

Tamene Kenei Walga

Department of Psychology, College
of Social Sciences and Humanities
Debre Berhan University, Ethiopia
kenenitmn@gmail.com

Job Satisfaction and Satisfaction with Work-Life Balance across Cultures

ABSTRACT

Objective: To determine the extent of and the relationship between Job Satisfaction (JS) and Work-Life Balance (WLB) across cultures.

Methodology: European Social Survey (ESS) data 2012 were used to answer the research questions put forth. To organize and make meaning of the data, both descriptive and inferential statistics have been used. Mean scores and standard deviations of job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance (WLB) were computed for all the 29 countries. Correlation analysis was used to discern and test for the correlations among the variables of interest. Independent samples

t-test was used to compare countries with high power distance and those with low power distance on job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance (WLB).

Findings: Mean scores of job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB and correlation coefficients between the two varied across the countries under study as expected. Mean scores of job satisfaction ranged from 6.53 in Ukraine to 8.20 in Denmark. Similarly, mean scores of satisfaction with WLB varied from 6.08 in Russia to 7.65 in Denmark. Pearson's coefficients of correlation between job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB varied from .301 in Finland to .667 in Ukraine. Of the six dimensions of culture, only power distance had moderate inverse relationships with both job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB. Furthermore, as a group, countries with low power distance (PD) had significantly higher job satisfaction than countries with high power distance.

Value Added: The study highlighted the relevance and importance of job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB in organizations. It also showed the universality and culture-specificity of job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB.

Recommendations: Managers need to pay attention to enhancing employees' job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB to ensure organizational effectiveness regardless of organizational context. Managers also need to employ culturally appropriate managerial strategies in promoting job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction (JS), work-life balance (WLB), crosscultural management, Hofstede's dimensions of culture, power distance

JEL codes: Z1, Z19

Introduction

Job satisfaction has been the main focus of academic research in various fields including marketing, human resource management and organizational psychology. Business managers view job satisfaction as one of the most important employee attitudes because of its positive work-related outcomes such as enhanced employee's job performance, organizational commitment, citizenship behavior and life satisfaction. On the other hand, job satisfaction has been negatively linked to undesirable job-related attributes such as work stress (e.g. Khan & Ali, 2013; Klassen, Usher, & Bong, 2010; Mohammed & Elsewed, 2013), intention to quit job or turnover and absenteeism (e.g., Khan & Ali, 2013; Luu, Beach, & Hatstrup, 2010).

Kord's (2012) cross-cultural study of bank workers in India and Iran showed that affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment sub-scales and total scores of organizational commitment have significant correlation with job satisfaction. This same study also revealed that Indian bank employees have higher mean scores on job satisfaction questionnaire in comparison with Iranian counterparts (Kord, 2012). Moreover, a meta-analysis by Bowling, Eschleman and Wang (2010) found positive relationships between job satisfaction and life satisfaction, happiness, positive affect, and the absence of negative affect in employees. In addition, they suggested that the causal relationship from subjective well-being to job satisfaction was stronger than the causal relationship from job satisfaction to subjective well-being. In short, job satisfaction is, as evidenced in the foregoing review, closely tied to productivity and organizational effectiveness. Employees who are satisfied at work are likely to be more stable, productive and accomplished towards organizational goals (Jessen, 2010). Job satisfaction is, perhaps, one of the top ten crucial factors that determine retention of employees in all industries. Beyond its relevance and importance in organizations job satisfaction is also important in everyday life.

Similarly, satisfaction with work-life balance, also sometimes termed as work-life balance, appears to be vital for organizational effectiveness though less researched compared to job satisfaction. Nowadays, corporations have begun to recognize that an inadequate work-life balance can have detrimental impacts on staff performance, satisfaction and retention. Like job satisfaction work-life balance is positively related to several work-related attitudes and outcomes including job satisfaction itself (Mukhtar, 2012; Saif, Malik, & Awan, 2011). In contrast, work-life conflict was negatively related to job satisfaction and family life satisfaction (Gamage, 2013). Moreover, in the workplace, people with a good work-life balance regularly outperform those who do not have a work-life balance. Managers and employees with good work and lifestyle balance are important to ensure their good health and support business productivity and not having work-life balance in the work-

place can incur costs with occupational health and safety, staff turnover and productivity levels (www.advancing-businesses.co.nz/business-coaching/practical-business-advice/life-work-balance). Work-life conflict has been found to be associated with decreased employee job satisfaction, increased staff turnover and absenteeism, lower performance, increased job stress levels, intention to leave the organization and workaholism (E-guide to managing stress and psychosocial risks – Safety and health at work – EU-OSHA).

Evidences are accumulating, showing that job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance cannot be free from cultural contexts in which the organization and its employees are embedded. For example, Luu, Beach and Hatstrup (2010) compared the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions across four countries that differ in Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) and Individualism-Collectivism (I/C), namely France, Japan, the Philippines, and the United States of America. Their study revealed that the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions was significantly stronger in the U.S. and France than in Japan and the Philippines, supporting the hypothesis that turnover intentions are more strongly related to job satisfaction in countries that are higher in individualism (Luu, Beach & Hatstrup, 2010).

Although both job satisfaction and work-life balance are widely studied, cross-cultural studies are sparse. The main purpose of this paper was therefore to cross-culturally compare job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance. To this end this study aimed at answering the following research questions:

- 1) How do job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance vary as a function of levels of cultural dimensions?
- 2) How and to what extent are job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance related to Hofstede's dimensions of culture?
- 3) How and to what extent are job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance related to each other?
- 4) How does the relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB vary across countries (cultures)?

Alternatively, the study sought to test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The relationship between Job Satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance vary across the countries under study.

Hypothesis 2: Job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life time balance are positively linked.

Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance are related to Hofstede's dimensions of culture in one way or the other.

More on the variables

Job satisfaction: There are many definitions of job satisfaction in the literature. From one point of view, job satisfaction is simply defined as employees' feelings about different dimensions of their job; it is the degree of their pleasure in their job (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction can be defined as an attitude associated with the degree to which people like or dislike their job (Calvo-Salguero, Carrasco-González, & Salinas-Martínez de Lecea, 2010). Belias and Koustelios (2014) elaborate job satisfaction as "the employees' perceptions of their working environment, relations among colleagues, earnings and promotion opportunities."

Work-life balance (WLB): Work-life balance is a broad concept and has been defined differently in literature. Here are some of the common definitions. Work-life balance is defined as the optimal arrangement of an individual's on-the-job and private time to facilitate health and personal satisfaction without negatively impacting productivity and professional success (<https://www.techtarget.com/search/query?q=Work%20life%20balance&type=definition&pageNo=1&sortField=>). Greenhaus et al. (Greenhaus, Collins & Shaw, 2003) define work-family balance, a subset of work-life balance, as the "extent to which an individual is equally engaged in – and equally satisfied with – his or her work role and family role". Work-life balance consists of three components (Greenhaus et al., 2003): (1) time balance which refers to equal time being given to both work and family roles; (2) involve-

ment balance which refers to equal levels of psychological involvement in both work and family roles; and (3) finally, satisfaction balance which refers to equal levels of satisfaction in both work and family roles. So work-life balance is achieved when these three components are fulfilled. Work-life imbalance may lead to work-life conflict which in turn costs an individual's health and her/his organization's productivity.

Culture and cultural dimensions: Culture is an elusive term and does not lend itself to be clearly defined. Perhaps; no term has as many definitions as culture. Here is one of the widely accepted and typical definitions of culture: "Culture is the deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving" (Samovar & Porter, 2003, p. 8). Another early but widely used definition of culture is: "Culture is the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group over another" (Hofstede, 2011).

As regards dimensions of culture, a dozen of models are available. However, Hofstede's 6-D model is opted for because scores for the dimensions are available for the cultures to be compared. Hofstede's study demonstrated that there are national and regional cultural groupings that are very persistent across time and that affect the behavior of societies and organizations (Hofstede, 2011). Hofstede discovered four well-known dimensions of culture in his study of national work related values. Later he added two additional dimensions and came up with the model that is known as Hofstede's six dimension (6-D for short) model. Hofstede's six dimensions of culture are briefly described below (<https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison>).

Power distance: Power distance reflects the attitude of the culture towards inequalities among the people in the society. It is the degree to which less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect, accept, and tolerate unequal distribution of power. Thus, high Power Distance Index (PDI) indicates that people accept a hierarchical order in which

everybody has a place and which needs to be accepted without question and further justification. On the other hand, low PDI score indicates that the society believes that inequalities amongst people should be minimized and is less tolerant of inequalities among people.

Collectivism versus Individualism (I-C): Individualism is the tendency of people to look after themselves and their immediate family only. In contrast, collectivism is the tendency of people to belong to groups or collectives and to look after each other in exchange for loyalty. The fundamental issue addressed by this dimension is the degree of interdependence among people. Thus high score on this dimension means less interdependence among the people (high individualistic tendency) and low score reflects high interdependence (high collectivistic tendency).

Uncertainty avoidance (UA): UA is the extent to which people feel threatened by ambiguous situations and have created beliefs and institutions that try to avoid such situations. High need for security, strong belief in experts and their knowledge, more written rules and procedures, and less risk-taking by managers are some of the characteristics of countries high in uncertainty avoidance. In low uncertainty avoidance countries, people are more willing to accept risks associated with the unknown, fewer written rules and procedures, more risk taking by managers, higher employee turnover, and more ambitious employees.

Masculinity and femininity (M-F): In masculine societies (high score on M-F index), competition, achievement, success, money, recognition, advancement, wealth and challenge are the dominant social values. In contrast, caring for others and the quality of life are the dominant social values for feminine societies (low score on M-F index). Feminine societies put importance on cooperation, friendly atmosphere, employment security, and the natural environment.

Long-term orientation (LTO): LTO describes 'how every society has to maintain some links with its own past while dealing with the challenges of the present and future' (<https://www.techtarget.com/search/query?q=Work%20>

life%20balance&type=definition&pageNo=1&sortField=). Low score on LTO index means the society is a normative society that strives to maintain time-honored traditions and resists change. High score on LTO dimension means the society tends to take more pragmatic approach to prepare for the future.

Indulgence (IND): This dimension is defined as ‘the extent to which people try to control their desires and impulses, based on the way they were raised’ (<https://www.techtarget.com/search/query?q=Work%20life%20balance&type=definition&pageNo=1&sortField=>). People with relatively weak control are said to be ‘indulgent’ and people with relatively strong control are called ‘restraint’. Thus a culture can be indulgent or restraint based on its score on this dimension. In other words, high score on this dimension means the culture is ‘indulgent’. Low score on this dimension characterizes ‘restraint’ culture.

Culture and Hofstede’s dimensions of culture have been studied in relation to a number of work-related attributes and behavior. There are also speculations that Hofstede’s dimensions of culture are related to a multitude of work-related or organizational behaviors. For example, Hofstede (2011) argues that work prevails over family in masculine societies but in feminine societies there is a tendency to strike balance between work and family.

Methods

Research design: This research is a cross-cultural comparative study as it endeavored to cross-culturally compare level of job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance across 29 European and neighboring countries with varying cultures as measured by Hofstede’s 6-D model. At the same time, the research is a cross-sectional research as it used a one-shot secondary data from European Social Survey. Furthermore, it is a descriptive correlational study due to the fact that in addition to comparing the cultures on job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance the study tries to examine the relationships between job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance across the 29 countries. Besides, the study attempts to

discern the relationships between country level job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance and Hofstede’s dimensions of culture.

Description of the data: The data used for this study is a secondary data obtained from European Social Survey database. Detailed descriptions of the data can be obtained from the website of the institutions associated with data on request (ESS6-2012, ed.2.1). The ESS is a multistage cross-sectional survey conducted biannually that covers over 30 nations, both within and outside of the European Union (EU). The survey was established in 2001 and conducted sixth round surveys till 2012. For the purposes of this study, I used the 2012 dataset.

Countries’ Scores for the six dimensions of culture are extracted from the Hofstede Centre website (<https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison>). Twenty five of the twenty nine countries had scores on all the six dimensions. While Israel had no score only on the last dimension (indulgence), Ukraine had no scores on LTO and Indulgence. Cyprus and Kosovo had no scores on the six dimensions.

The scores of the countries for job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life time balance were extracted from European Social Survey database. The database is in a public domain and accessible for free. Scores for the six dimensions of culture, Job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life time balance were displayed in table 1.

Table 1. Country level scores on the variables

| No | Country Name | JS | WLB | PD | I-C | M-F | UA | LTO | INDL |
|----|--------------|------|------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|
| 1 | Albania | 2411 | 2271 | 90 | 20 | 80 | 70 | 61 | 15 |
| 2 | Belgium | 7280 | 6489 | 65 | 75 | 54 | 94 | 82 | 57 |
| 3 | Bulgaria | 6575 | 6077 | 70 | 30 | 40 | 85 | 69 | 16 |
| 4 | Switzerland | 7399 | 6634 | 34 | 68 | 70 | 58 | 74 | 66 |
| 5 | Cyprus | 4121 | 3774 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|-------|-------|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|
| 6 | Czech Republic | 7941 | 7561 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 74 | 70 | 29 |
| 7 | Germany | 11939 | 10231 | 35 | 67 | 66 | 65 | 83 | 40 |
| 8 | Denmark | 7579 | 7043 | 18 | 74 | 16 | 23 | 35 | 70 |
| 9 | Estonia | 8944 | 8096 | 40 | 60 | 30 | 60 | 82 | 16 |
| 10 | Spain | 6129 | 5205 | 57 | 51 | 42 | 86 | 48 | 44 |
| 11 | Finland | 8867 | 7944 | 33 | 63 | 26 | 59 | 38 | 57 |
| 12 | France | 7050 | 6401 | 68 | 71 | 43 | 86 | 63 | 48 |
| 13 | UK | 7683 | 7021 | 35 | 89 | 66 | 35 | 51 | 69 |
| 14 | Hungary | 6645 | 5966 | 46 | 80 | 88 | 82 | 58 | 31 |
| 15 | Ireland | 7902 | 7228 | 28 | 70 | 68 | 35 | 24 | 65 |
| 16 | Israel | 10197 | 9088 | 13 | 54 | 47 | 81 | 38 | - |
| 17 | Iceland | 3994 | 3600 | 28 | 70 | 68 | 35 | 24 | 65 |
| 18 | Italy | 3324 | 2909 | 50 | 76 | 70 | 75 | 61 | 30 |
| 19 | Lithuania | 7450 | 7102 | 42 | 60 | 19 | 65 | 82 | 16 |
| 20 | Netherlands | 7654 | 6999 | 38 | 80 | 14 | 53 | 67 | 68 |
| 21 | Norway | 8511 | 7566 | 31 | 69 | 8 | 50 | 35 | 55 |
| 22 | Poland | 7128 | 5975 | 68 | 60 | 64 | 93 | 38 | 29 |
| 23 | Portugal | 6040 | 5452 | 63 | 27 | 31 | 99 | 28 | 33 |
| 24 | Russia | 9381 | 8542 | 93 | 39 | 36 | 95 | 81 | 20 |
| 25 | Sweden | 7969 | 6886 | 31 | 71 | 5 | 29 | 53 | 78 |
| 26 | Slovenia | 3788 | 3638 | 71 | 27 | 19 | 88 | 49 | 48 |
| 27 | Slovakia | 6281 | 5749 | 100 | 52 | 100 | 51 | 77 | 28 |
| 28 | Ukraine | 5879 | 5412 | 92 | 25 | 27 | 95 | - | - |
| 29 | Kosovo | 2465 | 2373 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Source: European Social Survey database.

Description of variables and measures

Job satisfaction (JS): In the European Social Survey 2012, job satisfaction was assessed by a single Likert-type question. More specifically, the participants were asked the following question: "How are you satisfied with your job?" Participants rated their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their job on an eleven point scale ranging from 0 (extremely dissatisfied) to 10 (extremely satisfied). Zero indicates complete dissatisfaction with one's job and 10 indicates complete satisfaction.

Satisfaction with Work-life Balance (WLB): WLB was assessed in such a way that, like job satisfaction, participants were asked to rate their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their work-life time balance on an eleven point scale which ranged from 0 (extremely dissatisfied) to 10 (extremely satisfied).

Culture and cultural dimensions: Country is considered as a proxy measure of culture and cultural dimensions were already defined following Hofstede’s 6D model of culture (Hofstede, 2011).

Data analysis. To organize and make meaning of the data, both descriptive and inferential statistics have been used. Mean scores and standard deviations of job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB were computed for all the 29 countries (table 2). Correlation analysis was used to discern and test for the correlations among the variables of interest. Independent samples of t-test were used to compare countries with high PD and those with low PD on job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB.

Results

Table 2 reports descriptive statistics and bi-variate correlation coefficients between job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance across the 29 countries. As can be seen from the table (table 2), the mean scores for job satisfaction ranged from 6.53 in Ukraine to 8.2 in Denmark. Similarly, mean scores for satisfaction with work-life balance ranged from 6.08 in Russia Federation to 7.65 in Denmark.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and bi-variate correlation coefficients

| Serial No | Country | Mean (JS) | Mean(WLB) | Correlation between JS and satisfaction WLB |
|-----------|----------|------------|------------|---|
| 1 | Albania | 7.28(2.34) | 6.92(2.17) | .567** |
| 2 | Belgium | 7.65(1.67) | 6.82(1.96) | .436** |
| 3 | Bulgaria | 6.95(2.36) | 6.47(2.3) | .562** |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------|------------|------------|--------|
| 4 | Switzerland | 7.96(1.73) | 7.15(2.13) | .506** |
| 5 | Cyprus | 7.72(2.0) | 7.13(2.3) | .38** |
| 6 | Czech Republic | 7.62(1.96) | 7.12(2.13) | .59** |
| 7 | Germany | 7.45(2.1) | 6.39(2.35) | .459** |
| 8 | Denmark | 8.2(1.7) | 7.65(1.86) | .449** |
| 9 | Estonia | 7.16(2.07) | 6.49(2.26) | .501** |
| 10 | Spain | 7.43(2.06) | 6.33(2.3) | .525** |
| 11 | Finland | 7.84(1.54) | 7.05(1.98) | .301** |
| 12 | France | 7.43(1.9) | 6.76(2.14) | .466** |
| 13 | UK | 7.4(2.08) | 6.76(2.22) | .465** |
| 14 | Hungary | 7.06(2.28) | 6.33(2.39) | .539** |
| 15 | Ireland | 7.33(2.04) | 6.69(2.13) | .541** |
| 16 | Israel | 7.71(2.21) | 6.93(2.55) | .504** |
| 17 | Iceland | 7.96(2.02) | 7.23(1.95) | .404** |
| 18 | Italy | 7.29(2.02) | 6.46(2.11) | .578** |
| 19 | Lithuania | 7.39(1.88) | 7.02(1.87) | .573** |
| 20 | Netherlands | 7.75(1.59) | 7.08(1.79) | .35** |
| 21 | Norway | 7.98(1.59) | 7.11(1.9) | .429** |
| 22 | Poland | 7.55(2.04) | 6.35(2.29) | .502** |
| 23 | Portugal | 7.07(1.86) | 6.39(1.82) | .599** |
| 24 | Russia | 6.67(2.38) | 6.08(2.36) | .597** |
| 25 | Sweden | 7.8(1.78) | 6.75(2.15) | .408** |
| 26 | Slovenia | 7.34(2.17) | 7.11(2.22) | .421** |
| 27 | Slovakia | 6.85(1.94) | 6.2(2.09) | .585** |
| 28 | Ukraine | 6.53(2.57) | 6.11(2.55) | .667** |
| 29 | Kosovo | 7.21(2.58) | 6.96(2.39) | .629** |

Numbers in () are standard deviations; ** $p < .001$

Source: Computed by the author based on the data extracted from European Social Survey (ESS).

The relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance was substantial and significant in all countries. The Pearson's coefficients of correlation obtained ranged from .301 in Finland to .667 in Ukraine and all the correlations were significant at $p < .001$. Job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance was found to be positively significantly related in the group as a whole ($r(N = 26717) = .519, p < .001$).

Another hypothesis that this study sought to test was the relationships between the variables of satisfaction (job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB) and the variables of culture (Hofstede’s cultural dimensions). Table 3 summarizes country level inter-correlations among the variables in question.

Table 3. Inter-correlation matrix

| | Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---|-----------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|--------|---|
| 1 | Job satisfaction | - | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Satisfaction with WLB | .995** | - | | | | | | |
| 3 | PD | -.417* | -.408** | - | | | | | |
| 4 | C-I | .332 | .322 | -.653** | - | | | | |
| 5 | M-F | -.229 | -.251 | .235 | .112 | - | | | |
| 6 | UA | -.128 | -.141 | .607** | -.551** | .048 | - | | |
| 7 | LTO | .200 | .220 | .406* | -.022 | .135 | .260 | - | |
| 8 | Indulgence | .141 | .124 | -.641** | .588** | -.245 | -.615** | -.453* | - |

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; PD = Power Distance; C-I = collectivism-Individualism; M-F = Masculinity-Femininity; UA = Uncertainty Avoidance; LTO = Long-Term Orientation; WLB = Work-life balance

Source: Computed by the author based on the data extracted from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison> and European Social Survey (ESS).

Table 3 depicts that, in aggregate, job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB perfectly positively correlated ($r = .995, p < .01$). Of the six dimensions of culture, only Power Distance (PD) had moderate inverse relationships with both job satisfaction ($r = -.417, p < .05$) and satisfaction with WLB ($r = -.408, p < .01$). In other words, countries with high PD had lower job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB as well. In fact, all the Pearson correlation coefficients between job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB and dimensions of culture were not negligible in terms of magnitude but they did not reach statistical significance. For instance, the correlation between job satisfaction

and individualism-collectivism ($r = .332, p > .05$) and satisfaction with WLB and individualism-collectivism ($r = .322, p > .05$) were substantial in terms of magnitude but they did not reach statistical significance. The same holds true for the rest of cultural dimensions.

Following Hofstede's center's interpretation of scores of cultural dimensions, the countries were dichotomized on all the six dimensions of culture to allow the comparisons of countries on job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB. However, the dichotomization did not allow the comparison for all dimensions. For example, a vast majority of the countries in this study (about 80%) went to the individualistic camp when dichotomized into collectivistic versus individualistic on the basis of their scores on this dimension leading to incomparable groups. Hence, the countries were not compared on this dimension. The same holds true for Uncertainty Avoidance. Twenty one (about 81%) countries fell in high UA dichotomy. Therefore, a series of independent samples of t-test were run for the rest of dimensions wherein the dichotomizations led to comparable groups. Results of the t-tests run for both variables were given in table 4.

As it is clearly evident from the table (table 4), significant mean difference in job satisfaction was found only for Power Distance (PD). In other words, as a group, countries with low PD had significantly higher job satisfaction than countries with high PD ($t = -2.448, p = .022$). This result is consistent with the result from correlation analysis wherein PD was negatively related to job satisfaction ($r = -.417, p < .05$). Similarly, countries with low PD had significantly higher satisfaction with work-life balance ($t = -2.462, p = .021$) and this is also consistent with the result from correlation analysis which showed significant inverse relationship between satisfaction with work-life balance and power distance ($r = -.408, p < .01$).

Table 4. Summary of t-test statistics

| Dependent Variables | Dichotomies | N | Mean Difference | t(df) | p-value |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------------|------------|---------|
| Job Satisfaction | High PD Low PD | 14 12 | 1728.77 | -2.448(24) | .022 |
| | High M-F Low M-F | 12 15 | 806.95 | -1.006(25) | .324 |
| | High LTO Low LTO | 16 10 | 231.875 | .269(24) | .79 |
| | High IND Low IND | 10 15 | 748.733 | .893(23) | .381 |
| Satisfaction With Work-life Balance | High PD Low PD | 12 14 | 1512.143 | -2.462(24) | .021 |
| | High M-F Low M-F | 12 15 | 793.900 | -.96(25) | .268 |
| | High LTO Low LTO | 16 10 | 284.475 | .376(24) | .71 |
| | High IND Low IND | 10 15 | 662.667 | .114(23) | .378 |

Numbers in () are degrees of freedom (df); PD = Power Distance; M-F = Masculinity-Femininity; LTO = Long Term Orientation; IND = Indulgence

Source: Computed by the author based on the data extracted from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison>.

Discussion

This study sought to test the following main hypotheses using ESS 2012 database and scores on dimensions of cultures from Hofstede’s center: (1) The relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life time balance vary across the countries under study; (2) Job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life time balance are positively linked; and (3) Job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life time balance are related to Hofstede’s dimensions of culture in one way or the other. To this end, independent samples of t-test and correlation analysis were used to test for

the hypotheses put forth. Results were in the directions expected and the hypotheses were partially supported.

Mean scores of Job Satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life time balance and correlation coefficients between the two showed that job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB varied across the countries under study as expected. Mean scores of job satisfaction ranged from as low as 6.53 in Ukraine to as high as 8.20 in Denmark. Similarly, mean scores of satisfaction with WLB varied from as low as 6.08 in Russia to as high as 7.65 in Denmark. Coefficients of correlation between job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB varied from .301 in Finland to .667 in Ukraine. This variation in magnitude of the relationships between the variables in question appears to be consistent with previous empirical studies. For instance, Luu, Beach and Hatstrup (2010) found stronger relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in countries higher in individualism. In this study, the relationships between job satisfaction and satisfaction with work-life balance appear to be stronger in countries lower in individualism (or higher in collectivism) such as Ukraine, Albania, Bulgaria and Portugal than countries higher in individualism. In fact, this is not surprising for there is no clear boundary between work and personal life in collectivistic cultures. Indeed, job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB can vary across cultures or nations for several reasons and culture can be one of such reasons. Job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB are closely connected to and may be derived from the meaning and value people attach to work and social life. Work and social life, in turn, are highly influenced by culture. Therefore, it is reasonable and logical to argue that job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB cannot be free from the influence of culture.

The second hypothesis was supported in that job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB were significantly positively related across the 29 countries (r 's = .301- .667, p 's < .001) as well as in the sample as a whole (r (N= 26717) = .519, p < .001). This is perfectly in line with previous similar works that reported positive relationships between job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB (e.g. Mukhtar, 2012; Saif et al., 2011) or negative relationship between

job satisfaction and work-life conflict (e.g., Gamage, 2013). The third hypothesis was partially supported in that of the 6 cultural dimensions only power distance (PD) was found to be significantly related to both job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB. Power distance (PD) was inversely related to both job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB.

Implications for cross-cultural management

The relevance and importance of job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB in organizations is unquestionable. Beyond their relevance and importance in organizations, job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB are also very important in everyday lives of employees. In short, both job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB are closely linked to productivity and organizational effectiveness. So managers cannot afford to overlook job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB if they envisage organizational effectiveness and managerial success. Having said this much about the relevance and importance of job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB in organization, it is recommended for managers and leaders to pay attentions to the following points in their endeavors to ensure job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB in their organizations.

First, job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB positively correlated in all cultures studied. This implies the universality of the relationship between the two variables. The managerial implication of this point is that managers need to pay due attention to enhancing employees' job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB to ensure productivity and organizational effectiveness regardless of organizational context. Second, the magnitude of relationships between job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB varied greatly across cultures/countries suggesting the context specificity of the association. The managerial implication of this point is that there may not be universal managerial strategies that can be used to promote job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB. Therefore, managers need to employ culturally appropriate

managerial strategies in promoting job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB. For example, bonus salary at the end of a fiscal year may be effective in one culture but may be ineffective in another culture. Third, this study suggested that both job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB are related to Hofstede's dimensions of culture. For instance, PD was inversely related to both job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB though further research with large sample is required to substantiate these findings. This implies that managers of multinational organizations and companies need to take into account cultural differences while devising strategies to promote job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB.

References

Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). Leadership and job satisfaction – A review. *European Scientific Journal*, *10*(8), 1857–7881.

Bowling, N. A., Eschleman, K. J., & Wang, Q. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of the relationship between job satisfaction and subjective well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *83*, 915–934.

Calvo-Salguero, A., Carrasco-González, A. M., & Salinas-Martínez de Lecea, J. M. (2010). Relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: The moderating effect of gender and the salience of family and work roles. *African Journal of Business Management*, *4*(7), 1247–1259.

Gamage, P. N. (2013). Work-life conflict and job and family satisfaction of legal practitioners in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research*, *2*(4), 1–10.

Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *63*, 510–531.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, *2*(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>.

Jessen, J. T. (2010). Job satisfaction and social rewards in the social services. *Journal of Comparative Social Work*, *1*, 1–18.

Khan, F., & Ali, P. U. (2013). A cross-cultural study: Work stress as mediator between job satisfaction and intention to quit. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *4* (9), 305–311.

Klassen, R. M., Usher, E. L., & Bong, M. (2010). Teachers' collective efficacy, job satisfaction, and job stress in cross-cultural context. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 78(4), 464–486.

Kord, B. (2012). A cross-cultural study of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of bank employees of Iran and India. *J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res.*, 2(1), 605–609.

Luu, L., Beach, L., & Hatstrup, K. (2010). An investigation of country differences in the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Applied H.R.M. Research*, correlational study in Bahrain. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 3(5), 43–53.

Mukhtar, F. (2012). *Work life balance and job satisfaction among faculty at Iowa State University*. A dissertation submitted to 12(1), 17–39.

Mohammed, F., & Eleswed, M. (2013). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: a the graduate faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

Saif, M. I., Malik, M. I., & Awan, M. Z. (2011). Employee work satisfaction and work-life balance: A Pakistani Perspective. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3, (5), 606–617.

Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (2003). Co-Cultures: Living in Two Cultures. *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*. Thomson Learning, Inc., 105–107.

Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause and consequences*. London: Sage Publications.

Website sources

www.advancing-businesses.co.nz/business-coaching/practical-business-advice/life-work-balance.

E-guide to managing stress and psychosocial risks – Safety and health at work – EU-OSHA (2018, March 9). *European Agency for Safety and Health at work – EU-OSHA*. <http://osha.europa.eu>.

<https://www.techtarget.com/search/query?q=Work%20life%20balance&type=definition&pageNo=1&sortField=..>

<https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison>.

European Social Survey (ESS). <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/>.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to all organizations and individuals involved the European Social Survey (ESS) project.

The author received no grant for this research.

