



Working Paper Series  
Department of Economics  
University of Verona

# All in the Family: How Do Social Capital and Material Wellbeing Affect Relational Wellbeing?

Martina Menon, Ravi Pendakur, Federico Perali

WP Number: 3

February 2014

ISSN: 2036-2919 (paper), 2036-4679 (online)

# **All in the Family: How Do Social Capital and Material Wellbeing Affect Relational Wellbeing?**

Martina Menon,<sup>1</sup> Ravi Pendakur,<sup>2</sup> and Federico Perali<sup>3</sup>

This draft: 20th January 2014

**Abstract:** We use a unique dataset from Italy to investigate the impact of socioeconomic characteristics and social capital on family wellbeing and satisfaction. We assess wellbeing using four dimensions of satisfaction with family life: satisfaction with decision making processes, with relationships with partner and children, and with time spent with children. Social capital is measured through information about membership in organizations, trust, and interactions with others. We find that while socioeconomic characteristics and equivalent income in general do not have an impact on family wellbeing, social capital matters for family life satisfaction.

**JEL:** D19, I31, Z13.

**Keywords:** Subjective wellbeing, Relational satisfaction, Social capital.

**Acknowledgment:** We are especially thankful to Judith A. Moe. All errors and omissions are the sole responsibility of the authors.

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Economics, University of Verona (Italy) and CHILD, [martina.menon@univr.it](mailto:martina.menon@univr.it).

<sup>2</sup> Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa (Canada), [pendakur@uottawa.ca](mailto:pendakur@uottawa.ca).

<sup>3</sup> Department of Economics, University of Verona (Italy) and CHILD, [federico.perali@univr.it](mailto:federico.perali@univr.it).

## 1. Introduction

The relationship between social capital and material wellbeing on life satisfaction within the family unit is largely unexplored despite the fact that it embraces the fields of sociology, psychology and economics. Indeed Helliwell and Barrington-Leigh (2010) and Donati (2003, 2007) argue that there is very little work done in the area even though the family is a core societal institution and thus worthy of research. The goal of this study is to assess the impact of social capital and material wellbeing on life satisfaction within the family. We use a unique dataset from Italy, designed by a multidisciplinary research team, which allows us to directly assess family wellbeing and indirectly assess social capital characteristics. Unlike the general measure of life satisfaction assessed with the standard question “all things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?”, in our dataset the information about life satisfaction is delimited to the domain of relational wellbeing within the family unit. This peculiarity will allow us to shed light on some aspects of family life (Barrington-Leigh 2010; Donati 2003, 2007).

Social capital can be defined as the “...features of social life - social networks, associated norms and trustworthiness - that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives” (Putnam 1995: 664-665; see also Durlauf and Fafchamps 2005; Franke 2005; Schookner 2002; Glaeser *et al.* 2002; Van Der Gaag and Snijders 2005). While there are competing definitions of social capital, a common thread by way of an acknowledgement of social relations through network interactions is always present. Reimer *et al.* (2008), for example, describe social capital as “...the social networks and their associated norms that may facilitate various types of collective action” (page 258). Coleman (1988) describes community social capital as the social relationships that exist among people and the relationships they have with institutions in the community.

An important distinction within the social capital literature lies in the difference between “bonding” (within group interaction) and “bridging” (interactions which reach outside the group) social capital. It is this distinction that has resulted in a growing understanding that not all social capital may be positive. In particular, if individuals’ interactions and trust in others remain within a fairly narrow range of contacts with similar individuals (bonding), increased levels of social

capital may actually serve to increase distrust between groups, thereby exacerbating inequities, constraining actions and increasing social exclusion (Babacan and Babacan 2007; Cheong 2006; Jaynes 2007; Portes 1998; Wakefield and Poland 2005). For example, bonding on the part of the majority can act to exclude minorities from membership recruitment, which results in lower civic participation and social capital formation on the part of minority group members (Bloemraad and Ramakrishnan 2006). Bridging social capital is more difficult, requiring people to go outside their comfort zone, but potentially resulting in greater information flows across groups.

Italian sociologists envision the family as a “firm” *par excellence* producing primary social relations and merit goods that benefit family members, parents, friends and institutions (Donati 2003, 2007; Prandini 2010; Tronca 2007). The extent of the benefit is proportional to the proximity of the relational circle to the family core. These relational goods and services are traditionally seen as positive generating bonding social capital in the form of trust and support within the family, as well as the wider kinship network. The family unit is also engaged in civic activities through participation in associations committed to meeting common social goals. Thus, the level of social capital held by a family unit may differ depending on how it combines the nuclear, kinship or civic dimensions of social capital and in the amount and quality of time invested in weaving together and maintaining nuclear, community or civic ties.

Social capital is an important dimension of social inclusion. An individual who lacks relationships and interactions within or outside the family is likely to be socially excluded thus aggravating the disadvantage, particularly if economically deprived (Berghman 1995; Bradshaw *et al.* 2004; Burchardt *et al.* 2002; Robila 2006; Sirovátka and Mareš 2006). Social inclusion as a policy goal presumes that a fundamental objective of society is to enable all members to participate fully as valued, respected and contributing members (United Nations 2005). It describes a means by which everyone, regardless of their experiences and circumstances, may gain fair access to the key social and economic resources required to achieve their potential, including access to health and education services and employment, available within a family or a community (Atkinson *et al.* 2002; Levitas 2003, 1998; Monnickendam and Berman 2008; Siemiatycki 2005; Toyne and Infanti 2004). Thus an individual who is rich in physical capital, but poor both in the quantity and quality of social interactions may not be satisfied with life.

In this study we assess the importance of social capital as a determinant of four dimensions of

subjective wellbeing within the family: satisfaction with the rules adopted in the decision process, the conjugal relationship, the parental relationship with children, and with the time spent with the children. We operationalize the different definitions of social capital by distinguishing three main dimensions: membership or degree of civic participation capturing the degree of social inclusion of the family, trust of people with both family and kinship ties describing a Putnam type of network capital, interactions with others of both the bonding and bridging type, and the degree of altruism as expressed by participation in public petitions and charitable donations. As a proxy for the intensity of the interactions with others we use information about the amount of time shared with family members during breakfast, the time invested in talking with each other about personal problems and the amount of time spent for helping family members in accomplishing their daily tasks. Other controls include income, the location in the macro-regions of Italy, level of education, marital status, and family composition. We find that while socioeconomic characteristics and income in general do not have an impact on family wellbeing, social capital matters for family life satisfaction with different facets depending on the dimension of subjective wellbeing of interest.

We first revisit the existing literature in order to derive an informed specification of our working model presented in Section 3. The subsequent section presents the data and empirical method used in the paper. Section 5 discusses the results and derives policy implications that are summarized in the conclusive section.

## **2. The literature**

Our goal is to illuminate the relative importance of social capital and material wellbeing on life satisfaction within families. However, our understanding of the link between these elements is in its infancy. This is particularly the case within economics, where research on the relationship between social capital and wellbeing is relatively recent (Maluccio *et al.* 2000; Robison *et al.* 2011). The differentiation between material wellbeing and subjective wellbeing or life satisfaction is even more so and in some ways treated with skepticism (Decancq *et al.* 2013; Helliwell and Barrington-Leigh 2010). In part, this is because subjective wellbeing is considered to be a function of utility, where life satisfaction is defined as the weighted product of the quantity of goods and services consumed by individuals. Thus material wellbeing should reflect

subjective wellbeing. Indeed, Klein (2011) suggests that, in general, economists consider the concepts of wellbeing, satisfaction and happiness as interchangeable. However, Helliwell and Barrington-Leigh (2010) make a case for including subjective wellbeing indicators in economic research arguing that subjective wellbeing can be used as a proxy measure for experienced utility and hence can reveal preferences and places and circumstances where more conventional revealed preference analysis is not possible. Adding to this, Klein (2011) argues that happiness can be viewed as a more emotional aspect of subjective wellbeing, while life satisfaction is more closely related to cognitive aspects of subjective wellbeing. Regardless, both Klein (2011) and Helliwell and Barrington-Leigh (2010) maintain that at the very least, subjective wellbeing is complementary to standard objectivist analysis of utility. Building on these ideas, Bartolini *et al.* (2013) use American GSS data and conclude that subjective wellbeing is a product of four forces: income growth, relational goods, confidence in institutions and social comparisons.

Where subjective wellbeing is viewed as reflective of material wellbeing and therefore redundant, social capital is viewed as theoretically difficult to grasp from an economic perspective. In part this is because traditional components of social capital (trust, belonging and networks) are largely ignored by economic literature. Further social capital, like subjective wellbeing, lacks a universally accepted definition. At the same time, while admittedly, social capital has a broad range of definitions (Aizlewood and Pendakur 2005; Bjørnskov 2006; Reimer *et al.* 2008; McElroy *et al.* 2006; van Oorschot *et al.* 2006), the idea of social relations through network interactions is always present. Reimer *et al.* (2008), for example, describe social capital as “the social networks and their associated norms that may facilitate various types of collective action” (p. 258). Coleman (1988) describes community social capital as the social relationships that exist among people and the relationships they have with institutions in the community. Thus at root it concerns the “features of social life - social networks, associated norms and trustworthiness - that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives” (Cheong 2006; Putnam 1995, 2007; Van Der Gaag and Snijders 2005). To date, social capital has been shown to be positively associated with high levels of education, confidence in public institutions, and participation in social, cultural, and political activities (Fukuyama 1995; Granberry and Marcelli 2007; McElroy *et al.* 2006; Patulny *et al.* 2007; Putnam 2007; Van Der Gaag and Snijders 2005). Within the social capital literature, an important distinction is made between bonding social capital (within group interactions bonding similar people) and bridging social capital (interaction

that reaches outside the group and bridges diverse people). The value of social capital depends upon the quantity and quality of social networks and interactions based on norms of reciprocity (Dekker and Uslaner 2001; Donati 2010; Uslaner 2001).

Stone and Hughes (2002) argue that while both types of interaction are important, bonding has specific implications for the capacity to “get by” while bridging has specific implications “getting ahead”. “Getting by” is more personal - linked to subjective wellbeing through life satisfaction, often at a local or family level and on a daily basis (page 4). “Getting ahead” is linked to both subjective wellbeing and material wellbeing because the broader networks are seen as providing a greater array of information, which can lead to advancement. However, where bridging is seen as universally beneficial, bonding is more problematic. In particular, if individuals’ interactions and trust in others remain within a fairly narrow range of contacts of similar individuals (bonding), increased levels of social capital may actually serve to increase distrust between groups (Babacan and Babacan 2007). Thus, areas with high levels of bonding but relatively little bridging may be characterised by a substantive ability to get by, but a limited ability to get ahead.

Seen in this light, overall wellbeing can be viewed as a function of social capital, material wellbeing, and subjective wellbeing. Indeed White (2009) equates wellbeing with social capital, stating, “the way to wellbeing includes connecting with people around you” (page 8). Reiterating this, Sarracino (2010) uses European values surveys to compare 11 Western European countries and concludes that declines in subjective wellbeing can be traced back to declines in social capital trends.

Klein (2011) looks at the link between social capital and subjective wellbeing using the European values survey. He finds positive correlations with living in a couple and trusting institutions as well as trusting people and having a lot of social contacts. Thus, for Klein, wellbeing is linked to being in a family, trust and having informal contacts. Calvo *et al.* (2012) compare wellbeing and social capital in 142 countries concluding that subjective wellbeing is linked to social trust and volunteering. They further argue that high subjective wellbeing is associated with many desirable outcomes including healthier and longer lives.

Much of the literature on family wellbeing and social capital is driven by researchers in social work and sociology. These studies are often qualitative in nature and point to differences across

family types, often highlighting the place of women and single parent households (see for example Castillo and Fenzi-Crossman 2010; Edwards 2004; Furstenberg 2005; Stone 2001; Stone and Hughes 2002). These researchers assess the dynamics of family structure on social capital formation and wellbeing. Furstenberg (2005), for example, looks at the prerequisites for assessing how social capital is accumulated across family structures. In particular, he argues that children quickly become players in the accumulation of social capital. Thus children can act as the go-betweens in more isolated communities (i.e.: recent immigrants) creating ties with the mainstream social worlds through school and friendship networks. Others (Castillo and Fenzi-Crossman 2010; Donati 2010; Hogan 2001) look at the impact of family structure, interactions within the family and networks on outcomes for children. Looking at interactions, Hogan finds that involving fathers in children's activities has a positive impact on children's schooling. Donati (2010) observes that the presence of children generates both costs and benefits, mainly of a relational nature. Such bonding capital stemming from the presence of children contributes significantly to the level of subjective wellbeing of the household. Castillo and Fenzi-Crossman (2010) assess the relationship of non-marital fathers' informal social networks and social capital of children. Similar to Hogan, they find that while informal social networks have a positive impact for children, formal networks do not.

There is limited economic or quantitative research linking family structure to social capital or wellbeing. Ravenera and Rajulton (2010), for example, look at social capital by family structure, arguing that the type of family (i.e., 2 parents and children versus single parent families) can affect the size of networks or interactions, which in turn can have an impact on total social capital and wellbeing.

Helliwell and Barrington-Leigh (2010) define subjective wellbeing as divided into 3 main categories, which tap into human experience in different ways - life evaluations, positive emotions and negative emotions. Bartolini *et al.* (2008), taking a more economic perspective, argue that subjective wellbeing is largely explained by four forces acting in different directions: income growth, decreasing relational goods, decreasing confidence in institutions, and social comparisons. These 4 groups of variables, they contend, allow us to explain the whole variation in subjective wellbeing.

White (2009) ties the three types of wellbeing together, arguing that they are essentially related

within a triangle associating subjective, material and relational wellbeing. Within this construct, material wellbeing is associated with food, shelter, and economic items. Relational wellbeing involves social interactions, and subjective wellbeing concerns people's perceptions of their situation. Relational wellbeing is most closely related to the interactions central to social capital, whereas material wellbeing is a more traditional assessment of wellbeing within the economic literature. Subjective wellbeing is most closely tied to the ideas espoused by Helliwell and Barrington-Leigh (2010).

### **3. Data and Method**

The above review suggests that subjective wellbeing is multidimensional and not solely based on income. Rather, subjective wellbeing is a product of material wellbeing, social capital, and personal circumstance. Our goal is to parse apart these dimensions of wellbeing in order to determine the degree to which they are distinct and additive.

Our data are drawn from a survey sponsored by the Italian International Center of Family Studies (CISF). This nationwide survey was conducted in 2009 using computer assisted telephone interviews by Coesis Research.<sup>4</sup> The sample of 4017 interviews is a representative sample of Italian households from the population households with land-based or cellular telephone service. The survey was designed to study the material and subjective wellbeing of Italian households and the cost of children by a multidisciplinary group of sociologists, psychologists and economists. Survey modules cover information on a wide range of topics including family background, disposable household income, social capital, and satisfaction with many aspects of family life.

Satisfaction with family life is assessed using four indicators. First, a measure assesses how satisfied a respondent is with the way decisions are made in her/his family. The second indicator of family life satisfaction measures satisfaction with the respondent's partner relationship. The third indicator measures how satisfied the respondent is with the relationship with children. The fourth indicator assesses how satisfied the respondent is with the time that s/he and children spend together.

---

<sup>4</sup> Coesis Research is an Italian service research agency specialized both in qualitative and quantitative researches located in Milan (<http://www.coesisresearch.it/>).

Given the aim of our study, we include only observations in which the respondent is a member of a family, either with or without children. Specifically, when analysing satisfaction with the way family decisions are made we only look at households comprising couples with and without children or an adult with children (sample size is 1955 observations). When assessing satisfaction with the relationship with children and with the time spent with children, we include only households with children (sample size is 1835 observations). When assessing the level of satisfaction with the partner we include only couples regardless of the presence of children (sample size 1554 observations).<sup>5</sup> Table 1 shows the distributions of the four measures of life satisfaction. In Appendix B we report a full description of the associated questions asked in the survey.

Social capital attributes are measured at the household level and include membership in civic organizations, as well as trust and interactions with others. The set *membership in civic organizations* taps inclusion or degree of family isolation and comprises information about 1) whether an individual within the family is a member of one or more associations, 2) whether they participate in voluntary activities, 3) whether individuals participate in social activities, and 4) whether they participate in neighbourhood meetings. The variables capturing *trust* are 1) trust in family members, 2) trust in friends, and 3) generalized trust. The set *interactions with others* taps relational well-being within both bonding and bridging realms and comprises 1) mutual help from friends, 2) help from family members, 3) breakfast time spent with family, 4) time spent with family members to talk through problems, 5) time spent for helping family members in their daily tasks, 6) participation to public petition, and 7) donation of money (altruism).<sup>6</sup>

As pointed out by Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters (2004) psychologists and sociologists describe responses to self-reported happiness or life satisfaction or subjective wellbeing surveys as cardinal and comparable, thus allowing the estimation of OLS regressions on levels of happiness. Cardinality implies that the relative difference between satisfaction responses is clearly perceived by all individuals and is linked to the relative difference in welfare  $(W_i - W_j) = \delta(LS_i - LS_j)$  by a positive function  $\delta$  known up to a multiplicative constant, where  $W$  is the welfare function and  $LS$  is life satisfaction of individuals  $i$  and  $j$ . On the other hand, economists maintain that individuals

---

<sup>5</sup> We assume that among divorced or separated families satisfaction with the former partner is low.

<sup>6</sup> Appendix B reports a detailed description of the social capital variables.

have a common opinion of what subjective wellbeing is recognizing that if  $LS_i > LS_j$ , then  $W_i > W_j$ . Therefore, they only assume interpersonal ordinal comparability and adopt ordered latent response models. In the case of single cross-sections, the authors report that the two econometric methods should not matter for the results.

We study the relationship between family life satisfaction (subjective wellbeing) and socioeconomic variables and social capital by estimating the following reduced equation model using ordinary least squares

$$LS_i = \alpha + \beta X_i + \gamma SC_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

where  $LS_i$  is satisfaction of individual  $i$  for the four dimensions of family life, and  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$  are parameters to be estimated. The vector  $X_i$  refers to a set of socioeconomic characteristics that may affect the dependent variable  $LS_i$ . The vector  $X_i$  comprises variables at the individual and household level, such as age, gender, marital status, education, presence of children by age groups, and quintiles of household equivalent income. The vector  $SC_i$  comprises variables related to the social capital of the household, and  $\varepsilon_i$  is the latent error term capturing unobservable heterogeneity. We also study the determinants of life satisfaction using ordered latent models to add additional diagnostic check. Estimations of the ordered probit and logit models are shown in Appendix A.

We estimate two types of regression models differing for the variables used as controls. We first estimate a baseline model controlling only for socioeconomic variables and then a model adding also the social capital of the family. In doing so, we can test the explanatory power of social capital in explaining the four measures of satisfaction with family life.

The four dependent variables are coded with 0, when the individual is not satisfied, and 10, when the individual is fully satisfied. For description convenience, in Table 1 we report the distributions of the life satisfaction indicators aggregated in three groups - not satisfied 0-5, rather satisfied 6-7 and fully satisfied 8-10. However, in the regression analysis the four indicators are expressed as discrete variables ranging from 0 to 10. The majority of respondents report being fully satisfied with all the four aspects of family life: 87 percent of the respondents are fully satisfied with the way family decisions are made, 91 percent of the respondents are fully satisfied

both with the relationship with their partner and their children, while 75 percent of the respondents are fully satisfied with the time spent with their children. These figures are in line with expectations because the sample is comprised of randomly selected households where the proportion of families deprived under both material and relational dimensions is likely to be negligible.

Table 2 provides definitions and descriptive statistics of the socioeconomic variables used in the empirical analysis. We aggregate Italy in five macro-regions (North West, North East, Centre, South and Islands) and whether the respondent lives in an urban area as opposed to non-urban. We control for a wide number of respondent characteristics and household attributes including age, gender, education, marital status, presence of children and number of income earners. The average respondent is 49 years old and about 74 percent of respondents are female. In our sample 70 percent of households are single-earner families where the breadwinner is likelihood to be the husband. This may explain the overrepresentation of female respondents. Marital status is grouped in married, unmarried, separated/divorced and widowed. Because of the selection criteria, almost 4 fifths of respondents are married and only a small percentage are unmarried or divorced, 8 percent and 6 percent respectively.

We control for the presence of children using three dichotomous indicator variables equal to 1 if there is at least one child aged 0-5 (child 0-5), if there is at least one child aged 6-14 (child 6-14), and if there is at least one child 15-17 (child 15-17). The set of socioeconomic variables also includes education of both the respondent and her/his partner when present. Looking at Table 2, we note that there is not much variation between the educational attainment pattern of the respondent and her/his partner. For instance, for many respondents and their partners the highest level of schooling attended is high school, 42 percent and 32 percent respectively. Whereas 14 percent of respondents have completed university, the corresponding proportion for partners is 10 percent. In the empirical analysis, we control for household equivalent income aggregated into quintiles.<sup>7</sup> Equivalent income is thus modelled by five dichotomous indicator variables. The first quintile corresponds to an equivalent monthly income between €185 and €649, the second quintile between €650 and €810, the third quintile between €811 and €1017, the fourth quintile

---

<sup>7</sup> To calculate equivalent income, we adopt the OECD modified equivalence scale (Hagenaars *et al.* 1994). This scale assigns a value of one to the household head, of 0.5 to each additional adult member and of 0.3 to each child.

between €1018 and €1287, and the last quintile if the equivalent income is above €1287. The reference category is individuals who belong to the first (poorest) quintile of household equivalent income.

As discussed earlier, social capital characteristics are assessed using fourteen indicators grouped into three classes: membership, trust and interactions with others. In our sample, 17 percent of respondents are members of one or more associations, 3 percent participate in voluntary family activities, 20 percent in social activities and 16 percent have participated in neighbourhood meetings over the last year (Table 3). Looking at the table, we see that on average respondents have high levels of trust for her/his family members, but trust decreases both for friends and for people in general.

Interactions with others are assessed using seven variables. We use variables tapping the propensity to offer or receive help by family members or friends, and how much time the respondent and her/his family spend together during breakfast and dealing with family challenges. On average, respondents are moderately satisfied with their interactions with others.<sup>8</sup> These interactions are characterised as bonding activities - they are largely within group. Bridging activity crosses traditional groups and allows for interactions with people outside the immediate circle of friends and relatives. We assess bridging activity through questions on networks and by assessing 'softer' bridging activity such as information about participation to public petitions and charitable giving. Over the last year, 75 percent of respondents donated money and 18 percent signed a public petition.

#### **4. Results**

We begin by estimating a baseline version of equation (1) without social capital and then turn to models that include also social capital. Table 4 presents results from regressions assessing four aspects of satisfaction with family life - satisfaction with the way family decisions are made, satisfaction with partner, satisfaction with children and satisfaction with time spent with children - without controlling for social capital.

---

<sup>8</sup> The set of variables grouped in *trust* and *interactions with others* are recorded using a Likert scale rating from 0 (not satisfied) to 10 (fully satisfied).

Overall the explanatory power of these models is not high with  $R^2$  values of between 0.028 and 0.049. However, the models do point to some interesting findings. As can be seen, macro-region has no significant impact on any of the measures of satisfaction. However, age of respondent has a strong and negative impact on satisfaction with relationship and time with children ( $-0.049$  and  $-0.088$  respectively). As compared to males, female respondents display greater satisfaction with time spent with children but gender does not play a role in our other models. Marital status does impact satisfaction in a number of models. As compared to being married, being unmarried is negatively correlated with satisfaction with family decisions, though statistically significant at only 10 per cent. People who are divorced are less satisfied with both the relations with children and time spent with them (coefficients of  $-0.54$  and  $-0.65$  respectively). Those who are widowed are also less satisfied with time spent with children (coefficient of  $-0.75$ ).<sup>9</sup>

As compared to having no young children in the home, having young children increases satisfaction in all the models by about 0.20 points. However, having older children does not have a significant impact on satisfaction in any of the models.

Socioeconomic indicators, usually relevant determinants of life satisfaction (Clark *et al.* 2008; Layard *et al.* 2012), do not have a strong impact on satisfaction with the family. Level of schooling has no significant impact on satisfaction in any of our models. However, having two income earners (as compared to one or no earners) in the household results in significantly lower levels of satisfaction with time spent with children (coefficient of  $-0.32$ ). In the same way, income does not appear to be a driver of satisfaction. The one exception is with satisfaction with spouse. As compared to being in the bottom income quintile, being in the second or top income quintile results in a significantly lower level of satisfaction with spouse (coefficients of  $-0.19$  and  $-0.33$  respectively).

There is an important distinction to keep in mind when comparing our outcomes with the results of other happiness studies. Our life satisfaction questions are not overall measures of the type “In general, how happy would you say you are? Or how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?” Rather, they ask about the level of satisfaction specific to the relational dimension of subjective wellbeing associated with intra-family interactions within the couple and between parents and

---

<sup>9</sup> Satisfaction with spouse was not asked for respondents who were single, divorced or widowed. It is probably a safe bet to assume that for divorced respondents the satisfaction with the former spouse is low and significant.

children. Because our indicators of subjective wellbeing are confined to non-material aspects, it is not surprising to find that the wellbeing derived from intra-family relationships does not depend on absolute incomes. Based on our evidence, we may answer Easterlin's question (1974) asking whether, at a point in time within a society, the wealthy are on average happier than the poor by asserting that, for Italian society, wealthy households are not happier than poor households in terms of relational wellbeing.

Focusing on satisfaction with relationships between partners reveals that being very poor, (that is in the lowest quintile of the income distribution), or being very rich does significantly affect the partnership. Having too little or too much money is a relevant determinant of the fragility of a couple. The policy implications of this fact are of course different. While for households in poverty it may be a society's responsibility to remove such circumstances, this is not the case for rich households.

What we take from this initial model is that the standard human capital characteristics such as education and income are not drivers of satisfaction with family. Indeed, with few exceptions, human capital does not impact subjective wellbeing.

In order to test this further, models in Table 5 add characteristics associated with social capital - membership in organizations, trust, and interactions with others. The first thing of note is that adding these social capital characteristics greatly increases the explanatory power of the models, which now range from an  $R^2$  value of 0.156 to 0.22. In particular, the explanatory power of the model concerning satisfaction with how decisions are made increases almost eight fold (from 0.028 to 0.22).

The second finding of note is the fact that effects of the previously included variables are remarkably stable. With few exceptions, the impact of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics on our measures of satisfaction is the same in both magnitude and level of significance. This combined with the increase in explanatory power of the models suggests that social capital characteristics (trust, interaction and participation) have strong impacts on subjective family wellbeing.

Turning to the social capital variables, we see trust in family members has a strong positive impact across all models (ranging from a coefficient of 0.22 to 0.39). As is to be expected, trust in family members has the strongest impact on satisfaction with spouse. Trust in friends and the ability to get help from friends have a small but significant effect on satisfaction with the family (coefficient of 0.07 and 0.39 respectively) but do not really impact satisfaction with spouse or how decisions are made. The ability to get help from friends does have a positive impact on satisfaction with time spent with children (coefficient of 0.069) suggesting that family members may be able to draw on support from friends thereby increasing satisfaction with time spent with family.

The ability to get help from family members and time spent eating breakfast with family members does not appear to have a substantive impact on subjective family wellbeing. However ability to get help from within the family has a small (but significant) impact on overall satisfaction. The ability to talk through problems does however have a significant impact on all the measures of subject family wellbeing (ranging from 0.053 to 0.11) suggesting that open communication is a pathway to familial wellbeing. Somewhat surprisingly, help from family members outside the household is not a strong predictor of family wellbeing.

The preceding variables are often viewed as bonding characteristics - these characteristics bring within group members closer together. We also tested five measures of social capital related to membership and participation that are often seen as bridging (making connections outside the group). With the exception of membership in an organization, which is strongly negative across all variables, other bridging activity has no impact on subjective family wellbeing. The impact of membership is however quite powerful reducing for example overall satisfaction with the family by -0.22 points for every increase in the scale. This suggests that membership in organizations, rather than adding a dimension to family relations, is seen as taking time away from the family. Results derived from the ordered probit and logit models are comparable in sign, magnitude and statistical significance with OLS estimations (Tables A.1 and A.2 of Appendix A).

## **5. Conclusions**

In this study we have assessed the impact of social capital and two forms of wellbeing (material and relational) on subjective wellbeing within the family. A distinctive feature of our study is the

ability to separate out the impact of relational dimension from subjective wellbeing associated with intra-family interactions.

Using this approach allows us to assess the impact of the material and non-material aspects of wellbeing on subjective wellbeing and ask if within the family, at least, “Does money buy happiness?” Based on our evidence, we may qualify the answer to Easterlin’s question (1974) asking whether the wealthy are, in general, happier than the poor by asserting that, for the Italian society, wealthier households are not happier than poor households as far as intra-family relations are concerned. In the same way, higher levels of schooling do not buy happiness - subjective wellbeing for more educated families are no higher than for families with lower levels of schooling. This evidence may be partly explained by the fact that Italian households are endowed with comparable stocks of human capital.

Income, on the other hand, is a relevant determinant of the fragility of the Italian couple. But the effect is bimodal. Satisfaction with relationships between partners is significantly worse for very poor or very rich households. The policy implications of this fact are of course different. While for households in poverty it may be a society’s responsibility to remove such circumstances, this may not be the case for rich households. The causes behind the fragility of the very poor and very rich are likely different and should be analysed in a dedicated study if it is of social interest to undertake effective prevention policies.

Finally, it appears that family wellbeing is all about bonding as compared to bridging social capital. Interactions within the family (both nuclear and extended) are important for wellbeing, but interactions outside the family do not appear to have an impact.

Our results are especially relevant if read through the lenses of the recent recession. Economic crises not only contract the material dimension of wellbeing, but also may critically weaken both the quality of relations and the strength of bridging and bonding ties. In periods of economic recession, the private and public investment on social capital may be a successful copying strategy because of the low economic costs associated with the investment on proximity relations and reciprocity activities. On the other hand, families that are more endowed with social capital may have higher resiliency.

## References

- Aizlewood, A. and R. Pendakur. 2005. "Ethnicity and Social Capital in Canada," *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, xxxvii(2): 77-102.
- Atkinson, T. and B. Cantillon, E. Marlier, and B. Nolan, (eds). 2002. *Social Indicators: The EU and Social Inclusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Babacan, H. and A. Babacan. 2007. "Achieving Social Cohesion: Impact of Insecurity, Fear and Racism on Migrant Integration," *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities & Nations*, 17(5): 213-222.
- Bartolini, S., E. Bilancini and M. Pugno. 2013. "Did the Decline in Social Connections Depress Americans' Happiness?" *Social Indicators Research*, 110(3): 1033-1059.
- Berghman, J. 1995. "Social Exclusion in Europe: Policy Context and Analytical Framework," in G. Room, (ed). *Beyond the Threshold: The Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*. Bristol: Policy Press, 10-28.
- Bjørnskov, C. 2006. "The Multiple Facets of Social Capital," *European Journal of Political Economy*, 22(1): 22-40.
- Bloemnraad, I. and S. Ramakrishnan. 2006. "Civic Invisibility? The Civic and Political Stratification of Immigrant and Mainstream Community Organizations," Paper presented at the American Sociological Association 2006 Annual Meeting, Montreal. <http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/ehost/pdf?vid=2&hid=101&sid=e48002d-d-ad7e-41e6-9f94-82d60493a9bf@sessionmgr102#db=sih&AN=26641870>.
- Bradshaw, J., P. Kemp, S. Baldwin, and A. Rowe. 2004. "The Drivers of Social Exclusion. A Review of the Literature for the Social Exclusion Unit in the Breaking the Cycle Series," Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London.
- Burchardt, T., J. Le Grand, and D. Piachaud. 2002. "Introduction," in J. Hills, J. Le Grand and D. Piachaud, (eds). *Understanding Social Exclusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-12.
- Calvo, R., Y. Zheng, K. S. A. Olgiati and L. Berkman. 2012. "Well-Being and Social Capital Earth: Cross National Evidence from 142 Countries," *PLOS One*, 7(8): 1-10.
- Castillo, F. and A. Fenzi-Crossman. 2010. "The Relationship between Non-Marital Fathers' Social Networks and Social Capital and Father Involvement," *Child and Family Social Work*, 15(1): 66-76.
- Cheong, P. 2006. "Communication Context, Social Cohesion and Social Capital Building among Hispanic Immigrant Families," *Community, Work & Family*, 9(3): 367-387.
- Clark, A. E., P. Frijters and M. A. Shields. 2008. "Relative Income, Happiness, and Utility: An Explanation for the Easterlin Paradox and Other Puzzles," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 46(1): 95-144.

- Coleman, J. S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital," *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement): S95-S120.
- Decancq, K., M. Fleurbaey and E. Schokkaert. 2013. "Inequality, Income, and Well-Being," Draft prepared for the *Handbook on Income Distribution*, vol. 2 edited by A. B. Atkinson and F. Bourguignon.
- Dekker, P. and E. M. Uslaner. 2001. "Introduction," in P. Dekker and E. M. Uslaner (eds). *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*. London: Routledge, 1-7.
- Donati, P. 2003. "La Famiglia come Capitale Sociale Primario," in P. Donati (ed). *Famiglia e Capitale Sociale Nella Società Italiana. Ottavo Rapporto Cisf sulla Famiglia*. Milan: San Paolo, 31-101.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "L'Approccio Relazionale al Capitale Sociale," *Sociologia e Politiche Sociali*, 10: 9-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. "Il Costo dei Figli: Un Investimento, un Consumo, un Bene Meritorio o un Bene Relazionale?" in P. Donati (ed). *Il Costo Dei Figli. Quale Welfare per le Famiglie? Rapporto Famiglia Cif 2009*, 19-35.
- Durlauf, S. N. and M. Fafchamps. 2005. "Social Capital," in P. Aghion and S. Durlauf (eds). *Handbook of Economic Growth, edition 1, volume 1, chapter 26*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1639-1699.
- Easterlin, R. 1974. "Does Economic Growth Improve the Human Lot? Some Empirical Evidence," in P. David and M. W. Reder (eds). *Nations and Households in Economic Growth: Essays in Honor of Moses Abramovitz*. New York: Academic Press, 89-125.
- Edwards, R. 2004. "Present and Absent in Troubling Ways: Families and Social Capital Debates," *Sociological Review*, 52(1): 1-21.
- Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. and P. Frijters. 2004. "How Important Is Methodology for the Estimates of the Determinants of Happiness?" *Economic Journal*, 114(497): 641-659.
- Franke, S. 2005. "Measurement of Social Capital: Reference Document for Public Policy Research, Development, and Evaluation," Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.
- Fukuyama, F. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, New York: Free Press.
- Furstenberg, F. F. 2005. "Banking on Families: How Families Generate and Distribute Social Capital," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(4): 809-821.
- Glaeser, E. L., D. Laibson and B. Sacerdote. 2002. "An Economic Approach to Social Capital," *Economic Journal*, 112(483): 437-458.
- Granberry, P. and E. Marcelli. 2007. "In the Hood and on the Job: Social Capital Accumulation among Legal and Unauthorized Mexican Immigrants," *Sociological Perspectives*, 50(4): 579-595.

- Hagenaars, A., K. De Vos and M. A. Zaidi. 1994. *Poverty Statistics in the Late 1980s: Research Based on Micro-data*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Luxembourg.
- Helliwell, J. F. and C. P. Barrington-Leigh. 2010. "Viewpoint: Measuring and Understanding Subjective Well-Being," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 43(3): 729-753.
- Hogan, M. 2001. "Social Capital: Potential in Family Social Sciences," *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 30(2): 151-155.
- Jaynes, G. 2007. "Migration and Social Stratification: Bipluralism and the Western Democratic State," *Du Bois Review* 4(1): 5-17.
- Klein, C. 2011. "Social Capital or Social Cohesion: What Matters for Subjective Well-Being?" *Social Indicators Research*, 110(3): 891-911.
- Layard, R., A. Clark and C. Senik. 2012. "The Causes of Happiness and Misery," in J. F. Helliwell, R. Layard and J. Sachs (eds). *The World Happiness Report*, New York: The Earth Institute, Columbia University, USA, 58-89.
- Levitas, R. 1998. *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. "The Idea of Social Inclusion," Paper prepared for the 2003 Social Inclusion Research Conference. <http://www.ccsd.ca/events/Inclusion/papers/rlevitas.htm>.
- McElroy, M. W., R. Jorna and J. Engelen. 2006. "Rethinking Social Capital Theory: A Knowledge Management Perspective," *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 10(5): 124-136.
- Maluccio, J., L. Haddad and J. May. 2000. "Social Capital and Household Welfare in South Africa, 1993-98," *Journal of Development Studies*, 36(6).
- Monnickendam, M. and Y. Berman. 2008. "An Empirical Analysis of the Interrelationship between Components of the Social Quality Theoretical Construct," *Social Indicators Research*, 86(3): 525-538.
- Patulny, R. V., G. Lind and H. Svendsen. 2007. "Exploring the Social Capital Grid: Bonding, Bridging, Qualitative, Quantitative," *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 27(1/2): 32-51.
- Portes, A. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24: 1-24.
- Prandini, R. 2007. "Il Capitale Sociale Familiare in Prospettiva Relazionale: Come Definirlo, Misurarlo e Sussidiarlo," *Sociologia e Politiche Sociali*, 10(1): 41-74.
- Putnam, R. 1995. "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America," *Political Science and Politics*, 28(4): 664-683.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century. The 2006

- Johan Skytte Prize Lecture," *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2): 137-174.
- Ravanera, Z. and F. Rajulton. 2010. "Measuring Social Capital and Its Differentials by Family Structures," *Social Indicators Research*, 95(1): 63-89.
- Reimer, B., T. Lyons, N. Ferguson and G. Polanco. 2008. "Social Capital as Social Relations: The Contribution of Normative Structures," *Sociological Review*, 56(2): 256-274.
- Robila, M. 2006. "Economic Pressure and Social Exclusion in Europe," *Social Science Journal*, 43(1): 85-97.
- Robison, L. J., M. E. Siles and S. Jin. 2011. "Social Capital and the Distribution of Household Income in the United States: 1980, 1990, and 2000," *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 40(5): 538-547.
- Sarracino, F. 2010. "Social Capital and Subjective Well-Being Trends: Comparing 11 Western European Countries," *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 39(4): 482-517.
- Schookner, M. 2002. "An Inclusion Lens: Workbook for Looking at Social and Economic Exclusion and Inclusion," Halifax: Health Canada, Atlantic Regional Office.
- Siemiatycki, M. 2005. "From Social Exclusion to Social Inclusion: Conceptual, Research and Policy Approaches," Paper prepared for the Social Development Roundtable on Social and Economic Inclusion. Ottawa: SDC.
- Sirovátka, T. and P. Mareš. 2006. "Poverty, Social Exclusion and Social Policy in the Czech Republic," *Social Policy and Administration*, 40(3): 288-303.
- Stone, W. 2001. "Measuring Social Capital: Towards a Theoretically Informed Measurement Framework for Researching Social Capital in Family and Community Life," Research paper No. 24, Australian Institute for Family Studies, Melbourne.
- Stone, W. and J. Hughes. 2002. "Social Capital: Empirical Meaning and Measurement Validity," Research paper No. 27, Melbourne: Australian Institute for Family Studies.
- Toye, M. and J. Infanti. 2004. "Social Inclusion and Community Economic Development Literature Review," Ottawa: The Canadian CED Network.
- Tronca, L. 2007. *L'analisi del Capitale Sociale*, Padova: CEDAM.
- United Nations. 2005. *Ensuring Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law*. 2005 World Summit, 14-16 September 2005.
- Uslaner, E. M. 2001. "Volunteering and Social Capital: How Trust and Religion Shape Civic Participation in the United States," in P. Dekker and E. M. Uslaner (eds). *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*. London: Routledge, 93-104.
- Van Der Gaag, M. and T. Snijders. 2005. "The Resource Generator: Social Capital Quantification with Concrete Items," *Social Networks*, 27(1): 1-29.
- van Oorschot, W., W. Ares and J. Gelissen. 2006. "Social capital in Europe: Measurement and

Social and Regional Distribution of a Multifaceted Phenomenon,” *Acta Sociologica* 49(2): 149-167.

Wakefield, S. and B. Poland. 2005. “Family, Friend or Foe? Critical Reflections on the Relevance and Role of Social Capital in Health Promotion and Community Development,” *Social Science & Medicine*, 60(12): 2819-2832.

White, S. 2009. “Bringing Wellbeing into Development Practice,” Wellbeing in Developing Countries Research Group Working Paper 09/50, Bath: University of Bath.

**Descriptive Statistics**

**Table 1.** Distribution of Satisfaction with Family Life

	Likert scale:		
	Unsatisfied (0-5) %	Rather satisfied (6-7) %	Fully satisfied (8-10) %
<i>Satisfaction with:</i>			
Decision taking rules	1.73	11.41	86.85
Partner relationship	1.87	6.89	91.24
Children relationship	1.25	7.08	91.67
Time with children	4.20	20.22	75.58

**Table 2.** Summary Statistics of Socioeconomic Characteristics. Number of Households 1955

Variable	Definition	Mean	Std. Dev.
North West	= 1 if living in North West	0.256	0.436
North East	= 1 if living in North East	0.184	0.387
Centre	= 1 if living in Centre	0.195	0.397
South	= 1 if living in South	0.246	0.431
Islands	= 1 if living in Islands	0.119	0.324
Urban	= 1 if living in urban area	0.423	0.494
Age	Respondent's age in years	49.113	12.036
Age squared	Respondent's age squared	2556.881	1266.485
Female	= 1 if respondent is female	0.743	0.437
Married	= 1 if respondent is married	0.783	0.412
Unmarried	= 1 if respondent is not married	0.079	0.269
Divorced	= 1 if respondent is separated or divorced	0.062	0.242
Widowed	= 1 if respondent is widowed	0.076	0.265
Child 0-5	= 1 if there is at least one child aged 0-5	0.161	0.367
Child 6-14	= 1 if there is at least one child aged 6-14	0.350	0.477
Child 15-17	= 1 if there is at least one child aged 15-17	0.174	0.380
Respondent education:			
Elementary	= 1 if elementary school certificate	0.115	0.319
Middle school	= 1 if middle school certificate	0.333	0.471
High school	= 1 if high school certificate	0.418	0.493
University	= 1 if university certificate	0.135	0.341
Partner education:			
Elementary	= 1 if elementary school certificate	0.075	0.263
Middle school	= 1 if middle school certificate	0.294	0.456
High school	= 1 if high school certificate	0.323	0.468
University	= 1 if university certificate	0.103	0.304
Missing	= 1 if no partner	0.205	0.404
Double-earner family	= 1 if double earner family	0.305	0.461
Quintile of equivalent income:			
1 <sup>st</sup>	= 1 first quintile	0.203	0.402
2 <sup>nd</sup>	= 1 if second quintile	0.216	0.412
3 <sup>rd</sup>	= 1 if third quintile	0.197	0.398
4 <sup>th</sup>	= 1 if fourth quintile	0.199	0.400
5 <sup>th</sup>	= 1 if fifth quintile	0.185	0.388

**Table 3.** Summary Statistics of Social Capital Variables. Number of Households 1955

Variable	Definition	Mean	Std. Dev.
<i>Membership</i>			
Membership	= 1 if member of one or more associations	0.172	0.378
Family voluntariness	= 1 if participate to voluntary activities among families	0.029	0.167
Social activities	= 1 if participate to social activities	0.196	0.397
Meetings	= 1 if participate to neighbourhood meetings over the last year	0.163	0.370
<i>Trust</i>			
Trust family	Trust in family members - Likert scale	9.138	1.441
Trust friends	Trust in friends - Likert scale	6.796	2.209
Generalized trust	People are trustworthy - Likert scale	5.842	1.856
<i>Interactions with others</i>			
Mutual help	Mutual help from friends - Likert scale	6.246	2.503
Family help	Help from family members - Likert scale	7.086	3.442
Breakfast time	Time spent with family members during breakfast - Likert scale	5.691	3.491
Talk time	Time spent with family members to talk through problems Likert scale	6.988	2.247
Daily task help	Time spent for helping family members in their tasks - Likert scale	6.841	2.482
Public petition	= 1 if sign a public petition over the past year	0.185	0.389
Charity	= 1 if donate some money over the last year	0.747	0.435

**Notes:** Likert scale indicates that the variable is measured using a scale ranging from 0, when respondents are not satisfied, to 10, when respondents are fully satisfied.

**Table 4.** Satisfaction with Life and Socioeconomic Variables in Italy

	Life satisfaction with:			
	Decision taking rules	Partner relationship	Children relationship	Time with children
Northeast - ref. group NW	-0.030 <i>0.091</i>	0.100 <i>0.105</i>	-0.148* <i>0.084</i>	-0.018 <i>0.109</i>
Centre	-0.087 <i>0.091</i>	0.010 <i>0.105</i>	-0.109 <i>0.084</i>	-0.032 <i>0.108</i>
South	-0.150* <i>0.087</i>	-0.136 <i>0.101</i>	-0.104 <i>0.076</i>	-0.062 <i>0.103</i>
Islands	-0.071 <i>0.100</i>	0.189* <i>0.103</i>	0.011 <i>0.089</i>	0.079 <i>0.121</i>
Urban	0.069 <i>0.060</i>	0.049 <i>0.067</i>	0.046 <i>0.058</i>	-0.056 <i>0.074</i>
Age	-0.022 <i>0.018</i>	-0.041 <i>0.025</i>	-0.0430** <i>0.019</i>	-0.0883*** <i>0.025</i>
Age squared	0.000 <i>0.000</i>	0.000 <i>0.000</i>	0.000313* <i>0.000</i>	0.000786*** <i>0.000</i>
Female	-0.030 <i>0.066</i>	-0.097 <i>0.075</i>	0.104 <i>0.066</i>	0.296*** <i>0.089</i>
Unmarried	-0.364* <i>0.187</i>		-0.206 <i>0.187</i>	-0.293 <i>0.221</i>
Divorced	-0.058 <i>0.216</i>		-0.544** <i>0.252</i>	-0.650* <i>0.340</i>
Widowed	-0.053 <i>0.253</i>		-0.320 <i>0.272</i>	-0.748** <i>0.346</i>
Child 0-5	0.205** <i>0.093</i>	0.190** <i>0.095</i>	0.195** <i>0.085</i>	0.208* <i>0.122</i>
Child 6-14	0.022 <i>0.073</i>	0.078 <i>0.076</i>	0.046 <i>0.063</i>	0.052 <i>0.086</i>
Child 15-17	0.061 <i>0.078</i>	0.037 <i>0.082</i>	0.039 <i>0.068</i>	0.212** <i>0.090</i>
Respondent education - ref. group "University"				
Elementary	-0.124 <i>0.172</i>	-0.082 <i>0.213</i>	0.112 <i>0.137</i>	-0.131 <i>0.183</i>
Middle school	-0.050 <i>0.119</i>	-0.006 <i>0.147</i>	-0.017 <i>0.110</i>	-0.143 <i>0.143</i>

High school	-0.095	-0.017	0.020	-0.134
	<i>0.109</i>	<i>0.118</i>	<i>0.098</i>	<i>0.128</i>
Partner education - ref. group "Missing"				
Elementary	0.008	-0.155	-0.273	-0.511
	<i>0.239</i>	<i>0.206</i>	<i>0.266</i>	<i>0.344</i>
Middle school	0.197	-0.017	-0.063	-0.455
	<i>0.204</i>	<i>0.142</i>	<i>0.249</i>	<i>0.320</i>
High school	0.185	-0.019	-0.102	-0.469
	<i>0.204</i>	<i>0.124</i>	<i>0.246</i>	<i>0.321</i>
University	0.225		-0.100	-0.425
	<i>0.223</i>		<i>0.257</i>	<i>0.334</i>
Double-earner family	-0.153*	-0.110	-0.112	-0.324***
	<i>0.082</i>	<i>0.081</i>	<i>0.069</i>	<i>0.095</i>
Quintile of equivalent income - ref. group "1 <sup>st</sup> quintile"				
2nd	0.095	-0.188*	-0.117	-0.125
	<i>0.090</i>	<i>0.105</i>	<i>0.085</i>	<i>0.110</i>
3rd	0.085	-0.116	-0.013	0.186
	<i>0.094</i>	<i>0.107</i>	<i>0.088</i>	<i>0.114</i>
4th	0.043	-0.151	0.034	0.013
	<i>0.112</i>	<i>0.119</i>	<i>0.094</i>	<i>0.127</i>
5th	-0.033	-0.332**	-0.170	-0.148
	<i>0.110</i>	<i>0.125</i>	<i>0.106</i>	<i>0.136</i>
Number of households	1955	1554	1835	1835
$R^2$	0.028	0.034	0.049	0.045

**Notes:** All regressions include a constant term. Standard errors in italics. \* denotes significance at  $p < 0.10$ , \*\* at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\* at  $p < 0.001$ .

**Table 5.** Satisfaction with Life, Socioeconomic Variables and Social Capital in Italy

	Life Satisfaction with:			
	Decision taking rules	Partner relationship	Children relationship	Time with children
Northeast - ref. group "NW"	-0.022 <i>0.082</i>	0.109 <i>0.094</i>	-0.124 <i>0.078</i>	0.003 <i>0.103</i>
Centre	-0.091 <i>0.083</i>	0.017 <i>0.097</i>	-0.092 <i>0.082</i>	0.005 <i>0.104</i>
South	-0.104 <i>0.079</i>	-0.055 <i>0.094</i>	-0.058 <i>0.071</i>	-0.014 <i>0.098</i>
Islands	-0.017 <i>0.091</i>	0.203** <i>0.094</i>	0.048 <i>0.084</i>	0.109 <i>0.113</i>
Urban	0.063 <i>0.055</i>	0.030 <i>0.062</i>	0.038 <i>0.055</i>	-0.058 <i>0.069</i>
Age	-0.011 <i>0.016</i>	-0.0572** <i>0.023</i>	-0.0438** <i>0.018</i>	-0.0875*** <i>0.024</i>
Age squared	0.000 <i>0.000</i>	0.000490** <i>0.000</i>	0.000335** <i>0.000</i>	0.000786*** <i>0.000</i>
Female	-0.006 <i>0.060</i>	-0.069 <i>0.068</i>	0.124** <i>0.060</i>	0.320**** <i>0.082</i>
Unmarried	-0.030 <i>0.192</i>		-0.019 <i>0.190</i>	-0.021 <i>0.242</i>
Divorced	0.267 <i>0.252</i>		-0.279 <i>0.283</i>	-0.412 <i>0.368</i>
Widowed	0.150 <i>0.251</i>		-0.221 <i>0.291</i>	-0.569 <i>0.365</i>
Child 0-5	0.236** <i>0.085</i>	0.165* <i>0.089</i>	0.214** <i>0.084</i>	0.201* <i>0.118</i>
Child 6-14	0.009 <i>0.068</i>	0.027 <i>0.073</i>	0.051 <i>0.063</i>	0.032 <i>0.085</i>
Child 15-17	0.033 <i>0.071</i>	0.048 <i>0.076</i>	0.033 <i>0.065</i>	0.180** <i>0.084</i>
Respondent education - ref. group "University"				
Elementary	-0.002 <i>0.151</i>	-0.053 <i>0.190</i>	0.166 <i>0.139</i>	-0.064 <i>0.182</i>
Middle school	0.008 <i>0.110</i>	-0.008 <i>0.136</i>	-0.003 <i>0.109</i>	-0.132 <i>0.141</i>
High school	-0.095 <i>0.099</i>	-0.034 <i>0.109</i>	0.001 <i>0.096</i>	-0.147 <i>0.126</i>
Partner education - ref. group "Missing"				
Elementary	0.133 <i>0.249</i>	0.023 <i>0.191</i>	-0.175 <i>0.288</i>	-0.329 <i>0.364</i>
Middle school	0.273 <i>0.225</i>	0.091 <i>0.127</i>	-0.009 <i>0.278</i>	-0.342 <i>0.341</i>
High school	0.206 <i>0.206</i>	0.017 <i>0.017</i>	-0.092 <i>0.092</i>	-0.419 <i>0.419</i>

	0.220	0.113	0.270	0.342
University	0.167		-0.156	-0.414
	0.233		0.279	0.343
Double-earner family	-0.065	-0.030	-0.064	-0.246**
	0.072	0.075	0.066	0.090
Quintile of equivalent income - ref. group "1 <sup>st</sup> quintile"				
2nd	0.058	-0.223**	-0.151*	-0.151
	0.081	0.097	0.078	0.103
3rd	0.029	-0.092	-0.049	0.156
	0.085	0.100	0.083	0.110
4th	0.032	-0.152	0.022	0.013
	0.097	0.110	0.090	0.120
5th	-0.077	-0.295**	-0.196*	-0.161
	0.101	0.120	0.101	0.133
Membership	-0.224**	-0.369**	-0.181**	-0.280**
	0.094	0.125	0.091	0.109
Family voluntariness	0.014	0.072	-0.011	0.314
	0.176	0.211	0.155	0.210
Social activities	0.098	0.106	0.124	0.079
	0.085	0.111	0.076	0.099
Meetings	0.069	0.141	-0.132	0.059
	0.079	0.090	0.082	0.103
Trust family	0.307****	0.389****	0.246****	0.219****
	0.041	0.048	0.034	0.039
Trust friends	0.0724***	0.017	0.0290*	0.031
	0.021	0.024	0.017	0.024
Generalized trust	-0.005	0.033	0.0283*	0.027
	0.017	0.021	0.016	0.021
Mutual help	0.0388**	0.028	0.010	0.0691**
	0.019	0.022	0.015	0.022
Family help	-0.0306**	-0.012	-0.005	-0.005
	0.009	0.010	0.008	0.012
Breakfast time	0.002	-0.0222*	-0.015	0.008
	0.011	0.012	0.010	0.013
Talk time	0.111****	0.0841**	0.0529**	0.101***
	0.023	0.029	0.020	0.030
Daily task help	-0.0535**	0.003	-0.029	-0.028
	0.020	0.024	0.018	0.028
Public petition	-0.069	-0.064	0.052	-0.095
	0.073	0.085	0.069	0.096
Charity	0.054	-0.033	0.112*	0.047
	0.065	0.073	0.061	0.081
Number of households	1955	1554	1835	1835
R <sup>2</sup>	0.220	0.211	0.170	0.156

**Notes:** All regressions include a constant term. Standard errors in italics. \* denotes significance at  $p < 0.10$ , \*\* at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\* at  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*\*\* at  $p < 0.0001$ .

## Appendix A: Ordered Probit and Logit Estimations

**Table A.1** Ordered Probit Estimation: Satisfaction with Life, Socioeconomic Variables and Social Capital

	Life Satisfaction with:			
	Decision taking rules	Partner relationship	Children relationship	Time with children
Northeast - ref. group "NW"	-0.026 <i>0.078</i>	0.082 <i>0.091</i>	-0.135 <i>0.084</i>	0.000 <i>0.079</i>
Centre	-0.101 <i>0.078</i>	-0.023 <i>0.091</i>	-0.124 <i>0.084</i>	-0.006 <i>0.079</i>
South	-0.125* <i>0.076</i>	-0.107 <i>0.090</i>	-0.078 <i>0.081</i>	-0.018 <i>0.076</i>
Islands	-0.039 <i>0.090</i>	0.158 <i>0.104</i>	0.051 <i>0.100</i>	0.093 <i>0.091</i>
Urban	0.057 <i>0.053</i>	0.037 <i>0.063</i>	0.039 <i>0.058</i>	-0.040 <i>0.054</i>
Age	-0.007 <i>0.015</i>	-0.0518** <i>0.024</i>	-0.0547** <i>0.022</i>	-0.0730*** <i>0.020</i>
Age squared	0.000 <i>0.000</i>	0.000437* <i>0.000</i>	0.000427** <i>0.000</i>	0.000657*** <i>0.000</i>
Female	0.000 <i>0.058</i>	-0.067 <i>0.068</i>	0.134** <i>0.064</i>	0.243*** <i>0.061</i>
Unmarried	-0.047 <i>0.185</i>		-0.114 <i>0.210</i>	-0.035 <i>0.172</i>
Divorced	0.215 <i>0.239</i>		-0.309 <i>0.311</i>	-0.302 <i>0.268</i>
Widowed	0.145 <i>0.234</i>		-0.281 <i>0.318</i>	-0.434 <i>0.271</i>
Child 0-5	0.251** <i>0.087</i>	0.244** <i>0.100</i>	0.297** <i>0.103</i>	0.162* <i>0.093</i>
Child 6-14	0.013 <i>0.066</i>	0.047 <i>0.077</i>	0.041 <i>0.073</i>	0.023 <i>0.066</i>
Child 15-17	0.017 <i>0.070</i>	0.047 <i>0.080</i>	0.015 <i>0.072</i>	0.145** <i>0.067</i>
Respondent education - ref. group "University"				
Elementary	0.058 <i>0.135</i>	0.051 <i>0.169</i>	0.159 <i>0.148</i>	-0.068 <i>0.141</i>
Middle school	0.013 <i>0.103</i>	0.059 <i>0.124</i>	-0.031 <i>0.116</i>	-0.124 <i>0.106</i>
High school	-0.068 <i>0.091</i>	0.000 <i>0.106</i>	-0.024 <i>0.102</i>	-0.135 <i>0.095</i>
Partner education - ref. group "Missing"				
Elementary	0.108 <i>0.236</i>	0.032 <i>0.162</i>	-0.228 <i>0.316</i>	-0.235 <i>0.271</i>
Middle school	0.238 <i>0.217</i>	0.035 <i>0.123</i>	-0.067 <i>0.310</i>	-0.248 <i>0.254</i>
High school	0.155 <i>0.212</i>	-0.035 <i>0.108</i>	-0.165 <i>0.302</i>	-0.328 <i>0.253</i>
University	0.156		-0.216	-0.320

	<i>0.224</i>		<i>0.312</i>	<i>0.257</i>
Double income family	-0.063	-0.031	-0.058	-0.189**
	<i>0.069</i>	<i>0.079</i>	<i>0.075</i>	<i>0.069</i>
Quintile of equivalent income - ref. group "1 <sup>st</sup> quintile"				
2 <sup>nd</sup>	<i>0.072</i>	-0.218**	-0.176**	-0.118
	<i>0.079</i>	<i>0.096</i>	<i>0.087</i>	<i>0.081</i>
3 <sup>rd</sup>	<i>0.029</i>	-0.109	-0.059	0.134
	<i>0.084</i>	<i>0.104</i>	<i>0.093</i>	<i>0.089</i>
4 <sup>th</sup>	<i>0.052</i>	-0.186	0.011	0.011
	<i>0.092</i>	<i>0.113</i>	<i>0.103</i>	<i>0.095</i>
5 <sup>th</sup>	-0.077	-0.332**	-0.229**	-0.126
	<i>0.096</i>	<i>0.116</i>	<i>0.106</i>	<i>0.101</i>
Membership	-0.218**	-0.357***	-0.191**	-0.220**
	<i>0.084</i>	<i>0.102</i>	<i>0.093</i>	<i>0.082</i>
Family voluntariness	0.017	0.071	-0.017	0.275
	<i>0.171</i>	<i>0.206</i>	<i>0.165</i>	<i>0.174</i>
Social activities	0.102	0.142	0.114	0.066
	<i>0.076</i>	<i>0.092</i>	<i>0.083</i>	<i>0.075</i>
Meetings	0.048	0.109	-0.121	0.041
	<i>0.075</i>	<i>0.090</i>	<i>0.084</i>	<i>0.077</i>
Trust family	0.249***	0.336***	0.248***	0.168***
	<i>0.031</i>	<i>0.038</i>	<i>0.032</i>	<i>0.028</i>
Trust friends	0.0743**	0.034	0.0383**	0.0305*
	<i>0.019</i>	<i>0.021</i>	<i>0.019</i>	<i>0.018</i>
Generalized trust	0.000	0.0345*	0.0306*	0.023
	<i>0.015</i>	<i>0.019</i>	<i>0.017</i>	<i>0.016</i>
Mutual help	0.0379**	0.020	0.012	0.0528**
	<i>0.017</i>	<i>0.020</i>	<i>0.017</i>	<i>0.016</i>
Family help	-0.0286**	-0.011	-0.005	-0.003
	<i>0.009</i>	<i>0.010</i>	<i>0.009</i>	<i>0.009</i>
Breakfast time	0.003	-0.0290**	-0.0186*	0.007
	<i>0.010</i>	<i>0.011</i>	<i>0.011</i>	<i>0.010</i>
Talk time	0.103***	0.0728**	0.0584**	0.0811***
	<i>0.022</i>	<i>0.025</i>	<i>0.023</i>	<i>0.022</i>
Daily task help	-0.0538**	-0.001	-0.0342*	-0.023
	<i>0.020</i>	<i>0.024</i>	<i>0.021</i>	<i>0.020</i>
Public petition	-0.066	-0.025	0.060	-0.072
	<i>0.070</i>	<i>0.082</i>	<i>0.077</i>	<i>0.072</i>
Charity	0.061	-0.001	0.108*	0.032
	<i>0.060</i>	<i>0.071</i>	<i>0.065</i>	<i>0.062</i>
Number of households	1955	1554	1835	1835
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.080	0.087	0.075	0.055
Log-likelihood	-2530.038	-1821.857	-2098.822	-2759.160

**Notes:** Standard errors in italics. \* denotes significance at  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*\*\*  $p < 0.0001$ .

**Table A.2** Ordered Logit Estimation: Satisfaction with Life, Socioeconomic Variables and Social Capital

	Life Satisfaction with:			
	Decision taking rules	Partner relationship	Children relationship	Time with children
Northeast - ref. group "NW"	-0.051 <i>0.130</i>	0.105 <i>0.153</i>	-0.246* <i>0.141</i>	0.034 <i>0.136</i>
Centre	-0.144 <i>0.135</i>	-0.014 <i>0.156</i>	-0.190 <i>0.143</i>	-0.014 <i>0.134</i>
South	-0.204 <i>0.131</i>	-0.158 <i>0.156</i>	-0.106 <i>0.139</i>	-0.013 <i>0.131</i>
Islands	-0.112 <i>0.150</i>	0.266 <i>0.184</i>	0.050 <i>0.169</i>	0.132 <i>0.154</i>
Urban	0.059 <i>0.090</i>	0.066 <i>0.109</i>	0.038 <i>0.098</i>	-0.089 <i>0.092</i>
Age	-0.011 <i>0.026</i>	-0.0729* <i>0.042</i>	-0.0902** <i>0.037</i>	-0.121*** <i>0.034</i>
Age squared	0.000 <i>0.000</i>	0.001 <i>0.000</i>	0.000729** <i>0.000</i>	0.00109*** <i>0.000</i>
Female	0.032 <i>0.100</i>	-0.062 <i>0.119</i>	0.236** <i>0.111</i>	0.418*** <i>0.105</i>
Unmarried	-0.194 <i>0.303</i>		-0.328 <i>0.356</i>	-0.015 <i>0.303</i>
Divorced	0.204 <i>0.384</i>		-0.875* <i>0.510</i>	-0.341 <i>0.423</i>
Widowed	0.190 <i>0.379</i>		-0.785 <i>0.524</i>	-0.488 <i>0.436</i>
Child 0-5	0.405** <i>0.148</i>	0.462** <i>0.176</i>	0.534** <i>0.183</i>	0.266* <i>0.154</i>
Child 6-14	0.055 <i>0.111</i>	0.102 <i>0.133</i>	0.071 <i>0.129</i>	0.045 <i>0.110</i>
Child 15-17	0.039 <i>0.121</i>	0.058 <i>0.138</i>	0.017 <i>0.124</i>	0.251** <i>0.113</i>
Respondent education - ref. group "University"				
Elementary	0.063 <i>0.229</i>	0.003 <i>0.280</i>	0.147 <i>0.254</i>	-0.275 <i>0.246</i>
Middle school	0.013 <i>0.175</i>	0.095 <i>0.220</i>	-0.107 <i>0.201</i>	-0.289 <i>0.182</i>
High school	-0.105 <i>0.155</i>	-0.003 <i>0.187</i>	-0.097 <i>0.178</i>	-0.289* <i>0.161</i>
Partner education - ref. group "Missing"				
Elementary	0.186 <i>0.381</i>	0.111 <i>0.272</i>	-0.612 <i>0.519</i>	-0.110 <i>0.438</i>
Middle school	0.314 <i>0.345</i>	0.012 <i>0.218</i>	-0.394 <i>0.510</i>	-0.190 <i>0.408</i>
High school	0.135 <i>0.342</i>	-0.100 <i>0.190</i>	-0.574 <i>0.499</i>	-0.374 <i>0.403</i>
University	0.155 <i>0.362</i>		-0.651 <i>0.516</i>	-0.352 <i>0.415</i>
Double income family	-0.098	-0.021	-0.040	-0.305**

	<i>0.117</i>	<i>0.137</i>	<i>0.128</i>	<i>0.120</i>
Quintile of equivalent income - ref. group "1 <sup>st</sup> quintile"				
2 <sup>nd</sup>	0.102	-0.336**	-0.308**	-0.197
	<i>0.134</i>	<i>0.162</i>	<i>0.149</i>	<i>0.138</i>
3 <sup>rd</sup>	0.030	-0.230	-0.093	0.259*
	<i>0.144</i>	<i>0.177</i>	<i>0.158</i>	<i>0.156</i>
4 <sup>th</sup>	0.084	-0.354*	-0.031	0.010
	<i>0.157</i>	<i>0.191</i>	<i>0.175</i>	<i>0.165</i>
5 <sup>th</sup>	-0.104	-0.567**	-0.408**	-0.177
	<i>0.160</i>	<i>0.198</i>	<i>0.180</i>	<i>0.178</i>
Membership	-0.341**	-0.606***	-0.351**	-0.405**
	<i>0.139</i>	<i>0.173</i>	<i>0.158</i>	<i>0.142</i>
Family voluntariness	0.103	0.178	-0.024	0.513*
	<i>0.280</i>	<i>0.363</i>	<i>0.279</i>	<i>0.292</i>
Social activities	0.181	0.274*	0.178	0.069
	<i>0.127</i>	<i>0.155</i>	<i>0.140</i>	<i>0.126</i>
Meetings	0.065	0.189	-0.158	0.081
	<i>0.129</i>	<i>0.159</i>	<i>0.146</i>	<i>0.130</i>
Trust family	0.550****	0.687****	0.543****	0.369****
	<i>0.063</i>	<i>0.071</i>	<i>0.074</i>	<i>0.061</i>
Trust friends	0.127***	0.0691*	0.0715**	0.0570*
	<i>0.033</i>	<i>0.036</i>	<i>0.032</i>	<i>0.032</i>
Generalized trust	-0.008	0.0524*	0.0506*	0.032
	<i>0.025</i>	<i>0.031</i>	<i>0.029</i>	<i>0.028</i>
Mutual help	0.0648**	0.026	0.015	0.0852**
	<i>0.028</i>	<i>0.032</i>	<i>0.028</i>	<i>0.027</i>
Family help	-0.0556***	-0.026	-0.009	-0.007
	<i>0.015</i>	<i>0.017</i>	<i>0.015</i>	<i>0.016</i>
Breakfast time	0.005	-0.0519**	-0.0367*	0.013
	<i>0.016</i>	<i>0.019</i>	<i>0.020</i>	<i>0.017</i>
Talk time	0.188****	0.107**	0.0992**	0.145***
	<i>0.036</i>	<i>0.040</i>	<i>0.040</i>	<i>0.038</i>
Daily task help	-0.0945**	0.006	-0.053	-0.044
	<i>0.033</i>	<i>0.040</i>	<i>0.036</i>	<i>0.035</i>
Public petition	-0.101	-0.071	0.097	-0.122
	<i>0.122</i>	<i>0.144</i>	<i>0.135</i>	<i>0.124</i>
Charity	0.124	0.007	0.206*	0.044
	<i>0.101</i>	<i>0.118</i>	<i>0.108</i>	<i>0.107</i>
Number of households	1955	1554	1835	1835
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.086	0.091	0.082	0.058
Log-likelihood	-2512.425	-1814.311	-2084.827	-2749.209

**Notes:** Standard errors in italics. \* denotes significance at  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*\*\*  $p < 0.0001$ .

## **Appendix B: Variable Description**

### **Life Satisfaction Questions**

#### Decision taking rules

How satisfied are you with the way decisions are taken in your family?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you are not satisfied and 10 that you are fully satisfied. Amount of agreement: |\_\_|\_\_|

#### Partner relationship

How satisfied are you with the relationship with your partner?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you are not satisfied and 10 that you are fully satisfied. Amount of agreement: |\_\_|\_\_|

#### Children relationship

How satisfied are you with the relationship with your children?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you are not satisfied and 10 that you are fully satisfied. Amount of agreement: |\_\_|\_\_|

#### Time with children

How satisfied are you with the time that you and your children spend together?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you are not satisfied and 10 that you are fully satisfied. Amount of agreement: |\_\_|\_\_|

### **Social Capital Questions**

#### Membership

Altogether, how many associations have you subscribed or are you an active member?

(To understand associations: social cooperatives, voluntary organisations, associations - social, family, sports - non-governmental organizations, trade unions, social movements - religious or cultural - and political parties). Number of associations: |\_\_|\_\_|

#### Family voluntariness

Do you participate in voluntary activities among families?" (Yes/No)

#### Social activities

Do you participate in:

- Religious activities (Yes/No)
- Volunteer activities in favour of needy people (Yes/No)
- Political activities (Yes/No)
- Artistic-cultural activities (Yes/No)

· Sport activities (Yes/No)

### Meetings

Have you participated in meetings to discuss about problems of your community over the last year? (Yes/No)

### Trust family

How much do you trust the members of your family to meet daily needs?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you never trust the members of your family and 10 you always trust. Amount of agreement: |\_|\_|

### Trust friends

Generally, do you trust friends of your family?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you never trust friends of your family and 10 that you always trust them. Amount of agreement: |\_|\_|

### Generalized trust

How much do you agree with the following statement? Most people are trustworthy.”

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you do not agree and 10 you totally agree. Amount of agreement: |\_|\_|

### Mutual help

In case of need, how much do you rely on mutual help from friends of your family?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you never rely on help from family friends and 10 you always rely on them. Amount of agreement: |\_|\_|

### Family help

Recently, in case of serious need, how often have you been helped by the members of your family?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you have never been helped and 10 you have always been helped. Amount of agreement: |\_|\_|

### Breakfast time

In the working week, how much time do you spend with your family during breakfast?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that you do not have breakfast with your family and 10 that you always have breakfast with them. Amount of agreement: |\_|\_|

### Talk time

On average, how much time do members of your family spend to talk with the other members about their personal problems?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that no time is allocated to the activity and 10 that a lot of time is allocated to the activity. Amount of agreement: |\_\_|\_\_|

Daily task help

On average, how much time do members of your family dedicate to the other members to help them in carrying out their daily tasks?

To answer use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 indicates that no time is dedicated to the activity and 10 that a lot of time is allocated to the activity. Amount of agreement: |\_\_|\_\_|

Public petition

Have you signed a public petition over the last year? (Yes/No)

Charity

Have you given cash contribution for purposes of social solidarity or charities over the last year? (Yes/No)