STANOVNIŠTVO, 2022, 60(2), 75–88
Original research paper

Submitted: 05 Oct 2022 | Revised: 15 Nov | Accepted: 18 Nov 2022
https://doi.org/10.2298/STNV2202075M
UDC 331.212.2:304.35-043.92(4)
First Online: 15 Dec 2022

Aging well? Social spending, age, and subjective wellbeing across Europe

Vladimir Mentus [1]

ABSTRACT

The association between age and subjective wellbeing has been examined across different samples and observational time frames, most often indicating a decline in subjective wellbeing with age or a U-shaped relation. Although various contextual variables have been examined as moderators of this relation, the moderating effect of social spending has not been investigated so far. Given that social spending is potentially beneficial for wellbeing and that social spending in Europe is primarily elderly-oriented, we assumed that in countries with higher social spending expenditures, there is a more positive effect of age on subjective wellbeing. We used cross-sectional hierarchical linear modelling (HLM) analysis and the data from the ninth round of the European Social Survey, including 29 countries. Our results show that age is generally negatively related, while age squared is positively related to subjective wellbeing, indicating a U-shaped relation between age and wellbeing. Additionally, social spending at the aggregate level is a significant determinant of wellbeing at the individual level. Most importantly, social spending is a significant positive moderator of this association: with increasing social spending levels, aging is more positively related to wellbeing.

KEYWORDS

age, subjective wellbeing, social spending, HLM, European Social Survey

[1] *Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia*

Correspondence:
Vladimir Mentus,
Institute of Social Sciences,
Kraljice Natalije 45,
11000 Belgrade, Serbia

Email:
vmentus@idn.org.rs

1 INTRODUCTION

Subjective wellbeing is becoming more widely recognised as a reliable wellbeing indicator that offers a supplemental perspective on living conditions beyond the objective components. It may be defined as "the various ways that people evaluate and experience their lives" and involves "three distinct but often related components of wellbeing: frequent positive affect, infrequent negative affect, and cognitive evaluations such as life satisfaction" (Tov and Diener 2013: 1).

A rising number of studies have indicated the association of wellbeing indicators with many individual-level qualities, such as health and longevity, self-efficacy, optimism and self-esteem, pro-social behaviour and sociability, creativity, and cognitive flexibility. (Blanchflower, Oswald and Stewart-Brown 2012; Schneider et al. 2009; Jovanović and Brdarić 2012; Davis 2009; Lyubomirsky, King and Diener 2005; Tay and Diener 2011). There is also evidence that many aggregate-level factors, such as GDP per capita, the unemployment rate, the quality of government, economic, political, and personal freedom, inflation rate, corruption rate, the rule of law, the standard of public goods, and labour protection, have a strong effect on people's wellbeing (Clark 2018; Frey and Stutzer 2002; Boarini et al. 2013; Preziosi 2013; Di Tella, MacCulloch and Oswald 2003; Helliwell 2005).

Age belongs to a much-examined sociodemographic category in relation to subjective wellbeing, although the results are relatively mixed. This inconsistency can be partially explained by a large number of potentially confounding variables, such as gender (Hansen and Slagsvold 2012). For example, a study from 65 countries indicates higher average levels of wellbeing among women by midlife, but lower rates in old age compared to men (Inglehart, 2002). Although some authors emphasise that the relationship between age and wellbeing depends on many contextual factors, the effect of social spending in this regard has not been examined so far, even though the importance of social spending for wellbeing has been indicated many times (Boarini et al. 2013; Radcliff 2001; Rothstein 2010; Boarini et al. 2012).

Social spending is a key component of welfare policy and is primarily implemented to enhance population wellbeing, since it offers insurance in the form of social assistance and financial contributions to people or households in need (Nordheim and Martinussen 2019). "Such insurance provides social assistance and financial contributions to individuals or households experiencing difficulties, where such arrangements are related to a range of social protection programmes associated with poverty, unemployment and labour market, pensions and old age support, family and child care, health and long-term care, housing, as well as support, facilitation and income maintenance for sick or disabled individuals" (ibid: 4). Social spending has the potential to be effective in order to reduce poverty and income inequality. Additionally, efforts to enhance the overall welfare of society mostly depend on rises and drops in public spending caused by the redistribution of spending on public goods in order to minimise social inequities (Aydan, Bayin Donar and Arikan 2021: 442). In European countries, although not homogeneously, the most significant beneficiaries of expenditure on social protection are elderly populations (Eurostat 2019). More precisely, the largest expenditures go towards pension payments, survivors,

https://doi.org/10.2298/STNV2202075M

sickness, and disability, while much less is typically spent on family and children, unemployment, and housing. "The growing imbalance between the needs of the old and the young is likely to create a fracture over welfare policy: in most developed countries, one can observe a rise in pensions spending due to the increasing ageing of the population […] On the other hand, the homogeneous proportion of old voters makes it difficult to reform extant pensions systems in favour of the young, as well as encourage future workforce participation in those countries where 'tax increases are needed to pay for transfer to growing older population'" (Focacci 2022). Thus, it becomes crucial to understand age-subjective wellbeing association differences potentially resulting from different social spending levels.

This paper aims to examine the moderating effect of social spending on age-subjective wellbeing association. Bearing in mind that the largest beneficiaries of expenditure on social protection in European societies are the elderly, we hypothesised the lessening of the negative effect of age on subjective wellbeing as social spending increases. The data coming from the European Social Survey from 2018 covering 29 countries confirmed our hypothesis. The structure of the paper is as follows: after the introduction, we present the state of research about age and subjective wellbeing, as well as the associated between social spending and wellbeing. In the third section, we present the novelties of this study. In the fourth section, we present the results and methodology of the analysis, while in the fifth section, we present the results of the HLM analysis. The last section contains discussion, policy recommendations, and directions for future research.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Although relatively mixed, research findings on the relationship between age and subjective wellbeing generally point to a decline in wellbeing with age (e.g., Deaton 2008; Carmel 2001) or a U-shaped association (e.g., van Landeghem 2012; Blanchflower and Oswald 2008). Data from many countries regarding the latter indicates such an association with a minimum level of wellbeing occurring in middle age (35–50 years) (Blanchflower and Oswald 2008), while other studies indicate a minimum level around the age of 40–43 (Frey and Stutzer 2002; Oswald 1997).

However, research results also indicate that the relationship between age and wellbeing may differ between nations. For instance, numerous cross-national studies reveal a negative correlation between age and wellbeing in poorer nations but a U-shaped association in affluent countries (Bartram 2020; Deaton 2008; Morgan, Robinson and Thompson 2015; Swift et al. 2014). Some authors suggest that these differences relate to welfare regimes, arguing that the association between age and wellbeing may be "distinctly positive in the Nordic countries because of more generous pensions and high-quality, affordable medical care than in most other countries" (Hansen and Blekesaune 2022: 2). On the other hand, "wellbeing among the elderly is particularly low in Eastern European and former Soviet Union countries, which mirrors low health and financial satisfaction and high levels of disability among the elderly in these societies" (Hansen and Slagsvold 2012: 188). However, the fact that the elderly are not uniformly the biggest beneficiaries of social spending in Europe adds another layer of complication to

this pattern. For example, compared to Southern and Continental European welfare states, Scandinavian welfare states spend proportionately more on social programs for their youthful populations (Calero 2002).

Prior studies regarding social spending effects on individual wellbeing have mainly "focused either on subsets of social protection (for instance, unemployment benefits) or the size of the state as proxies to welfare policies" (Kolev and Tassot 2016: 8). Pacek and Radcliff (2008) "considering individual responses in 18 industrial democracies from 1981 to 2000, found that welfare state generosity exerts a positive and significant impact on life satisfaction and happiness". Di Tella, MacCulloch and Oswald (2003) challenged the idea that European unemployment arises because higher unemployment benefits have made life "too easy" for the unemployed. Using the Euro-Barometer Survey Series, these authors evidenced "a positive effect of generous unemployment benefits on life satisfaction and happiness, with a similar impact on both employed and unemployed individuals". According to Radcliff (2013), life satisfaction is positively correlated with social spending, general government consumption, decommodification, and higher tax rates. These were similar to Radcliff's earlier findings (2001), which showed that "societies with more socialist and less liberal welfare state regimes tended to have higher levels of satisfaction".

Findings from studies concerning the size of the state as proxies to welfare policies, however, are more inconsistent. Using individual- and aggregate-level data for OECD nations, Flavin, Pacek and Radcliff (2014) discovered that life satisfaction is positively correlated with the level of government intervention in the economy as measured by social spending, government consumption, decommodification, and labour market regulation. Furthermore, these results are not sensitive to changes in income: both high- and low-income people seem to view more "leftist" social policies to be beneficial to their subjective wellbeing. De Neve et al. (2018) demonstrated that economic recessions lead to greater declines in wellbeing than growth leads to increases, and they made the case that social spending should be used in relation to macroeconomic cycles in order to minimise wellbeing losses by acting as a cycle buffer.

In contrast to these results, Bjørnskov, Dreher and Fischer (2007) demonstrated that life satisfaction declines as government consumption increases using data from a cross-section of 74 nations. When the administration is left-wing, the effect is significantly more pronounced for persons with low and intermediate incomes and men. Additionally, neither social nor governmental spending has a large effect on life satisfaction. Veenhoven (2000) discovered no correlation between the level of personal wellbeing and social spending, which is a proxy for the size of the welfare state. In a sample of 12 EU nations from 1990 to 2000, Hessami (2010) found an inversely U-shaped association between government size and wellbeing.

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

Our aim in this paper is to examine the moderating effect of social spending on the association between age and subjective wellbeing. Although it has been found that contextual variables may have a significant moderating effect and there is an assumption that the social welfare system can have an important

https://doi.org/10.2298/STNV2202075M

role in that sense, this theory has not been empirically tested. Additionally, since "social protection spending also increases with the number of people eligible, i.e. the elderly or unemployed and, consequently, spending may be increased by economic or demographic conditions and not represent a great measure of policy" (O'Connor 2017: 6–7), we added controls for the unemployment rate and old-age-dependency ratio at the aggregate level. Finally, we introduced data from the European Social Survey to replicate and extend previous research on social welfare and subjective wellbeing. Given that the largest beneficiaries of expenditure on social protection in European societies are the elderly, we hypothesised that there would be a reduced negative effect of age on subjective wellbeing in countries with higher social spending levels. More specifically, regardless of whether wellbeing declines with age or this relationship is U-shaped, we expect that in countries with higher social spending, the relationship between age and subjective wellbeing becomes more positive. We set up our hypothesis expecting a positive effect of aggregate social spending on individual wellbeing.

4 METHOD

We used cross-sectional HLM analysis and data from the ninth round of the European Social Survey (from 2018), including 29 countries and 49,519 respondents (51.4% female, M_{age} = 47.84, SD_{age} = 18.89). Happiness assessment captures the affective aspect of subjective wellbeing, whereas life satisfaction data refers to the cognitive aspect (Diener 2012). One question in the database measures life satisfaction, while the other measures happiness. Both items use an 11-point scale, with 0 denoting "very unhappy/dissatisfied" and 10 denoting "extremely happy/satisfied". We calculated the mean of both components as a measure of subjective wellbeing, bearing in mind findings that these two components measure one unique feature of the same latent factor (Diener and Ryan 2009).[1] Subjective wellbeing has an internal consistency level of Cronbach's α = 0.82.

The data on social spending comes from the Eurostat database on social protection expenditure and is composed of social benefits related to "sickness/health care, disability, old age, survivors, family/children, unemployment, housing, and benefits related to social exclusion not elsewhere classified" (Eurostat 2019).

We control for a set of individual variables shown in prior research as potentially relevant determinants of subjective wellbeing: gender, education, subjective income, locality size, subjective health, interpersonal trust, social contacts, religiosity, having or ever having had a child, being or ever having been married, being unemployed, being divorced, and being widowed. We use dummy variables to measure gender (1 = female), having or ever having had a child (1 = having or ever having had a child), being or ever having been married (1 = being or ever having been married), being unemployed (1 = unemployed), being divorced (1 = divorced), and being widowed (1 = widowed). Since objective income may be a poor measure of personal feelings of income adequacy, and these differences may be particularly moderated by age (Isengard and König 2021), we use subjective income instead.

[1] See also Glatz and Eder 2020, Sortheix and Schwartz 2017.

In the European Social Survey, "feeling about household's income nowadays" is used, with a four-point Likert scale ranging from "1–living comfortably on present income" to "4–finding it very difficult on present income". Social contacts ("How often do you meet socially with friends, relatives, or work colleagues?"), subjective health ("How is your health in general?"), interpersonal trust (a composite index constructed additively from three items: "Most people can be trusted, or you can't be too careful", "Most people try to take advantage of you, or try to be fair", "Most of the time people helpful, or they mostly look out for themselves"),[2] and religiosity ("How religious are you?") are measured with scales from 1 to 5, 1 to 7, or 1 to 10.

At the aggregate level, we controlled for the unemployment rate and used the International Labour Organization database. We also controlled for the old-age-dependency ratio, defined as "the ratio of the people aged 65 years and older to the population aged 15–64" (Eurostat 2019). GDP per capita, which is frequently used as a controlling contextual variable, was omitted due to indicated multicollinearity with social spending levels. This indicator data is available from the Eurostat database; we used data from 2018 all aggregate-level variables.

We applied a post-stratified design weight "constructed using the information on age, gender, education, and region in order to mutually adjust individual respondents' probabilities of being sampled, accounting for differences in inclusion probabilities, sampling errors, and possible non-response errors" (Mentus and Vladisavljević 2021).

[2] The index has good internal consistency, with Cronbach's α = 0.79.

5 RESULTS

With a mean of 7.3, as presented in the descriptive statistics in Table 1, it is evident that there are high levels of subjective wellbeing across European countries. In 2018, approximately 8% of Europeans felt extremely happy/satisfied with their lives, while less than 1% were extremely unhappy/dissatisfied. The countries with the highest levels of average subjective wellbeing were Denmark (M = 8.41, SD = 1.34), Iceland (M = 8.18, SD = 1.33), Switzerland (M = 8.61, SD = 1.45), and Finland (M = 8.07, SD = 1.38), while the lowest levels were in Bulgaria (M = 5.43, SD = 2.23), Hungary (M = 6.47, SD = 1.97), Slovakia (M = 6.57, SD = 1.85), and Serbia (M = 6.69, SD = 2.31). The countries with the highest levels of social spending per inhabitant in 2018 were Denmark (€16,588), Norway (€18,612), and Switzerland (€19,279), while the lowest levels were found in Serbia (€1,192), Montenegro (€1,248), and Bulgaria (€1,347). Given the large variability in social spending levels, in further analysis we used the logarithm of this indicator.

As the first step of the HLM analysis, null models were computed to check whether there was a systematic variance between groups among the dependent variables. This precondition was fulfilled (Wald Z = 3.790, p < 001) and showed that around 11% of the variation in subjective wellbeing lies at the country level. Table 2 presents the results of our regression analysis. In model 1, we entered individual-level predictors only. In model 2, we added level-2 predictors. Finally, in model 3, we ran an additional model with the interaction term to test the moderating effect of social spending on the association between age and subjective wellbeing.

As our first model shows, all individual-level variables are significant

https://doi.org/10.2298/STNV2202075M

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Subjective wellbeing	49,122	7.325	1.865	0	10
Age	49,286	47.843	18.893	15	90
Education	48,800	12.923	4.097	0	60
Subjective income	48,711	1.947	0.836	1	4
Locality size	49,479	2.882	1.211	1	5
Subjective health	49,459	2.146	0.913	1	5
Interpersonal trust	48,992	5.218	1.999	0	10
Social contacts	49,355	4.927	1.570	1	7
Religiosity	48,989	4.488	3.129	0	10
Social spending	49,519	3.775	0.368	3.08	4.29
Unemployment rate	49,519	6.487	3.277	2.24	15.25
Old-age dependency ratio	49,519	29.272	3.591	21.10	35.20
		n		%	
Female		25,475		51.4	
Are or have ever been married		31,876		64.4	
Have or have ever had a child		16,440		33.2	
Unemployed		2,754		5.6	
Divorced		3,624		7.3	
Widowed		3,436		6.9	

determinants of subjective wellbeing, with the exception of education. Age is negatively related and age squared is positively related to wellbeing, indicating a U-shaped association between age and subjective wellbeing. Furthermore, being female is associated with greater wellbeing, although the effect is relatively weak. Locality size, feeling better about household income, higher interpersonal trust, better health, more frequent social contacts, and higher religiosity are all significantly and positively related to wellbeing. On the contrary, being unemployed, divorced, and widowed negatively affects wellbeing. Concerning life-course variables, being or ever having been married and having or ever having had a child are significant positive predictors of wellbeing.

Social spending significantly and positively affects subjective wellbeing (model 2). On the contrary, our level-2 controls have no significant effect on subjective wellbeing. Most importantly, as shown in model 3, the interaction effect between social spending and age on subjective wellbeing is positive and significant. In other words, as hypothesised, social spending is a positive moderator of the association between age and subjective wellbeing, meaning that the negative effect of age on wellbeing is lessened as social spending increases. Given that subjective wellbeing is on the rise in old age on average, this finding suggests that it rises more intensely with higher social spending levels. Judging by AIC and BIC, model 3 represents a better fit for the data than models 1 and 2.

Table 2. Results of the HLM analysis on subjective wellbeing

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Parameter	Estimate	Std. error	Estimate	Std. error	Estimate	Std. error
Intercept	6.768***	0.113	5.279***	0.688	6.639***	0.71
Individual level variables						
Female	0.089***	0.014	0.089***	0.014	0.089***	0.014
Age	-0.038***	0.002	-0.038***	0.002	-0.066***	0.005
Age squared	0.001***	0.001	0.001***	0.001	0.001***	0.001
Education	-0.003	0.002	-0.003	0.002	-0.002	0.002
Subjective income = Living comfortably	1.795***	0.036	1.793***	0.036	1.783***	0.036
Subjective income = Coping	1.392***	0.034	1.391***	0.034	1.381***	0.034
Subjective income = Difficult	0.732***	0.036	0.731***	0.036	0.726***	0.036
Subjective income = Very difficult (ref)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Locality size	0.033***	0.006	0.033***	0.006	0.032***	0.006
Subjective health	-0.503***	0.009	-0.503***	0.009	-0.493***	0.009
Interpersonal trust	0.155***	0.004	0.154***	0.004	0.153***	0.004
Social contacts	0.154***	0.005	0.154***	0.005	0.152***	0.005
Religiosity	0.040***	0.002	0.040***	0.002	0.039***	0.002
Are or have ever been married	0.272***	0.022	-0.272***	0.022	-0.275***	0.022
Have or have ever had a child	0.270***	0.022	-0.271***	0.022	-0.266***	0.022
Unemployed	-0.484***	0.091	-0.485***	0.091	-0.488***	0.091
Divorced	-0.217**	0.079	-0.217**	0.079	-0.219**	0.079
Widowed	-0.498***	0.032	-0.498***	0.032	-0.483***	0.032
Aggregate-level variables						
Ln social spending			0.424**	0.144	0.068	0.152
Unemployment rate			0.023	0.016	0.022	0.016
Old-age dependency ratio			-0.009	0.013	-0.009	0.013
Cross-level interaction						
Age*Ln social spending					0.008***	0.001
AIC	170,354.794		170,352.982		170,300.612	
BIC	170,529.948		170,554.408		170,510.796	
Obs. n	49,519		49,519		49,519	
Obs. N	29		29		29	

Note: – indicates reference category; ***p < 0.001; **p < 0.01.

https://doi.org/10.2298/STNV2202075M

6 DISCUSSION

In this paper, we analysed the moderating effect of social spending on the association between age and wellbeing in Europe. Given that social spending is potentially beneficial for wellbeing and that in Europe it is primarily oriented towards elderly populations, we assumed that in countries with greater social spending, age has a more positive association with subjective wellbeing. The data indicated a significant positive moderating effect of social spending on the association between age and wellbeing, thus confirming our hypothesis.

In general, the data indicated a U-shaped relationship between age and wellbeing, which is consistent with most findings from previous studies. There are several explanations for such a result. The demands on a person's time may increase as they get older, and they may find it difficult to juggle work and family obligations. Middle age also comes with the difficulties of having to care for both parents and children at the same time as individuals start having children later in life. On the other hand, younger people who might still be in school and older, retired people might have more free time for enjoyable pursuits (Gayle 2016). Another explanation is that the U-shape could be caused by unfulfilled hopes that are painfully felt in middle age but abandoned in later years. When people are young, they expect a bright future, which lowers actual wellbeing, but as they get older, their expectations are revised downward and actual wellbeing increases (Schwandt 2016; George 2006).

Our analysis further showed that extent of social spending at the aggregate level is a significant determinant of subjective wellbeing at the individual level. The results indicate that welfare state policy directly "affects the concerns important for individual wellbeing: it protects individuals from the impersonal market mechanisms that force people to behave as a commodity in order to survive" (O'Connor 2017). Despite the evidence for the positive effects of social spending on individual wellbeing, "there appears in certain countries a trend of reducing social spending owing to the pressure of economic restructuring that follows neoliberal prescriptions. As social protection nets are removed, the notion of individual responsibility comes to the fore, requiring the individual to assume adverse life situations. Sharp reduction in social protection spending is likely to hurt wage workers, pensioners, low-wage families, the ill and injured, single families with children, etc., and sends threatening messages to intimidated people who have already been living on the margin of a decent living condition/ (Tsai 2009: 105). Tsai adds that institutional rules that normally include social protection measures make them less susceptible to short-term volatility, while long-term reductions in social spending are, on the contrary, detrimental to people's wellbeing.

One more way in which social spending can affect wellbeing is that "government intervention in the economy is associated with lower levels of poverty, inequality, and unemployment", which can also lead to "lower self-esteem, lower efficacy, higher rates of depression, and other deleterious psychological states […] poor physical health, greater rates of alcoholism, domestic violence, and divorce rates". All of these factors are potentially important to individual wellbeing (Flavin, Pacek and Radcliff 2014: 1243).

The explanation for the stronger association between age and wellbeing in countries with higher social spending levels may be found in the expenditure structure, which across Europe is predominantly oriented towards the elderly population (Eurostat 2019). Considering the apparent beneficial effects of social spending on wellbeing and the U-shaped pattern of the age-wellbeing association, our results advocate for increasing expenditures on middle age populations in Europe. These protection expenditures include "general social assistance, unemployment benefits, labour market programs, sickness, maternity, employment injury, and disability" (O'Connor 2017: 400). Additionally, our results call for a general increase in social spending, regardless of beneficiaries' age category, especially in the countries with the lowest levels among examined, such as Serbia, Montenegro, and Bulgaria.

In future research, it will be very important to investigate the moderating effects of social spending over time, with potentially more observation cases. Additionally, the introduction of a random slope in addition to random intercept HLM model would potentially reveal specific patterns of associations between countries. Finally, it would also be useful to carry out split analyses by gender, since gender is shown as a possible moderator of the association between age and wellbeing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper was written as part of the 2022 Research Program of the Institute of Social Sciences with the support of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

https://doi.org/10.2298/STNV2202075M

REFERENCES

Aydan, S., Bayin Donar, G., & Arikan, C. (2021). Impacts of Economic Freedom, Health, and Social Expenditures on Well-Being Measured by the Better Life Index in OECD Countries. *Social Work in Public Health*, 37(5), 435–447. https://doi.org/10.1080/19371918.2021.2018083

Bartram, D. (2020). Age and Life Satisfaction: Getting Control Variables under Control. *Sociology* 55(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038520926871

Bjørnskov, C., Dreher, A., & Fischer, J. A. V. (2007). The Bigger the Better? Evidence of the Effect of Government Size on Life Satisfaction around the World. *Public Choice*, 130(3/4), 267–292. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-006-9081-5

Blanchflower, D. G., & Oswald, A. J. (2008). Is well-being U-shaped over the life cycle? Social *Science & Medicine*, 66(8), 1733–1749. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.01.030

Blanchflower, D. G., Oswald, A. J., & Stewart-Brown, S. (2012). Is psychological well-being linked to the consumption of fruit and vegetables? *Social Indicators Research*, 114(3), 785–801. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0173-y

Boarini, R., Comola, M., Smith, C., Manchin, R., & de Keulenaer, F. (2012). What Makes for a Better Life? The Determinants of Subjective Well-Being in OECD Countries – Evidence from the Gallup World Poll. Paris: OECD Publishing *(OECD Statistics Working Papers*, 2012/03). https://doi.org/10.1787/5k9b9ltjm937-en

Boarini, R., Cornola, M., Keulenaer, F., Manchin, R., & Smith, C. (2013). Can governments boost people's sense of well-being? The impact of selected labour market and health policies on life satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research* 13(1), 105–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0386-8

Calero, J. (2002). The Distribution of Public Social Expenditure in Spain: A General Analysis with Special Reference to Age and Social Class. *Social Policy and Administration*, 36(5), 443–464. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9515.00296

Carmel, S. (2001). The will to live: gender differences among elderly persons. *Social Science & Medicine*, 52(6), 949–958. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536(00)00198-2

Clark, A. (2018). Four Decades of the Economics of Happiness: Where Next? *Review of Income and Wealth,* 64(2), 245–269. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/roiw.12369

Davis, M. A. (2009). Understanding the relationship between mood and creativity: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.04.001

De Neve, J-E., Ward, G., De Keulenaer, F., Van Landeghem, B., Kavetsos, G., & Norton, M. I. (2018). The Asymmetric Experience of Positive and Negative Economic Growth: Global Evidence Using Subjective Well-Being Data. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 100(2), 362–375. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00697

Deaton, A. (2008). Income, Health, and Well-Being around the World: Evidence from the Gallup World Poll. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(2), 53–72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jep.22.2.53

Di Tella, R., MacCulloch, R. J., & Oswald, A. J. (2003). The Macroeconomics of Happiness. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85(4), 809–827. https://doi.org/10.1162/003465303772815745

Diener, E. (2012). New findings and future directions for subjective well-being research. *American Psychologist*, 67(8), 590–597. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029541

Diener, E., & Ryan, K. (2009). Subjective well-being: A general overview. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 39(4), 391–406. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/008124630903900402

Eurostat (2019). *Government expenditure on social protection*. Statistical Database. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/DDN-20190319-1

Flavin, P., Pacek, A. C., & Radcliff, B. (2014). Assessing the Impact of the Size and Scope of Government on Human Well-Being. *Social Forces*, 92(4), 1241–1258. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sou010

Focacci, C. N. (2022). Old versus young: How much do countries spend on social benefits? Deterministic modeling for government expenditure. *Quality & Quantity*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11135-022-01371-3

Frey, B., & Stutzer, A. (2002). What Can Economists Learn From Happiness Research? *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40(2), 402–435. http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/002205102320161320

Gayle, D. (2016, February 4). The age group that is least happy and most anxious. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from https://www.businessinsider.com/the-age-group-that-is-the-least-happy-and-most-anxious-2016-2

George, L. K. (2006). Eighteen – Perceived Quality of Life. In R. H. Binstock & L. K. George (Eds.), *Handbook of aging and the social sciences* (pp. 320–336). https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012088388-2/50021-3

Glatz, C., & Eder, A. (2020). Patterns of Trust and Subjective Well-Being Across Europe: New Insights from Repeated Cross-Sectional Analyses Based on the European Social Survey 2002–2016. *Social Indicators Research*, 148(3), 417–439. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02212-x

Hansen, T., & Blekesaune, M. (2022). The age and well-being "paradox": a longitudinal and multidimensional reconsideration. *European Journal of Ageing*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10433-022-00709-y

Hansen, T., & Slagsvold, B. (2012). The age and subjective well-being paradox revisited: A multidimensional perspective. *Norsk Epidemiologi*, 22(2), 187–195. https://doi.org/10.5324/nje.v22i2.1565

Helliwell, J. F. (2005). Well-Being, Social Capital and Public Policy: What's New? Cambridge: NBER (Working Paper series 11807). https://doi.org/10.3386/w11807

Hessami, Z. (2010). The Size and Composition of Government Spending in Europe and Its Impact on Well-Being. *Kyklos*, 63(3), 346–382. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6435.2010.00478.x

Inglehart, R. (2002). Gender, aging, and subjective well-being. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 43(3), 391–408. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002071520204300309

Isengard, B., & König, R. (2021). Being Poor and Feeling Rich or Vice Versa? The Determinants of Unequal Income Positions in Old Age Across Europe. *Social Indicators Research*, 154(3), 767–787. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02546-x

Jovanović, V., & Brdarić, D. (2012). Did curiosity kill the cat? Evidence from subjective well-being in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(3), 380–384. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.10.043

Kolev, A., & Tassot, C. (2016). Can investments in social protection contribute to subjective well-being? A cross-country analysis, Paris: OECD Publishing (*OECD Development Centre Working Papers*, No. 332). https://doi.org/10.1787/5jlz3k7pqc5j-en

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The Benefits of Frequent Positive Affect: Does Happiness Lead to Success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(6), 803–855. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803

Mentus, V., & Vladisavljević, M. (2021). Easterlin Paradox Revisited: Do Increases in Income Bring Higher Levels of Income Satisfaction? *Sociologija*, 63(2), 220–235. https://doi.org/10.2298/SOC2102220M

Morgan, J., Robinson, O., & Thompson, T. (2015). Happiness and age in European adults: the moderating role of gross domestic product per capita. *Psychology and Aging,* 30(3), 544–560. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pag0000034

Nordheim, O., & Martinussen, P. E. (2019). Happiness and the role of social protection: how types of social spending affected individuals' life satisfaction in OECD countries, 1980–2012, *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 36(4), 1–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21699763.2019.1601586

O'Connor, K. J. (2017). Happiness and Welfare State Policy Around the World. *Review of Behavioral Economics*, 4(4), 397–420. http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/105.00000071

Oswald, A. J. (1997). Happiness and Economic Performance. The *Economic Journal*, 107(445), 1815–1831. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.1997.tb00085.x

Pacek, A. C., & Radcliff, B. (2008). Assessing the Welfare State: The Politics of Happiness. *Perspectives on Politics*, 6(2), 267–277. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1537592708080602

Preziosi, N. (2013). Life Is Getting Worse in ESS Data: Is This Due to Micro or Macro Factors? *Bruges European Economic Research (BEER) Papers* 28/November 2013. Retrieved from http://aei.pitt.edu/58624/

Radcliff, B. (2001). Politics, Markets, and Life Satisfaction: The Political Economy of Human Happiness. *American Political Science Association*, 95(4), 939–952. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055400400110

Radcliff, B. (2013). *The political economy of human happiness: how voters' choices determine the quality of life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rothstein, B. (2010). Happiness and the welfare state. *Social Research*, 77(2), 441–468. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40972225

Schneider, M., Graham, D., Grant, A., King, P., & Cooper, D. (2009). Regional brain activation and affective response to physical activity among healthy adolescents. *Biological Psychology*, 82(3), 246–252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2009.08.003

Schwandt, H. (2016). Unmet Aspirations as an Explanation for the Age U-shape in Wellbeing. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 122, 75–87. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2015.11.011

Sortheix, F., & Schwartz, S. (2017). Values that Underlie and Undermine Well-Being: Variability Across Countries. *European Journal of Personality*, 31(2), 187–201. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/per.2096

Swift, H. J., Vauclair, C-M., Abrams, D., Bratt, C., Marques, S., & Lima, M-L. (2014). Revisiting the paradox of well-being: The importance of national context. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 69(6), 920–929. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbu011

Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2011). Needs and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 354–365. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023779

Tov, W., & Diener, E. (2013). Subjective Wellbeing. In K.D. Keith (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339893.wbeccp518

Tsai, M.-C. (2009). The Impact of Instability on Subjective Well-Being: A Cross-National Study. In V. Møller & D. Huschka (Eds.), *Quality of Life and the Millennium Challenges. Social Indicators Research Series* vol. 35 (pp. 101–114). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8569-7_8

Van Landeghem, B. (2012). A test for convexity of human well-being over the lifecycle: Longitudinal evidence from a 20-year panel. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 81(2), 571–585. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2011.08.001

Veenhoven, R. (2000). Well-Being in the Welfare State: Level Not Higher, Distribution Not More Equitable. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis Research and Practice*, 2(1), 91–125. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1010058615425

How to cite: Mentus, V. (2022). Aging well? Social spending, age, and subjective wellbeing across Europe. *Stanovništvo,* 60(2), 75–88. https://doi.org/10.2298/STNV2202075M

Srećno starenje? Socijalna davanja, starost i subjektivno blagostanje u Evropi

PROŠIRENI SAŽETAK

Povezanost između starosti i subjektivnog blagostanja ispitivana je na različitim uzorcima i vremenskim okvirima posmatranja, najčešće ukazujući na pad subjektivnog blagostanja sa starošću ili na povezanost u obliku slova U. Iako su različite kontekstualne varijable ispitivane kao moderatori ove povezanosti, moderirajući efekat socijalnih davanja do sada nije istražen. Kako su socijalna davanja potencijalno korisna za blagostanje i kako su davanja u Evropi prvenstveno orijentisana ka starijim, hipotetisali smo da u zemljama sa većim socijalnim davanjima postoji pozitivniji efekat starosti na subjektivno blagostanje. Koristili smo kros-sekcionalno hijerarhijsko linearno modelovanje i podatke iz devetog talasa Evropskog društvenog istraživanja, iz 2018. i dvadeset devet zemalja.

Rezultati su ukazali, prvo, da je starost generalno negativno, dok je kvadrat starosti pozitivno povezan sa subjektivnim blagostanjem, što ukazuje na povezanost između starosti i blagostanja u obliku U. Objašnjenja ovakvog nalaza se kriju u rastućim poslovnim i porodičnim (istovremeno brinući se i za roditelje i za decu) obavezama u srednjem dobu, kao i neostvarenim aspiracijama tokom tog doba, a koje se napuštaju u starosti.

Drugo, podaci su ukazali da je nivo socijalnih davanja na agregatnom nivou značajna pozitivna determinanta blagostanja na individualnom nivou. Naime, kako je intervencija vlade u ekonomiju potencijalno povezana sa nižim nivoima siromaštva, nejednakosti i nezaposlenosti, posledično se nižu pozitivni efekti i na rast efikasnosti, samopouzdanja, pad depresije i drugih štetnih psihičkih stanja, poboljšanje fizičkog zdravlja, pa i pad alkoholizma, porodičnog nasilja, stope razvoda itd. – a koji su svi od potencijalno velikog značaja za individualno blagostanje.

Konačno, rezultati su ukazali da su socijalna davanja značajan pozitivan moderator povezanosti između starosti i subjektivnog blagostanja: sa povećanjem nivoa socijalnih davanja starenje je pozitivnije povezano sa blagostanjem. Time se potvrdila naša hipoteza. Objašnjenje za ovaj nalaz se može naći u strukturi socijalnih davanja, koja je, kako je istaknuto, dominantno orijentisana širom Evrope ka starijoj populaciji.

Uzimajući u obzir nalaze o pozitivnom efektu socijalnih davanja na blagostanje i U-oblik povezanosti između starosti i blagostanja, naši rezultati pozivaju na rast sociajlnih davanja ka sredovečnoj populaciji u Evropi. Pored toga, rezultati pozivaju na generalno povećanje socijalnih davanja bez obzira na starosnu kategoriju korisnika, a posebno u zemljama sa najnižim nivoom davanja od ovde ispitivanih, kao što su Srbija, Crna Gora i Bugarska.

KLJUČNE REČI

starost, subjektivno blagostanje, socijalna davanja, HLM, Evropsko društveno istraživanje

https://doi.org/10.2298/STNV2202075M