



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

# **A Note on Satisfaction with Life, Government and Job: The Case of Eastern Europe**

Humpert, Stephan

Leuphana University Lüneburg

23 March 2013

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/45449/>  
MPRA Paper No. 45449, posted 23 Mar 2013 16:15 UTC

# **A Note on Satisfaction with Life, Government and Job: The Case of Eastern Europe**

Stephan Humpert

Leuphana University of Lueneburg (Germany),  
Institute of Economics

humpert@leuphana.de

(March 2013)

## **Abstract:**

Recent studies on life satisfaction or well-being focus on transition countries. These countries are the Central Eastern European and Baltic states (CEE) and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The half of the CEE countries are meanwhile members of the European Union (EU). Using the year 2008 of the European Values Study 2010 (EVS), I use simple OLS regressions for life satisfaction, as well as satisfaction with government and the job. Individual characteristics are in line with global well-being results. I find no evidence that Eastern European EU member countries behave different than other transition countries. But there are some differences between the countries concerning governmental quality and job satisfaction.

*Keywords:* Subjective Well-Being, Transition, Central Eastern European and Baltic states, Commonwealth of Independent States

*JEL Classification:* D60, I31, O52

## Introduction

After the fall of the iron curtain in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet countries, these countries turned into strong economic transitions. According to the papers of Blanchflower (2001), Hayo and Seifert (2003), Hayo (2008), Humpert (2010) and Selezneva (2011) I try to estimate the effects concerning subjective well-being in these countries. According to Frey and Stutzer (2002) happiness research deals with the question, which determinants can influence personal satisfaction or well-being. The idea of happiness is an adequate approximation of economical utility.

I start the discussion with the question of interest: Do transition countries behave similar or are their differences between them? To investigate transition effects, I regress three specifications: overall satisfaction, satisfaction with government and job satisfaction. The data in use is the 2008 wave of the European Values Survey. These countries are Central Eastern European and Baltic states (CEE) and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The half of the CEE countries are meanwhile members of the European Union (EU).

I use individual informations from Albania, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldavia, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, and Ukraine.

This paper is organized as follows: After the introduction, the second section describes the general findings, which are known from the relevant literature. In the third section, I will describe the dataset and the estimation models. In the fourth section, I do some regressions for the set of countries and discuss the results. In the fifth section, I give a conclusion.

## Global Happiness

In this part I give a short review of the transition literature concerning life satisfaction. Blanchflower (2001) analyses a few of micro and macro economic criteria to investigate systematic differences between Western European countries and CEE<sup>1</sup> and CIS. He shows the mayor problems of the transition countries from 1990 to 1997: unemployment and economical uncertainty lead to dissatisfaction with the young democracies. Blanchflower uses several macro economic datasets and micro economic information from East Europe Eurobarometer and the EU Eurobarometer to analyse the first years after political change. Different well-being data sets for Eastern Europe are used to analyse differences between Eastern Europe and the rest of the world. Hayo and Seifert (2003) and Hayo (2008) use the so called New Democracies Barometer to compare Eastern European countries with Austria. Similar work is done by others. Deaton (2008) uses the Gallup World Poll. Compared to Western European countries the transition countries report always lower levels of satisfaction<sup>2</sup>.

Frijters et al. (2006) analyse well-being data for Russia over the period of 1995 to 2001. They show that tremendous changes in life satisfaction can be partly explained by changes in income. Borooah (2009) uses the Integrated Value Data File of the European Value Survey to analyse job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is reported lower in Eastern Europe as well. Humpert (2010) analyses pooled country information of Eastern Europe for the years of 1994 to 2007. Here a combined dataset of both World and European Value Survey is used.

---

<sup>1</sup> Blanchflower (2001) handles Eastern Germany as one of the CEE countries. For 2008 this is not more useful.

<sup>2</sup> See Pittau et al. (2010) for a comparison between Western European regions and Jagodzinski (2010) for a comparison between Europe and Asia.

Additional I give an overlook of the typical results of well-being analysis. Inglehart et al. (2008) use the European Values Survey and the World Values Survey to show the positive correlation between economic growth, the power of democracy and the rise of personal happiness for a large number of countries worldwide. Heukamp and Arino (2003) show five determinants that explain a huge part of the differences in well-being between countries. With the World Values Survey they present that inter alia high life expectancy and a countries' location close to the equator have positive effects, while heavy corruption has negative effects on well-being. Halliwell and Huang (2008) use the same data to show that the so called "good governance" is more important for the poorer countries than for the richer ones. Rode (2012) uses the World Values Survey to analyse the causality between economic freedom and well-being. Knoll et al. (2013) use the European Values Survey and the World Values Survey to show that economic liberalization and less regulation have positive effects, as well. Some macro-economical determinants are negative on the level of subjective well-being, too. Easterlin (1974) describes the so called Easterlin paradox, that poor people feel dissatisfied with life in their countries, but not between the countries. Stevenson and Wolfers (2008) reject this hypothesis and present evidence for positive relation between GDP per capita and mean level of satisfaction. Di Tella et al (2001) observe a trade off between inflation and general unemployment. The result can be interpreted, that unemployment is much worse than inflation.

On individual levels Layard (2005) describes a set of five negative and seven positive determinants on happiness, where age, types of gender and education have only small negative effects on subjective well-being. The levels of intelligence and appearance are meaningless. Family, financial situation, labour, social settings, psychological health, personal freedom and good way of life are all positive indicators on happiness. The effect of age as U-shaped is discussed first by Blanchflower and Oswald (2004). For a literary review of the age effects see Humpert (2011). Concerning gender effects, Stevenson and Wolfers (2009) show lower level of female happiness unlike the male level. Since the influential paper of Clark and Oswald (1994) it is known that personal unemployment lowers happiness very much. Winkelmann and Winkelmann (1998) agree with that finding for German micro data. Even remembering past unemployment lowers satisfaction in life (Clark et al. 2001). Diener et al. (2000) and Stutzer and Frey (2006) show for different countries and cultures worldwide, that married people are happier than unmarried people.

## **Data and Econometric Method**

I want to discuss the dataset and the estimation model. The dataset in this paper is the 2008 wave of the European Values Survey (EVS). For the estimations I have to limit to a shorter set of twenty-two countries with information for the year of 2008<sup>3</sup>. These countries are Central Eastern European and Baltic states (CEE) and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The half of the CEE countries are meanwhile members of the European Union (EU). I use individual informations from Albania, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldavia, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, and Ukraine. Macedonia is not observed, because it is the only country in the region where interviews are made in 2009. At the end I exclude all Western European countries. Table 1 shows the country information.

*- insert Table 1 about here -*

---

<sup>3</sup> It should be kept in mind, that 2008 was the world's hardest financial crisis since the Great Recession.

I use three specifications to analyse transition effects: life satisfaction, satisfaction with government and job satisfaction. All specifications are made together and separated for gender. The question about life satisfaction and job satisfaction have ten categories in a scale from one (dissatisfied) to ten (satisfied):

*“All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?”*

*“Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your job?”*

The question about satisfaction with government is asked in a similar way:

*“People have different views about the system for governing this country. Here is a scale for rating how well things are going: 1 means very bad; 10 means very good”*

All questions concerning satisfaction are proxy variables for unobservable characteristics. Life satisfaction is a proxy for economic utility, while job satisfaction measures confidence with work. Satisfaction with government is used as a proxy variable for the political system in the country and it measures the governmental quality. The sample size differs between 20,449 and 11,971 observation, because the question on job satisfaction is only answered by the employed. I control for a set of variables like age, gender, health, family formation, employment, religiousness, citizenship of the interview country, the number of children, household income and size of home town. I analyse individuals in the age of 18 to 65 years. For observing the different effects of income, I use a scale from 1 to 10 of purchasing power parity Euros. Age is used as a continuous variable and squared.

In reference to good health, I analyse effects of normal and bad health conditions. The type of family formation is controlled, as well. While status married is used as a reference, other characteristics are a registered partnership, widowed, divorced, separated and ever single (never married or registered partnership). The employment status is used as follows: full time employment, part time employment, self-employed, retirement, housewife, student and unemployment. The question concerning job satisfaction only asked to the first three of them. Religiousness and citizenship of the country of residence are both used as a dummy variables. No citizenship is a proxy for migration, but I do not know the country of origin. The number of children is used, as well. To analyse income effects, I use monthly household informations of purchasing power parity Euros. Individuals without any household income are excluded. Additionally I use the size of town as a proxy for control for inner country differences between city and countryside. The descriptive statistics are shown in table 2.

*- insert Table 2 about here -*

Concerning the methodology, the satisfaction literature discuss two typical estimation strategies. The first possible strategy is an ordered probit or ordered logit model. Ferrer-i Carbonell (2005) shows the advantage of using ordered probability models for an ordered dependent variable with a discrete scale such as 1 to 10. The second possible strategy is using an OLS estimation technique. Ferrer-i Carbonell and Frijters (2004) discuss this more simple strategy. I regress an OLS model with controls and robust standard errors. The general model is described as follows:

$$satisfaction_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 country_{it} + X_{it} \beta + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Satisfaction is regressed on country specifics and a vector of individual characteristics. Epsilon describes the residuum.

## **Estimations and Results**

I regress to observe the effect of happiness. For the first dependent variables, I find the typical effects of happiness, which are already known from the literature. The age variables show the typical U-shape curve. The gender and the citizenship variable are not statistical significant. Given the reference full-employment, I observe strong negative effects of unemployment for both types of gender. Retirement hit women negative, but not the men. Surprisingly students are happier than the group of reference. Compared to married couples all other types of family formations are negative for the individuals. Income has a general positive effect on subjective well-being. Religiousness is only positive for men. A less good stature of health lowers the satisfaction level. The effect for the number of children is not statistically significant. Given the reference country of Albania, the most of the country dummies are positive and statistical significant. Negative effects can be found for both types of gender in Armenia and Georgia. Bulgarian men and women from Azerbaijan are dissatisfied as well. Table 3 shows the results.

*- insert Table 3 about here -*

Concerning the satisfaction with government, I find no effect of age and gender. Religious people and country citizens are more satisfied with their government. Bad health lowers satisfaction. The labour effects are mixed, while male pensioner are dissatisfied, female students are confident. For both types of gender, the income is positive related to the satisfaction with government. The most of the countries show positive effects of satisfaction with their government given the reference country. Negative effects can be found for both types of gender for Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Hungary, Lithuania and Ukraine. Serbian and Moldavian men are dissatisfied as well. It is an interesting result, that the EU member countries Bulgaria, Hungary and Lithuania have less confidence in their government than the reference country Albania. This may be an effect of the 2008 global financial crisis. Table 4 shows the results.

*- insert Table 4 about here -*

The regressions for job satisfaction show the typical U-shape of the age variables. Religiousness is positive only for men, while citizenship is positive only for women. A bad stature of health lowers job satisfaction. The family aspects are only negative for men, but not for women. There is weak evidence that part time employment rises satisfaction with job. Income is positive influenced again. While only a few countries show significant results. Here especially men have higher levels of satisfaction with their jobs. Positive effects of job satisfaction in reference to Albania can be found for both types of gender for the Kosovo. While men show positive effects in Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Moldavia, Montenegro, Poland, Romania and the Slovak Republic, women have negative effects in Armenia and Azerbaijan. Table 5 shows the results.

*- insert Table 5 about here -*

## **Conclusion**

In this paper I discuss some determinants of subjective well-being. According to the literature I find the expected results of satisfaction. Life satisfaction is positive in the most of the countries observed. The Central Eastern European and Commonwealth of Independent States countries behave in line with the descriptive findings from all over the world. I find

systematic no evidence that Eastern European EU member countries behave different than other transition countries. Concerning the question about satisfaction with government, there seems to be evidence that confidence with the state or government is driven by individual economic success. Governmental quality is seen as positive in the most of the countries, even if three EU member countries show less confidence in their political system. This may be driven by the 2008 financial crisis. Job satisfaction shows the most differences. Men have a general higher level of job satisfaction than women. I find weak evidence for higher job satisfaction in part time work.

The differences between the countries can be interpreted as cultural specific or inter country effects.

## Reference

- Blanchflower, D.G (2001), Unemployment, Well-Being, and Wage Curves in Eastern and Central Europe. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 15, pp.364-402
- Blanchflower, D.G., Oswald, A. (2004), Well-Being over Time in Britain and the US. *Journal of Public Economics* 88(7-8), pp. 1359-1386
- Borooah, V.K. (2009), Comparing levels of job Satisfaction in the Countries of Western and Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Manpower* 30(4), pp. 304-325
- Clark, A., Oswald A. J. (1994), Unhappiness and Unemployment. *The Economic Journal*, 104(424), pp. 648-659
- Clark, A., Georgellis, Y., Sanfey, P. (2001), Scarring: The psychological Impact of Unemployment. *Economica*, 68(2), pp. 221-241
- Deaton, A. (2008), Income, Health and Wellbeing Around the World: Evidence from the Gallup World Poll. *Journal of Economic Perspective*, 22(2), pp. 53-72
- Diener, E., Gohm, C.L., Suh, E., Oishi, S. (2000), Similarity of the Relation between marital Status and subjective Well-Being across Cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(4), pp.419-436
- Di Tella, R., MacCulloch, R., Oswald, A. J. (2001), Preferences over Inflation and Unemployment: Evidence from Surveys of Happiness. *American Economic Review*, 91(1), pp. 335-341
- Easterlin, R.A. (1974), Does economic Growth improve the human lot? Some empirical Evidences. In: David, O.A. and M.W. Reder (Eds.) *Nations and Households in economic Growth. Essays in Honor of Moses Abramowitz*, pp. 89-125
- EVS (2010), European Values Study 2008, 4th wave, Integrated Dataset. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne, Germany, ZA4800 Data File Version 2.0.0 (2010-11-30), doi:10.4232/1.10188.
- Ferrer-i Carbonell, A., Frijters, P. (2004), How important is Methodology for the Estimates of the Determinants of Happiness? *Economic Journal*, 114(497), pp. 641 – 659
- Ferrer-i Carbonell, A. (2005), Income and Well-Being: an empirical analysis of the comparison income effect. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89(5-6), pp. 997 – 1019
- Frijters, P., Geishecker, I., Haisken-DeNew, J., Shields, M. A. (2006) Can The Large Swings in Russian Life Satisfaction be Explained by Ups and Downs in Real Incomes *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 108(3), pp. 433-458
- Frey, B.S., Stutzer, A. (2002), What can Economists learn from Happiness Research. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40(2), pp. 403-435
- Halliwel, J. F., Huang, H. (2008), How's your Government? International Evidence Linking good Government and Well-Being. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38, pp. 595-619.
- Hayo, B. (2007), Happiness in Transition: An empirical Study on Eastern Europe. *Economic Systems*, 31(2), pp. 204-221.

- Hayo, B., Seifert, W. (2003), Subjective economic Well-Being in Eastern Europe. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 24(3), pp. 329-348.
- Heukamp, F. H., Arino, M. A., (2011), Does Country matter for Subjective Well-Being? *Social Indicator Research*, 100(1), pp.155-170.
- Humpert, S. (2010), A Note on Happiness in Eastern Europe, *European Research Studies*, 13(3), pp. 133-144
- Humpert, S. (2011): The u-shape on aging revisited: An international Comparison with aggregated Data, Schöning, S., Richter, J., Pape, A., (Ed.) *Kleine und mittlere Unternehmen: Finanz-, Wirtschafts- und andere Krisen*, pp. 227-244, Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt a.M.
- Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson C., Ilzel, C. (2008), Development, Freedom, and Rising Happiness A Global Perspective (1981–2007). *Perspectives of psychological Science*, 3(4), pp. 264-285
- Jadogzinski, W. (2010), Economic, Social, and Cultural Determinants of Life Satisfaction: Are there Differences between Asia and Europe? *Social Indicator Research*, 97(1), pp.85-104
- Layard, R. (2005), *Happiness: Lessons from a New Science*, Penguin.
- Knoll, B., Pitlik, H., Rode, M. (2013), A Note on the Impact of economic Regulation on Life Satisfaction. *Applied Economics Letters* 20(9), pp. 916-920.
- Rode, M. (2012), Do good Institutions make Citizens happy, or do happy Citizens make good Institutions? *Journal of Happiness Studies*, forthcoming.
- Pittau, M. G., Zelli, R., Gelman, A. (2010), Economic Disparities and Life Satisfaction in European Regions. *Social Indicator Research* 96, pp. 339-361
- Selezneva, E. (2011), Surveying transitional Experience and Subjective Well-Being: Income, Work, Family. *Economic Systems* 35(2), pp.139-157.
- Stevenson, B., Wolfers, J. (2008), Economic growth and subjective well-being: Reassessing the Easterlin Paradox. *Brooking Papers on Economic Activity*, (Spring), pp. 1-87
- Stevenson, B., Wolfers, J. (2009), The Paradox of declining female Happiness. *American Economic Journal. Economic Policy* 1(2), pp. 190-225
- Stutzer, A., Frey, B. (2006), Does marriage make people happy, or do happy people get married? *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 35, pp. 326-347
- Winkelmann, L., Winkelmann, R. (1998), Why are the Unemployed so Unhappy? *Economica* 65(257), pp.1-15



## Appendix

**Table 1 – County Information**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
Albania (CEE)	497	471	968
Armenia (CIS)	390	573	963
Azerbaijan (CIS)	701	699	1,400
Belarus (CIS)	438	636	1,074
Bosnia Herzegovina (CES)	397	529	926
Bulgaria (CEE, EU)	396	490	886
Czech Republic (CEE, EU)	438	478	916
Estonia (CEE, EU)	338	577	915
Georgia (CIS)	366	634	1,000
Hungary (CEE, EU)	460	455	915
Kosovo (CEE)	584	549	1,133
Latvia (CEE, EU)	348	557	905
Lithuania (CEE, EU)	400	485	885
Moldova (CIS)	454	512	966
Montenegro (CEE)	412	564	976
Poland (CEE, EU)	408	488	896
Romania (CEE, EU)	334	426	760
Russian Federation (CIS)	291	558	849
Serbia (CEE)	434	478	912
Slovak Republic (CEE)	265	407	672
Slovenia (CEE)	267	322	589
Ukraine (CIS)	376	567	943
Total	8,994	11,455	20,449

**Table 2 - Descriptive Statistics**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Satisfaction with Life	20,449	6.654	2.348	1.000	10.000
Satisfaction with Government	20,449	4.634	2.346	1.000	10.000
Satisfaction with Job	11,971	7.008	2.304	1.000	10.000
Female	20,449	0.560	0.496	0.000	1.000
Age	20,449	40.371	13.440	18.000	65.000
Age <sup>2</sup> /100	20,449	18.104	11.091	3.240	42.250
Religious	20,449	0.736	0.441	0.000	1.000
Health normal	20,449	0.353	0.478	0.000	1.000
Health bad	20,449	0.087	0.282	0.000	1.000
Citizenship	20,449	0.965	0.185	0.000	1.000
registered Partnership	20,449	0.018	0.131	0.000	1.000
Widowed	20,449	0.061	0.240	0.000	1.000
Divorced	20,449	0.073	0.259	0.000	1.000
Separated	20,449	0.010	0.098	0.000	1.000
Single (ever)	20,449	0.266	0.442	0.000	1.000
Part Time	20,449	0.055	0.229	0.000	1.000
Self-Employed	20,449	0.065	0.246	0.000	1.000
Retirement	20,449	0.101	0.301	0.000	1.000
Housewife	20,449	0.072	0.258	0.000	1.000
Student	20,449	0.070	0.255	0.000	1.000
Unemployed	20,449	0.149	0.356	0.000	1.000
Children	20,449	1.438	1.246	0.000	13.000
HH Income (ppp)	20,449	761.934	851.712	10.211	14728.160
Azerbaijan	20,449	0.068	0.253	0.000	1.000
Armenia	20,449	0.047	0.212	0.000	1.000
Bosnia-Herzegovina	20,449	0.045	0.208	0.000	1.000
Bulgaria	20,449	0.043	0.204	0.000	1.000
Belarus	20,449	0.053	0.223	0.000	1.000
Czech Republic	20,449	0.045	0.207	0.000	1.000
Estonia	20,449	0.045	0.207	0.000	1.000
Georgia	20,449	0.049	0.216	0.000	1.000
Hungary	20,449	0.045	0.207	0.000	1.000
Latvia	20,449	0.044	0.206	0.000	1.000
Lithuania	20,449	0.043	0.203	0.000	1.000
Moldavia	20,449	0.047	0.212	0.000	1.000
Montenegro	20,449	0.048	0.213	0.000	1.000
Poland	20,449	0.044	0.205	0.000	1.000
Romania	20,449	0.037	0.189	0.000	1.000
Russian Federation	20,449	0.042	0.199	0.000	1.000
Serbia	20,449	0.045	0.206	0.000	1.000
Slovak Republic	20,449	0.033	0.178	0.000	1.000
Slovenia	20,449	0.029	0.167	0.000	1.000
Ukraine	20,449	0.046	0.210	0.000	1.000
Kosovo	20,449	0.055	0.229	0.000	1.000
Town Size	20,449	4.406	2.576	1.000	8.000

**Table 3 – Satisfaction with Life**

	Satisfaction All	Satisfaction Men	Satisfaction Women
Female	0.0615 (0.0332)	.	.
Age	-0.0533*** (0.0105)	-0.0496** (0.0154)	-0.0544*** (0.0141)
Age <sup>2</sup> /100	0.0539*** (0.0124)	0.0492** (0.0182)	0.0562*** (0.0169)
Religious: yes	0.142*** (0.0398)	0.204*** (0.0572)	0.0545 (0.0553)
Ref Health Health normal	.	.	.
Health bad	-0.786*** (0.0365)	-0.823*** (0.0551)	-0.758*** (0.0482)
Citizen: yes	-1.896*** (0.0714)	-1.860*** (0.117)	-1.908*** (0.0896)
Ref Married registered Partnership	0.0326 (0.0888)	-0.0192 (0.133)	0.0913 (0.118)
Widowed	.	.	.
Divorced	-0.240* (0.111)	-0.182 (0.161)	-0.277 (0.153)
Separated	-0.467*** (0.0770)	-0.413* (0.169)	-0.475*** (0.0868)
Single (ever)	-0.511*** (0.0636)	-0.369*** (0.109)	-0.587*** (0.0777)
Ref Full Time Part Time	-0.878*** (0.165)	-0.901** (0.281)	-0.845*** (0.203)
Self Employed	-0.233*** (0.0547)	-0.242** (0.0834)	-0.204** (0.0722)
Retirement	.	.	.
Housewife	-0.0732 (0.0760)	-0.161 (0.125)	0.00861 (0.0933)
Student	0.0636 (0.0646)	0.0420 (0.0809)	0.133 (0.110)
Unemployed	-0.00966 (0.0725)	0.103 (0.115)	-0.0893 (0.0938)
Children	0.0253 (0.0689)	-0.449 (0.264)	0.0792 (0.0746)
HH Income	0.162* (0.0735)	-0.0248 (0.115)	0.328*** (0.0935)
Ref Albania Azerbaijan	-0.438*** (0.0544)	-0.446*** (0.0788)	-0.424*** (0.0753)
Armenia	0.0328 (0.0185)	0.0261 (0.0298)	0.0371 (0.0231)
Bosnia-Herzegovina	0.000198*** (0.0000202)	0.000227*** (0.0000300)	0.000172*** (0.0000276)
Bulgaria	.	.	.
	-0.344** (0.106)	-0.199 (0.156)	-0.477*** (0.143)
	-0.351** (0.109)	-0.303 (0.165)	-0.347* (0.145)

Belarus	-0.0253 (0.0980)	-0.0533 (0.144)	-0.00694 (0.133)
Czech Republic	0.766*** (0.103)	0.574*** (0.150)	0.961*** (0.140)
Estonia	0.387*** (0.102)	0.178 (0.158)	0.574*** (0.131)
Georgia	-0.442*** (0.106)	-0.477** (0.161)	-0.401** (0.141)
Hungary	0.0945 (0.101)	-0.0804 (0.144)	0.278* (0.141)
Latvia	0.0933 (0.0987)	-0.210 (0.145)	0.393** (0.133)
Lithuania	0.0926 (0.0987)	-0.0505 (0.144)	0.235 (0.135)
Moldavia	0.596*** (0.106)	0.668*** (0.153)	0.567*** (0.148)
Montenegro	1.190*** (0.103)	1.080*** (0.153)	1.298*** (0.140)
Poland	0.653*** (0.0968)	0.527*** (0.140)	0.785*** (0.134)
Romania	0.595*** (0.115)	0.492** (0.168)	0.731*** (0.156)
Russian Federation	0.564*** (0.109)	0.478** (0.170)	0.666*** (0.139)
Serbia	0.732*** (0.104)	0.497*** (0.150)	0.981*** (0.144)
Slovak Republic	0.891*** (0.108)	0.837*** (0.158)	0.955*** (0.149)
Slovenia	1.053*** (0.109)	0.813*** (0.157)	1.285*** (0.153)
Ukraine	0.0967 (0.104)	0.0933 (0.155)	0.122 (0.139)
Kosovo	0.486*** (0.108)	0.294 (0.152)	0.685*** (0.153)
Town Size	Ok	Ok	Ok
_cons	7.812*** (0.245)	7.798*** (0.363)	7.826*** (0.333)

---

N 20,449 8,994 11,455

EVS 2008, OLS, \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001,

**Table 4 – Satisfaction with Government**

	Satisfaction All	Satisfaction Men	Satisfaction Women
Female	0.0589 (0.0324)	.	.
Age	-0.00208 (0.0102)	0.00426 (0.0149)	-0.00596 (0.0138)
Age <sup>2</sup> /100	0.00616 (0.0121)	-0.000497 (0.0177)	0.00953 (0.0163)
Religious: yes	0.196*** (0.0387)	0.172** (0.0570)	0.206*** (0.0521)
Ref Health	.	.	.
Health normal	-0.209*** (0.0355)	-0.212*** (0.0540)	-0.213*** (0.0468)
Health bad	-0.610*** (0.0606)	-0.579*** (0.0984)	-0.646*** (0.0763)
Citizen: yes	0.701*** (0.0948)	0.822*** (0.144)	0.590*** (0.126)
Ref Married	.	.	.
registered Partnership	-0.459*** (0.116)	-0.309 (0.161)	-0.597*** (0.167)
Widowed	0.116 (0.0698)	0.139 (0.151)	0.120 (0.0794)
Divorced	-0.145* (0.0611)	-0.246* (0.107)	-0.0675 (0.0738)
Separated	-0.173 (0.156)	-0.353 (0.260)	-0.0274 (0.192)
Single (ever)	0.0987 (0.0533)	0.101 (0.0809)	0.133 (0.0712)
Ref Full Time	.	.	.
Part Time	0.144* (0.0730)	0.109 (0.113)	0.184 (0.0956)
Self Employed	-0.0402 (0.0681)	-0.0341 (0.0866)	-0.0222 (0.111)
Retirement	-0.134* (0.0678)	-0.216* (0.107)	-0.0405 (0.0871)
Housewife	-0.0360 (0.0650)	-0.377 (0.221)	0.0231 (0.0716)
Student	0.131 (0.0734)	0.0343 (0.112)	0.193* (0.0974)
Unemployed	-0.229*** (0.0507)	-0.231** (0.0737)	-0.218** (0.0699)
Children	0.0341 (0.0184)	0.0684* (0.0288)	0.00428 (0.0237)
HH Income	0.0000370 (0.0000212)	0.0000131 (0.0000290)	0.0000647* (0.0000310)
Ref Albania	.	.	.
Azerbaijan	1.748*** (0.111)	1.824*** (0.160)	1.694*** (0.154)
Armenia	0.535*** (0.103)	0.398** (0.154)	0.713*** (0.137)
Bosnia-Herzegovina	-1.078*** (0.105)	-1.246*** (0.154)	-0.880*** (0.142)
Bulgaria	-1.044*** (0.100)	-1.224*** (0.147)	-0.850*** (0.134)

Belarus	1.653*** (0.104)	1.409*** (0.157)	1.903*** (0.136)
Czech Republic	0.409*** (0.107)	0.282 (0.155)	0.540*** (0.146)
Estonia	0.397*** (0.109)	0.310 (0.170)	0.512*** (0.139)
Georgia	1.101*** (0.109)	0.835*** (0.167)	1.382*** (0.142)
Hungary	-1.192*** (0.101)	-1.383*** (0.144)	-0.990*** (0.139)
Latvia	0.110 (0.104)	-0.0994 (0.153)	0.332* (0.139)
Lithuania	-0.569*** (0.104)	-0.740*** (0.155)	-0.382** (0.139)
Moldavia	-0.103 (0.107)	-0.344* (0.157)	0.162 (0.147)
Montenegro	0.948*** (0.115)	0.767*** (0.173)	1.138*** (0.152)
Poland	0.0901 (0.104)	-0.0168 (0.154)	0.214 (0.138)
Romania	0.293* (0.116)	0.202 (0.172)	0.415** (0.154)
Russian Federation	1.092*** (0.110)	0.685*** (0.173)	1.492*** (0.138)
Serbia	-0.297** (0.106)	-0.441** (0.151)	-0.130 (0.147)
Slovak Republic	1.052*** (0.116)	0.967*** (0.171)	1.144*** (0.156)
Slovenia	0.323** (0.119)	0.201 (0.177)	0.446** (0.158)
Ukraine	-1.062*** (0.104)	-1.360*** (0.156)	-0.753*** (0.139)
Kosovo	2.178*** (0.106)	1.897*** (0.152)	2.458*** (0.148)
Town Size	Ok	Ok	Ok
_cons	3.604*** (0.246)	3.506*** (0.364)	3.692*** (0.334)
N	20,449	8,994	11,455

EVS 2008, OLS, \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001,

**Table 5 – Satisfaction with Job (only for Employed)**

	Satisfaction All	Satisfaction Men	Satisfaction Women
Female	0.0768 (0.0429)	.	.
Age	-0.0202 (0.0146)	-0.0130 (0.0204)	-0.0288 (0.0208)
Age <sup>2</sup> /100	0.0348* (0.0173)	0.0213 (0.0240)	0.0506* (0.0247)
Religious: yes	0.191*** (0.0508)	0.195** (0.0716)	0.175* (0.0717)
Ref Health	.	.	.
Health normal	-0.627*** (0.0478)	-0.618*** (0.0683)	-0.642*** (0.0663)
Health bad	-1.132*** (0.110)	-1.393*** (0.172)	-0.927*** (0.143)
Citizen: yes	0.308* (0.123)	0.260 (0.191)	0.361* (0.152)
Ref Married	.	.	.
registered Partnership	-0.192 (0.145)	-0.0695 (0.197)	-0.355 (0.210)
Widowed	-0.0750 (0.114)	0.111 (0.226)	-0.174 (0.133)
Divorced	-0.106 (0.0791)	-0.215 (0.139)	-0.0475 (0.0959)
Separated	-0.119 (0.185)	0.0139 (0.320)	-0.199 (0.224)
Single (ever)	-0.0966 (0.0699)	-0.190 (0.100)	0.000931 (0.0968)
Ref Full Time	.	.	.
Part Time	-0.212** (0.0806)	-0.297* (0.127)	-0.168 (0.104)
Self Employed	0.102 (0.0729)	0.145 (0.0903)	0.0509 (0.123)
Children	-0.00185 (0.0263)	0.0128 (0.0376)	-0.0205 (0.0363)
HH Income	0.000256*** (0.0000237)	0.000270*** (0.0000316)	0.000242*** (0.0000359)
Ref Albania	.	.	.
Azerbaijan	-0.784*** (0.146)	-0.494* (0.200)	-1.107*** (0.220)
Armenia	-1.014*** (0.173)	-1.013*** (0.232)	-1.044*** (0.259)
Bosnia-Herzegovina	0.103 (0.162)	0.276 (0.218)	-0.174 (0.241)
Bulgaria	0.398** (0.145)	0.568** (0.195)	0.148 (0.221)
Belarus	-0.176 (0.132)	-0.109 (0.179)	-0.316 (0.200)
Czech Republic	0.361** (0.138)	0.493** (0.181)	0.147 (0.215)
Estonia	0.0240 (0.137)	0.0974 (0.193)	-0.134 (0.201)
Georgia	-0.0632 (0.165)	-0.0274 (0.219)	-0.186 (0.246)

Hungary	0.0599 (0.140)	0.243 (0.185)	-0.205 (0.215)
Latvia	0.267* (0.133)	0.286 (0.185)	0.168 (0.198)
Lithuania	0.141 (0.135)	0.169 (0.184)	0.0280 (0.203)
Moldavia	0.619*** (0.153)	0.851*** (0.201)	0.328 (0.236)
Montenegro	0.272 (0.150)	0.414* (0.198)	0.0566 (0.233)
Poland	0.222 (0.140)	0.408* (0.185)	-0.0472 (0.215)
Romania	0.338* (0.155)	0.506* (0.207)	0.124 (0.235)
Russian Federation	0.327* (0.143)	0.476* (0.202)	0.111 (0.207)
Serbia	-0.0183 (0.155)	0.106 (0.206)	-0.197 (0.238)
Slovak Republic	0.445** (0.147)	0.593** (0.197)	0.239 (0.223)
Slovenia	0.0295 (0.159)	0.232 (0.214)	-0.252 (0.241)
Ukraine	0.288* (0.141)	0.255 (0.193)	0.266 (0.208)
Kosovo	0.805*** (0.150)	0.844*** (0.185)	0.806** (0.267)
Town Size	Ok	Ok	Ok
_cons	6.782*** (0.346)	6.629*** (0.488)	7.133*** (0.492)
N	11,971	5,896	6,075

EVS 2008, OLS, \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001,