



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Work and family as factors determining Individual Subjective Well-Being in Spain

Lasierra, Jose Manuel

Universidad de Zaragoza

1 October 2018

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/89404/>
MPRA Paper No. 89404, posted 08 Oct 2018 15:23 UTC

Work and family as factors determining Individual Subjective Well-Being in Spain

José Manuel Lasierra

Economía Aplicada

Universidad de Zaragoza

We investigate the degree of satisfaction with life carried by individuals for the Spanish case and which are some of the most influential work and personal factors, all according to their family structure: single, single parent, couples with children and childless couples, and two periods in the recent economic cycle. In this paper, the subjective individual well-being level is analyzed as an indicator of inequality. We use factors from two of the areas in which the individual develops most part of his life: work and family.

It is an empirical analysis with not too many precedents in the literature, using these family models and incorporating only labour and personal factors and not considering other variables such as health, to better highlight the relevance of labor considerations.

The results indicate substantial differences in the degree of individual well-being depending on family type and cycle. Furthermore, of the explanatory variables, job satisfaction, and good labour relations and social relations on the job were found to be the most important and significant in relation to well-being.

The research could serve to orient human resource policies in companies and also public policies to improve the plight of those least satisfied with the lives they lead, here single parents and couples with children.

Key words: Individual well-being; Family structure; Job satisfaction; Public policy; Social inequality

JEL: J 11, J12, J13, J28

Introduction

Work and family are two of the areas to which people devote most of their time and attention. They are the main source of their concerns and joy and stand at the heart of life in general, Giménez et al. (2012) and Molina (2015).

With the exception of relatively acute health problems and financial crises that may depend on unemployment or financial failures, work and family life are the areas that impact individual well-being and configure individuals' perception of how satisfied they are with their personal lives (García et al. (2007, 2010), Giménez & Molina (2015), Labeaga et al. (2011), Molina et al. (2011)). These two spheres of life often interact and have a continuous bearing on each other. A complicated situation at work may thus affect family relations and the family's situation, and the converse also holds. Family problems affect performance at work and work relations. Furthermore, well-being at work may make certain family problems easier to bear and vice versa.

Therefore, it is important to take these spheres into account when taking stock of a person's level of well-being. Clear parameters can be set out for both work and family to measure their degree of impact on individual well-being. Thus, factors such as job satisfaction, working hours, levels of educational and income, and so on, can be considered as can family-related factors such as single parent, persons living on their own, or couples with children or without children.

Here, research was done on the degree of life satisfaction that individuals have in Spain and the job and personal factors that impact it the most, while considering all of these factors in the light of family structure. Based on the literature consulted, there is scant information on this in previous research. Similar research including family models has been conducted, but the models are not the same. Nor do the studies we are aware of include the social and labour variables we have used.

Like Veenhoen (1991) and Winkelmann (2005), we equate life satisfaction or individual happiness with Individual Subjective Well Being (SWB). We believe it is important to analyse individuals' subjective well-being not just as a fact in and of itself but taking job and family issues into consideration. This is because labour policy in general and

human resource policies specifically may be designed to take into account family structure and its effects, and this also enables them to be better evaluated. Furthermore, we can consider public policies in terms of their impact on individual well-being if we bear in mind that, given identical working conditions, individuals are not as happy if they live alone as they are if they live together as a couple without children. While the decision whether or not to live alone or together as a couple is up to the individual, that is, it is a question of personal choice, public policy on public spending or taxation poses incentives or disincentives in making these decisions. In a country such as France that promotes policies to boost the birth rate, those who have children may be likely to manifest greater well-being than those who do not have children.

That is to say, the relationship between these two spheres of an individual's life, which impacts their levels of life satisfaction, may have a bearing not only on performance or turnover at work or commitment to one's company, but also on the decision not to have children which, for instance, contributes to reducing society's population replacement rate and in turn has demographic and other long-term repercussions. As a result, there are several dimensions to the interest in this research on the degree of individual well-being, including both an individual and public dimension and a micro and macro dimension.

This research is based firstly on having only selected personal and job variables. Secondly we applied the types of family that are representative of present-day society in Spain and around the world. Thirdly, we based the information we used on the Quality of Life at Work Survey (*Encuesta de Calidad de Vida en el Trabajo - ECTV*) which covers individuals belonging to the same socioeconomic group with common job and cultural patterns for two different years of the economic cycle: Growth (2006) and Crisis (2010). Given that one's job and one's individual characteristics vary, an analysis of individual well-being or happiness both requires and justifies the application of multivariate statistical techniques.

This article is structured as follows. After the objective, motivation and contribution made by this research are made in an introduction, a section is devoted to a review of the literature and to stating the hypothesis to be verified. This is followed by a presentation of the data and methodology used. The results are then presented and

discussed. Finally, a fifth section contains a summary indicating the constraints encountered, contributions to public policy and potential expansion of the research.

Review of the literature and hypothesis to be verified

Turning to the controversy over measuring individual well-being, Forgeard et al. (2011) raise several factors that can measure or be equated with this notion. They cite factors such as happiness, life satisfaction and good social relations. This broad, varied ensemble of aspects has to do with one's affective state at a given point in time and involves a certain hedonistic dimension. The authors also indicate other eudaimonic aspects tied to situations "in relation to". These involve psychological issues such as the meaning of life and one's social or life engagement. These ways of observing well-being have been categorized into objective and subjective. The concern for measuring well-being in a society has generated a series of indicators in certain countries, for instance the Key National Indicators list in the United States of America, the United Nations Human Development Index, and other living conditions indexes in various European Union countries. Indicators including education, health, social services, life expectancy and income are used (Diener et al. 2009 and Gasper, 2010). Together with these objective indicators, there is another approach to subjective well-being using indicators such as personal fulfilment, self-esteem, intensity of social life, and independence (Ryffs 1989 and 1995). Kahneman and Krueger (2006) fine-tune the subjectivity of these emotional states even further and the answers to how happy does one feel come from laboratory experiments observing how the answers change when one has had a pleasant or unpleasant experience before the question about one's well-being. From the aggregate point of view of attempting to measure well being in a given society, the twofold subjective and objective approach may lead to a model for a fairly complete means of measuring well being.

Kahneman and Krueger (2006) acknowledge the significance of demographic factors such as ethnicity, income, education and marital status as predictors of life satisfaction. They also point towards a series of job traits such as status, qualification, non-salary benefits and others related to performance at work such as pressure or working conditions (noise, dangerousness, demands for attention and/or care). In this study, the objective focuses on aspects related to two life spheres, i.e. family and work.

However, Kahneman and Krueger mention that certain economists are sceptical about measuring individual well-being because when one answers questions on life satisfaction based on living conditions there is no indication of the changes in the individual's life circumstances. This is what led us to include two periods in our research, one during an expansive economic period (2006) and another during a period of crisis (2010). As we will see, our results refute their opinion. These authors contend that the value of the preferences revealed with a subjective component is controversial as compared to objective measurements of well-being. Here we use a subjective measurement of well-being, a survey question where individuals give themselves a score for SWB. The question comes at the end of a questionnaire with a great number of questions on demographic and work variables. We understand that a question posed in this way, nearly at the end of the document, after a set of preliminary questions, prevents contaminating the subjects' disposition to evaluate their well-being with a certain degree of objectivity. We thus believe that the questionnaire can indeed objectively discern an individual's life satisfaction. Coupled with this are the uniformity provided by a labour and social framework common to Spain and a large sample size. For these reasons, without getting into the controversy over the validity of subjective and objective variables in measuring SWB, we consider our methodology sufficiently reliable.

In the literature, single parent families, that is, persons living by themselves who have children, are overlooked. Numerically speaking, this group is significant and on the rise in present-day societies. It is also important due to the special characteristics that a single parent must develop. In SWB analysis, an individual's marital status, i.e. married, divorced or widowed, is analysed more often than their type of family (Halliwell and Huang, 2011). Here, we consider that the type of family particularly impacts SWB. (Winkelmann, 2005) evaluates the intrinsic effects of the family on an individual's welfare as accounting for 44%, while attributing 56% to the individual's personal traits. Literature on time allocation in the home points to the family structure as having a significant bearing on SWB (Magnusson and Neramo, 2016; Gimenez and Molina, 2016).

There is diverse literature which, when analysing SWB, includes variables such as health, education and economic status (Ferro et al., 2008, Fusco et al. 2008, Bonke and Browning, 2009). Helliwell and Huang (2011) highlight the degree of trust in a

company, understood as deriving from Social Capital, to bring out the most significant factors impacting SWB. When speaking of SEW (Subjective Economic Well-Being) Cracolici et al. 2014 highlight the extent of possession of durable goods, the characteristics of and individual's dwelling and shortcomings in facing certain needs. Beyond any doubt, these factors have a powerful influence on SWB. But they will not affect work and family's relationship and underlying influence on them. We could say that contingently including any of these variables would impact the relationship and the results might not reflect the true impact of family and work that we aim to ascertain. It would be reasonable to believe that if a person has a health problem, he or she will not manifest the same high degree of well-being as someone else who does not have that problem. The same holds if the person has very low income and requires public subsidies. Likewise, people can experience changes in their lives that, for a period of time, generate a high level of well-being, and this is what Kahneman and Krueger term "hedonic treadmill". A specific situation generates a given emotional state that changes over time. For instance, for a certain period of time those recently married may indicate a degree of well-being that attenuates over time. Similarly, these contingent factors distort the impact of work and type of family on a "normal" group with no significant bias compared to the general characteristics of a community.

Analogously, we used the ECVT instead of other surveys such as the European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS) or the European Values Study. While these and other surveys provide information similar to what we have used, happiness and life satisfaction, the reason we turned to the ECVT is that general characteristics of the individuals are more uniform. In other words, in a country like Spain where the job market has a great deal of unemployment and specific labour institutions, job aspects cannot be perceived in the same way as they can for instance in Germany. We therefore have sought a sample that includes individuals in the same national job market with relatively uniform labour traits and institutions. Soukiazis and Ramos (2015) also highlight the importance of a certain degree of social and cultural uniformity when doing an empirical analysis in this field.

Variables and hypothesis.

The dependent variable is the individual's degree of life satisfaction. It corresponds to a literal question from the ECVT rating satisfaction from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 10. It is a cognitive variable in the EQLS classification and it enables cardinalist statistical analysis (Frey and Stutzer, 2010). The ECVT was run until 2010 by the Ministry of Labour and Immigration (for the methodology and questionnaire, see the Ministry's website¹).

Variables	Sign	Meaning	References
Age	-	The older you are, the less SWB	Blanchflower & Oswald, (2008), Peiro (2006), Helliwell & Huang (2011), Soukiazis, & Ramos (2015), Winkelmann, (2005), Hung-Lin Tao (2005)
Gender	-	Women are less happy	Alesina, et al. (2004), Helliwell & Huang (2011), Soukiazis, & Ramos (2015),
Level of studies	-	The more studies, the less SWB in particular when it relates to the world of work	Helliwell & Huang (2011), Kahneman, & Krueger. (2006),
Job Satisfaction	+	The more satisfaction at work, the more satisfaction with life	
Satisfaction with the workday	+	The more satisfaction at workday, the more satisfaction with life	Knabe, & Rätzel (2010),
Satisfaction with stability	+	The more satisfaction with stability, the more satisfaction with life	Peiro (2006), Frey, & Stutzer, (2000, 2005, 2010). Soukiazis, & Ramos (2015),
Net monthly income	+	To more income more satisfaction with life	Helliwell & Huang (2011), Kahneman, & Krueger. (2006), Knabe, & Rätzel (2010), Winkelmann, (2005), Easterlin, (2001)
Occupation	+	The higher the professional level, the more SWB	Kahneman, & Krueger. (2006), Easterlin, (2001)
Working hours	-	More hours, less SWB	Helliwell & Huang (2011), Knabe, & Rätzel (2010); John Ifcher (2011)

¹ <http://www.empleo.gob.es/estadisticas/ecvt/ecvt2010/>

Good labor and social relationships at the workplace Factor alpha Crombach=	+	The better the work and social relationships in the company, the more SWB	Helliwell & Huang (2011), Lelkes, (2006), Haller, M., & Hadler, (2006), Soukiazis & Ramos (2015) ,
Difficulties for work-life balance Factor.	-	The more difficulties to reconcile work and family, the less SWB	Pichler, (2006), Soukiazis & Ramos, (2015), Tsang et al.(2003), Boreham et al. (2016)

The independent variables are both economic and labour-related. Among the former are age (Souziakis and Ramos, 2015; Winkelman, 2005; Cracolici et al. 2014 ; Peiró, 2006); gender (Souziakis and Ramos, 2015; Winkelman, 2005; Cracolici et al. 2014; Peiró, 2006); education (Cracolici et al. 2014 ; Peiró, 2006); and occupation (Souziakis and Ramos, 2015; Cracolici et al.). Labour variables include job satisfaction, working hours, job stability (Ritzen, 2015; Peiro, 2006; Slutzer et al, Boreham et al. (2016)); income (Pereira and Coelho, 2013; Helliwell and Huang, 2011), working hours (Souziakis and Ramos, 2015; Peiró, 2006; John Ifcher, 2011), satisfaction with job and social relations in the company (Helliwell and Huang, 2011) and degree of work-life balance (Souziakis and Ramos, 2015; Boreham et al., 2016). Boreham et al. (2016) analyses some of the previously mentioned characteristics such as flexibility in working hours, job insecurity and pressure on the job as factors that impact well-being at work and that will impact well-being beyond work and specifically in the family. These last two authors add other factors that we have not considered such as the participative business management, linked to modern business management techniques.

The following explains the hypothesis of these variables' impact on SWB:

The factors are four different categories of family type and two points in the economic cycle: expansion and crisis. In Cracolici et al. (2014); Soukiazis and Ramos, (2015); Winkelman, (2005); Magnusson and Neramo (2016) we find references to type of family, but none of them includes the types of family that we do here. The factors are related to the size of the family to financial needs, which in turn impact the degree of individual satisfaction. Specifically, Cracolici et al. (2014) find that couples without children indicated greater SWB than those who have children and then those living alone. Myers (2000 and Ramos) find that stable couples indicate a slightly greater SWB. Our categories include couples with and without children, single parent families, and

individuals living alone, an additional type of family to Cracolici et al. (2014) and Magnusson and Neramo (2016). Rather than family structure, Helliwell and Huang (2011) focus on marital status, i.e. divorced, married, or widowed. In the hypothesis to be verified, our premise is that family structure does not lead us to establish a clear hypothesis as in the previously mentioned literature. Nor do theories about time allocation in the family seem to serve to establish well-founded hypotheses. Couples may divide time between themselves to take care of obligations, yet those living alone may have fewer obligations. According to these theories, those faring worst would be single parents who must take care of children on their own.

In the previously mentioned research, family impact when there are more, fewer or no children is based on financial ease vis-à-vis the potential costs and financial difficulties which would reduce an individual's happiness (Cracolici et al., 2014). Peiró (2006) observes no significant relationship between the number of children and life satisfaction. Huang-Li (2005) does establish a positive relationship between children, family and happiness, but does not clearly perceive a cause and effect. In other words couples may have children because they are happy or it may be the children that make them happy. The same is observed by Haller and Hadler (2006). However Tsang et al. (2003) find a negative correlation between children and marital relationships.

Children may reduce the amount of free time and require resources that could reduce individual well-being in families with children. Popular wisdom would indicate that children afford happiness, in other words that families with children would be happier. Furthermore, the lowering of birth rates in developed countries would point to levels of family income determining the number of children. One outlook regarding the quantity and quality of children is that the more children the worse they are taken care of, and the fewer, the better education they can be given and the more opportunities they may have. As Peiró (2006) remembers, in developed countries children may be a burden while in less developed countries they may serve to contribute to family income.

Yet our data do not enable us to research these aspects on a micro level. As a result, we do not dare to establish who has greater well-being, those who live by themselves or those who live in a different type of family. It was Becker (1981) who pioneered the theory on the quantity and quality of children.

Finally, certain surveys collect information on family size and certain labour aspects but do not enable us to conduct this type of research.

We therefore maintain that family structure does have a bearing on SWB, but we establish no hypothesis and leave it to the results to tell which individuals are the happiest according to their type of family.

Insofar as the economic cycle is concerned, we do believe it impacts individual wellbeing. Delle Fave (2014) summarizes several works related to the recent crisis' impact on SWB. Whether the individual experiences a period of economic boom or bust does determine or at least impact his or her SWB. Among references to the relationship between economic cycle and the evolution of SWB we find Veenhoven and Hagerty (2006) and Inglehart et al. (2008) who contradict Johns and Ormerod's (2007) thesis of invariability. They indicate factors including growth elements increasing happiness in society. Here, although only two specific periods are used to compare the economic cycle and no continuity or trends are shown, we believe the factor may be important. This impact of the factors on the environment is based on bottom-up theories where a series of material factors including job and financial conditions and the family determines the level of satisfaction. Conversely, in top-down theories, the variables configuring the degree of SWB are an individual's character and personality and not his or her surroundings.

Other factors driving happiness such as tolerance and democratization in society were not included in this research.

Data and methodology

The data we used are extracted from the ECVT, a survey that was conducted until 2010 by the Ministry of Labour and Immigration. Since that date, the EQLS has replaced that survey. While the EQLS broadens the scope to a European perspective, it significantly reduces each country's sample size. As we previously explained, the advisability of a uniform cultural, social and economic framework led us to turn to a national survey. Furthermore, the Spanish sample size enabled us to compare two points during the economic cycle and run a classification by types of families.

The model we use is the Univariate General Linear Model (GLM). First, a model including factors such as family structure and cycle was considered. This allowed us to

appraise their impact on SWB. Later, the GLM was run for each one of the types of families so as to obtain models that enable us to relatively easily compare each one of the family types of family. We ruled out using a single model to avoid the complex structure obtained when the interactions of factors are considered when there are numerous predicting variables, as is the case here.

Assuming the function's cardinality, the model is as follows:

$$SWB = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i X_i + \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j I(F = j)$$

SWB is a cardinal measurement for well-being. X expresses the explanatory numerical variables. I expresses that the F factor is in category j. α and β are the parameters to be simulated and ε the random error not explained by the model. The model is to be estimated by (Ordinary Least Square) OLS. The signification and standard error corresponding to each parameter is to be considered as well as its t statistic as a tool for comparing the effect among numeric predictions with different scales.

Underlying this model is that the term of error ε is uncorrelated with the explanatory variables to achieve a consistent estimate, which was checked by analysing residuals. The residuals analysis shows that its distribution is symmetrical and not far from normality, so that the high sample size allows the hypothesis tests to be considered adequate.

Furthermore, there are no problems of collinearity. If we apply the variance inflation factor (VIF), all models are below 10, Lin et al., (2011).

Results

Annex 1 shows observations related to the independent variables and the factors Type of Family and Cycle. A survey of 11.196 individuals is available.

As initial results, tables 1 and 2 present the mean Life Satisfaction for the different categories of families and according to the cycle. The most marked separation appears between the highest, couples without children and the lowest, single parents. The maximum and minimum confidence intervals of 95% for the average SWB value in

each category do not overlap, meaning that the four types of families provide yields with different behaviours. There is less of a difference between the average SWB score in both phases of the economic cycle.

Table 1: Life Satisfaction Mean, Types of families

Dependent variable Type of family	Individual's degree of life satisfaction			
	Mean	Standard Error	Confidence level 95%	
			Minimum	Maximun
Single	7,327 ^a	,048	7,234	7,421
Single-parent families	6,801 ^a	,063	6,677	6,926
Couple with children	7,654 ^a	,020	7,614	7,693
Couple without children	7,866 ^a	,035	7,798	7,934

Table 2: Estimated mean, Cycle

Dependent variable Cycle	Individual's degree of life satisfaction			
	Mean	Standard Error	Confidence level 95%	
			Minimum	Maximun
Growth 2006	7,553 ^a	,032	7,491	7,615
Crisis 2010	7,271 ^a	,027	7,217	7,325

Building a joint invariant MLG model was envisaged to include both factors and potential predictors in order to be able to analyse the relative impact of those sources of variation at the same time. Among the factors, couples without children was taken as the base level and as was the expansion period associated with the first sampling year (2006). The model's main characteristics are summed up in table 3.

Table 3: Personal life satisfaction, Univariate Analysis

Individual's degree of life satisfaction	B	t statistic
Interception	6,245*** (,182)	34,31
[Type of family =1,00] Single	-,539*** (,059)	-9,14
[Type of family =2,00] Single-parent families	-1,065*** (,072)	-14,79
[Type of family =3,00] Couple with children	-,213*** (,040)	-5,33
[Type of family =4,00] Couple without children	-- ^a	*
[cycle =,00] Crisis	-,282*** (,039)	-7,23
[cycle =1,00] Growth	-- ^a	*
Age	-,010*** (,002)	-5,00
Gender	-,074*** (,034)	-2,18
Level of studies	-,020** (,009)	-22,22
Job satisfaction	,129*** (,011)	11,73
Satisfaction with the workday	,103*** (,008)	12,87
Satisfaction with stability	,069*** (,007)	9,86
Net monthly income	,096*** (,013)	7,38
Occupation	,002 (,016)	0,13
Working hours	-,059*** (,021)	-2,81
Good labour and social relationships at the workplace	,191*** (,019)	10,05
Difficulties for work-life balance	-,059*** (,021)	-2,81
R²	0.16	
N	11196	

Both of the factors and all of the variables except Occupation appear as significant. The results of the factors are clear. In the economic cycle, the crisis period reduced the degree of an individual's life satisfaction by 0.28% (on a scale of 10). By comparison with the crisis' impact, the type of family clearly had more of an impact. So compared to the base model, couples without children, the other three categories had lower SWBs: 0.21% lower for couples with children, 0.54 for singles and 1.07 for single parents.

With respect to the co-variables, firstly, the coefficients' signs concur with a great portion of the literature examined. Beginning with the negative signs, satisfaction with the life one leads, age, the female gender, higher level of education, the number of hours worked, and the difficulties in striking work-life balance all diminish well-being. Nevertheless, the β coefficients are relatively low, particularly when we compare them with the coefficients of variables with positive signs. Specifically, there are three variables with a high β : job satisfaction, satisfaction with working hours, and the co-variable including good job and social relations in the company. Satisfaction with stability and income are also important.

Table 4 presents the OLS for the sample set of the two different years and for each one of the types of family. We included the cycle as a dummy variable.

Table 4: Personal life satisfaction according to type of family and cycle, OLS.

	Total	Single	Single-parent families	Couple with children	Couple without children
(Constant)	5,800***	4,617***	5,325***	6,294***	6,047***
	(,155)	(,547)	(,916)	(,227)	(,373)
Age	-,007***	-,008	-,004	-,011***	-,010***
	(,001)	(,005)	(,009)	(,002)	(,003)
Gender	-,150***	,105	-,261	-,123***	,013
	(,030)	(,103)	(,219)	(,043)	(,069)
Level of studies	-,025***	,013	,002	-,031***	-,019
	(,008)	(,030)	(,045)	(,012)	(,020)
Job satisfaction	,137***	,119***	,147***	,124***	,138***
	(,010)	(,033)	(,049)	(,013)	(,022)
Satisfaction with the workday	,103***	,132***	,118***	,101***	,091***
	(,007)	(,026)	(,038)	(,010)	(,018)
Satisfaction with stability	,070***	,109***	,041	,061***	,080***
	(,006)	(,022)	(,032)	(,009)	(,016)
Net monthly income	,140***	,097*	,109	,099***	,111***
	(,011)	(,048)	(,071)	(,015)	(,028)
Occupation	-,008	-,008	,073	-,006	,024
	(,015)	(,053)	(,079)	(,020)	(,034)
Working hours	-,068***	-,063	-,227***	-,037	-,084
	(,018)	(,068)	(,090)	(,026)	(,044)
Good labor and social relationships at the workplace	,208***	,161***	,314***	,177***	,182***
	(,017)	(,057)	(,086)	(,023)	(,040)
Difficulties for work-life balance	-,051***	,042	,007	-,086***	-,074
	(,019)	(,063)	(,095)	(,026)	(,046)
Cycle (0= Growth; 1= Crisis)	-,336***	,035	-,325*	-,321***	-,374***
	(,034)	(,122)	(,182)	(,048)	(,083)
R	,382	,391 ^a	,381 ^a	,358 ^a	,402 ^a
R2	,146	,153	,145	,128	,161
Number of observations	14518	1301	737	6891	2264

***<1%; **<3%; *<5%

(Standard Errors in Parentheses)

If we heed the significance of the variables, we get confirmation of four quite distinct groups. Among couples there are differences in terms of gender, level of education and

difficulties in striking work-life balance. These three variables are not significant for couples without children. For couples with children, there are negative coefficients. That is, among the category of couples with children, it is women with the highest levels of education who are least satisfied with the lives they lead. The three co-variables concur to a great extent with the literature, particularly regarding gender and difficulties in striking work-life balance. In families with children, it is women who take care of them and this reduces their levels of satisfaction. In couples without children, the gender variable is not significant. In all four groups, three significant variables appear with a high B: job satisfaction, satisfaction with working hours, and good social and job relations. Here, both groups of couples, those with and without children, are more uniform than the other two groups.

A higher proportion of those living alone state satisfaction with working hours and income than the other groups. For single parent families, good work and social relations is the variable with the greatest satisfaction in the lives they lead, and the difference compared to the other types of families is very high. The number of working hours also heavily negatively impacts their satisfaction. The B is both high and negative for this group. In the other three groups, working hours do not appear to be as important. Interestingly, in this group, income does not have a significant bearing.

The cycle greatly impacts all types of families with the exception of those living alone.

Interpretation of the results

From a labour standpoint, there are differences in individuals' satisfaction with the lives they lead according to family type. The approach is undoubtedly partial in that it does not factor in health, family and social relations outside the company, or material aspects related to daily life such as the characteristics of one's dwelling, or household goods or any other factors indicated in the previously mentioned literature. However, some of the variables used incorporate aspects indirectly reflecting some of the characteristics of those variables we did not use. For instance, the income variable may indirectly be tied to the household's ability to meeting its needs and even to the dwelling's characteristics. The type of social relations in the company and the chances for striking work-life

balance also cover some of the aspects potentially offered by nearby family or friends when there is a need, for instance for child care. We therefore believe that a labour approach significantly reflects the degree of individual well-being in relation to the life one leads.

Turning to family structure, there is a high similarity among couples and the difference is marked by issues related basically to children, including the importance of work-life balance, and women's burden in household chores. The figures continue to point to traditional models for divvying up work in traditional families, i.e. couples with children. The crisis has hit the couples without children category the most severely. The interpretation of the effects of the recent crisis in Spain shows that it has not significantly affected the most affluent classes as it has the least. Yet the crisis has struck more "anguish" among middle classes than among the poorest or the richest. When coupling income (couples without children attach more importance to this parameter for their SWB) with the dummy, cycle, our results confirm this perception.

Insofar as the other two family categories, the single parent family shows only four predictors with a significant effect. Its subjective level of well-being is significantly lower and it particularly values a good atmosphere at work and being able to work fewer hours. Paradoxically, work-life balance is not mentioned. Perhaps the disutility attributed to the amount of working hours owes to the need for time to take care of household obligations. This group has been identified as being at risk for the purposes of public policy in childcare, school dropouts, delinquency, and so forth (John Ifcher 2011), and particularly young single mothers who tend to account for the majority of single parent homes (Here, the gender $\beta = -.261$, although it is not significant).

There are three co-variables that stand out due to their importance in the four categories of family used to evaluate SWB: job satisfaction, satisfaction with working hours, and good relations on the job and social relations. We understand that these are important indicators of what is most influential in an individual's SWB, that is, labour-related issues. This occurs irrespective of stability's influence on employment -- and stability is a very important factor in Spain -- of income, occupation, and level of education, especially among single parents. We had believed occupation would have a certain bearing on SWB, but this is not the case.

The results on age concurred with the literature analysed. Generally speaking, age follows an upside-down U that we did not capture well. The greatest level of satisfaction with one's life comes during the central period both in work and in biological terms.

If we make a distinction between families with and without children, the latter appear to be more satisfied with their lives. We were unable to capture the factors triggering the potential disutility of having children. However, with the drop in the birth rate in addition to sociological and cultural factors, we also suspect that work and income factors impact this. Countries with high birth and replacement rates such as France and Sweden have active labour policies and tax and financial stimuli to foster the birth rate.

Summary, policy proposals and furthering of this research

This research analyses individuals' degree of life satisfaction according to a series of demographic and labour variables. It differentiates between four major types of families and two specific years during the recent economic cycle. The results bring out substantial differences between the four family types and the two phases of the cycle and this partially justifies this research's pertinence.

Among the results, the single parent family appears to be the group with substantially lower life satisfaction. Again, when examining policies to combat poverty and inequality, many countries have already taken this group into consideration as being at risk. In addition, parents with children also have lower levels of satisfaction than those who do not have children. Problems of population loss, aging, and non-replacement are not present on Spain's political and social agenda in any way other than their potential repercussion on financing pensions. Therefore, there are no policies that substantially and effectively modify the trend towards having fewer children.

If at any time there is a change in perception about the problems that a lack of replacement of the population may generate, then a shortcoming as well as a possible extension of this research would arise. The data managed does not enable us to find factors to measure the disutility families perceive, be their couples or single parents, when deciding to have and raise children. This research could be expanded by studying

the potential factors that would disincentivise having children, and this would provide orientation for public policies to incentivize increasing birth rates.

Among the results, we have seen that job satisfaction, working hours and good job and social relations in the company are the most important aspects for a person's life satisfaction. We have not begun here to disaggregate the dimensions of job satisfaction. This research could be expanded by such disaggregation, which would help to better demarcate aspects impacting life satisfaction. Regarding working hours, increasing labour deregulation and diversification in models of production is making it increasingly difficult to maintain stable, regular working hours. Stated otherwise, the trend towards deregulation may indirectly, by worsening working hours, reduce individuals' life satisfaction. The results offered by the cycle variable seem to support this argument. The worsening of the labour market during the crisis is reflected in lower SWB. This calls into question theories stating that SWB is virtually an issue of genetics.

Finally, regarding companies' human resource policies, the fact that single parent families are the least satisfied may owe to their being put at a disadvantage in processes to gain employment. There is evidence that in job screening interviews, of the overall set of non-strictly professional questions, lifestyle sometimes constitutes yet one more variable that companies take into account when hiring. From this standpoint, public policies that compensate for the disutilities these families find in their day-to-day lives could both provide them with more opportunities and prevent certain discriminatory practices.

References

Alesina, A., Di Tella, R., & MacCulloch, R. (2004): Inequality and happiness: Are Europeans and Americans different? *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(9–10), 2009–2042. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2003.07.006>

Becker, G. (1981): *A treatise on the family*. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press

Blanchflower, D. G., & Oswald, A. J. (2008): Is well-being U-shaped over the life cycle? *Social Science and Medicine*, 66(8), 1733–1749.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.01.030>

Bonke, J., & Browning, M. (2009): The distribution of financial well-being and income within the household. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 7(1), 31–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-008-9044-3>

Boreham, P., Jenny Povey & Wojtek Tomaszewski (2016): Work and social well-being: the impact of employment conditions on quality of life, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27:6, 593-611.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1027250>

Cracolici, Maria Francesca & Francesca Giambona & Miranda Cuffaro, (2014): Family Structure and Subjective Economic Well-Being: Some New Evidence, *Soc Indic Res* (2014) 118:433–456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0425-5>

Delle Fave, A. (2014): Well-Being in Times of Crisis: Interdisciplinary Evidence and Policy Implications. *J Happiness Stud* (2014) 15:119–123
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9499-2>

Diener, E., Lucas, R., Schimmack, U., & Helliwell, J. (2009): *Well-being for public policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195334074.001.0001>

- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999): Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 276–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276>
- Easterlin, R. A. (2001): Income and happiness: Towards a unified theory. *The Economic Journal*, 111(473), 465–488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00646>
- Ferro Luzzi, G., Fluckiger, Y., & Weber, S. (2008): A cluster analysis of multidimensional poverty in Switzerland. In N. Kakwani & J. Silber (Eds.), *Quantitative approaches to multidimensional poverty measurement* (pp. 63–79). New York: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230582354_4
- Forgeard, M. J. C., Jayawickreme, E., Kern, M. & Seligman, M. E. P. (2011): Doing the right thing: Measuring wellbeing for public policy. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 1(1), 79-106. <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v1i1.15>
- Frey, B. S., & Stutzer, A. (2000): Happiness, economy and institutions. *The Economic Journal*, 110(466), 918–938. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00570>
- Frey, B. S., & Stutzer, A. (2005): Happiness research: State and prospects. *Review of Social Economy*, 63(2), 207–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00346760500130366>
- Frey, B. S., & Stutzer, A. (2010): *Happiness and economics: How the economy and institutions affect human well-being*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400829262>

Fusco, A., & Dickes, P. (2008): The Rasch model and multidimensional poverty measurement. In N.Kakwani & J. Silber (Eds.), Quantitative approaches to multidimensional poverty measurement (pp.49–62). New York: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230582354_3

Galinha, I. C., & Pais-Ribeiro, J. L. (2008): The structure and stability of subjective well-being: A structure equation modelling analysis. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 3(4), 293–314. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-009-9063-0>

García, I., Molina, J.A., Montuenga, V. (2011): “Gender differences in childcare: time allocation in five European countries”. *Feminist Economics*, 17 (1), 119-150. [DOI:10.1080/13545701.2010.542004](https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2010.542004).

García, I., Molina, J.A. , Montuenga, V. (2010): “Intra-family distribution of paid-work time”. *Applied Economics*, 42, 589-601. [DOI: 10.1080/00036840701704469](https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840701704469).

García, I., Molina, J.A., Navarro, M. (2010): “The effects of education on spouse’s satisfaction in Europe”. *Applied Economics*, 42, 3607-3618. [DOI: 10.1080/0036840802314572](https://doi.org/10.1080/0036840802314572).

Gasper, D. (2010): Understanding the diversity of conceptions of well-being and quality-of-life. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 39, 351-360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2009.11.006>

Giménez, J.I. and Molina, J.A. (2013). “Parents’ education as determinant of educational childcare time”. *Journal of Population Economics*, 26, 719-749.

Giménez, J.I. and Molina, J.A. (2014): “Regional unemployment, gender and time allocation of the unemployed”. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 12 (1), 105-127.

Giménez, J.I. and Molina, J.A. (2015): “Voluntary activities and daily happiness in the US”. *Economic Inquiry*, 53 (4), 1735-1750. DOI: 10.1111/ecin.12227.

Giménez, J.I., Molina, J.A. and Ortega, R. (2012): “Self-employed mothers and the work-family conflict”. *Applied Economics*, 44, 2133-2148.

Giménez, J.I., Molina, J.A. and Ortega, R. (2017): “Like my parents at home? Gender differences in childrens’ housework in Germany and Spain”. *Empirical Economics*, 52(4), 1143-1179. DOI:10.1007/s00181-016-1100-x.

Haller, M., & Hadler, M. (2006): How social relations and structures can produce happiness and unhappiness: An international comparative analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, 75(2), 169–216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-6297-y>

Helliwell, John F. & Haifang Huang (2011) Well-Being and Trust in the Workplace *J Happiness Stud* (2011) 12:747–767. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-010-9225-7>

Hung-Lin Tao (2005): The effects of income and children on marital happiness — evidence from middle- and old-aged couples *Applied Economics Letters*, 2005, 12, 521–524 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504850500120045>

Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson, C., & Welzel, C. (2008): Development, freedom, and rising happiness: A global perspective (1981–2007). *Perspective on*

Psychological Science, 3(4), 264–285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00078.x>

John Ifcher (2011): "The Happiness of Single Mothers after Welfare Reform," The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy :Vol. 11: Iss. 1 (Topics), Article 60. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1935-1682.2727>

Johns, H., & Ormerod, P. (2007): Review article on "Happiness, Economics and Public Policy". London: The Institute of Economic Affairs

Kahneman, D., & Krueger, A. (2006): Developments in the measurement of subjective well-being. The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 20, 3-24. <https://doi.org/10.1257/089533006776526030>

Labeaga, J.M., Molina, J.A. , Navarro, M. (2011): “Deprivation using satisfaction measures in Spain: an evaluation of unemployment benefits”. Journal of Policy Modeling, 33, 287-310.

Lelkes, O. (2006): Knowing what is good for you: Empirical analysis of personal preferences and the «objective good». The Journal of Socio-Economics, 35(2), 285–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2005.11.002>

Lin, Dongyu ; Dean P. Foster, and Lyle H. Ungar (2011): VIF-Regression: A Fast Regression Algorithm for Large, Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 106, No. 493: 232-247

- Magnusson, Ch. & Magnus Neramo (2016): Gender, Parenthood and Wage Differences: The Importance of Time-Consuming Job Characteristics, Soc Indic Res, DOI 10.1007/s11205-016-1271.
- Molina, J.A. (2015): “Caring within the family: reconciling work and family life”, Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 36, 1-4. DOI: [10.1007/s10834-015-9441-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-015-9441-8).
- Molina, J.A., Navarro, M. , Walker, I. (2011): “Intergenerational well-being mobility in Europe”. Kyklos, 64, 253-270.
- Myers, D. G. (2000): The funds, friends, and faith of happy people. American Psychologist, 55(1), 56–67. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.56>
- Peiro, A. (2006): Happiness, satisfaction and socio-economic conditions: Some international evidence. The Journal of Socio-Economics, 35, 348–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2005.11.042>
- Pereira, M. C., & Coelho, F. (2013): Untangling the relationship between income and subjective well-being: The role of perceived income adequacy and borrowing constraints. Journal of Happiness Studies, 14(3), 985–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-012-9365-z>
- Pichler, F. (2006): Subjective quality of life of young Europeans. Feeling happy but who knows why? Social Indicators Research, 75(3), 419–444. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-4337-2>

Ritzen, Jo (2015): Happiness as a guide to labor market policy. IZA World of Labor 2015: 149 <https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.149>

Ryff, C. (1989): Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1069-1081. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>

Ryff, C. D. (1995): Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4, 99-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10772395>

Soukiazis, Elias & Sara Ramos¹ (2015): The Structure of Subjective Well-Being and Its Determinants: A Micro-Data Study for Portugal, *Soc Indic Res* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-0938-1>

Tsang, L. L. W., Harvey, C. D. H., Duncan, K. A. and Sommer, R. (2003): The effects of children, dual earner status, sex role traditionalism, and marital structure on marital happiness overtime, *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 24,5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022478919443>

Veenhoven, R. (1991): Questions on happiness: Classical topics, modern answers, blind spots. In F. Strack, Argyle, M. & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Subjective well-being: An interdisciplinary perspective* (p. 13). Oxford: Pergamon Press

Veenhoven, R., & Hagerty, M. (2006): Rising happiness in nations 1946–2004. A reply to Easterlin. *Social Indicators Research*, 79, 421–436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-005-5074-x>

Winkelmann, R. (2005): Subjective well-being and the family: Results from an ordered probit model with multiple random effects, *Empirical Economics* (2005) 30:749–761

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-005-0255-7>

Annex 1

DESCRIPTIVES	N	Min	Max	Mean	St.Dev
Age	15599	20,00	70,00	42,586	10,6032
Gender (1: Male; 2: Female)	15599	1,00	2,00	1,4341	,49565
Level of Studies	15599	1,00	10,00	5,6982	2,16019
Job Satisfaction	15599	0,00	10,00	7,3478	1,90145
Satisfaction with the workday	15599	0,00	10,00	7,0315	2,32545
Satisfaction with stability	15599	0,00	10,00	7,2868	2,57985
Net monthly income	15599	1,00	9,00	3,9282	1,61505
Occupation: (1: Top manager; 5: Uncredited workers)	15563	1,00	5,00	3,5079	1,20813
Working hours: (1 de 5 h a 30h per week; 2: de 21 a 30; 3: de 31 a 40; 4 de 41 a 50; 5: de 51 a 55)	14554	1,00	5,00	3,0558	,81695
Good labor and social relationships at the workplace (α Cronbach = 0.81): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relations between managers and employees, from 0 to 10 • Relationship between workers, from 0 to 10 • Degree of confidence in superiors, from 0 to 10 • Degree of confidence in peers of the same level, from 0 to 10 	15599	-4,6961	1,5169	-,00663	,95769
Difficulties for work-life balance (α Cronbach = 0.79): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty applying for days without employment and salary for family reasons, from 0 to 10. • Difficulty applying for leave for family reasons, from 0 to 10. • Difficulty requesting reduction of the day for family reasons, from 0 to 10. • Difficulty to be absent to solve particular sporadic issues, from 0 to 10. 	15599	-1,1205	2,4610	-,1491	,80249

N	14519				