

ISSN: 2038-632X

PECOB'S PAPERS SERIES

*Well-Being, Work and Government: Insights from
Eastern Transition Countries*

Dr. Stephan Humpert

*Institute of Economics
Leuphana University of Lueneburg*

November 2013 | #41

ver.2.0 | Timestamp: 201404021040



PECOB

Portal on Central Eastern and Balkan Europe
University of Bologna - Forlì Campus

www.pecob.eu

*Well-Being, Work and Government: Insights from
Eastern Transition Countries*

Dr. Stephan Humpert

*Institute of Economics
Leuphana University of Lueneburg*

Table of Contents

Abstract	5
Keywords.....	5
1. Introduction	6
2. Key Findings on Satisfaction	7
3. Data and Econometric Model.....	9
4. Estimations and Results.....	14
5. Conclusion	22
Bibliography:	22
Author's name	27

Abstract

Recent studies on well-being or life satisfaction focus on transition countries. Using the year 2008 of the European Values Study 2010 (EVS), I use simple OLS regressions for life and job satisfaction, as well as satisfaction with government. A set of Central Eastern European and Baltic states (CEE) and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) is analysed. The half of the CEE countries are meanwhile member states of the European Union (EU).

There two key findings observable. At first, general results known from the literature hold for Eastern European and former Soviet countries, as well. However, the analysis of job satisfaction and governmental quality shed some light on differences on the individual level and between countries. However, some of these differences may be driven by the 2008 financial crisis.

Keywords

Well-Being, Transition, Central Eastern European and Baltic States (CES), Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), European Union (EU)

1. Introduction

After the fall of the iron curtain in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet countries, the countries turned into strong economic transitions. E.g. unemployment rates increased quickly because of weak competitiveness towards Western economies and plants closures. In the following years the economic situation in these rather different countries changed into economic growth. According to papers of Blanchflower (2001), Hayo and Seifert (2003), Hayo (2008), Humpert (2010), Selezneva (2011) and, Rodríguez-Pose and Maslauskaitė (2012) economic transitions in Eastern Europe lowered general well-being¹, relative to the Western European countries..

In this paper, I try an update of these investigations. I analyse if former transition countries behave in 2008 similar or different from each other in terms of well-being. To investigate transition effects, I use three different measures of well-being: overall life satisfaction, satisfaction with government and job satisfaction.

All regressions are performed separately for men and women, to catch up gender specific differences (e.g. Humpert 2013). The survey data in used is the 2008 wave of the European Values Study (EVS) has several country information for Albania, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, and Ukraine. These countries can be generally clustered in Central Eastern European and Baltic states (CEE) and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The half of the CEE countries turned in 2008 into members of the European Union (EU).

There two key findings observable. At first, general results known from the literature hold for Eastern European and former Soviet countries, as well. However, the analysis of job satisfaction and governmental quality shed some light on differences on the individual level and

1 In this paper the terms well-being and satisfaction are used identical.

between countries. However, some of these differences may be driven by the 2008 financial crisis.

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 describe the dataset and the estimation models used. In section four, I perform OLS estimations and discuss the results. The last section gives a conclusion.

2. Key Findings on Satisfaction

In this part I give a short review of the transition literature concerning general satisfaction. Additionally I present evidence how democratic aspects or freedom affects well-being.

At first I start with a short description of well-being theory. Following Frey and Stutzer (2000, 2002) well-being of life satisfaction can be improved or lowered by several characteristics. These factors may be macroeconomic, such as a high unemployment rate in a given country, or may be individual, such being individually unemployed. A third characteristic is institutional or political. An example may be a high rate of corruption. All these three examples will lower the country specific well-being and the individual one. The following examples should give a perspective what well-being drives.

Blanchflower (2001) analyses a few of micro and macro economic criteria to investigate systematic differences between Western European countries and CEE² 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

2 Blanchflower (2001) handles Eastern Germany as one of the CEE countries. For 2008 this is not more useful.

is done by others. Deaton (2008) uses the Gallup World Poll. Compared to Western European countries the transition countries report always lower levels of satisfaction³. Rodríguez-Pose and Maslauskaitė (2012) use the EVS data for the years 1999 and 2008 to analyse trends and differences between 10 CEE countries. Although the CEE countries face an economic recovery, people in the CEE countries remain less satisfied than in Western Europe.

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 EVS 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 Value Survey (WVS) and EVS is used.

Inglehart et al. (2008) use the EVS and WVS data to show the positive correlation between economic growth, the power of democracy and the rise of personal satisfaction 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 WVS they present that inter alia high life expectancy and a country's 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 (2013) uses the WVS data to analyse the causality between economic freedom and well-being. Knoll et al. (2013) use EVS and WVS 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 a positive relation between GDP per capita and mean level of satisfaction. Di Tella et al (2001) observe a trade off between inflation and general unem-

³ See Pittau et al. (2010) for a comparison between Western European regions and Jagodzinski (2010) for a comparison between Europe and Asia.

ployment. 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 well-being determinants, where age, gender and education have only small negative effects on well-being, and 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 satisfaction. The effect of age as u-shaped is discussed first by Blanchflower and Oswald (2004). In influential papers of Clark and Oswald (1994) and Winkelmann and Winkelmann (1998) show that individual unemployment strongly lowers satisfaction.

3. Data and Econometric Model

In this section I discuss the dataset and the estimation model. The dataset in this paper is the 2008 wave of the EVS data. For the estimations I have to limit the raw data into a shorter set of twenty-two countries with information for the year of 2008⁴. These countries are CEE and CIS states. The half of the CEE countries are actual members of the EU. I use individual information 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 separately for 8,994 men and 11,455 women.

⁴ It should be kept in mind, that 2008 was the world's hardest financial crisis since the Great Recession.

Table 1 – County Information – Source: EVS 2008

Country	Male	Female	Total
Albania (CEE)	497	471	968
Armenia (CIS)	390	573	963
Azerbaijan (CIS)	701	699	1,400
Belarus (CIS)	438	636	1,074
Bosnia-Herzegovina (CEE)	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, EU)	265	407	672
Slovenia (CEE, EU)	267	322	589
Ukraine (CIS)	376	567	943
Total	8,994	11,455	20,449

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 utility, while job satisfaction measures confidence with work. The third measure, satisfaction with government, is used as a proxy variable for the political system in the country and it should catch up 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 Euro. Age is used twice, 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 Euro. 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.

Table 2 - Descriptive Statistics – Source EVS 2008

Variable	Obs.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Satisfaction with Life	20,449	6.654	2.348	1	10
Satisfaction with Government	20,449	4.634	2.346	1	10
Satisfaction with Job (only Employed)	11,971	7.008	2.304	1	10
Female	20,449	0.560	0.496	0	1
Age	20,449	40.371	13.440	19	65.000
Age ² /100	20,449	18.104	11.091	3.240	42.250
Religious	20,449	0.736	0.441	0	1
Health normal	20,449	0.353	0.478	0	1
Health bad	20,449	0.087	0.282	0	1
Citizenship	20,449	0.965	0.185	0	1
registered Partnership	20,449	0.018	0.131	0	1
Widowed	20,449	0.061	0.240	0	1
Divorced	20,449	0.073	0.259	0	1
Separated	20,449	0.010	0.098	0	1
Single (ever)	20,449	0.266	0.442	0	1

Variable	Obs.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Part Time	20,449	0.055	0.229	0	1
Self-Employed	20,449	0.065	0.246	0	1
Retirement	20,449	0.101	0.301	0	1
Housewife	20,449	0.072	0.258	0	1
Student	20,449	0.070	0.255	0	1
Unemployed	20,449	0.149	0.356	0	1
Children	20,449	1.438	1.246	0	13
HH Income (ppp)	20,449	761.934	851.712	10.211	14728.160
Azerbaijan	20,449	0.068	0.253	0	1
Armenia	20,449	0.047	0.212	0	1
Bosnia-Herzegovina	20,449	0.045	0.208	0	1
Bulgaria	20,449	0.043	0.204	0	1
Belarus	20,449	0.053	0.223	0	1
Czech Republic	20,449	0.045	0.207	0	1
Estonia	20,449	0.045	0.207	0	1
Georgia	20,449	0.049	0.216	0	1
Hungary	20,449	0.045	0.207	0	1
Latvia	20,449	0.044	0.206	0	1
Lithuania	20,449	0.043	0.203	0	1
Moldavia	20,449	0.047	0.212	0	1
Montenegro	20,449	0.048	0.213	0	1
Poland	20,449	0.044	0.205	0	1
Romania	20,449	0.037	0.189	0	1
Russian Federation	20,449	0.042	0.199	0	1
Serbia	20,449	0.045	0.206	0	1
Slovak Republic	20,449	0.033	0.178	0	1
Slovenia	20,449	0.029	0.167	0	1
Ukraine	20,449	0.046	0.210	0	1
Kosovo	20,449	0.055	0.229	0	1
Town Size	20,449	4.406	2.576	1	8

Concerning the methodology, the satisfaction literature discuss two typical estimation strategies. The first one is the use of 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 a simple OLS estimation technique. Ferrer-i Carbonell and Frijters (2004) discuss this more simple strategy. I estimate 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.

4. Estimations and Results

In this section I present estimation results based on three specification concerning well-being. All of them are separated for men and women to catch up gender differences.

For the first dependent variables, overall satisfaction, I observe the typical effects of life satisfaction, which are 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 men and women. 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.

Table 3 – Satisfaction with Life – Source EVS 2008

	Satisfaction All		Satisfaction Men		Satisfaction Women	
Female	0.0615	(0.0332)	/		/	
Age	-0.053***	(0.011)	-0.049**	(0.015)	-0.054***	(0.014)
Age^2/100	0.054***	(0.012)	0.049**	(0.018)	0.056***	(0.017)
Religious: yes	0.142***	(0.039)	0.204***	(0.057)	0.054	(0.055)
Health normal (Ref: good Health)	-0.786***	(0.037)	-0.823***	(0.055)	-0.758***	(0.048)
Health bad	-1.896***	(0.071)	-1.860***	(0.117)	-1.908***	(0.090)
Citizen: yes	0.033	(0.089)	-0.019	(0.133)	0.091	(0.118)
registered Partnership (Ref: Married)	-0.240*	(0.111)	-0.182	(0.161)	-0.277	(0.153)
Widowed	-0.467***	(0.077)	-0.413*	(0.169)	-0.475***	(0.087)
Divorced	-0.511***	(0.064)	-0.369***	(0.109)	-0.587***	(0.078)
Separated	-0.878***	(0.165)	-0.901**	(0.281)	-0.845***	(0.203)
Single (ever)	-0.233***	(0.055)	-0.242**	(0.083)	-0.204**	(0.072)
Part Time (Ref: Full Time Employed)	-0.073	(0.076)	-0.161	(0.125)	0.00861	(0.093)
Self Employed	0.064	(0.065)	0.0420	(0.0809)	0.133	(0.110)
Retirement	-0.010	(0.073)	0.103	(0.115)	-0.089	(0.094)
Housewife	0.025	(0.069)	-0.449	(0.264)	0.079	(0.075)
Student	0.162*	(0.074)	-0.0248	(0.115)	0.328***	(0.094)
Unemployed	-0.438***	(0.054)	-0.446***	(0.079)	-0.424***	(0.075)
Children	0.033	(0.018)	0.026	(0.030)	0.037	(0.023)
HH Income	0.0002***	(0.00002)	0.0003***	(0.00003)	0.0002***	(0.00002)
Azerbaijan (Ref: Albania)	-0.344**	(0.106)	-0.199	(0.156)	-0.477***	(0.143)
Armenia	-0.351**	(0.109)	-0.303	(0.165)	-0.347*	(0.145)

	Satisfaction All		Satisfaction Men		Satisfaction Women	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	0.731***	(0.104)	0.809***	(0.152)	0.668***	(0.143)
Bulgaria	-0.338**	(0.111)	-0.405*	(0.164)	-0.255	(0.151)
Belarus	-0.025	(0.098)	-0.053	(0.144)	-0.007	(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	0.095	(0.101)	-0.080	(0.144)	0.278*	(0.141)
Latvia	0.093	(0.099)	-0.210	(0.145)	0.393**	(0.133)
Lithuania	0.093	(0.099)	-0.050	(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***	(0.097)	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						

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 4 shows the results.

Table 4 – Satisfaction with Job (only for employed)
- Source EVS 2008

	Satisfaction All		Satisfaction Men		Satisfaction Women	
Female	0.077	(0.043)	/		/	
Age	-0.020	(0.015)	-0.013	(0.020)	-0.029	(0.021)
Age ² /100	0.035*	(0.017)	0.021	(0.024)	0.051*	(0.025)
Religious: yes	0.191***	(0.051)	0.195**	(0.072)	0.175*	(0.072)
Health normal (Ref: good Health)	-0.627***	(0.048)	-0.618***	(0.068)	-0.642***	(0.066)
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)
registered Partnership (Ref: Married)	-0.192	(0.145)	-0.070	(0.197)	-0.355	(0.210)
Widowed	-0.075	(0.114)	0.111	(0.226)	-0.174	(0.133)
Divorced	-0.106	(0.079)	-0.215	(0.139)	-0.047	(0.096)
Separated	-0.119	(0.185)	0.014	(0.320)	-0.199	(0.224)



	Satisfaction All		Satisfaction Men		Satisfaction Women	
Single (ever)	-0.097	(0.070)	-0.190	(0.100)	0.0001	(0.097)
Part Time (Ref: Full Time Employed)	-0.212**	(0.081)	-0.297*	(0.127)	-0.168	(0.104)
Self Employed	0.102	(0.073)	0.145	(0.091)	0.051	(0.123)
Children	-0.002	(0.026)	0.013	(0.038)	-0.021	(0.036)
HH Income	0.0003***	(0.00002)	0.0003***	(0.00003)	0.0002***	(0.00004)
Azerbaijan (Ref: Albania)	-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	0.024	(0.137)	0.097	(0.193)	-0.134	(0.201)
Georgia	-0.063	(0.165)	-0.027	(0.219)	-0.186	(0.246)
Hungary	0.060	(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)	0.028	(0.203)
Moldavia	0.619***	(0.153)	0.851***	(0.201)	0.328	(0.236)
Montenegro	0.272	(0.150)	0.414*	(0.198)	0.057	(0.233)
Poland	0.222	(0.140)	0.408*	(0.185)	-0.047	(0.215)
Romania	0.338*	(0.155)	0.506*	(0.207)	0.124	(0.235)

	Satisfaction All		Satisfaction Men		Satisfaction Women	
Russian Federation	0.327*	(0.143)	0.476*	(0.202)	0.111	(0.207)
Serbia	-0.018	(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	0.029	(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	
OLS, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001,						

Concerning the satisfaction with government, I find neither age nor gender differences. Religious people and country citizens are more satisfied with their government. Bad health lowers satisfaction. The labour effects are mixed, while male pensioners 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 5 shows the results.

	Satisfaction All		Satisfaction Men		Satisfaction Women	
Female	0.059	(0.032)				
Age	-0.002	(0.010)	0.0043	(0.015)	-0.006	(0.014)
Age ² /100	0.006	(0.012)	-0.001	(0.018)	0.010	(0.016)
Religious: yes	0.196***	(0.039)	0.172**	(0.057)	0.206***	(0.052)
Health normal (Ref: good Health)	-0.209***	(0.036)	-0.212***	(0.054)	-0.213***	(0.047)
Health bad	-0.610***	(0.061)	-0.579***	(0.098)	-0.646***	(0.076)
Citizen: yes	0.701***	(0.095)	0.822***	(0.144)	0.590***	(0.126)
registered Partnership (Ref: Married)	-0.459***	(0.116)	-0.309	(0.161)	-0.597***	(0.167)
Widowed	0.116	(0.070)	0.139	(0.151)	0.120	(0.079)
Divorced	-0.145*	(0.061)	-0.246*	(0.107)	-0.0675	(0.074)
Separated	-0.173	(0.156)	-0.353	(0.260)	-0.0274	(0.192)
Single (ever)	0.0987	(0.053)	0.101	(0.081)	0.133	(0.071)
Part Time (Ref: Full Time Employed)	0.144*	(0.073)	0.109	(0.113)	0.184	(0.096)
Self Employed	-0.0402	(0.068)	-0.0341	(0.087)	-0.0222	(0.111)
Retirement	-0.134*	(0.068)	-0.216*	(0.107)	-0.041	(0.087)
Housewife	-0.036	(0.065)	-0.377	(0.221)	0.023	(0.072)
Student	0.131	(0.073)	0.034	(0.112)	0.193*	(0.098)
Unemployed	-0.229***	(0.051)	-0.231**	(0.074)	-0.218**	(0.070)

	Satisfaction All		Satisfaction Men		Satisfaction Women	
Children	0.034	(0.018)	0.068*	(0.029)	0.004	(0.024)
HH Income	0.00003	(0.00002)	0.00001	(0.00002)	0.00006*	(0.00003)
Azerbaijan (Ref: Albania)	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)
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	

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



5. Conclusion

In this paper I try to investigate if former transition countries behave similar or different from each other in terms of well-being today. Therefore, I use three different measures of well-being: overall life and job satisfaction and satisfaction with government. All regressions are performed separately for men and women

Life satisfaction is positive in the most of the countries observed. The CEE and CIS countries behave in line with the descriptive findings from all over the world. I find no systematic evidence that Eastern European EU member countries behave different than other transition countries. Job satisfaction shows the most differences. Men have higher level of job satisfaction than women. I find weak evidence for higher job satisfaction in part time work.

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

Bibliography:

Blanchflower, David G, Unemployment, Well-Being, and Wage Curves in Eastern and Central Europe. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies*, Vol. 15 (No. 4), 2001, pp.364-402.

Blanchflower, David G., Oswald, Andrew, Well-Being over Time in Britain and the US. *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 88 (No. 7-8), 2004, pp. 1359-1386.

Borooah, Vani K., Comparing levels of job Satisfaction in the Countries of Western and Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 30 (No. 4), 2009, pp. 304-325.

Clark, Andrew, Oswald, Andrew, Unhappiness and Unemployment. *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 104 (No. 424), 1994, pp. 648-659.

Deaton, Angus, Income, Health and Wellbeing Around the World: Evidence from the Gallup World Poll. *Journal of Economic Perspective*, Vol. 22 (No. 2), 2008, pp. 53-72.

Di Tella, Rafael, MacCulloch, Robert, Oswald, Andrew, Preferences over Inflation and Unemployment: Evidence from Surveys of Happiness. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 91 (No.1), 2001, pp. 335-341.

Easterlin, Richard, 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*, 1974, pp. 89-125.

EVS, European Values Study 2008, 4th wave, Integrated Dataset. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne, Germany, ZA4800 Data File Version 2.0.0 (2010-11-30), 2010, doi:10.4232/1.10188.

Ferrer-i Carbonell, Ada., Frijters, Paul, How important is Methodology for the Estimates of the Determinants of Happiness? *Economic Journal*, Vol. 114 (No. 497), 2004, pp. 641-659.

Ferrer-i Carbonell, Ada, Income and Well-Being: an empirical analysis of the comparison income effect. *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 89 (No. 5-6), 2005, pp. 997-1019.

Frijters, Paul, Geishecker, Ingo, Haisken-DeNew, John, Shields, Michael A., Can The Large Swings in Russian Life Satisfaction be Explained by Ups and Downs in Real Incomes. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 108 (No. 3), 2006, pp. 433-458.

Frey, Bruni, Stutzer, Alois, Happiness, Economy and Institutions. *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 110 (No. 466), 2000, pp. 918-938.

Frey, Bruno, Stutzer, Alois, What can Economists learn from Happiness Research.. *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 40 (No. 2), 2002, pp. 403-435.

Halliwell, John F., Huang, Haifang, How's your Government? International Evidence Linking good Government and Well-Being. *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 38 (No. 4), 2008, pp. 595-619.

Hayo, Bernd, Happiness in Transition: An empirical Study on Eastern Europe. *Economic Systems*, Vol. 31 (No. 2), 2007, pp. 204-221.

Hayo, Bernd, Seifert, Wolfgang, Subjective economic Well-Being in Eastern Europe. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 24 (No. 3), 2002, pp. 329-348.

Heukamp, Franz H., Arino, Miguel A., Does Country matter for Subjective Well-Being? *Social Indicator Research*, Vol. 100 (No. 1), 2011, pp.155-170.

Humpert, Stephan, Gender Differences in Life Satisfaction and Social Participation. *International Journal of Economic Sciences and Applied Research*, Vol.6 (No.4), 2013, pp.123-142.

Humpert, Stephan, A Note on Happiness in Eastern Europe. *European Research Studies*, Vol.13 (No. 3), 2010, pp. 133-144.

Inglehart, Richard, Foa, Roberto, Peterson Christopher, Welzel, Christian, Development, Freedom, and Rising Happiness A Global Perspective (1981-2007). *Perspectives of psychological Science*, Vol. 3 (No. 4), 2008, pp. 264-285.

Jadogzinski, Wolfgang, Economic, Social, and Cultural Determinants of Life Satisfaction: Are there Differences between Asia and Europe? *Social Indicator Research*, Vol. 97 (No. 1), 2010, pp.85-104.

Layard, Richard, Happiness: Lessons from a New Science, 2005 Penguin.

Knoll, Bodo, Pitlik, Hans, Rode, Martin, A Note on the Impact of economic Regulation on Life Satisfaction. *Applied Economics Letters*, Vol. 20 (No 9), 2013, pp. 916-920.

Rode, Martin, Do good Institutions make Citizens happy, or do happy Citizens make good Institutions? *Journal of Happiness Studies*, Vol. 14 (No.5), 2013, pp.1479-1505.

Rodríguez-Pose, Andrés, Maslauskaitė, Kristina, Can policy make us happier? Individual characteristics, socio-economic factors and life satisfaction in Central and Eastern Europe, *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, Vol. 5 (No. 1), 2012, pp.77-96.

Pittau, M. Gratia, Zelli, Roberto, Gelman, Andrew, Economic Disparities and Life Satisfaction in European Regions. *Social Indicator Research*, Vol. 96 (No. 2), 2010, pp. 339-361.

Selezneva, Ekaterina (2011), Surveying transitional Experience and Subjective Well-Being: Income, Work, Family. *Economic Systems*, Vol. 35 (No. 2), pp.139-157.

Stevenson, B., Wolfers, Justin, Economic growth and subjective well-being: Reassessing the Easterlin Paradox. *Brooking Papers on Economic Activity*, Spring, 2008, pp. 1-87.

Winkelmann, L., Winkelmann, Rainer, Why are the Unemployed so Unhappy? *Economica*, Vol. 65 (No. 257), 1998, pp.1-15

Author's name

Stephan Humpert is a post doctoral researcher. He is affiliated as a research fellow at Leuphana University Lueneburg in northern Germany. He holds a Ph.D. and a master degree in economics and a bachelor degree in social sciences. His research topics are related to the field of labour and population economics, especially to age and gender.

E-mail: humpert@leuphana.de

PECOB's Scientific Board

is an interdisciplinary board of directors, responsible for reviewing proposals and accepting international high quality scientific pieces of research with the assistance of the Europe and the Balkans International Network and the Association of Italian Slavists.

Only the scientific papers accepted after a blind review process will be published in the portal.

Members of the Scientific Board of Directors are:

- Stefano Bianchini (IECOB)
- Francesco Privitera (IECOB)
- Marcello Garzanti (AIS)
- Stefano Garzonio (AIS)



PECOB's Editorial Staff

selects and brings together the thinking of distinguished scholars, experts, researchers and interested people on Central-Eastern Europe, the Balkan region and the Post-Soviet space, by collecting scientific and information documents.

Ms Luciana Moretti

You can contact her for proposals and submission of scientific contributions for the Scientific Library (under the blind peer review). You can contact her for information about Newsletter, general requests, conferences and events, academic calls, communications concerning cultural and eco-tourism.

luciana.moretti@unibo.it

Mr Andrea Gullotta

He contributes to Pecob's Scientific Library, particularly with the "Papers, essays and articles in Language, Literature and Culture on Central Eastern and Balkan Europe.

andrea.gullotta@unive.it

Mr Michele Tempera

Is responsible of the Business Guide Section. You can contact him for communications concerning the economic and business section and for the Informative Area issues.

michele.tempera@unibo.it

Ms Elvira Oliva

Is responsible for the Energy Policy Studies branch of the Portal. You can contact her for submitting requests and to obtain information about the Energy policy Study section.

elviraoliva@libero.it

www.pecob.eu



Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported (CC BY-NC-ND 3.0)

You are free:



to Share — to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:



Attribution — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).



Noncommercial — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.



No Derivative Works — You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

With the understanding that:

Waiver — Any of the above conditions can be **waved** if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Public Domain — Where the work or any of its elements is in the **public domain** under applicable law, that status is in no way affected by the license.

Other Rights — In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:

- Your fair dealing or **fair use** rights, or other applicable copyright exceptions and limitations;
- The author's **moral** rights;
- Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is used, such as **publicity** or privacy rights.

Notice — For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. The best way to do this is with a link to this web page.

This is a human-readable summary of the Legal Code (the full license).

Disclaimer

PECOB



Portal on Central Eastern and Balkan Europe
University of Bologna - Forlì Campus

PECOB

disseminates up-to-date materials, provides contents of high scientific value and raises the visibility of research works with the aim of facilitating national/international collaboration on the institutional level and promoting scientific research in the disciplinary fields concerning East-Central Europe, the Balkans, and the Post-Soviet space.

PECOB's Scientific Library

collects original scientific contributions selected through peer review process and published online as PECOBS volumes (with an ISBN code) or under the PECOBS papers series (with the ISSN code: 2038-632X).

It provides an opportunity for scholars, researchers and specialists to contribute a comprehensive collection of scientific materials on various topics (politics, economics, history, society, language, literature, culture and the media). Texts can be submitted in English as well as any language of the countries considered on PECOBS.

PECOB's Informative Area

offers continuously updated news regarding academic and cultural events and provides with information about, as well as access to, a large collection of publications and online news resources, academic centres and institutions.

PECOB's Business Guide

is an innovative instrument to monitor the region from an economic perspective, offering a selection of quality information, analyses and reports on business topics related to the region.

Supported by the University of Bologna, the portal is developed by the Institute for East-Central Europe and the Balkans (IECOB) with the collaboration of the Italian Association of Slavists (AIS) and the 'Europe and the Balkans' International Network.



CALL FOR PAPERS!
The Scientific Board of PECOBS announces an open call for papers to be published with ISSN 2038-632X

CALL FOR PAPERS!

Interested contributors may deal with any topic focusing on the political, economic, historical, social or cultural aspects of a specific country or region covered by PECOBS.

Potential contributors must submit a short abstract (200-300 words) and the full text, which can be in English as well as in any other language from the countries covered by PECOBS.

Upcoming deadlines for submitting proposals are:
January 31st
June 30th
November 30th

All texts must comply with PECOBS Submission Guidelines (www.pecob.eu).

All proposals, texts and questions should be submitted to
Ms Luciana Moretti
luciana.moretti@unibo.it or info@pecob.eu

Supported by the University of Bologna, the portal is developed by the Institute for East-Central Europe and the Balkans (IECOB) with the collaboration of the Italian Association of Slavists (AIS) and the 'Europe and the Balkans' International Network.

PECOB

www.pecob.eu