LIFE SATISFACTION AND MIGRATION - WHAT RELATIONSHIP?

Ioana CIORBAGIU^{a*}, Adrian STOICA^b, Monica MIHAILA^c

^{a)b)c)} Author affiliation: *West University of Timișoara, Romania*

Abstract

The aim of the paper is to empirically assess if immigrations is a potential predictor of life satisfaction in European countries, considering also other socio-economic determinants. For this purpose, we are using data from the European Quality of Life Survey 2016 implemented by Eurofound. Our results show that immigration, measured here by migrants born in another country, has a net positive impact on subjective well-being, and strictly in this context, migration does not prove to be a threat on well-being. Also, the results suggest that immigration leads to well-being in different ways, more precisely it seems to support a better quality of life for the more privileged and not so much for the less privileged. The statistical and econometrical evaluation of the connection between life satisfaction and other determinants, grouped in categories such as demographical, socio-professional, economical highlights a series of general and specific influences. Subjective well-being, representing eudaimonic well-being, is positively associated with an improvement in the areas of life satisfaction, especially with the standard of living and family life. We also identified positive influence on life satisfaction, in relation to aspects such as the freedom to decide how to live, the efforts made to have a better life or individuals' own optimism. A very important aspect is a good health, a reduced risk of psychological depression and chronic physical and mental problems.

Keywords: Life satisfaction, Happiness, Subjective well-being, First generation migrants, Probit models

JEL Classification: C90, J61, D63

Corresponding author, **Ioana Ciorbagiu** – c_ioana_v@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

Through the shapes, dimensions, implications it determines in real life, the issue of migration – in both directions – continues to be a central one for all micro and macroeconomic actors, from individuals, to economic agents, organisations, policy makers around the world. This is also reflected in the interest in further research, in different interdisciplinary approaches, in drivers or consequences of migration, often with different results. One of the frequently studied relationships concerns the immigration effects on the receiving country labour market and, in particular, on foreign and national wages (incomes). A well-known author on the subject, George Borjas (2017) points out that immigration means costs for many workers in the host country, while others benefit from it. Borjas (2003; 2006) estimates a negative effect of immigration on the local people wages, and according to Card (2001), inflows of immigrants into some American cities (for example Miami or Los Angeles), in the 1980s, have reduced local employment rates by low a qualification level of by almost 1%, and salaries by at least 3%.

In contrast, in an analysis made in France, using data from labor force surveys implemented during 1968-1999, Ortega and Verdugo (2014) estimate higher salaries by 3.3% of natives at an increase of 10% in the immigrant share. They explain the positive relationship between the increase in the proportion of immigrants and the wage through a certain substitutability, i.e. a reallocation of tasks, between immigrants and natives on the labour market, the latter tending to operate primarily abstract tasks. Another explanation for the gain of the indigenous population, induced by immigrants, would be that of complementarities in production between them and other production factors. Maintaining the same area of interest and space (France), but extending the analysis period (1976-2007), Ortega and Verdugo (2016, p. 1) found that immigrants with a low educational level “generally lowers the wages of blue-collar workers, but its impact is heterogeneous across sectors”. Using Borjas’s theoretical model (2003), Bratsberg, Oddbjørn, Røed, and Schøne (2014, p. 388) examined Norwegian wage effects from immigration, and under the same capital and labor conditions, they found a negative impact of “an immigrant-induced labor supply shock”, for all labour market participants. More recent evidence on European mobility (Manafî et al., 2017) show different patterns in Eastern and Western European countries in what concerns the relationship between mobility and economic characteristics at country level, as well as intra-European differences in specific mobility types such as student mobility (Roman and Suciú, 2007; Dabasi-Halász et al., 2019).

The relationship between immigration and wages on the US market is the subject of research by Edo and Rapoport (2018, pp. 15-60), who also found a negative effect in US countries with low minimum wages, those affected being especially low-educated and inexperienced workers. In addition, the effect is even more pronounced when using

instruments as the geographical distance between a host and the origin country, than in estimates using standard OLS methods. The authors explain this unfavourable impact through the protection that the minimum wage can provide when the local population faces competition from low-skilled immigrants.

However, behind the assumed, voluntary decision to emigrate are multiple motivations, quality of life being the corollary of combining different drivers in nature, from individual feelings to challenges or macroeconomic perspectives. The mere opportunity to obtain a financial gain only as a result of cross-border mobility, very often invoked, does not seem to be accepted as absolute truth. All the more so when it comes to the subjective component of people's well-being. Are immigrants more satisfied with living conditions or happier compared to those who did not leave their country of origin? A general assessment, based on the development and magnitude of the phenomenon, could often lead to a positive response. Otherwise, it would seem pointless.

The literature, rich in analyses or debates on this topic, offers us numerous examples, controversies, punctual assessments that highlight a complex of determinants of subjective well-being, including from the perspective of migration. Thus, Bartram (2013) examines the output of happiness, as an expression of subjective well-being, in correlation with emigration from 14 Eastern European countries to Western European countries. Its study is based on data from the fourth (2008) and fifth (2010) waves of the European Social Survey, comprising a sample of 42,380 Western European stayers and 1,071 migrants from 13 Eastern and Central European countries. Overall, his conclusions lead to the idea of a gain of happiness for Eastern European emigrants with higher levels of happiness and not simply as a result of traveling abroad for economic purposes. In general, those who emigrate seem happier, but with big differences between countries and, according to Bartram, this does not result for Polish emigrants, less happy than stayers.

After 2009, in China (which became an upper-middle-income country from a lower middle-income one), with the increase in income, the inequality gaps of happiness deepened. Yang, Liu, and Zhang (2015) find that an increase in income inequality also deepens disparities between happiness satisfaction states, while an increase in income and education levels contribute to reducing them. A recent study (Papageorgiou, 2018) reflects the approach that adverse effects of immigration have created throughout the process of leaving the bloc by the United Kingdom. Analysing the relationship between subjective well-being (measured by life satisfaction and happiness) and migration on panel data from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) and the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS) over the period 2004-2016, the author finds no impact significant on well-being natives.

A top of the World Happiness Report 2018, conducted in 117 countries (with a significant number of immigrants in the sample analysed), shows that the levels of happiness among people born in that country are almost exactly the same as those born in other countries.

Interestingly, a similar result, namely happiness approaching as a degree of satisfaction, concerns immigrants from "countries with life assessments less than half as high as in the destination country". (Sachs, Layard and Helliwell, 2018, p. 37)

Easterlin (1995) appreciated that in the long run there is no causal relationship between real income and happiness (the so-called Easterlin paradox). In a review of this paradox, on a large sample of 17 developed and 17 developing countries in Latin America, 11 former communist countries in Central and Eastern Europe and 9 less developed countries, Easterlin et al. (2010) show that a sustained dynamic of economic growth does not necessarily translate into greater happiness. This often controversial theory, still present in empirical research, concerns the relationship between well-being and GDP per capita. At the mere observation of the data for the USA in the period 1973-2004, the income almost doubled, but the level of happiness remained unchanged. However, at some point, there is a tendency among richer households to report a higher state of well-being / happiness than that declared by poor households. According to Deaton (2010), this self-assessment does not extend to emotional well-being, which is valid only if the income increases up to \$ 75,000, in the sense that above this threshold is only the impression of good well-being.

Yu and Wang (2017) conducted a study on 12 European and US countries identifying a U-shaped relationship between income inequality (measured by the Gini coefficient) and annual variations in happiness, by virtue of a double competitive effect: at a lower income inequality, the feeling of happiness as satisfactory as possible gives the signal for increased mobility; once inequality exceeds a critical point, the degree of dissatisfaction with happiness increases, the effect of jealousy predominating, individuals are no longer as enthusiastic about increasing mobility, being instead jealous of the richest. In a recent study, Yu, Zhang, Zou, and Wang (2019) examine the effects of income in relation to the subjective well-being (SWL) of the migrant population in China, and their result shows the unfavourable impact of income inequality on happiness, SWB expression. In essence, results on different specifications show robust associations between a high level of inequality and a limited satisfaction of subjective well-being.

Thus, numerous studies reveal that well-being can only be defined in terms of a wide variety of factors, dimensions, features. Our study contributes to highlighting the link between migration and life satisfaction, as an expression of well-being, both from the perspective of the cognitive component (including evaluation of areas of life satisfaction) and the affective component (optimism, confidence), in turn directly related to the physical and mental health of people. In relative (strictly) terms, the data indicate that first-generation migrants are more satisfied than natives, which reinforces the importance of trait measures, emotions, along with state assessments. Logically, this could suggest a positive role of migrants in improving the well-being of the communities in which they live, our analysis supporting this effect, under certain conditions and limits.

2. Migration and life satisfaction

2.1 Migration – defining phenomenon of contemporary society

The contemporary world is increasingly defined by the overseas mobility of the population, the beginning of the great movements dating somewhere in the first half of the 19th century, with the waves of Europeans to North America. During the 20th century and in this century we can observe an increase in the trend of international mobility, the statistical data being eloquent. According to United Nations (2019), the stock of international migrants increased from 153,011,473 people in 1990 (representing 2.9% of the world's population) to 271,642,105 in mid-2019 (3.6% of the world's population), with an average annual growth exceeding 2.3% in the first decade of this century. Separately, by groups of countries, in 2019 the stock of migrants in more developed countries exceeded 12% of the population, compared to 1.9% in the least developed. Geographically, this stock was 11% in Europe and 16% in North America (mid-same year, 2019). In terms of income, over 175.8 million people went to high-income countries equivalent to 14% of the population of these countries, and a number of 82.37 million in middle-income countries, their share not exceeding 1.4% of the population, which would it could be a brief indication of the financial motivation in the migration decision.

**Figure no. 1: International migrant stock at mid-year,
UN development groups and World Bank income groups, 1990-2019**

Source: United Nations (2019)

At the regional level, Asia and Europe remained major destinations: the stock of migrants in Asia was 48,209,949 people in 1990, increasing by over 73% in 2019 (mid-year), when it reached 83,559,197 people, which means 30.76 % of total stock. In Europe, if in 1990, the stock amounted to 49,608,231 people (32.42%); in 2019, the statistics showed 82,304,539 international migrants (30.30% of the total) and here the dynamics being sustained (+ 65.91%). North America is an increasingly dynamic pole of attraction, reaching 58,647,822 migrants in 2019 (21.59% of the total stock), from a number of 27,610,408 in 1990 (18.04%),

respectively an increase of 112.41%. For the other regions, the developments were less impressive: in 2019, Africa accumulated 9.8% of the total stock (compared to 10.25% in 1990), Latin America and the Caribbean about 4.3% (also a slight decrease compared to 1990), and Oceania 3.29% (3.09% in 1990).

The main European destinations are developed countries, 12 countries (Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Sweden, Belgium, Austria, Greece, Ireland) accounting for over 68% (56,064 thousand people) of European migrants, in 2019, compared to 48% (24,017 thousand people) in 1990. In most developed countries, immigrants make up more than 10% of the total population. The average stock of migrants from Western European countries in 2019 was 15.6% and 14.3% in Northern Europe (Austria - 19.9%; Luxembourg - 47.4%; Switzerland - 29.9%; Belgium - 17.2%; Sweden - 20%, Ireland - 17.1%; Norway - 16.1%; Great Britain - 14.1%).

Table no. 1: International migrant stock at mid-year, European countries, 1990-2019

	World	Europe	CY	BG	CZ	HU	PL	RO	SK	DK	EE
1990	153,011	49,608	43.8	21.5	110.4	347.5	1,127.8	135.8	41.3	235.2	382.0
1995	161,317	53,490	61.9	32.4	165.6	322.2	964.7	135.0	69.3	303.1	315.8
2000	173,588	56,859	80.1	43.4	220.8	297.0	825.3	134.3	116.4	371.0	249.5
2005	191,616	63,595	117.2	61.1	322.5	366.8	722.5	145.2	130.5	440.4	233.7
2010	220,782	70,678	191.9	76.3	398.5	436.6	642.4	177.2	146.3	500.8	217.9
2015	248,861	75,008	192.0	123.8	416.5	475.5	619.4	281.0	177.6	595.9	194.7
2019	271,642	82,305	191.9	168.5	512.7	512.0	656.0	462.6	188.0	722.9	190.2
	FI	IE	LV	LT	NO	SE	UK	HR	EL	IT	MT
1990	63.3	228.0	646.0	349.3	192.6	788.8	3,650.3	475.4	618.1	1,428.2	15.1
1995	99.7	226.9	538.1	273.6	233.3	936.0	4,155.3	674.1	857.9	1,775.0	17.7
2000	136.2	350.6	430.2	214.3	292.4	1,003.8	4,730.2	585.3	1,111.7	2,121.7	21.5
2005	192.2	589.0	376.7	201.2	361.1	1,125.8	5,926.2	579.3	1,190.7	3,954.8	24.6
2010	228.5	730.5	313.8	160.8	526.8	1,384.9	7,119.7	573.2	1,321.1	5,787.9	33.0
2015	314.9	759.3	265.4	136.0	746.4	1,676.3	8,411.6	561.1	1,242.9	5,805.3	52.6
2019	383.1	833.6	237.3	117.2	867.8	2,005.2	9,552.1	518.1	1,211.4	6,273.7	84.9
	PO	SI	ES	AT	BE	FR	DE	LU	NL	CH	
1990	435.8	178.1	821.6	793.2	1,280.6	5,897.3	5,936.2	113.8	1,182.3	1,392.3	
1995	532.8	174.4	1,020.1	894.9	1,288.0	6,088.0	7,464.4	126.1	1,346.2	1,478.8	
2000	651.5	214.5	1,657.3	996.5	1,268.4	6,278.7	8,992.6	139.8	1,556.3	1,570.8	
2005	771.2	217.2	4,107.2	1,136.3	1,248.7	6,737.6	9,402.4	150.6	1,736.1	1,805.4	
2010	762.8	253.8	6,280.1	1,276.0	1,503.8	7,310.0	9,812.3	163.1	1,832.5	2,075.2	
2015	864.8	237.6	5,891.2	1,492.4	1,783.5	7,874.2	10,220.4	248.9	1,996.3	2,416.4	
2019	888.2	253.1	6,104.2	1,779.9	1,981.9	8,334.9	13,132.1	291.7	2,282.8	2,572.0	

Source: United Nations (2019)

2.2 Migrations and life satisfaction

The report *How's life? 2018* of the OECD highlights the existence of a fracture between generations in terms of lifestyle, standard of living, or a deepening of the cleavages between populations, issues such as age, gender, level of education, place of birth being determinants

of the state of good. Currently, young people are more educated, but among those up to 25 years of age there is a higher unemployment. With less experience, their income is lower. Only 10% of households have more than half of the wealth held by those living in OECD countries, and out of 25 OECD countries analysed, more than 1 in 3 individuals would fall into poverty if they had to give up 3 months of income (OECD, 2019). This cleavage is equally evident between natives and migrants. The income of households from immigration is on average 25% lower than that of native households. Immigrants are more likely to work in worse conditions (work more overtime, etc.), have poorer health, are overqualified for the job they do, their homes are worse, and generally appear to be less satisfied with life than the rest of the population.

Trying to make a similar assessment among European countries, we estimated the median income of migrant households and native households. The first is lower. However, these data must be seen in this context, as they are the result of an estimated calculation of the income declared by respondents in the 2016 survey of Eurofound.

Figure no. 2: Equivalised monthly income, by household migration status, PPP euros, 2016

Source: Estimation based on Eurofound EQLS 2016 data

Life satisfaction

The economic, psychological or sociological literature emphasizes the multidimensionality of the concept of quality of life, incorporating subjective elements such as personal well-being, health and personal quality of life, as well as material elements regarding living conditions (housing, risk of poverty and material deprivation), work-life balance, etc. Globally, there are many approaches to measuring quality of life, subjective well-being or happiness, including through the filtering of demographic (marital status, age, gender), educational or occupational dimensions. The most recognized and used are the

primary databases obtained in extensive surveys, such as Gallup Global Well-Being or World Values Survey. As our analysis concerns the European geographical area, we will illustrate the perspective on the quality of life as it results from the surveys of Eurofound.

In this approach, "quality of life" is a broader concept than "living conditions" and refers to the general well-being of individuals in a society. The fourth *European Quality of Life Survey* (EQLS), managed by Eurofound, was conducted from September 2016 to March 2017 in all EU Member States and in the five candidate countries (Albania, Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey). The sample of respondents in each country ranged from 1,000 to 2,000, for a total of almost 37,000 people from 33 different countries.

Quality of life is a concept that identifies a number of dimensions of human existence as essential to a well-defined human life; it is inevitably culturally relative or normative, but in this case it reflects the broad values and policy objectives of the European Union (Eurofound EQLS, Report 2018, p. 8). The concept for EQLS (Eurofound, 2003) is based on a multidimensional approach, which incorporates individual and societal perspectives, combining objective and subjective indicators. Satisfaction with life is a complex concept, and the term is sometimes used interchangeably with happiness, even if the two reflect separate concepts. Life satisfaction is the assessment of one's life as a whole, not just one's current level of happiness.

Although there are small differences between definitions, the basic idea is the same: life satisfaction refers to the individual's general feelings about his life. In other words, life satisfaction is a global assessment rather than one based on any specific moment or area. Although related, happiness and life satisfaction are not the same thing. Happiness is an immediate experience, in time; although pleasant, it is ultimately fleeting. A healthy life certainly includes moments of happiness, but happiness alone does not lead to a fulfilled and satisfying life.

Figure no. 3: Personal satisfaction (life satisfaction, medium scores), 2012 and 2016 (The levels of personal satisfaction remain stable)

Source: Eurofound, EQLS, 2018

The EQLS survey measures both personal satisfaction and happiness on a scale of 1 to 10. The data remained relatively constant, stable, in the European Union (overall), with an

average score of about 7.0 - 7.1. At national level, in 2016, the best located are the Northwest countries: Finland, Denmark, Luxembourg, whose performance score is over 8.0, followed by Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Ireland (7.8), Austria (7.9). Values above the EU average are in Germany, France, Belgium, Poland, Portugal, Croatia (7.4 - 7.5). The lowest scores were registered in 2016 in EU countries such as Bulgaria (6.4) and Greece (6.0; decreasing compared to 2012 when the score was 6.5, following a prolonged crisis), but also in some candidate countries (North Macedonia - 6.1; Turkey - 6.2). Relatively low levels are also found in Italy or the Czech Republic (6.8). Very close to the score of 7 are many states like: Romania, Hungary; Lithuania; Latvia, Serbia (7.0), Slovakia, Cyprus (7.1), Estonia, Slovenia (7.2), Spain, Montenegro (7.3).

Figure 3 also shows that, across a large European area, the indicator did not evolve dramatically in 2016 compared to 2012, with personal satisfaction remaining almost the same or increasing slightly. Only Greece, Macedonia and Turkey are the countries where personal satisfaction has experienced a significant decline (even about 10%). The largest differences between countries are directly observable in the analysis by age groups of the population. In the vast majority of countries, there is a tendency for the indicator score to decrease with increasing age, as well as a significantly higher average score than the total average for the 18-24 age group.

Happiness

The concepts of happiness and life satisfaction, which are fundamental for subjective well-being, are different, the first one referring to emotional aspects and the second to a cognitive assessment of life as a whole (Eurofound, 2003). Even though the difference may be less emphasized in certain languages and cultures, questions regarding life satisfaction and happiness are separately presented in the questionnaire. Each of them, particularly worldwide satisfaction, briefly indicate the degree to which people's expectations and needs are met. In EQLS, happiness is measured by the question how happy are the individuals. The term "happiness" measures the hedonic well-being. However, as Abdallah, Marks, Michaelson, Steuer and Thompson (2009) show, the question is evaluatively formulated, because respondents are asked to consider all the things together (Eurofound, 2013).

The question related to happiness is less influenced by the standard of living and more emotionally controlled, in comparison to personal satisfaction. Individuals tend to evaluate their level of happiness as being higher in comparison with their general life satisfaction level. However, the two indicators are very correlated (0.65) and the country model for happiness is similar with the one for life satisfaction. The medium level of happiness calculated for the E.U. is between 7.4-7.5. Similar to life satisfaction, the highest level for happiness is recorded in Denmark (8.2) and the lowest in Bulgaria (6.3).

Figure no. 4: Happiness with life as a whole, average scores, 2012 and 2016

Source: Eurofound, EQLS, 2018

Regarding personal satisfaction, the biggest differences are in Eastern and Central European countries, European Union member and candidate countries and in some of the old member European countries (Figure no 5). Thus, the medium score for personal satisfaction for the population between 50-65 years in Greece is with approximately 11% lower than the total population average, while the same score for the younger population (18-24 years) exceeds by 26% the general average.

Figure no. 5: Subjective well-being by European countries, 2016.

Source: Estimation in Stata

Significant differences can be found in Croatia (-9.5% for old individuals and +22% for young individuals), Lithuania (-16.9%, +18.5%), Romania (-12%, +13.8%), Slovakia (-11%, +17%), Slovenia (-8.7%, +15.9%), Estonia (-11%, +13%) etc. Only in a few countries the medium score for old individuals is close to the general average (+/-1-3%) and the one for the young individuals is not very much higher (Austria, Finland, Belgium). A special case is that

of Sweden, where, personal satisfaction for individuals between 50-64 years is with 5% higher than the national average, while the medium score for young individuals between 18-24 years is lower with 11%.

As a whole, life satisfaction and happiness are not constant, significant modifications being observed at country level. Thus, between 2003 and 2007, life satisfaction and happiness increased in an important number of East European countries, while between 2007 and 2011 there was a significant decrease for these two concepts, especially in the recession affected countries and the ones that adopted austerity measures, due to the economic crisis. Both indicators decreased in Cyprus, Croatia, Italy, Spain Greece, and happiness in the Czech Republic. Scores were higher for both dimensions in Austria, Estonia, Malta, Great Britain, with a plus in countries like Hungary and Ireland for life satisfaction and a higher value for happiness in Latvia, Poland, Portugal and Slovakia.

3. Data, methodology and descriptive statistics

3.1 Data and empirical methodology

In our analysis regarding determinant factors of subjective well-being, with focus on the migration phenomenon, we used data from the European Quality of Life Surveys, EQLS wave 6 (Eurofound, 2018), defined at the European countries level and Great Britain. Life satisfaction and happiness are widely accounted indicators considered in the subjective well-being measurement, including the affective dimension of subjective well-being (the sense of satisfaction) as well as the cognitive dimension (evaluation of life as a whole). The regressors through which the influence of life satisfaction was evaluated (*question Y16_Q4 and question Y16_Q5, as dependent variable*) are: a) Demographic characteristics (gender, age, marital status, children under 18 years old) ; b) Satisfaction with different life levels; c) educational level, material life conditions (income), concerns regarding the development of knowledge and abilities (through professional training); d) Satisfaction in relation with a series of statements (optimism and future perspectives, freedom of decision); Socio-cultural facilities (internet connection, sport activities etc.); f) Physical and mental health; g) social risks; h) Migrational status. These are defined in EQLS 2016 as follows:

1) Socio-demographic characteristics (gender, age, marital status)

- Dichotomous gender (*question Y16_HH2a*) contains separate variables for men (the variable has the value 1 and is considered the reference) and women (value 2);
- Variable regarding age (*question Y16_HH2b*) has an interval between 16 to 100 years, contains five groups (18-24 years being the reference), 25-34 years, 35-49 years, 50-64 years and over 65 years;
- Marital status (*question Y16_Q37*), the reference are the married individuals, the other options being never married, widow and the group with divorced and separated;

- Number of minor children of the household.

2) *Satisfaction regarding different domains of life*

The variables regarding *satisfaction with domains of life*: *education* (question *Y16_Q6a*), *current job* (question *Y16_Q6b*), *life standard* (question *Y16_Q6c*), *residence* (question *Y16_6d*), *family life* (question *Y16_Q6e*) and *living area* (question *Y16_Q6f*), options on a scale from 1 to 10 were grouped on five categories, the first one containing the answers of the most unsatisfied ones and the last one the very satisfied ones.

3) *Educational level, occupational status, perspectives and income*

- The education variable (*Education_3categories*) has three levels: tertiary (taken as reference in some models), secondary and primary.

- Monthly household income (*Equivalised_income*), expressed in Euro PPP, and also grouped in quartiles in some models. Taking into account the measurement scale, the values of the Equivalised_Income Indicator between 1 and 6 represent the first three categories that report low levels of satisfaction, the values 7-8 a relative satisfaction (fourth category) and the values 9-10 represent the category of the very satisfied;

- Measures concerning the Security in keeping one's job (question *Y16_21*), current occupation (question *Y16_11*),

4) *Degree of satisfaction in relation with a series of statements:*

- *own optimism* (question *Y16_7a*),
- *Life is worth the effort I make in general* (question *Y16_7c*)
- *Freedom degree to decide how to live* (question *Y16_7d*)
- *Temporal possibility to do the things I really enjoy* (question *Y16_7e*)
- *Difficulty to deal with important problems that come up in life* (question *Y16_7f*).

5) *Health status*

A real predictor of life satisfaction is self-perceived health status. Evaluation of the influence of a good or bad health status (question *Y16_Q48*) is completed with the mental health index (*Y16_WHO5_MWIndex*).

6) *Potential risk*

- Of social exclusion (*Y16_SocExIndex*), from a scale from 1-5
- Depression risk (*Depression_risk*)

7) Personal development by participating to socio-cultural activities (question *Y16_Q27c* *Take part in sports/ physical exercise*) or using communication technologies (*Internet_Daily*).

8) *Migration* – *firstgen_migration indicator* is expressed by persons born in another country than the surveyed country.

Empirical methodology

Since life satisfaction variables are categorical variables (nominal), to evaluate the impact of these factors upon life satisfaction, the suitable model is the probit ordered logistic type (probit ordered), with the explained variable that takes more than two values. The output of subjective well-being measures life satisfaction or happiness on a five-point Likert scale.

The model including the explanatory variables may be described as follows:

$$\text{Life satisfaction/happiness} = \beta_1 \text{ Life satisfaction domains} + \beta_2 \text{ Socio-demographic characteristics} + \beta_3 \text{ Educational level, occupational status, perspectives} + \beta_4 \text{ Income} + \beta_5 \text{ Participating to socio-cultural activities} + \beta_6 \text{ Degree of satisfaction in relation with a series of statements} + \beta_7 \text{ Potential risk} + \beta_8 \text{ Health status} + \beta_9 \text{ Migration} - \text{firstgen_migration} + \varepsilon$$

3.3 Descriptive statistics

The dependent variable reflects subjective well-being and the measures used are life satisfaction (*Y16_Q4*), for the models 2-7 in the Table 4, and happiness (*Y16_Q5*) in the first model (*Y16_Q88*), having five categories of answers, as a result of grouping the alternatives on a scale from 1 (totally unsatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied). Analysing the given answers, from all 30.745 answers, there are 1,296 persons in the first category (unsatisfied and very unsatisfied), representing 4.22% from all the respondents. There are 2,226 (7.24%) persons in the second category (relative satisfied persons) and 7,163 (23.30%) persons in the third category (not satisfied, not unsatisfied). The forth category, 13,465 persons (43.80%) who declared themselves unsatisfied, and the fifth category with 6,595 persons who declared themselves very satisfied represent 21.45% from the total number of respondents. As a general observation, almost two thirds from the respondents appreciated their life satisfaction as being satisfactory.

Table no. 2: Descriptive statistics

a) Q4 – General satisfaction with life				b) Q5 - Happiness			
	Freq.	Percent	Cum.		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	1,296	4.22	4.22	1	817	2.66	2.66
2	2,226	7.24	11.46	2	1,827	5.95	8.61
3	7,163	23.30	34.75	3	6,690	21.78	30.39
4	13,465	43.80	78.55	4	13,588	44.25	74.64
5	6,595	21.45	100.00	5	7,788	25.36	100.00
Total	30,745	100.00		Total	30,710	100.00	

Source: Estimation in Stata

As to what regards happiness, the results are close one to each other, the first three categories which include the most unhappy people are 9,334 (30.39% from the total number of 30,710 valid answers). Significant differences as to what regards *Life satisfaction* are to be found at the extreme categories, the unhappy ones are 37% fewer than those satisfied with their life and the ones that are happy and very happy with their living conditions are 18% higher. This could explain the differences between the two measures, the predominant

objective component of Life satisfaction and the predominant subjective one of happiness. From the total number of 30775 respondents, 89.60% are locals (27,575 persons), and 3,200 are born in another country than the surveyed country (firstgen_migrant).

**Table no. 3: Life satisfaction and happiness
for migrant population and natives**

Migrant status	Life satisfaction (1 very dissatisfied, 5 very satisfied))					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Natives	1,184	2,020	6,337	12,135	5,841	27,517
Migrants	109	205	818	1,315	747	3,194
Total	1,293	2,225	7,155	13,450	6,588	30,711

Migrant status	Happiness (1 very dissatisfied, 5 very satisfied))					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Natives	743	1,650	6,027	12,178	6,887	27,485
Migrants	73	172	658	1,393	895	3,191
Total	816	1,822	6,685	13,571	7,782	27,782

Source: Estimation in Stata

Table 3 and figure 6 suggest the associations between the life satisfaction/ happiness for the two population groups (immigrants and nationals), considering the five categories for the subjective well-being measures. Migrants seems to be more satisfied with their life and happier than natives.

Figure no. 6: Immigrants versus natives differences in life satisfaction (a) and happiness (b)

Source: Estimation based on EQLS 2016 data

Therefore, from the total of 30,711 valid answers regarding life satisfaction (in this case), 27,517 belong to locals and 3,194 to the ones born in another country than the one they find themselves in. For 65.33% of the locals (17,976 persons) life is less satisfying, almost a quarter of them being uncertain if they can appreciate their life satisfaction as being positive or negative. As a general observation, the proportion of the unsatisfied migrants (9.83%) is lower than the proportion of natives (11.64%), including the ones that are relatively satisfied; foreigners however being more satisfied with their lives compared to locals (+2.16%). Comparing, a higher percent from both categories of population are more satisfied with their

level of happiness: from 30676 respondents, the last two categories sum up 19,065 nationals (41.31%) and 2,288 migrants (71.70% from their total number).

4. Results

4.1 Results of the ordered probit models

The estimations of our models give the results from Table 4. Life standard, education and family are most important for a high personal satisfaction. The probit analysis of gender indicates an advantage for women only in the first model. Gender was not a significant factor in models 2-7.

Table no. 4: Life satisfaction and happiness predictors

	(1) Y16_Q5	(2) Y16_Q4	(3) Y16_Q4	(4) Y16_Q4	(5) Y16_Q4	(6) Y16_Q4	(7) Y16_Q4
HH2a gender	0.0764** (2.89)	0.0343 (1.27)	0.0326 (1.21)	0.0283 (1.04)	0.0324 (1.19)	0.0309 (1.13)	0.0416 (1.90)
Agegroup	-0.0329 (-1.85)	-0.0560** (-3.07)	-0.0720*** (-3.96)	-0.0715*** (-3.92)	-0.0729*** (-3.97)	-0.0609** (-3.29)	-0.0412** (-2.77)
Q37 marital status	-0.124*** (-5.06)	-0.0259 (-1.10)	-0.0234 (-0.99)	-0.0248 (-1.05)	-0.0266 (-1.12)	-0.0263 (-1.10)	-0.0434* (-2.17)
minor_summ minors children	0.109*** (7.67)	0.0768*** (5.48)	0.0814*** (5.85)	0.0817*** (5.84)	0.0816*** (5.83)	0.0779*** (5.51)	0.0763*** (6.46)
Education_3categories	-0.00751 (-0.32)	0.00878 (0.38)	0.0136 (0.58)	0.0252 (1.05)	0.0239 (0.99)	0.0173 (0.71)	-0.00281 (-0.14)
Q6a satisfaction with education				-0.0310 (-1.70)	-0.0305 (-1.67)	-0.0299 (-1.63)	-0.0204 (-1.38)
Q6b Satisfaction with present job		0.109*** (6.07)	0.113*** (6.29)	0.121*** (6.56)	0.122*** (6.56)	0.113*** (6.05)	0.0904*** (5.98)
Q6c Satisfaction with present living standard		0.463*** (19.10)	0.481*** (19.91)	0.483*** (19.92)	0.482*** (19.84)	0.456*** (18.72)	0.473*** (23.96)
Q6d Satisfaction with accommodation		0.0446* (2.16)	0.0379 (1.84)	0.0408* (1.97)	0.0418* (2.01)	0.0442* (2.10)	0.0493** (2.95)
Q6e Satisfaction with family life		0.209*** (9.96)	0.212*** (10.07)	0.213*** (10.08)	0.214*** (10.10)	0.206*** (9.71)	0.219*** (12.24)
Q6f Satisfact with local area as a place to live		0.0625*** (3.35)	0.0641*** (3.45)	0.0642*** (3.44)	0.0637*** (3.41)	0.0565** (3.01)	0.0410** (2.67)
Q7a optimism about own future	0.271*** (11.35)	0.218*** (9.19)				0.213*** (8.86)	0.223*** (11.54)
Q7c what I do in life is worthwhile	0.234*** (8.11)	0.0918** (3.19)	0.152*** (5.44)	0.153*** (5.45)	0.153*** (5.45)	0.0832** (2.85)	0.0694** (2.93)
Q7d I am free to decide how to live my life	0.156*** (6.80)	0.107*** (4.72)	0.149*** (6.72)	0.147*** (6.61)	0.147*** (6.61)	0.0948*** (4.14)	0.101*** (5.39)
Q7e I have time to do the things I enjoy	-0.0568*** (-3.66)	-0.0414** (-2.67)	-0.0405** (-2.61)	-0.0405** (-2.60)	-0.0409** (-2.63)	-0.0332* (-2.12)	-0.0364** (-2.85)
Q7f I find difficult to deal with problems	-0.192*** (-10.72)	-0.126*** (-7.03)	-0.130*** (-7.22)	-0.132*** (-7.30)	-0.132*** (-7.31)	-0.110*** (-6.02)	-0.0960*** (-6.48)
Q11 current occupation	-0.0258* (-2.25)	-0.00366 (-0.31)	-0.00578 (-0.49)	-0.00719 (-0.61)	-0.00781 (-0.66)	0.000977 (0.08)	-0.00216 (-0.23)
Q19 working hours fit in with your family	-0.152*** (-8.29)	-0.0570** (-3.00)	-0.0636*** (-3.37)	-0.0636*** (-3.36)	-0.0645*** (-3.40)	-0.0530** (-2.75)	-0.0693*** (-4.44)
Q21 might lose your job in the next 6 months	0.0841*** (3.98)	0.0296 (1.33)	0.0397 (1.80)	0.0397 (1.80)	0.0398 (1.80)	0.0165 (0.74)	0.0356 (1.95)
Q28a Training/ courses for professional	-0.0881** (-3.08)	-0.0841** (-2.90)	-0.0833** (-2.88)	-0.0848** (-2.92)	-0.0853** (-2.94)	-0.0860** (-2.93)	-0.0847*** (-3.61)
Firstgen_migrants (born in another country)	0.0890* (2.06)	0.0887* (2.05)	0.0942* (2.20)	0.0835 (1.93)	0.0848* (1.96)	0.0936* (2.13)	0.100** (2.84)
Equalised_income	0.0745*** (3.78)	0.127*** (6.23)	0.132*** (6.51)	0.131*** (6.38)	0.132*** (6.42)	0.119*** (5.73)	
income_squared	0.0239** (3.08)	0.0380*** (4.99)	0.0373*** (4.89)	0.0373*** (4.88)	0.0375*** (4.90)	0.0360*** (4.72)	
lowest_quartile				-0.0504 (-1.21)			
second_quartile				-0.0525 (-1.42)			
third_quartile				0.00516 (0.16)			
highest_quartile				0.0522 (1.65)			
Q48 health status	0.157*** (5.39)	0.143*** (4.89)	0.154*** (5.25)	0.154*** (5.28)	0.154*** (5.26)	0.154*** (4.75)	0.177*** (6.80)
Q49 chronic physical or mental health problem						-0.0346 (-0.92)	-0.0460 (-1.49)
risk_depression	-0.412*** (-11.60)	-0.185*** (-5.18)	-0.201*** (-5.64)	-0.200*** (-5.59)	-0.199*** (-5.57)	-0.169*** (-4.66)	-0.151*** (-5.07)
internet_daily	0.116** (2.74)	0.0800 (1.81)	0.0907* (2.07)	0.0884* (2.01)	0.0856 (1.94)	0.0646 (1.45)	0.0708* (2.05)
Q27c Take part in sports/ physical exercise	-0.0756*** (-3.69)	-0.0967*** (-4.75)	-0.106*** (-5.24)	-0.108*** (-5.30)	-0.107*** (-5.26)	-0.0995*** (-4.83)	-0.119*** (-7.24)

Q53 living area	-0.0462*** (-3.37)	-0.0216 (-1.52)	-0.0214 (-1.51)	-0.0218 (-1.54)	-0.0228 (-1.60)	-0.0218 (-1.53)	-0.0304** (-2.64)
SocExIndex Social exclusion				-0.122*** (-5.91)	-0.107*** (-6.47)		
cut1 _cons	-0.875***	2.828***	2.654***	2.578***	2.577***	2.227***	0.973***
cut2 _cons	-0.193	3.608***	3.423***	3.350***	3.347***	3.016***	1.732***
cut3 _cons	0.928***	4.890***	4.691***	4.618***	4.614***	4.301***	3.032***
cut4 _cons	2.501***	6.693***	6.481***	6.409***	6.406***	6.113***	4.838***
N	7575	7524	7536	7493	7472	7413	11368

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Source: Estimation on Stata 16

Nevertheless, there are certain differences related to the age of the individuals. The most satisfied persons are those with an average of 40 years, which can be justified by the fact that the very young ones are still in the educational system, are affected by unemployment and depend on their family or public support. Clearly, marriage has an important contribution to personal satisfaction being negatively influenced by separated or widowed persons.

Income has a positive impact upon life satisfaction in different countries, the estimated parameters being positive and statistically significant. Occupational status becomes very important for personal satisfaction as well as the safety of one's job for an indeterminate period. Health and life expectancy lead, in some situations, to a higher life satisfaction. Family support is a relevant driver for life satisfaction. Depression risk and social exclusion negatively influence subjective well-being.

As to what concerns our variable of interest which is the effect of migration upon life satisfaction and happiness, in all models, the elasticity coefficients have a plus sign and are significant from a statistical point of view. This suggests a real impact that the first generation of individuals born in a foreign country has upon the increase of subjective well-being.

4.2 Marginal effects

In this kind of models, the direct interpretation of the estimated coefficients can lead to errors in interpreting the relationship analysed, an important fact is the recognition of the regressors' change, which affects the characteristics of the output variable with the aid of marginal effects. So, for the probabilities prediction for each level of satisfaction depending on life conditions, we calculate the marginal effects dy/dx , which represent the changes at the basic level of the factor. Nevertheless, the estimation methods that were used and the conducted tests (especially Akaike Criterion and Schwarz) indicate a good fit between variables, leading to conclusions that complete the empirical research. Results are presented in Table 5.

Considering that the first category refers to total dissatisfaction and the last one (the 5th) to total satisfaction with life conditions, significant answers indicate a negative probability, if the sign of the estimated coefficient is minus and a positive probability when the sign is plus.

Our variable of interest regards migration status and we focus on the influence of being a migrant (*firstgen_migrant*) on life satisfaction. Our result (Table 5) show that migration can be a driver for increasing life satisfaction in the case of European population. An increase with one unit (which means a modification with plus of the indicator) leads to a decrease with 0.04% of the very unsatisfied ones, with 0.30% of the ones that are not satisfied but not unsatisfied, increasing with 2.14% the probability of the satisfied ones and with 2.46% of the very satisfied ones. This result is in line with similar findings such as those of Borjas (2008).

Satisfaction with domains indicates an estimated relationship with life satisfaction in general, excepting „Satisfaction with education”, case in which results do not have a statistical significance. The influence of the other satisfaction life domains is important and relevant tacking into account the impact that it has. So, at an increase with one unit of the specific indicator „Satisfaction with your present job”, the probability of being totally unsatisfied decreases with 0.6%, with 0.39% there would be an improbable fit in the unsatisfied category and with 2.65% for those who have an appreciation that is not good but also not bad. Also, the satisfaction increase of those in the higher categories of life satisfaction (the last two) by over 5% in probability.

A good life standard means more than the material aspect (financial), it also means the opportunities and possibility of choosing the lifestyle and workstyle, health, facilities etc. Starting form 2003, at EU-28 level, the indicator has improved very little, the score in 2016 at the last evaluation was 7.0 compared with 6,9 in the former years. The situation is different depending on the country, even though there is a certain convergence between them (Eurofound, 2016), a significant growth was registered in the EU15 countries and less in central and east European countries, where some have registered a decrease. The correlation between the general level of satisfaction with life standard suggests a strong connection, so that an increase with a unit of the indicator *Satisfaction with Your present standard of living* leads to an increase in the satisfaction with one's life, fact which leads to the reduction of the totally unsatisfied ones with 0,24%, with 1,56% of the one that are not very satisfied and with 10,72 of those from the third category, in parallel with a higher probability of 0,92% for the ones that are satisfied and with 11,61% for those who are very satisfied. Thus, this proves to be one of the most important domains with positive affect upon life conditions.

Satisfaction with your accommodation is a factor that increases insatisfaction for individuals. Home insecurity, due to the lack of space, rent or mortgage is a risk factor. Nevertheless, this feeling is decreasing, 69% of the individuals are subject to this this risk in 2016 as compared to 91% in 2011. Also, only 3% from the ones with risk reported that they must leave their home in 6 months, over three quarters of them +considering this risk to be improbable. In our model, an increase with one unit of the conditions (which means a modification with plus of the indicator) leads to a decrease of the proportion of the ones that are not satisfied at all with 0.02%, of those that are not very satisfied with 0.15% and with

1,04% of the ones that are in the centre of the measuring scale, which leads to the increase for the ones that are relatively satisfied (the forth category) with 0.09 and with 1.12% (fifth category) of the ones that are very satisfied.

Another regressor tacking into account in our model (with statistical signification) is *Satisfaction with Your family life*. An increase with one unit can decrease the probability of being unsatisfied with 0.11%, of those that are not very satisfied with 0.71% and with 4.85% of the ones that are not very determined. In the same time, the proportion of the ones that are relatively satisfied increases with 0.41% and for the very satisfied ones with 5.25%.

The local area where people live has also become important in appreciating life satisfaction, people being concerned about utilities, air quality, facilities for access to various services (health, education, banking, transportation), entertainment opportunities, etc., with large differences between those in urban areas and those in rural areas. According to EQLS on a scale of 1 to 10, almost 40% of the population reported an increased degree of satisfaction while only 6% were relatively unsatisfied. In our analysis, an increase by one unit of Satisfaction with Your local area as a place to live indicates a decrease of only 1.55% of the proportion of the very unsatisfied ones and an increase of the individuals from the upper categories of life satisfaction with a similar percent.

An increase by one unit of the Equivalised_Income indicator, meaning an improvement in income, decreases the proportion of those included in the weakest categories of life satisfaction, by 0.06% in the first category, by 0.41% of those in the endowment category and by 2.81% of those who are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, being more likely to be among those who are satisfied with 0.24% and those who are very satisfied with 3.28%.

Similar results can be observed in relation with other variables. In the case of Training or courses mostly for professional/work-related reasons a high value of the variable means a higher number of the ones who did not benefit of any training; the result indicated an increase of the frequency of the unsatisfied ones (categories 1-3) with 2.36% and a decrease of the probability of the very satisfied ones with the same percent.

If the variable referring to personal optimism increases with one unit, meaning the increase of the proportion of the optimist persons, it is less probable with 0.11% that someone can fit in the first category (of the ones that are not satisfied at all), with 0.73% - in the category of the ones that are not very satisfied and with 5.02% to fit in the category of the ones that are not satisfied and not unsatisfied, increasing the number of the ones that are relatively satisfied (forth category) with 0.43% and of the very satisfied ones with 5.43% (fifth category).

In the case of the variable counting for the meaningful of life, (I generally feel that what I do in life is worthwhile) an increase with one unit means a decrease with 0.04% of the ones that are totally unsatisfied, 0,28% less in the category of the ones that are very satisfied and

with 1.95% fewer persons that consider their satisfaction either positive or negative; an important increase can be observed for the very satisfied ones 2,12% (fifth category).

The increase of the variable *I feel I am free to decide how to live my life* corresponds to an increase of the probability (a small one, 0.37%) of the ones that are not satisfied with their life (the first two categories), a percent of 2.23% fitting in the category of the undecided ones and a beneficial perception of the satisfied ones (+2.41% fitting in the upper satisfaction category).

As to what regards the *health status* even if the European space has many differences in the quality of medical services, the marginal positive effects mean a positive probability to fit in the category of the very satisfied ones: an increase with one unit of the indicator reduces the probability with 0.08% for the very unsatisfied ones (the first category), with 0.53% for the ones that are not very satisfied, with 3.62% for the ones that are not satisfied, increasing the proportion of the very satisfied ones with 0.31% (the fourth category) and with 3.92% for the very satisfied ones with 3.92% (fifth category). This indicates a great importance of a good health status for life quality appreciation.

If there is an increased of social exclusion risk (*SocExindex exclusion*), it is more probable (with 0.06%) that someone fits in categories with an increased dissatisfaction of life with 3.35%, increasing the probability of the satisfied and very satisfied ones with 3.36%.

The increase of the indicator *Take part in sports or physical exercise* means an increase of the ones that never take part in sports activities, raises the dissatisfaction with life conditions with 2.72%, decreasing the probability of fitting in categories with increased life satisfaction. The *Risk of psychological depression* is a relevant indicator for life satisfaction. The increase of the indicator with one unit makes it probable to fit in lower satisfaction levels with 4.83% (the first three), being less probable to fall in the category of persons that are satisfied with their life conditions.

Children complete family life and should increase life satisfaction. This fact reflects upon individuals' well-being, the ones that have children under 18 years are more satisfied with 1.98% than the rest.

As spare time for the individual is decreasing, the indicator (*In my daily life, I seldom have time to do the things I really enjoy*), increases the number of the ones unsatisfied with their life conditions (+1.16%) and decreases (-0.92%) the probability of having an increased life satisfaction. Leisure time is therefore a significant factor for a better life and improves life satisfaction.

An important factor for satisfaction is the ability of solving difficult problems (*I find it difficult to deal with important problems that come up in my life*). The increase with one unit of the variable (meaning great difficulties) increases the probability of fitting in the unsatisfied with life categories with 2.44%, decreasing the proportion of the satisfied ones with 3% (categories three and four).

Table no. 5: Marginal effects of *Life satisfaction*

y = Pr(Y16_Q4==1) (predict, outcome(1)) = .00164936			y = Pr(Y16_Q4==2) (predict, outcome(2)) = .01414982			y = Pr(Y16_Q4==3) (predict, outcome(3)) = .17797165			y = Pr(Y16_Q4==4) (predict, outcome(4)) = .63469021			y = Pr(Y16_Q4==5) (predict, outcome(5)) = .17153896		
variable	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z	dy/dx	P> z		
HH2a (gender)	-.0001642	0.264	-.001058	0.259	-.0072554	0.258	.0006214	0.288	.0078562	0.258				
Agegroup	.0003241	0.004	.0020878	0.001	.0143176	0.001	-.0012263	0.024	-.0155032	0.001				
Q37 (marital status)	.00014	0.280	.0009019	0.271	.0061849	0.270	-.0005297	0.301	-.006697	0.269				
Q7a optimism about own future	-.0011354	0.000	-.0073143	0.000	-.0501596	0.000	.0042962	0.004	.0543132	0.000				
Q7c what I do in life is worthwhile	-.0004428	0.010	-.0028527	0.005	-.0195629	0.004	.0016756	0.037	.0211829	0.004				
Q7d I am free to decide how to live my life	-.0005045	0.001	-.0032501	0.000	-.0222883	0.000	.001909	0.013	.024134	0.000				
Q7e I seldom have time to do the things I enjoy	.0001768	0.046	.0011387	0.035	.0078088	0.034	-.0006688	0.081	-.0084554	0.034				
Q7f I find difficult to deal with import problem	.0005851	0.000	.0037693	0.000	.0258485	0.000	-.0022139	0.006	-.027989	0.000				
Q28a Training or courses mostly for professional	.0004577	0.009	.0029482	0.004	.0202177	0.003	-.0017316	0.036	-.0218918	0.003				
Q48 health status	-.0008192	0.000	-.0052772	0.000	-.0361892	0.000	.0030996	0.010	.039186	0.000				
Firstgen_migrants born in another country	-.0004475	0.026	-.0029764	0.023	-.0214451	0.029	.0002252	0.803	.0246438	0.039				
Equalised_income	-.0006352	0.000	-.0040919	0.000	-.0280612	0.000	.0024034	0.008	.0303849	0.000				
income squared	-.0001913	0.000	-.0012322	0.000	-.0084504	0.000	.0007238	0.009	.0091501	0.000				
Q11 current occupation	-5.20e-06	0.935	-.0000335	0.935	-.0002298	0.935	.0000197	0.935	.0002488	0.935				
minor_summ minors children	-.0004146	0.000	-.0026709	0.000	-.018316	0.000	.0015688	0.007	.0198327	0.000				
risk Depression	.0010522	0.001	.006429	0.000	.0408414	0.000	-.0075527	0.005	-.0407699	0.000				
internet_daily	-.0003686	0.193	-.0023226	0.170	-.0154105	0.154	.0020229	0.301	.0160789	0.138				
Q19 working hours fit in with your family	.0002821	0.013	.0018173	0.007	.0124626	0.006	-.0010674	0.036	-.0134946	0.006				
Education_3categories	-.0000923	0.484	-.0005946	0.478	-.0040776	0.475	.0003492	0.488	.0044153	0.476				
Q21 might lose your job in the next 6 months	-.0000877	0.466	-.0005652	0.463	-.0038757	0.462	.0003319	0.475	.0041966	0.462				
Q27c Take part in sports/ physical exercise	.0005297	0.000	.0034121	0.000	.023399	0.000	-.0020041	0.010	-.0253366	0.000				
Q53 living area	.0001162	0.131	.0007485	0.128	.0051327	0.127	-.0004396	0.171	-.0055577	0.127				
Q6a satisfaction with education	.0001589	0.117	.0010239	0.106	.0070214	0.103	-.0006014	0.154	-.0076028	0.103				
Q6b Satisfaction with present job	-.0005989	0.000	-.0038577	0.000	-.0264553	0.000	.0022659	0.006	.028646	0.000				
Q6c Satisfaction with present standard of living	-.0024261	0.000	-.0156289	0.000	-.0171786	0.000	.0091798	0.002	.1160538	0.000				
Q6d Satisfaction with accommodation	-.0002354	0.050	-.0015164	0.037	-.0103992	0.036	.0008907	0.085	.0112604	0.036				
Q6e Satisfaction with family life	-.0010983	0.000	-.0070751	0.000	-.0485188	0.000	.0041556	0.003	.0525365	0.000				
Q6f Satisfact with local area as a place to live	-.0003007	0.007	-.0019369	0.003	-.0132826	0.003	.0011377	0.030	.0143825	0.003				
Q49 chronic physical or mental health problem	.000184	0.369	.0011852	0.360	.0081279	0.358	-.0006962	0.378	-.0088009	0.358				
SocExIndex Social exclusion	.0006494	0.000	.0041833	0.000	.0286881	0.000	-.0024571	0.007	-.0310637	0.000				

Table no. 6: Margins of life satisfaction

Adjusted predictions		Number of obs = 7,413				
		Delta-method				
predict	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	.0016494	.0003354	4.92	0.000	.000992	.0023067
2	.0141498	.0012779	11.07	0.000	.0116453	.0166544
3	.1779717	.0047468	37.49	0.000	.1686681	.1872752
4	.6346902	.0071972	88.19	0.000	.620584	.6487964
5	.171539	.0049984	34.32	0.000	.1617422	.1813357

Figure no. 7: Margins of life satisfaction and income

Source: Estimation in Stata 16

5. Conclusions

Using data from EQLS 2016, we have conducted a statistical and econometrical evaluation of the connection between life satisfaction and a series of determinants, grouped in categories such as demographical, socio-professional, and economical, with a focus on migration status. The paper proves that migration, alongside with other factors increases subjective well-being in Europe. Subjective well-being, representing eudaimonic well-being, is associated with an improvement in the areas of life satisfaction, especially with the standard of living and family life.

Migration has a net positive impact on subjective well-being and does not prove to be a threat on individuals' well-being. Moreover, the results suggest that immigration leads to well-being in different ways, more precisely it seems to support a better quality of life. The positive role of migration on well-being must be seen in the context of all the factors taken into account in the analysis and it is important to emphasize that our conclusion is valid in all of the model specifications.

We also identified other positive influences on life satisfaction, in relation to aspects such as the freedom to decide how to live, the efforts made to have a better life or optimism. Also very important aspects are good health, but also a reduced risk of depression and chronic physical and mental problems.

The results of our research may contribute to better understanding the beneficial effects of migration at individual level in the case of the first generation migrants living in Europe. In the context of population decline and labor shortages in some European countries, migration and migrants' well-being may help in dealing with population imbalances.

References

- Abdallah, S., Marks N., Michaelson, J, Steuer, N, and Thompson, S. (2009). 'The (Un) Happy Planet Index 2.0. Why Good Lives don't have to Cost the Earth', Centre for Well-Being, New Economics Foundation (NEF), 2009, London, UK.
- Bartram, D. (2013). 'Happiness and 'economic migration': A comparison of Eastern European migrants and stayers', *Migrant Studies*, 1(2), pp. 156-175.
- Borjas, G.J. (2017). 'The Wage Impact of the *Marielitos*: A Reappraisal', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* <https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793917692945>.
- Borjas, G.J. (2006). 'Native internal migration and the labor market impact of immigration', *Journal of Human Resources*, 41, pp. 221-258.
- Borjas, G.J. (2003). 'The Labor Demand Curve Is Downward Sloping: Reexamining the Impact of Immigration on the Labor Market', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118 (4), pp. 1335-74.

- Bratsberg, B., Raaum, O., Røed, M. and Schøne, P. (2014). 'Immigration Wage Effects by Origin', *Scand. J. of Economics*, 116(2), pp. 356–393.
- Card, D. (2001). 'Immigrant Inflows, Native Outflows, and the Local Labor Market Impacts of Higher Immigration.' *Journal of Labor Economics*, 19(1) pp. 22–64.
- Dabasi-Halász, Z., Kiss, J., Manafi, I., Marinescu, D. E., Lipták, K., Roman, M., & Lorenzo-Rodriguez, J. (2019). 'International youth mobility in Eastern and Western Europe—the case of the Erasmus+ programme'. *Migration Letters*, 16(1), pp. 61-72.
- Deaton (2010). 'Income, Aging, Health and Well-Being around the World: Evidence from the Gallup World Poll', NBER Chapters, in: Research Findings in the Economics of Aging, pp. 235-263.
- Easterlin, R.A., Angelescu McV. L., Switek, M., Sawangfa, O. and Smith, ZJ. (2010). 'The happiness–income paradox revisited' PNAS.
- Easterlin, R.A. (1995). 'Will raising the incomes of all increase the happiness of all? *J. Econ. Behav. Organ.* 21, pp. 35–47, doi: 10.1016/0167-2681(95)00003-B.
- Edo, A. and Rapoport, H. (2018). 'Minimum Wages and the Labor Market Effects' IZA DP No. 11778.
- Edo, A. and Toubal, F (2015). 'Selective Immigration Policies and Wages Inequality', *Review of International Economics*, 23(1), pp. 160-187.
- Eurofound (2013). 'Third European Quality of Life Survey – Quality of society and public services', *Publications Office of the European Union*, Luxembourg.
- Eurofound (2016, 2018). 'Sixth European Working Conditions Survey – Overview report', *Publications Office of the European Union*, Luxembourg.
- Eurofound (2003). 'Monitoring quality of life in Europe', Report, Dublin.
- Manafi, I., Marinescu, D., Roman, M., & Hemming, K. (2017). 'Mobility in Europe: Recent trends from a cluster analysis'. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 19(46), pp. 711-726.
- OECD (2019). *How's life? 2018*.
- Ortega, J. and Verdugo, G. (2014). 'The impact of immigration on the French labor market: Why so different?' *Labour Economics*, Elsevier, 2014, 29, pp. 14-27.
- Ortega, J. and Verdugo, G. (2016). 'Moving Up or Down? Immigration and the Selection of Natives across Occupations and Locations'. IZA Discussion Paper No. 10303.
- Papageorgiou, A. (2018). 'The Effect of Immigration on the Well-Being of Native Populations: Evidence from the United Kingdom', MPRA Paper No. 93045,
- Roman, M., and Suci, C. (2007). 'International Mobility of Romanian Students in Europe: From Statistical Evidence to Policy Measures', Discussion Paper No. 16439. University Library of Munich, Germany.
- Sachs, J. D., Layard, R. and Helliwell John F. (2018). *World Happiness Report 2018*.
- Tov, W. (2018). 'Well-being concepts and components'. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), *Handbook of well-being*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.

- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2019). International Migrant Stock 2019.
- Yang, J., Liu, K. and Zhang, Y (2015). 'Happiness Inequality in China' MPRA Paper No. 66623.
- Yu, Z. and Wang, F. (2017). 'Income Inequality and Happiness: An Inverted U-Shaped Curve', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 24 Nov 2017, 8:2052.
- Yu, K., Zhang, Y., Zou, H. and Wang, C. (2019). 'Absolute Income, Income Inequality and the Subjective Well-Being of Migrant Workers in China: Toward an Understanding of the Relationship and Its Psychological Mechanisms', *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2019, 16(14), 2597.