

# Disentangling the Job Satisfaction Puzzle

by

Raquel Justo González

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements  
for the MSc in Economics, Finance and Computer Science

*University of Huelva & International University of Andalusia*

uhu.es

un  
i Universidad  
Internacional  
de Andalucía  
A

September 2016

# Disentangling the job satisfaction puzzle

Raquel Justo

Máster en Economía, Finanzas y Computación

Supervisor: Emilio Congregado

*Universidad de Huelva y Universidad Internacional de Andalucía*

2016

## Abstract

This piece of research attempts to determine whether some types of transitions into self-employment negatively influence job satisfaction, and therefore increases self-employed workers' propensity to leave entrepreneurship. We explore this hypothesis extending previous analysis, at least, into three different ways. Firstly, considering the potential existence of different effects depending on the different dimensions that job satisfaction can adopt. Secondly, and importantly, we check the potential depending on the push or pull character of the transition into self-employment. In particular, we hypothesize that transitions to self-employment governed by push-factors should have a lower impact in terms of job satisfaction than those governed by pull-factors. Thirdly, we explore the potential existence of different impacts on the job satisfaction depending on the occupational status in the period before the transition into self-employment –i.e. unemployment, paid-employment and inactive–. Finally, we combine the two previous criteria in order to check different effects on job satisfaction across each group of transitions not only by considering the initial state but also dividing it into two separate categories called “push” and “pull”.

**JEL classification:** J24, J28, M13, O52.

**Key words:** job satisfaction; self-employment; entrepreneurship; paid-employment; unemployment; occupational status, EU-15.

## Resumen

Este trabajo de investigación trata de determinar si algunos tipos de transiciones al autoempleo repercuten negativamente en términos de satisfacción laboral, y por tanto influyen negativamente en la satisfacción laboral y por tanto aumentan la probabilidad de que los autoempleados abandonen el *entrepreneurship*. Exploramos esta hipótesis, extendiendo los análisis previos, en

al menos, tres direcciones distintas. Primero, teniendo en cuenta la potencial existencia de diferentes efectos dependiendo de las diferentes dimensiones de la satisfacción laboral que consideremos. Segundo, y muy importante, testando si el propio efecto depende del carácter *pull* o *push* de la transición al autoempleo. En concreto, planteamos la hipótesis de que en las transiciones al autoempleo que están gobernadas o motivadas por factores de carácter *push*, el efecto de estas transiciones sobre la satisfacción laboral son menores que aquellas que vienen determinadas por factores *pull*. En tercer lugar, exploramos la existencia potencial de impactos diferentes sobre la satisfacción laboral dependiendo del estado laboral previo a la transición al autoempleo –esto es, desempleo, empleo asalariado o inactividad–. Finalmente combinamos los dos criterios anteriores para contrastar si existen diferentes efectos sobre la satisfacción laboral, en cada tipo de transición dependiendo no solo de cada tipo de transición en función del estado inicial, sino de l carácter *push* o *pull* de cada una de ellas.

## Acknowledgments

I am grateful to my supervisor Emilio Congregado whose guidance and support made it possible for me to work on this topic. It was a pleasure working with him. I am also indebted to Professor Millán and Román for helping me and for being ever so kind to show interest in my research. I would also like to thank all my teachers during the program. Your lectures have been really tempting. You have urged me to do better.

A mis padres, a mi Hermana y a Adrián por estar siempre ahí.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction	p. 7
2. Literature review	p.10
3. Hypotheses	p.14
4. Data, methodology and variables	p.17
5. Results	p.21
6. Conclusion and avenues for future research	p.23
7. References	p.25

## List of Tables

Table 1	p.30
Table 2	p.32
Table 3	p.34
Table 4	p.36
Table 5	p.38
Table 6	p.40
Table 7	p.42
Table 8	p.44

# 1 Introduction

Some scholars has emphasized on the role of job satisfaction as a competitive advantage by stating that it is important not only in terms of productivity but also, in the case of self-employment as a factor which propitiate the success a higher probability of survival in this status. In a certain extent, individuals are able to express a judge about the advantages and disadvantages associated to every type of employment based on their own experience. As it is well-known, this opinion is not only based on the return but also in other dimensions related to job satisfaction such as, hours of work, prospects –for instance in terms of job satisfaction–; how hard is the job; other non pecuniary rewards, such as prestige or independence among others, and interpersonal relationships. All this set of characteristics determine the job satisfaction and, largely, are factor which determines the employment status, the occupational choice and the decision to keep or to switch between different status when conditions change. These questions are important at least in three directions: i) first, because these factors are key determinants in the decision to become entrepreneur and to keep in this status when economic conditions are different. In other words, individuals are ever looking for new opportunities guided by the desire to switch from bad employments to good jobs; ii) second, because job satisfaction and productivity seem to be highly correlated; and iii) third, Individual's decisions about whether to participate or not and to work or not as a paid-employee or as entrepreneur, and even the type of job to accept or the profit opportunity to exploit depends in part upon the individual's subjective evaluation of the current situation, i.e. on their job satisfaction. In sum, satisfaction scores in the previous labor market status or employment is related with the subsequent observed transitions in the labor market. For instance, wage workers who are dissatisfied should be more likely to switch to another job or to self-employment or self-employed workers dissatisfied should be more likely to quit.

In this context, this paper focuses on job satisfaction and self-employment. Previous empirical literature has provided robust evidence on the differences in job satisfaction between self-employed and employees, interpreting it in terms of factors that play a key role in the relative valuation of self-employment as an alternative to wage employment. Another brand of the literature have investigated the role of job satisfaction for understanding the why individuals

choose self-employment, i.e. in the body of literature devoted to analyze the determinants of self-employment and as determinant of self-employment survival<sup>1</sup>. A third group of empirical studies addressed the computation of job satisfaction differentials across different occupational status by using different kind of decomposition methods, and finally, some studies have dealt the study of the impact of different kind of transitions on the job satisfaction score after the transition. This is basically the approach carried out by Millán et al. (2011) that we follow and extended in this article.

In fact, our approach extends previous literature incorporating two important facts, which treats to disentangle the current job satisfaction puzzle, that is, the existence of some controversies due to the weak evidence about the effect of some factors. One could argue that the lack of disaggregation –among the different dimensions of the job satisfaction and by type of transition— could be behind these, apparently, contradictory results. First, we hypothesize that each type of transition into self-employment can have different effects on the overall job satisfaction scale, and on its different dimensions. Our feeling is that behind the different types of transitions –defined in terms of the different initial state– are different factors and not all of them play at the same direction and intensity on job satisfaction. But, in addition whatever the initial state, the incidence of pulled or pushed factors on the decision to become entrepreneur could play an important role in the job satisfaction perceived after the transition. In order to deal with this possibility this article makes an important contribution providing criteria to distinguish transitions not only in terms of the possible initial states –unemployment, paid-employment and inactive– but also in terms of pulled or pushed transitions. In order to distinguish between transitions pulled and pushed within the group of transitions into self-employment from paid-employment we follow the definition provided by Román et al (2012) for dependent and independent self-employed, being considered as pushed transitions the different forms of false self-employment.

---

<sup>1</sup> This body of literature has explored the role of macroeconomic factors, social security and taxation, institutional and cultural conditions, working conditions, wages, and socioeconomic factors, among others.



For distinguishing between pulled and pushed transitions in the case of whose transit from unemployment, we use the long or short duration in unemployment as a criterion of delimitation. Finally, we consider also, separately the transitions from inactivity, considering the kind of inactivity as a way to discriminate between pulled and pushed factors in the transitions from inactivity to the effect. To the best of our knowledge this approach is novel and it might be a good strategy for disentangling the puzzle above mentioned.

In order to test our hypotheses, we report the estimates for comparing self-reported levels of job satisfaction in terms of different dimensions or elements associated to satisfaction for individuals who switch to self-employment.

Next we run separate estimations for the different kind of self-employees by the initial status – unemployed, paid-employed or inactive–. Finally, by running a third set of estimations by applying our criterion of delimitation among self-employed individuals, we will attempt to distinguish among opportunity and necessity self-employed workers depending on whether pull or push factors have governed the transition into self-employment and by the initial status, i.e. the observed status before the transition. Estimates are drawn by using survey data of 15 European countries for the 1994-2001 period and a large range of explanatory variables.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. The second section is devoted to present a selective review about job satisfaction and self-employment. The third section provides a detailed description of the data and econometric strategy used for testing our main hypotheses. Finally, last section concludes and provides some avenues for further research.

## 2 Literature review

At least one out of ten workers chooses entrepreneurship as a lifestyle in many economies around the world (Blanchflower, 2000). Despite this fact, it is still unclear why individuals become entrepreneurs.

The topic of occupational choice has been intensively studied over the last decades. Traditionally, scholars have tried to model this decision based on the assumption that individuals would choose entrepreneurship when it is optimal for them to do it. Usually, these models of utility maximization implicitly assumed that expected earnings were the main aspect that individuals would consider when deciding whether to become self-employed or wage-employees (Lucas, 1978; Kihlstrom and Laffont, 1979; Evans and Jovanovic, 1989; Evans and Leighton, 1989). However, the study carried out by Hamilton (2000) showed that, on average, entrepreneurs earn less money than paid-employees, but they still decide to become and remain self-employed. Hamilton argued that there should be some non-pecuniary benefits which are compensating the fact that these individuals generate less income. Later research has also confirmed the existence of non-pecuniary benefits in several other occasions (e.g. Moskowitz and Vissing-Jørgensen, 2002; Hurst and Pugsley, 2011). It is likely that these non-monetary aspects of entrepreneurship are driving the decision of many individuals to start a business, simply because they aim to have a more satisfying occupation.

One would therefore wonder whether entrepreneurs are really more satisfied with their job than the rest of the population. The largest part of the economic literature tends to answer this question in a positive way, implying that entrepreneurs do enjoy a higher job satisfaction than others (e.g. Blanchflower, 2004; Benz and Frey, 2004). Before getting any deeper into whether this is an irrefutable fact, let us begin by defining the concept of *job satisfaction*. According to Weiss (2002), job satisfaction has been defined in several different ways in the literature, which has possibly led to misleading conclusions. For example, Locke (1969) defined it as “*a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating one’s job values*”, and Cranny et al. (1992) argued that job satisfaction is “*an emotional reaction to one’s job*” and that it is grounded on “*the comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired*”. In any case, Miner (1992) stated that the concept of job satisfaction is equivalent to the notion of job attitude.

Behind the different definitions described above, there are some common determinants that explain why some individuals are more satisfied with their jobs than others. For instance, some of these factors arise from aspects such as participation in the decision-making process or implementation of fringe benefits. Fringe benefits are commonly believed to be endogenous to job satisfaction, in the sense that the causal relationship between them could be bidirectional. Individuals who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to have a more productive performance and, therefore, are rewarded with fringe benefits such as health insurance, extra training or paid vacations. On the other hand, employers can implement fringe benefits in order to make their employees more satisfied with the job conditions and, thus, increase their productivity. In this sense, Fringe benefits are often regarded as a relevant part of worker compensation. However, while fringe benefits generally have a positive effect on job satisfaction (Artz, 2010), the effect could be the opposite if workers feel they are sacrificing part of their wages in order to obtain such benefits (Woodbury, 1983; Baughman et al., 2003). Similarly, job satisfaction –as well as commitment– increases when employees feel they are taking part in the decision-making process (Lau and Chong, 2002).

The reason why employers would try to implement incentive systems like the ones described above is because job satisfaction is associated to higher worker productivity, commitment and motivation and to lower absenteeism and quitting intentions, which are aspects that potentially affect the performance of the company (Saari and Judge, 2004; Lange, 2012); Gazioglu and Tansel, 2006; Lange 2008). Satisfied workers are typically more motivated, work better in a team context and are often more creative and productive, and this job satisfaction eventually extends to their personal lives (De Neve et al., 2013). On the contrary, dissatisfied employees are more likely to quit their jobs and subsequently find a job in a different company or even start their own firms (Henley, 2012), with the aim of increasing their satisfaction levels (Lévy-Garboua et al., 2007). Therefore, the search for happiness is part of every individual's behavior, and it often involves transitions towards different employment status in order to pursue higher levels of satisfaction. In this paper we focus on how job satisfaction is affected by transitions that have self-employment as the main destination.

Whether individuals who become entrepreneurs become more satisfied with their jobs has been previously studied in the literature in multiple occasions and contexts. (e.g. Binder and

Coad, 2013; Guerra and Patuelli, 2014; Hanglberger and Merz, 2015). In general, self-employed individuals are considered to enjoy a higher level of job satisfaction (e.g. Blanchflower and Oswald, 1998). However, it is less clear why and under which circumstances self-employed individuals are more satisfied. The literature has usually focused on aspects related to both the personality of individuals and the characteristics of the entrepreneurial activity itself. It is relevant to disentangle the role of personality traits in the relationship between job satisfaction and self-employment, since the positive relationship that is usually found in the literature might be spurious if self-employed individuals are intrinsically more optimistic than others (Blanchflower and Oswald, 1998). Indeed, Bradley and Roberts (2004) find that characteristics like self-efficacy and a lower depression tendency are positively related to both being a self-employed and having a higher job satisfaction.

Nevertheless, (Lange, 2012) found that some job characteristics associated to entrepreneurship such as autonomy, independence or decision freedom are very significant predictors of job satisfaction even when controlling for aspects like personality traits or sociodemographic factors. These characteristics of the self-employment activity produce a higher satisfaction because it allows entrepreneur enjoy not only the outcome of their work –for example the money they make– but also the process leading to that outcome –the way they make that money– (Benz and Frey, 2008a) and because they are able to “do what they like” while performing their tasks (Benz and Frey, 2008b). Indeed, other studies have confirmed that self-employment offers even more aspects that are associated to a higher level of job satisfaction like flexibility of schedule (Hyytinen and Ruuskanen, 2007) or being you own boss (Schjoedt, 2009).

While becoming a self-employed makes an immediate positive impact on the degree of job satisfaction, the effect is not necessarily permanent because the excitement of the new type of employment decreases over time as reality does not meet expectations (Georgellis and Yusuf, 2016). In fact, self-employment entails some disadvantages compared to paid-employment that can negatively affect job satisfaction, such as initial investments (Moskowitz and Vissing-Jørgensen, 2002), risk and uncertainty (Douglas and Shepherd, 2002) or longer working hours (Kaufmann, 1999). In fact, Blanchflower (2004) carried out an analysis of self-employment and job satisfaction in over seventy countries and found that, in general, self-employed individuals are less satisfied with working hours and the level of stress and pressure in their job. However,

they reported a higher satisfaction in terms of earnings, type of work and distance to the workplace, as well as a higher life satisfaction.<sup>2</sup>

Whether self-employed individuals are also more satisfied with their lives and not just with their jobs is a different source of concern. In this regard, Binder and Coad (2013) explores the change in life satisfaction experiences by individuals who become entrepreneurs, distinguishing between those coming from paid-employment and those coming from unemployment. Their findings suggest that individuals who were paid-employees experience a short-term boost in their life satisfaction while those who come from unemployment do not experience a larger increase in their life satisfaction than unemployed individuals who find a paid job. They argue that this puzzling effect on life satisfaction can be explained by the fact that employees were *pulled* towards self-employment while unemployed people were *pushed*.

This re-opens the debate between *opportunity* and *necessity* entrepreneurship. The first group consists of those who are often regarded as the true Schumpeterian entrepreneurs: those who have an idea that is meant to be innovative and with good market prospects and are therefore *pulled* to entrepreneurship. The latter group, however, is formed by individuals who are not able to find a job and are *pushed* to entrepreneurship in order to bring money home –these are also known as *refugee* entrepreneurs (Thurik et al., 2008). The differentiation of these two types of individuals is important because they have different motivations to enter self-employment (Gilad and Levine, 1986; Amit and Muller, 1995). A possible list of pulled factors may include need for achievement, locus of control and need for independence, whereas push factors are related to a high dissatisfaction with the current employment or financial situations. For example, individuals who experience long periods of unemployment are likely to eventually become self-employed not as their preferred option, but as possibly the last resource (Moore and Mueller, 2002). Macroeconomic factors also play a role in determining the amount of opportunity and necessity entrepreneurs. For example, it is reasonable to think that pushed entrepreneurs are more common during economic downturns because it is more difficult to find a paid job, whereas pulled

---

<sup>2</sup> The fact that self-employed individuals report more satisfaction than paid-employees in some aspects of their job and less satisfaction in other aspects evidences the need to disaggregate the concept of job satisfaction in different sub-categories. In our paper, we distinguish between satisfaction with (i) earnings, (ii) job security, (iii) type of work, (iv) working hours, (v) working times, (vi) working conditions, and (vii) distance to work.

entrepreneurs arise more often during upturn periods because there are more market opportunities (Parker, 2009). However, Svaleryd (2015) warns that this relationship is only relevant depending on the human capital endowments of the individuals: more able individuals are more likely to be pulled into self-employment while less able individuals will probably be pushed.

Another determinant aspect in the dichotomy between pushed and pulled entrepreneurship is the level of employment protection legislation in the labor market (Parker, 2007). In this regard, Robson (2003) provides evidence that more strict legislations are correlated to higher rates of unemployment. Román et al. (2011) relate this positive correlation with the figure of the *dependent self-employed*, which they define as “*self-employed workers who are employed with the same tasks by the same employer for whom they previously worked as employees*”. This concept is interesting because it disaggregates a type of transition that was usually regarded as being purely opportunity-driven (the transition from paid-employment to self-employment) into two categories: one motivated by pull factors (the independent self-employed) and a second one motivated by push factors (the dependent self-employed). Consistent with the argument of Binder and Coad (2013) that pulled self-employed are more satisfied than pushed self-employed, results provided by Román et al. (2011) indicate that the dependent self-employed are less satisfied in their entrepreneurial activity than the independent self-employed.

Therefore, with all the above we can conclude that, even though the common finding is that self-employed report higher levels of job satisfaction, there is a high degree of heterogeneity derived from the motivations that drive the decision of individuals to become self-employed. Thus, it is necessary to identify whether the transition to self-employment is mostly driven by push or by pull factors to understand the potential impact on job satisfaction. Moreover, it is very possible that the differences in satisfaction between self-employed and others vary across the different aspects of the job.

### 3 Hypotheses

As we mentioned, job satisfaction is a hot policy issue in different fields of labour economics such as how organisations work (Lau & Chong, 2002), on the absenteeism (Lange, 2008) and in the wealth of workers (Appelbaum et al, 2013). This fact is behind the renewed interest on the

study of the determinants of job satisfaction. In that sense, the relationship between job satisfaction and the choice of employment (paid employment) has been not only largely explored (Henley, 2007, Lin et al., 2001, Christelis & Fonseca, 2015), but also in the literature of the determinants of the transition into self-employment (see, Carrasco 1999, Moore & Mueller 2002, for the transitions from unemployment and Hamermesh, 1999; Georgellis et. al, 2005; Guerra y Patuelli, 2014, for the transitions from paid-employment).

As we mentioned in the introduction, there are only a few works, in which the analysis of the transition from inactivity to self-employment (Zissimopoulos & Karoly, 2007 and Giandrea et al., 2013) is included. However this transition is particularly stressing, specially in times of crisis, when there is a high probability of observing several transitions from inactivity to self-employment caused by added worker effects among the low skilled and less educated workers, who decide to become entrepreneur facing up to the “sure” lack of job opportunities for them when these job offers are scarce. They are a special group of necessity entrepreneurs, other than those necessity entrepreneurs who are pushed into self-employment from unemployment. We hypothesise that this group will consist of some categories of inactive population and they should show lower levels of job satisfaction than those inactive individuals who switch to self-employment because they have found an opportunity –true entrepreneurs– (Henley, 2012).

This paper focused on the study of job satisfaction for individuals who switch into self-employment, in order to check if some kind of transitions has more likely to survive comparing with the rest.

In sum, the main contribution of this paper is to fill three gaps: i) considering the transitions from inactivity; ii) providing criterion for separating pulled and pushed transitions into self-employment for different kind of transitions –i.e. considering dependent and independent for transitions from paid-employment; by using the duration in unemployment for distinguished pulled and pushed self-employed for those individuals who switch from unemployment, and using the categories of inactive population–; iii) allowing the existence of asymmetries across different dimensions of job satisfaction.

Precisely to fill these research gaps, the current study distinguishes between seven types of job satisfaction and 8 types of transitions into self-employment and compares self-reported levels of these types of job satisfaction among the pulled and pushed self-employed.

In sum, we believe that the existence of pull and push factors behind the different kind of transitions must translate in different job satisfaction scores. Since necessity self-employed workers are waiting for a better opportunity, for a good job, one would expect that “necessity” self-employed are less satisfied than the opportunity ones. This leads to our first proposition:

*Proposition 1: The opportunity entrepreneurs are more satisfied than necessity entrepreneurs independently to the type of transition into self-employment considered.*

However, some aspects of the global job security record, some dimensions of job satisfaction are independent of the character pulled and pushed that ruled the transition and are common to every self-employed worker. Therefore, our second proposition is:

*Proposition 2: Some dimensions of the job satisfaction are independent of the pulled or pushed character of the transition.*

The main objective of this paper is to test the validity of these two propositions.



## 4 Data, methodology and variables

### Data

In order to obtain our estimates, we draw a sample from the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) covering the period 1994-2001, and fourteen European countries –Sweden is excluded of our analysis.<sup>3</sup> As starting point, the initial sample consists of about 130,000 individuals aged 16 years and older. In our analysis, we first classify individuals in the subsample according to their labor market status: (i) paid employment –private, public and both, (ii) self-employment, (iii) unemployment, and, (iv) inactivity. In addition, we select those individuals who switch from inactivity, unemployment or paid-employment, into self-employment during the period of interest. In a final step, we remove observations with missing data for any of the variables included in our regressions. Our final dataset comprises 5,032 transitions into self-employment (4,718 individuals) with 2,814 (55,92 percent) transitions coming from paid-employment, 860 (17,09 percent) from unemployment and 1,358 (26,99 percent) from inactivity.

As we mentioned, one of our objectives is to distinguish between pulled and pushed transitions. In order to identify them, we further classify each group of origin into different categories. Thus, those entering self-employment from unemployment are disaggregated into two groups depending on how long their period of unemployment was before becoming self-employed. Thus, we distinguish between long-term and short-term unemployed individuals depending on whether they spent more or less than twelve months without a job, respectively. Second, following the distinction made in the work by Román et al. (2011), we consider two different types of transitions from paid-employment to self-employment. In particular, we can identify dependent and independent self-employed individuals based on whether they keep a relationship with the previous employer or not. Finally, those entering from inactivity are

---

<sup>3</sup> Contract ECHP/2006/09, Department of Economics, University of Huelva.

classified depending on their initial status as (i) in education or training, (ii) retired, (iii) doing housework, looking after children or other persons, and (iv) other economically inactive (including those in community or military service).

## Methodology and dependent variables

The main aim of this work is to investigate whether job satisfaction as self-employed depends not only on the initial situation before the transition, but also on whether the transition was motivated by pulled or pushed factors. To this end, we use ordered logit models. In particular, to avoid violating the proportional odds assumption (also called parallel regressions assumption, or parallel lines assumption) we apply generalized ordered logit models.<sup>4</sup>

Within this framework, an individual's self-reported job satisfaction ( $sat_i$ ) is interpreted as an ordinal indicator of a latent wellbeing variable ( $WB_i$ ), which is unobservable. Our dependent variables measure job satisfaction in terms of (1) earnings, (2) job security, (3) type of work, (4) number of working hours, (5) working times, (6) working conditions or environment, and (7) distance to job or commuting. These variables range from 1 to 6, where 1 indicates that the individual is not satisfied with their present job and 6 implies that she is fully satisfied with her job. In order to simplify the comparisons, the dependent variables have been reclassified into three broader values for job satisfaction: (1) dissatisfied, (2) neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, (3) satisfied.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The parallel lines model is a special case of the generalized ordered model which assumes that the coefficients are equal across categories (proportional-odds assumption -also called parallel lines assumption-). Different tests provided evidence that the parallel regression assumption was violated and, as a consequence, demonstrate the need to apply generalized ordered logit models. See Williams (2006) for a complete description of the methodology.

<sup>5</sup> There are two reasons for doing this: first, in most cases, there are only few observations in the low satisfaction scales. A second reason for recoding is that we assume that there is quite a bit of "noise" in detailed scales. This can be illustrated using the following - much-cited - example: people usually know if they are tall or short; they may, however, have difficulties in classifying themselves as very short or extremely short.

The relationship between self-reported job satisfaction ( $sat_i$ ) and the latent variable ( $WB_i$ ) is given by

$$(1) \quad sat_i = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad -\infty < WB_i \leq \mu_1$$

$$(2) \quad sat_i = 2 \quad \text{if} \quad \mu_1 < WB_i \leq \mu_2$$

$$(3) \quad sat_i = 3 \quad \text{if} \quad \mu_2 < WB_i \leq +\infty$$

where  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  are the thresholds of the variable  $WB_i$  that divide its range into separate intervals associated with the different levels of job satisfaction.

The generalized ordered logit model can be written as

$$(4) \quad Pr(sat_i > j) = g(X\beta_j) = \frac{\exp(a_j + X_i\beta_j)}{1 + \exp(a_j + X_i\beta_j)}$$

where the vector  $X_i$  represents individual and firm-specific characteristics and macroeconomic conditions;  $\beta_j$  is the associated vector of coefficients to be estimated;<sup>6</sup> and  $g(\cdot)$  is specified as the logistic cumulative distribution function. It can be determined that the probability that  $sat_i$  will take on each of the values 1, 2 and 3 is equal to

$$(5) \quad Pr(sat_i = 1) = 1 - g(X_i\beta_1)$$

$$(6) \quad Pr(sat_i = 2) = g(X_i\beta_1) - g(X_i\beta_2)$$

$$(7) \quad Pr(sat_i = 3) = g(X_i\beta_2)$$

As an additional dependent variable, we also include a job satisfaction index that is calculated as the mean of the other seven different dependent variables capturing the different aspects of self-reported job satisfaction. Since the ECHP tracks the same individuals from 1994 to 2001, standard errors are adjusted for intra-individual correlation to control for possible unobserved heterogeneity.

## Independent variables

---

<sup>6</sup> The formulas for the parallel lines model and generalized ordered logit model are the same, except that in the parallel lines model the Betas (but not the Alphas) are the same for all values of  $j$ .

*Main independent variables.* The main independent variables are a set of dummy variables that classify individuals who transit into self-employment depending on the type of starting status. Firstly, we construct three dummies distinguishing between those entering self-employment from unemployment, inactivity and paid-employment. Secondly, these transitions are split by the predominance of pulled or pushed motivations. In doing so, we consider new dummies. In particular, for the transition from unemployment to self-employment we consider two dummies: one for long-term unemployed individuals and one for short-term unemployed. For the transition from inactivity, we consider four dummies in order to distinguish between (i) in education or training, (ii) retired, (iii) doing housework, looking after children or other persons, and (iv) other economically inactive (including those in community or military service). Finally, we consider also two different dummies in the transition from paid-employment to self-employment, depending on whether there is still a relationship with the previous employer (dependent vs. independent self-employment). All these dummies take the value 1 for those in the considered group and 0 otherwise.

*Control variables.* In the analyses we include a large number of individual-specific independent variables such as demographic indicators (gender, age, health and household financial situation), family aspects and structure (cohabiting status and number of young children), educational attainment, firm-specific indicators (firm size and sector of industry) and employment characteristics (hours of work,). Finally, we also include region and time dummies in order to check the spatial and temporary stability of our estimates.

## 5 Results

This section is devoted to discuss the main results of our empirical estimates. In order to doing so, we are going to present the results in several steps. First we are going to focus on the differences in terms of job satisfaction among the different kind of transitions into self-employment depending on the initial status, i.e. unemployment, inactivity or paid-employment. To this end we consider several measures of job satisfaction, in terms of: earnings, job security, type of work, working hours, working times, working conditions or environment, and distance to job. First, we try to test if we can find differences in the effects of the general index of job satisfaction in each type of transition in function of whether pulled or pushed factors were ruled the decision of becoming entrepreneur.

The results of the first task will be presented in table 8. The results of predicted probabilities for the different kind of transitions and final status are reported by using the different categories of job satisfaction as the dependent variable are presented in tables 1 to 7. In a four-column format, tables present results for different specifications from the simplest one (column 1, without differences among pulled and pushed transitions) to the more complex which includes all the potential initial states, which are represented as “main variables” into the box of the first rows in the table. At the top of each column, the number of individuals and observations involved in the estimations are reported. Then, for each possible level of job satisfaction (1 = dissatisfied, 2 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 3 = satisfied), predicted probabilities of job satisfaction for the sample means are shown. Below only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented in terms of marginal effects (and not the coefficients). These marginal effects are expressed in relative terms (with respect to the predicted probabilities for the sample means). Finally, t-statistics associated with marginal effects are reported in each column.

The last column in table 8 presents results for satisfaction with the present job in terms of the kind of transition which has been included as independent variable. In accordance with proposition 1, a positive value in the dummy which captures each type of transition reveals that these group of self-employed are more satisfied with their jobs than the category used as reference (the transition from paid employment to independent self-employment). On this basis

this group of new self-employed workers are more satisfied than the self-employed which came from unemployment and inactivity and with regard the dependent self-employed workers. To be precise, we observe a 2,47% increase of the probability of being satisfied with the type of work in case of being independent self-employed with regard false self-employed. With respect to demographic characteristics, a number of factors such as to have children, health status and the financial situation are also key elements for determining job satisfaction. Regarding education, the findings indicate that education matters in the sense that those who received secondary schooling or university education are more likely to be satisfied with the type of work as compared to those who received only primary education or no schooling at all. Several employment characteristics are considered. The most important finding is related with the less likely to be satisfied with the type of work in the agriculture. Regarding the impact of the state of the various national economies, it can be seen that when countries have higher unemployment rates, both employees and self-employed individuals are more likely to be satisfied with the type of work they do.

As explained above, we focus not only on job satisfaction index but also on satisfaction in terms of diff job security. Tables 1 to 7 displays the results for satisfaction with the present job in terms of earnings, job security, type of work, working hours, working time, working conditions and distance to work.. In line with our second proposition, we find that the pushed self-employed are less likely to be satisfied than the opportunities entrepreneurs, but only in terms job security – only with regard those self-employed who came from unemployment– types of work, working hours and working time. However, in terms of earnings, working conditions and distance to work we can not find evidence supporting our hypothesis.

## 6 Conclusion and avenues for future research

Governments around the world are devising portfolios of policies for promoting entrepreneurship not only across unemployed but also encouraging inactive individuals to participate and to paid employees to become entrepreneurs. However, it is important to distinguish between schemes of incentives oriented to become a more entrepreneurial society, i.e. promoting transitions among those individuals which want to exploit a profit opportunity – true entrepreneurs–, and policies oriented to turning unemployment into self-employment or schemes used by employers as a way to avoid employment protection legislation or by those individuals endowed with the lowest skills and educational attainment, who become entrepreneurs as the only alternative to face up the lack of job offers.

In terms of job satisfaction, one could argue that the transitions ruled by push factors should be associated to lower scores in the different dimensions of job satisfaction than the transitions ruled by pulled factors.

In this paper we provided and applied some criterion for distinguish across pulled and pushed transitions into self-employment and we reported estimates for comparing the effects of these different categories of transitions on the job satisfaction scores.

The other novelty of our study with regard previous literature was the inclusion of the transition into self-employment from inactivity, a group with special characteristics given that they incorporate some secondary workers who switch directly from inactivity to self-employment, specially in times of crisis, as a response to worse economic conditions. The presence of a high number of transitions of this type –when added worker effects are intense– may cause important effects on the self-employment sector, given the predominance in this group of the less employable people.

Our results support our two main hypothesis –partially the second one– and point to the need to be very careful with our policies to ensure that our incentives are responding to our objectives, given the heterogeneity and how different transitions lead different effects.

The challenges of this research will come from new empirical estimates by using more richer data bases which allow to capture different episodes or spells in order to capture previous job satisfaction records. Another issue should come from the analysis of the differentials in job

satisfaction not only between different groups of self-employed workers, but also the potential decay of this satisfaction after a few periods.



## 7 References

- Amit, R., & Muller, E. (1995) “Push” and “pull” entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 12(4), 64-80.
- Appelbaum, S.H., Louis, D., Makarenko, D., Saluja, J., Meleshko, O. & Kulbashian, S. (2013) Participation in decision making: a case study of job satisfaction and commitment (part one). *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 45(4), 222 – 229.
- Artz, B. (2010) Fringe benefits and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 31(6), 626 – 644.
- Baughman, R., DiNardi, D. & Holtz-Eakin, D. (2003) Productivity and wage effects of ‘family-friendly’ fringe benefits. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(3), 247-259.
- Benz, M., & Frey, B.S. (2004) Being independent raises happiness at work. *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, 11, 95–134.
- Benz, M., & Frey, B.S. (2008a) Being independent is a great thing: Subjective evaluations of self-employment and hierarchy. *Economica*, 75, 362–383.
- Benz, M., & Frey B.S. (2008b) The Value of Doing what you Like: Evidence from the Self-Employed in 23 Countries. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 68(3), 445-455.
- Binder, M., & Coad, A. (2013) Life satisfaction and self-employment: a matching approach. *Small Business Economics*, 40(4), 1009-1033.
- Blanchflower, D.G. (2000) Self-employment in OECD countries. *Labour Economics*, 7(5), 471-505.
- Blanchflower, D.G. (2004) Self-employment: More may not be better *National Bureau of Economic Research*, (No. w10286).
- Blanchflower, D. G., & Oswald, A. J. (1998) What makes an entrepreneur?. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(1), 26–60.
- Bradley, D. E., & Roberts, J. A. (2004) Self-employment and job satisfaction: investigating the role of self-efficacy, depression, and seniority. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 42(1), 37-58.

- Carrasco, R. (1999) Transitions to and from self-employment in Spain: an empirical analysis. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 61(3), 315-341.
- Cooper, A. C., & Artz, K.W. (1995) Determinants of Satisfaction for Self-Employed. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(6), 439-457.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992) Job satisfaction: how people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. *New York: Lexington Press*.
- Christelis, D., & Fonseca, R. (2015). *Labor Market Policies and Self-Employment Transitions of Older Workers*, 1516.
- Dawson, C., & Henley, A. (2012) “Push” versus “pull” entrepreneurship: an ambiguous distinction?. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 18(6), 697-719.
- De Neve, J. E., Diener, E., Tay, L., & Xuereb, C. (2013) The objective benefits of subjective well-being. *World happiness report*.
- Douglas, E. J., & Shepherd, D.A. (2002) Self-Employment as a Career Choice: Attitudes, Entrepreneurial Intentions, and Utility Maximization. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(3), 81-90.
- Evans, D.S. & Jovanovic B. (1989) An estimated model of entrepreneurial choice under liquidity constraints. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97(4), 808-827.
- Evans, D.S. & Leighton L.S. (1989) Some empirical aspects of entrepreneurship. *American Economic Review*, 79(3), 519-535.
- Gazioglu, S., & Tansel, A. (2006) Job satisfaction in Britain: Individual and job related factors. *Applied Economics*, 38, 1163–1171.
- Georgellis, Y., & Yusuf, A.O. (2016) Is becoming self-employed a panacea for job satisfaction? Longitudinal evidence from work to self-employment transitions. *Journal of Small Business Management, Forthcoming*.
- Georgellis, Y., Sessions, J., & Tsitsianis, N. (2005) The Effect of Windfall Gains on Self-Employment Transitions: UK Evidence. *Small Business Economics*, 25(5), 407-428.
- Giandrea, M. D., Cahill, K. E., & Quinn, J. F. (2013) New evidence on self-employment transitions among older Americans with career jobs. *US Bureau of Labor Statistics WP-463*.

- Gilad, B., & Levine, P. (1986) A behavioral model of entrepreneurial supply. *Journal of small business management*, 24, 45.
- Guerra, G., & Patuelli, R. (2014) The Role of Job Satisfaction in Transitions Into Self-Employment. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*.
- Hamermesh, D. S. (1999) The changing distribution of job satisfaction. *National bureau of economic research*, 7332.
- Hamilton, B.H. (2000) Does entrepreneurship pay? An empirical analysis of the returns to self-employment. *Journal of Political Economy*, 108(3), 604-631.
- Hanglberger, D., & Merz, J. (2015) Does self-employment really raise job satisfaction? Adaptation and anticipation effects on self-employment and general job changes. *Journal for Labour Market Research*, 48(4), 287-303.
- Henley, A. (2007) Entrepreneurial aspiration and transition into self-employment: evidence from British longitudinal data. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 19(3), 253-280.
- Hurst, E. & Pugsley B.J. (2011) What do small businesses do? *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, Economic Studies Program, The Brookings Institution, 43(2), 73-142.
- Hyytinen, A. & Ruuskanen O. (2007) Time Use of the Self-Employed. *Kyklos*, 60(1), 105-122.
- Kaufmann, P.J. (1999) Franchising and Choice of Self-Employment. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 14(4), 345–361.
- Kihlstrom, R.E. & Laffont J.J. (1979) A general equilibrium entrepreneurial theory of firm formation based on risk aversion. *Journal of Political Economy*, 87(4), 719-748.
- 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.
- Lange, T. (2012) Job Satisfaction and Self-Employment: Autonomy or Personality?. *Small Business Economics*, 38(2), 165-177.
- Lau, C.M. & Chong, J. (2002) The effects of budget emphasis, participation and organizational commitment on job satisfaction: evidence from the financial services sector, *Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research*, Emerald Group Publishing, 5, 183-211.
- Lévy-Garboua, L., Montmarquette, C., & Simonnet, V. (2007) Job satisfaction and quits. *Labour Economics*, 14(2), 251-268.

- Lin, Z., Picot, G., & Compton, J. (2000) The entry and exit dynamics of self-employment in Canada. *Small business economics*, 15(2), 105-125.
- Locke, E.A. (1969) What is job satisfaction?. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 309–336.
- Lucas, R.E. (1978) On the size distribution of business firms. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 9(2), 508-523.
- Millán, J., Hessels, J., Thurik, A.R. and R. Aguado (2013). Determinants of job satisfaction: a European comparison of self-employed and paid employees, *Small Business Economics*, 40(3), 651–670.
- Miner, J. B. (1992) *Industrial–organizational psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Moore, S.C. & Mueller, R.E. (2002) The transition from paid to self- employment in Canada: the importance of push factors. *Applied Economics*, 34(6), 791-801.
- Moskowitz, T.K., & Vissing-Jørgensen, A. (2002) The returns to entrepreneurial investment: A private equity premium puzzle? *The American Economic Review*, 92(4), 745-778.
- Parker, S. C. (2007) Law and the Economics of Entrepreneurship. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 28(4).
- Parker, S.C. (2009) *The Economics of Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robson, M. T. (2003) Does stricter employment protection legislation promote self-employment?. *Small Business Economics*, 21(3), 309-319.
- Román, C., Congregado, E., & Millán, J. M. (2011) Dependent self-employment as a way to evade employment protection legislation. *Small Business Economics*, 37(3), 363-392.
- Saari, L., & Judge, T. (2004) Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), 395–407.
- Schjoedt, L. (2009) Entrepreneurial Job Characteristics: An Examination of Their Effect on Entrepreneurial Satisfaction. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 619-644.
- Svaleryd, H. (2015) Self-employment and the local business cycle. *Small Business Economics*, 44(1), 55-70.

- Thurik, A. R., Carree, M. A., Van Stel, A., & Audretsch, D. B. (2008) Does self-employment reduce unemployment?. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 23(6), 673-686.
- Weiss, H.M. (2002) Deconstructing job satisfaction Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 173-194.
- Woodbury, S. (1983) Substitution between wage and nonwage benefits, *American Economic Review*, 73 (1), 166-82.
- Zissimopoulos, J.M. & Karoly, L.A. (2007) Transitions to self-employment at older ages: The role of wealth, health, health insurance and other factors. *Labour Economics*, 14, 269–295.

# Appendix

Table 1. Job satisfaction with earnings

*-Generalized Ordered Logit estimations-*

Specification	I		II		III		IV	
<b>Total # ind.</b>	4,718		4,718		4,718		4,718	
<b>Total # obs.</b>	5,032		5,032		5,032		5,032	
<b>Prob (JS = 1)</b>	0.216		0.216		0.216		0.216	
<b>Prob (JS = 2)</b>	0.649		0.649		0.649		0.651	
<b>Prob (JS = 3) <sup>(a)</sup></b>	0.135		0.135		0.134		0.134	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.
<b>Main variables</b>								
PE → SE	<i>(Ref)</i>							
PE → DSE			8.693	0.91	8.61	0.90	0.09	0.97
PE → ISE			<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
U → SE	-36.92	-4.25 ***	-33.15	-3.37 ***				
U <sub>LT</sub> → SE					-47.15	-4.44 ***	-0.47	-4.41 ***
U <sub>ST</sub> → SE					-12.35	-0.87	-0.12	-0.85
I → SE	-16.06	-1.74 *	-11.37	-1.06	-11.62	-1.08		
I <sub>ST</sub> → SE							-20.93	-1.33
I <sub>RET</sub> → SE							18.76	0.81
I <sub>HW</sub> → SE							-27.77	-2.21 **
I <sub>OT</sub> → SE							15.72	0.76
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>								
Female	-11.93	-1.41	-11.68	-1.38	-11.73	-1.39	-4.00	-0.44
Age (18-30)	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Age (31-40)	-19.40	-2.1 **	-19.26	-2.09 **	-18.64	-2.01 **	-16.93	-1.78 *
Age (41-50)	-1.70	-0.16	-2.25	-0.21	-1.23	-0.11	2.01	0.18
Age (+50)	1.42	0.12	0.03	0	1.13	0.1	3.47	0.29
Cohabiting	5.07	0.56	5.17	0.57	4.61	0.51	4.06	0.44
Children under 14	7.22	1.59	7.07	1.56	7.19	1.58	8.57	1.86 *
Health	-15.16	-2.81 ***	-15.23	-2.81 ***	-15.34	-2.83 ***	-17.26	-3.15 ***
Household financial situation	59.39	16.61 ***	59.26	16.53 ***	59.07	16.44 ***	59.01	16.47 ***
<b>Education</b>								
Basic education	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Secondary education	14.46	1.55	14.56	1.56	14.15	1.52	14.72	1.56
University studies	14.58	1.21	14.60	1.21	14.14	1.17	13.15	1.09
<b>Employment characteristics</b>								
Working hours	0.23	0.9	0.24	0.96	0.23	0.92	0.28	1.1
Activity sector								
AB	-47.32	-4.26 ***	-47.69	-4.31 ***	-47.43	-4.26 ***	-49.20	-4.42 ***
CE	-41.57	-1.16	-41.63	-1.16	-41.83	-1.17	-41.57	-1.18

DA	17.84	0.58	16.32	0.53	15.54	0.51	14.63	0.48
DBDC	-49.19	-2.78 ***	-49.59	-2.81 ***	-49.57	-2.81 ***	-51.33	-3.02 ***
DDDE	17.41	0.61	17.23	0.6	17.57	0.62	16.83	0.59
DFDI	-13.65	-0.47	-14.06	-0.48	-13.21	-0.45	-14.51	-0.49
DJDK	-27.86	-1.41	-28.35	-1.44	-28.66	-1.46	-29.11	-1.5
DLDN	-27.55	-1.57	-27.70	-1.58	-27.60	-1.58	-28.41	-1.62
F		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
G	-22.57	-2 **	-22.70	-2.01 **	-22.01	-1.94 *	-23.55	-2.08 **
H	-18.98	-1.29	-18.91	-1.29	-19.18	-1.31	-19.88	-1.36
I	24.63	1.09	24.06	1.06	23.32	1.03	22.38	1
J	63.74	1.88 *	63.77	1.88 *	64.32	1.89 *	64.28	1.87 *
K	-3.49	-0.24	-2.93	-0.2	-2.90	-0.2	-3.88	-0.27
L	29.96	0.44	27.81	0.41	29.08	0.42	21.96	0.33
M	-19.09	-0.79	-18.97	-0.78	-17.52	-0.71	-17.89	-0.73
N	7.56	0.34	7.30	0.33	5.92	0.27	5.00	0.23
OQ	-7.20	-0.46	-7.53	-0.49	-6.96	-0.45	-8.10	-0.52
<b>Country</b>								
Austria	69.30	2.6 ***	71.72	2.67 ***	71.67	2.65 ***	73.30	2.67 ***
Belgium	34.06	1.42	36.76	1.5	36.85	1.5	35.96	1.47
Denmark	137.38	3.76 ***	138.63	3.79 ***	138.36	3.78 ***	132.38	3.68 ***
Finland	68.86	2.88 ***	69.97	2.91 ***	69.65	2.9 ***	67.93	2.81 ***
France	18.08	0.53	22.52	0.64	23.70	0.66	24.33	0.68
Germany	-60.69	-4.36 ***	-59.51	-4.15 ***	-59.00	-4.09 ***	-59.58	-4.16 ***
Greece	-49.10	-4.89 ***	-49.28	-4.91 ***	-49.43	-4.92 ***	-51.35	-5.18 ***
Ireland	74.44	3.33 ***	77.46	3.4 ***	78.30	3.4 ***	76.37	3.32 ***
Italy	-29.85	-3.07 ***	-29.68	-3.05 ***	-29.12	-2.98 ***	-29.22	-2.99 ***
Luxembourg	-66.75	-1.89 *	-66.66	-1.89 *	-66.83	-1.9 *	-66.85	-1.91 *
Netherlands	71.59	3.19 ***	72.51	3.21 ***	72.04	3.2 ***	72.23	3.21 ***
Portugal	-51.57	-4.96 ***	-51.00	-4.86 ***	-51.01	-4.86 ***	-52.34	-5 ***
Spain		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
United Kingdom	-4.20	-0.13	-6.63	-0.21	-6.15	-0.19	-7.94	-0.25
<b>Wave</b>								
1995	8.85	0.62	8.39	0.59	7.98	0.56	8.88	0.62
1996	2.41	0.17	2.06	0.15	2.90	0.21	3.29	0.23
1997	4.95	0.37	4.93	0.37	6.27	0.47	5.45	0.41
1998	1.08	0.08	1.13	0.09	1.22	0.09	1.34	0.1
1999	19.04	1.26	19.21	1.27	19.40	1.28	20.95	1.37
2000	6.23	0.44	6.30	0.44	6.27	0.44	7.61	0.53
2001		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
Log pseudolikelihood	-4,241.84		-4,241.36		-4,238.73		-4,227.95	

Notes: (a) For brevity and focus, only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented; \*\*\* denotes significance at 1% level; \*\* denotes significance at 5% level; \* denotes significance at 10% level.

Table 2. Job satisfaction with job security  
 -Generalized Ordered Logit estimations-

Specification	I		II		III		IV	
Total # ind.	4,718		4,718		4,718		4,718	
Total # obs.	5,032		5,032		5,032		5,032	
Prob (JS = 1)	0.145		0.145		0.145		0.143	
Prob (JS = 2)	0.518		0.518		0.518		0.521	
Prob (JS = 3) <sup>(a)</sup>	0.337		0.337		0.337		0.336	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.
<b>Main variables</b>								
PE → SE	<i>(Ref)</i>							
PE → DSE			5.16	0.87	5.13	0.87	6.08	1.02
PE → ISE			<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
U → SE	-24.48	-4.3 ***	-21.89	-3.35 ***				
U <sub>LT</sub> → SE					-24.30	-3.23 ***	-24.36	-3.23 ***
U <sub>ST</sub> → SE					-17.46	-1.96 **	-17.95	-2.01 **
I → SE	-4.83	-0.85	-1.80	-0.27	-1.90	-0.28		
I <sub>ST</sub> → SE							-33.19	-3.36 ***
I <sub>RET</sub> → SE							28.64	2.37 **
I <sub>HW</sub> → SE							-3.30	-0.38
I <sub>OT</sub> → SE							12.98	1.11
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>								
Female	-0.14	-0.03	-0.10	-0.02	-0.13	-0.03	2.71	0.48
Age (18-30)	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Age (31-40)	-15.67	-2.72 ***	-15.65	-2.71 ***	-15.56	-2.69 ***	-15.33	-2.6 ***
Age (41-50)	-8.64	-1.37	-9.01	-1.43	-8.85	-1.4	-7.42	-1.15
Age (+50)	-0.60	-0.08	-1.30	-0.18	-1.16	-0.16	-0.51	-0.07
Cohabiting	7.48	1.37	7.51	1.38	7.38	1.35	3.92	0.7
Children under 14	-2.16	-0.79	-2.20	-0.81	-2.19	-0.8	-1.55	-0.56
Health	-4.26	-1.33	-4.30	-1.34	-4.32	-1.35	-6.35	-1.97 **
Household financial situation	26.12	12.23 ***	26.01	12.14 ***	25.97	12.12 ***	25.73	12.01 ***
<b>Education</b>								
Basic education	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Secondary education	13.75	2.49 **	13.84	2.51 **	13.78	2.5 **	16.18	2.89 ***
University studies	15.41	2.15 **	15.51	2.16 **	15.46	2.16 **	16.18	2.24 **
<b>Employment characteristics</b>								
Working hours	0.59	3.75 ***	0.60	3.79 ***	0.59	3.77 ***	0.64	4.03 ***
<b>Activity sector</b>								
AB	42.22	4.69 ***	41.98	4.67 ***	42.14	4.69 ***	37.56	4.15 ***
CE	29.17	0.98	28.44	0.96	28.36	0.96	24.37	0.84
DA	46.53	2.35 **	45.83	2.3 **	45.73	2.29 **	45.81	2.27 **
DBDC	28.18	1.6	28.11	1.6	28.25	1.61	26.50	1.5



DDDE	24.98	1.43	25.06	1.43	25.13	1.43	23.63	1.35
DFDI	58.78	2.85 ***	58.12	2.81 ***	58.40	2.82 ***	59.80	2.87 ***
DJDK	23.64	1.33	23.39	1.32	23.39	1.32	23.51	1.33
DLDN	6.45	0.39	6.45	0.39	6.52	0.4	7.16	0.44
F	<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>	
G	34.36	4 ***	34.36	4 ***	34.52	4.02 ***	32.79	3.82 ***
H	31.68	2.77 ***	31.97	2.79 ***	32.00	2.79 ***	30.41	2.65 ***
I	39.59	2.8 ***	39.46	2.79 ***	39.31	2.77 ***	38.14	2.68 ***
J	46.13	2.52 **	46.10	2.52 **	46.09	2.52 **	48.31	2.64 ***
K	5.01	0.51	5.33	0.55	5.37	0.55	6.79	0.69
L	50.05	1.15	49.18	1.13	49.71	1.14	45.71	1.02
M	13.29	0.73	13.31	0.74	13.82	0.76	16.85	0.92
N	30.67	2.03 **	30.48	2.02 **	30.38	2.02 **	31.85	2.1 **
OQ	5.24	0.5	5.07	0.48	5.20	0.49	4.22	0.4
<b>Country</b>								
Austria	57.15	4.14 ***	58.09	4.2 ***	57.93	4.18 ***	59.24	4.24 ***
Belgium	-5.76	-0.44	-4.71	-0.35	-4.86	-0.36	-5.75	-0.43
Denmark	70.08	4.46 ***	70.75	4.52 ***	70.51	4.5 ***	67.32	4.27 ***
Finland	-3.64	-0.33	-3.33	-0.3	-3.61	-0.33	-4.22	-0.38
France	-34.30	-2.07 **	-32.88	-1.95 *	-32.95	-1.96 **	-34.79	-2.11 **
Germany	-27.30	-1.88 *	-26.36	-1.8 *	-26.29	-1.8 *	-29.34	-2.06 **
Greece	-56.12	-9.84 ***	-56.17	-9.84 ***	-56.29	-9.82 ***	-59.00	-10.47 ***
Ireland	20.62	1.93 *	21.68	2.01 **	21.55	2 **	17.52	1.64
Italy	-27.97	-4.62 ***	-27.95	-4.61 ***	-28.01	-4.62 ***	-28.64	-4.74 ***
Luxembourg	-45.57	-1.48	-45.30	-1.48	-45.45	-1.49	-46.36	-1.57
Netherlands	14.46	1.29	14.90	1.33	14.70	1.31	14.14	1.27
Portugal	-36.59	-5.87 ***	-36.25	-5.78 ***	-36.40	-5.79 ***	-38.40	-6.1 ***
Spain	<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>	
United Kingdom	-10.96	-0.5	-12.39	-0.57	-12.35	-0.57	-14.88	-0.7
<b>Wave</b>								
1995	4.17	0.5	3.82	0.46	3.57	0.43	4.57	0.54
1996	0.20	0.02	0.09	0.01	0.02	0	0.36	0.04
1997	8.58	1.09	8.52	1.08	8.65	1.1	6.99	0.88
1998	3.55	0.44	3.52	0.44	3.45	0.43	3.85	0.48
1999	15.43	1.82 *	15.46	1.83 *	15.38	1.82 *	15.76	1.84 *
2000	-2.72	-0.32	-2.70	-0.32	-2.79	-0.33	-1.76	-0.21
2001	<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>	
Log pseudolikelihood	-4,650.54		-4,650.18		-4,649.82		-4,632.03	

Notes: (a) For brevity and focus, only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented; \*\*\* denotes significance at 1% level; \*\* denotes significance at 5% level; \* denotes significance at 10% level.

**Table 3. Job satisfaction type of work**  
**-Generalized Ordered Logit estimations-**

Specification	I		II		III		IV	
<b>Total # ind.</b>	4,718		4,718		4,718		4,718	
<b>Total # obs.</b>	5,032		5,032		5,032		5,032	
<b>Prob (JS = 1)</b>	0.037		0.036		0.035		0.035	
<b>Prob (JS = 2)</b>	0.452		0.453		0.453		0.454	
<b>Prob (JS = 3) <sup>(a)</sup></b>	0.511		0.511		0.511		0.511	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.
<b>Main variables</b>								
PE → SE	<i>(Ref)</i>							
PE → DSE			-14.79	-3.33 ***	-14.81	-3.34 ***	-14.75	-3.29 ***
PE → ISE			<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
U → SE	-7.53	-1.68 *	-16.09	-3.14 ***				
U <sub>LT</sub> → SE					-21.02	-3.67 ***	-21.39	-3.7 ***
U <sub>ST</sub> → SE					-7.25	-1	-7.73	-1.06
I → SE	-7.26	-1.68 *	-16.23	-3.2 ***	-16.34	-3.22 ***		
I <sub>ST</sub> → SE							-26.87	-3.23 ***
I <sub>RET</sub> → SE							15.15	1.85 *
I <sub>HW</sub> → SE							-29.02	-4.54 ***
I <sub>OT</sub> → SE							-9.35	-1.1
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>								
Female	-0.43	-0.11	-0.50	-0.13	-0.66	-0.17	5.83	1.38
Age (18-30)	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Age (31-40)	0.47	0.11	0.40	0.09	0.71	0.16	3.31	0.74
Age (41-50)	-5.80	-1.2	-4.71	-0.97	-4.42	-0.91	-0.39	-0.08
Age (+50)	-8.59	-1.6	-6.73	-1.25	-6.45	-1.2	-2.99	-0.54
Cohabiting	3.97	0.98	3.81	0.94	3.62	0.89	2.19	0.53
Children under 14	-7.10	-3.34 ***	-6.84	-3.21 ***	-6.86	-3.22 ***	-5.80	-2.69 ***
Health	-8.40	-3.58 ***	-8.43	-3.59 ***	-8.48	-3.62 ***	-10.42	-4.4 ***
Household financial situation	12.35	8.06 ***	12.57	8.16 ***	12.47	8.1 ***	12.28	7.94 ***
<b>Education</b>								
Basic education	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Secondary education	8.45	2.09 **	8.11	2.01 **	7.98	1.98 **	9.07	2.22 **
University studies	18.58	3.55 ***	18.42	3.52 ***	18.31	3.5 ***	17.49	3.33 ***
<b>Employment characteristics</b>								
Working hours	0.61	5.02 ***	0.60	4.86 ***	0.59	4.81 ***	0.64	5.22 ***
<b>Activity sector</b>								
AB	-9.78	-1.64	-9.35	-1.56	-9.07	-1.51	-12.60	-2.08 **
CE	-23.16	-1.18	-22.20	-1.1	-22.27	-1.1	-24.24	-1.22
DA	6.20	0.47	7.78	0.59	7.74	0.58	7.26	0.54
DBDC	27.34	2.66 ***	27.47	2.69 ***	27.57	2.7 ***	25.28	2.45 **

DDDE	25.85	2.32 **	25.89	2.34 **	25.86	2.34 **	24.61	2.2 **
DFDI	18.18	1.35	18.58	1.38	19.12	1.42	17.87	1.31
DJDK	9.90	0.82	9.93	0.83	9.98	0.84	9.44	0.78
DLDN	28.20	2.67 ***	27.86	2.65 ***	28.02	2.66 ***	27.23	2.56 **
F		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
G	15.61	2.73 ***	15.31	2.67 ***	15.59	2.72 ***	14.07	2.43 **
H	7.07	0.91	6.01	0.77	6.09	0.78	4.87	0.62
I	5.75	0.66	5.89	0.67	5.64	0.64	4.31	0.49
J	34.08	2.83 ***	33.98	2.81 ***	33.88	2.79 ***	33.96	2.79 ***
K	32.14	4.78 ***	31.38	4.63 ***	31.60	4.66 ***	31.23	4.55 ***
L	38.86	2.11 **	40.01	2.14 **	40.75	2.2 **	38.87	2.06 **
M	63.06	7.66 ***	62.60	7.56 ***	63.04	7.67 ***	63.03	7.68 ***
N	38.87	3.95 ***	39.37	4.03 ***	39.06	3.99 ***	38.54	3.92 ***
OQ	16.40	2.34 **	16.66	2.38 **	16.87	2.4 **	15.78	2.23 **
<b>Country</b>								
Austria	66.26	10.09 ***	64.75	9.55 ***	64.59	9.49 ***	64.81	9.49 ***
Belgium	23.18	2.05 **	20.45	1.77 *	20.42	1.77 *	18.51	1.61
Denmark	56.42	5.68 ***	55.69	5.57 ***	55.39	5.51 ***	52.09	4.9 ***
Finland	23.77	2.93 ***	22.81	2.8 ***	22.38	2.73 ***	20.42	2.46 **
France	42.21	2.81 ***	37.72	2.39 **	37.93	2.4 **	37.26	2.34 **
Germany	15.05	1.01	12.17	0.81	12.18	0.81	9.66	0.64
Greece	-63.10	-14.47 ***	-62.96	-14.41 ***	-63.28	-14.53 ***	-65.89	-15.26 ***
Ireland	46.69	6.59 ***	44.63	6.09 ***	44.56	6.07 ***	42.56	5.66 ***
Italy	-22.59	-4.73 ***	-22.78	-4.78 ***	-22.91	-4.8 ***	-23.78	-4.96 ***
Luxembourg	26.42	0.59	26.40	0.59	25.91	0.58	26.90	0.58
Netherlands	56.40	8.11 ***	55.75	7.96 ***	55.54	7.9 ***	55.42	7.77 ***
Portugal	-26.32	-5.26 ***	-27.17	-5.42 ***	-27.51	-5.48 ***	-30.56	-6.06 ***
Spain		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
United Kingdom	21.17	1.18	25.37	1.44	25.47	1.45	22.83	1.28
<b>Wave</b>								
1995	12.12	1.95 *	12.80	2.06 **	12.29	1.97 **	12.96	2.06 **
1996	5.14	0.81	5.18	0.82	4.99	0.79	5.20	0.81
1997	4.84	0.82	4.72	0.8	4.88	0.83	3.36	0.57
1998	12.84	2.16 **	12.99	2.18 **	12.85	2.15 **	12.86	2.15 **
1999	1.80	0.29	1.55	0.25	1.32	0.21	1.93	0.31
2000	-9.03	-1.38	-9.43	-1.44	-9.66	-1.47	-8.67	-1.31
2001		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
Log pseudolikelihood	-3,836.30		-3,828.71		-3,826.09		-3,809.71	
<i>Notes: (a) For brevity and focus, only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented; *** denotes significance at 1% level; ** denotes significance at 5% level; * denotes significance at 10% level.</i>								

Table 4. Job satisfaction with number of working hours

-Generalized Ordered Logit estimations-

Specification	I		II		III		IV	
Total # ind.	4,718		4,718		4,718		4,718	
Total # obs.	5,032		5,032		5,032		5,032	
Prob (JS = 1)	0.140		0.140		0.140		0.139	
Prob (JS = 2)	0.585		0.585		0.585		0.587	
Prob (JS = 3) <sup>(a)</sup>	0.275		0.275		0.274		0.274	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.
<b>Main variables</b>								
PE → SE	<i>(Ref)</i>							
PE → DSE			-20.18	-3.1 ***	-20.26	-3.11 ***	-19.77	-3.02 ***
PE → ISE			<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
U → SE	-8.22	-1.19	-19.04	-2.59 ***				
U <sub>LT</sub> → SE					-25.79	-3.21 ***	-25.92	-3.22 ***
U <sub>ST</sub> → SE					-7.00	-0.65	-7.34	-0.68
I → SE	1.06	0.16	-10.70	-1.45	-10.93	-1.48		
I <sub>ST</sub> → SE							-28.20	-2.64 ***
I <sub>RET</sub> → SE							18.79	1.36
I <sub>HW</sub> → SE							-20.70	-2.27 **
I <sub>OT</sub> → SE							7.29	0.54
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>								
Female	-11.00	-1.93 *	-11.37	-2 **	-11.52	-2.02 **	-5.61	-0.89
Age (18-30)	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Age (31-40)	-12.63	-1.93 *	-12.75	-1.95 *	-12.56	-1.92 *	-11.06	-1.65 *
Age (41-50)	-9.05	-1.24	-7.54	-1.02	-7.13	-0.96	-4.29	-0.56
Age (+50)	-6.98	-0.9	-4.15	-0.53	-3.77	-0.48	-1.89	-0.23
Cohabiting	-1.86	-0.3	-2.03	-0.33	-2.42	-0.39	-4.27	-0.67
Children under 14	-8.20	-2.47 **	-7.86	-2.36 **	-7.76	-2.33 **	-6.82	-2.04 **
Health	-13.25	-3.57 ***	-13.19	-3.55 ***	-13.26	-3.57 ***	-15.30	-4.06 ***
Household financial situation	14.45	5.95 ***	14.78	6.07 ***	14.70	6.05 ***	14.46	5.93 ***
<b>Education</b>								
Basic education	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Secondary education	10.06	1.57	9.65	1.51	9.33	1.46	10.34	1.6
University studies	8.95	1.08	8.74	1.06	8.51	1.03	7.77	0.94
<b>Employment characteristics</b>								
Working hours	-2.23	-11.38 ***	-2.25	-11.52 ***	-2.26	-11.55 ***	-2.22	-11.23 ***
<b>Activity sector</b>								
AB	4.40	0.46	4.75	0.49	4.89	0.51	1.55	0.16
CE	-8.66	-0.27	-7.31	-0.23	-7.31	-0.23	-8.30	-0.26
DA	3.53	0.16	5.94	0.27	5.69	0.26	5.56	0.25

DBDC	10.63	0.54	11.05	0.56	10.63	0.54	8.48	0.44
DDDE	48.11	2.07 **	48.59	2.11 **	48.52	2.12 **	47.37	2.08 **
DFDI	5.11	0.21	5.65	0.23	6.60	0.27	6.39	0.26
DJDK	-15.48	-0.81	-14.97	-0.78	-14.79	-0.77	-15.56	-0.81
DLDN	29.60	1.64	29.45	1.63	29.36	1.63	28.91	1.6
F		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
G	13.37	1.4	12.87	1.34	13.14	1.37	11.58	1.2
H	-5.60	-0.44	-6.71	-0.53	-7.12	-0.56	-8.37	-0.66
I	9.32	0.6	9.46	0.6	9.38	0.6	8.07	0.52
J	33.63	1.52	32.74	1.47	32.43	1.47	33.40	1.5
K	28.35	2.38 **	27.01	2.27 **	26.91	2.26 **	27.17	2.26 **
L	37.46	0.97	40.95	1.03	42.24	1.06	39.62	1
M	62.78	2.58 ***	62.09	2.56 **	63.51	2.61 ***	64.75	2.68 ***
N	6.25	0.39	6.97	0.43	6.28	0.39	6.23	0.38
OQ	12.22	1.03	12.80	1.07	12.72	1.06	11.51	0.97
<b>Country</b>								
Austria	90.57	5.34 ***	86.03	5.04 ***	85.59	5 ***	85.68	5 ***
Belgium	54.84	2.91 ***	49.24	2.62 ***	48.66	2.6 ***	47.72	2.55 **
Denmark	83.08	4.46 ***	81.69	4.39 ***	80.65	4.33 ***	76.64	4.08 ***
Finland	32.61	2.3 **	30.89	2.18 **	30.15	2.13 **	29.17	2.05 **
France	0.00	. ***	0.00	. ***	0.00	. ***	0.00	. ***
Germany	-13.83	-0.81	-18.70	-1.13	-18.56	-1.12	-20.75	-1.28
Greece	-61.11	-9.7 ***	-60.94	-9.66 ***	-61.33	-9.76 ***	-63.56	-10.21 ***
Ireland	76.43	5.59 ***	71.80	5.2 ***	71.51	5.17 ***	68.76	4.93 ***
Italy	-25.99	-3.76 ***	-26.13	-3.78 ***	-26.42	-3.83 ***	-26.99	-3.92 ***
Luxembourg	48.49	0.66	48.50	0.63	46.32	0.6	46.49	0.62
Netherlands	68.32	4.67 ***	66.45	4.53 ***	65.62	4.47 ***	64.57	4.39 ***
Portugal	-44.35	-6.3 ***	-45.40	-6.46 ***	-45.93	-6.54 ***	-48.66	-6.93 ***
Spain		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
United Kingdom	14.11	0.54	21.36	0.78	21.39	0.78	18.97	0.7
<b>Wave</b>								
1995	25.50	2.39 **	27.05	2.51 **	26.27	2.43 **	26.99	2.48 **
1996	19.80	1.87 *	20.65	1.94 *	20.63	1.94 *	21.11	1.97 **
1997	8.50	0.91	8.93	0.96	9.23	0.98	7.66	0.82
1998	12.32	1.25	12.82	1.3	12.80	1.29	12.99	1.3
1999	9.26	0.94	9.46	0.96	9.25	0.93	9.89	0.99
2000	8.01	0.78	7.77	0.75	7.18	0.7	8.38	0.81
2001		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
Log pseudolikelihood		-4,297.24		-4,292.47		-4,290.31		-4,281.24
<i>Notes: (a) For brevity and focus, only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented; *** denotes significance at 1% level, ** denotes significance at 5% level; * denotes significance at 10% level.</i>								

Table 5. Job satisfaction with working time

-Generalized Ordered Logit estimations-

Specification	I		II		III		IV	
Total # ind.	4,718		4,718		4,718		4,718	
Total # obs.	5,032		5,032		5,032		5,032	
Prob (JS = 1)	0.071		0.071		0.071		0.071	
Prob (JS = 2)	0.524		0.525		0.525		0.525	
Prob (JS = 3) <sup>(a)</sup>	0.404		0.404		0.404		0.404	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.
<b>Main variables</b>								
PE → SE	<i>(Ref)</i>							
PE → DSE			-12.85	-2.43 **	-12.96	-2.45 **	-12.47	-2.34 **
PE → ISE			<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
U → SE	2.65	0.49	-4.68	-0.77				
U <sub>LT</sub> → SE					-14.22	-2.07 **	-14.39	-2.09 **
U <sub>ST</sub> → SE					12.12	1.41	11.78	1.36
I → SE	-0.89	-0.17	-8.53	-1.41	-8.79	-1.45		
I <sub>ST</sub> → SE							-28.40	-3.06 ***
I <sub>RET</sub> → SE							15.67	1.44
I <sub>HW</sub> → SE							-13.68	-1.76 *
I <sub>OT</sub> → SE							4.72	0.46
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>								
Female	-3.19	-0.68 **	-3.29	-0.7	-3.50	-0.74	0.17	0.03
Age (18-30)	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Age (31-40)	2.40	0.46	2.33	0.45	2.72	0.52	3.60	0.68
Age (41-50)	-8.94	-1.5 **	-8.13	-1.36	-7.50	-1.26	-5.82	-0.95
Age (+50)	1.34	0.21	2.95	0.46	3.64	0.57	4.82	0.73
Cohabiting	-0.63	-0.13	-0.71	-0.14	-1.06	-0.22	-3.13	-0.63
Children under 14	-5.63	-2.22 **	-5.41	-2.13 **	-5.36	-2.11 **	-4.75	-1.87 *
Health	-2.70	-0.96 **	-2.67	-0.95	-2.75	-0.98	-4.30	-1.51
Household financial situation	13.48	7.23 ***	13.72	7.32 ***	13.55	7.23 ***	13.33	7.09 ***
<b>Education</b>								
Basic education	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Secondary education	15.99	3.17 ***	15.63	3.1 ***	15.27	3.02 ***	16.56	3.24 ***
University studies	20.31	3.19 ***	20.13	3.16 ***	20.02	3.15 ***	19.89	3.11 ***
<b>Employment characteristics</b>								
Working hours	-1.31	-8.78 ***	-1.33	-8.88 ***	-1.34	-8.96 ***	-1.31	-8.71 ***
<b>Activity sector</b>								
AB	-17.26	-2.55 **	-17.09	-2.51 **	-16.65	-2.44 **	-19.78	-2.88 ***
CE	-44.21	-2.19 **	-43.93	-2.17 **	-43.98	-2.16 **	-44.87	-2.24 **
DA	1.06	0.07	2.45	0.15	1.97	0.12	1.79	0.11

DBDC	23.26	1.73 *	23.45	1.75 *	23.39	1.75 *	21.71	1.63
DDDE	14.55	0.89	14.50	0.89	14.65	0.91	13.60	0.85
DFDI	1.95	0.12	2.07	0.13	3.01	0.18	3.27	0.2
DJDK	6.44	0.45	6.35	0.44	6.57	0.46	6.18	0.43
DLDN	8.65	0.66	8.57	0.65	8.81	0.68	8.60	0.66
F		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
G	2.16	0.31	1.76	0.26	2.34	0.34	0.92	0.13
H	-28.25	-3.24 ***	-29.05	-3.35 ***	-29.52	-3.41 ***	-30.68	-3.56 ***
I	-18.84	-1.75 **	-18.80	-1.75 *	-19.21	-1.79 *	-20.28	-1.9 *
J	22.39	1.42	22.09	1.39	21.89	1.37	23.03	1.45
K	20.16	2.29 **	19.30	2.18 **	19.70	2.22 **	20.47	2.29 **
L	30.79	0.94	32.38	1	34.19	1.05	32.89	1.02
M	22.87	1.36	22.06	1.32	23.43	1.39	24.22	1.46
N	-6.95	-0.56 **	-6.51	-0.53	-7.07	-0.57	-6.96	-0.56
OQ	-21.44	-2.56 **	-21.27	-2.54 **	-21.07	-2.51 **	-22.10	-2.64 ***
<b>Country</b>								
Austria	85.19	8.57 ***	83.53	8.25 ***	83.20	8.22 ***	83.53	8.27 ***
Belgium	24.91	1.82 *	21.90	1.58	21.41	1.55	21.00	1.52
Denmark	88.69	7.82 ***	87.93	7.68 ***	86.96	7.52 ***	85.23	7.18 ***
Finland	37.65	3.59 ***	36.74	3.49 ***	35.91	3.4 ***	35.56	3.34 ***
France	-12.55	-0.72 **	-17.32	-1	-17.49	-1	-18.61	-1.07
Germany	7.21	0.45	4.32	0.27	4.16	0.26	2.19	0.14
Greece	-57.70	-11.11 ***	-57.50	-11.06 ***	-58.16	-11.22 ***	-60.23	-11.73 ***
Ireland	83.88	9.62 ***	81.85	9.16 ***	81.82	9.12 ***	80.08	8.72 ***
Italy	-32.11	-5.96 ***	-32.21	-6 ***	-32.58	-6.08 ***	-33.01	-6.17 ***
Luxembourg	-5.22	-0.12 **	-4.55	-0.1	-6.74	-0.15	-7.18	-0.16
Netherlands	52.60	5.29 ***	51.76	5.18 ***	50.96	5.07 ***	50.52	5.02 ***
Portugal	-42.22	-7.64 ***	-42.92	-7.77 ***	-43.71	-7.93 ***	-45.78	-8.29 ***
Spain		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
United Kingdom	1.32	0.06	5.46	0.25	5.38	0.25	3.46	0.16
<b>Wave</b>								
1995	30.57	3.89 ***	31.31	3.98 ***	30.60	3.87 ***	31.45	3.95 ***
1996	12.98	1.64	13.19	1.66 *	13.23	1.67 *	13.75	1.72 *
1997	14.57	1.98 **	14.59	1.98 **	14.74	1.99 **	13.73	1.85 *
1998	12.81	1.68 *	12.99	1.69 *	12.86	1.68 *	13.18	1.71 *
1999	6.36	0.83	6.29	0.82	5.71	0.74	6.37	0.82
2000	9.69	1.19	9.47	1.16	9.04	1.11	10.18	1.24
2001		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
Log pseudolikelihood		-4,116.25		-4,112.53		-4,108.29		-4,100.83
<i>Notes: (a) For brevity and focus, only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented; *** denotes significance at 1% level; ** denotes significance at 5% level; * denotes significance at 10% level.</i>								

Table 6. Job satisfaction with working conditions

-Generalized Ordered Logit estimations-

Specification	I		II		III		IV	
Total # ind.	4,718		4,718		4,718		4,718	
Total # obs.	5,032		5,032		5,032		5,032	
Prob (JS = 1)	0.041		0.040		0.040		0.041	
Prob (JS = 2)	0.455		0.455		0.455		0.455	
Prob (JS = 3) <sup>(a)</sup>	0.504		0.504		0.504		0.504	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.
<b>Main variables</b>								
PE → SE	<i>(Ref)</i>							
PE → DSE			-12.67	-2.89 ***	-12.67	-2.89 ***	-12.48	-2.83 ***
PE → ISE			<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
U → SE	-0.44	-0.1	-7.65	-1.51				
U <sub>LT</sub> → SE					-8.17	-1.41	-8.47	-1.45
U <sub>ST</sub> → SE					-6.73	-0.95	-7.23	-1.02
I → SE	4.78	1.12	-2.78	-0.55	-2.80	-0.56		
I <sub>ST</sub> → SE							-17.14	-2.01 **
I <sub>RET</sub> → SE							17.85	2.17 **
I <sub>HW</sub> → SE							-10.27	-1.57
I <sub>OT</sub> → SE							8.82	1.07
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>								
Female	7.17	1.9 *	7.06	1.87 *	7.04	1.86 *	11.54	2.75 ***
Age (18-30)	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Age (31-40)	2.78	0.64	2.76	0.64	2.78	0.64	4.08	0.93
Age (41-50)	4.56	0.94	5.51	1.14	5.54	1.14	7.75	1.56
Age (+50)	1.80	0.36	3.36	0.66	3.39	0.67	5.12	0.98
Cohabiting	-0.25	-0.06	-0.36	-0.09	-0.38	-0.09	-1.85	-0.45
Children under 14	-4.24	-2.13 **	-4.03	-2.02 **	-4.03	-2.02 **	-3.40	-1.69 *
Health	-7.27	-3.18 ***	-7.23	-3.16 ***	-7.23	-3.16 ***	-8.65	-3.75 ***
Household financial situation	12.55	8.27 ***	12.78	8.38 ***	12.78	8.37 ***	12.61	8.24 ***
<b>Education</b>								
Basic education	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Secondary education	12.13	3.09 ***	11.89	3.03 ***	11.88	3.02 ***	12.80	3.22 ***
University studies	21.02	4.1 ***	20.90	4.07 ***	20.88	4.07 ***	20.35	3.94 ***
<b>Employment characteristics</b>								
Working hours	0.09	0.74	0.07	0.62	0.07	0.62	0.11	0.91
<b>Activity sector</b>								
AB	13.14	2.3 **	13.35	2.33 **	13.38	2.33 **	11.00	1.89 *
CE	-43.20	-2.18 **	-42.79	-2.15 **	-42.79	-2.15 **	-43.72	-2.19 **
DA	-7.56	-0.51	-5.83	-0.39	-5.81	-0.39	-6.40	-0.43



DBDC	45.98	5.23 ***	46.07	5.27 ***	46.08	5.27 ***	44.73	5.03 ***
DDDE	40.69	4.04 ***	40.62	4.06 ***	40.62	4.06 ***	39.87	3.94 ***
DFDI	30.69	2.41 **	31.02	2.45 **	31.07	2.46 **	30.98	2.43 **
DJDK	10.39	0.86	10.42	0.86	10.42	0.86	10.15	0.83
DLDN	35.49	3.71 ***	35.14	3.65 ***	35.16	3.65 ***	34.85	3.58 ***
F		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
G	34.80	6.63 ***	34.49	6.55 ***	34.52	6.55 ***	33.47	6.29 ***
H	26.24	3.68 ***	25.24	3.51 ***	25.24	3.51 ***	24.16	3.34 ***
I	7.48	0.84	7.61	0.86	7.58	0.85	6.57	0.74
J	54.83	5.55 ***	54.78	5.52 ***	54.77	5.52 ***	55.19	5.65 ***
K	34.01	5.29 ***	33.33	5.15 ***	33.34	5.15 ***	33.53	5.16 ***
L	0.10	0	2.06	0.08	2.15	0.08	0.90	0.03
M	45.80	4.17 ***	45.27	4.09 ***	45.33	4.1 ***	45.71	4.14 ***
N	47.31	5.56 ***	47.65	5.6 ***	47.61	5.6 ***	47.40	5.55 ***
OQ	23.67	3.35 ***	24.01	3.4 ***	24.03	3.41 ***	23.05	3.25 ***
<b>Country</b>								
Austria	61.72	7.98 ***	60.26	7.62 ***	60.23	7.61 ***	60.22	7.61 ***
Belgium	12.59	1.12	10.02	0.88	9.99	0.87	9.27	0.81
Denmark	39.99	3.73 ***	39.33	3.65 ***	39.29	3.64 ***	36.94	3.33 ***
Finland	-2.38	-0.29	-3.09	-0.37	-3.15	-0.38	-4.12	-0.49
France	8.70	0.52	3.76	0.22	3.75	0.22	2.80	0.17
Germany	-9.16	-0.67	-12.09	-0.88	-12.09	-0.88	-13.99	-1.02
Greece	-57.99	-13.11 ***	-57.84	-13.07 ***	-57.87	-13.07 ***	-59.87	-13.67 ***
Ireland	29.32	3.78 ***	27.15	3.42 ***	27.13	3.42 ***	25.07	3.12 ***
Italy	-26.46	-5.53 ***	-26.63	-5.58 ***	-26.64	-5.58 ***	-27.30	-5.72 ***
Luxembourg	-13.80	-0.36	-13.72	-0.35	-13.80	-0.35	-14.28	-0.37
Netherlands	10.92	1.32	10.06	1.21	10.03	1.2	9.30	1.11
Portugal	-26.73	-5.31 ***	-27.44	-5.44 ***	-27.49	-5.44 ***	-29.68	-5.84 ***
Spain		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
United Kingdom	31.47	1.72 *	34.90	1.95 *	34.91	1.95 *	33.31	1.83 *
<b>Wave</b>								
1995	13.59	2.27 **	14.26	2.37 **	14.21	2.35 **	14.87	2.46 **
1996	15.65	2.57 **	15.77	2.59 ***	15.75	2.58 ***	16.23	2.66 ***
1997	6.16	1.08	6.13	1.07	6.15	1.07	5.36	0.94
1998	7.48	1.28	7.60	1.29	7.58	1.29	7.72	1.31
1999	10.98	1.83 *	10.85	1.81 *	10.83	1.8 *	11.49	1.91 *
2000	-0.02	0	-0.29	-0.05	-0.31	-0.05	0.68	0.11
2001		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
Log pseudolikelihood		-3,982.37		-3,977.77		-3,977.74		-3,968.65
<i>Notes: (a) For brevity and focus, only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented; *** denotes significance at 1% level; ** denotes significance at 5% level; * denotes significance at 10% level.</i>								

Table 7. Job satisfaction with distance to work

-Generalized Ordered Logit estimations-

Specification	I		II		III		IV	
Total # ind.	4,718		4,718		4,718		4,718	
Total # obs.	5,032		5,032		5,032		5,032	
Prob (JS = 1)	0.058		0.057		0.057		0.057	
Prob (JS = 2)	0.364		0.364		0.364		0.365	
Prob (JS = 3) <sup>(a)</sup>	0.578		0.578		0.578		0.578	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.
<b>Main variables</b>								
PE → SE	<i>(Ref)</i>							
PE → DSE			-1.17	-0.32	-1.16	-0.32	-0.92	-0.25
PE → ISE			<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
U → SE	-2.30	-0.63	-3.00	-0.71				
U <sub>LT</sub> → SE					-1.81	-0.37	-1.87	-0.38
U <sub>ST</sub> → SE					-5.03	-0.88	-5.19	-0.91
I → SE	9.53	2.69 ***	8.83	2.13 **	8.87	2.14 **		
I <sub>ST</sub> → SE							-1.43	-0.19
I <sub>RET</sub> → SE							16.56	2.59 ***
I <sub>HW</sub> → SE							8.53	1.59
I <sub>OT</sub> → SE							12.72	1.92 *
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>								
Female	13.73	4.4 ***	13.71	4.4 ***	13.74	4.41 ***	14.60	4.3 ***
Age (18-30)	<i>(Ref)</i>							
Age (31-40)	-3.12	-0.87	-3.10	-0.86	-3.17	-0.88	-3.06	-0.84
Age (41-50)	0.75	0.19	0.85	0.21	0.79	0.2	1.27	0.31
Age (+50)	3.37	0.78	3.52	0.81	3.45	0.8	3.66	0.82
Cohabiting	-0.91	-0.27	-0.93	-0.28	-0.87	-0.26	-1.89	-0.55
Children under 14	0.07	0.04	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.31	0.17
Health	-0.98	-0.52	-0.97	-0.52	-0.96	-0.51	-1.55	-0.81
Household financial situation	7.38	5.93 ***	7.40	5.94 ***	7.42	5.96 ***	7.32	5.86 ***
<b>Education</b>								
Basic education	<i>(Ref)</i>							
Secondary education	5.42	1.63	5.36	1.61	5.41	1.62	6.06	1.8 *
University studies	5.48	1.26	5.45	1.25	5.48	1.25	5.63	1.28
<b>Employment characteristics</b>								
Working hours	0.24	2.46 **	0.24	2.44 **	0.24	2.46 **	0.25	2.56 **
<b>Activity sector</b>								
AB	37.04	9.15 ***	37.01	9.14 ***	36.94	9.11 ***	35.95	8.7 ***
CE	12.47	0.81	12.53	0.81	12.54	0.82	11.67	0.75
DA	31.59	3.56 ***	31.53	3.55 ***	31.53	3.55 ***	31.39	3.52 ***

DBDC	43.20	7.32 ***	43.17	7.31 ***	43.14	7.29 ***	42.81	7.18 ***
DDDE	24.75	2.88 ***	24.65	2.87 ***	24.65	2.87 ***	24.30	2.81 ***
DFDI	19.23	1.87 *	19.19	1.87 *	19.10	1.86 *	19.34	1.88 *
DJDK	11.10	1.15	11.06	1.14	11.04	1.14	10.78	1.11
DLDN	28.96	4.01 ***	28.86	3.99 ***	28.83	3.99 ***	28.72	3.97 ***
F		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
G	26.22	6.19 ***	26.17	6.17 ***	26.11	6.15 ***	25.65	6.01 ***
H	34.72	7.11 ***	34.59	7.06 ***	34.59	7.06 ***	34.30	6.97 ***
I	18.54	2.83 ***	18.43	2.81 ***	18.50	2.82 ***	18.23	2.77 ***
J	9.70	0.96	9.64	0.96	9.69	0.96	10.10	1.01
K	19.90	3.81 ***	19.80	3.78 ***	19.76	3.77 ***	20.23	3.88 ***
L	38.94	2.8 ***	39.09	2.82 ***	38.96	2.8 ***	38.79	2.82 ***
M	33.63	3.95 ***	33.55	3.93 ***	33.43	3.91 ***	33.74	3.99 ***
N	6.89	0.77	6.90	0.78	6.98	0.78	7.35	0.83
OQ	9.43	1.6	9.40	1.59	9.34	1.58	9.02	1.53
<b>Country</b>								
Austria	42.88	7.08 ***	42.73	7.01 ***	42.77	7.02 ***	42.98	7.08 ***
Belgium	26.49	3.22 ***	26.27	3.18 ***	26.29	3.18 ***	26.33	3.2 ***
Denmark	19.38	2.3 **	19.31	2.29 **	19.40	2.3 **	18.63	2.18 **
Finland	21.35	3.3 ***	21.27	3.29 ***	21.38	3.31 ***	21.19	3.27 ***
France	-5.03	-0.38	-5.47	-0.41	-5.43	-0.41	-6.16	-0.46
Germany	12.80	1.16	12.59	1.14	12.60	1.14	11.90	1.08
Greece	-19.98	-4.41 ***	-19.91	-4.39 ***	-19.82	-4.37 ***	-20.81	-4.56 ***
Ireland	33.51	5.96 ***	33.28	5.89 ***	33.32	5.9 ***	32.47	5.65 ***
Italy	-19.85	-4.72 ***	-19.85	-4.72 ***	-19.82	-4.71 ***	-20.07	-4.77 ***
Luxembourg	20.51	0.71	20.52	0.71	20.75	0.73	20.10	0.7
Netherlands	36.08	6.11 ***	36.01	6.09 ***	36.08	6.1 ***	35.84	6.05 ***
Portugal	-21.90	-5 ***	-21.96	-5 ***	-21.86	-4.97 ***	-22.53	-5.09 ***
Spain		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
United Kingdom	21.78	1.65 *	22.07	1.68 *	22.03	1.67 *	21.32	1.6
<b>Wave</b>								
1995	17.72	3.77 ***	17.77	3.78 ***	17.89	3.8 ***	18.29	3.89 ***
1996	13.69	2.77 ***	13.64	2.76 ***	13.69	2.77 ***	14.03	2.85 ***
1997	6.10	1.32	6.08	1.32	6.06	1.31	5.82	1.26
1998	3.17	0.66	3.21	0.67	3.24	0.68	3.45	0.72
1999	7.69	1.54	7.68	1.54	7.73	1.55	7.99	1.6
2000	8.03	1.58	8.01	1.58	8.05	1.59	8.46	1.67 *
2001		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)		(Ref.)
Log pseudolikelihood	-4,074.51		-4,072.89		-4,072.71		-4,069.37	
<i>Notes:</i> (a) For brevity and focus, only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented; *** denotes significance at 1% level; ** denotes significance at 5% level; * denotes significance at 10% level.								

Table 8. Job satisfaction index

-OLS estimations-

Specification	I		II		III		IV	
Total # ind.	4,718		4,718		4,718		4,718	
Total # obs.	5,032		5,032		5,032		5,032	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (abs)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (abs)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (abs)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (abs)	t-stat.
<b>Main variables</b>								
PE → SE	<i>(Ref)</i>							
PE → DSE			-0.08	-2.61 ***	-0.08	-2.62 ***	-0.08	-2.47 **
PE → ISE			<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
U → SE	-0.13	-3.78 ***	-0.17	-4.61 ***				
U <sub>LT</sub> → SE					-0.21	-4.77 ***	-0.21	-4.79 ***
U <sub>ST</sub> → SE					-0.11	-2.12 **	-0.12	-2.18 **
I → SE	0.02	0.64	-0.03	-0.82	-0.03	-0.85		
I <sub>ST</sub> → SE							-0.21	-3.6 ***
I <sub>RET</sub> → SE							0.17	2.87 ***
I <sub>HW</sub> → SE							-0.06	-1.28
I <sub>OT</sub> → SE							0.03	0.48
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>								
Female	3.8E-04	0.01	-5.8E-04	-0.02	-1.2E-03	-0.04	0.02	0.78
Age (18-30)	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Age (31-40)	-0.06	-1.81 *	-0.06	-1.83 *	-0.06	-1.77 *	-0.05	-1.5
Age (41-50)	-0.05	-1.31	-0.04	-1.14	-0.04	-1.08	-0.02	-0.62
Age (+50)	-0.01	-0.4	-4.3E-03	-0.12	-2.1E-03	-0.06	0.01	0.22
Cohabiting	0.04	1.27	0.04	1.24	0.04	1.19	0.02	0.52
Children under 14	-0.04	-2.64 ***	-0.04	-2.56 **	-0.04	-2.56 **	-0.04	-2.22 **
Health	-0.09	-5.03 ***	-0.09	-5.03 ***	-0.09	-5.05 ***	-0.10	-5.7 ***
Household financial situation	0.20	17.62 ***	0.21	17.68 ***	0.20	17.66 ***	0.20	17.48 ***
<b>Education</b>								
Basic education	<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>		<i>(Ref)</i>	
Secondary education	0.10	3.41 ***	0.10	3.35 ***	0.10	3.31 ***	0.11	3.72 ***
University studies	0.12	3.27 ***	0.12	3.24 ***	0.12	3.22 ***	0.12	3.25 ***
<b>Employment characteristics</b>								
Working hours	-1.4E-03	-1.7 *	-1.5E-03	-1.82 *	-1.6E-03	-1.86 *	-1.3E-03	-1.53
<b>Activity sector</b>								
AB	0.02	0.52	0.02	0.53	0.03	0.58	-2.2E-03	-0.05
CE	-0.12	-1.02	-0.11	-0.98	-0.11	-0.99	-0.13	-1.1
DA	0.11	1.07	0.12	1.16	0.12	1.16	0.12	1.11
DBDC	0.20	2.51 **	0.20	2.53 **	0.20	2.55 **	0.19	2.38 **
DDDE	0.27	2.61 ***	0.27	2.62 ***	0.27	2.63 ***	0.26	2.56 **

DFDI	0.19	1.59	0.19	1.6	0.19	1.63	0.20	1.65 *
DJDK	0.07	0.81	0.07	0.81	0.07	0.83	0.07	0.79
DLDN	0.17	2.16 **	0.17	2.12 **	0.17	2.14 **	0.17	2.14 **
F	<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>	
G	0.18	4.17 ***	0.17	4.1 ***	0.17	4.14 ***	0.16	3.87 ***
H	0.08	1.54	0.08	1.4	0.08	1.41	0.07	1.24
I	0.10	1.3	0.10	1.28	0.10	1.26	0.09	1.17
J	0.35	4.39 ***	0.35	4.34 ***	0.35	4.33 ***	0.36	4.44 ***
K	0.18	3.65 ***	0.17	3.5 ***	0.18	3.53 ***	0.18	3.62 ***
L	0.21	0.97	0.21	1.02	0.22	1.04	0.21	1.01
M	0.31	3.83 ***	0.30	3.76 ***	0.31	3.81 ***	0.32	3.95 ***
N	0.15	2.01 **	0.15	2.03 **	0.15	2 **	0.15	2.04 **
OQ	0.06	1.04	0.06	1.04	0.06	1.08	0.05	0.97
<b>Country</b>								
Austria	0.71	10.42 ***	0.70	10.2 ***	0.70	10.18 ***	0.70	10.22 ***
Belgium	0.35	4.72 ***	0.33	4.47 ***	0.33	4.45 ***	0.33	4.49 ***
Denmark	0.71	9.65 ***	0.71	9.55 ***	0.70	9.51 ***	0.68	9.23 ***
Finland	0.31	5.4 ***	0.31	5.29 ***	0.30	5.23 ***	0.30	5.1 ***
France	-0.30	-3.12 ***	-0.33	-3.4 ***	-0.34	-3.38 ***	-0.35	-3.5 ***
Germany	0.03	0.38	0.02	0.18	0.02	0.19	0.00	0
Greece	-0.38	-9.29 ***	-0.38	-9.23 ***	-0.38	-9.29 ***	-0.41	-9.73 ***
Ireland	0.62	10.68 ***	0.60	10.31 ***	0.60	10.29 ***	0.58	9.86 ***
Italy	-0.20	-4.89 ***	-0.20	-4.91 ***	-0.20	-4.93 ***	-0.21	-5.02 ***
Luxembourg	0.13	0.55	0.13	0.54	0.12	0.51	0.12	0.48
Netherlands	0.51	9.64 ***	0.51	9.52 ***	0.51	9.48 ***	0.50	9.4 ***
Portugal	0.11	2.72 ***	0.10	2.61 ***	0.10	2.53 **	0.08	2.14 **
Spain	<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>	
United Kingdom	0.26	1.65 *	0.28	1.82 *	0.28	1.83 *	0.27	1.71 *
<b>Wave</b>								
1995	0.05	1.17	0.06	1.26	0.05	1.17	0.06	1.28
1996	0.03	0.7	0.03	0.72	0.03	0.7	0.03	0.77
1997	-4.5E-03	-0.11	-4.9E-03	-0.12	-3.9E-03	-0.1	-0.01	-0.33
1998	0.02	0.54	0.02	0.57	0.02	0.54	0.02	0.58
1999	0.04	0.87	0.04	0.84	0.03	0.81	0.04	0.91
2000	0.01	0.31	0.01	0.26	0.01	0.23	0.02	0.4
2001	<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>		<i>(Ref.)</i>	

Notes: (a) For brevity and focus, only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented; \*\*\* denotes significance at 1% level; \*\* denotes significance at 5% level; \* denotes significance at 10% level.