

Section on a specific subject from:

DATABOOK OF HAPPINESS

A complementary reference work to
Conditions of Happiness

Ruut Veenhoven
with the assistance of Ton Jonkers
Erasmus University Rotterdam

D.Reidel Publishing Company
Member of Kluwer Academic Publishers Group
1984
Dordrecht/Boston/Lancaster

ISBN 90-277-1793-1

I 1 INCOME

I 1.1 Level of income (money)

I 1.2 Perceived sufficiency of income

I 1.3 Debts

I 1.4 Satisfaction with income, standard of living . . see A 2.2.14, S 1.8.3,
S 1.9.2

I 1.5 Concerns about income, money

I 1.6 Various indicators of income, standard of living

I 1.7 Change in income

I 1.1 - LEVEL OF INCOME (MONEY)

INCOME	low / medium / high		HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .38	Gt'	01	Adult population of 5 Westernized nations, 3 underdeveloped giants, 2 countries in the Middle East, 3 Caribbean nations & Representative samples The Philippines N: 18653, date: ± 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 259
ECONOMIC STATUS	Classification by the interviewer lower / middle / upper		HAPP 1.1	G'	+ .24	Gt'	01	National adult population, U.S.A. Non-probability quota sample N: 2377, date: February, 1946	WESSM 56 p. 184
INCOME	less than average / average / greater than average	See remarks in excerpt (Part II). In 1946: negroes: G' = +.15 (ns) whites: G' = +.24 (01) In 1966: negroes: G' = -.32 (05) whites: G' = +.26 (01)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+	Gt'		National adult populations, U.S.A. Non-probability quota samples and probability area samples N: 25617, date: 1946, 1947, 1948, 1956, 1966	MANNI 72 p. 50
INCOME		Unaffected by educational level	HAPP 1.1		+		s	Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage area sample N: 2460, date: spring, 1957	GURIN 60 p. 216
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	Cantril's book did not offer enough information to decide whether 'income' or 'S.E.S' was measured here.	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .25	Gt'	01	National adult population, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 1549, date: 1959	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
ECONOMIC LEVEL	income lower / middle / upper one-third		HAPP 2.1	r	+ .15			National adult population, U.S.A. Cantril (1965) modified probability sample N: 1406, date: 1959	BORTN 70 p. 44
			HAPP 3.1	r	+ .19				
			CON 1.1	r	+ .16				
INCOME	lower / lower middle / upper middle / upper	See remarks in excerpt (Part II). lower : Mean = 5.93 (6.27) lower middle: Mean = 6.48 (6.52) upper middle: Mean = 6.76 (7.03) upper : Mean = 7.49 (7.41)	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			Non-institutionalized national adult population, U.S.A. Multi-stage probability sample, stratified by size of locality N: 1588, date: January, 1971 (+ 1964)	CANTR 71 p. 66
INCOME	4-point scale	Gamma based on proportions 'very happy' answers. Stronger among whites: G' = +.19 (01) Not among blacks : G' = -.01 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+ .21	Gt'	01	Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. Type of sample construction unclear N: 1602, date: March, 1972	ALSTO 74 p. 100

INCOME			HAPP 3.1 (1st instr.)	h^2	.18			National adult population, U.S.A. Probability area sample (first sample) N: 1297, date: May, 1972	ANDRE 74 p. 20
FAMILY INCOME	12-point scale	Unaffected by age (under 65 vs 65+) Unaffected by S.E.S.	HAPP 1.1	r_{pm}	+ .13	01		Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 1547, date: 1972, 1973	SPREI 74 p. 455/457
INCOME	8-point scale	Stronger among those of lower educational level Stronger among older Ss	HAPP 1.1	G'	+ .29	Gt'	01	Inhabitants of 4 small communities, Illinois, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage samples N: 2006, date: March, 1962	BRADB 65/1 p. 9/23
	4-point scale		AFF 2.3	G'	+ .26	Gt'	01		
INCOME	10-point scale	Significant among those of lower educational levels (less than high school graduate) and among high school graduates under the age of 35 only (05). Unaffected by number of children. Index of Positive Affects: $\overline{DR} = +.25$ (05) Index of Negative Affects: $\overline{DR} = -.10$ (05) Computation of Gamma on the basis of a 3-point scale: less than \$ 5,000 / 5,000-7,999 / 8,000 and more	AFF 2.3	\overline{DR}	+ .25	BCI	05	Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. Probability area samples N: 2787, date: January, 1963 - January, 1964	BRADB 69 p. 45/91/ 95/99
			HAPP 1.1	G'	+ .33				
INCOME	Closed question on total income during last year 16-point scale	L-shaped curve: Stronger among lower income levels. Slightly stronger among persons of age 46-59.	HAPP 3.1	r_{pm}	+ .10			People of 46 and older, Duke, U.S.A. Probability systematic random sample, stratified by age and sex N: 502, date: 1968	PALMO 72 p. 70
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	Cantril's book did not offer enough information to decide whether 'income' or 'S.E.S.' was measured.	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .88	Gt'	01	National adult population, Dominican Republic Probability samples N: 814, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	See above	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .52	Gt'	01	National adult population, Panama Probability sample, proportionally poststratified by dwelling and mortality N: 642, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	See above	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .16	Gt'	01	National adult population, Cuba Probability area sample N: 992, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
INCOME	8-point scale	Unaffected by educational level. Stronger among those of age 50+ Lower in rural areas ($Q = +.13$)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+ .20	Gt'	01	National adult population, Puerto Rico Probability simple random sample	MATLI 66 p. 22
			AFF 2.3	G'	+ .19	Gt'	01	N: 1417, date: November, 1963 - January, 1964 and August, 1964 - October 1964	
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	See above at Cantril's sample from the Dominican Republic.	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .38	Gt'	01	National adult population, Brazil Probability samples N: 2168, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	lower vs upper	See above Stronger among those who have no children (01) Lower among those who have children (01)	HAPP 3.1	DM	+	DMRT	01	Married adults in the Dominican Republic, Panama and Yugoslavia Pooling of the Cantril (1965) samples of the Dominican Republic, Panama and Yugoslavia N: 4113, date: + 1960	BOHN 72 p. 31
FAMILY INCOME	low / average / high		HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .24	Gt'	01	National populations of nine European countries Type of sample construction not reported N: 9605 (9543), date: May, 1975	COMMI 75 p. 139/153
			HAPP 1.1	G'	+ .21	Gt'	01		
INCOME	2-point scale	low income : Mean = 5.25 high income: Mean = 6.70	HAPP 2.1	DM	+			National population, Britain Non-probability quota sample N: 213, date: March, 1971	ABRAM 73 p. 4

SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	Cantril's book did not offer enough information to decide whether 'income' or 'S.E.S.' was measured.	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .23	Gt'	01	National population, W. Germany Probability area sample N: 480, date: \pm 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 370-380
INCOME	4-point scale		HAPP 1.1	G'	+ .19	Gt'	05	National adult population, The Netherlands N: at least 1000, date: 1948	NIPO 49 p. 4
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	See above	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .22	Gt'	01	National adult population, Yugoslavia Probability sample N: 1523, date: \pm 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	See above	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .55	Gt'	01	National population, Israel Probability sample N: 1170, date: \pm 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
INCOME	lower / middle / upper	Lower income group : Mean = 4.0 Middle income group: Mean = 5.5 Upper income group : Mean = 6.5	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			National population, Israel Probability sample N: 1170, date: \pm 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 369
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	See above at Cantril's sample from W. Germany	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .52	Gt'	01	National adult population, Nigeria Probability sample, proportionally stratified by dwelling and region N: 1200, date: \pm 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	See above	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .42	Gt'	01	National population, India Probability sample, proportionally poststratified by dwelling N: 2366, date: 1958	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
INCOME	4-point scale	Lowest income group : Mean = 3.0 Second income group : Mean = 3.8 Third income group : Mean = 4.3 Highest income group: Mean = 4.9	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			National population, India Probability sample, proportionally poststratified by dwelling N: 2366, date: 1958	CANTR 65/1 p. 368
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	lower; lower middle / middle / upper middle; upper	See above at Cantril's sample from W. Germany Upper, upper middle: Mean = 5.8 Middle : Mean = 5.3 Lower middle, lower: Mean = 4.3	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			National adult population, Japan Probability sample N: 972, date: \pm 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 370
SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL	low / middle / high	See above at Cantril's sample from W. Germany	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .44	Gt'	01	National adult population, The Philippines Probability sample, proportionally poststratified by dwelling N: 500, ate: \pm 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
HOUSEHOLD INCOME		Lower among males : G = +.21 Stronger among females: G = +.38	HAPP 1.1	G	+			Adults, Metro Manila, Philippines Probability area sample N: 941, date: January - April, 1972 ⁷	BULAT 73 p. 234-235
		males : G = +.53 females: G = +.50	HAPP 3.1	G	+				
		Index of Positive Affects: males : G = +.25 females: G = +.26 Index of Negative Affects: males : G = +.14 females: G = +.06	AFF 2.3	G	+				

SPECIAL GROUPS:

INCOME	Husband's income rated on a 3-point scale		HAPP 1.1	r_{pm}	+ .21			Housewives, The Netherlands Probability area sample N: 450, date: autumn, 1964	PHILI 66 p. 66
INCOME	4-point scale	Stronger among the handicapped: $G' = +.49$ (01) Lower among normals : $G' = +.09$ (ns)	HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .31	Gt'	01	Physically defective and normal persons, Detroit, U.S.A. Non-probability purposive samples N: 295, date: —	CAMER 71 p. 641
INCOME	4-point scale	Stronger among the handicapped: $r = +.34$ (01) Lower among normals : $r = +.11$ (ns)	HAPP 2.1	r	+			CAMER 71 sample; See above	CAMER 73/1 p. 209
INCOME	4-point scale		HAPP 2.1				ns	Physically handicapped and normal persons, U.S.A. Non-probability purposive samples N: 90, date: —	CAMER 73/2 p. 211
TOTAL ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME		L- shaped curve: Significant among lower income levels only (below \$ 4,000).	AFF 1.1		+	Chi^2	s	Aged persons, Metropolitan Boston, U.S.A. Probability area sample N: 1335, date: 1965	FOWLE 69. p. 734
INCOME	Clinic fee rating based on an evaluation of the patient's total financial situation 3-point scale	When among the lowest income category the welfare Ss were compared with those dependent on Social Security or relatives, welfare status appears to be negatively related to happiness: $G' = -.79$ (01).	HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .37	Gt'	01	Aged chronically-ill patients, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 167, date: 1959	HENLE 67 p. 70
INCOME	4-point scale: less than \$ 3,999 / 4,000 - 4,999 / 5,000 - 7,999 / 8,000 or more	Those with incomes between \$ 5,000 and \$ 7,999 generally are less happy than those with incomes of \$ 4,000 - 4,999.	HAPP 1.1	t_{kc}	+ .15			Non-hospitalized schizophrenic males, Monroe County, New York, U.S.A. Probability sample, drawn from the Monroe County psychiatric case register N: 178, date: 1964 - 1965	ALEXA 68 p. 97/108
				G	+ .26				
<u>1.1.2 - PERCEIVED SUFFICIENCY OF INCOME</u>									
SUFFICIENT FAMILY INCOME	Closed question ranging from 'insufficient' to 'definitely sufficient'		HAPP 1.1	mc	+ .35			Urban adult Jewish population, Israel Probability area sample, using dwelling units N: 1940, date: spring, 1973	LEVY 75/1 p. 372
SUFFICIENT FAMILY INCOME	Closed question		HAPP 1.1	mc	+ .29			Urban adult Jewish population, Israel Probability area sample, using dwelling units N: 1830, date: summer, 1973	LEVY 75/2 p. 373
PERCEIVED FINANCIAL ADEQUACY	Closed question: not enough to manage on / just enough to get by / comfortable		HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .92	Gt'	01	Aged chronically-ill patients, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 167, date: 1959	HENLE 67 p. 70

I 1.3 - DEBTS

HAVING DEBTS	no debts vs debts	Data from the third interview wave were used here. When elaborated for income: less than \$ 5,000: $\bar{D}R = +.05$ (ns) \$ 5,000 - \$ 6,999: $\bar{D}R = .00$ (ns) \$ 7,000 - \$ 9,999: $\bar{D}R = -.04$ (ns) \$ 10,000 or more : $\bar{D}R = .00$ (ns) When those having debts were divided into those who could pay off debts and those who could not pay off their debts without borrowing, in all income groups the differences with those who have no debts were still non-significant. Also when debt-level was assessed by the actual dollar debt instead of the subjective report of debt no significant relationships with hedonic level appear.	AFF 2.3	$\bar{D}R$	+ .01	E	ns	Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. Probability area samples N: 2787, date: January, 1963 - January, 1964	BRADB 69 p. 100
INABILITY TO PAY DEBTS	Could pay off debts vs could not pay off debts without borrowing	See above Ss having no debts were excluded here. Significant (05) among those with incomes between \$ 5,000 and \$ 7,000 only	AFF 2.3	$\bar{D}R$	- .06	BCI	ns	See above	BRADB 69 p. 100
INCREASE IN DEBT LEVEL	decreased / stable / increased	Analysis on the basis of a comparison between data from January, 1963 (wave 1) and October, 1963 (wave 3).	AFF 2.3	$\bar{D}R$	-	BCI	ns	See above	BRADB 69 p. 102
WORRY ABOUT DEBTS	Closed question on worries about debts during the past few weeks no vs yes	Lower among those with incomes of \$ 10,000 or more : $\bar{D}R = -.04$ (05).	AFF 2.3	$\bar{D}R$	- .11	BCI	05	See above	BRADB 69 p. 102

I 1.4 - SATISFACTION WITH INCOME,
STANDARD OF LIVING

see 'Satisfaction with Income, Standard of Living' (S 1.8.3), 'Satisfaction with Work, Job + Specific Aspects' (S 1.9.2), 'Types of Affect - Present Work' (A 2.2.14)

I 1.5 - CONCERNS ABOUT INCOME, MONEY

REPORT OF HOPES CONCERNING ECONOMIC CONDITIONS	Open-ended question on personal wishes and hopes for the future Responses rated as concerning improved or decent standard of living for oneself or family; having own business, own land, own farm, own house, modern conveniences, having wealth, etc.		HAPP 3.1	G'	- .27	Gt'	01	Adult populations of 5 Westernized nations, 3 underdeveloped giants, 2 countries in the Middle East, 3 Caribbean nations and the Philippines Representative samples N: 18,653, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 263
REPORT OF FEARS CONCERNING ECONOMIC CONDITIONS	Open-ended question on personal worries and fears for the future Responses rated as concerning deterioration in or inadequate standard of living for oneself or family, etc.		HAPP 3.1	G'	- .29	Gt'	01	See above	CANTR 65/1 p. 263

UNFULFILLED ASPIRATIONS: MONEY	Open-ended question on unfulfilled aspirations other aspirations vs aspirations mentioned	Computed for those having unfulfilled aspirations only (N = 1646)	HAPP 1.1	G'	-.07	Gt'	ns	National adult population, U.S.A. Non-probability quota sample N: 2377, date: February, 1946	WESSM 56 p. 210
MOST IMPORTANT WORRY: FINANCIAL WORRIES, MONEY	Open-ended question on most important worry other worries vs worry mentioned	Computed for those having worries only (N = 2040)	HAPP 1.1	G'	-.23	Gt'	01	See above	WESSM 56 p. 213
THINKING OFTEN ABOUT MONEY	Closed question: not at all / sometimes / often, during last week	Gamma's computed on the basis of proportion 'often' answers. Unaffected by S.E.S.	HAPP 1.1	G'	-.22	Gt'	01	Inhabitants of 4 small communities, Illinois, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage samples N: 2006, date: March, 1962	BRADB 65/1 p. 54
HAVING PROBLEMS WITH MONEY	Closed question	High school students only L - shaped curve: Stronger negative among unhappier students	COMP 4.1		-		s	Students, U.S.A. Non-probability chunk sample N: 1651, date: —	SYMOM 37 p. 292
BEING INTERESTED IN MONEY	Closed question		COMP 4.1				ns	See above	SYMOM 37 p. 292

1.6 - VARIOUS INDICATORS OF INCOME,
STANDARD OF LIVING

SELF-EVALUATED COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL STATUS	3-item index of closed questions on present financial situation compared with former expectations, former situation, situation of most relatives and friends worse (stressful) vs better (non-stressful)	Unaffected by S.E.S.	AFF 1.3	DR	+12		05	Adults, Alameda County, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 6928, date: 1965	BERKM 71 p. 41
MATERIAL STYLE OF LIFE	Measures based on amount of material possessions and material wealth	Index of Negative Affects: $r = -.16$ (05) No relationship with Index of Positive Affects	AFF 2.3	r_{pm}	+			Residents of Stirling County, Maritime, Canada. Probability sample, stratified by sex, age, socio-environmental circumstances and mental health N: 112, date: 1963 - 1968	BEISE 74 p. 325
LEVEL OF INCOME COMPARED WITH OTHER JOBS	Closed question: very small / small / average / large / very large		HAPP 2.1	T^2	+18	Chi ²	001	Individual farm owners and their families, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 1002, date: June - July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 112
LEVEL OF INCOME COMPARED WITH OTHER JOBS	Closed question: very small / small / average / large / very large		HAPP 2.1	T^2	+13	Chi ²	001	Persons gainfully employed outside agriculture, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 982, date: June - July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 113
BEING ABLE TO SAVE	Closed question		HAPP 1.1 AFF 1.1	mc mc	+23 +25			Urban adult Jewish population, Israel Probability area sample, using dwelling units N: 1830, date: summer, 1973	LEVY 75/2 p. 373
INCOME	Being vs not being a member of the sick-fund	Significant among lower educational levels only (025).	HAPP 1.1		+	Chi ²		Adults, Utrecht, The Netherlands Probability sample, stratified by age N: 300, date: autumn, 1967	MOSER 69 p. 21
WELFARE STATUS	formerly-welfare vs welfare	Significant (05) among husband-present females only.	HAPP 1.1	DM	-			Low-income women with children, New York State, U.S.A. Probability systematic random sample, stratified by employed status and presence or absence of a husband in the house (marital status) N: 1325, date: —	BENDO 74 p. 77

ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION	not deprived vs economically deprived	See remarks in excerpt (Part II). Stronger among the gainfully employed: G' = -.54(01) Stronger among those retirees who had a positive orientation to retirement when they were retired : G' = -.53(01) Lower among those retirees who had a negative orientation to retirement : G' = -.40(ns)	COMP 1.2	G'	-.55	Gt'	01	Aged males (those satisfied in 1952), U.S.A. Non-probability accidental sample N: 787, date: 1952 - 1956	THOMP 60 p. 168
----------------------	---------------------------------------	---	----------	----	------	-----	----	--	--------------------

1.1.7 - CHANGE IN INCOME

REPORTED PAY-CUT DURING PAST YEAR	Closed question on pay-cut of chief wage earner during past year: no vs yes		AFF 2.3	DR	-.04	BCI	ns	Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. Probability area samples N: 2787, date: January, 1963 - January, 1964	BRADB 69 p. 104
REPORTED PAY-RAISE DURING PAST YEAR	Closed question on pay-raise of chief wage earner during past year: no vs yes		AFF 2.3	DR	+.05	BCI	05	See above	BRADB 69 p. 104
INCREASE IN INCOME DURING ONE YEAR	Total family income of 1962 compared with total income in 1963 less / same / greater	In January, 1963 (wave 1) Ss were enquired after their total family income in 1962. In October, 1963 (wave 3) Ss were enquired after their expected total income in 1963 Unaffected by level of income.	AFF 2.3	DR	+.01	BCI	ns	See above	BRADB 69 p. 104
EXPECTING WAGE INCREASE DURING NEXT 5 YEARS	Closed question: decreasing / no change / increasing		HAPP 2.1	t ²	+.17	Chi ²	001	Persons gainfully employed outside agriculture, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 982, date: June - July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 112
EXPECTING INCOME INCREASE DURING NEXT 5 YEARS	Closed question: decreasing / no change / increasing		HAPP 2.1	t ²	+.16	Chi ²	001	Individual farm-owners and their families, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 1002, date: June - July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 112