Women's work: myth or reality? Occupational feminisation and women's job satisfaction in Australia

ALFRED MICHAEL DOCKERY *Bankwest Curtin Economics Centre, Curtin University*
SANDRA BUCHLER *Faculty of Social Science, Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main*

Abstract

Data on men and women's job satisfaction conditional upon the degree of feminisation of their occupation are used to explore potential causes of occupational segregation by gender in the Australian labour market. We find some evidence for the notion of 'women's work' – that certain occupations are highly feminised because women prefer the type of work done in those occupations. However, this primarily applies to mothers and the results also support the view that occupational segregation is generated by societal norms around roles allocated to men and women. In particular, patterns in satisfaction with hours of work and with pay in highly feminised occupations are consistent with mothers taking on the role of the 'secondary breadwinner'. In contrast to suggestions in some of the existing Australian literature, the results also indicate that more highly feminised occupations are relatively poorly paid, other things held equal.

JEL Codes: J28, J71, J24
Keywords: Occupational sex segregation, job satisfaction, identity

Acknowledgement: This report uses unit record data from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey. The HILDA project was initiated and is funded by the Australian Government Department of Social Services (DSS) and is managed by the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research (Melbourne Institute). The findings and views reported in this paper are those of the author and should not be attributed to DSS or the Melbourne Institute.

Corresponding author: Associate Professor Mike Dockery, Bankwest Curtin Economics Centre, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth WA 6845, Australia. Email: m.dockery@curtin.edu.au

Introduction

This paper provides evidence on the nature of occupational segregation and its role in shaping differential labour market outcomes for men and women using Australian data. The Australian labour market displays clear gender-based differences reflecting lower opportunity for women, including a persistent gender wage gap, lower rates of female labour force participation and stark over-representation of women among part-time workers (Barns and Preston, 2010; Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2021a,b). The Australian labour market also displays a high degree of occupational segregation by gender. This is important because gender segregation across occupations is intertwined with inequalities in labour market outcomes by gender. Its root cause has implications for the extent to which gender differences should be considered discriminatory and, accordingly, the target of equity policy.

On the one hand it can be argued that women experience lower wages and more precarious employment arrangements because they choose to work in jobs offering those conditions. For example, it is argued that women have a preference for occupations which require 'feminine' skills associated with the traditional household division of labour, such as caring, cooking and cleaning roles (Huppatz and Goodwin, 2013). If those roles are not as highly valued in the market, then women will find themselves lower paid. Similarly, women may choose to enter occupations that offer part-time and more flexible working arrangements to enable them to realise priorities in non-work domains. Conceivably, occupational segregation and the lower wages and other outcomes associated with highly feminised occupations may simply reflect differences in preferences of men and women.

An alternative hypothesis is that the gendered nature of career paths – potentially commencing from early childhood and perpetuated through historically grounded social and institutional settings – disproportionately channel women into particular occupations. It has been argued that highly feminised occupations are low paid *because* they are highly feminised (England, Allison and Wu, 2007; Macdonald and Charlesworth, 2013).

The critical difference between these two views of occupational segregation is the extent to which women are seen to exercise free choice of careers and associated occupations. To explore this, we investigate employee job satisfaction conditional upon the degree of feminisation of their occupation. Our data contain self-assessed ratings of overall job satisfaction, and of satisfaction with specific job aspects: total pay, job security, 'the work itself', hours worked and flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments. While it is difficult to know exactly how reports of job satisfaction relate to occupational preferences, we show that there is fundamental shift in patterns of women's job satisfaction once they take on mothering roles. Relative to other workers, women who have had children are markedly more satisfied with the type of work done, flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments and their pay, when working in more feminised occupations. In contrast, for women who have not had children, working

in a more feminised occupation is not associated with greater satisfaction with the type of work done, and is associated with strong dissatisfaction with their pay. The results are consistent with literature suggesting a shift in women's identities with motherhood. We further argue they are consistent with occupational segregation being driven primarily by socially constructed norms around women's roles rather than an innate preference for particular types of work.

Background

Gender segregation and the Australian labour market

In the spirit of Gary S. Becker's Human Capital theory (1964) and his Treatise on The Family (1981), occupational segregation by gender can be seen as arising from women making rational, cost-benefit type decisions. Hakim (2000) argues that gender differences in labour market participation can be explained by differences in the preferences of males and females, and by taking account of changes in women's preferences over stages of the life cycle. Hakim's emphasis on individual choice is commonly used as a point of departure by those who instead stress the importance of constraints on women's occupational choices (for example, Crompton and Harris, 1998; Duncan, Edwards, Reynolds and Alldred, 2003; Hill, 2007; Karamessini and Ioakimoglou, 2007). These include norms and stereotypes about appropriate occupations for men and women (Acker, 1992; Kanji and Hupka-Brunner, 2015), the gendered within-household division between paid and unpaid work (Baxter, Hewitt and Haynes, 2008; Craig and Bittman, 2008; Ting, Perales and Baxter, 2016), and appropriate mothering behavior (Faircloth, 2014). In turn, institutional settings (Crompton and Harris, 1998) and normative or moral frameworks (Duncan *et al.*, 2003) develop that reinforce those stereotypes, for example, employers' perceptions of women as less stable employees may affect decisions relating to employee recruitment and progression (Rubery, Fagan and Maier, 1996). Importantly, occupational segregation has been attributed as a causal factor in women's labour market disadvantage (Mandel and Semyonov, 2005).

There are stark gender differences in the Australian labour market, whereby women are markedly more likely than men to be working in marginal, part-time employment (Barns and Preston, 2010). In 2019 the female labour force participation rate averaged 60.9 per cent, 10.2 percentage points lower than the male rate of 71.1 per cent (ABS 2021a)[1]. While a marked improvement on the 35 percentage point gap recorded when this Labour Force Survey series commenced in early 1978 (43.4 per cent for women

1 Figures are cited to 2019. This coincides with the final wave of the HILDA data used in this study, and also predates any impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the Australian labour market.

compared to 79.3 per cent for men), the growth in women's labour force participation has been mainly in part-time employment and has largely stalled since 2009. Once in work, women are more than twice as likely to work part-time than are men (45.8 per cent compared to 18.9 per cent in 2019; ABS, 2021a).

The ongoing gap in labour force engagement persists despite women now being more likely than men to gain university level qualifications, and reflects different social roles for Australian men and women. While a wide variety of arrangements and attitudes slowly chip away at the 'male breadwinner/female carer' gender order that was at its peak in the 1950s, much of that model remains engrained in Australian culture (Broomhill and Sharp, 2005; Hill, 2007; Van Egmond, Baxter, Buchler and Western, 2010; Baxter and Hewitt, 2013). Based on 1996 Census data, Lee and Miller (2004) show that occupation segregation stems primarily from gender differences in occupations at entry to the labour market. Research points to substantial continuing gender segregation in the pathways taken by more recent cohorts of Australian school leavers (Buchler and Dockery, 2015) and minimal change in segregation by occupation and industry over the past three decades (Lind and Colquhoun, 2021).

Occupational segregation, the gender wage gap and the motherhood penalty

On average, Australian women earn lower wages than men even when seemingly doing equivalent jobs. In November 2019, average weekly ordinary-time earnings of full-time male employees were 16 per cent higher than for females (ABS 2021b). This difference has been found to be already apparent at labour market entry, where women earn 20 per cent less than their male counterparts in their first significant job, with a portion (4 per cent) remaining significant when numerous job characteristics, such as hours worked, occupation and education, are controlled (Buchler and Dockery, 2015).

There is ongoing debate on the contribution of occupational segregation to the gender wage gap. Recent studies in the international literature generally point to occupational segregation being a contributing factor to wage inequality (Blau and Kahn, 2000; Mandel and Semyonov, 2005; Karamessini and Ioakimoglou, 2007). Hakim (1992: 128) reviewed earlier studies to suggest 20 to 25 per cent as a 'reasonable estimate' of the contribution of job segregation to gender wage differentials. In contrast, Australian studies have suggested women's wages are higher as a result of this segregation (Lee and Miller, 2004; Barón and Cobb-Clark, 2010). That is, women in Australia would have lower pay if they had the same occupational distribution as men.

Using data from the 2001 to 2006 waves of HILDA, Barón and Cobb-Clark (2010) find that the wage gap can be largely explained by observable characteristics for workers in the public sector and those in the lower part of the wage distribution, but not for workers in the upper end of the wage distribution. Thus they conclude gender discrimination in Australia takes the form of 'glass ceilings' rather than 'sticky floors'. Barón and Cobb-Clark (2010) also find that the inclusion of occupational controls significantly increases the 'unexplained' proportion of the gender wage gap, leading them to ponder "…why does

occupational segregation seem to improve rather than undermine the relative wages of women in Australia when then [sic] opposite appears to be the case in other countries?".

Barón and Cobb-Clark's assessment derives partly from Lee and Miller's (2004) calculation based on 1996 data which suggested the gender wage gap is attributable to intra-occupation differences rather than differences in pay rates between occupations. They calculate the contribution of occupational distribution to be negative: "The quite different occupational distributions of men and women actually lead to women having slightly higher earnings than would otherwise have been the case." (Lee and Miller, 2004: 359). However, this calculation is based on only 9 different occupational categories. Lee and Miller note that if the exercise is repeated using the 44 minor occupational categories, the result reverses but "… is economically unimportant" (2004: 359). We, however, argue that an even finer level of disaggregation is needed to adequately capture occupational segregation, a tenet that has been argued by Barns and Preston (2010) in the context of examining the gender wage gap in Australia.

In addition to occupational segregation, research has shown that a second factor plays a substantial role in the gender wage gap: women's responsibility for childrearing. Research consistently finds, across numerous Western nations, that mothers earn not only significantly less than men, but they also earn less than non-mothers (Budig and England, 2001; Anderson, Binder and Krause, 2003; Correll, 2013). This difference is usually found to be 5–7 per cent lower wages per child compared to childless women who are otherwise equal (Budig and England, 2001). The existence of a motherhood penalty despite controls for human capital, workplace and other factors leads researchers to suspect a bias against mothers (Correll, 2013).

These two factors, occupational segregation and women's responsibility for childrearing, however, have been argued to be largely unrelated (England, 2005). Specifically, that the causes of segregation are not related to women's mothering responsibilities, and that penalties associated with motherhood are not caused by segregation (England, 2005). Part-time work, however, is more common amongst mothers and it is more common in highly feminised occupations (Chalmers, Campbell and Charlesworth, 2005; Sobeck, 2022).

Recently, US economist Claudia Goldin has promoted the concept of 'greedy jobs' to position gender wage differentials within the compensating differentials framework (Goldin, 2014; Goldin and Katz, 2011; Sobeck, 2022). Greedy jobs are those that offer high rewards for working long hours of work and inflexibility of working hours. If, as is typically the case, women have a stronger preference for flexible working arrangements, gender segregation (male over-representation) in greedy jobs can account for part of the gender wage gap, and attribute it to differences in preferences of men and women. Sobeck (2022) provides evidence that greedy jobs also exist in Australia and contribute significantly to the gender pay gap, although not to the same extent as in the US. The phenomenon of 'greedy jobs' may account for some to the motherhood penalty, given mothers are particularly adverse to jobs with long and inflexible working arrangements.

Women's job satisfaction

Despite lower wages women are consistently found to have higher levels of job satisfaction than men, something which is often referred to as the 'the paradox of the contented female worker' (Bender, Donohue and Heywood, 2005: 482). This has been found in studies across a range of countries, including the UK (Clark, 1997; Sloane and Williams, 2000; Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2000; Gazioglu and Tansel, 2006), US (Bender, Donohue and Heywood, 2005), Canada (Dilmaghani 2022), Korea (Kim, 2005) and Australia (Kifle, Kler and Shankar, 2014a; Long 2005). Based on analyses of the 1991 British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), Clark's (1997) preferred explanation for the paradox was that women then had lower expectations due to their generally inferior labour market outcomes at that time, drawing support for this in finding the gender satisfaction differential is not present for groups of women likely to have higher expectations: the young, more highly educated, whose mothers were professionals and who work in male dominated workplaces. Hence, he suggested the phenomenon may be transitory, and disappear as women's relative position in the labour market improved. With the benefit of BHPS data through to 2014, Green *et al.* (2018) revisit Clark's prediction to find, indeed, the gender job satisfaction difference in Britain had disappeared by 2012-14, as female workers became less satisfied as they aged and new cohorts of young female workers entered the labour market with relatively lower job satisfaction.

A second explanation is self-selection. Because women have lower employment rates and are more likely to take on roles outside of the paid labour market, women who are dissatisfied with their jobs may be more likely to leave their jobs than men who are dissatisfied. However, several empirical studies have found the gender satisfaction differential is robust to controls for selection (Clark, 1997; Hauret and Williams, 2017; Perugini and Vladisavljević, 2019).

International comparative studies have produced conflicting evidence on the gender/job-satisfaction paradox across countries. Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza (2000) found that only eight out of 21 countries show a gap in job satisfaction in favour of women and, after adding controls, significant differences only remain for Great Britain, the US and Switzerland (Australia was not considered). This leads the authors to argue that a large job satisfaction differential in favour of women is a predominantly Anglo-Saxon phenomenon. Examining variations in labour market and welfare state regimes in Europe, Kaiser (2007) finds that the gender/job-satisfaction paradox is more likely in countries where women's labour market access is more restricted. This suggests that when institutional labour market interventions that enable equal opportunities for men and women have been implemented, for example in the Scandinavian countries, women no longer have higher levels of job satisfaction. This is supported by Perugini and Vladisavljević's (2019) analyses of gender job satisfaction differentials in 32 European countries. They find a significant job satisfaction difference in favour of women that is lower for women exposed to more equal labour force participation rates by gender in their early life stages. They argue this is consistent with Clark's (1997) hypothesis of women's lower expectations as the explanation for the contented female worker paradox.

In contrast, Hauret and Williams' (2017) analysis of 2010 European Social Survey data for 14 countries found the gender paradox to apply only in the Nordic group of countries. Using data from the 2015 International Social Survey Programme pooled for 37 countries, Andrade, Westover and Peterson (2019) find no statistically significant difference in men's and women's level of job satisfaction once extrinsic and intrinsic job rewards were controlled for. In models estimated for individual country models, only Georgia returned a significant gender effect. Dilmaghani's (2022) Canadian study also found that variables capturing subjective intrinsic job reward accounted for the gender gap in job satisfaction, but such results still leave open the question of why women experience higher intrinsic reward or place higher value on intrinsic reward in their assessments of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction and occupational gender segregation

Research from the US and UK has shown that women report higher levels of job satisfaction in female dominated workplaces (Bender, Donohue and Heywood, 2005; Clark, 1997; Dilmaghani and Tabvuma, 2019; Sloane and Williams, 2000). Bender, Donohue and Heywood (2005), however, show with US data that this association becomes non-significant when job flexibility is accounted for. Specifically, they find that when feelings that one must choose between family and advancing one's career is taken into account[2] the baseline effect of being female on job satisfaction becomes non-significant. They argue that women place greater value on flexibility between work and home lives, and self-select into workplaces with more job flexibility. It is, however, also plausible that industries that are dominated by women offer higher levels of flexibility as their workforce requires it due to family care responsibilities. Regardless of the explanation, these findings suggest that having responsibility for children, which leads women to seek out flexible workplaces, is of central importance for explaining the 'the paradox of the contented female worker'.

Indeed, Fleming and Kler (2014) and Kifle, Kler and Shankar (2014b) find that having children is associated with higher levels of job satisfaction amongst Australian women. Specifically, over-educated employees are more satisfied with their job overall, with pay, type of work, hours and workplace flexibility if they are mothers (as opposed to men and non-mothers) (Fleming and Kler, 2014). Women with young children who work part-time are found to be particularly satisfied with hours worked (in comparison to women with older children or no children) and work-life balance (in comparison to women with older children). This is the opposite of the findings for full-time employees, where mothers of young children are significantly less satisfied compared to both groups on both measures (Kifle, Kler and Shankar, 2014b). Consistent with this, Aletraris (2010) finds that Australian men employed as temporary agency workers report lower job satisfaction

2 The question wording is: 'At my place of employment, employees must choose between advancing in their job or devoting attention to their family or personal lives' (Bender, Donohue and Heywood, 2005:490).

than workers on permanent contracts, but this does not hold true for women. Booth and Van Ours (2009) find that among married Australian women, those who work part-time are more satisfied with their hours of work than those who work full-time, while married men are most satisfied working full-time. Fleming and Kler (2014) suggest that mothers' main reasons for work may lie above and beyond obtaining a job that matches their skill set. In the same vein, women who are mothers, and therefore seek out flexible employment, may have different desires from work and work orientations compared to men and childless women.

Hypotheses

Our main objective is to explore the way in which the notion of 'women's work' relates to occupational gender segregation and women's responsibility for childrearing. In particular, we examine whether patterns of job satisfaction are consistent with men and women having different preferences for undertaking particular types of work, or with alternative explanations for occupational segregation relating to institutional and social norms resulting from the role of women as mothers. To test this, we first examine if men's and women's job satisfaction is conditional upon the degree of feminisation of the occupation in which they are employed, before going on to examine the same association for mothers and non-mothers.

Our expectations are outlined in the following hypotheses:

> **H1:** *Women working in feminised occupations will have significantly higher satisfaction with 'the work itself' and their job overall, after controlling for other factors that influence job satisfaction, (a) compared to women working in less feminised occupations and (b) this relationship will not apply for men.*

This differential effect between women and men of working in feminised occupations should be additional to the average gender effect on job satisfaction, since we anticipate from the existing literature that women will tend to have higher job satisfaction than men across the board. This expectation is against the null hypotheses (a) that women's satisfaction with the work itself and their jobs overall in feminised occupations is not significantly higher relative to other women, and (b) any positive effect of working in feminised occupations is the same for women and men, which would suggest rejection of the 'women's work' explanation.

Across research on the gender wage gap, women's job satisfaction and occupational gender segregation, women's status as mothers, and thereby their responsibility for childrearing, has frequently been cited as a central factor. In light of this, we expect that women who have taken on the role of a mother (either currently have children or have had children in the past), will be significantly more satisfied with

the work they do and with their jobs overall in highly feminised occupations, compared to women who have no children. Given the gendered within-household division of labour (Baxter, Hewitt, and Haynes, 2008; Craig and Bittman, 2008; Ting *et al*. 2016) and the institutional settings (Crompton and Harris, 1998) present in both contemporary and past Australia we equate being a mother with having childrearing responsibility and taking on a secondary earner function. Specifically, we argue that institutional and social norms relating to women's roles will influence women's preferences and choices following child-bearing, and that this effect will be especially strong in feminised workplaces.

> **H2:** *Mothers working in feminised occupations will have significantly higher satisfaction with 'the work itself' and their job overall, after controlling for other factors that influence job satisfaction, (a) compared to mothers working in less feminised occupations, and (b) this relationship will not apply for non-mothers.*

Confirmation of such differences for mothers would support explanations for occupational segregation based on institutional and social norms over those based on preferences for 'women's work'.

We further finesse findings against these hypotheses by also modelling associations for satisfaction with pay, security, hours of employment and flexibility.

Method

Data and sample

To test our hypotheses we use the data from the first 19 waves of HILDA (2001–2019) supplemented by data on employment by occupation and gender from the 2006, 2011 and 2016 Australian Census of Population and Housing. HILDA is a panel survey of individuals from a representative sample of private households (Watson and Wooden, 2010). Within selected households all occupants aged 15 and over are surveyed annually. Around 13,000 individuals from over 7,000 households have responded in each year, with year-on-year attrition rates averaging below 10 per cent. In 2011 an additional top-up sample of 2,153 households encompassing 4,009 responding individuals was recruited to the survey sample (HILDA Survey Annual Report, 2012)[3]. By definition, all observations included in the analysis are for persons aged 15 and over and who were employed at the time of the relevant HILDA survey. For all analyses the sample is also restricted to exclude multiple job-holders and those who work as unpaid family helpers.

3 see http://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/hilda for further details on the HILDA survey.

Key variables

In addition to a wealth of information on individuals' demographic and labour market characteristics, HILDA collects attitudinal data on a range of aspects of life in Australia. For all employed persons, this includes an assessment of their satisfaction with various aspects of their job on a scale ranging from 0 (totally dissatisfied) to 10 (totally satisfied). The items assessed are: total pay; job security; the work itself (what you do); the hours you work; flexibility available to balance work and non-work commitments; and finally 'All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job?'.

Taken by the ABS every five years, the Census covers virtually the entire Australian population, providing accurate data on gender composition by occupation at a more finely grained level of occupation than is possible using the HILDA sample. The level of feminisation by occupation was calculated as the proportion of females to total employment in each occupation, and matched to employed individuals in the HILDA sample by occupation and year. It is set to the 2006 Census value for waves 1–6 (2001 to 2006), the 2011 Census value for wave 11, the 2016 Census value for waves 16-19, and interpolated linearly for the periods in between (2007 to 2010 and 2012 to 2015).[4]

The level of feminisation was calculated at the Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO) 3-digit level. This was assessed as being the most appropriate level to capture occupational feminisation while also retaining sufficient within-occupation observations for analysis with the HILDA data. For example, the ANZSCO structure includes the 'Major Group' or '1-Digit' category of '2 Professionals'. In 2006, women made up the majority (53 per cent) of this 'Major Group'. Within this group is the 'Sub major' or 2-digit level of '25 health professionals', of whom 75 per cent were female in 2006. Within this group, the degree of occupational segregation becomes starkly apparent at the 3-digit level: women made up just 35 per cent of '253 medical practitioners', but 91 per cent of '254 Midwifery and Nursing Professionals'. In 2016, there were four 3-digit occupations in which women comprised more than 90 per cent of the workforce. Personal assistants and secretaries top the list at 97.2 per cent, followed by child carers, receptionists, and education aides. At the other end of the spectrum there were no fewer than 17 occupations in which women comprised less than 10 per cent of the workforce, with bricklayers, carpenters and joiners; plumbers; and fabrication engineering trades workers the most male dominated, with women comprising 1 per cent of workers or less in each case. This indicates that a fine level of disaggregation is necessary to accurately capture the degree of feminisation across occupations.

4 Data on occupational feminisation from the 2001 Census could not be used due to a change in occupational coding between the 2001 and 2006 Censuses. The data was downloaded from the ABS' online Table Builder facility.

Control variables

The control variables employed in the models comprise those used in previous empirical studies of job satisfaction using the HILDA data and cover characteristics of the individual, the workplace and the job. They include dummy variables capturing gender, whether the individual has a disability, is a union member, works non-standard hours, works some hours from home, is employed through a labour hire firm, has supervisory responsibilities and whether the firm operates from a single location as opposed to multiple locations. Categorical variables are used to capture level of highest qualification, country of birth (Australia, other English speaking country, or non-English speaking country); region of residence; marital status by presence and age of dependent children; firm sector; workplace size; type of employment contract; and usual hours of employment per week. Age, socioeconomic status (SES) of neighbourhood (decile), real hourly wage (logged), years worked in current occupation and years with current employer are entered as linear variables. The squares of age, years in current occupation and years with current employer are also included to capture possible second-order effects.

Analytic strategy

As the dependent variables (job satisfaction ratings) are ordered categorical variables, ordered probit models with random effects are estimated using the XTOPROBIT model available in STATA. The XTOPROBIT model has the advantage of utilising the full scale of the ordered dependent variable, whereas previous panel versions of probit or logit models required the outcome variable to be collapsed into a binary variable (such as 'satisfied' or 'dissatisfied'). There is, however, no fixed-effects version of XTOPROBIT. As a robustness check key models are also estimated using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression with both the random-effects and fixed-effects specifications, the latter to control for potential unobserved heterogeneity. Previous studies have indicated that results are robust to the assumption of ordinality or cardinality of satisfaction ratings (Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters 2004), and thus estimation by OLS should provide a satisfactory test of the sensitivity of our results to controlling for fixed effects.

To test each hypothesis, the estimation approach proceeds in four stages. Consider, first, testing for gender differences in job satisfaction and the effect of occupational feminisation on job satisfaction (H1).

a) A multivariate model of the following form is estimated for the full sample of workers (male and female):

$$JS_{it} = \alpha + \gamma F_i + \beta X_{it} + v_i + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

Where JS_{it} denotes individual i's self-reported job satisfaction at time t; F_i is a dummy variable indicating whether the individual is male (F=0) or

female (F=1); X represents the vector of other control variables with associated vector of coefficients β to be estimated. The error term has an individual-specific component v_i and the classical component ε_{it} which is distributed independently with mean zero. The coefficient γ is an estimate of the effect associated with being female on job satisfaction, and expected to be positive given the 'paradox of the contented woman'.

b) The model set out in equation (1) is then augmented with the additional variable capturing occupational feminisation:

$$JS_{it} = \alpha + \beta X_{it} + \gamma F_{it} + \delta FSHARE_{it} + v_i + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

Where $FSHARE_{it}$ is the proportion of females in total employment in the occupation that individual i is employed in at time t. The estimated coefficient δ represents the average effect of occupational feminisation on job satisfaction across men and women, while any change in the estimate of γ from (1) indicates the degree to which the feminisation of occupations accounts for the gender difference in job satisfaction.

c) The model set out in equation (2) is estimated with interaction terms between *F* and *FSHARE* to allow differential effects of occupational feminisation on job satisfaction by gender.

d) The model set out in equation (2) is estimated separately for the sub-samples of males and females. This allows differential effects of all covariates by gender.

To test H2, relating to the effect of occupational feminisation on job satisfaction by motherhood status, the same four steps are followed with the sample restricted to female workers only, and the additional dummy variable, interaction terms and separate samples defined with respect to mothers versus non-mothers, instead of females versus males.

With the very large sample size available few variables proved insignificant and the extensive set of control variables potentially influencing job satisfaction was retained in all models, as can be seen in Table 6 in the Appendix which reports full regression results from estimating Equation (2). Note that variables for hours worked were not included in the models for satisfaction with hours worked or satisfaction with flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments; and the (log of) real hourly wages was not included in the model for satisfaction with total pay, as these relationships are considered too directly intertwined. However we comment on the sensitivity of the results to the omission of these variables. Means for all variables used can be found in Table 5 of the Appendix.

Findings

Descriptive statistics

As observed in previous studies for a number of countries, and in line with the 'paradox of the contented female worker', Australian women report significantly higher satisfaction with their jobs than men (see Table 1). Relative to men, women appear significantly more satisfied with their pay, with job security, the hours they work, flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments and their job overall. Women are also happier than men with the work itself, but the difference in mean ratings is only marginally significant.

Table 1: Mean job satisfaction: men and women, pooled data 2001-2019

	Total pay	Job security	The work itself	Hours worked	Flexibility	Job overall
Women	7.06	7.99	7.65	7.32	7.58	7.74
Men	7.00	7.84	7.63	7.15	7.44	7.62
Difference	0.06	0.15	0.02	0.18	0.14	0.12
t-test[a]	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00

Notes: based on between 78,651 to 78,756 responses from women and 87,711 to 87,834 responses from men.
a. Figures give the probability of observing the difference in the means between men and women under the null hypothesis that the means are equal.

Table 2 shows raw correlations between the degree of feminisation of an occupation, measured as the percentage representation of females in an occupation, and job satisfaction. Women's overall job satisfaction increases with the degree of feminisation, as does satisfaction with each job aspect with the exception of flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments, for which the correlation is zero. The relationship is positive but not significant in the case of satisfaction with pay.

In contrast, men's overall job satisfaction decreases with the degree of feminisation of their occupation, and this applies for satisfaction with the work itself and hours worked. However, satisfaction with total pay, job security and the flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments is higher in occupations in which a higher proportion of women are employed. While the correlations are largest in magnitude for job security (men and women) and hours worked (women), they are generally very small in magnitude (though with the large sample size the hypothesis of a zero correlation can be confidently rejected in all but a few cases).

Table 2: Correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and degree of feminisation of occupation, pooled data 2001-2019

	Total pay	Job security	The work itself	Hours worked	Flexibility	Job overall
Women	+0.004 (0.27)	+0.057 (0.00)	+0.027 (0.00)	+0.060 (0.00)	+0.000 (0.97)	+0.042 (0.00)
Men	+0.007 (0.06)	+0.045 (0.00)	-0.027 (0.00)	-0.006 (0.07)	+0.036 (0.00)	-0.011 (0.00)

Notes: based on between 78,098 to 78,203 responses from women and 86,395 to 86,517 responses from men. Figures in parentheses indicate the probability of observing a correlation of this magnitude under the null hypothesis that the true correlation is zero.

H1: The effect of occupational feminisation on men's and women's job satisfaction

Table 3 summarises the key estimates of interest from the ordered probit models, with Panels A to D corresponding to estimates from steps a) to d) set out in the analytic strategy above. For brevity, full results are reported only for the models from Panel B (Table 6 in the Appendix).[5]

Results show that women are more satisfied than men with all job aspects despite controls for an extensive range of personal and job-related characteristics (Panel A). The higher level of satisfaction estimated for women is robust to the inclusion of the variable measuring the degree of feminisation of the individual's occupation (Panel B), and in fact becomes more pronounced in the case of satisfaction with pay and the work itself. Results presented in Panels C and D reveal that for men, satisfaction with the work itself and overall job satisfaction decline with the degree of feminisation of their occupation; while for women satisfaction in these domains is higher in more feminised occupations. Moreover, including these differential effects largely accounts for the higher job satisfaction observed for women, since the coefficient on the female dummy variable becomes insignificant (Panel C) for satisfaction with pay, the work itself, hours worked and for overall job satisfaction.

These results confirm Hypothesis 1. A comparison of Table 3 and Table 7(a) in the Appendix reveals that the results for key variables from the probit and OLS models with random-effects are qualitatively identical. Table 7(b) confirms that, with few exceptions, the results are also robust to estimation by fixed-effects to control for unobserved heterogeneity. The estimates relating to satisfaction with flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments are the most sensitive to the fixed-effects specification. The estimated effect of occupational feminisation on satisfaction with the work itself for the sub-sample of women is also no longer significant in the fixed effects model (Panel D,

5 Full results for all other models available from the authors upon request.

Table 7(b)). Importantly, however, the key findings hold that working in a more feminised occupation has a significantly more positive (or less negative) effect on satisfaction with pay, the work itself, hours worked and overall job satisfaction for women than for men.

Table 3: Ordered probit models of job satisfaction: males and females, selected coefficients

	Satisfaction with …					
Variable	Pay	Security	The work itself	Hours	Flexibility	Overall
Panel A						
Female	0.058*** (0.000)	0.126*** (0.000)	0.058*** (0.000)	0.121*** (0.000)	0.095*** (0.000)	0.087*** (0.000)
Panel B: Add Fshare						
Female	0.081*** (0.000)	0.086*** (0.000)	0.068*** (0.000)	0.098*** (0.000)	0.063*** (0.000)	0.086*** (0.000)
Fshare	-0.076*** (0.001)	0.149*** (0.000)	-0.031 (0.200)	0.079*** (0.000)	0.107*** (0.000)	0.005 (0.823)
Panel C: Add interaction term						
Female	0.017 (0.559)	0.061** (0.036)	-0.047 (0.117)	-0.023 (0.412)	0.105*** (0.000)	-0.032 (0.271)
Fshare	-0.129*** (0.000)	0.129*** (0.000)	-0.124*** (0.000)	-0.019 (0.508)	0.141*** (0.000)	-0.092*** (0.002)
Female*Fshare	0.125*** (0.007)	0.048 (0.308)	0.220*** (0.000)	0.231*** (0.000)	-0.080* (0.093)	0.228*** (0.000)
Panel D: Estimation on separate samples						
Fshare - females	-0.024 (0.490)	0.205*** (0.000)	0.101*** (0.006)	0.220*** (0.000)	0.070* (0.054)	0.130*** (0.000)
Fshare - male	-0.123*** (0.000)	0.093*** (0.004)	-0.154*** (0.000)	-0.063** (0.037)	0.107*** (0.001)	-0.106*** (0.001)

Notes: Significance levels in parenthesis. ***, ** and * denote the estimate is significantly different from zero at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively. Full results for models reported in Panel B can be found in Table 6. Number of observations (males plus females) varies from 142,065 to 162,880 depending upon the model, with women contributing 48.5% of observations.

For women satisfaction with job security, hours worked and flexibility also increases with the degree of feminisation of their occupation. Interestingly, men working in more feminised occupations are also happier with the security and flexibility of their work compared to men working in less feminised fields, but less happy with all other aspects of their work. When it comes to satisfaction with flexibility, the positive effect of working in more feminised occupations is more robust for men, while for satisfaction with security women experience a larger positive effect.

As noted, controls for actual hours worked were not included in the initial models for satisfaction with hours or satisfaction with flexibility, and separate models were estimated to test the sensitivity of the results to their inclusion. When controls for hours usually worked are included in the model for hours satisfaction, the positive estimated effect of occupational feminisation is reduced for women and the negative effect accentuated for men. This suggests that working in more feminised occupations is associated with a greater mismatch between actual and preferred hours of work for men than is the case for women. Adding controls for actual hours worked in the model for satisfaction with flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments results in the coefficient on being female (Panel A) becoming negative and highly significant, as does the coefficient on *FSHARE* in Panel B. For men and women the estimated effect of working in a more feminised occupation is now to reduce satisfaction with flexibility, and the estimated effect of *FSHARE* is not significantly different for women and men. That is to say, the greater satisfaction women report in terms of flexibility, and the added flexibility benefits associated with more feminised occupations, are captured in working hours. A caveat to this is that the presence of other forms of flexible working arrangements have also been controlled for in the original models, including working non-standard hours (defined as working anything other than a regular Monday to Friday day-time schedule) and working some hours from home.

Of particular note, men are markedly less satisfied with their pay if they work in more feminised occupations. For women, satisfaction with pay is also estimated to decline marginally with occupational feminisation. While this estimate is not statistically significant, pay is the only domain in which women's satisfaction does not increase significantly with feminisation (although the effect is only weakly significant for flexibility). As noted, actual pay was not included as a control variable in the models for satisfaction with pay. When the log of the hourly wage rate is included as a control variable (results not reported), the coefficient for occupational feminisation (Panel B) becomes insignificant, as do the coefficients on the female-by-*FSHARE* interaction term (Panel C) and for *FSHARE* in the male sub-sample (Panel D). Thus the lower satisfaction with pay observed in more feminised occupations for both male and female workers can be accounted for by the actual (lower) earnings in those occupations.

The findings that women are on average more satisfied with the work itself and their jobs overall when working in more feminised occupations, and are more satisfied with these aspects compared to men working in feminised occupations, are consistent with the argument that women choose to work in highly feminised occupations because they prefer the type of work done and are generally satisfied with their employment situation. Such findings frequently lead to claims that women are content to accept lower wages, a lower status, or less secure employment contracts as compensating differentials for other desired job attributes. Following this argument, women's lower status in the labour market (and high levels of representation in ranks of generally lower paying, highly feminised occupations) would not constitute discrimination, and should therefore not be seen as a societal 'problem' which should be countered by policy efforts (such as gender equality policies).

Of central importance, however, the way responsibility for childrearing may shape women's preferences has not been sufficiently addressed in these models. The models do control for the direct effect of marital status, the number of children in the household, and the age of those children on job satisfaction. However, they do not permit the effects of covariates on job satisfaction to vary between mothers and non-mothers, which is necessary to capture differences in preferences by workers' motherhood status – most importantly with respect to working in feminised occupations. This is addressed by Hypothesis 2, and is examined in the next section.

H2: Mothers' and non-mothers' job satisfaction

Table 4 displays the ordered probit results for women's job satisfaction by occupational feminisation and motherhood status. Mothers are defined on the basis of whether or not the woman has ever had children. The set-up of the panels is equivalent to the men's and women's job satisfaction models, except that the comparison groups are now mothers and non-mothers (rather than women and men). For comparability, the same set of independent variables are retained in each satisfaction domain as before (see Table 6, Appendix), with the exception of the set of mutually exclusive variables capturing marital status and the presence of dependent children by age. As the presence and age of children are inapplicable to non-mothers, these were replaced by a single dummy variable indicating whether or not the woman is married or living in a de facto relationship.

Panel A of Table 4 shows that mothers are significantly happier than non-mothers with the work itself, their hours of work, flexibility and their job overall. These associations remain significant in Panel B when occupational feminisation is controlled. This panel reaffirms that women in more feminised occupations are more satisfied with all aspects of their work with the exception of pay. These effects remain despite the wide range of controls included in the models.

Estimates for the interaction term (Panel C) show that for women who are mothers, working in more feminised occupations is associated with a significantly greater increase in satisfaction with their pay and the work itself (weakly significant, p=0.080) than is the case for non-mothers. This provides qualified support for *Hypothesis 2b*, that mothers in female dominated occupations will be significantly more satisfied with their jobs, and notably with the work itself, compared to non-mothers in similar occupations. Further support is provided in Panel D: the estimated effect of occupational feminisation on satisfaction is more positive for mothers than for non-mothers for all aspects with the exception of job security, for which the estimates are very similar. That satisfaction with the work itself increases with occupational feminisation for mothers, and more so than for non-mothers, is also supported by the OLS estimates with random- and with fixed-effects (Table 8, Appendix).

Table 4: Ordered probit models of mothers' and non-mothers' job satisfaction: (women only) selected coefficients

	Satisfaction with …					
Variable	Pay	Security	The work itself	Hours	Flexibility	Overall
Panel A						
Mother	-0.035 (0.125)	0.037 (0.127)	0.157*** (0.000)	0.158*** (0.000)	0.145*** (0.000)	0.108*** (0.000)
Panel B: Add Fshare						
Mother	-0.034 (0.132)	0.034 (0.161)	0.154*** (0.000)	0.149*** (0.000)	0.143*** (0.000)	0.104*** (0.000)
Fshare	-0.023 (0.501)	0.203*** (0.000)	0.099*** (0.007)	0.217*** (0.000)	0.068* (0.060)	0.130*** (0.00)
Panel C: Interaction effects with mother status						
Mother	-0.156*** (0.001)	0.031 (0.523)	0.081* (0.089)	0.090** (0.048)	0.171*** (0.001)	0.071 (0.130)
Fshare	-0.135*** (0.006)	0.200*** (0.000)	0.035 (0.493)	0.166*** (0.000)	0.093* (0.067)	0.101** (0.043)
Mother*Fshare	0.192*** (0.003)	0.005 (0.939)	0.116* (0.080)	0.093 (0.138)	-0.044 (0.516)	0.051 (0.430)
Panel D: Separate samples (mothers and non-mothers)						
Fshare - mother (female)	0.044 (0.351)	0.194*** (0.000)	0.168*** (0.001)	0.261*** (0.000)	0.084* (0.102)	0.136*** (0.005)
Fshare - non-mother (female)	-0.152*** (0.002)	0.209*** (0.000)	0.032 (0.542)	0.160*** (0.001)	0.033 (0.506)	0.107** (0.036)

Notes: Significance levels in parenthesis. ***, ** and * denote the estimate is significantly different from zero at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively. Number of observations (mothers plus non-mothers) varies from 69,246 to 77,078 depending upon the model, with mothers contributing 58.8% of observations.

Hypothesis 2a is also confirmed in Panel D (Table 4). For mothers, working in a more feminised occupation is associated with significantly higher satisfaction with job security, the work itself, hours, flexibility (p=0.10) and their jobs overall. This is in contrast to non-mothers who, compared to their contemporaries working in less feminised occupations, are significantly less happy with their pay, and are not significantly happier with the work itself or flexibility. Non-mothers in more female dominated occupations are, however, happier with the security, the hours they work and their job overall (marginally significant, p=0.036). However, for non-mothers only the effect of feminisation on satisfaction with security and hours worked attain significant in the fixed-effects models.

It is worth noting that the direct estimated effect of motherhood in the OLS fixed-effects model (Panel A, Table 8(b)) is positive and highly significant for satisfaction

with the work itself, hours worked and flexibility, and positive and weakly significant for overall job satisfaction ($p<0.10$). However, motherhood is negatively associated with pay satisfaction. With the fixed effects estimator, these estimates are based on observations only for women who became mothers during the timeframe of our panel. Hence, these results are consistent with the 'paradox of the contented woman' being partially associated with motherhood, and with the motherhood penalty experienced with respect to pay.

As with the differences between men and women's satisfaction with their pay, the differential effect of feminisation on pay satisfaction between mothers and non-mothers (Panel C) becomes insignificant when actual pay is added to the control variables. In the model for satisfaction with hours worked, adding the controls capturing actual hours worked fully accounts for the higher hours satisfaction observed for mothers relative to non-mothers, and partially accounts for the positive overall association between occupational feminisation and hours of work satisfaction (results not shown). The inclusion of actual hours worked also accounts for the higher satisfaction mothers report with regard to flexibility (Panel A), and the positive association between occupational feminisation and satisfaction with flexibility (results not shown). It remains the case that no significant differential effect of occupational feminisation on satisfaction with flexibility is observed once hours of work are taken into account.

For both men and non-mothers, greater occupational feminisation is strongly associated with dissatisfaction with pay, a relationship not evident for mothers. For satisfaction with the work itself, hours, flexibility and the job overall, the estimated coefficient on *FSHARE* for non-mothers lies between the corresponding estimates for men and for mothers. Thus, empirical support for the notion of 'women's work' as an explanation for gender segregation by occupation is most evident for mothers. Furthermore, if we restrict the estimating sample to men and non-mothers, the resulting coefficients on the female dummy variable (which compare to estimates for all women in Panel A, Table 3) show no significant difference between men and non-mothers in terms of satisfaction with the work itself ($\beta=-0.010$ $p=0.569$) and overall job satisfaction ($\beta=+0.010$ $p=0.593$). The 'paradox of the contented female worker' primarily characterises mothers, and ought perhaps, be reframed as the 'paradox of the contented working mother'. As we discuss below, given the gendered social and institutional norms surrounding parenthood in modern-day Australia, which lead to women taking on the childrearing responsibilities and secondary earner role upon becoming mothers, this finding is not such a paradox after all.

Conclusion and discussion

In Australia, as in other countries, there is ongoing debate about the causal processes that generate occupational segregation by gender, the implications of that segregation

for equality in labour market outcomes (such as wages), and the appropriate role, if any, for government policy and human resource practice. If occupational segregation is the result of individuals exercising their free choices and reflects differences in preferences of men and women regarding the given set of job attributes across occupations, then one could argue that inequality in outcomes should not be considered discrimination. To investigate the degree to which occupational segregation is driven by differences in preferences, this paper has analysed patterns in workers' job satisfaction conditional upon the degree of feminisation of their occupation.

Some caveats must be noted regarding the use of self-report of job satisfaction to reflect preferences. First, preferences themselves may be shaped by societal norms regarding gender roles in and between the family and the labour market, particularly through people identifying certain occupations as being 'men's work' or 'women's work'. In this sense it is argued that occupational choice is not so 'free', but significantly constrained by societal norms. Second, people's satisfaction reports can be shaped by the degree to which they conform to social norms (Triandis, 2000), and thus individuals' reports of job satisfaction may partly reflect societal values rather than the actual value derived from the intrinsic elements of their jobs.[6] The fact that HILDA collects data on satisfaction with specific aspects of a job, as well as overall job satisfaction, partly mitigates this concern. Finally, the job attributes that men and women are choosing between may not be 'given' but endogenous to that choice, such that job attributes change depending upon gender composition. An example is the suggestion that highly feminised jobs are lower paid *because* a high proportion of women choose those jobs.

With these caveats in mind, the available evidence does not completely dispel the notion of 'women's work' as a contributing factor to segregation – that certain types of work are preferred by women. However, our analyses suggest that this applies particularly to women following childbirth. In particular we find that mothers – who are in turn more likely to have caring responsibilities and to be doing more unpaid work (Collin, 2008; Ting *et al*., 2016) – are especially likely to prefer the type of work done in occupations that are more highly feminised. No such relationship is apparent for women who have not had the responsibilities associated with mothering, while men tend to dislike the type of work done in more highly feminised occupations. In addition to liking the type of work done in more feminised occupations, mothers in those occupations are particularly more satisfied – or rather, less dissatisfied – with their pay compared to women who are not mothers. Satisfaction with hours worked also appears to increase marginally more sharply with occupational feminisation for mothers than non-mothers.

Overall, these patterns of job satisfaction conditional upon gender and motherhood status provide evidence of the persistence of the male breadwinner model in shaping occupational segregation by gender. The women who are most likely to face work and family arrangements that conform to this model – women who have children

6 This is not to deny that people will also derive satisfaction from not conforming, as undoubtedly applies to some women who break into male dominated jobs.

– are the women who most appreciate the hours of work offered in highly feminised occupations. Mothers are also more content with wages in those occupations, consistent with their income being considered secondary to her (male) partner's. That non-mothers' job preferences are a bit more like men's, but then drift towards preferencing highly feminised occupations when they become mothers is certainly suggestive of gender roles affecting occupational preferences. It is less clear why women who are mothers prefer the 'type of work' done in highly feminised occupations, since the type of work done should not affect their ability to take on family roles. A possible explanation is complementarity between the work done in those jobs and the roles they take on at home as wives and mothers that increases the preference for that type of work. Alternatively, or possibly fittingly, research has shown that women's identities shift when they become mothers (Deutsch *et al*., 1988), and working in highly feminised occupations may more closely fit their identity as 'mother' and secondary earner.

With regard to the causes of occupational segregation, Crompton and Harris (1998: 118) could well have been summarising our own results in concluding "employment structures are the outcome of both choice and constraint". We do not find evidence of discriminatory processes as a cause of occupational segregation by gender, but clearly social norms around the role of women as mothers shape occupational preferences and expectations. This is unlikely to change until there is greater balance within families in the division of caring roles and other non-work commitments between women and men. Such change may be promoted by the reform of employment entitlements within the Fair Work Act and practices within organisations to more proactively promote fathers taking on more of the caring role for young children, such as promoting male employees' uptake of parental leave.

However, our results present interesting new perspectives on the debate surrounding the gender wage gap in Australia. If it is true that the market does not highly value the type of work that women have a preference for, this may be a non-discriminatory reason for pay being lower in female dominated occupations. However, our finding that men's and non-mothers' satisfaction with their pay decreases with the degree of feminisation of their occupation, while that of mothers' does not, is inconsistent with this. Importantly, the differential effect by gender between pay satisfaction and occupational feminisation can be fully accounted for by controlling for *actual* wages. This appears contradictory to Baron and Cobb-Clark's (2010) suggestion that women's jobs are better paid, other things held equal. The observation that non-mothers are particularly less satisfied than other women with pay in feminised occupations is also inconsistent with women's jobs being better paid. This does give cause for greater scrutiny of pay equity between highly feminised occupations and other occupations. This applies in particular to how society values caring roles, such as in health, childcare and aged care, which are disproportionately undertaken by women, and their wages closely linked to state and federal government awards or funding decisions.

In following this line of investigation, we have stumbled upon an empirical resolution to the paradox of the contented female worker. The higher reported job satisfaction for women, in Australia at least, can be accounted for by the fact that

women's job satisfaction increases with the degree of feminisation of their occupation while men's job satisfaction falls. The inclusion of an interaction term between gender and occupational feminisation accounts for the higher average levels of overall job satisfaction reported by women. This applies particularly to mothers and, in terms of individual job characteristics, to satisfaction with the work itself and hours worked.

Our findings relating to the role of motherhood in Australia contrast with other explanations for the paradox of the contented woman. Clark's (1997) 'low expectations' hypothesis suggested the paradox would be a transitory phenomenon, and disappear as women's relative labour market position improved and their expectations were revised. Perugini and Vladisavljević (2019: 130) suggest overcoming 'gender role beliefs' as women are exposed to better jobs may contribute to this revision in expectations. Accordingly, Green *et al*. found evidence of the satisfaction gap vanishing in Britain "… because younger women became less satisfied as they aged, and because new female workers entered with lower job satisfaction than their early 1990's peers." (2018: 484). Our findings relating to mothers' job satisfaction and the type of work done suggest the effects of social norms extend well beyond gendered differences in expectations regarding job quality. Notably, the fixed-effects results (Panel A, Table 8) suggest that women's job satisfaction increases once they become mothers, even though they must also have aged.

In this paper we have sought to explore the notion of 'women's work' as a factor contributing to occupational segregation – the idea that certain occupations are highly feminised because women have a strong preference for the type of work done in those occupations. The evidence indicates that this notion of 'women's work' applies primarily to mothers. A priority for further research is to take a closer look at how women's preferences, attitudes and expectations develop over the life cycle, with a focus on the effect of motherhood and young women's fertility expectations.

References

Acker, J. (1992), From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions. *Contemporary Sociology*, 21(5), 565–569.

Aletraris, L. (2010), How satisfied are they and why? A study of job satisfaction, job rewards, gender and temporary agency workers in Australia. *Human Relations*, 63(8), 1129–1155.

Anderson, D. J., Binder, M., and Krause, K. (2003), The motherhood wage penalty revisited: Experience, heterogeneity, work effort, and work-schedule flexibility. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 56(2), 273–294.

Andrade, M., Westover, J., and Peterson, J. (2019), Job satisfaction and gender. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 19(3): 22-40.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2021a), Labour Force, Australia, Catalogue Number 6202.0, Table 01. Labour force status by sex – Seasonally Adjusted, downloaded 2 February 2022.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2021b), *Average Weekly Earnings Australia, Catalogue Number 6302.0*, Table 2. Average Weekly Earnings Australia (Dollars) – Seasonally adjusted, downloaded 2 February 2022.

Barns, A., and Preston, A. (2010), Is Australia really a world leader in closing the gender gap? *Feminist Economics*, 16(4), 81–103.

Barón, J. D. and Cobb-Clark, D. A. (2010), Occupational Segregation and the Gender Wage Gap in Private- and Public-Sector Employment: A Distributional Analysis. *Economic Record*, 86(273), 227–246.

Baxter, J., Hewitt, B. and Haynes, M. (2008), Life Course Transitions and Housework: Marriage, Parenthood, and Time on Housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(2), 259–272.

Baxter, J, and Hewitt, B. (2013), Negotiating Domestic Labor: Women's Earnings and Housework Time in Australia. *Feminist Economics*, 19(1), 29–53.

Becker, G. S. (1964), *Human Capital*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Becker, G. S. (1981), *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bender, K. A., Donohue, S. M. and Heywood, J. S. (2005), Job satisfaction and gender segregation. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 57(3), 479–496. doi: 10.1093/oep/gpi015

Blau, F. D., and Kahn, L. M. (2000), Gender Differences in Pay. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(4), 75–99.

Booth, A. L., and van Ours, J. C. (2009), Hours of work and gender identity: does part-time work make the family happier? *Economica*, 76: 176–196.

Broomhill, R., and Sharp, R. (2005), The Changing Male Breadwinner Model in Australia: a New Gender Order? *Labour & Industry: a Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work*, 16(1), 103–127.

Buchler, S., and Dockery, A. M. (2015), The influence of gender on pathways into the labor market: Evidence from Australia. In H. P. Blossfeld, S. Buchholz, and M. Triventi (Eds.), *Gender, education and employment: An international comparison of school-to-work transitions* (pp. 81–99). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Budig, M. J., and England, P. (2001), The wage penalty for motherhood. *American Sociological Review*, 66(2), 204–225.

Chalmers, J., Campbell, I., and Charlesworth, S. (2005), Part-time work and caring responsibilities in Australia: Towards an assessment of job quality. *Labour & Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work*, 15(3), 41–66.

Clark, A. E. (1997), Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work? *Labour Economics*, 4(4), 341–372. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371(97)00010-9

Collin, J. (2008), Sharing the Load: The Gender Divide in Unpaid Work in 21st Century Australia. *ANIP Research Report*.

Correll, S. J. (2013), Minimizing the motherhood penalty: What works, what doesn't and why. *Gender and work: Challenging conventional wisdom*, Research Symposium, Harvard Business School, 80–86.

Craig, L., and Bittman, M. (2008), The incremental time costs of children: An analysis of children's impact on adult time use in Australia. *Feminist Economics*, 14(2), 59–88.

Crompton, R., and Harris, F. (1998), Explaining Women's Employment Patterns: 'Orientations to Work' Revisited. *British Journal of Sociology*, 49(1), 118–136.

Deutsch, F. M., Ruble, D., Fleming, A., Brooks-Gunn, J., and Stangor, C. (1988), Information-seeking and maternal self-definition during the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(3), 420–431.

Dilmaghani M. (2022), Revisiting the gender job satisfaction paradox: The roots seem to run deep. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 60(2), 278-323.

Dilmaghani, M., and Tabvuma, V. (2019), The gender gap in work–life balance satisfaction across occupations. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 34(5), 398–428.

Duncan, S., Edwards, R., Reynolds, T., and Alldred. P. (2003), Motherhood, paid work and partnering: values and theories. Work, *Employment and Society*, 17(2), 309–330.

England, P. (2005), Gender Inequality in Labor Markets: The Role of Motherhood and Segregation. *Social Politics*, 12(2), 264–288. doi: 10.1093/sp/jxi014

England, P., Allison, P., and Wu, Y. (2007), Does bad pay cause occupations to feminize, Does feminization reduce pay, and How can we tell with longitudinal data? *Social Science Research*, 36(3), 1237–1256. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2006.08.003

Faircloth, C. (2014), Intensive Parenting and the Expansion of Parenting. In E. Lee, J. Bristow, C. Faircloth, and J. Macvarish (Eds.) *Parenting Culture Studies* (pp. 25–50). Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. and Frijters, P. (2004), How important is methodology for the estimates of the determinants of happiness? *Economic Journal*, 114(497), 641–659.

Fleming, C. M., and Kler, P. (2014), Female over education, job satisfaction and the impact of children at home in Australia. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 44(2), 143–155. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2014.05.006

Gazioglu, S., and Tansel, A. (2006), Job satisfaction in Britain: individual and job related factors. *Applied Economics*, 38(10), 1163–1171. doi: 10.1080/00036840500392987

Goldin, C. (2014), A Grand Gender Convergence: Its Last Chapter. *American Economic Review*, 104(4), 1091–1119.

Goldin, C. and Katz, L. (2011), The Cost of Workplace Flexibility for High-Powered Professionals. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 638(1), 45–67.

Green, C.P., Heywood, J.S., Kler, P., and Leeves, G. (2018), Paradox lost: the disappearing female job satisfaction premium. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 56(3), 484–502.

Hakim, C. (1992), Explaining Trends in Occupational Segregation: The Measurement, Causes, and Consequences of the Sexual Division of Labour. *European Sociological Review*, 8(2), 127–152.

Hakim, C. (2000), *Work-lifestyle choices in the 21st Century*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hauret, L., and 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.

Hill, E. (2007), Budgeting for Work–Life Balance: The Ideology and Politics of Work and Family Policy in Australia. *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 33(2), 226–245.

Huppatz, K., and Goodwin, S. (2013), Masculinised jobs, feminised jobs and men's 'gender capital' experiences: Understanding occupational segregation in Australia. *Journal of Sociology*, 49(2-3), 291–308. doi: 10.1177/1440783313481743

Kanji, S., and Hupka-Brunner, S. (2015), Young women's strong preference for children and subsequent occupational gender segregation: What is the link? *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 34(2), 124–140.

Kaiser, L. C. (2007), Gender-job satisfaction differences across Europe: An indicator for labour market modernization. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(1), 75–94.

Karamessini, M., and Ioakimoglou, E. (2007), Wage determination and the gender pay gap: A feminist political economy analysis and decomposition. *Feminist Economics*, 13(1), 33–66.

Kifle, T., Kler, P., and Shankar, S. (2014a), Are women really that happy at work? Australian evidence on the 'contented female'. *Applied Economics*, 46(7), 686–697. doi: 10.1080/00036846.2013.851781

Kifle, T., Kler, P., and Shankar, S. (2014b), The power of the pram: do young children determine female job satisfaction? *Applied Economics Letters*, 21(4) 289–292. doi: 10.1080/13504851.2013.856991

Kim, S. (2005), Gender Differences in the Job Satisfaction of Public Employees: A Study of Seoul Metropolitan Government, Korea. *Sex Roles*, 52(9-10), 667–681. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-3734-6

Lee, Y. L., and Miller, P. W. (2004), Occupational segregation on the basis of gender: The role of entry-level jobs. *Australian Journal of Labour Economics*, 7: 355–374.

Lind, G., and Colquhoun, R. (2021), Analysis of gender segregation within detailed occupations and industries in Australia. *Australian Journal of Labour Economics*, 24(1): 47-69.

Long, A. (2005), Happily ever after? A study of job satisfaction in Australia. *Economic Record*, 81(255), 303–321.

Macdonald, F. and Charlesworth, S. (2013), Equal Pay under the Fair Work Act 2009: Mainstreamed or Marginalised? *UNSW Law Journal*, 36(2), 563–586.

Mandel, H., and Semyonov, M. (2005), Family policies, wage structures and gender wage gaps: Sources of earnings inequality in 20 countries. *American Sociological Review*, 70(6), 949–967.

Perugini, C., and Vladisavljević, M. (2019), Gender inequality and the gender-job satisfaction paradox in Europe. *Labour Economics*, 60, 129–147.

Rubery, J., Fagan, C., and Maier, F. (1996), Occupational segregation, discrimination and equal opportunity. In G. Schmid, J. O'Reilly, and K. Schömann (Eds.), *International handbook of labour market policy and evaluation* (pp. 431–461). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Sloane, P. J., and Williams, H. (2000), Job Satisfaction, Comparison Earnings, and Gender. *Labour: Review of Labour Economics & Industrial Relations*, 14(3), 473.

Sobeck, K. (2022), Greedy jobs, labour market institutions, and the gender pay gap. Tax and Transfer Policy Institute Working Paper 15/2022. Australian national University.

Sousa-Poza, A., and Sousa-Poza A. A. (2000), Taking Another Look at the Gender/Job-Satisfaction Paradox. *Kyklos*, 53(2), 135–152. doi: 10.1111/1467-6435.00114

Ting, S., Perales, F., and Baxter, J. (2016), Gender, ethnicity and the division of household labour within heterosexual couples in Australia, *Journal of Sociology*, 52(4), 693-710.

Triandis, H. C. (2000), Cultural syndromes and subjective well-being. In E. Diener and E. M. Suh (Eds.), *Culture and subjective well-being* (pp.13–36). Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Van Egmond, M., Baxter, J., Buchler, S. and Western, M. (2010), A Stalled Revolution? Gender Role Attitudes in Australia, 1986-2005. *Journal of Population Research*, 27(3), 147–168.

Watson, N., and Wooden, M. (2010), The HILDA survey: progress and future developments. *Australian Economic Review*, 43: 326–36.

Watson, N., and Wooden, M. (2010), HILDA Survey. http://www.melbourneinstitute.com/hilda/ (accessed August 2017).

Appendix

Table 5: Variable means by gender, pooled data 2001-2019

Variable	Females	Males	Persons
Female share in occupation (0-1)	0.65	0.31	0.47
Satisfaction with [0-10]			
Pay	7.06	7.00	7.03
Security	7.99	7.84	7.91
The work itself	7.65	7.63	7.64
Hours worked	7.32	7.15	7.23
Flexibility	7.58	7.44	7.50
Overall job satisfaction	7.74	7.62	7.68
Female	1.00	0.00	0.47
Age	39.02	39.61	39.33
Age squared	1712.19	1764.27	1739.65
Has disability	0.13	0.13	0.13
Born in:			
Australia	0.81	0.80	0.80
English speaking country	0.08	0.10	0.09
Non-English speaking country	0.11	0.10	0.11
Highest qualification			
Post-graduate	0.06	0.05	0.05
Degree	0.27	0.19	0.23
Diploma	0.11	0.09	0.10
Certificate III/IV	0.17	0.29	0.23
Completed Year 12	0.17	0.16	0.17
Did not complete Year 12	0.23	0.22	0.22
Lives in:			
Major capital city	0.69	0.68	0.68
Inner regional	0.20	0.20	0.20
Outer regional/remote	0.11	0.12	0.12
SES of neighborhood (decile)	5.86	5.75	5.80
Married	0.65	0.69	0.67
Marital/dependent. child status			
Married, no children	0.30	0.31	0.30
Married, child aged 0-4	0.11	0.16	0.13
Married, child aged 5-14	0.15	0.14	0.15
Married, child age 15-24	0.09	0.08	0.08
Single, no children	0.28	0.30	0.29
Single, child aged 0-4	0.01	0.00	0.01
Single, child aged 5-14	0.04	0.01	0.02
Single, child age 15-24	0.03	0.01	0.02
Mother (female, ever had children)	0.60	0.00	0.28

Table 5: continued

Firm sector:			
Private for-profit	0.63	0.80	0.72
Private not-for-profit	0.10	0.04	0.06
Government business	0.04	0.04	0.04
Public sector	0.23	0.12	0.17
Other	0.01	0.00	0.01
Workplace size:			
Small (1-19 workers)	0.41	0.48	0.45
Medium (20-99 workers)	0.29	0.25	0.27
Large (100+ workers)	0.29	0.27	0.28
Operates from single location	0.36	0.43	0.39
Employment contract:			
Self-employed/employer	0.11	0.19	0.15
Fixed term contract	0.09	0.07	0.08
Casual contract	0.22	0.15	0.18
Permanent/ongoing	0.58	0.58	0.58
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00
Usual no. hours per week:			
0 to 15 hours	0.18	0.07	0.12
16 to 30 hours	0.26	0.09	0.17
31 to 38 hours	0.25	0.19	0.21
39 to 44 hours	0.17	0.26	0.21
45 to 54 hours	0.10	0.24	0.18
55 hours or more	0.04	0.15	0.10
Real hourly wage (log of)	3.32	3.42	3.38
Union member	0.25	0.22	0.23
Years in current occupation	8.71	10.76	9.79
Years in occupation squared	167.27	242.68	207.03
Years with current employer	6.59	7.82	7.24
Years current employer squared	101.82	145.27	124.73
Works non-standard hours	0.25	0.25	0.25
Works some hours from home	0.24	0.26	0.25
Employed by labour hire firm	0.02	0.02	0.02
Has supervisory responsibilities	0.41	0.50	0.46

Table 6: Job satisfaction: random effects probit models, HILDA 2001-2019 full sample (with female employment share in occupation)

	Satisfaction with …					
Independent variable	Pay	Security	The work itself	Hours	Flexibility	Overall
Female	0.081***	0.086***	0.068***	0.098***	0.063***	0.086***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Age	-0.016***	-0.057***	-0.015***	-0.038***	-0.032***	-0.034***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Age squared	0.000***	0.001***	0.000***	0.001***	0.000***	0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Has disability	-0.086***	-0.079***	-0.059***	-0.047***	-0.012	-0.067***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.282)	(0.000)
Born in:						
Australia	–	–	–	–	–	–
English speaking country	-0.080***	-0.041	-0.059**	-0.050**	-0.009	-0.037
	(0.001)	(0.112)	(0.020)	(0.029)	(0.729)	(0.143)
Non-English speaking country	-0.180***	-0.171***	-0.057**	0.017	-0.077***	-0.087***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.013)	(0.437)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Highest qualification:						
Post-graduate	0.152***	-0.187***	-0.162***	-0.346***	-0.254***	-0.429***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Degree	0.026	-0.149***	-0.185***	-0.278***	-0.208***	-0.390***
	(0.212)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Diploma	-0.004	-0.131***	-0.158***	-0.150***	-0.095***	-0.261***
	(0.861)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Certificate III/IV	-0.012	-0.102***	-0.097***	-0.139***	-0.112***	-0.199***
	(0.520)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Completed Year 12	0.050***	-0.041**	-0.151***	-0.122***	-0.048**	-0.200***
	(0.007)	(0.028)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.011)	(0.000)
Did not complete Year 12	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lives in:						
Major capital city	–	–	–	–	–	–
Inner regional	0.059***	0.057***	0.084***	0.038**	0.011	0.094***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.013)	(0.490)	(0.000)
Outer regional/remote	0.159***	0.121***	0.085***	0.085***	0.013	0.142***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.548)	(0.000)
SES of neighborhood (decile)	0.007***	0.009***	-0.008***	-0.001	0.004	-0.005**
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.790)	(0.101)	(0.013)
Family status:						
Married, no children	–	–	–	–	–	–
Married, child aged 0-4	0.017	-0.027*	0.098***	0.065***	0.083***	0.068***
	(0.258)	(0.095)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Married, child aged 5-14	0.020	-0.027	0.081***	0.033**	0.060***	0.078***
	(0.221)	(0.113)	(0.000)	(0.038)	(0.000)	(0.000)

Table 6: continued

	Satisfaction with …					
Independent variable	Pay	Security	The work itself	Hours	Flexibility	Overall
Married, child age 15-24	0.033**	0.001	0.065***	0.003	0.045***	0.067***
	(0.041)	(0.944)	(0.000)	(0.847)	(0.010)	(0.000)
Single, no children	-0.030**	-0.088***	-0.024*	-0.023*	0.020	0.000
	(0.019)	(0.000)	(0.075)	(0.069)	(0.144)	(0.986)
Single, child aged 0-4	-0.087*	-0.058	0.090	0.154***	0.137***	0.139***
	(0.096)	(0.292)	(0.105)	(0.002)	(0.008)	(0.009)
Single, child aged 5-14	-0.161***	-0.097***	0.107***	0.004	0.073**	0.096***
	(0.000)	(0.006)	(0.001)	(0.912)	(0.027)	(0.003)
Single, child age 15-24	-0.136***	-0.075**	0.021	-0.080**	-0.028	-0.006
	(0.000)	(0.045)	(0.532)	(0.020)	(0.424)	(0.862)
Firm sector:						
Private for-profit	–	–	–	–	–	–
Private not-for-profit	0.054***	0.108***	0.263***	0.181***	0.153***	0.217***
	(0.006)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Government business	0.199***	0.124***	0.167***	0.148***	0.066***	0.213***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.000)
Public sector	0.217***	0.180***	0.229***	0.186***	0.087***	0.276***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Other	0.019	0.161***	0.295***	0.109**	0.127***	0.223***
	(0.670)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.017)	(0.008)	(0.000)
Workplace size:						
Small (1-19 workers)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Medium (20-99 workers)	0.026**	-0.037***	-0.103***	-0.082***	-0.122***	-0.076***
	(0.016)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Large (100+ workers)	0.146***	-0.039***	-0.141***	-0.089***	-0.132***	-0.076***
	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Operates from single location	0.008	0.094***	0.110***	0.055***	0.102***	0.102***
	(0.438)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Employment contract:						
Self-employed/employer	-0.200***	-0.307***	0.113***	-0.098***	0.217***	0.159***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Fixed term contract	0.052***	-0.464***	0.041***	0.003	-0.043***	-0.013
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.808)	(0.001)	(0.331)
Casual contract	0.187***	-0.483***	-0.093***	-0.140***	0.225***	-0.096***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Permanent/ongoing	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other	-0.164**	-0.480***	0.099	0.002	-0.028	-0.098
	(0.018)	(0.000)	(0.169)	(0.981)	(0.681)	(0.196)
Usual no. hours per week:						
0 to 15 hours	0.025	0.052***	-0.077***			0.071***
	(0.186)	(0.007)	(0.000)			(0.000)
16 to 30 hours	-0.084***	-0.040***	-0.098***			0.017
	(0.000)	(0.008)	(0.000)			(0.247)

Table 6: continued

	Satisfaction with …					
Independent variable	Pay	Security	The work itself	Hours	Flexibility	Overall
31 to 38 hours	-0.058***	-0.023**	-0.064***			-0.021*
	(0.000)	(0.046)	(0.000)			(0.056)
39 to 44 hours	–	–	–			–
45 to 54 hours	0.070***	0.059***	0.046***			-0.035***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)			(0.002)
55 hours or more	0.111***	0.083***	0.079***			-0.120***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)			(0.000)
Real hourly wage (log of)		0.011	0.062***	0.259***	0.202***	0.212***
		(0.321)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Union member	0.018	-0.050***	-0.030**	-0.060***	-0.176***	-0.067***
	(0.129)	(0.000)	(0.011)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Years in current occupation	0.002	0.001	-0.011***	-0.006***	-0.006***	-0.014***
	(0.104)	(0.437)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Years in occupation squared	-0.000	0.000	0.000***	0.000***	0.000**	0.000***
	(0.183)	(0.589)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.015)	(0.000)
Years with current employer	-0.001	0.011***	-0.018***	-0.009***	0.004*	-0.020***
	(0.754)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.051)	(0.000)
Years current employer squared	0.000	-0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	-0.000***	0.000***
	(0.210)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.000)
Works non-standard hours	-0.012	-0.033***	-0.041***	-0.314***	-0.170***	-0.119***
	(0.246)	(0.003)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Works some hours from home	-0.001	0.036***	0.107***	-0.108***	0.077***	0.082***
	(0.918)	(0.002)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Employed by labour hire firm	0.041	-0.376***	-0.052**	0.065**	-0.121***	-0.040
	(0.132)	(0.000)	(0.049)	(0.011)	(0.000)	(0.130)
Has supervisory responsibilities	0.008	0.175***	0.049***	-0.135***	-0.105***	-0.010
	(0.362)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.241)
Fshare (Female share in occupation) (0-1)	-0.076***	0.149***	-0.031	0.079***	0.107***	0.005
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.200)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.823)
N (observations)	161,043	142,065	142,164	142,152	142,065	142,151
N (individuals)	23,943	22,833	22,849	22,847	22,838	22,846
Obs. per person:						
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Average	6.7	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2
Maximum	19	19	19	19	19	19
Wald Chi-square	1857	3955	1968	3008	2371	2561
Prob > chi2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Notes: p-values based on robust standard errors in parenthesis. ***, ** and * denote the estimate is significantly different from zero at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively. Coefficients for the 10 cut-points relating to the 11-point satisfaction scale not reported.

Table 7: Linear models of job satisfaction: males and females, selected coefficients

	Satisfaction with …					
Variable	Pay	Security	The work itself	Hours	Flexibility	Overall
(a) Random effects						
Panel A						
Female	0. 055*** (0.010)	0. 159*** (0.000)	0. 071*** (0.000)	0.155*** (0.000)	0. 138*** (0.000)	0.097 *** (0.000)
Panel B: Add Fshare						
Female	0.090*** (0.000)	0.095*** (0.000)	0.085 *** (0.000)	0.128*** (0.000)	0.087*** (0.000)	0.096*** (0.000)
Fshare	-0. 117*** (0.001)	0. 238*** (0.000)	-0.047 (0.158)	0.095*** (0.006)	0.172*** (0.000)	0.005 (0.856)
Panel C: Add interaction term						
Female	-0.010 (0.823)	0.089** (0.037)	-0.061 (0.137)	-0.064 (0.137)	0.157*** (0.001)	-0.040 (0.267)
Fshare	-0.201*** (0.000)	0. 233*** (0.000)	-0.168*** (0.000)	-0.063 (0.163)	0.230*** (0.000)	-0.107*** (0.005)
Female*Fshare	0.195*** (0.008)	0.011 (0.874)	0.282*** (0.000)	0.371*** (0.000)	-0.136* (0.079)	0.262*** (0.000)
Panel D: Estimation on separate samples						
Fshare – females	-0.042 (0.459)	0.288*** (0.000)	0.122** (0.021)	0.337*** (0.000)	0.107* (0.070)	0.150*** (0.001)
Fshare – males	-0.174*** (0.000)	0.174*** (0.004)	-0.195*** (0.000)	-0.116** (0.012)	0.175*** (0.001)	-0.113*** (0.004)
(b) Fixed effects						
Panel A – n.a.						
Panel B: with Fshare						
Fshare	-0.122*** (0.007)	0.147*** (0.001)	-0.076* (0.073)	0.024 (0.594)	0.076 (0.123)	-0.025 (0.489)
Panel C: Add interaction term						
Fshare	-0.235*** (0.000)	0.138** (0.020)	-0.163*** (0.003)	-0.154*** (0.009)	0.038*** (0.568)	-0.133*** (0.006)
Female*Fshare	0.253*** (0.005)	0.019 (0.829)	0.198*** (0.021)	0.407*** (0.000)	0.087 (0.378)	0.247*** (0.001)
Panel D: Estimation on separate samples						
Fshare - females	-0.022 (0.749)	0.187*** (0.004)	0.038 (0.570)	0.270*** (0.000)	0.123* (0.094)	0.097* (0.077)
Fshare - males	-0.198*** (0.001)	0.107* (0.076)	-0.185*** (0.001)	-0.161*** (0.006)	0.047 (0.478)	-0.121** (0.013)

Notes: Significance levels in parenthesis. ***, ** and * denote the estimate is significantly different from zero at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively. Number of observations (males plus females) varies from 142,065 to 162,880 depending upon the model, with women contributing 48.5% of observations.

Table 8: Linear models of mothers' and non-mothers' job satisfaction: (women only) selected coefficients

	Satisfaction with …					
Variable	Pay	Security	The work itself	Hours	Flexibility	Overall
(a) Random effects						
Panel A						
Mother	-0.093**	0.053	0.200***	0.210***	0.184 ***	0.128***
	(0.011)	(0.132)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Panel B: Add Fshare						
Mother	-0.092**	0.049	0.197***	0.198***	0.180***	0.125***
	(0.013)	(0.161)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Fshare	-0.040	0.286***	0.121**	0.334***	0.106*	0.150***
	(0.480)	(0.000)	(0.022)	(0.000)	(0.074)	(0.001)
Panel C: Interaction effects with mother status						
Mother	-0.281***	0.051	0.075	0.106	0.232***	0.082
	(0.000)	(0.481)	(0.274)	(0.159)	(0.005)	(0.164)
Fshare	-0.215***	0.288***	0.013	0.253***	0.152*	0.113*
	(0.007)	(0.000)	(0.861)	(0.001)	(0.070)	(0.080)
Mother*Fshare	0.300***	-0.003	0.193**	0.145	-0.082	0.066
	(0.004)	(0.975)	(0.045)	(0.157)	(0.463)	(0.423)
Panel D: Separate samples (mothers and non-mothers)						
Fshare – mother (female)	0.056	0.272***	0.223***	0.407***	0.126	0.160***
	(0.453)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.114)	(0.007)
Fshare – non-mother (female)	-0.227***	0.299***	0.018	0.232***	0.052	0.120*
	(0.005)	(0.000)	(0.821)	(0.003)	(0.540)	(0.072)
(b) Fixed effects						
Panel A						
Mother	-0.089*	-0.053	0.128***	0.220***	0.253***	0.067*
	(0.079)	(0.282)	(0.006)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.094)
Panel B: Add Fshare						
Mother	-0.086*	-0.053	0.128***	0.211***	0.250***	0.064
	(0.091)	(0.290)	(0.006)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.113)
Fshare	-0.021	0.187***	0.039	0.270***	0.124*	0.099*
	(0.760)	(0.004)	(0.559)	(0.000)	(0.092)	(0.072)
Panel C: Interaction effects with mother status						
Mother	-0.252***	-0.043	0.003	0.164*	0.363***	0.031
	(0.005)	(0.634)	(0.975)	(0.083)	(0.000)	(0.668)
Fshare	-0.175*	0.195**	-0.070	0.230**	0.222**	0.071
	(0.062)	(0.030)	(0.453)	(0.015)	(0.028)	(0.361)
Mother*Fshare	0.265**	-0.016	0.198*	0.073	-0.179	0.051
	(0.026)	(0.891)	(0.086)	(0.556)	(0.179)	(0.599)
Panel D: Separate samples (mothers and non-mothers)						
Fshare – mother (female)	0.016	0.153*	0.169*	0.282***	0.149	0.104
	(0.865)	(0.084)	(0.060)	(0.003)	(0.143)	(0.168)
Fshare – non-mother (female)	-0.081	0.200**	-0.081	0.198*	0.104	0.091
	(0.424)	(0.039)	(0.432)	(0.050)	(0.326)	(0.282)

Notes: see notes, Table 4.