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

W 2 WORK

W 2.1 Having work . . . . see also R 2

W 2.2 Type of work . . . . see also H 4.2

W 2.3 Change of work

W 2.4 Work prestige . . . . see also S 5, W 2.2

W 2.5 Career orientation

W 2.6 Characteristics of one's job . . . . see also I 1

W 2.7 Adjustment to one's job . . . . 'see also A 2.2.14, S 1.9

W 2.8 Perceived importance of specific aspects of one's job

W 2.9 Reasons for having a job

W 2.10 Desire for change of job

W 2.11 Various attitudes towards work

W 2.1 – HAVING WORK

see also 'Retirement' (R 2)

NON-LABOR		Gamma is based on the difference in happiness between the 'non-labor' category and the entire population (including 'non-labor'). Housewives were not considered as 'non-labor'. See also under 'Type of Work' (Part III, W 2.2).	HAPP 3.1	G'	+.04	Gt'	ns	Adult population of 5 Westernized nations, 3 underdeveloped giants, 2 countries in the Middle East, 3 Caribbean nations and the Philippines Representative samples N: 19653, date: $\pm$ 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 259
NON-LABOR		The mean happiness score of the 'non-labor' was compared with the mean score of the entire population (including the 'non-labor'). Housewives probably were considered as 'non-labor' here. See also under 'Type of Work' (Part III, W 2.2).	HAPP 3.1	DM	-0.3			National adult population, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 1549, date: $\pm$ 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 375
NON-LABOR FORCE		The mean score on perceived realization of aspirations of the 'non-labor' was compared with the mean score of the entire population. See also under 'Type of Work' (Part III, W 2.2).	HAPP 3.1	DM	$\pm$ 0			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
EMPLOYMENT STATUS:		The Gammas are based on a comparison of those reporting 'not too happy' in the occupational group mentioned and in the entire population.						Inhabitants of 4 small communities, Illinois, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage samples N: 2006, date: March, 1962	BRADB 65/1 p. 14
– SELF-EMPLOYED		Stronger among males: G' = +.33 (05) Lower among females : G' = +.02 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+	Gt'			
– EMPLOYED		males : G' = +.20 (01) females: G' = +.20 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+	Gt'			
– PART-TIME EMPLOYED		Computed for females only: G' = +.07 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+	Gt'	ns		
– UNEMPLOYED		Stronger among males: G' = -.41 (01) Lower among females : G' = -.28 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	–	Gt'			
– RETIRED		males : G' = -.29 (01) females: G' = -.27 (05)	HAPP 1.1	G'	–	Gt'			
– NOT IN LABOR FORCE	Full-time housewives; disabled; etc.	Stronger among males: G' = -.28 (ns) Not among females : G' = +.00 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	–	Gt'	ns		
EMPLOYED STATUS AS CHIEF WAGE EARNER	Unemployed vs employed chief wage earner	Stronger among females : $\bar{DR}$ = +.21 (05) (primarily single women) Lower among males : $\bar{DR}$ = +.13 (05) (to be continued on next page)	AFF 2.3	$\bar{DR}$	+.15	BCI	05	Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. Probability area samples N: 2787, date: January, 1963 – January, 1964	BRADB 69 p. 184-186

		Index of Positive Affects: DR̄ = +.13 (05)
		  Unaffected by sex
		Index of Negative Affects: DR̄ = −.12 (05)
		  Stronger among females : DR̄ = −.19 (05)
		  Lower among males : DR̄ = −.10 (ns)						

		Stronger among males: G' = +.66 Lower among females : G' = +.57	HAPP 1.1	G'	+			
WIFE OF EMPLOYED CHIEF WAGE EARNER	Wife of unemployed vs employed wage earner	This analysis concerns only women who are not chief wage earner.					Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. (See last page)	BRADB 69 p. 184–186
		Index of Positive Affects: DR̄ = +.19 (05) Index of Negative Affects: DR̄ = +.02 (ns)	AFF 2.3 HAPP 1.1	DR̄ G	+.10 +.32	BCI	05	
EMPLOYED STATUS	Unemployed vs employed	Computed for married respondents only.	AFF 2.3	DR̄	+.08	BCI	05	See above	BRADB 69 p. 187

		Stronger among males : DR̄ = +.15 (05)
		  with employed wife : DR̄ = +.11 (ns)
		  with unemployed wife : DR̄ = +.16 (05)
		Lower among females : DR̄ = +.08 (05)
		  with employed husband : DR̄ = +.08 (05)
		  with unemployed husband: DR̄ = −.05 (ns)						

		Index of Positive Affects : DR̄ = +.02 (ns)
		  males with employed wife : DR̄ = +.15 (ns)
		  males with unemployed wife : DR̄ = +.17 (05)
		  females with employed husband : DR̄ = +.04 (ns)
		  females with unemployed husband: DR̄ = +.03 (ns)
		Index of Negative Affects : DR̄ = −.10 (05)
		  males with employed wife : DR̄ = −.09 (ns)
		  males with unemployed wife : DR̄ = −.11 (ns)
		  females with employed husband : DR̄ = −.09 (05)
		  females with unemployed husband: DR̄ = +.11 (ns)						

EMPLOYED STATUS OF SPOUSE	Ss with unemployed vs employed spouse	Computed for married respondents only.	AFF 2.3	DR̄	+.03	BCI	ns	See above	BRADB 69 p. 187

		Lower among males : DR̄ = +.04 (ns)
		  employed males : DR̄ = +.03 (ns)
		  unemployed males : DR̄ = +.08 (ns)
		Stronger among females: DR̄ = +.10 (05)
		  employed females : DR̄ = +.18 (05)
		  unemployed females : DR̄ = +.05 (ns)						

		Index of Positive Affects: DR̄ = +.06 (05)
		  employed males : DR̄ = +.04 (ns)
		  unemployed males : DR̄ = +.06 (ns)
		  employed females : DR̄ = +.19 (05)
		  unemployed females : DR̄ = +.18 (05)
		Index of Negative Affects: DR̄ = +.06 (05)
		  employed males : DR̄ = .00 (ns)
		  unemployed males : DR̄ = −.02 (ns)
		  employed females : DR̄ = −.11 (ns)
		  unemployed females : DR̄ = +.09 (ns)						

GETTING EMPLOYED	Staying unemployed vs changing from unemployment to employment	Computed for chief wage earners only. Analysis on the basis of a comparison between data from January 1963 (wave 1) and October 1963(wave 3).	AFF 2.3	DR̄	+.05			See above	BRADB 69 p. 189
		Index of Positive Affects: DR̄ = −.01 Index of Negative Affects: DR̄ = −.04						
FALLING UNEMPLOYED	Staying employed vs changing from employment to unemployment	See above	AFF 2.3	DR̄	−.13			See above	BRADB 69 p. 189
		Index of Positive Affects: DR̄ = −.19 Index of Negative Affects: DR̄ = −.03						

EMPLOYED STATUS	Not working vs working full- or part-time	in 1972:
		  Affect Balance : r = +.11 (ns)
		  Index of Positive Affects: r = +.14 (001)
		  Index of Negative Affects: r = -.02 (ns)
		in 1973:
		  Affect Balance : r = +.17 (001)
		  Index of Positive Affects: r = +.18 (001)
		  Index of Negative Affects: r = -.08 (01)
		Unaffected by sex
			AFF 2.3	r	+			Adults, Los Angeles County, U.S.A.
								Multi-stage probability samples of households
								N: 1078 in 1972 and 1008 in 1973, date: 1972 and 1973
									CHERL 75
									p. 197

EMPLOYED STATUS	Not having a job or business vs having one	Unaffected by sex	HAPP 3.1	r	+.06			People of 46 and over, Duke, U.S.A. Probability, systematic random sample, stratified by age,sex N: 502, date: 1968	PALMO 72 p. 70
EMPLOYED STATUS	Not in labor force / unemployed / employed	males : G = +.18 females: G = +.15	HAPP 1.1	G	+			Adults, Metro Manila, Philippines Probability area sample N: 941, date: January – April, 1972	BULAT 73 p. 234-235
		Lower among males : G = +.10 Stronger among females: G = +.22	HAPP 3.1	G	+				

		Index of Positive Affects:
		  males : G = +.03
		  females: G = +.03
		Index of Negative Affects:
		  males : G = -.06
		  females: G = -.13
			AFF 2.3	G	+				

FEMALES:

BEING A HOUSEWIFE (if no head of household)		Gamma is based on the difference in happiness between the housewives and the entire population (including the housewives). See also under 'Type of Work' (Part III, W 2.2).	HAPP 3.1	G'	-.06	Gt'	ns	Adult population of 5 westernized nations, 3 underdeveloped giants, 2 countries in the Middle East, 3 Caribbean nations & Representative sample The Philippines N: 18653, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 259
BEING A HOUSEWIFE		Gamma is based on the difference in happiness between the housewives and the entire population (including the housewives) See also under 'Type of Work' (Part III, W 2.2)	HAPP 2.1	G'	-.03			National adult population, U.S.A. Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1015, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 214
BEING A HOUSEWIFE		See above	HAPP 2.1	G'	+.07			National adult population, Mexico Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1752, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 189
BEING A HOUSEWIFE		See above	HAPP 2.1	G'	-.12			National adult population , Great Britain Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1195, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 138
BEING A HOUSEWIFE		See above	HAPP 2.1	G'	-.06			National adult population , France Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1000, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 148
BEING A HOUSEWIFE		See above	HAPP 2.1	G'	-.07			National adult population , W. Germany Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 3371, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 157

BEING A HOUSEWIFE		Gamma is based on the difference in happiness between the housewives and the entire population (including the housewives) See also under 'Type of Work' (Part III, W 2.2)	HAPP 2.1	G'	+.08			National adult population, Italy Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1078, date: 1948 - 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 176
BEING A HOUSEWIFE		See above	HAPP 2.1	G'	+.06			National adult population, Norway Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1030, date: 1948 - 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 206
BEING A HOUSEWIFE		See above	HAPP 2.1	G'	-.09			National adult population, Australia Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 945, date: 1948 - 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 131
BEING A HOUSEWIFE		The mean happiness score of the housewives was compared with the mean happiness score of the entire population (including the housewives). See also under 'Type of Work' (Part III, W 2.2).	HAPP 3.1	DM	± 0			National adult population, Yugoslavia Probability sample N: 1523, date: ± 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 377
EMPLOYED STATUS	Housewife / part-time work / full-time work	Computed for females only. Unaffected by marital status Among females with 12 or fewer years of education: C = +.13 (05) Among females with 13 or more years of education: C = +.19 (ns) The role of full-time housewife appears to be slightly associated with both low and high degrees of happiness.	HAPP 1.1	C	+.11	Chi²	ns	Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. National probability sample N: 1500, date: spring, 1973	SPREI 75 p. 243
BEING A HOUSEWIFE	Respondents (males and females) employed outside the house vs housewives		AFF 1.1	r_{pm}	-.02		ns	Families of hourly workers and salaried employees, U.S.A. Samples from two large industrial firms N: 712, date: summer, 1973	TESSL 75 p. 103
EMPLOYED STATUS	non-employed vs employed	Not among husband-present females Positive among husband-absent females	HAPP 1.1	DM	+			Low-income women with children, New York State, U.S.A. Probability systematic random sample, stratified by employed status and marital status N: 1325, date: —	BENDO 74 p. 75
BEING EMPLOYED OUTSIDE THE HOUSE AT PAID TASKS		Reported for married females only. 64% of the dissatisfied and 76% of the satisfied women have paid work	HAPP 2.1	D%	+		s	Middle-age, middle class married couples, U.S.A. Non-probability accidental sample of couples N: 416, date: 1952 - 1953	ROSE 55 p. 17
EMPLOYED STATUS	non-employed vs employed	Computed for females only. Gamma based on proportion 'very satisfied' answers Stronger among females with husbands of high S.E.S. Slightly reversed among females with husbands of low S.E.S.	HAPP 2.1	G'	-.02	Gt'	ns	Inhabitants of Helsinki, Finland Probability sample N: 442, date: spring - summer, 1966	HAAVI 71 p. 595

SPECIAL GROUPS:

HOURS SPENT ON WORK FOR PAY	Direct question on number of hours per week during the school year	Among those of lower social class : $G = +.01$ Among those of middle and upper class: $G = -.05$	HAPP 1.1	G V	$-.02$ $..03$	Chi^2	ns	Juniors and seniors attending public high schools in New York State, U.S.A. Probability cluster sample of 10 public high schools N: sample A: 1682, sample B: 1664, sample C: 1678 date: 1960	BRENN 70 p. 108/182/326
		Among those of lower social class : $G = +.04$ Among those of medium and upper class: $G = -.05$	AFF 1.1	G V	$-.03$ $.03$	Chi^2	ns		
HAVING OUTSIDE WORK (for board, room, pay)	Non-working vs working	L-shaped curve: positive relationship among happier females only.	COMP 2.2		$+$		ns	Female college students, New York, U.S.A. Type of construction unclear N: 238, date: —	WASHB 41 p. 283
HAVING GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT	Absence vs presence of gainful employment	The relationship disappears when controlled for self-perceived health.	COMP 1.1	r_{pm}	$+.36$		01	White males who experienced a first heart attack, Durham, North Carolina, U.S.A. Non-probability quota sample N: 56, date: 1970	GARRI 73 p. 201
EMPLOYED STATUS	Unemployed vs employed		HAPP 1.1	t_{k_c}	$+.25$		001	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. 175
		Index of Positive Affects: $t_k = +.19$ (001) Index of Negative Affects: $t_k = -.02$ (ns)	AFF 2.3	t_{k_c}	$+$				
EMPLOYMENT HISTORY	Percentage of time employed during last five years, corrected for time in hospital 0 – 49% / 50 – 89% / 90 – 100%		HAPP 1.1	t_{k_c}	$+.21$ $+.48$		001	See above	ALEXA 68 p. 173-174
		Index of Positive Affects: $t_k = +.25$ (001) Index of Negative Affects: $t_k = -.07$ (05)	AFF 2.3	t_{k_c}	$+$ $-$				
EMPLOYED STATUS	Unemployed vs employed		HAPP 2.1	G'	$+.46$	Gt'	05	Aged chronically-ill patients, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 167, date: 1959	HENLE 67 p. 69

W 2.2 – TYPE OF WORK   see also 'Household Work' (H 4.2)

OCCUPATION:		Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupational group mentioned and the happiness of the entire population.						Adult population of 5 westernized nations, 3 underdeveloped giants, 2 countries in the Middle East, 3 Caribbean nations and the Philippines, Representative samples N: 18653, date: ± 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 259
– PROFESSIONALS, BUSINESSMEN, TECHNICIANS			HAPP 3.1	G'	$+.55$	Gt'	01		
– MANAGERS, OFFICIALS			HAPP 3.1	G'	$+.50$	Gt'	01		
– WHITE COLLAR WORKERS			HAPP 3.1	G'	$+.35$	Gt'	01		
– SKILLED WORKERS			HAPP 3.1	G'	$+.09$	Gt'	ns		
– UNSKILLED WORKERS			HAPP 3.1	G'	$-.10$	Gt'	01		
– FARMERS			HAPP 3.1	G'	$-.12$	Gt'	01		
– NON-LABOR			HAPP 3.1	G'	$+.04$	Gt'	ns		
– HOUSEWIVES (if no head of the household)			HAPP 3.1	G'	$-.06$	Gt'	ns		

OCCUPATION:	Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupational group mentioned and the happiness of the entire population.					National adult population, U.S.A. Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1015, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 214
– PROFESSIONAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.09			
– OWNERS OF BUSINESS AND LARGE, MEDIUM SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.28			
– WORKERS ON OWN ACCOUNT, OWNERS OF SMALL SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.02			
– SALARIED-MANAGERIAL AND TOP-GRADE CLERICAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.11			
– OTHER CLERICAL WORKERS, SHOP-ASSISTENTS, etc.		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.03			
– MANUAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.10			
– FARM WORKERS, FISHERMEN, GARDENERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.15			
– FARM OWNERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.32			
– HOUSEWIVES		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.03			
– RETIRED, INDEPENDENT		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.04			
– STUDENTS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.02			
OCCUPATION:	Computed for presently married employed persons only. Males were categorized according to their own occupation and females according to their husband's occupation. Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupational group mentioned and the happiness of all the married males and females					Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage area sample N: 2460, date: spring, 1957	GURIN 60 p. 223
– PROFESSIONALS, TECHNICIANS	Lower among males : G' = +.12 (ns) Stronger among females: G' = +.30 (01)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+	Gt'		
– MANAGERS, PROPRIETORS	Stronger among males: G' = +.21 (05) Lower among females : G' = +.15 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+	Gt'		
– CLERICAL WORKERS	Negative among males : G' = –.11 (ns) Positive among females: G' = +.09 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'		Gt'		
– SALES WORKERS	males : G' = +.25 (05) females: G' = +.28 (05)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+	Gt'		
– SKILLED WORKERS	Negative among males : G' = –.03 (ns) Positive among females: G' = +.03 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'		Gt'		
– SEMI-SKILLED WORKERS	females only: G' = –.16 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	–	Gt'		
– UNSKILLED WORKERS	Lower among males : G' = –.24 (05) Stronger among females: G' = –.36 (01)	HAPP 1.1	G'	–	Gt'		
– FARMERS	Stronger among males: G' = –.16 (ns) Lower among females : G' = –.08 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	–	Gt'		

OCCUPATION:					National adult population, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 1549, date: ± 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 375
	The mean happiness score of the occupational group mentioned was compared with the mean happiness of the entire population (mean score: 6.6)					
– PROFESSIONALS, BUSINESSMEN	Mean happiness score: 7.1	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
– WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 6.6	HAPP 3.1	DM	± 0		
– SKILLED WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 6.6	HAPP 3.1	DM	± 0		
– UNSKILLED WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 6.3	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– FARMERS	Mean happiness score: 6.5	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– NON–LABOR	Mean happiness score: 6.3	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
OCCUPATION:	See remarks in excerpt (Part II). The mean happiness score of the occupational group mentioned was compared with the mean happiness of the entire population (1964: 6.85; 1971: 6.56).				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
– PROFESSIONALS; BUSINESSMEN	Mean: 7.26 (1964); 7.18 (1971)	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
– WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	Mean: 7.03 (1964); 6.49 (1971)	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
– FARMERS	Mean: 6.78 (1964); 6.12 (1971)	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– MANUAL WORKERS	Mean: 6.61 (1964); 6.33 (1971)	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– NON–LABOR FORCE	Mean: 6.88 (1964); 6.50 (1971)	HAPP 3.1	DM	± 0		
OCCUPATION:	Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupational group mentioned and the happiness of the entire population				National adult population , Mexico Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1752, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 189
– PROFESSIONAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.17		
– OWNERS OF BUSINESS AND LARGE, MEDIUM SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.00		
– WORKERS ON OWN ACCOUNT, OWNERS OF SMALL SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.10		
– SALARIED–MANAGERIAL AND TOP–GRADE CLERICAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.03		
– OTHER CLERICAL WORKERS, SHOP– ASSISTANTS, etc.		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.11		
– MANUAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.10		
– FARM WORKERS, FISHERMEN, GARDENERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.18		
– FARM OWNERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.43		
– HOUSEWIVES		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.07		
– RETIRED, INDEPENDENT		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.05		

OCCUPATION:	Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupational group mentioned and the happiness of the entire population.				National adult population, Britain Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1195, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 138
– PROFESSIONAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.42		
– OWNERS OF BUSINESS AND LARGE, MEDIUM SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.00		
– WORKERS ON OWN ACCOUNT, OWNERS OF SMALL SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.11		
– SALARIED–MANAGERIAL AND TOP–GRADE CLERICAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.32		
– OTHER CLERICAL WORKERS, SHOP–ASSISTANTS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.05		
– MANUAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.10		
– FARM WORKERS, FISHERMEN, GARDENERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.10		
– FARM OWNERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.47		
– HOUSEWIVES		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.12		
– RETIRED, INDEPENDENT		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.08		
OCCUPATION:	The mean happiness score of the occupational group mentioned was compared with the mean happiness of the entire population (mean score: 5.53)				National population, Britain Non–probability quota sample N: 213, date: March, 1971	ABRAM 73 p. 4
– BUSINESS EXECUTIVES; COMPANY DIRECTORS	Mean happiness score: 6.84	HAPP 2.1	DM	+		
– PROFESSIONAL WORKERS (doctors, teachers, investors, shareholders, etc.)	Mean happiness score: 5.91	HAPP 2.1	DM	+		
– OFFICE WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 6.04	HAPP 2.1	DM	+		
– SKILLED MANUAL WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 5.64	HAPP 2.1	DM	+		
– UNSKILLED MANUAL WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 4.75	HAPP 2.1	DM	–		
– SMALL BUSINESSMEN; SHOPKEEPERS	Mean happiness score: 4.10	HAPP 2.1	DM	–		
– OLD AGE PENSIONERS	Mean happiness score: 4.74	HAPP 2.1	DM	–		
OCCUPATION:	Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupation group mentioned and the happiness of the entire population				National adult population, France Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and educattion N: 1000, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 148
– PROFESSIONAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.10		
– OWNERS OF BUSINESS AND LARGE, MEDIUM SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.39		
– WORKERS ON OWN ACCOUNT, OWNERS OF SMALL SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.08		

(to be continued on next page)

- SALARIED-MANAGERIAL AND TOP-GRADE CLERICAL WORKERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.45			
- OTHER CLERICAL WORKERS, SHOP ASSISTENTS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.05			
- MANUAL WORKERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.22			
- FARM WORKERS, FISHERMEN, GARDENERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.11			
- FARM OWNERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.29			
- HOUSEWIVES			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.06			
- RETIRED, INDEPENDENT			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.56			
OCCUPATION:	Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupation group mentioned and the happiness of the entire population						National adult population, W. Germany Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 3371, date: 1948 - 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 157
- PROFESSIONAL WORKERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.09			
- OWNERS OF BUSINESS AND LARGE, MEDIUM SHOPS			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.07			
- WORKERS ON OWN ACCOUNT, OWNERS OF SMALL SHOPS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.15			
- SALARIED-MANAGERIAL AND TOP-GRADE CLERICAL WORKERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.12			
- OTHER CLERICAL WORKERS, SHOP ASSISTANTS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.19			
- MANUAL WORKERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.08			
- FARM WORKERS, FISHERMEN, GARDENERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.15			
- FARM OWNERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.02			
- HOUSEWIVES			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.07			
- RETIRED, INDEPENDENT			HAPP 2.1	G'	-.28			
OCCUPATION:	See above						National adult population, Italy Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1078, date: 1948 - 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 176
- PROFESSIONAL WORKERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.00			
- OWNERS OF BUSINESS AND LARGE, MEDIUM SHOPS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.26			
- WORKERS ON OWN ACCOUNT, OWNERS OF SMALL SHOPS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.09			
- SALARIED-MANAGERIAL AND TOP-GRADE CLERICAL WORKERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.14			

(to be continued on next page)

– OTHER CLERICAL WORKERS, SHOP ASSISTANTS, etc.		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.15			
– MANUAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.33			
– FARM WORKERS, FISHERMEN, GARDENERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.36			
– FARM OWNERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.29			
– HOUSEWIVES		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.08			
– RETIRED, INDEPENDENT		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.05			
OCCUPATION:	Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupation group mentioned and the happiness of the entire population.					National adult population, The Netherlands Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 942, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 197
– PROFESSIONAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.39			
– OWNERS OF BUSINESS AND LARGE, MEDIUM SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.35			
– WORKERS ON OWN ACCOUNT, OWNERS OF SMALL SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.04			
– SALARIED-MANAGERIAL AND TOP-GRADE CLERICAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.43			
– OTHER CLERICAL WORKERS, SHOP ASSISTANTS , etc.		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.20			
– MANUAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.22			
– FARM WORKERS, FISHERMEN, GARDENERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.12			
– FARM OWNERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.00			
– RETIRED, INDEPENDENT		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.14			
OCCUPATION:	Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupation group mentioned and the happiness of the entire population.					National adult population , Norway Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1030, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 206
– PROFESSIONAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.38			
– OWNERS OF BUSINESS AND LARGE, MEDIUM SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.39			
– WORKERS ON OWN ACCOUNT, OWNERS OF SMALL SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.19			
– SALARIED-MANAGERIAL AND TOP-GRADE CLERICAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.41			
– OTHER CLERICAL WORKERS, SHOP ASSISTANTS, etc.		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.06			
– MANUAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.03			
– FARM WORKERS, FISHERMEN, GARDENERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	-.52			

– FARM OWNERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.24		
– HOUSEWIVES		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.06		
– RETIRED, INDEPENDENT		HAPP 2.1	G'	–.02		
OCCUPATION:	The mean happiness score of the occupational group mentioned was compared with the mean happiness of the entire population (mean score: 4.4).				National adult population, Poland Probability samples N: 1464, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 374
– FARMERS	Mean happiness score: 4.1	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– UNSKILLED WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 3.7	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– SKILLED WORKERS, CRAFTSMEN	Mean happiness score: 4.5	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
– WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 4.9	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
– OTHERS; STUDENTS	Mean happiness score: 4.8	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
OCCUPATION:	The mean happiness score of the occupational group mentioned was compared with the mean happiness of the entire population (mean score : 5.0)				National adult population, Yugoslavia Probability sample N: 1523, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 377
– STATE EMPLOYEES	Mean happiness score: 5.9	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
– WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 4.9	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– FARMERS	Mean happiness score: 4.6	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– HOUSEWIVES	Mean happiness score: 4.9	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
OCCUPATION:	The mean happiness score of the occupational group mentioned was compared with the mean happiness score of the entire population (mean score : 3.7)				National population, India Probability sample, proportionally poststratified by dwelling N: 2366, date: 1958	CANTR 65/1 p. 368
– PROFESSIONALS; STUDENTS	Mean happiness score: 4.5	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
– CLERKS; TEACHERS	Mean happiness score: 4.2	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
– SKILLED WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 3.7	HAPP 3.1	DM	+ 0		
– UNSKILLED WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 3.2	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– FARM OWNERS	Mean happiness score: 3.7	HAPP 3.1	DM	+ 0		
– FARM WORKERS	Mean happiness score: 3.1	HAPP 3.1	DM	–		
– OTHERS	Mean happiness score: 4.1	HAPP 3.1	DM	+		
OCCUPATION:	Gammas are based on a comparison of the happiness ratings of the occupation group mentioned and the happiness of the entire population.				National adult population, Australia Probability sample proportionally stratified by sex, age, S.E.S. and education N: 945, date: 1948 – 1949	BUCHA 53 p. 131
– PROFESSIONAL WORKERS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.19		
– OWNERS OF BUSINESS AND LARGE, MEDIUM SHOPS		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.20		

– WORKERS ON OWN ACCOUNT, OWNERS OF SMALL SHOPS			HAPP 2.1	G'	–.05				
– SALARIED-MANAGERIAL AND TOP-GRADE CLERICAL WORKERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.05				
– OTHER CLERICAL WORKERS, SHOP ASSISTANTS, etc.			HAPP 2.1	G'	–.03				
– MANUAL WORKERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.04				
– FARM WORKERS, FISHERMEN, GARDENERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.19				
– FARM OWNERS			HAPP 2.1	G'	+.10				
– HOUSEWIVES			HAPP 2.1	G'	–.09				
– RETIRED, INDEPENDENT			HAPP 2.1	G'	–.20				

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL	Farmers, farm labourers / service workers / semi- and unskilled workers / skilled workers / white collar / business executives / (semi-) professionals	See remarks in excerpt (Part II).
		
		in 1946: negroes: G' = +.09 (ns)
		           whites : G' = +.09 (01)
		in 1956: negroes: G' = –.03 (ns)
		           whites : G' = +.13 (01)
		in 1966: negroes: G' = –.17 (05)
		           whites : G' = +.13 (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. 43

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL	Retired / unskilled / semi-skilled / skilled / service / sales / clerical / business / farm / professional		HAPP 2.1 HAPP 3.1 CON 1.1	r r r	+.02 +.09 +.02			National adult population, U.S.A. Cantril (1965) modified probability sample N: 1406, date: 1959	BORTN 70 p. 44
OCCUPATION	Unskilled / semi-skilled / skilled / clerical and sales / professional	Computed for employed Ss only. Clerical and sales workers are less happy than skilled workers. Presented for Index of Negative Affects only.	HAPP 1.1 AFF 2.3	t_{k_c} G	+.15 +.30		01 ns	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/ 121

OCCUPATIONAL SKILL LEVEL

SKILLED WORKER	Unskilled / semi-skilled / skilled	Computed for presently married males only (N=908).	HAPP 1.1	G'	+.09	Gt'	ns	Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage area sample N: 2460, date: spring 1957	GURIN 60 p. 223
WIVE OF SKILLED WORKER	Wife of unskilled / semi-skilled / skilled worker	Computed for presently married females only (N=963)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+.26	Gt'	01	See above	GURIN 60 p. 223
OCCUPATIONAL SKILL LEVEL	Low vs high	Mexican males : DM = +1.1 Mexican females: DM = +0.5 Black males : DM = +1.0 Black females : DM = +0.8 Anglo males : DM = +0.5 Anglo females : DM = +0.4 Trend indicated, but non-significant	AFF 2.3 COMP 1.1	DM	+ +	Chi^2	 ns	Adults, Houston, Texas, U.S.A. Non-probability purposive quota sample stratified by age, sex, occupational skill level and ethnicity N: 1441, date: autumn, 1969	GAITZ 72 p. 63–64

MANUAL VS NON-MANUAL

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL	Manual vs non-manual	See remarks in excerpt (Part II).
		
		in 1946: negroes: G' = -.04 (ns)
		          whites : G' = +.17 (01)
		in 1956: negroes: G' = -.07 (ns)
		          whites : G' = +.14 (01)
		in 1966: negroes: G' = -.36 (01)
		          whites : G' = +.16 (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. 47

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL	Blue vs white collar	Gammas based on proportions 'very happy' answers. Farmers were excluded Among whites : G' = +.22 (01) Reversed among blacks: G' = -.34 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+.22	Gt'	01	Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. Type of sample construction unclear N: 1602, date: March, 1972	ALSTO 74 p. 100

WHITE-COLLAR JOB	Blue-collar vs white-collar workers	Computed for chief wage earners only.
		Female chief wage earners were, almost without exception, single women.
		
		Index of Positive Affects : $\overline{DR}$ = +.11 (05)
		- males : $\overline{DR}$ = +.10 (05)
		  Not in high income group: $\overline{DR}$ = -.02 (ns)
		  Unaffected by occupational prestige
		- females : $\overline{DR}$ = +.13 (05)
		  Stronger among higher occupational prestige levels
		Index of Negative Affects : $\overline{DR}$ = +.02 (ns)
		- males : $\overline{DR}$ = +.01 (ns)
		  Unaffected by occupational prestige
		- females : $\overline{DR}$ = -.02 (ns)
		  Slightly positive among higher occupational prestige levels (ns)
			AFF 2.3	$\overline{DR}$	+	BCI		Adults, urban areas, U.S.A.
								Probability area samples
								N: 2787, date: January, 1963 - January, 1964
									BRADB 69
									p. 191-205

		- males : G' = +.03 - females : G' = +.06 G' based on proportions 'very happy' answers When among the males occupational prestige was controlled : G_{pt} = -.04	HAPP 1.1	G'	+				

W 2.3 - CHANGE OF WORK

GETTING EMPLOYED	Staying unemployed vs changing from employment to employment	Analysis on the basis of a comparison between data from January, 1963 (wave 1) and October, 1963 (wave 3). Computed for chief wage earners only. Index of Positive Affects: $\overline{DR}$ = -.01 Index of Negative Affects: $\overline{DR}$ = -.04	AFF 2.3	$\overline{DR}$	+.05			Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. Probability area samples N: 2787, date: January, 1963 - January, 1964	BRADB 69 p. 189
FALLING UNEMPLOYED	Staying employed vs changing from employment to unemployment	See above Index of Positive Affects: $\overline{DR}$ = -.19 Index of Negative Affects: $\overline{DR}$ = -.03	AFF 2.3	$\overline{DR}$	-.13			See above	BRADB 69 p. 189

Variable	Operationalization	Finding	Code	Stat	Value			Population	Source
SELF-PERCEIVED INCREASE IN OCCUPA-TIONAL PRESTIGE AFTER MILITARY RETIREMENT	3-item index od closed questions on present job in comparison with former military job, with respect to: its general importance, level of skill and knowledge required, authority over other people	Index of Positive Affects: G = +.30 Index of Negative Affects: G = -.01	AFF 2.3	G	+.22			Middle-aged presently employed army retirees, California, U.S.A. Probability simple random sample N: 352, date: August, 1970	GARBE 71 p. 181
SELF-PERCEIVED AMOUNT OF CHANGE IN OCCUPATIONAL ROLE CLUSTER	5-item index of closed questions on amount of change in present occupation, compared with former military occupation, rated on 4-point scales ranging from 'the same' to 'very differ-ent'. Items used: actual work performed, knowledge and skill used, amount of time spent working, type of organization, kind of people one works with	Index of Positive Affects: G = -.17 Index of Negative Affects: G = +.12 Among those with increased occupational prestige: affect balance : G = -.29 positive affect: G = -.25 negative affect: G = +.20 Among those with the same occupational prestige: affect balance : G = +.17 positive affect: G = +.05 negative affect: G = -.12 Among those with decreased occupational prestige: affect balance : G = -.19 positive affect: G = -.17 negative affect: G = +.19	AFF 2.3	G	-.15			See above	GARBE 71 p. 81
CIVILIAN REFERENCE GROUP SALIENCE AFTER MILITARY RETIREMENT	8-item index of statements indicating orienta-tion towards and identification with civilian life and current civilian career	Presented for Index of Positive Affects only: G = +.28	AFF 2.3	G	+			See above	GARBE 71 p. 196
MILITARY REFERENCE GROUP SALIENCE AFTER MILITARY RETIREMENT	8-item index of statements indicating orienta-tion towards and identification with the Army and former military career	Presented for Index of Positive Affects only: G = +.10	AFF 2.3	G	+			See above	GARBE 71 p. 208

W 2.4 – WORK PRESTIGE

see also 'Socio-Economic Status' (S 5),
and 'Type of Work' (W 2.2)

Variable	Operationalization	Finding	Code	Stat	Value			Population	Source
OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE	10-point scale (Duncan prestige scale; see Duncan, 1961)	Lower among those under the age of 65: r = +.09 Stronger among those of age 65+ : r = +.26 This difference is significant (05). When controlled for S.E.S.: Lower among those under the age of 65: r_{pc} = +.01 Stronger among those of age 65+ : r_{pc} = +.19	HAPP 1.1	r_{pm}	+.11		01	Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. Probability samples N: 1547, date: 1972, 1973	SPREI 74 p. 455/457

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE	10-point scale of occupations, ranked for occupational prestige (Duncan prestige scale; see Duncan, 1961)
	
	Respondents in white-collar jobs were dichoto-mized into medium and low vs high prestige.
	Respondents in blue-collar jobs were dichoto-mized into low vs medium and high prestige.
		Computed for chief wage earners only.
		Female chief wage earners were, almost without exception, single women.
		
		Index of Positive Affects:
		- Among white-collar workers: $D\bar{R}$ = +.07 (05)
		  males : $D\bar{R}$ = +.08 (05)
		  medium income group only: $D\bar{R}$ = +.12 (ns)
		  females : $D\bar{R}$ = +.05 (ns)
		- Among blue-collar workers : $D\bar{R}$ = +.08 (05)
		  males : $D\bar{R}$ = +.09 (05)
		  unaffected by income
		  females : $D\bar{R}$ = -.03 (ns)
		Index of Negative Affects:
		- Among white-collar workers: $D\bar{R}$ = .00 (ns)
		  males : $D\bar{R}$ = -.01 (ns)
		  females : $D\bar{R}$ = +.06 (ns)
		(to be continued on next page)
			AFF 2.3	$D\bar{R}$	+	BCI		Adults, urban areas, U.S.A.
								Probability area sample
								N: 2787, date: January, 1963 – January, 1964
									BRADB 69
									p. 191-205

Variable	Question/Description	Findings	HAPP/AFF	Statistic	Sign	Test	Sig.	Sample	Reference

		– Among blue-collar workers : $\bar{DR} = -.07$ (05)
		  males : $\bar{DR} = -.05$ (ns)
		  females : $\bar{DR} = -.05$ (ns)
		
		When among the males white/blue-collar job was controlled:
		Index of Positive Affects : $G_{pt} = +.23$
		Index of Negative Affects : $G_{pt} = -.08$
		  Stronger among the blue-
		  collar workers : $G_{pt} = -.15$
		  Not among white-collar workers
		
		The reported differences in affect appeared to be largely determined by differences between the occupational categories in job advancement level and work satisfaction.							

		Among white-collar males : $G' = +.17$ Among white-collar females : $G' = +.11$ Among blue-collar males : $G' = +.14$ Among blue-collar females : $G' = -.25$ Gammas based on proportions 'very happy' answers When among the males white/blue-collar job was controlled : $G_{pt} = +.19$	HAPP 1.1	G'	+				

PERCEIVED JOB PRESTIGE	Question: 'Do the people you know think of you as having a good job, an average job, or not too good a job?'
	not too good or average vs good
		Computed for male chief wage earners only.
		
		Index of Positive Affects:
		– Among white-collar workers : $\bar{DR} = +.15$ (05)
		  high occupational prestige : $\bar{DR} = +.19$ (05)
		  medium and low prestige : $\bar{DR} = +.09$ (ns)
		– Among blue-collar workers : $\bar{DR} = +.10$ (05)
		  high and medium prestige : $\bar{DR} = +.14$ (05)
		  low prestige : $\bar{DR} = +.06$ (ns)
		Index of Negative Affects:
		– Among white-collar workers : $\bar{DR} = -.03$ (ns)
		  Unaffected by occupational prestige
		– Among blue-collar workers : $\bar{DR} = -.04$ (ns)
		  Unaffected by occupational prestige
			AFF 2.3	$\bar{DR}$	+	BCI			Adults, urban areas, U.S.A.
									(see last page)
										BRADB 69
										p. 201

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE		Housewives and retirees were excluded in order to rank occupations from low to high degrees of prestige.	HAPP 1.1 HAPP 2.1	G G	+.01 +.05			Adults, Toledo, Ohio, U.S.A. Systematic random sample N: 510, date: 1973	SNYDE 74 p. 32
SOCIAL STRATUM	Working in prestigeous occupations, rated on a 9-point scale	Computed for employed Ss only. Positive among males Negative among females	HAPP 2.1					Inhabitants of Helsinki, Finland Probability sample N: 442, date: spring – summer, 1966	HAAVI 71 p. 594
SOCIAL STRATUM	Social stratum of husband, rated on a 9-point scale (see above)	Computed for married females only. Gammas based on proportions 'very satisfied' answers. Stronger among employed females: $G' = -.31$ (ns) Lower among unemployed females : $G' = -.20$ (ns)	HAPP 2.1	G'	–	Gt'	ns	See above	HAAVI 71 p. 595
OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE	10-point scale	unmarried males : $r = +.08$ (ns) married males : $r = +.05$ (ns) unmarried females: $r = +.03$ (ns) married females : $r = +.07$ (ns)	HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	+	Chi^2	ns	Adults, Amsterdam, The Netherlands Probability systematic random sample, stratified by sex and marital status N: 600, date: September – December, 1965	JONG 69 p. 190

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL	Low / medium / high	Married females were coded for the occupational level of their husbands U-shaped curve: those of medium occupational level being most happy. Unaffected by sex and age.	HAPP 1.1	G'	+.10	Gt'	ns	Adults, Utrecht, The Netherlands Probability sample stratified by age N: 300, date: autumn, 1967	MOSER 69 p. 20
PERCEIVED OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE	Question: 'Is your job generally respected and looked up to by people?' not at all / little / average / yes, rather / yes, very much		HAPP 2.1	T^2	+.13	Chi^2	001	Housewives and persons gainfully employed outside agriculture, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 1251, date: June - July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 112
PERCEIVED OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE	Question: 'Is farming generally respected and looked up to by people?' not at all / little / average / much / very much		HAPP 2.1	T^2	+.11	Chi^2	001	Individual farmowners and their families, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 1002, date: June - July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 113

W 2.5 - CAREER ORIENTATION

UPWARD CAREER ANCHORAGE	6-item index of forced choice statements measuring whether a person tends to evaluate success in terms of how far a person has come (downward anchorage) or in terms of how far a person has to go before he reaches the top of his career (upward anchorage). (Career-Anchorage Scale; see Tausky & Dubin, 1965).		HAPP 3.1	r	+.03		ns	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
PREFERENCE FOR 'A JOB THAT DOESN'T BUG ME'	7-item index of closed questions indicating preference for: no one to boss me, don't have to work too hard, clean job, not a lot of responsibility, lot of free time, high prestige, and not learning a lot of new things.		COMP 1.2	r_{pm}	-.05		ns	Public high school boys, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage sample N: 2213 in 1966, 1886 in 1968 and 1799 in 1969 date: fall 1966, spring 1968 and spring 1969	BACHM 67/70 p. 243
PREFERENCE FOR 'A JOB THAT PAYS OFF'	6-item index of closed questions indicating preference for: steady job, learning new things, good chances for getting ahead, good pay, using one's skills, nice friendly people.		COMP 1.2	r_{pm}	+.21		001	See above	BACHM 67/70 p. 243
AMBITIOUS JOB ATTITUDE	13-item index of closed questions indicating preference for: 'a job that doesn't bug me' and preference for 'a job that pays off' (see above).		COMP 1.2	r_{pm}	+.16		001	See above	BACHM 67/70 p. 242
KNOWLEDGE ABOUT OCCUPATIONS	25-item test containing questions on income, status, working hours, requirements, etc. of different occupations (Job Information Test).		COMP 1.2	r_{pm}	-.01		ns	See above	BACHM 67/70 p. 242

W 2.6 - CHARACTERISTICS OF ONE'S JOB   see also 'Income' (I 1)

FREEDOM ON THE JOB	Closed question: none / some / much freedom		HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	+	Chi^2	ns	Adults, Amsterdam, The Netherlands Probability systematic random sample stratified by sex and marital status N: 600, date: September - December, 1965	JONG 69 p. 191

ACCEPTABLE WORKLOAD	Closed question: no vs yes		HAPP 2.1	G	+.75	Chi^2	000	Male employees of age 40+, The Netherlands Non-probability chunk sample N: 13000, date: —	SONDE 75
WORKING IN SHIFTS	Closed question: no vs yes		HAPP 2.1	G	+.18	Chi^2	000	See above	SONDE 75
WORKING IN OWN HOUSE	Closed question: no vs yes		HAPP 2.1	G	+.20	Chi^2	000	See above	SONDE 75
DISTANCE TO WORK	Amount of time spent travelling		HAPP 2.1	G	-.20	Chi^2	ns	See above	SONDE 75
POSITIVE EVALUATION OF EXISTING WORK RELATIONS BETWEEN EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS in one's of spouse's place of work	Closed question ranging from 'not at all good' to 'very good'		HAPP 1.1 AFF 1.1	mc mc	+.23 +.26			Urban adult Jewish population, Israel Probability area sample, using dwelling units N: 1940, date: spring, 1973	LEVY 75/1 p. 372
PERCEIVED OPPORTUNITY TO USE ONE'S SKILLS IN PRESENT JOB	Closed question: not at all / insufficiently / only partly / yes, completely		HAPP 2.1	T^2	+.15	Chi^2	001	Persons gainfully employed outside agriculture, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 982, date: June – July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 110
PERCEIVED SECURITY IN OCCUPATION	Closed question: insecure / average / secure / very secure		HAPP 2.1	T^2	+.11	Chi^2	001	See above	MAKAR 62 p. 113
EXTENT OF THE NECESSARY INTER-ACTION IN THE JOB SETTING	2-item index of closed questions on necessary talking to other employees, and to customers, clients or just the general public: no / rarely or sometimes / often or all day	Computed for employed Ss only. No relationships with happiness and with both positive and negative affect. Also no relations with the two separate questions.	HAPP 2.1 AFF 2.3		± 0 ± 0		ns ns	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. 195
EXTENT OF POTENTIAL INTERACTION IN THE JOB SETTING	2-item index measuring amount of time spent working around three or more fellow-workers: very little or some / most / all the time	Presented for Index of Negative Affect only: G' = -.42 (05)	AFF 2.3	G'	+	Gt'		See above	ALEXA 68 p. 199

W 2.7 – ADJUSTMENT TO ONE'S JOB

see also 'Satisfaction with Work, Job' (S 1.9)
and 'Types of Affect – Present Work' (A 2.2.14)

JOB ADVANCEMENT	4-item index of closed questions on whether current job is the best one ever had, raise in pay during past year, promotion during past year and changes for advancement very low / low / medium / high / very high	Computed for male chief wage earners only. Index of Positive Affects: – Among white-collar workers: Positive relationship (05) among both workers of high occupational prestige and workers of medium or low prestige. – Among blue-collar workers: Positive relationship (05) among workers of high or medium occupational prestige only. Not among workers of low prestige. Index of Negative Affects: – Slightly negative (ns) among blue-collar workers of low occupational prestige only. No relationships among the other occupational categories.	AFF 2.3	DR	+	BCI		Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. Probability area samples N: 2787, date: January, 1963 – January, 1964	BRADB 69 p. 199
FEELINGS OF INADEQUATE JOB PERFORMANCE	Two closed questions on feeling one is not doing as good a job as one would like to, and frequency of these feelings during the past few weeks never / once or twice / often	Computed for chief wage earners only. Female chief wage earners were almost without exception single women. (to be continued on next page)	AFF 2.3	DR				See above	BRADB 69 p. 207

		Positive relationships with both the Index of Positive Affects and the Index of Negative Affects. - Among males slight positive relationship with positive affect and stronger positive relationship with negative affect. . - Among females positive relationship with positive affect and lower positive relationship with negative affect.							
INCREASED FEELINGS OF INADEQUATE JOB PERFORhANCE	Changes in frequency of feelings of inadequacy over a period of 9 months decreased / remained the same / increased	Computed for male chief wage earners only. Analysis on the basis of a comparison between data from January, 1963 (wave 1) and October, 1963 (wave 3). Computed for the Index of Negative Affects only: DR = + (05) - Among white-collar workers: Lower among those of high occupational prestige (ns) Stronger among those of medium or low prestige (ns) - Among blue-collar workers: Stronger among those of high or medium occupational prestige (05) Lower among those of low prestige (ns)	AFF 2.3	$\overline{DR}$	-	BCI		Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. (see last page)	BRADB. 69 p. 208
SUCCESS IN PERFORMING JOb	Closed·question		HAPP 1.1 AFF 1.1	mc mc	+.29 +.31			Urban adult Jewish popuiation, Israel Probability area sample, using dwelling units N: 1830, date: summer, 1973	LEVY 75/2 p. 373
PERCEIVED ADEQUACY IN PERFORMING JOB	Closed question: not very good / average / little better than average / very good	Computed for males only.	HAPP 1.1	t_k	-.09		05	Adult married population with children, U.S.A. Probability area sample N: 797, date: spring, 1957	VEROF 62 p. 196
PROBLEMS WITH JOB (in the past)	Direct question S never had problems vs mentions problems	Computed for males only.	HAPP 1.1	t_k	-.03		ns	See above	VEROF 62 p. 196
MOST IMPORTANT WORRY: WORK CONDITIONS	Open-ended question on most important worry: Other worries vs worry mentioned	Computed for those having worries only (N=2040).	HAPP 1.1	G'	+.05	Gt'	ns	National adult population, U.S.A. Non-probability quota sample N: 2377, date: February, 1946	WESSM 56 p. 213
PERCEIVED APPRECIATION BY PEOPLE ONE IS WORKING WITH ON THE JOB	Closed question rated on a 3-point scale	unmarried males : r = +.16 (ns) married males : r = +.08 (ns) unmarried females: r = +.10 (025) married females : r = +.16 (ns)	HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	+	Chi^2		Adults, Amsterdam, The Netherlands Probability systematic random sample stratified by sex and marital status N: 600, date: September – December, 1965	JONG 69 p. 191
GETTING ON WELL WITH SUPERIORS AT WORK	Closed question: very badly / rather badly / average / fairly well / very well		HAPP 2.1	T^2	+.18	Chi^2	001	Persons gainfully employed outside agriculture, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 982, date: June – July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 109
GETTING ON WELL WITH WORK-FELLOWS	Closed question: very badly / rather badly / average / fairly well / very well		HAPP 2.1	T^2	+.11	Chi^2	001	See above	MAKAR 62 p. 109

PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE JOB:	Closed questions rated on 7-point scales ranging from 'unimportant' to 'important', using items from the Job Descriptive Index (see Smith et al., 1969).	See 'sample construction' in excerpt (Part II).					Male supervisors of a chemical plant, U.S.A. Probability samples N: 69, date: —	IRIS 72 p. 302
– ACTUAL WORK DONE		sample A: $r = -.52$ (01) sample B: $r = +.59$ (01)	HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}				
– PAY		sample A: $r = -.11$ (ns) sample B: $r = +.17$ (ns)	HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}				
– PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES		sample A: $r = -.53$ (01) sample B: $r = +.18$ (ns)	HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}				
– SUPERVISION		sample A: $r = -.39$ (05) sample B: $r = +.22$ (ns)	HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}				
– CO-WORKERS		sample A: $r = -.24$ (ns) sample B: $r = +.03$ (ns)	HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}				

W 2.9 – REASONS FOR HAVING A JOB

REASONS FOR EMPLOYMENT:	Open-ended direct question						Employed married females, Helsinki, Finland Probability sample N: 72, date: spring – summer, 1966	HAAVI 71 p. 599
– UTILIZE THE EDUCATION ATTAINED			HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	-.05	ns		
– SATISFACTION WITH WORK			HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	+.11	ns		
– NOT ENOUGH TO DO AT HOME			HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	+.08	ns		
– GETTING INDEPENDENCE			HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	+.10	ns		
– LACKING INTEREST IN HOUSEWORK			HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	+.14	ns		
– MEETING PEOPLE			HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	+.07	ns		
– RETAINING CONNECTION WITH THE WORK LIFE			HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	+.04	ns		
– RAISING THE STANDARD OF LIVING			HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	-.11	ns		
– EARNING NECESSARY INCOME FOR FAMILY			HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	-.01	ns		
ECONOMIC REASONS MOST IMPORTANT FOR EMPLOYMENT	See above	In the lower social stratum, wives worked for money. In the upper stratum also for other reasons, but especially to utilize the education attained.	HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	-.28	05	See above	HAAVI 71 p. 599

W 2.10 – DESIRE FOR CHANGE OF JOB

			HAPP	Stat	Value	Test	Sig	Population / Sample	Source
UNFULFILLED ASPIRATIONS: NEW JOB, OWN BUSINESS	Open-ended question on unfulfilled aspirations: other aspirations vs aspiration mentioned	Computed for those having unfulfilled aspirations only (N=1646)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+.01	Gt'	ns	National adult population, U.S.A. Non-probability quota sample N: 2377, date: February, 1946	WESSM 56 p. 210
UNFULFILLED ASPIRATIONS: MOVE TO COUNTRY, BECOME FARMER	See above	See above	HAPP 1.1	G'	+.00	Gt'	ns	See above	WESSM 56 p. 210
DESIRED PERSONAL CHANGES: BETTER WORK AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS IT	Open-ended question on desired personal changes: other changes vs change mentioned	Computed for those who desire to change only (N = 1591).	HAPP 1.1	G'	-.39	Gt'	01	See above	WESSM 56 p. 211
PREFER TO CHANGE JOB WHEN POSSIBLE	Closed question: no / perhaps / yes	unmarried males : $r = -.08$ married males : $r = -.09$ unmarried females: $r = -.33$ married females : $r = -.03$	HAPP 2.1	r_{pm}	-	Chi^2		Adults, Amsterdam, The Netherlands Probability systematic random sample, stratified by sex and marital status N: 600, date: September – December, 1965	JONG 69 p. 22
DESIRE FOR CHANGE OF JOB	Question: 'If you had the choice, would you change your present job in agriculture for an other occupation?' no vs yes		HAPP 2.1	T^2	+.10	Chi^2	001	Individual farmowners and their families, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 1002, date: June – July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 110

W 2.11 – VARIOUS ATTITUDES TOWARDS WORK

			HAPP	Stat	Value	Test	Sig	Population / Sample	Source
REPORT OF HOPES CONCERNING JOB OR WORK SITUATION	Open-ended question on personal wishes and hopes for the future. Resonses rated as concerning good job, congenial work, employment, success in one's work, etc.; for oneself, spouse, or other family members.		HAPP 3.1	G'	-.01	Gt'	ns	Adult population of 5 Westernized nations, 3 underdeveloped giants, 2 countries in the Middle East, 3 Caribbean nations and the Philippines. Representative samples N: 18653, date: ± 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 263
REPORT OF FEARS CONCERNING JOB OR WORK SITUATION	Open-ended question on personal worries and fears for the future. Responses rated as concerning poor job, uncongenial work, unemployment, failure in one's work, etc.; for oneself, spouse, or other family members.		HAPP 3.1	G'	-.05	Gt'	ns	See above	CANTR 65/1 p. 263
THINKING OFTEN ABOUT WORK	Closed question: not at all / sometimes / often, during last week	Gammas computed on the basis of proportions 'often' answers. Unaffected by S.E.S. high S.E.S.: $G' = -.08$ (ns) low.S.E.S. : $G' = -.11$ (05)	HAPP 1.1	G'	-	Gt'		Inhabitants of 4 small communities, Illinois, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage samples N: 2006, date: March, 1962	BRADB 65/1 p. 54
ANXIETY ABOUT FUTURE OF FARM	Closed question: not anxious at all / rather not anxious / little anxious / very anxious		HAPP 2.1	T^2	-.16	Chi^2	001	Individual farmowners and their families, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 1002, date: June – July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 112