

The Gender Paradox in Work Satisfaction and the Protestant Clergy

Elaine M. McDuff*

Iowa State University

Female clergy are more likely than male clergy to serve small, rural churches in declining communities, yet they express a high level of satisfaction with their work, often higher than that of male clergy. Why are female clergy relatively happy with their jobs in spite of poor work conditions? Studies of other occupations have consistently found that while women's work conditions and rewards are inferior to those of men in comparable positions (a situation which should reduce satisfaction), women report being as satisfied or more satisfied with their work (Fry and Greensfield 1980; Mannheim 1983; Phelan and Phelan 1983; Moore 1985; Bokemeier and Lacy 1986; Hodson 1989; Phelan 1994). This discrepancy is called the "gender paradox" in work satisfaction.

The purpose of this study is to address female clergy's reports of higher satisfaction, using the five main explanations of the paradox which have been identified and tested (Phelan 1994; Mueller and Wallace 1996); the emphasis is on arguments that involve justice perceptions. Beyond the effects of justice perceptions on satisfaction, gender difference in justice perceptions are of interest in and of themselves, since sources of gender inequality are not likely to be corrected as long as men and women evaluate those inequalities as just and fair (Marx [1848]1964; Smelser 1962). A comprehensive model of sources of satisfaction will be used, as previous studies (Mueller and Wallace 1996) have found that using a properly specified model may eliminate much of the paradox for job satisfaction. The data come from a 1996 national survey of pastors in two Protestant denominations, and show that a gender paradox does exist for clergy job satisfaction. While justice perceptions play a highly significant role in explaining job satisfaction, they fail to eliminate the gender paradox. A finding which contradicts previous studies is evidence of differences in job values for male and female clergy. It is suggested that future studies include variables that assess the importance of gender-specific job values in producing job satisfaction.

Studies of male and female clergy consistently find a gender gap in pay and benefits. There is also clear evidence that female clergy experience inferior work conditions. They are more likely than men to serve small, rural churches in declining communities, yet they express a high level of satisfaction with their work, often higher than that of male clergy. Why are female clergy relatively

* Direct all correspondence to: Elaine M. McDuff, Department of Sociology, 22 Catt Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011. email: emcduff@iastate.edu. This paper was presented at the 1999 American Sociological Association Meetings in Chicago, Illinois. Funding for this study was provided by a Dissertation Improvement Grant from the National Science Foundation, a grant from the Louisville Institute, and a University of Iowa Student Government Research Grant.

happy with their jobs in spite of poor work conditions? Studies of other occupations have consistently found that while women's work conditions and rewards are inferior to those of men in comparable positions (a situation which should reduce satisfaction), women report being as satisfied or more satisfied with their work than men (Fry and Greenfield 1980; Mannheim 1983; Phelan and Phelan 1983; Moore 1985; Bokemeier and Lacy 1986; Hodson 1989; Phelan 1994). This discrepancy is called the "gender paradox" in work satisfaction.

Efforts to explain why the paradox exists have met with limited success (Phelan 1994; Mueller and Wallace 1996). Both Phelan (1994) and Mueller and Wallace (1996) identified and tested five explanations for the paradox: differential job inputs, own-gender referents, differential entitlements, differential job values, and subjective rewards. The first three explanations are based on justice theory (Jasso and Rossi 1977), according to which individuals perceive that justice or injustice exists based on a comparison of their rewards with the rewards of others (Jasso and Rossi 1977; Hegtvedt 1994). As Jasso (1980) points out, the definition of "just reward" (the standard with which one's own rewards are compared to determine justice or injustice) may vary across individuals or groups. Using justice theory to explain women's higher levels of satisfaction in spite of inferior rewards therefore involves testing for a gender difference in the meaning of a "just reward" or in perceptions of justice. While Phelan (1994) found no support for justice or equity arguments in her assessment of these explanations for the gender paradox, she used objective rather than subjective measures of justice. The only one of the five explanations tested by Phelan (1994) which received some support was the argument that perceived or "subjective" features of work (which are similar for men and women) have a stronger effect on work satisfaction than objective features of work (which tend to favor men). Mueller and Wallace (1996), on the other hand, used perceptual rather than objective measures of justice, and found that while perceptions of both pay justice and distributive justice have no effect on job satisfaction (a more global measure), they do have an important effect on pay satisfaction (a reward-specific measure), and reduce the gender gap in satisfaction with pay. These findings underscore the importance of using perceptual measures of justice, and support Kalleberg's (1977) argument that it is the subjective (comparative) meanings that employees associate with work conditions that determine satisfaction.

The purpose of this study is to revisit the various "gender paradox" arguments in an attempt to explain female clergy's reports of higher job satisfaction, with an emphasis on the arguments that involve justice perceptions. Beyond the effects of justice perceptions on satisfaction, gender differences in justice perceptions are of interest in and of themselves, since, as Phelan (1994) points out, even if the sources of gender inequality in the workplace (in this case the local church) are identified, it is unlikely that they will be corrected as long as men and women evaluate those inequalities as just and fair (Marx [1848]1964; Smelser 1962). A better understanding of the "gender paradox" for clergy may

help provide insight into why female clergy have been, and are still, willing to accept employment in small, problem-filled churches and communities, and to accept inadequate levels of pay and benefits. In addition, since perceptions of justice are likely to be more important in work settings with low absolute pay, testing possible explanations of the gender paradox for clergy [the lowest paying profession (Gannon 1971; Wessinger 1998)] may provide additional insights into the role of justice perceptions in creating satisfaction. A comprehensive model of sources of satisfaction will be used, as Mueller and Wallace (1996) found that using a properly specified model may eliminate much of the paradox for job satisfaction.

PHELAN'S (1994) FIVE EXPLANATIONS FOR THE GENDER PARADOX

Phelan's (1994) first explanation for the gender paradox is the *differential job inputs* argument. This explanation suggests that women actually have lower inputs (less effort, less education and training, etc.), making it logical for them to perceive their lower rewards as just and to be as satisfied as more highly-rewarded men. This involves justice theory insofar as it suggests that women's lower pay is in fact just; i.e. the reward structure is just in an objective sense. This argument can be tested directly by determining whether the gender gap in satisfaction is eliminated by equalizing men and women on job inputs.

Phelan's (1994) second explanation is the *own-gender referents* argument, which suggests that women compare themselves to other women instead of comparing themselves to men in comparable positions in order to decide whether their workplace rewards are just and fair. Phelan's (1994) third explanation is the *differential entitlement standards* argument which suggests that women have been socialized in both family and workplace to expect less for their inputs. Both of these arguments require assessment not of the objective justice of women's rewards relative to their inputs, but of women's perceptions of justice relative to men's perceptions of justice. If women are comparing themselves to other women in evaluating fairness of reward, or if they have different conceptions of what a just reward involves, then there should be gender differences in justice perceptions, and these perceptions should have a significant effect on the gender gap in satisfaction. These two arguments can be tested by determining if justice perceptions have a relatively strong effect on satisfaction, and if women's justice perceptions are as high as those of their male counterparts.

The fourth explanation is the *differential job values* argument, which suggests that women are as satisfied as men because women value subjective rewards (which are more equally distributed) more highly than objective rewards (which are more unequally distributed) (Phelan 1994). This can be tested by examining the significance of gender/reward interaction effects on satisfaction.

The last explanation is the *subjective rewards* explanation. This argument also focuses on subjective rewards, but argues that subjective (relatively equal) rewards play a more important role than objective (relatively unequal) rewards in creating satisfaction for *both* men and women. This argument can be assessed by examining gender differences in subjective rewards and comparing the effects of objective and subjective rewards on the gender gap in satisfaction.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN OBJECTIVE WORK CONDITIONS FOR CLERGY

Among the professional clergy, significant gender disparities are known to exist in pay and employment opportunities (Prichard 1996; Tucker 1996; Zikmund 1996; Schneider and Schneider 1997). While declining membership and declining contributions in mainline Protestant denominations limit the upward mobility of all clergy, that limitation is felt disproportionately by female clergy (Schneider and Schneider 1997). Across Protestant denominations, women tend to remain in entry level positions, while men tend to move on to positions of higher status and pay (Prichard 1996; Schmidt 1996; Tucker 1996; Zikmund 1996; Chaves 1997; Schneider and Schneider 1997). More women than men are likely to be part-time, and fewer full-time women are likely to be married, a statistic closely related to mobility problems (Carroll et al. 1981; Nesbitt 1997). By their second or third placement, women clergy are much more likely than men to serve smaller, less financially stable churches in small towns or rural areas, to have more older members, and to have fewer middle and upper class members (Carroll et al. 1981; Schmidt 1996; Chaves 1997; Nesbitt 1997). Together these factors constitute dual employment tracks for male and female clergy (Nesbitt 1993, 1997; Chaves 1997). Since the theory and research on satisfaction consistently show that inferior work conditions have a negative impact on employee satisfaction, these differences in objective work conditions should make female clergy less satisfied than their male colleagues. However, several recent studies have found evidence that female clergy are as satisfied, if not more satisfied, with their work than male clergy (Ice 1987; Nesbitt 1997; Schneider and Schneider 1997). It is therefore anticipated that support will be found for the existence of a gender paradox in clergy work satisfaction.

EVIDENCE OF GENDER DIFFERENCES IN CLERGY EVALUATIONS OF WORK CONDITIONS

The existence of a gender paradox has often been assumed to provide evidence (without testing) that there is a gender difference in perceptions of justice in the workplace; i.e. that women evaluate their inferior rewards as just and fair, and are therefore as satisfied as their male colleagues with their jobs (Phelan and Phelan 1983; Bokemeier and Lacy 1986). Direct evidence that

women do in fact expect lower rewards for the same contributions and that they consider these rewards to be just and fair comes primarily from experimental rather than natural work settings. For example, women tend to pay themselves less for performing experimental tasks than men (Callahan-Levy and Messe 1979) and they are more likely than men to perceive an experimental underpayment as fair (Kahn 1972). Also, Jasso and Rossi (1977) find evidence that both men and women consider a married man to be more underpaid than a married woman earning the same low salary. Following this argument, the growing number of women entering programs of professional training for ministry, in spite of evidence of overall economic decline in mainline churches, can be assumed to indicate clergywomen's greater willingness to accept inferior rewards and to perceive these rewards as just. At the same time, the number of men entering ministry training has declined, suggesting that men are less willing to accept the inadequate rewards many churches are offering. In fact, most mainline Protestant seminaries now have student bodies that are more than 50 percent female (Wessinger 1996). In addition, clergywomen show a willingness (often eagerness) to accept employment in those ministry positions that offer very low pay, few benefits, and few opportunities for advancement. This suggests that female clergy's justice perceptions differ from those of male clergy, and that support is likely to be found for the two *perceptions of justice* explanations for the gender paradox in satisfaction.

Edward Lehman (1993), who recently conducted an exploratory study of gender differences in ministerial style, concludes that while some variations in clergy style are associated with sex differences (e.g. more men than women make use of social power in dealing with their congregations, and more women than men seek to enable their congregations to develop autonomy and power over their own collective lives), the male/female differences are slight, and there are no significant differences between men and women on five dimensions of approach to pastoral ministry. Others researchers, however, have found significant male/female differences. Martha Long Ice (1987), in her qualitative study of clergywomen's worldviews, finds that many female clergy (unlike male clergy) are prepared to sacrifice opportunities for career advancement in order to "model and articulate convincingly ministries that offer few public rewards but much intrinsic satisfaction" (Ice 1987: 50). Schneider and Schneider (1997), after describing the current workplace inequalities and overall underemployment of female clergy, suggest that many clergywomen are in fact satisfied with their smaller congregations, "delighting in the intimacy," and pleased at their ability to avoid the myriad administrative tasks imposed on clergy who serve larger churches. As for the possibility that women are simply changing their expectations to match reality, they conclude on the basis of their research that women are truly happy with their smaller pulpits and are seeking to develop alternative models of ministry. They offer evidence that women who are serving in part-time positions, often "stitching together several different responsibilities," see

themselves as expanding the images of authentic ways of performing ministry, and "fruitfully cross-fertilizing" (Schneider and Schneider 1997: 258). These findings suggest that clergy may in fact have *differential job values*, differences which contribute to female clergy's high levels of satisfaction.

Another recent study (McDuff and Mueller 1999) found that female clergy receive higher levels of social support than male clergy. This finding, together with the low levels of *objective rewards* received by both male and female clergy, suggests that *subjective rewards* may be playing a more important role in determining levels of work satisfaction for clergy — especially female clergy — than has been found to be the case for male and female lawyers (Mueller and Wallace 1996).

Therefore, while it is expected that gender differences in *perceptions of justice* will play a significant role in explaining the gender paradox for clergy, as was the case for lawyers (Mueller and Wallace 1996), gender differences in *job values* and an emphasis on *subjective rewards* over *objective rewards* are also expected to contribute to female clergy's high levels of satisfaction in spite of their inferior work conditions and rewards.

THE MODEL

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in the model is job satisfaction. *Job satisfaction* involves an affective response to the job situation and can be defined as how much an employee likes her/his job (Locke 1969; Kalleberg 1977).

Explanatory and Control Variables

Following both Phelan's (1994) and Mueller and Wallace's (1996) studies, the explanatory variables are grouped into four categories associated with the five explanations of the gender paradox. Other variables are included as controls in order to ensure a properly specified model.

Female is a dummy variable for gender with female coded as 1 and male coded as 0. The dependent variable is regressed on gender in order to estimate the gender gap in satisfaction, first as a zero-order effect, and then as a net effect controlling for the four groups of explanatory variables.

The first group of variables in the model are the controls which are known to affect satisfaction for clergy, but which are not part of Phelan's five explanations of the gender paradox. Control variables include: work setting characteristics (*church category* which combines a measure of church size and church budget), family situation (number of *dependents*), and external *job opportunities*, as well as some factors uniquely important to clergy: *calling* and *intrinsic religiousness*. While *calling* or a desire to serve others through one's work is a

general professional value, for clergy *calling* is specifically defined as a "task set by God with a sense of obligation to work for purposes other than one's own" (Christopherson 1994: 219). *Intrinsic religiousness* describes a person who lives for their religion, and whose belief system is part of the pattern of their personality (Feagin 1974). Since clergy careers are expected to be the embodiment of a professional call to service grounded in a high level of intrinsic religiousness, both of these variables are considered to be important sources of clergy satisfaction.

The first group of explanatory variables is related to Phelan's *differential inputs* argument and includes human capital, and employee inputs and characteristics. *Tenure* is the number of years a minister has been serving in his/her current parish. *Years in Ministry* is the total number of years in professional ministry. *Education* in this study is defined as whether or not a minister has received an advanced level of college and seminary training. *Work motivation* is the extent to which an individual considers work to be central to life (Price and Mueller 1986). *Negative affectivity* is a general sense of dissatisfaction across time and situation (Watson and Clark 1984).

The second group of explanatory variables is used to evaluate the *subjective rewards* argument. The first subset of variables in this category measures objective workplace rewards, and includes *salary* and *formal benefits*. The effect of these variables is assessed net of the input variables in order to determine whether objective rewards are important in and of themselves for explaining the paradox. The second subset of variables in this category involves job condition perceptions. *Congregational support* is a form of workplace social support unique to the clergy, since pastor and parish share in a community of social relationships without sharing the same professional or employment status. *Collegial support* for clergy is comparable to the concept of professional collegiality, even though colleagues are usually not employed in the same workplace. Both of these variables (congregational and collegial support) are conceptualized as the perceived willingness of congregation members/colleagues to help the minister deal with job-related problems and accomplish tasks. *Formalization* involves the explicit formulation of organizational norms and procedures through written rules and regulations (Price and Mueller 1986). Formalization is expected to increase satisfaction by increasing the legitimacy of workplace authority. *Professional growth* is an indicator of the opportunities an employee has to increase professional qualifications within the work setting (Mangelsdorff 1989). *Autonomy* refers to the freedom, independence, and discretion an employee has in making decisions about how to do her/his job (Hackman and Oldham 1980). *Decision-making* is the degree to which employees are involved in making major policy decisions (Aiken and Hage 1968). *Job security* is the degree to which employees feel their job situation is stable (Wallace 1995). *Grievance procedures* are structured channels by which employees are enabled to appeal decisions and have complaints heard. A comparison of the effects of subjective and objective

rewards on the gender gap in satisfaction, along with an examination of gender differences in subjective rewards, can help to determine whether subjective (equal) rewards are more important than objective (unequal) rewards in creating satisfaction for female as well as male clergy.

The third group of explanatory variables measures *perceptions of justice*, in place of the objective measures Phelan (1994) used to evaluate the *own-gender referents* and *differential entitlement standards* arguments. *Distributive justice* refers to a general perception by employees that they are being fairly and justly rewarded for their performance (Doeringer and Piore 1971). *Pay justice* focuses specifically on whether an individual believes his/her pay and benefits are fair and just. Based on justice theory and the evidence of previous studies, both variables are expected to have an important effect on satisfaction, and to help explain the gender paradox.

DATA AND METHODS

Data

The data come from a 1996 national survey of pastors in two Protestant denominations: the United Church of Christ (UCC) and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) (DOC). Both denominations employ relatively large numbers of female clergy. In 1995, 18.8 percent ($N = 733$) of clergy in the UCC were female, and about 13 percent ($N = 388$) of the clergy in the DOC were female (United Church of Christ *Yearbook* 1996; *Yearbook and Directory* of the Christian Church 1995).

To ensure sufficient cases for various subgroup analyses, a fifty percent random sample of male ministers was drawn and all female ministers from both denominations were included in the survey. Questionnaires were mailed initially to 4500 pastors, and a reminder letter and a second questionnaire were mailed to nonrespondents. 2780 questionnaires were returned, for a 62 percent return rate, a reasonable response rate for national mail surveys (Dillman 1991). Once cases with missing data are deleted and weights are introduced to account for the oversampling of female pastors, the sample size is 1987. There are 447 female pastors and 1540 male pastors.

When several sample characteristics are compared with population characteristics (gender, race, church size, and church budget) few differences are found in the distribution of clergy in the sample and the population. For gender (and after correcting for the fact that women were double over-sampled), 83 percent of UCC clergy are male, and 84.5 percent of UCC survey respondents are male; 12 percent of DOC clergy are female, and 13.6 percent of DOC survey respondents are female. For race, 93.7 percent of UCC clergy are white and 3.1 percent are African-American, while 92.8 percent of UCC respondents are white and 2.8 percent are African-American; in the DOC 90.8 percent of clergy are white

and 6.6 percent are African-American, while in the DOC sample 91.8 percent are white and 6 percent are African-American. Fewer clergy in the sample are employed in churches located in the smallest size and budget categories than are actually employed in small churches in the population, however, these churches are often served by interim ministers, who have been excluded from the sample.

Measures

The measures used in the analysis are described in the Appendix. The majority of them are, or are derived from, established scales in the literature. Alpha values are given for multiple item constructs. Table 1 provides descriptive data on the variables used in the study.

Analysis

Job satisfaction is the dependent variable in the analysis. Multiple regression is used to measure the effect of the groups of explanatory and control variables listed above on job satisfaction, and to estimate the gender satisfaction gap (the unstandardized coefficient for *female*) while controlling the variables in the model. First, the *differential job values* argument is assessed by determining whether the effects of any of the explanatory variables on satisfaction vary by gender (interaction effects). Then control variables are introduced to produce a gender gap net of factors that are known to affect satisfaction for clergy but which are not included in the four explanations. Finally, groups of variables are successively introduced in order to assess the *differential inputs*, *subjective job rewards*, and *justice perception* explanations for the gender paradox. Both standardized and unstandardized coefficients are presented in Table 2, since the unstandardized coefficient for *female* shows the literal difference between men and women in regard to the effect of each group of variables on satisfaction.

RESULTS

Table 1 provides descriptive data by gender. Consistent with research reviewed above, female clergy are located in smaller churches with smaller budgets, they receive less pay, and they have fewer opportunities for advancement. Female clergy also have fewer dependents than male clergy. In terms of workplace perceptions, female clergy experience more collegial support, but have fewer opportunities for making major policy decisions. They have less human capital in terms of length of tenure and total years in ministry, and are less likely than male clergy to consider work to be central in their lives. They have higher levels of intrinsic religiousness, which suggests that female clergy place a greater emphasis on spiritual and subjective factors in the workplace, while male clergy are more likely to emphasize material and objective factors. Female clergy have a

lower estimate of the overall justice of their rewards than do male clergy, and a lower sense of pay justice. This is not consistent with the entitlement argument which suggests that women expect less and consider a smaller reward for the same input as men to be fair (Phelan 1994). Instead, the data in Table 1 show that women ministers have significantly higher job satisfaction than male ministers, but a lower estimation of the overall justice of their rewards. This inconsistency needs to be addressed. The evidence of women's higher job satisfaction in spite of their inferior work conditions is clearly consistent, however, with the claims of a gender paradox.

TABLE 1

Descriptive Data by Gender (N = 1987)

Variable	Females (N = 447)	Males (N = 1540)
Job Satisfaction	17.64 (2.30)	17.26** (2.71)
<i>Control Variables for Clergy Satisfaction</i>		
Church Category	3.91 (1.39)	4.65*** (1.32)
Dependents	2.90 (1.25)	3.19*** (1.26)
Opportunity	18.18 (4.28)	19.18*** (4.51)
Sense of Calling	21.60 (2.47)	21.41 (2.44)
Intrinsic Religiousness	17.23 (2.13)	16.75*** (2.19)
<i>Differential Inputs</i>		
Tenure	4.74 (4.00)	7.40*** (6.10)
Years in Ministry	10.35 (6.83)	20.29*** (9.43)
Education	.93 (.25)	.94 (.23)
Work Motivation	9.97 (1.86)	10.39*** (1.98)
Negative Personality	7.91 (2.49)	7.89 (2.44)
<i>Objective Rewards</i>		
Formal Benefits	7.66 (2.79)	8.04* (2.66)
Yearly Earnings	27.717 (12,418)	35,970*** (14,135)
<i>Subjective Rewards</i>		
Congregational Support	11.47 (1.97)	11.40 (2.18)
Collegial Support	11.09 (2.43)	10.61*** (2.43)
Formalization	7.26 (2.18)	7.04 (2.20)
Professional Growth	6.85 (2.05)	7.00 (2.03)
Oppor.		
Autonomy	3.92 (1.44)	3.90 (1.36)
Decision-Making	11.52 (2.12)	12.04*** (1.92)
Job Security	11.70 (2.48)	11.87 (2.64)
Grievance Procedures	7.18 (1.62)	7.08 (1.71)
<i>Own-Gender Referents and Entitlement Standards (Perceptions of Justice)</i>		
Pay Justice	2.23 (.61)	2.30* (.61)
Distributive Justice	9.35 (3.10)	9.97*** (3.07)

^a Means are given; values in parentheses are standard deviations. Tests are for gender differences in means, using 2-tailed tests.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table 2 presents the OLS regression results for job satisfaction. Results for each of Phelan's (1994) explanations of the gender paradox are discussed separately.

The *differential job values* argument is assessed first by running the model with and without interaction terms for each of the variables, in order to determine whether work characteristics have a differential influence on satisfaction for men and women (Hodson 1989; Phelan 1994; Mueller and Wallace 1996). The overall test of gender interactions with all explanatory and control variables produced an R^2 of .478 in the non-additive model and .462 in the additive model. This means that when the interaction terms are included, the model has a better fit to the data. The F-test for additional sums of squares was significant at the .05 level, and 3 of the 22 individual interaction terms (*djust*female*, *negat*female*, and *yrsmin*female*) were significant for job satisfaction. Thus distributive justice, personality factors and years in ministry operate differently for men and women in terms of their effect on satisfaction. These terms were therefore included in the analysis, producing a non-additive model for job satisfaction. Once gender interaction terms are introduced in Equation 3 (Table 2), the coefficient for the gender dummy variable should not be interpreted as evidence for a gender gap. However, Equations 3–6 still provide useful information for assessing the various explanations for the gender paradox. The presence of significant interaction effects for job satisfaction suggests that there may be some gender differences in clergy *job values* that help explain female clergy's high levels of job satisfaction. While the significant interactions of years in ministry and negative affectivity with gender do not directly indicate gender differences in the valuing of job rewards, it is interesting to note that increased years in ministry does not result in steadily increasing satisfaction over a ministry career for women — i.e. being female reduces the otherwise significantly positive effect of years in ministry on satisfaction. According to previous studies, increased length of time in a profession should increase job rewards, which should in turn increase satisfaction. The lack of increase in satisfaction for women with increased years in ministry suggests one of two possibilities. Either women's job rewards are not increasing as rapidly with age and experience as are men's rewards, or the combined effect of reward increases (both measured and unmeasured) that correlate significantly with years in ministry are not as important for women's job satisfaction as men's job satisfaction (suggesting a possible gender difference in job values). Of greater importance for the *differential job values* argument is the finding that women's perceptions of justice have a stronger positive effect on their levels of job satisfaction than do men's perceptions of justice. This indicates that female clergy value justice perceptions more highly than do male clergy. While this is the only direct evidence of a gender difference in job values, it is possible that there are other clergy job values that operate differently by gender that have not been measured by the model. In any case, these results suggest a need to include *differential job values* as

TABLE 2
Regression Results for Job Satisfaction (N = 1,987)

Variables	Eq. 1		Eq. 2		Eq. 3		Eq. 4		Eq. 5		Eq. 6	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Females ^a	.383**	.061	.432***	.069	-.057	-.009	-.027	-.004	-.196	-.031	-1.00	-.159
<i>Control Variables for Clergy Satisfaction</i>												
Church Category			.071**	.037	.117**	.061	.112*	.058	.071	.037	.072	.037
Dependents			-.094*	-.045	.026	.012	.027	.013	.040	.019	.045	.021
Advancement Opportunity			.109***	.186	.089***	.152	.086***	.147	.011	.019	.009	.015
Sense of Calling			.385***	.357	.305***	.284	.302***	.281	.220***	.205	.230***	.213
Intrinsic Religiousness			.031	.026	.006	.005	.006	.006	-.013	-.011	-.014	-.011
<i>Differential Inputs Argument (Employee Inputs)</i>												
Tenure			.014	.031	.015	.033	.015	.033	-.014	-.031	-.013	-.028
Years in Ministry			.017*	.063	.017*	.063	.017*	.063	.010	.038	.012	.043
Years in Ministry X Female			-.049**	-.102	-.051**	-.104	-.051**	-.104	-.049***	-.101	-.049***	-.100
Type of Education			-1.20***	-.107	-1.35***	-.120	-1.35***	-.120	-.894***	-.080	-.906***	-.072
Work Motivation			.108***	.080	.120***	.089	.120***	.089	.071**	.053	.065**	.048
Negative Personality			-.302***	-.281	-.302***	-.281	-.302***	-.281	-.201***	-.187	-.200***	-.186
Negative Personality X Female			.167**	.158**	.222	.158**	.222	.158**	.210	.140***	.186	.147***
.196												
<i>Subjective Rewards Argument</i>												
Objective Rewards							.084***	.086	.037	.038	.042*	.043
Formal Benefits							-.096	-.052	-.130**	-.070	-.176***	-.095
Yearly Income												
Subjective Rewards									.291***	.236	.276***	.224
Congregational Support									.051**	.047	.051*	.047
Collegial Support									.007	.006	-.002	-.002
Formalization									.058*	.045	.026	.020
Professional Growth Opportunities									.112**	.059	.099*	.052
Autonomy									-.001	-.001	.009	.007
Decision-Making												

(Continued)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Variables	Eq. 1		Eq. 2		Eq. 3		Eq. 4		Eq. 5		Eq. 6	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Subjective Rewards												
Job Security									.199***	.194	.188***	.183
Grievance Procedures									.075*	.048	.060	.039
Own-Gender Referents and Differential Entitlement Standards Arguments (Perceptions of Justice)												
Pay Justice											.192*	.044
Distributive Justice											.044*	.052
Distributive Justice X Female											.082*	.130
Constant	17.257		6.380		10.227		10.056		6.220		5.862	
R ² /adjusted R ²	.004	.003	.212	.210	.300	.296	.306	.300	.459	.453	.469	.462

a The unstandardized coefficient for female represents the differences between job satisfaction for men and women after the other variables in the equation have been controlled.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

a factor in analyses of job satisfaction for male and female clergy.

Before assessing the *differential inputs explanation*, several factors are controlled that are known to be related to work satisfaction and gender, but which are not part of the model: *church size and budget, number of dependents, opportunities for advancement, calling and intrinsic religiousness* (Eq. 2). Since there are no interaction terms in equation 2, the large, significant coefficient for female indicates that women are higher in job satisfaction when they have been equalized on these variables; women are significantly more satisfied than their male counterparts who serve similar size and budget churches, who have similar levels of opportunity, and who have an equally strong sense of calling and intrinsic religiousness.

The variables used in Table 2 to assess the *differential inputs* argument (which examines the effect of differences in men's and women's human capital and other job-related inputs on job satisfaction) are: *tenure at the current church, total years in ministry, level of theological education, work motivation, and negative affectivity* (personality) (Eq. 3). In order to properly specify the model, it is necessary to include two interaction terms (*yrsmin*female, negaf*female*), which means that it is no longer possible to interpret the unstandardized coefficient for gender as the adjusted difference in mean satisfaction. However, Table 1 shows that women have significantly fewer years in ministry and tenure at the current church, as well as lower work motivation. Yet, being in ministry for many years has little effect on women's satisfaction, while men's satisfaction increases over time. There is no significant difference between men and women in level of education or negative affectivity, but having a negative personality does not reduce women's satisfaction in the same way it reduces men's. Overall, differences in men's and women's job inputs seem to have little effect on gender differences in job satisfaction.

In assessing the *subjective rewards* explanation, it is necessary to first examine the effect of the objective workplace rewards of *pay* and *benefits* on satisfaction. The presence of interaction terms means that it is not possible to determine the direct effect of objective rewards on the gender gap (Eq. 4), but Table 2 shows that income does not have a significant effect on satisfaction for either men or women, while formal benefits have a small but significant effect. There is little change in the R^2 (.300 to .306) with the introduction of these objective rewards variables, but subjective rewards (Equation 5) increase the R^2 by 50 percent (.306 to .459) for job satisfaction. As Phelan (1994) found, Table 1 shows that male and female clergy are much more balanced in terms of subjective rewards than objective rewards — the only differences are in *collegial support* (women perceive more) and *decision-making* (men perceive more). The strong positive effect of most of these subjective reward variables (*congregational support, professional growth opportunities, autonomy, job security and grievance procedures*) therefore suggests that perceptions of adequate subjective rewards are making important contributions to clergywomen's high levels of job satisfaction.

Phelan (1994) and Mueller and Wallace (1996) argue that women will judge their lower rewards as just if they have been socialized to believe that they are entitled to less than men. Assessing this *perceived justice* explanation means seeing if justice perceptions have a relatively strong effect on satisfaction, and if women's perceptions of justice are as high as men's (Eq. 6). In fact, Table 1 shows that in place of an equal or higher perception of justice, female clergy have a small but significantly lower sense of *pay justice*, and a much lower sense of *distributive justice* than male clergy. At the same time, the interaction term for *distributive justice* indicates that overall perceptions of justice have a larger positive effect on job satisfaction for female than for male clergy, while perceptions of *pay justice* significantly increase job satisfaction for both men and women. The non-additive nature of the model makes it difficult to determine whether the gender gap is significantly reduced by the introduction of the justice terms. However, the greater effect of *distributive justice* on satisfaction for women relative to men, together with the overall importance of justice perceptions in creating satisfaction, suggest that perceptions of justice are making important contributions to female clergy's relatively high levels of job satisfaction.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

There are three important questions that need to be addressed. First, is there a gender paradox in job satisfaction for clergy, even with a properly specified model? Second, if a gender paradox exists, is it explained by one or more of Phelan's (1994) arguments: 1) different job values for men and women, 2) lower job inputs by women, or 3) a greater emphasis on subjective rewards (which are more equal) than objective rewards (which are more unequal) in determining levels of satisfaction, or 4) a perception on the part of female clergy that they are justly rewarded, in spite of inferior objective work conditions? And third, does the low absolute pay received by clergy increase the importance of justice perceptions for clergy's (especially clergywomen's) sense of job satisfaction?

With regard to the first question, the results of this study clearly show that a gender paradox exists for clergy job satisfaction. Female clergy receive lower pay, serve less desirable churches, and have fewer opportunities for advancement, yet they are significantly more satisfied with their jobs than male clergy in comparable positions.

With regard to the second question, there is evidence of a larger role for subjective rewards rather than objective or material rewards as a source of job satisfaction for both male and female clergy. This is in keeping with Phelan (1994) and the McDuff and Mueller (1998) study of gender differences in clergy social support, which found that female clergy receive more congregational and collegial support (important subjective rewards) than do male clergy. In addition, there is some evidence of differences in job values for male and female clergy, a finding which contradicts the results of previous gender paradox studies

(Hodson 1989; Phelan 1994; Mueller and Wallace 1996). Previous studies of clergy, however, have found that female clergy discuss their work in ways that indicate values that differ from those of male clergy (Ice 1987; Schneider and Schneider 1997). For example, women frequently express a lack of desire to "move up" and a preference for marginal ministry positions (Ice 1987), while men express more traditional professional aspirations. While it cannot be shown conclusively with current data, this study provides some support for the existence of gender differences in job values that may in turn contribute to female clergy's higher job satisfaction in spite of inferior rewards.

In response to the third question there is evidence that justice perceptions play a highly significant role in explaining job satisfaction for both men and women. However, women have an unexpectedly lower sense of justice than men, i.e. women are more likely to label their system of employment as unjust. This may be attributable to women clergy (most of whom have a keen interest in issues of social justice/injustice) reflecting on their own employment situation in light of larger justice issues. Ice (1987) finds in her interviews with clergywomen that most clergywomen say they want to intentionally increase awareness and knowledge of institutional injustice as part of their ministry. In addition, those with feminist concerns see their clearest statement of both the need and possibility for social justice as residing in their role enactments as women and professional ministers. As the same time, women talk about their job satisfaction more in terms of religious than justice concerns. Thus women's high levels of intrinsic religiousness relative to men may be helping to compensate for women's lower sense of justice in order to keep their satisfaction high.

Overall, the results of this study, in comparison to the results of Phelan's (1994) and Mueller and Wallace's (1996) studies, suggest that while a gender paradox in satisfaction is characteristic of employees across occupations and professions, including the Protestant ministry, the factors which contribute to the paradox can vary considerably. *Perceptions of justice* can be expected to play a consistently important role in creating satisfaction, but may or may not contribute significantly to explaining the gender paradox. *Perceptions of subjective rewards* can also be anticipated to contribute in important ways to job satisfaction, but may not help explain the gender paradox. Similarly, *job inputs* may contribute to level of satisfaction, but appear to have little impact on gender differences. As well, *differential job values* cannot be totally discounted as a contributor to the gender paradox. In fact they can be expected to be particularly important for such value-laden occupations as parish ministry. Value differences by gender may be even more important for the clergy gender paradox than this study suggests, since the traditional assessment of professional value differences used here does not directly address other potentially important value differences for male and female clergy — the types of uniquely female clergy values that keep women satisfied in spite of their awareness of the injustice of their rewards: "I'm not glory-bound. I'm not looking to rise to the top. I see work

as intrinsically valuable — nice to do — not for competition or status or achievement” (Ice 1987: 52), and “We [women] are in a unique position to take professional ministry . . . off a false pedestal as if it were more worthy, more faithful, in and of itself — and bring it to ground level, rooted in the real stuff of existence, where most people live” (Schneider and Schneider 1997: 259). Future studies should therefore consider incorporating measures of gender-specific values which are relevant to the occupation(s) included in the study in order to assess their impact on the gender paradox in satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, M., and J. Hage. 1968. Organizational Interdependence and Intraorganizational Structure. *American Sociological Review* 21: 21–46.
- Bokemeier, J. L., and W. B. Lacy. 1986. Job Values, Rewards, and Work Conditions as Factors in Job Satisfaction among Men and Women. *Sociological Quarterly* 28: 189–204.
- Callahan-Levy, C. M., and L. A. Messe. 1979. Sex Differences in the Allocation of Pay. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37: 433–46.
- Carroll, J., B. Hargrove, and A. Lummis. 1981. *Women of the Cloth: A New Opportunity for the Churches*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Chaves, M. 1997. *Ordaining Women: Culture and Conflict in Religious Organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Christopherson, R. W. 1994. Calling and Career in Christian Ministry. *Review of Religious Research* 35: 219–37.
- Crosby, F. J. 1982. *Relative Deprivation and Working Women*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dillman, D. 1991. The Design and Administration of Mail Survey. *Annual Review of Sociology* 17: 225–49.
- Doeringer, P., and M. J. Piore. 1971. *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Feagin, J. R. 1964. Prejudice and Religious Types. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 4:3–13.
- . 1974. Prejudice and Religious Types: A Focused Study of Southern Fundamentalists. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 9: 3–13.
- Fry, L. W., and S. Greenfeld. 1980. An Examination of Attitudinal Differences between Policewomen and Policemen. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 65: 123–26.
- Gannon, T. M. 1971. Priest/Minister: Profession or Non-Profession? *Review of Religious Research* 12: 66–79.
- Hegtvedt, K. 1994. Justice. In *Group Processes*, edited by M. Fosch and E. J. Lawler, 177–204. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Hodson, R. 1989. Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction: Why Aren't Women More Dissatisfied? *Sociological Quarterly* 30: 385–399.
- Ice, M. L. 1987. *Clergy Women and Their Worldviews: Calling for a New Age*. New York: Praeger.
- Jasso, G. 1979. A New Theory of Distributive Justice. *American Sociological Review* 45: 3–32.
- Jasso, G., and P. H. Rossi. 1977. Distributive Justice and Earned Income. *American Journal of Sociology* 42:639–651.
- Kahn, A. 1972. Reactions to the Generosity or Stinginess of an Intelligent or Stupid Work Partner: A Test of Equity Theory in a Direct Exchange Relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 21: 116–123.

- Kalleberg, A. 1977. Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction. *American Sociological Review* 42: 124-143.
- Lehman, E. C., Jr. 1985. *Women Clergy: Breaking Through Gender Barriers*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- . 1991. Gender and Ministry Style: Things Not What They Seem. *Sociology of Religion* 54: 1-11.
- Lehman, E. C. 1993. *Gender and Work: The Case of the Clergy*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Locke, E. A. 1969. What is Job Satisfaction? *Organizational Behavioral and Human Performance* 4: 301-336.
- Mangelsdorff, A. D. 1989. A Cross-Validation Study of Factors Affecting Military Psychologists. *Military Psychology* 1:241-251.
- Mannheim, B. 1983. Male and Female Industrial Workers: Job Satisfaction, Work Role Centrality, and Work Place Preference. *Work and Occupations* 10:413-36.
- Marx, K. [1848] 1964. *Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*, edited by T. B. Bottomore and M. Ruble. Baltimore: Penguin.
- McDuff, E. M., and C. W. Mueller. 1999. Social Support and Compensating Differentials in the Protestant Ministry: Gender Differences in Two Protestant Denominations. *Review of Religious Research* 40: 307-329.
- Moore, H. A. 1985. Job Satisfaction and Women's Spheres of Work. *Sex Roles* 13: 663-78.
- Mueller, C. W., and J. E. Wallace. 1996. Justice and the Paradox of the Contented Female Worker. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59: 338-349.
- Nesbitt, P. D. 1993. Dual Ordination Tracks: Differential Benefits and Costs for Men and Women Clergy. *Sociology of Religion* 54: 13-30.
- . 1997. *Feminization of the Clergy in America: Occupational and Organizational Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Phelan, J. 1994. The Paradox of the Contented Female Worker: An Assessment of Alternative Explanations. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57: 95-107.
- Phelan, T. J., and J. Phelan. 1983. Higher Education and Early Life Outcomes. *Higher Education* 12: 665-80.
- Price, J. L., and C. W. Mueller. 1986. *Absenteeism and Turnover of Hospital Employees*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Prichard, R. B. 1996. Grandes Dames, Femmes Fortes, and Matrones: Reformed Women Ministering. In *Religious Institutions and Women's Leadership: New Roles Inside the Mainstream*, edited by C. Wessinger, 39-57. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Sauser, W. I., and C. M. York. 1978. Sex Differences in Job Satisfaction: A Re-Examination. *Personnel Psychology* 31: 537-47.
- Schmidt, F. W., Jr. 1996. *A Still, Small Voice: Women, Ordination and the Church*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Schneider, C. J., and D. Schneider. 1997. *In Their Own Right: The History of American Clergywomen*. New York: Crossroad.
- Smelser, N. J. 1962. *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- United Church of Christ Yearbook. 1996. United Church Press, Cleveland, OH.
- Tucker, C. G. 1996. Women and the Unitarian-Universalist Ministry. In *Religious Institutions and Women's Leadership: New Roles Inside the Mainstream*, edited by C. Wessinger, 79-100. Columbia, SC: University of SC Press.
- Wallace, J. E. 1995. Corporatist Control and Organizational Commitment Among Professionals: The Case of Lawyers Working in Law Firms. *Social Forces* 73: 811-839.
- Watson, D., and L. A. Clark. 1984. Negative Affectivity: The Disposition to Experience Aversive Emotional States. *Psychological Bulletin* 96: 465-490.

- Wessinger, C. 1996. Women's Religious Leadership in the United States. In *Religious Institutions and Women's Leadership: New Roles Inside the Mainstream*, edited by C. Wessinger, 3-36. Columbia, SC: USC Press.
- Yearbook and Directory of the Christian Church. 1995. Office of the General Minister and President of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Indianapolis, IN.
- Zikmund, B. B. 1996. Women's Ministries Within the United Church of Christ. In *Religious Institutions and Women's Leadership: New Roles Inside the Mainstream*, edited by C. Wessinger, 58-78. Columbia, SC: USC Press.

APPENDIX

(Measures)

All variables were measured with a mailed questionnaire. For variables measured by multiple items, the coefficient alpha is reported, and an R means the item was reverse coded. Unless indicated otherwise, the multiple-item scales were based on items with five-point Likert response categories going from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). Scales represent the sum of the items.

Female is a dummy variable for gender with female coded 1 and male as 0.

CONTROL VARIABLES

Church Category is created by adding the value of church size to the value of church budget.

Church Size is measured by the pastor answering "what is the size of your present congregation"? (1) 0-100 members, (2) 101-300 members, (3) More than 300 members.

Church Budget is measured by the pastor answering "what is the budget of your present church? (1) Under \$50,000, (2) \$50,000 to \$100,000, (3) Over \$100,000.

Number of dependents is the number given in response to the question: Including yourself, what is the total number of individuals for whom you are personally responsible (spouse, children, etc.)?

Promotional Opportunity is measured by three items: (1) I have the opportunity for advancement in parish ministry, (2) I can get ahead quickly in parish ministry, (3) I have a good chance to get ahead in parish ministry, (4) There are plenty of good pastoral positions outside this congregation that I could have, (5) Given the state of the clergy job market, finding another pastoral position outside of this congregation would be very difficult for me (R), (6) There is at least one good pastoral position outside of this congregation that I could begin right away if I were to leave my employment here (Alpha value is .728).

Sense of Calling is measured with five items: (1) By serving as a parish minister, I feel I am making a difference in people's lives, (2) As a parish minister I am able to work with and help people who need my assistance, (3) I believe that my work as a parish minister is important to society, (4) Ordained ministry is my calling, (5) I became a minister because I knew it was what I was meant to be (Alpha value is .720).

Intrinsic Religiousness is measured with four items: (1) I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life, (2) My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life, (3) The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services, (4) It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation (Alpha value is .673).

APPENDIX (Continued)
(Measures)

DIFFERENTIAL INPUTS

Tenure is total number of years in the current church.

Years in the ministry is total number of years in a ministry career.

Education is measured with the following question: Where did you receive your academic preparation for ministry? (1) Bible college or alternative route to ordination through part-time study while serving a church, (2) University seminary or denominational seminary.

Work Motivation is measured with three items: (1) Work is something people should get involved in most of the time, (2) Work should only be a small part of one's life (R), (3) Work should be considered central to life (Alpha value is .60).

Negative Affectivity is measured with three items: (1) Often I get irritated at little annoyances, (2) My mood often goes up and down, (3) I sometimes feel miserable (Alpha value is .69).

OBJECTIVE REWARDS

Formal Benefits is measured by counting the number of formal benefits (included in a written contract) that the minister currently receives. Ministers are asked to indicate the formal benefits they are currently receiving from the following list: health insurance, dental insurance, vacation, maternity/paternity leave, life insurance, disability insurance, sabbaticals, pension/annuity, travel expenses, continuing education.

Pay was computed by first recoding *pay* to the midpoints of each salary category, then dividing by 10,000. [Pareto estimates were used to determine the means for men and women separately for the top category of salary]. The following are the original salary categories:

What is your current yearly income from parish ministry (base salary plus housing or fair rental value of parsonage) before taxes?

- 1) Less than \$10,000 2) \$10,000 to \$15,999 3) \$16,000 to \$20,999 4) \$21,000 to \$25,999 5) \$26,000 to \$30,999 6) \$31,000 to \$35,999 7) \$36,000 to \$40,999 8) \$41,000 to \$50,999 9) \$51,000 to \$60,000 10) More than \$60,000.

SUBJECTIVE REWARDS

Congregational Support is measured by three items: (a) my congregation members are helpful to me in getting my job done, (b) when things get tough on my job, I can rely on my congregation members for help, (c) my congregation members are willing to listen to my job-related problems (Alpha value is .80).

Colleague Support is measured by three items: (a) my colleagues in the ministry are helpful to me in getting my job done, (b) my colleagues in the ministry can be relied on when things get tough on my job, (c) my colleagues in the ministry are willing to listen to my job-related problems (Alpha value is .86).

Formalization is measured with two items: (1) There is a complete written contract for my employment as pastor of this congregation, (2) This congregation has a written contract which follows denominational guidelines for clergy employment (Alpha value is .792).

Professional Growth Opportunities is measured with two items: (1) Support for continuing education opportunities provided by this congregation meet my needs for professional growth in ministry, (2) My congregation provides me with adequate support for continuing education (Alpha value is .705).

(Continued)

APPENDIX (Continued)
(Measures)

Autonomy is measured with four items: (1) I have a considerable amount of freedom as to how I do my job, (2) I have input in deciding what tasks or parts of tasks I will do, (3) I control the scheduling of my own work, (4) I influence the things that affect me on the job (Alpha value is .833).

Decision-Making is measured with three items: (1) I usually participate in the decision to hire new staff in this congregation, (2) I usually do not participate in the promotion of professional or non-professional staff in this congregation, (3) I often participate in decisions regarding the adoption of new congregational policies (Alpha value is .891).

Job Security is measured with three items: (1) I am secure in my current job, (2) I will be able to keep my present job as long as I wish, (3) My job could be at this local church as long as I want it (Alpha value is .897).

Grievance Procedures is measured with two items: (1) The pastor-parish relations committee in this congregation serves as an effective forum for conflicts, (2) The pastor-parish relations committee in this congregation sees its role as one of criticism rather than support of the pastor.

**OWN-GENDER REFERENTS AND DIFFERENTIAL
ENTITLEMENT STANDARDS (Perceptions of Justice)**

Pay Justice is measured with a single item: Which of the following describes your beliefs about your current pay and benefits? (1) I receive much more than I deserve, (2) I receive more than I deserve, (3) I receive exactly what I deserve, (4) I receive less than I deserve, and (5) I receive much less than I deserve. Values were recoded so that item 3 is considered the highest value, items 2 and 4 the next highest value, and items 1 and 5 the lowest value of pay justice.

Distributive Justice is measured with three items: (1) I am fairly rewarded for the amount of work I put in, (2) I am fairly rewarded considering the responsibilities I have, (3) I am fairly rewarded in view of my experience (Alpha value is .925).
