Children of migration and their well-being

ABSTRACT

Findings regarding immigrants' well-being focus mostly on international migrants without distinguishing between parents and children's perception of well-being. Some studies pay attention to different indicators of psychological well-being without including an overall indicator that comprises psychological and economics spheres. We propose to use an indicator of perceptions of quality of life which has a broad definition beyond only objective or subjective well-being. The respondents assessed their well-being according to three options: getting better, remaining the same, and getting worse. This study involves children living in urban areas with rural migrants parents in Peru in order to identify how children's perception of well-being is affected by having parents who experienced a rural-to-urban migration.

The main hypothesis is that having rural migrant parents affects children's perception of well-being and this effect will differ depending on if the migrant is the father or the mother. Using an ordered logit method, the results support the hypothesis proposed, that is, children of migrant parents are more likely to report getting worse if they have a rural migrant mother with no statistical effect of having a rural migrant father.

INTRODUCTION

This paper explores the well-being of children in urban areas being raised by rural migrant parents. The literature in human well-being has paid more attention to objective well-being indicators such as income, expenditure, consumption, education or employment, with few studies focusing on a subjective approach. However, the concept of human well-being includes broader aspects of life which are not always quantifiable or objectively measurable. In the last decade there has been an

emphasis on the importance of using the subjective well-being approach to complement the objective well-being indicators that are traditionally relied upon (Campbell et al., 1976; Diener, 2000; Knight & Gunatilaka, 2008; Ziegler & Britton, 1981). There has been increasing public policy interest in the non-quantifiable factor that affects human well-being (Graham, 2003; Graham, 2008), including the European Union's position that life satisfaction is a national indicator of development (De Jong et al., 2002). A society's perceived quality of life (or what many in the literature term 'happiness') may sway political reforms in the society or country (Graham & Pettinato, 2000).

In the literature the concept of 'subjective equilibrium' is accepted as more appropriate than the more limited objective well-being. Measuring subjective well-being is complicated because it is not a physical good that is observable and quantifiable. Interestingly, subjective well-being and the economic term 'utility function' include more than one dimension of human life, They include dimensions such as personal experiences, psychological attitudes and the general cultural environment; concepts which have a subjective nature making them difficult to measure and to compare among different population groups (Knight & Gunatilaka, 2008; Nicholson, 2005; Ziegler & Britton, 1981). Over the last decade, subjective equilibrium has become one of the most salient topics studied in the well-being literature, although economic studies have been slower than most to explore the multiple dimensions of subjective well-being. Recent economic studies have incorporated a psychological basis for well-being research through the incorporation of expectations, anticipations, and adaptations (Clark et al., 2007; Easterlin, 2001). The importance of understanding subjective well-being from an economic perspective is justified by the importance of understanding development processes and ultimately building policies that enhance the life satisfaction and happiness of people (Clark et al., 2007; De Jong et al., 2002; Easterlin, 2001; Knight & Gunatilaka; Lora & Chaparro, 2008). However, well-being can best be thought of as a multi-dimensional concept (De Jong et al., 2002), therefore it is necessary to use an overall indicator which embodies subjective and objective indicators of life satisfaction.

There currently exists a gap in the literature linking migration and well-being in spite of the importance of psychological and emotional effects which may offset income effects on the quality of life of migrants (Silver, 2011). Most studies related to migration have focused on causes of or factors influencing movement, both international and internal, with some literature focusing on the economic consequences of migration both for those who have migrated and at the origin for those left behind (Ortega-Sanchez & Findeis, 2001). The majority of studies have focused on the economic field with negligible attention to non-economic consequences. Those studies have centered on the effects of migration on income and expenditure levels of migrants and their families, including possible impacts on productivity of agricultural activities due to changes in household labor allocation (Morrison, 1993; Ortega-Sanchez, 2001). On the other hand, the literature on well-being of migrants has focused on mental health of migrants and those relatives left behind, such as depression, loneliness, self-esteem, and suicide rates (Driscoll et al., 2008; Mirsky et al., 2007; Silver, 2011; Tousignant, 1992), and perceptions of life satisfaction and happiness with their jobs, living environment, and educational attainment (De Jong et al., 2002; Knight & Gunatilaka, 2008) without an analysis of the overall well-being of migrants. Those studies address well-being using different indicators separately, instead of using an overall indicator of well-being. This article uses an overall indicator to analyze differences in migrant well-being.

In the case of Peru, there is a high rate of internal migration (20.2% in 2007) which raises questions about the impact of migration on the perceived changes in subjective well-being of this population, especially for the children living in a migrant household[1]. This article attempts to understand the relationship between changes in subjective well-being and internal migration in Peru by comparing outcomes between children of migrants and those who have native parents. The study focuses on children growing up in migrant households because migration can create a challenging adaptation process faced by youngsters and elderly (Tousignant, 1992).

[1] Migrant household refers to a household with parents (at least one of them) who are rural-to-urban migrants.

A key development question that has not yet been explored is: whether changes in subjective well-being of migrants from rural areas who now live in new urban destinations, lags behind those of others native to the area? This is an important question because it is often argued that 'a rising tide lifts all boats', implying that migrant households should be able to participate and share in prosperity like other residents. The question arises: is economic growth in the larger economy perceived as making a difference in the subjective well-being perceived by rural-to-urban migrants, a group often believed to be more economically disadvantaged and potentially left behind? Particularly, how children with one or more parents who have migrated from rural-to-urban places perceive changes in their household's subjective well-being?

INTERNAL MIGRATION IN PERU

The migration phenomenon itself has been extensively studied in Peru, with studies found in both the economics and sociological literature. Migration in Peru shows two streams. First, internal migration from the mountains to cities has occurred as a response to terrorism during the 1980s and 1990s; and second, international migration was more commonly observed in the late 1980s due to the economic crisis in Peru, and before 1950 toward Europe.

The last official figures for Peru, based on the 2007 Census, show that 20.2% of the population are internal migrants (5.5 million persons, 19.9% Peruvians and 0.3% foreigners) whereas in 1993[2], 22.3% of the population were internal migrants (4.9 million persons, 22.1% Peruvians and 0.2% foreigners). Nevertheless, in absolute figures the migrant population in Peru has increased by 12.6% (+620,912 persons) since 1993. For 2007, the main *sending departments*[3]

[2] Previous Census in Peru.

[3] The main sending departments were Huancavelica, Apurimac, Ayacucho, Cajamarca, Pasco, Ancash, Huanuco, and Puno.

of migrants were located in the Peruvian highlands (mostly rural areas) and the main *recipient departments*[4] of migrants were located in the Peruvian coast (mostly urban areas).

According to figures from the National Institute of Statistics and Computing (INEI[5]) of Peru, during the last five Censuses (1961, 1972, 1981, 1993, and 2007), more people in the Peruvian highlands have moved outwards toward the coast or jungle. Through the five Census years, the departments comprising the Peruvian coast overall had received more in-migrants as a result of the migratory process, typifying them as a '*recipient region*'. This fact reflects that departments on the Peruvian coast are still perceived by migrants as a better place to live or work.

As pointed out above, during the last five Censuses, the Peruvian highlands always show positive net out-migration rates compared to the Peruvian coast and jungle. This situation suggests the importance of taking a deep look into internal migration, especially for the rural population because the Peruvian highlands have traditionally been identified as rural. According to the 2007 Census, the Peruvian highlands have the greater percentage of rural population (51.1%) among the three Peruvian regions.

The rural population in Peru has a high poverty rate: 64.6% were poor during 2007, while only 25.7% of the urban population was poor (Indicadores sociales – pobreza[6]). This suggests one reason for the high net migration rate in rural areas, i.e., migrants looking to escape from rural poverty. In 1993, four of the main sending departments (Huancavelica, Apurimac, Cajamarca, and Ayacucho) were the poorest departments in Peru[7], and located in the Peruvian highlands with a high percentage of rural population.

[4] The main recipient departments were Lima & Callao, Tacna, Arequipa, Tumbes, and Moquegua.
[5] According to its initials in Spanish.
[6] National Institute of Statistics and Computing (consulted at July, 22nd 2009).
[7] Peruprensa.

A recent study by Veenhoven (2009) compares life satisfaction and happiness indicators across 146 countries worldwide, using published and unpublished data from other studies (see Table 1 for South America). Data collected about life satisfaction over the period 2000-2006[8], shows that Peru is ranked 52nd, with an average score of 6.4 on a scale from 0 to 10. The responses about life satisfaction ranged from 'dissatisfied' to 'very satisfied' on a 10-step numerical scale. Iceland, Denmark, Colombia, Switzerland, and Mexico had the highest rankings, scoring above 8.0. In addition to Colombia and Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Costa Rica –also Latin American countries- are among the 20th highest ranked in the Veenhoven (2009) study.

Table 1 – Subjective well-being for South American countries

Countries	GDP Growth rate 2000 - 2006	Satisfaction with life (Scale 0 to 10) 2000 - 2006	Happiness (Scale 1 to 4) 2000	2001	2002	2003	2005
Colombia	4.18	8.1			2.95	3.36	3.35
Argentina	2.77	7.5			2.60		3.20
Brazil	3.18	7.4			2.87	3.50	
Venezuela	4.14	7.2	3.42	3.26	3.13		
Chile	4.31	6.8	3.16		2.93		3.08
Peru	**4.54**	**6.4**		**2.95**	**2.53**		**2.94**
Uruguay	0.58	6.1			2.85		
Bolivia	3.94	5.9			2.45		
Ecuador	4.84	5.7			2.64		
Paraguay	1.98	5.5			2.89		

Source: World Bank - Indicators & Veenhoven, R. (2009)
Own elaboration.

Considering only 10 countries of South America, Peru is ranked in 6th place for life satisfaction during the period 2000-2006 (Table 1), with a score below the average for the region (6.7). However, in economic terms, Peru is ranked in 2nd place for GDP growth rate. Thus,

[8] Scores of 56 countries were based on a different question about life satisfaction but with a range of responses from 0 to 10, as well. In those cases, the author used a linear transformation to make comparable the scores.

population in Peru is enjoying a high economic growth but this is not reflected in their subjective well-being.

Research on subjective well-being for Peru is a relatively new field of study, recently developed with a seminal paper by Graham & Pettinato (2000). However, the research on subjective well-being has been focused on its determinants without exploring the linkage between migration and subjective well-being, and differences between migrants and non-migrants. Since high internal migration is observed in Peru, it is interesting to analyze what happens with the migrant population and the next-generation of these migrant households.

Moreover, there are no studies about the outcome of internal migration on subjective well-being of children in Peru. Children with migrant parents are identified as "provincianos" and they suffer bullying in schools due to their condition of "provincianos"[9]. Children of rural migrants who socialize in urban areas face two realities, one in their households with their rural customs learned from their parents, and the other reality in schools and neighborhoods surrounded by native children with urban customs. The identity of these migrant children is mixed and determined by rural and urban influences. This may cause social conflicts which in turn affects children's well-being. However, there are no studies analyzing how this rural migrant status affects children's well-being in urban areas of Peru.

On the other hand, studies about well-being of migrant children are focused on the effect through generations of parenting styles and the presence of both parents in the household (Driscoll et al., 2008; Tousignant, 1992) with no attention to the migration status of parents and the differences between the presence and status migration of the father and the mother as this article proposes.

[9] http://elcomercio.pe/lima/656710/noticia-menor-quedo-paraplejico-ataque-companeros-colegio-san-juan-lurigancho

OBJECTIVE

As pointed out above, the migration process, international and internal, exhibits an increasing trend, and there are relatively few studies comparing migrant subjective well-being to that of non-migrants. Most studies argue that people migrate to look for better jobs and higher wages (Galarza & Yancari, 2005), but a higher income may not result in a higher perception of well-being or quality of life. According to the relative income hypothesis, the migrant has a new reference group which is now urban not rural peers. A person does not realize his poverty until he compares with the rest; a rural migrant who arrives to the city (urban area) begins noting the difference in his previous rural lifestyle in contrast to the urban lifestyle, and begins a process of adjustment and adaptation to this new urban condition of life. Thus, the relevant group to compare with is their urban peers and not those left behind.

The discussion of this article will contribute to the literature on migration and subjective well-being for less developed countries with an emphasis on the role played by parents. The analysis is based on the Peruvian case which focuses on children's perception of their quality of life in their migrant households after having migrated from rural to urban areas in Peru. The empirical analysis of this research will consider perceptions of changes in quality of life as an indicator of changes in well-being. This is based on a survey question about changes in the household's quality of life with a range of three possible responses.

Hence, the main objective of this article is to understand the influence of living in a migrant household (with rural migrant parents) on changes in quality of life perceptions among children in urban areas in contrast with those children living in a native household (with native parents).

DATA

The empirical work is based on cross-sectional data taken from the Peruvian National Household Survey - 2006 (ENAHO[10]) elaborated by the INEI, using perceived changes in quality of life as an indicator of changes in subjective well-being.

The INEI conducts the ENAHO which provides information at national, dominion, and stratum levels[11] of statistical inference, with the unit of research being the household and its members. The information is collected at the individual level, but there is some information that is collected at the household level and is provided only by 'the qualified informant', a member of the household who is 12 years old or older. Generally, the qualified informant is the person typically considered head of the household or the head's spouse, but in some cases the son or daughter provides the information. In the case of the variable representing change in the perception of the quality of life, there is only one respondent per household, and this information is provided by the qualified informant.

The data employed in this article correspond to ENAHO 2006. The sample contains data from 20,538 households and 81,219 individuals. Since the survey provides national statistical inference, for the econometric analysis the weighted sample will be used, to obtain robust standard errors. The information about subjective well-being is provided by the qualified informant, thus it is possible to identify if the respondent is a parent or is a child (son/daughter or grandson/granddaughter). The econometric analysis only considers observations when the qualified informant is a child, thus the sample is reduced to 2,659 observations. Responses provided by parents are excluded of the analysis since the objective of this analysis is to understand children's well-being.

Means and percentages of the covariates used in the analysis are presented in Table 2. The mean age of the sample is 17.4, 46.5% is female, and 19.4% suffers a chronic disease. In the case

[10] According to its initials in Spanish.
[11] Dominion level refers to departments and stratum level refers to rural – urban areas within a department.

of household variables, the majority live with their parents, 81.3% have their fathers in the household, and 97.2% have their mothers. Meanwhile, less than 30% have a parent who is a rural migrant.

Table 2 – Descriptive statistics

	All
Socio-demographic variables	
Individual variables	
Gender	
Male	53.5 %
Female	46.5 %
Age	17.4
Health	
Suffer chronic disease	19.4 %
Years of education	9.6
Household variables	
Father is present	81.3 %
Mother is present	97.2 %
Father is a rural migrant	22.3 %
Mother is a rural migrant	26.4 %
Economic variables	
Employed	37.0 %
Logarithm household income	11.0
GDP variation in destination	6.0

Source: ENAHO 2006.

METHODOLOGY

The dependent variable studied in this article is the perceived changes in quality of life as an indicator of subjective well-being for the period 2005-2006. The variable is based on the self-perceptions of the children population in Peru who answered the question: During the last year, the quality of life of your household was … ?, with three possible outcomes: getting better, remaining

the same, or getting worse. This range of possible answers states a valuation order about quality of life made by the respondent. Thus, an ordered logit method is more appropriate for the econometric analysis.

The unit of analysis is '*the next generation'*. This next generation comprises children (young adults) of migrant parents (with at least one of the parents) who migrated from rural to urban areas. The analysis presented in this article compares whether the next generation from migrant households perceive their quality of life as improving more than those living around them which have native (non-migrant) parents. It is expected that having migrant parents will negatively affect the children's perception of their well-being due to the different customs within their households in contrast to the new urban culture in school and neighborhood.

The migration status for parents is created based on two questions provided by the survey: i) where were you born?, asked to each family member, with a location code assigned by the surveyors, and ii) where do you currently live?, the location code is assigned by the surveyors. Both questions are matched to determine if the father or mother is a permanent migrant or not; that is, a permanent migrant is a person who was born in a rural area and moved permanently to an urban area.

For the analysis of migrant children, the sample considers only children who are older than 12 years old but less than 26 years of age, and who are single (never married and still reside in the household). Therefore, these children even as 'young adults' still depend on the head of household and/or parents. Authors like Tousignant (1992) points out that the population between 11 and 22 are more vulnerable during the migration process; however we propose to include population until 25 years old because they still attend university, and in the Peruvian society children usually stay with their parents until they get married.

The exogenous variables incorporated in the estimated model include both socio-demographic and economic variables. The economic variables include employment status of the respondent; the logarithm of household income (annual); and variation of GDP in the department of

destination. It is expected that those children living in a household with a higher income report a better perception of their well-being because they are not going to experience a feeling of being restricted in their needs. Having a job has two effects, first it gives economic independence which may produce a better feeling but it is likely that children work to contribute to the household income which will negatively affect children's perception of well-being. The variation of GDP is included to control for the income relative hypothesis.

In the case of socio-demographic variables, there are two set of variables, individual and household, in order to control for differences in children's background. The individual level includes age, age squared, health (if the children suffers a chronic disease), and years of education. At household level, a variable to determine if the father and/or mother are rural migrants and if they are present in the household is included. The adaptation process differs between genders, thus each parent has a different effect on children's well-being. Especially in the case of most rural migrant females, when they first arrive to urban areas they work as housekeepers, an employment with low social status in urban areas. Also the absence of parents may negatively affect the emotional perception of children (Silver, 2011). The study by Ryan & Sales (2011) points out that the absence of parents may be manifested by negative outcomes in children's education.

The following overall model is used to evaluate variables influencing perceptions of changes in subjective well-being of children by migration status:

$$\text{CQL} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \beta_2 X_h + \beta_3 X_e + \varepsilon$$

where:

CQL = changes in quality of life.

X_i = individual variables that include socio-demographic indicators,

X_h = household variables,

X_e = economic variables.

The multivariate model addresses whether differences in well-being of children can be explained by their parents' migration status. Thus, the main comparison is between children raised by rural migrant parents versus children raised by native parents.

RESULTS

Examining only household variables, we find a significant statistical relationship between the migrant status of parents with the perception of well-being of children. Findings showed in Table 3 support the hypothesis that migration status of parents has different effects on children's subjective well-being, while having a rural migrant mother is associated with negative effects, having a rural migrant father is associated with positive effects on children's perception of well-being. Children in urban areas raised by a rural mother are more likely to report *getting worse* (9.2%) and less likely to report *remaining the same* (-4.4%) and *getting better* (-4.9%). In contrast, children living in urban areas with a rural father are less likely to report *getting worse* (-3.4%), but more likely to have a positive perception of their well-being, reporting *remaining the same* (1.2%) and *getting better* (2.2%).

Controlling by presence of parents, migration status of father loses significance and its effect is picked up by the presence of the father in the household regardless of his migration status. In the case of the mother, only the migration status is significant while her presence in the household shows no significant effect on children's perception of well-being. Children with a rural migrant mother are more likely to report *getting worse* (8.4%), and less likely to report *remaining the same* (-3.9%) or *getting better* (-4.5%). However, the presence of a father in the household has a significant effect, children are less likely to report *getting worse* (-5.9%), and more likely to report *remaining the same* (2.7%) and *getting better* (3.25).

Table 3 – Household variables

	Getting worse	
Father is rural migrant	-0.034*	-0.019
	(0.017)	(0.019)
Mother is rural migrant	0.092***	0.084***
	(0.020)	(0.021)
Father is present in household		-0.059**
		(0.023)
Mother is present in household		-0.008
		(0.046)
	Remaining the same	
Father is rural migrant	0.012**	0.007
	(0.006)	(0.007)
Mother is rural migrant	-0.044***	-0.039***
	(0.011)	(0.011)
Father is present in household		0.027**
		(0.012)
Mother is present in household		0.003
		(0.020)
	Getting better	
Father is rural migrant	0.022*	0.012
	(0.012)	(0.012)
Mother is rural migrant	-0.049***	-0.045***
	(0.010)	(0.010)
Father is present in household		0.032***
		(0.011)
Mother is present in household		0.005
		(0.027)
Observations	3,281	3,281
Wald chi2(15)	22.77	29.77
P>chi2	0.00	0.00

Robust standard errors in parentheses.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

In Table 4, three models are presented, first including only individual variables, then adding household variables, and the third is the complete model with the three sets of variables: individual, household, and economics.

Considering only individual variables, two variables: *suffering of a chronic disease* and *years of education* have a statistically significant effect on children's perception of well-being. Those children in urban areas who are suffering a chronic disease have a negative perception meanwhile those children with more years of education have a positive perception of their well-being. Suffering a chronic disease increases the probability by 5.0% of reporting getting worse, and decreases by 2.2% and by 2.8% the probability of remaining the same and getting better, respectively.

The next step is to include the set of household variables. Comparing to Model 1, having a chronic disease is not significant for getting worse and remaining the same, this may be explained by the presence of parents in household who play a role of emotional support to children even if they are suffering a chronic disease. However, suffering a chronic does have a significant and negative effect on getting better. Years of education remains significant, children with more years of education are more likely to have a more positive perception about their well-being. In the household set, two variables: *father is present* and *mother is a rural migrant* have a significant effect on children's perception of well-being, but these effects are opposite. Children living with their fathers are less likely to report getting worse, and more likely to report remaining the same and getting better. Meanwhile, children living with a mother who is a rural migrant are more likely to report getting worse, and less likely to report remaining the same and getting better. It seems that the negative effect of having a rural migrant mother is related to the job status of most of the rural mothers working as housekeepers, and supports the hypothesis that learning rural customs in households, mostly transmitted by mothers, produces an identity conflict in children living in urban areas.

Finally, the last model includes all the variables, socio-demographic and economic variables. Controlling for economic variables, only the variable *mother is a rural migrant* has a significant and negative effect on the children's perception of well-being. Thus, economic variables offset the influence of years of education and the presence of father in the household. A higher

household income implies a negative likelihood to report getting worse, and a positive likelihood to report remaining the same and getting better. Nevertheless, the results do not support the relative income hypothesis, on the contrary if the *GDP in the department of destination* are going up then it is less likely that children reports getting worse and it is more likely that they report remaining the same and getting better.

Table 4 – Marginal effects of ordered logit models

	Getting worse		
	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**
Socio-demographic variables			
Individual variables			
Gender (Male=1)	-0.005	-0.014	-0.011
	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.014)
Age	0.017	0.022	0.012
	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.027)
Age squared	-0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)
Health (Chronic disease=1)	0.050**	0.027	0.012
	(0.022)	(0.017)	(0.018)
Years of education	-0.007**	-0.006*	-0.001
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Household variables			
Father is present		-0.060***	-0.022
		(0.019)	(0.020)
Mother is present		0.003	0.013
		(0.038)	(0.039)
Father is a rural migrant (=1)		-0.026	-0.021
		(0.016)	(0.018)
Mother is a rural migrant (=1)		0.086***	0.079***
		(0.017)	(0.019)
Economic variables			
Job (employed=1)			-0.006
			(0.015)
Logarithm of household income			-0.096***
			(0.010)
Change in the GDP in the department of destination			-0.003**
			(0.001)

…continue

	Remaining the same		
	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**
Socio-demographic variables			
Individual variables			
Gender (Male=1)	0.002	0.005	0.004
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.006)
Age	-0.007	-0.008	-0.005
	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.011)
Age squared	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Health (Chronic disease=1)	-0.022**	-0.011	-0.005
	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Years of education	0.003**	0.002*	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Household variables			
Father is present		0.027***	0.009
		(0.010)	(0.009)
Mother is present		-0.001	-0.005
		(0.014)	(0.013)
Father is a rural migrant (=1)		0.009*	0.008
		(0.005)	(0.006)
Mother is a rural migrant (=1)		-0.039***	-0.037***
		(0.009)	(0.010)
Economic variables			
Job (employed=1)			0.002
			(0.006)
Logarithm of household income			0.037***
			(0.006)
Change in the GDP in the department of destination			0.001*
			(0.001)

…continue

	Getting better		
	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**
Socio-demographic variables			
Individual variables			
Gender (Male=1)	0.003	0.008	0.007
	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.009)
Age	-0.010	-0.013	-0.008
	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.017)
Age squared	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Health (Chronic disease=1)	-0.028**	-0.016*	-0.007
	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.010)
Years of education	0.004**	0.004*	0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Household variables			
Father is present		0.033***	0.013
		(0.009)	(0.011)
Mother is present		-0.002	-0.008
		(0.024)	(0.026)
Father is a rural migrant (=1)		0.017	0.013
		(0.011)	(0.012)
Mother is a rural migrant (=1)		-0.047***	-0.043***
		(0.008)	(0.009)
Economic variables			
Job (employed=1)			0.004
			(0.009)
Logarithm of household income			0.058***
			(0.006)
Change in the GDP in the department of destination			0.002**
			(0.001)
Observations	3,277	3,277	2,659
Wald chi2(15)	13.69	55.99	135.10
P>chi2	0.02	0.00	0.00

Robust standard errors in parentheses.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

DISCUSSION

The results show that having a rural migrant mother statistically impacts the perception of well-being among children living in urban areas in contrast to the migrant status of the father. Adapting to a new society, even within the same country, implies challenges for the migrant household, especially for the children. In the Peruvian society, mostly in urban areas, where the "status" is important, being identified as a migrant ("provinciano") may sway the perceptions of well-being of children. Children of migration are living two different realities, one is a rural environment in households (transmitted by their mothers), the other one is an urban reality at schools and in their neighborhoods. Therefore, it may be necessary to develop a policy to help children and rural mothers in urban areas to better adapt to the new reality of the urban destination area and to reduce the negative impact on children's well-being.

REFERENCES

Campbell, A., P. Converse & W. Rodgers (1976). The quality of American life. Perceptions, evaluations and satisfactions. Russell Sage Foundation, 583p.

Clark, A.; P. Frijters & M. Shields (2007). Relative income, happiness and utility: an explanation for the Easterlin paradox and other puzzles. Institute for the Study of Labor, Discussion Paper, 2840, 65p

De Jong, G., A. Chamratrithirong & Q. Tran (2002). For better, for worse: Life satisfaction consequences of migration. *International Migration Review*, 36 (3), pp. 838-863.

Diener, Ed (2000). The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychological Association*, 55 (1), pp. 34-43.

Driscoll, A., S. Russell & L. Crockett (2008). Parenting styles and youth well-being across immigrant generations. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29, pp.185-209.

Easterlin, Richard (2001). Income and happiness: Towards a unified theory. *The Economic Journal*, 111 (473), pp. 465-484.

Galarza, F. & J. Yancari (2005). La importancia de las remesas en los hogares peruanos. Una primera aproximacion desde la ENAHO 2001. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 58p.

Graham, Carol (2003). Happiness and Hardship: Lessons from panel data on mobility and subjective well being in Peru and Russia. Draft for *Workshop on understanding growth and freedom from the bottom up*, World Bank, 10p.

Graham, Carol (2008). Measuring quality of life in Latin America: What happiness research can (and cannot) contribute. Inter-American Development Bank, 45p.

Graham, C. & S. Pettinato (2000). Frustrated achievers: Winners, losers, and subjective well being in new market economies. Center on Social and Economic Dynamics, Working Paper Series, 20, 41p.

Knight, J. & R. Gunatilaka (2008). Aspirations, adaptation and subjective well-being of rural-urban migrants in China. University of Oxford, 26p.

Lora, Eduardo & Juan Chaparro (2008). The conflictive relationship between satisfaction and income. Inter-American Development Bank, 52p. Nicholson, Walter (2005). Microeconomic theory. Basic principles and extensions. Thomson, 671p.

Mirsky, J., V. Slonim-Nevo & L. Rubinstein (2007). Psychological wellness and distress among recent immigrants: A four-year longitudinal study in Israel and Germany. *International Migration*, 45 (1), pp. 151-175.

Morrison, Andrew (1993). Unproductive migration reconsidered: a stochastic frontier production function framework for analyzing internal migration. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 45 (3), pp. 501-518.

National Institute of Statistics and Computing (INEI). www.inei.gob.pe

Ortega-Sanchez, Ismael (2001). Labor out-migration impact on agrarian economics: The case of Central and Southern Mexican communities. Unpublished PhD dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

Ortega-Sanchez, I. & J. Findeis (2001). Production impacts of labor outmigration in Agrarian Economies: The case of corn farmers in Central and Southern Areas of Mexico. Selected paper presented at the 2001 American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL. August.

Ryan, L. & R. Sales (2011). Family migration: The role of children and education in family decision-making strategies of Polish migrants in London. *International Migration*, 49.

Silver, Alexis (2011). Families across borders: The emotional impacts of migration on origin families. *International Migration*, 49.

Tousignant, T. (1992). Migration and mental health. Some prevention guidelines. *International Migration*, 30, pp.167-177.

Veenhoven, Ruut (2009). World database of happiness, distributional findings in Nations. http://www.worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl/

The World Bank Indicators. http://data.worldbank.org/indicator

Ziegler, J. & C. Britton (1981). A comparative analysis of socioeconomic variations in measuring the quality of life. *Social Science Quarterly*, 62 (2), pp. 303-312.