

Displacement, Placemaking and Wellbeing in the City (DWELL)

Government Statistics
and measures of
wellbeing



Economic
and Social
Research Council

Prelims

Citation

Wong Espejo, A. (2021) *Government Statistics and Measures of Wellbeing*, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies, DOI: 10.19088/IDS.2021.029

Author

Andrei Wong Espejo

Published

11 March 2021

ISBN: 978-1-78118-788-3

DOI: 10.19088/IDS.2021.029

Funding acknowledgements and disclaimers

The support of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) is gratefully acknowledged (Grant Ref ES/R011125/1)

Licensing



This is an Open Access report distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence (CC BY NC), which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, providing this is not for commercial nor monetisation purposes and the original authors and source are credited and any modifications or adaptations are indicated. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Contents

- Prelims..... 0
- Contents..... 2
 - Tables..... 2
- 1. Introduction..... 3
- 2. Objectives 4
- 3. Methodology..... 5
- 4. General results..... 6
 - 4.1 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in the European Union..... 9
 - 4.2 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in India 10
 - 4.3 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in Finland..... 11
 - 4.4 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in Norway 12
 - 4.5 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in the United Kingdom..... 14
- 5. Conclusions and recommendations..... 16
- 6. References 18
- 7. Annex 1: Search results..... 21

Tables

- Table 1: Keywords search 5
- Table 2: Other wellbeing initiatives in the UK..... 15
- Table 3: National wellbeing measurement initiatives and indicator sets..... 21
- Table 4: Datasets..... 25
- Table 5: Studies..... 40
- Table 6: Research projects / initiatives 41

1. Introduction

As the Global Compact for Refugees (UNHCR 2018) mentions, there is a growing divide in the world between those who regard international migration as beneficial for economies and a necessity for human progress and those who regard it as a threat to social cohesion, national identity and security. It is therefore essential that the migration research agenda built on the considerable knowledge accumulated in recent decades and addresses priorities in both fundamental and policy-oriented research.

In this sense, the Displacement, Placemaking and Wellbeing in the City (DWELL) project seeks to examine the placemaking processes through which people build, attach meaning, belong to and derive wellbeing (or not) from and in their urban living and working environments. This report aims to provide evidence about the availability of data sources explicitly designed for measuring wellbeing with an emphasis on migrants' outcomes.

While the literature exploring the relationship between migration and wellbeing is rather scant to date (Alpaslan, Constant and Corrado 2014), recent work exploring the relationship in this area is offered by Simpson (2013). This is partly because the definition of migrant itself is contested as shown by several reports of the UN Statistical Commission (UNDESA 1953; UNDESA, Population Division 1980, 1986; UNDESA, Statistics Division 1998). These reports include recommendations for not only common statistical definitions of long and short migration, refugee migration and international mobility but also described effective and appropriate methods of data collection for the generation of stocks, flows and characteristics of migrant populations, as well as priorities in data dissemination (cross-tabulations) of disaggregated migration data by age, sex, country of origin, and country of destination, at the very least (Kraly and Hovy 2020). More specifically, these authors mention that there are tensions in conceptualising migration that arise between a classical demographic perspective on international migration (seeking to measure mobility behaviours and experiences among all members of a population at different scales of analysis). In opposition to a rather limiting perspective of migration that focusses on identifying persons through entitlements and status under sovereign/national law and administration.

Additionally, ways by which to measure wellbeing outcomes by migrant status is very challenging for official statisticians as obtaining accurate and detailed information about inflows and outflows, and defining and measuring the stock of migrants within a country is a real challenge. Hence, relatively few data sources are explicitly designed for measuring migrants' wellbeing outcomes. Furthermore, this report finds a bias towards a material and subjective conceptualisation of wellbeing in detriment to conceptualisations that consider sustainability and relational wellbeing.

A natural data source in any research is the national census which tends to have migration background questions. The comprehensive nature of national censuses makes it possible to provide detailed information on several migrant outcomes (for both first- and second-generation migrants), and some internationally harmonised census data are available through the Integrated Public-Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) project, coordinated by the University of

Minnesota. However, while census data provides highly granular information that allows users to analyse outcomes for the migrant population by a number of background characteristics (including reported ethnicity or country of origin), the coverage of wellbeing outcomes is generally very limited.

This report begins by providing a brief description of the objectives and the methodology used to find migration-related wellbeing datasets, publications and projects. Section 4, particularly focusses on the most relevant search results in terms of the ways government statistics explicitly incorporate, or not, measures of wellbeing and at what scale. After reflecting on whether or not these statistics show differential wellbeing outcomes for migrants as compared to other populations, the report concludes with recommendations concerning wellbeing related data collection.

2. Objectives

By mapping out current government approaches in selected countries, that is, the members of the European Union (EU), India, Finland, Norway and the United Kingdom (UK), to assess wellbeing, this report will set the backdrop against which the research efforts and fieldwork of the DWELL project can form their base. This analysis will also provide useful background information to support future key informant interviews with government officials and others concerned with urban wellbeing and will help introduce case studies in particular cities. Hence, this report maps out current government approaches in the selected countries to assess wellbeing by addressing the following questions:

- In what ways are government statistics explicitly incorporating (or not) established measures of wellbeing?
- At what geographical and administrative scales is the analysis presented (national, urban/rural, city or urban local authority specific, neighbourhood specific?)
- Are these statistics (produced by the government itself or by other researchers) recording and showing differential wellbeing outcomes for displaced people as compared to other populations? If so, what are the differences and how are these explained for?

3. Methodology

To identify existing government published (and “in-print”) statistics on wellbeing for the EU, India, Finland, Norway and the UK a set of keywords were used. These keywords are as follows:

Table 1: Keywords search

EU / UK		Finland	Norway		India			
English		Finish	Norwegian		Hindi		English	
wellbeing	wellbeing	hyvinvointi	velvære	trivsel	कल्याण	kalyaan	wellbeing	wellbeing
wellbeing policy	wellbeing policy	hyvinvointi politiikka	velferdspolitik	trivselspolitikk	कल्याणकारी नीति	kalyaanakaree neeti	wellbeing policy	wellbeing policy
quality of life		elämänlaatu	livskvalitet		जीवन की गुणवत्ता	jeevan kee gunavatta	quality of life	
happiness		onnellisuus	lykke		खुशी	khushee	happiness	
Life satisfaction			Livsglede		जीवन की संतुष्टि	jeevan kee santushti	Life satisfaction	
liveability							liveability	
migrant/inmigrant		siirtolainen	innvandrere		प्रवासी	pravaasee	migrant/inmigrant	
foreign-born		ulkomailla syntynyt	utenlandsfødte		विदेश में पैदा	videsh main paida	foreign-born	

Source: Author’s own.

Documents were collated using a web-based search for publicly available publications and datasets for the selected countries. Specific emphasis was put on searching in these countries’ national data portals, using a comprehensive list of open data portals from around the world (<https://dataportals.org/>), and in their respective national statistical offices (https://unstats.un.org/home/nso_sites/). Where available, local government statistical offices websites were consulted. Other important information sources are the migration authority, university websites and the Global Migration Data Portal (<https://migrationdataportal.org/>). The focus was on statistics and publications dated within the last five years (the period 2015-2020, inclusive).

For each of the identified government statistics, the following was recorded:

- a) the metadata (the year, sample size, sampling strategy, relevant government agency, official URL, if there are other more easily accessible data repositories the URLs of these);
- b) the way wellbeing is operationalised;
- c) whether displaced or migrant populations (e.g. as migrants, asylum seekers, ethnic minorities (e.g. Roma), EU citizens, homeless people, etc.) are accounted

- for in these statistics. If yes, what are their differential wellbeing outcomes compared to the rest of the population;
- d) the administrative scale of the statistics; and
 - e) whether the full survey dataset or a restricted sample dataset is available for public access.

Finally, if a dataset was identified additional analysis with project researchers other than this author was undertaken, to determine whether the dataset warranted subsequent analysis. The full results are presented in detail in tabular form in Section 7. Annex 1: Search results. The main results are set out in the following section.

4. General results

1. In what ways are government statistics explicitly incorporating (or not) established measures of wellbeing?

As each country invariably has its specific history and priorities, significant differences were found between the evaluated governments, but in general, relatively few data sources were found to be explicitly designed for measuring migrants' wellbeing outcomes. There were additional challenges: National migration statistics were found to be rarely available in a readily accessible format, the type of migration data collected was found to be quite variable as was the time interval over which migration is measured, and the spatial frameworks used differed amongst sets. Many differences in the measurements made in the data sets, directly stemmed from the differences in national immigration policies. This in turn reflected differences in *modalities of reception* through which governments and other actors direct the legal statuses and rights, behaviours and integration options of displaced populations, all of which was reflected in their data collection efforts. Important international initiatives, in this respect, are the Immigration Policies in Comparison project (IMPIC) (<http://www.impic-project.eu/data>) and the Internal Migration Around the Globe project (IMAGE) (<https://imageproject.com.au>), a global inventory of migration data collection.

In addition to specific wellbeing indexes or indicators, over the past decades, there has been an extraordinary amount of attention in the development of national wellbeing frameworks. In this sense, we found 16 wellbeing frameworks in 9 countries (Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, India, Ireland, Italy, Sweden, and the UK) and the How's Life framework for Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. For more detail see Table 3: National wellbeing measurement initiatives and indicator sets in Annex 1.

At the national level, no wellbeing framework was found in India and Norway, but these nations produce several specific quality of life indicators. Finland and especially the UK have a well-established framework and a variety of data sources and active government and civil society actors that produce high-quality wellbeing data. An outstanding case is the Health and Wellbeing of Asylum Seekers Survey (Skogberg *et al.* 2019) in Finland. Concerning the OECD, which encompasses all the EU members, the How's Life framework compares wellbeing across countries, based on 11 topics that the OECD has identified as essential, in the areas of material

living conditions and quality of life. This initiative led to the development of the MAPWELL group of 14 national statistical offices working on the Beyond GDP agenda, and the establishment of a supporting non-governmental organisation (NGO), the Oxford-based Foundation for Knowledge Exchange (Anand 2016).

One notable difference among these national initiatives is their effective influence and motivation. In some countries, responsibility was with the National Statistical Office or similar agencies (e.g., in Denmark and Austria), suggesting that the underlying rationale of these initiatives was that of providing additional metrics beyond GDP, without necessarily embedding these measures into policy. In other cases, however, measurement frameworks were developed by a centre-of-government agency or by a combination of policy-related agencies (e.g., in Finland, India and Italy), with a clear ambition to use these metrics in policy settings (Stiglitz, Fitoussi and Durand 2018).

Nevertheless, the existence of different and competing understandings and interpretations of wellbeing risks creating problems in international comparability and tends to obscure the way wellbeing is used and applied in public policy. In particular, it is difficult to separate what wellbeing *is* from those factors that can *impact on* wellbeing (Alwaer *et al.* 2016). Therefore, depending on the motivation of the framework and the wellbeing conceptualisation, the wellbeing framework is applied at several different stages of the policy cycle, from strategic analysis and prioritisation to evaluations of policy (Exton and Shinwell 2018). It follows then that the policy focus of most frameworks is biased towards a material and subjective conceptualisation of wellbeing in detriment to conceptualisations that consider sustainable and relational wellbeing. As a consequence, less attention may be given to migrant populations in these statistics as they do not represent a significant constituency. As such, this report finds that none of the before mentioned frameworks explicitly includes this subpopulation. Detailed information about these frameworks in selected countries is given in sections 4.1 to 4.5.

2. At what geographical and administrative scales is the analysis presented (national, urban/rural, city or urban local authority specific, neighbourhood specific?)

There will always be a need for indicators and measures specific to regional opportunities and challenges, nevertheless, most measures of wellbeing and especially wellbeing frameworks are designed mostly at the national and urban level (see Table 3: National wellbeing measurement initiatives and indicator sets in Annex 1).

Some civil society initiatives aim for city-level representation, especially in the UK, where I found wellbeing measures for Bristol, the Happy City and Happiness Pulse frameworks and Thriving Places Index. It is not clear if these measures can be complemented with migration-related data. An interesting initiative, in India, is the Ease of Living Index, which covers 111 Indian cities, totalling about 134 million people residing in these cities. To our best of knowledge, this initiative is the first of its kind globally, in terms of scale and coverage.

More detailed information about the selected countries is given in sections 4.1 to 4.5.

3. Are these statistics (produced by the government itself or by other researchers) recording and showing differential wellbeing outcomes for displaced people as compared to other populations? If so, what are the differences and how are these explained for?

From the search results (see Table 4: Datasets in Annex 1) it can be concluded that the coverage of wellbeing outcomes of migrants is generally very limited. The available datasets and reports indicate that in general there are differential wellbeing outcomes for migrants, with unfavourable outcomes in terms of health, income disparities, feelings of discrimination, level of housing tenure and wealth accumulation, and favourable outcomes in the domains of educational achievements, income growth, access to technology and report higher life satisfaction than the peers they left behind in their country of origin. With this limited evidence base in mind, overall studies suggest that the consequences of migration are slightly positive, at least in the short term, but more research is warranted. More detailed information about the selected countries is given in sections 4.1 to 4.5.

Some attempts to understand the differential outcomes indicate that migrants may have high expectations that are not always met. For example, according to Hendriks *et al.* (2018), excessive expectations exist about their future happiness in the host country, which stems from inaccurate perceptions of or incomplete information about the destination country. Also, high aspirations in relation to achievement, influenced by their new reference groups, may generate unhappiness. In this sense, several studies suggest that migrants may be mistaken in thinking that moving will increase happiness as findings show that migration can affect negatively the happiness of relatives in the home country and that migrants, on average, tend to have a lower happiness score than non-migrants (see Bălțătescu 2007; Bartram 2010, 2011; Borraz *et al.* 2008; Knight and Gunatilaka 2010). One question that requires attention is why some migrants voluntarily move abroad if it benefits neither themselves nor their families back home. Furthermore, Polgreen and Simpson (2011) using the World Values Survey discovered a U-shaped relationship between emigration rates and happiness, this is, emigration decreases as happiness increases in relatively unhappy countries but rises as happiness increases in relatively happy countries.

For the UK, Nowok *et al.* (2013), find that, on average, migration is preceded by a period when individuals experience a significant decline in happiness. The authors find that, as opposed to labour market outcomes of migration, subjective wellbeing outcomes do not differ significantly between men and women. Perhaps surprisingly, long-distance migrants are at least as happy as short-distance migrants despite the higher social costs that are involved.

Most studies do not specifically address the welfare impacts that migrants have on native populations (with the exception of Betz and Simpson 2013). But a major issue is that most studies related to migrant happiness are based on cross-sectional surveys, which makes it hard to attribute causality.

4.1 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in the European Union

The **OECD How's Life framework** distinguishes between current and future wellbeing at the national scale. According to this framework (OECD 2017), current wellbeing is measured in terms of outcomes achieved in the two broad domains: material living conditions (income and wealth, jobs and earnings, housing conditions) and quality of life (health status, work-life balance, education and skills, social connections, civic engagement and governance, environmental quality, personal security and subjective wellbeing). The prospects for future wellbeing are taken into account in this framework by looking at some of the key resources that drive wellbeing over time and that are persistently affected by today's actions: these drivers can be measured through indicators of different types of capitals, i.e. economic, natural, human and social capital (OECD 2017). The OECD Better Life Index has four distinctive characteristics (Boarini, Kolev and McGregor 2014):

- First, it focuses on people (i.e. individuals and households), their situation and how they relate to others in the community where they live and work.
- Second, it concentrates on wellbeing outcomes as opposed to wellbeing inputs or outputs because outcomes provide the best direct information on people's lives.
- Third, it considers the distribution of wellbeing in the population alongside average achievements. Nevertheless, at the moment it only allows for the exploration of disparities across gender and individuals' socio-economic backgrounds.
- Lastly, it looks at both objective and subjective aspects of wellbeing because personal experiences and assessments of life circumstances provide important information alongside more objective measures of these circumstances.

It should be noted that irregular, one-off publications presenting a range of migrant outcomes are made available by the OECD. In particular, the publication: 'Settling in: Indicators of Migrant Integration' (OECD and the EU 2015) examines selected outcomes for migrants and their children across a number of the dimensions of the How's Life? framework, including the labour market, job quality, education, income, housing, health, civic engagement and social cohesion. These dimensions correspond to the European framework of the 'Zaragoza indicators' of migrant integration (European Commission 2013).

Other notable wellbeing frameworks and indicators that do not pertain to the selected countries are:

- How is Austria? (Austria);
- Quality of Life Indicators (Denmark);
- New Wealth Indicators (*Les nouveaux indicateurs de richesse*) (France);
- Equality Budgeting (Ireland);
- Equitable and Sustainable Wellbeing (*Benessere Equo e Sostenibile*) (Italy); and,
- New Measures of Wellbeing (*nya mått på välförhållande*) (Sweden).

Other sources of wellbeing statistics at the European level, include European Social Survey (ESS), Income and Living Conditions Survey (ILCS) and the European Quality of Life Surveys (EQLS). For more technical details about these surveys (the year, sample size, sampling strategy, relevant government agency, official URL and if they include migrant related variables) refer to Table 4: Datasets.

Some differential wellbeing outcomes of migrants compared to the rest of the population are:

- In most OECD countries, the household median income is lower for migrants than for the native-born, with the median income of migrant households around 25 per cent lower, on average, than that of native-born households across the 22 European countries for which data are available (US\$ 17,609 compared with US\$ 23,353 in native-born households in 2014) (OECD 2017).
- Migrants in European countries are more likely than the native-born to do shift work or work on evenings or weekends (OECD 2017).
- People born in countries other than the survey country also feel less resilient than the native population; approximately 30 per cent of migrants from outside the EU find it difficult to deal with problems and 29 per cent need a long time to bounce back (European Quality of Life Survey 2016).
- On average, migrants experience greater poverty, lower levels of income and wealth, and more exposure to poor environmental and housing conditions relative to non-migrants (OECD 2017).
- They also find it harder to access decent work: they are more likely to be overqualified for their jobs, experience more in-work poverty and work more atypical hours (OECD 2017).

4.2 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in India

No national-level wellbeing framework was found for India. Some evidence of state-level initiatives in Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh were found, in respect to the *Anand Vibhag* or happiness department was set-up in these states. News reports mentioned the existence of a Happiness Index (to be elaborated by the Indian Institute of Technology-Kharagpur) in Madhya Pradesh and that the State of Andhra Pradesh convened a panel to formulate a Happiness index in 2018, but a thorough search did not result in relevant findings.

At the city level, the **Ease of Living Index 2018**, covers 111 Indian cities, which includes selected smart cities, capital cities and a few more cities with a population of over 1 million. With more than 134 million people residing in these 111 cities, this initiative is the first of its kind globally, in terms of scale and coverage. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs produces this index intending to “help cities systematically assess themselves against global and national benchmarks and encourage them to shift towards an “outcome-based” approach to urban planning and management” (Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs 2018: 10).

This index intends to capture the quality of life in cities across 4 pillars and 15 categories using 78 indicators, of which 56 are core indicators and 22 are supporting indicators. The core

indicators measure those aspects of ease of living that are considered 'essential' urban services, a product of extensive consultations with state and city governments, sector experts and citizen feedback using the MyGov portal (Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs 2018). The supporting indicators are used to measure the adoption of innovative practices, which are considered desirable for enhancing the ease of living. This index covers the following dimensions:

- quality of life: Assessing social wellbeing (education, health, housing and shelter, wash and solid waste management, mobility, safety and security, recreation);
- economic ability: Economic robustness (level of economic development, economic opportunities, Gini coefficient); and
- sustainability: Managing urban spaces (environment, green spaces and buildings, energy consumption, city resilience).

An interesting, non-government initiative is the **City-Systems framework** elaborated by Janaagraha Centre for Citizenship and Democracy. This NGO evaluates urban governance using the City-Systems framework consisting of four distinct but inter-related components that help govern a city and deliver a good quality of life to all citizens. These four components are:

- urban planning and design;
- urban capacities and resources;
- transparency, accountability and participation; and
- empowered and legitimate political participation.

The 23 chosen cities (considering their political and economic significance) include the capital cities of the 19 largest states in India and the next four largest cities subject to availability and ease of gathering of data.

For more technical details about these indexes (the year, sample size, sampling strategy, relevant government agency, official URL and if they include migrant related variables) refer to Table 4: Datasets. Both indexes do not allow the exploration of disparities across the migrant and native population. As such, no differential wellbeing outcomes of migrants compared to the rest of the population can be shown.

4.3 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in Finland

Launched in 2009 by Finland's Prime Minister's Office and Statistics Finland, the Findicator (*Findikaattori*) is an online compendium of over 100 indicators on social progress, with a specific category on life satisfaction indicators. The life satisfaction indicators include 23 indicators across eight dimensions, based on the Survey on Income and living conditions from Statistics Finland. These statistics describe the living conditions of the household population from different perspectives, such as the risk of poverty or social exclusion, subjective wellbeing and livelihood, health and housing by population groups in Finland¹. Some of the data published in the statistics are collected only at set intervals, but some yearly.

¹ The classification used are the person's age, the household's socio-economic group, the household's income level, the household's stage in life and regional classifications.

Other sources of potential wellbeing statistics are the following:

- **Health and Wellbeing of Asylum Seekers: Survey of Asylum Seekers who came to Finland in 2018** (Skogberg *et al.* 2019): a 1,087 sample based on the Foreigners' Register that covers information on the health and health service use of asylum seekers in Finland.
- **Wellbeing Study of Foreign-born (FinMonik)**: a 12,877 sample, including people aged 18-64 with a foreign-born background, representative at the national level. Covers a range of different areas of life, including quality of life, welfare, and participation in social and societal activities, experiences of discrimination, safety, perceived health, employment, and competence. Data was also collected about the need for and use of social and health care services as well as employment and immigration services, and trust in these services. Claims to be the most extensive survey so far carried out among the foreign-born population living in Finland.
- **Workplace and Wellbeing of Foreign Origin Survey**: provides information about the labour market situation, ability to work and function, physical and mental health, possible experiences of discrimination and need for services among people of foreign origin.

For more technical details about these surveys (the year, sample size, sampling strategy, relevant government agency, official URL and if they include migrant related variables) refer to Table 4: Datasets.

Some differential wellbeing outcomes of migrants compared to the rest of the population are:

- Experiences of discrimination create major challenges to the health and welfare of the population with foreign background: 40 per cent of men and 37 per cent of women had experienced discrimination within the previous year (Skogberg *et al.* 2019).
- Women's welfare was also threatened by insecurity they experienced: One in ten women felt unsafe in the streets near their home (*ibid*).
- Compared to the whole population, both men and women with foreign background were less likely to consider their health as good or fairly good (*ibid*).

4.4 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in Norway

No national-level wellbeing framework was found for Norway. Nevertheless, Statistics Norway has produced several interesting data sources.

The **Survey on Living Conditions** together with complementary surveys of working environment, carried out every three years, and a survey of health, carried out approximately every five years, represents an important source of wellbeing data. The concept of living conditions covers a very wide range of topics and statistics such as the risk of poverty or social exclusion, subjective wellbeing and livelihood, health and housing by population groups (migrants, age cohorts and gender). The main result data collected in the interview are:

- the sampled person's experience of his or her own health and wellbeing;
- material deprivation experienced by the sample person and the whole household;
- the household's difficulties in making ends meet, arrears and indebtedness;
- the household's mode of housing, housing expenditure and costs and data describing the quality of the dwelling;
- children's material standard of living and children's health; and
- availability of various services.

The statistics cover internal migration and, immigration and emigration out of Norway. Data is compiled by age, gender, marital status, native language, country of birth, and region of arrival and departure of migrants. A person may appear in one year's statistics several times because the statistical unit is the time of migration (action of moving) and the migrant. The data describes the situation on the day of the move. Data is available on the country of departure and arrival for immigration and emigration, and on the municipality of departure and arrival for internal migration. According to Statistics Norway, data is available from the statistics on migration between different areas, such as regions and sub-regional units. Immigration and emigration statistics are available for the whole country starting from 1945 and statistics on migration by municipality starting from 1975 (Statistics Norway 2018).

The **Living Conditions among Immigrants Survey** has the objective of comparing the general living conditions between large immigrant groups and, between immigrants and their Norwegian-born children, as these groups are not sufficiently covered by Statistics Norway's ordinary surveys on living conditions (Statistics Norway 2016). Immigrants from the following countries are included in the survey: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Eritrea, Iran, Iraq, Kosovo, Pakistan, Poland, Somalia, Sri-Lanka, Turkey and Vietnam. According to Statistics Norway, this survey covers the following wellbeing domains:

- living conditions;
- health;
- work and working environment;
- housing and living situation;
- sense of belonging;
- inclusion and discrimination; and
- attitudes and values.

For more technical details about these surveys (the year, sample size, sampling strategy, relevant government agency, official URL and if they include migrant related variables) refer to Table 4: Datasets.

Some differential wellbeing outcomes of migrants compared to the rest of the population are:

- Immigrants are less likely to own the dwelling they live in compared to the entire population (Statistics Norway 2016).

- They tend to live in blocks of flats, and they more often experience a poor dwelling standard. Many immigrants live in overcrowded dwellings (*ibid*).
- However, considerably fewer migrants consider their dwelling to be too small than those who are objectively defined as living in an overcrowded dwelling (*ibid*).
- Immigrants are more often subjected to violence and threats than the population in general, but they rarely state that there are problems with crime, violence and vandalism where they live (*ibid*).

4.5 Wellbeing measures and differential outcomes for migrants in the United Kingdom

The **Measuring National Wellbeing Programme** from the Office for National Statistics (ONS), established in 2010, has the objective of understanding societal and personal wellbeing in the UK beyond traditional measures. The framework comprises 41 indicators grouped into ten dimensions: personal wellbeing, our relationships, health, what we do, where we live, personal finance, economy, education and skills, governance and the environment. According to the ONS, the reported data is based on four personal wellbeing questions, these are:

- Overall, how satisfied are you with your life nowadays?
- Overall, to what extent do you feel the things you do in your life are worthwhile?
- Overall, how happy did you feel yesterday?
- Overall, how anxious did you feel yesterday?

People are asked to respond on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is ‘not at all’ and 10 is ‘completely’. The ONS produces estimates of the mean ratings for all four personal wellbeing questions, as well as their distributions. To communicate the indicators, the ONS developed a “wellbeing wheel” to show results at a glance across all dimensions (see <https://blog.ons.gov.uk/2017/03/28/national-statistical-blog-reinventing-the-wellbeing-wheel/>). However, in 2017, the wheel was replaced by an online dashboard to foster user interaction. The dataset underpinning the framework is open to the public and the ONS reports on progress on the headline wellbeing measures twice a year through its website (Exton and Shinwell 2018).

Estimates are representative at the national, country and local authority level. Nevertheless, estimates are not directly comparable at the local authority level because of small sample sizes and large confidence intervals they cannot be used to rank all local authorities against each other (unless population size and structures are similar). There are no indications that this data can be used for the exploration of disparities across migrant and native populations, especially if no direct comparisons can be made between the Opinions and Lifestyle Survey (OPN) as a basis for the subjective wellbeing data, and the Annual Population Survey (APS), because of the differences in coverage and sample size.

There are many other wellbeing initiatives in the UK, some of them at the city level, as can be seen in the following table.

Table 2: Other wellbeing initiatives in the UK

Administrative Level	Initial Year	Framework / Measurement initiative	Leading agency	URL
National	2019	'People and prosperity' as part of 'Beyond GDP' initiative	ONS	https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/economicstatisticsclassificationsandanalysisstrategyfinancialyearending2019#beyond-gdp-broader-measures-of-welfare-and-activity
National	2014	What works for Wellbeing?	What Works Centre for Wellbeing	https://whatworkswellbeing.org/
Scotland	2018	Scotland Performs	Scottish Government	http://nationalperformance.gov.scot
Wales	2015	Welsh 'Wellbeing of Future Generations Act'	Welsh Parliament	https://www.futuregenerations.wales/about-us/future-generations-act/
City		Happy City	Centre for thriving (UK-based charity)	https://www.centreforthrivingplaces.org
City	2014	Happiness Pulse	Centre for thriving places	https://www.happinesspulse.org/
City		Thriving Places Index from Bristol	Centre for thriving places	https://www.thrivingplacesindex.org/

Source: Author's own.

Another highly relevant initiative is the new and revised version of the **National Performance Framework** in June 2018 by the Scottish Government. This framework is explicitly structured to be incorporated into the decision-making process of the Scottish Government and aims to (Scottish Government 2018):

- create a more successful country;
- give opportunities to all people living in Scotland;
- increase the wellbeing of people living in Scotland;
- create sustainable and inclusive growth; and
- reduce inequalities and give equal importance to economic, environmental and social progress.

The National Performance Framework consists of 11 national outcomes (children and young people, communities, culture, economy, education, environment, fair work and business, health, human rights, international and poverty) and 81 national indicators², all interrelated to the

² The 81 indicators as of 8 March 2021 are available at this link: <https://nationalperformance.gov.scot/>

United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Following the National Performance Framework review in 2018, some new indicators were chosen and are still in development. The framework explicitly includes “increased wellbeing” as part of its purpose and combines measurement of how well Scotland is DOing in economic terms with a broader range of wellbeing measures (Scottish Government 2018). These indicators incorporate a wide range of different types of data, from social attitudes and perceptions to economic and environmental statistics, to paint a picture of Scotland’s performance.

Some differential wellbeing outcomes of migrants compared to the rest of the population are:

- In 2017 the Labour Force Survey found that foreign-born individuals were less likely to own a home (42 per cent) compared with British-born people (69 per cent) –and almost three times more likely to rent (41 per cent) than British-born people (15 per cent).
- According to the Annual Population Survey, 9 per cent of black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi people are unemployed, compared with 4 per cent of white and Indian people.
- Based on data from the European Social Survey (ESS) and the UK Longitudinal Household Survey (UKLH), in 2018, non-EU born migrants were over twice as likely to describe themselves as members of a group that faces discrimination because of nationality, religion, language, race or ethnicity, compared to EU-born migrants (19 per cent vs. 8 per cent) (Fernández-Reino 2020).
- About 13 per cent of the foreign-born population in the UK in 2015-2017 said that they had been insulted because of their ethnicity, nationality, religion, language or accent (Fernández-Reino 2020).
- The findings from the Understanding Society Covid-19 survey show that the pandemic exacerbates entrenched socio-economic inequalities along intersecting ethnic and native–migrant lines.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

The measurement of wellbeing outcomes by migrant status is very challenging for official statisticians as obtaining accurate and detailed information about inflows and outflows and defining and measuring the stock of migrants within a country is a challenge in itself. Therefore, the composition of migrant samples may not be fully representative of actual migrant populations, in terms of gender, age, country of origin, education level and other important variables. Sampling frames that provide accurate and informative records of the migrant population may not exist or may not be up to date (such as those based on a once-every-ten-years census) (OECD 2017). Intra-group statistics, for example, refugees, asylum-seekers, minor-aged, elderly, disabled, LGBT and other vulnerable migrant populations are basically non-existent.³ Furthermore, national migration statistics are rarely available in a readily accessible format, the type of migration data that is collected is quite variable as is the time interval over which migration is measured, and the spatial framework used differs between data sources (Bell

³ Exceptions are the IAB-BAMF-SOEP Refugee Survey, a 3-year longitudinal study of more than 4,500 people, launched in Germany in 2016; the Health and Wellbeing of Asylum Seekers Survey (TERTTU 2018), a 1,087 sample based on the Finnish Immigration Service's Foreigners' Register.

et al. 2015). As such, internationally comparable data that tracks the same individuals during the whole migration cycle simply does not exist (OECD 2017).⁴

In addition to the difficulties in collecting migration data, the existence of different and competing understandings and interpretations of wellbeing compromises comparability between countries and tends to obscure the way wellbeing is used and applied in public policy. In particular, it is difficult to separate what wellbeing *is* from those factors that can *impact on* wellbeing (Alwaer *et al.* 2016). Even less attention is given to migrant populations in these statistics. None of the frameworks presented in this report includes explicitly this subpopulation.

Hence, relatively few data sources are explicitly designed for measuring migrants' wellbeing outcomes at the city level and the findings indicate a bias towards material and subjective conceptualisation of wellbeing (wellbeing today) in detriment of conceptualisations that consider sustainability (wellbeing tomorrow) and relational aspects (wellbeing together). The importance of public consultation in the construction of wellbeing metrics and for the overall wellbeing frameworks, for both reasons of ownership and legitimacy but also to highlight local concerns, is not always acknowledged. Beyond this, from the revised frameworks we can conclude that there is a considerable degree of convergence on the overarching areas and aspects of wellbeing that governments are beginning to monitor. Finally, we put forward the following recommendations to enhance the project' scope of data sources:

- At the national level, for European countries, use the European Social Survey combined with immigration and macroeconomic variables from OECD statistics (see for example Betz and Simpson 2013) and/or other national representative household surveys (see for example Fernández-Reino 2020). To achieve a sufficient number of observations multiples waves should be pooled across years.
- At lower geographic scales, undertake a detailed evaluation of wellbeing related variables between different data sources (population surveys and censuses) to determine comparability in terms of representativeness, temporality and geographic scale.
- Undertake a more in-depth evaluation of the censuses of the selected countries (as the Internal Migration Around the GlobE project).

⁴ At country level we have France's Longitudinal Survey of the Integration of First-Time Arrivals (ELIPA), launched in 2010.

6. References

- Alpaslan, A.; Constant, A. and Corrado, G. (2014) 'The Impact of Immigration on the Well-being of Natives', *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 103: 72-92, DOI: <https://DOI.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2014.03.024> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Alwaer, H., Searle, B. and Cooper, I. (2016) 'Measuring Wellbeing for Effective Place-making. Conference: Measuring Wellbeing for Effective Place-making', *Symposium Proceedings*, CECHR and the Geddes Institute, University of Dundee, Dundee: University of Dundee
- Anand, P. (2016) 'Happiness, Well-being and Human Development: The Case for Subjective Measure', *UNDP Human Development Report Background Paper*, New York, NY: United Nations Development Programme
- Bălăţescu, S. (2007) 'Central and Eastern Europeans Migrants' Subjective Quality of Life. A Comparative Study', *Journal of Identity and Migration Studies* 1.2: 67-81
- Bartram D (2010) 'International Migration Open Borders Debates and Happiness', *International Studies Review* 12.3: 339-361, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40931112> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Bartram D (2011) 'Economic Migration and Happiness: Comparing Immigrants' and Natives' Happiness Gains from Income', *Social Indicators Research* 103.1: 57-76
- Borraz, F.; Rossi, M. and Pozo, S. (2008) 'And what about the Family Back Home? International Migration and Happiness', *Universidad de la Republica dECON Working Paper* 03/08, Montevideo: Universidad de la Republica, <http://decon.edu.uy/publica/2008/0308.p> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Bell, M. *et al.* (2015) 'The IMAGE Inventory: A User Guide', *QCPR Working Paper* 2015/01, Brisbane: University of Queensland
- Betz, W. and Simpson, N.B. (2013) 'The Effects of International Migration on the Well-being of Native Populations in Europe', *IZA Journal of Migration* 2.12: 1-21, DOI: <https://DOI.org/10.1186/2193-9039-2-12> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Boarini, R.; Kolev, A. and McGregor, J.A. (2014) 'Measuring Well-being and Progress in Countries at Different Stages of Development: Towards a More Universal Conceptual Framework', *OECD Development Centre Working Paper* 325, Paris: OECD Publishing, DOI: <https://DOI.org/10.1787/18151949> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Exton, C. and Shinwell, M. (2018) 'Policy Use of Wellbeing Metrics: Describing Countries' Experiences', *OECD Statistics Working Paper* 2018/07, Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, DOI: <https://DOI.org/10.1787/d98eb8ed-en> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- European Commission (2013) *Using EU Indicators of Migrant Integration: Final Report for Directorate-General for Home Affairs*, Brussels: European Commission <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/index.cfm?action=media.download&uuid=FC375682-95DF-1B86-CF670D84CA41C2D6> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Fernández-Reino, M. (2020) 'Briefing: Migrants and discrimination in the UK', *Migration Observatory Briefing*, Oxford: Centre on Migration, Policy, and Society (COMPAS), University of Oxford
- Hendriks, M.; Burger, M.; Ray, J. and Esipova, N. (2018) 'Do International Migrants Increase their Happiness and that of their Families by Migrating?', in J.F. Helliwell; R. Layard.; B. Layard and J. Sachs (eds), *World Happiness Report 2018*, New York, NY: United Nations Sustainable Development Solutions Network

- Knight, J. and Gunatilaka, R. (2010) 'Great Expectations? The Subjective Wellbeing of Rural-urban Migrants in China', *World Development* 38.1: 113–124
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.03.002> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Kraly, E.P. and Hovy, B. (2020) 'Data and Research to Inform Global Policy: The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration', *Comparative Migration Studies* 8.11, DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0166-y> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (2018) *Ease of Living Index 2018, National report*,
<https://smartnet.niua.org/content/a552c66b-188d-48b7-965b-6aaf98ee530e> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Nowok, B.; van Ham, M.; Findlay, A. and Gayle, V. (2013) 'Does Migration Make You Happy? A Longitudinal Study of Internal Migration and Subjective Wellbeing', *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 45.4: 986-1002, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1068/a45287> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- OECD (2017) *How's Life? 2017: Measuring Wellbeing*, Paris, OECD Publishing, DOI:
https://doi.org/10.1787/how_life-2017-en (accessed 7 March 2021)
- OECD and the EU (2015) *Indicators of Migrant Integration 2015: Settling in*, Paris: OECD Publishing, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264234024-en> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Polgreen, L. and Simpson, N. (2011) 'Happiness and International Migration', *Journal of Happiness Studies* 12.5: 819–840
- Scottish Government (2018) *National Performance Framework*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government, <https://nationalperformance.gov.scot/> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Simpson N.B. (2013) 'Happiness and Migration', in K. Zimmermann and A. Constant (eds), *International Handbook on the Economics of Migration*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing
- Skogberg, N. et al. (2019) 'Asylum Seekers Health and Wellbeing (TERTTU) Survey: Study Protocol for a Prospective Total Population Health Examination Survey on the Health and Service Needs of Newly Arrived Asylum Seekers in Finland', *BMJ Open* 9.4: e027917,
<https://doi.org/10/ggdjd8> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Statistics Norway (2016) *Living Conditions Among Immigrants in Norway*, Oslo: Statistics Norway, <https://www.ssb.no/308564/living-conditions-among-immigrants-in-norway-2016> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Statistics Norway (2018) *Survey on Living Conditions*, Oslo: Statistics Norway,
<https://www.ssb.no/en/bo/> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- Stiglitz, J.; Fitoussi, J. and Durand, M. (2018) 'Beyond GDP: Measuring What Counts for Economic and Social Performance', Paris: OECD Publishing, DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264307292-en> (accessed 7 March 2021)
- UNDESA, Population Division (1980) 'Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration', *Statistical papers series M 58 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.M/58)*, New York, NY: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
- UNDESA, Statistical Division (1986) 'National Data Sources and Programmes for Implementing the United Nations Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, Studies in Methods', *Statistical papers series F 37 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.F./37)*, New York, NY: United Nations: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
- UNDESA, Statistics Division (1998) 'Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration', *Statistical papers series M 58.1*, New York, NY: United Nations: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs

- UNDESA (1953) 'International Migration Statistics', *Statistical papers series M.20* (ST/SOA/SER. M/20), New York, NY: United Nations: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
- UNHCR (2018) 'Global Compact on Refugees', *General Assembly Official Records Seventy-third Session Supplement 12 (A/73/12 (Part II))* New York, NY: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

7. Annex 1: Search results

The following tables show in detail the search results obtained using the methodology indicated in section 3. The results are divided into four tables: 1) national wellbeing frameworks; 2) datasets, 3) studies and, 4) research projects/initiatives.

Table 3: National wellbeing measurement initiatives and indicator sets

Country	Level	Year	Framework / Measurement initiative	Indicator set	Leading agency	Short description	Link main	Link secondary
Austria	National	2015	How is Austria?		Statistics Austria	Statistics Austria's "How is Austria DOIng?" indicator set provides concise, interactive information on the various dimensions of prosperity and progress. Indicators of material prosperity, quality of life and environmental development complement the gross domestic product (GDP) and thus contribute to a broader understanding of the development of prosperity in our society. The selection of indicators is based on the framework developed in the sponsorship group of the European Statistical System (ESS) based on the recommendations of the Stiglitz Commission. The selection of indicators was coordinated in a broad communication process with national experts, institutions and ministries.	http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistik/en/wohlstand_und_fortschritt/wie_gehts_oesterreich/index.html	
Denmark	National	2016	Quality of life		Statistics Denmark		https://www.dst.dk/en/Statistik/emner/levelvilkkaar/lyskvalitet	
Finland	National	2009		Findicator	Statistics Finland and the Prime Minister's Office	Launched in 2009 by Finland's Prime Minister's Office and Statistics Finland, the Findicator (Findikaattori) is an online compendium of over 100 indicators on social progress, with a specific category on Wellbeing indicators. The Wellbeing indicators include 23 indicators across eight dimensions.	https://findikaattori.fi/en/	https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=es&sl=auto&tl=en&u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.stat.fi%2Ftup%2Fkuntapuntari%2Fkuntap_3_2005_hyinvoinniti.html
France	National	2015	New Wealth Indicators (<i>Les nouveaux indicateurs de richesse</i>)			The domain 'quality of life' consists of ten subdomains (and therefore ten main indicators). The tenth-dimension addresses wellbeing in general, for which the main indicator is the question in SILC.	www.strategie.gouv.fr/sites/strategie.gouv.fr/files/atoms/files/a9rb245.pdf	
India	National	2018	Liveability of Indian cities	Ease of Living Index	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs	Launched in 2018	https://smartnet.niua.org/sites/default/files/resources/ease-of-	https://www.teriin.org/article/liveability-indian-cities-turning-urban-legend-reality

					Government of India		living-national-report.pdf	
India	City	2013	City-Systems framework		Janaagraha Centre for Citizenship and Democracy		http://www.janaagraha.org/asics/	
Ireland	National		Equality Budgeting					
Italy	National		Equitable and Sustainable Wellbeing (<i>Benessere Equo e Sostenibile</i>)		Italian Institute of Statistics (ISTAT)	In December 2010, the National Council for Economics and Labor (CNEL, a constitutional body that advises the Italian government, the Parliament and the regions, and promotes legislative initiatives on economic and social matters) and the Italian Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) launched the 'Equitable and Sustainable Wellbeing' (<i>Benessere Equo e Sostenibile</i> – BES) project, intending to agree on a measurement framework that could be used to assess people's wellbeing in Italy.	www.misuredelbenessere.it/	https://www4.istat.it/it/benessere-e-sostenibilit%C3%A0/misure-del-benessere/le-12-dimensioni-del-benessere
Sweden	National		New Measures of Wellbeing (<i>nya mått på välförstånd</i>)			The New Measures of Wellbeing developed by the Swedish government as a complement to GDP have been integrated into the Budget Bill 2017		
UK	National	2010	Measuring National Wellbeing Programme		ONS	The framework comprises 41 indicators grouped into ten dimensions: Personal wellbeing, our relationships, health, what we do, where we live, personal finance, economy, education and skills, governance and the environment. To communicate the indicators, the ONS developed a 'wellbeing wheel' to show results at a glance across all dimensions. However, in 2017, the wheel was replaced by an online dashboard to foster user interaction. The dataset underpinning the framework is open to the public and the ONS reports on progress on the headline wellbeing measures twice a year through its website.	https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing	https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/measuring-nationalwellbeing/internationalcomparisons2019
UK	National	2019	'people and prosperity' as part of 'Beyond GDP' initiative		ONS	In measuring economic growth, it seeks to know the extent to which it benefits different groups in society.	https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/economicstatisticsclassifications/ons-economicstatisticsandanalysisstrategyfinanceending2019#beyond-gdp-broader-	https://blog.ons.gov.uk/2019/02/04/beyond-gdp-how-ons-is-developing-wider-measures-of-wellbeing/

							measures-of-welfare-and-activity	
UK	National	2014	What works for Wellbeing?		ONS			
UK	City		Thriving Places Index from Bristol		Centre for Thriving Places		https://www.thrivingplacesindex.org/	
UK	Scotland	2018	Scotland Performs		Scottish Government	Scotland's National Performance Framework (NPF) was launched in 2007, put into law in 2015, and last refreshed in 2018. The NPF sets an overall purpose and vision for Scotland. It highlights the broad National Outcomes that support the purpose and provides measures on how well Scotland is progressing towards the National Outcomes. The NPF is Scotland's wellbeing framework. It explicitly includes 'increased wellbeing' as part of its purpose and combines measurement of how well Scotland is DOing in economic terms with a broader range of wellbeing measures. These indicators incorporate a wide range of different types of data - from social attitudes and perceptions to economic and environmental statistics -to paint a picture of Scotland's performance.	http://nationalperformance.gov.scot/	https://nationalperformance.gov.scot/wellbeing-report-chapter-1
UK	Wales	2015	Welsh 'Wellbeing of Future Generations Act'		Office of the Future Generations Commissioner for Wales	The Wellbeing of Future Generations Act requires public bodies in Wales to think about the long-term impact of their decisions, to work better with people, communities and each other, and to prevent persistent problems such as poverty, health inequalities and climate change.	https://www.futuregenerations.wales/about-us/future-generations-act/	
UK	City		Happy City	Happy City Index	Centre for thriving places		https://www.centreforthrivingplaces.org/	

UK	City	2014	Happiness Pulse		Centre for thriving places	<p>The Happiness Pulse measures the detailed reality of individual wellbeing. It gets to the heart of the how people feel and function in their lives, work and communities.</p> <p>Centre for Thriving Places designed the Happiness Pulse in 2014 in partnership with the New Economics Foundation and a global advisory board, with national representatives from the ONS UK National Wellbeing Programme, University of Cambridge Wellbeing Institute, Public Health England (PHE), Department of Communities and Local Government (now the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) and the United National Development Programme (UNDP).</p> <p>The OECD wellbeing framework (shown below) distinguishes between current and future wellbeing. Current wellbeing is measured in terms of outcomes achieved in the two broad domains: Material living conditions (income and wealth, jobs and earnings, housing conditions) and quality of life (health status, work-life balance, education and skills, social connections, civic engagement and governance, environmental quality, personal security and subjective wellbeing). The prospects for future wellbeing are taken into account in the framework by looking at some of the key resources that drive wellbeing over time and that are persistently affected by today's actions: these drivers can be measured through indicators of different types of 'capital', i.e. economic, natural, human and social capital.</p>	https://www.happinesspulse.org/
OECD	National	2011	OECD Better Lives Framework	Better life index	OECD		http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/#/1111111111

Source: Author's own, based on documentation and the websites of each indicator

Table 4: Datasets

Area	Year	Data	Sample Size	Sampling Strategy	Implementing Government Agency	Time Period Covered	Geographical Coverage	Wellbeing related Domains Covered	Migrant Population (key ID variables)	Dataset Availability	Comments
EU	2018	European Social Survey (persona and social wellbeing module/ work, family and wellbeing module)	Differs by country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples must be representative of all persons aged 15 and over (no upper age limit) resident within private households in each country, regardless of their nationality, citizenship or language. • Individuals are selected by strict random probability methods at every stage. • All countries must aim for a minimum 'effective achieved sample size' of 1,500 or 800 in countries with ESS populations of less than 2 million after discounting for design effects. 	European Research Infrastructure Consortium Forum	2001 - 2018 (every two years)	EU (Norway, Finland and the UK all rounds)	Subjective wellbeing such as 'life satisfaction' and 'happiness' (core questionnaire). More in-depth data on wellbeing is also provided for some rounds where thematic 'rotating modules'.	Migrant (Born in-country Country of birth What year you first came to live in-country Father/Mother born in-country Country of birth, father/mother)	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migration in Round 1 (2002/3) and Round 7 (2014/15). • Subjective wellbeing all rounds. • Measuring and Reporting on Europeans' Wellbeing: Findings from the European Social Survey, not sure if can be connected to migration.
EU	2019	Income and living conditions	Differs by country	Differs by country	EUROSTAT	2005-2019	Europe	Statistics on income, social inclusion and living conditions cover objective and subjective aspects of these themes in both monetary and non-monetary terms for both households and individuals.	Migrants (PB210: COUNTRY OF BIRTH; PB220A: CITIZENSHIP 1; PB220B: CITIZENSHIP 2)	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018 – Material deprivation, wellbeing and housing difficulties ad-hoc module. • https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/infographs/qol/index_en.html

EU	2016	European Quality of Life Surveys (EQLS)	Interviewed nearly 37,000 residents above aged 18 or older in 33 countries – the 28 EU Member States and 5 candidate countries (Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey). In most countries, the target sample size was 1,000. To reflect the larger populations in certain countries, the target was increased to 1,300 in the UK, 1,600 in Germany and 2,000 in Turkey.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-stage, stratified, random sample in each country. Depending on the availability of high-quality registers, sampling was carried out using individual-level, household-level and address-level registers or through enumeration using a random-walk approach. Country-level samples were stratified by region and degree of urbanisation. In each stratum, primary sampling units (PSUs) were randomly selected proportional to population size. Subsequently, a random sample of individuals or households was drawn in each PSU. Finally, unless individual-level registers were used, in each household the respondent was randomly selected. Questionnaire-based with interviews conducted face to face, at the respondent's home in the national language(s) of the country; average duration of the interview was 40 minutes in the EU28 and 35 minutes in the candidate countries. 	Eurofound	2003-2007-2012-2016	Europe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of life: subjective wellbeing, optimism, health, standard of living and aspects of deprivation, work-life balance. Quality of society: social insecurity, perception of social exclusion and societal tensions, trust in people and institutions, participation and community engagement, and involvement in training/life-long learning. Quality of public services: Health-care, long-term care, childcare and other public services. 	Migrants (Q99) In which country were you born?; Q100 in which country was your father born?; Q101 In which country was your mother born?.	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents living conditions and the people's social situation and explores issues pertinent to the lives of European citizens. The EQLS 2016 questionnaire placed a considerable focus on public services: healthcare, long-term care, childcare and schools, and measuring different aspects of quality such as fair access, facilities, staff and information available to citizens.
EU	2019	Better Life Index	Differs by country	Differs by country	OECD	2016	Austria, Denmark, Spain, Estonia, France, Greece, the	Based on the dimensions of the How's Life? framework covering: material conditions	Migrants	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International comparable wellbeing framework. Report: Migrants' wellbeing: Moving to a better life? (See studies section).

							Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden	(income and wealth, jobs and earnings, housing) and quality of life (work-life balance, education and skills, health status, subjective wellbeing, civic engagement and governance, personal security, environmental quality and social connections).			
Finland	2017	Welfare and Inequality in Finland 2017-2018	2,402, Finnish-speaking Finns aged 18-79 residing in mainland Finland	<p>Probability: Stratified: Proportional.</p> <p>Probability: Simple random.</p> <p>The selection of the sample was based on a stratified sampling with the regions of residence as strata. The respondents were selected from each stratum using simple random sampling.</p> <p>Telephone interview: Computer-assisted (CATI).</p>	Tampere University	2017-2018	Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life satisfaction, mood, ability to achieve things, perceived status in society and trust in other people. • The respondents were asked how much they cared about the wellbeing of different groups (e.g. the homeless, immigrants, refugees and asylum-seekers, children in poor families, the elderly). • The respondents were presented statements about whether the differences in income, health, neighbourhoods and education 	No	Online	

								were too high in Finland. • The respondents were asked to what extent they agreed with statements about their own welfare and wellbeing.			
Finland	2015	Finnish Attitudes to Immigration : Iltalehti Survey 2015	1,005, Adult population of Finland aged 15 and over (excluding the Åland Islands)	Probability: Stratified. The sample was drawn from the Population Register of Finland through stratified random sampling. Telephone interview: Computer-assisted (CATI).	Tampere University	2015	Finland	Public opinion on Finland's refugee policy and asylum seekers arriving in the country.	No	Online	
Finland	2020	Statistics on living conditions (subjective wellbeing and livelihood)	10,000 households, private households permanently living in Finland at the end of the statistical reference year	The data of households and persons are collected with interviews and from administrative registers. Most of the data depicting persons and households (e.g. level of education, marital status, income bracket) are derived from registers.	Statistics Finland	2017-2019	Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the living conditions of the household population from different perspectives, such as risk of poverty or social exclusion, subjective wellbeing and livelihood, health and housing by population group in Finland. • The sample person's experience of his or her own health and wellbeing • Children's material standard of living and children's health 	No	No data online	Data are collected yearly with the income and living conditions survey. These sample data are also used for the production of the income distribution statistics and Finland's data for Eurostat's EU-SILC survey. Some of the data published in the statistics are collected only at set intervals, but some yearly.

Finland	2019	Health and wellbeing of asylum seekers: Survey of asylum seekers who came to Finland in 2018 (TERTTU)	1087	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample based on the data of the Finnish Immigration Service's Foreigners' Register (UMA). • Target group: newly arrived asylum seekers. • Participants were classified into four groups based on the nationality of the asylum seeker: Russia and the former Soviet Union, the Middle East and North Africa (Maghreb region), the rest of Africa, and the rest of the region. • Face-to-face interview and brief health examination (1,5h) conducted by bilingual trained research nurses (+interpreter). • Record linkage with reception centre EHR 	Finish Institute for Health and Welfare (THL)	2017-2018		Information on the health and health service use of asylum seekers in Finland.	Asylum seekers	No data online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the information collected, a nationwide initial health inspection model was developed to identify the different service needs of asylum seekers and to collect follow-up data. • The Finnish Immigration Service is responsible for the further development and implementation of the model in reception centres. • Possibilities of record linkage with national registers for those who receive a permanent residence (approx. 30% of all who have applied) will be explored.
----------------	------	---	------	--	---	-----------	--	--	----------------	----------------	--

Finland	2020	Wellbeing study of foreign-born (FinMonik)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12,877, aged 18-64 with foreign-born people, representative at national level. • Response rate was 53.1 per cent (n= 6,836) 	The data were primarily collected using an electronic questionnaire. This was supplemented with paper questionnaires and telephone interviews conducted among those individuals who had not responded to the electronic survey.	Finish Institute for Health and Welfare (THL)	2019-2019		Wide range of different areas of life, including quality of life, welfare, participation in social and societal activities, experiences of discrimination, safety, perceived health, employment, and competence. Data were also collected about the need for and use of social and health care services as well as employment and immigration services, and trust in these services.	Migrants	No data online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claims to be the most extensive survey so far carried out among the foreign-born population living in Finland.
Finland	2015	Workplace and wellbeing of foreign origin conducted by Statistics Finland, the National Institute for Health and Welfare and the National Institute for Occupational Health (UTH)				2014		Information about the labour market situation, ability to work and function, physical and mental health, possible experiences of discrimination and need for services among people of foreign origin.	Migrants	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey on work and wellbeing among persons of foreign origin (UTH-survey), because of the information need for integrating the population of foreign origin has grown, but the present population studies do not provide sufficiently reliable on the living conditions of this group.

Global	2020	World Happiness Report 2020: chapter 3 Cities and Happiness a Global Ranking		All cities worldwide with at least 300 observations in the Gallup World Poll during the period 2014-2018 as well as the ten largest cities in the US using data from the Gallup US Poll. The outcome measure is a negative index on a zero-to-one scale.						No Data online	Our ranking is fundamentally different from existing rankings of cities in terms of quality of life, such as The Economist's Global Liveability Index. Rather than relying on a list of factors that researchers consider relevant, our ranking relies on city residents' self-reports of how they themselves evaluate the quality of their lives.
India	2020	Happiness index			Anand Vibhag or the happiness department	?	Madhya Pradesh	?	?	No Data online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anand Vibhag or the happiness department set up in 2016 • The government's 'Sunrise AP Vision 2029' envisions the transformation of the state into 'a happy, inclusive, responsible, & globally competitive society'. • News reports indicating the existence of an index (Indian Institute of Technology-Kharagpur to develop a happiness index for measuring the wellbeing of citizens) but was not found.
India	2020	Happiness index					Andhra Pradesh			No Data online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department dedicated to happiness set up in 2017 • News reports indicating Andhra Pradesh to set up a panel to formulate happiness index (2018), but a link to report does not work.

India	2019	Ease of Living Index 2018	111 Indian cities, which includes selected smart cities, capital cities and a few more cities with a population of over 1 million. With more than 134 million people residing in these 111 cities, this initiative is the first of its kind globally, in terms of scale and coverage.	Classification of cities according to population range (As per 2011 Census). Small Towns Population less than 50,000, Medium Towns Population $\geq 50,000 < 5$ lakh, Large Towns Population ≥ 5 lakh < 1 million, Metropolitan Cities Population ≥ 1 million < 5 million, Megapolis Population ≥ 5 million.	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs Government of India	2018 - 2019	111 Indian cities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of Life: Assessing Social Wellbeing (Education, Health, Housing and Shelter, Wash and SWM, Mobility, Safety and Security, Recreation) • Economic Ability: Economic Robustness (Level of Economic Development, Economic Opportunities, Gini Coefficient) • Sustainability: Managing Urban Spaces (Environment, Green Spaces and Buildings, Energy Consumption, City Resilience) • The Ease of Living Index calculated using the above will also be accompanied by a citizen perception survey. The survey will aim to validate whether the experience of the citizens with service delivery aligns with the findings of the index. 	No	No Data online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ease of Living Index examines the liveability of Indian cities across a set of three pillars, which encompass the various aspects of wellbeing of citizens. The three pillars include a total of 14 categories and 50 indicators. • The study will be later expanded to more cities.
India	2017	City-Systems framework	The 23 cities chosen include the	Cities have been chosen for engagement to ensure the maximum traction in	Janaagraha Centre for Citizenship and	2013-2017	23 cities		No	No data online	• ASICS evaluates urban governance using the City-Systems framework consisting

			capital cities of the 19 largest states in India and the next four largest cities subject to availability and ease of gathering data.	terms of advocacy. The cities have been chosen keeping in mind their political and economic significance.	Democracy (NGO)						of four distinct but inter-related components that help govern a city and deliver good quality of life to all citizens. It scores cities on a scale of 0 to 10. The ASICS score of a city indicates the health of its governance systems and therefore its ability to deliver a good quality of life in the medium to long term. It aims to push the envelope on transformative reforms in city governance.
Norway	2017	Working environment, survey on living conditions	5,000, persons at the age of 16-66 years, and as from 2006 persons aged 18-66 years.	Interview data from the annual representative sample surveys and various attached registry information. The sample is drawn according to the procedures for random selection. Data collection is done by telephone (Computer Assisted Telephone Interview CATI).	Statistics Norway	2011 - 2019	Norway	The concept of living conditions covers a very wide range of topics and statistics on living conditions is therefore associated with many other statistics. Poverty-related problems (2020), Housing conditions (2018).	No	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employed short-term immigrants and persons living in institutions are not covered by the statistics. • A survey of working environment that is carried out every three years, and a survey of health that is carried out approximately every five years.
Norway	2016	Living conditions among immigrants	9,500, immigrants aged 16-74 with at least two years' residence in Norway, with backgrounds from 12 different countries.	Immigrants have been randomly selected from the Central Population Register. Immigrants from the following countries are included in the survey: Turkey, Poland, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Kosovo, Somalia, Sri-Lanka, Vietnam, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Eritrea.	Statistics Norway	1983, 1996, 2005/2006 and 2016	Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living conditions of immigrants and their Norwegian-born children in Norway; • own health; • work and working environment; • housing and living situation; • sense of belonging; • inclusion and 	Migrants, refugees	No data online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They wanted to compare the general living conditions in Norway, between large immigrant groups and between immigrants and their Norwegian-born children. So there is a report on Norwegian-born to immigrant parents who participated in the Survey on living conditions among persons with an immigrant background in 2016 (See studies section).

								discrimination; and • attitudes and values.			
UK	2019	Opinions Survey (formerly General Lifestyle Survey, formerly General Household Survey)	2,010 individuals per month, with an average response rate of 55% (approximately 1,100 completed interviews per month).	<p>Omnibus survey that is conducted eight months of the year (two months collection, one month no collection). Data are collected using an online self-completion questionnaire; alternatively, if required interviewers will conduct the interview by telephone.</p> <p>A two-stage approach is applied to sampling. In the first stage, a sample of households from the Annual Population Survey (APS) – those completing the last wave of the LFS or LFS boost – is drawn; in the second stage, one individual from each sampled household is selected. To overcome the under-representation of younger age groups in the sample in the last wave of the LFS and the LFS boost, younger people are oversampled.</p>	ONS	2000-2010	UK		Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inter-departmental multi-purpose survey carried out by the Office for National Statistics collecting information on people living in private households in Great Britain. • Unable to access survey questions. 	

UK	2019	Annual population survey (APS) QMI	122,000 households (or 320,000 respondents) on each annual APS dataset	The sample frame for the survey in Great Britain is the Royal Mail Postcode Address File (PAF) and the National Health Service (NHS) communal accommodation list. The resident population comprises persons who regard the sample address as their main address and also those who have lived in the dwelling for more than 6 consecutive months, even if they do not regard this as their principal dwelling. Persons absent for more than 6 months are not regarded as members of the resident population. The APS datasets are weighted to reflect the size and composition of the general population, by using the most up-to-date official population data.	ONS	APS Persons 2004-2019; APS Households 2004-2018; APS Longitudinal Pooled 2013-2018	Great Britain			Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Annual Population Survey is a combined survey of households in the UK. Its purpose is to provide information on key social and socioeconomic variables between the 10-yearly censuses, with particular emphasis on providing information relating to sub-regional (local authority) areas. • Unable to access survey questions.
UK	2019	UK Longitudinal Household Survey (UKLHS) (Immigrant and Ethnic Minority Boost Sample)	Longitudinal survey of the members of approximately 40,000 households (at Wave 1) The total number of 'active' households issued at Wave 9 was 24,741.	Households recruited at the first round of data collection are visited each year to collect information on changes to their household and individual circumstances. Interviews are carried out face-to-face in respondents' homes by trained interviewers or through a self-completion online survey. Young people aged 10-15 complete a youth questionnaire,	Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)	Wave 11 (2019-2021) Wave 10 (2018-2020) Wave 9 (2017-2019) Wave 8 (2016-2018)	UK	Consumer durables, Assets, Caring, Job satisfaction, Educational aspirations, Life satisfaction (self-completion), Positive and negative events, Neighbourhood belonging (self-completion),	Migrants (Individual interview modules – ethnicity strand (rotating): Migration background, Migration history)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall purpose of Understanding Society is to provide high-quality longitudinal data on subjects such as health, work, education, income, family, and social life to help understand the long-term effects of social and economic change, as well as policy interventions designed to impact upon the general wellbeing of the UK population. To this end, the Study collects both objective and subjective indicators and offers opportunities for

			The immigrant and ethnic minority boost (IEMB) sample, originally sampled at Wave 6 of Understanding Society–2,155 IEMB households were issued at Wave 9.	whilst respondents aged 16 and over complete the adult survey. The Understanding Society main survey sample consists of a large General Population Sample plus three other components: The Ethnic Minority Boost Sample, the former British Household Panel Survey sample and the Immigrant and Ethnic Minority Boost Sample.		Wave 7 (2015-2017)					research within and across multiple disciplines including sociology and economics, geography, psychology and health sciences. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on ethnicity-related questions in the survey as a whole. • Ethnic minority boost (EMB) sample of over 6,000 adults from all ethnic minority groups (designed to reach at least 1,000 in each of five ethnic groups: Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black Caribbean and Black African), in addition to over 5,500 in the main, nationally representative sample. • An immigrant and ethnic minority boost (IEMB) sample of additional respondents from the five target ethnic minority groups in the EMB, plus a sample of immigrants from groups other than these five ethnic minority groups.
UK	2011	Data for Integration (D4I)			European Commission	2011	Concentration of migrants in cells of 100 by 100 m in all cities of eight European countries (France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal,	None	The migrants are grouped at three different levels of aggregation: by a specific country, continent, and EU versus third country origin.	On request	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dataset has been obtained through a spatial disaggregation of statistics of the 2011 Census, collected from national statistical institutes. The results of the spatial processing of the original data are a uniform grid showing the concentration of migrants in cells of 100 by 100 m in all cities of eight European countries (France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, the UK) and the large geographical coverage which is including almost 45 thousand local

							Spain, the UK)					administrative units. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From this data set it is possible to calculate indicators of concentration of migrants, diversity and spatial residential segregation which can support comparative research and policies on the local aspect of the integration of migrants in the EU.
UK		Labour force survey			ONS							

EU	2016	Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey	25,515 respondents with different ethnic minority and immigrant backgrounds, including Roma, across all EU Member States.	<p>The EU-MIDIS II sample is representative for the selected population groups that were surveyed. The sample includes persons belonging to ethnic or national minorities, Roma and Russians, as well as persons born outside the EU (first-generation respondents) and persons with at least one parent born outside the EU (second-generation respondents). All respondents were aged 16 years or older and have lived in private households for at least 12 months before the survey. Persons living in institutional settings – for example, in hospitals or prisons - were not surveyed.</p> <p>Countries/regions of origin of immigrants and descendants of immigrants include: immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa; immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Turkey; immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa; immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Asia and South Asia; recent</p>	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights	2016	All EU Member States	The questionnaire contains questions on perceived discrimination in different settings, such as employment, education, housing, health and when using public or private services. It also covers police stops, criminal victimization (including hate crime) as well as awareness of rights and of institutions that offer victim support. Also, respondents were asked about issues of societal participation and integration, including trust in public institutions and their level of attachment to the country of residence.	immigrant or ethnic minority background	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dataset provides invaluable information on how the situation developed since the first minorities and discrimination survey in 2008. • It covers additional areas from the first survey such as citizenship, residence, participation, trust and tolerance. • The dataset covers 28 EU Member States, including the UK, as the survey took place in 2016. • Identifies gaps in the protection of the fundamental rights of people with an immigrant or ethnic minority background.
----	------	--	---	---	--	------	----------------------	---	---	-----	---

immigrants; Roma; members of the Russian minority.

Whenever possible, a sample was drawn from a sampling frame covering the target population. For some target groups in some countries, a combination of different methods was used to ensure better coverage of the target population. The median coverage across countries and target groups was 60 per cent of the target population.

Source: Author's own, based on documentation and website of each entry.

Table 5: Studies

Area	Year	Data	Implementing Government agency	Link main
Finland		Welfare Study of Foreign-born (FinMONIK)	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health	https://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&hl=es&pto=aue&url=translate.google.com&sl=auto&sp=nmt4&tl=en&u=https://thl.fi/fi/tutkimus-ja-kehittaminen/tutkimukset-ja-hankkeet/ulkomailla-syntyneiden-hyvinvointitutkimus-finmonik-&usg=ALkJrhgeYGFvPe4OsP7XOPzFffXRIK0-8A
Finland	2018	Health and Wellbeing of Asylum Seekers: Survey of Asylum Seekers who came to Finland in 2018 (TERTTU)	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health	https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=es&sl=auto&tl=en&u=https%3A%2F%2Fthl.fi%2Ffi%2Fweb%2Fmaahanmuutto-ja-kulttuurinen-moninaisuus%2Fmaahanmuutto-ja-hyvinvointi
Finland		Social Security, Welfare and Health of Migrants (STM)	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health	https://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&hl=es&pto=aue&url=translate.google.com&sl=auto&sp=nmt4&tl=en&u=https://stm.fi/maahanmuuttajien-hyvinvointi&usg=ALkJrhic1cSbFHs4AVc3ybcIbz1xIDEaDg
Finland	2015	Work and Wellbeing of People of Foreign Origin in Finland in 2014	Statistics Finland	http://www.stat.fi/ajk/julkistamiskalenteri/kuvailusivu_en.html?ID=16163
Finland	2016	Welfare and Health of People with a Foreign Background (slides)	National Institute for Health and Welfare	https://www.slideshare.net/THLfi/anu-castaneda-ulkomaalaistaustaisten-hyvinvointi-ja-terveys
Finland	2018	Wellbeing and Sustainable Growth with Well-functioning Networks, Services and Information	City of Helsinki	http://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/handle/10024/160924
Finland	2019	Glimpses of the Future: Data Policy, Artificial Intelligence and Robotisation as Enablers of Wellbeing and Economic Success in Finland	City of Helsinki	http://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/handle/10024/161675
Finland	2016	From the Perspective of a Place-based Society	City of Helsinki	https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/handle/10024/75129
Finland	2020	Strengthening Wellbeing and Equality During and After the Coronary Crisis: A Group set up by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health and the Ministry of Employment and the Economy	City of Helsinki	https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/162283/VN_2020_19.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
Global	2020	World Happiness Report		https://worldhappiness.report/
Norway	2018	Housing and Housing Conditions in Norway	Statistics Norway	https://www.ssb.no/en/bygg-bolig-og-eiendom/artikler-og-publikasjoner/housing-and-housing-conditions-in-norway
Norway	2017	Immigration, Immigrants and Subjective Wellbeing	Statistics Norway	https://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/immigration-immigrants-and-subjective-wellbeing
Finland	2017	Population with Foreign Background in Helsinki 2016	City of Helsinki, City Office, urban research and statistics	https://www.hel.fi/hel2/tietokeskus/julkaisut/pdf/17_01_16_Tilastoja_2_Hiekkavu.pdf
Finland	2020	Getting Integrated in the City – A Comprehensive Picture of Residents with a Foreign Background in Helsinki in 2020	City of Helsinki, City Office, urban research and statistics	https://www.hel.fi/hel2/tietokeskus/julkaisut/pdf/20_05_06_Tutkimuksia_1_Saukkonen.pdf
Norway	2018	Living Conditions among Norwegian-born with Immigrant Parents in Norway 2016	Statistics Norway	https://www.ssb.no/sosiale-forhold-og-kriminalitet/artikler-og-publikasjoner/_attachment/352917?_ts=163f3c45b50
EU	2017	Migrants' Wellbeing: Moving to a Better Life?	OECD	https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/how_life-2017-7-en/index.html?itemId=/content/component/how_life-2017-7-en

India	2019	Ease of Living Index 2019	Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs Government of India	https://smartnet.niua.org/eol19/pdf/EOL-2019-Completed-Version.pdf
India	2017	Annual Survey of India's City-systems 2017		http://www.janaagraha.org/asics/report/ASICS-report-2017-fin.pdf
Global	2020	Wellbeing Adjusted Life Years	Happiness Research Institute	https://6e3636b7-ad2f-4292-b910-faa23b9c20aa.filesusr.com/ugd/928487_1595c32a127341f7a2769c624898dc6c.pdf

Source: Author's own, based on documentation and website of each indicator.

Table 6: Research projects / initiatives

Area	Year	Data	Report	Report link	Contact	Comments	Link_main	Link secondary
Finland Norway UK		Drawing Together Project: Relational wellbeing in the lives of refugee young people in Finland, Norway and the UK	No		Ravi KS Kohli Project leader T: +44 (0)1582 743092 M: 07894937418 E: ravi.kohli@beds.ac.uk	In each country, the project examines how young refugees draw and describe their networks and relationships. Over three years they accompany them in Finland, Norway, and the UK. The project also interviewed people who they nominate as their 'value person' from their social networks. The project considers how Finns, Norwegians and the British make room for them in their countries. The focus is on mutuality, hospitality and reciprocity. By gathering stories about building peace and prosperity for each other as an expression of relational wellbeing. The stories are gathered regularly, to see how young people and their social networks flow and evolve over time.	https://www.drawingtogetherproject.org/	

Finland Norway UK India	2015	The IMAGE Project: Comparing Internal Migration Around the GlobE	Yes	https://imageproject.com.au/publications/	e.charles-edwards@uq.edu.au	The IMAGE project (2011 - 2015) has been developed around several discrete modules, including a global survey of migration data collection practice, a repository of internal migration data, specialized software and analytical tools, and a series of journal articles and technical reports. The project: (1) proposed a suite of statistical indicators, (2) developed methods to generate estimates where these metrics are not collected directly, and (3) made cross-national comparisons using a global repository of data.	https://imageproject.com.au/	https://imageproject.com.au/framework/
UK	2016	The Well Worth Policy Toolkit	Yes	https://www.centreforthrivingplaces.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/WellWorth-Policy-Toolkit-Outline.pdf	Ruth Townsley, programme manager E: ruth@happycity.org.uk	The WellWorth project is led by Happy City, a leading social enterprise and charity within the area of city wellbeing measurement and promotion. Over the past 5 years, it has developed the internationally recognized Happy City Index Project, as well as a range of wellbeing training programmes and community engagement projects. The WellWorth Policy Toolkit is a 12-month project (1/10/15-30/9/16), funded by Innovate UK.	https://www.centreforthrivingplaces.org/	
EU	2020	European Demographic Data Sheet 2020	Yes	http://www.populationeurope.org/en/download/EDS2020_KEY_FINDINGS.pdf		Allows to explore, visualize and compare population indicators for 45 European countries. Includes a Years of Good Life wellbeing indicator.	http://www.populationeurope.org/en/	

Sweden, Germany, France, Spain, Netherlands, Belgium, Austria and Switzerland	2011	The Integration of the European Second Generation (TIES). A research project in fifteen cities in eight countries	Yes	https://library.open.org/handle/20.500.12657/34469	The TIES project will describe the position of the second generation in several different domains (education, labour market, housing, identity, social relations, family formation, transnationalism, religion) through a standardized international survey. In the TIES project, we will compare the Turkish, Moroccan and ex-Yugoslavian second generation (18-35) across fifteen cities in eight countries (Sweden, Germany, France, Spain, Netherlands, Belgium, Austria and Switzerland). The TIES project will analyse the relative effects of group-specific integration policies as compared to generic policies (including the way the educational system and the transition to the labour market is organized) in promoting or hampering immigrant integration.	https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and-results/research-projects/i/04/2204.html
Global		Mapping population distributions on city level, using Twitter data	No		This project visualizes population distributions in cities worldwide with using Twitter data. Organized by residents and tourists, the project develops innovative infographics that help to better understand how intertwined the everyday life of residents and short-term visitors is. The project is supported by the company “MapBox”, providing automatically updated maps enabled by artificial intelligence algorithms.	https://migrationdataportal.org/data-innovation/mapping-population-distributions-city-level-using-twitter-data

Global		Facebook Data Science Team: Coordinated Migration	No			The Facebook Data Science Team analysed migration using social media data. Facebook offers a wealth of data suitable for the study of human mobility. In particular, the city-level accuracy offers the possibility of mapping internal and international migrations alongside each other, which cannot be done easily through traditional surveys. This project focused on so-called "coordinated migration", defined as cases where a significant share of a population migrates as a group to a different city. To study these between-city coordinated migration, the team examines aggregated, anonymized data of all users who list both cities (departure and destination) on their Facebook profile.	https://migrationdataportal.org/data-innovation/facebook-data-science-team-coordinated-migration
Global		Happier Lives Institute	Yes	https://www.happierlivesinstitute.org/measuring-happiness.html		The Happier Lives Institute aims to answer the following question: how can we most effectively use our resources to help people become happier? To address this, the institute combines data from people's self-reported happiness and life satisfaction with insights from multiple academic disciplines using the concept of Wellbeing adjusted life years.	https://www.happierlivesinstitute.org/
OECD	2012	Migration insights	Yes	https://www.oecd.org/migration/		The OECD monitors developments in migration movements and policies in OECD countries and analyses integration policies of immigrants and their children into education and labour markets.	https://www.oecd.org/migration-insights/
UK, Norway, Sweden	2020	Life at the Frontier: Social mobility, segregation and the integration of migrants	No		Prof Gwilym Pryce, Director of the Project E.g.pryce@shef.ac.uk	Three-year (2020-2023) project funded by Nordforsk and the ESRC that will compare and contrast the social integration of migrants between neoliberal societies (the four nations of the UK) and socio-liberal ones (Norway and Sweden). The project will be launched this 10 September 2020.	https://www.lifeatthefrontier.org

Source: Author's own elaboration, based on documentation and website of each entry.