Are Women Really That Happy at Work? Australian Evidence on the 'Contented Female'

Authors: *Dr Temesgen Kifle, The Institute for Social Science Research (ISSR), UQ*
             Dr Parvinder Kler, UN-ESCWA, Beirut, Lebanon

Abstract
This paper investigates the apparent paradox of females possessing higher levels of job satisfaction compared to their male counterparts despite having (on average) less secure jobs, lower promotion opportunities and receiving lower take home pay. Using panel of HILDA Waves 1-8, we test three theories that attempt to explain the aforementioned gender-job satisfaction paradox; these being (a) differing gender expectations, (b) gender-bifurcated personal and employment characteristics as well as (c) gender-divergent work values.

Postulating that the female workforce is heterogenous by age, education and the presence of children, this paper divides the genders into three groups; the aggregated, young (and childless) and the educated. As well, we expand our study to encapsulate not just overall job satisfaction but also five other aspects of job satisfaction – satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with job security, satisfaction with the type of work undertaken, satisfaction with the hours worked and satisfaction with work-life balance.

The paper finds statistical evidence of significant gender differences in employment characteristics in all three groups, and while gender differences are less apparent with regard to personal characteristics, they do however appear in both the employed-only as well as overall samples. This result is strengthened with the finding that most personal and employment characteristics between genders are significantly different across the three groups. Further statistical analysis also indicates that across the six measure of satisfaction, females do, by a wide margin, report higher rates of satisfaction relative to males across the three groups, and almost all these differences are statistically significant as well. These results led to econometric testing in the form of random effects ordered probits in order to examine the veracity of these findings. The results, however paint a muddier picture. There are no longer any gender differences in satisfaction for five of the six measures for the young, while for the educated group, females are less satisfied with one measure with another two being statistically insignificant. The paradox does nevertheless continue to exhibit itself strongly in the case of the aggregated group.

In sum, the paper finds that the paradox does exhibit itself when employed females are not disaggregated by age, parental status and education. The paradox weakens and arguably even disappears when such factors are incorporated into the analysis. This suggests that employed females should not be viewed as a monolithic block in the labour force. The three tested theories also produce mixed results, intimating that stylised facts regarding gender sensitive workplace satisfaction in Australia are untenable, at least as far as this study is concerned.

Section 1: Introduction

Job satisfaction has increasingly made in-roads in the labour economics literature in recent years mainly due to the introduction of subjective measures imported from the field of psychology (Clark, 1996, 1997; Sloane and Williams, 2000; Long, 2005). Job satisfaction allows economists to investigate individual well-being in the workplace, alongside traditional labour market research areas such as gender wage differentials and unemployment. According to Clark (1996: 189), "the analysis of job satisfaction may give us a number of insights into certain aspects of the labour market".

One specific area of investigation is the study of differing levels of reported job satisfaction by gender. Practically all studies (Blanchflower and Oswald, 1999; Clark, 1997; Groot and Brink, 1999; Kaiser, 2002; Sloane and Williams, 2000; Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2003; Long, 2005) have shown that females possess higher levels of job satisfaction compared to males, a puzzling outcome when one considers the existence of gender wage differentials in favour of males (Blau and Kahn, 2006),[1] as well as occupational segregation by gender, with women occupying jobs with 'lower' prestige. As well they are less likely to receives promotions (Booth *et al.*, 2005), receive promotions with lower associated wage increases (Booth *et al.*, 2003) and have higher probabilities of suffering from a number of negative experiences within the workplace, such as sexual harassment and bullying (Welsh, 1999). There exist a number of theories as to why females possess higher levels of job satisfaction. These include the role of expectations, a possible difference in work 'values,' female selection into employment as well as gender differences in terms of personal and employment characteristics. These will be covered in greater detail in Section 3 of this paper.

Research into differing levels of job satisfaction by gender in Australia has only been briefly covered, and this paper contributes to the literature by using a panel dataset that specifically questions participants on six aspects of job satisfaction.[2] Given that overall job satisfaction may be partially determined by a whole host of competing factors, it would be preferable to study various aspects of workplace satisfaction rather than simply using overall job satisfaction as a 'stand-alone' measure of workplace satisfaction. As well, differing work values by gender may show up when looking at more specific workplace satisfaction measures. Previous study in Australia on this topic has been limited to using cross-sectional data and only one aspect of workplace satisfaction, though it did find that employed females are a heterogeneous group with respect to workplace satisfaction by dividing them into an aggregated, young (and childless) and educated groups.[3] The data available to us allows us to not only investigate various aspects of workplace satisfaction, but also study the determinants driving workplace satisfaction by gender, and different groups operating within the labour market.[4] Briefly, in our gender combined results, we find employed females, as a whole to be more satisfied with five of the six aspects of job satisfaction compared to males. However, satisfaction for young (and childless) females relative to males is only evident in one case, and even then is marginally significant. The only case of females being less satisfied than males appears in the educated group, but even then females are still on the whole more

---

[1] A significant portion of the gender wage gap is usually left 'unexplained' and is partially attributed to discrimination against females (Blau and Kahn, 2006).

[2] These are overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with job security, satisfaction with (type of) work, satisfaction with hours worked and satisfaction with work-life balance. See Appendix Box A1 for more details.

[3] Long (2005) investigates overall job satisfaction, and employs a cross-sectional study.

[4] Following from Long (2005), this paper also divides them into three groups: the aggregated; young (and childless); and educated.

satisfied than their male counterparts. This indicates that employed females are a heterogeneous group, and that different groups of females may possess different characteristics, work values and levels of expectations which impacts on their workplace satisfaction.

This paper is structured as follows. Section two reviews the existing literature on gender differences in job satisfaction. Section three presents the hypotheses and methodology, while section four introduces the dataset and preliminary statistical results. Section five presents the econometric results of our study while section six summarises and concludes.

Section 2: Literature Review

Clark's (1997) study of gender differences in levels of job satisfaction in Britain found females to have greater levels of satisfaction compared to males, despite being in jobs with lower earnings and promotion opportunities compared to males. He posits that this is due to females having lower expectations at work due to "the poorer position in the labour market that that women have held in the past" (1997: 342). Clark suggests that females' higher levels of job satisfaction could be transitory as they improve their labour market performances over time,[5] which is confirmed by Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza (2003)'s study in Britain. Clark also investigated female self-selection into employment to see if only 'happier' females entered the workforce[6] but found no evidence of sample selection bias, a finding supported by Long (2005) and Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza (2007). Neither did Clark find any significant gender differences with respect to personal and work characteristics. He does however find that gender differences in job satisfaction disappear for the young, the higher educated, professionals and those in male-dominated workplaces. This indicates that females in the aforementioned groups may possess expectation levels greater than females as a whole.

Consistent with Clark, Sloane and Williams[7] (2000) report higher levels of job satisfaction for females compared to males, despite earning lower pay. They also note that this could be due to females having lower expectations. Nevertheless, females in male dominated workplaces have similar satisfaction levels compared to males, perhaps reflecting higher expectations. Similar to Clark's (1997) as well as Sloane and William's (2000) findings, Donohue and Heywood (2004) found no gender job satisfaction gap for young US workers, once again indicating that specific female labour market groups possess expectation levels similar to those of their male counterparts. Bender and Heywood (2006) report that highly educated American females are more satisfied at work, indicating that females in the labour force are a heterogeneous group.

Souza-Poza and Sousa-Poza (2000) report their findings on an international investigation of gender differences in job satisfaction of 21 countries using 1997 data.[8] Only in Great Britain, New Zealand, USA and Spain were differing levels of job satisfaction by gender statistically significant, and in Spain, in favour of males. Souza-Poza and Sousa-Poza stated that their finding points to an 'Anglo-Saxon paradox' where females are more satisfied with work

---

[5] With greater labour market successes, females should increase their expectations at work, and thus be less satisfied at work than in previous times when they were not so involved in labour markets.

[6] The argument made is that due to cultural and historical reasons, females face less pressure to remain in the workforce and hence, 'unhappier' females can exit the labour market, leaving only 'happier' females in the labour market, thus artificially inflating females' job satisfaction levels compared to males.

[7] Also using British data, though a different dataset.

[8] These countries are Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the USA.

compared to males. However, a survey into gender job satisfaction differences across 14 member states of the European Union (Kaiser 2005) showed females to have higher levels of job satisfaction in 10 countries, suggesting that higher satisfaction levels among females might not be an 'Anglo-Saxon paradox' after all. [9] Equal employment opportunities, appropriate child day care and tax and social security system are the reason given by Kaiser (2005) for no gender job satisfaction difference in some of these countries.

Long (2005) used cross-sectional 2001 Australian data to investigate gender differences in overall job satisfaction. Both her statistical and econometric (ordered probit) analysis suggests that females are more satisfied at work compared to males. She also finds no evidence that females are self-selecting into the labour force. However, as most the majority of studies cited above, this gender-job satisfaction gap disappears for younger females and also those with higher levels of education.

Section 3: Hypotheses and Methodology
Hypotheses
Following Clark's (1997) seminal study and later research on the topic, we expect that females in general will exhibit greater levels of workplace satisfaction compared to males. It is opined that this should be true of the Australian case, following on from Long (2005). As noted in the previous section, lower expectations amongst employed females have often been posited as a possible reason for gender sensitivity in workplace satisfaction. This 'expectation gap' has been attributed to cultural reasons constraining female participation in the workforce; as well, the fact that the Australian occupational structure is gender segregated[10] is also a possible cause of this gap. We assume from previous findings that females in male dominated occupations will have higher expectations than females in female dominated occupations but given that most employed females are in female dominated occupations (ABS, 2010), this will lead to females in general possessing lower expectations and hence, higher levels of workplace satisfaction.

However, as the panel dataset utilised is unable to track 'expectation proxies' over time,[11] this paper will instead follow from Clark and Oswald (1996), Sloane and Williams (2000), Ley-Garboua and Montmarquette (2004), Donohue and Heywood (2004) and Senik (2004) and create a predicted (log) wage variable from a standard earnings equation and use it as a comparison income against which the individual compares himself or herself. As this is far from ideal, we caution against making sweeping and significant inferences of the results of this proxy for a market wage or wage expectations. Nevertheless, its inclusion does aid in providing some indication as to the role of expectations in possibly creating and propagating gender differences in workplace satisfaction. Briefly, this hypothesis posits that the predicted log wage is used as an appropriate comparison income variable when the actual log wage variable is also included in the estimation. The two variables together gauge the differences between actual and predicted log of wages, controlling for other observed characteristics. According to Clark and Oswald (1996), job satisfaction declines as the predicted log wage

---

[9] Countries with females' higher job satisfaction are Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg and Spain. In Portugal satisfaction was higher for males with no significant gender differences in Denmark, Finland and the Netherlands.

[10] Summary statistics in Table 2 confirm the existence of gender based occupational segregation. This is also confirmed in ABS (2010).

[11] Useful proxies for expectations were recorded in wave one of the HILDA dataset used in this study, but these questions were not repeated in subsequent years. Given that the theory suggests that expectations will change over time, we are unable to include these variables in our analysis, unlike Long (2005), as she only made use of the first wave of the dataset.

rises. The idea that a comparison income has an effect on job satisfaction is also mentioned by others (Hamermesh, 2001; Levy-Garboua and Montmarquette, 2004; Sloane and Ward, 2001)

As well, we posit that the association with workplace satisfaction and both personal and employment characteristics will differ by gender as tested by Clark (1997), where he found against the hypothesis. Nevertheless, given that occupational and industry segregation is prevalent in Australia, this hypothesis is worth re-visiting within the Australian context.

Overall job satisfaction is also a 'catch-all' or a 'composite' of various workplace satisfaction variables. Simply investigating this one aspect of workplace satisfaction may lead to aggregated results that hide the finer nuances of various workplace satisfaction measures. In addition, this paper takes the view that work values may be gender sensitive (see Clark, 1997; Sloane and Williams, 2000 and Long, 2005). If so, then specific aspects of workplace satisfaction may be picking up gender differences which are blurred when looking at overall job satisfaction.

The literature also notes the possibility of sample selection bias regarding female exit out of employment due to workplace dissatisfaction. More specifically, the literature suggests that due to cultural reasons, females who are relatively dissatisfied at work may find it easier to exit employment relative to dissatisfied males. If so, this may explain the higher levels of workplace satisfaction among females compared to males. Evidence to date (Clark, 1997; Long, 2005) suggests that there is no evidence of sample selection bias of females into the labour market. The sample selection bias explanation is also not accepted by Sloane and Williams (2000) who comment that the male exit out of employment can also happen if not satisfied with the current job. As well, the changing nature of workplace satisfaction over time has been reported previously (Souza-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2003).

Long (2005) reported that females were more prone to answer at the outliers of subjectives measures. If so, this may explain why females, on average, have higher satisfaction rates compared to males.[12] However, Long (2005) finds against this in the Australian context. Specifically, she suggests that should the gender differences on dissatisfaction be minute, then this can be taken as evidence against female self-selection, as unhappy females could have left the workforce, but instead stayed on. Table 1 below shows the near uniformity in figures between genders across the three groups for all six satisfaction measures with reference to low levels of satisfaction. In addition, for the most part, no significant difference is found between the male and female proportions, though we note that the 'catch-all' category of overall job satisfaction indicate gender sensitivity for the aggregated group. Given that a plethora of research papers have concentrated on overall job satisfaction rather than more specific aspects of workplace satisfaction, this would indicate that whilst this study concludes against female sample selection bias, this finding is indicative and should not be extrapolated into a stylised fact.

---

[12] Thus, we would expect females to be over-represented at both ends of the spectrum. The literature has established that satisfaction rates tend to be much more positive than negative however (Argyle, 1987), so 'negative' outliers are outnumbered by 'positive' outliers. Hence, the overall weight is towards the higher end of the rankings.

Table 1: Percentage of responses to workplace satisfaction by gender across the three sub-categories

	Aggregated				Young				Educated			
	Zero to One		One to Five		Zero to One		One to Five		Zero to One		One to Five	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Pay	1.71	2.23	20.49	22.47	**2.00**	**1.93**	23.22	22.62	0.97	1.76	15.25	19.66
Security	1.75	1.64	12.80	11.98	1.65	1.27	11.95	11.38	**1.23**	**1.70**	10.99	10.98
Work	0.80	0.93	12.82	13.69	1.10	0.87	15.84	15.70	0.73	0.66	11.10	12.46
Hours	1.53	1.48	20.47	19.78	1.61	1.78	19.89	19.63	1.27	1.54	20.22	21.57
Flex	2.78	2.54	**22.22**	**19.97**	2.53	2.32	21.59	20.90	**2.02**	**2.85**	19.45	23.87
Overall	0.87	0.74	**11.58**	**10.73**	0.90	0.70	12.02	12.21	0.60	0.61	10.15	10.20

Note: The Young group includes those aged between 16-34, but excludes those with children. The educated group excludes those who do not have at least a Bachelor's Degree. Observations in bold confirm statistically significant difference between two proportions.

Noting that individuals could choose between the numbers of zero (lowest level of satisfaction) and ten (highest level of satisfaction), this paper follows Long (2005) in investigating gender responses for those deemed to be highly dissatisfied (responding with values of zero and one) and generally dissatisfied (responding with values between zero and five). We find indicative evidence that there is no sample selection bias out of employment for females present in the dataset used. Nevertheless, and consistent with Long (2005) as well, females are more likely to express higher levels of satisfaction with the various aspects of workplace satisfaction (see Appendix Table A1). Thus, this paper will not pursue sample-selection bias as a possible source of gender sensitivity with respect to workplace satisfaction.

Methodology

The oft-used Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) method is not a suitable method for investigating workplace satisfaction in this study as the workplace satisfaction measures utilised are not continuous. As well, it is improper for this study as it takes the 'interval' between any two adjoining responses to be equal (Donohue and Heywood, 2004). When linear regression is used to analyse non-continuous dependent variables: nonsensical predicted values (predicted values falling outside the possible range of the outcome); biased regression coefficients; nonnormally distributed error terms; and heteroscedasticity. This inherent non-linearity will cause OLS regression error terms to have inconsistent variances, leading to inconsistent standard errors (McKelvey and Zavonia, 1975). Given these issues, we proceed to use an order probit specification instead. This specification builds upon the theoretical work undertaken by Clarke and Oswald (1996) presented below:

In accordance with Clarke and Oswald (1996), an individual's utility (satisfaction) from working is nested in the total utility function. An overall utility function (or an overall life satisfaction) can be expressed as:

$$v = v(u, \mu), \qquad\qquad (1)$$

where v is overall utility, u is utility from work and μ is utility from other aspects of life (e.g., leisure time, family time). As a type of sub-utility function utility from work can be written as follows:

$$v = v(u(y, h, i, j), \mu), \qquad\qquad (2)$$

where y is income, h is hours of work, i and j are individual and job specific characteristics respectively. From the above expression, the utility of working is then considered to be of the form:

$$u = u(y, h, i, j) \qquad (3)$$

Similar to the argument that job satisfaction relating specifically to pay may depend not only on worker's own income but also on relative or comparative income, the notion of overall job satisfaction can be partly determined by relative arguments. This implies that the above model should capture the effect of a general relative utility and thus the complete model of utility from work can be expressed as:

$$u = u(y, h, i, j, E), \qquad (4)$$

where E is a vector of comparison level that applies to all independent variables included in the model. It is a vector of variables that capture an individual's expectations. As stated by Clark (1997), E may come from observation of others, from one's own experience in the past or from one's feelings of what one should receive.

To analyse our six measures of workplace satisfaction we use random effects ordered probit models. The econometric model of job satisfaction has the general form:

$$y^* = x\beta + u \qquad (5)$$

where y^* is a latent variable indicating the unobservable level of workplace satisfaction of the employees, x is a matrix containing individual socio-demographic characteristics, family and household characteristics, work related factors, information on working conditions, geographical locations and other control variables, β is a parameter vector and u is the error term. The individual workplace satisfaction cannot be observed instead a categorical but ordered random variable y is estimated as a function of the explanatory variables and a set of cut-off points z_i .

The conditional probability of a given observation can be expressed as:

$$\Pr(y = i / x) = \Pr(z_{i-1} \leq x\beta + u < z_i)$$
$$= \Pr(z_{i-1} \leq y^* + u < z_i) \qquad (6)$$

where i in our case is the average workplace satisfaction scores that range between 0 and 10.

By rearranging the above terms can be written as:

$$\Pr(y = i / x) = \Pr(z_{i-1} - x\beta \leq u < z_i - x\beta)$$
$$= \Pr(u < z_i - x\beta) - \Pr(u \leq z_{i-1} - x\beta)$$
$$= \Phi(u < z_i - x\beta) - \Phi(u \leq z_{i-1} - x\beta) \qquad (7)$$

where $\Phi(.)$ is the standard cumulative distribution function.

The probability of an employee choosing a workplace satisfaction level of i given the explanatory variables (x) is the difference between the cumulative normal distribution function valued at a cut-off points for i (z_i) minus the vector of explanatory variables

multiplied by their respective coefficients, and cumulative normal distribution function valued at a preceding cut-off point (z_{i-1}) minus all the included explanatory variables multiplied by their respective coefficients.

Section 4: Dataset and Preliminary Findings

Data is obtained from the first eight waves (2001-2008) of the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) panel dataset. Designed to be consistent with the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) and the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (GSOEP), it is a household-based panel study that collects information pertaining to economic, family labour market dynamics. For the purposes of this paper, we utilise the individual person dataset across the eight waves. This provides an initial sample of 64254 individuals (49.75% male; 50.25% female) after checking for inconsistencies in the data, removing individuals with incomplete answers and restricting individuals to those within the labour force age group of 16-64 years. Of this sample 37074 or 57.70% are employees,[13] of which, 19114 (51.56%) are males and 17960 (48.44%) females.

The HILDA dataset provides a rich source of information on labour market participation, outcome and performance. There is information on firm size, union membership, occupation and industry type, qualification levels attained, and of particular interest to this paper, workplace satisfaction measures. Appendix Table 2 provides a complete list of variables and definitions used in this study.

Six measures of workplace satisfaction are available in the HILDA dataset. The various measures are overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with job security, satisfaction with hours of work, satisfaction with (type of) work and satisfaction with the flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments (work-life balance). Respondents are asked to choose a number between 0 and 10 to indicate their levels of satisfaction with the six measures of workplace satisfaction. These questions are reproduced for every new wave.

The mean and proportion values of the explanatory variables by gender and grouping are presented in Table 2.[14] All variables were tested for gender sensitivity.[15] According to Table 2, most variables exhibit gender heterogeneity, indicating the existence of gender variation with respect to personal (not uniformly so for the young group) and employment characteristics, consistent with the hypothesis posited in Section 3. Both the degree and significance of gender sensitivity is somewhat predicated by the three groups investigated. For instance, whilst aggregated females are far more likely to be in casual work (irrespective of hours of work) compared to their male counterparts, this difference is almost negligible for the young group, and while it is double for the educated group, two of the three casual contract variables are not gender sensitive. Nevertheless, for part-time work, all groups exhibit not just gender differences but also highlight the leading role played by females in limited hours employment.

We also note that educated females earn only 81.83% of the average hourly wage of comparable males, less than for the aggregated group (86.80%) and far less than for the young group (97.41%). There is statistical evidence of occupational and industry-wide gender segregation (as suggested by Bender *et al*., 2005). The occupation and industry segmentation

---

[13] This excludes those employed in family businesses and those who are self-employed.
[14] See Appendix Table A3 for the corresponding values for the sample that includes the non-employed.
[15] Values in bold are not statistically significant.

can be partially explained by education levels attained; males are far more likely to hold certificate type qualifications that lead to trade, manufacturing and construction work.

Overall, gender differences seem less pronounced (though still relatively widespread) for the young and educated groups relative to the aggregated group. Of the latter group, we find that females have a different labour force participation history compared to males. They have less tenure with respect to both occupation and employer, and have less experience. As well, they have spent almost five times more years out of the labour force, suggesting that females might be more likely to have experienced interrupted labour force participation in the past. This group-level heterogeneity among females strengthens the argument of this paper to split the sample into the three aforementioned groups.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics by Gender and Sub-Groups – Employed Only

Variables	Aggregated		Young (Childless)		Educated	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	(Mean/Proportion)		(Mean/Proportion)		(Mean/Proportion)	
Personal Characteristics						
Age (between 16 – 64)	38.29	39.01	25.34	25.13	39.80	38.69
Married / *de facto*	0.70	0.67	0.38	0.51	0.78	0.70
Long Term Health Problems	**0.15**	**0.14**	**0.10**	**0.10**	**0.12**	**0.12**
Non-Indigenous ABRs	**0.78**	**0.78**	**0.85**	**0.84**	0.71	0.75
ATSI	**0.02**	**0.02**	**0.02**	**0.02**	0.00	0.01
ESB Immigrants	0.10	0.10	**0.06**	**0.06**	0.12	0.11
NESB Immigrants	**0.10**	**0.10**	0.07	0.08	0.17	0.13
Tenure – Current Occupation	9.43	8.38	3.79	3.33	**9.50**	**9.55**
Tenure – Current Employer	7.04	6.09	2.85	2.62	7.57	7.03
Years Worked	19.91	17.50	6.94	6.51	18.93	16.95
Years Unemployed	0.57	0.42	0.45	0.30	0.28	0.24
Years Out of the Labour Force	0.87	4.09	0.65	0.78	2.00	3.19
Type & Hours of Work						
Hourly Wage	21.89	19.00	17.78	17.32	28.90	23.65
Permanent (35-40 Hours)	0.34	0.31	0.32	0.40	**0.30**	**0.29**
Permanent (< 35 Hours)	0.03	0.22	0.03	0.08	0.03	0.20
Permanent (> 40 Hours)	0.42	0.17	0.36	0.21	0.49	0.26
Fixed-Term (35-40 Hours)	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.06
Fixed-Term (< 35 Hours)	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04
Fixed-Term (> 40 Hours)	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.08	0.04
Casual (35-40 Hours)	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.04	**0.01**	**0.01**
Casual (< 35 Hours)	0.06	0.17	0.08	0.14	0.03	0.09
Casual Contract (> 40 hours)	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	**0.01**	**0.00**
Hired By Labour-Hire Firm	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.02
Workplace Characteristics						
Small Firm	**0.34**	**0.35**	0.40	0.35	0.20	0.22
Medium Sized Firm	0.31	0.33	0.31	0.32	0.32	0.36
Large Firm	0.34	0.32	0.29	0.33	0.47	0.43
Union Member	0.32	0.30	**0.22**	**0.21**	0.31	0.44
Supervisory Responsibilities	0.57	0.46	0.50	0.46	0.65	0.55
Occupation						
Managerial	0.14	0.08	**0.09**	**0.08**	0.23	0.10
Professional	0.20	0.29	0.19	0.30	0.57	0.68
Technical Trade	0.22	0.04	0.27	0.05	0.05	0.02
Personal Services	0.06	0.14	0.07	0.12	0.03	0.05
Clerical	0.09	0.26	0.07	0.25	0.06	0.12
Sales	0.06	0.10	0.08	0.13	**0.03**	**0.03**
Machinery	0.12	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.01	0.00
Labour Work	0.11	0.08	0.15	0.05	0.02	0.01
Industry						
Agriculture	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.00
Mining	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00
Manufacturing	0.18	0.06	0.17	0.06	0.09	0.03
Power	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00
Construction	0.09	0.01	0.12	0.02	0.03	0.01
Wholesale Trade	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.01
Retail Trade	0.07	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.04	0.03

Hospitality	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.10	**0.01**	**0.01**
Transport	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.01
Communication Services	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03
Finance	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.07	0.04
Property	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00
Technical	**0.07**	**0.07**	0.09	0.10	0.17	0.09
Administration	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02
Public Services	0.11	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.14	0.09
Education	0.06	0.17	0.03	0.09	0.18	0.32
Health	0.04	0.23	0.03	0.16	0.07	0.27
Arts	0.02	0.01	**0.02**	**0.02**	**0.01**	**0.01**
Other Services	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	**0.02**	**0.01**
Geographical Location						
City	**0.66**	**0.66**	0.69	0.73	0.79	0.75
Regional	**0.32**	**0.32**	0.29	0.25	0.19	0.23
Remote	**0.02**	**0.02**	**0.02**	**0.02**	**0.01**	**0.01**
Family Characteristics						
Child at Home	0.44	0.50	-	-	0.50	0.46
No dependents at Home	**0.54**	**0.54**	0.86	0.88	0.50	0.55
Education						
Masters & Ph. D	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.18	0.12
Post-grad. Dip. & Cert.	0.05	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.21	0.27
Degree	0.15	0.19	0.17	0.28	**0.61**	**0.61**
Diploma	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.10	-	-
Certificate	0.30	0.17	0.26	0.17	-	-
Year 12	0.15	0.16	0.27	0.24	-	-
Year 11 or less	0.22	0.25	0.19	0.12	-	-
Observations	19114	17960	5456	4708	4648	5576

Note: The Young group includes those aged between 16-34, but excludes those with children. The educated group excludes those who do not have at least a Bachelor's Degree. Observations in bold are **NOT** gender sensitive.

Table 3 reports the average (mean) workplace satisfaction score by gender and groupings. Looking at the average for all the years (2001-2008), we note that females in the aggregated group have higher levels of workplace satisfaction with the exception of satisfaction with pay, and even then the difference is minute. Except for the satisfaction with pay, all differences are statistically significant. The difference between genders is large for overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with job security, satisfaction with hours worked and satisfaction with work-life balance. We thus have statistical indication that females are more satisfied than males at work.

However, Clark (1997) and Long (2005) among others, do find that female workplace satisfaction can differ by age, parental status and educational qualifications. Looking at the young group, we find that the magnitude of the difference between gender narrows (in the main) compared to the aggregated group (suggesting less gender divergence with respect to workplace satisfaction). While young childless females have higher satisfaction scores than males across the six satisfaction measures, the differences for satisfaction with pay and type of work is statistically insignificant. It is also only weakly significant for satisfaction with work-life balance. Hence, we have preliminary indications that the young childless group is not as gender sensitive relative to the aggregated group with respect to workplace satisfaction. Educated females are also more satisfied in four of the six measures compared to their male counterparts, though they are dissatisfied with pay and work-life balance. Overall, statistical evidence points to limited evidence of female workplace satisfaction changing by age or education, with a few exceptions, and also suggests that employed females do not constitute a monolithic block within the labour market, and that different groups of employed females may reflect heterogeneity in satisfaction based on their particular characteristics. We return to this matter in Section 5 when we test for possible differences econometrically.

Table 3: Workplace Satisfaction by Gender and Sub-Groups

Aspects of Workplace Satisfaction					
Aggregated					
2001-2008	**Overall**	**Pay**	**Job Sec.**	**Work**	**Hours**	**Work-Life**
Female	7.72	6.94	8.12	7.63	7.33	7.46
Male	7.52	6.96	7.94	7.56	7.10	7.21
Difference	0.20***	-0.02	0.18***	0.07***	0.23***	0.25***
Young (Childless)					
2001-2008	**Overall**	**Pay**	**Job Sec.**	**Work**	**Hours**	**Work-Life**
Female	7.49	6.79	8.16	7.40	7.17	7.33
Male	7.39	6.74	8.02	7.33	7.09	7.25
Difference	0.10**	0.05	0.14***	0.07	0.08**	0.12*
Educated					
2001-2008	**Overall**	**Pay**	**Job Sec.**	**Work**	**Hours**	**Work-Life**
Female	7.54	7.00	8.18	7.58	7.07	7.09
Male	7.42	7.17	8.01	7.49	6.96	7.22
Difference	0.12***	-0.17***	0.17***	0.11***	0.11**	-0.13***

Note: ***, ** and * denote 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance respectively

Section 5: Empirical Investigation

Having established (often significant) statistical evidence of both gender and group sensitivity in workplace satisfaction, this section presents random effects ordered probit results in order to investigate whether these differences are maintained after imposing a host of control variables.

Section 5.1: Aspects of Workplace Satisfaction on the Female Gender Dummy
Table 4 below presents summary results for six random-effects ordered probit models (one for each workplace satisfaction) with a female gender dummy. Results are discussed by groupings.

Table 4: Workplace Satisfaction: Random-Effects Ordered Probit Results

Aspects of Workplace Satisfaction on the Female Gender Dummy					
	Overall	**Pay**	**Job Sec.**	**Work**	**Hours**	**Work-Life**
Aggregated	0.15***	0.18***	0.19***	0.11***	0.05*	-0.03
Young (Childless)	0.07	0.03	0.10*	0.05	0.04	-0.02
Educated	0.10	0.21***	0.20***	0.12*	-0.11	-0.26***

Note: Whilst the table only produces the results for the female gender dummy, the six regressions run also controlled for personal characteristics, type and hours of work, workplace characteristics, occupation, industry, geographical location, family characteristics and education (full results are available on request). ***, ** and * denote 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance

Aggregated Group
Table 3 indicated that all six measures are gender sensitive. Econometric results also suggest gender sensitivity with respect to workplace satisfaction, with the exception of satisfaction with work-life balance. The work-life balance satisfaction also changes signs from being in favour of females in the descriptive analysis to being negative in the ordered probit results. Another anomaly between descriptive statistics and econometric results occur with respect to satisfaction with pay. While gender sensitivity is present for both statistical and econometric analysis, the study finds that females are more satisfied than males following econometric results, contrary to statistical indications. Overall, results presented in Table 4 suggest the existence of the paradox for the aggregated group.

Young (Childless) Group
The ordered probit results indicate that workplace satisfaction based gender sensitivity is largely absent. Indeed, only satisfaction with job security shows sign of gender sensitivity, and even then only weakly so. This finding is inconsistent with that indicated by the descriptive analysis presented in Table 3, which posited gender sensitivity to be more prevalent, if not uniformly so. As with the aggregated group, the sign for the insignificant work-life balance satisfaction measure switches from being in favour of female satisfaction in the descriptive analysis to negative after controlling for a host of characteristics. Overall, results suggest that the paradox may not be present for young, childless females.

Educated Group
The educated sub-group produces the only robust econometric satisfaction result that suggests females are relatively less satisfied than males at work, and even then only for one measure; work-life balance. As with the aggregated group, educated females are more satisfied with pay, an inconsistency when compared to statistical findings. They are also more satisfied with job security and hours worked, though only weakly so for the latter.

The results presented in Table 4 also suggest the presence of gender-divergent work values, at least for the aggregated and educated groups. The near total absence of workplace satisfaction gender sensitivity for the young group suggests that employed females are a heterogenous group. As well, a number of previous studies have concentrated their results on overall job satisfaction. Had this paper also undertaken a similar study, we would conclude that young and educated females are just as satisfied as their male colleagues. While this statement may be tenable for the young group, it would hide considerable differences in specific aspects of workplace satisfaction that perhaps cancel each other out, and miss out on the fact that gender sensitivity in workplace satisfaction is present among the education group.

Section 5.2: Determinants of Workplace Satisfaction
Having found that gender and group differences in workplace satisfaction do exist, though neither necessarily uniformly so nor across all sections of working females, this section will further investigate the forces driving these specific workplace satisfaction measures in order to check for possible gender and group differences. Tables 5a – 5f summarise these findings, which are briefly discussed in turn.

Section 5.2.1: Determinants of Overall Job Satisfaction
Table 5a: Overall Job Satisfaction: Random-Effects Ordered Probit Results

Variables	Aggregated		Young (Childless)		Educated	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Personal Characteristics						
Age	-0.06 (0.02)**			0.24 (0.07)***		
Age Squared	0.00 (0.00)**			-0.00 (0.00)***		
Married / *de facto*						
Long Term Health Problems	-0.11 (0.03)***	-0.12 (0.03)***	-0.18 (0.06)***	-0.16 (0.06)**		-0.15 (0.06)**
ATSI	0.34 (0.13)**					-0.43 (0.25)*
ESB Immigrants					-0.20 (0.12)*	
NESB Immigrants			-0.25 (0.10)**			
Tenure – Current Occupation	-0.02 (0.00)***	-0.01 (0.00)**	-0.04 (0.02)**		-0.03 (0.01)***	
Tenure – Current Occupation Squared	0.00 (0.00)***	0.00 (0.00)**	0.00 (0.00)*		0.00 (0.00)***	
Tenure – Current Employer	-0.03 (0.00)***	-0.03 (0.01)***	-0.04 (0.02)**	-0.05 (0.02)**	-0.02 (0.01)*	
Tenure – Current Employer Squared	0.00 (0.00)***	0.00 (0.00)***				
Years Worked		0.02 (0.01)*		0.07 (0.03)***		
Years Worked Squared				-0.00 (0.00)*		
Years Unemployed						
Years Out of the Labour Force	-0.03 (0.02)**					-0.03 (0.02)*
Years Out of the Labour Force Squared	0.00 (0.00)***					0.00 (0.00)**
Type & Hours of Work						
Hourly Wage (Y)	0.28 (0.03)***	0.27 (0.04)***	0.29 (0.06)***	0.41 (0.07)***	0.39 (0.07)***	0.31 (0.06)***
Predicted Hourly Wage (Y*)	-0.32 (0.18)*	-0.36 (0.16)**				
Permanent (< 35 Hours)		0.08 (0.03)**				0.12 (0.07)*
Permanent (> 40 Hours)						
Fixed-Term (35-40 Hours)						
Fixed-Term (< 35 Hours)						
Fixed-Term (> 40 Hours)						
Casual (35-40 Hours)	-0.22 (0.05)***	-0.10 (0.06)*	-0.27 (0.08)***	-0.20 (0.10)**	-0.35 (0.16)***	-0.30 (0.15)**
Casual (< 35 Hours)	-0.22 (0.06)***	0.10 (0.05)**	-0.27 (0.10)***		-0.46 (0.15)***	
Casual (> 40 hours)	-0.27 (0.06)***	-0.19 (0.11)*	-0.32 (0.11)***		-1.03 (0.24)***	
Workplace Characteristics						
Small Firm	0.11 (0.04)***	0.07 (0.04)*		0.12 (0.07)*	0.22 (0.10)**	0.15 (0.09)*
Medium Sized Firm					0.13 (0.06)**	0.11 (0.06)*
Union Member		-0.11 (0.03)***				
Supervisory Responsibilities					-0.11 (0.05)**	
Education						
Masters & Ph. D		-0.21 (0.11)**				
Post-grad. Dip. & Cert.		-0.18 (0.08)**				
Degree	-0.18 (0.07) **	-0.12 (0.07)*			Omitted	Omitted
Diploma	-0.12 (0.07)*	-0.10 (0.06)*			-	-
Certificate					-	-
Year 11 or less	0.13 (0.05)**	0.27 (0.05)***	0.22 (0.08)***	0.18 (0.09)*	-	-
Time Effects						
Wave 1		0.12 (0.04)***	-0.23 (0.08)***			
Wave 2			-0.16 (0.08)**			
Wave 3						
Wave 4						-0.14 (0.07)*
Wave 5						
Wave 6						
Wave 7						
Observations	19114	17960	5456	4708	4648	5576
Log likelihood	-32616.04	-30917.97	-9540.16	-8400.83	-7389.74	-9299.51
Chi-square test statistic for Y = Y*	11.26 (*p* value = 0.00)	14.54 (*p* value = 0.00)	5.75 (*p* value = 0.02)	6.48 (*p* value = 0.01)	1.06 (*p* value = 0.30)	1.11 (*p* value = 0.30)

Note: Selected variables only. Empty cells refer to statistically insignificant results. Full results are available on request. Omitted categories are: Not Married/Not in a *de facto* Relationship; Australian Born (not Aboriginal and/or Torres Straits Islander); Permanent (35-40 Hours); Large Sized Firm; Not a Union Member; Has No Supervisory Responsibilities; Year 12 (for educated group the omitted category is Degree); and Wave 8. ***, ** and * denote 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance respectively.

Starting first with the determinants of overall job satisfaction, this study finds few significant gender differences across all three groups, though some heterogeneity remain apparent. There are no expectational differences though some differences in personal characteristics do exhibit themselves when looking at the young and educated groups. Despite obvious gender

divergences in occupational categories (see Table 2), the determinants of overall job satisfaction explained by employment characteristics seem rather uniform across genders, though once again, this is more the case with the aggregated group. Casual work irrespective of hours plays a more prominent role in determining overall job satisfaction among young and educated males relative to their female counterparts while education is a stronger predictor of overall job satisfaction for females in the aggregated group.

More interesting however are differences between females across the three groups. In terms of personal characteristics, age is only a significant determinant of overall job satisfaction among young females, and negatively so.[16] We also find that overall job satisfaction for educated females is not predicated by tenure and experience, unlike that of their young and aggregated female counterparts. Another divergence between these groups is evident when looking at permanent and casual work irrespective of hours; these types of contracts are stronger determinants of overall job satisfaction for the aggregated group only. Indeed, this is also the case for education qualification.

Overall, the results in Table 5a (with respect to females) are not easily explained. One may posit *a priori*, that given overall job satisfaction is made up of a combination of other, at times contrary satisfaction measures, that many of these possible determinants would turn up insignificant. This was not the case for the aggregated group. Given that overall job satisfaction is a 'composite' of other satisfaction measures, it may be very difficult to get a good gauge of its determinants. Instead, a study into the determinants of the other aspects of workplace satisfaction below may prove rather more illuminating in indirectly understanding the determinants of overall job satisfaction.

For the aggregated group there is no gender difference in wage expectations as measured by the predicted log wage. But, the fact that the significance level for male is only marginal indicates that females are less satisfied with the overall job as comparison income increases. A significant negative sign for comparison income represents higher aspirations which are more difficult to be met (Vanin, 2001). For the young and educated groups overall job satisfaction is not determined by the comparison income. It is their actual income that matters and not the relative income.

---

[16] In unreported results age squared is positive and significant, suggesting the existence of a U-shaped age profile with respect to satisfaction.

Section 5.2.2: Determinants of Satisfaction with Pay

Table 5b: Satisfaction with Pay: Random-Effects Ordered Probit Results

Variables	Aggregated		Young (Childless)		Educated	
	Male	**Female**	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**	**Female**
Personal Characteristics						
Age	-0.06 (0.02)***		-0.16 (0.07)**			
Age Squared	0.00 (0.00)**		0.00 (0.00)*			
Married / *de facto*		0.10 (0.03)***				
Long Term Health Problems	-0.07 (0.03)***	-0.08 (0.03)***	-0.25 (0.06)***	-0.15 (0.06)**		-0.12 (0.06)**
ATSI				-033 (0.17)*	0.94 (0.38)**	
ESB Immigrants	-0.11 (0.05)**					
NESB Immigrants		-0.11 (0.05)**				
Tenure – Current Occupation						
Tenure – Current Employer	-0.01 (0.00)**				-002 (0.01)*	
Tenure – Current Employer Squared	0.00 (0.00)**				0.00 (0.00)**	
Years Worked						
Years Unemployed		-0.04 (0.02)**				
Years Unemployed Squared		0.00 (0.00)**				
Years Out of the Labour Force						
Type & Hours of Work						
Hourly Wage (Y)	1.16 (0.03)***	0.89 (0.04)***	1.21 (0.06)***	1.24 (0.07)***	1.15 (0.07)***	0.94 (0.06)***
Predicted Hourly Wage (Y*)	-0.33 (0.17)*	-0.29 (0.16)*	-0.94 (0.27)***	-0.57 (0.27)**		1.43 (0.63)**
Permanent (< 35 Hours)	-0.15 (0.06)**				-0.37 (0.13)***	-0.15 (0.07)**
Permanent (> 40 Hours)	0.24 (0.03)***	0.11 (0.04)***	0.17 (0.05)***		0.13 (0.07)**	0.23 (0.07)***
Fixed-Term (35-40 Hours)	0.14 (0.05)***	0.09 (0.05)*	0.23 (0.08)***	0.23 (0.08)***	0.31 (0.10)***	0.21 (0.08)***
Fixed-Term (< 35 Hours)						
Fixed-Term (> 40 Hours)	0.24 (0.05)***	0.26 (0.07)***	0.22 (0.08)***	0.37 (0.10)***	0.21 (0.09)**	0.42 (0.10)***
Casual (35-40 Hours)	0.09 (0.05)*	0.32 (0.06)***		0.41 (0.10)***		
Casual (< 35 Hours)		0.28 (0.05)***	0.16 (0.09)*	0.30 (0.09)***		
Casual (> 40 hours)	0.31 (0.06)***	0.49 (0.11)***	0.29 (0.10)***	0.67 ().17)***		
Workplace Characteristics						
Small Firm			-0.15 (0.07)**			0.23 (0.09)**
Medium Sized Firm	-0.08 (0.03)***	-0.08 (0.03)**	-0.17 (0.05)***			
Union Member		-0.06 (0.03)**			-0.10 (0.06)*	-0.08 (0.05)*
Supervisory Responsibilities						
Education						
Masters & Ph. D	-0.17 (0.10)*					-0.28 (0.12)**
Post-grad. Dip. & Cert.						
Degree	-0.12 (0.07)*				Omitted	Omitted
Diploma	-0.14 (0.06)**				-	-
Certificate	-0.11 (0.05)**		-0.18 (0.07)***		-	-
Year 11 or less		0.16 (0.05)***			-	-
Time Effects						
Wave 1		-0.07 (0.04)*	-0.23 (0.07)***	-0.27 (0.08)***		
Wave 2		-0.11 (0.04)***	-0.16 (0.08)**	-0.19 (0.08)**		
Wave 3						
Wave 4						
Wave 5				-0.12 (0.07)*		
Wave 6						
Wave 7						
Observations	19114	17960	5456	4708	4648	5576
Log likelihood	-35258.70	-34543.34	-10466.22	-9156.82	-7978.84	-10306.78
Chi-square test statistic for Y = Y*	71.11 (*p* value = 0.00)	49.96 (*p* value = 0.00)	58.88 (*p* value = 0.00)	41.37 (*p* value = 0.00)	0.44 (*p* value = 0.51)	0.61 (*p* value = 0.44)

Note: Selected variables only. Empty cells refer to statistically insignificant results. Full results are available on request. Omitted categories are: Not Married/Not in a *de facto* Relationship; Australian Born (not Aboriginal and/or Torres Straits Islander); Permanent (35-40 Hours); Large Sized Firm; Not a Union Member; Has No Supervisory Responsibilities; Year 12 (for educated group the omitted category is Degree); and Wave 8. ***, ** and * denote 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance respectively.

Unlike overall job satisfaction, the determinants of satisfaction with pay are slightly more gender differentiated. There are no expectational differences for the aggregated and young groups, but for the educated groups, females are more satisfied with their pay as comparison income increases. Concentrating on females, our expectation proxy suggests that as comparison income increases pay satisfaction level for the young group decreases but the opposite occurs for the educated group. For the educated female group the magnitude of the coefficient for comparison income (predicted log wage) indicates the importance of relative

income in determining pay satisfaction. This can be an indication that educated females are more optimistic persons and happier with their pay, other things being equal (Senik, 2004).

Educated females also seem to have different determinants compared to the other two groups, as evinced by their casual contracts, which failed to significantly determine satisfaction with pay.

Personal characteristics do however seem to differ by gender across all three groups. Employment contracts show minute gender heterogeneity whilst for the aggregated group, education is a consistent determinant of satisfaction with pay only for males.

.

Table 5c: Satisfaction with Job Security: Random-Effects Ordered Probit Results

Variables	Aggregated		Young (Childless)		Educated	
	Male	**Female**	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**	**Female**
Personal Characteristics						
Age	-0.07 (0.02)***	-0.06 (0.02)***			-0.11 (0.05)**	-0.13 (0.04)***
Age Squared	0.00 (0.00)***	0.00 (0.00)***			0.00 (0.00)**	0.00 (0.00)***
Married / *de facto*		0.07 (0.03)**				
Long Term Health Problems	-0.08 (0.03)***	-0.09 (0.03)***		-0.17 (0.07)**	-0.13 (0.06)**	-0.18 (0.06)***
ATSI					1.33 (0.50)***	
ESB Immigrants						-0.18 (0.10)*
NESB Immigrants	-0.10 (0.06)*	-0.22 (0.06)***	-0.22 (0.10)**	-0.19 (0.11)*		-0.29 (0.10)***
Tenure – Current Occupation						
Tenure – Current Employer	0.01 (0.00)***	0.02 (0.01)***	0.08 (0.02)***	0.11 (0.02)***	0.02 (0.01)**	0.02 (0.01)*
Tenure – Current Employer Squared	-0.00 (0.00)*		-0.01 (0.00)***	-0.01 (0.00)***		
Years Worked						
Years Unemployed	-0.06 (0.02)***	-0.10 (0.02)***	--0.11 (0.05)**	-0.18 (0.08)**	-0.26 (0.10)***	
Years Unemployed Squared	0.00 (0.00)*			0.02 (0.01)*	0.04 (0.02)*	
Years Out of the Labour Force						
Type & Hours of Work						
Hourly Wage (Y)		0.12 (0.04)***		0.14 (0.07)*		
Predicted Hourly Wage (Y*)	-0.31 (0.18)*		-0.48 (0.28)*			
Permanent (< 35 Hours)						
Permanent (> 40 Hours)	0.07 (0.03)**	0.10 (0.04)***		0.18 (0.07)***		
Fixed-Term (35-40 Hours)	-0.35 (0.05)***	-0.56 (0.05)***	-0.27 (0.08)***	-0.48 (0.08)***	-0.95 (0.10)***	-0.95 (0.08)***
Fixed-Term (< 35 Hours)	-0.54 (0.13)***	-0.68 (0.07)***	-0.47 (0.23)**	-0.76 (0.18)***	-1.07 (0.27)***	-1.12 (0.12)***
Fixed-Term (> 40 Hours)	-0.17 (0.05)***	-0.52 (0.07)***	-0.19 (0.08)**	-0.49 (0.11)***	-0.28 (0.09)***	-0.88 (0.10)***
Casual (35-40 Hours)	-0.83 (0.05)***	-0.77 (0.06)***	-0.82 (0.08)***	-0.85 (0.10)***	-0.83 (0.17)***	-1.13 (0.16)***
Casual (< 35 Hours)	-0.56 (0.06)***	-0.48 (0.05)***	-0.47 (0.10)***	-0.59 (0.10)***	-0.78 (0.15)***	-0.85 (0.12)***
Casual (> 40 hours)	-0.61 (0.06)***	-0.62 (0.12)***	-0.56 (0.11)***	-0.49 (0.18)***	-0.66 (0.26)***	-0.89 (0.29)***
Workplace Characteristics						
Small Firm				0.18 (0.08)**		
Medium Sized Firm			-0.10 (0.05)*	0.15 (0.06)**		
Union Member	-0.07 (0.03)***					
Supervisory Responsibilities	0.23 (0.02)***		0.22 (0.04)***	0.14 (0.05)***	0.18 (0.06)***	0.21 (0.05)***
Education						
Masters & Ph. D						
Post-grad. Dip. & Cert.						
Degree					Omitted	Omitted
Diploma					-	-
Certificate					-	-
Year 11 or less					-	-
Time Effects						
Wave 1	-0.17 (0.04)***		-0.19 (0.08)**		-0.15 (0.09)*	-0.18 (0.08)**
Wave 2	-0.09 (0.04)**		-0.13 (0.08)*			
Wave 3					-0.15 (0.09)*	
Wave 4						
Wave 5				-0.16 (0.08)**		-0.12 (0.07)*
Wave 6	-0.06 (0.03)*					
Wave 7	0.07 (0.03)**	0.07 (0.03)*	0.12 (0.06)*			
Observations	19114	17960	5456	4708	4648	5576
Log likelihood	-32950.59	-30227.07	-9521.90	-7940.87	-7550.54	-8892.27
Chi-square test statistic for Y = Y*	3.58 (*p* value = 0.06)	0.86 (*p* value = 0.35)	2.84 (*p* value = 0.09)	0.00 (*p* value = 0.98)	0.24 (*p* value = 0.63)	1.07 (*p* value = 0.30)

Note: Selected variables only. Empty cells refer to statistically insignificant results. Full results are available on request. Omitted categories are: Not Married/Not in a *de facto* Relationship; Australian Born (not Aboriginal and/or Torres Straits Islander); Permanent (35-40 Hours); Large Sized Firm; Not a Union Member; Has No Supervisory Responsibilities; Year 12 (for educated group the omitted category is Degree); and Wave 8. ***, ** and * denote 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance respectively.

There is little evidence of differing determinants of satisfaction with job security by gender, though time effects are somewhat gender sensitive. The literature suggests that as more females enter the workforce their expectations will increase and that this should show up with earlier cohorts being more satisfied relative to newer cohorts. Nevertheless, according to Table 5c, this is more the case for males rather than females, and does not match the theory.

The expectations proxy is insignificant for all female groups and only negatively weakly significant for aggregated and young males.

There is also little evidence of differences in the determinants of satisfaction with job security between female groups, though a few points can be made. In terms of personal characteristics, age (negative) and cohabitating (positive) is only significant for aggregated females while years unemployed does not decrease the likelihood of satisfaction with job security for educated females, as it does for the other two groups. Workplace characteristics do determine satisfaction for young females, though not for aggregated females and only occasionally so for educated females. Time effects appear significant occasionally but differ between the groups.

Section 5.2.4: Determinants of Satisfaction with Type of Work
Table 5d: Satisfaction with Type of Work: Random-Effects Ordered Probit Results

Variables	Aggregated		Young (Childless)		Educated	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Personal Characteristics						
Age						0.06 (0.03)*
Age Squared						-0.00 (0.00)*
Married / *de facto*	0.08 (0.03)**		0.12 (0.05)**			
Long Term Health Problems	-0.10 (0.03)***	-0.09 (0.03)***		-0.13 (0.06)**	-0.11 (0.06)*	-0.12 (0.06)**
ATSI	0.31 (0.12)**		0.30 (0.18)*		0.96 (0.40)**	
ESB Immigrants					-0.22 (0.11)**	
NESB Immigrants						
Tenure – Current Occupation	-0.02 (0.00)***	-0.01 (0.00)*	-0.06 (0.02)***		-0.03 (0.01)***	
Tenure – Current Occupation Squared	0.00 (0.00)***	0.00 (0.00)*	0.00 (0.00)***		0.00 (0.00)***	
Tenure – Current Employer	-0.02 (0.00)***	-0.02 (0.01)***				-0.02 (0.01)*
Tenure – Current Employer Squared	0.00 (0.00)***	0.00 (0.00)***				
Years Worked		0.02 (0.01)*		0.08 (0.03)***	-0.08 (0.03)***	
Years Worked Squared				-0.00 (0.00)*	0.00 (0.00)**	
Years Unemployed	0.05 (0.02)**	-0.04 (0.02)*				
Years Unemployed Squared	-0.00 (0.00)**	0.00 (0.00)**				
Years Out of the Labour Force	-0.04 (0.02)**			-0.09 (0.04)**		
Years Out of the Labour Force Squared	0.00 (0.00)***			0.01 (0.01)**		
Type & Hours of Work						
Hourly Wage (Y)						
Predicted Hourly Wage (Y*)		-0.31 (0.16)*		-0.61 (0.27)**		
Permanent (< 35 Hours)						
Permanent (> 40 Hours)	0.11 (0.03)***	0.07 (0.04)**	0.10 (0.05)*		0.12 (0.07)*	
Fixed-Term (35-40 Hours)	0.08 (0.05)*	-0.09 (0.05)*				
Fixed-Term (< 35 Hours)						-0.14 (0.08)*
Fixed-Term (> 40 Hours)	0.10 (0.05)**	0.14 (0.06)**			0.21 (0.09)**	
Casual (35-40 Hours)	-0.24 (0.05)***	-0.13 (0.06)**	-0.31 (0.08)***			
Casual (< 35 Hours)	-0.20 (0.06)***		-0.19 (0.10)**		-0.34 (0.15)**	
Casual (> 40 hours)					-0.75 (0.25)***	
Workplace Characteristics						
Small Firm	0.10 (0.04)***	0.12 (0.04)***			0.22 (0.10)**	0.17 (0.09)*
Medium Sized Firm						
Union Member		-0.11 (0.03)***				
Supervisory Responsibilities	0.09 (0.02)***	0.06 (0.02)**	0.10 (0.04)**			
Education						
Masters & Ph. D						
Post-grad. Dip. & Cert.					0.17 (0.08)**	
Degree	-0.21 (0.07)***		-0.23 (0.11)**		Omitted	Omitted
Diploma	-0.13 (0.07)*				-	-
Certificate					-	-
Year 11 or less	0.13 (0.06)**	0.17 (0.05)***	0.15 (0.08)*		-	-
Time Effects						
Wave 1	0.11 (0.04)***	0.07 (0.04)*		-0.15 (0.08)*	0.20 (0.09)**	
Wave 2				-0.22 (0.08)***		
Wave 3				-0.17 (0.08)**		-0.15 (0.08)**
Wave 4				-0.20 (0.07)***		
Wave 5			-0.11 (0.07)*	-0.13 (0.07)*	0.13 (0.07)*	
Wave 6				-0.22 (0.07)***		
Wave 7						
Observations	19114	17960	5456	4708	4648	5576
Log likelihood	-33562.58	-32347.19	-10096.67	-8831.94	-7834.24	-9760.74
Chi-square test statistic for Y = Y*	0.01 (*p* value = 0.94)	4.43 (*p* value = 0.04)	0.13 (*p* value = 0.71)	5.20 (*p* value = 0.02)	1.46 (*p* value = 0.23)	0.08 (*p* value = 0.78)

Note: Selected variables only. Empty cells refer to statistically insignificant results. Full results are available on request. Omitted categories are: Not Married/Not in a *de facto* Relationship; Australian Born (not Aboriginal and/or Torres Straits Islander); Permanent (35-40 Hours); Large Sized Firm; Not a Union Member; Has No Supervisory Responsibilities; Year 12 (for educated group the omitted category is Degree); and Wave 8. ***, ** and * denote 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance respectively.

Gender differences in determining satisfaction with type of work are relatively more abundant compared to the previously noted satisfaction measures. Cohabitation has no effect on satisfaction for females but does so for males with the exception of the educated group. As well, Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islander (ATSI) males are happier with their type of work.

However, the insignificance of this variable with respect to females might be a construct of their small numbers in employment. Tenure with current occupation negatively (but with increasing effect) affects satisfaction for males but only so for aggregated females, and even then at a marginal significance level. Years of work experience also exhibit gender heterogeneity, with aggregated and young females more satisfied, while educated males are less satisfied. Years unemployed also affect aggregated males and females differently. Our expectation proxy, as measured by the predicted log wage variable, is negative for both aggregated and young females, suggesting that females do have differing expectations compared to males, though we caution against making sweeping statements in this regard given the limitations of our proxy variable. For these groups, females are significantly more satisfied with the type of work they do when their predicted log income falls. Gender differences also appear throughout employment contract variables, and differences in time effects are evident between genders among the young. This suggests that young females are increasing their satisfaction level over time, contrary to the theory that higher expectations will lower satisfaction among employed females.

Concentrating on females, the paper finds that employment contracts have a far greater impact on satisfaction among aggregated females relative to young and educated females. This finding extends to labour market indicators and workplace characteristics while time effects, on the other hand are largely significant only for young females.

Section 5.2.5: Determinants of Satisfaction with Hours Worked
Table 5e: Satisfaction with Hours Worked: Random-Effects Ordered Probit Results

Variables	Aggregated		Young (Childless)		Educated	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Personal Characteristics						
Age						
Married / *de facto*		0.05 (0.03)*				0.13 (0.06)**
Long Term Health Problems	-0.08 (0.03)***	-0.13 (0.03)***	-0.18 (0.06)***	-0.20 (0.06)***		
ATSI						-0.64 (0.29)**
ESB Immigrants	-0.10 (0.05)**					
NESB Immigrants		-0.15 (0.05)***	-0.31 (0.09)***			
Tenure – Current Occupation	-0.01 (0.00)***		-0.03 (0.02)**	-0.04 (0.02)*	-0.03 (0.01)***	
Tenure – Current Occupation Squared	0.00 (0.00)***			0.00 (0.00)**	0.00 (0.00)***	
Tenure – Current Employer	-0.02 (0.00)***				-0.02 (0.01)**	
Tenure – Current Employer Squared	0.00 (0.00)***					
Years Worked				0.05 (0.03)**		
Years Unemployed		-0.08 (0.02)***			-0.16 (0.08)*	-0.19 (0.07)***
Years Unemployed Squared		0.00 (0.00)***				0.02 (0.01)**
Years Out of the Labour Force						
Type & Hours of Work						
Hourly Wage (Y)	0.32 (0.03)***	0.19 (0.03)***	0.33 (0.06)***	0.32 (0.07)***	0.38 (0.06)***	0.30 (0.06)***
Predicted Hourly Wage (Y*)						
Permanent (< 35 Hours)	-0.16 (0.06)**	0.27 (0.03)***	-0.26 (0.11)**	-0.21 (0.08)***		0.37 (0.07)***
Permanent (> 40 Hours)	-0.54 (0.03)***	-0.50 (0.03)***	-0.53 (0.05)***	-0.60 (0.06)***	-0.78 (0.07)***	-0.61 (0.06)***
Fixed-Term (35-40 Hours)			-0.15 (0.08)**			
Fixed-Term (< 35 Hours)		0.32 (0.06)***	-0.50 (0.22)**		0.49 (0.27)*	0.48 (0.11)***
Fixed-Term (> 40 Hours)	-0.53 (0.05)***	-0.64 (0.06)***	-0.44 (0.08)***	-0.69 (0.10)***	-0.67 (0.09)***	-0.69 (0.09)***
Casual (35-40 Hours)	-0.15 (0.05)***		-0.17 (0.08)**	-0.26 (0.09)***		
Casual (< 35 Hours)	-0.66 (0.06)***		-0.74 (0.09)***	-0.52 (0.09)***	-0.64 (0.15)***	0.24 (0.11)**
Casual (> 40 hours)	-0.45 (0.06)***	-0.28 (0.11)***	-0.38 (0.10)***	-0.44 (0.16)***	-0.65 (0.25)***	
Workplace Characteristics						
Small Firm	0.18 (0.04)***	0.13 (0.04)***	0.15 (0.07)**	0.23 (0.07)***	0.24 (0.09)**	0.24 (0.09)***
Medium Sized Firm				0.15 (0.05)***		0.14 (0.06)**
Union Member		-0.10 (0.03)***		-0.09 (0.05)*	-0.15 (0.06)**	-0.13 (0.05)***
Supervisory Responsibilities	-0.12 (0.02)***	-0.05 (0.02)*			-0.20 (0.05)***	
Education						
Masters & Ph. D	-0.27 (0.10)***	-0.20 (0.10)**				
Post-grad. Dip. & Cert.	-0.15 (0.08)*	-0.21 (0.08)***				-0.11 (0.06)*
Degree	-0.15 (0.07)**				Omitted	Omitted
Diploma	-0.14 (0.06)**				-	-
Certificate					-	-
Year 11 or less	0.18 (0.05)***	0.18 (0.05)***	0.17 (0.07)**		-	-
Time Effects						
Wave 1	0.07 (0.04)*	0.07 (0.04)*		-0.15 (0.08)**		
Wave 2						-0.14 (0.08)*
Wave 3						-0.14 (0.08)*
Wave 4						
Wave 5				-0.13 (0.07)*	0.12 (0.07)*	
Wave 6				-0.17 (0.07)**		-0.11 (0.06)*
Wave 7						
Observations	19114	17960	5456	4708	4648	5576
Log likelihood	-36233.87	-34528.57	-10521.03	-9215.60	-8396.62	-10656.01
Chi-square test statistic for Y = Y*	0.39 (*p* value = 0.53)	2.67 (*p* value = 0.10)	1.02 (*p* value = 0.31)	3.22 (*p* value = 0.07)	0.21 (*p* value = 0.64)	1.72 (*p* value = 0.19)

Note: Selected variables only. Empty cells refer to statistically insignificant results. Full results are available on request. Omitted categories are: Not Married/Not in a *de facto* Relationship; Australian Born (not Aboriginal and/or Torres Straits Islander); Permanent (35-40 Hours); Large Sized Firm; Not a Union Member; Has No Supervisory Responsibilities,; Year 12 (for educated group the omitted category is Degree); and Wave 8. ***, ** and * denote 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance respectively.

Compared to satisfaction with type of work, gender differences are less pronounced when looking at the determinants of satisfaction with hours worked. Cohabitation improves satisfaction for aggregated and educated females but no significant effects are evident for males. Tenure with occupation negatively affects satisfaction for males across the board but only does so for young females, and even then only weakly so. Dissatisfaction with hours worked among those with longer spells of unemployment is also more pronounced among

females than males. Excluding the young group, there is some evidence of gender difference with respect to employment contract, where females in part-time work are more likely to be satisfied with working hours compared to their male counterparts. Given that cohabitating females are also more satisfied with hours worked, there is some indication in our results to suggest that there is a significant gender difference with respect to how satisfaction with hours worked is viewed, excluding the young group. Lesser hours at work is not necessarily seen as a cause for dissatisfaction for females, but the reverse is not the case for males. Compared to the omitted category of working in large firms, females are almost always more satisfied when working in both small and medium sized firms; for males, this is only so for small firms. As well, we note some gender differences with education and time effects.

Comparing females only, this paper notes that young females have significantly different determinants of satisfaction with hours worked relative to the aggregated and educated groups. This is evident when looking at tenure and specific aspects of labour market history as well as working part-time hours. Time effects are however, more consistent between the young and educated groups.

Section 5.2.6: Determinants of Satisfaction with Work-life Balance

Table 5f: Satisfaction with Work-Life Balance: Random-Effects Ordered Probit Results

Variables	Aggregated		Young (Childless)		Educated	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Personal Characteristics						
Age				-0.13 (0.07)*		-0.07 (0.03)**
Age Squared				0.00 (0.00)*		0.00 (0.00)**
Married / *de facto*				-0.09 (0.05)*	0.13 (0.08)*	
Long Term Health Problems	-0.06 (0.03)*	-0.10 (0.03)***	-0.12 (0.06)*	-0.18 (0.06)***		-0.16 (0.06)***
ATSI	0.32 (0.05)**					
ESB Immigrants						
NESB Immigrants	-0.11 (0.06)**	-0.14 (0.05)***	-0.29 (0.10)***			
Tenure – Current Occupation	-0.01 (0.00)**	-0.01 (0.00)**		-0.05 (0.02)***	-0.02 (0.01)**	
Tenure – Current Occupation Squared	0.00 (0.00)*	0.00 (0.00)*		0.00 (0.00)**	0.00 (0.00)***	
Tenure – Current Employer		0.01 (0.01)**			0.02 (0.01)*	
Tenure – Current Employer Squared		-0.00 (0.00)**			-0.00 (0.00)*	
Years Worked				0.10 (0.03)***		0.06 (0.02)***
Years Worked Squared				-0.00 (0.00)***		-0.00 (0.00)***
Years Unemployed	-0.05 (0.02)***		-0.19 (0.05)***			-0.15 (0.07)**
Years Unemployed Squared			0.02 (0.01)**			0.02 (0.01)*
Years Out of the Labour Force						
Type & Hours of Work						
Hourly Wage (Y)	0.15 (0.33)***	0.13 (0.04)***	0.24 (0.06)***	0.16 (0.07)**	0.23 (0.07)***	0.14 (0.06)**
Predicted Hourly Wage (Y*)						
Permanent (< 35 Hours)	0,29 (0.07)***	0.46 (0.03)***	0.27 (0.12)**	0.29 (0.08)***	0.34 (0.14)**	0.59 (0.07)***
Permanent (> 40 Hours)	-0.29 (0.03)***	-0.20 (0.03)***	-0.30 (0.05)***	-0.26 (0.06)***	-0.33 (0.07)***	-0.33 (0.07)***
Fixed-Term (35-40 Hours)				0.16 (0.08)**		0.19 (0.08)**
Fixed-Term (< 35 Hours)	0.26 (0.13)**	0.45 (0.06)***				0.68 (0.12)***
Fixed-Term (> 40 Hours)	-0.38 (0.05)***	-0.32 (0.06)***	-0.36 (0.08)***	-0.41 (0.10)***	-0.31 (0.09)***	-0.35 (0.09)***
Casual (35-40 Hours)						
Casual (< 35 Hours)	0.33 (0.06)***	0.56 (0.05)***	0.44 (0.10)***	0.27 (0.09)***	0.30 (0.15)**	0.93 (0.11)***
Casual (> 40 hours)	-0.40 (0.06)***		-0.45 (0.10)***		-1.09 (0.24)***	
Workplace Characteristics						
Small Firm	0.19 (0.04)***	0.12 (0.04)***		0.27 (0.07)***		
Medium Sized Firm		0.05 (0.03)*		0.20 (0.06)***		
Union Member	-0.14 (0.03)***	-0.23 (0.03)***	-0.09 (0.05)*	-0.16 (0.06)***	-0.20 (0.06)***	-0.20 (0.05)***
Supervisory Responsibilities		-0.07 (0.02)***		-0.13 (0.05)***	-0.17 (0.05)***	
Education						
Masters & Ph. D						
Post-grad. Dip. & Cert.		-0.38 (0.08)***		-0.28 (0.15)*		-0.23 (0.07)***
Degree		-0.12 (0.07)*			Omitted	Omitted
Diploma	-0.15 (0.07)**				-	-
Certificate					-	-
Year 11 or less		0.13 (0.05)***	0.14 (0.08)*		-	-
Time Effects						
Wave 1				-0.14 (0.08)*		
Wave 2				-0.14 (0.08)*		
Wave 3						
Wave 4						
Wave 5						-0.11 (0.06)*
Wave 6						-0.11 (0.06)*
Wave 7						
Observations	19114	17960	5456	4708	4648	5576
Log likelihood	-37422.21	-34310.21	-10876.79	-9336.17	-8740.93	-10900.89
Chi-square test statistic for Y = Y*	1.59 (*p* value = 0.21)	0.01 (*p* value = 0.90)	1.57 (*p* value = 0.21)	0.49 (*p* value = 0.48)	0.13 (*p* value = 0.72)	1.23 (*p* value = 0.27)

Note: Selected variables only. Empty cells refer to statistically insignificant results. Full results are available on request. Omitted categories are: Not Married/Not in a *de facto* Relationship; Australian Born (not Aboriginal and/or Torres Straits Islander); Permanent (35-40 Hours); Large Sized Firm; Not a Union Member; Has No Supervisory Responsibilities; Year 12 (for educated group the omitted category is Degree); and Wave 8. ***, ** and * denote 1, 5 and 10% levels of significance respectively.

In terms of gender heterogeneity, age maturity negatively affects satisfaction with work-life balance for both young and educated females while age fails to be a significant determinant for males. Tenure with both occupation and employer as well as years unemployed show mixed results, though greater years of work experience positively affects satisfaction with work-life balance for both young and educated females only, as is the case with full-time

work for those on fixed-term contracts. The one clear and significant gender difference with employment contracts are seen with casuals on overtime weekly hours; in this case only males are significantly dissatisfied. Working in medium-sized firms tends to improve satisfaction for aggregated and young females only but also reduce their satisfaction when observing those holding supervisory responsibilities. There are also slight indications of time effects differences as no time effects are significant for males but are weakly and negatively so for young and educated females, but not uniformly so.

The female only sample shows no clear trend that educated females have different determinants of satisfaction with work-life balance. This is perhaps surprising as this is the only instance in this study where females are significantly less satisfied than their male peers (see Table 4). Labour market results indicate that there may be some difference between educated females and the rest, as do workplace characteristics, but in many other instances, similarities with one or both of the other female groups are evident as well.

The Chi-squared statistic at the foot of the tables (5a-5f) shows that for the educated group, irrespective of gender, there is no statistically significant difference between the coefficients of the actual income and comparison income (in absolute value). This implies that the actual income has the same impact on job satisfaction as comparison income. To the contrary, for the aggregated and young groups, the Chi-squared statistic shows statistical evidence that the effect of actual income and comparison income are not equal, especially with regard to overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with pay. The only aspect of job satisfaction that doesn't show any significant difference between the two variables is satisfaction with work-life balance.

Section 6: Conclusion
This paper has investigated gender sensitivities in workplace satisfaction in Australia using a panel dataset. Descriptive statistics produced results indicating the veracity of the hypothesis of differing gender differences with respect to personal and employment characteristics, though gender differences in personal characteristics for the young childless group were less pronounced than for the aggregated and educated groups. Descriptive analysis was also utilised in order to further investigate the assertion that the genders are heterogeneous with respect to work values, tested by looking at five specific aspects of workplace satisfaction, along with overall job satisfaction. Results suggest that females are, in the main, more satisfied than males across the bulk of the workplace satisfaction measures, though this is not consistent for the young childless group while educated females are less satisfied than males with work-life balance. Both these hypotheses were then further studied using random effects ordered probit models, alongside the hypothesis that females exhibit different expectation levels from their work relative to males.

The random effects ordered probit results suggests that work values do exhibit gender sensitivities for the aggregated group (five out of six measures), and somewhat for the educated group (four out of six measures), but for the young childless group this was only the case for satisfaction with job security, and even then marginally so. In nine out of these ten cases of significance, females were more satisfied than males. Thus, this study is unable to reject the hypothesis that work values differ by gender. As well, we find that females are heterogeneous in their workplace satisfaction, and that the study is justified in following Long's (2005) approach in dividing females (and males as a point of comparison) into three groups. We also note (comparing tables 3 and 4) that controlling for a host of characteristics and related variables can alter findings on the nature and extent of gender sensitivity in

workplace satisfaction. In sum, findings from a descriptive statistics should be treated with caution, and ideally should be followed up with econometric testing.

The ordered probit results also highlighted the determinants of workplace satisfaction by gender. While findings suggest a degree of gender heterogeneity with respect to personal and employment characteristics, these were neither uniform across workplace satisfaction measures and groups, nor were they as encapsulating as suggested by the descriptive statistics posited in Table 2. The paper was unable to formulate any consistent set of stylised facts in this respect. Suffice to say, the hypothesis that gender differences in personal and employment characteristics contribute to differences in workplace satisfaction cannot be rejected, but neither can it be supported with any degree of veracity. Our results on expectations sheds little light on the hypothesis that females possess different levels of expectations compared to males, as for the most part gender differences were not evident. In the 18 comparison cases,[17] only on five occasions did expectations differ by gender. As well, given that our expectation proxy is far from the ideal proxy, we are unable to categorically state any conclusion regarding the role of expectations and gender with regards to workplace satisfaction measures.

In sum, this investigation notes that any effort to treat employed females as a monolithic block would likely produce erroneous conclusions regarding workplace satisfaction. As well, this paper suggests that work values are gender sensitive, and thus, any findings based solely on overall job satisfaction should be treated with caution. Finally, given the strong emphasis on the role of expectations on workplace satisfaction in the literature, greater thought must be given to the use of proxy variables so as to obtain a better gauge of its roles in apparently propagating gender sensitivities with respect to workplace satisfaction measures.

---

[17] Three gender comparisons per workplace satisfaction (e.g. for overall job/pay/job security/work/hours/work-life balance satisfaction, we compare expectations between gender for the aggregated, young and educated groups).

Section 7: References

Argyle, M. (1987), *The Psychology of Happiness*, Methuen: London.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2010), *Australian Labour Market Statistics*, Cat No.
6105.0, Canberra: AGPS.

Bender, K. and Heywood, J. (2006), 'Job Satisfaction of the Highly Educated: The Role of
Gender, Academic, Tenure and Earnings,' *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*,
Vol. 53, pp. 253-279.

Blanchflower, D. and Oswald A. (1999), 'Well-being, insecurity and the decline of
American job satisfaction,' *Mimeo*, Dartmouth College, USA

Blau, F. D. and Kahn, L. M (2006) 'The U.S. Gender Pay Gap in the 90s: Slowing
Convergence,' *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 60, pp. 45-66.

Booth, A., Francesconi, M. and Frank, J. (2003), 'A Sticky Floor Model of Promotion, Pay
and Gender,' *European Economic Review,* Vol. 47, Iss. 2, pp. 295-322.

Booth, A., Blackaby, D. and Frank, J. (2005), 'Outside Offers and the Gender Pay Gap:
Empirical Evidence from the UK Academic Labour Market,' *The Economic Journal*,
Vol. 115, pp. F81-F107.

Clark, A. E. (1996), 'Job Satisfaction in Britain,' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.
34, pp.189-217.

Clark, A. E. (1997), 'Job Satisfaction and Gender: Why Are Women So Happy in Work?,'
Labour Economics, Vol. 4, pp. 341-372.

Clark, A. E., and Oswald, A. J. (1996) 'Satisfaction and Comparison Income,' *Journal of
Public Economics*, Vol. 61, pp. 359-81.

Donohue, S. and Heywood, J. (2004), 'Job Satisfaction, Comparison Income and Gender:
Evidence from the NLSY,' *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 25, pp. 211-234.

Groot, W. and van den Brink, H. (1999), 'Job satisfaction and preference drift,'
Economic Letters, Vol. 63, 363-367.

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

Kaiser, C. (2002), '*Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of Standard, Non-Standard, and Self-
Employed Patterns Across Europe with a Special Note to the Gender/Job
Satisfaction Paradox,'* EPAG Working Paper No. 27, University of Essex,
Colchester.

Kaiser, L. C. (2005), '*Gender Job Satisfaction Differences Across Europe: An Indicator for
Labour Market Modernization,'* DIW Working Paper, No. 537, Berlin, Germany.

L´evy-Garboua, L. and Montmarquette, C. (2004), 'Reported Job Satisfaction: What Does it Mean?' *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 33, 135–151.

Long, A. (2005), 'Happily Ever After? A Study of Job Satisfaction in Australia,' *The Economic Record,* Vol. 81, pp. 303-321.

McKelvey, R. D., and Zavonia, W. (1975), 'A Statistical Model for the Analysis of Ordinary Level Dependent Variables,' *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, Vol. 4, pp. 103-20.

Senik, C. (2004), 'When Information Dominates Comparison: Learning from Russian Subjective Panel Data,' *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 88, 2099–2123.

Sloane, P. and Williams, H. (2000), 'Job Satisfaction, Comparison Earnings and Gender,' *Labour,* Vol. 14, pp. 473-501.

Sloane, P. and Ward M. E. (2001), 'Cohort effects and job satisfaction of academics,' Applied Economics Letters, Vol. 8, 787 – 91

Sousa-Poza, A. and Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2000), 'Taking Another Look at the Gender Job Satisfaction Paradox,' *Kyklos, Vol. 53*, pp. 135-152.

Sousa-Poza, A. and Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2003), 'Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction in Great Britain, 1991-2000: Permanent or Transitory?,' *Applied Economic Letters,* Vol. 10, pp. 691-694.

Sousa-Poza, A. and Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2007), 'The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Labor Turnover by Gender: An Analysis for Switzerland', *The Journal of Socio-Economics,* Vol. 36, pp. 895-913.

Vanin, P. (2001), "Job satisfaction and comparison income in Germany,' Applied Econometric, Bonn Graduate School of Economics

Welsh, S. (1999), 'Gender and Sexual Harassment,' *Annual Review of Sociology,* Vol. 25, pp. 169-190.

Section 8: Appendix

Appendix Box A1: Workplace Satisfaction Question in Wave 1 of the HILDA Person Questionnaire

E36   I now have some questions about how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with different aspects of your job.

If not currently employed: These questions refer to the most recent job you were working in the last 7 days.

I am going to read out a list of different aspects of your job and, using the scale on SHOWCARD 36, I want you to pick a number between 0 and 10 to indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following aspects of your job. The more satisfied you are, the higher the number you should pick. The less satisfied you are, the lower the number.

a   Your total pay
b   Your job security
c   The work itself (what you do)
d   The hours you work
e   The flexibility available to balance work and non-work commitments
f   All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job?

Table A1: Percentage of responses to workplace satisfaction by gender across the three sub-categories

	Aggregated		Young (Childless)		Educated	
	Nine to Ten		Nine to Ten		Nine to Ten	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Pay	19.83	22.42	17.32	18.12	20.91	21.04
Security	47.97	53.16	49.28	53.91	48.99	55.51
Work	31.28	34.95	27.23	28.84	27.91	31.82
Hours	24.94	32.54	24.21	27.26	20.93	26.11
Flex	33.95	39.32	34.95	35.34	31.46	31.56
Overall	27.82	34.53	24.54	27.02	22.14	27.48

Table A2: Variable List and Description

List	Description
Personal Characteristics	
Age (between 16 – 64)	Individual is aged between 16-64 years (continuous variable)
Non-Cohabitating	Individuals not married or living in *de facto* relationships (omitted case)
Married / *de facto*	Individual is either married or living in a *de facto* relationship
No Long Term Health Problems	Individual has no long term health problems (omitted case)
Long-term Health Problems	Individual has long-term health problems
Non-Indigenous ABRs	Australian Born Resident not of Aboriginal or Torres Straits Islander background (omitted case)
ATSI	Australian Born Resident of Aboriginal or Torres Straits Islander background
ESB Immigrants	Immigrant from the UK and Ireland, USA, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and Zimbabwe
NESB Immigrants	Immigrant from countries not covered by 'ESB Immigrant'
Tenure – Current Occupation	Tenure (in years) in current occupation (continuous variable)
Tenure – Current Employer	Tenure (in years) with current employer (continuous variable)
Years Worked	Years worked since finishing full-time education for the first time (continuous variable)
Years Unemployed	Years spent looking for work since finishing full-time education for the first time (continuous variable)
Years Out of the Labour Force	Years out of the labour force since finishing full-time education for the first time (continuous variable)
Type & Hours of Work	
Log of Hourly Wage	The log of hourly wage (continuous variable)
Predicted Log of Hourly Wage	The predicted log of hourly wage (continuous variable)
Permanent (35-40 Hours)	Individual on a permanent contract working an average of 35-40 hours a week (omitted case)
Permanent (< 35 Hours)	Individual on a permanent contract working over 40 hours a week on average
Permanent (> 40 Hours)	Individual on a permanent contract working less than 35 hours a week on average
Fixed-Term (35-40 Hours)	Individual on a fixed-term contract working an average of 35-40 hours a week (omitted case)
Fixed-Term (< 35 Hours)	Individual on a fixed-term contract working over 40 hours a week on average
Fixed-Term (> 40 Hours)	Individual on a fixed-term contract working less than 35 hours a week on average
Casual (35-40 Hours)	Individual on a casual contract working an average of 35-40 hours a week (omitted case)
Casual (< 35 Hours)	Individual on a casual contract working over 40 hours a week on average
Casual Contract (> 40 hours)	Individual on a casual contract working less than 35 hours a week on average
Workplace Characteristics	
Small Firm	Individual works for an employer that employs less than 20 people
Medium Sized Firm	Individual works for an employer that employs between 20 and 99 people
Large Firm	Individual works for an employer that employs 100 or more people (omitted case)
Union Member	Individual belongs to a union
Non-Union Member	Individual does not belong to a union (omitted case)
Supervisory Responsibilities	Individual's work includes supervising other employees
No Supervisory Responsibilities	Individual's work does not include supervising other employees (omitted case)
Occupation	
Managerial	Individual is employed as a manager
Professional	Individual is employed as a professional (omitted case)
Technical Trade	Individual is employed as a technician or trade worker
Personal Services	Individual is employed as a community or personal service worker
Clerical	Individual is employed as a clerical or administrative worker
Sales	Individual is employed as a sales worker
Machinery	Individual is employed as a machinery operator or driver
Labour Work	Individual is employed as a labourer
Industry	
Agriculture	Individual employed in the agriculture, forestry and fishing industry
Mining	Individual employed in the mining industry
Manufacturing	Individual employed in the manufacturing industry
Power	Individual employed in the electricity, gas, water and waste industry
Construction	Individual employed in the construction industry
Wholesale Trade	Individual employed in the wholesale trade industry
Retail Trade	Individual employed in the retail trade industry
Hospitality	Individual employed in the accommodation and foodservices industry
Transport	Individual employed in the transport, postal and warehousing industry
Communication Services	Individual employed in the information media and telecommunications industry
Finance	Individual employed in the finance and insurance industry
Property	Individual employed in rental, hiring and real estate industry
Technical	Individual employed in the professional, technical and scientific services
Administration	Individual employed in the administrative and support services
Public Services	Individual employed in the public administration and safety industry (omitted case)
Education	Individual employed in the education and training industry
Health	Individual employed in the health care and social assistance industry
Arts	Individual employed in the arts and recreation services
Other Services	Individual employed in other services
Geographical Location	
City	Individual resides in a major metropolitan area (omitted case)

Regional	Individual resides in a regional area
Remote	Individual resides in a rural area
Family Characteristics	
No Child at Home	Individual does not have child(ren) at home (omitted case)
Child at Home	Individual has child(ren) at home
Dependents at Home	Individual has dependents at home (omitted case)
No dependents at Home	Individual has no dependents at home
Education	
Masters & Ph. D	Individual highest qualification level attained – Masters or Doctorate
Post-grad. Dip. & Cert.	Individual highest qualification level attained – Post-Graduate Diploma or Certificate
Degree	Individual highest qualification level attained – Degree (omitted case for educated group)
Diploma	Individual highest qualification level attained – Diploma
Certificate	Individual highest qualification level attained – Certificate
Year 12	Individual highest qualification level attained – Completed Year 12 in high school (omitted case)
Year 11 or less	Individual highest qualification level attained – Completed Year 11 or less

Table A3: Descriptive Statistics by Gender and Sub-Groups – Employed and Non-Employed

Variables	Aggregated		Young (Childless)		Educated	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	Mean/Proportion		Mean/Proportion		Mean/Proportion	
Personal Characteristics						
Age	39.26	38.65	24.79	24.27	41.17	39.08
Married / *de facto*	0.68	0.67	0.34	0.44	0.77	0.71
Long Term Health Problems	0.20	0.18	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.14
Non-Indigenous ABRs	0.77	0.77	0.83	0.84	0.69	0.73
ATSI	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.01
ESB Immigrants	0.11	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.13	0.11
NESB Immigrants	0.11	0.12	0.08	0.09	0.18	0.15
Years Worked	20.45	15.93	6.26	5.53	20.07	16.70
Years Unemployed	0.76	0.57	0.56	0.41	0.32	0.30
Years Out of the Labour Force	1.18	5.26	0.77	0.89	2.15	3.79
Geographical Location						
City	0.63	0.63	0.69	0.71	0.78	0.74
Regional	0.35	0.35	0.29	0.27	0.20	0.24
Remote	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Family Characteristics						
Child at Home	0.42	0.53	-	-	0.49	0.50
No dependents at Home	0.55	0.49	0.80	0.81	0.51	0.51
Education						
Masters & Ph. D	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.19	0.12
Post-grad. Dip. & Cert.	0.05	0.07	0.25	0.04	0.21	0.26
Degree	0.13	0.17	0.14	0.24	0.60	0.62
Diploma	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.08	-	-
Certificate	0.30	0.17	0.23	0.16	-	-
Year 12	0.16	0.18	0.31	0.32	-	-
Year 11 or less	0.23	0.29	0.22	0.14	-	-
Observations	31965	32289	9254	7711	7101	8691

The Young group includes those aged between 16-34, but excludes those with children. The educated group excludes those who do not have at least a Bachelor's Degree.