

The effects of education on spouse's satisfaction in Europe

Garcia, Inmaculada; Molina, Jose Alberto; Navarro, María

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Garcia, I., Molina, J. A., & Navarro, M. (2008). The effects of education on spouse's satisfaction in Europe. *Applied Economics*, 42(28), 3607-3618. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840802314572>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



The effects of education on spouse's satisfaction in Europe

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-07-0492.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-May-2008
Complete List of Authors:	Garcia, Inmaculada; University of Zaragoza Molina, Jose Alberto; University of Zaragoza; Institute for the Study of Labor-IZA Navarro, María; FEDEA
JEL Code:	I20 - General < I2 - Education < I - Health, Education, and Welfare, I31 - General Welfare Basic Needs Living Standards Quality of Life < I3 - Welfare and Poverty < I - Health, Education, and Welfare, D10 - General < D1 - Household Behavior and Family Economics < D - Microeconomics
Keywords:	Education, Spouses, Income satisfaction, Europe



The effects of education on spouses' satisfaction in Europe

INMACULADA GARCÍA^a, JOSE-ALBERTO MOLINA^b and MARIA NAVARRO^c

^a *Department of Economic Analysis, University of Zaragoza (Zaragoza, Spain)*

^b *Department of Economic Analysis, University of Zaragoza (Zaragoza, Spain), and Institute for the Study of Labor-IZA (Bonn, Germany)*

^c *FEDEA (Madrid, Spain)*

Abstract: This paper identifies the effects of both own and spouse's education levels on individual economic satisfaction for European households. To that end, it estimates several specifications based on the family collective approach, for each of the 14 EU countries, by using the eight waves of the European Community Household Panel-ECHP (1994-2001). After demonstrating that the IV Hausman-Taylor procedure is the selected estimation method in the majority of cases, the empirical results show that male and female income satisfaction significantly increases when the husband achieves higher education qualifications in the majority of European countries. However, the positive effect of the wife's higher education on female income satisfaction only appears in a very limited number of countries. Additionally, increases in individual wage and non-wage incomes generally lead to higher satisfaction levels.

Key words: Education, Spouses, Income satisfaction, Europe

JEL classification: I20, I31, D10

Correspondence: J.A. Molina. Department of Economic Analysis, University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain. Phone: 34 976 761818, Fax: 34 976 761996, E-mail: jamolina@unizar.es

I. INTRODUCTION

The existing state of research on individual satisfaction suggests that reported subjective well-being is a satisfactory empirical approximation of individual utility, that can be applied in socio-economic research (Oswald, 1997; Easterlin, 2002; Frey and Stutzer, 2002; Hamermesh, 2004). The evidence adduced to date has shown that education appears to have a significant impact on the different satisfaction domains of individuals. For example, Van Praag *et al.*, (2003) conclude that individuals with higher education are significantly more satisfied with their health, thus indicating that more highly educated individuals enjoy a healthier life style. Belfield and Harris (2002), Gazioglu and Tansel (2006) and Fleming and Kler (2007) also find a significant relationship between satisfaction and educational level. For their part, Clark and Oswald (1994 and 1996) and Clark *et al.* (1996) observe that highly educated people are less content with respect to their job satisfaction when other factors (income, etc.) are controlled for. The possible explanation here is that this low level of contentment might result from the significant reduction in income of those with lower qualifications. Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Van Praag (2003) produce ambiguous evidence for income satisfaction in Germany. On the one hand, they find that more education leads to more efficient consumption, which would appear to point to a positive effect on income satisfaction; on the other hand, more education widens the individual's horizon, thereby giving rise to increased expectations, which carries with it a negative effect as anticipated by neoclassical economic theory.

Despite the clear relevance of the evidence, the effects of education on satisfaction have usually been studied in a way that does not reflect the fact that the household is composed of interdependent spouses. The literature reflects only a limited number of exceptions to this approach. Thus, Schwarze (2004) finds that parental life satisfaction increases with a child's

1
2
3 years of education. Health and education can serve as an approximation of income or future
4 earnings, as has been confirmed in Blanchflower and Oswald (2004). In this way, if parents
5 make some level of investment in their children's education while the children are still young,
6 they can expect some returns when they become older. Thus, a positive impact of children's
7 education on parental life satisfaction can also be driven by an exchange motive. Within
8 couples, Groot and Maassen Van Den Brink (2002) study the effect of age and education
9 differences between spouses on happiness, finding that female life satisfaction increases if the
10 education gap between husband and wife is smaller.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 In this line of modelling individual satisfaction within the household, as a fully
24 interdependent process, this paper assumes the collective approach, in which one spouse's
25 satisfaction not only depends on his/her own determinants, but also on the other spouse's
26 variables, in order to model the effects of both own and spouse's education levels on
27 individual economic satisfaction (Chiappori, 1988, 1992; Browning and Chiappori, 1998;
28 Chiappori *et al.*, 2002). Additionally, we also consider the influence of other individual and
29 economic variables, such as age, the number of children, wages and non-wage incomes. The
30 collective approach adopted in this paper makes it possible to derive some stochastic
31 formulations which are then estimated for 14 EU countries, using the panel structure which
32 results from the eight waves of the European Community Household Panel-ECHP (1994-
33 2001).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 With respect to the estimation strategy, this takes the form of four consecutive
50 estimations, namely pool, fixed effects, random effects and efficient generalized instrumental
51 variables. The fixed or random effects methods correct the heterogeneity bias that appears
52 when the use of subjective variables could imply that some people look at life either
53 pessimistically or optimistically, even though there is "really" no difference in their level of
54 well-being (Clark and Oswald, 2002; Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters, 2004; Senik, 2004).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Moreover, it is well known that individual behaviour is oriented towards achieving higher
4 satisfaction levels. As a consequence, all the variables which can be chosen by individuals
5 will be endogenous in the satisfaction regression, in such a way that the majority of estimated
6 parameters obtained by standard regressions are likely to be underestimated. A standard
7 solution to this endogeneity bias, which depends on the degree that individuals can choose
8 their actions in order to be better off, is to use instrumental variables (Powdthavee, 2004;
9 Schwarze, 2004). After carrying out all these estimations, the strategy selects the one that is
10 statistically most appropriate in every case, by using the LM value, as well as two Hausman
11 tests (Baltagi *et al.*, 2003).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the following section we describe the
26 data. Next section is dedicated to the stochastic formulation. The following section is devoted
27 to the empirical results and, finally, we close the paper with a summary of the most relevant
28 conclusions.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 II. DATA

39
40 Bearing in mind that the purpose of the study is to study the effects of both own and spouse's
41 education levels on individual economic satisfaction, for individuals who work as wage
42 earners, the data used in this work comes from the eight waves of the ECHP (1994-2001) for
43 each of the 14 sample EU countries.¹ In our study, households have been selected in which
44 both spouses are aged between 16 and 65 years old. Individuals both with and without
45 children have been included in these households. Those households lacking the required
46 information have been excluded, resulting in two sub-samples, male wage earners and female
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ¹ The ECHP is an extensive, sample-based panel survey in which the same households and individuals are interviewed annually. The data come from a standardised questionnaire and are designed to be cross-nationally comparable (Peracchi, 2002).

1
2
3 wage earners, with the number of observations ranging from France (17,623 husbands and
4
5 13,589 wives) to Luxembourg (1,288 husbands and 774 wives).
6
7

8
9 The ECHP includes questions about several subjective aspects of well-being, enquiring
10 into the level of satisfaction that individuals reach with respect to different aspects, such as
11 their income. The specific question this paper is interested in is: “How satisfied are you with
12 your financial situation?”. Each of these responses takes values from 1 to 6, moving from not
13 satisfied at all (1) to completely satisfied (6). This satisfaction question is based on
14 individuals’ own perception, in such a way that Table 1 begins by showing the simple means
15 which are comparable across the populations, after assuming linearity across responses.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation of the dependent variables used in the
27 analysis. The dependent variables are husband and wife income satisfaction (*HusbSatisf*,
28 *WifeSatisf*). Starting with the male sample, it can be appreciated that for male wage earners,
29 these generally declare higher satisfaction levels than their respective wives in the majority of
30 the sample countries, namely Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy,
31 Portugal and Spain. With respect to the female sample, it emerges that female wage earners
32 report higher satisfaction levels than their respective husbands, this being the case for all
33 sample countries, save Portugal.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 (Table 1)
46
47

48 With respect to the exogenous variables, the study includes both own and spouse’s
49 education levels (*HusbPrimEduc*, *HusbSeconEduc*, *HusbHighEduc*, *WifePrimEduc*,
50 *WifeSeconEduc*, *WifeHighEduc*), as well as a number of individual characteristics and several
51 economic variables. As regards individual characteristics, they include the age of the spouses
52 (*HusbAge*, *WifeAge*), the age difference between the spouses (*AgeDifference*), as well as two
53 other variables which refer to the presence of children in the household: a dummy variable
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 indicating if there is a child under 12 in the household (*Children<12*), and another indicating
4 the number of children under 16 (*Children<16*). Additionally, we include the percentages of
5 self-employed and wage-earning wives in the husband's sample (*WifeWage-Earner*, *WifeSelf-*
6 *Employed*), and the percentage of self-employed and wage-earning husbands in the wife's
7 sample (*HusbSelf-Employed*, *HusbWage-Earner*). With respect to the variables which refer to
8 the economic situation of the household, these include the wages of both spouses (*HusbWage*,
9 *WifeWage*), as well as the annual non-wage incomes of both the husband and the wife
10 (*HusbNon-WageInc*, *WifeNon-WageInc*), and the wife's participation in the household income
11 (*WifeParticipation*).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Table 2 shows the mean and the standard deviation of each of the exogenous variables
26 used in the analysis. As regards the education level, it can be noted in the majority of
27 countries, and for both samples of wage-earners, that wives generally show a higher
28 percentage than husbands for the primary education level. By contrast, the percentage of
29 husbands who have attained higher education levels is generally greater than that
30 corresponding to wives, with this evidence appearing generally in the male sample, but not at
31 all in the female sample. The percentage of husbands who have secondary education is higher
32 than that corresponding to wives who have attained this level, this being the case in both
33 samples of male and female wage-earners, with the exceptions only of Germany and Ireland.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 (Table 2)
48
49

50 In every sample country analysed, the age of the husband is greater than that of the wife
51 in both samples of males and females. The age difference is greater for the female sample,
52 with the highest mean value corresponding to Greece in both sample groups, where this age
53 difference reaches 4.6 years. With respect to the variables that refer to the presence of
54 children in the household, note that the percentages are higher in the male sample (where
55 wives can be either wage-earners or self-employed) in the majority of the countries, namely in
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the
4
5 Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom, with the highest values corresponding to
6
7 Austria. However, there appears to be clear evidence that the mean number of children under
8
9 16 is higher for the sample of male wage-earners than for the female sample, this being the
10
11 case in every sample country.
12
13
14

15
16 From this simple descriptive analysis it also emerges that the husband's mean income
17
18 per hour is higher than that of the wife's for both male and female wage-earners in every
19
20 sample country. We can further note the smaller wage gap in the sample of female wage-
21
22 earners, and the highest values being reached for the male sample in Finland and
23
24 Luxembourg. With respect to non-wage annual incomes, the wife's non-wage income is
25
26 higher than that of the husband's in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece,
27
28 Ireland and the United Kingdom in the male wage earner sample. However, in the female
29
30 wage-earner sample, the husband's non wage income is higher than that of the wife in every
31
32 country, save Belgium and Denmark. Finally, note the higher percentage of wage-earner
33
34 wives, as compared to self-employed wives, in the sample of male wage-earners and of
35
36 female wage-earners, respectively, in all EU sample countries.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 III. THE MODEL

46
47 This section develops the model specification and its estimation procedure. In order to
48
49 describe the empirical specification to model the effects of both own and spouse's education
50
51 levels on individual economic satisfaction, we first adopt the family collective approach. On
52
53 the basis of the assumption that intra-household decisions are Pareto-efficient, this approach
54
55 considers that the household consists of two working-age individuals, $A =$ husband and $B =$
56
57 wife, whose rational preferences could be represented by indirect utility functions, defined in
58
59
60

terms of their own exogenous variables, as well as in terms of the other member's variables. Moreover, the panel data structure provided by the ECHP permits the application of techniques that help to control for unobservable heterogeneity. On these theoretical and empirical bases, the stochastic formulation underlying the observed subjective well-being responses takes the form of linear functions:

$$v_{it}^I = \mu_{it}^I + \delta_1^A ED_{it}^A + \delta_2^B ED_{it}^B + \delta_3^A z_{it}^A + \delta_4^B z_{it}^B + \beta_1^A w_{it}^A + \beta_2^B w_{it}^B + \beta_3^A y_{it}^A + \beta_4^B y_{it}^B + \alpha_i^I + e_{it}^I$$

$$i = 1, \dots, N; t = 1, \dots, T; I = A, B \quad (1)$$

where v_{it} corresponds to the income subjective satisfaction of the individual i in period t , with this t being the current period, whereas an individual can be in the sample a maximum of T periods. This dependent variable, v_{it} , is explained, according to the collective framework, by a number of exogenous variables. Thus, ED_{it} and z_{it} represent the education and other socio-demographic characteristics, respectively; w_{it} and y_{it} are wages and non-labour incomes; the parameters δ and β represent the coefficients; μ and α are constant terms, with μ being the average population and α the individual deviation with respect to this average; and, finally, e are the error terms that are supposed to be independent, with null mean and constant variance. These equations are estimated independently for both spouses, in such a way that N is the number of households in the sample.

The estimation strategy follows these steps.² First, each equation is estimated separately, considering the aggregated data, that is to say, a pool estimation is carried out. A panel data structure is then used in order to estimate functions, considering individual effects, both fixed and random. As is well known, the difference between the two lies in the fact that, while, in

² Given the ordinal nature of the dependent variable on individual satisfaction, an appropriate regression model would be an ordered probit. However, while a random-effects ordered probit model is available in standard statistical software packages (Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Van Praag, 2003; Schwarze, 2004; Winkelmann, 2005), the fixed-effects ordered probit estimator is not. This is why the present paper uses as approximations both random-effects and fixed-effects regression models, which are perfectly comparable by using habitual tests (D'Ambrosio and Frick, 2004; Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters, 2004; Graham *et al.*, 2004).

1
2
3 the case of fixed effects, the α coefficients are considered as fixed values for each individual,
4
5 in the specification of random effects, the specific aspects of each spouse are taken as
6
7 independent random variables.
8
9

10
11 Consideration is also given to an alternative estimation procedure suggested in the
12
13 literature, namely the Efficient Generalized Instrumental Variables (EGIV), proposed by
14
15 Hausman and Taylor (1981).³ The method followed in this paper uses as instruments the
16
17 individual time averages of the variables (the individual's own wage, the presence of children
18
19 under 12, the number of children under 16, the spouse's own wage, male and female non-
20
21 labour income, the wife's participation in household income, own age and a dummy that
22
23 indicates if the individual is self-employed) for the time-invariant variables that are correlated
24
25 with the individual effects (the age difference between the spouses, the individual's own
26
27 education levels, and the spouse's higher education level). Thus, this procedure allows for the
28
29 simultaneous control of the correlation between regressors and unobserved individual effects,
30
31 by using instruments. Similarly, it permits the identification of the estimates of the time-
32
33 invariant covariates, such as education. Moreover, it avoids the insecurity associated with the
34
35 choice of suitable instruments, since the individual means over time of all the included
36
37 regressors can serve as valid instruments. Additionally, the variance-covariance structure can
38
39 be taken into account so as to obtain more efficient estimators.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 This EGIV method is implemented in the following steps. First, equations (1) are
48
49 estimated by pooled Two Stage Least Squares (2SLS), where the set of variables mentioned
50
51 above act as instruments. Second, the pooled 2SLS residuals are used to construct the weights
52
53 for a Feasible Generalized Least Squares estimator. Third, these weights are used to transform
54
55 (by quasi-time demeaning) all the dependent variables, explanatory variables and instrumental
56
57
58

59
60 ³ The recent work by Baltagi *et al.*, (2003) provides information on the suitability of the Hausman-Taylor procedure in a general framework where panel data is available and some regressors are correlated with the individual effects.

1
2
3 variables. Finally, the transformed regression is again estimated by pooled 2SLS, where the
4 individual means over time of the time-varying regressors, and the exogenous time-invariant
5 regressors, are the instruments. Under the full set of assumptions, this Hausman and Taylor
6 estimator coincides with the efficient GMM estimator.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 After estimating the four alternative specifications, some appropriate econometric tests
14 allow for the best formulation to be selected in every case. In particular, an LM test indicates
15 if a panel or a pool estimation is preferred. If a panel estimation is selected, then a choice
16 must be made from among the three alternative specifications, with two Hausman tests
17 allowing the best panel estimation to be selected (Hausman, 1978).⁴ The first Hausman test
18 (Hausman-1) is the standard to distinguish between the random and fixed effects estimators,
19 and the second (Hausman-2) tests the Hausman-Taylor against the fixed effects model.⁵
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 IV. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

34
35 Table 3 includes the empirical results for both sub-samples, male wage earners and female
36 wage earners. We begin with a brief description of the test results that allows us to select a
37 particular estimation procedure for each sample country. First, the LM tests indicate that the
38 pool estimation is not selected in any sample country. Second, Hausman-1 tests reveal that the
39 fixed effects estimation is preferred over random effects and, third, Hausman-2 tests indicate
40 that, for all cases, save for male wage earners in Austria, the Hausman-Taylor estimation is
41 preferred over the fixed effects.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 (Table 3)
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ⁴ See, for details, Hausman and Taylor (1981), Wooldridge (2002) and Baltagi, Bresson and Pirotte (2003).

⁵ The 8.0 version of Stata includes the Hausman-Taylor procedure and is used to obtain the estimates presented in this paper

1
2
3 With respect to the education variables, we show that income satisfaction significantly
4 increases when husbands achieve higher education qualifications, with this result appearing in
5 a significant number of cases, particularly Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain,
6 the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Similar results have been obtained in Ferrer-i-
7 Carbonell and Van Praag (2003); Van Praag, Frijters and Ferrer-i-Carbonell (2003) and
8 Frijters, Haisken-DeNew and Shields (2004). As regards the effect of a wife's higher
9 education on her husband's income satisfaction, this appears to increase in France, which can
10 be interpreted as that the wife can better appreciate the necessary effort of her husband to
11 reach a certain level of income and, therefore, according to the cooperative nature of the
12 relationship between spouses, this assessment increases the husband's satisfaction with
13 respect to his level of income. By contrast, the effect decreases in Finland and Germany,
14 where the wife's higher education does not imply a higher assessment of her spouse's effort
15 to reach a certain level of income.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Wives' higher education increases income satisfaction of wives in Greece, Ireland and
35 Portugal. The wife is affected more than the husband by the spouse's education level, in such
36 a way that income satisfaction is increased when the husband has received higher education,
37 in the cases of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Portugal and the United
38 Kingdom. Groot and Maasen Van Den Brink (2002) find that husbands typically tend to be
39 older and higher educated than their wives. Education differences between spouses can effect
40 marital stability and divorce rates, in such a way that life satisfaction increases when the
41 education gap is smaller. This is also the case of Finland and Germany, where we can note
42 that the effect of the wife's education on the husband's satisfaction runs in the opposite
43 direction.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

61 Additionally, we can observe that the effect of age is significantly positive for male
62 wage earners in the majority of countries, namely Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Greece,

1
2
3 Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain. This same result appears for the
4 wife's age in the female samples of Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, The
5 Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom. Groot and Maasen Van Den Brink (2002) find
6 that a positive age gap between husband and wife increases both male and female satisfaction,
7 and we find an increase in female satisfaction in Finland and Greece. The effects of the
8 presence of children vary across countries, also depending on age. Thus, we find that if the
9 child is under 12, then the effect is positive in Spain and negative in Austria, Denmark,
10 France and the Netherlands for male wage earners. For the female sample, we can observe the
11 same result and, in addition, a negative effect in Italy and the United Kingdom, but a positive
12 effect in Greece. Moreover, if the age is less than 16 years, then the effect is positive for male
13 wage-earners in France and Luxembourg, and negative in Belgium, Denmark, Germany,
14 Greece, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom. For the female sample, it is similarly negative
15 in Denmark, Greece, Ireland and the United Kingdom, but positive in France.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Turning to the economic variables, it can be observed that increases in the husband's wage has, according to the normality assumption, a highly significant positive impact on male satisfaction for the majority of cases, particularly for both samples in Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain. Moreover, this same positive effect from the wife's wage is also observable for both samples in France, Greece and Portugal. For their part, Belgium, France, Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain show altruistic behaviour with respect to wage incomes, in such a way that male satisfaction positively depends on female wages, and female satisfaction on male wages. By contrast, all male workers in Austria, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom exhibit egoistic behaviour, with their utilities remaining indifferent to changes in their wives' labour incomes. With respect to non-wage incomes, the husband's variable has a clearly positive effect on male and female income satisfaction in Greece and Portugal. Finally, it can be noted that increases in

1
2
3 the female's share of household income increases male income satisfaction in Finland,
4
5 Ireland, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, and decreases it in Belgium and the United
6
7 Kingdom. Finally, note that when the wife's participation in household income increases, so
8
9 her satisfaction increases in the cases of Italy, Portugal and the United Kingdom.
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 V. CONCLUSIONS

17
18
19 This paper has analysed the effects of both own and spouse's education levels, as well as
20
21 other individual and economic variables, on economic satisfaction for the case of European
22
23 households. To that end, we have assumed a collective family model framework, whose
24
25 empirical specifications (pool, fixed effects, random effects and efficient generalized
26
27 instrumental variables) have been estimated using the eight waves of the ECHP (1994-2001).
28
29
30

31
32 With respect to the selected formulation, the empirical results show that the IV
33
34 Hausman-Taylor estimator has been selected in the majority of cases. As regards the relevant
35
36 variables for this article, male income satisfaction significantly increases when the husband
37
38 achieves higher education qualifications in Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands,
39
40 Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom. Female income satisfaction is positively related to
41
42 her education level in Greece, Ireland and Portugal; and, additionally, to the husband's
43
44 education level in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal
45
46 and the United Kingdom.
47
48
49

50
51 As regards other determinants, age has a significantly positive impact on income
52
53 satisfaction for wage earners in the majority of countries. With respect to the economic
54
55 variables, it first appears that increases in individual wage and non-wage incomes lead to
56
57 higher satisfaction levels. Moreover, with respect to interrelations between spouses, our
58
59 results reveal that in France, Greece and Portugal, all workers, whether male or female, show
60

1
2
3 altruistic behaviour with respect to wage incomes, while in Finland, both male and female
4
5 workers exhibit egoistic behaviour.
6
7

8
9 An understanding of individual satisfaction derived from income within the household
10
11 could be particularly useful for policy-makers in evaluating socio-economic policies. Thus,
12
13 the empirical conclusions drawn from this study will hopefully assist in the drafting of such
14
15 policies, that have the objective of increasing the satisfaction levels reported by the spouses
16
17 within the household.
18
19

20
21 There appears to be support for such policies, e.g. the reduction in class sizes, that has
22
23 been shown to improve children's education outcomes (Bingley *et al.*, 2005). Moreover,
24
25 while it is clear that both genders have benefited from progress in the sphere of education,
26
27 these advances have failed to eradicate the gender gap. Compulsory education laws are not
28
29 sufficient to equalize attendance rates, so special policies should be enacted aimed at
30
31 increasing the number of women benefiting from education, such as building more schools in
32
33 remote rural areas, or providing correspondence courses. However, the costs associated with
34
35 school attendance, as well as opportunity costs, are high and the perceived benefit of formal
36
37 education for girls is low, which could reduce the demand for education on the part of some
38
39 groups in certain developing countries.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

49
50
51 This paper was partially written while José Alberto Molina was Visiting Fellow at the
52
53 Department of Economics of the University of Warwick (UK), to which he would like to
54
55 express his thanks for the hospitality and facilities provided. An earlier version of this paper
56
57 has been presented at the Spanish Economic Analysis Meeting-2004 (Pamplona, Spain), as
58
59 well as at the Department of Economics of the University of Warwick-2005 (Warwick, UK),
60

1
2
3 with all the comments made by the participants, particularly those of Ian Walker, being highly
4 appreciated. Moreover, the authors would like to express their thanks to one anonymous
5 referee for helpful comments and suggestions. Thanks are due also for the financial support
6 provided by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science and FEDER (Project SEC2005-
7 06522), by the BBVA Foundation and the DGA. The usual disclaimer applies.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Baltagi, B. H., Bresson, G., and Pirotte, A. (2003) Fixed effects, random effects or Hausman-Taylor? A pretest estimator. *Economics Letters*, **79**, 361-369.
- Belfield, C.R. and Harris, R.D.F. (2002) How well do theories of job matching explain variations in job satisfaction across education levels? Evidence for UK graduates. *Applied Economics*, **34**, 535-548.
- Bingley, P., Myrup Jensen, V., and Walker, I. (2005) The effects of school resources on participation in post-compulsory education: Danish quasi-experimental evidence, and evidence that controls for family, school and neighbourhood effects. Mimeo.
- Blanchflower, D. G., and Oswald, A. J. (2004) Well-being over Time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics*, **88**, 1359-1386.
- Browning, M., and Chiappori, P-A. (1998) Efficient intra-household allocations: a general characterization and empirical tests. *Econometrica*, **66**, 1241-1278.
- Chiappori, P-A. (1988) Rational household labour supply. *Econometrica*, **56**, 63-89.
- Chiappori, P-A. (1992) Collective labour supply and welfare. *Journal of Political Economy*, **100**, 437-467.
- Chiappori, P-A., Fortin, B., and Lacroix, G. (2002) Divorce legislation and household labour supply. *Journal of Political Economy*, **110**, 37-71.
- Clark, A. E., and Oswald, A. J. (1994) Unhappiness and unemployment. *Economic Journal*, **104**(424), 648-659.
- Clark, A. E., and Oswald, A. J. (1996). Satisfaction and Comparison Income. *Journal of Public Economics*, **61**, 359-381.

- 1
2
3 Clark, A. E., and Oswald, A. J. (2002) A simple statistical method for measuring how life
4 events affect happiness. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, **31**, 1139-1144.
5
6
7
8 Clark, A.E., Oswald, A.J. and Warr, P. (1996) Is Job Satisfaction U-shaped in Age? *Journal*
9 *of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, **69**, 57-81.
10
11
12
13 D'Ambrosio, C., and Frick, J. R. (2004) Subjective well-being and relative deprivation: an
14 empirical link. *IZA Discussion Paper Series*, No. 1351.
15
16
17
18
19 Easterlin, R.A. (2002) *Happiness in Economics*. Edward Elgar.
20
21
22 Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. and Frijters, P. (2004) How Important is Methodology for the
23 Estimates of the determinants of Happiness? *Economic Journal*, **114**, 641-659.
24
25
26
27 Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. and Van Praag, B. (2003) Income Satisfaction Inequality and its
28 Causes. *Journal of Economic Inequality*, **1**, 107-127.
29
30
31
32 Fleming, C. M. and Kler, P. (2007) I'm too clever for this job: a bivariate probit analysis on
33 overeducation and job satisfaction in Australia. *Applied Economics*, **40**, 1123-1138.
34
35
36
37 Frey, B.S., and Stutzer, A. (2002) What can Economists Learn from Happiness Research?
38 *Journal of Economic Literature*, **40**, 402-435.
39
40
41
42 Frijters, P., Haisken-DeNew, J., and Shields, M. (2004) Money does Matter! Evidence from
43 Increasing Real Incomes and Life Satisfaction in East Germany following
44 Reunification. *American Economic Review*, **94**, 730-740.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Gazioglu, S. and Tansel, A. (2006) Job satisfaction in Britain: individual and job related
52 factors. *Applied Economics*, **38**, 1163-1171.
53
54
55
56 Graham, C., Eggers, A., and Sukhtankar, S. (2004) Does happiness pay? An exploration
57 based on panel data from Russia. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, **55**,
58 319-342.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Groot, W., and Maassen van den Brink, H. (2002) Age and education differences in marriages
4 and their effects on life satisfaction. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, **3**, 153-165.
5
6
7
8
9 Hamermesh, D.S. (2004) Subjective outcomes in economics. *Southern Economic Journal*, **71**,
10 1-11.
11
12
13
14 Hausman, J. A. (1978) Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica*, **46**, 1251-1271.
15
16
17 Hausman, J. A., and Taylor, W. E. (1981) Panel data and unobservable individual effects.
18
19 *Econometrica*, **49**, 1377-1398.
20
21
22 Oswald, A.J. (1997) Happiness and Economic Performance. *Economic Journal*, **107**, 1815-
23 1831.
24
25
26
27 Peracchi, F. (2002) The European Community Household Panel: a review. *Empirical*
28
29 *Economics*, **27**, 63-90.
30
31
32
33 Powdthavee, N. (2004) Mental risk-sharing in marriage: evidence from panel data. *The*
34
35 *Warwick Economics Research Paper Series No 798*.
36
37
38 Schwarze, J. (2004) Living Conditions of Children and Parental Well-being: Evidence from
39
40 German Data on Life Satisfaction. *IZA Discussion Paper Series*, No. 1200.
41
42
43 Senik, C. (2004) Relativizing relative income. *DELTA Working Paper*, No. 2004-17.
44
45
46 Van Praag, B., Frijters, P. and Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. (2003) The Anatomy of subjective well-
47
48 being. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, **51**, 29-49.
49
50
51 Winkelmann, R. (2005) Subjective well-being and the family: results from an ordered probit
52
53 model with multiple random effects. *Empirical Economics*, **30**, 749-761.
54
55
56 Wooldridge, J. M. (2002) *Econometric Analysis of Cross-Section and Panel Data*. MIT Press.
57
58
59
60

Table 1. *Mean and std. dev of dependent variables of husbands and wives*

	Austria	Belgium	Denmark	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Ireland	Italy	Luxembourg	The Netherlands	Portugal	Spain	United-Kingdom
Husbands														
HusbIncSatisf	4.327 (1.21)	4.159 (1.14)	4.635 (1.05)	4.093 (1.08)	3.698 (1.16)	3.915 (1.16)	3.319 (1.13)	3.819 (1.32)	3.403 (1.20)	4.252 (1.25)	4.619 (0.93)	3.259 (0.99)	3.419 (1.28)	3.896 (1.06)
WifeIncSatisf	4.256 (1.35)	4.157 (1.22)	4.580 (1.16)	4.067 (1.16)	3.703 (1.20)	3.847 (1.26)	3.165 (1.14)	3.910 (1.37)	3.292 (1.24)	4.327 (1.27)	4.706 (0.95)	3.071 (1.03)	3.385 (1.31)	3.993 (1.06)
Number of observations	7615	8284	8356	6280	17623	5764	8814	5295	17344	1288	16442	13612	15524	8427
Wives														
HusbIncSatisf	4.235 (1.30)	4.086 (1.16)	4.594 (1.09)	4.065 (1.14)	3.738 (1.16)	3.868 (1.20)	3.388 (1.20)	3.774 (1.37)	3.612 (1.20)	4.149 (1.30)	4.624 (0.96)	3.261 (1.02)	3.469 (1.33)	3.859 (1.08)
WifeIncSatisf	4.389 (1.26)	4.208 (1.11)	4.641 (1.10)	4.170 (1.09)	3.826 (1.10)	3.897 (1.22)	3.393 (1.15)	3.967 (1.31)	3.617 (1.18)	4.278 (1.27)	4.739 (0.93)	3.221 (0.99)	3.559 (1.31)	3.996 (1.03)
Number of observations	5523	6604	7790	6513	13589	4399	4884	3800	10403	774	12218	10271	7600	7839

Table 2. Mean and std. dev of exogenous variables of husbands and wives

	Austria	Belgium	Denmark	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Ireland	Italy	Luxembourg	The Netherlands	Portugal	Spain	United-Kingdom
Husbands														
HusbPrimEduc	0.123 (0.33)	0.227 (0.42)	0.190 (0.39)	0.188 (0.39)	0.272 (0.44)	0.175 (0.38)	0.428 (0.49)	0.391 (0.49)	0.486 (0.50)	0.484 (0.50)	0.213 (0.41)	0.823 (0.38)	0.579 (0.49)	0.354 (0.48)
HusbSeconEduc	0.780 (0.41)	0.324 (0.47)	0.426 (0.49)	0.447 (0.50)	0.434 (0.50)	0.493 (0.50)	0.281 (0.45)	0.371 (0.48)	0.379 (0.49)	0.286 (0.45)	0.527 (0.50)	0.102 (0.30)	0.174 (0.38)	0.226 (0.42)
HusbHighEduc	0.089 (0.29)	0.369 (0.48)	0.378 (0.48)	0.360 (0.48)	0.235 (0.42)	0.331 (0.47)	0.287 (0.45)	0.227 (0.42)	0.107 (0.31)	0.228 (0.42)	0.242 (0.43)	0.063 (0.24)	0.247 (0.43)	0.404 (0.49)
WifePrimEduc	0.271 (0.44)	0.243 (0.43)	0.216 (0.41)	0.183 (0.39)	0.315 (0.46)	0.307 (0.46)	0.520 (0.50)	0.392 (0.49)	0.508 (0.50)	0.595 (0.49)	0.294 (0.46)	0.806 (0.40)	0.635 (0.48)	0.446 (0.50)
WifeSeconEduc	0.631 (0.48)	0.299 (0.46)	0.399 (0.49)	0.381 (0.49)	0.375 (0.48)	0.551 (0.50)	0.243 (0.43)	0.430 (0.50)	0.374 (0.48)	0.282 (0.45)	0.517 (0.50)	0.099 (0.30)	0.170 (0.38)	0.243 (0.43)
WifeHighEduc	0.084 (0.28)	0.393 (0.49)	0.378 (0.48)	0.433 (0.50)	0.241 (0.43)	0.139 (0.35)	0.235 (0.42)	0.167 (0.37)	0.088 (0.28)	0.119 (0.32)	0.176 (0.38)	0.064 (0.24)	0.195 (0.40)	0.303 (0.46)
HusbAge	41.602 (9.56)	41.095 (9.04)	41.893 (11.14)	41.394 (9.97)	40.685 (9.53)	43.079 (10.15)	43.163 (9.66)	43.310 (10.19)	43.082 (9.29)	39.958 (9.03)	41.769 (9.33)	42.187 (11.48)	42.015 (9.87)	41.614 (10.97)
WifeAge	39.127 (9.53)	39.038 (9.23)	39.621 (10.99)	39.761 (10.11)	38.580 (9.69)	40.534 (10.01)	38.690 (9.71)	41.323 (10.04)	39.945 (9.23)	37.231 (8.84)	39.468 (9.41)	39.563 (11.33)	39.561 (9.71)	39.669 (10.98)
AgeDifference	2.489 (4.15)	2.057 (3.84)	2.264 (4.22)	1.629 (3.76)	2.110 (4.30)	2.547 (3.94)	4.664 (4.25)	1.989 (3.60)	3.154 (3.64)	2.742 (4.16)	2.296 (3.71)	2.614 (4.42)	2.493 (3.56)	1.962 (4.63)
Children < 12	0.476 (0.50)	0.354 (0.48)	0.363 (0.48)	0.450 (0.50)	0.428 (0.49)	0.272 (0.45)	0.413 (0.49)	0.432 (0.50)	0.412 (0.49)	0.367 (0.48)	0.374 (0.48)	0.401 (0.49)	0.401 (0.49)	0.333 (0.47)
Children < 16	0.978 (1.01)	1.117 (1.12)	0.914 (1.04)	1.082 (1.17)	1.092 (1.11)	0.899 (1.03)	1.060 (0.96)	1.471 (1.34)	0.930 (0.91)	1.203 (1.08)	1.006 (1.11)	0.971 (1.04)	0.958 (0.95)	0.920 (1.06)
WifeSelf-Employed	0.064 (0.25)	0.054 (0.23)	0.025 (0.16)	0.047 (0.21)	0.026 (0.16)	0.028 (0.17)	0.080 (0.27)	0.030 (0.17)	0.037 (0.19)	0.027 (0.16)	0.027 (0.16)	0.070 (0.26)	0.039 (0.19)	0.039 (0.19)
WifeWage-Earner	0.565 (0.50)	0.655 (0.48)	0.786 (0.41)	0.738 (0.44)	0.609 (0.49)	0.624 (0.48)	0.356 (0.48)	0.501 (0.50)	0.417 (0.49)	0.500 (0.50)	0.649 (0.48)	0.557 (0.50)	0.343 (0.47)	0.710 (0.45)
HusbWage	10.046 (5.17)	9.854 (4.80)	10.833 (6.17)	14.039 (8.92)	9.657 (8.68)	10.733 (6.25)	5.281 (3.51)	9.997 (11.903)	0.007 (0.00)	14.296 (7.13)	10.546 (14.68)	3.808 (3.04)	6.421 (4.22)	7.638 (6.28)
WifeWage	4.165 (5.67)	5.560 (5.19)	7.269 (5.41)	8.020 (10.12)	4.857 (6.69)	4.255 (6.32)	1.728 (2.93)	3.766 (6.521)	0.003 (0.00)	5.664 (8.31)	5.348 (8.12)	1.902 (2.66)	1.957 (3.64)	4.307 (6.80)
HusbNon-WageInc	2025.505 (4271.17)	1855.242 (5086.61)	1347.727 (3456.13)	1777.939 (4912.63)	2212.050 (3898.42)	1169.542 (3195.05)	414.627 (1327.78)	614.436 (1920.66)	0.597 (2.53)	3616.738 (6378.44)	1640.062 (3351.43)	432.686 (2051.76)	533.796 (1657.48)	860.891 (2637.27)
WifeNon-WageInc	2400.428 (4826.48)	3406.671 (5045.16)	3907.233 (4870.13)	4483.919 (7621.38)	1563.077 (3203.06)	1680.182 (2618.47)	440.924 (1426.85)	869.619 (1232.95)	0.514 (2.10)	1944.135 (4034.56)	732.279 (2068.92)	342.062 (1398.80)	348.595 (1247.23)	1191.522 (1943.32)
WifeParticipation	0.267 (0.20)	0.347 (0.18)	0.428 (0.12)	0.402 (0.14)	0.310 (0.19)	0.263 (0.19)	0.205 (0.22)	0.228 (0.20)	0.212 (0.22)	0.229 (0.21)	0.230 (0.20)	0.271 (0.22)	0.175 (0.22)	0.318 (0.18)
Number of observations	7615	8284	8356	6280	17623	5764	8814	5295	17344	1288	16442	13612	15524	8427

1															
2															
3	Wives														
4	HusbPrimEduc	0.112	0.197	0.185	0.218	0.257	0.152	0.364	0.370	0.424	0.497	0.227	0.775	0.493	0.383
5		(0.32)	(0.40)	(0.39)	(0.41)	(0.44)	(0.36)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.50)	(0.42)	(0.42)	(0.50)	(0.49)
6	HusbSeconEduc	0.786	0.321	0.426	0.432	0.447	0.502	0.245	0.395	0.410	0.245	0.507	0.125	0.196	0.228
7		(0.41)	(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.43)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.43)	(0.50)	(0.33)	(0.40)	(0.42)
8	HusbHighEduc	0.094	0.391	0.384	0.343	0.235	0.344	0.386	0.222	0.142	0.257	0.247	0.081	0.310	0.373
9		(0.29)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.47)	(0.42)	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.42)	(0.35)	(0.44)	(0.43)	(0.27)	(0.46)	(0.48)
10	WifePrimEduc	0.223	0.168	0.197	0.191	0.272	0.278	0.398	0.296	0.348	0.539	0.275	0.719	0.449	0.434
11		(0.42)	(0.37)	(0.40)	(0.39)	(0.44)	(0.45)	(0.49)	(0.46)	(0.48)	(0.50)	(0.45)	(0.45)	(0.50)	(0.50)
12	WifeSeconEduc	0.653	0.286	0.394	0.356	0.384	0.557	0.232	0.461	0.494	0.284	0.502	0.130	0.199	0.235
13		(0.48)	(0.45)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.50)	(0.42)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.45)	(0.50)	(0.34)	(0.40)	(0.42)
14	WifeHighEduc	0.111	0.472	0.404	0.449	0.284	0.162	0.368	0.237	0.140	0.176	0.210	0.104	0.352	0.323
15		(0.31)	(0.50)	(0.49)	(0.50)	(0.45)	(0.37)	(0.48)	(0.43)	(0.35)	(0.38)	(0.41)	(0.31)	(0.48)	(0.47)
16	HusbAge	41.342	40.121	42.579	43.909	41.655	43.420	43.291	42.417	43.347	39.760	41.367	41.793	41.169	42.557
17		(10.42)	(9.05)	(11.19)	(10.66)	(10.32)	(10.59)	(9.80)	(10.49)	(9.80)	(9.63)	(9.86)	(11.47)	(10.25)	(11.46)
18	WifeAge	38.254	37.784	40.109	41.807	39.281	40.671	38.792	40.012	40.146	36.809	38.805	38.923	38.600	40.173
19		(9.58)	(8.54)	(10.59)	(10.03)	(9.68)	(9.96)	(8.70)	(9.73)	(8.92)	(8.55)	(9.40)	(10.73)	(9.45)	(10.90)
20	AgeDifference	3.070	2.344	2.453	2.091	2.369	2.750	4.634	2.421	3.210	2.944	2.557	2.835	2.596	2.383
21		(4.31)	(4.07)	(4.41)	(4.01)	(4.30)	(4.16)	(4.33)	(3.92)	(3.80)	(4.86)	(3.96)	(4.62)	(3.67)	(4.77)
22	Children< 12	0.434	0.366	0.355	0.390	0.385	0.225	0.405	0.419	0.388	0.322	0.340	0.404	0.375	0.288
23		(0.50)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.42)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.45)
24	Children < 16	0.858	1.101	0.911	0.968	0.926	0.727	1.023	1.318	0.844	1.004	0.873	0.896	0.857	0.798
25		(0.95)	(1.05)	(1.05)	(1.12)	(0.98)	(0.91)	(0.94)	(1.23)	(0.87)	(1.01)	(1.04)	(0.92)	(0.92)	(1.01)
26	HusbSelf-Employed	0.102	0.112	0.071	0.143	0.083	0.070	0.245	0.188	0.170	0.070	0.045	0.149	0.153	0.135
27		(0.30)	(0.32)	(0.26)	(0.35)	(0.28)	(0.25)	(0.43)	(0.39)	(0.38)	(0.25)	(0.21)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.34)
28	HusbWage-Earner	0.780	0.822	0.843	0.712	0.789	0.817	0.642	0.698	0.694	0.832	0.873	0.738	0.701	0.763
29		(0.41)	(0.38)	(0.36)	(0.45)	(0.41)	(0.39)	(0.48)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.37)	(0.33)	(0.44)	(0.46)	(0.43)
30	HusbWage	8.419	8.635	9.894	11.547	8.354	9.171	4.315	8.241	0.006	11.764	9.084	3.439	5.495	6.527
31		(6.12)	(5.26)	(5.99)	(9.46)	(8.72)	(7.23)	(3.68)	(13.19)	(0.00)	(7.67)	(7.40)	(3.63)	(5.08)	(5.81)
32	WifeWage	7.048	7.963	9.234	10.295	7.706	6.552	4.302	7.218	0.007	10.903	8.080	3.328	5.313	5.922
33		(5.68)	(4.03)	(25.62)	(9.32)	(6.88)	(6.34)	(3.24)	(7.09)	(0.00)	(8.07)	(8.75)	(2.88)	(4.24)	(7.86)
34	HusbNon-WageInc	2517.009	2538.528	1761.033	3750.770	2807.368	1872.685	894.047	1032.872	1.495	4167.538	2211.000	922.560	1130.574	1272.431
35		(5039.66)	(14082.2)	(4306.20)	(14882.8)	(5111.04)	(4422.17)	(2595.90)	(2650.63)	(4.36)	(7159.73)	(4490.66)	(3466.66)	(2893.00)	(3336.48)
36	WifeNon-WageInc	2329.866	2982.722	2898.999	3495.802	1015.532	1331.961	297.597	756.956	0.447	1772.625	513.332	203.070	335.230	985.124
37		(4425.93)	(4907.32)	(3941.09)	(5560.03)	(2370.71)	(2236.49)	(917.66)	(1087.38)	(1.91)	(4493.73)	(1470.04)	(738.53)	(1187.87)	(1746.65)
38	WifeParticipation	0.397	0.441	0.455	0.460	0.409	0.353	0.441	0.388	0.452	0.385	0.325	0.433	0.416	0.388
39		(0.19)	(0.16)	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.20)	(0.18)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.22)	(0.18)
40	Number of observations	5523	6604	7790	6513	13589	4399	4884	3800	10403	774	12218	10271	7600	7839

Table 3. *Husband's and wife's income satisfaction*

	Austria	Belgium	Denmark	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Ireland	Italy	Luxembourg	The Netherlands	Portugal	Spain	United-Kingdom
Husbands														
HusbSeconEduc		0.518 (0.11)	-0.426 (-0.25)	2.466** (2.04)	-2.604** (-3.78)	1.398 (0.34)	2.277 (1.42)	7.247* (1.75)	0.705 (0.70)	4.551 (1.09)	-0.561** (-2.74)	1.128 (0.47)	6.602 (1.42)	-3.559* (-1.82)
HusbHighEduc		2.244 (1.26)	1.819 (1.31)	4.774** (3.45)	0.464 (0.80)	9.578** (2.66)	3.541** (2.18)	3.280 (1.36)	2.341* (1.70)	3.599 (1.35)	1.129** (3.48)	2.211** (3.92)	2.508** (2.05)	1.602** (3.39)
WifeHighEduc		-0.598 (-1.50)	-0.632 (-0.89)	-2.641** (-2.17)	1.816** (3.83)	-3.151** (-2.02)	-1.620 (-1.15)	-1.872 (-0.72)	-0.976 (-0.56)	-0.003 (-0.00)	0.261 (0.90)	-0.469 (-0.22)	-1.798 (-1.10)	0.068 (0.17)
HusbAge	0.021** (4.80)	0.011** (3.07)	0.003 (1.26)	0.024** (4.12)	0.030** (10.28)	-0.043** (-4.92)	0.025** (7.28)	0.064** (8.59)	-0.010** (-2.67)	0.033** (2.31)	0.018** (6.14)	0.007** (4.20)	0.028** (8.90)	0.008 (1.33)
AgeDifference		-0.022 (-0.76)	-0.003 (-0.23)	0.009 (0.58)	-0.026** (-2.72)	-0.008 (-0.29)	-0.001 (-0.05)	-0.004 (-0.10)	0.004 (0.37)	-0.048 (-1.23)	-0.007 (-1.50)	0.004 (0.53)	0.013 (0.67)	-0.005 (-0.72)
Children < 12	-0.103** (-2.20)	-0.017 (-0.72)	-0.057* (-1.90)	-0.052 (-0.93)	-0.096** (-4.30)	-0.013 (-0.37)	0.010 (0.31)	-0.067 (-1.54)	-0.047 (-1.35)	-0.071 (-1.28)	-0.075** (-3.45)	-0.002 (-0.11)	0.060** (2.25)	0.019 (0.55)
Children < 16	0.012 (0.40)	-0.050** (-2.40)	-0.120** (-5.81)	-0.018 (-0.55)	0.072** (4.69)	-0.135** (-2.88)	-0.071** (-3.24)	-0.035 (-1.18)	-0.066** (-2.42)	0.141* (1.79)	-0.011 (-0.74)	-0.021 (-1.41)	-0.095** (-4.76)	-0.087** (-2.49)
HusbWage	0.087** (3.69)	0.032** (2.66)	0.020 (1.46)	0.188** (3.84)	0.011* (1.90)	0.055* (1.93)	0.105** (7.53)	0.010 (0.23)	0.307** (4.83)	0.037 (0.83)	0.003 (0.16)	0.037** (4.35)	0.037** (3.76)	0.022 (0.68)
WifeWage	0.014 (1.32)	0.019** (2.73)	0.033** (3.84)	-0.032 (-0.98)	0.016** (2.63)	-0.010 (-0.54)	0.030** (4.45)	0.018 (0.49)	0.099* (1.85)	0.006 (0.29)	0.038** (4.01)	0.016** (3.46)	0.028** (4.51)	0.035 (1.48)
HusbNon-WageInc	0.241 (1.01)	-0.166** (-2.95)	-0.577 (-1.17)	0.869 (1.25)	0.590 (1.58)	0.631 (0.25)	0.104** (3.94)	-6.686 (-0.51)	-0.949 (-0.50)	0.005 (0.04)	-4.158** (-3.11)	0.040** (2.46)	-0.086** (-2.23)	0.748 (0.14)
WifeNon-WageInc	0.034 (0.13)	0.116* (1.90)	0.902** (2.36)	-0.420 (-0.88)	-1.556** (-3.49)	0.612 (0.17)	0.039 (1.28)	-27.193 (-1.39)	2.385 (0.68)	-0.367* (-1.86)	-0.459 (-0.22)	0.044 (1.50)	-0.008 (-0.15)	1.340 (0.17)
WifeParticipation	-0.083 (-0.56)	-0.248** (-2.09)	-0.206 (-1.55)	0.908** (2.88)	0.085 (1.07)	0.173 (1.06)	-0.177 (-1.62)	0.387* (1.66)	-0.221 (-0.82)	0.749** (2.41)	0.207** (2.55)	-0.073 (-1.04)	0.034 (0.34)	-0.294* (-1.84)
LM	3051.17 (0.0000)	5198.11 (0.0000)	2883.17 (0.0000)	1176.81 (0.0000)	8369.92 (0.0000)	902.67 (0.0000)	1307.60 (0.0000)	1277.06 (0.0000)	2132.94 (0.0000)	246.20 (0.0000)	6668.60 (0.0000)	5873.75 (0.0000)	3354.24 (0.0000)	1408.33 (0.0000)
Hausman 1	63.29 (0.0000)	41.32 (0.0000)	93.74 (0.0000)	70.50 (0.0000)	240.28 (0.0000)	193.94 (0.0000)	111.38 (0.0000)	135.69 (0.0000)	57.81 (0.0000)	45.46 (0.0000)	212.57 (0.0000)	137.24 (0.0000)	214.70 (0.0000)	125.96 (0.0000)
Hausman 2	0.54 (0.0003)	0.23 (1.0000)	6.20 (0.6246)	0.68 (0.9996)	2.30 (0.9703)	4.89 (0.7688)	0.18 (1.0000)	0.33 (1.0000)	1.72 (0.9885)	0.53 (0.9998)	2.90 (0.9406)	1.32 (0.9953)	0.18 (1.0000)	1.05 (0.9979)
Selected estimation	FE	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT
Number of observations	7615	8284	8356	4615	17622	5764	8814	5295	7303	1288	16442	13612	15524	8427

1															
2															
3	Wives														
4	WifeSeconEduc	-2.173	1.398	-0.964	1.744	-4.233	-10.376**	1.517	0.734	0.780**	-2.785	-1.824**	-0.123	4.594**	1.429
5		(-1.08)	(1.09)	(-1.57)	(2.18)	(-0.80)	(-2.78)	(1.09)	(0.94)	(2.10)	(-1.37)	(-2.57)	(-0.20)	(3.18)	(1.27)
6	HusbHighEduc	5.188*	1.584**	1.233**	1.674**	1.964	3.534*	-0.842	0.125	0.734	1.049	2.201**	1.094*	0.424	1.878**
7		(1.86)	(2.76)	(2.67)	(2.84)	(0.70)	(1.74)	(-0.46)	(0.25)	(0.91)	(0.39)	(2.00)	(1.74)	(0.51)	(5.65)
8	WifeHighEduc	1.422	0.327	0.066	0.476	2.153	-2.697	4.177**	1.271**	0.291	0.287	0.965	1.875**	1.109	0.410
9		(0.77)	(0.58)	(0.14)	(0.81)	(1.32)	(-1.56)	(2.29)	(2.51)	(0.25)	(0.08)	(1.31)	(3.20)	(1.53)	(1.17)
10	WifeAge	0.001	0.014**	0.010**	0.028**	0.028**	-0.055**	0.026**	0.028**	-0.002	-0.011	0.022**	-0.000	0.043**	0.024**
11		(0.12)	(3.01)	(3.16)	(5.17)	(8.89)	(-3.22)	(4.15)	(4.04)	(-0.38)	(-0.56)	(6.94)	(-0.01)	(7.76)	(4.56)
12	AgeDifference	0.010	-0.007	0.011	0.020*	0.018	-0.064*	0.032*	0.002	-0.002	0.005	0.015	0.007	0.014	0.002
13		(0.50)	(-0.70)	(1.30)	(1.82)	(0.44)	(-1.85)	(1.85)	(0.15)	(-0.19)	(0.20)	(1.20)	(1.32)	(0.98)	(0.31)
14	Children < 12	-0.124**	-0.045	-0.129**	-0.082	-0.095**	-0.030	0.087*	-0.065	-0.058*	-0.026	-0.093**	0.017	-0.040	-0.104**
15		(-2.16)	(-1.57)	(-3.85)	(-1.54)	(-3.95)	(-0.54)	(1.90)	(-1.22)	(-1.65)	(-0.28)	(-3.68)	(0.68)	(-0.96)	(-3.04)
16	Children < 16	0.010	-0.011	-0.089**	-0.015	0.060**	-0.098	-0.090**	-0.088**	-0.000	0.139	-0.017	-0.032	0.014	-0.105**
17		(0.26)	(-0.47)	(-3.83)	(-0.46)	(3.52)	(-1.40)	(-2.86)	(-2.56)	(-0.01)	(1.16)	(-1.03)	(-1.61)	(0.44)	(-3.22)
18	HusbWage	0.051**	0.016	0.056**	0.028	0.014**	0.069**	0.020**	0.268**	0.262**	0.078**	0.101**	0.036**	0.054**	0.168**
19		(3.39)	(1.45)	(4.85)	(0.65)	(2.36)	(2.29)	(1.97)	(5.92)	(4.99)	(2.02)	(7.32)	(6.12)	(6.18)	(7.31)
20	WifeWage	0.005	0.010	-0.001	-0.004	0.017**	0.002	0.031**	0.041	0.053	-0.059	-0.006	0.021**	0.003	-0.097**
21		(0.36)	(0.95)	(-0.08)	(-0.12)	(2.57)	(0.08)	(2.42)	(0.87)	(1.03)	(-1.64)	(-0.49)	(2.44)	(0.31)	(-3.79)
22	HusbNon-WageInc	0.459	0.009	-1.300**	0.659*	0.660**	-1.274	0.075**	6.870	3.473**	-0.383*	-0.770	0.038**	-0.008	9.967**
23		(1.56)	(0.36)	(-2.82)	(1.89)	(2.11)	(-0.43)	(3.04)	(0.60)	(1.98)	(-1.83)	(-0.56)	(2.64)	(-0.21)	(2.26)
24	WifeNon-WageInc	-0.492	-0.073	-0.798	-2.529**	-1.085**	-3.990	-0.057	29.381	-0.914	-0.021	-15.854**	-0.014	-0.011	-2.975
25		(-1.59)	(-1.13)	(-1.63)	(-2.97)	(-1.97)	(-0.80)	(-1.15)	(1.19)	(-0.28)	(-0.09)	(-5.52)	(-0.21)	(-0.16)	(-0.43)
26	WifeParticipation	0.062	-0.013	0.088	-0.301	-0.034	0.238	0.008	0.215	0.786**	0.536	0.102	0.219**	0.125	0.456**
27		(0.42)	(-0.10)	(0.61)	(-1.13)	(-0.42)	(1.18)	(0.05)	(0.89)	(3.20)	(1.22)	(1.24)	(2.75)	(1.01)	(3.60)
28	LM	1992.82	3054.99	2499.05	1391.77	5514.11	603.45	799.41	944.91	2461.96	133.32	4175.75	4105.12	1257.95	994.30
29		(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
30	Hausman 1	57.56	38.68	100.95	52.46	148.29	86.84	132.36	21.15	71.86	15.99	94.71	91.59	127.35	121.99
31		(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0068)	(0.0000)	(0.0425)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
32	Hausman 2	0.82	2.01	9.08	2.16	0.00	0.08	1.23	4.72	2.07	0.07	0.31	0.03	0.45	0.17
33		(0.9991)	(0.9806)	(0.3353)	(0.9756)	(1.0000)	(1.0000)	(0.9963)	(0.7876)	(0.9787)	(1.0000)	(1.0000)	(1.0000)	(0.9999)	(1.0000)
34	Selected estimation	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT	HT
35															
36	Number of observations	5523	6604	7790	5187	13589	4399	4884	3800	8317	774	12218	10271	7600	7839
37															
38															
39															
40															
41															
42															
43															
44															
45															
46															
47															