

Appendix 6d): Family impact – employee responses.

Roster * Extent working dayshift causes problems with: family life

% within Roster

		Extent working dayshift causes problems with: family life			
		Never or rarely	Sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	30.5%	37.3%	32.2%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	20.7%	26.9%	52.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	20.3%	40.5%	39.2%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	36.9%	36.9%	26.2%	100.0%
Total		26.5%	34.3%	39.2%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(6) = 22.389$ p = .001 n = 426.

Roster * Extent working dayshift causes problems with: social life

% within Roster

		Extent working dayshift causes problems with: social life			
		Never or rarely	Sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	20.9%	33.0%	46.1%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	14.9%	20.9%	64.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	11.4%	34.2%	54.4%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	34.6%	30.9%	34.6%	100.0%
Total		19.6%	28.6%	51.8%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(6) = 28.439$ p = .000 n = 423.

Roster * Extent working nightshift causes problems with: family life

% within Roster

		Extent working nightshift causes problems with: family life			
		Never or rarely	Sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	23.7%	35.6%	40.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	12.6%	22.4%	65.0%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	11.3%	30.0%	58.8%	100.0%
Total		16.1%	28.7%	55.1%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Only rotating rosters included in analysis ñ permanent dayshift removed n = 365.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(4) = 17.710$ p = .001 n = 341.

Roster * Extent working nightshift causes problems with: social life

% within Roster

		Extent working nightshift causes problems with: social life			
		Never or rarely	Sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	16.2%	29.1%	54.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	4.9%	18.2%	76.9%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	3.7%	28.4%	67.9%	100.0%
Total		8.5%	24.3%	67.2%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.
 Notes: Only rotating rosters included in analysis ñ permanent dayshift removed n = 365.
 Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(4) = 21.203$ p = .000 n = 341.

Family structure * Extent working dayshift causes problems with: family life

% within Family structure 2

		Extent working dayshift causes problems with: family life			
		Never or rarely	Sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Family structure 2	No children	35.4%	37.8%	26.8%	100.0%
	Children aged 0-18	21.9%	32.4%	45.7%	100.0%
	Children all over 18	40.9%	36.4%	22.7%	100.0%
Total		27.1%	34.0%	38.9%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.
 Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(4) = 17.293$ p = .002 n = 373.

Family structure * Extent working nightshift causes problems with: family life

% within Family structure 2

		Extent working nightshift causes problems with: family life			
		Never or rarely	Sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Family structure 2	No children	23.7%	32.9%	43.4%	100.0%
	Children aged 0-18	11.8%	26.6%	61.6%	100.0%
	Children all over 18	29.3%	34.1%	36.6%	100.0%
Total		16.4%	28.8%	54.8%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.
 Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(4) = 17.180$ p = .002 n = 354.

Age of respondent * Extent working nightshift causes problems with: family life

% within Age of respondent

		Extent working nightshift causes problems with: family life			
		Never or rarely	Sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Age of respondent	18-24	23.5%	41.2%	35.3%	100.0%
	25-34	13.3%	22.7%	64.1%	100.0%
	35-44	11.9%	29.8%	58.3%	100.0%
	45-54	20.0%	26.2%	53.8%	100.0%
	55-64	41.2%	29.4%	29.4%	100.0%
Total		15.9%	27.8%	56.2%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(8) = 20.884$ p = .007 n = 395.

Main advantages of shift system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Break blocks/weekend off	176	27.4	33.5	33.5
	None	172	26.8	32.7	66.2
	Financial	70	10.9	13.3	79.6
	Other	58	9.1	11.1	90.7
	Increased family/home time	37	5.8	7.1	97.8
	Dayshift	7	1.2	1.4	99.2
	Increased social time	4	.7	.8	100.0
	Total	526	81.8	100.0	
Missing	System	117	18.2		
Total		643	100.0		

Population: Processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 643.

Notes: Population estimates of main advantage of current shift system

Main disadvantages of shift system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other	138	21.4	26.3	26.3
	Disrupts family/home life	128	19.9	24.5	50.8
	Hours	68	10.6	13.1	63.9
	Insufficient time off	65	10.0	12.4	76.2
	Fatigue	54	8.3	10.3	86.5
	Disrupts social life	48	7.4	9.2	95.6
	Amount of days in shift block	23	3.6	4.4	100.0
	Total	523	81.3	100.0	
Missing	System	120	18.7		
Total		643	100.0		

Population: Processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 643.

Notes: Population estimates of main disadvantage of current shift system

Roster * Main advantages of shift system

% within Roster		Main advantages of shift system						
		Increased family /home time	Break blocks /weekend off	Financial	Dayshift	None	Other	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	13.6%	63.6%	2.7%		11.8%	8.2%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)		5.5%	22.8%		64.6%	7.1%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	4.2%	40.8%	12.7%		26.8%	15.5%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	13.2%	30.9%	13.2%	7.4%	13.2%	22.1%	100.0%
Total		7.2%	33.8%	13.3%	1.3%	32.7%	11.7%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Cell counts in some cells were too small to complete significance testing.

Roster * Main disadvantages of shift system

% within Roster		Main disadvantages of shift system							
		Disrupts family /home life	Disrupts social life	Amount of days in shift block	Hours	Insufficient time off	Fatigue	Other	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	17.4%	6.4%	1.8%	21.1%	1.8%	12.8%	38.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	32.6%	11.6%	7.0%	9.3%	19.4%	10.9%	9.3%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	20.6%	5.9%	7.4%	2.9%	17.6%	8.8%	36.8%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	22.4%	11.9%	1.5%	17.9%	10.4%	6.0%	29.9%	100.0%
Total		24.1%	9.1%	4.6%	13.1%	12.3%	10.2%	26.5%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: cell counts in some cells were too small to complete significance testing.

Roster * Do you feel the advantages of current shift outweigh disadvantages

% within Roster		Do you feel the advantages of current shift outweigh disadvantages					
		Definitely not	Probably not	Maybe	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	19.0%	14.0%	24.8%	22.3%	19.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	69.7%	8.3%	14.5%	4.1%	3.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	35.4%	21.5%	22.8%	7.6%	12.7%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	26.8%	23.2%	15.9%	12.2%	22.0%	100.0%
Total		40.7%	15.2%	19.2%	11.5%	13.3%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(12) = 102.335$ $p = .000$ $n = 427$

Roster * Satisfied with hours worked and money earned Crosstabulation

% within Roster

		Satisfied with hours worked and money earned			
		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	41.1%	13.7%	45.2%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	76.8%	12.6%	10.6%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	68.7%	12.0%	19.3%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	50.0%	12.5%	37.5%	100.0%
Total		60.1%	12.8%	27.1%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(6) = 52.514$ p = .000 n = 446

Roster * I would accept less money for fewer hours

% within Roster

		I would accept less money for fewer hours			
		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	60.2%	17.9%	22.0%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	25.0%	18.4%	56.6%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	53.7%	28.0%	18.3%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	54.7%	22.1%	23.3%	100.0%
Total		45.8%	20.8%	33.4%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(6) = 63.045$ p = .000 n = 443

Roster * I would like to work fewer hours but would not accept less money

% within Roster

		I would like to work fewer hours but would not accept less money			
		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	30.4%	16.8%	52.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	36.1%	19.7%	44.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	11.1%	25.9%	63.0%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	23.5%	29.4%	47.1%	100.0%
Total		27.4%	21.9%	50.7%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(6) = 21.279$ p = .002 n = 438

Roster * My family understands the need for me to work the roster I do

% within Roster

		My family understands the need for me to work the roster I do				
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	9.1%	11.6%	74.4%	5.0%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	8.0%	26.7%	58.7%	6.7%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	5.0%	27.5%	62.5%	5.0%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	8.5%	8.5%	69.5%	13.4%	100.0%
Total		7.9%	19.2%	65.8%	7.2%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(9) = 25.584$ p = .002 n = 433

Roster * My family is not supportive of the roster I currently work

% within Roster

		My family is not supportive of the roster I currently work				
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	12.6%	47.9%	33.6%	5.9%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	10.1%	25.5%	43.0%	21.5%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	6.2%	50.6%	32.1%	11.1%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	8.9%	46.8%	30.4%	13.9%	100.0%
Total		9.8%	40.4%	36.0%	13.8%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(9) = 30.292$ p = .000 n = 428

Roster * I like the roster I work and it fits in with my family life

% within Roster

		I like the roster I work and it fits in with my family life				
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	10.7%	34.7%	45.5%	9.1%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	51.3%	34.7%	8.0%	6.0%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	26.5%	44.6%	18.1%	10.8%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	17.3%	32.1%	39.5%	11.1%	100.0%
Total		29.0%	36.1%	26.2%	8.7%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(9) = 91.820$ p = .000 n = 435

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between age groups $X^2(4) = 9.928$ p = .042 n = 430

Roster * The roster has a detrimental impact on my family life

% within Roster

		The roster has a detrimental impact on my family life				
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	9.4%	40.2%	41.9%	8.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	5.4%	10.7%	38.3%	45.6%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	6.1%	25.6%	36.6%	31.7%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	5.1%	44.3%	34.2%	16.5%	100.0%
Total		6.6%	27.9%	38.2%	27.4%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(9) = 69.989$ p = .000 n = 427

Roster * The overall quality of my relationship with my partner on roster

% within Roster

		The overall quality of my relationship with my partner on roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	25.7%	21.9%	36.2%	16.2%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	26.1%	38.8%	28.4%	6.7%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	23.7%	46.1%	19.7%	10.5%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	20.0%	26.2%	35.4%	18.5%	100.0%
Total		24.5%	33.4%	30.0%	12.1%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(9) = 22.496$ p = .007 n = 380

Roster * The overall quality of my relationship with my partner off roster

% within Roster

		The overall quality of my relationship with my partner off roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	4.9%	7.8%	43.7%	43.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	5.3%	14.3%	41.4%	39.1%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	5.4%	13.5%	33.8%	47.3%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	3.0%	12.1%	42.4%	42.4%	100.0%
Total		4.8%	12.0%	40.7%	42.6%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Some cell sizes were too small to assess significance.

Roster * The overall quality of my relationship with my children on roster

% within Roster

		The overall quality of my relationship with my children on roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	26.1%	27.2%	28.3%	18.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	29.1%	31.1%	29.1%	10.7%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	26.3%	28.1%	35.1%	10.5%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	23.5%	17.6%	43.1%	15.7%	100.0%
Total		26.7%	27.1%	32.3%	13.9%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: No significant difference between the rosters n = 303

Roster * The overall quality of my relationship with my children off roster

% within Roster

		The overall quality of my relationship with my children off roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	3.3%	8.8%	37.4%	50.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	4.9%	14.6%	35.9%	44.7%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)		20.0%	34.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	3.8%	13.5%	36.5%	46.2%	100.0%
Total		3.3%	13.6%	36.2%	46.8%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Some cell sizes were too small to assess significance.

Roster * My ability to spend as much time as desired with my partner on roster

% within Roster

		My ability to spend as much time with my partner on roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	54.9%	18.6%	21.6%	4.9%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	69.9%	21.3%	6.6%	2.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	52.1%	38.4%	9.6%		100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	53.7%	25.4%	17.9%	3.0%	100.0%
Total		59.5%	24.6%	13.2%	2.6%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(9) = 27.290$ p = .001 n = 378

Roster * My ability to spend as much time as desired with my partner off roster

% within Roster

		My ability to spend as much time with my partner off roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	10.7%	13.6%	37.9%	37.9%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	13.0%	27.5%	34.4%	25.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	12.5%	25.0%	38.9%	23.6%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	15.2%	18.2%	39.4%	27.3%	100.0%
Total		12.6%	21.5%	37.1%	28.8%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: No significant difference between the rosters n = 372.

Roster * My ability to spend as much time as I would like with my family on roster

% within Roster

		My ability to spend as much time with my family on roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	56.1%	17.8%	22.4%	3.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	76.1%	16.4%	5.2%	2.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	59.2%	31.6%	9.2%		100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	57.1%	20.6%	19.0%	3.2%	100.0%
Total		63.9%	20.5%	13.2%	2.4%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Some cell sizes were too small to assess significance.

Roster * My ability to spend as much time as I would like with my family off roster

% within Roster

		My ability to spend as much time with my family off roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	12.1%	17.8%	36.4%	33.6%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	19.8%	29.8%	29.8%	20.6%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	17.1%	28.9%	35.5%	18.4%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	12.5%	18.8%	39.1%	29.7%	100.0%
Total		15.9%	24.3%	34.4%	25.4%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Difference between the rosters approaching significance $X^2(9) = 15.094$ p = .088 n = 378.

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Roster * The quality of communication with my partner on roster

% within Roster

		The quality of communication with my partner on roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	29.1%	33.0%	27.2%	10.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	32.6%	41.5%	20.7%	5.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	19.4%	47.2%	23.6%	9.7%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	17.9%	29.9%	38.8%	13.4%	100.0%
Total		26.5%	38.2%	26.3%	9.0%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between the rosters $X^2(9) = 19.046$ p = .025 n = 377

Roster * The quality of communication with my partner off roster

% within Roster

		The quality of communication with my partner off roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	5.8%	10.7%	44.7%	38.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	6.1%	19.8%	47.3%	26.7%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	1.4%	18.1%	50.0%	30.6%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	3.0%	16.7%	47.0%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		4.6%	16.4%	47.0%	32.0%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Some cell sizes were too small to assess significance.

Roster * The quality of communication with my children on roster

% within Roster

		The quality of communication with my children on roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	35.5%	34.4%	18.3%	11.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	40.7%	29.6%	22.2%	7.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	24.6%	49.1%	17.5%	8.8%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	26.9%	26.9%	34.6%	11.5%	100.0%
Total		33.9%	34.2%	22.3%	9.7%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Difference between rosters approaching significance $X^2(9) = 15.006$ p = .091 n = 310

Roster * The quality of communication with my children off roster

% within Roster		The quality of communication with my children off roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	4.3%	17.2%	39.8%	38.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	5.7%	17.1%	51.4%	25.7%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	3.6%	19.6%	42.9%	33.9%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	1.9%	17.3%	44.2%	36.5%	100.0%
Total		4.2%	17.6%	45.1%	33.0%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Some cell sizes too small to assess significance.

Roster * My ability to be involved in childrens activities on roster

% within Roster		My ability to be involved in childrens activities on roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	67.8%	20.0%	8.9%	3.3%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	83.5%	11.7%	2.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	83.3%	11.7%	5.0%		100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	73.9%	6.5%	13.0%	6.5%	100.0%
Total		77.3%	13.4%	6.7%	2.7%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between rosters $X^2(9) = 17.228$ p = .045 n = 299

Roster * My ability to be involved in childrens activities off roster

% within Roster		My ability to be involved in childrens activities off roster				
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	19.3%	15.9%	39.8%	25.0%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	33.3%	22.2%	28.3%	16.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	31.0%	15.5%	32.8%	20.7%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	23.4%	14.9%	21.3%	40.4%	100.0%
Total		27.1%	17.8%	31.5%	23.6%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between rosters $X^2(9) = 17.672$ p = .039 n = 292

Roster * My ability to be involved in social activities on roster

% within Roster		My ability to be involved in social activities on roster				Total
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	68.6%	19.8%	11.6%		100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	89.2%	7.4%	2.0%	1.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	82.5%	12.5%	5.0%		100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	64.1%	19.2%	15.4%	1.3%	100.0%
Total		77.5%	14.1%	7.7%	.7%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: some cell counts too small to assess significance.

Roster * My ability to be involved in social activities off roster

% within Roster		My ability to be involved in social activities off roster				Total
		Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	19.0%	23.1%	37.2%	20.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	34.5%	30.3%	21.8%	13.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	31.6%	25.3%	31.6%	11.4%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	21.8%	24.4%	35.9%	17.9%	100.0%
Total		27.1%	26.2%	30.7%	16.0%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between rosters $X^2(9) = 18.160$ p = .033 n = 420

Roster * Are the above aspects of family life affected by the shift you are on?

% within Roster		Are the above aspects of family life affected by the shift you are on?			Total
		Yes, things are better on day shift	No, it does not make a difference	Yes, things are better on night shift	
Roster	Rotating D/N even-time roster (42 hr)	21.6%	73.3%	5.2%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	26.0%	67.8%	6.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	45.0%	50.0%	5.0%	100.0%
	Day shift (40-60+ hr)	50.7%	47.8%	1.4%	100.0%
Total		32.6%	62.5%	4.9%	100.0%

Population: Effective sample size of processing workers in Tasmanian mines n = 464.

Notes: Significant difference between rosters $X^2(6) = 26.376$ p = .000 n = 411