

APPENDIX 1: Tables | *June 2022*

CIPD Good Work Index 2022

UK Working Lives Survey

The CIPD is the professional body for HR and people development. The registered charity champions better work and working lives and has been setting the benchmark for excellence in people and organisation development for more than 100 years. It has more than 160,000 members across the world, provides thought leadership through independent research on the world of work, and offers professional training and accreditation for those working in HR and learning and development.

CIPD Good Work Index 2022

UK Working Lives Survey

Appendix 1: Tables

Contents

Introduction 2

Chapter 1 – The Great Rethink..... 3

Chapter 2 – Flexible and hybrid working..... 20

Chapter 3 – Career progression and social mobility 47

Chapter 4 – Relationships at work and the quality of management..... 56

Introduction

This appendix accompanies the main report from the CIPD's Good Work Index 2022. It contains data tables reported in the survey report, which can be found at cipd.co.uk/workinglives.

Details of the CIPD Job Quality Index are presented in Appendix 2, also available on the report webpage.

The counts (n) used in the tables below are weighted in order that the percentages are more accurate of the UK working population. As a result, the counts given should be seen as indicative; the actual number of respondents is slightly different.

Throughout the Good Work Index 2022 survey report, the guidelines issued by YouGov have been followed regarding not reporting any patterns in the data calculated on bases fewer than 50 respondents to ensure reliability in the analysis of the data collected. Patterns observed have been tested for statistical significance using descriptive statistics including Chi-squared tests, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and correlation coefficients (Pearson's R and Spearman's rho), as well as forms of regression analysis. Relevant tests and statistical output are provided in this appendix for reference. Care should be taken in interpreting the tables presented below; specifically, percentages with cell counts of $n < 50$ should not be taken to be accurate.

Table 3: Job tenure by NS-SEC analytical categories (column %)

			NS-SEC analytical categories							Total
			Higher managerial and professional	Lower managerial and professional	Intermediate occupations	Small employers and own-accounts	Lower supervisory and technical	Semi-routine occupations	Routine occupations	
Length of tenure in current organisation, in any job	Less than one year	Count	164	199	121	25	25	73	41	648
		% within NS-SEC analytical categories	12.8%	13.2%	14.8%	7.9%	9.9%	13.0%	17.1%	13.0%
	More than one year	Count	1,121	1,311	698	292	227	489	199	4,337
		% within NS-SEC analytical categories	87.2%	86.8%	85.2%	92.1%	90.1%	87.0%	82.9%	87.0%
Total		Count	1,285	1,510	819	317	252	562	240	4,985
		% within NS-SEC analytical categories	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4: Comparison of pay in current with last job, by age (column %)

Length of tenure in current organisation, in any job				Age						Total
				18–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65+	
Under one year	Comparing pay in current job with last job	Better paid	Count	21	150	78	46	23	4	322
			%	77.8%	63.6%	56.1%	39.0%	31.5%	33.3%	53.2%
		Similarly paid	Count	3	39	37	34	17	3	133
			%	11.1%	16.5%	26.6%	28.8%	23.3%	25.0%	22.0%
		Lower paid	Count	3	47	24	38	33	5	150
			%							

			%	11.1%	19.9%	17.3%	32.2%	45.2%	41.7%	24.8%
	Total		Count	27	236	139	118	73	12	605
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
More than one year	Comparing pay in current job with last job	Better paid	Count	21	553	698	642	381	109	2,404
			%	67.7%	72.3%	67.7%	55.6%	45.7%	33.2%	58.0%
		Similarly paid	Count	7	134	225	348	247	104	1,065
			%	22.6%	17.5%	21.8%	30.2%	29.6%	31.7%	25.7%
		Lower paid	Count	3	78	108	164	206	115	674
			%	9.7%	10.2%	10.5%	14.2%	24.7%	35.1%	16.3%
Total		Count	31	765	1,031	1,154	834	328	4,143	
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Total	Comparing pay in current job with last job	Better paid	Count	42	703	776	688	404	113	2,726
			%	72.4%	70.2%	66.3%	54.1%	44.5%	33.2%	57.4%
		Similarly paid	Count	10	173	262	382	264	107	1,198
			%	17.2%	17.3%	22.4%	30.0%	29.1%	31.5%	25.2%
		Lower paid	Count	6	125	132	202	239	120	824
			%	10.3%	12.5%	11.3%	15.9%	26.4%	35.3%	17.4%
Total		Count	58	1,001	1,170	1,272	907	340	4,748	
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 5: Comparison of responsibility in current with last job, by age (column %)

Length of tenure in current organisation, in any job			Age						Total	
			18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+		
Under one year	Comparing responsibility in current job with last job	More responsibility	Count	10	94	51	36	11	3	205
			%	35.7%	40.0%	36.7%	30.5%	15.1%	27.3%	33.9%
	About the same responsibility	Count	8	81	57	59	38	4	247	
		%	28.6%	34.5%	41.0%	50.0%	52.1%	36.4%	40.9%	
	Less responsibility	Count	10	60	31	23	24	4	152	
		%	35.7%	25.5%	22.3%	19.5%	32.9%	36.4%	25.2%	

	Total		Count	28	235	139	118	73	11	604
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
More than one year	Comparing responsibility in current job with last job	More responsibility	Count	20	497	616	594	329	128	2,184
			%	64.5%	65.0%	59.7%	51.5%	39.4%	38.9%	52.7%
		About the same responsibility	Count	11	181	276	373	303	103	1,247
			%	35.5%	23.7%	26.7%	32.3%	36.3%	31.3%	30.1%
		Less responsibility	Count	0	87	140	187	202	98	714
			%	0.0%	11.4%	13.6%	16.2%	24.2%	29.8%	17.2%
	Total		Count	31	765	1,032	1,154	834	329	4,145
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Comparing responsibility in current job with last job	More responsibility	Count	30	591	667	630	340	131	2,389
			%	50.8%	59.1%	57.0%	49.5%	37.5%	38.5%	50.3%
		About the same responsibility	Count	19	262	333	432	341	107	1,494
			%	32.2%	26.2%	28.4%	34.0%	37.6%	31.5%	31.5%
		Less responsibility	Count	10	147	171	210	226	102	866
			%	16.9%	14.7%	14.6%	16.5%	24.9%	30.0%	18.2%
	Total		Count	59	1,000	1,171	1,272	907	340	4,749
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 6: Comparison of level of fulfilment in current with last job, by age (column %)

Length of tenure in current organisation, in any job				Age						Total
				18–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65+	
Under one year	And, compared to your last job, is your current role:	More fulfilling	Count	16	146	76	71	35	3	347
			%	59.3%	61.9%	54.7%	60.2%	47.9%	25.0%	57.4%
		About as fulfilling	Count	3	64	46	32	28	7	180
			%	11.1%	27.1%	33.1%	27.1%	38.4%	58.3%	29.8%
		Less fulfilling	Count	8	26	17	15	10	2	78
			%	29.6%	11.0%	12.2%	12.7%	13.7%	16.7%	12.9%
	Total		Count	27	236	139	118	73	12	605

			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
More than one year	And, compared to your last job, is your current role:	More fulfilling	Count	21	471	571	595	408	178	2244
			%	67.7%	61.6%	55.3%	51.6%	48.9%	54.3%	54.2%
		About as fulfilling	Count	6	211	348	418	321	103	1407
			%	19.4%	27.6%	33.7%	36.2%	38.5%	31.4%	34.0%
		Less fulfilling	Count	4	83	113	141	105	47	493
			%	12.9%	10.8%	10.9%	12.2%	12.6%	14.3%	11.9%
	Total		Count	31	765	1032	1154	834	328	4144
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	And, compared to your last job, is your current role:	More fulfilling	Count	37	617	647	666	443	181	2591
			%	63.8%	61.6%	55.3%	52.4%	48.8%	53.2%	54.6%
		About as fulfilling	Count	9	275	394	450	349	110	1587
			%	15.5%	27.5%	33.6%	35.4%	38.5%	32.4%	33.4%
		Less fulfilling	Count	12	109	130	156	115	49	571
			%	20.7%	10.9%	11.1%	12.3%	12.7%	14.4%	12.0%
	Total		Count	58	1001	1171	1272	907	340	4749
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 7: Comparison of work-life balance in current with last job, by age (column %)

Length of tenure in current organisation, in any job			Age						Total	
			18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+		
Under one year	And, compared with your last job, does your current job offer:	More work-life balance	Count	6	125	70	48	35	8	292
			%	22.2%	53.0%	50.4%	41.0%	48.6%	61.5%	48.3%
	About the same work-life balance	Count	9	84	44	47	22	2	208	
		%	33.3%	35.6%	31.7%	40.2%	30.6%	15.4%	34.4%	
	Less work-life	Count	12	27	25	22	15	3	104	
		%	44.4%	11.4%	18.0%	18.8%	20.8%	23.1%	17.2%	

		balance								
	Total		Count	27	236	139	117	72	13	604
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
More than one year	And, compared with your last job, does your current job offer:	More work-life balance	Count	16	360	472	579	414	204	2,045
			%	51.6%	47.1%	45.8%	50.2%	49.6%	62.0%	49.3%
	About the same work-life balance	Count	8	252	360	405	302	101	1,428	
		%	25.8%	32.9%	34.9%	35.1%	36.2%	30.7%	34.5%	
	Less work-life balance	Count	7	153	199	170	119	24	672	
		%	22.6%	20.0%	19.3%	14.7%	14.3%	7.3%	16.2%	
	Total		Count	31	765	1,031	1,154	835	329	4,145
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	And, compared with your last job, does your current job offer:	More work-life balance	Count	22	485	542	627	449	212	2,337
			%	37.9%	48.5%	46.3%	49.3%	49.5%	62.0%	49.2%
	About the same work-life balance	Count	17	336	404	452	324	103	1,636	
		%	29.3%	33.6%	34.5%	35.6%	35.7%	30.1%	34.4%	
	Less work-life balance	Count	19	180	224	192	134	27	776	
		%	32.8%	18.0%	19.1%	15.1%	14.8%	7.9%	16.3%	
	Total		Count	58	1,001	1,170	1,271	907	342	4,749
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 8: Main reasons you are likely to leave your role (%)

Which, if any, of the following are the main reasons you are likely to leave your role?	
To do a different type of work	22%
To get better training and development	9%
Because I dislike my immediate manager/colleagues	8%

Reduce stress	0%
To learn new things	0%
Increase job satisfaction	26%
Unhappy with leadership of senior management	19%
Better pay/benefits elsewhere	34%
Opportunities for promotion	12%
I want to work for a more ethical/greener employer	5%
Easier/shorter journey to work	0%
More flexible working hours	10%
Increased job security in another organisation	5%
Opportunity for greater remote working	7%
Better work–life balance	23%
COVID-19 pandemic prompted change in career path	5%
Discrimination or harassment at current workplace	4%
Other reason	25%
n	1,175

Table 9: Ease in finding new job, by age (column %)

			Age						Total	
			18–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65+		
ease in finding a job at least as good as current	Very easy	Count	23	137	79	99	69	22	429	
		%	13.6%	10.6%	5.8%	6.8%	6.3%	5.4%	7.4%	
	Fairly easy	Count	57	440	389	343	240	63	1,532	
		%	33.7%	34.1%	28.6%	23.6%	21.9%	15.6%	26.5%	
	Neither easy nor difficult	Count	29	252	363	369	262	79	1,354	
		%	17.2%	19.5%	26.7%	25.3%	23.9%	19.6%	23.4%	
	Fairly difficult	Count	46	360	393	434	313	114	1,660	
		%	27.2%	27.9%	28.9%	29.8%	28.5%	28.2%	28.7%	
	Very difficult	Count	14	101	138	211	214	126	804	
		%	8.3%	7.8%	10.1%	14.5%	19.5%	31.2%	13.9%	
	Total		Count	169	1,290	1,362	1,456	1,098	404	5,779
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 10: Ease in finding new job, by gender (column %)

	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	

Table 12: Likelihood of voluntarily quitting job in next 12 months, by age (column %)

			Age						Total	
			18–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65+		
Likelihood of voluntarily quitting job in next 12 months	Very likely	Count	45	110	80	61	67	66	429	
		%	25.6%	8.4%	5.7%	4.1%	6.0%	15.5%	7.2%	
	Likely	Count	33	215	175	136	99	69	727	
		%	18.8%	16.5%	12.5%	9.1%	8.8%	16.2%	12.3%	
	Neither likely nor unlikely	Count	27	224	235	270	234	84	1,074	
		%	15.3%	17.2%	16.8%	18.1%	20.8%	19.8%	18.1%	
	Unlikely	Count	32	338	360	380	265	87	1,462	
		%	18.2%	25.9%	25.8%	25.4%	23.6%	20.5%	24.7%	
	Very unlikely	Count	39	417	548	647	458	119	2,228	
		%	22.2%	32.0%	39.2%	43.3%	40.8%	28.0%	37.6%	
	Total		Count	176	1,304	1,398	1,494	1,123	425	5,920
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 13: Likelihood of voluntarily quitting job in next 12 months, by gender (column %)

			Gender		Total	
			Male	Female		
Likelihood of voluntarily quitting job in next 12 months	Very likely	Count	203	226	429	
		%	6.6%	7.9%	7.2%	
	Likely	Count	358	369	727	
		%	11.7%	12.9%	12.3%	
	Neither likely nor unlikely	Count	598	476	1,074	
		%	19.6%	16.6%	18.1%	
	Unlikely	Count	739	723	1,462	
		%	24.2%	25.2%	24.7%	
	Very unlikely	Count	1,158	1,072	2,230	
		%	37.9%	37.4%	37.7%	
	Total		Count	3,056	2,866	5,922
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 14: Likelihood of voluntarily quitting job in next 12 months, by SOC2020 occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total	
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
Likelihood of voluntarily quitting job in next 12 months	Very likely	Count	42	100	70	56	21	23	47	21	42	422	
		%	6.5%	6.1%	6.9%	7.4%	5.9%	8.7%	7.8%	9.7%	12.8%	7.3%	
	Likely	Count	73	203	115	90	49	32	89	23	40	714	
		%	11.3%	12.5%	11.3%	11.9%	13.8%	12.2%	14.7%	10.6%	12.2%	12.3%	
	Neither likely nor unlikely	Count	88	298	190	128	82	45	123	35	56	1,045	
		%	13.7%	18.3%	18.6%	17.0%	23.1%	17.1%	20.3%	16.2%	17.0%	18.0%	
	Unlikely	Count	179	435	239	203	76	64	128	38	79	1,441	
		%	27.8%	26.7%	23.4%	26.9%	21.4%	24.3%	21.1%	17.6%	24.0%	24.8%	
	Very unlikely	Count	262	591	407	278	127	99	219	99	112	2,194	
		%	40.7%	36.3%	39.9%	36.8%	35.8%	37.6%	36.1%	45.8%	34.0%	37.7%	
	Total		Count	644	1,627	1,021	755	355	263	606	216	329	5,816
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 15: Likelihood of voluntarily quitting job in next 12 months, by NS-SEC analytical categories (column %)

			NS-SEC analytical categories							Total
			Higher managerial and professional	Lower managerial and professional	Intermediate occupations	Small employers and own-accounts	Lower supervisory and technical	Semi-routine occupations	Routine occupations	
Likelihood of voluntarily quitting job	Very likely	Count	80	92	56	11	19	47	24	329
		%	6.4%	6.4%	7.4%	3.6%	7.8%	9.0%	10.6%	6.9%

in next 12 months	Likely	Count	158	153	93	21	28	67	30	550
		%	12.7%	10.6%	12.3%	6.9%	11.5%	12.8%	13.3%	11.6%
	Neither likely nor unlikely	Count	211	243	129	49	41	111	40	824
		%	17.0%	16.9%	17.0%	16.0%	16.8%	21.3%	17.7%	17.4%
	Unlikely	Count	344	363	189	69	65	113	44	1,187
		%	27.7%	25.2%	24.9%	22.5%	26.6%	21.6%	19.5%	25.1%
	Very unlikely	Count	449	589	291	156	91	184	88	1,848
		%	36.2%	40.9%	38.4%	51.0%	37.3%	35.2%	38.9%	39.0%
	Total	Count	1,242	1,440	758	306	244	522	226	4,738
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 16: Feeling of doing useful work for organisation among recent job movers, by year (column %)

Length of tenure in current organisation, in any job				Year			Total		
				2020	2021	2022			
Up to one year	Feeling of doing useful work for organisation	Strongly agree	Count	126	159	134	454		
			%	18.7%	27.1%	18.4%	21.4%		
		Agree	Count	378	308	404	1,164		
			%	56.1%	52.5%	55.6%	54.8%		
		Neither agree nor disagree	Count	109	80	110	318		
			%	16.2%	13.6%	15.1%	15.0%		
		Disagree	Count	46	27	51	129		
			%	6.8%	4.6%	7.0%	6.1%		
		Strongly disagree	Count	15	13	28	58		
			%	2.2%	2.2%	3.9%	2.7%		
		Total			Count	674	587	727	2,123
					%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 17: Feeling of doing useful work for society among recent job movers, by year (column %)

Length of tenure in current organisation, in any job				Year			Total		
				Jan 2020	Jan 2021	Jan 2022			
Up to one year	Feeling of doing useful work for society	Strongly agree	Count	108	132	99	339		
			%	14.9%	21.3%	13.1%	16.1%		
		Agree	Count	249	244	274	767		
			%	34.3%	39.4%	36.1%	36.5%		
		Neither agree nor disagree	Count	180	133	187	500		
			%	24.8%	21.5%	24.7%	23.8%		
		Disagree	Count	135	82	141	358		
			%	18.6%	13.2%	18.6%	17.0%		
		Strongly disagree	Count	54	29	57	140		
			%	7.4%	4.7%	7.5%	6.7%		
		Total			Count	726	620	758	2,104
					%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 18: Feeling of purpose among recent job movers, by year (column %)

Length of tenure in current organisation, in any job				Year			Total		
				Jan 2020	Jan 2021	Jan 2022			
Up to one year	I am highly motivated by my organisation's core purpose	Strongly agree	Count	87	99	88	303		
			%	13.0%	16.9%	12.2%	14.4%		
		Agree	Count	252	254	271	833		
			%	37.6%	43.3%	37.6%	39.5%		
		Neither agree nor disagree	Count	183	150	208	570		
			%	27.3%	25.6%	28.9%	27.0%		
		Disagree	Count	107	55	100	276		
			%	16.0%	9.4%	13.9%	13.1%		
		Strongly disagree	Count	41	28	53	127		
			%	6.1%	4.8%	7.4%	6.0%		
		Total			Count	670	586	720	2,109
					%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 19: Bargaining power by SOC2020 occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total	
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
I have strong bargaining power as an employee	Strongly agree	Count	34	51	30	18	10	3	14	1	8	169	
		%	6.2%	3.5%	3.4%	2.4%	3.8%	1.3%	2.5%	0.5%	2.4%	3.2%	
	Agree	Count	165	320	164	132	64	29	53	27	37	991	
		%	30.1%	22.0%	18.6%	17.5%	24.4%	12.1%	9.3%	13.9%	11.2%	18.9%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	166	426	256	229	86	70	147	60	82	1,522	
		%	30.2%	29.2%	29.1%	30.4%	32.8%	29.3%	25.7%	30.9%	24.9%	29.1%	
	Disagree	Count	127	417	286	216	64	80	204	55	98	1,547	
		%	23.1%	28.6%	32.5%	28.7%	24.4%	33.5%	35.7%	28.4%	29.8%	29.6%	
	Strongly disagree	Count	57	243	145	158	38	57	153	51	104	1,006	
		%	10.4%	16.7%	16.5%	21.0%	14.5%	23.8%	26.8%	26.3%	31.6%	19.2%	
	Total		Count	549	1,457	881	753	262	239	571	194	329	5,235
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 20: Would like to quit, but too few options, by SOC2020 occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
To what extent do you agree with the following statements? – I'd like to quit my job, but I feel that I have too few options to	Strongly agree	Count	45	101	93	72	14	22	68	17	49	481
		%	8.2%	6.9%	10.4%	9.6%	5.2%	8.7%	11.5%	8.8%	14.1%	9.0%
	Agree	Count	94	305	184	175	56	45	156	43	91	1,149
		%	17.1%	20.8%	20.5%	23.3%	20.9%	17.7%	26.4%	22.3%	26.2%	21.6%
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	102	272	176	164	58	57	129	39	74	1,071
		%	18.6%	18.5%	19.6%	21.8%	21.6%	22.4%	21.8%	20.2%	21.3%	20.1%
	Disagree	Count	173	455	244	179	71	72	141	55	63	1,453
		%	31.5%	31.8%	27.6%	21.5%	26.8%	26.7%	24.7%	26.3%	21.1%	19.2%

consider leaving the organisation		%	31.5 %	31.0 %	27.2 %	23.8 %	26.5 %	28.3 %	23.8 %	28.5 %	18.2 %	27.3 %
	Strongly disagree	Count	135	334	201	162	69	58	98	39	70	1,166
		%	24.6 %	22.8 %	22.4 %	21.5 %	25.7 %	22.8 %	16.6 %	20.2 %	20.2 %	21.9 %
Total		Count	549	1,467	898	752	268	254	592	193	347	5,320
		%	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

Table 21: Difficult to leave, even if wanted to, by SOC2020 occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 20 1-digit code									Total	
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
To what extent do you agree with the following statements? – It would be difficult for me to leave the organisation right now, even if I wanted to	Strongly agree	Count	77	135	77	66	29	20	53	19	34	510	
		%	14.1 %	9.2 %	8.7 %	8.8 %	10.9 %	8.0 %	9.0 %	9.6 %	9.9 %	9.6 %	
	Agree	Count	162	405	268	229	72	81	171	42	112	1,542	
		%	29.6 %	27.6 %	30.3 %	30.4 %	27.1 %	32.3 %	29.2 %	21.2 %	32.6 %	29.1 %	
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	91	293	184	187	58	54	137	36	64	1,104	
		%	16.6 %	20.0 %	20.8 %	24.8 %	21.8 %	21.5 %	23.4 %	18.2 %	18.6 %	20.8 %	
	Disagree	Count	170	457	275	173	78	54	142	62	84	1,495	
		%	31.0 %	31.2 %	31.1 %	22.9 %	29.3 %	21.5 %	24.2 %	31.3 %	24.4 %	28.2 %	
	Strongly disagree	Count	48	175	81	99	29	42	83	39	50	646	
		%	8.8 %	11.9 %	9.2 %	13.1 %	10.9 %	16.7 %	14.2 %	19.7 %	14.5 %	12.2 %	
	Total		Count	548	1,465	885	754	266	251	586	198	344	5,297
			%	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

Table 23: Good Work Index, by turnover intention

Likelihood of voluntarily quitting	Subjective pay	Contracts	Work-life	Job design	Relationships	Employee voice	Health and
------------------------------------	----------------	-----------	-----------	------------	---------------	----------------	------------

job in next 12 months				balance				wellbeing
Very likely	Mean	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.5
	N	429	429	429	428	424	429	406
	Std deviation	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Likely	Mean	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.5
	N	725	727	727	727	724	727	697
	Std deviation	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Neither likely nor unlikely	Mean	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.6
	N	1,071	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,070	1,074	1,026
	Std deviation	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Unlikely	Mean	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.6
	N	1,458	1,462	1,462	1,462	1,458	1,462	1,392
	Std deviation	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Very unlikely	Mean	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.6
	N	2,220	2,230	2,230	2,230	2,209	2,230	2,140
	Std deviation	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Total	Mean	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.6
	N	5,903	5,922	5,922	5,921	5,886	5,922	5,661
	Std deviation	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2

Table 23: Probit regression: turnover intention

		N	Marginal Percentage
Likelihood of voluntarily quitting job in next 12 months	Very unlikely	2,068	37.8%
	Unlikely	1,358	24.8%
	Neither likely nor unlikely	984	18.0%
	Likely	671	12.3%
	Very likely	390	7.1%
Gender	Male	2,821	51.6%
	Female	2,649	48.4%
Ethnicity white non-white	White	5,148	94.1%
	Non-white	323	5.9%

SOC2020 1-digit code	Managers, directors and senior officials	615	11.2%
	Professional occupations	1,525	27.9%
	Associate professional occupations	955	17.5%
	Administrative and secretarial occupations	715	13.1%
	Skilled trades occupations	335	6.1%
	Caring, leisure and other service occupations	238	4.3%
	Sales and customer service occupations	572	10.5%
	Process, plant and machine operatives	210	3.8%
	Elementary occupations	306	5.6%
Valid		5,471	100.0%
Missing		820	
Total		6,291	

Model fitting information				
Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept only	16,059.516			
Final	15,080.950	978.567	18	0.000

Link function: Probit.

Parameter estimates								
		Estimate	Std error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% confidence interval	
							Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	[quitjobmodel = 1]	-3.056	0.138	492.868	1	0.000	-3.326	-2.786
	[quitjobmodel = 2]	-2.353	0.136	298.313	1	0.000	-2.619	-2.086
	[quitjobmodel = 3]	-1.742	0.135	166.074	1	0.000	-2.007	-1.477
	[quitjobmodel = 4]	-1.072	0.135	63.218	1	0.000	-1.336	-0.808
Location	Age	-0.001	0.012	0.006	1	0.938	-0.024	0.023
	Subjective pay sub-index	-0.224	0.058	15.027	1	0.000	-0.338	-0.111
	Contracts index	-0.940	0.104	81.186	1	0.000	-1.145	-0.736
	Work-life balance index	-0.399	0.088	20.705	1	0.000	-0.571	-0.227
	Job design index	-0.981	0.100	95.528	1	0.000	-1.177	-0.784
	Relationship index	-1.058	0.109	94.531	1	0.000	-1.271	-0.845
	Employee voice index	0.121	0.078	2.415	1	0.120	-0.032	0.273
Health and wellbeing index	-0.552	0.102	29.431	1	0.000	-0.751	-0.352	

Std deviation	44.4	19.5	43.3	12.1	42.0	19.7	40.3	13.4
---------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Table 25: Work location, by gender

Gender		Employer/business premises	Client, supplier or partner premises/site	At home	Other
Male	Mean	46.94	7.15	42.75	3.16
	N	3,249	3,249	3,249	3,249
	Std deviation	44.160	21.769	43.375	14.656
Female	Mean	53.67	4.13	41.00	1.21
	N	3,042	3,042	3,042	3,042
	Std deviation	44.481	16.672	43.256	8.404
Total	Mean	50.19	5.69	41.90	2.22
	N	6,291	6,291	6,291	6,291
	Std deviation	44.439	19.528	43.323	12.084

Table 26: Work location, by age

Age		Employer/business premises	Client, supplier or partner premises/site	At home	Other
18–24	Mean	62.53	5.27	30.49	1.72
	N	183	183	183	183
	Std deviation	42.903	18.647	39.998	9.521
25–34	Mean	49.75	4.37	44.38	1.49
	N	1,396	1,396	1,396	1,396
	Std deviation	43.010	15.984	42.389	9.086
35–44	Mean	47.17	4.50	46.85	1.48
	N	1,473	1,473	1,473	1,473
	Std deviation	43.402	16.507	43.293	9.249
45–54	Mean	48.94	6.59	42.23	2.24
	N	1,590	1,590	1,590	1,590
	Std deviation	45.123	21.634	43.858	12.334
55–64	Mean	54.96	7.18	35.20	2.66
	N	1,198	1,198	1,198	1,198

	Std deviation	45.450	22.639	42.815	13.901
65+	Mean	48.18	6.69	39.34	5.79
	N	451	451	451	451
	Std deviation	46.006	21.698	44.034	20.021
Total	Mean	50.19	5.69	41.90	2.22
	N	6,291	6,291	6,291	6,291
	Std deviation	44.439	19.528	43.323	12.084

Table 27: Work location, by SOC occupation group

SOC2020 1-digit code		Employer/business premises	Client, supplier or partner premises/site	At home	Other
1	Mean	43.4	4.3	51.1	1.2
	N	672	672	672	672
	Std deviation	41.7	13.6	41.9	5.9
2	Mean	32.0	4.1	62.8	1.1
	N	1,708	1,708	1,708	1,708
	Std deviation	39.2	15.0	40.1	6.4
3	Mean	36.2	4.8	57.1	1.8
	N	1,069	1,069	1,069	1,069
	Std deviation	41.1	17.0	41.8	10.2
4	Mean	55.6	1.1	42.7	0.6
	N	818	818	818	818
	Std deviation	43.4	7.7	42.9	5.1
5	Mean	55.5	23.6	17.4	3.5
	N	375	375	375	375
	Std deviation	46.1	39.5	33.5	16.1
6	Mean	70.3	16.4	7.8	5.5
	N	288	288	288	288
	Std deviation	42.6	34.8	22.0	21.3
7	Mean	81.9	1.0	16.0	1.1
	N	660	660	660	660
	Std deviation	36.0	6.5	33.8	8.6
8	Mean	65.0	12.6	5.2	17.2
	N	226	226	226	226

	Std deviation	44.0	29.5	17.0	35.0
9	Mean	90.2	5.2	2.1	2.5
	N	359	359	359	359
	Std deviation	27.0	20.5	10.2	13.5
Total	Mean	50.2	5.7	41.9	2.2
	N	6,174	6,174	6,174	6,174
	Std deviation	44.5	19.6	43.4	12.1

Table 28: Work location, by key worker status

Whether the respondent is a key worker, according to government definition		Employer/business premises	Client, supplier or partner premises/site	At home	Other location
Yes	Mean	66.0	7.4	23.6	3.0
	N	2,406	2,406	2,406	2,406
	Std deviation	42.1	22.8	36.8	14.8
No	Mean	40.1	4.5	53.8	1.6
	N	3,766	3,766	3,766	3,766
	Std deviation	42.9	16.9	43.1	9.6
Don't know	Mean	49.6	7.4	37.3	5.6
	N	119	119	119	119
	Std deviation	43.8	21.4	42.2	18.8
Total	Mean	50.2	5.7	41.9	2.2
	N	6,291	6,291	6,291	6,291
	Std deviation	44.4	19.5	43.3	12.1

Table 29: Flexible working arrangements (row %)

		I have used this arrangement	Available to me but I do not use it	Not available to me	Don't know
Flexitime	2019	33.0%	11.5%	49.1%	3.4%
	2020	32.7%	11.8%	51.6%	3.8%
	2021	34.4%	16.0%	45.2%	4.4%
	2022	36.6%	13.7%	45.9%	3.8%

Job-sharing	2019	2.4%	11.6%	74.0%	8.8%
	2020	2.9%	11.0%	77.5%	8.6%
	2021	2.2%	13.3%	75.1%	9.5%
	2022	1.9%	12.8%	75.6%	9.6%
Reduced working hours	2019	9.6%	30.6%	47.6%	9.1%
	2020	10.8%	29.5%	50.6%	9.1%
	2021	8.8%	31.7%	49.8%	9.6%
	2022	9.8%	31.4%	49.1%	9.7%
Compressed hours	2019	10.2%	19.1%	60.1%	7.6%
	2020	10.0%	17.4%	64.6%	8.1%
	2021	10.7%	22.9%	58.0%	8.3%
	2022	10.6%	19.1%	62.8%	7.5%
Working from home	2019	30.7%	8.5%	55.4%	2.3%
	2020	32.1%	7.6%	57.9%	2.4%
	2021	53.7%	5.4%	38.8%	2.1%
	2022	55.4%	5.0%	38.0%	1.5%
Term-time working	2019	4.1%	11.2%	72.0%	9.6%
	2020	4.4%	12.3%	74.4%	9.0%
	2021	4.4%	15.0%	69.2%	11.4%
	2022	3.9%	12.8%	72.5%	10.8%

Table 30: Informal flexibility, by SOC2020 occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Ease in taking a few hours off work to take care of personal or family matters	Very easy	Count	221	546	336	237	128	32	99	42	32	1,673
		%	33.5%	32.5%	32.1%	29.8%	34.7%	11.6%	15.8%	19.4%	9.5%	27.8%
	Fairly easy	Count	275	654	430	296	114	80	198	60	106	2,213
		%	41.7%	38.9%	41.0%	37.2%	30.9%	28.9%	31.5%	27.8%	31.4%	36.8%
	Neither easy nor difficult	Count	66	195	129	125	61	50	113	31	61	831
		%	10.0%	11.6%	12.3%	15.7%	16.5%	18.1%	18.0%	14.4%	18.0%	13.8%

	Fairly difficult	Count	65	170	92	85	40	41	103	32	59	687
		%	9.8%	10.1%	8.8%	10.7%	10.8%	14.8%	16.4%	14.8%	17.5%	11.4%
	Very difficult	Count	33	116	61	52	26	74	115	51	80	608
		%	5.0%	6.9%	5.8%	6.5%	7.0%	26.7%	18.3%	23.6%	23.7%	10.1%
Total		Count	660	1,681	1,048	795	369	277	628	216	338	6,012
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 31: Work autonomy, by use of work from home (column %)

	Type of autonomy											
	Tasks done in job			Pace of work			How you do your work			Time start and finish the working day		
	Used arrangement	Available, not used	Not available	Used arrangement	Available, not used	Not available	Used arrangement	Available, not used	Not available	Used arrangement	Available, not used	Not available
A lot	27.0%	29.4%	16.5%	40.7%	38.8%	25.3%	52.6%	46.2%	29.9%	38.0%	30.5%	10.4%
Some	41.0%	42.0%	28.1%	38.1%	41.1%	29.2%	33.4%	37.8%	31.9%	33.7%	40.1%	16.6%
A little	22.4%	18.3%	26.6%	15.5%	16.7%	22.2%	11.0%	13.4%	23.4%	16.0%	15.6%	20.2%
None	9.7%	10.3%	28.8%	5.6%	3.4%	23.4%	3.0%	2.7%	14.8%	12.4%	13.7%	52.8%

Table 32: Job affects personal commitments, by year (column %)

					Total
	2019	2020	2021	2022	
Count	255	325	277	337	1,568

Finding it difficult to fulfil commitments outside of work because of job	Strongly agree	%	5.0%	4.9%	4.4%	5.4%	4.8%
	Agree	Count	1,105	1,287	1,050	1,238	6,291
		%	21.5%	19.3%	16.8%	19.8%	19.4%
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	1,095	1,331	1,284	1,332	6,735
		%	21.3%	19.9%	20.5%	21.3%	20.8%
	Disagree	Count	1,904	2,457	2,453	2,312	12,129
		%	37.1%	36.8%	39.2%	36.9%	37.5%
	Strongly disagree	Count	760	1,251	1,169	1,008	5,504
		%	14.8%	18.7%	18.7%	16.1%	17.0%
	Don't know	Count	17	30	24	35	120
%		0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	
Total		Count	5,136	6,681	6,257	6,262	32,347
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 33: Personal commitments affect job, by year (column %)

							Total
			Jan 2019	Jan 2020	Jan 2021	Jan 2022	
Finding it difficult to do job properly because of commitments outside of work	Strongly agree	Count	50	71	78	71	339
		%	1.0%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%
	Agree	Count	290	421	372	389	1,968
		%	5.6%	6.3%	5.9%	6.2%	6.1%
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	714	897	773	865	4,321
		%	13.9%	13.4%	12.4%	13.8%	13.4%
	Disagree	Count	2,709	3,310	3,112	3,194	16,584
		%	52.7%	49.5%	49.7%	51.0%	51.3%
	Strongly disagree	Count	1,352	1,963	1,908	1,716	9,039
		%	26.3%	29.4%	30.5%	27.4%	27.9%
Don't know	Count	21	19	14	27	95	
	%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	
Total		Count	5,136	6,681	6,257	6,262	32,346
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 34: Hard to relax due to work, by year (column %)

			Finding it difficult to relax in personal time because of work				Total	
			Jan 2019	Jan 2020	Jan 2021	Jan 2022		
Finding it difficult to relax in personal time because of work	Strongly agree	Count	237	307	348	358	1,662	
		%	4.6%	4.6%	5.6%	5.7%	5.1%	
	Agree	Count	1,019	1,310	1,265	1,285	6,588	
		%	19.8%	19.6%	20.2%	20.5%	20.4%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	956	1,242	1,139	1,162	5,888	
		%	18.6%	18.6%	18.2%	18.6%	18.2%	
	Disagree	Count	1,962	2,406	2,279	2,239	11,843	
		%	38.2%	36.0%	36.4%	35.8%	36.6%	
	Strongly disagree	Count	947	1,396	1,207	1,194	6,280	
		%	18.4%	20.9%	19.3%	19.1%	19.4%	
	Don't know	Count	15	20	19	24	88	
		%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	
	Total		Count	5,136	6,681	6,257	6,262	32,349
			%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 35: Job affects personal commitments, by level of hybrid working (row %)

			Finding it difficult to fulfil commitments outside of work because of job					Total
			Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
Finding it difficult to fulfil commitments outside of work because of job	No work from home (zero)	Count	139	404	550	907	450	2,450
		%	5.7%	16.5%	22.4%	37.0%	18.4%	100.0%

	Hybrid non-home dominant (1–49)	Count	65	249	221	339	158	1,032
		%	6.3%	24.1%	21.4%	32.8%	15.3%	100.0%
	Hybrid home majority (50–74)	Count	30	107	105	156	68	466
		%	6.4%	23.0%	22.5%	33.5%	14.6%	100.0%
	Hybrid home dominant (75–99)	Count	63	280	277	572	193	1,385
		%	4.5%	20.2%	20.0%	41.3%	13.9%	100.0%
	Home (100)	Count	36	159	186	363	176	920
		%	3.9%	17.3%	20.2%	39.5%	19.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	333	1,199	1,339	2,337	1,045	6,253
		%	5.3%	19.2%	21.4%	37.4%	16.7%	100.0%

Table 36: Personal commitments affect job, by level of hybrid working (row %)

			Finding it difficult to do job properly because of commitments outside of work					Total
			Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
Finding it difficult to do	No work from	Count	26	118	358	1,212	745	2,459

job properly because of commitments outside of work	home (zero)							
		%	1.1%	4.8%	14.6%	49.3%	30.3%	100.0%
	Hybrid non-home dominant (1–49)	Count	17	76	142	534	267	1,036
		%	1.6%	7.3%	13.7%	51.5%	25.8%	100.0%
	Hybrid home majority (50–74)	Count	10	32	64	238	124	468
		%	2.1%	6.8%	13.7%	50.9%	26.5%	100.0%
	Hybrid home dominant (75–99)	Count	11	102	194	763	317	1,387
		%	0.8%	7.4%	14.0%	55.0%	22.9%	100.0%
	Home (100)	Count	11	65	121	464	259	920
		%	1.2%	7.1%	13.2%	50.4%	28.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	75	393	879	3,211	1,712	6,270
		%	1.2%	6.3%	14.0%	51.2%	27.3%	100.0%

Table 37: Difficult to relax by level of hybrid working (row %)

			Finding it difficult to relax in personal time because of work					Total
			Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
Finding it difficult to relax in personal time because of work	No work from home (zero)	Count	109	411	409	955	572	2,456
	Hybrid non-home dominant (1-49)	%	4.4%	16.7%	16.7%	38.9%	23.3%	100.0%
	Hybrid home majority (50-74)	Count	82	243	193	334	185	1,037
	Hybrid home dominant (75-99)	%	7.9%	23.4%	18.6%	32.2%	17.8%	100.0%
	Home (100)	Count	34	96	97	148	91	466
		%	7.3%	20.6%	20.8%	31.8%	19.5%	100.0%
		Count	67	342	258	501	217	1,385
		%	4.8%	24.7%	18.6%	36.2%	15.7%	100.0%
		Count	43	175	160	353	190	921
		%	4.7%	19.0%	17.4%	38.3%	20.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	335	1,267	1,117	2,291	1,255	6,265
		%	5.3%	20.2%	17.8%	36.6%	20.0%	100.0%

Table 38: Level of hybrid working, by SOC2020 occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Homeworking proportion cats	No work from home (zero)	Count	158	277	212	291	249	223	505	185	334	2,434
		%	23.5%	16.2%	19.8%	35.6%	66.6%	77.4%	76.5%	81.9%	93.0%	39.4%
	Hybrid non-home dominant (1-49)	Count	153	286	217	158	59	44	42	30	18	1,007
		%	22.8%	16.8%	20.3%	19.3%	15.8%	15.3%	6.4%	13.3%	5.0%	16.3%
	Hybrid home majority (50-74)	Count	62	170	89	78	18	7	23	5	4	456
		%	9.2%	10.0%	8.3%	9.5%	4.8%	2.4%	3.5%	2.2%	1.1%	7.4%
	Hybrid home dominant (75-99)	Count	198	630	321	153	19	6	37	4	3	1,371
		%	29.5%	36.9%	30.0%	18.7%	5.1%	2.1%	5.6%	1.8%	0.8%	22.2%
	Home (100)	Count	101	344	230	138	29	8	53	2	0	905
		%	15.0%	20.2%	21.5%	16.9%	7.8%	2.8%	8.0%	0.9%	0.0%	14.7%
Total		Count	672	1,707	1,069	818	374	288	660	226	359	6,173
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 39: Good Work Index, by level of hybrid working

Homeworking proportion cats		Subjective pay index	Contract s index	Job design index	Work-life balance index	Relationship s index	Employee voice index	Health and wellbeing index
No work from home (zero)	Mean	0.49	0.86	0.54	0.52	0.68	0.28	0.56
	N	2,457	2,468	2,466	2,468	2,458	2,468	2,349
	Std deviation	0.29	0.15	0.20	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.19

Hybrid non-home dominant (1–49)	Mean	0.55	0.86	0.63	0.53	0.72	0.33	0.58
	N	1,037	1,041	1,040	1,041	1,038	1,041	987
	Std deviation	0.29	0.15	0.19	0.20	0.17	0.20	0.18
Hybrid home majority (50–74)	Mean	0.54	0.85	0.64	0.56	0.74	0.33	0.58
	N	466	470	469	470	465	470	448
	Std deviation	0.29	0.16	0.18	0.20	0.16	0.21	0.18
Hybrid home dominant (75–99)	Mean	0.57	0.89	0.64	0.60	0.74	0.38	0.57
	N	1,386	1,389	1,388	1,389	1,383	1,389	1,334
	Std deviation	0.27	0.13	0.18	0.19	0.15	0.22	0.17
Home (100)	Mean	0.54	0.85	0.61	0.67	0.74	0.27	0.58
	N	919	923	921	923	902	923	881
	Std deviation	0.29	0.16	0.19	0.20	0.17	0.23	0.18
Total	Mean	0.53	0.86	0.59	0.56	0.71	0.31	0.57
	N	6,265	6,291	6,285	6,291	6,246	6,291	5,999
	Std deviation	0.29	0.15	0.20	0.20	0.17	0.21	0.18

Table 40: Work–life balance index, by level of hybrid working

Homeworking proportion cats		Balance sub-index	HR practice sub-index	Hours sub-index	Work–life balance index
No work from home (zero)	Mean	0.67	0.35	0.53	0.52
	N	2,439	2,455	2,468	2,468
	Std deviation	0.21	0.25	0.35	0.19
Hybrid non-home dominant (1–49)	Mean	0.62	0.55	0.42	0.53
	N	1,027	1,034	1,041	1,041
	Std deviation	0.22	0.26	0.35	0.20

Hybrid home majority (50–74)	Mean	0.63	0.63	0.43	0.56
	N	466	468	470	470
	Std deviation	0.23	0.24	0.36	0.20
Hybrid home dominant (75–99)	Mean	0.64	0.68	0.48	0.60
	N	1,379	1,387	1,389	1,389
	Std deviation	0.20	0.21	0.36	0.19
Home (100)	Mean	0.67	0.72	0.63	0.67
	N	917	914	923	923
	Std deviation	0.21	0.24	0.37	0.20
Total	Mean	0.65	0.53	0.51	0.56
	N	6,227	6,259	6,291	6,291
	Std deviation	0.21	0.29	0.36	0.20

Table 41: Relationships index, by level of hybrid working

Homeworking proportion cats		Relationships sub-index	Psychological safety sub-index	Line management sub-index	Relationships index
No work from home (zero)	Mean	0.7566	0.6341	0.6202	0.6776
	N	2,455	2,249	2,203	2,458
	Std deviation	0.16497	0.22976	0.23504	0.18219
Hybrid non-home dominant (1–49)	Mean	0.7869	0.6691	0.6788	0.7241
	N	1,037	909	898	1,038
	Std deviation	0.14680	0.22007	0.21909	0.16714
Hybrid home majority (50–74)	Mean	0.7831	0.6910	0.7126	0.7411
	N	465	395	383	465
	Std deviation	0.15014	0.21373	0.18563	0.15821
Hybrid home dominant (75–99)	Mean	0.7768	0.7238	0.7206	0.7438
	N	1,379	1,247	1,225	1,383
	Std deviation	0.13517	0.19781	0.20240	0.14822
Home (100)	Mean	0.7687	0.7099	0.6884	0.7421
	N	899	648	634	902
	Std deviation	0.16287	0.21675	0.21537	0.17403
Total	Mean	0.7698	0.6736	0.6678	0.7140
	N	6,236	5,448	5,343	6,246
	Std deviation	0.15483	0.22158	0.22353	0.17232

Table 42: OLS regression: subjective pay index and hybrid working

Model summary				
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate
1	.168a	0.028	0.026	0.28342

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.101	16	0.881	10.972	.000b
	Residual	487.488	6069	0.080		
	Total	501.590	6085			

a. Dependent variable: Subjective pay index

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.468	0.029		16.288	0.000
	SOC2020 – manager dummy	0.031	0.020	0.033	1.562	0.118
	SOC2020 – professional dummy	-0.020	0.018	-0.032	-1.125	0.261
	SOC2020 – associate professional dummy	-0.022	0.019	-0.029	-1.180	0.238

SOC2020 – administrative dummy	-0.005	0.019	-0.006	-0.250	0.803
SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy	-0.012	0.022	-0.010	-0.559	0.576
SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy	-0.078	0.023	-0.057	-3.431	0.001
SOC2020 – sales dummy	-0.033	0.019	-0.036	-1.750	0.080
SOC2020 – PPM dummy	-0.050	0.024	-0.033	-2.048	0.041
Ethnicity white non-white	0.025	0.015	0.021	1.668	0.095
Age	0.014	0.003	0.062	4.714	0.000
Gender	-0.025	0.008	-0.044	-3.241	0.001
Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework	0.051	0.012	0.066	4.434	0.000
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority	0.047	0.015	0.043	3.030	0.002
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant	0.079	0.011	0.114	6.989	0.000
Homeworking proportions – homework only	0.047	0.013	0.057	3.715	0.000
Employment status	0.003	0.006	0.006	0.473	0.636

a. Dependent variable: subjective pay index

Table 43: OLS regression: contracts index and hybrid working

Model summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate
1	.277a	0.077	0.074	0.14179

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	10.199	16	0.637	31.706	.000b
	Residual	122.462	6,091	0.020		
	Total	132.661	6,107			

a. Dependent variable: contracts index

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.921	0.014		64.080	0.000
	SOC2020 – manager dummy	0.051	0.010	0.109	5.206	0.000
	SOC2020 – professional dummy	0.049	0.009	0.149	5.469	0.000
	SOC2020 – associate professional dummy	0.050	0.009	0.129	5.388	0.000
	SOC2020 – administrative dummy	0.052	0.009	0.120	5.519	0.000

SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy	0.045	0.011	0.073	4.216	0.000
SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy	0.007	0.011	0.010	0.591	0.555
SOC2020 – sales dummy	0.032	0.009	0.066	3.343	0.001
SOC2020 – PPM dummy	0.033	0.012	0.042	2.682	0.007
Ethnicity white non-white	-0.046	0.008	-0.076	-6.122	0.000
Age	0.005	0.001	0.045	3.540	0.000
Gender	0.000	0.004	-0.002	-0.122	0.903
Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework	0.002	0.006	0.006	0.431	0.666
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority	-0.012	0.008	-0.021	-1.510	0.131
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant	0.021	0.006	0.059	3.723	0.000
Homeworking proportions – homework only	-0.002	0.006	-0.004	-0.298	0.766
Employment status	-0.059	0.003	-0.237	-18.305	0.000

a. Dependent variable: contracts index

Table 44: OLS regression: job design index and hybrid working

Model summary				
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate

1	.291a	0.084	0.082	0.18816
---	-------	-------	-------	---------

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	19.870	16	1.242	35.076	.000b
	Residual	215.493	6,087	0.035		
	Total	235.363	6,103			

a. Dependent variable: job design index

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.419	0.019		21.977	0.000
	SOC2020 – manager dummy	0.105	0.013	0.166	8.008	0.000
	SOC2020 – professional dummy	0.110	0.012	0.250	9.204	0.000
	SOC2020 – associate professional dummy	0.085	0.012	0.164	6.874	0.000
	SOC2020 – administrative dummy	0.056	0.013	0.098	4.498	0.000
	SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy	0.062	0.014	0.076	4.387	0.000

SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy	0.085	0.015	0.091	5.605	0.000
SOC2020 – sales dummy	0.013	0.013	0.021	1.054	0.292
SOC2020 – PPM dummy	0.012	0.016	0.011	0.725	0.468
Ethnicity white non-white	0.011	0.010	0.014	1.093	0.274
Age	0.008	0.002	0.054	4.216	0.000
Gender	0.001	0.005	0.003	0.199	0.842
Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework	0.055	0.008	0.103	7.114	0.000
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority	0.060	0.010	0.081	5.928	0.000
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant	0.054	0.007	0.114	7.203	0.000
Homeworking proportions – homework only	0.024	0.008	0.043	2.883	0.004
Employment status	0.026	0.004	0.079	6.124	0.000

a. Dependent variable: job design index

Table 45: OLS regression: work–life balance index and hybrid working

Model summary				
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate
1	.346a	0.120	0.118	0.18967

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white

non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	29.876	16	1.867	51.902	.000b
	Residual	219.141	6,091	0.036		
	Total	249.017	6,107			

a. Dependent variable: work–life balance index

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.412	0.019		21.415	0.000
	SOC2020 – manager dummy	-0.058	0.013	-0.089	-4.392	0.000
	SOC2020 – professional dummy	-0.052	0.012	-0.114	-4.284	0.000
	SOC2020 – associate professional dummy	-0.033	0.012	-0.062	-2.670	0.008
	SOC2020 – administrative dummy	-0.003	0.013	-0.006	-0.275	0.783
	SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy	-0.005	0.014	-0.006	-0.369	0.712
	SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy	-0.029	0.015	-0.030	-1.902	0.057
	SOC2020 – sales dummy	-0.003	0.013	-0.005	-0.261	0.794

SOC2020 – PPM dummy	-0.056	0.016	-0.052	-3.434	0.001
Ethnicity white non-white	0.000	0.010	0.000	-0.014	0.989
Age	0.019	0.002	0.119	9.517	0.000
Gender	0.003	0.005	0.007	0.533	0.594
Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework	0.029	0.008	0.053	3.731	0.000
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority	0.055	0.010	0.072	5.377	0.000
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant	0.102	0.008	0.210	13.593	0.000
Homeworking proportions – homework only	0.149	0.008	0.260	17.708	0.000
Employment status	0.050	0.004	0.147	11.617	0.000

a. Dependent variable: work–life balance index

Table 46: OLS regression: relationships index and hybrid working

Model summary				
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate
1	.274a	0.075	0.073	0.16571

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

ANOVA ^a

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13.483	16	0.843	30.687	.000b
	Residual	166.219	6,053	0.027		
	Total	179.701	6,069			

a. Dependent variable: relationship index

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.562	0.017		33.373	0.000
	SOC2020 – manager dummy	0.067	0.012	0.121	5.793	0.000
	SOC2020 – professional dummy	0.064	0.011	0.167	6.087	0.000
	SOC2020 – associate professional dummy	0.058	0.011	0.128	5.343	0.000
	SOC2020 – administrative dummy	0.051	0.011	0.101	4.628	0.000
	SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy	0.047	0.013	0.065	3.749	0.000
	SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy	0.064	0.013	0.078	4.811	0.000
	SOC2020 – sales dummy	0.022	0.011	0.040	2.002	0.045
	SOC2020 – PPM dummy	0.004	0.014	0.004	0.253	0.800
	Ethnicity white non-white	-0.034	0.009	-0.048	-3.879	0.000
	Age	0.010	0.002	0.078	6.088	0.000

Gender	0.017	0.005	0.048	3.648	0.000
Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework	0.031	0.007	0.067	4.625	0.000
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority	0.041	0.009	0.063	4.561	0.000
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant	0.047	0.007	0.113	7.089	0.000
Homeworking proportions – homework only	0.027	0.007	0.055	3.626	0.000
Employment status	0.046	0.004	0.155	11.986	0.000

a. Dependent variable: relationship index

Table 47: OLS regression: employee voice index and hybrid working

Model summary				
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate
1	.479a	0.230	0.228	0.18583

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	62.800	16	3.925	113.657	.000b
	Residual	210.355	6,091	0.035		
	Total	273.155	6,107			

a. Dependent variable: employee voice index

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.410	0.019		21.749	0.000
	SOC2020 – manager dummy	0.053	0.013	0.078	4.116	0.000
	SOC2020 – professional dummy	0.049	0.012	0.104	4.185	0.000
	SOC2020 – associate professional dummy	0.048	0.012	0.086	3.951	0.000
	SOC2020 – administrative dummy	0.044	0.012	0.070	3.532	0.000
	SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy	0.036	0.014	0.040	2.545	0.011
	SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy	0.043	0.015	0.043	2.895	0.004
	SOC2020 – sales dummy	0.031	0.012	0.045	2.494	0.013
	SOC2020 – PPM dummy	0.017	0.016	0.015	1.048	0.295
	Ethnicity white non-white	0.005	0.010	0.006	0.554	0.580
	Age	0.005	0.002	0.030	2.576	0.010
	Gender	-0.007	0.005	-0.017	-1.393	0.164
	Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework	0.054	0.008	0.095	7.172	0.000

Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority	0.061	0.010	0.076	6.117	0.000
Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant	0.092	0.007	0.180	12.428	0.000
Homeworking proportions – homework only	0.043	0.008	0.072	5.254	0.000
Employment status	-0.160	0.004	-0.450	-38.086	0.000

a. Dependent variable: employee voice index

Table 48: OLS regression: health and wellbeing index and hybrid working

Model summary				
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate
1	.217a	0.047	0.044	0.17946

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9.229	16	0.577	17.910	.000b
	Residual	187.352	5,817	0.032		
	Total	196.581	5,833			

a. Dependent variable: health and wellbeing index

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employment status, Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, SOC2020 – PPM dummy, Ethnicity white non-white, SOC2020 – manager dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority, Age, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, Homeworking proportions – homework only, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.434	0.019		23.177	0.000
	SOC2020 – manager dummy	0.033	0.013	0.057	2.595	0.009
	SOC2020 – professional dummy	0.021	0.012	0.052	1.813	0.070
	SOC2020 – associate professional dummy	0.032	0.012	0.066	2.631	0.009
	SOC2020 – administrative dummy	0.036	0.012	0.067	2.930	0.003
	SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy	0.030	0.014	0.039	2.126	0.034
	SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy	0.026	0.015	0.030	1.780	0.075
	SOC2020 – sales dummy	0.010	0.012	0.016	0.781	0.435
	SOC2020 – PPM dummy	0.021	0.016	0.022	1.334	0.182
	Ethnicity white non-white	0.044	0.010	0.057	4.451	0.000
	Age	0.022	0.002	0.157	11.830	0.000
	Gender	-0.029	0.005	-0.079	-5.797	0.000
	Homeworking proportions – hybrid low homework	0.019	0.007	0.039	2.603	0.009
	Homeworking proportions – hybrid home majority	0.014	0.010	0.020	1.409	0.159

	Homeworking proportions – hybrid home dominant	0.002	0.007	0.003	0.209	0.835
	Homeworking proportions – homework only	0.000	0.008	0.000	0.030	0.976
	Employment status	0.020	0.004	0.065	4.828	0.000

a. Dependent variable: health and wellbeing index

3 Career progression and social mobility

Table 49: Main earner in household at age 14

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Valid	Mother/female guardian	971	15.4	15.4	15.4
	Father/male guardian	4,544	72.2	72.2	87.7
	Other family member	39	0.6	0.6	88.3
	Joint main earners	558	8.9	8.9	97.2
	No one was earning	124	2.0	2.0	99.1
	Don't know	54	0.9	0.9	100.0
	Total	6,291	100.0	100.0	

Table 50: Respondent's SOC2020 major occupation group, by parents' occupation at age 14 (column %)

	SOCMO SOC2020 1-digit code – parents' occupation at age 14	
--	--	--

		Managers, directors and senior officials	Professionals	Associate professional occupations	Administrative and secretarial	Skill ed trades	Caring , leisure , and other service occupations	Sales and customer service occupations	Process, plant and machine operatives	Elementary occupations	Total	
SOC 2020 1-digit code	1	Co unt	133	158	62	49	115	12	29	50	30	638
		%	18.1 %	11.4%	11.1%	10.7%	9.5 %	8.5%	9.0%	9.7%	6.8%	11.1 %
	2	Co unt	220	525	153	126	285	31	77	102	89	1,608
		%	30.0 %	37.8%	27.4%	27.5%	23.5 %	22.0%	23.8%	19.7 %	20.3%	27.9 %
	3	Co unt	141	275	109	75	180	26	67	70	61	1,004
		%	19.2 %	19.8%	19.5%	16.4%	14.8 %	18.4%	20.7%	13.5 %	13.9%	17.4 %
	4	Co unt	81	140	70	79	184	17	42	79	66	758
		%	11.1 %	10.1%	12.5%	17.2%	15.2 %	12.1%	13.0%	15.3 %	15.1%	13.1 %
	5	Co unt	27	63	37	12	106	6	18	39	24	332
		%	3.7%	4.5%	6.6%	2.6%	8.7 %	4.3%	5.6%	7.5%	5.5%	5.8 %
	6	Co unt	34	51	27	19	74	13	15	20	17	270
		%	4.6%	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	6.1 %	9.2%	4.6%	3.9%	3.9%	4.7 %
	7	Co unt	43	89	66	61	150	21	48	79	56	613
		%	5.9%	6.4%	11.8%	13.3%	12.4 %	14.9%	14.9%	15.3 %	12.8%	10.6 %
	8	Co unt	25	24	17	19	49	8	10	39	25	216
		%	3.4%	1.7%	3.0%	4.1%	4.0 %	5.7%	3.1%	7.5%	5.7%	3.7 %
	9	Co unt	29	65	17	18	70	7	17	40	70	333
		%	4.0%	4.7%	3.0%	3.9%	5.8 %	5.0%	5.3%	7.7%	16.0%	5.8 %
Total	Co unt	733	1,390	558	458	1,213	141	323	518	438	5,772	
	%	100.0 %	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	

Table 51: Key worker status, by parents' occupation at age 14 (column %)

	SOCMO SOC2020 1-digit code – parents' occupation at age 14	
--	--	--

			Managers, directors and senior officials	Professionals	Associate professional occupations	Administrative and secretarial	Skilled trades	Caring, leisure, and other service occupations	Sales and customer service occupations	Process, plant and machine operatives	Elementary occupations	Total
Whether the respondent is a key worker, according to government definition	Yes	Count	274	448	218	195	499	57	114	231	208	2,244
		%	36.4%	31.6%	38.4%	42.1%	40.7%	39.3%	35.4%	44.3%	46.7%	38.3%
	No	Count	466	938	339	265	709	85	202	286	225	3,515
		%	62.0%	66.1%	59.7%	57.2%	57.8%	58.6%	62.7%	54.8%	50.6%	60.0%
	Don't know	Count	12	32	11	3	19	3	6	5	12	103
%		1.6%	2.3%	1.9%	0.6%	1.5%	2.1%	1.9%	1.0%	2.7%	1.8%	
Total		Count	752	1,418	568	463	1,227	145	322	522	445	5,862
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 52: Career expectation, by parents' occupation at age 14 (column %)

			SOCMO SOC2020 1-digit code – parents' occupation at age 14									Total
			Managers and senior officials	Professionals	Associate professional and technical	Administrative and secretarial	Skilled trades	Caring, leisure, and other services	Sales and customer services	Process, plant, machine operatives	Elementary	
To what extent has your career progression met your expectations to date?	Failed to meet my expectations	Count	150	310	128	108	307	26	72	103	95	1,299
		%	20.9%	23.3%	24.0%	24.5%	26.7%	19.3%	23.1%	21.1%	22.4%	23.5%
	Met my expectations	Count	351	632	226	175	468	43	127	205	170	2,397
		%	48.9%	47.5%	42.4%	39.8%	40.7%	31.9%	40.7%	41.9%	40.1%	43.3%
	Exceeded my expectations	Count	82	144	54	46	99	19	29	31	42	546
		%	11.4%	10.8%	10.1%	10.5%	8.6%	14.1%	9.3%	6.3%	9.9%	9.9%

	Not applicable – I do not have any career expectations	Co unt	135	244	125	111	276	47	84	150	117	1,289
		%	18.8%	18.3%	23.5%	25.2%	24.0%	34.8%	26.9%	30.7%	27.6%	23.3%
Total		Co unt	718	1,330	533	440	1,150	135	312	489	424	5,531
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 53: Workplace factors that have helped career progression to date

What workplace factors, if any, have helped your career progression to date?	%
Access to training and development programmes	27.8
Coaching and mentoring	14.8
Good-quality line managers	35.8
Relationships and networks	29.9
The option to work flexibly	21.1
Opportunities to develop new skills	36.3
The organisation I work/worked for encourages progression and promotion from within	30.5
None of the above	14.6

Table 54: Workplace factors that have acted as a barrier to career progression to date

What workplace factors, if any, have been a barrier to your career progression to date?	%
Lack of training and development programmes	30.9
Lack of coaching and mentoring	22.2
Poor-quality line management	36.0
Lack of clear objectives in my work	17.7
Lack of flexible working opportunities	10.0
Experienced discrimination	13.8
Lack of opportunities to develop new skills	32.6
Lack of clear career pathways	43.8
Other	11.0
No barriers to my career progression to date	4.4

Table 55: Career prospects, by parents' occupation at age 14 (column %)

	SOC2020 1-digit code – parents' occupation at age 14	
--	--	--

			Managers, directors and senior officials	Professionals	Associate professional occupations	Administrative and secretarial	Skilled trades	Caring, leisure, and other service occupations	Sales and customer service occupations	Process, plant and machine operatives	Elementary occupations	Total
Good prospects for career advancement in job	Strongly agree	Co unt	70	124	49	39	75	6	29	30	23	445
		%	9.4%	8.8%	8.7%	8.5%	6.2%	4.2%	9.1%	5.8%	5.3%	7.7%
	Agree	Co unt	234	453	187	117	289	41	90	150	109	1,670
		%	31.4%	32.3%	33.1%	25.4%	24.0%	28.9%	28.2%	29.2%	25.1%	28.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	Co unt	220	370	145	147	372	47	77	141	128	1,647
		%	29.5%	26.4%	25.7%	32.0%	30.8%	33.1%	24.1%	27.5%	29.5%	28.5%
	Disagree	Co unt	142	294	119	99	272	28	76	124	89	1,243
		%	19.1%	21.0%	21.1%	21.5%	22.6%	19.7%	23.8%	24.2%	20.5%	21.5%
Strongly disagree	Co unt	79	162	65	58	198	20	47	68	85	782	
	%	10.6%	11.5%	11.5%	12.6%	16.4%	14.1%	14.7%	13.3%	19.6%	13.5%	
Total		Co unt	745	1,403	565	460	1,206	142	319	513	434	5,787
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 56: Opportunity to develop skills in job, by parents' occupation at age 14 (column %)

			SOCMO SOC2020 1-digit code – parents' occupation at age 14									Total
			Managers and senior officials	Professionals	Associate professional and technical	Administrative and secretarial	Skilled trades	Caring, leisure, and other services	Sales and customer services	Process, plant, machine operatives	Elementary	
Opportunity to develop skills in job	Strongly agree	Co unt	96	200	69	58	126	15	35	50	36	685
		%	12.8%	14.1%	12.2%	12.6%	10.3%	10.4%	11.0%	9.7%	8.3%	11.8%
	Agree	Co unt	344	646	263	184	430	58	126	215	166	2,432

		%	46.0%	45.7%	46.4%	39.9%	35.3%	40.3%	39.6%	41.5%	38.2%	41.8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	Co unt	167	297	124	119	347	42	71	124	104	1,395
		%	22.3%	21.0%	21.9%	25.8%	28.5%	29.2%	22.3%	23.9%	24.0%	24.0%
	Disagree	Co unt	90	186	70	66	201	18	59	96	75	861
		%	12.0%	13.2%	12.3%	14.3%	16.5%	12.5%	18.6%	18.5%	17.3%	14.8%
	Strongly disagree	Co unt	51	85	41	34	115	11	27	33	53	450
		%	6.8%	6.0%	7.2%	7.4%	9.4%	7.6%	8.5%	6.4%	12.2%	7.7%
Total		Co unt	748	1,414	567	461	1,219	144	318	518	434	5,823
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 57: A job is a way of earning money, by parents' occupation at age 14 (column %)

			SOCMO SOC2020 1-digit code – parents' occupation at age 14									Total
			Managers and senior officials	Professionals	Associate professional and technical	Administrative and secretarial	Skilled trades	Caring, leisure, and other services	Sales and customer services	Process, plant, machine operatives	Elementary	
A job is a way of earning money – no more	Strongly agree	Co unt	79	165	70	55	211	18	31	73	68	770
		%	10.5%	11.6%	12.3%	11.9%	17.2%	12.6%	9.6%	14.0%	15.3%	13.1%
	Agree	Co unt	199	352	155	146	316	59	91	151	149	1,618
		%	26.4%	24.8%	27.3%	31.5%	25.8%	41.3%	28.2%	28.9%	33.6%	27.6%
	Neither agree nor disagree	Co unt	148	296	129	95	246	32	79	120	86	1,231
		%	19.7%	20.9%	22.7%	20.5%	20.0%	22.4%	24.5%	23.0%	19.4%	21.0%
	Disagree	Co unt	251	465	181	134	356	27	95	143	105	1,757
		%	33.3%	32.8%	31.9%	28.9%	29.0%	18.9%	29.4%	27.4%	23.7%	30.0%
	Strongly disagree	Co unt	75	138	32	34	95	7	27	33	33	474
		%	10.0%	9.7%	5.6%	7.3%	7.7%	4.9%	8.4%	6.3%	7.4%	8.1%

Table 59: Good Work Index, by parents' occupation at age 14

SOC2020 1-digit code – parents' occupation at age 14		Subjective pay index	Contracts index	Job design index	Work-life balance index	Relationship index	Employee voice index	Health and wellbeing index
Managers, directors and senior officials	Mean	0.55	0.86	0.62	0.58	0.74	0.33	0.58
	N	751	752	752	752	749	752	718
	Std deviation	0.28	0.15	0.19	0.20	0.16	0.22	0.18
Professionals	Mean	0.54	0.87	0.61	0.57	0.73	0.32	0.56
	N	1,411	1,418	1,417	1,418	1,409	1,418	1,346
	Std deviation	0.29	0.15	0.19	0.20	0.16	0.22	0.18
Associate professional occupations	Mean	0.54	0.88	0.60	0.56	0.73	0.33	0.57
	N	564	568	568	568	563	568	548
	Std deviation	0.29	0.13	0.19	0.20	0.16	0.21	0.19
Administrative and secretarial occupations	Mean	0.55	0.87	0.59	0.57	0.72	0.32	0.57
	N	463	464	464	464	462	464	446
	Std deviation	0.28	0.15	0.20	0.19	0.17	0.21	0.18
Skilled trades	Mean	0.52	0.86	0.58	0.55	0.70	0.30	0.58
	N	1,224	1,227	1,227	1,227	1,220	1,227	1,181
	Std deviation	0.29	0.15	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.21	0.18
Caring, leisure, and other service occupations	Mean	0.46	0.88	0.57	0.56	0.70	0.30	0.55
	N	144	144	144	144	143	144	140
	Std deviation	0.31	0.12	0.19	0.19	0.16	0.19	0.19
Sales and customer service occupations	Mean	0.51	0.86	0.59	0.56	0.72	0.32	0.56
	N	322	322	322	322	320	322	307
	Std deviation	0.29	0.15	0.19	0.21	0.15	0.21	0.19
Process, plant and machine operatives	Mean	0.54	0.87	0.59	0.56	0.70	0.31	0.58
	N	521	522	521	522	518	522	499
	Std deviation	0.28	0.15	0.19	0.19	0.18	0.21	0.18
Elementary occupations	Mean	0.51	0.86	0.57	0.57	0.68	0.31	0.57
	N	442	444	444	444	441	444	419

	Std deviation	0.28	0.16	0.20	0.20	0.17	0.20	0.19
Total	Mean	0.53	0.87	0.60	0.56	0.72	0.32	0.57
	N	5,842	5,861	5,859	5,861	5,826	5,861	5,605
	Std deviation	0.29	0.15	0.19	0.20	0.17	0.21	0.18

Table 60: Job design index, by parents' occupation at age 14

SOC2020 1-digit code – parents' occupation at age 14		Skills sub-index	Development sub-index	Job demands resources sub-index	Purpose sub-index	Job design index
Managers, directors and senior officials	Mean	0.63	0.57	0.67	0.63	0.62
	N	726	743	752	727	752
	Std deviation	0.39	0.25	0.23	0.22	0.19
Professionals	Mean	0.61	0.57	0.65	0.62	0.61
	N	1,369	1,402	1,414	1,384	1,417
	Std deviation	0.40	0.26	0.22	0.23	0.19
Associate professional occupations	Mean	0.58	0.56	0.66	0.62	0.60
	N	538	563	568	554	568
	Std deviation	0.41	0.26	0.23	0.23	0.19
Administrative and secretarial occupations	Mean	0.60	0.54	0.65	0.60	0.59
	N	439	460	464	449	464
	Std deviation	0.41	0.26	0.22	0.24	0.20
Skilled trades	Mean	0.59	0.50	0.64	0.60	0.58
	N	1,176	1,204	1,225	1,177	1,227
	Std deviation	0.42	0.26	0.23	0.23	0.20
Caring, leisure, and other service occupations	Mean	0.56	0.53	0.63	0.56	0.57
	N	140	142	142	142	144
	Std deviation	0.40	0.24	0.23	0.25	0.19
Sales and customer service occupations	Mean	0.61	0.52	0.63	0.61	0.59
	N	307	317	322	316	322
	Std deviation	0.41	0.27	0.21	0.22	0.19
Process, plant and machine operatives	Mean	0.60	0.52	0.64	0.60	0.59
	N	503	512	521	500	521
	Std deviation	0.42	0.25	0.22	0.22	0.19
Elementary occupations	Mean	0.57	0.49	0.63	0.59	0.57
	N	425	430	444	428	444

	Std deviation	0.41	0.27	0.22	0.24	0.20
Total	Mean	0.60	0.54	0.65	0.61	0.60
	N	5,623	5,774	5,850	5,677	5,859
	Std deviation	0.41	0.26	0.22	0.23	0.19

5 Relationships at work and the quality of management

Table 61: Quality of relationships at work (column %)

	Line manager or supervisors	Other managers at workplace	Colleagues in team	Other colleagues	Staff managed	Customers, clients or service users	Suppliers
Very good	38.0%	21.0%	39.7%	24.1%	37.1%	31.4%	24.3%
Good	41.4%	53.1%	48.5%	56.9%	52.1%	51.7%	52.6%
Neither good nor poor	13.7%	18.6%	9.5%	15.8%	9.1%	14.9%	20.5%
Poor	4.4%	5.2%	1.7%	2.4%	1.3%	1.5%	1.8%
Very poor	2.6%	2.1%	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%	0.5%	0.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n	6,291	6,291	6,291	6,291	6,291	6,291	6,291

Table 62: Mistakes held against employee by manager or supervisor, by SOC2020 major occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
If I make a mistake, my manager or supervisor will hold it against me	Strongly agree	Count	22	51	38	27	16	9	27	14	10	214
		%	4.3%	3.2%	4.1%	3.9%	7.3%	4.4%	7.0%	7.6%	4.3%	4.3%
	Agree	Count	72	178	108	87	28	19	62	31	51	636
		%	14.1%	11.1%	11.6%	12.6%	12.8%	9.3%	16.1%	16.8%	21.9%	12.8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	90	287	145	124	50	52	62	39	64	913
		%	17.6%	17.9%	15.6%	17.9%	22.8%	25.4%	16.1%	21.1%	27.5%	18.4%
	Disagree	Count	207	686	405	263	79	70	15.6%	64	77	2,007

		%	40.6%	42.8%	43.6%	38.0%	36.1%	34.1%	40.6%	34.6%	33.0%	40.5%
	Strongly disagree	Count	119	400	232	192	46	55	77%	37	31	1,189
		%	23.3%	25.0%	25.0%	27.7%	21.0%	26.8%	20.1%	20.0%	13.3%	24.0%
Total		Count	510	1,602	928	693	219	205	38.4%	185	233	4,959
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 63: People in team sometimes reject others for being different, by SOC2020 major occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
People in team sometimes reject others for being different	Strongly agree	Count	26	47	26	13	12	8	18	10	18	178
		%	4.5%	2.9%	2.7%	1.8%	5.2%	3.9%	4.5%	5.4%	7.8%	3.5%
	Agree	Count	77	195	136	108	42	36	89	38	59	780
		%	13.4%	11.9%	14.2%	15.2%	18.3%	17.5%	22.2%	20.7%	25.4%	15.2%
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	79	215	148	108	52	45	58	37	41	783
		%	13.8%	13.1%	15.4%	15.2%	22.6%	21.8%	14.5%	20.1%	17.7%	15.2%
	Disagree	Count	185	564	316	227	70	54	134	51	63	1,664
		%	32.2%	34.4%	32.9%	32.0%	30.4%	26.2%	33.4%	27.7%	27.2%	32.4%
	Strongly disagree	Count	207	620	334	253	54	63	102	48	51	1,732
		%	36.1%	37.8%	34.8%	35.7%	23.5%	30.6%	25.4%	26.1%	22.0%	33.7%
Total		Count	574	1,641	960	709	230	206	401	184	232	5,137
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 64: No one in team would deliberately act in a way that undermines efforts, by SOC2020 occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
No one in team		Count	149	435	263	176	44	47	72	38	34	1,258

would deliberately act in a way that undermines efforts	Strongly agree	%	25.8%	26.2%	27.3%	24.5%	18.8%	23.3%	18.0%	20.0%	14.4%	24.3%
	Agree	Count	275	750	403	316	101	85	183	74	94	2,281
		%	47.7%	45.1%	41.8%	43.9%	43.2%	42.1%	45.9%	38.9%	39.8%	44.0%
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	75	241	163	118	54	35	60	41	47	834
		%	13.0%	14.5%	16.9%	16.4%	23.1%	17.3%	15.0%	21.6%	19.9%	16.1%
	Disagree	Count	52	174	97	78	24	30	59	24	45	583
		%	9.0%	10.5%	10.1%	10.8%	10.3%	14.9%	14.8%	12.6%	19.1%	11.2%
	Strongly disagree	Count	26	63	38	31	11	5	25	13	16	228
		%	4.5%	3.8%	3.9%	4.3%	4.7%	2.5%	6.3%	6.8%	6.8%	4.4%
	Total	Count	577	1,663	964	719	234	202	399	190	236	5,184
%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 65: Incidence of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by gender (column %)

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
In the last 12 months, have you personally experienced discriminatory behaviour because of a protected characteristic (ie my gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, or age) at work?	Yes	Count	185	270	455
		%	6.0%	9.2%	7.5%
	No	Count	2,921	2,659	5,580
		%	94.0%	90.8%	92.5%
Total	Count	3,106	2,929	6,035	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 66: Resolution of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by gender (column %)

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Do you feel that the behaviour you have experienced in the last 12 months has been resolved?	Yes, fully resolved	Count	24	32	56
		%	13.6%	13.5%	13.6%
	Partly resolved	Count	37	70	107
		%	21.0%	29.5%	25.9%

Table 69: Incidence of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by sexuality (column %)

			Sexuality					Total
			Heterosexual	Gay or lesbian	Bisexual	Other	Prefer not to say	
In the last 12 months, have you personally experienced discriminatory behaviour because of a protected characteristic (ie my gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, or age) at work?	Yes	Count	341	35	47	16	16	455
		%	6.6%	9.3%	17.5%	21.9%	10.3%	7.6%
	No	Count	4,801	341	222	57	139	5,560
		%	93.4%	90.7%	82.5%	78.1%	89.7%	92.4%
Total		Count	5,142	376	269	73	155	6,015
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 70: Resolution of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by sexuality (column %)

			Sexuality					Total
			Heterosexual	Gay or lesbian	Bisexual	Other	Prefer not to say	
Do you feel that the behaviour you have experienced in the last 12 months has been resolved?	Yes, fully resolved	Count	39	5	11	0	1	56
		%	12.5%	16.7%	25.6%	0.0%	7.7%	13.6%
	Partly resolved	Count	85	3	8	4	6	106
		%	27.3%	10.0%	18.6%	25.0%	46.2%	25.7%
	No, not resolved	Count	187	22	24	12	6	251
		%	60.1%	73.3%	55.8%	75.0%	46.2%	60.8%
Total		Count	311	30	43	16	13	413
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 71: Incidence of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by disability (column %)

			Disability			Total
			Yes, limited a lot	Yes, limited a little	No	
In the last 12 months, have you personally experienced discriminatory behaviour because of a protected characteristic (ie my gender,	Yes	Count	53	107	292	452
		%	24.4%	14.0%	5.8%	7.5%
	No	Count	164	660	4,730	5,554
		%	75.6%	86.0%	94.2%	92.5%

race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, or age) at work?						
Total	Count	217	767	5,022	6,006	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 72: Resolution of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by disability (column %)

			Disability			Total
			Yes, limited a lot	Yes, limited a little	No	
Do you feel that the behaviour you have experienced in the last 12 months has been resolved?	Yes, fully resolved	Count	9	12	35	56
		%	17.3%	11.8%	13.6%	13.6%
	Partly resolved	Count	11	19	76	106
		%	21.2%	18.6%	29.6%	25.8%
	No, not resolved	Count	32	71	146	249
		%	61.5%	69.6%	56.8%	60.6%
Total	Count	52	102	257	411	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 73: Incidence of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by ethnicity (column %)

			Ethnicity white non-white		Total
			White	Non-white	
In the last 12 months, have you personally experienced discriminatory behaviour because of a protected characteristic (ie my gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, or age) at work?	Yes	Count	399	44	443
		%	7.1%	11.9%	7.4%
	No	Count	5,202	326	5,528
		%	92.9%	88.1%	92.6%
Total	Count	5,601	370	5,971	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 74: Resolution of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by ethnicity (column %)

			Ethnicity white non-white		Total
			White	Non-white	
Do you feel that the behaviour you have experienced in the last 12 months has been resolved?	Yes, fully resolved	Count	46	7	53
		%	12.6%	19.4%	13.3%
	Partly resolved	Count	98	6	104
		%	26.9%	16.7%	26.0%
	No, not resolved	Count	220	23	243
		%	60.4%	63.9%	60.8%

Total	Count	364	36	400
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 75: Incidence of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by SOC2020 occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
In the last 12 months, have you personally experienced discriminatory behaviour because of a protected characteristic (ie my gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, or age) at work?	Yes	Count	50	109	76	56	27	19	43	18	45	443
		%	7.7%	6.6%	7.5%	7.1%	7.5%	6.8%	6.8%	8.1%	13.4%	7.5%
	No	Count	603	1,531	942	736	333	260	586	203	290	5,484
		%	92.3%	93.4%	92.5%	92.9%	92.5%	93.2%	93.2%	91.9%	86.6%	92.5%
Total		Count	653	1,640	1,018	792	360	279	629	221	335	5,927
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 76: Resolution of conflict involving discriminatory behaviour, by SOC2020 occupation group (column %)

			SOC2020 1-digit code									Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Do you feel that the behaviour you have experienced in the last 12 months...	Yes, fully resolved	Count	8	10	10	8	4	2	2	1	10	55
		%	17.0%	9.9%	14.9%	14.8%	14.8%	12.5%	4.9%	6.7%	27.0%	13.6%
	Partly resolved	Count	13	34	15	12	3	7	9	6	3	102
		%	27.7%	33.7%	22.4%	22.2%	11.1%	43.8%	22.0%	40.0%	8.1%	25.2%
	No, not resolved	Count	26	57	42	34	20	7	30	8	24	248
		%	55.3%	56.4%	62.7%	63.0%	54.1%	23.7%	72.3%	53.3%	41.3%	71.2%

months has been resolved ?	resolved	%	55.3 %	56.4 %	62.7 %	63.0 %	74.1 %	43.8 %	73.2 %	53.3 %	64.9 %	61.2 %
Total		Count	47	101	67	54	27	16	41	15	37	405
		%	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

Table 77: Quality of line management (row %)

Line manager...	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	n
Respects me as a person	30.9%	46.4 %	14.6%	4.6%	3.6%	5,172
Recognises when I have done a good job	24.0%	45.8 %	17.1%	8.3%	4.8%	5,287
Is successful in getting people to work together	16.1%	41.8 %	25.2%	11.3%	5.6%	5,198
Helps me in my job	16.8%	41.4 %	26.3%	10.4%	5.0%	5,289
Provides useful feedback on my work	14.7%	40.4 %	24.7%	13.4%	6.8%	5,279
Supports my learning and development	17.8%	39.4 %	25.6%	10.8%	6.4%	5,197
Can be relied upon to keep their promise	19.3%	40.9 %	22.8%	10.7%	6.2%	5,132
Is supportive if I have a problem	27.5%	46.2 %	16.4%	5.7%	4.1%	5,211
Treats me fairly	29.1%	47.6 %	15.4%	4.9%	3.0%	5,303
Supports my longer-term career development	16.6%	31.5 %	30.8%	12.5%	8.6%	5,013
Is open and approachable on issues like mental health	23.1%	39.2 %	20.7%	9.7%	7.3%	4,782

Table 78: Relationships index and sub-indexes, by SOC2020 occupation group

SOC2020 1-digit code		Relationships sub-index	Psychological safety sub-index	Line manager sub-index	Relationships index
Managers, directors and senior officials	Mean	0.79	0.68	0.68	0.74
	N	668	552	493	669
	Std deviation	0.14	0.22	0.23	0.16
Professionals	Mean	0.78	0.71	0.70	0.73
	N	1,694	1,494	1,473	1,695

	Std deviation	0.15	0.21	0.21	0.16
Associate professional occupations	Mean	0.77	0.69	0.69	0.73
	N	1,055	908	913	1,057
	Std deviation	0.15	0.21	0.22	0.17
Administrative and secretarial occupations	Mean	0.78	0.69	0.68	0.71
	N	816	752	747	816
	Std deviation	0.15	0.22	0.22	0.17
Skilled trades	Mean	0.77	0.63	0.63	0.71
	N	371	268	264	372
	Std deviation	0.16	0.23	0.24	0.19
Caring, leisure, and other service occupations	Mean	0.79	0.67	0.66	0.72
	N	283	243	238	284
	Std deviation	0.15	0.22	0.22	0.17
Sales and customer service occupations	Mean	0.75	0.63	0.62	0.68
	N	652	592	582	654
	Std deviation	0.17	0.23	0.24	0.19
Process, plant and machine operatives	Mean	0.73	0.60	0.60	0.65
	N	225	198	195	225
	Std deviation	0.19	0.25	0.23	0.20
Elementary occupations	Mean	0.73	0.59	0.59	0.64
	N	358	345	345	359
	Std deviation	0.16	0.22	0.24	0.18
Total	Mean	0.77	0.67	0.67	0.71
	N	6,121	5,353	5,250	6,131
	Std deviation	0.15	0.22	0.22	0.17

Table 79: Correlations of management quality and the health and wellbeing index

	Line manager respects me as a person	Line manager recognises when I have done a good job	Line manager is successful in getting people to work together	Line manager helps me in my job	Line manager provides useful feedback on my work	Line manager supports my learning and development	Line manager can be relied upon to keep their pro	Line manager is supportive if I have a problem	Line manager treats me fairly	Line manager supports my longer-term career development	Line manager is open and approachable on issues like mental health	Health and wellbeing index
--	--------------------------------------	---	---	---------------------------------	--	---	---	--	-------------------------------	---	--	----------------------------

								mis e					
Health and well-being index	Pearson correlation	.319**	.325*	.339*	.362**	.341**	.347**	.349**	.316*	.334**	.335**	.358**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
	N	4,940	5,047	4,964	5,050	5,039	4,965	4,902	4,976	5,062	4,786	4,572	5,999
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).													

Table 80: Correlations of management quality and the work-life balance index

		Line manager respects me as a person	Line manager recognises when I have done a good job	Line manager is successful in getting people to work together	Line manager helps me in my job	Line manager provides useful feedback on my work	Line manager supports my learning and development	Line manager can be relied upon to keep their promise	Line manager is supportive if I have a problem	Line manager treats me fairly	Line manager supports my longer-term career development	Line manager is open and approachable on issues like mental health	Work-life balance index
Work-life balance index	Pearson correlation	.305**	.294*	.302*	.280**	.265**	.299**	.308**	.323*	.310**	.276**	.340**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
	N	5,172	5,287	5,198	5,289	5,279	5,197	5,132	5,211	5,303	5,013	4,782	6,291
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).													

Table 81: OLS regression: relationship quality and the health and wellbeing index

Model summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate
1	.471a	0.222	0.220	0.16088

- a. Predictors: (Constant), SOC2020 – PPM dummy, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, psychsafe_subindex, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, Age, SOC2020 – manager dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, reln_subindex, linemgr_subindex, SOC2020 – professional dummy

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	35.524	13	2.733	105.574	.000b
	Residual	124.767	4,820	0.026		
	Total	160.291	4,833			

a. Dependent variable: health and wellbeing index

- b. Predictors: (Constant), SOC2020 – PPM dummy, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, psychsafe_subindex, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, Age, SOC2020 – manager dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, reln_subindex, linemgr_subindex, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.213	0.018		12.191	0.000
	Relationship sub-index	0.197	0.021	0.160	9.544	0.000
	Psychological safety sub-index	0.126	0.013	0.152	9.604	0.000
	Line manager sub-index	0.178	0.014	0.217	12.397	0.000
	Gender	-0.035	0.005	-0.096	-7.072	0.000
	Age	0.015	0.002	0.102	7.701	0.000
	SOC2020 – manager dummy	-0.003	0.012	-0.006	-0.297	0.767
	SOC2020 – professional dummy	-0.019	0.010	-0.046	-1.845	0.065
	SOC2020 – associate professional dummy	-0.004	0.011	-0.008	-0.378	0.706

	SOC2020 – administrative dummy	0.000	0.011	0.000	-0.011	0.991
	SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy	0.025	0.014	0.030	1.793	0.073
	SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy	-0.011	0.014	-0.012	-0.737	0.461
	SOC2020 – sales dummy	-0.010	0.011	-0.018	-0.907	0.364
	SOC2020 – PPM dummy	0.016	0.015	0.016	1.024	0.306

a. Dependent variable: health and wellbeing index

Table 82: OLS regression: relationship quality and the work–life balance index

Model summary				
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate
1	.414a	0.172	0.169	0.17468

a. Predictors: (Constant), SOC2020 – PPM dummy, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, psychsafe_subindex, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, Age, SOC2020 – manager dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, reln_subindex, linemgr_subindex, SOC2020 – professional dummy

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	31.883	13	2.453	80.375	.000b
	Residual	154.004	5,047	0.031		
	Total	185.887	5,060			

a. Dependent variable: work–life balance index

b. Predictors: (Constant), SOC2020 – PPM dummy, SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy, psychsafe_subindex, SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy, Age, SOC2020 – manager dummy, SOC2020 – sales dummy, Gender, SOC2020 – associate professional dummy, SOC2020 – administrative dummy, reln_subindex, linemgr_subindex, SOC2020 – professional dummy

Coefficients ^a	
---------------------------	--

Model		Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.243	0.019		13.114	0.000
	Relationship sub-index	0.060	0.022	0.046	2.732	0.006
	Psychological safety sub-index	0.168	0.014	0.193	12.126	0.000
	Line manager sub-index	0.188	0.015	0.218	12.363	0.000
	Gender	-0.003	0.005	-0.007	-0.493	0.622
	Age	0.011	0.002	0.070	5.266	0.000
	SOC2020 – manager dummy	-0.051	0.012	-0.078	-4.074	0.000
	SOC2020 – professional dummy	-0.023	0.011	-0.053	-2.101	0.036
	SOC2020 – associate professional dummy	-0.001	0.011	-0.002	-0.108	0.914
	SOC2020 – administrative dummy	0.014	0.012	0.026	1.226	0.220
	SOC2020 – skilled trade dummy	-0.017	0.015	-0.019	-1.170	0.242
	SOC2020 – caring and leisure dummy	-0.051	0.015	-0.055	-3.347	0.001
	SOC2020 – sales dummy	-0.004	0.012	-0.006	-0.291	0.771
	SOC2020 – PPM dummy	-0.057	0.016	-0.056	-3.546	0.000

a. Dependent variable: work-life balance index

CIPD

Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development
151 The Broadway London SW19 1JQ United Kingdom
T +44 (0)20 8612 6200 **F** +44 (0)20 8612 6201
E cipd@cipd.co.uk **W** cipd.co.uk

Incorporated by Royal Charter
Registered as a charity in England and Wales (1079797)
and Scotland (SC045154)

Issued: June 2022 Reference: 8252 © CIPD 2022

