

Once in the public sector, do differences in job satisfaction by sex disappear?

Adolfo Cosme Fernández

Nuria Sanchez

Once in the public sector, do differences in job satisfaction by gender disappear?

1. Introduction.

Job satisfaction, “the feeling that a worker has about his job” (Smith *et al*, 1969), that “positive or pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience” (Locke, 1976), has received increased attention in economic literature in recent decades. Among the reasons for the growing interest are the impact of this variable on employee performance (Appelbaum and Kamal, 2001; Hackman and Oldham, 1975; Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, 1980; Judge *et al*, 2001; Tietjen and Myer, 1998), absenteeism (Hausknecht *et al*, 2008; and Lee, 1998), turnover (Hom and Griffeth, 1995), among other variables affecting organizational behaviour or performance in addition to humanitarian and welfare concerns (Ellickson and Logston, 2001). For this reason, numerous studies have emerged trying to identify job satisfaction determinants and the differences between different types of workers and organizations.

One of the issues that has aroused the most interest, since the seminal work of Clark (1997), is the existence of differences in job satisfaction between men and women. Although there is no consensus on this topic, especially when international comparisons are considered, a large number of studies point to greater satisfaction of female employees in comparison to their male colleagues (Clark, 1997; Sloane and Williams, 2000; Long, 2005; and Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2000a and 2007). This result is in spite of the fact that working conditions, in terms of job segregation and wage, are, on average, inferior for women (Duncan and Corcoran, 1984; England and McCreary, 1987; Madden, 1985, among others). This outcome is known in economic literature as the paradox of the contented female worker (Crosby, 1982). In any case, numerous studies have qualified this result taking into consideration variables such as age or education. In this sense, as we consider younger groups with a higher educational level, the differences between men and women seem to be smaller (Sánchez-Sánchez and Fernández, 2019).

Despite the large number of studies that focus on differences in job satisfaction by gender, very few analyse the differential patterns of work satisfaction for men and women in the public and private sector. The economic literature agrees that there are significant

differences in both sectors in terms of salary, promotion, working hours and holidays, among other issues (Fotler, 1981; Meyer, 1982; Perry and Porter, 1982; Perry and Rainey, 1988; Rainey *et al*, 1976; and Whornton and Worthley, 1981). If preferences by gender were different with respect to each of these items, these differences could also cause differences in job satisfaction between men and women in the public and private sector.

On the other hand, labour conditions in the public sector are more uniform among workers in the same professional category. In the private sector, contracts tend to be negotiated in a more discretionary and individualized way, which could lead to greater differentiation among workers. In fact, if we focus on female participation in managerial positions and the wage gap between men and women, we could conclude that the working conditions of the latter are worse, on average, than those of men, at least in the private sector¹. This could explain why, as the data reflects, more women opt to work in the public sector.

Finally, working hours, the schedule, the lower required mobility and the greater stability could facilitate in the public sector the conciliation of work and personal life, especially in the case of having members of the family dependent. Given that women have traditionally been responsible for care work, this fact could explain, once again, their greater presence in the public sector and their bigger job satisfaction (see Bender *et al*, 2005; Borra *et al*, 2017; Konrad *et al*, 2000; Pinguart and Söresen, 2000; Scandura and Lankau, 1997; and Sloane and Williams, 2000).

What happens when public sector employees are considered? Are there still differences in job satisfaction by gender or the assessment made by men and women of their job is the same? It is in this framework where our work is defined. In the first place, we study if significant differences in male and female job satisfaction are observed at an aggregate level. Secondly, to what extent these differences can be attributed to employment in the public or the private sector. If, indeed, public sector job satisfaction was higher than that in the private sector, the difference in aggregate job satisfaction by gender could lie in the greater presence of women in the public sector. In any case, if we considered exclusively employees in the public sector, the differences in job satisfaction of men and women should disappear.

¹ See data from the National Securities Market Commission (2018) and the European Institute for Gender Equality (2018) for the participation of women in executive positions and the National Statistics Institute (2010) for gender wage gaps.

On the other hand, though the public sector is generally associated with greater advantages in terms of stability, working hours and vacations, it is also linked with lower wages, at least at the highest levels of the distribution, where the maximum salary would be below that available in the private sector. As a result, it is very likely that there will be a trade-off between satisfaction with wage, on the one hand, and stability and working hours, on the other. A priori, it is difficult to determine whether a differential pattern by gender exists, that is, if the assessment made by women of the different domains of satisfaction is equal to that of men.

The analysis of this issue is of special interest in Spain. On the one hand, there is no agreement regarding women's job satisfaction compared to that of men. On the other hand, the characteristics of the labour market, especially in terms of unemployment and temporality, make the option of working in the public sector particularly attractive. In fact, as evidenced by the data, the unemployment and job temporality rates are higher for women than for men. Not only these two variables, but also the reduced presence of women in private sector managerial and CEO positions and the wage gap between men and women, could justify the greater satisfaction of women in the public sector. It is not obvious, however, if once within the public sector, the differences in job satisfaction by gender should persist.

The scarcity of data, particularly in the case of Spain, has led most studies to focus on job satisfaction in aggregate terms, and very few analyse job satisfaction in different domains. The consideration of all these aspects could help to determine why women and men choose positions in the public or private sector. At the same time, it would allow us to define strategies aimed at boosting public employee job satisfaction using experiences from the private sector, and vice versa, establishing guidelines by gender. In this sense, data from the Survey of Quality of Life at Work used in the present work allows us to obtain not only aggregate job satisfaction information, but also information with respect to different job domains².

² In the case of Spain, data referring to job satisfaction come from the Survey of Quality of Life at Work and the Survey of Quality of Life. The data from this latest survey do not offer information on job satisfaction in different domains. There are also international data, as the European Working Conditions Survey, but the number of observations is much smaller

The structure of the work is as follows. In the first place, we include the theoretical framework in which we consider differences in job satisfaction by gender and between the public and private sectors. Subsequently, a descriptive statistical analysis is carried out to observe aggregate level gender differences in job satisfaction in the public and private sector. These differences are also considered in terms of satisfaction with wage, job stability, working hours, flexibility, holidays, work organization, independence, the assessment made by hierarchical superiors, monotony and stress. Thirdly, econometric estimations are carried out using job satisfaction as the dependent variable, and disaggregating the sample into public and private sector employees, to observe if the variable female positively affects job satisfaction. To reinforce the analysis, the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition is used to determine which differences in job satisfaction are due to characteristics of the position and which correspond to the worker's assessments. Finally, estimations are made considering job satisfaction as the dependent variable with respect to certain job domains. The impact of public sector work is studied for men and women. The article ends with a few brief conclusions.

Our results show that average job satisfaction is slightly higher for women than for men but the difference is exclusively justify by women working in the public sector, since in the private sector the differences are non-existent. The econometric estimations reinforce these results. The variable female has only a positive impact on job satisfaction in the public sector. The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition shows that the characteristics of jobs performed by women have a negative effect on their job satisfaction, especially in the private sector, but the assessment they make of these characteristics is higher than that of men. Lately, the results of job satisfaction by domain show a differential pattern by gender. The results seem to corroborate the existence of a trade-off between wages and stability, although this fact is exclusively justified by men. Working in the public sector has a negative influence on satisfaction with work organization and independence nevertheless the results are exclusively justified by men. The impact of working in the public sector on monotony and stress is negative for both, men and women, but higher for the latter. In terms of policy implications, it is difficult for administrators to consider gender to define the wage structure, training programs or work hours, as the principle of non-discrimination should govern public sector decision making. However, family responsibilities, salary and training expectations, monotony and stress and the differences by gender should be considered.

2. Theoretical framework

The economic literature shows that there is a strong correlation between job satisfaction and worker performance (Appelbaum and Kamal, 2001; Hackman and Oldham, 1975; Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, 1980; Judge *et al*, 2001; Tietjen and Myer, 1998), absenteeism (Hausknecht *et al*, 2008; and Lee, 1998), turnover (Hom and Griffeth, 1995) and the performance of the organization as a whole (Garrido *et al*, 2005; Ostroff, 1992; Ryan *et al*, 1996; Harter *et al*, 2002). Not only utilitarian reasons, but also humanitarian interests, justify the studies of job satisfaction. Workers deserve to be respected and their physical and psychological well-being must be guaranteed (Ellickson and Logston, 2001). For all these reasons, numerous works have tried to determine the differences in worker satisfaction by sector, educational level or gender of the employees, as well as their determinants, as key factors in an organization's human resources policy.

One of the issues that has attracted the most attention is the difference in job satisfaction by gender. The seminal work of Clark (1997) focuses, for the first time, on these differences and opens up a field of research that deals not only with determining their existence, but also their origin. Despite the fact that the results are inconclusive, a large number of works, especially those based on the Anglo-Saxon experience, show a greater job satisfaction for women in relation to that of men (Clark, 1997; Sloane and Williams, 2000; Long, 2005; and Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2000a and 2007)³. The results in Spain are also inconclusive, thus, Álvarez (2004), Kaiser (2007), Rico (2012), Sánchez-Sánchez and Fernández (2019) and Hauret and Williams (2017) point out that job satisfaction of women is superior to that of men. However, Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza (2000b) and Gamero (2004) conclude that differences by gender are non-existent.

In parallel, numerous studies have focused on the differences in job satisfaction according to the organization employees are working for, specifically considering their public or private sector nature. Although there is an extensive debate regarding the defining features of private and public organizations, there is a consensus on the existence of strong differences between them (Fotler, 1981; Meyer, 1982; Perry and Porter, 1982; Perry and

³ See Kim (2005) for a review of studies related to gender and job satisfaction, as well as Green *et al* (2018) for a recent review of the paradox of the contented female worker.

Rainey, 1988; Rainey *et al.*, 1976; and Whornton and Worthley, 1981). From the point of view of organizational mission, the activities developed by workers in the public sector could have a more altruistic perspective that would increase motivation (Perry and Hondeghem, 2008). It is feasible, in any case, that, in spite of their more altruistic nature, the concretion of public sector objectives may be less precise, and that inaccuracy could lead to lower job satisfaction (Kjeldsen and Rosenberg, 2018). In addition, from the organizational perspective, the structure of public sector organizations is often more bureaucratic and can impede development of the worker's potential. Public sector workers have to develop their activity in a more politicized environment that is subject to rigid accountability mechanisms and intense public scrutiny (Taylor and Westover, 2011). These characteristics could reduce the range of activities, the flexibility to carry them out and remuneration. From this perspective, private sector workers would perform a greater diversity of tasks, could further develop their skills, face new challenges, experience less tedium and, therefore, increase their job satisfaction.

Although the differences between sectors are evident, there is no clear consensus on how they affect public and private workers job satisfaction globally. At an aggregate level, Demoussis and Giannakopoulos (2007), De Santis and Durst (1996), Maidani (1991) and Steel and Warner (1990) point out that public workers would be more satisfied than those in the private sector. Heywood *et al.* (2002), Emmert and Taher (1992), Gabris and Simo (1995) and Lewis (1991) consider that differences would be practically non-existent. Finally, Bogg and Cooper (1995) and Buchanan (1974) conclude that public sector workers would be less satisfied than private sector workers, although their study focuses exclusively on managers, where it is feasible that possibilities for promotion in the public sector will be more limited. Artz (2010) attributed the difference to the fact that in the private sector workers are more likely to be paid in accordance with their performance at work.

We have not considered job satisfaction exclusively in aggregate terms but we have considered specific domains of job satisfaction. In this sense, it is feasible that workers in the public sector will be less satisfied in terms of wage but will earn a premium with some non-pecuniary job factors, especially with job security, labour environment, and safety and health considerations (Ghinetti, 2007).

Should there be a differential pattern of job satisfaction in the public and in the private sector by gender?. In this regard, several considerations could be made. In the first place,

if preferences with respect to salary, promotion, working hours or holidays were different for men and women, it is feasible that their levels of job satisfaction in the public and the private sector would also differ. As has been pointed out, the differences between both sectors in these domains are clear. Second, slower professional advancement, the glass ceiling, sexual harassment and other forms of gender discrimination can erode women's authority and position in many organizations, especially within the private sector (Booker, 1998; Cooper, 1997; Daley and Naff, 1998; Gutek *et al.*, 1996). This factor could motivate, once again women to participate more in the public sector than men do, while also increasing their levels of job satisfaction by doing so. Third, a longer workday could affect job satisfaction, especially when workers have family responsibilities (Scandura and Lankau, 1997; Cha 2013; and Booth and Ours, 2013). In this sense, the requirements of the public sector in terms of work schedules and mobility could facilitate largely the balance between work and family life. Since it is women who have traditionally been in charge of care work, it is also feasible that they prefer to work in the public sector and/or to be more satisfied when doing so. In all the cases mentioned, we are faced with the possibility that women either choose to work largely in the public sector and increase job satisfaction by doing so.

The Spanish labour market exhibits certain specificities that could influence public sector employee job satisfaction in comparison to those in the private sector. In the first place, the unemployment rate in Spain is considerably higher than that of other neighbouring European countries, such as Germany, the United Kingdom, and France, especially in times of crisis. The elasticity of employment with respect to the economic cycle in Spain is very high, which means that during recessions, such as the one we have experienced, the unemployment rate exceeds 25 percent. The second specificity is the high rate of temporality characterizing the Spanish labour market. During economic upswings, it exceeds 35 percent and during recessions, despite a reduction, is superior to 25 percent⁴. These particularities could alter the workers' perception, given that permanent contract jobs in periods of crisis will be considered precious assets (Luechinger *et al.*, 2010, Ortiz, 2007; Sánchez-Sánchez and Fernández, 2014). These qualities of the labour market can lead certain individuals, with high qualification and with ample possibilities to work in

⁴ The reduction of temporary employment during crisis is mainly due to the destruction of temporary jobs. In 2007, according to Eurostat data, the temporary rate reached 27 percent in Spain while in Europe (15) it was 14 percent.

the private sector, to opt to work in the public sector, as it is, in principle, more stable, although they will receive lower remuneration. In aggregate terms, it would be necessary to contrast, in any case, if this supposed greater satisfaction with stability compensates the possible losses in other job satisfaction domains. It is also worthwhile identifying if these possible trade-offs affect men and women equally.

Why is the consideration of gender in Spain especially interesting in this framework? As noted above, unemployment rates in Spain are higher than in other European countries. In fact, if the differences by gender are studied, it can be verified that the unemployment rates of women are higher than those of men. Thus, according to data from the National Statistics Institute (hereafter INE), the unemployment rate of men was 12.1 percent, on average, over the period 2006-2010, while that of women was 14.6 percent⁵. Likewise, women's temporary employment rates exceed those of men (26.8 percent versus 21.8 percent, according to INE⁶). It is also noted that the presence of women in management and CEO positions is lower than that of men (14.3 percent of the management positions and 2.9 percent of the CEO positions in 2010 were occupied by women, according to data from the National Securities Market Commission (2018) and the European Institute for Gender Equality (2018)). The participation of women in these positions were, in fact, lower than that in Europe-28 (15.9 percent and 6.3 percent, respectively). Finally, the wage gap between men and women in the case of Spain amounts to 14 percent (23 percent if not adjusted for hours worked) according to INE (2010). All these reasons could signify that the attractiveness of the public sector will be greater for women than for men and their reported satisfaction higher.

It is also feasible that the specificity of the Spanish labour market will affect the valuations that women make regarding the different domains of job satisfaction considered and not only total job satisfaction. In this sense, and considering the existing wage gap, it would be possible that the satisfaction of women with wages in the public sector, where in principle discrimination based on gender is not feasible, would be higher than that of men. Something similar could happen with training, as it is frequently related to the capacity for promotion. With regard to satisfaction with work hours, flexibility and holidays, if

⁵ Data on average throughout the period.

⁶ Temporality rates have been calculated as average from the quarterly data of temporary and total workers throughout the period.

women do indeed take more responsibility than men for family and household burdens, it would be feasible that working in the public sector will have a positive impact on job satisfaction in this domain. Finally, in relation to the rest of the dependent variables, satisfaction with social help, stability, organization at work, independence, assessment of hierarchical superiors, monotony and stress there is no a priori idea as to whether a differential pattern by gender exists.

3.-Method and data.

The data for this work are extracted from the Spanish Survey of Life Quality at Work (SLQW). This survey is conducted on more than 7000 Spanish workers, starting in 1999. Our study focuses on five cross-sections of the survey for the years 2006–2010⁷. 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 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 each category of satisfaction levels⁸, therefore leaving a large room for interpretation of heterogeneity across interviewees. Another characteristic to note is that the responses are ordered qualitatively⁹.

⁷ 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 government budget cuts.

⁸ The categories (2, 3, 4, ..., 9) between the worst (=1) and the best (=10) have no words attached to them.

⁹ 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.

In this paper we do not use exclusively a single measure of job satisfaction but multiple-items measures, as suggested by Oshagbemi (1999). Thus, apart from the aggregate job satisfaction, satisfaction with wage, social help, training, stability, work hours, flexibility, holidays, organization at work, independence, assessment of hierarchical superiors, monotony and stress are included as dependent variables¹⁰. Job satisfaction with these domains also corresponds to the subjective perception of the interviewee and is measured in the same way as the aggregate job satisfaction. In the case of the two last items, individuals were asked to indicate the level of stress and monotony they were suffering, ranging from 1 (minimum) to 10 (maximum)

The analysis begins with simple “averages” of the responses. The simple average provides a satisfaction measure which is comparable across year or population under the assumption of linearity across response category. In Appendix, Table A1 the set of variables used, their definition, how they are measured, their average and standard deviation are shown.

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

$$u = u(x, j), \quad (1)$$

where x includes those variables related to the worker's individual characteristics and j those related to the job characteristics. In this work, among individual characteristics, we have included, apart from gender, the range of age and the educational level, other variables related to the family environment (having a partner and children, the number of children, and the household income)¹¹. These variables, as noted by Ellickson (2002), Glisson and Durik (1988), Mottaz (1984 and 1987), Reiner and Zhao (1999), Steijn (2004) and Ting (1997), appear to be insufficient to explain the variations in total job satisfaction¹², hence the inclusion of other variables related to job characteristics. In this sense, according to Herzberg's (1967) two factor theory it is feasible to include the

¹⁰ The election of variables was conditioned by the availability of data in the survey but also by the consideration of those aspects in which working in the public or the private sector and could make a difference by gender.

¹¹ The region has been also included as a control variable.

¹² It is also feasible, as pointed by Durst and DeSantis (1997), that personal characteristics may be interacting with some of the job characteristics.

extrinsic characteristics of the job, related to more basic needs of the employees (salary, status, job security, fringe benefits, among others) and extrinsic factors that correspond to the less tangible needs which are more emotional in nature (the work itself, potential of recognition and growth, and workplace relationships among others)¹³. In this work, we have included fundamentally intrinsic factors, mainly, and apart from working in the public or private sector, the wage, the sector, the type of work (manager, employer or employee), work hours, working in shifts or at night, the nature of the contract (temporary or permanent), having a continuous schedule, working more than 8 hours and work on Sundays. The fundamental reason is that some of the intrinsic values, such as the perception of work organization, independence or autonomy, assessment of hierarchical superiors, stress or monotony have been used as dependent variables. In this way, we have included exclusively those of an objective nature as independent variables, and those more subjective¹⁴ as dependent variables.

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:

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

Job satisfaction (hereafter JS*) is a latent variable that denotes the probability of an individual 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 expressed in the following manner:

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

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

¹³ See Cantarelli *et al* (2016) and Glisson and Durik (1988) for different classifications of job satisfaction correlates.

¹⁴ In previous works, these variables were included as independent variables. The impact was high and significant although collinearity problems were detected.

Since the values of the dependent variable are ordered, in the estimation of the model, an ordered probit model could be used. However, results will be easier to be interpreted if an ordinary least square (OLS) estimation is used and the results, according to Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters (2004), are similar¹⁵.

A key concern in the literature is the potential non-random selection of workers into public or private sector that could provoke an endogeneity problem. In case of cross-sectional data, the endogeneity problem has been solved by specifying a switching regression model. For this reason, we specify a public selection equation and estimate the parameters jointly using maximum likelihood¹⁶. The control for self-selection does not qualitatively affect the results¹⁷. For an easier interpretation, we only include in the text the estimation without the selection model¹⁸.

Besides, the method of Blinder-Oaxaca (Oaxaca, 1973) is 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 and that corresponding to the performance of those characteristics for men and women. The analysis has been made considering both sector (public or private) and considering separately public and private sector.

The conventional decomposition equation is:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{JS}_M - \overline{JS}_F &= [E(X_M) - E(X_F)]'[\Omega\beta_M + (I - \Omega)\beta_F] \\ &+ [(I - \Omega)'E(X_M) + \Omega'E(X_F)]'(\beta_M - \beta_F) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

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 men and women. The first term of the right side is the part attributable to differences in job satisfaction that are due to differences in personal and job

¹⁵ We have also verified the results using an ordered probit model instead of OLS model and the conclusions do not vary. For further information, contact the authors.

¹⁶ We use the maximum likelihood estimation of endogenous switching and sample selection models developed by Miranda and Rabe-Hesketh (2006).

¹⁷ The SSM command is used to evaluate the random selection. A likelihood-ratio test for $\rho=0$ accepts the null hypothesis so we can admit the absence of a significant sample selection problem.

¹⁸ For further information, contact the authors.

characteristics (X). The second term is the part attributable to differences in the valuation of these characteristics.

The right side of equation depends on different assumptions about Ω . If Ω is equal to an identity matrix, then the coefficients estimated would be the ones for women. In contrast if Ω is considered a null matrix, then the coefficients would be the ones for men. In this work a value of 0.5 for Ω is considered.

The decomposition results have been obtained with an OLS model in order to be consistent with the econometric estimations. Ordered Probit models are difficult to interpret and highly sensitive to the definition of the dependent variable. In any case, we have checked the robustness considering an oprobit and a probit model and the conclusions of different tests are similar¹⁹. We have also transformed the coefficients of the categorical variables, following Jann (2008), so that the results of the decomposition will be invariant to the choice of the omitted category. Sinning *et al* (2008) are followed for the decomposition for nonlinear regression models.

4. Results

Table 1 shows the distribution of workers in the sample in the private and in the public sector by sex, as well as by reported job satisfaction²⁰. As can be observed, the total number of workers in the private sector represent 75.1 percent of the sample, and the public sector 27.9 percent. It is also noteworthy that the participation of women in the private sector is 40.9 percent, while in the public sector it is 54.3 percent. Women's job satisfaction is slightly higher than that of men (7.29 vs. 7.26). Additionally, differences in male and female private sector job satisfaction of women are non-existent on average (7.2 in both cases), while they are slightly higher in the public sector for the former (7.51 vs. 7.48).

TABLE 1

¹⁹ For further information, contact the authors.

²⁰ Table 1 and 2 include sample data available in SLQW after cleaning the data considering only employees under 65 years old.

Table 2 shows job satisfaction by gender in each of the domains considered: with respect to wage, social help, formation, stability, working hours, flexibility, holidays, organization at work, autonomy or independence, the assessment of hierarchical superiors, stress and monotony.

TABLE 2

In general terms, public sector workers are more satisfied than those in the private sector in practically all the domains considered, except in organization at work and the assessment made by hierarchical superiors. Public sector workers also declare themselves to be under greater stress.

As can be observed, the pattern observed at the aggregate level -superior women's job satisfaction- is not present in all the domains. Thus, in the private sector, women are less satisfied than men in terms of wage. In the other domains, they are either less satisfied or the differences are very small (less than 0.1 points).

In the public sector, women are less satisfied than men in terms of stability and flexibility. In the rest of the domains, the differences increase, in this case in favour of women.

It is noteworthy that, in terms of wages, in contrast to the results in the private sector, women in the public sector are more satisfied than men. In addition, there is a differential pattern between men and women relative to the trade-off in the different public and private sector satisfaction domains. Specifically, women are more likely to increase their job satisfaction with wages working in the public sector, while men are more likely to do so in terms of stability. On the other hand, while men state that they suffer less stress in the public sector workplace, women report feeling it more intensely.

Although most of the descriptive results in the previous section seem reasonable and in line with previous findings, 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 OLS regressions including many relevant variables available in our data.

The econometric estimations that study the influence of gender (variable "female") and that of working in the public sector (variable "public") on job satisfaction are shown

below. The definition of all the independent variables included in the estimation appears, as mentioned, in the Appendix, Table A1. The omitted variables are those considered as references to perform the analysis. The coefficients are interpreted, therefore, with respect to these variables. A positive coefficient would imply a higher impact of that variable with respect to the omitted one (vice versa when it is negative).

Table 3 and Annex A2 shows the impact of the variable female on job satisfaction at the aggregate level, in both the public and the private sector.²¹ As can be observed, the variable female has a positive and significant impact on job satisfaction, as pointed out by Alvarez (2004), Kaiser (2007), Rico (2012), Sánchez-Sánchez and Fernández (2019) and Hauret and Williams (2017). Results show that the impact in the public sector is positive and significant; however, in the private sector it is not significant. The impact on the overall satisfaction of the variable female should, therefore, be attributed exclusively to public sector employees.

TABLE 3

Table 4 and Annex A3 disaggregate the sample by gender and study the impact of working in the public sector on job satisfaction for men and women. As can be seen, working in the public sector increases job satisfaction, as pointed out by Demoussis and Giannakopoulos (2007), De Santis and Durst (1996), Maidani (1991) and Steel and Warner (1990) and Sánchez-Sánchez and Fernández (2019). The impact is higher for women than for men and statistically significant.

In short, women are more satisfied than men are in aggregate terms, although their higher levels of satisfaction are justified exclusively by public sector workers. The proportion of women working in the public sector is bigger than that in the private sector. Once within the public sector, the differences between men and women do not disappear, as the impact of the variable female on job satisfaction remains positive.

²¹ The sample size in Table 3 and the following does not match with that of Table 1 since many individuals do not answer all the questions of the survey.

TABLE 4

Regarding individual characteristics, the impact of age on job satisfaction takes the form of an inverted U, with the youngest and over 65 groups being the most satisfied. In any case, as pointed out by Ellickson (2002), Glisson and Durik (1988), Mottaz (1987), Reiner and Zhao (1999) and Ting (1997), the significance of this variable, except in the case of the elderly 65, is low. However, other individual characteristics are significant. Having children has a negative effect on job satisfaction, although the variable is only statistically significant for men. As educational level increases, job satisfaction is lower, especially for those individuals with university degrees. Job satisfaction also increases as household income rises. By sex, however, the impact is only significant for women.

Regarding job characteristics, job satisfaction increases as wage rise. By gender, the increase in wages has a greater impact on men than on women, as pointed out by Phelan (2019). Holding a managerial position increases job satisfaction and it is especially valued by women, as shown by Lup (2017) and Sánchez-Sánchez and Fernández (2019). In this sense, the reduced presence of women in managerial positions could justify their higher satisfaction.

The number of hours worked and having a temporary contract reduces job satisfaction, especially for men. Working more than eight hours has a negative impact on satisfaction, especially in the case of women. Finally, working at night, having a part-time job and working on Sundays has a negative impact on satisfaction, but the impact is not statistically significant.

Next, to reinforce these results, Table 5 shows the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition to observe the differences in male-female job satisfaction and identify which correspond to the characteristics performed by the workers and which correspond to differences in the valuation of these characteristics. The analysis has been conducted considering the entire sample (public and private sectors) and then disaggregating the public and private sector workers. Results are shown considering where Ω is equal to 0.5²².

²² We have checked the results when Ω is equal to a null matrix or an identity matrix and they are analogous. In all cases, women's job characteristics decrease their total job satisfaction comparing to men, and the returns they get from them increase it. Contact the authors to request further information

TABLE 5

The first row of table 5 shows the difference in job satisfaction between men and women that is being explained. The results suggest that women report higher levels of job satisfaction than men in the public sector but not in the private sector. The decomposition suggests that job and personal characteristics penalize women with respect to men in terms of job satisfaction, as suggested by Duncan and Corcoran (1984), England and McCreary (1987) and Madden (1985). By contrast, the evaluation they make of these characteristics is superior to that of men. In fact, the role of this second component is decisive because it is greater than the first and sufficient to cause female job satisfaction to be greater than that of men.

In the case of the private sector, the results are further apart: differences in job satisfaction in favour of women disappear, and men are the most satisfied. The job characteristics are still lower for women than for men. In fact, slightly inferior. The evaluation of the characteristics is lower than in the private sector.

The results corroborate the econometric estimations. Women are more satisfied than men in aggregate terms, but the difference is due exclusively to public sector workers. Once inside the public sector, female valuation of their job characteristics continues to be superior to that of their male colleagues.

Finally, we examine the different domains of job satisfaction to identify the possible trade-off between the public and the private sector and to verify, if it exists, whether it is homogeneous between both sexes. We have proceeded to group the different satisfaction domains in three blocks: i) wage, social help, formation, and stability (table 6), referring to present income or benefits and the possibility to maintain them in the future; ii) work hours, flexibility and holidays (table 7), referring to the workload and the possibility to balance the compatibility of personal and work life; iii) organization of work, independence, assessment by hierarchical superiors, monotony and stress (table 8) referring to other aspects of the job that could affect job satisfaction. In all cases, the effect of working in the public sector at the aggregate level and by gender is highlighted. In the estimations, and to ensure comparisons are homogeneous, the same control

variables have been included, but for reasons of space and clarity, we only show the main results²³.

Satisfaction with wage, formation, social assistance, and stability

The aggregate effect of working in the public sector on wage satisfaction is practically non-existent and not significant. This result could be justified by the argument presented by Artz (2010) who considers that workers in the private sector are more likely to be paid in accordance with their efforts. Our aggregate result hides, in any case, strong differences by gender. Thus, working in the public sector has a positive and significant impact for women while for men it is also significant but negative. Intuitively, it could be argued that the existing wage gap in the private sector penalizes women and, therefore, working in the public sector, where differences are non-existent in principle, increases women's job satisfaction but not that of men. In the case of satisfaction with workplace training, results are consistent with our intuition. Working in the public sector increases women's job satisfaction with training, but reduces that of men. In terms of satisfaction with social assistance, there is no difference by sex. The impact of working in the public sector is positive and significant and the coefficient is similar for both.

TABLE 6

In terms of satisfaction with job stability, and in accordance with the results of Ghinetti (2007), working in the public sector has a positive and significant impact. Although, in Spain, this outcome is justified exclusively by men, since it is not significant for women. These results support also the work of Ghinetti (2007), who considers that workers in the public sector will be less satisfied in terms of wage but will earn a premium with other non-pecuniary aspects.

Satisfaction with work hours, flexibility and holidays

The impact of working in the public sector on satisfaction with work hours is positive and significant and its impact is greater for men than for women. Working in the public sector

²³ To further information, request the authors.

has a positive impact on satisfaction with flexibility, but it is only significant for men. Lately, the impact of working in the public sector on satisfaction with holidays is positive and significant for men and women, although greater for the latter.

TABLE 7

Satisfaction with organization at work, independence, assessment made by hierarchical superiors, monotony and stress

Working in the public sector has a negative influence on satisfaction with the organization at work and independence. This result could be justified by the reasons given by Kjeldsen and Rosenberg (2018) related to less precise objectives and the structure of public sector organizations, frequently more bureaucratic and politicized. The results in our case are, in any case, justified exclusively by the perception of men, since among women the coefficient is not significant. The impact on satisfaction with the assessment made by the hierarchical superiors is negative for both sexes and somewhat higher for women. This result could be also justified by the argument of Taylor and Westover (2011), who consider that the environment in which public sector workers have to develop their activity is subject to rigid accountability mechanisms and intense scrutiny.

TABLE 8

The impact of working in the public sector on monotony and stress is negative for both groups. This result is coherent with the arguments of Kjeldsen and Rosenberg (2018). The coefficient is higher for women.

A priori, no conjecture was made regarding the influence of gender on satisfaction with the variables included in Table 8. The results, however, are revealing and evidence the need to differentiate by gender to increase job satisfaction with organization at work, independence and assessment of hierarchical superiors and to reduce monotony and stress.

5. Conclusions

This paper analyses the differences in job satisfaction between men and women in the public and the private sectors. In order to do so, the Survey of Quality of Life at Work is used between the years 2006-2010. Differences in satisfaction levels are identified, as well as the influence of individual and job characteristics. Differences in satisfaction are analysed on average initially, and subsequently according to different domains of satisfaction, namely wage, social help, formation, stability, work hours, flexibility, holidays, organization at work, independence, assessment of hierarchical superiors, monotony and stress.

Subsequently, the econometric estimations have been calculated considering total male and female job satisfaction as the dependent variable and working in the public sector, among others, as the independent variable. We then considered job satisfaction within each of the domains as the dependent variables.

The descriptive analysis reveals that average levels of job satisfaction are slightly higher for women than for men. However, this difference is exclusively justified by women who work in the public sector, since, in the private sector, the differences are non-existent. Public sector workers are also more satisfied than those in the private sector. The degree of participation of women in the public sector is higher than that of men.

The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition shows how characteristics of jobs performed by women have a negative effect on their job satisfaction. However, the assessment they make of these characteristics is higher than that of men. This coefficient is large enough to cause higher overall job satisfaction for women. This result is justified, exclusively by public sector workers, since the differences in the private sector are practically non-existent. In the public sector, differences observed in the characteristics of the work position penalize women to a lesser degree. Working conditions between men and women seem to be more uniform than in the private sector.

The econometric estimations show that the variable female positively influences job satisfaction. It could be argued that this greater satisfaction is derived from greater participation in the public sector; however, when disaggregating the sample by sector, the impact of the variable observed is still positive and significant.

The results seem to corroborate the existence of a trade-off between wages and stability, although this result would be justified exclusively by men. Working in the public sector has a positive impact on wage satisfaction for women, but a negative effect on men. In the case of satisfaction with stability, the impact is positive exclusively for men, since for women it is not significant. For both sexes, working in the public sector increases satisfaction with social assistance.

The impact of working in the public sector on satisfaction with work hours and holidays is positive for both groups: superior for men in the first domain and for women in the second.

Working in the public sector has a negative influence on satisfaction with work organization and independence. This result, in any case, is justified exclusively by the perception of men, since the coefficient in the case of women is not significant.

What are the implications for human resources management? Firstly, in the case of Spain, it seems clear that public sector worker satisfaction is higher than that of private sector workers. At the same time, it is noteworthy that women are the most satisfied within this group. One possible justification could be the smaller difference in work conditions between men and women in the private sector in relation to the public sector, as evidenced by the results of the surveys and the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition. In any case, this leaves a part of the job satisfaction that will be attributable to the perception of women and that remains unexplained.

In terms of policy implications, the analysis would also allow defining strategies to boost job satisfaction among public employees using the experience of the private sector, and vice versa, establishing guidelines by gender. From this perspective, the satisfaction of women in terms of wage in the public sector is higher than that of men, which may be conditioned by the fact that wages in the public sector are determined by competition and discrimination is less feasible. Males, however, are more satisfied with job stability. This pattern is also observed in the case of training. Besides, public sector workers are more satisfied in terms of work hours, but the gains are higher for men. Likewise, men have the greatest satisfaction in terms of flexibility. Finally, organization at work and the lack of independence in the public sector reduce men's job satisfaction, but not that of women. It is the latter, however, that have greater problems in terms of monotony and stress. It is difficult for administrators to consider gender when defining the wage structure, training

programs or work hours, as the principle of non-discrimination should govern public sector decision making. However, family responsibilities, salary and training expectations, monotony and stress and the differences by gender should be considered.

Finally, regarding the possible limitations of the analysis, we have found that there is no bias among workers when deciding to work in the public sector, that is to say, it is not the most satisfied workers who opt to work in the public sector. However, the database does not offer any data related to unemployed or inactive individuals, thus, it is not possible to identify if the selection bias exists prior to employment. In the case of women, the existence of a bias would imply that only the most satisfied would participate in the labour market. If this statement were true, the differences between men and women could be partly explained. In any case, there should be no difference in job satisfaction between women working in the private or public sector.

6. Bibliography

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

Appelbaum, S. and Kamal, R. (2001), “An analysis of the utilisation and effectiveness of non-financial incentives in small, business”, *Journal of Management Development*, 19(9): 733-763.

Artz, B. (2010), "Fringe benefits and job satisfaction", *International Journal of Manpower*, 31(6): 626-644.

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

Bogg, J. and Cooper, C. (1995), “Job Satisfaction, Mental Health, and Occupational Stress among Senior Civil Servants”, *Human Relations*, 48(3): 327–41.

Booker, M. J. (1998), “Can sexual harassment be salvaged?”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17: 1171-1177.

Booth, A. L. and Ours, J.C. (2013), “Part-time jobs: what women want?”, *Journal of Population Economics*, 26(1): 263-283.

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.

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

Cantarelli, P., Belardinelli, P. and Belle, N. (2016), “A meta-analysis of job satisfaction correlates in the public administration literature”, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(2): 115-144.

Cha, Y. (2013), “Overwork and the persistence of gender segregation in occupations”, *Gender & Society*, 27(2): 158-184.

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

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

Cooper, V.W. (1997), “Homophily of the Queen Bee syndrome: Female evaluation of female leadership”, *Small Group Research*, 28: 483-499.

Crosby, F. J. (1982), *Relative Deprivation and Working Women*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Daley, D.M. and Naff, K.C. (1998), “Gender differences and managerial competencies: Federal supervisor perceptions of the job of management”, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 18: 41-56.

Demoussis M. and Giannakopoulos N. (2007), “Exploring Job Satisfaction in Private and Public Employment: Empirical Evidence from Greece”, *Labour*, 21(2): 333-359.

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

Duncan, G. J. and Corcoran, M. (1984), "Do Women 'Deserve' to Earn Less Than Men?" in *Years of Poverty, Years of Plenty*, edited by G. Duncan, R. Coe, M. Corcoran, M. Hill, S. Hoffman, and J. Morgan, University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research: 153-72.

- Durst, S. L. and DeSantis, V. S. (1997), "The determinants of job satisfaction among federal, state, and local government employees", *State and Local Government Review*, 29: 7-16.
- Ellickson, M. C. and Logsdon, K. (2001), "Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees", *State and Local Government Review*, 33: 173-184
- Ellickson, M.C. (2002), "Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees", *Public Personnel Management*, 31(3): 343-358
- Emmert, M.A. , and Taher, W.A. (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.
- England, P. and McCrear, L. (1987), "Gender Inequality in Paid Employment", in *Analyzing Gender*, edited by Beth B. Hess and M. M. Ferree, Newbury Park, CA. Sage: 286-320.
- Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. and Frijters P. (2004), "How important is methodology for the estimates of the determinants of happiness?", *The Economic Journal*, 114:641-659.
- Fottler, M.D. (1981), "Is management really generic?", *Academy of Management Review*, 6(1): 1-12.
- Gabris, G.T. , and Simo, G. (1995), "Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions", *Public Personnel Management*, 24(1): 33-51.
- Gamero C. (2004), "Satisfacción laboral de los asalariados en España. Especial referencia a las diferencias por género", *Cuadernos de Economía*, 27: 109-146.
- Garrido, M.J., Perez, P. and Anton C. (2005), "Determinants of Sales Manager Job satisfaction: an Analysis of Spanish Industrial Firms", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(10): 1934-1954.
- Ghinetti, P (2007), "The Public-Private Job Satisfaction Differential in Italy", *Labour*, 21(2): 361-388
- Glisson, C. and Durick, M. (1988), "Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Human Service Organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33(1): 61-81.

- Gutek, B.A, Cohen, G. and Tsui, A. (1996), “Reactions to perceived sex discrimination”, *Human relations* , 49: 791-813.
- Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. R. (1975), “Development of the job diagnostic survey”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60: 159-170.
- Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. R. (1980), *Work redesign*, Reading, PA: Addison-Wesley.
- Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L. and Hayes T.L. (2002), “Business-unit Level Relationship between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Business Outcomes: A Meta-analysis”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2): 268-279.
- Hauret, L. and Williams, D.R. (2017), “Cross-National Analysis of Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction”, *Industrial Relations*, 56(2): 203-235.
- Hausknecht, J.P., Hiller N.J. and Vance, R.J. (2008), “Work-Unit Absenteeism: Effects of Satisfaction, Commitment, Labour Market Conditions and Time”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6): 1125-1245.
- Herzberg, F. (1966), *Work and the Nature of Man*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Heywood, J. S., Siebert, W. S., and Wei, X. (2002), “Worker Sorting and Job Satisfaction: The Case of Union and Government Jobs”, *ILR Review*, 55(4): 595–609.
- Hom, P.W. and Griffeth, R.W. (1995), *Employee Turnover*, South-Western Publishing: Cincinnati, OH.
- Iaffaldano, M. T. and Muchinsky, P. M. (1985), “Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis”, *Psychological Bulletin*, 97(2): 251-273.
- Jann, B (2008), “The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition for linear regression models”, *The Stata Journal*, 8(4): 453-479.
- Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J. Bono J.E. and Patton, G.K. (2001, May), “The Job Satisfaction-Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review”, *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3): 376-407.
- Kaiser, L. C. (2007), “Gender-job satisfaction differences across Europe”, *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(1): 75-94.
- Kim, S. (2005), “Gender differences in the job satisfaction of public employees: A study of Seoul metropolitan government, Korea”, *Sex Roles*, 52: 667-681.

Kjeldsen, A.M. and Hansen, J.R (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.

Konrad, A., Corrigall, E., Lieb, P., and Ritchie, J. (2000), “Sex differences in job attribute preferences among managers and business students”, *Group and Organization Management*, 25: 108-131.

Lee T. (1998), “Job satisfaction leads to turnover”, *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2: 263-271.

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

Locke, E. (1976), “The nature and causes of job satisfaction”, in M. Dunette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1297-1349.

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

Luechinger, S, Meier, S, and Stutzer, A. (2010), “Why Does Unemployment Hurt the Employed? Evidence from the Life Satisfaction Gap Between the Public and the Private Sector”, *Journal of Human Resources*, 45(4): 998–1045.

Lup D. (2018), “Something to celebrate (or not). The differing impact of promotion to manager on the job satisfaction of women and men”, *Work, employment and Society*, 32(2): 407-425

Madden, J. (1985), "The Persistence of Pay Differentials: The Economics of Sex Discrimination." in *Women and Work*, Vol. 1, edited by L.Larwood, A. H. Stromberg, and B. A. Gutek., Beverly Hills, Sage, 76-114.

Maidani, E.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, M.W. (1982), “Bureaucratic vs. profit organization”, in B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, Greenwich, CT: JAI, 89-126.

Miranda A. and S. Rabe-Hesketh (2006), “Maximum likelihood estimation of endogenous switching and sample selection models for binary, ordinal, and count variables”, *Stata Journal*, 6(3): 285-308.

Mottaz, C. J. (1984), “Education and work satisfaction. *Human Relations*”, 37(11): 985-1004.

Mottaz, C. J. (1987), “Age and work satisfaction”, *Work and Occupations*, 14(3): 387-409.

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

Ortiz (2007), “Not the Right Job, but a Secure One: Over-education and Temporary Employment in France, Italy and Spain”, paper nº 2007-23 , Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

Oshagbemi, T (1999), “Overall job satisfaction: How good are single versus multiple-item measures?”, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14: 388-403.

Ostroff, C. (1992), “The Relationship Between Satisfaction, Attitudes and Performance: An Organizational Level Analysis”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, December: 963-974.

Perry, J. L. and Hondeghem, A. (2008), *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

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

Phelan, J. (1994), “The paradox of the contented female worker: an assessment to alternative explanations”, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 7(2): 95-107

Pinquart, M. and Sorensen, S (2000), “Influences of socioeconomic status, social network, and competence on subjective well-being in later life: A meta-analysis”, *Psychology and Aging*, 15(2): 187-224.

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

Reiner, M. D. and Zhao, J. (1999), “The determinants of job satisfaction among United States Air Force security police”, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19(3): 5-18.

- Rico, P. (2012), “Satisfacción laboral de los asalariados en España”, *Revista de métodos cuantitativos para la economía y la empresa*, 14: 137-158.
- Ryan, A.M., Schmit M.J. and Johnson, R. (1996), “Attitudes and Effectiveness: Examining Relations at an Organizational Level”, *Personnel Psychology*, Winter: 853-882.
- Sánchez-Sánchez, N M, and Fernández, A.C. (2014), “Educational and skill mismatches: differential effects on job satisfaction. A study applied to the Spanish job market”, *Estudios de Economía*, 41(2): 261-281
- Sánchez-Sánchez, N M, and Fernández, A.C. (2019), “Is women’s satisfaction higher than men’s?: self-selection, expectations of utility function”, *Acta Aoeconomica*, 69(2): 267-295.
- Scandura, T.A. and Lankau M.J. (1997), “Relations of gender, family responsibility and flexible hours to organizational commitment and job satisfaction”, *Journal of organizational behavior*, 18: 377-391.
- Sinning, M., M. Hahn and T.K. Bauer. (2008), “The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition for nonlinear regression models”, *Stata Journal*, 8(4): 480-492.
- Sloane, P. J. and Williams, H. (2000), “Job satisfaction, comparison earnings and gender”, *Labour*, 14(3): 473-501.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M. and Hulin, C.L. (1969), *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*, Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- 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. (2000a). Taking another look at the gender/job satisfaction paradox, *Kyklos* 53: 135-52.
- 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.
- Steel, B.S. and Warner, R.L. (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.
- Steijn, B. (2004), “Human resource management and job satisfaction in the Dutch public sector”, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 24: 291-303.

Taylor, J. and Westover, J. H. (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, M and Myers, R. (1998), "Motivation and Job satisfaction", *Management Decision*, 36(4): 226-231.

Ting, Y. (1997), "Determinants of job satisfaction of federal government employees", *Public Personnel Management*, 26(3): 313-334.

Whorton, J.W. and Worthley, J.A. (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 sex and sector-contract

	<i>Total</i>			<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>		
	<i>Distribution</i>	<i>Job Sat.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Distribution</i>	<i>Job Sat.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Distribution</i>	<i>Job Sat.</i>	<i>SD</i>
Total	32053	7.27	1.78	17878	7.26	1.76	14175	7.29	1.81
Private	24069	7.20	1.81	14230	7.20	1.76	9839	7.20	1.87
Public	7984	7.50	1.68	3648	7.48	1.72	4336	7.51	1.65

Table 2: Mean Satisfaction Scores in Different Job Domains by sector

	<i>Total</i>					
	<i>Total</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>Male</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Wage	6.04	2.26	5.96	2.33	6.1	2.20
Social help	3.47	3.28	3.32	3.28	3.59	3.28
Formation	5.73	3.13	5.63	3.21	5.81	3.06
Stability	7.38	2.55	7.39	2.62	7.38	2.49
Work hours	7.12	2.24	7.24	2.27	7.03	2.21
Flexibility	6.29	3.05	6.29	3.13	6.29	2.97
Holidays	7.37	2.39	7.45	2.41	7.3	2.37
Organization at work	6.81	2.26	6.83	2.29	6.79	2.25
Independence / autonomy	7.22	2.27	7.22	2.27	7.21	2.27
Assesment of hierarchical superiors	7.03	2.29	7.07	2.31	7	2.28
Stress	5.55	3.05	5.72	3.07	5.42	3.04
Monotony	4.92	3.11	4.93	3.15	4.91	3.08
	<i>Public</i>					
	<i>Total</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>Male</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Wage	6.31	2.16	6.39	2.13	6.23	2.19
Social help	4.46	3.14	4.30	3.18	4.64	3.10
Formation	6.13	2.82	6.15	2.82	6.1	2.82
Stability	7.97	2.47	7.85	2.57	8.12	2.34
Work hours	7.62	1.99	7.68	1.97	7.55	2.02
Flexibility	6.42	3.07	6.27	3.18	6.6	2.92
Holidays	7.92	2.05	7.96	2.05	7.87	2.04
Organization at work	6.77	2.17	6.83	2.1	6.71	2.25
Independence / autonomy	7.31	2.11	7.36	2.03	7.26	2.2
Assesment of hierarchical superiors	6.98	2.26	7.04	2.23	6.91	2.29
Stress	5.69	2.96	5.95	2.91	5.38	3.00
Monotony	4.64	3.06	4.53	3.1	4.76	3.00
	<i>Private</i>					
	<i>Total</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>Male</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Wage	5.95	2.29	5.78	2.39	6.06	2.20
Social help	3.13	3.26	2.87	3.23	3.31	3.27
Formation	5.60	3.22	5.39	3.35	5.74	3.12
Stability	7.19	2.54	7.19	2.62	7.19	2.50
Work hours	6.96	2.29	7.04	2.36	6.9	2.24
Flexibility	6.25	3.04	6.30	3.11	6.21	2.98
Holidays	7.18	2.47	7.22	2.52	7.16	2.43
Organization at work	6.82	2.30	6.83	2.36	6.81	2.25
Independence / autonomy	7.18	2.32	7.16	2.37	7.2	2.28
Assesment of hierarchical superiors	7.04	2.31	7.08	2.34	7.02	2.28
Stress	5.50	3.08	5.61	3.13	5.43	3.05
Monotony	5.02	3.12	5.11	3.15	4.95	3.10

Table 3: OLS Estimation Results on Job Satisfaction. Sample groups: total, public and private.
(t-statistics in parenthesis)

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Public</i>		<i>Private</i>	
	<i>(Omitted)</i>		<i>(Omitted)</i>		<i>(Omitted)</i>	
Male						
Female	0.07	(1.50)	0.18	(2.44)	-0.01	(-0.15)
Adjusted R ²	0.05		0.07		0.06	
N	15257		3771		11486	

Observations are weighted using the individual weights in the SLQW

Table 4: OLS Estimation Results on Job Satisfaction. Sample groups: total, female and male
(t-statistics in parenthesis)

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>Male</i>	
	<i>(1)</i>		<i>(1)</i>		<i>(1)</i>	
Private	<i>(Omitted)</i>		<i>(Omitted)</i>		<i>(Omitted)</i>	
Public	0.18	(3,94)	0,25	(3,75)	0,13	(1,96)
Adjusted R ²	0.06		0.08		0.06	
N	15257		6637		8620	

Observations are weighted using the individual weights in the SLQW

Table 5: Linear decomposition of job satisfactio: male-female
 $\Omega=0.5$

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
<u>TOTAL</u>	-0.03	-0.1	0.025
Characteristics	0.07	0.07	0.11
Coefficient (Returns)	-0.1	-0.17	-0.09

Table 6: OLS Estimation of Satisfaction with wage, promotion, job training, corporate social assistance and stability
(t-statistics in parenthesis)

	<i>Wage</i>			<i>Social help</i>			<i>Formation</i>			<i>Stability</i>		
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>
Private	<i>(Omitted)</i>			<i>(Omitted)</i>			<i>(Omitted)</i>			<i>(Omitted)</i>		
Public	-0.002	0.19	-0.17	0.72	0.7	0.73	0.03	0.20	-0.12	0.15	-0.02	0.32
	(-0.05)	(-2.16)	(-2.17)	(7.82)	(5.13)	(5.79)	(0.37)	(1.61)	(-1.17)	(2.27)	(0.22)	(3.39)
Adjusted R ²	0.09	0.06	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.11	0.09	0.11
N	15212	6614	8.598	13.690	5.857	7.833	14.958	6.490	8.468	15.257	6637	8.620

Table 7: OLS Estimation of Satisfaction with work hours, time flexibility and holidays
(t-statistics in parenthesis)

	<i>Work hours</i>			<i>Flexibility</i>			<i>Holidays</i>		
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>
Private	<i>(Omitted)</i>			<i>(Omitted)</i>			<i>(Omitted)</i>		
Public	0.30	0.27	0.36	0.08	0.01	0.19	0.35	0.46	0.25
	(5.44)	(3.30)	(4.77)	(1.01)	(0.12)	(1.76)	(5.83)	(5.24)	(3.03)
Adjusted R ²	0.11	0.13	0.09	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.09
N	15257	6637	8620	15257	6637	8620	15257	6637	8.620

(t-statistics in parenthesis)															
	<i>Organization at work</i>			<i>Independence</i>			<i>Assesment of hierarchical superiors</i>			<i>Monotony</i>			<i>Stress</i>		
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>
Private	<i>(Ommited)</i>			<i>(Ommited)</i>			<i>(Ommited)</i>			<i>(Ommited)</i>			<i>(Ommited)</i>		
Public	-0.08	0.015	-0.165	-0.083	-0.02	-0.12	-0.18	-0.17	-0.2	-0.23	-0.34	-0.14	-0.12	-0.18	-0.07
	<i>(-1,36)</i>	<i>(0,08)</i>	<i>(-1,89)</i>	<i>(-1,41)</i>	<i>(0,09)</i>	<i>(1,58)</i>	<i>(-2,95)</i>	<i>(-2,05)</i>	<i>(-2,31)</i>	<i>(-2,77)</i>	<i>(-2,89)</i>	<i>(-1,22)</i>	<i>(-1,61)</i>	<i>(-1,61)</i>	<i>(-0,76)</i>
Adjusted R ²	0.03	0.05	0.04	0,05	0,05	0,06	0.04	0.04	0,05	0,04	0,05	0,04	0,08	0,08	0,09
N	15257	6637	8620	15257	6637	8620	14.668	6.359	8.309	15257	6637	8620	15257	6.637	8.620

Table A1: Descriptive statistics		Total		
	Definition	Measure	Mean	Std. Dev
<i>Dependent variables</i>				
Job satisfaction	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	7.30	1.85
Satisfacion 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 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 the assesment made by hierarchical super	Subjective job satisfaction	0 to 10	7.03	2.29
Stress	Subjective stress	0 to 10	5.55	3.05
Monotony	Subjective monotony or routine	0 to 10	4.92	3.11
<i>Individual characteristics</i>				
female	If individual is female	Dummy 0/1	0.43	0.49
age30	Age<=30 (ref)	Dummy 0/1	0.12	0.33
age 40	30<Age<=40	Dummy 0/1	0.40	0.49
age 50	40<age<=50	Dummy 0/1	0.35	0.47
age 60	51<age<=60	Dummy 0/1	0.1	0.30
age 65	60<age<=65	Dummy 0/1	0.01	0.11
partner	If the individual is married or cohabiting	Dummy 0/1	0.80	0.39
children	If the individual has children	Dummy 0/1	0.73	0.44
n.children	Number of children	Number (0-5)	0.4	0.64
educ1	No education (ref)	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.16
educ2	Maximum education primary	Dummy 0/1	0.14	0.35
educ3	Maximum education secondary	Dummy 0/1	0.20	0.40
educ4	Maximum education high-school	Dummy 0/1	0.34	0.47
educ5	Maximum education University	Dummy 0/1	0.26	0.44
hwages600	House wages below 600 (ref)	Dummy 0/1	0.05	0.21
lowwagehouse	601 <house wages <=1200	Dummy 0/1	0.14	0.35
mediumwagehouse	1201 <house wages <=3000	Dummy 0/1	0.56	0.49
highwagehouse	House wages >3001	Dummy 0/1	0.26	0.44
region1	Andalucia (ref)	Dummy 0/1	0.10	0.11
region2	Aragon	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.18
region3	Asturias	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.16
region4	Baleares	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.17
region5	Canarias	Dummy 0/1	0.04	0.19
region6	Cantabria	Dummy 0/1	0.02	0.19
region7	Castilla-leon	Dummy 0/1	0.04	0.21
region8	Castilla la mancha	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.19
region9	Cataluña	Dummy 0/1	0.27	0.44
region10	Comunidad Valenciana	Dummy 0/1	0.07	0.26
region11	Extremadura	Dummy 0/1	0.02	0.17
region12	Galicia	Dummy 0/1	0.04	0.20
region13	Madrid	Dummy 0/1	0.10	0.30
region14	Murcia	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.19
region15	Navarra	Dummy 0/1	0.02	0.16
region16	País Vasco	Dummy 0/1	0.05	0.21
region17	La Rioja	Dummy 0/1	0.02	0.14
<i>Job characteristics</i>				
ocup1	Directors and Managers	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.18
ocup2	Scientific and intellectual technicians	Dummy 0/1	0.15	0.36
ocup3	Technicians	Dummy 0/1	0.15	0.35
ocup4	Accounting, administrative	Dummy 0/1	0.09	0.29
ocup5	Customer services clerks	Dummy 0/1	0.15	0.36
ocup6	Skilled agricultural, fishery workers	Dummy 0/1	0.01	0.12
ocup7	Skilled manufacturing industry workers	Dummy 0/1	0.23	0.42
ocup8	Food, tobacco and textile workers	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.17
ocup9	Elementary occupations (ref)	Dummy 0/1	0.12	0.32
ocup10	Armed forces occupations	Dummy 0/1	0.00	0.06
seniority	Work experience	Years	10	9.23
wages600	wages below 600 (ref)	Dummy 0/1	0.10	0.22
lowwage	601<wages<=1200	Dummy 0/1	0.31	0.46
mediumwage	1201 <wages <=3000	Dummy 0/1	0.48	0.49
highwage	Wages >3001	Dummy 0/1	0.11	0.31
employee	employee (ref)	Dummy 0/1	0.79	0.12
Low manager	If individual is manager	Dummy 0/1	0.02	0.14
High manager	If individual is high manager	Dummy 0/1	0.19	0.39
lnhours	Hours worked	Ln hours	3.62	0.31
Hours>8	If individual works more than 8 hours	Dummy 0/1	0.23	0.42
continuoushours	Continuous working hours	Dummy 0/1	0.58	0.49
night	If individual works at night	Dummy 0/1	0.15	0.39
Sunday	If individual works on Sunday	Dummy 0/1	0.03	0.17
tum	If individual works by turns	Dummy 0/1	0.19	0.39
temporary	If individual holds temporal contract	Dummy 0/1	0.22	0.41
partial	If individual holds part-time job	Dummy 0/1	0.14	0.35
public	If individual works in public sector	Dummy 0/1	0.24	0.43
Observations			15.257	

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

Table A2: OLS Estimation Results on Job Satisfaction (Complete Results of Table 3)

	<i>total</i>		<i>Public</i>		<i>Private</i>	
	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>t-statistics</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>t-statistics</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>t-statistics</i>
<i>Individual characteristics</i>						
female	0.07	1.50	0.20	2.65	0.02	0.35
age 40	-0.27	-0.42	-0.24	-1.79	-0.02	-0.26
age 50	-0.08	-1.21	-0.39	-2.76	-0.03	-0.42
age 60	-0.14	-1.37	-0.44	-2.26	-0.09	-0.79
age 65	0.47	2.55	0.46	1.51	0.45	2.05
partner	-0.01	-0.10	-0.06	-0.47	0.00	0.01
children	-0.13	-2.14	-0.12	-1.12	-0.13	-1.75
nchildren	0.01	0.41	0.00	-0.07	0.01	0.31
lowwagehouse	0.05	0.27	0.26	0.63	0.02	0.08
mediumwagehou	0.39	2.22	0.63	1.60	0.36	1.85
highwagehouse	0.33	1.80	0.42	1.05	0.34	1.72
educ2	-0.15	-1.11	0.01	0.02	-0.16	-1.13
educ3	-0.16	-1.17	-0.03	-0.07	-0.16	-1.12
educ4	-0.41	-3.10	-0.33	-0.92	-0.41	-2.92
educ5	-0.65	-4.61	-0.58	-1.57	-0.63	-4.07
<i>Job characteristics</i>						
ocup1	0.41	3.06	0.47	1.78	0.34	2.29
ocup2	0.56	6.21	0.61	3.61	0.52	4.77
ocup3	0.39	4.88	0.29	1.78	0.40	4.38
ocup4	0.18	2.05	0.16	0.97	0.19	1.80
ocup5	0.21	2.62	0.13	0.72	0.24	2.73
ocup6	-0.11	-0.72	0.51	1.86	-0.18	-1.05
ocup7	-0.01	-0.11	0.17	0.95	-0.04	-0.53
ocup8	-0.16	-1.40	0.02	0.06	-0.17	-1.38
ocup10	-0.30	-1.09	-0.23	-0.74	0.03	0.18
seniority	-0.01	-4.87	-0.01	-2.72	-0.01	-3.55
lowwage	0.23	2.20	-0.09	-0.42	0.26	2.23
mediumwage	0.46	4.08	0.12	0.53	0.49	3.91
highwage	0.61	4.91	0.21	0.84	0.72	5.03
low manager	0.70	5.85	0.58	2.10	0.68	5.09
high manager	0.28	6.16	0.19	2.10	0.30	5.52
lnhours	-0.38	-3.47	-0.31	-1.75	-0.40	-3.07
hours>8	-0.20	-3.74	-0.12	-0.94	-0.21	-3.61
continoushours	-0.09	-2.05	-0.06	-0.70	-0.08	-1.68
night	-0.05	-0.80	0.08	0.68	-0.07	-1.03
sunday	-0.21	-1.86	-0.10	-0.49	-0.21	-1.64
turn	-0.05	-0.94	-0.22	-2.01	-0.01	-0.18
temporary	-0.33	-6.66	-0.16	-1.76	-0.37	-6.35
partial	-0.09	-1.14	-0.14	-1.06	-0.08	-0.97
public	0.18	3.94				
const	8.51	18.54	8.88	11.20	8.50	15.79

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

Regions is a control variable but are not showed in the table to avoid so much data.

Table A3: OLS Estimation Results on Job Satisfaction (Complete Results of Table 4)

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Female</i>		<i>Male</i>	
	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>t-statistics</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>t-statistics</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>t-statistics</i>
<i>Individual characteristics</i>						
female	0.07	1.50				
age 40	-0.27	-0.42	-0.06	-0.71	0.03	0.31
age 50	-0.08	-1.21	-0.06	-0.57	-0.08	-0.85
age 60	-0.14	-1.37	-0.07	-0.43	-0.18	-1.33
age 65	0.47	2.55	0.45	1.47	0.43	1.84
partner	-0.01	-0.10	0.01	0.07	-0.01	-0.08
children	-0.13	-2.14	-0.02	-0.26	-0.23	-2.67
nchildren	0.01	0.41	-0.07	-1.39	0.07	1.72
lowwagehouse	0.05	0.27	0.27	1.30	-0.68	-1.64
mediumwageho	0.39	2.22	0.56	2.74	-0.29	-0.73
highwagehouse	0.33	1.80	0.43	2.02	-0.30	-0.75
educ2	-0.15	-1.11	-0.19	-0.84	-0.13	-0.81
educ3	-0.16	-1.17	-0.12	-0.52	-0.20	-1.27
educ4	-0.41	-3.10	-0.43	-1.93	-0.42	-2.68
educ5	-0.65	-4.61	-0.74	-3.16	-0.57	-3.27
<i>Job characteristics</i>						
ocup1	0.41	3.06	0.38	1.69	0.40	2.46
ocup2	0.56	6.21	0.75	5.40	0.37	3.09
ocup3	0.39	4.88	0.41	3.19	0.39	3.82
ocup4	0.18	2.05	0.27	2.08	0.07	0.54
ocup5	0.21	2.62	0.32	2.77	0.02	0.18
ocup6	-0.11	-0.72	-0.53	-1.19	0.00	-0.00
ocup7	-0.01	-0.11	-0.22	-1.01	-0.01	-0.10
ocup8	-0.16	-1.40	-0.30	-1.59	-0.09	-0.58
ocup10	-0.30	-1.09	-0.92	-1.07	-0.29	-1.01
seniority	-0.01	-4.87	-0.03	-5.56	-0.01	-1.62
lowwage	0.23	2.20	0.23	2.07	0.57	1.81
mediumwage	0.46	4.08	0.45	3.61	0.78	2.52
highwage	0.61	4.91	0.55	3.49	0.94	2.98
low manager	0.70	5.85	0.94	4.31	0.56	3.91
high manager	0.28	6.16	0.24	2.76	0.30	5.55
lnhours	-0.38	-3.47	-0.32	-2.88	-0.41	-1.87
hours>8	-0.20	-3.74	-0.31	-3.08	-0.16	-2.21
continoushours	-0.09	-2.05	-0.02	-0.37	-0.13	-2.41
night	-0.05	-0.80	-0.07	-0.64	-0.03	-0.40
sunday	-0.21	-1.86	-0.35	-1.97	-0.02	-0.11
turn	-0.05	-0.94	-0.01	-0.18	-0.09	-1.34
temporary	-0.33	-6.66	-0.34	-4.58	-0.34	-5.03
partial	-0.09	-1.14	-0.07	-0.75	-0.18	-1.27
public	0.18	3.94	0.25	3.75	0.13	1.96
const	8.51	18.54	80.18	16.45	90.01	10.46

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

Regions is a control variable but are not showed in the table to avoid so much data.