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ABSTRACT
In this study we analyse employment commitment and organizational commitment in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, using data from the International Social Survey Programme (1997). We begin with an institutional comparison of the three countries, where it is concluded that a strong institutionalized commitment to work is of longest standing in Sweden and most recent in Denmark. It is concluded that, contrary to expectations, both employment and organizational commitment among the population is weakest in Sweden and strongest in Denmark. Group patterns in commitment are basically similar in all three countries, the only exception being a lower employment commitment among the unemployed in Denmark. In all three countries, differences related to stratification, such as differences between classes and between educational categories, are much more important than family structure in determining commitment. An especially noteworthy finding is that in all three countries, employment commitment is significantly higher among women than among men.
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The commitments and attitudes attached to work may be regarded as important outcomes of the social stratification and the structure of work. We could therefore expect such attitudes to vary between different groups in accordance with their cultural and structural location. Work orientations may also have important effects for actual performance in relation to work, such as productivity, absenteeism or loyalty to the employer.

Studies of work orientations have a long pedigree within social science. From the classic arguments of Adam Smith and Karl Marx on the capitalist work process and its alienation of labour, through Weber’s and Durkheim’s analyses of the ‘protestant work ethic’ and the division of labour in society, and up until contemporary studies of the implications of ‘post-industrialism’ and the possible decline of the work society, the values and meanings of paid labour have been a recurring theme within sociological analysis.1

While empirical studies of work orientations and employment commitment abound, they have rarely been conducted in a comparative perspective. Where they have been pursued, it is unusual that comparisons go beyond comparing aggregate distributions (Harpaz 1989; Giorgi & Marsh 1990; Gallie & Alm 1997; Julkunen & Malberg-Heimonen 1998; Russell 1998; one exception is Lincoln & Kalleberg 1990). This is highly unfortunate, since the institutional frameworks within which people act and form their values and attitudes can be hypothesized to play an important role in creating group differences in how work is perceived and valued.

The main aim of this study is to compare...
work orientations among the populations of the three Scandinavian countries, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, using the ‘comparable-cases’ design in comparative research (Liphart 1975). As is well known, the Scandinavian countries are very similar when it comes to their basic economic, cultural and political structures, all being highly developed capitalist countries with a Lutheran cultural legacy, encompassing and redistributive welfare states and strong social democratic labour movements. They differ, however, in important aspects in their institutionalized commitment to paid labour and employment, as will be shown in the next section. One research question we seek to answer in our analysis is in what ways and to what extent such an institutionalized commitment will affect work orientations among the populations of the three countries.

The second main research task is to study group variations in work orientations. Here it might be claimed that the Scandinavian countries constitute especially interesting cases. In particular, we may ask to what extent the unusually high integration of women on the Scandinavian labour markets affects work orientations. At this point, it seems increasingly plausible to speculate that the story of the Scandinavian countries to some extent can be read as an indicator for the future of other countries as well. Thus, in exploring social variations in work orientations in the Scandinavian countries, we add important findings to the somewhat Anglo-Saxon bias of most studies of work orientations.

In this context ‘Work orientation’ is used as an ‘umbrella concept’, under which different aspects of work and employment commitment are gathered. In conducting our analyses, we restrict ourselves to a couple of aspects of commitment to work (cf. Mueller et al. 1992). The first is ‘employment commitment’, by which we mean individuals’ non-financial commitment to paid work in a general sense. The second is ‘organizational commitment’, by which we denote individuals’ commitment and loyalty to a particular job, firm or organization. In the empirical analysis, we seek suitable empirical indicators of these two aspects of work orientations and compare distributions both within and between countries. We also show the extent to which these various aspects of work orientations actually form distinct empirical dimensions.

The article is organized in the following way. In section 1 we describe some key characteristics of the Scandinavian policy regimes concerning employment and unemployment. This institutional description functions as an explanatory context to the findings presented in the later sections of the article. Section 2 presents and motivates the set of hypotheses about variations between and within countries to be tested in the analysis. Section 3 contains a presentation of the data that is used in the article and a discussion of the promises and pitfalls of comparative attitude research. In section 4, various indicators of work orientations are compared for the three countries and their dimensionality tested. In section 5 the comparison is extended to patterns of group differences in work orientation within and between countries. The concluding section summarizes the main findings, discusses their wider implications and suggests some avenues for further research.

1. Employment and unemployment regimes in Scandinavia

With some justification, the Scandinavian countries have usually been described as giving top priority to securing full employment while at the same time being economically dependent on high labour-market participation rates (Esping-Andersen 1990: chapters 6–8; Stephens 1996). The Scandinavian welfare states, most authors contend, have contributed to job growth through high public employment and an active labour-market policy and by creating possibilities for temporary absence from work by paid sick and parental leave.

Furthermore, the Scandinavian countries also display distinctive properties when it comes to the organization of work. Regardless of whether data from employees or employers are used, the Scandinavian countries come out as distinctly different from other Western countries. Work practices are more collaborative and include more job autonomy and involvement in decision-making among employees than is the case elsewhere (Gallie 2000; Gooderham et al. 1999; Gill & Krieger 2000; Dobbin & Boychuk 1999).

Although institutional traditions as well as patterns of labour-market participation are essentially similar in Scandinavia, there are also significant differences that could be expected to affect work orientations. These similarities and differences can be briefly summarized under four headings: labour-mar-
Labour market participation

All Scandinavian countries have a tradition of high labour-market participation rates, which can be explained partly by the comparatively high labour-market participation among the elderly. In contrast to the extensive ‘early exit’ strategies of continental Europe, Scandinavian public policies have emphasized high labour-market participation for the older members of the workforce as a desirable goal. This has, however, been less the case for Denmark, where a comparatively generous and extensive ‘early exit’-programme (efterlønn) was in effect during most of the 1990s. The labour-market participation among the population aged 55–64 years is substantially lower in Denmark than in the other two countries, and, in contrast to Sweden and Norway, there is also a declining trend in the labour-market participation of the elderly (NOSOSKO 1999:11, 24–7).

But first and foremost, high participation rates are due to the integration of women in the labour market. Since the early 1960s, the Scandinavian countries began to distinguish themselves very significantly from other countries in terms of female labour-market participation. The tradition of life-long labour-market participation by women is, however, longest in Sweden, whereas Norway has tended to lag behind the other two countries.

This development has occurred in two stages in all three countries. In the first stage, lasting until about 1980 in Denmark and Sweden and a little longer in Norway, nearly all married women were integrated in the labour market, facilitated by a very marked increase in part-time labour. Nearly all the European countries outside Scandinavia still find themselves in this first stage. However, in the second stage of integration, women have increasingly moved from part-time to full-time employment. In the 1990s, this process has gone further in Denmark than in the other two countries.

This runs counter to a widely shared belief that part-time employment and other ‘non-standard’ forms of employment will become more common, since they serve to satisfy a need for more flexibility (Blossfeld & Hakim 1997; Gallie et al. 1998:chapter 6). Indeed, this is often described as a fundamental trait of a ‘post-fordist’ or ‘post-industrial’ society. As far as women’s employment is concerned, however, the trend has actually been the reverse in Scandinavia, a development that has been actively supported by trade unions and the state. It is also important to note that the same social rights and protection as those in full-time employment generally cover part-time employees. Only a few employees are ‘outsiders’ with low pay, little protection or in ‘non-standard’ employment.

The process of female integration in the labour market has obviously been facilitated by the welfare state. The Scandinavian countries allocate a much larger share of social expenditures to families and children than is the case elsewhere in Europe (NOSOSKO 1998:31), most significantly in the form of provision of public day care, but also as possibilities for comparatively long and well-compensated maternity/paternity leave.

Unemployment experience

The experience of unemployment in the three countries is highly dissimilar. Like most European countries, Denmark was hit by mass unemployment as early as 1974/1975, and the fight against unemployment became a major political concern in Danish politics to a much larger extent than in the other two countries (Goul Andersen 1994). Sweden, on the other hand, managed to escape mass unemployment until the early 1990s when the country was hit by a massive economic crisis. Norway, partly owing to huge oil revenues, has been able to maintain comparably low unemployment rates throughout the period, although there have been fluctuations in the level of unemployment. At the time of the study, Norway was moving towards ‘full employment’ and even began to experience widespread labour shortages.

Employment policies

Employment policies has historically been rather different in the three countries. Sweden has a long-standing, institutionalized commitment to work in the form of ‘active’ labour-market policies, which form a strong safety net but also place strong demands on the flexibility and the willingness to work among the unemployed (Furåker 1986; Rothstein 1986). Today, the institutionalized commitment to work is displayed in both the new and stricter demands on the unemployed to seek and find work, and in a strong emphasis on reinsertion of the long-term incapacitated into the workforce (Marklund 1995; Lindqvist 2000).

Inspired by the Swedish labour-market
policy. Norway also developed a strong commitment to an ‘active’ policy regarding employment and unemployment in the early postwar period (Hvinden 1994). Extensive use of expanding labour-market programmes during recessions, along with recent experiments with ‘work for benefit’ arrangements for recipients of social assistance, have sought to secure that the unemployed to a large extent stay in work rather than become ‘passive’ benefit recipients (Lødemel 1998; Dropping et al. 1999; Enjolras & Lødemel 2000). While the right to work and the society’s obligation to secure ‘work for all’ have been stressed, more emphasis has recently been put on the obligation of the individual to find paid work (NOU 1992; 1993).

Denmark used to be a counter-point. In the early 1970s the compensation levels of unemployment benefits were massively increased. Up until 1982 the unemployment policies of the Social Democratic governments were concentrated on stimulating demand for labour through increasing public employment, reducing labour supply through early retirement programmes, and by integrative policies that offered subsidized employment or other forms of activation to maintain the unemployed within the unemployment benefit system. The conservative/liberal governments in the subsequent decade largely continued this strategy.

From the early 1990s onwards, however, this strategy has been gradually replaced with one in which more emphasis is put on the right and duty of work for everyone (Dropping et al. 1999). This change of strategy culminated in the second half of the decade (from 1994) in three path-breaking labour-market reforms, in which the system has been substantially tightened regarding eligibility rules, work requirements and maximum periods of benefits (Boje & Åberg 1999). To some degree, this came as a reflection of the international debates on ‘dependency cultures’, ‘the underclass’, and so on (Murray 1984), as there have been fears that generous, passive strategies would erode people’s commitment to work. These institutional reforms are, however, less likely to affect the attitudes that are analysed here, since the impact of all these reforms, some of which are not yet fully implemented, were mainly felt after 1997. It still cannot be ruled out that the change in ideological ‘climate’ from the early 90s onwards have affected attitudes in one way or another.

The organization of work and employment

The Scandinavian countries also differ to some extent in the structure of employment and workplaces. The Norwegian and Danish economies consist of considerably more small and medium-sized enterprises than is the case in Sweden. In Denmark, the legal regulation of hiring and firing practices is much less extensive than that in Norway and Sweden (Madsen 1999:chapter 3).

It is also the case that while collaborative human resource management and ‘work enrichment’ practices have been extensive in Scandinavia compared with those in other Western countries (Gallie 2000; Gill & Krieger 2000; Goodeham et al. 1999), they have been particularly pronounced in Sweden (Gill & Krieger 2000:127–128; Gallie 2000).

Owing to lack of data, we are unable directly to assess the impact of such work-related factors on commitment. In the conclusion, however, some indirect evidence related to these issues will be marshalled.

2. Hypotheses about between and within country variations

From the description of institutional and structural differences, we would expect attitudes towards work to differ to some extent between the three countries. Since Sweden has the most long-standing and deepest institutionalized commitment to work, one could expect Swedes to show the strongest work orientation in their attitudes. In Denmark, on the other hand, where the previous system almost amounted to a ‘citizen’s income’ (Sorensen 1998; Goul Andersen 1996; 1999), one could expect a lower commitment to work, since life without work could be pursued with less unfortunate pecuniary and stigmatizing effects than in the other two countries. In particular, according to the arguments of Lindbeck (1995) and many others, generous welfare systems may slowly affect norms regarding work and support. If there is any truth in this claim, which is a rationale for much of the current policy changes, we should expect norms with less emphasis on the virtues of paid labour to be more frequent in Denmark than in the other two countries. In these respects, Norway falls somewhere in-between the other two Scandinavian countries, although closer to Sweden than Denmark in most respects.

One could also expect the greater emphasis in Sweden on ‘work enrichment’ strategies and collaborative human resource management to
result in stronger commitment, especially when it comes to organizational commitment.

On the other hand, there are indications that point in a different direction. Since labour-market participation is highest in Denmark, and the history of full inclusion of women in the labour market is shortest in Norway, one might expect labour as a way of life to be established to a greater extent in Denmark than in the other countries, and especially Norway. The higher unemployment figures in Denmark might also, per se, work to demonstrate the advantages of life in employment. Furthermore, it is not to be taken for granted that the gradual changes in the ‘ideological climate’ regarding employment and unemployment have not affected attitudes in the Danish population.

Nevertheless, the first hypothesis to be tested will be: \( H_1 \): Employment and work commitment will be strongest in Sweden, followed by Norway, while Danes will display the lowest commitment to work.

Moving from aggregate to group differences, why would we expect groups within the three countries to differ in their commitment to employment and work? In general, we would expect those who have a favourable experience or expectation of work and employment to display stronger employment and organizational commitment than others. This means that class and education will be important determinants and that we would expect higher-level employees and those with higher education to have a stronger commitment than workers and those with a lower education. We would also expect the self-employed to have the strongest organizational commitment of all groups, since their firm is tightly connected to their very person, many of them being the founders of and perhaps the only person working in the firm.

However, some previous research has questioned the assumption that class and employment commitment are correlated. Both Marklund (1993:90–91) and Gallie et al. (1998:194) find that class differences in employment commitment are small and non-significant. We would nevertheless maintain our hypotheses about the importance of class and education for work orientations.

We would also expect differences to occur between groups with different labour-market status. The most important fault-line here runs between the unemployed and those in work. However, it is difficult to decide exactly in which direction we should expect differences. On the one hand, an influential research tradition from Jahoda (Jahoda et al. 1933/1971; Jahoda 1982) to Gallie & Alm (1999) and Nordenmark (1999) has emphasized the latent value of paid work. This means that the advantages of employment become more salient for people when they lose their work. In this case, we would expect stronger employment commitment among the unemployed than among those in paid work.

On the other hand, others have argued the exact opposite. Owing to adaptive preferences among the unemployed, it is likely that they will lower their aspirations towards and expectations of paid work, something which is particularly likely among the long-term unemployed (Halvorsen 1997; 1999). This tendency might be especially strong in the relatively generous unemployment benefit systems of Scandinavia, which will make it less financially painful to adjust to a life without work. We will therefore expect a weak tendency for the unemployed to be less committed to employment than those in paid work, but we would also expect substantial variation among the unemployed.

We would also expect commitment to be weaker among those in part-time employment and among those who are not in the labour force. Part-time employment and other ‘non-standard’ forms of employment have in many countries become more common over the past decade, since they are thought to increase flexibility for the employer (Blossfeld & Hakim 1997; Gallie et al. 1998:chapter 6). One central feature of this development is that part-time employees (of whom women are a majority) are supposed to have weaker commitment to their work and their employer than full-time employees. This will, it is argued, act as a slow-down on the use of non-standard employment contracts, such as part-time work, since weak commitment is likely to lead to poor work quality and output.

People who have already left the labour force or never entered it are also thought to display weaker employment commitment. Either because of old age or long-term incapacity, these groups have a strong legitimate ground for not being oriented to work at all, and we would expect this to show in their employment commitment.\(^4\)

In the case of students, we would expect employment commitment to be fairly strong. Most of the students included in our samples are in some form of tertiary education, with expectations of future professional careers. We
would expect that such expectations would show in, on average, stronger employment commitment among students than among groups already in the labour market.

The importance of age for work commitment is also obvious. There are some reasons why we should expect commitment to be weaker among the young. First, they are often found at entry-level jobs in the labour market, which means that their organizational commitment might be expected to be weak. Second, it has been suggested that younger generations generally have weaker commitment to formal work and the labour market, being less influenced by ‘materialist’ values and more exposed to ‘post-materialist’ concerns (Inglehart 1997). On the other hand, it might be expected that the very oldest groups in the labour market would display less employment commitment, owing to fatigue acquired in the course of a long working life or in anticipation of (early) retirement. We would therefore expect a curvilinear relationship between age and commitment.

There are also non-work factors that we would expect to play an important role in forming commitment to work and employment. In this respect, gender plays a pivotal role in structuring work and family commitments. Traditionally, it has been argued that women have weaker commitment to work than men because of a stronger family orientation and a less continuous attachment to paid work. Lately, this assumption has been questioned, since several surveys actually show very small differences in employment commitment between women and men (de Vaus & McAllister 1992; Ellingsæter 1995:chapter 8; Rowe & Snizek 1995; Halvorsen 1997; Gallie & Alm 1999). Others have argued that the ‘traditional’ patterns still apply, and that regardless of progressively higher labour-market participation among women during the past decades, there are still substantial groups of women for whom paid labour is a secondary concern to homemaking and family (Hakim 1991: 1995). Others have pointed out that, compared with men, women are less often found in jobs that tend to enhance commitment (Bielby & Bielby 1989; Marsden et al. 1993). On balance, previous research would therefore lead us to expect employment and organizational commitment to be slightly weaker among women than among men, because of the stronger impact of family considerations in many women’s lives or because women’s jobs tend to be less conducive to commitment.

We would also expect gender to structure the relationship between household type and commitment to work and employment. Partnership and, in particular, the presence of children tend to reinforce a ‘traditional’ division of labour and role orientation (Ahrne & Roman 1997). For men, we would therefore expect cohabitation and the presence of dependent children to increase employment and organizational commitment; for women, we would expect these factors to decrease such commitment (Marsden et al. 1993:372).

In sum, both work and non-work factors imply that the centrality of work in people’s lives differs considerably between different categories, and that it therefore is likely that we will find this reflected in their commitment to employment and jobs. The hypothesized relationships can be summarized thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypothesized relationship to commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Weaker among workers than in service class and among self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Stronger with higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour-market status</td>
<td>Weaker among unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weaker among part-timers than among full-timers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weaker among those outside the labour force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Stronger among students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Weaker among women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>Men: stronger among cohabiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women: weaker among cohabiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Men: stronger among parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women: weaker among parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What should be expected in terms of country differences in how groups differ in their work orientation? In general, we expect the patterns depicted above to hold in all three countries. They are, after all, quite similar in their economic structure and institutional set-ups. There are, however, a couple of points where one would expect country differences to emerge. First, one could expect gender differences to be slightly greater in Norway, since female labour-market participation has been slower to rise there than in the other two countries, and since the religious influence on
politics, with the emphasis on the homemaking role of women, has been stronger there.\textsuperscript{55}

Second, one could expect the Danish unemployed to be less committed to work than the unemployed in Sweden and Norway. The ‘decommodification’ in the Danish unemployment system, although it has changed recently, will result, we assume, in less emphasis on the values of paid labour among the Danish unemployed. Furthermore, the longer period of high unemployment in Denmark has made adaptive preferences to a life without employment more likely here than in Sweden and Norway due to composition effects (greater share of long-term unemployed among the unemployed).

\section*{3. Data and variables: the International Social Survey Program}

The data are derived from the \textit{International Social Survey Program} (ISSP), a comparative attitude survey, which was inaugurated in the mid-1980s and now involves about 30 countries. The ISSP is an attempt to create a truly comparative data set with which to analyse attitudes and values among the populations of the industrialized countries (Davis \& Jowell 1989; Becker et al. 1990). A wide variety of topics has been surveyed, and from 1990 previous modules have been replicated allowing comparison both between nations and over time (Svallfors 1996).

The data for the analysis in this paper are taken from the 1997 replication of the \textit{Work Orientation} module.\textsuperscript{66} In this survey a wide range of questions were posed on work orientations and preferences. While most of these are not of interest to this study, a subset of questions dealing with employment commitment, work involvement and career/organizational commitment is very useful. These items will be presented in the following section.

While comparative attitude research is potentially very fruitful, it is also fraught with difficulties that may make results and interpretations fragile (Svallfors 1996; Jowell 1998). The most important problem is probably how to establish the cross-national validity of indicators. Attitudes are by their very nature context-dependent, which is why we seek to compare them across nations in the first place. This is of course not a problem in itself. A problem arises if we find that it is not values and attitudes that vary across nations, but the meaning and connotations of various concepts. There is an immanent danger of creating research design artefacts instead of comparing and explaining substantive findings.

This problem has been dealt with as far as possible within the ISSP. The questionnaire design is truly a cross-national exercise involving drafting groups comprising people from several countries and requiring approval from the entire 30-country group. The possibility to locate and eliminate problems of cross-national validity has thus been uniquely great within the ISSP. In order to be able to interpret and explain survey findings, something that requires a thorough contextual understanding, researchers are still advised to use a few strategically chosen countries rather than to include as many countries as possible in the analysis.

This is also motivated by the fact that translations of questionnaires pose similar problems when it comes to establishing cross-national validity. Concepts sometimes cannot be literally translated since they carry nation-specific connotations. Within the ISSP, this has been dealt with both through careful indications in the ‘master’ questionnaire as to which concept the literal expressions refer and through careful national procedures in translating the questionnaire.\textsuperscript{7} It should be emphasized that the Scandinavian countries have very similar cultures and that the languages are also very similar. Problems of establishing cross-national validity in concepts and translations therefore seem not to be insurmountable in this case.

The level and structure of non-responses are very similar in the samples. The Danish response rate is estimated at 64 per cent, achieving a net sample of 1,034 respondents. The Norwegian response rate is 63.1 per cent, achieving a net sample of 2,199 respondents, while the Swedish (weighted) response rate is 68.4 per cent, achieving a net sample of 1,355 respondents. The structure of non-responses is similar in all three countries. Response rates are lower among the elderly, among people outside the labour force, and among those with low education and very low incomes (Edlund \& Svallfors 1997; NSD 1997; Nielsen 1998). Given the topic of the survey, this pattern is hardly surprising. It should be emphasized that in spite of this pattern, comparisons of net samples with national populations show very small deviations in the variables at hand. In short, even if a non-response rate of 30–35 per
cent is hardly ideal in itself, it seems unlikely that differences in non-responses should have much effect on comparisons.

A number of problems were encountered and strategic decisions made in operationalizing the factors we think will affect employment and organizational commitment. While the operationalizations of gender and age are perhaps self-evident, more needs to be said about the other variables. Labour-market status is self-reported, at the point of interview. This may be somewhat unfortunate in the case of the unemployed, where it would have been useful to include a broader measure of recent unemployment experience and duration of unemployment. Such information is, however, not present in the data.

In operationalizing household type, we chose to include two variables; one indicating whether a respondent was single or married/cohabiting, and the other indicating whether they had dependent children or not.

The education variable distinguishes between those who have only primary education as their highest formal education level, those who have some sort of secondary education, and those who have a university degree. Assessing a more fine-grained and yet comparable classification proved impossible.

In comparing different occupational classes the occupational codes have been recoded into a six-class version of the class schema devised by Goldthorpe and colleagues and used in a multitude of empirical studies of social mobility and work. The logic behind this schema is to distinguish classes according to the work and market situation that various occupations entail (Erikson & Goldthorpe 1992:28–47).

The class schema comes in several versions. The version used here distinguishes between unskilled workers, skilled workers, routine non-manual employees, Service class II (lower-level controllers and administrators), Service class I (higher-level controllers and administrators) and the self-employed.

In Denmark, unfortunately, only those presently in paid work have been asked about their occupation, thereby excluding the unemployed, pensioners, and so on. In the regression models, we are therefore not able to include class and labour-market status in the same models. Separate regressions including either class or labour-market status have been conducted for Denmark, something which also means that models including class only pertain to respondents who are currently working.

### 4. Different dimensions of work orientation

How far does the data support our hypothesis about country differences in commitment? In Table 1, a number of propositions used in ISSP97 regarding work and employment are displayed. The table shows the percentage in each country that agrees (‘strongly’ or not) with the proposition and the mean value for each variable. The mean value is calculated to vary between 0 and 4, with higher values indicating stronger commitment to work and employment. As seen in the table, expectations about country differences are not supported. Where country differences are found, they point in the direction of work and employment commitment being strongest in Denmark and weakest in Sweden, contrary to our initial hypotheses.

Before going any further in our interpretation, we need to move beyond the single indicators in order to construct more robust and comprehensive measures of various aspects of work orientation. As mentioned previously, our aim is to distinguish between two dimensions: ‘employment commitment’ and ‘organizational commitment’. But how do the various indicators correlate, and what patterns and dimensions can be detected empirically? In order to study this, a series of dimensional analyses were conducted, the final one of which is reported in Table 2. It soon became evident that item 3 from Table 1, on work being a person’s most important activity, did not correlate well with any of the other indicators. This is perhaps not surprising, since respondents are here asked to rate work in comparison with any other life activity, while all the other items in the table ask them for their views about work per se. This item was therefore excluded from further analysis.

For the rest of the items from Table 1, the factor analysis displayed in Table 2 shows two dimensions being clearly present in all three countries. The first (factor 2) relates to employment commitment in general, obviously measuring our first aspect of work orientation. The second (factor 1) indicates the level of organizational commitment. In contrast to the first dimension, this dimension relates to the actual job and organization of the particular individual.

Item 3 in the table loads on both factors in Denmark and Sweden. Since this is not the case in Norway, and since it also has a stronger
loading on the first factor in the other two countries, it nevertheless seems reasonable to view it as an indicator of organizational commitment and not as a general employment commitment.

With support from the dimensional analyses, it was decided to build two summated indices. The first one – ‘Employment commitment’ – consists of the first two items in Table 1 and can vary between 0 and 8. The second one – ‘Organizational commitment’ – is the sum of the last five items and can then vary between 0 and 20. In order to increase comparability between the indices, each index was then divided by its maximum value and multiplied by 100. Both indices can thus vary between 0 and 100, and higher index values indicate stronger commitment.

Means, dispersion and reliability measures for the two indices are displayed in Table 3. We find, for both indices, that the values are highest in Denmark and lowest in Sweden, as is already evident in Table 1. Danes seem to have a stronger commitment both to employment in general and to their particular job and organization than is the case in Sweden.

We also find that the reliability is problematically low for the ‘Employment commitment’ index, especially in Denmark. While this is perhaps not surprising for an index that only contains two items, it is nevertheless necessary to treat the index with some caution. We will therefore, in addition to OLS regressions for this index, also use logistic regressions on a dichotomized version of item 2 when comparing group differences within and between countries.

Table 2. Dimensions of work orientation in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Principal components analysis (varimax rotation). Factor loadings (>0.4 in bold).
(as reported in the Appendix). The reason for choosing item 2 is that it has been widely used in analyses of non-financial employment commitment and that it seems to have slightly better face validity than the first item.

In concluding this section, it is clearly not the case that employment and organizational commitment is strongest in Sweden, as predicted by the type of incentive/work ethic considerations underpinning work incentive policies. On the contrary, commitment is weakest in Sweden and strongest in Denmark. But is this fact only reflecting differences in group compositions between the three countries or will significant country differences also remain when we take other factors than country differences into account? More generally, do patterns of group differences look similar in all three countries? This is the topic for the next section.

5. Social cleavages and work orientation

The various variables described above were entered in a set of both simple and multiple regression OLS models and logistic regression on a dichotomized variable in order to test the different hypotheses. Out of these preliminary models and tests came a few results, which led to changes in assumptions and models:

- No evidence was found for any curvilinear relationship between age and commitment.

- There are virtually no differences in employment or organizational commitment between those who work full time and those who work part time. Full-time employment and part-time employment are therefore collapsed in the constant in the following models.

- Neither the presence of children nor co-habitation has any discernible effects on commitment. Furthermore, this result holds for both men and women. These variables were therefore omitted from the final models.

- There are no systematic differences between men and women in how factors affect commitment. There is therefore little point in displaying separate models for men and women.

- With a couple of minor exceptions, results from OLS regressions on the employment commitment scale and logistic regressions on a dichotomized variable yielded consistent results. Results from logistic regressions are displayed and discussed in the Appendix.

In Tables 4 and 5 results from the final models are displayed for each country. In Table 4, where group differences in employment commitment are displayed, we find that only some of our expectations are supported by the data. First, in all three countries, women are significantly more committed to employment than men. This finding is particularly clear in Denmark and less so in Norway, but it is nevertheless the case that in all three countries, and, contrary to our expectations, women express a stronger non-financial commitment to employment than do men.

Second, our expectations about class and education differences are clearly supported by the data. In all three countries, we find that higher-level, non-manual employees, the self-employed and those with higher education have stronger employment commitment than workers and those with a lower level of education. The only interesting country difference in this respect is that the self-employed in Denmark seem to have a particularly strong employment commitment, whereas in the other two coun-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Employment commitment and organizational commitment in Denmark, Norway and Sweden.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commit-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All pair-wise country differences statistically significant at the 0.001 level.
tries we find the strongest commitment among members of service class I.

Third, while the employment commitment among the unemployed is weaker than among the employed in all three countries, differences are clearest in Denmark, as we hypothesized. In Norway, these differences are not even statistically significant. Only in Norway do we find the expected patterns among students and among other groups outside the labour force. Such differences are not significant in Denmark and Sweden.

Fourth, the expected age differences fail to materialize. Only in Denmark do we find any significant age differences, and here we find that older people are somewhat less committed to employment than younger people.

Turning to Table 5, we find both similarities and differences in how organizational commitment is structured compared to employment

| Table 4. Employment commitment in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Unstandardized OLS regression coefficients. |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Gender (men = 0)                                | Denmark (I)      | Denmark (II)     | Norway           | Sweden           |
|                                                  | 7.79***          | 5.16**           | 3.07***          | 4.72***          |
| Skilled worker                                  | –                | 1.97             | 1.86             | 2.28             |
| Lower non-manual                                | –                | 5.63*            | 5.02**           | 1.12             |
| Service class II                                | –                | 9.43***          | 10.07***         | 4.94*            |
| Service class I                                 | –                | 11.85***         | 11.40***         | 11.77***         |
| Self-employed                                   | –                | 16.50***         | 4.51             | 5.17*            |
| (Unskilled worker reference group)              |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Secondary education                             | 7.30***          | 6.38**           | 3.02             | 3.19*            |
| Tertiary education                              | 16.47***         | 14.96***         | 7.46***          | 8.28***          |
| (Primary education reference group)             |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Unemployed                                      | –13.21***        | –                | –3.42            | –4.70*           |
| Student                                         | –5.28            | –                | 6.04**           | 2.01             |
| Others outside labour force                     | 0.60             | –                | –4.18**          | –0.79            |
| (In paid work reference group)                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Age                                             | –0.16**          | –0.13*           | –0.01            | –0.003           |
| Constant                                        | 69.09***         | 64.11***         | 59.82***         | 57.59***         |
| $R^2$ (per cent)                                | 10.2             | 12.9             | 11.6             | 9.1              |

*** t-value significant at the 0.001 level; ** 0.01 level; * 0.05 level.

| Table 5. Organizational commitment in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Unstandardized OLS regression coefficients. |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Gender (men = 0)                                | Denmark          | Norway           | Sweden           |
|                                                  | 1.21             | 1.11             | –0.05            |
| Skilled worker                                  | 4.38             | 4.48*            | 3.54             |
| Lower non-manual                                | 5.88**           | 2.07             | –2.26            |
| Service class II                                | 7.17***          | 4.85**           | 4.42*            |
| Service class I                                 | 10.09***         | 8.84***          | 12.94***         |
| Self-employed                                   | 23.35***         | 14.31***         | 20.81***         |
| (Unskilled worker reference group)              |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Secondary education                             | 3.50             | 4.07*            | 3.09             |
| Tertiary education                              | 4.06             | 4.21*            | 3.03             |
| (Primary education reference group)             |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Age                                             | 0.24***          | 0.24***          | 0.17**           |
| Constant                                        | 46.45***         | 41.22***         | 41.31***         |
| $R^2$                                           | 10.1             | 10.4             | 17.1             |

*** t-value significant at the 0.001 level; ** 0.01 level; * 0.05 level.
commitment. Gender differences are negligible.\textsuperscript{18} Class and education differences are found in the expected direction. As expected, we find organizational commitment to be strongest among the self-employed, followed by service class I members. Education differences are considerably smaller, and there are virtually no differences between those with secondary education and those with some university education, once class position is taken into account.

Age differences are clearer regarding organizational commitment than was the case for employment commitment. As expected, organizational commitment increases with age in all three countries.

Since group patterns look roughly the same in all three countries, it makes sense to include them in a joint model, the results of which are displayed in Table 6. We find that differences in employment commitment between Sweden and Norway are no longer statistically significant when labour-market status is included in the model. As for organizational commitment, we find clearly significant country differences. Danes still display the strongest commitment to both employment and organization. Other results appear to be similar to those found in Tables 4 and 5.

Coming back to the set of hypotheses that were the point of departure for this section, we find that some of them have been confirmed, while others clearly have not. Our expectations about differences between class and education categories are clearly supported by the data. Workers have weaker commitment to both employment and organization than the service class and the self-employed. The organizational commitment is particularly strong among the self-employed, just as we expected.

Expectations about the impact of labour-market status for employment commitment showed a more mixed record. No differences between full-time and part-time employees were found, an interesting finding that could be explained by the integrative mechanisms of labour-market legislation and welfare policies, where only a few of the part-time employees are truly ‘outsiders’ in the labour market. Furthermore, it was only in Norway that we found the expected patterns among students (stronger commitment) and those outside the labour force (weaker commitment). However,
the hypothesis that employment commitment should be weaker among the unemployed than among those in work was supported. This was most clearly the case in Denmark, which indicates that our hypothesis in this respect was supported. In Norway, such differences were not statistically significant, most likely because of a low level of long-term unemployed.

Differences in commitment between younger and older persons varied in a more complicated pattern than was anticipated. Age differences in employment commitment were significant only in Denmark, where younger people had a slightly stronger commitment than older people. As for organizational commitment, we found clear age differences in all three countries, but here the findings supported the hypotheses that commitment should be stronger among older respondents. No evidence was found for any curvilinear relationship between age and commitment.

Gender differences were perhaps the most surprising finding of all in this section. Contrary to expectations, in all three countries we find significantly stronger employment commitment among women than among men. Since the debate on gender differences in employment commitment has been between those who argue that women still have weaker employment commitment than men and those who argue that there are no differences, the finding in this study is indeed remarkable, and one to which we will return in the concluding section. In organizational commitment, we find no gender differences.

We also find that factors related to the family, such as the presence of children or marriage/cohabitation, have little or no effect on employment or organizational commitment. This is found for both men and women, so there is virtually no support for our hypothesis that family factors should work differently in the case of women compared to what is found among men. In neither case do family factors have any discernible impact on work orientations.

In the concluding section, we return to these findings in an attempt to interpret them in a wider empirical and theoretical context, and suggest some new issues for research emanating from this study.

6. Conclusion

The conclusion regarding country differences at an aggregate level is rather surprising. Contrary to expectations, we find that both employment commitment and organizational commitment are strongest in Denmark and weakest in Sweden. At a group level, we find both confirmation and refutation of the hypotheses we set out to test. While both class and educational differences are as we expected beforehand, the pattern is more mixed when it comes to age differences, and the findings regarding gender differences are contrary to what was expected. The relevance of family structure for work orientations turned out to be negligible for both men and women.

What further conclusions might be drawn from the findings? One important conclusion is that the linkage between public institutions and policies on the one hand and work orientations on the other is more complex than our initial hypothesis recognized. The fact that commitment was weakest in Sweden, where we expected it to be strongest, and strongest in Denmark might either indicate that such policies and institutions are not particularly efficient in inducing commitment to work, or that the institutional changes in the Danish system were premonished to such an extent that work orientations had already been affected by them at the time of the survey. Owing to lack of data, we cannot at this point judge between these possible interpretations.

What might be suggested is that, in explaining country differences in work orientations, it could be commendable to put more emphasis on the structure and content of work itself, rather than taking the departure in public policies regarding work, or in employers’ strategies to induce commitment. Could it be that because Danish workplaces are smaller, they are also less hierarchical, more rewarding regarding work content, and so on, and that employment and organizational commitment is therefore higher here than in the other countries? The ISSP data are unfortunately not detailed enough to allow systematic comparison, but we know from previous research that such workplace-related factors tend to induce commitment (Lincoln & Kalleberg 1990:chapter 4; Gallie et al. 1998:chapter 9; Marsden et al. 1993:378–81).

Some indirect evidence that this might be the case also exists here. Dobbin & Boychuk (1999) point out that while all the Scandinavian countries display greater ‘job autonomy’ for employees than is the case in Canada, Australia and the US, job autonomy is greatest in Denmark, followed by Norway and then
Sweden. That is, exactly the same order as is found here for commitment.

One further interesting finding in this respect is the fact that Danish employees are on average more content with their work than is the case in Sweden and Norway. Thirty-eight per cent of the Danish respondents in work ‘strongly agree’ that their job is interesting, compared with 15 per cent in Norway and 13 per cent in Sweden. Forty-two per cent of them are ‘completely’ or ‘very’ satisfied with their job, compared with 27 per cent in Norway and 26 per cent in Sweden (ISSP97). Figures such as these indicate that both job autonomy and the level of satisfaction with work are higher in Denmark than in the other two countries. It would be an interesting task in itself to try to explain why this is the case, something which data limitations unfortunately prevent us from doing.

When analysing group differences, it seems generally to be the case that variables related to stratification, such as class and education, are much more important for commitment than factors related to the family. The strong effects of class on commitment are contrary to some of the previous research we reviewed (Marklund 1993:90–91; Gallie et al. 1998:194). It is still unclear why the findings differ in this respect.²⁰

Furthermore, the fact that stratification is more important than family for structuring employment is the case for both men and women (cf Bielby 1992). A ‘dualistic’ approach when analysing gender differences in work orientations, that is, the propensity to explain men’s work orientations with their work experiences and women’s work orientations with their family obligations, which Ellingsæter (1995) identifies and criticizes, thus seems inappropriate in explaining gender differences in Scandinavia.

In gender terms, the task at hand now for the three countries in question seems to be to explain why employment commitment is actually stronger among women than among men. Here, it might again be ventured that we should look at work itself in order to explain gender differences, rather than at family obligations (see also Marsden et al. 1993). For example, women more often than men are found in ‘people-processing’ organizations, where issues of commitment, devotion and ‘emotional labour’ are crucial (Hochschild 1983; 1997; Johansson 1991:186), and it is possible that this explains why their employment commitment is stronger.

Finally, what has to be remembered is, first, that these data pertain only to one specific point in time. More research is needed in order to judge whether the attitude levels and structure are robust over time, something that cannot be taken for granted when we consider the continuing rapid transformation of work.

Second, the analyses have included only three rather similar country cases. Before we attempt to explain why groups and countries differ in their work orientations, we should be well advised not to extrapolate too far from the countries in question. After all, in the context of the industrialized world, the Scandinavian countries are rather extreme examples of ‘dual breadwinner’ models. They are certainly extreme in the extent to which paid labour has been established as a way of life for most of the adult population. As pointed out, they are also to some extent different from other Western nations when it comes to the organization of work. Further comparative research might still find the approach and findings of this study useful, regardless of where they might arrive in their conclusions.
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Notes

¹ For some recent examples, see Blackburn & Mann (1979:chapters 6–8); Mowday et al. (1982); Warr (1982); Rose (1985); Furnham (1990); Lincoln & Kalleberg (1990); Ellingsæter (1995:part IV); Gallie et al. (1998:chapters 7–9); Nordenmark (1999).

² One bewildering aspect in the literature is that one of the most common indicators of employment commitment is the ‘Work Involvement Scale’ (WIS). The scale was developed by Warr et al. (1979) and has since been used, in one version or another, in a multitude of studies of employment commitment. It is our opinion that this scale indicates commitment to employment rather than ‘work involvement’, and this also seems to be the way it has been used in research.

³ A third possible dimension of work orientation is ‘career commitment’, which refers to identification with and involve-
ment in one’s occupation. It is, however, impossible to discern this dimension in the data. The indicators designed to measure this particular dimension therefore have been merged with the indicators designed to measure ‘organizational commitment’ (see Tables 2–3). A possible further aspect of work orientation is ‘job involvement’, which refers to the extent to which individuals are absorbed by their daily job, their (stated) willingness to put effort into it (Randall & Cote 1991:197). We are, however, unable to find suitable measures of this in the data material (see also note 12).

4 The category of home-workers is on the way to extinction in the Scandinavian countries. About 4 per cent of respondents in Denmark and Norway and less than 1 per cent of respondents in Sweden report themselves as home-workers/makers. Among those under age 50, the Danish figure is also below 1 per cent.

5 This is to some extent also reflected in the attitudes towards working mothers in Norway and Sweden, both in terms of how parents perceive social norms (Ellingsæter 1998:65), and in terms of individual attitudes (cf. Knudsen & Wiernes 1996 and Sundström 1999).

6 At the time of the 1997 survey, Denmark was still not a member of the ISSP. The survey on Work Orientations was nevertheless fielded as a separate survey in Denmark.

7 The procedure for translating the questionnaire is very similar in the three countries. Two independent translations by research team members are compared, discussed and decided on in a wider forum. Specific translation problems are discussed with the ISSP secretariat. No reverse translation is made.

8 In legal and ‘moral’ terms, marriage and cohabitation are virtually one and the same in the Scandinavian countries.

9 The codings from ISCO88 used in this study are provided in Svallfors (1997, appendix 2, ISCO88 into Goldthorpe classes), and can be obtained as files from Stefan Svallfors (stefan.svallfors@soc.umu.se). When reclassifying the ISCO88 into Goldthorpe classes, the reclassifications made by Ganzeboom and Treiman (1996) proved immensely helpful. These may be downloaded from Harry Ganzeboom’s homepage (www.fss.uu.nl/HG). Minor deviations from the standard ISCO88 classification. An alternative way to create Goldthorpe classes in Sweden is to use a combination of the Swedish socio-economic classification (SEI) and the Nordic classification of occupations (NYK) (Svallfors 1997: appendix 2). This creates a somewhat smaller ‘Routine non-manual’ class, and somewhat larger service classes and working classes compared to the algorithm used here. Patterns regarding differences in work orientation are quite similar to those presented (although correlations are slightly lower). SPSS runs are available from the authors.

10 Since Sweden has the lowest age cut-off point of the original sample (75), the Norwegian and Danish samples have also been cut off in order to exclude those above 75 years. The last five items in the table have only been asked of those presently in paid work.

11 For all items except nos. 1 and 6, respondents who answer ‘strongly agree’ get the highest value and those who answer ‘strongly disagree’ the lowest. Items 1 and 6 have been reversed.

12 A different indicator asking respondents how much they are involved with their work (Q 12 in the 1997 ISSP questionnaire at http://www.za.uni-koeln.de/data/en/issp/questpdf.htm) also did not correlate well with any of the other indicators. This is probably because it does not discriminate clearly between those who are driven by inner conviction and dedication and those whose hard work is induced by external demands and pressure.

13 SPSS runs are available from the authors on request.

14 This has been tested by using sets of age categories instead of the linear variable.

15 A couple of minor exceptions to this is that cohabitation is (barely) significant among women in Denmark in the expected direction when it comes to employment commitment, while the presence of children tends to lower both employment and organizational commitment for men in Sweden, contrary to expectations. In both of these cases there are minuscule improvements in model fit when the child and cohabitation variables are included.

16 In order to increase comparability of the levels of significance, the (n)s have been weighted to an average of the three samples.

17 This is not an effect of the fact that class cannot be included in the same model as labour-market status in Denmark. The figures for Norway and Sweden change somewhat, but not much, if we exclude the dummy variables for class from the model.

18 Only in Sweden do we find any significant differences between men and women at a bivariate level, where men are more committed than women. Precisely as in the analysis by Marsden et al. (1993), these differences disappear once we control for the higher occurrence of self-employment among men.

19 One possible way to save the hypothesis about weaker commitment among women than among men would be to point out that gender differences are of the expected kind if one chooses to compare answers to the omitted variable from Table 1 (‘Work is a person’s most important activity’). Here we find that men more often than women agree with this proposition. As argued for in the text, though, this variable hardly measures employment commitment per se, but rather the importance of work in relative terms (cf. Eriksson 1999). This demonstrates that women may have a more ambiguous attitude towards employment than men, which is also supported by the fact that significantly more women than men prefer part-time work (ISSP97).

20 One possible explanation is the fact that Gallie et al. (1998:194) include ‘work ethic’ and ‘locus of control’ as dependent variables in their model. If there is a strong correlation between class and ‘work ethic’ or ‘locus of control’, the correlation between class and employment commitment may be obscured.
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Appendix: logistic regression

Since the employment commitment scale showed dubious reliability, a dichotomized version of the item ‘I would enjoy having a paid job even if I did not need the money’ was used in a logistic regression to check whether the results obtained from the two-item scale, as presented in the body of the text, would change in any significant manner. The particular item chosen seems to be the one most often used in previous ‘single indicator’ analyses. In Table A1, results for a joint model for all three countries are displayed (results from single-country models are available from the authors).

Table A1. Employment commitment\(^1\) in Denmark, Norway and Sweden (odds ratios).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (men ref.)</td>
<td>1.42(***)</td>
<td>1.41(***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled worker</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower non-manual</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class II</td>
<td>1.44(**)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class I</td>
<td>2.03(*)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>1.79(*)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unskilled worker reference group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>1.34(**)</td>
<td>1.36(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td>2.01(***)</td>
<td>2.10(***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary education reference group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.63(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others outside labour force</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(In paid work reference group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1.60(***)</td>
<td>1.32(***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of significance (Wald): \(***\) significant at the 0.001 level; \(**\) 0.01 level; \(*) 0.05 level.

\(^1\) Measured as odds for agreeing with the proposition ‘I would enjoy having a paid job even if I did not need the money’.
As shown in the Table, the results are more or less similar to those obtained when we used the employment commitment scale (compare Table 6 in the main text). Two minor exceptions are:

- The category ‘others outside labour force’ now has a significantly weaker employment commitment than those in paid work, which was not the case when we used the two-item scale.

This is in accordance with our initial hypothesis. This is probably attributable to the fact that most people in this category, e.g. old-age pensioners and the long-term incapacitated, have strong legitimate grounds for not wanting or seeking paid labour, and that this will show more clearly when using this particular item to measure employment commitment.

- Norwegians now have slightly weaker employment commitment than Swedes, while the opposite was found when we used the two-item scale.

Since these differences were not statistically significant, it still seems like a minor deviation from the results presented in the main text.