Public versus private job satisfaction. Is there a trade-off between wages and stability?

Adolfo C. Fernández Puente [1]

adolfocosme.fernandez@unican.es

Nuria Sánchez-Sánchez

sanchezn@unican.es

University of Cantabria

Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

Avda. Castros s/n

39007 Santander

1. Introduction

Economic literature has underscored the importance of identifying employee job satisfaction determinants by linking it to job performance and turnover. The action on job satisfaction determinants is conditioned by the nature of the organization and the economic and political context in which it operates. Most of the studies do agree that the remuneration and promotion policy, time schedule (working hours, flexibility, breaks and holidays) and the content and nature of the activities carried out by workers -factors that could determine the degree of job satisfaction- differ considerably depending on the public or private nature of the organization or company considered. There is no

[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.

consensus, however, on whether these differences lead to greater job satisfaction and if, on average, the public sector employee job satisfaction is higher than that of those in the private sector.

The results in the different studies are also conditioned by the cultural, economic and socio-political context of the reference country, so it is expected that the comparison of job satisfaction levels between public and private workers will differ in different regional contexts. Specifically, the Spanish labour market has certain characteristics that could influence public workers job satisfaction in relation to private ones. Firstly, the unemployment rate in Spain is considerably higher than that of other European countries in their immediate surroundings, such as Germany, United Kingdom, and France, especially in times of crisis. The elasticity of employment with respect to the economic cycle is very high, which means that, during recessions, such as the one experienced since 2008, the unemployment rate exceeds 25 percent. The second characteristic is the high rate of temporality that characterizes the Spanish labour market. During economic booms, the proportion of temporary contracts usually exceeds 35 percent and during recessions, despite a reduction, it exceeds 25 percent[2]. These particularities could alter worker job perception, especially when considering public positions, which are more stable and permanent.

If these aspects are considered, it is feasible that in the case of Spain, or any other country with similar characteristics, public sector employee job satisfaction will be higher than that of private sector employees. It is also feasible, in any case, that there will be a trade-off between satisfaction with respect to salary and stability and working hours. In

[2] The reduction in the number of temporary contracts during crisis is linked, fundamentally, to the destruction of temporary jobs.

principle, the public sector would offer greater stability, and better working hours which allow employees to reconcile work with family life, but lower remuneration. This trade-off will be especially high for the most qualified and competent workers who could demand a higher wage in the private sector (Antón and Muñoz, 2015; and Hospido and Moral-Benito, 2016).

From this perspective, it will be relevant to question i) whether public employees job satisfaction is higher than those in the private sector; ii) if the difference between both groups lies exclusively on the temporality of the position, which will be higher in the private sector; and iii) if there is a trade-off, or substitution effect, between satisfaction with job stability and working hours and salary. To corroborate these hypotheses, initially, it is necessary to distinguish between public and private sector workers and, then, to differentiate within each group those with a temporary or an indefinite contract.

The scarcity of data has led most studies to analyse job satisfaction at an aggregate level, private or public sector, without considering the temporary, or permanent, condition of the contract. Likewise, it has prevented analysis of job satisfaction regarding different domains, such as salary, working time, stability or flexibility and not only at an aggregated level. A more detailed study of the different facets of job satisfaction would make it feasible to identify the existence of the aforementioned trade off. It will also allow us to define lines of action that would increase public employee job satisfaction using the experience of those in the private sector and vice versa.

The present study aims, specifically, to fill this gap, using the European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS) for Spain throughout the period 2006-2010.The structure of the work is as follows. In the first place, differences in job satisfaction by sector (public and private) at the aggregate level are analysed. Subsequently, the existing differences are observed separating workers from the public and the private sector according to the temporality of

their contract. Through this procedure, it could be possible to identify whether differences between the public and the private sector are exclusively attributable to the stability or, on the contrary, they obey other causes. Differences by sector and temporality are also considered in terms of satisfaction with wage, job stability, work hours, time flexibility, time breaks, holidays, organization of work, independence, decision making, assessment by hierarchical superiors and in terms of stress. Secondly, econometric estimations are carried out considering job satisfaction as the dependent variable. Determinants, among others, will be gender (female), age, education, occupation, and sector (public and private, permanent and temporary). Finally, estimates are made using job satisfaction with all the domains mentioned as dependent variables.

2. Literature

Job satisfaction could be defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience (Locke, 1976). It describes a positive feeling about a job, resulting from evaluation of its characteristics. A review of the literature shows that there is a strong correlation between this variable and job performance (Appelbaum and Kamal, 2001; Judge *et al*, 2001; Tietjen and Myer, 1998). Satisfied employees tend to be more effective than those who are not. Research results also support the satisfaction-performance relationship at the organizational level (Garrido, Pérez and Anton, 2005; Ostroff, 1992; Ryan, Schmidt and Johnson, 1996; Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002). Additionally, a negative relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism (Hausknecht, Hiller and Vance, 2008; and Lee, 1998), turnover (Hom and Griffeth, 1995) and workplace deviance (Spector *et al* 2006) is observed.

Many studies have been conducted to measure job satisfaction in different types of organizations, specifically studying the differences between job satisfaction of public and private sector workers. Although there is a debate about the differences between the characteristics of both sectors, there is general agreement that differences currently do

exist (Fotler, 1981; Meyer, 1982; Perry and Porter, 1982; Perry and Rainey, 1988; Rainey, Backoff and Levine, 1976; and Whorthon and Worthley, 1981).

Public sector workers could have missions that often provide greater opportunities to achieve altruistic or higher order needs, that could lead to greater workforce motivation (Perry and Hondeghem, 2008). However, the very structure of public organizations - purportedly characterized by greater red tape and conflict - could hinder the realization of these opportunities. At the same time, the absence of organizational goal specificity, which are often more present in public sector organizations, may have a negative influence on job satisfaction (Kjeldsen and Hansen, 2018).

Public sector employees typically have to undertake their tasks in a highly political and even politicized work environment that is subject to relatively rigid accountability mechanisms and intense public and media scrutiny (Taylor and Westover, 2011). These characteristics could reduce the range of activities performed by workers, flexibility to carry them out and remuneration. From this perspective, research suggests that workers who experience a greater variety of tasks, allowing workers to apply a variety of skills to an array of new and different work challenges also experience less tedium and, therefore, enhanced job satisfaction (Stimson and Johnson, 1977).

Finally, public employees could be less satisfied than their private sector counterparts are with respect to specific aspects of their work, including the fulfilment of their self-esteem, autonomy and self-actualization needs (Paine, Stephen and Leete,1966; Porter and Mitchell, 1967; Rhinehart *et al*, 1969; and Solomon, 1986).

Although the differences are evident, there is no clear consensus on how public employee job satisfaction compares with that of private ones. On an aggregate level, De Santis and Durst (1996), Maidani (1991) and Steel and Warner (1990) show that public employees are generally more satisfied than the private ones. Emmert and Taher (1992), Gabris and Simo (1995) and Lewis (1991) consider that the differences are non-existent. Finally, Bogg and Cooper (1995) and Buchanan (1974) conclude that public employees are less satisfied than the private ones[3].

Employment precariousness in the Spanish regional context, measured by unemployment rates and high proportion of temporary contracts, leads certain highly qualified

[3] These last two studies are focused exclusively on managers.

individuals, with private sector employment opportunities, to prefer jobs in the public sector with lower remuneration but greater stability (Ortiz, 2007, Sánchez-Sánchez and Fernández, 2017). It should not be forgotten that, apart from the nature of public activity, which reduces instability, the degree of temporality is also lower. This reason could justify higher public sector employee job satisfaction than that of private sector employees. In any case, to contrast this hypothesis accurately, it would be necessary to differentiate between public and private sector workers with temporary and permanent contracts. It will be also necessary to observe whether job satisfaction is superior with respect to employment stability or is higher in other domains of satisfaction.

3. Data and Descriptive Results

The study focuses on five cross-sections of the ECVT survey for the years 2006-2010[4]. 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 information on relevant worker and job characteristics. Unfortunately, the survey is not longitudinal, therefore unable to examine the factors affecting transitions in satisfaction level or to control for fixed individual effects.

At the outset, it is important to understand the satisfaction questions we analyse. 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 each category of satisfaction levels[5], therefore leaving a

[4] Although the 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 cuts by Government.

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

large room for interpretation heterogeneity across interviewees. Another characteristic to note is that the responses are ordered qualitatively[6]. Comparing the responses between groups of people is not straightforward. We begin 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.

Table 1 reports average job satisfaction and the distribution of workers by sector (public or private sector). Public and private sector workers have also been separated according to the nature of the contract, permanent or temporary. 75.1 percent of the sample corresponds to private sector workers and 24.9 percent to public sector workers. Among the first, the degree of temporality is 23.5 percent and among the second 20.8 percent. As can be observed, the satisfaction of public employees is higher than that of private sector employees. Likewise, permanent contract workers have higher job satisfaction than those with a temporary contract. In any case, belonging to the public sector prevails, which means that job satisfaction is always higher in the public sector than in the private sector, regardless of temporality. Thus, temporary contract public workers have greater job satisfaction than permanent contract private workers.

Table 1

It seems clear that public sector workers job satisfaction does not follow the same pattern as that of the private sector ones and the differences are not exclusively justified by contract temporality. That is why a deeper analysis is necessary to establish the domains in which public sector employees are more satisfied. To this purpose, overall job

[6] 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.

satisfaction could be considered as a combined (weighted average) evaluation by workers of several different job aspects.

For this reason, average satisfaction scores in different job domains (wage, stability, work hours, time flexibility, time break, holidays, organization at work, independence, decision making and assessment of hierarchical superior) are compared. A question related to the degree of stress is also included. This variable should be considered in the opposite way to satisfaction variables (greater stress implies a worse situation). Definitions and descriptive statistics of the dependent variables are shown in Appendix, Table A1.

As can be observed in Table 2, public workers are more satisfied in most of the domains considered, but in the assessment made by hierarchical superiors and the organization at work. If we compare temporary public sector workers with those of the private sector, there is also a penalty in terms of stability, independence and in decision-making participation. Their perception of stress is lower than that of the private sector on average.

(Table 2)

4. Multivariate Analysis

Although most of the descriptive results in the previous section seem reasonable, they are likely to be biased due to the confounding effects of other correlated characteristics. To establish the net effects of other correlated variables we run regressions including many relevant variables available in our data. As will be seen below, the effects of some variables differ substantially from the results of descriptive comparisons. We

have estimated using an ordinary least squared (OLS) method. 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 the OLS model, and therefore we decided to present OLS results for simplicity of interpretation[7].

Econometric estimates studying the effect on job satisfaction of working in the public and private sectors are shown in Table 3. In the estimate (1) all public and private workers are considered as a whole, while in the estimate (2) the nature of the contract, permanent and temporary, is considered in both groups. We have also included worker and job characteristics such as gender, age, education, partner occupation, wage, job tenure, job rank and region. Definitions and descriptive statistics of the variables are shown in Appendix, Table A2.

Let us discuss other control variables (Table A3 in Appendix) before we go on to the variables of main interest. The dummy female is positive, although its significance is not very high. Age is only marginally significant. Younger and older workers (>65) are more satisfied than the other group ages. Education level is also marginally significant with negative effects for those with a university degree and maximum secondary studies. Individual and household wage has a significant positive effect. Managers are also more satisfied than regular employees are. Working hours have a negative and significant impact on job satisfaction. These findings are in accordance with existing literature, supporting the validity of our data.

Now turning to the variables of interest, the effect of working in the public sector is positive and significant. If we also differentiate between permanent and temporary contract workers, it is observed that the highest degree of satisfaction corresponds to that

[7] See Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters (2004) for a more detailed discussion on different estimation methods and the similarity in their results.

of permanent public workers (0.506), followed by the temporary contract public sector workers (0.482), permanent contract private sector workers (0.418) and the temporary contract private sector ones (variable omitted). These results, therefore, support the results of DeSantis and Durst (1996), Maidani (1991) and Steel and Warner (1990) and also demonstrate that it not only contract permanence, but other elements that justify the higher degree of job satisfaction of public employees.

Table 3

That is why it is relevant to go through the different concrete aspects that explain the higher job satisfaction of public sector employees. Additionally, it will be interesting to observe the existence of a possible trade-off between these different domains of job satisfaction. Different domains are grouped into three categories: i) wage and job stability (Table 4 and appendix A4)), referring to present and future income possibilities; ii) work hours, flexibility, break times and holidays (Table 5 and appendix A5), referring to the workload and the possibility to make work and personal life compatible; and iii) organization at work, independence, decision making participation, assessment by hierarchical superiors and stress[8] (Table 6 and appendix A6) referring to other aspects of the work that could affect total job satisfaction. In all cases, differences between workers in the public and private sectors are studied in aggregate terms (1) and subsequently the temporary or permanent nature of the contract is considered (2)[9].

Satisfaction with wages and and job stability:

[8] According to Herzberg's model (1966) this last grouping corresponds largely with intrinsic factors (features related to job content and tasks). The first two groups correspond mainly to extrinsic factors (contextual elements).

[9] In the appendix, the differences between workers in the public and private sector in aggregate terms are not included due to lack of space.

Aggregated estimates allow us to contrast the second hypothesis, the existence of a possible trade-off between salaries and stability. As can be observed, public sector employee job satisfaction with stability is higher than that of private sector employees. In contrast, satisfaction in terms of wages is negative (although not statistically significant).

If the nature of the contract is considered, the existence of a trade-off between wages and stability is more visible and statistically significant (the omitted variable is worker of the private sector temporary contract). The coefficient of permanent contract public sector workers related to stability is 2.75, while that of permanent contract private sector employees is 2.16. In terms of wages, however, the results are inverse, wage satisfaction is higher in permanent contract private sector workers than among the permanent contract public sector (0.19 vs. 0.10).

It is noteworthy that the aforementioned trade off does not take place in temporary contract public sector workers, which evidence a negative coefficient in job stability but the highest positive coefficient among the different groups in terms of wage. Intuitively, this result is understandable if we take into account that public sector workers, despite having a temporary contract, receive similar wages to those with a permanent contract. In the private sector wage differences between temporary and permanent contract workers are wider. This greater job satisfaction will disappear as their contract becomes permanent.

Table 4

Satisfaction with work hours, flexibility, breaks and holidays:

In aggregate terms, the results of Table 5 corroborate that public sector workers are more satisfied with holidays and break times than private sector workers are. Satisfaction with work hours and labour flexibility, however, does not register significant differences between both sectors.

If the nature of the contract is considered, in the public sector workers with permanent contracts are more satisfied in terms of flexibility and holidays, however are less satisfied in terms of working hours and time breaks. It is observed, as it was in terms of wage satisfaction, that certain variables positively affect job satisfaction for temporary contracts and that, later, when these contracts become permanent, the positive impact disappears.

In the private sector, temporary contract workers are clearly the least satisfied, not only in relation to the public sector ones but also to the permanent contract private sector workers. Temporary contracts reduce satisfaction in terms of workload and the possibility to make work and personal life compatible.

Table 5

Satisfaction with organization at work, independence, decision making, superior assessment and stress.

The aggregate results of Table 6 show that job satisfaction in the public sector is lower than that of the private sector in terms of organization at work, independence, and assessment made by hierarchical superiors. Public employee stress is, however, lower than that of private employees. It has to be pointed out that the statistical significance of these variables, not taking into account contract temporality, is not very high.

At a disaggregated level, however, the degree of significance of the variables is much higher. It could be inferred that the non-consideration of contract temporality variable biases the results. As can be observed, permanent contract private sector workers are considerably more satisfied than those in the public sector (regardless of whether they are on temporary or permanent contracts) in terms of work organization, independence, decision-making and the assessment made by their hierarchical superiors. These results are coherent with those of Paine, Stephen and Leete (1966), Porte and Mitchell (1967), Rhinehart el al (1969) and Solomon (1986). It is remarkable, however, that they suffer greater stress than permanent contract public sector employees, corroborating the results of Bogg and Cooper (1995).

Temporary contract private sector workers are clearly, again, in the worst position in all the categories considered, other than in terms of stress.

Temporary contracts do not affect univocally public sector workers. Thus, temporary public workers would be more satisfied than those with permanent contracts in terms of organization at work and the assessment made by their superiors. They will also suffer less stress. However, they will be less satisfied in terms of independence and decision-making. This result will be easily explained intuitively given the temporary nature of their position.

Table 6

Conclusions

The present study analyses the differences in job satisfaction by sector, public and private, and temporality. Economic literature has not been determinant regarding the differences

in overall job satisfaction in the public and private sectors and job satisfaction in different domains of the work. The study focuses on five cross-sections of the ECVT survey for the years 2006-2010 that includes workers' self-reported satisfaction scores in different job domains (wage, job stability, work hours, time flexibility, break times, holidays, organization of work, independence, decision making, assessment made by hierarchical superiors and stress) as well as overall job satisfaction. We begin with a descriptive analysis and, then, we have made econometric estimations using ordinary least square method including worker and job characteristics. We focus our attention on public and private coefficient and then, within them, between temporary and permanent contracts.

The descriptive analysis shows that job satisfaction reported by public sector employees is higher than that of private sector employees, regardless of the nature of the contract, temporary or permanent. In any case, temporary contracts reduce average satisfaction in both public and private sectors. By domains, public sector workers are more satisfied in most of the items considered, other than organization at work and the assessment made by hierarchical superiors. If we compare temporary public sector workers with those of the private sector there is also a penalty in terms of stability, independence and participation in decision-making.

Econometric estimations allow us to contrast some of the hypotheses. First, at an aggregate level, public sector workers are observed to be more satisfied than those in the private sector. At a disaggregated level, the highest job satisfaction corresponds to permanent contract public sector workers, followed by temporary contract public sector workers, the permanent contract private sector workers and the temporary contract private sector employees. Secondly, it is not just contract temporality but other elements which also justify the higher public sector employee satisfaction. In third place, it can be affirmed that a trade-off between wages and stability exists. Thus public sector employees

are more satisfied in terms of stability but not in terms of wages. This result is significant if permanent public sector employees are compared with those on permanent contracts in the private sector.

In terms of work load (work hours and break times) and the possibility to make work and personal life compatible (time flexibility and holidays), workers in the public sector are definitely in the best position and those with private sector temporary contracts in the worst.

Finally, public employee job satisfaction in terms of work organization, independence, decision-making and assessment made by supervisors is lower than that of private sector employees, but their stress is more reduced. This result is particularly striking, and statistically significant, if the results of permanent contract public sector workers are compared with those on private sector permanent contracts.

The results evidence, therefore, notable differences in job satisfaction of public and private sector employees, in favour of the former. These differences persist when temporality is considered. By domains, there seems to exist a trade-off between salary and stability. Workers in the private sector are also less satisfied in terms of working hours, work breaks, vacations and flexibility. All these results would allow us to identify possible lines of action. Measures in the private sector should be aimed to promote stability, as well as the redefinition of work times and enhancing work flexibility. In the public sector, the objective should be the improvement of the remuneration system and the organization of work, as well as favouring independence, decision-making and worker assessment.

References bibliography

Antón, Jose I and Rafael Muñoz de Bustillo. 2015. "Public-private sector wage differentials in Spain. An updated picture in the midst of the Great Recession". *Investigación Económica*, 74 (292):115-157.

Appelbaum, Steven and Rammie Kamal. 2001. "An analysis of the utilisation and effectiveness of non financial incentives in small, business". J*ournal of Management Development* 19(9): 733-763

Bogg, Janet and Cary Cooper. 1995. "Job Satisfaction, Mental Health, and Occupational Stress among Senior Civil Servants". *Human Relations* 48(3): 327–41

Buchanan, Bruce. 1974. "Government Managers, Business Executives, and Organizational Commitment". *Public Administration Review* 34(4): 339–47.

DeSantis, Victor S and Samantha L. Durst. 1996." Comparing job satisfaction among public and private sector employees". *The American Review of Public Administration* 26(3): 327-343.

Emmert, Mark A and Walied A. Taher. 1992. "Public sector professionals: The effects of public sector jobs on motivation, job satisfaction and work involvement". *The American Review of Public Administration* 22(1): 37-48.

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

Fottler, Myrond.D. 1981. "Is management really generic?". *Academy of Management Review* 6(1), 1-12.

Garrido, María J, Pilar Perez. and Carmen Anton. 2005. "Determinants of Sales Manager Job satisfaction: an Analysis of Spanish Industrial Firms". *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 19(10): 1934-1954.

Gabris, Gerald T. and Gloria Simo (1995). "Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions". *Public Personnel Management* 24(1): 33-51.

Harter, James K., Frank L. Schmidt and Theodore L. Hayes. 2002. "Business-unit Level Relationship between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and

Business Outcomes: A Meta-analysis". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, April: 268-279.

Herzberg, Frederick. 1966. *Work and the Nature of Man*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Hospido, Laura and Enrique Moral-Benito. 2016. "The public sector wage premium in Spain: Evidence from longitudinal administrative data". *Labour Economics* 42: 101-122.

Hausknecht, John P, Nathan J Hiller and Robert J Vance. 2008. "Work-Unit Absenteeism: Effects of Satisfaction, Commitment, Labour Market Conditions and Time", *Academy of Management Journal* 51(6): 1125-1245.

Hom, Peter W and Rodger W. Griffeth. 1995. *Employee Turnover*, South-western Publishing: Cincinnati, OH.

Judge, Timothy A, Carl J Thoresen, Joyce E Bono and Gregory K. Patton. 2001. "The Job Satisfaction-Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review". *Psychological Bulletin* May: 376-407.

Kjeldsen, Anne M. and Jesper R. Hansen. 2018. "Sector differences in the public sector motivation-job satisfaction relationship: Exploring the role of organizational characteristics". *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 38(1), 24-48.

Lee Thomas. 1998. "Job satisfaction leads to turnover". *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2(3): 263-271.

Lewis, Gregory B.1991. "Pay and job satisfaction in the federal civil service". *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 11(3): 17-31.

Locke, Edwin.1976. *The nature and causes of job satisfaction*, in M.Dunette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago: Rand McNally.

Maidani, Ebrahim A. 1991. "Comparative study of Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction among public and private sectors". Public Personnel Management, 20(4): 441-448.

Meyer, John W. 1982. "Bureaucratic vs. profit organization. In *Research in organizational behaviour*, 89-126 edited by B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Ostroff, Cheri. 1992. "The Relationship Between Satisfaction, Attitudes and Performance: An Organizational Level Analysis". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, December: 963-974.

Paine, Frank T, Carroll Jr Stephen and Burt A Leete. 1966. "Need satisfactions of managerial level personnel in a government agency". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(3): 247-249.

Perry, James L. and Annie Hondeghem. 2008. *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Perry, James L and Lyman W Porter. 1982. “Factors affecting the context for motivation in public organizations”. *Academy of Management Review* 7(1): 89-98.

Perry, James L and Hal G Rainey. 1988. “The public-private distinction in organizational theory: A critique and research strategy”. *Academy of Management Review* 13(2): 182-201.

Porter, Lyman W and Vence F Mitchell. 1967. “Comparative study of need satisfactions in military and business hierarchies”. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 51(2): 139-144.

Rainey, Hal G , Robert W Backoff and Charles Levine. 1976. “Comparing public and private organizations”. *Public Administration Review* 36(2): 182-201.

Rhinehart, Jessie B, Robert Barrell, A S DeWolfe, J E Griffin, and F A Spaner. 1969. “Comparative study of need satisfactions in governmental and business hierarchies”. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 53(3): 230-235.

Ryan, Anne M, Mark J Schmidt and Raymond Johnson. 1996. “Attitudes and Effectiveness: Examining Relations at an Organizational Level” *Personnel Psychology*, Winter: 853-882.

Sánchez-Sánchez, Nuria M, and Fernández, Adolfo C. 2017. “Is women’s satisfaction higher than men’s ?: self-selection, expectations of biology”, *XII Jornadas de Economía Laboral*, Valladolid.

Solomon, Esther E. 1986. “Private and public sector managers: An empirical investigation of job characteristics and organizational climate”. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 71(2): 247-259.

Spector, Paul E, Suzy Fox, Lisa M Penney, Kari Bruursema, Angeline. Goh and Stacey Kessler. 2006. The Dimensionality of Counterproductivity: Are All Counterproductive Behavior Created Equal? Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68(3): 446-460.

Steel, Brent S and Rebeca L Warner.1990.”Job satisfaction among early labor force participants: Unexpected outcomes in public and private sector comparisons”. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 10(3): 4-22.

Stimson, John and Thomas Johnson. 1977. “Tasks, individual differences, and job satisfaction”. *Industrial Relations* 3: 315-322.

Taylor, Jeannette and Jonathan H Westover. 2011. “Job Satisfaction in the public service: The effects of public service motivation, workplace attributes and work relations”. *Public Management Review* 13(5): 731-753.

Tietjen, Mark and Robert M Myers. 1998. “Motivation and Job satisfaction”. *Management Decision* 36(4): 226-231.

Whorton, Josepth W and John A Worthley. 1981. “A perspective on the challenge of public management: Environmental paradox and organizational culture”. *Academy of Management Review* 6(3): 357-361.

TABLES

Table 1: Mean Job Satisfaction and Distribution by sector-contract

	Total	
	Distribution	Job Sat.
Private	24.069	7.20
Private-perm	18.412	7.31
Private-temp	5.657	6.83
Public	7.984	7.50
Public-perm	6.326	7.51
Public-temp	1.658	7.45

Table 2: Mean Satisfaction Scores in Different Job Aspects by sector-contract

	Public	Public-perm	Public-temp	Private	Private-perm	Private-temp
Wage	6.31	6.32	6.28	5.95	6.06	5.56
Job stability	7.97	8.66	5.34	7.19	7.76	5.33
Work hours	7.62	7.63	7.58	6.96	7.03	6.72
Time flexibility	6.42	6.44	6.37	6.25	6.35	5.93
Break times	6.93	6.92	6.97	6.45	6.52	6.23
Holidays	7.92	8.08	7.32	7.18	7.51	6.12
Organization at work	6.77	6.77	6.80	6.82	6.89	6.58
Independence	7.31	7.37	7.08	7.18	7.36	6.62
Desision making participation	6.66	6.75	6.33	6.48	6.70	5.76
Assesment of hierarchical superiors	6.98	6.96	7.08	7.04	7.10	6.84
Stress	5.69	5.83	5.13	5.50	5.71	4.83

Table 3: OLS Estimation Results on Job Satisfaction

(t-statistics in parenthesis)

	(1)		*(2)*	
Private	*(Omitted)*			
Private-perm			0.419	*(7.32)*
Omitted: Private-temp			*(Omitted)*	
Public	0.184	*(3.94)*		
Public-perm			0.506	*(6,99)*
Public-temp			0.482	*(5.74)*
Adjusted R^2	0.059		0.06	
N	15.257		15.257	

Observations are weighted using the individual weights in the ECVT.

Table 4: OLS Estimation of Satisfaction with wage, promotion, job training, corporate social assistance and stability

(t-statistics in parenthesis)

	Wage				*Job stability*			
	(1)		*(2)*		*(1)*		*(2)*	
Private	*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*			
Private-perm			*0.19*	*(2.78)*			*2,16*	*(25.90)*
Private-temp			*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*	
Public	-0.002	(-0.05)			*0.15*	*(2.27)*		
Public-perm			0.10	*(1.10)*			2,75	*(27.80)*
Public-temp			0.32	*(2.56)*			-0,34	*(-2.05)*
Adjusted R^2	0.087		0.0892		10.108		0,2342	
N	15.212		15.212		15.257		15.257	

Table 5: OLS Estimation of Satisfaction with work hours, time flexibility, break times and holidays

(t-statistics in parenthesis)

	Work hours				*Time flexibility*				*Break times*				*Holidays*			
	(1)		*(2)*		*(1)*		*(2)*		*(1)*		*(2)*		*(1)*		*(2)*	
Private	*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*			
Private-perm			*0.2*	*(2.80)*			*0,50*	*(5.31)*			*0.23*	*(2.60)*			*1.24*	*(14.40)*
Private-temp			*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*	
Public	*0*	*(-0,05)*			*0.07*	*1.01*			*0.31*	*4.57*			*0.35*	*5.83*		
Public-perm			0.44	*(4.90)*			0,54	*(4.38)*			0,48	*(4.40)*			1.52	*(15.09)*
Public-temp			0.55	*(5.19)*			0,34	*(2.28)*			0,57	*(2.60)*			0.96	*(7.40)*
Adjusted R^2	0.108		0.1091		0.044		0,0479		0.053		0,0548		0.089		0.1211	
N	15.257		15.257		15.257		15257		15.257		15257		15.257		15.257	
Other control variables included are age																

Table 6: OLS Estimation of Satisfaction with type of work

(t-statistics in parenthesis)

	Organization at work				*Independence*				*Decision making*				*Assesment of hierarchical superiors*				*Stress*			
	(1)		*(2)*		*(1)*		*(2)*		*(1)*		*(2)*		*(1)*		*(2)*		*(1)*		*(2)*	
Private	*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*			
Private-perm			0.37	*(4,64)*			*0.70*	*(8.69)*			0.77	*(8.22)*			0.25	*(3.34)*			0.35	*(3.56)*
Private-temp			*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*				*(omitted)*	
Public	*-0.08*	*(-1.36)*			*-0.08*	*(-1.41)*			*0.04*	*0.55*			*-0.18*	*-2.95*			*-0.12*	*(-1.61)*		
Public-perm			0.21	*(2,19)*			0.54	*(5.63)*			0.72	*(6.34)*			0.01	*(0.14)*			0.25	*(2.07)*
Public-temp			0.24	*(2,08)*			0.34	*(2,89)*			0.56	*(3.70)*			0.04	*(0.30)*			-0.07	*(-0.47)*
Adjusted R^2	0.034		0.038		0.053		0.064		0.080		0.089		0.042		0.044		0.088		0.091	
N	15257		15257		15.257		15257		14.861		14861		14.668		14668		15.257		15257	

Table A1: Descriptive statistics				
	Definition	Measure	Mean	Std. Dev
Job satisfaction	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	7.3	1.85
Satisfaction with wage	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	6.04	2.26
Satisfacion with job stability	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	7.38	2.55
Satisfacion with work hours	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	7.12	2.24
Satisfacion with time flexibility	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	6.29	3.05
Satisfacion with break times	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	6.57	2.68
Satisfacion with holidays	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	7.37	2.55
Satisfacion with the organization at work	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	6.81	2.26
Satisfacion with independence	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	7.22	2.27
Satisfacion with decision making participation	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	6.52	2.72
Satisfacion with the assesment made by hierarchical super	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	7.03	2.29
Stress	Subjetive stress	0 to 10	5.55	3.05

Table A2: Descriptive statistics				
	Definition	Measure	Mean	Std. Dev
Job satisfaction	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	7.30	1.85
female	If individual is female	Dummy 0/1	0.42	0.49
age30	Age<=30	Dummy 0/1	0.17	0.37
age 40	30<Age<=40	Dummy 0/1	0.29	0.45
age 50	40<age<=50	Dummy 0/1	0.30	0.46
age 60	51<age<=60	Dummy 0/1	0.19	0.40
age 65	60<age<=65	Dummy 0/1	0.04	0.20
partner	If the individual is married or cohabiting	Dummy 0/1	0.67	0.47
children	If the individual has children	Dummy 0/1	0.35	0.47
n.children	Number of children	Number (0-5)	0.39	0.64
educ1	No education	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.18
educ2	Maximum education primary	Dummy 0/1	0.17	0.37
educ3	Maximum education secondary	Dummy 0/1	0.21	0.41
educ4	Maximum education high-school	Dummy 0/1	0.34	0.47
educ5	Maximum education University	Dummy 0/1	0.25	0.43
ocup1	Directors and Managers	Dummy 0/1	0.07	0.26
ocup2	Scientific and intellectual technicians	Dummy 0/1	0.14	0.35
ocup3	Technicians	Dummy 0/1	0.14	0.35
ocup4	Accounting, administrative	Dummy 0/1	0.07	0.26
ocup5	Customer services clerks	Dummy 0/1	0.16	0.36
ocup6	Skilled agricultural, fishery workers	Dummy 0/1	0.04	0.19
ocup7	Skilled manufacturing industry workers	Dummy 0/1	0.22	0.41
ocup8	Food, tobacco and textile workers	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.17
ocup9	Elementary occupations	Dummy 0/1	0.12	0.32
ocup10	Armed forces occupations	Dummy 0/1	0.00	0.06
seniority	Work experience	Years	12.80	10.70
lowwage	If wages is below 1200	Dummy 0/1	0.29	0.45
mediumwage	1201 <wages<=3000	Dummy 0/1	0.50	0.50
highwage	Wages >3001	Dummy 0/1	0.13	0.34
lowwagehouse	If house wages is below 1200	Dummy 0/1	0.12	0.33
mediumwagehouse	1201 <house wages<=3000	Dummy 0/1	0.54	0.49
highwagehouse	House wages >3001	Dummy 0/1	0.29	0.45
self-employed withou	Self-employed without employees	Dummy 0/1	0.13	0.34
self-employed with	Self-employed with employees	Dummy 0/1	0.05	0.22
Low manager	If individual is manager	Dummy 0/1	0.15	0.36
High manager	If individual is high manager	Dummy 0/1	0.02	0.13
lnhours	Hours worked	Ln hours	3.64	0.33
night	If individual works at night	Dummy 0/1	0.14	0.34
turn	If individual works by turns	Dummy 0/1	0.17	0.37
temporary	If individual holds temporal contract	Dummy 0/1	0.19	0.40
public	If individual works in public sector	Dummy 0/1	0.20	0.40
partial	If individual holds part-time job	Dummy 0/1	0.13	0.34
region1	Andalucia	Dummy 0/1	0.09	0.28
region2	Aragon	Dummy 0/1	0.04	0.19
region3	Asturias	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.18
region4	Baleares	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.18
region5	Canarias	Dummy 0/1	0.04	0.19
region6	Cantabria	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.16
region7	Castilla-leon	Dummy 0/1	0.05	0.21
region8	Castilla la mancha	Dummy 0/1	0.04	0.19
region9	Cataluña	Dummy 0/1	0.26	0.44
region10	C. valenciana	Dummy 0/1	0.07	0.26
region11	Extremadura	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.17
region12	Galicia	Dummy 0/1	0.05	0.22
region13	Madrid	Dummy 0/1	0.10	0.30
region14	Murcia	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.18
region15	Navarra	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.17
region16	País Vasco	Dummy 0/1	0.05	0.21
region17	La Rioja	Dummy 0/1	0.02	0.15
Continuoushours	Continuous working hours	Dummy 0/1	0.53	0.49
Sunday	If individual works on Sunday	Dummy 0/1	0.06	0.24
Hours>8	If individual works more than 8 hours	Dummy 0/1	0.28	0.45
Observations			30.882	

Note: The variables in bold are the categories of reference in the estimations.

Table A3: Complete Results of Table 3				
	Job satisfaction			
	(1)		(2)	
	Coefficient	t-statistics	Coefficient	t-statistics
female	0.07	1.50	0.07	1.37
age 40	-0.27	-0.42	-0.03	-0.53
age 50	-0.08	-1.21	-0.09	-1.27
age 60	-0.14	-1.37	-0.15	-1.46
age 65	0.47	2.55	0.46	2.46
partner	-0.01	-0.10	-0.01	-0.16
children	-0.13	-2.14	-0.13	-2.12
nchildren	0.01	0.41	0.01	0.36
educ2	-0.15	-1.11	-0.15	-1.08
educ3	-0.16	-1.17	-0.15	-1.13
educ4	-0.41	-3.10	-0.41	-3.07
educ5	-0.65	-4.61	-0.65	-4.55
ocup1	0.41	3.06	0.40	2.98
ocup2	0.56	6.21	0.57	6.25
ocup3	0.39	4.88	0.39	4.81
ocup4	0.18	2.05	0.19	2.09
ocup5	0.21	2.62	0.21	2.67
ocup6	-0.11	-0.72	-0.11	-0.72
ocup7	-0.01	-0.11	-0.01	-0.11
ocup8	-0.16	-1.40	-0.16	-1.35
ocup10	-0.30	-1.09	-0.25	-0.92
seniority	-0.01	-4.87	-0.01	-4.6
lowwage	0.23	2.20	0.22	2.08
mediumwage	0.46	4.08	0.45	4
highwage	0.61	4.91	0.60	4.87
lowwagehou	0.05	0.27	0.05	0.26
mediumwage	0.39	2.22	0.39	2.2
highwagehou	0.33	1.80	0.32	1.78
low manager	0.70	5.85	0.69	5.71
high manage	0.28	6.16	0.28	5.99
lnhours	-0.38	-3.47	-0.38	-3.43
night	-0.05	-0.80	-0.05	-0.76
turn	-0.05	-0.94	-0.06	-1.06
temporary	-0.33	-6.66		
public	0.18	3.94		
public-perm			0.51	6.99
public-temp			0.42	7.32
private	*(omitted)*			
Private-perm			0.48	5.74
private-temp			*(omitted)*	
partial	-0.09	-1.14	-0.09	-1.21
continousho	-0.09	-2.05	-0.08	-1.97
Sunday	-0.21	-1.86	-0.20	-1.76
Hours>8	-0.20	-3.74	-0.20	-3.72
const	8.51	18.54	8.13	17.52
Note: The categories of reference are: age30 (< 30 years), educ1 (without studies), ocup9 (semiskilled workers), minimum wage. Regions is a control variable but are not showed in the table to avoid so much data.				
Other control variables included are region (17).				

Table A4: Complete results of Table 4

	Wage		*Job Stability*	
	Coef.	t	Coef.	t
female	0.28	*4.60*	0.02	*0.30*
age 40	-0.22	*-2.90*	-0.13	*-1.52*
age 50	-0.27	*-3.27*	-0.17	*-1.77*
age 60	-0.30	*-2.90*	-0.33	*-2.72*
age 65	-0.33	*-1.39*	-0.16	*-0.66*
partner	-0.05	*-0.64*	-0.05	*-0.57*
children	-0.53	*-7.77*	-0.28	*-3.52*
nchildren	0.18	*5.23*	0.05	*1.12*
educ2	-0.04	*-0.27*	-0.09	*-0.54*
educ3	0.05	*0.32*	0.08	*0.51*
educ4	-0.10	*-0.69*	-0.10	*-0.61*
educ5	-0.12	*-0.76*	-0.13	*-0.78*
ocup1	0.43	*3.63*	0.22	*1.34*
ocup2	0.36	*3.38*	0.30	*2.46*
ocup3	0.26	*2.71*	0.25	*2.29*
ocup4	0.22	*2.18*	0.24	*1.96*
ocup5	0.20	*2.07*	0.34	*3.31*
ocup6	-0.16	*-1.10*	-0.17	*-0.67*
ocup7	0.10	*1.16*	-0.15	*-1.51*
ocup8	0.09	*0.67*	-0.17	*-0.98*
ocup10	-0.45	*-1.63*	-1.00	*-1.46*
seniority	0.00	*-1.42*	0.02	*4.55*
lowwage	0.47	*4.03*	0.05	*0.33*
mediumwage	1.41	*11.16*	0.25	*1.66*
highwage	2.02	*14.49*	0.39	*2.36*
lowwagehouse	0.48	*2.35*	0.53	*1.82*
mediumwageh	0.66	*3.27*	0.85	*2.99*
highwagehous	0.77	*3.72*	0.79	*2.72*
Low manager	-0.06	*-0.59*	0.61	*4.61*
High manager	0.26	*0.71*	0.28	*4.92*
lnhours	0.36	*5.51*	-0.25	*-1.94*
night	0.51	*5.17*	-0.15	*-1.95*
turn	-0.33	*-1.96*	-0.07	*-0.97*
Public-perm	1.15	*1.74*	2.75	*27.87*
Public-temp	-0.31	*-1.81*	-0.34	*-2.05*
Private-perm	-0.28	*-2.26*	2.16	*25.94*
Private-temp	*(omitted)*			
partial	-0.31	*-3.11*	-0.10	*-1.07*
continoushou	0.11	*1.67*	-0.09	*-1.77*
Sunday	-0.03	*-0.43*	-0.20	*-1.28*
Hours>8	-0.04	*-7.13*	-0.19	*-2.68*
const	-0.06	*-0.94*	5.67	*9.94*

Note: The categories of reference are: age30 (< 30 years), educ1 (without studies), ocup9 (semiskilled workers), minimum wage.

Other control variables included are region (17).

Table A5: Complete results of Tables 5								
	Work hours		*Time flexibility*		*Break times*		*Holidays*	
	Coef.	t	Coef.	t	Coef.	t	Coef.	t
female	-0.01	*-0.16*	-0.32	*-4.13*	-0.397	-5.97	-0.029	-0.48
age 40	0.08	*0.96*	-0.06	*-0.61*	-0.106	-1.13	0.133	1.46
age 50	0.05	*0.61*	-0.02	*-0.18*	-0.14	-1.36	0.046	0.47
age 60	0.23	*2.02*	-0.21	*-1.41*	-0.16	-1.17	-0.004	-0.04
age 65	0.60	*2.21*	0.64	*2.53*	0.086	0.31	0.22	0.93
partner	-0.05	*-0.67*	0.01	*0.12*	-0.127	-1.37	-0.012	-0.14
children	0.20	*2.78*	-0.09	*-0.93*	0.202	2.2	-0.024	-0.3
nchildren	-0.08	*-2.00*	0.08	*1.58*	-0.07	-1.51	-0.054	-1.34
educ2	0.26	*1.67*	0.34	*1.69*	0.013	0.08	0.37	1.94
educ3	0.23	*1.49*	0.32	*1.59*	0.048	0.29	0.607	3.28
educ4	0.08	*0.51*	0.13	*0.66*	-0.117	-0.72	0.348	1.9
educ5	-0.21	*-1.27*	-0.12	*-0.56*	-0.195	-1.1	0.301	1.58
ocup1	0.30	*1.84*	0.70	*3.39*	0.274	1.38	0.37	2.23
ocup2	0.41	*3.53*	0.01	*0.05*	0.029	0.21	0.536	4.31
ocup3	0.31	*3.01*	0.39	*2.98*	0.317	2.65	0.448	3.97
ocup4	0.37	*3.51*	0.18	*1.33*	0.284	2.14	0.401	3.37
ocup5	0.05	*0.46*	-0.17	*-1.43*	-0.005	-0.04	0.105	0.92
ocup6	0.28	*1.34*	-0.27	*-0.93*	0.435	2.07	-0.597	-1.96
ocup7	0.11	*1.23*	-0.43	*-3.78*	-0.176	-1.69	0.029	0.27
ocup8	0.18	*1.25*	-0.35	*-1.78*	-0.224	-1.13	0.102	0.58
ocup10	-0.07	*-0.16*	-0.88	*-1.69*	0.298	0.87	0.411	1.58
seniority	-0.01	*-2.78*	-0.02	*-3.54*	-0.013	-3.24	-0.001	-0.34
lowwage	0.51	*3.80*	-0.16	*-1.01*	0.545	3.19	0.296	2.06
mediumwage	0.65	*4.43*	-0.15	*-0.88*	0.826	4.59	0.484	3.19
highwage	0.69	*4.12*	-0.28	*-1.36*	0.878	4.34	0.511	2.98
lowwagehouse	0.02	*0.08*	0.31	*1.04*	0.306	1.06	0.315	1.03
mediumwageho	0.20	*0.78*	0.42	*1.44*	0.478	1.68	0.597	1.97
highwagehouse	0.19	*0.74*	0.41	*1.37*	0.39	1.35	0.608	1.99
Low manager	0.31	*1.89*	0.74	*3.24*	0.068	0.31	0.242	1.7
High manager	0.04	*0.64*	0.39	*4.50*	0.181	2.5	0.149	2.44
lnhours	-0.42	*-3.38*	-0.09	*-0.58*	-0.469	-3.24	-0.44	-2.95
night	-0.61	*-7.42*	-0.49	*-5.01*	-0.506	-5.72	-0.306	-3.49
turn	-0.07	*-1.06*	-0.06	*-0.65*	-0.142	-1.73	-0.011	-0.15
Public-perm	0.44	*4.97*	0.54	*4.38*	0.477	4.47	2E+06	15.09
Public-temp	0.55	*5.19*	0.34	*2.28*	0.565	4.37	0.962	7.41
Private-perm	0.20	*2.80*	0.50	*5.31*	0.225	2.66	1E+06	14.48
Private-temp	*(omitted)*							
partial	-0.06	*-0.70*	0.34	*2.86*	-0.413	-3.71	-0.101	-1.05
continoushours	0.73	*14.10*	0.24	*3.55*	-0.005	-0.09	0.011	0.21
Sunday	-0.34	*-1.97*	-0.41	*-2.10*	-0.123	-0.76	-0.127	-0.71
Hours>8	-0.86	*-12.83*	-0.65	*-7.52*	-0.744	-9.43	-0.557	-7.47
const	7.23	*14.22*	6.07	*8.70*	8E+06	12.89	6.176	9.14
Note: The categories of reference are: age30 (< 30 years), educ1 (without studies), ocup9 (semiskilled workers), minimum wage. Regions is a control variable but are not showed in the table to avoid so much data.								
Other control variables included are region (17).								

Table A6: Complete results of Table 6

	rganization at wor		*Independence*		*Decision making*		*Assesment of*		*Stress*	
	Coef.	t	Coef.	t	Coef.	t	Coef.	t	Coef.	t
female	0.047	0.76	0.024	0.42	0.097	1.37	0.081	1.31	0.517	7.01
age 40	-0.048	-0.56	0.04	0.45	-0.009	-0.08	-0.07	-0.77	0.288	2.67
age 50	0.068	0.74	0.126	1.32	0.053	0.46	-0.065	-0.66	0.168	1.42
age 60	0.08	0.62	0.025	0.2	-0.338	-2.18	-0.068	-0.51	-0.127	-0.81
age 65	1.199	5.57	0.616	2.74	0.523	1.78	0.732	3.54	-0.729	-2.16
partner	-0.045	-0.55	0.005	0.06	-0.019	-0.19	-0.013	-0.15	*0.1*	0.93
children	0.128	1.64	0.096	1.22	-0.167	-1.78	0.084	1.04	-0.049	-0.48
nchildren	-0.076	-1.82	-0.056	-1.41	-0.027	-0.57	-0.099	-2.43	-0.046	-0.89
educ2	-0.145	-0.84	0.287	1.3	-0.051	-0.21	-0.104	-0.64	0.128	0.58
educ3	-0.007	-0.04	0.372	1.7	-0.031	-0.13	-0.202	-1.25	-0.021	-0.1
educ4	-0.368	-2.18	0.188	0.88	-0.277	-1.2	-0.441	-2.76	0.385	1.79
educ5	-0.544	-3.01	0.034	0.16	-0.369	-1.52	-0.535	-3.08	0.378	1.64
ocup1	0.521	2.87	0.404	2.49	0.853	4.42	0.476	2.7	0.134	6.05
ocup2	0.436	3.29	0.644	5.45	1.006	6.39	0.552	4.5	0.113	7.2
ocup3	0.241	2.00	0.257	2.39	0.53	3.87	0.368	3.44	0.912	6.62
ocup4	0.297	2.39	-0.013	-0.12	0.086	0.6	0.31	2.66	0.796	5.35
ocup5	0.402	3.45	0.098	0.93	0.68	5.28	0.427	4.05	0.859	6.62
ocup6	0.378	1.85	-0.12	-0.51	-0.142	-0.48	0.415	1.8	0.053	0.15
ocup7	-0.025	-0.23	-0.061	-0.6	0.066	0.52	0.015	0.14	0.625	5.1
ocup8	-0.074	-0.43	-0.417	-2.54	-0.19	-0.95	-0.109	-0.68	0.583	2.83
ocup10	0.358	1.19	-0.653	-1.04	0.545	1.77	0.473	1.76	-0.116	-0.17
seniority	-0.021	-6.24	-0.017	-4.83	-0.017	-4.12	-0.02	-5.55	0.021	4.92
lowwage	0.204	1.4	-0.13	-0.86	0.012	0.07	0.087	0.69	0.252	1.41
mediumwage	0.546	3.58	0.199	1.29	0.42	2.29	0.357	2.67	0.374	1.98
highwage	0.623	3.74	0.368	2.15	0.654	3.27	0.511	3.34	0.302	1.4
lowwagehouse	0.115	0.38	0.053	0.2	-0.385	-1.19	0.071	0.24	-0.469	-1.47
mediumwagehouse	0.239	0.79	0.287	1.1	-0.12	-0.38	0.302	1.06	-0.508	-1.62
highwagehouse	0.092	0.31	0.257	0.97	-0.278	-0.86	0.121	0.42	-0.297	-0.93
Low manager	0.739	4.66	0.795	6.00	1.421	10.02	0.672	4.01	0.566	2.65
High manager	0.232	3.8	0.373	6.19	0.873	12.95	0.271	4.61	0.577	7.41
lnhours	-0.389	-3.15	-0.035	-0.18	-0.06	-0.25	-0.483	-4.06	0.658	4.12
night	-0.119	-1.51	-0.117	-1.48	-0.285	-2.91	-0.245	-2.98	0.364	3.8
turn	-0.121	-1.76	-0.273	-3.81	-0.431	-4.81	-0.288	-4.03	0.168	1.89
Public-perm	0.212	2.19	0.543	5.63	0.72	6.34	0.013	0.14	0.249	2.07
Public-temp	0.243	2.08	0.343	2.89	0.559	3.7	0.035	0.3	-0.072	-0.47
Private-perm	0.369	4.64	0.696	8.69	0.772	8.22	0.247	3.34	0.349	3.56
Private-temp					*(omitted)*					
partial	0.018	0.19	0.118	1.07	0.256	1.86	-0.04	-0.43	-0.004	-0.03
continoushours	-0.198	-3.66	-0.157	-2.94	-0.245	-3.77	-0.266	-4.9	0.013	0.19
Sunday	-0.199	-1.29	-0.087	-0.56	-0.044	-0.26	-0.152	-0.98	0.013	0.06
Hours>8	-0.208	-2.93	-0.126	-1.66	-0.157	-1.7	-0.085	-1.24	0.523	6
const	7.622	14.03	6.189	7.19	6.122	6.09	8.628	15.4	1.327	1.96

Note: The categories of reference are: age30 (< 30 years), educ1 (without studies), ocup9 (semiskilled workers), minimum wage.

Other control variables included are region (17).