



Working Paper No. 809

Causal Linkages between Work and Life Satisfaction and Their Determinants in a Structural VAR Approach*

by

Alex Coad**

Science and Technology Policy Research Unit, University of Sussex

Martin Binder

Levy Economics Institute of Bard College

June 2014

* We are grateful to Matthias Duschl and an anonymous referee for many helpful comments on a previous draft. This research was funded by the ESRC-TSB-BIS-NESTA as part of the ES/J008427/1 grant on Skills, Knowledge, Innovation, Policy and Practice (SKIPPY). The data used in this publication were made available to us by the German Socio-Economic Panel (GSOEP) study at the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), Berlin. Neither the original collectors of the data nor the Archive bears any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here. The usual disclaimer applies.

** Corresponding author: Alex Coad, a.coad@sussex.ac.uk

The Levy Economics Institute Working Paper Collection presents research in progress by Levy Institute scholars and conference participants. The purpose of the series is to disseminate ideas to and elicit comments from academics and professionals.

Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, founded in 1986, is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, independently funded research organization devoted to public service. Through scholarship and economic research it generates viable, effective public policy responses to important economic problems that profoundly affect the quality of life in the United States and abroad.

Levy Economics Institute
P.O. Box 5000
Annandale-on-Hudson, NY 12504-5000
<http://www.levyinstitute.org>

Copyright © Levy Economics Institute 2014 All rights reserved

ISSN 1547-366X

Abstract

Work and life satisfaction depends on a number of pecuniary and nonpecuniary factors at the workplace and determines these in turn. We analyze these causal linkages using a structural vector autoregression approach for a sample of the German working populace collected from 1984 to 2008, finding that workplace autonomy plays an important causal role in determining well-being.

Keywords: Subjective Well-Being; Job Satisfaction; Structural VAR; German Socio-Economic Panel (GSOEP)

JEL Classifications: C33, I12, I31

1 INTRODUCTION

Most of the working populace spends half of their waking hours or more at their jobs most of the days of a week. Thus, it is no wonder that one's employment plays a substantial role in determining one's health and well-being.

In the same way that being unemployed hurts an individual (Lucas et al., 2004), being employed can be beneficial for the employed (or self-employed, Binder and Coad, 2013c). Of course, this is partly due to the income a job provides for the individual but it is also be due in part to the sense of meaning it can provide, as well as social validation and other psychological factors (Layard et al., 2012, p. 66). These non-pecuniary factors should play an important role for individual job satisfaction and can be conjectured to be what drive the insight that, often, any job is preferable to no job at all in terms of individual well-being (Gruen et al., 2010). However, there are certain jobs that are better in some characteristics than others—for example, those that offer individuals a high level of self-determination and autonomy and which provide higher non-pecuniary benefits and increase job satisfaction (Benz and Frey, 2008; Deci and Ryan, 2000). Self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Frey, 1997) posits that individuals value autonomy in their jobs, as this satisfies an inborn psychological need. We can thus conjecture that workplace autonomy will be one important determinant of workplace well-being.

Work and life satisfaction thus depend on a multitude of factors that are likely to interact with each other. Assuming that autonomy increases job and life satisfaction (e.g., Benz and Frey, 2008) would neglect the fact that satisfied and happy workers are likely to be promoted more often and thus assume positions with more managerial autonomy (Graham, 2005; Lyubomirsky et al., 2005). Similarly, being in good health is a prerequisite for being successful in a job and earning higher incomes (Arrow, 1996). It is difficult to disentangle these problems of endogeneity in traditional multivariate regression frameworks, but it is possible to take them into account through vector autoregressions. We disentangle the causal relations between well-being and other life domains using data-driven structural vector autoregressions (VARs). VARs have been recently applied to the study of subjective well-being (Becchetti et al., 2008; Binder and Coad, 2010a; Bottan and Truglia, 2011). Using reduced-form VARs thus allows us to model the complex co-evolution of a number of interconnected variables, but cannot provide causal interpretation. We extend previous work by using a structural VAR approach to assess the

causal linkages between work and life satisfaction and a number of their most important workplace determinants.

2 DATA

We analyze the co-evolution of a number of key workplace variables for the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) household panel data set from 1984 to 2008. This well-known data set collects information on a representative sample of the German populace in a wide range of domains of the respondents' lives (for more information, see Wagner et al., 2007; Haisken-DeNew and Frick, 2005). We use an unbalanced panel with a total of 200,813 observations (after discarding observations where respondents did not provide data for the variables used in our analysis; see Table 1 for descriptive statistics). Since we are interested in causal linkages of life and work satisfaction at the workplace, we focus only on individuals who report being employed (with the majority being in full-time employment, 76%, and some individuals being in part-time or marginal employment statuses or training).

Our main variables of interest are as follows: we use an individual's life satisfaction as the measure of overall well-being, where individuals are asked how satisfied, all in all, they are with their life at the moment. This question is answered on an 11-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (lowest satisfaction) to 10 (highest satisfaction). We also look more specifically into an individual's satisfaction with the job, measured similarly to the life satisfaction variable. We also use a measure of (log) household income, which is deflated and adjusted for post-government transfers (taxes and transfers) and which we equalize using the International Experts' scale (i.e., dividing household income by the square root of household size (see, e.g., Headey et al., 2004).

Another variable of interest is an individual's health problems, which we operationalize with a composite variable created via principal component analysis and consisting of a satisfaction with health judgement and the (log) number of hospital days and doctor visits. The objective parts of this variable help to alleviate reservations about personality traits mediating the satisfaction with health judgment. Our measure accounts for $\rho = 47.96\%$ of the variance of the individual indicators (and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure indicates acceptable fit).

Apart from these variables that generally describe an individual's life, we also focus more directly on workplace-related variables, namely the autonomy associated with an individ-

ual's occupation, as well as number of hours worked in the job. Autonomy, especially, can be conjectured to be an important and under-researched workplace variable that plays an important role for well-being: self-determination theory (SDT, Deci and Ryan, 2000) holds that autonomy is one of three innate psychological needs that improve human functioning and well-being when satisfied. Empirical evidence on this relationship is robust and indeed shows that work satisfaction is generally higher for individuals in autonomous jobs (Spector, 1985; Parker and Ohly, 2012).¹ The autonomy variable in the SOEP dataset distinguishes autonomy levels *inter alia* based on task descriptions, vocational training, responsibilities and company size for civil servants, workers and employees and the self-employed. It distinguishes five regular autonomy levels plus the lowest level of apprenticeship (encompassing interns and trainees). Low autonomy levels are related to manual workers, whereas manager and freelance academics are in the highest autonomy level group. Self-employed individuals are categorized into autonomy levels 3 to 5 depending on their number of employees.²

¹ One could conjecture, as a referee points out to us, that there might be a difference between the autonomy that one seeks voluntarily and autonomy individuals are pushed into, e.g. when being forced into self-employment to escape unemployment. SDT holds that both types of autonomy are positive for workplace well-being, and the predicted relationship has been empirically found for a British data set of self-employed (Binder and Coad, 2013c). Autonomy thus is positive for workplace well-being generally.

² Why are self-employed individuals with employees classified into higher autonomy levels than those without employees? We conjecture this to be the case to deal with the above mentioned fact that some self-employed are pushed into self-employment to escape unemployment. These self-employed are likely in jobs that enjoy lower levels of autonomy (e.g. newspaper stand vendors) than entrepreneurs founding their own firm and hiring other employees.

Table 1 Summary Statistics

	(1)			
Life satisfaction	7.1614	1.6501	0	10
Work satisfaction	7.1303	2.0060	0	10
Bad Health	0.0000	1.1995	-1.7341	8.2271
Satisfaction With Health	7.0637	2.0153	0	10
log(hospital days)	0.1743	0.6348	0	5.7714
log(doc visits)	1.4337	1.2834	0	5.9839
Log(income)	9.9743	0.4637	2.2477	14.923
Hours worked	39.3494	12.0475	0.2000	80
Autonomy	2.5401	1.2313	0	5
Worries	4.5315	0.9571	2.2216	6.6648
Worry: Economy	2.2359	0.6186	1	3
Worry: Finances	1.9192	0.6767	1	3
Worry: Environment	2.2125	0.6299	1	3
Worry: Peace	2.2011	0.6949	1	3
Worry: Job Security	1.6797	0.7162	1	3
gender	0.4399	0.4964	0	1
age	40.4009	11.6853	16	86
age ²	136.5531	151.5436	0.2403	2071.1
d disabled	0.0469	0.2115	0	1
d fulltime	0.7579	0.4283	0	1
d parttime	0.1571	0.3639	0	1
d training	0.0459	0.2092	0	1
d marginal	0.0381	0.1914	0	1
d sheltered	0.0010	0.0312	0	1
Education dummies				
1b elementary	0.0944	0.2924	0	1
1c basic voc.	0.2689	0.4434	0	1
2b middle gen.	0.0429	0.2027	0	1
2a middle voc.	0.2698	0.4439	0	1
2c gen: hi gen.	0.0246	0.1548	0	1
2c voc: hi voc.	0.0649	0.2464	0	1
3a low tert.	0.0575	0.2328	0	1
3b high tert.	0.1483	0.3554	0	1
d single	0.2550	0.4358	0	1
d married	0.6383	0.4805	0	1
d separated	0.0200	0.1398	0	1
d divorced	0.0703	0.2557	0	1
d widowed	0.0141	0.1181	0	1
Number of Persons in HH	3.0280	1.3128	1	17
d German	0.8734	0.3326	0	1
d EastGermany	0.1992	0.3994	0	1
Observations	203816			

Source: Authors' calculations

A final main variable is an individual's worries, which is a composite measure computed via principal component analysis. It consists of a number of more specific worries, namely the extent to which an individual worries about economic development, finances, environment, peace and job security. These represent an individual's perceptions of life and may contrast with that individual's objective living conditions. They reflect both selfish (job, economic conditions) and more altruistic worries (world peace and the environment) and are originally assessed on a Likert scale from 1 ("very concerned") to 3 ("not concerned at all"). This worries variable can be seen as a crude proxy of some aspects of personality (worries actually capture more than, for example, just the neurotic attitudes of the individual, see Binder and Ward, 2013).³

Apart from these main variables, we also include some typical control variables (see Table 1) such as gender, age, age², regions (German "Bundeslaender" and East- vs. West-Germany) and an individual's highest level of education, as measured by the CASMIN (Comparative Analysis of Social Mobility in Industrial Nations) scale. This is measured ordinally, ranging from zero ("In School") to nine ("Higher Tertiary Education"). Our interest in job-related factors leads us to drop unemployed individuals. Control variables are not reported to conserve space. The main variables are standardized to allow comparison of effect magnitudes across our sample. Table 2 contains the correlation matrix.

3 METHODOLOGY

We focus on how changes in our main variables are associated with changes of other main variables over time. Treating several variables as mutually endogenous, VARs allow us to uncover multiple potential channels of intertemporal association between these variables.

To start, we pre-process our VAR series $w_{i,t}$ to remove the influence of the following control variables $X_{i,t}$: education dummies; gender dummy; German nationality; age and age-squared; East Germany dummy; Bundeslaender (regional) dummies; dummies for separated, single, divorced, widowed, spouse being away in a different country; year dummies, and dummies for each integer of household size (equal to 5 if 5 or more in the household). i and t are individual and year indices respectively.

³ While personality often tends to be seen as something fixed, there has been recent evidence for the variability of personality (Boyce et al., 2013).

$$W_{i,t} = a + \sum_{\tau=t-s}^{t-1} \beta_{i,\tau} w_{i,\tau} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

For the reduced-form VAR, estimated using Least Absolute Deviation (a.k.a. median regression), our regression equation takes the following simple form:

$$w_{i,t} = a + \sum_{\tau=t-s}^{t-1} \beta_{i,\tau} w_{i,\tau} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (2)$$

where $w_{i,t}$ is an $m \times 1$ vector containing the endogenous variables ($t - s$ refers to the number of lags examined). a is a constant and β is an $m \times m$ matrix containing the VAR coefficients. $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ the residual error term. In our application $m = 7$.

To estimate our SVAR, we allow for instantaneous (acyclic) causal effects such that the vector $w_{i,t} = f(w_{i,t})$. Our regression equation is:

$$w_{i,t} = B \cdot w_{i,t} + \sum_{\tau=t-s}^{t-1} \gamma_{i,\tau} w_{i,\tau} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (3)$$

A key step is identifying the matrix B . This is done using the algorithm in Moneta et al. (2013), which applies an Independent Component Analysis (ICA) to recover the latent components that are fully statistically independent, before they are arranged in a causal ordering that best fits the data. We begin by estimating a reduced-form VAR to obtain the residuals $\varepsilon_{i,t}$, then apply ICA to decompose the residuals into statistically independent shocks $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$. Then, the rows are permuted to obtain an estimate of a lower-triangular matrix with zeroes along the diagonal. Further details are in Moneta et al. (2013).

Table 2 Correlation Matrix

	lifesat	worksat	healthprob	log_inc	hoursworked	autonomy	worriesall
lifesat	1						
worksat	0.2308*	1					
healthprob	-0.1486*	-0.1576*	1				
log_inc	0.0209*	0.0084*	-0.0121*	1			
hoursworked	0.0061	0.0096*	-0.0076*	0.0324*	1		
autonomy	0.0178*	0.0297*	-0.0049	0.0186*	0.0375*	1	
worriesall	-0.1093*	-0.0936*	0.0397*	-0.0165*	-0.0013	-0.0140*	1

Source: Authors' calculations

Notes: Correlations significant at the 1% level indicated with stars.

4 RESULTS

We present two sets of results, namely the reduced-form panel VAR model (see Table 3) and, more importantly, the structural VAR model (see Table 4). For space reasons, we focus on commenting on the structural VAR model (in particular, on the instantaneous effects), and leave the reduced-form panel VAR model untouched, noting the similarity in results.

To test whether the VAR-LiNGAM approach is valid, we require that the SVAR residuals are non-Gaussian. To investigate this, we run normality tests on the VAR residuals, and observe that the Shapiro-Wilk and Shapiro-Francia p -values are all smaller than 10^{-15} .

The primary causal factor is autonomy, which affects every other SVAR variable within the period (although we find no significant effect on health problems): it has direct positive effects on life and work satisfaction, (log) income and hours worked, and a negative direct effect on our worries variable (i.e., decreasing one's worries). Workplace autonomy has been conjectured to explain work satisfaction of the self-employed (Benz and Frey, 2008; Binder and Coad, 2013a,c) and seems to be also relevant in explaining why work satisfaction is higher in smaller companies (Benz and Frey, 2008).⁴ Overall, we can show that this extends to life satisfaction more generally, and positive effects of autonomy are thus not limited to workplace well-being. These findings are highly consistent with self-determination theory, and empirical evidence from the psychological literature (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Spector, 1985; Parker and Ohly, 2012). It is important to note that SDT predicts this to be the case quite generally: while

⁴ See, however, Binder and Coad (2013a), who find that autonomy increases work and life satisfaction, as does company size. Whether company size is thus a good proxy for autonomy is not yet settled.

there might be individual factors moderating the effect of autonomy on well-being, autonomy has been shown to always increase work satisfaction in a large meta-analysis (Spector, 1985). This is consistent with our results, and further disaggregation (not reported here) confirms that autonomy plays an important role for the subset of marginally employed individuals (it is not at the top of the causal ordering for part-time employed individuals, but rather in the middle of the causal ordering; this heterogeneity should be explored more fully in subsequent research).

Table 3 Reduced-form Vector Autoregression Results, LAD Estimation.

	First lag							
	l_lifesat	l_worksat	l_hlthprob	l_log_inc	l_hrsworked	l_autonomy	l_worries	
lifesat	-0.530*** (0.00257)	0.0176*** (0.00254)	-0.00597** (0.00244)	0.00188 (0.00249)	-0.00551** (0.00252)	0.00194 (0.00239)	-0.00575** (0.00245)	-
worksat	0.0150*** (0.00201)	-0.495*** (0.00199)	0.000292 (0.00191)	0.00239 (0.00195)	-0.00610*** (0.00197)	-0.00197 (0.00187)	-0.00685*** (0.00191)	-
hlthprob	-0.0169*** (0.00337)	-0.00158 (0.00334)	-0.538*** (0.00320)	0.000218 (0.00327)	0.00376 (0.00331)	0.00179 (0.00314)	-0.00197 (0.00321)	-
log_inc	0.00927*** (0.00233)	0.00788*** (0.00231)	-0.00396* (0.00221)	-0.267*** (0.00226)	0.0191*** (0.00229)	0.0218*** (0.00217)	-0.00226 (0.00222)	-
hrsworked	-0.000725 (0.00142)	0.00202 (0.00141)	-0.00291** (0.00135)	0.00468*** (0.00138)	-0.348*** (0.00140)	0.00794*** (0.00133)	-0.00164 (0.00136)	-
autonomy	0.000357 (0.000553)	-0.000538 (0.000548)	-0.000899* (0.000526)	0.00494*** (0.000536)	0.00144*** (0.000543)	-0.0574*** (0.000516)	0.000260 (0.000527)	-
worries	-0.00767* (0.00414)	-0.0128*** (0.00410)	-0.00254 (0.00394)	0.00525 (0.00402)	-0.00529 (0.00407)	-0.00215 (0.00386)	-0.553*** (0.00395)	-
	Second lag							
	l2_lifesat	l2_worksat	l2_hlthprob	l2_log_inc	l2_hrsworked	l2_autonomy	l2_worries	Pseudo-R ²
lifesat	-0.234*** (0.00254)	0.00953*** (0.00251)	-0.00568** (0.00242)	-0.00425* (0.00232)	-0.00235 (0.00245)	-0.00203 (0.00233)	-0.0124*** (0.00241)	0.0945
worksat	0.0111*** (0.00199)	-0.213*** (0.00196)	-0.00206 (0.00190)	-0.00255 (0.00182)	-0.00734*** (0.00192)	-0.00269 (0.00182)	-0.00840*** (0.00188)	0.0766
hlthprob	-0.00831** (0.00333)	-0.00266 (0.00329)	-0.256*** (0.00318)	0.00547* (0.00305)	0.00701** (0.00321)	0.000522 (0.00306)	-0.00246 (0.00316)	0.1181
log_inc	0.00604*** (0.00230)	0.00813*** (0.00228)	-0.00156 (0.00220)	-0.0856*** (0.00210)	0.0178*** (0.00222)	0.0131*** (0.00211)	-0.000868 (0.00218)	0.0418
hrsworked	-0.000779 (0.00141)	0.00486*** (0.00139)	-0.00224* (0.00134)	0.00324** (0.00129)	-0.112*** (0.00136)	0.00466*** (0.00129)	-0.000362 (0.00133)	0.0502
autonomy	-0.000489 (0.000547)	-0.000764 (0.000541)	-0.00113** (0.000522)	0.00277*** (0.000500)	0.000855 (0.000527)	-0.0171*** (0.000501)	0.000544 (0.000518)	0.0073
worries	-0.00183 (0.00409)	-0.0130*** (0.00405)	0.00166 (0.00391)	0.00257 (0.00374)	-0.00350 (0.00395)	-0.00462 (0.00376)	-0.245*** (0.00388)	0.1325

Source: Authors' calculations

Notes: 2-lag model with 79,152 observations. Constant term included in the regressions but not reported here. Key to significance levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Our causal ordering suggests that the second most important influence in our SVAR is the number of hours worked, which has causal effects on the remaining variables, although not all effects are significant. Hours worked has a positive effect on work satisfaction (and a non-significant effect on life satisfaction),⁵ as well as a positive effect on income. It is interesting to note that we find the causal arrow runs from hours worked to work satisfaction and not vice versa. Working more hours thus contributes to higher work satisfaction (Block and Koellinger, 2009, p. 204). This could be explained with reference to part-time employment or working fewer hours, mostly signaling precarious employment which is not as conducive to workplace

well-being as a full-time job (the evidence on this is scarce and for UK data, Bardasi and Francesconi, 2004, cannot find negative effects of atypical employment on work satisfaction). Our findings here somewhat contradict conventional wisdom that working longer hours decreases work satisfaction (e.g., Clark, 1996). However, recent research has shown that longer working hours decrease work satisfaction mainly for females (Booth and Van Ours, 2008; Gash et al., 2010), thus casting doubt on the contention that working hours always decrease work satisfaction (see also Vieira, 2005).

Higher work satisfaction has positive effects on life satisfaction (which might be explained by a bottom-up view of well-being, where individual domain satisfactions add up to overall satisfaction with life) and positive effects on income. We interpret this to mean that individuals who are satisfied with their job are more productive within their company and earn higher incomes through promotions (Graham et al., 2004). The productivity-enhancing effect of work satisfaction is not limited to income though, but extends beyond workplace benefits: higher work satisfaction has a significant negative impact on health problems and worries. Being in a satisfying job is thus beneficial for physical and mental health of the worker.⁵

It is interesting to note that the causal impact of health problems in our working populace is limited to increasing one's worries and decreasing life satisfaction. It is well known in the literature that bad health impacts negatively on subjective well-being (Graham et al., 2011; Binder and Coad, 2013b). But finding no impact on income or the job more broadly might be driven by our focus on individuals who are holding a job, thus limiting the effect of health problems on the comparatively more healthy (individuals with severe health problems dropping out of the working populace are not part of our sample).

Life satisfaction has few causal effects in our analysis and is at the end of the causal ordering. It only affects worries negatively, as one would probably expect. At first glance, this runs counter to other studies that have found positive effects of life satisfaction on other life domains, showing that happier individuals tend to perform better in many respects such as income, health and job success (Graham et al., 2004; Lyubomirsky et al., 2005; Binder and Coad, 2010a). However, if we look additionally at the first lag effects here, we find such positive causal effects of life satisfaction (it positively influences work satisfaction and income

⁵ Meier and Stutzer (2008) report an inversely u-shaped effect of hours worked on life satisfaction for their SOEP sample.

and decreases health problems). Considering both instantaneous and lagged effects, our causal results are thus extremely consistent with previous work on reduced-form vector-autoregressions in this area (Binder and Coad, 2010a; Binder and Ward, 2013). Being happier thus increases productivity but it does so over time and probably less directly than the instantaneous relationships we observe in our SVAR.

Finally note that the worries variable has no causal effects on the other variables, when we consider instantaneous effects. However, it has a negative significant effect on subsequent work satisfaction when we look at the first lag. Since the worries variable includes aspects of the respondents' jobs, this result might stem from changes in objective working conditions (job security and finances) which prompt the individual to worry over one's job and hence decrease work satisfaction with a lag.

We have carried out extensive robustness analyses, which we cannot report for want of space: for example, our results are robust with respect to different lag lengths. If attrition were to bias our results, we would expect different causal orderings depending on lag length, which we have not found. Similarly, there might be a difference between Eastern and Western Germany (due to the countries' divided history). While we find that income comes higher in the causal ordering for East Germans (and work satisfaction correspondingly trumps income for West Germans), the main causal drivers in both parts of Germany are autonomy and hours worked. In this respect, we can report on some heterogeneity between East and West Germany that warrants further research, while at the same time finding that the main causal drivers are the same.

Table 4 SVAR Results: Instantaneous Effects, as Well as the First Lag

	instantaneous effects							first lag						
	lifesat	worksat	hlthprob	log_inc	hrsworked	autonomy	worries	l_lifesat	l_worksat	l_hlthprob	l_log_inc	l_hrsworked	l_autonomy	l_worries
lifesat	0	0.2156	-0.1214	0.0305	-0.0030	0.0090	0	-0.4253	0.0941	-0.0592	0.0096	-0.0041	0.0019	-0.0027
	0	0.0042	0.0036	0.0047	0.0032	0.0032	0	0.0059	0.0031	0.0029	0.0028	0.0028	0.0022	0.0021
worksat	0	0	0	0	0.0102	0.0309	0	0.0114	-0.3847	-0.0006	0.0019	-0.0035	-0.0026	-0.0063
	0	0	0	0	0.0029	0.0035	0	0.0028	0.0059	0.0024	0.0016	0.0024	0.0025	0.0015
hlthprob	0	-0.1678	0	0	-0.0088	0.0039	0	-0.0104	-0.0677	-0.4435	0.0002	0.0033	0.0025	-0.0046
	0	0.0033	0	0	0.0038	0.0029	0	0.0033	0.0034	0.0053	0.0030	0.0029	0.0028	0.0027
log_inc	0	0.0128	-0.0080	0	0.0406	0.0214	0	0.0080	0.0119	-0.0061	-0.2209	0.0240	0.0198	-0.0032
	0	0.0034	0.0035	0	0.0033	0.0030	0	0.0020	0.0031	0.0029	0.0042	0.0027	0.0028	0.0021
hrsworked	0	0	0	0	0	0.0440	0	-0.0006	0.0024	-0.0015	0.0025	-0.2391	0.0084	-0.0017
	0	0	0	0	0	0.0037	0	0.0013	0.0016	0.0010	0.0012	0.0076	0.0012	0.0010
autonomy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0001	-0.0001	-0.0010	0.0039	0.0009	-0.0388	0.0002
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0005	0.0004	0.0003	0.0003	0.0004	0.0010	0.0005
worries	-0.0932	-0.0822	0.0125	-0.0194	0.0025	-0.0117	0	-0.0446	-0.0409	0.0016	-0.0021	-0.0076	-0.0035	-0.4745
	0.0031	0.0038	0.0030	0.0029	0.0034	0.0030	0	0.0034	0.0036	0.0039	0.0032	0.0039	0.0035	0.0043

Notes: A second lag is included in the estimations but not reported here. Coefficients significant at the 1% level appear in bold. NB: The matrix of instantaneous effects appears about half empty because it should form a lower-triangular matrix after appropriate row permutations (reflecting the acyclic causal structure).

5 CONCLUSION

We analyzed causal linkages between well-being, income, health problems, worries, autonomy and hours worked in the job for working German individuals from 1984-2008 using a structural vector autoregression approach. Our most striking finding is the key role that workplace autonomy plays with respect to other variables. Given that autonomy and hours worked are the key causal drivers, it seems that individuals first choose their career trajectory in terms of autonomy or personal freedom, then decide how much to work (intensity down this trajectory), and well-being (work satisfaction and life satisfaction) is the result of these decisions. Finding that autonomy, no matter whether imposed or freely chosen, is such an important non-pecuniary determinant of individual well-being is consistent with the predictions of self-determination theory and prompts a more prominent role for autonomy in labour economics. Given autonomy's positive effect on life and work satisfaction as well as on worries, we note that any workplace-related policies that aim at improving worker's well-being should be aware that policy measures that try to further well-being at the expense of autonomy are likely to fail. To improve worker well-being, our results suggest taking an indirect route through improving the autonomy individuals enjoy at work. Individuals aiming at improving their workplace and general well-being are well advised to seek out work that allows them room for self-determined action and discretion. Given our results, it is not surprising that individuals seek out self-employment that pays less than corresponding employment or self-determined volunteering activities that pay nothing at all. Not all work brings disutility, as economic theory holds.

References

- Arrow, J. (1996). Estimating the Influence of Health as a Risk Factor on Unemployment: A Survival Analysis of Employment Durations for Workers Surveyed in the German Socio-Economic Panel (1984-1990). *Social Science & Medicine*, 42(12):1651– 1659.
- Bardasi, E. and Francesconi, M. (2004). The Impact of Atypical Employment on Individual Well-being: Evidence from a Panel of British Workers. *Social Science & Medicine*, 58:1671–1688.
- Becchetti, L., Pelloni, A., and Rossetti, F. (2008). Relational Goods, Sociability, and Happiness. *Kyklos*, 61(3):343–363.
- Benz, M. and Frey, B. S. (2008). Being Independent is a Great Thing: Subjective Evaluations of Self-employment and Hierarchy. *Economica*, 75:362–383.
- Binder, M. and Coad, A. (2010a). An Examination of the Dynamics of Well-being and Life Events Using Vector Autoregressions. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 76(2):352–371.
- Binder, M. and Coad, A. (2013a). How Satisfied are the Self-employed? A Life Domain View. Mimeo.
- Binder, M. and Coad, A. (2013b). “I’m Afraid I Have Bad News For You...” Estimating the Impact of Different Health Impairments on Subjective Well-being. *Social Science & Medicine*, 87:155–167.
- Binder, M. and Coad, A. (2013c). Life Satisfaction and Self-Employment: A Matching Approach. *Small Business Economics*, 40(4):1009–1033.
- Binder, M. and Ward, F. (2013). The Structure of Subjective Well-being: A Vector Autoregressive Approach. *Metroeconomica*, 64(2):361–400.
- Block, J. and Koellinger, P. (2009). I Can’t Get No Satisfaction - Necessity Entrepreneurship and Procedural Utility. *Kyklos*, 62(2):191–209.
- Booth, A. L. and Van Ours, J. C. (2008). Job Satisfaction and Family Happiness: The Part-time Work Puzzle. *The Economic Journal*, 118(526):F77–F99.
- Bottan, N. L. and Truglia, R. P. (2011). Deconstructing the Hedonic Treadmill: Is Happiness Autoregressive? *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 40:224–236.
- Boyce, C. J., Wood, A. M., and Powdthavee, N. (2013). Is Personality Fixed? Personality Changes as Much as “Variable” Economic Factors and More Strongly Predicts Changes to Life Satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research*, 111(1):287–305.
- Clark, A. E. (1996). Job Satisfaction in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 34(2):189–217.

- Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4):227–268.
- Frey, B. S. (1997). From the Price to the Crowding Effect. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics*, 133(2):325–350.
- Gash, V., Mertens, A., and Romeu Gordo, L. (2010). Women Between Part-time and Fulltime work: The influence of changing hours of work on happiness and life-satisfaction. *Mimeo*.
- Graham, C. (2005). The Economics of Happiness. Forthcoming in Durlauf, S. and Blume, L. (Eds.), *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2nd Edition.
- Graham, C., Eggers, A., and Sukhtankar, S. (2004). Does Happiness Pay? An Exploration Based on Panel Data from Russia. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 55:319–342.
- Graham, C., Higuera, L., and Lora, E. (2011). Which Health Conditions Cause the Most Unhappiness? *Health Economics*, 20:1431–1447.
- Gruen, C., Hauser, W., and Rhein, T. (2010). Is Any Job Better than No Job? Life Satisfaction and Re-employment. *Journal of Labor Research*, 31(3):285–306.
- Haisken-DeNew, J. and Frick, J. R. (2005). DTC - Desktop Companion to the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). Version 8.0 - Dec 2005, Berlin.
- Headey, B., Muffels, R., and Wooden, M. (2004). Money Doesn't Buy Happiness ... or Does it? A Reconsideration Based on the Combined Effects of Wealth, Income and Consumption. Melbourne Institute Working Paper No.15/04.
- Layard, R., Clark, A. E., and Senik, C. (2012). The Causes of Happiness and Misery. In Helliwell, J., Layard, R., and Sachs, J., editors, *World Happiness Report*, chapter 3, pages 58–90. The Earth Institute.
- Lucas, R. E., Clark, A. E., Georgellis, Y., and Diener, E. (2004). Unemployment Alters the Set Point for Life Satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 15(1):8–13.
- Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., and Diener, E. (2005). The Benefits of Frequent Positive Affect: Does Happiness Lead to Success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(6):803–855.
- Meier, S. and Stutzer, A. (2008). Is Volunteering Rewarding in Itself? *Economica*, 75:39–59.
- Moneta, A., Entner, D., Hoyer, P. O., and Coad, A. (2013). Causal Inference by Independent Component Analysis: Theory and Applications. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 75(5):705–730.
- Parker, S. K. and Ohly, S. (2012). Designing Motivating Jobs. In Kanfer, R., Chen, G., and Pritchard, R. D., editors, *Work Motivation: Past, Present, and Future*. Routledge.

- Spector, P. E. (1985). Higher-order Need Strength as a Moderator of the Job Scope-employee Outcome Relationship: A Meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58:119–127.
- Vieira, J. A. C. (2005). Skill Mismatches and Job Satisfaction. *Economics Letters*, 89(1):39–47.
- Wagner, G. G., Frick, J. R., and Schupp, J. (2007). The German Socio-economic Panel Study (SOEP) - Scope, Evolution and Enhancements. *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 1:139–169.