Bachelor Thesis General Economics

Differences in subjective well-being between Turkish migrants and Turkish natives

Abstract: This bachelor thesis tries to determine the influence of migration on the well-being of Turkish migrants. Since 1960, millions of Turks have left for (Western) Europe through bilateral labor agreements. To answer the research question: 'To what extent do Turkish migrants differ in well-being compared to Turkish stayers?', I analyzed the effect of migrant status on life satisfaction through an OLS regression. For the analysis, I used cross-sectional data from the 2000 Families survey, which consists of personal and family characteristics of over 2000 Turkish migrant and non-migrant families. Due to the voluntary aspect of the migratory flow, Turkish migrants are expected to report higher life satisfaction levels than Turkish stayers. The analysis has shown that this expectation does not hold for this sample. Migration status is strongly negatively correlated with life satisfaction. Moreover, this correlation is less negative for female migrants compared to male migrants. It has also been found that there are significant generational differences in the well-being effect of migration.

Name student: Mayessa Meftahi

Student ID number: 473146

Supervisor: Fatma Palut

Date final version: 01-03-2022

Table of contents

Introduction

The main purpose of migration is to improve life opportunities. Migrants leave their home country because they want to obtain better life opportunities than their parents had so that they can indirectly provide their own children with these opportunities that make it easier for them to live a happy life. This is one of the most familiar assumptions within migration literature. With this assumption in mind, my argument will be that when we look at the situation of Turkish migrants in Europe, Turkish migrants are expected to have left for Europe with the same aspirations. To further this line of analysis, I will examine the well-being effects of migration by comparing the life satisfaction of Turkish migrants that moved to Europe to that of non-migrants who stayed in Turkey. It is expected that Turkish migrants report a higher life satisfaction than their compatriots. This hypothesis will be examined using the well-known '2000 Families' study (Guveli et al., 2016), which lists personal and family-related information of three-generation genealogies of Turkish labor migrants and their compatriots from five high sending migration regions in Turkey.

While today geographical migration is a well-known social process in both developed and developing societies, the effects of migration on the subjective well-being of migrants remains an underexposed topic in migration research. The focus more often lies on the possible determinants of (internal) migration rather than looking at the consequences of migration. Some consequences of migration are mentioned, but these mainly discuss the income-related impacts of the migration process. Much can therefore be found about the effect of migration on post-migration income, educational success, or job market opportunities, but the mental health aspects and social impacts of the migration process are often neglected. As a further matter, the focus of these studies often lies only on the first generation migrants, while little is known about the following generations.

This paper will expand the existing literature on the well-being of Turkish migrants in Europe in the following ways. With regard to the well-being of Turkish migrants, divergent results can be found in existing literature because it is often not clear which group functions as a reliable counterfactual. Migrants are often compared to migrants of other origins within the same country of residence. Therefore, it is expected to believe that these migrants initially had different reasons to migrate, but also that they had their specific reasons to migrate to a particular destination country. Another comparison that is often made is between natives and migrants. Conclusions drawn from this comparison will not be very informative as these two

groups of individuals already differ in many ways prior to the migration decision. The fact that natives and migrants differ so much pre-migration is in itself a driver for migration, so statements made using this counterfactual will have little to no explanatory value. Comparing migrants to their compatriots would provide more useful information as it can give an idea of what the situation would have been had they not migrated. However, the fact that part of the population chooses to migrate and the other group does not, suggests that there are, in fact, (un)observable differences between the two groups. For the purpose of this research, it was decided to compare Turkish migrants who have migrated to Europe with comparable compatriots who have never left Turkey within five selected regions in Turkey. Migrants and stayers were selected within these five regions, so it can be argued that because both groups grew up in the same regions, the effects of unobserved pre-migration characteristics are minimized.

Subsequently, this paper will also expand the current literature by highlighting the importance of making a distinction in generations when approaching the effect of migration on well-being. The main focus in migration research usually lies on the first-generation migrants, or statements are made about large numbers of migrants in which all generations are lumped together. In order to gain insight into the changes in the determinants of the well-being of migrants over time, it is necessary to make a distinction between these generations.

The choice fell on Turkish migrants for multiple reasons. Firstly, together with Moroccan migrants, Turkish migrants are considered the largest migrant group in Europe (European University Institute, 2016). There are estimated to be more than 6.5 million Turkish citizens living abroad, of whom around 5.5 million live in Western European countries[1]. To gain insight into the well-being of Turkish migrants, the group size of the migrants can be an important factor. Larger groups of labor migrants are more likely to cling to traditional and cultural values that are based on the culture of origin. In addition, larger migrant groups usually experience more difficulty in the integration process compared to smaller migrant groups (Esser, 2004).

Secondly, the vast majority of these migratory flows were the result of bilateral labour agreements between European countries and Turkey. The 1960s were known as a period of a massive increase in labor migration between Turkey and Western Europe, making Turkey one of the main sources of labor and family migration of the last decades. These guest workers, as

[1] https://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-expatriate-turkish-citizens.en.mfa. This includes first-generation migrants who are born in Turkey, as well as second and third generations of Turkish descent, born abroad.

they were also called, left their home country because of differences in working conditions between Turkey and European countries. Large groups of unskilled men left for Western Europe over a period of 15 years. However, the European countries that provided these labour contracts did not take all the consequences into consideration. After the bilateral agreements came to an end in 1974, approximately 70 percent of the migrants chose to return to Turkey. The other portion of migrants anticipated staying for a longer period after settling down. Migrants who had left part of their families back in Turkey eventually brought relatives to be reunited with their family members. The period that followed mainly consisted of family reunification and refugees seeking asylum in Europe. Due to the primarily voluntary nature of this migratory flow in both receiving and sending countries, this makes Turkish migrants a migrant group that calls for a different approach in migration research compared to other migrant groups.

The third reason why Turkish migrants are relevant in migration studies is because they did not only have one country of destination within Europe. Turkish migrants are, unlike other migratory flows, not characterized by having only one destination country. Turkish migrants are currently distributed over about ten European countries. The European countries that have the largest share of Turkish-born citizens as a percentage of the total foreign-born population are Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria, and Denmark.[2].

The aim of this research is to gain insight into what extent Turkish migrants who migrated to Europe differ in levels of well-being compared to Turkish stayers. This will be followed with a question that functions as a sub-question that looks at whether there is any difference in migration effects between female migrants and males. Finally, attention will be paid to the question whether there are any generational differences in the assessed well-being of migrants and non-migrants. These questions will all be approached using the data from the 2000 Families study, using a wide range of econometric research methods.

It has become clear from the research that Turkish migrants report a significantly lower life satisfaction level than Turkish non-migrants, even after controlling for multiple control variables. In addition, among migrants, the migration status contributes to less negative life satisfaction for females compared to males. Finally, it was found that with respect to the second and third-generation migrants, the migrant status contributes to an almost equal negative correlation with life satisfaction. For first-generation individuals, no significant difference was

[2] Eurostat, 2021

found between the life satisfaction of migrants and non-migrants. This can be an indication that, besides the expected positive welfare effect of migration, the event of migration also results in negative consequences, which can lower the overall well-being of migrants.

The structure of the paper is as follows. It starts with an explanation of the concepts of well-being and migration. The hypotheses will then be elaborated by discussing findings from previous comparable studies. This will be followed by the data and methods that were used for the main experiment, to which the results will be discussed. Finally, the main findings will be listed, the limitations will be discussed, and suggestions will be made for further research.

2. Literature review

2.1 Well-being

To measure a society's overall well-being, economic measures such as GDP, national income, and consumption have often been viewed as the main indicators by researchers and policymakers. On the other hand, researchers and policymakers increasingly understand why people's individual well-being is important and perhaps more important than economic progress. However, there is still a lack of clarity within the research community as to how well-being should be measured and defined.

The term subjective well-being (SWB) is often used in well-being studies. Subjective well-being refers to people's own cognitive and affective evaluations of their lives (Diener, 2000) and is most often measured using terms like happiness and/or life satisfaction. Krueger (2009) describes subjective well-being in a way that distinguishes two components: the first component refers to how people experience their lives, also referred to as 'experienced happiness'. The second component relates to how one evaluates life, which is measured by overall life satisfaction, asking the question, "All things considered, how satisfied are you currently with your life as a whole?" This component of subjective well-being is more likely to respond to changes in living conditions compared to the more hedonic component (Diener, Ng, Harter, Arora, 2010), which is the reason why life satisfaction is a more relevant measure in migration studies compared to happiness.

Due to a lack of measures for life satisfaction, Diener et al. (1985) developed the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS), which he found gave the best representation of the subjective sense of well-being and life satisfaction. Subsequent research has shown that the SWLS serves as a valid and reliable measure of life satisfaction for use across all age groups. They also found evidence that subjective well-being is a global and stable phenomenon that is not based on temporal evaluations and momentary influences (Pavot, Diener, Colvin & Sandvik, 1991).

A person's overall life satisfaction can be seen as a convergence of satisfactions across different domains in a person's life (Cummins, 2005). However, Pavot & Diener (2013) explain that there can be differences in the weights assigned to these domains. They also argue that these weights have the ability to change over the course of a person's life. Many researchers agree on a set of conditions that contribute to a person's well-being level. These consist of economic conditions, family circumstances, health, and work. All these factors can vary depending on where you are located. This way, Turks migrating to Europe can result in an improvement of these domains, which will increase the well-being of these migrants.

2.2 Migration

Migration is the movement of (groups of) people from one place to another. One of the theories that dominate the earlier migration literature is the neoclassical migration theory. The neoclassical migration theory lists three main factors that are possible drivers of migration: interregional wage differences, the distance between origin and destination country, and the differences in labor market conditions, such as unemployment rates and labour productivity. According to this theory, if there are no differences in the expected earnings or employment rates of countries, workers do not have intentions to migrate. According to Borjas' (1989) well-known hypothesis, the inequality of wages and labor market opportunities causes unskilled individuals with lower labour market positions to migrate from places where income inequality is high and economic conditions are not prosperous to places with equal income distributions which offer low-skilled workers financial protection from economic downturns. To give a corresponding example, the introduction of the several bilateral labor agreements between Turkey and (Western) Europe created a huge demand for low-skilled workers from Turkey.

One of the main assumptions of the neoclassical migration theory is that migration mainly comes about through the economic comparisons of expected relative costs and benefits, with financial and psychological effects included (De Haas, 2010). The monetary factors that play a part in this comparison are often income and employment opportunities (Bartel 1979; Ghatak

et al., 1996). The other non-monetary factors that are taken into account in the calculation are aspirations and life satisfaction in the destination country (Diaz-Serrano & Stoyanova, 2009).

Migration can be seen as an instrument of achieving an improvement in subjective well-being. People migrate for a variety of reasons, but most have the expectation of improving their lives in some way. They migrate to take advantage of opportunities that are not available in their home country. Labour migrants, or economic migrants, in particular, would never make the journey to a distant foreign country if the living conditions in that country were worse than in the country of origin.

2.3 The impact of migration on well-being

The ‘hedonic treadmill theory’ or the ‘set-point theory’ often dominates the migration literature when it comes to the effects of migration on the overall well-being of migrants (Headey, 2010). This theory states that people have fixed levels of subjective well-being that are the result of genetics and personality. Major life events, such as migration, can thus cause a change in subjective well-being. However, according to the set-point theory, these events often have no permanent effect on subjective well-being. One will always return to their own fixed well-being levels or to so-called 'hedonic neutrality'. This is an indication that migration has no (long-term) effects on well-being. Since labour migrants initially migrate to realize a higher income, this must mean that the positive well-being effects of an increase in income will disappear over time. In the same trend, negative emotions associated with migration, such as loneliness and unhappiness, will also return to hedonic neutrality over time.

However, a paper by Diener, Lucas, and Scollon (2006) mentions five important revisions of the hedonic treadmill theory. First of all, they argue that individuals' set points are not hedonic neutral points. They then explain that people can have different set points linked to different components of well-being, all of which can have different directions. Besides, people have different set points, which is determined by temperament (which is most likely genetically determined), and individuals also differ in their ability to adapt their set points to certain external events. One of the most important revisions: well-being set points can change over time under some conditions. It follows that, contrary to the hedonic treadmill theory, there can indeed be a change in well-being levels among Turkish migrants after they have migrated.

Easterlin (2006) claims that an improvement in material conditions cannot lead to a permanent increase in subjective well-being because people will adapt to these conditions to which well-being returns to fixed levels. However, Easterlin also argues that changes in family and health

domains do result in permanent changes in subjective well-being. On the contrary, research on post-migration satisfaction by De Jong, Chamratrithirong & Tran (2002) showed that migration was associated with a decrease in post-migration satisfaction. Analysis of ESS data on intra-European migration, including Turkey, also showed that migrants do not necessarily experience greater happiness by migrating to a more wealthy society (European Social Survey, 2015).

2.4 Intergenerational assimilation of well-being among migrants

The straight-line assimilation paradigm assumes that migration entails an inherent psychological pain that slowly diminishes over time and over generations. According to this assumption, through the generations of migrants, migrants will increasingly become equal to natives. (Abramason, 1994; Alba, 1995, Alba & Nee, 2009). The increase in the life satisfaction of migrants across generations thus serves as an instrument to measure the progress of the intergenerational assimilation of well-being. Accordingly, when migrants report a lower average life satisfaction than natives, this indirectly means that the assimilation process has not yet been fully completed.

Safi (2010) has found in his research that first and second-generation migrants have a lower life satisfaction compared to later generations after controlling for a number of socio-economic factors. However, this difference does not increase over generations, which is in line with the assimilation hypothesis. The lower life satisfaction level of migrants does not seem to increase with time and across generations as the assimilation hypothesis predicts. Based on the assimilation theory, it will therefore be expected that Turkish migrants have an overall lower life satisfaction compared to Turkish stayers because of the psychological impact of migration, but that this difference decreases over the generations because of the intergenerational assimilation of well-being.

2.5 The impact of other socio-economic factors on well-being

Income

Although there are indicators that people in wealthier countries are more satisfied with their lives than people in less prosperous countries, the relationship is not always convincing. For example, the well-known Easterlin-paradox points out that there is no long-term relationship between growth in income and happiness. The Easterlin-paradox is not a U.S.-specific phenomenon as it shows the same trend in European countries, including Germany, Britain, Ireland, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Greece. (Easterlin, 1995). Easterlin (2005) also mentions that in contrast to the standard model of diminishing utility on

income, it turns out that there is no question of any return on income. Cantrill (1965) explains this by pointing out that material aspirations increase with society's income. The aspirations of less developed people are more modest as they do not know all that is potentially available as income increases.

Another study by Kahneman & Deaton (2010) has even shown that a certain saturation point exists at which more income no longer causes an increase in emotional well-being, which refers to the emotional quality of an individual's everyday experience. They also conclude that high incomes can buy life satisfaction but are not able to buy happiness. Likewise, Clark, Frijters & Shields (2008) mentioned that once an individual rises above a poverty line or so-called "subsistence level", the main source of increased well-being is more likely to be explained by friends and good family life than income does.

Education

Within the well-being domain, there is a popular finding that there exists an inverse relationship between intelligence or education and life satisfaction. Being considered 'ignorant' will have to bring more happiness in life. However, these claims are disproved by a number of researchers by finding a (slightly) positive correlation between an individual's educational level and subjective well-being (Witter et al., 1984). With respect to intelligence, however, the link with subjective well-being does not appear to exist (Furnham & Petrides, 2003).

With regard to the occupational situation of individuals, various studies have found that professionals are characterized by a higher degree of subjective well-being, while unskilled workers report relatively the lowest subjective well-being (Veenhoven, 1984). There is no consensus in the literature about subjective well-being depending on the level of education. For example, in some studies, slightly lower subjective well-being was found in the highly educated. However, the differences are limited (Campbell et al., 1976; Easterlin, 2001). In addition, there are also studies in which no significant differences are found or where a statistically negative relationship is even established (lower level of education increases subjective well-being). Furthermore, it was established in a number of studies that the association of education and life satisfaction could be attributed to the influence of the respondents' income level. In this sense, it is not the level of education per se that has an influence on subjective well-being but the income level associated with it (Veenhoven, 1984).

Gender

Theoretically, the cost-benefit analysis dominates the migration literature; people are expected to act rationally and only make the decision to migrate whenever the expected benefits exceed the expected costs of migration. However, when multiple people are involved in this decision, one may no longer act rationally as the decision will be made based on the collective return of the family and not on the individual level (Cooke, 2008). For example, it is possible that certain family members do not benefit from migration while other members, and the family as a whole, do benefit. Family migration, which is a big part of Turkish migratory flows to Europe, can therefore ensure that migration has negative effects on certain family members.

There are differences in the outcomes of migration when looking at lead and tie migrants (van Ham & Büchel, 2006). Men are more likely to be lead migrants, which refers to the migrants that make the decision to move abroad to work as labor migrants. Women are more likely to be tied migrants, following their partners across the border (Mincer, 1978), even if the woman is the highest-earning family member (Cooke, 2003), or if she has a higher job occupation compared to her partner (Boyle et al., 1999). In addition, several researchers found that the position of women in the labor market decreased after the migration (Boyle et al., 1999; Halfacree, 1995; Mincer, 1978). After migration, women are less likely to be employed, tend to have smaller incomes, and work fewer work hours than the average female (Boyle et al., 1999). However, there are results indicating that married women have returned to pre-migration levels of income after a period of three years (Clark & Huang, 2006). The labor market position of men post-migration, on the other hand, is usually positive.

Although much research has been done on the differences in well-being levels between men and women, so far, there is no clear difference in subjective well-being (van Ham & Büchel, 2006). However, it is known that women rather live at the extreme ends of the well-being scale due to the intensity in how they experience emotions. While men and women do not differ in overall subjective well-being, they do differ in the intensity of emotional experiences (Diener et al., 1999).

Since labor market-related factors such as occupation can indeed have an effect on subjective well-being, based on the results stated above, it will be expected that Turkish female migrants will have lower subjective well-being than Turkish male migrants.

Marital Status

A constant in the empirical research on the relationship between subjective well-being and marital status of individuals is that married individuals generally have higher subjective well-being. This was also found in studies where the influence of other variables such as education, income level, occupation, and age was kept constant (Argyle, 1987). The subjective well-being of respondents who are divorced or widowed is significantly lower (Bradburn, 1969). Some argue that the differences in subjective well-being depending on whether or not they are married are increasing (Mastekaasa, 1993), while other studies indicate that the difference is decreasing (Veenhoven, 1983).

Not only the people that are married are characterised by higher levels of subjective well-being, but also those who have a permanent partner (irrespective of being married or not) (Veenhoven, 1984). Living with a partner can be seen as the closest bond with others which in turn results in higher subjective well-being. With regard to the above findings, it is important to understand that only civil marriages are recognized in Turkey. Contrary to the cohabitation contracts used in Europe, no other forms besides the official marriage have been recognized in Turkey. Considering the fact that living together with a partner results in higher subjective well-being, it is expected that marriage will have an equal effect on subjective well-being for Turks, as Turks are not familiar with living together without marital conditions.

Age

The relationship between age and subjective-well being is not clear-cut. In general, individual well-being tends to decline with age (Horley and Lavery, 1995) though the relationship between age and well-being is rather quadratic than linear. Blanchflower & Oswald (2008) conducted an extensive study to examine the effect of age on subjective well-being. They tested the U-curve by using the data of approximately 500,000 Americans and Europeans and found a U-shape, keeping all other factors constant. The minimum of the U-curve is estimated to be around the age of 40. Mroczec & Spiro (2005) also mention the increase of subjective well-being from the age of 40 to 65, after which the positive effect gradually decreases as death approaches.

It is noted that older people have a higher general life satisfaction and are somewhat happier. On the other hand, the elderly experience fewer positive feelings but also fewer negative feelings. Various studies have shown that young people have a more eventful emotional life (Headey et al., 1984; Heady, 1993).

3. Data

3.1 Data description

For the implementation of the empirical research, it was decided to use the data from the 2000 Families survey (Guveli et al., 2016). Finding a good counterfactual for this analysis is difficult because no matter how similar one may be pre-migration, there will still be a difference in the motive for migrating, which cannot be explained by observable differences. However, this dataset is most appropriate for this study because it contains not only the information of Turkish migrants but also data of Turkish stayers who come from the same region. These regions were selected because they were major migrant-sending regions when the bilateral labour agreements were introduced (1960-1974). Thus, Turks who decide to migrate can be compared to their compatriots back home, who are expected to differ only in the incentive to migrate.

The data consists of family-specific information of almost 2000 migrant and non-migrant families over three generations. In total, family data and personal data are available on more than 40,000 individuals. The method used to sample the families was by systematic random sampling within the five pre-selected Turkish regions; Acıpayam, Akçaabat, Emirdağ, Kulu , and Şarkışla. The region that was only used for the pilot study (Sivas) was not used for this research.

The migrant and stayer families were selected by random walks, starting by identifying the first-generation migrants and stayers. The first generation is defined as a male ancestor, either dead or alive (1), who is born between 1921 and 1946 (2), grew up in the selected regions (3), moved to Europe between 1960 and 1974, and stayed there for at least five years (4). If all these conditions were met, the family labeled as "migrants". The same criteria applied to determine the counterfactual or “stayers”, however, they were selected if the male ancestor had not moved to Europe. For each qualified male ancestor, his data and the data of the descendants were collected.

The family tree questionnaire recorded basic demographic information of families such as the country the family members moved to, how long they stayed, gender, and ages of all the family members. The personal questionnaire provided more detailed socio-economic data on the first generation migrants and stayers and a maximum of two of his children and again on a maximum

of two of their children who are all above the age of 18. A total of 5,980 personal interviews were carried out in the period of 2010-2012. Since many socio-economic factors have been shown to be associated with well-being, it was decided to exclusively use the data on the personal interview for the use of this study.

The dependent variable in the regression is life satisfaction. The dependent variable was measured with the question (H5): "All being considered, how satisfied are you with your life?", that is responded by using a 5-point Likert response format. Participants were asked to what extent they agree with this statement, with one representing 'highly dissatisfied' and five representing 'very satisfied'. Within well-being studies, other extensive approaches are used to measure life satisfaction, including the satisfaction with life scale (SWLS), developed by Diener (1985). However, the SWLS has no application in this study as the dataset only asks one question on the valuation of the participants' life, whereas the SWLS poses multiple extensive questions regarding the valuations of one's life.

The main independent variable is the migration status of the individual. In order to find out the migration history of the respondents, a variable called 'migstat' was constructed. This variable is further subdivided into seven categories, of which only two are used for this study, being the 'Non-migrant' and the 'Migrant'. Migrant status is assigned when one is born in Turkey, has moved to Europe, and still (mostly) lives in Europe. The non-migrant is someone born in Turkey who has never left the country.

Whether someone is married is constructed by the response to the marital status question (K13). One is considered married when actually being married or when being in a civil partnership with their spouse. All other categories, including single, divorced, and widowed, are considered to be not married. The highest level of education obtained was measured using a constructed variable based upon the Common Education Level Metric (CELM), which equalized the different levels of education across all countries. The variable is divided into seven levels, starting with the respondent being a primary school dropout up to primary school, lower secondary, upper secondary, lower tertiary (vocational), lower tertiary (BA), and higher tertiary education (Masters/Ph.D.). For the analysis, it was decided to regard the highest educational level as a continuous variable. The reason for this is because the education levels of different countries have been equalized by means of the CELM. It can now be assumed that every education level increases by the number of academic years so that the highest level of education

attained comes close to being a continuous variable. The other reason to designate the highest education level as continuous is that it makes the interpretation in OLS easier. Basic controls have also been added, such as the age (agea) and gender (sexa) of the respondent, as well as the age squared to capture the enhanced U-curve effect of age on well-being. The last control variable added to the regression is the region variable. In this way, the possible effects of shared unobserved characteristics between individuals from the same region can be limited.

3.1 Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows the basic descriptive statistics on these variables. Looking at these statistics, it can be seen that the average life satisfaction of migrants is lower than the average life satisfaction of non-migrants. This prediction was also made based on the assumption of the assimilation paradigm mentioned in the literature above. Furthermore, it can be seen that the average age among migrants is higher than among non-migrants and that for this sample, the proportion of females is higher among non-migrants compared to migrants. Also, the percentage of married individuals is higher among migrants than non-migrants, and the average highest educational level is higher for non-migrants than for migrants. The following conclusions can be drawn about the regions from which the respondents of the total sample originate. There are three times more non-migrants coming from Akçaabat than migrants (36.9% versus 12.0%). Also, nearly four times as many migrants originate from Emirdağ than non-migrants (30.4% versus 8.3%).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Total Sample by Migrant Status

	Non-Migrant		Migrant	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Life satisfaction	2.112	0.833	1.990	0.714
Age	37.793	15.576	46.796	15.334
%Female	45.0		31.7	
%Married	66.8		86.7	
Highest Education	3.298	1.503	2.964	1.197
Region				
%Sarkisla	9.9		13.0	
%Acıpayam	28.0		15.1	
%Akçaabat	36.9		12.0	
%Emirdağ	8.3		30.4	
%Kulu	16.9		29.6	
N	2,050		1,390	

Note: The mean values for income are based on smaller sample sizes compared to the sample of the rest of the means. The mean income of non-migrants is computed using a sample of n = 1,627. The mean income of migrants is the average of n = 961 observations. p* indicates $p < 0.10$. ** indicates $p < 0.05$. *** indicates $p < 0.01$. Source: 2000 Families Study.

3.2 Average levels of reported life satisfaction by the destination country

To get a better picture of the distribution of Turkish migrants across European countries and the associated life satisfaction of these migrants, the average reported life satisfaction levels of migrants in each destination country are shown in Table 2. The total number of migrants who migrated to these countries is also listed. What becomes clear from Table 2 is that Turkish individuals who migrated to the Netherlands and Belgium report the highest average life satisfaction compared to the average life satisfaction levels of the whole sample (2.07 and 2.03 versus 1.99). The countries that report the lowest average life satisfaction compared to the average are Switzerland and Norway (1.79 and 1.83 versus 1.99). However, this last conclusion is based on a sample of 14 observations per country, which does not entail any explanatory value.

Table 2

Average Levels of Reported Life Satisfaction among Migrants by Destination Country

Country	Average Life Satisfaction	Observations
Germany	1.99 (0.738)	493
Belgium	2.03 (0.694)	233
Netherlands	2.07 (0.743)	152
France	1.98 (0.673)	120
Denmark	1.98 (0.733)	109
Austria	1.96 (0.634)	100
Sweden	1.96 (0.749)	97
Switzerland	1.79 (0.579)	14
Norway	1.93 (0.475)	14
Total	1.99 (0.715)	1,390

Note. Of the total sample, 24 observations representing eight countries, with the fewest observations per country, were excluded. Values in round brackets indicate the standard errors of the coefficient. Source: 2000 Families Study.

4. Analysis & Results

4.1 OLS regression

In order to explain the potential differences in life satisfaction between Turkish migrants and stayers, it was decided to perform an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. For the first regression, the explanatory variable migrant status was used to predict and explain the dependent variable life satisfaction. For regressions in which an ordinal variable is designated as a dependent variable, the ordered logistics regression is usually recommended in economics literature since the differences between the different categories are not likely to have equivalent distances. Blanchflower & Oswald (2004) have shown in their research that a simple OLS regression with three-point scales generates similar results to the ordered logit model. With regard to this study, a side-by-side comparison of the results of the OLS regression and ordered logistic model achieves a similar conclusion. The results of the ordered logistic model are shown in Appendix A. For this reason, the variable life satisfaction will be considered to be a continuous variable in order to use life satisfaction as the dependent variable in the OLS

regression. Likewise, the results of this analysis will be entirely based on the OLS regression results, considering that the argumentation of the results of the ordered logistic regression are more complicated.

Model 1 of Table 3 shows the bivariate comparison of migrant status on life satisfaction. It is clear that migrant status contributes to a significantly lower life satisfaction with an average of 0.124 points lower than non-migrants and with a constant life satisfaction level of 2.116. However, it is unlikely that the variance in life satisfaction is only explained by the migrant status. By adding control variables to the regression of Model 2, the residual variation in life satisfaction will be absorbed by the control variables, creating a more precise estimate of migrant status. With the addition of the control variables, the R-squared has increased from 0.0058 to 0.0355. This indicates that the variance in life satisfaction is explained more by the variables in Model 2 compared to the bivariate comparison of Model 1. The constant has also increased to a life satisfaction level of 2.156.

With respect to the estimates of the control variables, the first and perhaps most important point to notice is that the migrant estimate has become more negative after adding the control variables. The estimate went from -0.124 to -0.161. This means that migrant status significantly contributed to lowering life satisfaction when controlling for personal characteristics. This correlation is significant at the 1% significance level hence demonstrating a strong correlation. It can be assumed that part of the correlation in the variable migration status in Model 1 is explained by the control variables, which causes this decrease in the migrant estimate.

In Model 2, age is the only variable that has a positive correlation with life satisfaction. This means that, on average, an individual's life satisfaction increases with age. With each additional year of life, life satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 increases by an average of 0.033 points. This correlation is also significant at the 1% significance level, hence indicating a strong correlation. Age squared, however, has no positive correlation with life satisfaction. Instead, it shows a negative correlation with life satisfaction which means that if age goes up, the average life satisfaction goes up as well, but once people get older, this positive effect diminishes. Whether one is married or not appears to make a significant difference when looking at Table 3. Being married has a significant negative correlation with life satisfaction. Individuals who are married have an average life satisfaction of 0.184 points lower compared to people who are not married.

The highest attained education level is also important for determining one's life satisfaction. Model 2 shows that an increase in school-level results in an average lower life satisfaction. This correlation is significant at the 1% significance level and thus indicates a strong negative correlation. It is also remarkable that the regions show significant negative correlations with life satisfaction. This may mean that the life satisfaction of migrants and non-migrants partly depend on the region from which they originate. Compared to the base region Şarkışla, it can be seen that all regions have lower life satisfaction. This may indicate that, although systematic random sampling was used to select the families within each region, clear differences in life satisfaction exist across regions, beyond the fact that these regions were selected for the 2000 Families study. For the sake of this research, this is a good sign as it shows that part of the variance in migration status can be attributed to the different regions, which means that the estimate of migrant status is more accurate in Model 2 compared to Model 1.

In order to be able to give an answer to the question if there are differences in life satisfaction when being a female or male migrant, an interaction term of female and migrant status has been added to Model 3. As can be seen in Table 3, the interaction term is statistically significant at the 10% significance level and suggests a positive correlation. What has become clear from this outcome is that among migrants, females report less negative life satisfaction compared to male migrants—being a male migrant result in an average decrease in life satisfaction of 0.194 points compared to non-migrants. For female migrants, this estimate is significantly higher, with a 0.103 point decrease in life satisfaction. The difference in life satisfaction between female and male migrants is 0.091 points. So for male migrants, the effect of being migrant results in lower life satisfaction compared to female migrants.

In addition to this finding, among females, non-migrant females report lower life satisfaction than migrant females. Being a non-migrant female, on average, decreases life satisfaction by 0.10 points compared to males. For female migrants, this estimate is significantly less negative, with an average decrease in life satisfaction of 0.013 points. The difference in life satisfaction between female migrants and non-migrants is 0.091.

Table 3

Regression Coefficients on Determinants of Life Satisfaction

	Model (1) OLS	Model (2) OLS + Independent variables	Model (3) + Interaction term Female
Migrant	-0.124***	-0.161***	-0.194***
Age		0.033***	0.032***
Age^2		$-3.344*10^{-4}$***	$-3.271*10^{-4}$***
Female		-0.071***	-0.104***
Married		-0.184***	-0.183***
Migrant * Female			0.091*
Highest Education		-0.067***	-0.067***
Region			
Acıpayam		-0.186***	-0.185***
Akçaabat		-0.123**	-0.122**
Emirdağ		-0.110*	-0.112*
Kulu		-0.126**	-0.127**
Constant	2.116	1.917	1.940
R-squared	0.0058	0.0355	0.0362
N	3,423	3,118	3,118

Note: Regression method: OLS. Dependent variable: life satisfaction. Reference category for region is Şarkışla. * indicates $p < 0.10$. ** indicates $p < 0.05$. *** indicates $p < 0.01$. Source: 2000 Families study.

4.2 Family fixed effects

A family fixed effects model is included in Table 4 using the same variables as those used for the OLS regression of Model 2 of Table 3, with the family code used to account for all fixed aspects within each unique family code. An important thing to note is that all regions are omitted in the fixed effects model since people with the same family code come from the same regions. Looking at the differences between the two models, it is obvious that in the family fixed effects model, migrant status no longer has a significant effect on life satisfaction. A possible explanation for the differences between these estimates is that the standard OLS regression involves household selection. This means that households that generally have higher life satisfaction are more likely to migrate. By controlling for these within-household

characteristics, migration has no effect on life satisfaction which results in an insignificant estimate of migration status.

However, it is likely that the family fixed effects model does not show representative results since fixed-effect models require a reasonable sample size with sufficient observation in each group. In this case, it concerns 1,479 groups with an average of 2.1 observations per group. Fewer than five observations per group can be problematic as the variances, and their standard errors may be underestimated, which will affect the statistical power of the model (McNeish & Stapelton, 2016). It is not possible to be certain whether household selection causes a major problem in the research. However, for the remainder of the thesis, it is assumed that the OLS regression provides the most representative outcome.

Table 4

Regression results using family fixed effects

Variable	Coefficient
Migrant	-0.095
Age	0.041***
Age^2	$-0.3.961*10^{-4}$***
Female	-0.033
Highest Education	-0.042**
Married	-0.226***
Constant	1.478
	(0.166)
R-squared	0.0355
F (6,1633)	10.02
Prob > F	0.000
N	3,118

Note: Regression method: OLS including family fixed effects. Dependent variable: life satisfaction. Regression clustered by family code. The number of groups 1,479 with an average group size of 2.1. Within groups r-squared is reported. * indicates $p < 0.10$. ** indicates $p < 0.05$. *** indicates $p < 0.01$. Values in round brackets indicate the standard errors of the coefficient. Source: 2000 Families study.

4.3 OLS regression across generations

In order to be able to make statements about the generational differences in the life satisfaction of migrants and stayers, useful information is listed in Table 5. An OLS regression has been executed with the same variables as the previous regressions, subdivided over three generations. To draw valid conclusions about the data, it is important to pay close attention to the number of observations per generation. For the first generation, this number is 367, which is lower than the observations for generations 2 and 3. This can reduce the explanatory power of coefficients of the first generation.

For the first generation, it is clear that there are no significant differences in life satisfaction between migrants and non-migrants. In addition, age, age squared, marriage, and highest education level do not show statistically significant correlations with life satisfaction. However, a correlation can be seen in the regions Acıpayam and Emirdağ, both of which have a fairly strong negative correlation with life satisfaction. This may mean that for first-generation migrants and non-migrants, the region of origin is the only factor in which Turks differ with respect to life satisfaction.

If we look at the second generation, it is important to notice that the results are almost identical to the results of the main OLS regression of Table 3. Indeed, migrant status has a strong negative correlation with life satisfaction, as does age squared, female, marriage, and highest education level. Age is, just like in Table 3, the only positive coefficient, which predicts that the older one gets, the higher the average life satisfaction will be. In contrast to the first generation, the regions are not correlated with life satisfaction for this generation. This can be a positive sign since for the second generation, there are no differences in life satisfaction based on where one originates from. This indicates a selection process in which there are no possible pre-study differences in life satisfaction between the five selected regions.

Finally, it can be seen from Table 3 that third-generation Turkish migrants, on average, have lower life satisfaction than third-generation stayers. This finding is in line with the finding of the second generation and, therefore, also in line with the results of Table 3. Even if the differences are not large, this migration effect is stronger for third-generation migrants with an estimate of -0.173 compared to an estimate of -0.169 for second-generation migrants. This is not what was expected based on the discussed literature. The expectation was that the negative

migration effect on life satisfaction would decrease for the generations. This is not the case for this group.

Age has a significant positive effect on life satisfaction at the 10% significance level. However, age squared has no significant effect on life satisfaction. This can be explained by the possible low average age of the third generation, which is why the U-curve of happiness is not yet mapped out. This argument may also explain the less strong correlation of age with life satisfaction compared to the second generation and to the overall age result in the regression of Table 3. Female also has a significant negative correlation with life satisfaction, as well as married and highest education level. However, the negative correlation of the highest education level is less negative than for the second generation. The regions of Acıpayam, Akçaabat, and Kulu are significantly negatively correlated with life satisfaction. So for this generation, it does make a difference from which region they originate for determining their average life satisfaction levels.

When looking at the statistics of Table 5 in total, it is clear that the results are almost entirely driven by the second generation and partly from the third generation. This may be an indication that the second generation is over-represented in the total sample. Looking at the number of observations per generation, this may be the case since there are 1,674 observations for the second generation, 1,073 for the third generation, and only 367 observations for the first generation.

The first generation was selected for the 2000 Family study when they were between the age of 65 and 90 years old in the period 2010-2012, and if they had migrated between 1960 and 1974. A possible explanation for the insignificant correlation of migrant status on life satisfaction for the first generation is that the positive and negative effects of migration will disappear over time, which results in migrants returning to their fixed levels of life satisfaction. This is consistent with the predictions of the set-point theory. Moreover, the first generation is older than the other generations, which is why age and age squared show no significant correlations with life satisfaction because of the small range in age. It is, therefore, more difficult to establish the quadratic relationship of age and life satisfaction with OLS when you have this small range of age.

Another possible explanation for the corresponding results of generation 2 with the regression of Table 3 might be the wider range of characteristics compared to the other generations. The main difference between the second and third generations is the statistical significance in age and age squared. This can be explained by the possible smaller range in age at the younger side of the third generation, despite the larger amount of observations compared to the first generation. This may also be the reason why the age squared U-curve does not exist for this generation either, just like for the first generation, which was on the older side.

Table 5

OLS Regression Results of Generations

	Generation 1 (IKE)	Generation 2	Generation 3
Migrant	-0.105	-0.169***	-0.173***
Age	-0.002	0.040**	0.044*
Age^2	$4.580*10^{-5}$	$-4.584*10^{-4}$**	$-5.075*10^{-4}$
Female		-0.079**	-0.096**
Married	-0.275*	-0.253***	-0.157**
Highest Education	-0.006	-0.079***	-0.055***
Region			
Acıpayam	-0.500**	-0.125	-0.214**
Akçaabat	-0.271	-0.063	-0.176**
Emirdağ	-0.403*	-0.038	-0.084
Kulu	-0.202	-0.112	-0.150*
Constant	2.605	1.937	1.729
R-squared	0.0396	0.0379	0.0344
N	367	1,674	1,073

Note. Regression method: OLS. Dependent variable: life satisfaction. First-generation female is omitted as no females were selected as first-generation migrants. The reference category for region is Şarkışla. * indicates $p < 0.10$. ** indicates $p < 0.05$. *** indicates $p < 0.01$. Source: 2000 Families Study

Discussion

It is important to consider one of the main shortcomings of this study. The dataset used for this study consists of cross-sectional data and therefore has no information about the pre-migration levels of life satisfaction. Consequently, the results will most likely suffer from endogeneity. There is a possibility that migrants initially reported higher life satisfaction levels than non-migrants and that this serves as the main determinant of migration. This study also adds other socio-economic variables that have associations with life satisfaction which can also explain pre-migration differences between migrants and stayers. For example, a higher education level could be an indication of whether people qualified to migrate in the first place. It is therefore important to keep in mind that the following statistics will not be causal in nature. All correlations that were drawn are based on correlations and associations. For further research, it is therefore recommended to use panel data in order to discover the differences in pre-migration and post-migration life satisfaction over time.

Another specific note about this analysis concerns the use of family data. The sample used for the analysis contains relatives from the same family tree. The use of family data carries the risk that unobserved (genetic) characteristics within families explain why someone is or is not inclined to migrate. Take education as an example. It could be the case that migrants with a higher IQ, who, therefore probably have a higher level of education, are more likely to migrate than people with a lower IQ. Adding IQ to the regression using family data could result in a biased estimate for IQ on life satisfaction, assuming that IQ is a genetic characteristic. However, it can also serve as an identification strategy in itself. By examining the effect of migration on life satisfaction within a family, a large proportion of characteristics that might explain the intentions to migrate are automatically controlled for.

With regard to the scale on which life satisfaction is measured in the 2000 Family dataset, Cummins and Gullone (2000) recommended using an 11-point Likert scale rather than using a 5-point Likert scale for life satisfaction. This ensures higher scale sensitivity, as the 5-point Likert scale gives too little variance. More answer categories do not lower the scale validity but instead increase the scale sensitivity as the respondents can give more precise answers.

Conclusion

The migration literature often looks at the determinants of migration and the economic consequences of migration. However, the individual well-being consequences of migration are considered an underexposed topic. In this paper, I have made an attempt to analyse the differences in well-being between Turkish migrants and Turkish stayers in order to determine the effect of migration on well-being. The main conclusion that can be drawn from the analysis is that for Turkish migrants, migration status is negatively correlated with life satisfaction. This means that keeping all other variables constant, Turkish migrants have a lower average life satisfaction than their Turkish counterparts. This is in line with the literature discussed since migration does have negative consequences to the overall well-being, which, despite the positive economic consequences, for example, can lead to a decrease in life satisfaction. Moreover, in the reviewed literature, it is stated that due to the negative effect of migration on well-being, migrants generally have a lower life satisfaction than non-migrants, indicating that these migrants are not fully assimilated into the society the country of residence.

I also found evidence that among migrants, being a female result in a less negative correlation with life satisfaction compared to males. This finding was not in line with the expectations raised by the discussed literature. According to the literature, after the migration process, women tend to have more problems in the labor market, while men do not. Since the occupational situation can have an effect on life satisfaction, the expectation was raised that being a female migrant would result in a more negative correlation with well-being compared to male migrants.

Finally, the differences in life satisfaction between the different generations were examined. The originality in the results lies in the corresponding outcome of the main regression and the outcome of the second and third generations. This means that the second and third generations are the main drivers for the overall research outcome. This may be because these generations are over-represented in the study or because the first generation has been assimilated in such a way that the migration status has no additional negative effect on life satisfaction compared to non-migrants.

For further research, one could consider broadening the perspective of the well-being effects of migration. For example, longitudinal data on the life satisfaction of migrants and non-migrants can be used to investigate the long-term effect of migration on the well-being of migrants. Besides, when panel data is used instead of cross-sectional data, it is more likely that causal statements can be made.

In addition, the perspective can be broadened by examining other population groups besides Turks. However, each population group has different determinants of well-being, and this needs to be further investigated. In general, it will hence be useful to conduct further research into the determinants of well-being as these can change over time and differ from generation to generation. Especially now that we are situated in a global pandemic, it is even more important to examine the well-being effects of migration since well-being is likely to suffer.

Bibliography

Abramson, H., & Themstrom, S. (1994). Assimilation and Pluramlism, *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups.* Cambridge, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Akgündüz, A. (2008). Labour Migration from Turkey to Western Europe, 1960–1974: A Multidisciplinary Analysis (1st ed.). Routledge.

Alba, R. (1995) Assimilation's Quiet Tide. *Public Interest*, 119, 3-18.

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2009). *Remaking the American mainstram*. Assimilation and contemporary immigration. Harvard University Press.

Argyle, M. (1987). *The psychology of happiness*. London: Methuen.

Bartel, A. P. (1979). The migration decision: What role does job mobility play? The *American Economic Review, 69*(5), 775-786.

Blanchflower, D. G., & Oswald, A. J. (2004). Well-being over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics*, *88*(7-8), 1359-1386.

Blanchflower, D. G., & Oswald, A. J. (2008). Is well-being U-shaped over the life cycle? *Social Science & Medicine, 66(*8), 1733-1749.

Borjas, G. J. (1989). Economic theory and international migration. *International Migration Review, 23*(3), 457-485.

Boyle, P., Cooke, T., Halfacree, K., & Smith, D. (1999). Gender inequality in employment status following family migration in GB and the US: the effect of relative occupational status. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 19*(9-11), 109-143.

Bradburn, N. M. (1969). *The structure of psychological well-being*. Chicago: Aldine.

Campbell, A. (1976). Subjective measures of well-being. *American Psychologist, 31*(2), 117.

Cantrill, H. (1965). *Pattern of human concerns*. Rutgers University Press.

Clark, A. E., Frijters, O., & Shields, M. A. (2008). Relative income, happiness and utility: An explanation for the Easterlin paradox and other puzzles. *Journal of Economic Literature, 46*(1), 95-144.

Clark, W. A., & Huang, Y. (2006). Balancing move and work: women's labour market exits and entries after family migration. *Population, Space and Place, 12*(1), 31-44.

Cooke, T. J. (2008). Migration in a family way. *Population, space and place, 14*(4), 255-265.

Cooke, T. J., (2003). Family migration and the relative earnings of husband and wives. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 93(*2), 338-349.

Cummins, R. A., & Gullone, E. (2000). Why we should not use 5-point Likert scales: The case for subjective quality of life measurement. In *Proceedings, second international conference on quality of life in cities, 74*(2), 74-93.

Cummins, R. A., (2005). The domains of life satisfaction: An attempt to order chaos. In *Citation classics from social indicators research* (pp. 559-584). Springer, Dordrecht.

De Haas, H. (2010). The internal dynamics of migration processes: A theoretical inquiry. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 36*(10), 1587-1617.

De Jong, G. F., Chamratrihirong, A., & Tran, Q. C. (2002). For better, for worse: life satisfaction consequences of migration. *International Migration Review, 36*(3), 838-863.

Diaz-Serrano, L., & Stoyanova, A. P. (2010). Mobility and housing satisfaction: An empirical analysis for 12 EU countries. *Journal of Economic Geography, 10*(5), 661-683.

Diener, E. D., (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for national index. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 34.

Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment 49*(1), 71-75.

Diener, E. D., Lucas, R. E., & Scollon, C. N. (2009). Beyond the hedonic treadmill: Revising the adaptation theory of well-being. In *The science of well-being* (pp. 103-118). Springer, Dordrecht.

Diener, E. D., Ng, W., Harter, J., & Arora, R. (2010). Wealth and happiness across the world: material prosperity predicts life evaluation, whereas psychological prosperity predicts positive feeling. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*(1), 52.

Diener, E. D., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(2), 276.

Easterlin R. A. (2005). Diminishing marginal utility of income? Caveat emptor. *Social Indicators Research, 70*(3), 243-255.

Easterlin, R. A. (1995). Will raising the incomes of all increase the happiness of all? *Journal of Economic Behaviour & Organization, 27*(1), 35-47.

Easterlin, R. A. (2001). Income and happiness: Towards a unified theory. *The Economic Journal, 111*(473), 465-484.

Easterlin, R. A. (2006). Life cycle happiness and its sources: Intersections of psychology, economics, and demography. *Journal of Economic Ppsychology, 27*(4), 463-482.

Esser, H. (2004). Does the "New" Immigration Require a "New" Theory of Intergenerational Integration? *The International Migration Review, 38*(3), 1126-1159.

European Social Survey. (2015). Measuring and reporting on Europeans' well-being. Findings from the European Social Survey.

European University Institute. Migration Policy Centre. (2016). Migration profile : Turkey. Issue 2016/09, December 2016. Publications Office.

Furnham, A., & Petrides, K. V. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence and happiness. *Social Behaviour and Personality: An International Journal, 31*(8), 815-823.

Ghatak, S., Levine, P., & Price, S. W. (1996). Migration theories and evidence: an assessment. *Journal of Economic Surveys, 10*(2), 159-198.

Guveli, A., Ganzeboom, H. B. G., Baykara-Krumme, H., Platt, L., Eroğlu, S., Spierings, N., Bayrakdar, S., Nauck, B. & Sozeri, E. K. (2016): 2,000 Families: identifying the research potential of an origins-of-migration study, Ethnic and Racial Studies.

Halfacree, K. H. (1995). Household migration and the structuration of patriarchy: evidence from the USA. *Progress in Human Geography, 19*(2). 159-182.

Headey, B. (1993). An economic model of subjective well-being: Integrating economic and psychological theories. *Social Indicators Research, 28*(2), 97-116.

Headey, B. (2010). The set point theory of well-being has serious flaws: on the eve of a scientific revolution? *Social Indicators Research, 97*(1), 7-21.

Headey, B., Holström, E., & Wearing, A. (1984). The impact of life events and changes in domain satisfactions on well-being. *Social Indicators Research, 15*(3), 203-227.

Horley, J., & Lavery, J. J. (1995). Subjective well-being and age. *Social Indicators Research, 34*(2), 275-282.

Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 107*(38), 16489-16493.

Krueger, A. B. (Ed.). (2009). *Measuring the subjective well-being of nations: National accounts of time use and well-being*. University of Chicago Press.

Mastekaasa, A. (1993). Marital status and subjective well-being: A changing relationship? *Social Indicators Research, 29*(3), 249-276.

McNeish, D. M., & Stapleton, L. M. (2016). The effect of small sample size on two-level model estimates: A review and illustration. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*(2), 295-314.

Mincer, J. (1978). Family migration decisions. *Journal of Political Economy, 86*(5), 749-773.

Mroczek, D. K., & Spiro III, A. (2005). Change in life satisfaction during adulthood: findings from the veterans affairs normative aging study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(1), 189.

Pavot, W., & Diener, E. D., (2013). Happiness experienced: The science of subjective well-being. *The Oxford Handbook of Happiness*, 134-151.

Pavot, W., Diener, E. D., Colvin, C. R., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Further validation of the Satisfaction with Life Scale: Evidence for the cross-method convergence of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 57*(1), 149-161.

Safi, M. (2010). Immigrants' life satisfaction in Europe: Between assimilation and discrimination. *European Sociological Review, 25*(2), 159-176.

Van Ham, M., & Büchel, F. (2006). Unwilling or unstable? Spatial and socio-economic restrictions on females' labour market access. *Regional Studies, 40*(3), 345-357.

Veenhoven, R. (1983). The growing impact of marriage. *Social Indicators Research, 12*(1), 49-63.

Veenhoven, R. (1984). *Conditions of Happiness*. Springer Publishing.

Witter, R. A., Okun, M. A., Stock, W. A., & Haring, M. J. (1984). Education and subjective well-being: A meta-analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6*(2), 165-173.

Appendix A

Table 6

Ordered Logistic Regression

	Coefficient
Migrant	-0.402***
Age	0.086***
Age^2	$-8.786*10^{-4}$***
Female	-0.131
Married	-0.402***
Highest Education	-0.159**
Region	
Acıpayam	-0.547***
Akçaabat	-0.301*
Emirdağ	0.241
Kulu	0.297*
/cut 1	-0.999
/cut 2	2.156
/cut 3	3.402
/cut 4	4.461
Log Pseudolikelihood	-3182.055
Pseudo R2	0.016
Wald Chi2(37)	95.39
N	3,118

Note: Dependent Variable: life satisfaction. Reference category for region is Şarkışla * indicates $p < 0.10$. ** indicates $p < 0.05$. *** indicates $p < 0.01$. Source: 2000 Families study.