Fear of Robots and Life Satisfaction

Tim Hinks

University of the West of England (UWE), Bristol

Fear of Robots and Life Satisfaction

Tim Hinks[†]

Abstract

This paper examines whether fear of robots is correlated with life satisfaction. After controlling for individual effects and country effects and using both standard ordinary least squares and a linear multilevel regression model we find fear of robots correlates with lower reported life satisfaction. There are differences in the fear of robots and life satisfaction by age group, by how long countries have been members of the European Union and by whether we control for attitudes towards other things. We call for more research into attitudes towards technology and new technologies in particular, how these impact on current life satisfaction and other aspects of quality of life and to think more about how technological change and people's attitudes towards these can be more aligned.

1. Introduction

Innovation and the impact of new technologies on the economy, society and institutions is once more one of the most important questions facing the world today. The so called 4th industrial revolution or IR4.0 is happening today and is expected to impact on the global economy for the next 30-40 years. Whilst there is continued dispute about the impact robots are having and will have on society many mainstream and non-mainstream economists are predicting a new kind of labour market, one that will produce more lousy than lovely jobs (Goos and Manning, 2003), lower employment and wages (Acemoglu et al, 2017) and the continued and even speeding up of a lower wage share of output (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014; Karabarbounis and Neiman, 2014; Elsby, Hobijn, and Sahin, 2013 – refs from Graetz and Michaels, 2015; OECD, 2012). Whilst a consensus is forming on the impact robots could have on people's livelihoods there is also the frequently heard counter-argument that new jobs will be created, new products will be produced and that robots will allow people to focus on aspects of jobs that they are better at, that they may prefer and would allow an extension to their working lives (Alexopoulos and Cohen, 2016). At the heart of the debate is the substitutability between workers and capital and how robots have increased this substitutability thus making labour and particular tasks of labour more vulnerable in the

---

[†] Business Centre for Economics and Finance, University of the West of England, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol BS16 1QY. E-mail: timothy.hinks@uwe.ac.uk.

production process.[1][2] There is less research on the impact robotics or artificial intelligence has on people's behaviour. Papers by Frey et al (2017) and Anelli et al (2018) focus on voting behaviours of people from regions in the US, Europe and the UK respectively that are adversely affected by robotic automation. They find evidence that these regions are more likely to vote for populist leaders. Gallego et al (2018) also find some evidence that automation leads to something of a polarisation in voting patterns of those who benefit from compueterization and those who 'lose-out' to computerization.

Other research has asked what correlates with people's perceptions of robots and experiences of robots. Dekker et al (2017) find that having a fear of robots declines with the quality of occupation someone has, the years of study and whether someone has used a robot at work. Their multilevel analysis also suggests, but not conclusively, that "economic and institutional conditions matter to some extent for understanding country-level differences in the fear of robots at work" (ibid, p553). Giuntella and Wang (2019) find some evidence that exposure to robots in the workplace in China increases the likelihood of strikes. Hudson et al (2017) use the Eurobarometer 82.4 (2014) survey and find that as people age they become steadily more uncomfortable with having a robot provide services and companionship to elderly or infirm people. This is at odds with Taipale et al. (2015) who use Eurobarometer data from a 2012 survey and find that use of robots for caring was supported more by pensioners and students. As yet no studies have asked what impact perceptions of robots have on the quality of life of people or on the different aspects of the quality of life of people. This paper is the first to address this question by analysing peoples' perceptions of robots and in particular whether their fear of robots is connected to one aspect of quality of life, namely life satisfaction, using a cross-country representative sample. We find strong evidence that people who fear robots report significantly lower life satisfaction scores. The same is found for workers. We also find evidence that once we control for other negative views at the individual level that

---

[1] The prediction of consistently lower average working hours over time due to rising productivity is hardly new with John Maynard Keynes in his 1930 lecture titled *Economic Possibilities for our Grandchildren* arguing that by the 1970s the workers in the UK would be working a 15-hour week. Keynes saw this as a good thing driven by innovation and technology that increases productivity and economic growth. Recent examples of workers negotiating lower working hours to reduce the wage bill and retain employment is seen in Germany (Daily Telegraph, 2018) and there is a ground swell movement arguing for a 4-day working week in the UK with trials underway.

[2] Another important question raised concerns the ownership of robots and who gains the value these robots add. Freeman (2015) makes the simple argument that if workers are to benefit from new technologies that substitute for their skills then they need to own or at least part-own this technology. If the technology is not owned by the worker then they will be worse off, possible working for lower wages and having to work longer hours. One obvious result of this would be increasing inequality. This raises a host of questions to do with maintaining and improving the quality of lives of people, whether work in any way increases the quality of life of people apart from simply selling one's labour, what kind of jobs people will do or want to do in the future and what impact this will have on different form of inequality (income, wealth, opportunity, expectations).

whilst fear of robots remains a significant correlate of lower life satisfaction that the size of the coefficient declines but remains sizeable and significant in western and northern European countries.

The article is structured as follows. The next section will discuss the data used, the variables of interest and the basic econometric model that is used. Section 3 will report the results and some robustness checks. Section 4 will discuss the results and some limitations of the study. We finish with a conclusion.

2. Data and Variables

We use data from Eurobarometer 82.4 (2014) survey in this paper, conducted in November and December 2014 which was the first follow-up study to the Eurobarometer survey Public Attitudes towards Robots conducted in 2012. For 25 of the 28 member states approximately 1,000 individuals were interviewed over the age of 15, with the smaller states of Cyprus, Luxembourg and Malta interviewing approximately 500 people. Life satisfaction is captured in the survey by the question "On the whole, are you very satisfied=1, fairly satisfied=2, not very satisfied=3 or not at all satisfied=4 with the life you lead?". After recoding the answers so higher life satisfaction was given a higher value the average life satisfaction reported from our sample was 3.01 across all countries, indicating that on average people were fairly satisfied with the lives they lead.[3] Women represented 53 per cent of our sample and the average age was just over 49 years.

Dependent Variable

Life satisfaction in the survey is captured by the question "On the whole, are you satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the life your lead?". We recode the variable so satisfied has a score of 4, fairly satisfied a score of 3, not very satisfied a score of 2 and not at all satisfied a score of 1. This means that any estimated coefficients that are positive are correlated with higher life satisfaction and estimated coefficients that are negative, with lower life satisfaction.

Individual Level Variables

Main Variable of Interest: Fear of Robots

There are several questions in the survey that relate to perceptions of robots. The first is a general question on how the person views robots which has four possible responses, "*Generally speaking,*

---

[3] We simply recoded using recode LS 4=1 3=2 2=3 1=4 in STATA

do you have a very positive, fairly positive, fairly negative or very negative view of robots?". There are then a series of questions in which people are asked "*To what extent they agree or disagree with whether (1) robots are a good thing for society, because they help people (2) robots steal peoples' jobs and (3) robots are necessary as they can do jobs that are too hard or too dangerous for people.* There are four possible responses to these three questions. All people in the survey will answer these questions, but others in the survey are related more to people who are currently employed. In light of this we use just one other question from the survey which asks *how people would feel about having a robot to assist you at work.* People who are employed, unemployed, students and retired can answer this question. It could be argued that the unemployed and the retired should not answer this question because they do not have an informed view of perhaps how robots can assist in the workplace. However we have no information on how long someone has been unemployed or the reason for being unemployed and to assume this category of people are less informed this seems too strict. Retired people are also entitled to an opinion about what they think it would be like to have assistance from a robot drawing on their own work experiences.

The five questions are used to form an average fear of robot variable. Some recoding of the original data was required, notably regarding the question on how people felt about having a robot assist them at work. This question had 10 possible categories instead of the four categories in the other five questions used. Having looked at the distribution of responses to the question we recoded into four categories where 1 represents people who are very or totally comfortable with robots assisting in the workplace (8, 9 and 10), 2 less comfortable (6 and7), 3 fairly uncomfortable (4 and 5) and 4 representing those who are very or totally uncomfortable with robots assisting in the workplace (1,2 and 3). Table 1 reveals these five variables have similar factor loadings. When we run a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy we see that these are all well above 0.7 so are fine to use for factor analysis or principle components analysis.[4] Given these findings, we also create a fear of robot measure based on principle components analysis and use this as an alternative to the average fear of robot measure in the forthcoming analysis.

Table 1 Items, Factor Loadings and KMO measure for fear of robots

Question	Factor Loading	KMO measure

---

[4] A score of below 0.5 is given a label of unacceptable, a score between 0.5 and 0.6 is miserable, a score between 0.6 and 0.7 is mediocre, a score between 0.7 and 0.8 is middling, a score between 0.8 and 0.9 is meritorious and a score between 0.9 and 1.0 is marvellous (Kaiser, 1974)

"To what extent do you agree or disagree with whether robots are a good thing for society? *(1=totally agree, 2=tend to agree, 3-tend to disagree, 4=totally disagree)*	0.722	0.755
"To what extent do you agree or disagree with whether robots steal peoples' jobs?" *(1=totally disagree, 2=tend to disagree, 3-tend to agree, 4=totally agree)*	0.405	0.796
"To what extent do you agree or disagree with whether robots are necessary as they can do jobs that are too hard or too dangerous for people?" *(1=totally agree, 2=tend to agree, 3-tend to disagree, 4=totally disagree)*	0.616	0.775
Generally speaking, do you have a very positive, fairly positive, fairly negative or very negative view of robots?" *(1=very positive, 2=fairly positive, 3=fairly negative, 4=very negative)*	0.725	0.775
How would you personally feel about having a robot assist you at work (e.g. in manufacturing) *(1=totally comfortable, 2=fairly comfortable, 3=fairly uncomfortable, 4= totally uncomfortable)*	0.596	0.837
Cronbach's Alpha	0.742	

It is important to note that as well as fear of robots causing life satisfaction that causality can run in the other direction as well; people who are fearful of robots may well hold these views because of low life satisfaction. In the life satisfaction literature the issue of causality is hard to overcome when using individual, cross sectional data since it is hard to find an instrument that passes the necessary tests. One approach is to control for within sample averages at a regional or some other geographic level but these can be criticised since individuals can both cause and be influenced by their immediate surroundings especially with respect to attitudes and perceptions that they hold. Alternatively using information on the characteristics of parents or using data that has a time-series element to it can result in appropriate instruments. The Eurobarometer survey used in this paper has no such information and we interpret coefficients as correlations, given all other variables in the model remain constant.

Individual Control Variables

From the extensive empirical literature on life satisfaction we firstly include two demographic factors; gender and age. Women tend to report significantly higher life satisfaction relative to men consistent with much empirical work (e.g. Gerlach & Stephan, 1996; Winkelmann and Winkelmann 1998; Winkelmann, 2009; and Habibov and Afandi, 2015) but a universal explanation for this common empirical finding has not been agreed. Possible explanations focus on the hypothesis that life satisfaction expectations of men are far greater than actual life satisfaction when compared to women which results in men being less satisfied with life.[5] Following previous work we test for a non-linear relationship between age and life satisfaction by including both an age and an age-squared variable. We expect life satisfaction to decline with age but reach a minimum point and then begin increasing. Possible explanations for this include individuals learning to adapt to their own reality in mid-life and re-align aspirations and expectations accordingly, or greater comparison with others as we age (Blanchard and Oswald, 2008).

A universal finding in the individual-level life satisfaction literature is that life satisfaction increases with income (e.g. Frijters et al, 2004; Kahneman and Deaton, 2010; Luttmer, 2005; Layard et al, 2010). We do not have information on personal or household income levels in our data. Instead we use self-reported information on whether someone has been fine in paying bills at the end of the month in the past year to form a dummy variable (1=fine to have paid bills, 0=from time to time or most of the time have not been able to pay monthly bills) and whether the person sees themselves or their household as belonging to the working class, lower middle class, middle class, upper middle class or upper class of society. Whilst class is more complex than income, we expect that life satisfaction increases with movement up the class ladder and include class as a single variable that takes a value of 1 to 5 for the five different classes. The economic activity of people is included as a group of dummy variables for whether the person is self-employed, a manager, another white collar worker, a manual worker, at home, unemployed or retired. We expect that people who are unemployed report significantly lower life satisfaction than people from any of the other categories, ceteris paribus, consistent with a negative scarring effect of being unemployed (Blanchflower & Oswald, 2004; Gerlach & Stephan, 1996; Helliwell, 2003; Winkelmann, 2009). Marital status is also included in a group of dummy variables (cohabit, single, married, divorced, widowed or other marital status). Generally it is found that those who are married report higher levels of life satisfaction than all other categories.

---

[5] A similar argument has been put forward to explain the finding that women report higher job satisfaction than men (Clark, 1997) although Green et al, (2018) find that, overtime, women's job expectations in Britain rise and this gender gap vanishes.

Education is captured by information contained in the question "How old were you when you stopped full-time education?", with higher scores assumed to be associated with higher levels of investment in education. We create three education dummy variables. The first for those who had no full time education or had up to 15 years of education; the second for those who had 16-19 years of education; and thirdly for those who had 20 years or more full time education. Previous research into the impact of education on life satisfaction is mixed. Some studies find that the more educated have higher life satisfaction (e.g., Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004; Easterlin, 2001; Ferrer-i-Carbonell, 2005; Graham and Pettinato, 2002) while others find the opposite (e.g., Flouri, 2004; Powdthavee, 2008; Shields, Wheatley-Price, and Wooden, 2009). That there is no universal finding with respect to a relationship between life satisfaction and education is unsurprising. Education is a determinant of income, employment status and marital status, which we control for in our model. There will thus be both an indirect impact on life satisfaction through these variables and a direct impact on life satisfaction.[6] Finally we include a dummy variable for whether someone lives in a large town (=1) or lives in a small or middle sized town or a rural area or village (=0). Previous work tends to find people who live in large towns or cities report significantly lower life satisfaction when compared to people who live in rural and less populated areas (e.g. Knight and Gunatilaka, 2010; Sorenson, 2014), with possible explanations for this being that people prefer living in rural areas but have to move to urban areas for work or there are mental health benefits from living closer to nature.[7]

Because of the possibility that people who are fearful of robots may be fearful or negative about many others things, or maybe this way inclined we also control for individual attitudes towards whether people think their country is heading in the right or wrong direction and whether they think the EU is heading in the right or wrong direction. We also create three dummy variables for whether people have a positive, neutral or negative image of the EU. The inclusion of these variables could reduce any correlation between fear of robots and life satisfaction and may reflect the possibility that fear of robots is part of a fear of many other things.

Country Effects
In order to capture life satisfaction differences between countries we include a group of country dummy variables for each of the 28 countries in the survey. The survey also has information on

---

[6] See work by Powdthavee et al (2015) who estimate both direct and indirect effects of education on life satisfaction.
[7] That nature may have positive mental health benefits draws on the environmental psychology literature. Examples include Van den Berg et al (2003), Hartig et al (2003) Stigsdotter et al (2010) and Korpela and Kinnunen (2011),

someone's nationality but we have not included this in our models since the paper's main focus is not on whether someone has migrated or not or on the impact identity has on life satisfaction.

Estimation Strategy

Normally in the life satisfaction literature estimates of life satisfaction are performed using either ordered probit or ordered logit models. However the work of Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters (2004) and Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Ramos (2014) highlighted that such non-linear models and ordinary least squares (OLS) produced qualitatively similar results, but OLS has the advantage of being easier to interpret. The complete model we estimate regresses individual life satisfaction of individual i from country j ($LS_{i,j}$) onto the average fear of robots ($\overline{Fear\ of\ Robots}_{i,j}$) variable, other individual-level controls, X and country dummies (Country),

$$LS_{i,j} = \beta_1 \overline{Fear\ of\ Robots}_{i,j} + \beta_k X_{i,j} + \beta_j Country_{i,j} + \varepsilon_{i,j}$$

We expect fear of robots to be associated with lower life satisfaction, meaning that $\beta_1 < 0$.

3. Results

We begin with a simple regression that controls just for the average fear of robots (Model 1) in Table 2. We see that fear of robots is negatively and significantly correlated with self-reported life satisfaction. A one-point increase in the average fear of robots will result in a decline in life satisfaction of 0.2 points. When we include individual characteristics, we see that the size of the coefficient on fear of robots declines slightly (Model 2), and again when country dummies are included (Model 3). However, the sign and significance of the fear of robot variables do not change. Finally Model 4 controls for the individual's views on whether their country and the EU is going in the wrong direction and whether they have a positive or negative view of the EU. All of these variables are as expected with negative views being associated with lower life satisfaction whilst holding a positive image of the EU is associated with higher life satisfaction. Their inclusion reduces the size of the fear of robots variable indicating that negative views on other things in life are correlated with a specific fear of robots. When we use the principle components measure of fear of robots in Table 3, the results are similar although the size of the coefficient on the fear of robot measure is smaller in each of the models.

Table 2 Life Satisfaction and Average Fear of Robots

VARIABLES	(1) LS	(2) LS	(3) LS	(4) LS
Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction (1=not at all satisfied; 2=not very satisfied; 3=Fairly satisfied; 4=very satisfied)				
Fear of Robots	-0.216***	-0.087***	-0.064***	-0.036***
Up to 15 years of education		-0.018	-0.033**	-0.023
20 years or more education		0.084***	0.024**	0.013
Self Employed		0.006	0.050**	0.045**
Manager		0.043**	0.033*	0.025
Other white collar employee		0.004	0.013	0.011
At home		0.001	-0.033	-0.031
Unemployed		-0.247***	-0.253***	-0.240***
Retired		-0.052***	-0.032*	-0.028*
Student		0.086***	0.058**	0.051**
Female		0.029***	0.038***	0.035***
Age		-0.021***	-0.022***	-0.021***
Age-squared		0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Social Class		0.114***	0.112***	0.103***
Fine to have paid bills		0.488***	0.353***	0.339***
Cohabit		-0.013	-0.072***	-0.066***
Single		-0.095***	-0.158***	-0.153***
Divorced		-0.159***	-0.205***	-0.197***
Widow		-0.176***	-0.165***	-0.162***
Other marital status		0.025	-0.055	-0.058
Urban		-0.021**	-0.018*	-0.019*
Things wrong with own country				-0.085***
Things wrong with the EU				-0.025**
Positive view of EU				0.088***
Negative view of EU				-0.083***
Country Dummies	No	No	Yes	Yes
Constant	3.489***	3.114***	3.215***	3.267***
Observations	19,741	19,741	19,741	19,741
R-squared	0.036	0.235	0.333	0.341
F-Statistic	747.7	289.1	196.9	193.5

Notes: Reference groups are 16-19 years of education, manual employee, male, not fine to have paid the bills, married and living in a rural area or small town. The country reference group is Croatia. Significance levels *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 3 Life Satisfaction and Fear of Robots (PCA)

VARIABLES	(1) LS	(2) LS	(3) LS	(4) LS
Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction				
PCA Fear of Robots	-0.087***	-0.035***	-0.027***	-0.021***
Up to 15 years of education		-0.018	-0.033**	-0.023
20 years or more education		0.084***	0.024**	0.013
Self Employed		0.007	0.050**	0.045**
Manager		0.044**	0.033*	0.025
Other white collar employee		0.004	0.013	0.011
At home		0.001	-0.033	-0.031
Unemployed		-0.247***	-0.253***	-0.240***
Retired		-0.051***	-0.031*	-0.028*
Student		0.087***	0.058**	0.050**
Female		0.029***	0.038***	0.035***
Age		-0.021***	-0.022***	-0.021***
Age-squared		0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Social Class		0.114***	0.112***	0.103***
Fine to have paid bills		0.488***	0.352***	0.338***
Cohabit		-0.013	-0.072***	-0.066***
Single		-0.094***	-0.158***	-0.153***
Divorced		-0.159***	-0.205***	-0.197***
Widow		-0.175***	-0.164***	-0.162***
Other marital status		0.025	-0.055	-0.058
Urban		-0.021**	-0.017*	-0.019*
Things wrong with own country				-0.085***
Things wrong with the EU				-0.025**
Positive view of EU				0.088***
Negative view of EU				-0.083***
Country Dummies	No	No	Yes	Yes
Constant	3.013***	2.920***	3.073***	3.108***
Observations	19,741	19,741	19,741	19,741
R-squared	0.035	0.235	0.334	0.347
F	725.8	288.9	197.1	193.7

*Notes: Reference groups are 16-19 years of education, manual employee, male, not fine to have paid the bills, married and living in a rural area or small town. The country reference group is Croatia. Significance levels *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$.*

The individual controls themselves confirm previous research into correlates of life satisfaction. Life satisfaction has a U-shaped relationship with age. Women report significantly higher life satisfaction than men. There is strong evidence too that life satisfaction increases with the level of education someone has. Those with 20 years of more education report significantly higher life satisfaction levels relative to those with 16-19 years of full time education. The unemployed are the least satisfied with life compared to manual workers, whilst those in better quality jobs report higher levels of life satisfaction. People who are married (the reference group) report significantly higher life satisfaction levels than people who co-habit, are single, divorced, widowed or have another relationship status. People who report being in a higher social class or people who had no problems paying bills in the last month both report higher life satisfaction, conforming to a priories. Residing in a small or large town compared to living in a rural area has no statistical impact on life satisfaction. Finally, individuals who hold negative views of where their country is going and where the EU is going report significantly lower levels of life satisfaction, whilst people with a positive image of the EU report significantly higher levels of life satisfaction.

These findings suggest that people's fears of robots are correlated with their life satisfaction. In order to understand better whether this fear of robots is driven by particular groups of people we estimated models for just the employed. This group of people may be expected to be more fearful of robots with respect to their employment today and tomorrow and so the negative correlation with life satisfaction would be larger. The results in Table 4 illustrate a negative and significant correlation between fear of robots and life satisfaction with the size of the correlation slightly smaller if compared to the results in Tables 2 and 3. In Table 5 we analyse the relationship between fear of robots and life satisfaction for different age groups. All of the models illustrate a negative correlation between fear of robots and life satisfaction but this relationship is significant only for those aged between 31-40, 41-50 and those above 60 years of age. In terms of magnitude those between 41-50 years of age report the largest negative correlation with life satisfaction. This suggests that more experienced workers are more fearful of robots than those aged between 15 and 30 years.

Table 4 Life Satisfaction of Workers

VARIABLES	(1) LS	(2) LS
Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction		
Fear of Robots	-0.038***	
PCA Fear of Robots		-0.016***
Up to 15 years of education	-0.046*	-0.046*
20 years or more education	0.011	0.011
Self Employed	0.056***	0.056***
Manager	0.045**	0.045**
Other white collar employee	0.022	0.022
Female	0.011	0.011
Age	-0.019***	-0.019***
Age-squared	0.000***	0.000***
Social Class	0.097***	0.097***
Fine to have paid bills	0.318***	0.318***
Cohabit	-0.053***	-0.053***
Single	-0.146***	-0.146***
Divorced	-0.172***	-0.172***
Widow	-0.201***	-0.201***
Other marital status	-0.132	-0.133
Urban	-0.020	-0.020
Things wrong with own country	-0.097***	-0.097***
Things wrong with the EU	-0.006	-0.006
Positive view of EU	0.084***	0.084***
Negative view of EU	-0.074***	-0.074***
Country Dummies	*Yes*	*Yes*
Constant	3.116***	3.061***
Observations	9,571	9,571
R-squared	0.323	0.323
F	90.64	90.67

*Notes: Reference groups are 16-19 years of education, manual employee, male, not fine to have paid the bills, married and living in a rural area or small town. The country reference group is Croatia. Significance levels *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.*

Table 5 Life Satisfaction by Age Group

VARIABLES	(1) Age<30	(2) 30-39	(3) 40-49	(4) 50-59	(5) 60+
Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction					
Fear of Robots	-0.003	-0.037*	-0.046**	-0.019	-0.038***
Up to 15 years of education	-0.100	-0.055	-0.027	-0.039	-0.000
20 years or more education	0.013	0.010	0.023	0.007	0.013
Self Employed	0.023	0.089**	0.052	0.034	-0.015
Manager	0.064	0.041	0.015	0.025	-0.017
Other white collar employee	-0.050	0.040	0.027	-0.009	-0.020
At home	-0.110*	-0.014	-0.074	-0.049	0.008
Unemployed	-0.229***	-0.196***	-0.269***	-0.310***	-0.139**
Retired		-0.159*	-0.122**	-0.140***	-0.016
Student	0.105***	0.298***	-0.113	0.081	-0.262
Female	0.021	0.072***	0.005	0.050**	0.031*
Social Class	0.086***	0.127***	0.109***	0.100***	0.089***
Fine to have paid bills	0.245***	0.330***	0.328***	0.386***	0.360***
Cohabit	-0.079**	-0.022	-0.064*	-0.109***	-0.074*
Single	-0.121***	-0.158***	-0.198***	-0.150***	-0.159***
Divorced	-0.297***	-0.372***	-0.219***	-0.167***	-0.135***
Widow	-0.097	-0.476***	-0.441***	-0.173***	-0.123***
Other marital status	0.013	-0.318	-0.137	-0.132	-0.284
Urban	-0.065**	-0.013	0.004	-0.043*	-0.000
Things wrong with own country	-0.047	-0.091***	-0.121***	-0.083***	-0.073***
Things wrong with the EU	-0.055*	0.010	0.005	-0.031	-0.037*
Positive view of EU	0.120***	0.066***	0.064***	0.079***	0.102***
Negative view of EU	-0.104***	-0.016	-0.148***	-0.079**	-0.073***
Country Dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	2.805***	2.589***	2.689***	2.544***	2.730***
Observations	3,071	3,075	3,438	3,447	6,710
R-squared	0.251	0.336	0.389	0.383	0.376
F	19.87	29.41	41.51	40.59	76.99

*Notes: Reference groups are 16-19 years of education, manual employee, male, not fine to have paid the bills, married and living in a rural area or small town. The country reference group is Croatia. Significance levels *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$.*

Robustness Checks

Whilst including country dummies in our regressions is a way of controlling for between country differences and their impact on life satisfaction, this fails to differentiate between country-level and individual-level components and how they correlate with life satisfaction. It is also possible that individuals' fears of robots are correlated with the macro-economic environment and institutions of a country, as found by Dekker et al (2017) and acts as a robustness test to our previous findings. We use a linear multi-level regression model that recognizes that the macro-economic environment and institutions of a country may impact on the life satisfaction of individuals and may correlate with people's fears of robots. The regression informs the researcher of how much of the variance in individual life satisfaction is due to country-level and individual-level components. We include two country-level macro-economic variables, GDP per capita and the unemployment rate. We also include the trade union density of each country since this may reflect the power of workers in a country to voice their concerns about a range of issues including job insecurity, earnings and work conditions. Finally we include a variable for average job strain in a country, calculated by the OECD, that measures the quality of the work environment. Unfortunately, some of these variables are not available for Northern Ireland, Cyprus, Malta, Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia so our sample size is smaller than previously.

The results of the multi-level analysis are reported in Table 6. All models include a random intercept at the country level. Model 1 reports that 19.2% of the total variation in individual level life satisfaction is due to cross-country differences $((0.102/(0.433+0.102))=19.1\%)$ meaning a multi-level approach is appropriate. Model 2 includes individual level controls which are all similar sizes and significance levels to those reported in the OLS regression in Table 2. When country-level variables are included in Model 3, we see that people living in countries with high levels of job strain report significantly lower levels of life satisfaction, with all other macro-economic variables insignificant. The estimation of these models has no impact on either the size or significance of the fear of robot coefficient. For a comparison Model 4 represents the equivalent OLS regression which includes country dummies. The coefficient on fear of robots remains similar to that in Model 3.

The forced exclusion of some countries from Table 6 is not ideal but the slightly larger correlation between fear of robots and life satisfaction in this sample leads us to think that estimating the model for old and new EU country members may reveal some difference in this correlation through peoples' views of the EU and the performance of their own country. We grouped together the founding countries of the EU union with those that joined in 1973. We then grouped

Greece, Spain and Portugal together since they joined in the 1980s. Austria, Finland and Sweden were grouped as they all joined in 1995. The final group represent former communist party countries who joined in 2004 and 2007. Table 7 shows that fear of robots is significant amongst older member countries; amongst Austria, Finland and Sweden and amongst former communist countries who joined the EU in the 2000s. When we run the same analysis but remove the four variables on image of the EU and how the EU and how the country is performing we see a clearer relationship. Table 7 shows that the fear of robot coefficient doubles in size for people from Greece, Spain and Portugal (Column 4) and for people from former communist countries (Column 8) when we do not control for views on EU and country performance. The coefficient increases by approximately a half for people from countries who founded the EU and who joined in 1973 (Column 3) and for people from Austria, Finland and Sweden (Column 6).

Table 6 Life Satisfaction (Multi-Level Regression)

VARIABLES	(1) LS	(2) LS	(3) LS	(4) LS
Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction				
Fear of Robots		-0.042***	-0.042***	-0.043***
Up to 15 years of education		-0.034**	-0.034**	-0.035**
20 years or more education		0.003	0.002	0.003
Self Employed		0.032	0.033	0.033
Manager		0.027	0.027	0.026
Other white collar employee		0.002	0.003	0.003
At home		-0.007	-0.007	-0.009
Unemployed		-0.250***	-0.249***	-0.250***
Retired		-0.034*	-0.034*	-0.034*
Student		0.063**	0.062**	0.062**
Female		0.040***	0.040***	0.040***
Age		-0.019***	-0.019***	-0.019***
Age-squared		0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Social Class		0.103***	0.103***	0.101***
Fine to have paid bills		0.337***	0.337***	0.337***
Cohabit		-0.060***	-0.060***	-0.060***
Single		-0.144***	-0.144***	-0.143***
Divorced		-0.192***	-0.193***	-0.192***
Widow		-0.160***	-0.161***	-0.160***
Other marital status		-0.047	-0.047	-0.047
Urban		-0.028***	-0.028***	-0.026**
Things wrong with own country		-0.080***	-0.080***	-0.080***
Things wrong with the EU		-0.026**	-0.026**	-0.026**

16

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Positive view of EU		0.094***	0.094***	0.094***
Negative view of EU		-0.074***	-0.074***	-0.074***
Country Dummies	*No*	*No*	*No*	*Yes*
GDP per capita			0.050*	
Unemployment Rate			0.040	
TU Density			0.053	
Job Strain			-0.156***	
Constant	3.046***	3.237***	3.232***	3.656***
Variance Country Level	0.102	0.057	0.016	
Variance Individual Level	0.433	0.351	0.351	
Observations	17,018	17,018	17,018	17,018
Number of groups	23	23	23	

Notes: Reference groups are 16-19 years of education, manual employee, male, not fine to have paid the bills, married and living in a rural area or small town. The country reference group is Croatia. Significance levels *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 7 Life Satisfaction by when Country joined the European Union with and without views on EU and own Country

VARIABLES	(1) LS	(2) LS	(3) LS	(4) LS	(5) LS	(6) LS	(7) LS	(8) LS
Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction								
fear_robot_average2 (including EU and Country views)	-0.041***		-0.033		-0.076***		-0.024**	
fear_robot_average2 (excluding EU and Country views)		-0.065***		-0.070***		-0.102***		-0.058***
Things wrong with own country	-0.046**		-0.167***		-0.032		-0.112***	
Things wrong with the EU	-0.062***		0.032		-0.082***		0.029	
Positive view of EU	0.086***		0.116***		0.049*		0.102***	
Negative view of EU	-0.009		-0.185***		-0.009		-0.168***	
Constant	2.994***		3.307***		3.386***		3.320***	
Observations	6,451		2,224		2,309		7,222	
R-squared	0.310		0.322		0.209		0.266	

F	84.76	38.66	22.35	74.37

4. Discussion

The seemingly inevitable automation of how we produce and consume things is likely to transform peoples' lives. Whether this is necessarily for the better is unknown but much research points to a negative impact on earnings and employment of certain types of workers. This paper is interested in understanding whether a fear of robots has any correlation with current levels of life satisfaction. By using a data set with questions that asked about peoples' views on robots we found that a fear of robots does significantly correlate with a lower life satisfaction for a number of different model specifications. People who are employed or unemployed and have a fear of robots also report lower life satisfaction but the size of this impact is smaller compared to when we include students, people who work at home and people who are retired in the analysis. This may reflect workers being more open to working with robots and alongside robots or having adapted to working with and alongside robots. There is, as yet, little work that asks whether worker attitudes towards robots and new technologies impacts on their own life or job satisfaction. Brougham and Haar (2018) is one of the few studies to do so with more than a handful of employees. They find evidence that new technologies (defined as Smart Technology, Artificial Intelligence, Robotics, and Algorithms) are associated with lower job satisfaction and greater turnover intentions and depression.

More importantly we found that peoples' views on whether they saw their country and the EU in a positive or negative light correlates with our fear of robot measures. This gives weight to the argument that measuring fear of robots reflects to a greater or to a lesser extent a deeper rooted fear, or negative and positives views, or optimistic and pessimistic views on a variety of things. When we test across a number of different groups, it is clear that views about the state of one's country or of the EU or of the image of the EU reduce the size of the association of fear of robots on life satisfaction. Noticeably when placing countries into groups based on how long they have been a member of the EU we find that people from countries who are the oldest members of the EU, and people living in Finland, Sweden or Austria (Group 3) retain the largest and most significant decline in life satisfaction from fear of robots before and after controlling for their views on their own country and the EU. This suggests that amongst people from within these two groups of countries there could well be a greater fear of robots.

18

Limitations

The correlation of fear of robots with whether people think the country or the EU is heading in the right direction raises questions as to whether robots are detrimental to life satisfaction or whether this reflects deeper traits of individuals towards being negative or positive, pessimistic or optimistic, trusting or distrusting, or being fearful of anything new in life. This ensures that we interpret the correlations in the paper with a good degree of caution. The psychological nature of fear means that taking into account the individual's personality is important. Penley and Tomaka (2002) for example find fear is correlated with four of McCrae and Costa's Big-5 personality dimensions. That these factors are omitted from our analysis means the correlations are likely to be biased upwards in their size. However, these traits are also likely to impact on many of the other individual controls. For example someone's marital status or whether someone is employed or not and in what type of job. This means all of our coefficients are potentially biased. What we can say is that people's attitudes towards robots, whether they are caused by a fear of robots or by the predictable psychological traits of the person or both, can result in robots and other technologies such as artificial intelligence not being wanted by people with this impacting on the current life satisfaction of people.

Causality is also an issue since as well as fear of robots reducing life satisfaction there is also the possibility that someone with a low level of life satisfaction will be more fearful of robots or indeed more fearful of many others things since they are possibly feeling vulnerable. The issue of endogeneity is something that requires repeat cross-sectional data or better still a panel data set that asks questions about people's views about robots and their experiences of using robots as well as their life satisfaction and ideally health satisfaction and mental health satisfaction. This should also be extended to asking people about their attitudes towards other technologies such as artificial intelligence. Present data sets do not have this level of information meaning we can only ever interpret coefficients as correlations and be aware that there are likely to be correlations between our explanatory variables and any fear of robots measure.

5. Conclusion

Technological change is one of the driving forces of capitalism. The latest economic research predicts that the current level of robotic usage or an increased rate of robotic usage will have detrimental effects on both employment and earnings in a variety of occupations and industries in high income countries. We find that a fear of robots is associated with lower life satisfaction but

that more research needs to be undertaken in order to understand whether these fears are traits within people or specific to robots and to instrument for fear of robots to test for causality. We call for more research into people's attitudes towards technology and new technologies in particular, how these attitudes impact on current life satisfaction and other aspects of quality of life and to think more about how technological change and people's attitudes towards technology can be more collaborative.

References

Acemoglu, D., and Restrepo, P., (2017) "Robots and Jobs: Evidence from US Labor Markets," *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. w23285.*

Alexopoulos, M., and Cohen, J., (2016) "The Medium Is the Measure: Technical Change and Employment, 1909–1949." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 98(4), pp. 792–810.

Anelli, M., Colantone, I., Stanig, P., 2018. We were the robots: Automation and voting behavior in western europe. Bocconi University{Mimeo}.

Blanchard, D., and Oswald, A., (2008) "Is well-being U-shaped over the life cycle?" *Social Science and Medicine* 66(8):1733-1749.

Blanchflower D, Oswald AJ. Well-being over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics.* 2004;88(7):1359–1386.

Brougham, D., & Haar, J. (2018). Smart Technology, Artificial Intelligence, Robotics, and Algorithms (STARA): Employees' perceptions of our future workplace. *Journal of Management & Organization,* 24(2), 239-257.

Brynjolffson, E., and McAfee, A., (2014) *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies.* New York, NY: W.W. Norton

Clark, A.E., (1997), "Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work?", *Labour Economics*, 4(4), 341-372.

Dekker., F,, Salomons, A and van der Waal, J., (2017), "Fear of robots at work: the role of economic self-interest", *Socio-Economic Review*, 2017, Vol. 15, No. 3, 539–562.

Easterlin RA. Income and happiness: Towards a unified theory. *Economic Journal.* 2001;111(473):465–484

Elsby, M.W.L, Hobijn, B.,, Şahin, A., (2013), "The Decline of the U.S. Labor Share", Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Brookings Institution Press, 1-63

Ferrer-i-Carbonell A, Frijters P. How important is methodology for the estimates of the determinants of happiness. *Economic Journal.* 2004;114(497):641–659

Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A., and Ramos, X (2014), "Inequality and Happiness", *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 28(5), 1016-1027.

Ferrer-i-Carbonell A. (2005), "Income and well-being: An empirical analysis of the comparison income effect". *Journal of Public Economics.* 89(5–6):997–1019.

Flouri E. (2004), "Subjective well-being in midlife: The role of involvement of and closeness to parents in childhood. *Journal of Happiness Studies.* 5(4):335–358.

Freeman, R., (2015), "Who owns the robots rules the world: Workers can benefit from technology that substitutes robots or other machines for their work by owning part of the capital that replaces them", *IZA World of Labor: Evidence-based policy making.*

Frey, C. B., Berger, T., Chen, C., 2017. Political machinery: automation anxiety and the 2016 us presidential election. University of Oxford.

Frey, Carl B. and Michael A. Osborne (2017) "The Future of Employment: How Susceptible Are Jobs to Computerisation?" *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol 114, pp. 254–280.

Frijters, P., Haisken-DeNew, J.P., and Shields, M.A., (2004), " Money Does Matter! Evidence from Increasing Real Income and Life Satisfaction in East Germany Following Reunification, *American Economic Review*, 94(3), 730-740.

Gerlach, K., and Stephan, G., (1996), "A paper on unhappiness and unemployment in Germany", *Economic Letters*, 52(3), 325-330.

Goos, M., and Manning, A., (2007): "Lousy and Lovely Jobs: The Rising Polarization of Work in Britain," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89(1), 118–133

Giuntella, O., and Wang, T., (2019) "Is an Army of Robots Marching on Chinese Jobs?", *IZA Discussion Paper No. 12281*

Graham C, Pettinato S. Happiness and Hardship: Opportunity and Insecurity in New Market Economies. Brookings Institution Press; Washington DC: 2002

Green, C., J. Heywood, P. Kler, and G. Leeves, (2018), "Paradox Lost: Disappearing Female Job Satisfaction," *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, forthcoming.

Kahneman, D., and Deaton, A., (2010), "High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being", *PNAS*, 107(38), 16489-16493

Knight, J., and Gunatilaka, R., (2010) The rural–urban divide in China: Income but not happiness?, *Journal of Development Studies* 46, 506–534

Habibov, N. & Afandi, E. (2015), "Pre- and Post-crisis Life-Satisfaction and Social Trust in Transitional Countries: An Initial Assessment", *Social Indicators Research* 121(2), 503-524.

Hartig, T., Evans G. W., Jamner L. D., Davis D. S. and Garling T. (2003) Tracking restoration in natural and urban field settings, *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 23, 109–123.

Hudson, J., Orviska, M and Hunady, J., (2017), "People's Attitudes to Robots in Caring for the Elderly", *Int J of Soc Robotics* 9:199–210.

Kaiser, H. F. 1974. An index of factor simplicity. *Psychometrika* 39: 31-36.

Karabarbounis, L., and Neiman, B., (2014), "Capital depreciation and labor shares around the world: Measurement and Implications", *Working Paper 20606*.

Korpela, K., and Kinnunen, U., (2011) "How is leisure time interacting with nature related to the need for recovery from work demands? Testing multiple mediators", *Leisure Sciences* 33, 1–14.

Layard, R., Mayraz, G., and Nickell, S., (2010) Does Relative Income Matter? Are the Critics Right? in *International Difference in Well-Being* (eds) Ed Diener, Daniel Kahneman and John Helliwell, Oxford University Press, Inc New York.

Luttmer, E.F.P., (2005), "Neighbors as Negatives: Relative Earnings and Well-Being", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(3), 963–1002.

T. Nomura, T. Kanda, and T. Suzuki, (2006), "Experimental investigation into influence of negative attitudes toward robots on human–robot interaction," *AI Soc.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 138–150.

OECD. *OECD Employment Outlook 2012*. Paris: OECD, 2012.

Penley, J.Ja. and Tomaka, J., (2002) Associations among the Big Five, emotional responses, and coping with acute stress, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32(7), 1215-122

Powdthavee N. Putting a price tag on friends, relatives, and neighbors: Using surveys of life-satisfaction to value social relationships. *Journal of Socio-Economics*. 2008;37(4):1459–1480.

Shields MA, Wheatley-Price S, Wooden M., (2009), "Life satisfaction and the economic and social characteristics of neighborhoods". *Journal of Population Economics*, 22(2):421–443.

Sørensen, J.F.L (2014) Rural–Urban Differences in Life Satisfaction: Evidence from the European Union, *Regional Studies*, 48:9, 1451-1466.

Stigsdotter, U.K., Ekholm, O., Schipperun, J., Toftager, M., Kamper-Jorgensen, F., and Randrup, T.B., (2010) Health promoting outdoor environments. Associations between green space, and health, health-related quality of life and stress based on a Danish national representative survey, *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health* 38, 411–417.

Taipale S, de Luca F, Sarrica M, Fortunati L (2015) Robot shift from industrial production to social reproduction. In: Vincent J, Taipale S, Sapio B, Lugano G, Fortunati L (eds) *Social robots from a human perspective*. Springer, Berlin, pp 11–24.

Van den Berg, A.E., Kooles, S.L. and Van der Wulp, N.Y., (2003) Environmental preference and restoration: (how) are they related?, *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 23, 135–146.

Winkelmann, R., (2009), "Unemployment, Social Capital and Subjective Well-Being", *Journal of Happiness Studies* 10(4), 412-430.

Winkelmann, L., and Winkelmann, R., (1998), "Why are the Unemployed so Unhappy? Evidence from Panel Data", Economica, 65(257), 1-15.

Recent UWE Economics Papers
See https://www1.uwe.ac.uk/bl/research/bcef/publications.aspx for a full list.

2019

1901 **Education and the Geography of Brexit**
Robert Calvert Jump and Jo Michell

2018

1807 **Learning, Heterogeneity, and Complexity in the New Keynesian Model**
Robert Calvert Jump, Cars Hommes, and Paul Levine

1806 **DSGE Models and the Lucas Critique. A Historical Appraisal**
Francesco Sergi

1805 **A new approach to estimating interregional output multipliers using input-output data for South Korean regions**
Malte Jahn, Anthony T. Flegg and Timo Tohmo

1804 **Urban food security in the context of inequality and dietary change: a study of school children in Accra**
Sara Stevano, Deborah Johnston and Emmanuel Codjoe

1803 **The use of differential weighting and discounting in degree algorithms and their impact on classification inflation and equity: A further analysis**
David O. Allen

1802 **Unambiguous inference in sign-restricted VAR models**
Robert Calvert Jump

1801 **Degree algorithms, grade inflation and equity: the UK higher education sector**
David O. Allen

2017

1706 **Internal rationality, heterogeneity and complexity in the new Keynesian model**
Cars Hommes, Robert Calvert Jump and Paul Levine

1705 **The regionalization of national input□output tables: a study of South Korean regions**
Anthony T. Flegg and Timo Tohmo

1704 **The impact of quantitative easing on aggregate mutual fund flows in the UK**
Iris Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal