

This is a repository copy of Social Quality and Work: What Impact Does Low Pay Have on Social Quality?.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/91543/

Version: Supplemental Material

#### Article:

Tomlinson, M., Walker, A.C. and Foster, L. (2015) Social Quality and Work: What Impact Does Low Pay Have on Social Quality? Journal of Social Policy. ISSN 0047-2794

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279415000732

#### Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

#### Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



# Social Quality and Work: What Impact Does Low Pay Have on Social Quality?

Tables

Table 1	Variables	used	to i	identifv	social	quality

Latent Subdomain:	Measurement Variables:
Economic security	Finances good
	Finances improving
	Can save
Housing/environment	Satisfied with housing
	Satisfied with space
	Satisfied with heating
	No damp
	Good environment
	No crime
Health	Health status
	No health limitations
Work	Satisfied with job security
	Job satisfaction
Education/human capital	High education
	Recent courses/training
	Job opportunities
	Promotion prospects
Domain 2: Social cohesion	Management Variables
Truct	
ITust	Trust strangers
	Close to a political party
Altruism	Attend groups/voluntary orgs
	Volunteer (unpaid)
	Willingness to improve neighbourhood
Social networks	Local friends mean a lot
	Get advice from neighbours
	Talk to neighbours
	Borrow from neighbours
Information -	Circiler to reich bours
ιαεπιτιγ	Similar to neighbourbood
	Like to stay in neighbournood

#### Domain 1: Socio-economic security

Domain 3: Social inclusion	
Latent Subdomain:	Measurement Variables:
Citizenship	Voted
	Interest in politics
	Has a political party
Labour security	Permanent iob
	Satisfied with security
	Job opportunities
Services	Access to medical services
Scivices	Access to transport
	Access to shonning
	Access to leisure facilities
Social networks	Frequency of talking to neighbours
	Frequency of meeting people
	Satisfaction with social life
	Resources to entertain visitors
Domain 4: Social empowerment	
Latent Subdomain:	Measurement Variables:
Knowledge	High education
	Internet at home
_	
Time	Satisfaction with leisure time
	Satisfaction with use of leisure time
Labour control	Expect better job with employer
	Expect training from employer
	Job opportunities
	Flexitime
	Unionised workplace
Culture/participation	Play sports
	Watch sports live
	Go to cinema
	do to cinema
	Go to theatre
	Go to theatre Dine out
	Go to theatre Dine out Go to pubs/clubs

Model	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	Ν	
Socio-economic security	0.92	0.90	0.028	7175	
Social cohesion	0.97	0.96	0.042	7079	
Social inclusion	0.95	0.94	0.033	7175	
Social empowerment	0.95	0.94	0.037	7175	

 Table 2 Fit statistics for the 1st order CFA models

# Table 3 The highest educational status of various occupational groups 1991 and 2011 (%)

0	-	UKHLS 2011			BHPS 1991						
Standard	Degree	Other	А	Total	High	$1^{st}$	Teach	Other	Nursing	А	Total
Occupational		degree	level		degree	degree	qual	high		level	
Classification											
1: Managers	39	16	20	75	2	11	2	28	0	16	58
and senior											
officials											
2:	77	11	7	95	10	42	13	21	0	6	92
Professionals											
3: Associate	43	22	20	85	4	17	3	25	17	13	79
professional											
and technical											
4:	21	13	28	62	1	3	1	10	1	14	30
Administrative											
and secretarial											
5: Skilled	8	11	33	52	0	1	0	15	0	16	32
trades											
6: Personal	14	18	28	60	0	2	1	17	1	14	35
service											
7: Sales and	13	9	30	52	0	4	1	11	0	12	28
customer											
service											
8: Process,	7	7	20	34	0	1	1	8	0	7	17
plant, machine											
operators											
9: Elementary	7	6	24	37	0	1	0	4	0	8	13

Percentage with various qualifications by Standard Occupational Classification – all employees (%)

Source: BHPS, 1991 and UKHLS, 2011 Authors' analysis

% of workforce 2011
11.5
41.6
23.2
23.7
100.0 (N=21881)

#### Table 4 Proportions of employees by education (2011)

Source: UKHLS 2011 data, Authors' analysis

# Table 5 Average hourly wage rates (in £) by Standard Occupational Classification andeducation qualifications (2011)

Standard Occupational Classification	Low education	High education
1: Managers and senior officials	8.15	11.83
2: Professionals	11.01	20.15
3: Associate professional and technical	9.71	12.78
4: Administrative and secretarial	7.99	7.88
5: Skilled trades	9.05	9.62
6: Personal service	7.07	8.40
7: Sales and customer service	6.29	6.75
8: Process, plant, machine operators	9.20	8.52
9: Elementary	6.79	6.64
Sample average	8.21	
National minimum wage (age 21+)	6.08	
Living wage (outside London)	7.20	
N	5643	
	1 .	

Source: UKHLS 2011 data, Authors' analysis

## Table 6 Models of SQ Domain 1 (Socio-economic security).

Subdimension: Economic security	Coefficient	Lower 95% confidence	Upper 95% confidence	Standardised coefficient
Occupation/poverty Interaction	0.525	Interval	Interval	
Poor tier 2	-0.525	-0.739	-0.311	-0.348
Poor tier 2	-0.094	-0.887	-0.501	0.723
Non noor tior 2	-0.795	-0.903	-0.682	-0.827
Non-poor tier 2	-0.145	-0.242	-0.043	-0.149
Rof: non noor tier 1	-0.542	-0.427	-0.257	-0.337
Subdimension: Housing				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	-0.366	-0.526	-0.206	-0.596***
Poor tier 2	-0.322	-0.462	-0.181	-0.524***
Poor tier 3	-0.359	-0.444	-0.274	-0.585***
Non-poor tier 2	-0.081	-0.158	-0.004	-0.132*
Non-poor tier 3	-0.147	-0.215	-0.079	-0.239***
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Health				
Poor tier 1	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 2	-0.366	-0 573	-0.160	-0.386***
Poor tier 3	-0.348	-0.469	-0.226	-0.366***
Non-poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Non-poor tier 3	-0.165	-0.261	-0.069	-0.174***
Ref: non-poor tier 1		0.201	0.003	-
Subdimension: Human capital				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	-0.569	-0.778	-0.359	-0.724***
Poor tier 2	-0.782	-0.960	-0.604	-0.996***
Poor tier 3	-1.278	-1.403	-1.154	-1.628***
Non-poor tier 2	-0.271	-0.362	-0.179	-0.345***
Non-poor tier 3	-1.033	-1.123	-0.943	-1.316***
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Work security				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 3	-0.093	-0.185	-0.001	-0.146*
Non-poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Non-poor tier 3	NS	NS	NS	NS
Ker: non-poor tier 1				
FIT STATISTICS N=5439           Chi-square         8735.97***           CFI         0.906           TLI         0.877           RMSEA         0.029	-	1	1	<u> </u>

Subdimension: Trust	Coefficient	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Standardised
		confidence	confidence	coefficient
Occupation/poverty interaction		interval	interval	
Poor tier 1	-0.492	-0.738	-0.246	-0.543***
Poor tier 2	-0.569	-0.762	-0.375	-0.628***
Poor tier 3	-0.732	-0.852	-0.613	-0.809***
Non-poor tier 2	-0.213	-0.309	-0.116	-0.235***
Non-poor tier 3	-0.480	-0.566	-0.394	-0.531***
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Voluntary				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	-0.054	-0.097	-0.012	-0.436*
Poor tier 2	-0.053	-0.090	-0.016	-0.423**
Poor tier 3	-0.075	-0.111	-0.040	-0.605***
Non-poor tier 2	-0.038	-0.060	-0.016	-0.306***
Non-poor tier 3	-0.060	-0.088	-0.032	-0.480***
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Social networks				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 2	+0.170	+0.034	+ 0.307	+0.230**
Poor tier 3	+0.136	+ 0.052	+0.220	+0.143**
Non-poor tier 2	+0.071	-0.004	+0.146	+0.091*
Non-poor tier 3	+0.125	+0.059	+0.190	+0.161***
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Identity				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 3	NS	NS	NS	NS
Non-poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Non-poor tier 3	+0.147	0.073	0.221	+0.182***
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
FIT STATISTICS N=5499				
Chi-square 26445.64***				
CFI 0.973	]			
TLI 0.962	1			
RMSEA 0.036				

### Table 7 Models of SQ Domain 2 (Social cohesion). Standardised coefficients

Table 8	Models of S	Q Domain 3	(Social	inclusion).	Standardised	coefficients
---------	-------------	------------	---------	-------------	--------------	--------------

Subdimension: Citizenship	Coefficient	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Standardised
		confidence	confidence	coefficient
Occupation/poverty interaction		interval	interval	
Poor tier 1	-0.368	-0.551	-0.184	-0.480***
Poor tier 2	-0.626	-0.781	-0.470	-0.817***
Poor tier 3	-0.790	-0.889	-0.691	-1.032***
Non-poor tier 2	-0.237	-0.316	-0.158	-0.310***
Non-poor tier 3	-0.449	-0.523	-0.375	-0.587***
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Labour security				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	-0.394	-0.658	-0.129	-0.540**
Poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 3	-0.286	-0.424	-0.148	-0.392***
Non-poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Non-poor tier 3	-0.182	-0.289	-0.076	-0.250**
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Services				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 3	NS	NS	NS	NS
Non-poor tier 2	0.047	0.006	0.088	+0.116*
Non-poor tier 3	NS	NS	NS	NS
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Social networks				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 3	-0.049	-0.098	0.000	-0.178*
Non-poor tier 2	+0.044	0.002	0.087	+0.161*
Non-poor tier 3	NS	NS	NS	NS
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
FIT STATISTICS N=4636				
Chi-square 10589.10***	4			
CFI 0.943				

 TLI
 0.924

 RMSEA
 0.033

Subdimension: Knowledge	Coefficient	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Standardised
		confidence	confidence	coefficient
Occupation/poverty interaction	0.525	interval	interval	0 710***
Poor tier 1	-0.525	-0.752	-0.297	-0.719***
Poor tier 2	-0.829	-1.01/	-0.642	-1.13/***
Poor tier 3	-1.374	-1.503	-1.246	-1.884***
Non-poor tier 2	-0.401	-0.496	-0.307	-0.550***
Non-poor tier 3	-1.065	-1.155	-0.975	-1.460***
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Time				
Occupation (noverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	NC	NC	NC	NC
Poor tier 2				
Poor tier 2		NS NC		
Non near tion 2	NS 0.112	NS 0.027	NS 0.100	INS
Non-poor tier 2	0.112	0.027	0.198	+0.127**
Non-poor tier 3	0.111	0.035	0.186	+0.125**
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
Subdimension: Labour Control				
Subulinension. Labour Control				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	NS	NS	NS	NS
Poor tier 2	-0.179	-0.341	-0.017	-0.230*
Poor tier 3	-0.281	-0.378	-0.184	-0.362***
Non-poor tier 2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Non-poor tier 3	-0.261	-0 334	-0.189	-0 336***
Ref: non-poor tier 1	0.201	0.001	0.100	0.000
Subdimension: Culture				
Occupation/poverty interaction				
Poor tier 1	-0.134	-0.212	-0.056	-0.482***
Poor tier 2	-0.211	-0.286	-0.136	-0.758***
Poor tier 3	-0.250	-0.313	-0.187	-0.898***
Non-poor tier 2	-0.088	-0.123	-0.053	-0.316***
Non-poor tier 3	-0.158	-0.200	-0.116	-0.568***
Ref: non-poor tier 1				
FIT STATISTICS N=5117		•	•	
Chi-square 16277.47***				
CFI 0.954				
TLI 0.941				
RMSEA 0.032				

### Table 9 Models of SQ Domain 4 (Social empowerment). Standardised coefficients