



HAL
open science

Gender and job satisfaction: a European analysis in the light of gender ideology

Clotilde Coron

► **To cite this version:**

Clotilde Coron. Gender and job satisfaction: a European analysis in the light of gender ideology. Management international = International management = Gestión internacional, 2023, <https://biblos.hec.ca/biblio/libreacces/MI/mi2272.pdf>. 10.59876/a-948z-3r1r . halshs-04158456

HAL Id: halshs-04158456

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-04158456>

Submitted on 12 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Gender and job satisfaction: a European analysis in the light of gender ideology

Clotilde Coron

ABSTRACT

The gender-job satisfaction paradox, i.e., women reporting higher levels of job satisfaction while facing worse working conditions, has been hotly debated by scholars. This article studies the moderating role of national gender ideology in this paradox. In particular, the focus on Anglo-Saxon countries as well as the lack of attention towards the role of national gender ideology have received criticism. National gender ideology moderates the relationship between gender and job satisfaction: in more egalitarian countries, the gender gap of job satisfaction (to the detriment of women) is more important than in countries with more traditional gender ideologies. These results allow us to discuss expectation theory and the transitory nature of the gender-job satisfaction paradox.

Keywords: gender, job satisfaction, gender ideology, expectation theory

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi.org/10.59876/a-3jt2-ghtd

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59876/a-3jt2-ghtd>

Gender and job satisfaction: a European analysis in the light of gender ideology

Clotilde Coron, Université Paris-Saclay (RITM)

clotilde.coron@universite-paris-saclay.fr

Abstract: The gender-job satisfaction paradox, i.e., women reporting higher levels of job satisfaction while facing worse working conditions, has been hotly debated by scholars. This article studies the moderating role of national gender ideology in this paradox. In particular, the focus on Anglo-Saxon countries as well as the lack of attention towards the role of national gender ideology have received criticism. National gender ideology moderates the relationship between gender and job satisfaction: in more egalitarian countries, the gender gap of job satisfaction (to the detriment of women) is more important than in countries with more traditional gender ideologies. These results allow us to discuss expectation theory and the transitory nature of the gender-job satisfaction paradox.

Keywords: gender, job satisfaction, gender ideology, expectation theory

Genre et satisfaction au travail : une analyse européenne au prisme des stéréotypes de genre

Résumé : Les liens entre genre et satisfaction au travail sont très débattus dans la littérature académique. En particulier, l'accent mis sur les pays anglo-saxons et le manque d'attention portée aux stéréotypes de genre au niveau national ont été critiqués. Cet article étudie le rôle modérateur des stéréotypes de genre dans différents pays européens. Les stéréotypes de genre modèrent la relation entre le genre et la satisfaction au travail : dans les pays plus égalitaires, l'écart de satisfaction au travail entre les sexes (au détriment des femmes) est plus important que dans les pays moins égalitaires. Ces résultats nous permettent de discuter la théorie des attentes et la nature transitoire du paradoxe du genre et de la satisfaction au travail.

Mots-clés : genre, satisfaction au travail, stéréotypes de genre, théorie des attentes

Género y satisfacción laboral: un análisis europeo a través del prisma de los estereotipos de género

Resumen: Los vínculos entre el género y la satisfacción laboral son muy debatidos en la literatura académica. En particular, se ha criticado la concentración en los países anglosajones y la escasa atención prestada a los estereotipos de género a escala nacional. Este artículo examina el papel moderador de los estereotipos de género en varios países europeos. Los estereotipos de género moderan la relación entre género y satisfacción en el trabajo: en los países más igualitarios, la diferencia de género en la satisfacción en el trabajo (en detrimento de las mujeres) es mayor que en los países menos igualitarios. Estos resultados nos permiten discutir la teoría de las expectativas y el carácter transitorio de la paradoja del género y la satisfacción laboral.

Palabras clave: género, satisfacción laboral, estereotipos de género, teoría de las expectativas



Introduction

Many researchers have investigated the relationship between gender¹ and job satisfaction. Since Hodson's (1989) seminal article, which defined the "gender-job satisfaction paradox", i.e., the fact that women tend to report the same or higher levels of job satisfaction while facing worse working conditions, various studies have brought contradictory results.

Job satisfaction constitutes a critical element of employees' relationships with work (Top, Akdere, & Tarcan, 2015) and even individuals' lives (Linz & Semykina, 2012). It influences their performance, commitment, and intent to stay in the company (Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock, & Farr-Wharton, 2012; Flickinger, Allscher, & Fiedler, 2016). A considerable amount of research on this topic seeks to identify the determinants of job satisfaction, which include managerial support (Sawang, 2010), values and culture (Huang & Gamble, 2015), work-family conflict (Garner & Laroche, 2016), working conditions (Pujol-Cols & Dabos, 2018), and expected rewards (Linz & Semykina, 2012). Previous research has also highlighted several sociodemographic determinants, i.e., education (Bender & Heywood, 2006; Clark, 1997), level of responsibility (Smith, 2009), age (Clark, Oswald, & Warr, 1996), and sex (Clark, 1997; Hodson, 1989; Huang & Gamble, 2015).

Hodson's (1989) seminal article highlighted the so-called "gender-job satisfaction paradox" (Hauret & Williams, 2017; Perugini & Vladislavljević, 2019), also known as the "paradox of the contented female worker" (Valet, 2018). This paradox suggests that women report a higher level of job satisfaction despite facing more precarious employment conditions than men (Ficapal-Cusí, Díaz-Chao, Sainz-Ibáñez, & Torrent-Sellens, 2018). Even though comparative analyses have shown that the paradox does not exist in every country (Eskildsen, Kristensen, & Westlund, 2004; Hauret & Williams, 2017; Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000), Clark (1997) explains this paradox by hypothesising that women have lower job expectations than men, which could result in higher satisfaction levels among women than men. This theory has been the focus of much work on the relationship between gender and job satisfaction in recent decades (Hauret & Williams, 2017).

Clark's (1997) expectation theory has been rarely considered in the light of gender role socialization. However, as Grönlund and Oün (2018, p. 543) write, "another approach would be to widen the lens and consider job satisfaction more broadly in the light of gender role socialization and persistent gender inequalities." The abundant and inconsistent literature about gender and job satisfaction has given little attention to the different levels of gender ideology that characterize national cultures. Gender ideology refers to the beliefs regarding the appropriate behaviour for women and men in work and family. Gender ideology has been shown to influence the importance attached by women and men to their work (Gaunt & Benjamin, 2007), their training (Kosteas, 2013), their careers (Sweet, Sarkisian, Matz-Costa, & Pitt-Catsoupes, 2016), and, more importantly for the purpose of this study, their expectations toward work (Damaske, 2011). Although the literature suggests that gender ideology is an essential piece of the jigsaw, it has yet to address gender ideology's role in the gender-job satisfaction paradox as well as the national differences.

This paper complements the literature on the relationship between gender and job satisfaction and the expectation theory by studying the role of national gender ideology in this relationship. Our research uses two representative European surveys, namely, the 2015 European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS), which contains information about job satisfaction, and the 2017 European Values Study (EVS), which contains information about gender ideology. National gender ideology is computed with the EVS and is added to the EWCS, allowing the estimation of hierarchical models that combine individual characteristics (from the EWCS) and national gender ideology (from the EVS). The results show that in Europe women report a lower level of job satisfaction than men, although this gap varies between countries. National gender ideology plays an important role, as people living in countries with a more egalitarian gender ideology report a higher level of job

¹ Throughout the article, we use the word "sex" to refer to the statistical variable, and "gender" to refer to gender-related social phenomena.

satisfaction. National gender ideology also moderates the relationship between sex and job satisfaction in the sense that, in more egalitarian countries, the gender gap in job satisfaction (to the detriment of women) is more important than in countries with a more traditional gender ideology.

This paper contributes to the literature on both job satisfaction and gender, updating expectation theory and placing it in relation to national gender ideology. It also supports studies which expect the gender-job satisfaction paradox to be a transitory phenomenon, disappearing as soon as women are exposed to more equal gender settings. Finally, it argues that more equal gender settings have a paradoxical effect on the relationship between gender and job satisfaction. Although women may have better working conditions and thus higher job satisfaction in more egalitarian countries, the increase in job satisfaction associated with living or working in a country with an egalitarian gender ideology is more important for men than for women. In other words, women seem to benefit less than men from living or working in a country with a more egalitarian gender ideology.

The following section presents the literature review and the formulation of hypotheses, and the third section reports the data and the research design. Then the results are presented and discussed.

Literature review and hypotheses

Gender and job satisfaction: an unsolved debate

In his seminal article, Locke (1969, p. 316) defines job satisfaction as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values”. Locke’s definition has recently been refined by associating it with individuals’ perceptions of their jobs compared to their expectations (Drydakis, 2017). Perception can depend on the different facets of the work occupied (Christen, Iyer, & Soberman, 2006), as well as on personal values (Lange, 2015). Moreover, perception can refer to affective or cognitive elements (Pujol-Cols & Dabos, 2018) and can depend on individual emotional dispositions.

Since the publication of Locke’s article, conceptual subtleties have gradually been introduced to the literature in order to distinguish satisfaction with the different dimensions of work, e.g., remuneration, working conditions, development opportunities, working climate, working hours. Anglo-Saxon research has proposed a distinction between “work satisfaction” (referring to the intrinsic aspects of work, such as autonomy, self-development, and fulfilment) and “job satisfaction” (referring to the extrinsic aspects of work, such as remuneration, working hours, and contract) (Rose, 2003). This paper uses “job satisfaction” to include both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of job and work, as seen in recent research (García, Gonzales-Miranda, Gallo, & Roman-Calderon, 2019; Hünefeld, Gerstenberg, & Hüffmeier, 2020).

The relationship between gender and job satisfaction remains unclear among scholars. Several articles have shown that women tend to declare higher levels of job satisfaction than men, even though they generally face more demanding working conditions and have less autonomy in their jobs (Clark, 1997; Ficapal-Cusí et al., 2018; Hodson, 1989). In particular, women face precariousness (Young, 2010), involuntary part-time work (Gottfried, 2009), glass ceiling (Coron, 2018; Ng & Sears, 2017), and lower wages (Acker, 1989; Bergmann, Scheele, & Sorger, 2019; Stojmenovska, 2019) in their workplaces more often than men. However, other studies have shown that in other countries, women do not report higher levels of job satisfaction than men. Table 1 gives a non-exhaustive list of studies that report inconsistent relationships between gender and job satisfaction.

Table 1 around here

The inconsistent results in the table can be partly explained by the countries in which the studies were conducted. Comparative research has shown that the gender differential in job satisfaction depends strongly on the country (Kaiser, 2005; Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000). This result has been confirmed by a more recent study (Hauret & Williams, 2017), which shows that in some countries, women report higher levels of job satisfaction than men, whereas the inverse situation occurs in other countries. However, since most studies presented in Table 1 show that women report higher levels of job satisfaction, the first hypothesis of this study is formulated accordingly:

H1: In Europe, women report a higher level of job satisfaction than men.

The role of gender ideology

Two major explanations have been proposed by scholars to explain the “gender-job satisfaction paradox”. Clark’s (1997) expectation theory asserts that this paradox could be explained by women’s lower job expectations due to their poorer labour market condition in the past. In contrast, Hakim’s (2006) preference theory postulates that lifestyle preferences are the main explanatory factor of women’s choices and behaviours, as well as of the importance they grant to work and, therefore, their job satisfaction. However, Hakim’s assumption has since been partly questioned by studies showing that the “gender-job satisfaction paradox” cannot be attributed to the lower work centrality of women and their eventual work-family trade-offs (Grönlund & Öun, 2018).

In line with expectation theory, the national variations of the gender-job satisfaction paradox can be partly due to the national variations concerning the role of women and the sexual division of tasks, both of which shape women’s expectations towards their job (Huang & Gamble, 2015; K. S. Lee, 2006) and their job satisfaction (Clark, 1997). These national variations correspond to two dimensions: gender equality, manifested in women’s rights, situation at work and political empowerment; and gender ideology, manifested in social attitudes and values towards women and gender equality (Otterbach, Sousa-Poza, & Zhang, 2021).

Previous research on the gender-job satisfaction paradox has granted more attention to gender equality, and more precisely professional gender equality, than gender ideology. Professional gender equality refers to several aspects, e.g., equality in the access to the labor market (Blossfeld et al., 2015), gender diversity within occupations (K. A. Bender, Donohue, & Heywood, 2005), equality in the access to responsibilities (Acker, 2009), equal pay (A.-F. Bender & Pigeyre, 2016). Previous research has also shown the relationship between professional equality and the sharing of tasks in the domestic sphere (Pedulla & Thébaud, 2015). Professional gender equality has not reached the same level in every European country. For example, Eastern and Western European countries have been characterized by the professional equality between women and men, combined with an unequal share of domestic tasks; this combination of professional equality and domestic inequality has been called the “Soviet gender paradox” (Ashwin & Isupova, 2018). These national variations extend from the individual sphere to public policies, e.g., childcare and gender equality in the workplace (Annesley, Engeli, & Gains, 2015). The limited comparative research on the gender-job satisfaction paradox has shown that women who are exposed to more gender-equal settings at the national level have expectations towards work which are closer to their male counterparts’, which results in smaller gender gaps in job satisfaction than for women who are exposed to unequal settings (Perugini & Vladislavljević, 2019). This result supports Clark’s (1997) expectation theory. Previous research has suggested that the decline in women’s happiness, during decades when their concrete economic situation has improved, can be explained by an increase in their expectations. More precisely, Stevenson and Wolfers (2009) suggested that women’s expectations have increased faster than society was able to meet them. The disappearance of the gender-job

satisfaction paradox is actually considered in one previous study as an indicator of labor market modernization and progress towards gender equality (Kaiser, 2005). These studies bring an important new piece to the jigsaw by showing the paradoxical effect of the progress towards gender equality, which improves women's concrete situation but tends to decrease their satisfaction (Perugini & Vladislavjević, 2019). These previous studies investigate the concrete national situations related to gender equality, and not the national gender ideologies.

However, gender ideology can play an important role in the gender differences in job satisfaction, by shaping individual perceptions and preferences (Otterbach et al., 2021). Gender ideology can be measured thanks to representations of adequate behaviors and roles for women and men. Gender ideology refers to "individuals' beliefs regarding the appropriate behavior for men and women in the context of work and family" (Gaunt & Benjamin, 2007, p. 343), and is constituted by beliefs and norms about the gendered division of paid and unpaid work (Grunow, Begall, & Buchler, 2018). While previous studies have applied notions such as gender egalitarianism (Otterbach et al., 2021), sex roles (Elm, Kennedy, & Lawton, 2001), gender roles (Bagger, Li, & Gutek, 2008), gender ideology (Davis & Greenstein, 2009; Gaunt & Benjamin, 2007), social role theory (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000; Eibl, Lang, & Niessen, 2020), gender role orientation (Zhao, Zhang, & Foley, 2019), gender role attitudes (Kosteas, 2013), and gender role differences (Dolan, Bejarano, & Tzafrir, 2011), this study will draw on the notion of "gender ideology". Indeed, the notion of ideology refers to a "set of beliefs about the social world and how it operates, and what values and ideals are worth striving for" (Alvesson, 1987, p. 13) and therefore links more directly to beliefs and representations. These beliefs, which are internalized through the early socialization process (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010), influence individuals' behaviors in various contexts in turn, notably their working behaviors and decisions (Damaske, 2011; Dolan et al., 2011; Kosteas, 2013). Vespa (2009) presents gender ideology as a continuum between traditional and egalitarian gender ideology. Traditional gender ideology refers to the idea that men should take on the role of breadwinner and women should be responsible for household labor and childcare (Bagger & Li, 2012). In contrast, egalitarian gender ideology refers to the idea that women and men should have the same roles and responsibilities regarding breadwinning and household labor (Davis & Greenstein, 2009). Gender ideology varies considerably across countries, with some national cultures being more egalitarian and others more traditional (Beblo & Görge, 2018; Grunow et al., 2018).

To our knowledge, there exists no research which directly studies the role of national gender ideology in the gender-job satisfaction paradox. In this study, we try to bridge this gap by considering the role played by gender ideology. In line with expectation theory (Clark, 1997; Perugini & Vladislavjević, 2019), we assume that in countries with more egalitarian gender ideologies, women have higher job expectations and, thus, lower job satisfaction. H2 is formulated accordingly:

H2: Gender ideology moderates the relationship between gender and job satisfaction in the sense that women living in countries with more egalitarian gender ideology report a lower level of job satisfaction than women living in countries with more traditional gender ideology.

Data and methods

Data

Data for this study were derived from the 2015 European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS), which provides a rich cross-sectional dataset. The general survey is cross-sectional and includes responses from 35 European countries. The EWCS contains detailed information on various sociodemographic characteristics, including sex, age, educational attainment, and sector. Critical to the aims of this study, the EWCS also allows access to information on job satisfaction. It is possible to extrapolate the results obtained in this study using

weights provided within the dataset. The initial sample is 43,850 individuals, but it was restricted to employees (permanent and temporary contracts), which represents 32,681 individuals.

This dataset was combined with information drawn from the European Values Study (EVS), which was used to measure national gender ideology. The EVS is a large-scale cross-national study that includes responses from 34 European countries. The survey contains eight items often used to measure gender ideology. The average gender ideology was computed in the EVS for each country, and the value (average national gender ideology) was added in the EWCS database: each individual was attributed the average gender ideology of their country. The initial EVS sample is 56,491 individuals and it was not restricted, as gender ideology is measured in an aggregate way at the national level.

The final sample is constituted by the EWCS-restricted dataset, in which only the countries covered by the EVS were kept: Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Montenegro, Republic of North Macedonia, Serbia, Norway, Switzerland, and Albania². This represents 23,839 individuals (12,311 women and 11,528 men). Table 2 gives the number of respondents by country.

Table 2 around here

Measures

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured based on five items drawn from the EWCS survey: “On the whole, are you very satisfied, satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with working conditions in your main paid job?”; “Considering all my efforts and achievements in my job, I feel I get paid appropriately”; “My job offers good prospects for career advancement”; “I receive the recognition I deserve for my work”; “I generally get on well with my work colleagues”. Therefore, those five items correspond to the dimensions usually looked at in research about job satisfaction (working conditions, pay, career, recognition, and relationships) (Grönlund & Öun, 2018; Jones, Jones, Latreille, & Sloane, 2009; Kostea, 2013; Zou, 2015). In the EWCS survey, they are assessed with 4-point and 5-point Likert scales. The alpha coefficient was 0.74, higher than the suggested reliability level of 0.70. Job satisfaction was computed as the geometric mean of the five items (controlling for the fact that some are on a 4-points Likert scale and others on a 5-points Likert scale).

Sex. The sex of the respondents is reported by the interviewer, with three modalities: “Male”/“Female”/“Don’t know”. Within the initial sample, 22,101 individuals are coded as “females”, 21,740 as “males”, and nine as “Don’t know”. For the purpose of the analysis, the nine individuals coded as “Don’t know” had to be deleted from the sample. In the following text, and in compliance with APA guidelines, sex is referred to as “women” and “men”.

² The EWCS survey includes “United Kingdom” whereas the EVS survey includes “Great Britain”. Therefore, this country was deleted from the study. However, a separate analysis was conducted on this country. It shows that the average job satisfaction is higher in the UK than in the rest of Europe (3.77 against 3.63). Besides, all other things being equal, there is no significant difference between women and men in terms of job satisfaction, which differs from the rest of Europe where women report significantly lower job satisfaction than men (see Model 1). This result is interesting because the main studies showing the “gender-job satisfaction paradox” have been conducted on Anglo-Saxon countries. In 2015, the gender-job satisfaction paradox no longer exists in the UK (women no longer report higher job satisfaction than men), but women there are still more satisfied overall than in the rest of Europe where women report significantly lower job satisfaction than men.

National gender ideology. National gender ideology was measured by aggregating the individual responses from the EVS survey at the national level³. Seven items from the EVS survey were used to assess gender ideology. These seven items correspond to the degree of agreement with the following statements: “When a mother works for pay, the children suffer”; “A job is all right but what most women truly want is a home and children”; “All in all, family life suffers when the woman has a full-time job”; “A man’s job is to earn money, a woman’s job is to look after the home and family”; “On the whole, men make better political leaders than women do”; “A university education is more important for a boy than for a girl”; “On the whole, men make better business executives than women do.” All answers conform to Likert scales (1: “agree strongly” – 4: “disagree strongly”). Thus, a high score corresponds to an egalitarian gender ideology, and a low score corresponds to a traditional gender ideology (Gaunt & Benjamin, 2007). These or similar items are found in other studies on gender ideology (Otterbach et al., 2021) and, although the unidimensionality of gender ideology has been questioned (Grunow et al., 2018; Kroska, 2000), this measure of gender ideology is the most common among previous research (Davis & Greenstein, 2009; Gaunt & Benjamin, 2007; Grunow et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2019).

Control variables (individual level). Several variables identified in previous research as potential antecedents of job satisfaction were controlled for. Previous research has shown that part-time work can have inconsistent effects on job satisfaction (Fenton-O’Creedy, 1995). In the EWCS survey, part-time work corresponds to the binary question: “Do you work part-time or full-time?”. The ability to determine one’s own schedule can also influence positively job satisfaction, especially among women (Dijkers, van Engen, & Vinkenbun, 2010; Huang & Gamble, 2015). In the EWCS survey, respondents have to explain how their working time arrangements are set (“They are set by the company with no possibility for changes” / “I can choose between several fixed working schedules determined by the company” / “I can adapt my working hours within certain limits” / “My working hours are entirely determined by myself”). The type of contract also influences job satisfaction, as shown in Wilkin’s (2013) meta-analysis. The sample was restricted to three types of contracts: “Contract of unlimited duration”/“Contract of limited duration”/“A temporary employment agency contract”, and this variable was controlled for. Managerial status can also influence job satisfaction and has been controlled for in previous research (Huang & Gamble, 2015). In the EWCS survey, the question “How many people work under your supervision” was used to assess the managerial status (“Manager”/“Non-Manager”). Regarding demographics, previous research has examined the influence of age (R. Lee & Wilbur, 1985) and has shown a U-shaped relationship between age and job satisfaction (Clark et al., 1996), which justifies including both age and age-squared among the control variables (Zou, 2015). Other studies have shown the non-linear influence of tenure (Tlaid & Mendelson, 2014). Therefore, in this research, tenure and tenure-squared were controlled for. Since Clark’s (1997) seminal article, previous research has underlined that educational attainment strongly influences job satisfaction, with higher levels of education associated with lower job satisfaction (Perugini & Vladislavljević, 2019). In the present study, educational attainment corresponded to seven modalities (“Primary education”/“Lower secondary education”/“Upper secondary education”/“Post-secondary non-tertiary education”/“Sort-cycle tertiary education”/“Bachelor or equivalent”/“Master or Doctorate”). The EWCS survey also includes information on overskilling, a feeling which has been shown to

³ Three indices were computed with a hierarchical model to verify that it is possible to aggregate individual perceptions at the national level: the rwg index, and two Intraclass Correlation Coefficients, namely, ICC(1) and ICC(2) (Woehr, Loinon, Schmidt, Loughry, & Ohland, 2015). The rwg index, which measures the within-group agreement to justify aggregating individual-level data, is around 0.85 and shows very strong agreement (Woehr et al., 2015). The ICC(1) of 0.31 indicates that 31% of the variation in gender ideology can be attributed to the country-level (Bliese, 1998). It is far above the suggested 0.1 cutoff (Woehr et al., 2015). The ICC(2), which provides an estimate of the reliability of the country-level means (Bliese, 1998; Shieh, 2016; Woehr et al., 2015), is around 0.94. This is far above the suggested 0.7 cutoff (Shieh, 2016). Overall, all three indices justify the aggregation of individual perceptions at the national level.

influence job satisfaction (Rose, 2003): “Which of the following statements would best describe your skills in your own work?”, the modalities being “I need further training to cope well with my duties”/“My present skills correspond well with my duties”/“I have the skills to cope with more demanding duties”. Variables related to family situation were also added, as most gender stereotypes addressed here deal with the separation between the domestic and the professional spheres. Previous research has shown that parents tend to report higher levels of job satisfaction than non-parents (Grönlund & Öun, 2018). In the EWCS survey, the respondents answer a question about the number of children living in their household, and this variable was coded in three modalities (“No child” / “1-2 children” / “3 or more”). The marital status was also added, indicating whether the respondent lives with a partner or spouse, or not. Indeed, living with a partner can reduce work-family conflict, which can be better for job satisfaction (Buonocore & Russo, 2013). Finally, variables related to the company were added, such as sector (“Private sector”/“Public sector”/“Joint private-public organization or company”/“Not-for-profit sector or NGO”/“Other”), and company size (“1”/“2-9”/“10-249”/“250+”/“Don’t know”).

Control variables (national level). In addition, control variables at the national level were also added in one of the models, in order to check whether countries’ socioeconomic context and situation regarding gender equality have an influence on job satisfaction and on the gender-job satisfaction paradox. Several scholars have suggested to take into account national gender regimes (Orloff, 1993). Besides, the national concrete situations regarding gender equality can differ from the national gender ideologies (Otterbach et al., 2021), which makes it all the more interesting to add a model including concrete gender equality in order to check whether the role of national gender ideology stays the same. Three variables were added to account for the socioeconomic situation: GDP per capita (source: IMF 2015), HDI (Human Development Index, source: UNDP 2015), and the employment protection level for regular contracts (source: OECD 2015) (Caroli & Godard, 2016; Muñoz de Bustillo & de Pedraza, 2010). Six variables were added to control for the gender situation, as suggested by Orloff (1993): The existence of quotas to promote women’s political participation (source: OECD 2014), the feminization rate of national parliaments (source: OECD 2014), the GDI (Gender Development Index, source: UNDP 2015), the gender pay gap (source: EIGE 2014), the feminization rate of board presidents (source: EIGE 2015), and the feminization rate of board members (source: EIGE 2015). Some of these variables were not available for every year, so the available years closest to 2015 (date of the EWCS survey) were chosen.

Table 3 gives the main descriptive statistics for the whole sample and the women’s and men’s samples.

Table 3 around here

Table 4 indicates the average gender ideology for each country. The standard deviations cannot be reported because the measure is aggregated at the national level.

Table 4 around here

Table 4 indicates that the countries with the most egalitarian gender ideology are, in descending order: Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. The countries with the most traditional gender ideology are, in ascending order: Lithuania, Slovakia, and Montenegro.

As almost all the variables are categorical, the correlation matrix reported in Table 5 only includes job satisfaction, age, age-squared, tenure, tenure-squared, and gender ideology.

Table 5 around here

Table 5 indicates that gender ideology is positively and significantly correlated with job satisfaction, which seems to justify the inclusion of this dimension in the models.

Methods

In order to test hypotheses H1 (“In Europe, women report a higher level of job satisfaction than men”) and H2 (“Gender ideology moderates the relationship between gender and job satisfaction in the sense that women living in countries with more egalitarian gender ideology report a lower level of job satisfaction than women living in countries with more traditional gender ideology”), first, descriptive statistics with significance tests were conducted. Three generalized hierarchical (multilevel) linear models with job satisfaction as the dependent variable were estimated in the second step. The first one includes sex, national gender ideology, and control variables at the individual level, but does not include the mediation of gender ideology. It corresponds to the following specifications:

$$\text{Job satisfaction}_{ij} = \alpha + \beta \text{Sex}_i + \gamma X_i + \theta G_j + \mu_{ij},$$

where i denotes the individual level and j the country level, X_i being a vector of individual-level characteristics (presented in the previous section), and G_j being the national ideology of the country j .

The second one includes the same variables and adds the interaction effect between sex and national gender ideology. It corresponds to the following specifications:

$$\text{Job satisfaction}_{ij} = \alpha + \beta \text{Sex}_i + \gamma G_j + \delta \text{Sex}_i * G_j + \theta X_i + \vartheta_j + \mu_{ij},$$

where i denotes the individual level and j the country level, G_j being the national gender ideology of the country j , and X_i being a vector of individual-level characteristics (presented in the previous section).

The third one includes all the variables and interaction effects of Model 2 and also includes variables at the national level. It corresponds to the following specifications:

$$Job\ satisfaction_{ij} = \alpha + \beta Sex_i + \gamma GI_j + \delta Sex_i * GI_j + \theta X_i + \tau Y_j + \vartheta_j + \mu_{ij},$$

where i denotes the individual level and j the country level, GI_j being the gender ideology at the country level, X_i being a vector of individual-level characteristics (presented in the previous section), and Y_j being a vector of national-level characteristics (presented in the previous section).

Multilevel modeling is beneficial when phenomena can be explained at the individual and national levels (Renkema, Meijerink, & Bondarouk, 2016). Specifically, the present study is based on two levels of analysis: individuals are embedded in countries characterized by various gender ideologies. Multilevel modeling allows the researchers to determine the percentage of variation explained at the national level and is the best way to combine two levels of analysis within the same framework (Goldstein, Browne, & Rasbash, 2002; Smyth & Steinmetz, 2008). All the analyses were performed with the SAS software.

Main results

Descriptive statistics

Table 6 gives the average job satisfaction for women and men in each country. GLM tests were conducted in order to test the statistical significance of the sex differences in each country.

Table 6 around here

Table 6 indicates that women and men have nearly the same level of job satisfaction in almost all European countries. In only seven countries (out of 26), there is a significant difference between women and men, and in all those countries, women report lower job satisfaction than men. In no country do women have higher job satisfaction than men. The national variations in terms of job satisfaction are important, with levels of job satisfaction varying from 3.29 (Slovakia) to 3.95 (Denmark) among women. This invalidates hypothesis H1 (“In Europe, women report a higher level of job satisfaction than men”): in Europe, there are some countries where women and men have the same average level of job satisfaction, whereas others where women have a lower level of job satisfaction, but there is no country where women have a higher level of job satisfaction.

Models

In order to test more precisely hypotheses H1 (“In Europe, women report a higher level of job satisfaction than men”) and H2 (“Gender ideology moderates the relationship between gender and job satisfaction in the sense that women living in countries with more egalitarian gender ideology report a lower level of job satisfaction than women living in countries with more traditional gender ideology”), with control variables related to the working situations, we use multilevel modeling with job satisfaction as the dependent variable. The results of the models are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 around here

Model 1 shows that, even after controlling for individual and organizational characteristics, women report a lower level of job satisfaction than men. This means that in 2015, the gender-job satisfaction paradox does not exist anymore in Europe. This invalidates hypothesis H1. The multilevel model also allows us to measure the weight of the national level. In this case, the national level accounts for 4.43% of the individual variations in job satisfaction.

Model 2, which includes the moderation of gender ideology and sex, indicates that, when controlling for the moderating role of gender ideology, sex does not significantly affect job satisfaction anymore. Gender ideology influences significantly and positively job satisfaction, which means that in countries with a more egalitarian gender ideology, people report higher job satisfaction. Finally, the interaction effect between gender ideology and sex is also significant, but negative. Figure 1 shows the interaction effect. This indicates that in countries with a more egalitarian gender ideology, the gender gap of job satisfaction (to the detrimental of women) is more important than in countries with a more traditional gender ideology. This means that hypothesis H2 (“Gender ideology moderates the relationship between gender and job satisfaction in the sense that women living in countries with more egalitarian gender ideology report a lower level of job satisfaction than women living in countries with more traditional gender ideology”) is not validated because it is more complex than what was expected: women living in countries with more egalitarian gender ideology report, as their male counterparts, a higher level of job satisfaction, but they seem to benefit less from this egalitarian gender ideology than men. In other words, the increase in job satisfaction associated with the fact of living or working in a country with an egalitarian gender ideology is more important for men than women.

Figure 1 around here

In Model 3, which includes control variables at the national level, gender ideology is no more significant⁴. This result could indicate that gender ideology plays as a proxy of national situation (socioeconomic context and situation regarding gender equality). However, the interaction effect between gender ideology and sex has the same effect as in Model 2.

Concerning the control variables, in the three models, part-time tends to reduce job satisfaction, which brings another piece to the inconsistent literature about the effect of part-time on job satisfaction (Fenton-O’Creedy, 1995). The ability to determine one’s own schedule influences positively job satisfaction, as in previous research (Jijena Michel & Jijena Michel, 2015). Contracts of limited duration and agency contracts decrease job satisfaction, as in previous research (Wilkin, 2013). In conformity with previous research, age has a negative influence and age-squared has a positive influence (Zou, 2015), tenure has no effect, whereas tenure-squared also has a positive influence. Contrary to previous research (Clark, 1997), higher educational levels are associated with higher job satisfaction in this study. Being overskilled decreases job satisfaction, as in previous research (Rose, 2003). The number of children does not influence job satisfaction, whereas living without partner decreases job satisfaction. The company’s sector does not influence job satisfaction, and only the company size “2-9” has a significant effect, job satisfaction being higher than for other company sizes.

⁴ Due to the non-significance of most of the national variables, a multicollinearity test was carried out on the national variables, and no multicollinearity was found. Other models were estimated by removing some of the national variables and showed that many combinations of national variables made gender ideology insignificant. In the end, the choice was made to keep the set of national variables whose choice is justified by the existing literature review (see section “Control variables (national level)”).

Among the variables at the national level, only the feminization rate of board members plays an effect and affects negatively job satisfaction.

Finally, we have examined the sensitivity of the results to changes in the definition of the dependent variable. Notably, instead of using the arithmetic mean of the five items to measure job satisfaction, we have conducted a principal component analysis in order to compute job satisfaction as a linear combination of the five items. The results of the models stay roughly the same.

Discussion

This study based on a European representative sample of workers shows that in 2015, the gender-job satisfaction paradox has disappeared in Europe, where women tend to report lower levels of job satisfaction than men. National gender ideology plays an important role, as people living in countries with a more egalitarian gender ideology report a higher level of job satisfaction; however, the increase in job satisfaction associated with living or working in a country with an egalitarian gender ideology is more important for men than for women. The results of this study allow us to discuss previous research on three main aspects.

The first aspect relates to the gender-job satisfaction paradox in itself. The results presented here show that in 2015, this paradox no longer exists in Europe. Women report the same level of job satisfaction as men in most countries, and in the seven countries where the gender difference is significant, women report a lower level of job satisfaction. In addition, Model 1 indicates that, when controlling for individual characteristics, women report a lower level of job satisfaction than men. This result contradicts some existing studies conducted during the same period. Notably, Perugini and Vladisavljević's (2019) study conducted on data from the 2013 EU SILC (Survey on Income and Living Conditions) shows that on average and all other things being equal, women report higher job satisfaction than men. Even more surprisingly, if we focus on one country, France for example, we find that in Perugini and Vladisavljević's study and the SILC survey, women report higher job satisfaction than men, while the opposite is true in the EWCS survey. This difference in results can be explained by the way job satisfaction is measured. While it is measured as a single question ("How do you evaluate your current job?") in the SILC, the EWCS provides a perhaps more precise measure by combining both a general question ("On the whole, are you very satisfied, satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with working conditions in your main paid job?") and more specific questions (e.g., "Considering all my efforts and achievements in my job, I feel I get paid appropriately"). The current study also provides results which contradicts Andrade et al.'s (2019) research, based on the 2015 wave of the International Social Survey Program, but this difference can be explained by the geographical perimeter which is not the same. The result of the current study tends to support previous research that asserted that the gender-job satisfaction paradox would be a transitory phenomenon (Clark, 1997; Kaiser, 2005; Perugini & Vladisavljević, 2019). However, our result goes further than that, as the gender-job satisfaction paradox has not only disappeared but has been replaced by a situation in which women tend to report lower levels of job satisfaction than men. This conclusion seems to support Stevenson and Wolfers' (2009) general assumption that women's expectations have increased faster than society has been able to meet them, specifically with respect to job satisfaction. The results found here are consistent with those found by Huang and Gamble (2015) in the Chinese retail sector and Webber and Rogers (2018) in the UK academia.

To our knowledge, no other study has shown that people report higher levels of job satisfaction in more egalitarian countries. Earlier studies that examine the relationship between gender, job satisfaction, and national situation related to gender equality only give attention to the gender gap in job satisfaction and not to the level of job satisfaction in itself (Kaiser, 2005; Perugini & Vladisavljević, 2019). Besides, previous

comparative research on the gender-job satisfaction paradox has focused on the concrete national situations regarding gender equality, and not on gender ideology (Perugini & Vladisavljević, 2019). One explanation for the higher levels of job satisfaction in more egalitarian countries might involve a connection between gender ideology and other socioeconomic and institutional indicators. A more egalitarian gender ideology would reflect a better socioeconomic and institutional situation more broadly, in which workers' rights are more respected and guaranteed, and in which working conditions are more favorable. This interpretation is supported by the fact that gender ideology becomes insignificant when variables about the socioeconomic context and the national situation regarding gender equality are controlled for (Model 3). This latest result suggests that, even though gender equality and gender ideology do not totally overlap (Otterbach et al., 2021), they play a similar role in shaping the gender-job satisfaction paradox. An important aspect of the current study is that gender ideology was measured through direct questions about the individual beliefs regarding women and men's roles, with questions closed to other research projects as the GLOBE project (Otterbach et al., 2021), and then they were aggregated to produce an average national gender ideology. Research on values and cultures has relied heavily on the aggregation of individual beliefs to produce a national index (Hofstede, 2011; Leung & Morris, 2015). Although this strategy has been criticized because it postulates a form on consensus within nations (Alvesson, 1987), the different indices computed in the current study (*r_{wg}*, ICC(1), ICC(2)) justify the aggregation of individual perceptions at the national level.

The third important aspect of the study is that the positive influence of a more egalitarian national gender ideology on job satisfaction is stronger for men than for women. This result gives the impression that women benefit less than men from living and working in an egalitarian country, yet creates a new sort of paradox, which to our knowledge, has not been pointed out by previous research. Indeed, it shows that in more egalitarian countries, women are even less happy than men than in more traditional countries, whereas previous research has mostly shown that women are not happier than men in more egalitarian countries (referred to as the disappearance of the usual gender-job satisfaction paradox) (Kaiser, 2005; Perugini & Vladisavljević, 2019). One way to explain this new paradox would be to use an updated version of the expectation theory, relating it to gender ideology and gender role socialization, thus answering the call made by Grönlund and Oün (2018). In countries with a more egalitarian gender ideology, the differences between women and men are supposed to be less important. Therefore, women tend to compare themselves not only to the group of women but to the whole group of workers. Even when inequalities remain at lower levels, women are consequently less satisfied than men. This interpretation is supported by the fact that the positive influence of a more egalitarian national gender ideology on job satisfaction remains stronger for men than for women even after controlling for national socioeconomic contexts and situations regarding gender equality (Model 3). This explanation relies on the notion of reference group, following Clark and Oswald (1996) and Clark (1997), who introduced the idea that relative working conditions are more important determinants of job satisfaction than absolute working conditions. Another explanation could be that in less egalitarian countries, women participate less in the labor market, and thus there exists a selection bias which suggests that only the women most interested in working are employed in a job. This selection bias could explain part of this new paradox.

Conclusion

Overall, this study offers new empirical insights into the gender-job satisfaction paradox. It incorporates more recent data than previous studies and adds a new perspective by relating it to national gender ideology, updating the expectation theory and showing that women do not have lower expectations than men anymore, especially in more egalitarian countries. The study avoids part of the common method bias because the data come from two different databases, national gender ideology being computed with responses from individuals (EVS) other than the ones who answered about their job satisfaction (EWCS survey). There is a slight difference in dates between the two databases (EWCS data: 2015; EVS data: 2017), but it should not

jeopardize the validity of our results, as the changes in gender ideology are very slow. Besides, national variables were added and come from other sources of data (e.g., OECD, EIGE).

Despite these advantages, the current study suffers from several limitations. First, other studies have shown that it is important to take into account not only the current national situation regarding gender equality, but more so the earlier situation, e.g., during the respondents' childhood (Perugini & Vladislavljević, 2019). Further research could extend this strategy to national gender ideology. Second, this study does not include possible gender effects related to part-time work, flexible work schedule, marital status or the number of children. It could be of interest to extend this research by studying the possible interaction effects between gender and those control variables. Third, the current study measures national gender ideology with the EVS survey, whereas other datasets could be used, such as the GLOBE project. Future research could check the eventual differences between the EVS survey and the GLOBE survey and see whether the results stay the same when measuring national gender ideology with the GLOBE survey.

References

- Acker, J. (1989). *Doing Comparable Worth : Gender, Class, and Pay Equity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Acker, J. (2009). From glass ceiling to inequality regimes. *Sociologie Du Travail*, 51(2), 199-217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soctra.2009.03.004>
- Alvesson, M. (1987). Organizations, Culture, and Ideology. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 17(3), 4-18.
- Andrade, M. S., Westover, J. H., & Peterson, J. (2019). Job Satisfaction and Gender. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 19(3), 22-40.
- Annesley, C., Engeli, I., & Gains, F. (2015). The profile of gender equality issue attention in Western Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 54(3), 525-542.
- Ashwin, S., & Isupova, O. (2018). Anatomy of a Stalled Revolution : Processes of Reproduction and Change in Russian Women's Gender Ideologies. *Gender & Society*, 32(4), 441-468. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243218776309>
- Bagger, J., & Li, A. (2012). Being important matters : The impact of work and family centralities on the family-to-work conflict-satisfaction relationship. *Human Relations*, 65(4), 473-500. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726711430557>
- Bagger, J., Li, A., & Gutek, B. A. (2008). How much do you value your family and does it matter? The joint effects of family identity salience, family-interference-with-work, and gender. *Human Relations*, 61(2), 187-211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707087784>
- Beblo, M., & Görge, L. (2018). On the nature of nurture. The malleability of gender differences in work preferences. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 151, 19-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2018.05.002>
- Bender, A.-F., & Pigeyre, F. (2016). Job evaluation and gender pay equity : A French example. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 35(4), 267-279. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-07-2015-0062>
- Bender, K. A., Donohue, S. M., & Heywood, J. S. (2005). Job satisfaction and gender segregation. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 57(3), 479-496. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oepp/gpi015>
- Bender, K. A., & Heywood, J. S. (2006). Job Satisfaction of the Highly Educated : The Role of Gender, Academic Tenure, and Earnings. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 53(2), 253-279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9485.2006.00379.x>

- Bergmann, N., Scheele, A., & Sorger, C. (2019). Variations of the same? A sectoral analysis of the gender pay gap in Germany and Austria. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 26(5), 668-687. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12299>
- Bliese, P. D. (1998). Group size, ICC values, and group-level correlations : A simulation. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1(4), 355-373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442819814001>
- Blossfeld, H.-P., Buchholz, S., Dämmrich, J., Kilpi-Jakonen, E., Kosyakova, Y., Skopek, J., ... Vono de Vilhena, D. (2015). Gender Differences at Labor Market Entry : The Effect of Changing Educational Pathways and Institutional Structures. In H.-P. Blossfeld, J. Skopek, M. Triventi, & S. Buchholz, *Gender, Education and Employment* (p. 3-34). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784715038.00008>
- Brunetto, Y., Teo, S. T. T., Shacklock, K., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, well-being and engagement : Explaining organisational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22(4), 428-441. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2012.00198.x>
- Buonocore, F., & Russo, M. (2013). Reducing the effects of work-family conflict on job satisfaction : The kind of commitment matters. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 23(1), 91-108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2011.00187.x>
- Caroli, E., & Godard, M. (2016). Does job insecurity deteriorate health? *Health Economics*, 25(2), 131-147. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3122>
- Christen, M., Iyer, G., & Soberman, D. (2006). Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, and Effort : A Reexamination Using Agency Theory. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(1), 137-150. JSTOR. Consulté à l'adresse JSTOR.
- Clark, A. A. (1997). Job satisfaction and gender : Why are women so happy at work? *Labour Economics*, 4(4), 341-372. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371\(97\)00010-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371(97)00010-9)
- Clark, A. A., & Oswald, A. J. (1996). Satisfaction and comparison income. *Journal of Public Economics*, 61(3), 359-381. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2727\(95\)01564-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2727(95)01564-7)
- Clark, A. A., Oswald, A., & Warr, P. (1996). Is job satisfaction U-shaped in age? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69(1), 57-81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1996.tb00600.x>
- Coron, C. (2018). Quels effets des mesures d'égalité professionnelle, en fonction de leur difficulté d'appropriation ? Une étude de cas. *Revue de gestion des ressources humaines*, 4(110), 41-53.
- Damaske, S. (2011). A "Major Career Woman"? : How Women Develop Early Expectations about Work. *Gender & Society*, 25(4), 409-430. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243211412050>
- Davis, S. N., & Greenstein, T. N. (2009). Gender Ideology : Components, Predictors, and Consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 87-105. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115920>
- Diekmann, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as Dynamic Constructs : Women and Men of the Past, Present, and Future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(10), 1171-1188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200262001>
- Dijkers, J., van Engen, M., & Vinkenburg, C. (2010). Flexible work : Ambitious parents' recipe for career success in The Netherlands. *Career Development International*, 15(6), 562-582. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431011084411>
- Dolan, S. L., Bejarano, A., & Tzafrir, S. (2011). Exploring the moderating effect of gender in the relationship between individuals' aspirations and career success among engineers in Peru. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(15), 3146-3167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.560883>

- Drydakis, N. (2017). Trans employees, transitioning, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 98, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2016.09.003>
- Eibl, B., Lang, F. R., & Niessen, C. (2020). Employee voice at work : The role of employees' gender, self-efficacy beliefs, and leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(4), 570-585. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1733979>
- Elm, D. R., Kennedy, E. J., & Lawton, L. (2001). Determinants of Moral Reasoning : Sex Role Orientation, Gender, and Academic Factors. *Business & Society*, 40(3), 241-265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765030104000302>
- Eskildsen, J. K., Kristensen, K., & Westlund, A. H. (2004). Work motivation and job satisfaction in the Nordic countries. *Employee Relations*, 26(2), 122-136. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450410511043>
- Fenton-O'Creevy, M. (1995). Moderators of Differences In Job Satisfaction Between Full-Time and Part-Time Female Employees : A Research Note. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 5(5), 75-81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.1995.tb00391.x>
- Ficapal-Cusí, P., Díaz-Chao, A., Sainz-Ibáñez, M., & Torrent-Sellens, J. (2018). Gender inequalities in job quality during the recession. *Employee Relations*, 40(1), 2-22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-07-2016-0139>
- Flickinger, M., Allscher, M., & Fiedler, M. (2016). The mediating role of leader–member exchange : A study of job satisfaction and turnover intentions in temporary work. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 26(1), 46-62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12091>
- García, G. A., Gonzales-Miranda, D. R., Gallo, O., & Roman-Calderon, J. P. (2019). Employee involvement and job satisfaction : A tale of the millennial generation. *Employee Relations*, 41(3), 374-388. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2018-0100>
- Garner, P., & Laroche, P. (2016). Les effets du sentiment d'efficacité personnelle sur la relation entre l'équilibre travail-famille et la satisfaction au travail. *Revue de gestion des ressources humaines*, 2(100), 41-60.
- Gaunt, R., & Benjamin, O. (2007). Job insecurity, stress and gender : The moderating role of gender ideology. *Community, Work & Family*, 10(3), 341-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800701456336>
- Goldstein, H., Browne, W., & Rasbash, J. (2002). Partitioning Variation in Multilevel Models. *Understanding Statistics: Statistical Issues in Psychology, Education, and the Social Sciences*, 1(4), 223-231. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328031US0104_02
- Gottfried, H. (2009). Japan : The Reproductive Bargain and the Making of Precarious. In L. F. Vosko, M. MacDonald, & I. Campbell (Éds.), *Gender and the contours of precarious employment* (p. 90-105). Routledge.
- Grönlund, A., & Öun, I. (2018). The gender-job satisfaction paradox and the dual-earner society : Are women (still) making work-family trade-offs? *Work*, 59(4), 535-545. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-182708>
- Grunow, D., Begall, K., & Buchler, S. (2018). Gender Ideologies in Europe : A Multidimensional Framework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(1), 42-60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12453>
- Hakim, C. (2006). Women, careers, and work-life preferences. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 34(3), 279-294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069880600769118>
- Hauret, L., & Williams, D. R. (2017). Cross-National Analysis of Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 56(2), 203-235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/irel.12171>
- Hodson, R. (1989). Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 30(3), 385-399. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1989.tb01527.x>
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures : The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>

- Huang, Q., & Gamble, J. (2015). Social expectations, gender and job satisfaction : Front-line employees in China's retail sector. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25(3), 331-347. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12066>
- Hünefeld, L., Gerstenberg, S., & Hüffmeier, J. (2020). Job satisfaction and mental health of temporary agency workers in Europe : A systematic review and research agenda. *Work & Stress*, 34(1), 82-110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2019.1567619>
- Jijena Michel, R. D., & Jijena Michel, C. E. (2015). Work Schedule Flexibility, Work-Family Enrichment and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 25(1), 78-90.
- Jones, M. K., Jones, R. J., Latreille, P. L., & Sloane, P. J. (2009). Training, Job Satisfaction, and Workplace Performance in Britain : Evidence from WERS 2004. *Labour*, 23(s1), 139-175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9914.2008.00434.x>
- Kaiser, L. C. (2005). *Gender-job satisfaction differences across Europe : An indicator for labor market modernization* (IZA Discussion paper series N° 1876; p. 1-28). Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- Kosteas, V. D. (2013). Gender Role Attitudes, Labor Supply, and Human Capital Formation. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 52(4), 915-940. <https://doi.org/10.1111/irel.12040>
- Kroska, A. (2000). Conceptualizing and measuring gender ideology as an identity. *Gender & Society*, 14(3), 368-394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124300014003002>
- Lange, T. (2008). Communist Legacies, Gender and the Impact on Job Satisfaction in Central and Eastern Europe. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 14(3), 327-346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959680108094138>
- Lange, T. (2015). Social capital and job satisfaction : The case of Europe in times of economic crisis. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 21(3), 275-290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959680114542907>
- Lee, K. S. (2006). Gender Beliefs and the Meaning of Work Among Okinawan Women. *Gender & Society*, 20(3), 382-401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243206286727>
- Lee, R., & Wilbur, E. R. (1985). Age, Education, Job Tenure, Salary, Job Characteristics, and Job Satisfaction : A Multivariate Analysis. *Human Relations*, 38(8), 781-791. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678503800806>
- Leung, K., & Morris, M. W. (2015). Values, schemas, and norms in the culture-behavior nexus : A situated dynamics framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46(9), 1028-1050. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.66>
- Linz, S. J., & Semykina, A. (2012). What Makes Workers Happy? Anticipated Rewards and Job Satisfaction. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 51(4), 811-844. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-232X.2012.00702.x>
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is Job Satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 309-336.
- Muñoz de Bustillo, R., & de Pedraza, P. (2010). Determinants of job insecurity in five European countries. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 16(1), 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959680109355306>
- Ng, E. S., & Sears, G. J. (2017). The glass ceiling in context : The influence of CEO gender, recruitment practices and firm internationalisation on the representation of women in management: The glass ceiling in context. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 133-151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12135>
- Orloff, A. S. (1993). Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship : The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States. *American Sociological Review*, 58(3), 303. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095903>
- Otterbach, S., Sousa-Poza, A., & Zhang, X. (2021). Gender differences in perceived workplace harassment and gender egalitarianism : A comparative cross-national analysis. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, 30(3), 392-411. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12338>

- Pedulla, D. S., & Thébaud, S. (2015). Can We Finish the Revolution? Gender, Work-Family Ideals, and Institutional Constraint. *American Sociological Review*, 80(1), 116-139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414564008>
- Perugini, C., & Vladisavljević, M. (2019). Gender inequality and the gender-job satisfaction paradox in Europe. *Labour Economics*, 60, 129-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2019.06.006>
- Powell, G. N., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2010). Sex, Gender, and Decisions at the Family → Work Interface. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 1011-1039. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309350774>
- Pujol-Cols, L. J., & Dabos, G. E. (2018). Satisfacción laboral : Una revisión de la literatura acerca de sus principales determinantes. *Journal of Management and Economics for Iberoamerica*, 34(146), 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.18046/j.estger.2018.146.2809>
- Renkema, M., Meijerink, J., & Bondarouk, T. (2016). Advancing multilevel thinking and methods in HRM research. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 3(2), 204-218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-03-2016-0027>
- Rose, M. (2003). Good Deal, Bad Deal? Job Satisfaction in Occupations. *Work, Employment and Society*, 17(3), 503-530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170030173006>
- Sawang, S. (2010). Moderation or Mediation? An Examination of the Role Perceived Managerial Support has on Job satisfaction and Psychological Strain. *Current Psychology*, 29(3), 247-256. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-010-9083-9>
- Shieh, G. (2016). Choosing the best index for the average score intraclass correlation coefficient. *Behavior Research Methods*, 48(3), 994-1003. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0623-y>
- Smith, M. (2009). Gender, Pay and Work Satisfaction at a UK University. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 16(5), 621-641. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00403.x>
- Smyth, E., & Steinmetz, S. (2008). Field of Study and Gender Segregation in European Labour Markets. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 49(4-5), 257-281. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715208093077>
- Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A. A. (2000). Taking Another Look at the Gender/Job-Satisfaction Paradox. *Kyklos*, 53(2), 135-152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6435.00114>
- Stevenson, B., & Wolfers, J. (2009). The paradox of declining female happiness. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 1(2), 190-225.
- Stojmenovska, D. (2019). Management gender composition and the gender pay gap : Evidence from British panel data. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 26(5), 738-764. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12264>
- Sweet, S., Sarkisian, N., Matz-Costa, C., & Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (2016). Are women less career centric than men? Structure, culture, and identity investments. *Community, Work & Family*, 19(4), 481-500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2015.1078287>
- Tabvuma, V., Georgellis, Y., & Lange, T. (2015). Orientation Training and Job Satisfaction : A Sector and Gender Analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 54(2), 303-321. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21650>
- Tlaiss, H. A., & Mendelson, M. B. (2014). Predicting women's job satisfaction with personal demographics : Evidence from a Middle Eastern country. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(3), 434-458. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.792859>
- Top, M., Akdere, M., & Tarcan, M. (2015). Examining transformational leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational trust in Turkish hospitals : Public servants versus private sector employees. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(9), 1259-1282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.939987>

- Valet, P. (2018). Social Structure and the Paradox of the Contented Female Worker : How Occupational Gender Segregation Biases Justice Perceptions of Wages. *Work and Occupations*, 45(2), 168-193.
- Vespa, J. (2009). Gender Ideology Construction : A Life Course and Intersectional Approach. *Gender & Society*, 23(3), 363-387. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243209337507>
- Webber, K. L., & Rogers, S. M. (2018). Gender Differences in Faculty Member Job Satisfaction : Equity Forestalled? *Research in Higher Education*, 59(8), 1105-1132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-018-9494-2>
- Wilkin, C. L. (2013). I can't get no job satisfaction : Meta-analysis comparing permanent and contingent workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(1), 47-64. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1790>
- Woehr, D. J., Loignon, A. C., Schmidt, P. B., Loughry, M. L., & Ohland, M. W. (2015). Justifying Aggregation With Consensus-Based Constructs : A Review and Examination of Cutoff Values for Common Aggregation Indices. *Organizational Research Methods*, 18(4), 704-737. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428115582090>
- Young, M. C. (2010). Gender Differences in Precarious Work Settings. *Relations Industrielles*, 65(1), 74-97. <https://doi.org/10.7202/039528ar>
- Zhao, K., Zhang, M., & Foley, S. (2019). Testing two mechanisms linking work-to-family conflict to individual consequences : Do gender and gender role orientation make a difference? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(6), 988-1009. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1282534>
- Zou, M. (2015). Gender, work orientations and job satisfaction. *Work, Employment and Society*, 29(1), 3-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017014559267>

Tables and figures

Table 1. An inconsistent literature (some examples)

Relationship between sex (fact to be a woman) and job satisfaction	Reference	Country and sample
+	Hodson (1989)	US (Wisconsin), Full-time workers
	Clark (1997)	UK, Employees
	Lange (2008)	The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovak Republic and Slovenia, Employees
	Wilkin (2013)	Meta-analysis, Permanent and contingent workers
	Tabvuma et al. (2015)	UK, Newcomers
	Zou (2015)	UK, Employees
	Grönlund and Öun (2018)	Sweden, Newly graduated highly educated workers
	Perugini and Vladislavljevic (2019)	32 European countries, Employees
=	Eskildsen et al. (2004)	Nordic countries, Employees
	Bender and Heywood (2006)	US, PhD level scientists (Academia and non-Academia)
	Andrade et al. (2019)	37 European countries, Employees
-	Huang and Gamble (2015)	China, Employees in the retail sector
	Webber and Rogers (2018)	US, Tenure-track Faculty members

Table 2. Sample by country

Country	# of respondents
Albania	481
Austria	759
Bulgaria	840
Croatia	787
Czech Republic	802
Denmark	886
Estonia	843
Finland	856
France	1,299
Germany	1,657
Hungary	761
Italy	862
Lithuania	836
Montenegro	659
Netherlands	805
Norway	892
Poland	795
Portugal	604
Republic of North Macedonia	691
Romania	741
Serbia	663
Slovakia	758
Slovenia	1,336
Spain	2,436
Sweden	927
Switzerland	863

Table 3. Main descriptive statistics

	Whole sample (23,839)	Women (12,311)	Men (11,528)
Job satisfaction	m=3.63 sd=0.78	m=3.60 sd=0.75	m=3.65 sd=0.80
Part-time			
Part-time	14.83	22.21	7.92
Full-time	85.17	77.79	92.08
Time arrangement			
Set by the company	63.70	65.37	62.12
Choose between several schedules	7.75	8.75	6.81
Adaptation within certain limits	18.11	17.46	18.73
Entirely determined by the respondent	10.43	8.42	12.33
Type of contract			
Unlimited duration	84.64	84.28	84.99
Limited duration	14.01	14.44	13.59
Agency contract	1.35	1.27	1.43
Managerial status			
Manager	16.45	12.19	20.49
Non-manager	83.55	87.81	79.51
Age	m=42.08 sd=11.80	m=41.97 sd=11.25	m=42.19 sd=12.36
Tenure	m=10.17 sd=9.78	m=9.89 sd=9.35	m=10.43 sd=10.22
Educational attainment			
Primary edu.	2.40	2.21	2.58
Lower secondary edu.	9.11	8.03	10.13
Upper secondary edu.	45.69	41.91	49.27
Post sec. edu.	8.46	8.78	8.17
Short-cycle tertiary edu.	8.27	9.69	6.92
Bachelor	14.13	16.59	11.80
Master or Doctorate	11.94	12.80	11.12
Skills			
Underskilled	14.46	14.81	14.14
Skilled	57.76	58.87	56.72
Overskilled	27.77	26.32	29.14
Number of children			
0	50.03	46.07	53.78
1-2	43.76	47.45	40.27
3 and more	6.21	6.48	5.95
Marital status			
Living with spouse/partner	69.94	69.71	70.15
Living without spouse/partner	30.06	30.29	29.85
Sector			
Private	66.72	59.32	73.72
Public	27.15	34.09	20.59
Joint private-public	3.80	3.68	3.91
Not-for-profit	1.04	1.46	0.65
Other	1.29	1.45	1.14
Company size			
1	3.19	2.84	3.53
2-9	21.03	21.32	20.73
10-249	41.73	42.34	41.15
250+	30.26	29.46	31.03
Don't know	3.80	4.04	3.56

Table 4. Gender ideology by country (in descending order for gender ideology values)

Country	Gender ideology
Norway	3.56
Sweden	3.54
Denmark	3.46
Spain	3.32
France	3.25
Finland	3.24
Netherlands	3.16
Germany	3.13
Switzerland	3.06
Austria	3.04
Portugal	2.93
Slovenia	2.90
Estonia	2.88
Croatia	2.86
Italy	2.75
Albania	2.72
Hungary	2.72
Poland	2.72
Czech Republic	2.68
Serbia	2.68
Romania	2.63
Bulgaria	2.62
Republic of North Macedonia	2.61
Montenegro	2.60
Slovakia	2.56
Lithuania	2.54

Table 5. Correlation matrix

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Job satisfaction	3.63	0.78	1					
2. Age	42.08	11.80	-0.06***	1				
3. Age-squared	1907	1009	-0.05***	0.99***	1			
4. Tenure	10.17	9.78	-0.01**	0.57***	0.57***	1		
5. Tenure-squared	197.33	331.39	-0.01	0.51***	0.52***	0.94***	1	
6. Gender ideology	2.98	0.31	0.11***	0.02***	0.03***	0.15**	0.03***	1

*** : p<0.01, ** : p<0.05, * : p<0.1

Table 6. Average job satisfaction by sex

Country	Women (m, sd)	Men (m, sd)
Albania	3.38 (0.87)	3.40 (0.85)
Austria*	3.75 (0.71)	3.85 (0.74)
Bulgaria	3.72 (0.77)	3.79 (0.89)
Croatia	3.37 (0.78)	3.43 (0.90)
Czech Republic	3.69 (0.70)	3.69 (0.74)
Denmark	3.95 (0.64)	4.00 (0.68)
Estonia	3.62 (0.63)	3.63 (0.75)
Finland***	3.75 (0.68)	3.94 (0.65)
France***	3.39 (0.72)	3.54 (0.79)
Germany	3.66 (0.68)	3.65 (0.74)
Hungary	3.62 (0.81)	3.57 (0.83)
Italy	3.40 (0.65)	3.43 (0.69)
Lithuania	3.45 (0.72)	3.46 (0.76)
Montenegro	3.51 (0.91)	3.44 (0.76)
Netherlands	3.81 (0.65)	3.80 (0.69)
Norway**	3.92 (0.64)	4.01 (0.67)
Poland	3.59 (0.71)	3.58 (0.80)
Portugal	3.63 (0.71)	3.67 (0.84)
Republic of North Macedonia	3.74 (0.84)	3.67 (0.91)
Romania***	3.66 (0.69)	3.85 (0.69)
Serbia	3.32 (0.82)	3.30 (0.85)
Slovakia**	3.29 (0.70)	3.42 (0.80)
Slovenia	3.44 (0.80)	3.51 (0.88)
Spain	3.60 (0.79)	3.60 (0.85)
Sweden***	3.62 (0.69)	3.74 (0.65)
Switzerland	3.82 (0.65)	3.86 (0.78)

*** : p<0.01, ** : p<0.05, * : p<0.1

Table 7. Models

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Intercept	4.26 (0.08)***	3.53 (0.28)***	5.32 (2.57)*
Sex (ref. Man)			
Woman	-0.04 (0.01)***	0.12 (0.10)	0.14 (0.11)
Gender ideology	-	0.25 (0.09)***	0.31 (0.32)
Sex x Gender ideology			
Woman x Gender ideology	-	-0.06 (0.03)*	-0.06 (0.03)*
Part-time (ref. Full-time)			
Part-time	-0.05 (0.01)***	-0.05 (0.01)***	-0.05 (0.02)***
Time arrangement (ref. Set by the company)			
Choose between several schedules	0.17 (0.01)***	0.17 (0.01)***	0.18 (0.01)***
Adaptation within certain limits	0.04 (0.02)*	0.04 (0.02)**	0.04 (0.02)*
Entirely determined by the respondent	0.27 (0.02)***	0.27 (0.02)***	0.27 (0.03)***
Type of contract (ref. Unlimited duration)			
Limited duration	-0.10 (0.02)***	-0.10 (0.02)***	-0.11 (0.02)***
Agency contract	-0.34 (0.05)***	-0.34 (0.05)***	-0.34 (0.05)***
Managerial status (ref. Non-manager)			
Manager	0.17 (0.01)***	0.17 (0.01)***	0.16 (0.02)***
Age	-0.03 (0.00)***	-0.03 (0.00)***	-0.03 (0.00)***
Age ²	0.00 (0.00)***	0.00 (0.00)***	0.00 (0.00)***
Tenure	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)**
Tenure ²	0.00 (0.00)**	0.00 (0.00)**	0.00 (0.00)***
Educational attainment (ref. Upper secondary edu.)			
Primary edu.	-0.09 (0.04)**	-0.09 (0.04)**	-0.09 (0.04)**
Lower secondary edu.	-0.09 (0.02)***	-0.09 (0.02)***	-0.08 (0.02)***
Post sec. edu.	0.04 (0.02)*	0.03 (0.02)*	0.02 (0.02)
Short-cycle tertiary edu.	0.15 (0.02)***	0.15 (0.02)***	0.14 (0.02)***
Bachelor	0.21 (0.02)***	0.21 (0.02)***	0.18 (0.02)***
Master or Doctorate	0.24 (0.02)***	0.24 (0.02)***	0.22 (0.02)***
Skills (ref. Skilled)			
Underskilled	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.02)
Overskilled	-0.06 (0.01)***	-0.06 (0.01)***	-0.07 (0.01)***
Number of children (ref. 0)			
1-2	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
3 and more	-0.00 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)
Marital status (ref. Living with partner)			
Living without partner	-0.02 (0.01)*	-0.02 (0.01)*	-0.03 (0.01)**
Sector (ref. Private)			
Public	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)
Joint private-public	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	0.03 (0.03)
Not-for-profit	-0.00 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)
Other	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.05)
Company size (ref. 10-249)			
1	0.02 (0.06)	0.02 (0.06)	0.01 (0.07)
2-9	0.12 (0.01)***	0.12 (0.01)***	0.13 (0.02)***
250+	-0.02 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.01)
Don't know	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)
National variables			
GDP/capita	-	-	0.00 (0.00)
HDI	-	-	-0.73 (2.35)
Employment Protection Index	-	-	-0.02 (0.09)
Quotas (ref. At national and subnational levels)			
At national or subnational level			
No legal quotas	-	-	0.04 (0.17)
Fem. Rate National Parliaments	-	-	-0.01 (0.11)
GDI	-	-	0.09 (0.62)
Gender Pay Gap	-	-	-1.46 (1.50)
Fem. Rate Board Presidents	-	-	0.00 (0.01)
Fem. Rate Board Members	-	-	-0.00 (0.01)
-2*Log Likelihood	48929	48929	-0.01 (0.01)*
			40194

AIC	48933	48933	40198
Variation explained by national level	4.43%	3.74%	3.11%

*** : $p < 0.01$, ** : $p < 0.05$, * : $p < 0.1$

Figure 1. Interaction effect between sex and national gender ideology

