Is women´s job satisfaction higher than men´s?: Self-selection, expectations or utility function.

Nuria Sánchez-Sánchez[1]

Adolfo C. Fernández Puente

Abstract. This paper examines the paradox between high relative levels of job satisfaction and the characteristics of women's jobs compared to men´s in Spain. The Survey of Quality of Life Quality at Work (2006-2010) is used to study the differences in job satisfaction levels for both women and men and their determinants.

The study shows women are more likely to be satisfied at work than men, despite lower quality working conditions. This paradox persists regardless of the inclusion of a great range of variables of a different nature (both objective and subjective), age group and the educational level under consideration. The Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition suggests that women´s preferences are actually influencing the differences in job satisfaction. However, it is not demonstrated that these differences disappear as age decreases or the educational level increases.

Key words: satisfaction, self-selection, expectations, working conditions, personal development

JEL codes: J01, J16, I30.

[1] Nuria Sánchez-Sánchez (corresponding author): Department of Economics, University of Cantabria, Spain; e-mail: sanchezn@unican.es.. Adolfo C. Fernandez: Department of Economics, University of Cantabria, Spain; e-mail: adolfo.cosme@unican.es.

1. Introduction

The economic literature devoted to the determinants of job satisfaction has been extensive in the last two decades. One of the issues of most interest has been the existence of differences in job satisfaction between men and women. Although studies have shown mixed results, most conclude that the level of satisfaction of women is higher than that of men. This higher satisfaction is paradoxical, since the study of working conditions in terms of wage gap and employment segregation shows a clearly unfavourable situation for women, which does not seem to penalize job satisfaction.

The conditional gender differences are sensitive to specification (Clark and Oswald 1996; Sloane and Ward 2001; and Kifle et al. 2014). Additionally, the results do not appear to be homogeneous in the different age groups and educational levels. In fact, there appears to be a lower difference in satisfaction by gender in those younger workers with a higher educational level. Finally, the labour market conditions of each country also seem to determine the differences in satisfaction levels, not only in the differential between men and women, but also in the sign. In fact, studies related to the Spanish labour market show contradictory results.

This disparity of results is precisely what justifies this work. Thus, a detailed analysis of the differences in job satisfaction between men and women in the Spanish labour market is offered, including their personal characteristics and the objective and subjective characteristics of their jobs. In addition, the sample is firstly disaggregated according to age group and, secondly, to the worker´s educational level to verify whether differences in satisfaction levels persist, even when self-selection bias is reduced.

The article is structured as follows: In the second section, following this introduction, the theoretical framework that justifies the existence of differences in satisfaction levels by gender is developed. The third section describes the data, the methodology and the theoretical model used in the estimates, while the fourth shows the econometric results. Finally, some briefs conclusions are offered.

The analysis includes several novel aspects. First, the period considered, 2006-2010, includes two years in which the economic crisis had a strong impact on the Spanish labour market. In this period, far from being reduced, female activity rates increased and

converged with those of males, which reduced[2]. This convergence will evidence a reduction in self-selection bias differences between men and women. Second, estimations include, as independent variables, subjective labour characteristics, as well as satisfaction with housework. Thereby, estimates reflect more closely the differences in job satisfaction attributed inherently to sex[3]. Lastly, the sample has been disaggregated by age and educational levels, since it is precisely in the groups of younger and more educated people where the differences between men and women participation in the labour market are smaller.

2. Theoretical framework: job satisfaction and sex.

Clark´s seminal work (1997) approached for the first time the issue of differences between male and female job satisfaction and opened a field of research that aims not only at measuring its existence, but also at finding its cause.

Despite mixed results, most of the studies demonstrate a positive difference in job satisfaction of women compared to men (Clark 1997; Sloane and Williams 2000; Long 2005; and Souza-Poza and Sousa-Poza 2000a and 2007). The main reasons given to justify this differential are as follows: i) the existence of selection bias when participating in the labour market; ii) the presence of adaptive job satisfaction; and iii) the existence of differences related to gender and activities that have traditionally been performed by men and women, which are of a different nature to strictly labour issues.

The first hypothesis is that there may be a selection bias which means only women with greater motivation participate in the labour market, and that this increased motivation which would make them feel more satisfied. This situation could be caused by a woman´s marital status (Carleton and Clain, 2012). In principle, married women could enjoy additional resources from their husbands and therefore, greater discretion when starting or staying in a job. If this hypothesis were true, married women who work would do it to

[2] Female activity rate rose from 48.5 to 52.7 percent, while male activity rate dropped from 69.2 to 68.2 percent according to Labour Force Survey (hereafter EPA) published by the National Statistics Institute (hereafter INE).

[3] Kayser (2007) considers satisfaction with workplace safety and with hours worked as dependent variables, but not as explanatory ones, which may overestimate the coefficient of women's total job satisfaction.

a large extent because they wish to and would be more satisfied in their jobs (otherwise they would give them up). The authors add that in the case of married men, mobility is more reduced, as would be the aggregated satisfaction levels. The results of their work corroborate this idea by observing greater satisfaction in women than men, exclusively when considering married people.

In the case of Spain, the male activity rate exceeds by more than 12 percentage points the female activity rate[4], so it could be argued that there is a bias in market participation and it is possible that it could be related, among other factors, to motivation. In principle, participation would depend on the woman´s personal circumstances, but also in many cases on the real possibilities of entering the labour market, which in turn depend on age, education and effective discrimination when recruited. Being older, having lower education than required or being discriminated against when recruited, could lead to leaving the labour market, thereby younger and more highly qualified people exclusively remaining, with higher chances of being recruited and therefore being more satisfied.

If this hypothesis were true, satisfaction levels of men and women with the same educational level should be similar[5]. Since in Spain the different levels of education between men and women has tended to converge over time, satisfaction levels should also be the same, at least for younger people. The study of official data evidences a clear convergence in the activity rates by age[6] and by education[7]. Therefore, disaggregation by ages and levels of education would reduce the self-selection bias.

The second hypothesis is based on women's lower job expectations. The justification would be that women have traditionally been in the worst position in the labour market,

[4] See the corresponding data of the EPA published by the INE.

[5] The effect that discrimination could have at the moment of recruiting will not be removed.

[6] Women's activity rate rises from 48.9 percent in the 55-59 age group to 85.1 percent in the 25-29 age group, according to INE. Thus, in the first group the difference between female and male activity is almost 31 percentage points and, in the second one, only 4. Throughout the period, an increase of the activity rates is observed in all groups.

[7] Activity rates of women with higher vocational training certificates and university and post-university studies are significantly higher than those of women with lower educational levels. Moreover, female activity rates are bigger than those of men at those educational levels according to INE. Therefore, in these strata of population it could be concluded that self-selection bias does not exist, or that, at least, it is comparable to that of males.

which would be associated with lower job prospects. Thus, worse working conditions would affect women to a lesser extent than men and their satisfaction, *ceteris paribus*, would be higher, since they would internalize the difficulties they encounter to get the job.

This situation, once again should be transitional in the event that an equality of working conditions between men and women might occur over time. It is possible to assume that the equal level of working conditions is higher among younger and more qualified people (Sousa-Pouza and Sousa-Pouza, 2003). Therefore, one would expect sex not to affect job satisfaction levels in the younger and more qualified group (Sloane and Ward, 2001 and Green *et al*., 2016).

The third and final hypothesis is based on the existence of differences in satisfaction levels or preferences related to gender. This line of argument would be justified by biological reasons, which are beyond our analysis, or because women will include within their work utility function other aspects of their personal and family life to a greater extent than men. Since women most often take care of children, dependents and even the household chores, satisfaction with these activities could impact on job satisfaction (Borra et al. 2007). In this line, Bender *et al.* (2005) and Sloane and Williams (2000) attributed women's higher job satisfaction to greater flexibility and environment in their work, which will be chosen by the worker herself to reconcile with other personal or family aspects. When these variables are taken into account, the differences in job satisfaction associated with gender disappear.

In any case, to corroborate at least partially each of the hypotheses, it would be necessary to consider , apart from objective and subjective job characteristics, educational levels, age of workers and other variables associated with the worker´s family and personal environment.

At an aggregated level, labour market conditions in each country also seem to determine the differences in satisfaction between men and women. Research in Spain is scarce and the conclusions are disparate. Alvarez (2005), Kaiser (2007), Rico (2012) and Hauret and Williams[8] (2017) indicate that women´s satisfaction is higher than men´s, while Mora and Carbonell (2009) conclude that women´s satisfaction is lower than their male

[8] Spain is not analyzed separately as it is included in the group of Southern European countries.

colleagues´[9]. However, Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza (2000b) and Gamero (2004) conclude that there are no significant differences between the sexes. None of the studies mentioned considers the period 2006-2010, in which Spanish labour market conditions drastically changed due to the impact of the economic crisis.

3. Sources and methodology.

That research on job satisfaction in Spain has been scarce is mainly due to the lack of data. Euro-barometer surveys are often used, but the sample size for each country is rather small (1000 each year) and the covariates included too limited to carry out any extensive and robust analyses. The European Community Household Panel Survey contains information on job satisfaction but it ceased in 2001, substituted by a survey with reduced information.

The only available Spanish data with a reasonable sample size, which includes information on job satisfaction, is the Spanish Survey of Life Quality at Work (hereafter SLQW). The survey is conducted on more than 7000 Spanish workers each year starting from 1999. Our study focuses on five cross-sections of the SLQW survey for the years 2006-2010[10]. The main advantage of the survey is that it includes workers' self-reported satisfaction scores in different job domains as well as overall job satisfaction, along with the information on important worker and job characteristics. Unfortunately, the survey is not longitudinal; therefore it is unable to examine the factors affecting transitions in satisfaction levels or to control fixed individual effects.

At the outset, it is important to verify the job satisfaction questions analysed. The respondents in the survey were asked "How satisfied are you with your job (or different job aspects)?" with 10 possible response categories ranging from 'very dissatisfied' (=1) to 'very satisfied' (=10). The responses are based entirely on individuals' own perception. The question asked is not concrete in terms of comparison groups or in the description of

[9] Their research is focused exclusively on the region of Catalonia for the case of university lecturers.

[10] Although survey data is available since 1999, there were some methodological changes which make data incomparable between pre and post 2006 periods. The survey was discontinued in 2011 as a result of budget cut by the Government.

each satisfaction level category[11], thereby leaving room for interpretation of heterogeneity across interviewees. Another characteristic to note is that the responses are ordered qualitatively[12]. Comparing responses between groups of people is not straightforward. The analysis begins with simple "averages" of the responses. The simple average provides a satisfaction index which is comparable across year or population under the assumption of linearity across response category.

In Appendix 1 the set of variables used, its definition, how they are measured, their average and standard deviation are shown.

Regarding the theoretical model, it is based on an individual work utility function for each worker, which adopts the term used by Clark and Oswald (1996):

$$u = u\left(xj, fl\right) \tag{1}$$

where *x* includes those variables related to the worker´s individual characteristics, *j* those related to the job characteristics, both objective and subjective and *fl* those related to work flexibility and family life conciliation.

To estimate the model, it is assumed that job satisfaction can be used as a proxy of individual work utility so the following model is proposed:

$$JS_i^* = \beta X_i + \alpha J_i + \gamma fl_i + \varepsilon_i \tag{2}$$

Job satisfaction (hereafter *JS**) is a latent variable that denotes the probability of individual of being satisfied at work. This variable is unobservable, and, for its measurement, an ordinal assessment made by the individual himself is used. The relationship between the latent variable and our job satisfaction variable is shown by the following expression:

[11] The categories (2, 3, 4, …, 9) between the worst (=1) and the best (=10) have no words attached to them.

[12] To the extent that respondents considered the response numbers (1 to 10) as cardinal measures of their satisfaction (for example, the response 10 means twice more satisfied than the response 5), the reported values may be used as a cardinal measure of satisfaction. However, many studies have shown virtually no qualitative differences in empirical results between different treatments of the variable.

$$SL_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & if & JS_i^* \leq \mu_0 \\ 1 & if & \mu_0 < JS_i^* \leq \mu_1 \\ 2 & if & \mu_1 < JS_i^* \leq \mu_2 \\ & & \dots \\ 10 & if & \mu_{10} \leq JS_i^* \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where μ are the values of latent job satisfaction, which define the observed job satisfaction intervals. It is assumed $\mu_0 = 0$.

Since the values of the dependent variable are ordered, in the estimation of the model, an ordered probit model is used. The values of the variable measuring job satisfaction have been grouped into three categories: the value 0 expresses low satisfaction (values from 0 to 4), 1 average satisfaction (values 5-7) and 2 high satisfaction (values 8 to 10). The purpose of the group is twofold. On the one hand, the results will be easier to interpret. On the other hand, part of the subjective component a person has when assigning a specific value to their job satisfaction is eliminated. For the interpretation of the results marginal changes in each category are estimated, so that the change is reflected in the probabilities by estimating the marginal changes of each explanatory variable.

The marginal effect corresponds to the slope of the curve relating the dependent variable xi with the probability that the job satisfaction observed takes the value *j* conditioned to *xi*, keeping all other variables constant. In short, the curve relating *xi* with $\Pr(JS_i = j|x_i|$, where j =0,1,2, since our variable only takes three values. The results shown are the marginal effects when job satisfaction takes the maximum value (2) [13].

Finally, the method of Oaxaca-Blinder (1973) is also used to disaggregate the observed differences in satisfaction levels between men and women into two components: the component attributable to the characteristics of the job done by both and the component corresponding to the performance of each of those characteristics obtained by men and women.

[13] Refer to the authors to request estimates for the values 0 and 1.

In this case as a non-linear model is used, the conditional expectations of the characteristics may differ from the characteristics themselves (Oaxaca and Ransom, 1994). Therefore the conventional decomposition equation is redefined in terms of conditional expectations performing the following breakdown:

$$\overline{JS_F} - \overline{JS_M} = \left[E_{\beta^*}(JS_{iF} \setminus X_{iF}) - E_{\beta^*}(JS_{iM} \setminus X_{iM})\right] +$$

$$\left[E_{\beta_F}(JS_{iF} \setminus X_{iF}) - E_{\beta^*}(JS_{iF} \setminus X_{iF})\right] + \left[E_{\beta^*}(JS_{iM} \setminus X_{iM}) - E_{\beta_M}(JS_{iM} \setminus X_{iM})\right] \quad (4)$$

where β* is defined as a weighted average of the coefficient vectors β_F and β_M:

$$\beta^* = \Omega\beta_F + (I - \Omega)\beta_M$$

Where Ω is a weighting matrix and I is an identity matrix.

The left side of the equation (4) represents the differential of average satisfaction between women and men. The right side depends on different assumptions about Ω. In this work two values of Ω are considered. If Ω is equal to an identity matrix, then the right side of the equation reflects the aggregation of two components: the one attributable to the characteristics of the job done by both women and men, and the one corresponding to the performance of each of those characteristics obtained by men and women. The coefficients estimated would be the ones of women. In contrast if Ω is considered a null matrix, then the coefficients would be the ones for men. Sinning, Hahn y Bauer (2008) is followed for the econometric analysis.

4. Results

Table 1 shows the average satisfaction of men and women, according to objective personal and job characteristics, as well as the number of observations in each group[14]. The observation of these data allows a first approach to gender differences and the influence of other factors on the satisfaction level. As can be seen, differences in satisfaction levels are virtually non-existent, at least when the entire sample is considered

[14] The number of observations in each group is of great interest when analyzing the significance levels of the estimates made later.

(7.35 in women compared with 7.28 in men) [15]. With regard to age, there are not too many differences by gender. It is also observed that satisfaction increases with age, in both cases, workers over the age of 60 possessing higher satisfaction rates[16]. In addition, separated or divorced people have lower satisfaction rates than those of married people, as well parents, when compared to the whole sample.

TABLE 1

Educational level has a direct and positive effect on satisfaction for both men and women. Workers with university and post-university studies are the most satisfied while those less literate workers are the least so. In addition, having a managerial or intermediate post with subordinates provides greater satisfaction than being an employee or self-employed. Public sector workers are also more satisfied than those in the private sector, especially in the case of women[17].

Workers with temporary and part-time contracts are less satisfied than the average and this situation is particularly so in the case of men. This could be justified by Carleton and Clain (2012) who argue that women, if they have an alternative family income, would be ready to accept inferior working conditions, associated with instability, to a greater degree. At the same time, part-time jobs allow greater accommodation of other personal and family aspects that have traditionally been carried out by women [18].

Regarding the working day, women endure both working on Sundays and longer than 40-hour working weeks to a greater extent than men. This result could be justified, in the line of work by Sloane and Williams (2000), who argue that those type work schedule allows for less accommodation of family and personal obligations.

Finally, there is a direct relationship between wages and satisfaction levels. It is worth noting that in all wage ranges women´s satisfaction is higher than men´s. Note, in any case, that the proportion of women decreases as pay increases. In fact, the proportion of women with a wage lower than 600 Euros is 76.77 percent and with a wage higher than

[15] A test for comparison of means between satisfaction of men and women is performed and the results show that there is no significant difference between them.

[16] Note, in any case, that this group of workers represents just about 4.3 percent of the sample.

[17] In this group of workers, women are more numerous than men.

[18] There is a clear predominance of women among part-time workers (72.2 percent).

4500 Euros is 14.79 percent. These data do not correspond to those related to qualifications, since the proportion of women with university and post-university studies is higher than that of men (around 53.39 percent).

Table 2 shows the marginal effects of the probit estimate of job satisfaction including the entire sample, both women and men[19]. As can be seen, supporting Clark´s hypothesis (1997), women are more likely to be satisfied in their jobs in the highest job satisfaction category than their male colleagues (6.7 percent), regardless of the inclusion of objective and subjective job characteristics, personal ones and those associated with household chores.

TABLE 2

With regard to personal characteristics, in the case of men, an inverted "U" in the age variable is observed, the 40-60 age range being the least satisfied. At the same time, men with children show a 3.1 percent probability of being in the highest job satisfaction category, that is below average, while this factor is not significant for women. It is noteworthy that the level of education does not seem to affect satisfaction either for men or for women. It must not be forgotten in any case that this variable is highly correlated in many cases with the type of job and wage, so there could be co-linearity problems[20].

Objective job characteristics have a greater influence on job satisfaction than personal ones[21]. As was pointed out in the descriptive study, having a managerial or intermediate post with subordinates increases the probability of being satisfied at work, and this is especially true for women. If a glass ceiling that prevents their access to positions of

[19] Since the dependent variable has three categories, it is an ordered probit and the marginal effects shown are those corresponding to the maximum values of job satisfaction. In the econometric estimates, in accordance with the existing literature the following have also been included: type of job and region of the worker to measure its influence on satisfaction. In any case, since it moves away from the object of study of this article, it is not published. Refer to the author to request the complete estimates.

[20] They have remained, in any case, because the objective of the study is to focus on differences according to gender and not so much on the rest of the variables.

[21] Estimations have been built up progressively including: i) first, personal characteristics; (ii) second, personal and objective job characteristics; iii) third, personal and subjective job characteristics. The coefficient linked to the female variable is in all cases positive and significant. Robustness of estimates is thus demonstrated.

greater responsibility[22] is considered, holding such positions could affect satisfaction to a greater extent. Meanwhile working in the public sector affects satisfaction positively and it is also women who are more likely to be more satisfied in that higher position (8.8 percent versus 2.5 percent). This fact can be justified by better conditions offered by the State to reconcile work and personal life. Combining this explanation with the above, there may be a group of women who choose to focus on their professional life and would experience greater satisfaction when accessing managerial posts and there would be another group that would experience it in their personal life and would appreciate their work flexibility to a greater extent.

Number of working hours has a negative influence on the satisfaction level, both in the case of women and men.

As the wage increases, so does the probability of being satisfied at work. Again, the impact on women is considerably higher in all ranges compared to men. If a wage gap based on gender is considered, which, as shown by the data, does not correspond to the educational level, it would be logical to think that the fact of reaching a higher wage level has a greater impact on satisfaction levels.

Subjective job characteristics have a greater influence on satisfaction. Satisfaction with promotion, stability, personal development, senior levels, labour relations, working hours, schedule flexibility and safety at work have a positive and significant influence on satisfaction levels and again, the impact on women is higher than on men. This does not apply to the level of stress and physical effort, despite being negatively evaluated by both, men and women, it seems to impact more negatively on women. These results support the idea of Sloane and Williams (2000) and provide some evidence of women preferring jobs with more flexibility and stability, personal development and favourable labour relations.

With regard to educational labour imbalances, it is observed that they also affect satisfaction, but with a different pattern depending on sex[23]. Having a higher educational

[22] The proportion of female managers in the sample is just 27.13 percent and workers with wages higher than 4500 Euros 14.79 percent.

[23] See Sánchez-Sánchez and Fernández (2015) for a more comprehensive study of the influence of these variables on satisfaction.

level than that required for the job has a negative influence in the case of men, while, in the case of women, having a lower qualification than that required has a more negative impact. Finally, the number of hours spent on housework does not influence satisfaction levels, whereas the fact that the partner shares the housework does to a certain extent.

In Table 3 age groups (under 30, 30-40, 40-50, 50-60 and over 60) are separated to see if the variable associated with the female sex continues to have a significant effect on satisfaction in all ranges[24]. In this sense, women´s job prospects should have changed as the rate of activity increased and reached the same level as men´s working conditions[25]. The objective would, therefore, be to reduce the self-selection bias, since, as has already been pointed out, women's participation in the labor market is equal to men when the younger population is considered[26].

As can be seen, except in the last age group that is not significant, the variable associated with being a woman increases the probability of increased job satisfaction. Therefore, it cannot be confirmed that for younger people satisfaction levels are the same for both sexes. In any case, it is true that the associated coefficient for young people between 30 and 40 is almost half of the rest of the age groups (except for those over 60) and its significance level is lower than the 40-50 and 50-60 groups.

TABLE 3

[24] In Appendix 2 the influence of all the variables included in the analysis on each of the age groups is observed.

[25] As mentioned before, the differences in female and men activity rates in younger population are very small. Therefore, self-selection bias should have reduced.

[26] A formal evaluation of self-selection bias could be solved econometrically with Heckman (1979) correction However, data from SLQW do not allow this procedure, since information is not available for people who are not in the labour market. The European Social Survey would have been an alternative but the number of surveys per country is very small (between 800 and 1500). The analysis made by age and educational level would not be viable, as the number of observations is reduced. In any case, as mentioned, Evidence to date suggests that there is no evidence of sample-selection bias of females into the labor market (Clark, 1997; Sloane and Williams, 2000; and Long 2005). In fact , numerous studies do not have consider the selection bias when studying the differences in job satisfaction (Bender et al, 2005; Kasiser, 2007; Kiffe et al., 2014)

Finally, in Table 4 the sample is divided into workers who have no studies, primary studies, secondary school or vocational training studies and those who have university or post-university education[27]. The objective is similar to that of previous estimates. As noted before, women's activity rates at higher educational levels are much higher than those at lower levels. Moreover, in some cases, they are superior to those of men. The results show that more educated women are likely to be more satisfied than men, while this is not the case for those who have basic education (primary). In the case of secondary education or vocational training, the probability for a woman to be more satisfied in the highest job satisfaction category in her job is 7.2 percent and 6.8 percent for those with university studies. This result again contrasts with the hypothesis by Clark (1997) and Donohue and Heywood (2004), who claimed that in higher levels of education, satisfaction levels between men and women should be at the same level. TABLE 4

In Table 5 the Oaxaca-Blinder methodology developed in equation (4) to decompose the observed differences in job satisfaction between women and men in two components is shown: the component corresponding to job characteristics, both objective and subjective, and the performance obtained from them[28].

Two different results are shown. The one where Ω is equal to an identity matrix where the coefficients estimated would be female (characteristics of the job and returns of these characteristics), and the one where Ω is a null matrix and the coefficients would be male.

Firstly, the entire sample has been considered, followed by the group of women aged between 40 and 50 and the corresponding secondary school and university educational level, where there is a greater difference in satisfaction between men and women and a greater significance level.

TABLE 5

[27] In appendix 3, the influence of all the variables included in the analysis on each educational level groups is observed.

[28] The ordinary least squared method for the decomposition of Oaxaca-Blinder is used in the estimation. While ordered probit (or logit) estimation which respects the qualitative nature of the response options is theoretically more preferable, the results were very similar to those of OLS model, and therefore we decided to present OLS results due to their simplicity in interpretation. See Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters (2004) for a more detailed discussion on different estimation methods and the similarity in their results.

As can be observed, if the whole sample is considered, the difference in satisfaction between women and men is just 0.0118[29]. From the perspective of women (Ω is equal to an identity matrix), the positive sign is explained by the evaluation made by women about their job characteristics, which in fact, is higher than men´s (0.1383). However the characteristics of the job they occupy reduce their total satisfaction (-0.1265). The results prove that performance in terms of women's job satisfaction is large enough to compensate the worse job characteristics.

If the analysis is focused on the 40-50 age group results are similar, although the differences in satisfaction between women and men are higher (0.0682). Again, their job characteristics reduce their satisfaction (-0.1509), however, the evaluation of various labour conditions is higher (0.2191).

Finally, the results in the group corresponding to workers with secondary school and university studies are in the same line. However, our attention is drawn to how job characteristics reduce the satisfaction of women with higher educational levels to a greater extent (-0.1821 in university and post-university studies and -0.2608 in secondary school studies) than in total (-0.1265). This result could be justified by the disparity between the proportion of women with higher educational levels, which is much higher than that corresponding to higher wage levels.

The results when Ω is equal to a null matrix are analogous. In all cases, men job characteristics increase their total job satisfaction, although the returns they get from them reduce it. In this case, it is men with secondary and university studies that penalize their work circumstances to a greater extent.

5. Conclusions

This paper examines the paradox between high relative levels of job satisfaction and the characteristics of women´s jobs compared to men´s. In order to do so, the Survey of Quality of Life at Work is used between the years 2006-2010 and differences in satisfaction levels are studied, as well as the influence of personal and job characteristics, both objective and subjective, on satisfaction. Then the sample is divided, firstly, by age

[29] Job satisfaction differences obtained in terms of conditional expectations.

group and, secondly, by educational levels to see whether differences in satisfaction by gender predominate.

The study shows that in the Spanish case, and although the working conditions of women are lower than those of their male colleagues (at least in terms of the wages received and level of responsibility in their jobs), the former are more likely to be satisfied at work than the latter. This paradox persists regardless of the age group under consideration. The significance level, in any case, is higher in women between 40 and 50 and those between 50 and 60.

Satisfaction levels of women are higher than those of men in all age groups except for the over 60 group, where no significant differences are observed. In any case, the probability that a woman is satisfied is lower in the age group corresponding to 30 to 40, which may indeed be an indication that women´s prospects, although they are still lower than men´s are improving slightly in the new generations.

Regarding educational levels, women are more likely to be satisfied than their male colleagues, except for those workers whose educational level is lower than primary education, where the variable is not significant. Again, the results do not support the hypothesis that satisfaction levels converge as the level of education increases.

Finally, the factors affecting satisfaction levels are diverse. So, having children has a negative influence on men´s job satisfaction, but not in the case of women. It is also noted that wage levels have a positive effect on satisfaction levels, and it is precisely women who give more importance to this variable. The influence of subjective job characteristics also has a greater impact on women than on men.

Returning to the hypotheses proposed in the introduction, a reduction in the differences in male and female job satisfaction as youth and higher levels of education are considered is not observed. In the younger age group and in the corresponding group of more highly qualified people, the likelihood that women are more satisfied remains higher than that of men. Differences in job satisfaction do not appear to be attributable to self-selection bias as the activity rates of younger women are similar to that of males and in the population stratum with higher levels of study are in fact higher. For the older population, with a lower level of education, a group of women with lower probability of finding a job is feasible, and thus not participating in the labour market.

Regarding the hypothesis of lower job prospects, the data show that Spanish women are less present in positions requiring greater responsibility (managers and those that have workers under their supervision) and those with higher wages, so it is likely that their prospects will be lower. In addition, the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition suggests that these expectations are actually influencing differences in job satisfaction. However, it is not proven that these disappear as age decreases or the educational level increases.

Concerning the third hypothesis, results highlight that women would choose jobs with different characteristics than those chosen by men (flexibility, stability, labour environment and personal development). The omission of this kind of variables in the analysis will overestimate female job satisfaction coefficient. In any case, the inclusion of these variables do not eliminate completely the differences between male and female job satisfaction.

The prevalence of these differences encourages us, in any case, to continue examining the causes. In this sense, it would be interesting to corroborate the existence of discrimination in recruitment and working conditions of women compared to men and the effects arising from job satisfaction.

6. Bibliography

Álvarez, G. (2004): Análisis empírico de los determinantes de la satisfacción laboral en España, *Revista de Economía y Empresa* 52: 105-118.

Bender, K. A., Donohue, S. and Heywood, J.S. (2005): Job satisfaction and gender segregation, *Oxford Economic Paper* 57: 479-496.

Bender, K. A. and Heywood, J.S. (2006): Job satisfaction of the highly educated: the role of gender, academic tenure and earnings, *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 53(2): 253-279.

Blinder A. (1973): Wage discrimination: reduced form and structural estimates, *Journal of Human Resources* 8(4): 436-455.

Borra, C., Gómez, F and Salas, M. (2007): Los determinantes de la satisfacción laboral de los economistas: evidencia a partir de una nueva muestra, *Economic Working Papers* E2007/02 at Centro de Estudios Andaluces.

Clark, A.E (1997): Job satisfaction and gender: why are women so happy at work?, *Labour Economics* 4: 341-72.

Clark, A. E. and Oswald, A.J. (1996). Satisfaction and comparison income, *Journal of Public Economics*, 61: 359-381.

Carleton, C. J., and Clain S. H. (2012): Women, Men, and Job Satisfaction, *Eastern Economic Journal* Vol. 38 (Summer): 331–355.

Donohue S. M. and Heywood J. S. (2004): Job satisfaction and gender: an expanded specification from the NLSY, *International Journal of Manpower* 25(2): 211-234.

Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. and Frijters P. (2004): How important is methodology for the estimates of the determinants of happiness?, *The Economic Journal* 114(July): 641-659.

García Mora, M. B. (2004): *Efectos de la educación sobre los determinantes de la satisfacción laboral en España: un análisis de los beneficios monetarios y no monetarios en el mercado de trabajo mediante modelos logit ordenados*, Universidad de Valencia

Gamero C. (2004): Satisfacción laboral de los asalariados en España. Especial referencia a las diferencias por género, *Cuadernos de Economía* 27: 109-146.

Green C., Heywood J. Kler P. and Leeves G. (2016): Paradox Lost: Disappearing Female Job Satisfaction, *Economic Working Paper Series of Lancaster University Management School* 002.

Hamermesh, D.S. (2001): The changing distribution of job satisfaction, *The Journal of Human Resources* 36(1): 1-30.

Hauret, L. and Williams, D.R. (2017): Cross-National Analysis of Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction, Industrial Relations 56(2): 203-235

Heckman, J. (1979): Sample selection bias as a specification error, *Econometrica* 47 (1): 153-61.

Long, J. E. (2005): The Effects of Tastes and Motivation on Individual Income, *Industrial and Labor Relations* 48(2): 338-351.

Mora, T. y Ferrer-i-Carbonell A. (2009): The job satisfaction gender gap among young recent universities graduates: Evidence for Catalonia, *The Journal of Social-Economics* 38: 581-589.

Oaxaca, R. L. and Ransom M. (1994): On discrimination and the decomposition of wage differentials, Journal of Econometrics, 61(1): 5-21

Kaiser, L. C. (2007): Gender-job satisfaction differences across Europe, *International Journal of Manpower* 28(1): 75-94.

Kifle T., Kler P. and Shankar S. (2014): Are women really that happy at work? Australian evidence on the contented female, *Applied Economics* 46(7): 686-697.

Oaxaca R. (1973): Male-female wage differentials in urban labour markets, *International Economic Review* 4 (3): 693-709.

Rico Belda P. (2012): Satisfacción laboral de los asalariados en España, *Revista de métodos cuantitativos para la economía y la empresa* 14: 137-158.

Sánchez-Sánchez N. and Fernández A.C. (2015): « Desajuste educacional y de competencias: efectos diferenciales sobre la satisfacción laboral. Un estudio aplicado al mercado de trabajo español, *Estudios de Economía* 41 (2): 261-281.

Sinning, M., Markus, H. and Bauer, T. K. (2008): The Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition for Non-linear Regression Models, *The Stata Journal* 8(4): 480-492

Sloane P. J. and Ward M. E. (2001): Cohort effects and job satisfaction of academics, *Applied Economics Letters* 8: 787-791.

Sloane, P. J. and Williams, H. (2000): Job satisfaction, comparison earnings and gender, *Labour* 14(3): 473-501.

Sousa-Poza, A. and Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2000a): Taking another look at the gender/job satisfaction paradox, *Kyklos* 53: 135-52.

Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2000b): Well-being at work: a cross national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction, *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 29: 517-538.

Sousa-Poza, A. and Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2003): Gender differences in job satisfaction in Great Britain, 1991-2000: permanent or transitory?, *Applied Economics Letters* 10(11): 691-694.

Souza-Poza A, and Sousa-Poza A.A. (2007): The effect of job satisfaction on labour turnover by gender: An analysis for Switzerland, *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 36: 895-913.

Verhofstadt E., De Witte H. Omey E. (2007): Higher educated workers: better jobs but less satisfied?, *International Journal of Manpower* 28(2): 135 - 151

Ward, M. E. and Sloane, P. J. (2000): Non-pecuniary advantages vs. pecuniary disadvantages: job satisfaction among male and female academics in Scottish universities, *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 47: 273-303.

Table 1
Job satisfaction
Averages and number of observations

	Total	Women	Men
Total	7,31	7,35	7,28
	39.407	*16.652*	*22.755*
Personal characteristics			
Age < 30 years old	7,30	7,30	7,23
	6.498	*2.937*	*3.561*
Age 30-40 years old	7,27	7,27	7,28
	11.472	*5.070*	*6.402*
Age 40-50 years old	7,29	7,32	7,27
	12.028	*5.137*	*6.891*
Age 50-60 years old	7,31	7,33	7,31
	7.710	*2.897*	*4.813*
Age > 60 years old	7,56	7,53	7,58
	1.699	*611*	*1.088*
Marital status: separated/divorced	7,16	7,13	7,31
	2.006	*1.673*	*333*
Marital status: married	7,36	7,38	7,34
	26.461	*10.082*	*16.379*
Children	7,34	7,37	7,32
	13.728	*5.568*	*8.160*
Illiterate	7,08	6,95	7,15
	1.336	*455*	*881*
Primary studies	7,20	7,18	7,22
	6.661	*2.215*	*4.446*
Secondary studies	7,25	7,28	7,23
	8.230	*3.074*	*5.156*
Baccalaureate and vocational training	7,29	7,30	7,28
	13.301	*5.634*	*7.667*
University and Post-University studies	7,45	7,42	7,47
	9.879	*5.274*	*4.605*
Objective nature job characteristics			
Managerial post	7,80	7,74	7,83
	2.787	*756*	*2.031*
Intermediate post with subordinates	7,56	7,58	7,55
	6.256	*1.945*	*4.311*
Self-employed	7,15	7,15	7,15
	4.271	*1.469*	*2.802*
Employee	7,20	7,26	7,15
	26.093	*12.482*	*13.611*
Public sector workers	7,51	7,52	7,49
	8.035	*4.361*	*3.674*
Temporary job	6,98	7,08	6,88
	7.330	*3.557*	*3.773*
Part-time job	7,14	7,19	7,01
	5.210	*3.760*	*1.450*
Continuous day	7,23	7,27	7,19
	20.879	*10.408*	*10.471*
Sunday working days	6,93	6,91	6,95
	2.576	*1.168*	*1.408*
Working day > 40 hours	7,16	7,06	7,19

	11.091	*2.918*	*8.173*
Labour agreement	7,34	7,37	7,32
	14.100	*6.220*	*7.880*
Wage < 600 euros	6,82	6,94	6,46
	3.242	*2.489*	*753*
600 < Wage < 1200 euros	7,05	7,18	6,88
	10.727	*5.985*	*4.742*
1200 < Wage < 2100 euros	7,31	7,41	7,26
	9.425	*3.405*	*6.020*
2100 < Wage < 3000 euros	7,51	7,59	7,48
	10.512	*3.155*	*7.357*
3000 < Wage < 4500 euros	7,60	7,61	7,59
	5.190	*1.572*	*3.618*
Wage > 4500 euros	8,27	8,15	8,29
	311	*46*	*265*

Table 2

Job satisfaction

Ordered probit. Marginal effects (JS=2)

	Total	Women	Men
Personal characteristics			
Woman	0,067***		
	(0,000)		
Age 30-40 years	-0,014	-0,005	-0,025
	(0,362)	(0,926)	(0,247)
Age 40-50 years	-0,028	0,019	-0,055*
	(0,076)	(0,758)	(0,011)
Age 50-60 years	-0,030	0,050	-0,063*
	(0,132)	(0,537)	(0,014)
Age > 60 years	0,052	0,221	0,018
	(0,143)	(0,214)	(0,673)
Marital status: separated/divorced	-0,003	0,011	0,005
	(0,950)	(0,935)	(0,946)
Marital status: married (partner)	-0,002	-0,004	-0,009
	(0,911)	(0,958)	(0,726)
Children	-0,018	0,016	-0,031*
	(0,085)	(0,707)	(0,018)
Primary studies	-0,0003	0,086	-0,020
	(0,989)	(0,477)	(0,523)
Secondary studies	0,007	0,128	-0,017
	(0,778)	(0,277)	(0,578)
Baccalaureate and vocational training	-0,145	0,033	-0,031
	(0,558)	(0,778)	(0,306)
University and Post-University studies	-0,033	-0,023	-0,042
	(0,234)	(0,853)	(0,219)

Objective nature job characteristics			
Manager	0,104***	0,504***	0,081***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,003)
Intermediate manager with subordinates	0,050***	0,126*	0,048
	(0,000)	(0,012)	(0,000)
Self-employed	0,059	-0,011	0,084
	(0,156)	(0,946)	(0,114)
Public sector	0,031	0,088*	0,025**
	(0,004)	(0,031)	(0,086)
Temporary job	-0,001	0,105*	-0,035
	(0,968)	(0,022)	(0,026)
Part-time job	-0,003	-0,009	-0,025
	(0,860)	(0,858)	(0,316)
Continuous day	-0,011	-0,017	-0,014
	(0,214)	(0,642)	(0,185)
Sunday working days	0,004	0,053	-0,005
	(0,867)	(0,518)	(0,863)
Working day > 40 hours	0,008	-0,039	0,009
	(0,452)	(0,472)	(0,541)
Labour agreement	0,014	0,005	0,022
	(0,077)	(0,882)	(0,032)
Number or hours worked	-0,056*	-0,161*	-0,20*
	(0,014)	(0,035)	(0,565)
600 < Wage < 1200	0,047*	0,168**	0,056*
	(0,028)	(0,007)	(0,225)
1200 < Wage < 2100 euros	0,093***	0,246***	0,110***
	(0,000)	(0,001)	(0,016)
2100 < Wage < 3000 euros	0,120***	0,343***	0,116***
	(0,0000)	(0,000)	(0,012)
3000 < Wage < 4500 euros	0,109***	0,257**	0,123***
	(0,000)	(0,004)	(0,008)
Wage > 4500 euros	0,251***	0,831**	0,259***
	(0,000)	(0,006)	(0,000)
Subjective nature job characteristics			
Satisfacion with promotion (0-10)	0,146***	0,325***	0,158***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Satisfaction with job stability (0-10)	0,169***	0,427***	0,174***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Satisfaction with personal development(0-10)	0,320***	0,946***	0,304***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Satisfaction with senior levels (0-10)	0,206***	0,528***	0,203***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Satisfaction with labour relations (0-10)	0,123***	0,272**	0,136***
	(0,000)	(0,002)	(0,000)
Satisfaction with timetable	0,177***	0,390***	0,193***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)

Satisfaction with flexibility	0,126***	0,158***	0,107***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Stress	-0,113***	-0,299***	-0,110***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Physical effort	-0,034***	-0,082*	-0,038***
	(0,000)	(0,022)	(0,001)
Security at work	0,188***	0,421***	0,202***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Overeducation	-0,126***	-0,118	-0,131***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Undereducation	-0,014	-0,135***	0,042
	-0,621	(0,000)	(0,204)
Household conditions			
Hours used in houseworks	0,010	-0,013	0,013
	(0,300)	(0,844)	(0,240)
Satisfaction with partner housework hours	0,068***	0,159***	0,073***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)

(*) Significant at 10%; (**) Significant at 5%; (***)Significant at 1%

Note: other control variables included are occupation, region and year.

Tabla 3

Job satisfaction

Ordered probit. Marginal effects (JS=2)

	<30 years	30-40 years	40-50 years	50-60 years	>60 years
Woman	0,079*	0,044*	0,082***	0,078**	-0,036
	(0,020)	(0,016)	(0,000)	(0,002)	(0,638)

(*) Significant at 10%; (**) Significant at 5%; (***)Significant at 1%

Table 4

Job satisfaction

Ordered probit. Marginal effects (JS=2)

	< Primary Studies	Secundary Studies	University and Post-University Studies
Woman	0,046	0,072***	0,068***
	0,099	0,000	0,000

(*) Significant at 10%; (**) Significant at 5%;
(***) Significant at 1%

Table 5

Non-linear decomposition of job satisfaction: female-male

	Total	Age 40-50	Sec. Studies	Univ. Studies
Ω=1	0,0118	0,0682	0,0374	-0,0520
Characteristics	-0,1265	-0,1509	-0,2608	-0,1821
Coefficient (Returns)	0,1383	0,2191	0,2982	0,1301
Ω=0				
Characteristics	0,5336	0,3972	1,0860	1,1591
Coefficient (Returns)	-0,5218	-0,3290	-1,0486	-1,2111

Appendix 1

Definition of control variable

	Definition	Measure	Mean	Standard deviation
Personal characteristics				
Female	If the individual is female	0/1	.384	.486
Age				
Age < 30 años	Age <30 years	0/1	.096	.294
Age 30-40 años	40>Age>=30 years	0/1	.328	.469
Age 40-50 años	50>Age>=40 years	0/1	.370	.483
Age 50-60 años	60>Age>=50 years	0/1	.186	.389
Age > 60 años	Age>=60	0/1	.021	.143
Single	If the individual is single	0/1	.012	.108
separado (divorced)	If the individual is divorced	0/1	.916	.277
Casado (partner)	If the individual is married or cohabiting	0/1	.006	.079
Children	If the individual has children	0/1	.581	.493
Education				
No education	No education	0/1	.029	.168
Primary	Maximum education level of primary	0/1	.164	.371
Secondary	Maximum education level of secondary	0/1	.205	.404
High-school	Maximum education level of high-school	0/1	.339	.473
University	Maximum education level of University	0/1	.263	.440
Job characteristics				
Manager	If individual is manager	0/1	.040	.196
Intermediate manager	If individual has an intermediate job	0/1	.209	.407
Self-employed	If individual is self-employed	0/1	.011	.104
Public sector	If individual works in public sector	0/1	.253	.435
Temporal worker	If individual holds temporal contract	0/1	.187	.390
Part-time worker	If individual holds part-time job	0/1	.121	.326
Continous working	If individual works with a continuous timetable	0/1	.576	.494
Sunday	If individual works on Sunday or night	0/1	.037	.190
More than 40 hours	If individual Works more than 40 hours per week	0/1	.242	.428
Union agreement	If the company has an union agreement	0/1	.407	.491
Hours	Number of hours worked	Ln(Hours)	3.643	.281
Wages <600	Net wages	0/1	.059	.236
600 <=Wages < 1200	Net wages	0/1	.268	.443
1200 <=Wages < 2100	Net wages	0/1	.254	.436
2100 <=Wages < 3000	Net wages	0/1	.273	.445
3000 <=Wages < 4500	Net wages	0/1	.139	.345
Salario > 4500	Net wages	0/1	.008	.089
Sujective Job characteristics				
Satisfaction with promotion	0 if individual has satisfaction between 0 to 4, 1 if individual has satisfaction higher than 4	0/1	.650	.476

Satisfaction with job stability	The same as the above	0/1	.897	.304
Satisfaction with personal development	The same as the above	0/1	.929	.257
Satisfaction with boss	The same as the above	0/1	.883	.322
Satisfaction with labor relations	The same as the above	0/1	.964	.186
Satisfaction with timetable	The same as the above	0/1	.880	.325
Satisfaction with flexibility	The same as the above	0/1	.783	.413
Stress	The same as the above	0/1	.729	.444
Effort at work	The same as the above	0/1	.551	.497
Security at work	The same as the above	0/1	.914	.281
Overeducation	Higher level of education than required	0/1	.173	.378
Undereducation	Lower level of education than required	0/1	.021	.142
Household conditions				
Hours used in houseworks	If individual used 1 or more hours in houseworks	0/1	.759	.428
Satisfaction with partner housework hours	0 if individual has satisfaction between 0 to 7, 1 if individual has satisfaction higher than 7	0/1	.517	.500

Note: Regions and occupations are omitted due to the lack space

Appendix 2

Job satisfaction

Ordered probit. Marginal effects (JS=2)

	<30 years	30-40 years	40-50 years	50-60 years	>60 years
Personal characteristics					
Woman	0,079*	0,044*	0,082***	0,078**	-0,036
	(0,020)	(0,016)	(0,000)	(0,002)	(0,638)
Marital status: separated/divorced	-0,186	0,042	-0,088	0194*	0,250**
	(0,258)	(0,656)	(0,186)	(0,022)	(0,000)
Marital status: married (partner)	-0,087	-0,017	0,031	0,009	0,411*
	(0,035)	(0,653)	(0,454)	(0,880)	(0,016)
Children	0,060	-0,014	-0,021	-0,031	-0,244
	(0,151)	(0,586)	(0,137)	(0,237)	(0,121)
Primary studies	0,047	-0,091	-0,029	0,052	-0,026
	(0,596)	(0,108)	(0,517)	(0,239)	(0,785)
Secondary studies	0,131	-0,088	-0,022	0,052	-0,137
	(0,120)	(0,116)	(0,624)	(0,239)	(0,223)
Baccalaureate and vocational training	0,133	-0,139*	-0,046	0,060	0,098
	(0,114)	(0,012)	(0,306)	(0,205)	(0,313)
University and Post-University studies	0,093	-0,115	-0,076	0,004	-0,097
	(0,313)	(0,051)	(0,118)	(0,948)	(0,492)
Objective nature job characteristics					
Manager	0,298*	0,133**	0,037	0,138**	0,073
	(0,006)	(0,003)	(0,326)	(0,003)	(0,463)
Intermediate manager with subordinates	0,112*	0,036	0,035*	0,085***	-0,025
	(0,011)	(0,059)	(0,041)	(0,000)	(0,746)
Self-employed	0,284	0,063	0,066	0,067	-0,502
	(0,061)	(0,321)	(0,322)	(0,483)	(0,078)
Public sector	0,083	0,051*	0,026	0,011	0,013

	(0,059)	(0,010)	(0,132)	(0,653)	(0,837)
Temporary job	0,010	-0,038	0,019	0,031	-0,004
	(0,749)	(0,052)	(0,364)	(0,367)	(0,965)
Part-time job	-0,022	0,0192	0,022	-0,103*	-0,163
	(0,632)	(0,444)	(0,426)	(0,017)	(0,262)
Continuous day	0,011	0,026	-0,030*	-0,059**	-0,016
	(0,693)	(0,080)	(0,033)	(0,004)	(0,777)
Sunday working days	-0,084	-0,21	-0,009	0,146**	0,131
	(0,209)	(0,555)	(0,783)	(0,006)	(0,230)
Working day > 40 hours	0,013	0,023	-0,021	0,023	0,119
	(0,707)	(0,257)	(0,250)	(0,396)	(0,067)
Labour agreement	0,026	0,019	-0,006	0,041*	0,029
	(0,338)	(0,184)	(0,668)	(0,027)	(0,610)
Number or hours worked	-0,041	-0,068	-0,025	-0,081	-0,267*
	(0,472)	(0,070)	(0,539)	(0,176)	(0,037)
600 < Wage < 1200	0,043	0,003	0,059	0,071	0,256*
	(0,420)	(0,926)	(0,134)	(0,244)	(0,003)
1200 < Wage < 2100 euros	0,138*	0,040	0,114**	0,042	0,259*
	(0,023)	(0,290)	(0,006)	(0,501)	(0,003)
2100 < Wage < 3000 euros	0,231***	0,084*	0,120**	0,042	0,196
	(0,000)	(0,032)	(0,004)	(0,507)	(0,054)
3000 < Wage < 4500 euros	0,112	0,091*	0,117**	0,058	0,172
	(0,245)	(0,030)	(0,007)	(0,375)	(0,076)
Wage > 4500 euros	-0,277	0,361*	0,273***	0,149	0,258**
	(0,088)	(0,001)	(0,000)	(0,120)	(0,000)
Subjective nature job characteristics					
Satisfacion with promotion (0-10)	0,210***	0,149***	0,146***	0,130***	0,222***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Satisfaction with job stability (0-10)	0,184***	0,141***	0,186***	0,212***	0,434***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Satisfaction with personal development(0-10)	0,263***	0,326***	0,322***	0,348***	0,218
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,241)
Satisfaction with senior levels (0-10)	0,225***	-0,022***	0,225***	0,151***	0,043
	(0,000)	(0,154)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,671)
Satisfaction with labour relations (0-10)	(0,089	(0,211***	(0,158***	(0,095	(0,110
	(0,216)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,058)	(0,419)
Satisfaction with timetable	0,189***	0,132***	0,188***	0,240***	0,097
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,495)
Satisfaction with flexibility	0,115***	0,124***	0,131***	0,126***	0,146
	(0,001)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,082)
Stress	-0,107***	-0,118***	-0,104***	-0,111***	-0,188***
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Physical effort	-0,045	-0,118	-0,036*	-0,041*	0,017
	(0,117)	(0,000)	(0,014)	(0,043)	(0,748)
Security at work	0,137**	0,187***	0,197***	0,202***	0,255*
	(0,002)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,054)
Overeducation	-0,192***	-0,120***	-0,107***	-0,151***	0,109
	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,140)
Undereducation	0,038	0,032	-0,041	-0,060	0,050

	(0,668)	(0,506)	(0,361)	(0,366)	(0,746)
Household conditions					
Hours used in houseworks	-0,009	0,046*	0,006	-0,013	-0,014
	(0,769)	(0,011)	(0,738)	(0,550)	(0,806)
Satisfaction with partner housework hours	0,073**	0,075***	0,063***	0,064***	0,055
	(0,006)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,001)	(0,353)

(*) Significant at 10%; (**) Significant at 5%; (***) Significant at 1%

Note: other control variables included are occupation, region and year.

Appendix 3

Job satisfaction

Ordered probit. Marginal effects (JS=2)

	< =Primary studies	Secondary studies	University and Post-University Studies
Personal characteristics			
Mujer	0,046	0,072***	0,068***
	0,099	0,000	0,000
Age 30-40 years	0,056	-0,044*	0,023
	0,149	0,024	0,509
Age 40-50 years	0,003	-0,041*	0,004
	0,938	0,073	0,920
Age 50-60 years	0,004	-0,021	-0,046
	0,926	0,433	0,294
Age > 60 years	0,010	0,109	0,123
	0,866	0,081	0,077
Marital status: separated/divorced	-0,016	0,037	-0,046
	0,870	0,563	0,537
Marital status: married	0,061	-0,003	-0,020
	0,163	0,911	0,607
Children	-0,051*	-0,010	-0,016
	0,025	0,497	0,436
Objective nature job characteristics			
Managerial post	0,040	0,097*	0,119***
	0,579	0,016	0,000
Intermediate post with subordinates	0,083**	0,046**	0,037
	0,002	0,002	0,057
Self-employed	-0,048	0,109	0,061
	0,580	0,056	0,459
Public sector workers	0,077	0,016	0,038*
	0,004	0,304	0,042
Temporary job	-0,036	0,009	0,023
	0,123	0,583	0,396
Part-time job	-0,030	0,031	-0,086**
	0,402	0,148	0,008
Continuous day	-0,001	-0,019	0,004
	0,957	0,107	0,810
Sunday working days	-0,058	0,009	0,141*

	0,152	0,730	0,029
Working day > 40 hours	0,001	0,014	0,008
	0,962	0,346	0,751
Labour agreement	0,007	0,013	0,030
	0,679	0,000	0,069
Number of hours worked	-0,056	-0,064*	-0,054
	0,199	0,039	0,316
600 < Wage < 1200 euros	0,040	0,067*	-0,018
	0,345	0,014	0,784
1200 < Wage < 2100 euros	0,084	0,110***	0,030
	0,070	0,000	0,652
2100 < Wage < 3000 euros	0,091	0,145***	0,017
	0,061	0,000	0,797
3000 < Wage < 4500 euros	0,083	0,139***	0,024
	0,149	0,000	0,715
Wage > 4500 euros	-0,049	0,365***	0,139
	0,800	0,000	0,089
Subjective nature job characteristics			
Satisfacion with promotion (0-10)	0,118***	0,140***	0,184***
	0,000	(0,000)	0,000
Satisfaction with job stability (0-10)	0,141***	0,194***	0,139***
	0,000	0,000	0,000
Satisfaction with personal development(0-10)	0,327***	0,281***	0,398***
	0,000	0,000	0,000
Satisfaction with senior levels (0-10)	0,229***	0,200***	0,220***
	0,000	0,000	0,000
Satisfaction with labour relations (0-10)	0,030	0,158***	0,123***
	0,537	0,000	0,004
Satisfaction with timetable	0,200***	0,172***	0,177***
	0,000	0,000	0,000
Satisfaction with flexibility	0,120***	0,132***	0,123***
	0,000	(0,000)	0,000
Stress	-0,101***	-0,123***	-0,102***
	0,000	0,000	0,000
Physical effort	-0,038	-0,036**	-0,032
	0,061	0,003	0,058
Security at work	0,163***	0,201***	0,191***
	0,000	0,000	0,000
Overeducation	-0,119***	-0,111***	-0,167***
	0,000	(0,000)	0,000
Undereducation	0,089	-0,021	-0,184*
	0,107	0,535	0,029
Household conditions			
Hours used in houseworks	0,021	0,022	-0,026
	0,295	0,092	0,241
Satisfaction with partner housework hours	0,083***	0,072***	0,053**
	0,000	0,000	0,001

(*) Significant at 10%; (**) Significant at 5%; (***) Significant at 1%

Note: other control variables included are occupation, region and year.