

Studying Immigrant Integration Through Self-Reported Life Satisfaction in the Country of Residence

Angela Paparusso¹ 

Received: 14 September 2017 / Accepted: 2 April 2018 / Published online: 9 April 2018

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V., part of Springer Nature and The International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies (ISQOLS) 2018

Abstract Aim of this paper is to measure the effect of demographic, human capital and ‘immigration’ variables on the self-reported life satisfaction of young and adult immigrants residing in seven European countries, using the Immigrant Citizens Survey (ICS). Self-reported life satisfaction has been used to evaluate the immigrants’ integration within their country of residence, as it is commonly employed to estimate the perceived quality of life within a country or a specific social group. Results show that self-reported life satisfaction strongly depends on immigrants’ demographic characteristics and human capital factors, such as age, marital status, current economic situation and perceived financial well-being. ‘Immigration’ variables also play a role in determining life satisfaction, thus proving that conditions at both the origin and destination are important in determining immigrants’ self-reported life satisfaction. In particular, legal status and country of residence play a significant role in defining immigrants’ life satisfaction, thus demonstrating that the rights, resources and restrictions immigrants find within their country of residence determine their subjective experience of integration.

Keywords Immigrant integration · Self-reported life satisfaction · European countries · Immigrant citizens survey (ICS) · Principal component analysis (PCA)

Introduction

Immigrant integration has been defined as the sum of the “processes that increase the opportunities of immigrants and their descendants to obtain the valued ‘stuff’ of a society, as well as social acceptance, through participation in major institutions such

✉ Angela Paparusso
angela.paparusso@irpps.cnr.it

¹ Institute for Research on Population and Social Policies (IRPPS-CNR), Via Palestro 32, 00185 Rome, Italy

as the educational and political system and the labour and housing markets” (Alba and Foner 2016: 5). The academic literature unanimously recognises these processes as dynamic, multidimensional and two-directional. They involve the receiving society and the newcomers at the same time and by the same measure (Penninx 2004; Piché 2004). The complexity and the multi-dimensionality of these processes has led analysts and researchers to consider a multiplicity of factors, such as the demographic characteristics of immigrants, the human capital variables and the so-called ‘immigration variables’ (Amit 2010), which are variables pertaining to the migration process as a whole (e.g. years since migration, period of arrival, reason for migration). Moreover, with regard to the assessment of integration outcomes, several scholars have tried to examine the effect of different integration paradigms (e.g. assimilation, acculturation, multiculturalism and mandatory integration) on immigrants’ socioeconomic, sociocultural and political integration using ad hoc indicators (e.g. Ersanilli and Koopmans 2010; Maxwell 2010; Ersanilli and Koopmans 2011; Maxwell 2012; Wright and Bloemraad 2012; Koopmans 2013; Wallace Goodman and Wright 2015; Koopmans 2016). Despite the remarkable contribution these works have made to integration studies, it has been concluded that integration cannot only be understood by investigating its ‘objective’ forms (e.g. educational attainment, household income, employment, housing, legal status, etc. (OECD/EU 2015)). Rather, ‘subjective’ integration (Amit 2010; Neto 1995, 2001) must be studied, referring to the immigrants’ self-reported life satisfaction in order to take their perceptions and opinions about their experience in the country of residence into account.

Life satisfaction has been defined as “a global assessment of a person’s quality of life according to his chosen criteria” (Shin and Johnson 1978 cit. in Diener et al. 1985: 71). As it is commonly used to estimate the “apparent quality of life within a country or a specific social group” (Veenhoven 1996: 3), immigrants’ self-reported life satisfaction can be used to evaluate the integration process within the country of residence.

Determinants of immigrants’ self-reported life satisfaction, as subjective measure of migrant integration, have received attention from scholars (e.g. Van Tubergen et al. 2004; Verkuyten 2008; Amit 2010; Safi 2010; Schneider 2012; D’Isanto et al. 2016; Schalembier 2016). Theory and empirical evidence suggest that individual, economic, cultural and institutional factors may affect immigrants’ assessment of satisfaction with life in their country of residence. For an overview of these factors, see Table 1. I have distinguished between micro and macro level factors. Among the micro level factors, individual factors, such as demographic, human capital, immigration, integration and transnationalism variables can come into play before and after migration and affect subjective integration of immigrants. The effect of the individual factors can be complemented by economic, cultural and institutional factors, which shape the structure of the host setting, and may vary across immigrants’ receiving countries.

As it can be seen from Table 1, the factors shaping immigrants’ self-reported life satisfaction are multidimensional and they are dependent on the domains according to which immigrant integration is often described: political, economic, social and cultural (e.g. Piché 2004). Bearing the above in mind, immigrants’ self-reported life satisfaction appears a way to grasp and explain the mechanism at work in the process of immigrant integration from a subjective perspective that is by asking the immigrants about their experiences.

Given these considerations, this paper aims to contribute to this strand of research by exploring some of the factors associated with immigrants’ self-reported life satisfaction, in order to assess immigrants’ subjective integration within their country of residence in

Table 1 Factors shaping immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction and, thus, subjective integration

Level	Field	Variables
Micro	Demographic	Age, gender, marital status, country or area of origin, ethnic group, household structure, religious origin, perceived health
	Human Capital	Education, skills, language proficiency, occupational condition, earnings, perceived financial well-being
	Immigration	Years since migration, immigrant generation, migration channel, legal status
	Integration	Cultural assimilation, political participation, social networks, perceived discrimination
	Transnationalism	Return visits, contacts, investments, remittances to the country of origin
Macro	Economic	Human development Index (HDI), Gross Domestic Product (GDP), income inequality (Gini coefficient), economic opportunities (labour market participation rate)
	Cultural	Former colony, cultural affinities, common language, geographic proximity
	Institutional	Immigration and citizenship policies, structure of the labour market, qualification and skills recognition, public administration, social welfare, social security

Source: Own elaboration

Europe. In particular, I will measure the effect of micro level factors, such as demographic, human capital and 'immigration' variables on the self-reported life satisfaction of young and adult immigrants residing in seven European countries, using the Immigrant Citizens Survey (ICS). The paper is structured as follows: second section discusses the main determinants of self-reported life satisfaction. Third section describes the data and operationalisation. In the fourth section, I present the results and I conclude in the fifth section.

The Main Determinants of Self-Reported Life Satisfaction in the Country of Residence

Among the studies investigating the micro level determinants of immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction in their country of residence, many have found an association between immigrants' life satisfaction and their individual characteristics, such as demographic and human capital variables, on the one hand, and 'immigration' variables, on the other (e.g. Fugl-Meyer et al. 2002; Bonini 2008; Amit 2010; Safi 2010). While results according to gender are not very clear-cut, empirical evidence shows that the effect of age on immigrants' life satisfaction is not linear (e.g. Bartram 2013; D'Isanto et al. 2016; Schalembier 2016). Marital status appears to be a significant predictor of life satisfaction: immigrants engaged in a stable relationship express significantly higher levels of satisfaction with life, compared to those without this status (Fugl-Meyer et al. 2002). Economic and financial conditions also have a significant effect on life satisfaction: immigrants with more stable labour and economic

conditions show higher levels of life satisfaction compared to immigrants with more precarious labour and economic conditions (Amit 2010; D'Isanto et al. 2016). Education plays a significant role on immigrants' life satisfaction, as education improves social relationships and labour market opportunities, increasing well-being (e.g. Koopmans 2016). Therefore, highly educated immigrants are expected to express higher level of life satisfaction compared to less educated immigrants. However, it should not be overlooked that over-qualified immigrants can also express less satisfaction with life due to the difficulty of finding a proper occupation in their country of residence (e.g. Massey and Akresh 2006; Fullin and Reyneri 2011).

Concerning the 'immigration' variables, the number of years spent in the country of residence contributes to improving immigrants' satisfaction with life (Piché 2004; Cela et al. 2013). Indeed, a greater number of years since migration is expected to strengthen the socio-economic position of immigrants, as is their legal status in the country of residence, and both of these are predictors of high life satisfaction. With regard to the arrival period in the country of residence, it is well acknowledged that immigrants who migrated at younger ages, and therefore have been socialised in their country of residence, are more likely to be better integrated, especially in terms of language proficiency, educational attainment, labour opportunities and household income, compared to immigrants who migrated at older ages (e.g. Rumbaut 1997, 2004). Legal status has been defined as "the rights afforded or denied by the state to individuals residing in its territory" (Söhn 2014: 3). Legal status can depend on the civil, social and political rights (i.e. receipt of welfare benefits, political participation and representation) enjoyed by immigrants and their families, the access to and permanence within the labour market, the possibility to apply for and obtain a long-term residency permit or citizenship of the country of residence (Bauböck 2006; Morris 2001; Cangiano 2014). A more permanent legal status equates to a more stable stay in the country of residence, longer lasting participation in the labour market, more public resources and a higher social capital (Vertovec 2007), thus improving immigrants' life satisfaction and integration. On this regard, the analysis by Massey and Akresh (2006) revealed that more satisfied immigrants are more likely to wish to naturalise and permanently settle in the U.S. compared to less satisfied immigrants. In their view, the immigrants' intention to acquire citizen status and to remain in the country of residence are synonyms of a positive integration process.

As far as integration factors, Angelini et al. (2015) studied the association between immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction and cultural assimilation in Germany. In particular, they showed that the positive effect of cultural assimilation on immigrants' subjective well-being is stronger for established and second-generation immigrants than for more recent immigrants. Safi (2010) demonstrated that perceived discrimination negatively affects immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction. In particular, the grade of self-reported life satisfaction decreases among ethnic groups facing discrimination in their country of residence. Finally, in their analysis of Somali women in Melbourne, McMichael and Manderson (2004) concluded that weak social capital and social networks negatively affect women's self-reported life satisfaction.

As such, I have formulated the following research hypotheses based on the previous literature. (1) I expect younger and older immigrants, as well as those who arrived at younger ages, to be more satisfied with life and, therefore, better integrated within the country of residence. (2) Moreover, I expect that immigrants

with higher familial stability, better labour and financial conditions and a higher education will show higher levels of life satisfaction and, therefore, be more integrated within the country of residence. (3) I expect that the greater the number of years spent in the country of residence and the more permanent the legal status, the higher the immigrants' level of life satisfaction and therefore the higher the level of integration. (4) I also expect to find an association between the immigrants' level of life satisfaction, and therefore of integration, and their area of origin. As Maxwell (2012) has claimed, integration is not a unique and homogenous process and not all immigrant groups act in the same way. Immigrants' background and their area of origin can have an impact on the outcomes of their integration in their country of residence. For instance, the area of origin can affect their likelihood of obtaining citizenship of the country of residence, depending on whether or not the origin country in question tolerates dual citizenship (Vink 2013). It can also contribute to the creation of so-called 'ethnic penalties', forms of discrimination at work caused by the cultural distance between immigrants and natives (Koopmans 2016). In particular, ethno-cultural (e.g. former colonial ties, common history, use of the same language and practicing the same religion), social and economic (e.g. type of family organisation, labour market structure and level of economic development) similarities between the country of origin and the country of residence (Yang 1994; Piché 2004), including geographical proximity, can increase immigrants' satisfaction with life and facilitate the process of integrating within the new country of residence. Specifically, "countries that have been colonies or dependencies of more-developed countries tend to retain a special relationship with the colonising country, since many residents of such countries speak the language of the coloniser and immigrants from the former colony are often given an advantage in applying for permanent resident status" (Wanner 2011: 16). Therefore, I hypothesise that (5) immigrants coming from a country that is a former colony of their new country of residence will be more satisfied with life, and therefore better integrated compared to immigrants coming from a country that is not a former colony of their new country of residence. In addition, previous research has demonstrated a positive integration process for immigrants coming from Latin American countries, and a comparatively advantageous position in the labour market for immigrants coming from East European countries (e.g. Cesareo and Blangiardo 2009; Khattab and Fox 2016). Based on this, I hypothesise that (6) Latin Americans and East Europeans will be more satisfied with life, and therefore will be more integrated within the country of residence than immigrants coming from other countries. Finally, institutional factors, and the immigration and integration policies of the country of residence in particular, can affect immigrants' level of life satisfaction and integration (e.g. Martin 1994; Penninx 2003; Büchel and Frick 2005; Joppke 2007). (7) I therefore expect immigrants living in countries that adopt more inclusive policies to show higher levels of life satisfaction and face fewer challenges in relation to integration.

Data, Method and Operationalisation

This study draws on the Immigrant Citizens Survey (ICS) conducted by the King Baudouin Foundation and the Migration Policy Group from October 2011 to January 2012, with the aim of asking immigrants how they experience integration policies

personally (www.immigrantsurvey.org). In total, 7468 immigrants were surveyed in the following countries and cities: Belgium (Antwerp, Brussels and Liège), France (Lyon and Paris), Germany (Berlin and Stuttgart), Hungary (Budapest), Italy (Milan and Naples), Portugal (Faro, Lisbon and Setubal) and Spain (Barcelona and Madrid). The ICS survey targeted people: not born in the country of residence (but who immigrated as minors); who are or were non-EU citizens or stateless persons (born as the citizen of country other than EU/EEA countries or Switzerland); residing in the country for more than one year; holding or renewing a legal immigration status and being 15 years or older. The survey addressed the following topics: employment; languages; civic and political involvement; family reunions; long-term residency and citizenship. To test my research hypotheses, I performed a stepwise ordinary least squared (OLS) regression. I used the following variables in the analysis.

Self-Reported Life Satisfaction

I analysed immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction as a dependent variable. Respondents were asked the following question: could you please tell me on a scale of 0 to 10 how satisfied you are with each of the following items, when 0 means you are very dissatisfied and 10 means you are very satisfied? The items were the following: your life these days, your present level of education, your present job, your accommodation, your family life, your health and your social life. I excluded the item 'your present job' from the analysis because of the large number of missing data due to the unemployed not being supposed to answer. The ICS survey does not provide an item that rates satisfaction with life *as a whole*, as the literature suggests when measuring the concept of life satisfaction (Diener 1984; Diener et al. 1985, 1993). Therefore, I reduced the dimensions of the life satisfaction by carrying out a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation, as the items relating to life satisfaction can be treated as cardinal rather than ordinal variables (Matysiak et al. 2016). Before performing the PCA, I used a 'predictive mean matching' method to impute the missing data contained in the variables measuring life satisfaction. The PCA extracted one factor (with eigenvalue >1) explaining 45% of the total variance. Each respondent was assigned a life satisfaction score based on the factor loadings (see Table 1). After standardising this to mean zero and standard deviation one, I used the score as the dependent variable in the multiple linear regression model. The interpretation of the life satisfaction score is as follows: the higher the score, the higher the respondents' level of self-reported life satisfaction in the country of residence (Table 2).

Demographic, Human Capital and 'Immigration' Variables

Given the previous literature and my research hypotheses, I operationalised several independent variables. Among the demographic variables, I selected (a) respondents' *age*, measured in years; (b) *age squared*; (c) gender, represented by the dummy variable male (reference category) and female and (d) *marital status*, distinguishing between 'legally married or civil union' (reference category),

Table 2 Factor loadings ($N = 7468$)

	Factor loadings
Your life at these days	0.438
Your present level of education	0.364
Your accommodation	0.399
Your family life	0.424
Your health	0.393
Your social life	0.424

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

‘legally separated or divorced or civil union dissolved’, ‘living with my partner’, ‘widowed or civil partner died’ and ‘single’. Then I also referred to (e) *area of origin*, distinguishing between ‘Asia’ (reference category), ‘Eastern Europe’, ‘Latin America’, ‘Middle East’, ‘North Africa’ and ‘Sub-Saharan Africa’ and finally, (f) *former colony*, measured by a dummy variable (0/1) indicating whether the respondent’s country of origin is a former colony of his/her new country of residence (for instance, the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America for Spain, and Brazil for Portugal) or not (reference category). In terms of human capital variables, I selected (g) *current economic situation*, distinguishing between ‘in paid work’ (reference category), ‘in education’, ‘unemployed’, ‘retired or sick or disabled’, ‘doing housework or other’; (h) *perceived financial well-being*, distinguishing between ‘comfortable’ (reference category), ‘sufficient’, ‘difficult’ and ‘very difficult’ and (i) *educational attainment*, which refers to the number of years spent in education. I selected three variables for the so-called ‘immigration’ variables. The first of these, (l) *years since migration*, refers to the number of years spent living in the country of residence, measured by the difference between the year of the interview and the year of arrival in the country of residence. Second, (m) *years since migration squared*. Third, (n) respondents’ *immigrant generation*, distinguishing between 1st (reference category) and 1.5. In particular, 1st generation means those who migrated at age older than 17, while the 1.5 generation includes those who migrated at age younger than 17. Forth, (o) *legal status*, distinguishing between ‘work or study’ (reference category), ‘family reunion’, ‘permanent/long term residence permit’, ‘humanitarian’, ‘other legal status’ and ‘national’. The modalities considered by this variable include different categories of residence permit, which can determine specific sets of rights and conditions for the immigrants who possess them. Finally, I included the (p) *country of residence*, distinguishing between Belgium (reference category), France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Portugal and Spain.

Descriptive Results

The variables are defined in Table 3, along with their percentages, means and standard deviation. The average age of immigrants residing in Belgium, France, Germany,

Table 3 Descriptive statistics on independent variables. Sample of immigrants ($N = 7468$) in seven residence countries, around 2011–2012

Independent variables	% or mean and (SD)
Demographic variables	
Age (in years)	38.6 (13.4)
Female	50.9
<i>Marital status</i>	
- Legally married, civil union	52.3
- Legally separated, divorced, civil union dissolved	7.7
- Living with partner	6.4
- Single	29.3
- Widowed, deceased civil partner	3.2
<i>Area of origin</i>	
- Asia	16.2
- Eastern Europe	21.9
- Latin America	18.9
- Middle East	11.4
- North Africa	14.3
- Sub-Saharan Africa	15.8
Former colony	31.8
Human capital variables	
<i>Current economic situation</i>	
- In paid work	57
- Doing housework or other	7.4
- In education	10.8
- Retired, sick, disabled	6.8
- Unemployed	16.8
Perceived financial well-being	
- Comfortable	17.1
- Sufficient	45.1
- Difficult	24
- Very difficult	11.9
Educational attainment	10.9 (4.5)
Immigration variables	
Years since migration	14.4 (11.8)
Immigrant generation	
- 1st generation	74.9
- 1.5-generation	24.6
Legal status	
- Work or study	22.6
- Family reunion	7.4

Table 3 (continued)

Independent variables	% or mean and (SD)
- Humanitarian	2.7
- National	31.4
- Other legal status	3
- Permanent/long-term residence permit	31.8
Country of residence	
- Belgium	13.8
- France	13.2
- Germany	16.1
- Hungary	16.1
- Italy	10.7
- Portugal	16.9
- Spain	13.3

The variables marital status, area of origin, current economic situation, perceived financial well-being, immigrant generation and legal status contain missing values

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

Hungary, Italy, Portugal and Spain is 38.6 years old. Females represent around 51% of the total sample. While the majority of immigrants are married (52.3%), 29.3% are single, 7.7% are legally separated, divorced or with a dissolved civil union, 6.4% are living with their partner and 3.2% are widowed. With regard to the area of origin, 21.9% of immigrants come from Eastern Europe, 18.9% from Latin America, 16.2% from Asia, 15.8% from Sub-Saharan Africa, 14.3% from North Africa and 11.4% from the Middle East. It is interesting to note that 31.8% of the respondents' countries of origin are former colonies of their new country of residence. As far as the current economic situation is concerned, 57% of the respondents are in paid work, 16.8% are unemployed, 10.8% are in education, 7.4% are doing housework or other and 6.8% are retired, sick or disabled. Regarding their financial well-being, 17.1% of the respondents have a comfortable financial situation, 24% difficult, 45.1% sufficient and 11.9% very difficult. Educational attainment is quite high and equal to 10.84 years on average. In terms of the immigration variables, the average number of years since migration is 14.4. On average, three out of four respondents are 1st generation immigrants, while one out of four is 1.5-generation. Moreover, 31.8% of the respondents hold a permanent/long-term residence permit, 31.4% are nationals, 22.6% have a work or study status, 7.4% reunited with family, 2.7% have a humanitarian status and 3% have another legal status. Finally, 13.8% lives in Belgium, 13.2% in France, 16.1% in Germany, 16.1% in Hungary, 10.7% in Italy, 16.9% in Portugal and 13.3% in Spain.

Regression Results

A stepwise ordinary least squared (OLS) regression was carried out to ascertain the contributions of the demographic, human capital and so-called 'immigration' variables,

where demographic variables were introduced into the model first (Model 1), followed by the human capital variables (Model 2) and finally the ‘immigration’ variables (Model 3). The results of these analyses are presented in Table 4. Although all my research hypotheses were verified, it is important to note that the factors I chose may have selectively favoured immigrants who are more satisfied with life into the country of residence or produce attitudes that increase the immigrants’ likelihood of being satisfied. In other words, I do not know whether the relationship between these factors and the self-reported life satisfaction is selective or causally influenced (Axinn and Thornton 1992).

The combined explained variance (multiple R-squared) following the introduction of the demographic variables is around 7%. The variables that contribute significantly to the explained variance are age, age squared, marital status, area of origin and former colony. Age has a negative effect on immigrants’ life satisfaction: the older immigrants are, the lower their level of satisfaction with life. However, an additional analysis suggests that this effect is not linear, as age squared is positive. Thus, the negative effect of age is reduced as immigrants get older. As mentioned in the second section, evidence for this result can be found in the literature, according to which younger and older immigrants report higher levels of life satisfaction (e.g. Safi 2010; Bartram 2013; D’Isanto et al. 2016). With regard to marital status, the results show that immigrants who are single, living with a partner, legally separated, divorced or with a dissolved civil union and widowed are less satisfied with life than those who are married or in civil union. The literature has highlighted the positive association between being married and being satisfied with life (e.g. Diener et al. 1999). Although there are many individual (Diener et al. 2006) and contextual (Wadsworth 2016) differences, being married increases life satisfaction, at least in the short term. Indeed, marriage provides emotional, psychological, material and physical support, especially during the elderly stages of life (Chipperfield and Havens 2001). Being married can be a predictor of more social capital (i.e. family networks), especially among immigrants. It can also point to long-term residence abroad and, therefore, a successful integration process within the country of residence (e.g. Piracha et al. 2013). Concerning the area of origin, immigrants coming from Latin American and Eastern European countries appear to be the most satisfied with life, while immigrants coming from Sub-Saharan African countries are the least satisfied, as previous literature has shown (Cesareo and Blangiardo 2009). By contrast, North Africa is not statistically significant. With respect to the variable former colony, immigrants coming from a country that is a former colony of their new country of residence appear to be more satisfied with life, compared to immigrants coming from a country that is not a former colony of their new country of residence. “Smaller cultural discrepancies” (D’Isanto et al. 2016: 1124) and in particular the use of the same language can reduce immigrants’ difficulties interacting with natives, increase the chances of inclusion in the labour market and, therefore, promote social mobility.

When introducing the human capital variables, the explained variance increases to around 18%. The variable current economic situation contributes significantly to the model: immigrants who are retired, sick, disabled and unemployed are less satisfied with life than those who are employed, as previous research has stressed

Table 4 Beta coefficients of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions with dependent variable life satisfaction (N = 7468)

Independent variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographic variables			
Age	-0.044 ***	-0.047***	-0.039***
Age squared	0.307 ***	0.445***	0.308**
Female (ref. cat. = male)	0.020	-0.001	0.014
<i>Marital Status</i> (ref. cat. = legally married or civil union)			
- Legally separated, divorced, civil union dissolved	-0.759***	-0.624***	-0.598***
- Living with partner	-0.253 **	-0.174*	-0.068
- Single	-0.267***	-0.259***	-0.259***
- Widowed, deceased civil partner	-0.745***	-0.616***	-0.536***
<i>Area of origin</i> (ref. cat. = Asia)			
- Eastern Europe	0.509***	0.408***	0.211***
- Latin America	0.515***	0.549***	0.357***
- Middle East	0.203***	0.140*	-0.082
- North Africa	-0.066	0.104*	-0.140*
- Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.139*	0.206**	-0.111
Former colony	0.278***	0.283***	0.098
Human capital variables			
<i>Current economic situation</i> (ref. cat. = in paid work)			
- Doing housework or other		-0.069	-0.062
- In education		0.025	0.050
- Retired, sick, disabled		-0.521 ***	-0.614***
- Unemployed		-0.179***	-0.217***
<i>Perceived financial well-being</i> (ref. cat. = comfortable)			
- Sufficient		-0.476***	-0.472***
- Difficult		-1.014***	-0.979***
- Very difficult		-1.743***	-1.636***
Educational attainment (in years)		0.017***	0.020***
Immigration variables			
Years since migration			0.009*
Years since migration squared			-0.019
1.5 generation (ref. cat. = 1st generation)			0.144*
<i>Legal status</i> (ref. cat. = work or study)			
- Family reunion			0.190*
- Humanitarian			-0.344**
- National			0.410***
- Other legal status			0.056
- Permanent/long-term residence permit			0.212***
<i>Country of residence</i> (ref. cat. = Belgium)			
- France			-0.358***
- Germany			-0.282***
- Hungary			-0.430***

Table 4 (continued)

Independent variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
- Italy			-0.635***
- Portugal			0.254**
- Spain			-0.080
Multiple R^2	0.07	0.18	0.22

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

Significance: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

(e.g. Clark and Oswald 1994). Perceived financial well-being also contributes significantly to the model. As could be predicted, a worse financial situation decreases the immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction. Perceived financial well-being is a subjective indicator of integration, which can be interpreted as a proxy of income (OECD/EU 2015). Although this association is quite complex and not unidirectional, because of the psychological and relative factors that should be taken into account, by strengthening individuals' economic capabilities, security and independence, income increases life satisfaction and, therefore, improves immigrants' socio-economic integration within the country of residence (Tibesigwa et al. 2016). Moreover, in the light of the micro-perspective of the neoclassical theory of migration (e.g. Sjaastad 1962; Todaro 1969), as migration requires monetary and human capital investment, the expected positive net return in the form of real income or job perspectives is a sign of a completed mission in the country of residence, as goals and targets have been achieved. Education also has a positive impact on immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction, and immigrants who are more educated show higher levels of life satisfaction compared to less educated immigrants. The scientific literature recognises the interrelated role played by educational attainment, access to the labour market and economic well-being in the integration process (e.g. Di Bartolomeo and Strozza 2014; Di Bartolomeo et al. 2015). High educational and professional careers are, indeed, indicators that immigrants are successfully integrated within the receiving society (Crul and Vermeulen 2003; Schneider and Crul 2010). Age, age squared, marital status, area of origin and cultural similarity remain significant in both models. However, it is important to highlight that the disadvantaged position of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa tends to disappear when monitoring the human capital variables. This means that, all things being equal, there are no differences in self-reported life satisfaction according to area of origin. When introducing the 'immigration' variables, the explained variance increase to 22%. Years since migration, immigrant generation, legal status and country of residence contribute significantly to the model. The number of years since migration has a positive effect on the immigrants' life satisfaction: the more years spent living in the residence country, the higher the level of satisfaction with life. Additional analysis shows that this effect is linear: the

coefficient of the square of the years since migration is negative but not significant. Years since migration have been defined as “a key factor in the integration process” (Piché 2004: 352). In particular, integration is considered a long-term process and a higher number of years since migration indicates the maturity of this process in the country of residence (Mussino et al. 2014). Moreover, it can reveal a process of selectivity that excludes temporary immigrants who only planned to spend a short period abroad, as well as unsatisfied immigrants who decided to return home because their migration projects failed (Cassarino 2004; de Haas et al. 2014; Giner-Monfort et al. 2015). Immigrant generation positively affects life satisfaction, thus revealing that 1.5-generation immigrants are more satisfied with life than 1-generation immigrants. This result is consistent with the literature on integration studies, which argue that immigrants who arrived at younger ages are more integrated into the country of residence than immigrants who arrived at older ages (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). In particular, as recently stressed by Lueck (2018), younger first generation immigrants have higher probability of socio-economic success, compared to older first generation immigrants, given their higher possibilities to improve their language, occupational and income levels during their migration experience.

With regard to legal status, immigrants holding the citizenship of their country of residence appear to be the most satisfied with life. International literature (e.g. Portes and Curtis 1987; Yang 1994; Castles 1995; Joppke 1999; Koopmans and Statham 1999; Bauböck 2006; Guiraudon 2014) has largely demonstrated the pivotal role played by citizenship in the process of immigrants integrating within their country of residence. In particular, there are two positions taken within the public debate on the issue of the citizenship status of immigrants residing in European countries, as stressed by Ersanilli and Koopmans (2010). The first position argues that citizenship stimulates integration. From this point of view, citizenship is not the end of the integration process, but rather a piece of the puzzle that completes the picture of the immigrants’ entire integration process. By contrast, the second position argues that citizenship is the final step of the integration process, and therefore immigrants holding the citizenship of the country of residence are expected to have completed their integration process. These positions can have different implications for the ease with which immigrants can obtain citizenship in their new country of residence. Nevertheless, both agree that citizenship is a legal status, which, by providing the same status and rights of native-born residents, contributes to establishing parity with natives, strengthening foreign-born citizens’ sense of identity – which enhances social cohesion (Holtug 2017) – and, therefore, fostering integration (Joppke 2010). Moreover, the literature has linked citizenship status with immigrants’ circular mobility, and therefore with the possibility of travelling to the origin country more easily without any fear of losing residency status, or moving to other European countries to find better living conditions and economic opportunities (e.g. Massey et al. 2015). In addition, those who have not access to formal citizenship, but enjoy stable and long-term residency conditions and rights, such as family and permanent immigrants, have a higher level of life satisfaction, compared to immigrants with work or study status.

This means that a status that is at least “denizenship” (Hammar 1990) helps immigrants to express significantly high levels of satisfaction with life in their country of residence. On the other end of the spectrum, humanitarian immigrants show the lowest level of life satisfaction: their stay in the country of residence is more precarious and uncomfortable compared to other categories of immigrants (Connor 2010). Because of their weak migration networks and poor human capital (Sciortino 2006), humanitarian immigrants generally face many difficulties integrating. As recently elucidated by Ortensi (2015), although they are not excluded from access to regular employment, as could be expected, they generally experience high levels of unemployment, mainly because of poor education, language and working skills, insecure living conditions and fragile social networks in the country of residence. Moreover, because European societies often perceive them as a threat to national security and social cohesion, they often experience instances of discrimination and xenophobia.

Finally, when the country of residence is considered, results show that immigrants residing in Portugal appear to be the most satisfied with life and therefore the most integrated. The overall MIPEX score¹ can help to explain this result. Portugal has the highest score among the countries considered in this study. Portugal’s MIPEX overall score, which is equal to 75, suggests that immigrants living in countries that are considered more inclusive show a higher level of satisfaction with life, compared to those living in countries considered less inclusive. The overall MIPEX score takes different integration areas into account, ranging from education, to labour market participation to access to the nationality of the country of residence. Therefore, it can be concluded that an immigrant’s level of life satisfaction in relation to a country that has a high level of MIPEX can, to a substantial degree, mean the achievement of a complete and multifaceted level of integration in the country of residence.

Age, age squared, marital status, current economic situation and financial situation remain significant in all the models, while Middle Eastern and Sub-Saharan African areas of origin and cultural similarity become non-significant. The results of the variable country of residence suggest that further analysis is needed in order to better explain country differences. For that purpose, multiple linear regression models have been run separately at country level, for the seven countries included in the Survey (see Appendix Tables 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11). Compared to the whole model discussed above, I also included the variable *children outside the country of residence*, measured by a dummy variable (0/1) indicating whether the respondent has children who are not living in the country of residence. Nevertheless, the question about children living outside the country of residence has not been addressed in Germany, so I have not included this variable in the regression model for Germany. This is the same reason why I could not include this variable in the whole model. However, results are interesting since in most countries immigrants having children outside the country of residence are less satisfied, compared to immigrants who have not children outside the country of residence. This result

¹ MIPEX is constructed by the British Council and the Migration Policy Group. It consists of 167 policy indicators on migrants’ opportunities to participate in the hosting society. There are eight policy areas examined, which range from labour market mobility to family reunification, to access to nationality. MIPEX is calculated for 38 countries, namely all EU Member States, Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey and the USA (<http://www.mipex.eu>).

shows that the family unity is an important predictor of immigrants' life satisfaction in the country of residence. In other words, the lack of family unity or the absence of family members in the new country of residence, and especially of children, may affect negatively immigrants' subjective integration, leading them, for instance, to plan to re-emigrate or to return to the country of origin to re-join them.

As far as the other factors, while for some of them, such as age, marital status and perceived financial well-being, the results are similar among the seven countries, for other factors, the results are different, thus highlighting the importance of country characteristics (e.g. different socio-economic and institutional contexts) in shaping immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction. To make an example, in Germany, in education immigrants are more satisfied compared to in paid work immigrants, while in other countries, they are less satisfied or the variable is not statistically significant. In Italy and Portugal, humanitarian immigrants are strongly less satisfied compared to work or study immigrants, while in Spain they are more satisfied. In Germany, humanitarian immigrants are slightly less satisfied compared to work or study immigrants, while other legal statuses are not statistically significant.

Conclusions

The aim of this paper has been to measure the effect of demographic, human capital and 'immigration' variables on the self-reported life satisfaction of young and adult immigrants residing in seven European countries. This self-reported life satisfaction has been used to evaluate the immigrants' integration within their country of residence, as it is commonly employed to estimate the perceived quality of life within a country or a specific social group. Self-reported life satisfaction is centred on personal judgments and criteria, not on criteria deemed important by others (Neto 2001), thus it appears appropriate to take immigrants' view of their experience in their country of residence into account and, therefore, to assess their integration from a subjective perspective. The regression results show that self-reported life satisfaction strongly depends on immigrants' demographic characteristics and human capital factors, such as age, marital status, current economic situation and perceived financial well-being. Nevertheless, 'immigration' variables also play a role in determining life satisfaction, thus proving that conditions at both the origin and destination are important in determining immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction. In particular, legal status and country of residence play a significant role in defining immigrants' life satisfaction, thus demonstrating that the rights, resources and restrictions immigrants find within their country of residence as a whole determine their satisfaction with life and therefore their subjective experience of integration (e.g. Morris 2001; Vertovec 2007). As such, my results provide support for the importance of individual determinants in explaining immigrants' satisfaction with life in their country of residence and the differences shaping integration patterns in European societies. The concurrent role played by demographic, human capital and 'immigration' variables in explaining immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction and, therefore, their integration within their country of residence, provides evidence for the dynamic, multidimensional and bidirectional character of the integration process (Penninx 2003, 2004). To conclude, accounting

for immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction means studying the living conditions and perceived living conditions of immigrants, the latter representing a pervasive feature of European societies (Sciortino 2016).

Several limitations of the study must be acknowledged. First, this study is based on a cross-sectional survey conducted in the country of residence, which means that unsatisfied or not well integrated immigrants are not accounted for. In other words, data may hinder a process of selectivity and results may be biased. In addition, some of the micro level factors highlighted by international studies and mentioned in the introductory paragraphs as important factors shaping immigrants' subjective integration, such as ethnic group, social networks, cultural assimilation, perceived discrimination, and transnational ties with the country of origin, have not been considered by the ICS survey, therefore they are not covered by this study. Finally, the dataset is limited to only seven European countries. For instance, Nordic countries, such as Denmark, Norway and Sweden, and Switzerland, whose immigrants usually show high levels of life satisfaction (Veenhoven 2012), are excluded. Therefore, the main determinants of immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction in the country of residence emerged by this work are not applicable and generalizable to all Europe and can be drawn only partial policy conclusions.

These limitations notwithstanding, I believe that my study sheds important light on the individual-level dynamics of self-reported life satisfaction of immigrants living in some of the most consolidated countries of immigration and may contribute to a better understanding of these dynamics in other contexts. In particular, researchers and policy-makers could take advantage of this research to construct and implement immigration and integration policies, not only taking the needs of the host societies into account, but also the experiences, opinions, requirements and expectations of the immigrants. In fact, it is important to see whether integration policies match hopes and needs of immigrants in Europe. Especially in the light of the current European migration crisis, analysing the implications of the immigrants' self-reported life satisfaction on a selection of European countries, among which there are Germany, Hungary and Italy, which are among the most interested by the arrival of asylum seekers, can lead to the planning and the construction of new systems for attracting and incorporating immigrants, encouraging the peaceful cohabitation of different populations and boosting social cohesion and progress in our countries. Of course, policies should be designed to take into account national and local specificities. Likewise, immigrants can maximize their life satisfaction by adapting, before and after migration, their individual characteristics (skills, language fluency, household structure and labour market experience) to the receiving country, or by choosing to migrate and to reside in the most compatible and welcoming reception climates. Future research will be imperative to fully understand the spectrum of factors shaping immigrants' assessment of their life satisfaction, especially those left uncovered by this work.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflicts of Interest The author confirms that there are no known conflicts of interest associated with this publication.

Appendix

Table 5 Beta coefficients of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions with dependent variable life satisfaction, Belgium ($N = 1027$)

Independent variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographic variables			
Age	-0.033	-0.038*	-0.024
Age squared	0.202	0.314	0.187
Female (ref. cat. = male)	0.050	-0.031	-0.062
<i>Marital Status</i> (ref. cat. = legally married or civil union)			
- Legally separated, divorced, civil union dissolved	-0.618**	-0.404*	-0.430*
- Living with partner	-0.141	0.102	0.023
- Single	-0.533***	-0.364**	-0.397**
- Widowed, deceased civil partner	-0.141	0.046	0.066
<i>Children outside the country of residence</i> (ref. cat. = No)	-0.440**	-0.221	-0.164
<i>Area of origin</i> (ref. cat. = Asia)			
- Eastern Europe	-0.078	0.194	0.183
- Latin America	0.018	0.130	0.042
- Middle East	-0.375*	-0.314	-0.331
- North Africa	-0.251	0.001	-0.081
- Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.486*	-0.181	-0.235
Former colony ^a	-0.276	-0.186	-0.107
Human capital variables			
<i>Current economic situation</i> (ref. cat. = in paid work)			
- Doing housework or other		0.200	0.152
- In education		-0.075	0.010
- Retired, sick, disabled		-0.636**	-0.650**
- Unemployed		-0.140	-0.159
<i>Perceived financial well-being</i> (ref. cat. = comfortable)			
- Sufficient		-0.384**	-0.360*
- Difficult		-0.859***	-0.799***
- Very difficult		-1.543***	-1.466***
Educational attainment (in years)		-0.011	-0.008
Immigration variables			
Years since migration			0.007
Years since migration squared			-0.188
1.5 generation (ref. cat. = 1st generation)			0.253
<i>Legal status</i> (ref. cat. = work or study)			
- Family reunion			0.161
- Humanitarian			-0.073
- National			0.253
- Other legal status			0.071
- Permanent/long-term residence permit			-0.076
Multiple R^2	0.06	0.17	0.19

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

Significance: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

^a This variable has been included only in the regression models of Belgium, France, Portugal and Spain

Table 6 Beta coefficients of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions with dependent variable life satisfaction, France ($N=988$)

Independent variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographic variables			
Age	0.009	-0.015	0.005
Age squared	-0.205	0.215	0.046
Female (ref. cat. = male)	-0.047	0.063	0.013
<i>Marital Status</i> (ref. cat. = legally married or civil union)			
- Legally separated, divorced, civil union dissolved	-0.877***	-0.585***	-0.616***
- Living with partner	-0.131	0.071	0.043
- Single	-0.346*	-0.360*	-0.432**
- Widowed, deceased civil partner	-0.673*	-0.407	-0.351
<i>Children outside the country of residence</i> (ref. cat. = No)			
	-0.684*	-0.552*	-0.531*
<i>Area of origin</i> (ref. cat. = Asia)			
- Eastern Europe	0.116	0.001	-0.090
- Latin America	0.404	0.547*	0.475*
- Middle East	-0.562*	-0.420*	-0.527*
- North Africa	0.143	0.158	0.067
- Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.278	-0.097	-0.099
Former colony	-0.234	-0.133	-0.201
Human capital variables			
<i>Current economic situation</i> (ref. cat. = in paid work)			
- Doing housework or other		0.034	0.069
- In education		-0.097	0.044
- Retired, sick, disabled		-0.661**	-0.705**
- Unemployed		-0.182	-0.145
<i>Perceived financial well-being</i> (ref. cat. = comfortable)			
- Sufficient		-0.448**	-0.427**
- Difficult		-1.145***	-1.070***
- Very difficult		-1.720***	-1.671***
Educational attainment (in years)		-0.009	-0.015
Immigration variables			
Years since migration			-0.028*
Years since migration squared			0.444
1.5 generation (ref. cat. = 1st generation)			0.348*
<i>Legal status</i> (ref. cat. = work or study)			
- Family reunion			-0.623*
- Humanitarian			-0.519
- National			0.390*
- Other legal status			-0.302
- Permanent/long-term residence permit			0.287*
Multiple R^2	0.07	0.19	0.22

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

Significance: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 7 Beta coefficients of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions with dependent variable life satisfaction, Germany ($N = 1202$)

Independent variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographic variables			
Age	-0.012	-0.042*	-0.042*
Age squared	-0.203	0.276	0.224
Female (ref. cat. = male)	0.171*	0.124	0.114
<i>Marital Status</i> (ref. cat. = legally married or civil union)			
- Legally separated, divorced, civil union dissolved	-1.153***	-0.807***	-0.732***
- Living with partner	-0.905***	-1.003***	-1.008***
- Single	-0.119	-0.264*	-0.279*
- Widowed, deceased civil partner	-0.756**	-0.513*	-0.500*
<i>Area of origin</i> (ref. cat. = Asia)			
- Eastern Europe	0.229	0.139	0.007
- Latin America	0.514*	0.100	0.036
- Middle East	0.302*	0.244*	-0.020
- North Africa	0.307	0.240	0.238
- Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.926**	-0.222	-0.124
Human capital variables			
<i>Current economic situation</i> (ref. cat. = in paid work)			
- Doing housework or other		-0.267*	-0.198
- In education		0.201	0.282*
- Retired, sick, disabled		-0.747**	-0.596*
- Unemployed		-0.442***	-0.278*
<i>Perceived financial well-being</i> (ref. cat. = comfortable)			
- Sufficient		-0.552***	-0.469***
- Difficult		-1.143***	-0.974***
- Very difficult		-2.457***	-2.229***
Educational attainment (in years)		0.027*	0.027*
Immigration variables			
Years since migration			0.017
Years since migration squared			0.019
1.5 generation (ref. cat. = 1st generation)			0.047
<i>Legal status</i> (ref. cat. = work or study)			
- Family reunion			-0.080
- Humanitarian			-0.587*
- National			0.329
- Other legal status			-0.422
- Permanent/long-term residence permit			-0.029
Multiple R^2	0.16	0.33	0.36

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

Significance: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 8 Beta coefficients of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions with dependent variable life satisfaction, Hungary ($N = 1201$)

Independent variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographic variables			
Age	-0.034*	-0.057**	-0.035
Age squared	0.217	0.562*	0.430*
Female (ref. cat. = male)	-0.166	-0.128	-0.105
<i>Marital Status</i> (ref. cat. = legally married or civil union)			
- Legally separated, divorced, civil union dissolved	-0.812***	-0.715***	-0.746***
- Living with partner	-0.100	-0.202	-0.190
- Single	-0.535**	-0.472**	-0.464**
- Widowed, deceased civil partner	-0.632**	-0.674**	-0.701**
<i>Children outside the country of residence</i> (ref. cat. = No)	0.022	0.068	0.003
<i>Area of origin</i> (ref. cat. = Asia)			
- Eastern Europe	0.839***	0.638***	0.526**
- Middle East	-0.263	-0.392*	-0.324*
- North Africa	0.577*	0.496	0.648*
- Sub-Saharan Africa	0.421	0.859*	0.902*
Human capital variables			
<i>Current economic situation</i> (ref. cat. = in paid work)			
- Doing housework or other		-0.275	-0.295
- In education		-0.222	-0.146
- Retired, sick, disabled		-0.570*	-0.582*
- Unemployed		-0.353	-0.378
<i>Perceived financial well-being</i> (ref. cat. = comfortable)			
- Sufficient		-0.688***	-0.686***
- Difficult		-1.520***	-1.542***
- Very difficult		-1.687***	-1.616***
Educational attainment (in years)		0.039***	0.042***
Immigration variables			
Years since migration			-0.026*
Years since migration squared			0.178
1.5 generation (ref. cat. = 1st generation)			0.395*
<i>Legal status</i> (ref. cat. = work or study)			
- Family reunion			0.016
- Humanitarian			-0.078
- National			0.393*
- Other legal status			-0.080
- Permanent/long-term residence permit			0.241
Multiple R^2	0.07	0.2	0.22

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

Significance: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 9 Beta coefficients of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions with dependent variable life satisfaction, Italy ($N = 797$)

Independent variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographic variables			
Age	-0.019	-0.006	-0.024
Age squared	0.177	0.039	0.095
Female (ref. cat. = male)	0.129	0.014	0.002
<i>Marital Status</i> (ref. cat. = legally married or civil union)			
- Legally separated, divorced, civil union dissolved	-0.625**	-0.781***	-0.775***
- Living with partner	0.110	0.140	0.167
- Single	-0.082	-0.242	-0.163*
- Widowed, deceased civil partner	-1.042**	-1.095**	-0.929
<i>Children outside the country of residence</i> (ref. cat. = No)	-0.103	0.027	0.133
<i>Area of origin</i> (ref. cat. = Asia)			
- Eastern Europe	0.126	0.012	0.093
- Latin America	0.853***	0.794***	0.731***
- North Africa	-1.464***	-1.292***	-1.382***
- Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.850***	-0.121	0.135
Human capital variables			
<i>Current economic situation</i> (ref. cat. = in paid work)			
- Doing housework or other		-0.151	-0.274
- In education		0.553	0.283
- Retired, sick, disabled		0.214	-0.095
- Unemployed		0.240	0.242
<i>Perceived financial well-being</i> (ref. cat. = comfortable)			
- Sufficient		-0.701***	-0.689***
- Difficult		-0.927***	-0.891***
- Very difficult		-1.948***	-1.888***
Educational attainment (in years)		0.040*	0.046**
Immigration variables			
Years since migration			0.010
Years since migration squared			0.488
1.5 generation (ref. cat. = 1st generation)			-0.003
<i>Legal status</i> (ref. cat. = work or study)			
- Family reunion			0.455*
- Humanitarian			-1.347**
- National			0.360
- Other legal status			0.028
- Permanent/long-term residence permit			0.315
Multiple R^2	0.16	0.24	0.27

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

Significance: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 10 Beta coefficients of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions with dependent variable life satisfaction, Portugal ($N = 1259$)

Independent variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographic variables			
Age	-0.038*	-0.035*	-0.027
Age squared	0.030	0.145	0.017
Female (ref. cat. = male)	-0.013	-0.086	-0.091
<i>Marital Status</i> (ref. cat. = legally married or civil union)			
- Legally separated, divorced, civil union dissolved	-0.500*	-0.447*	-0.414*
- Living with partner	-0.043	0.049	0.083
- Single	-0.205*	-0.222*	-0.181*
- Widowed, deceased civil partner	-1.216***	-1.076**	-0.988**
<i>Children outside the country of residence</i> (ref. cat. = No)	-0.118	-0.069	0.015
<i>Area of origin</i> (ref. cat. = Asia)			
- Eastern Europe	0.032	0.095	0.026
- Latin America	-0.670*	-0.387	-0.198
- Middle East	-0.515	0.632	0.824
- North Africa	0.215	-0.382	-0.414
- Sub-Saharan Africa	-1.017**	-0.463	-0.380
Former colony	0.691*	0.483*	0.286
Human capital variables			
<i>Current economic situation</i> (ref. cat. = in paid work)			
- Doing housework or other		-0.108	-0.067
- In education		-0.047	-0.084
- Retired, sick, disabled		-1.017***	-0.895**
- Unemployed		-0.485***	-0.486***
<i>Perceived financial well-being</i> (ref. cat. = comfortable)			
- Sufficient		-0.363*	-0.349*
- Difficult		-0.766***	-0.739***
- Very difficult		-1.228***	-1.206***
Educational attainment (in years)		0.022*	0.024*
Immigration variables			
Years since migration			0.015
Years since migration squared			-0.326
1.5 generation (ref. cat. = 1st generation)			0.125
<i>Legal status</i> (ref. cat. = work or study)			
- Family reunion			0.262
- Humanitarian			-3.250*
- National			0.397***
- Other legal status			-0.356
- Permanent/long-term residence permit			0.313**
Multiple R^2	0.12	0.2	0.22

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

Significance: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 11 Beta coefficients of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions with dependent variable life satisfaction, Spain ($N=994$)

Independent variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographic variables			
Age	-0.060***	-0.048*	-0.050*
Age squared	0.613**	0.523*	0.456
Female (ref. cat. = male)	-0.088	-0.075	-0.100
<i>Marital Status</i> (ref. cat. = legally married or civil union)			
- Legally separated, divorced, civil union dissolved	-0.363*	-0.241	-0.275*
- Living with partner	-0.226*	-0.119	-0.060
- Single	-0.297*	-0.248*	-0.209*
- Widowed, deceased civil partner	0.746*	-0.719*	-0.674*
<i>Children outside the country of residence</i> (ref. cat. = No)	-0.526***	-0.349***	-0.243*
<i>Area of origin</i> (ref. cat. = Asia)			
- Eastern Europe	0.690*	0.608*	0.587*
- Latin America	0.071	0.049	0.055
- Middle East	0.825*	0.596	0.442
- North Africa	-0.279	0.092	0.024
- Sub-Saharan Africa	-0.217	0.328	0.224
Former colony	0.632**	0.713***	0.660***
Human capital variables			
<i>Current economic situation</i> (ref. cat. = in paid work)			
- Doing housework or other		0.095	0.072
- In education		0.316	0.213
- Retired, sick, disabled		-0.315	-0.491
- Unemployed		-0.028	-0.074
<i>Perceived financial well-being</i> (ref. cat. = comfortable)			
- Sufficient		-0.213*	-0.176
- Difficult		-0.678***	-0.662***
- Very difficult		-1.679***	-1.635***
Educational attainment (in years)		0.048***	0.050***
Immigration variables			
Years since migration			0.020
Years since migration squared			-0.093
1.5 generation (ref. cat. = 1st generation)			-0.059
<i>Legal status</i> (ref. cat. = work or study)			
- Family reunion			0.433*
- Humanitarian			1.602*
- National			0.334*
- Other legal status			0.569**
- Permanent/long-term residence permit			0.154
Multiple R^2	0.1	0.22	0.24

Source: Own elaboration on ICS data

Significance: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

References

- Alba, R., & Foner, N. (2016). Integration's challenges and opportunities in the wealthy west. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(1), 3–22.
- Amit, K. (2010). Determinants of life satisfaction among immigrants from western countries and from the FSU in Israel. *Social Indicators Research*, 96(3), 515–534.
- Angelini, V., Casi, L., & Corazzini, L. (2015). Life satisfaction of immigrants: Does cultural assimilation matter? *Journal of Population Economics*, 28(3), 817–844.
- Axinn, W., & Thornton, A. (1992). The relationship between cohabitation and divorce: selectivity or causal influence? *Demography* 29(3), 357–374.
- Bartram, D. (2013). Happiness and 'economic migration': A comparison of eastern European migrants and stayers. *Migration Studies*, 1(2), 156–175.
- Bauböck, R. (2006). *Migration and citizenship: Legal status, rights and political participation* (Ed.). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Bonini, A. N. (2008). Cross-national variation in individual life satisfaction: Effects of national wealth, human development, and environment conditions. *Social Indicators Research*, 87(2), 189–210.
- Büchel, F., & Frick, J. R. (2005). Immigrants' economic performance across Europe – does immigration policy matter? *Population Research and Policy Review*, 24(2), 175–212.
- Cangiano, A. (2014). Migration policies and migrant employment outcomes. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 2(4), 417–443.
- Cesaro, V., & Blangiardo, G. C. (2009). *Indici di integrazione. Un'indagine empirica sulla realtà migratoria italiana [Integration indexes. An empirical inquiry on the Italian migration reality]*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Cassarino, J.-P. (2004). Theorizing return migration: the conceptual approach to return migrants revisited. *International Journal of Multicultural Societies*, 6(2), 253–279.
- Castles, S. (1995). How nation-states respond to immigration and ethnic diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 21(3), 293–308.
- Cela, E., Fokkema, T., & Ambrosetti, E. (2013). Variation in transnationalism among Eastern European migrants in Italy: the role of duration of residence and integration. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 13(2), 195–209.
- Chipperfield, J. G., & Havens, B. (2001). Gender differences in the relationship between marital status transitions and life satisfaction in later life. *Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences*, 56(3), 176–186.
- Clark, A. E., & Oswald, A. J. (1994). Unhappiness and unemployment. *The Economic Journal*, 104(424), 648–659.
- Connor, P. (2010). Explaining the refugee gap: economic outcomes of refugees versus other immigrants. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23(3), 195–209.
- Crul, M., & Vermeulen, H. (2003). The second generation in Europe. Introduction to the special issue. *International Migration Review*, 37(4), 965–986.
- D'Isanto, F., Fouskas, P., & Verde, M. (2016). Determinants of well-being among legal and illegal immigrants: evidence from South Italy. *Social Indicators Research*, 126(3), 1109–1141.
- De Haas, H., Fokkema, T., & Fassi Fihri, M. (2014). Return migration as failure or success? The determinants of return migration intentions among Moroccan migrants in Europe. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 16(2), 415–429.
- Di Bartolomeo, A., & Strozza, S. (2014). L'Integrazione degli Immigrati nei Paesi dell'Ue15: Riscontri Empirici per Istruzione e Mercato del Lavoro [The integration of immigrants in the EU15: Empirical findings in the education system and labour market]. In P. Donadio, G. Gabrielli, & M. Massari (Eds.), *Uno Come Te. Europei e Nuovi Europei nei Percorsi di Integrazione [One like you. Europeans and new Europeans in the integration paths]* (pp. 37–50). FrancoAngeli: Milan.
- Di Bartolomeo, A., Kalantaryn, S., & Bonfanti, S. (2015). *Measuring integration of migrants. A multivariate approach. INTERACT research report no. 2015/01*. Florence: European University Institute and Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542–575.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75.
- Diener, E., Sandvik, E., Seidlitz, L., & Deiner, M. (1993). The relationship between income and subjective well-being: relative or absolute? *Social Indicators Research*, 28(3), 195–223.

- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, *125*(2), 276–302.
- Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Scollon, C. N. (2006). Beyond the hedonic treadmill. Revising the adaptation theory of well-being. *American Psychologist*, *61*(4), 305–314.
- Ersanilli, E., & Koopmans, R. (2010). Rewarding integration? Citizenship regulations and the socio-cultural integration of immigrants in the Netherlands, France and Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *36*(5), 773–791.
- Ersanilli, E., & Koopmans, R. (2011). Do immigrant integration policies matter? A three-country comparison among Turkish immigrants. *West European Politics*, *34*(2), 208–234.
- Fugl-Meyer, A. R., Melin, R., & Fugl-Meyer, K. (2002). Life satisfaction in 18- to 64-year-old swedes: in relation to gender, age, partner and immigrant status. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, *34*(5), 239–246.
- Fullin, G., & Reyneri, E. (2011). Low unemployment and bad jobs for new immigrants in Italy. *International Migration*, *49*(19), 118–147.
- Giner-Monfort, J., Hall, K., & Betty, C. (2015). Back to brit: retired British migrants returning from Spain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *42*(5), 797–815.
- Guiraudon, V. (2014). Economic crisis and institutional resilience: the political economy of migrant incorporation. *West European Politics*, *37*(6), 1297–1313.
- Hammar, T. (1990). *Democracy and the nation state: Aliens, denizens and citizens in a world of international migration*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Holtug, N. (2017). Identity, causality and social cohesion. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *43*(7), 1084–1100.
- Joppke, C. (1999). How immigration is changing citizenship: a comparative view. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *22*(4), 629–652.
- Joppke, C. (2007). Transformation of immigrant integration: civic integration and antidiscrimination in the Netherlands, France, and Germany. *World Politics*, *59*(2), 243–273.
- Joppke, C. (2010). *Citizenship and immigration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Khattab, N., & Fox, J. (2016). East-European immigrants responding to the recession in Britain: is there a trade-off between unemployment and over-qualification? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *42*(11), 1174–1789.
- Koopmans, R. (2013). Multiculturalism and immigration: a contested field in cross-national comparison. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *39*, 147–169.
- Koopmans, R. (2016). Does assimilation work? Sociocultural determinants of labour market participation of European Muslims. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *42*(2), 197–216.
- Koopmans, R., & Statham, P. (1999). Challenging the liberal nation-state? Post-nationalism, multiculturalism and the collective claims making of immigrants and ethnic minorities in Britain and Germany. *American Journal of Sociology* *105*(3), 652–696.
- Lueck, K. (2018). Socioeconomic success of Asian immigrants in the United States. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *44*(3), 425–438.
- Martin, P. L. (1994). Comparative migration policies. *International Migration Review*, *28*(1), 164–170.
- Massey, D. S., & Akresh, I. R. (2006). Immigrant intentions and mobility in a global economy: the attitudes and behavior of recently arrived U.S. immigrants. *Social Science Quarterly*, *87*(5), 954–971.
- Massey, D. S., Durand, J., & Pren, K. A. (2015). Border enforcement and return migration by documented and undocumented Mexicans. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *41*(7), 1015–1040.
- Matysiak, A., Mencarini, L., & Vignoli, D. (2016). Work-family conflict moderates the relationship between childbearing and subjective well-being. *European Journal of Population*, *32*, 355–379.
- Maxwell, R. (2010). Evaluating migrant integration: political attitudes across generations in Europe. *International Migration Review*, *44*(1), 25–52.
- Maxwell, R. (2012). *Ethnic minority migrants in Britain and France: integration trade-offs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McMichael, C., & Manderson, L. (2004). Somali women and well-being: social networks and social capital among immigrant women in Australia. *Human Organization*, *63*(1), 88–99.
- Morris, L. (2001). The ambiguous terrain of rights: civic stratification in Italy's emergent immigration regime. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *25*(3), 497–516.
- Mussino, E., Strozza, S., & Terzera, L. (2014). Il ruolo delle variabili individuali e delle realtà di insediamento nell'integrazione degli immigrati [The Role of Individual Variables and the Receiving Context in the Integration of Immigrants]. In P. Donadio, G. Gabrielli, & M. Massari (Eds.), *Uno Come Te. Europei e Nuovi Europei nei Percorsi di Integrazione [One like you. Europeans and new Europeans in the integration paths]* (pp. 119–130). FrancoAngeli: Milan.

- Neto, F. (1995). Predictors of satisfaction with life among second-generation migrants. *Social Indicators Research*, 35(1), 93–116.
- Neto, F. (2001). Satisfaction with life among adolescents from immigrant families in Portugal. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30(1), 53–67.
- OECD/EU. (2015). *Indicators of immigrant integration 2015: Settling in*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Ortensi, L. E. (2015). The integration of forced migrants into the Italian labor market. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*, 13(2), 179–199.
- Penninx, R. (2003). *Integration: The role of communities, institutions, and the state*. Migration information source. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Penninx, R. (2004). Integration processes of migrants in the European Union and policies relating to integration. Paper presented at the Conference on Population Challenges, International Migration and Reproductive Health in Turkey and the European Union: Issues and Policy Implications, held in Istanbul, October 11/12, 2004, <http://www.esiweb.org/pdf/turkeynetherlands/RinnusPenninx.pdf>.
- Piché, V. (2004). Immigration and intégration dans les pays développés: un cadre conceptuel. In G. Caselli, J. Vallin, & G. Wunsch (Eds.), *Demographie analyse et synthèse-population et société, vol VI* (pp. 159–178). Paris: Ined.
- Piracha, M., Tani, M., & Vaira-Lucero, M. 2013. Social Capital and Immigrants' Labour Market Performance. IZA Discussion Paper No. 7274.
- Portes, A., & Curtis, J. W. (1987). Changing flags: naturalization and its determinants among Mexican immigrants. *International Migration Review*, 21(2), 352–371.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second-generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rumbaut, R. G. (1997). Assimilation and its discontents: between rhetoric and reality. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 923–960.
- Rumbaut, R. G. (2004). Age, life stages, and generational cohorts: decomposing the immigrant first and second generations in the United States. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 1160–1205.
- Safi, M. (2010). Immigrants' life satisfaction in Europe: between assimilation and discrimination. *European Sociological Review*, 26(2), 159–176.
- Schalembier, B. (2016). The impact of exposure to other countries on life satisfaction: an international application of the relative income hypothesis. *Social Indicators Research*, 128(1), 221–239.
- Shin, D. C., & Johnson, D. (1978). Avowed happiness as an overall assessment of the quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 5, 475–492.
- Schneider, S. M. (2012). Income inequality and its consequences for life satisfaction: what role do social cognitions play? *Social Indicators Research*, 106(3), 419–438.
- Schneider, J., & Crul, M. (2010). New insights into assimilation and integration theory: introduction to the special issue. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(7), 1143–1148.
- Sciortino, G. (2006). Vent'anni di immigrazioni irregolari [Twenty years of irregular migration]. *IL MULINO*, 6, 1033–1043.
- Sciortino, G. (2016). Immigration. In E. Jones & G. Pasquino (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of Italian politics and society* (pp. 633–644). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sjaastad, L. A. (1962). The costs and returns of human migration. *Journal of Political Economy*, 70(5), 80–93.
- Söhn, J. (2014). How legal status contributes to differential integration opportunities. *Migration Studies*, 2(3), 369–391.
- Tibesigwa, B., Visser, M., & Hodkinson, B. (2016). Effects of objective and subjective income comparisons on subjective wellbeing. *Social Indicators Research*, 128(1), 361–389.
- Todaro, M. P. (1969). A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries. *The American Economic Review*, 59(1), 138–148.
- Van Tubergen, F., Ineke, M., & Henk, F. (2004). The economic incorporation of immigrants in 18 western societies: origin, destination, and community effects. *American Sociological Review*, 69(5), 704–727.
- Veenhoven, R. (1996). The study of life satisfaction. In W. E. Saris, R. Veenhoven, A. C. Scherpenzeel, & B. Bunting (Eds.), *A comparative study of satisfaction with life in Europe* (pp. 11–48). Budapest: Eötvös University Press.
- Veenhoven, R. (2012). Cross-national differences in happiness: cultural measurement bias or effect of culture? *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 2(4), 333–353.
- Verkuyten, M. (2008). Life satisfaction among ethnic minorities: the role of discrimination and group identification. *Social Indicators Research*, 89(3), 391–404.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054.
- Vink, M. P. (2013). Immigrant integration and access to citizenship in the European Union: the role of origin countries. INTERACT Research Report 2013/05. Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico di Fiesole (FI): European University Institute.

- Wadsworth, T. (2016). Marriage and subjective well-being: how and why context matters. *Social Indicators Research, 126*(3), 1025–1048.
- Wallace Goodman, S., & Wright, M. (2015). Does mandatory integration matter? Effects of civic requirements on immigrant socio-economic and political outcomes. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 41*(12), 1885–1908.
- Wanner, R. (2011). Immigration policy and the economic integration of immigrants: a cross-national comparison. Prairie Metropolis Centre Working Paper Series.
- Wright, M., & Bloemraad, I. (2012). Is there a trade-off between multiculturalism and socio-political integration? Policy regimes and immigrant incorporation in comparative perspective. *Perspectives on Politics, 10*(1), 77–95.
- Yang, P. Q. (1994). Explaining immigrant naturalization. *International Migration Review, 28*(3), 449–477.