depends prodn. norms*	-.1171 (2.86)	-.0711 (1.37)	-.1932 (2.85)
Work pace depends on machine*	-.0388 (0.81)	.0324 (0.54)	-.1707 (2.12)
Work pace depends on boss*	-.1606 (4.04)	-.1463 (2.76)	-.1716 (2.81)
Equal opportunities at work	.2139 (5.93)	.0869 (1.77)	.4423 (8.00)
Boss a man	.0700 (1.58)	.1332 (1.79)	.0491 (0.85)
Health and safety a risk*	-.7638 (17.77)	-.7319 (13.26)	-.8582 (12.27)
Can control temperature	.1120 (2.60)	.1218 (2.09)	.1242 (1.90)
Can control lighting	.0376 (0.86)	.0551 (0.93)	.0235 (0.35)
Can control ventilation	.1241 (2.81)	.1446 (2.43)	.0995 (1.48)
Can control position of desk	.0659 (1.46)	.0243 (0.39)	.1328 (1.98)
Can control position of seat	-.0523 (1.16)	-.0259 (0.42)	-.0473 (0.69)
Can control equipment used	.1719 (4.60)	.1796 (3.64)	.1714 (2.92)
Industry dummies	10	10	10
Size of establishment dummies	7	7	7
Cut_1	-3.4983	-3.4386	-3.6624
Cut_2	-1.7277	-1.6308	-1.9105
Cut_3	1.3278	1.4653	1.1680
LR Chi ²	3321.4	1903.8	1611.9
Pseudo R ²	.1099	.1101	.1247
N	14486	8304	6182

Notes: excluded categories, Belgium, <16 years schooling

* = a variable also included where the respondent reported they did not know the answer to this question

Appendix

Table A1. Losing and finding a job over time – United States 1977-1996 (%)

a) Thinking about the next 12 months, how likely do you think it is that you will lose your job or be laid-off?

	Not at all likely	Not too likely	Fairly likely	Very likely	N
1977	66 %	24	6	4	883
1978	71	21	4	4	876
1982	60	27	6	7	1016
1983	61	25	8	6	914
1985	65	23	5	6	927
1986	67	23	7	4	843
1988	66	25	4	4	607
1989	70	22	4	4	606
1990	67	25	6	3	588
1991	62	25	7	6	602
1993	61	27	8	4	668
1994	63	27	5	6	1279
1996	61	28	7	4	1338
All	64	26	6	5	11147

Source: General Social Survey

Table A1. Losing and finding a job over time – United States 1977-1996 (%) (continued)

b) About how easy would it be for you to find a job with another employer with approximately the same income and fringe benefits you now have?

	Not easy at all	Somewhat easy	Very easy	N
1977	42 %	30	27	878
1978	39	33	28	865
1982	51	26	22	1009
1983	51	30	19	908
1985	43	32	25	917
1986	39	33	28	847
1988	35	37	28	598
1989	38	28	35	600
1990	38	30	32	589
1991	40	36	24	596
1993	45	33	22	665
1994	46	33	21	1267
1996	40	33	27	1331
All	43	32	26	11147

Source: General Social Surveys.

Table A2. Probability of a) losing and b) finding a job in the USA, 1972-1996: ordered logits (Current workers only)

	<i>Losing a Job</i>			<i>Finding a job</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Age	-.0089 (5.56)	-.0085 (5.20)	-.0075 (3.43)	-.5975 (9.08)	-.0268 (17.41)	-.0278 (13.54)
Male	.0251 (0.64)	-.0843 (1.96)	-.0497 (0.87)	-.1036 (2.87)	.0429 (1.09)	.0879 (1.70)
Self-employed	-.8079 (11.86)	-.8650 (12.07)	-.9076 (9.42)	.5610 (10.13)	.3701 (6.36)	.2570 (3.38)
Black	.4577 (7.91)	.5014 (8.24)	.4958 (5.79)	-.2428 (4.30)	-.2421 (4.07)	-.1837 (2.21)
Other non-white	.1529 (1.37)	.1456 (1.27)	.1407 (0.92)	-.0056 (0.06)	-.0589 (0.56)	-.0685 (0.50)
Time	.0244 (6.83)	.0274 (7.22)	.0327 (6.27)	-.0099 (3.10)	-.0186 (5.46)	-.0200 (4.34)
Years of Schooling	-.0656 (9.13)	-.0500 (6.40)	-.0527 (5.08)	.0693 (10.53)	.0618 (8.56)	.0646 (6.80)
Log state unemployment	.5161 (7.21)	.7064 (8.10)	.7768 (6.55)	-.5975 (9.08)	-1.0182 (12.58)	-1.0155 (9.34)
Union			.2550 (3.46)			-.6222 (8.62)
Industry dummies (9)	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
State dummies (44)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cut_1	.6832	.8692	1.1925	-1.7301	-2.8702	-2.7832
Cut_2	2.2473	2.4527	2.7727	-.3095	-1.4008	-1.2670
Cut_3	3.1030	3.3141	3.6608			
Chi-Squared	448.9	639.3	424.5	669.81	1142.3	763.9
Pseudo R ²	.0214	.0305	.0350	.0284	.0484	.0551
N	11058	11045	6471	10981	10967	6431

Notes: losing and finding a job variables not available in years 1972-1976, 1980, 1984 and 1987.
 Union status not available in 1972, 1974, 1977 & 1982.

References

- Akerlof, George. A, Rose, Andrew K. and Yellen, Janet L. (1988). "Job Switching and Job Satisfaction in the US Labor Market", Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2, 495-582.
- Argyle, Michael. (1987). The Psychology of Happiness, Routledge, London.
- Birdi, Kamal, Warr, Peter and Oswald, Andrew J. (1995). "Age Differences in Three Components of Employee Well-being", Applied Psychology, 44, 345-373.
- Blanchflower, David (1991). "Fear, Unemployment and Pay Flexibility", Economic Journal, 101, 483-496.
- Blanchflower, David and Freeman, Richard (1997). "The Attitudinal Legacy of Communist Labor Relations", Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 50, 4438-459.
- Blanchflower, David and Oswald, Andrew J. (1999). "The Rising Well-Being of the Young", forthcoming in Youth Joblessness in Advanced Countries, edited by David Blanchflower and Richard Freeman, University of Chicago Press and NBER.
- Blanchflower, David, Oswald, Andrew J. and Warr, Peter B. (1993). "Well-Being Over Time in Britain and the USA", London School of Economics, mimeo.
- Borjas, George (1979). "Job Satisfaction, Wages and Unions", Journal of Human Resources, 14, 21-40.
- Burgess, Simon and Rees, Hedley (1996). "Job Tenure in Britain: 1975-92", Economic Journal, 106, 334-44.
- Campbell, A. (1981). The Sense of Well-Being in America, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Cappelli, Peter and Sherer, P.D. (1988). "Satisfaction, Market Wages and Labor Relations: An Airline Study", Industrial Relations, 27, 56-73.
- Clark, Andrew E. (1996). "Job Satisfaction in Britain", British Journal of Industrial Relations, 34, 189-217.
- Clark, Andrew E. (1998). "What Makes a Good Job? Evidence from OECD Countries", discussion paper, December, LEO-CRESEP, University of Orleans, France.
- Clark, Andrew E. and Oswald, Andrew J. (1994). "Unhappiness and Unemployment", Economic Journal, 104, 648-659.
- Clark, Andrew E. and Oswald, Andrew J. (1996). "Satisfaction and Comparison Income", Journal of Public Economics, 61, 359-381.
- Clark, Andrew E., Oswald, Andrew J. and Warr, Peter B. (1995). "Is Job Satisfaction U-Shaped in Age?", Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69, 57-81.

- Curtice, John (1993). "Satisfying Work – If You Can Get It", in Roger Jowell, Lindsay Brooks and Lizanne Dowds eds, International Social Attitudes: The 10th BSA Report, Dartmouth, Aldershot.
- Diener, Edward (1984). "Subjective Well-Being", Psychological Bulletin, 93, 542-575.
- Diener, Edward, Suh Eunkook M, Lucas Richard E., and Smith Heidi L. (1999). "Subjective Well-Being: Three Decades of Progress", Psychological Bulletin, forthcoming.
- Easterlin, Richard (1974). "Does Economic Growth Improve the Human Lot? Some Empirical Evidence". In Nations and Households in Economic Growth: Essays in Honour of Moses Abramovitz, (ed. P. A. David and M. W. Reder). New York and London: Academic Press.
- Farber, Henry S. (1990). "The Decline of Unionization in the United States: What Can be Learned from Recent Experience?", Journal of Labor Economics, 8, S75-105.
- Farber, Henry S. (1997). "The Changing Face of Job Loss in the United States, 1981-95", Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Special Issue S1, 55-142.
- Flanagan, Robert J., Strauss, G. and Ulman, Lloyd (1974). "Worker Discontent and Workplace Behavior", Industrial Relations, 13, 101-123.
- Frank, Robert H. (1985). Choosing the Right Pond, Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford.
- Freeman, Richard B. (1978). "Job Satisfaction as an Economic Variable", American Economic Review, 68, 135-141.
- Frey, Bruno S. and Stutzer, Alois (1999). "Happiness, Economy and Institutions", mimeo, University of Zurich.
- Gardner, Jonathan and Oswald, Andrew J. (1999). "Declining Psychological Health Among Britain's Public Sector Workers", mimeo, University of Warwick.
- Gregg, Paul and Wadsworth, Jonathan (1995). "A Short History of Labour Turnover, Job Tenure, and Job Security: 1975-93", Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 11, 1, 73-90.
- Hamermesh, Daniel S. (1977). "Economic Aspects of Job Satisfaction", in Orley Ashenfelter and Wallace Oates eds, Essays in Labor Market and Population Analysis, Wiley, New York.
- Hamermesh, Daniel S. (1998). "The Changing Distribution of Job Satisfaction", University of Texas at Austin, mimeo.
- Inglehart, Ronald (1990). Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Jackson, A. and Kumar, P. (1998). "Measuring and Monitoring the Quality of Jobs and the Work Environment in Canada", mimeo, Queen's University.
- Judge, T.A. and Watanabe, S. (1993). "Another Look at the Job Satisfaction - Life Satisfaction Relationship", Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 939-948.
- Kahneman, Daniel, Wakker, Peter P. and Sarin, Rakesh (1997). "Back to Bentham? Explorations of Experienced Utility", Quarterly Journal of Economics, 112, 375-406.

- Levy-Garboua, L. and Montmarquette, C. (1997). "Reported Job Satisfaction: What Does it Mean?", LAMIA, University of Paris I, discussion paper 1997-1.
- Ng, Yew-Kwang (1996). "Happiness Surveys: Some Comparability Issues and an Exploratory Survey Based on Just Perceivable Increments", Social Indicators Research, 38, 1-27
- Ng, Yew-Kwang. (1997). "A Case for Happiness, Cardinalism, and Interpersonal Comparability", Economic Journal, 107, 1848-1858.
- OECD (1997). "Is Job Insecurity on the Rise in OECD Countries?", OECD Employment Outlook.
- Oswald, Andrew J. (1997). "Happiness and Economic Performance", Economic Journal, 107, 1815-1831 .
- Pavot, William (1991) "Further Validation of the Satisfaction with Life Scale: Evidence for the Cross-Method Convergence of Well-Being Measures", Journal of Personality Assessment, 57, 149-161.
- Spector, Paul E. (1997). Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Spector, Paul E. and twenty nine co-authors (1999). "A Twenty-Two Nation Study of Work Locus of Control, Well-being, and Individualism: How Generalisable are Western Work Findings?", mimeo, University of South Florida.
- Sui, O. and Cooper, Cary L. (1998). "A Study of Occupational Stress, Job Satisfaction and Quitting Intentions in Hong Kong Firms: The Role of Locus of Control and Organizational Commitment", Stress Medicine, 14, 55-66.
- Turnbull, Peter and Wass, Victoria (1999). "Redundancy and the Paradox of Job Insecurity", mimeo, Cardiff Business School.
- Van de Stadt, H., Kapteyn, Ari, and Van de Geer, S. (1985). "The Relativity of Utility: Evidence from Panel Data", Review of Economics and Statistics, 67, 179-87.
- Veenhoven, R. (1991). "Is Happiness Relative?", Social Indicators Research, 24, 1-34.
- Warr, Peter B. (1987). Work, Unemployment and Mental Health, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Warr, Peter, B. (1997). "Age, Work and Mental Health", in K.W. Schale and C. Schooler eds, The Impact of Work on Older Adults, Springer, New York.
- Worrall, Les and Cooper, Cary L. (1998). The Quality of Working Life, Institute of Management, London.