

**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

# S 5 SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

- S 5.1 Socio-economic status . . . . . see also E 1.1.1, I 1.1, W 2.4
- S 5.2 Satisfaction with S.E.S. . . . . see S 1.8
- S 5.3 Social mobility
- S 5.4 Various factors concerning S.E.S.

## S 5.1 - SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

see also 'Level of Education' (E 1.1.1),  
'Level of Income' (I 1.1), 'Work Prestige' (W 2.4)

S.E.S.	Interviewer's estimate: very poor / working class / middle class / well-to-do		HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .30	Gt'	01	National adult population, U.S.A. Probability sample, proportionally stratified by sex, age, occupation, S.E.S. and education N: 1015, date: 1948 - 1949	BUGHA 53 p. 213
CLASS	working / lower / lower middle / middle / upper middle / upper	upper : Mean = 7.2 upper middle: Mean = 7.4 middle : Mean = 6.8 lower middle: Mean = 5.7 lower : Mean = 4.6 working : Mean = 6.3	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			National adult population, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 1549, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 375
S.E.S.	3-item index containing educational level, family income and occupational prestige		HAPP 1.1	r <sub>pm</sub>	+ .14		01	Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. Probability samples N: 1547, date: 1972, 1973	SPREI 74 p. 455
SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS	Closed question: lower class / working class / middle class / upper class	Unaffected by S.E.S. (see above) Stronger among those under age 65: r = +.18 Lower among those of age 65+ : r = +.06 The difference is not significant	HAPP 1.1	r <sub>pm</sub>	+ .15		01	See above	SPREI 74 p. 455-457
S.E.S.	3-item index containing family income, educational level, and occupational level low vs high	Stronger in economically depressed areas Strongest among those of age 50+ living in a depressed area	HAPP 1.1	G'	+ .28	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
S.E.S.	3-item index containing educational level, family income and occupational prestige low / medium / high	Computed for Index of Positive Affects only: G = +.29 When controlled for sociability and novelty: G <sub>s</sub> = +.18 Unaffected by esteem for others	AFF 2.3	G	+			Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. Probability area sample N: 2787, date: January, 1963 - January, 1964	BRADB 69 p. 132
S.E.S.	3-item index containing income, educational level and occupational prestige low / middle / high		AFF 1.3	DR	+		ns	Adults, Alameda County, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 6928, date: 1965	BERKM 71 p. 40
S.E.S.	2-item index containing occupational level and educational level (Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Position; see Hollingshead, 1957) low / medium / high	Stronger among those reporting low social participation : G' = +.69 (01) Lower among those reporting medium and high social participation: G' = +.18 (ns), resp. G' = +.21 (05)	HAPP 1.1	G'	+ .30	Gt'	01	Adults, New Hampshire, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 600, date: —	PHILL 69 p. 7-10/17
		Index of Positive Affects: G' = +.40 (01) Index of Negative Affects: G' = -.16 (ns) (to be continued on next page)	AFF 2.3	G'	+	Gt'			

Among those reporting high contact with friends:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.25$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.25$  (ns)

Among those reporting medium contact with friends:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.56$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.05$  (ns)

Among those reporting low contact with friends:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.42$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.16$  (ns)

Among those knowing a high number of neighbours:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.39$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.18$  (ns)

Among those knowing a medium number of neighbours:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.32$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.03$  (ns)

Among those knowing a low number of neighbours:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.49$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.00$  (ns)

Among those reporting high organizational activity:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.28$  (05)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.12$  (ns)

Among those reporting medium organizational activity:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.33$  (05)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.09$  (ns)

Among those reporting low organizational activity:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.40$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.07$  (ns)

Among those reporting high social participation:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.29$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = -.18$  (ns)

Among those reporting medium social participation:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.38$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = +.01$  (ns)

Among those reporting low social participation:  
 Index of Positive Affects:  $G' = +.48$  (01)  
 Index of Negative Affects:  $G' = +.20$  (ns)

S.E.S.	Interviewer's estimate: very poor / working class / middle class / well-to-do		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.21	Gt'	01	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
S.E.S.	Interviewer's estimate: very poor / working class / middle class / well-to-do		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.23	Gt'	01	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
SOCIAL GRADE	6-point scale: E / D / C <sub>2</sub> / C <sub>1</sub> / B / A	AB social grade: Mean = 6.64 C <sub>1</sub> social grade: Mean = 5.56 C <sub>2</sub> social grade: Mean = 5.37 DE social grade: Mean = 4.73	HAPP 2.1	DM	+			National population, Britain Non-probability quota sample N: 213, date: March, 1971	ABRAM 73 p. 4
S.E.S.	Interviewer's estimate: very poor / working class / middle class / well-to-do		HAPP 2.1	G'	+.24	Gt'	01	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

S.E.S.	Interviewer's estimate: very poor / working class / well-to-do		HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .18	Gt'	01	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. 156
S.E.S.	Interviewer's estimate: very poor / working class / middle class / well-to-do		HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .42	Gt'	01	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
S.E.S.	Interviewer's estimate: very poor / working class / middle class / well-to-do		HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .34	Gt'	01	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
S.E.S.	Classification on the basis of (earlier) occupational prestige of chief wage-earner		HAPP 1.1	G	- .08	ns		National adult population, The Netherlands Probability area sample N: 1552, date: June, 1968	BAKKE 74 p. 27
S.E.S.	Interviewer's estimate: very poor / working class / middle class / well-to-do		HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .34	Gt'	01	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. 205
CLASS	working / lower / middle / upper middle; upper	upper; upper middle: Mean = 6.8 middle : Mean = 5.7 lower : Mean = 3.2 working : Mean = 4.7	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			National population, Israel Probability sample N: 1170, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 369
S.E.S.	Interviewer's estimate: very poor / working class / middle class / well-to-do		HAPP 2.1	G'	+ .16	Gt'	05	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. 130
<u>SPECIAL GROUPS</u>									
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF FATHER	some grade school or grade school graduate / some high school or high school graduate / some college or college graduate / post graduate college work		HAPP 1.1	G	+ .04	Chi <sup>2</sup>	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. 113/338
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF MOTHER	some grade school or grade school graduate / some high school or high school graduate / some college or college graduate / post graduate college work	When standardized on: - participation in extracurricular activities : $G_s^S = +.09$ - social class : $G_s^S = +.06$	HAPP 1.1	G	+ .09	Chi <sup>2</sup>	05	See above	BRENN 70 p. 113/338
INCOME LEVEL OF FATHER'S OCCUPATION	Under \$ 3400 / \$ 3400-5000 / over \$ 5000		HAPP 1.1	G	+ .07	Chi <sup>2</sup>	ns	See above	BRENN 70 p. 113/334
SOCIAL CLASS	weighted score based on the medium score of father's occupation, father's education and father's primary source of income lower / middle / upper	When standardized on: - having fun in life : $G_s^S = +.07$ - frequency of low mood : $G_s^S = +.15$ - tending to be a lonely person : $G_s^S = +.08$ - self-esteem : $G_s^S = +.08$ - having faith in people : $G_s^S = +.09$ - sensitivity to criticism : $G_s^S = +.09$ (to be continued on next page)	HAPP 1.1	G	+ .12	Chi <sup>2</sup>	ns	See above	BRENN 70 p. 113/330

- presenting a false self :  $G_s = +.13$   
 - participation in extracurricular activities :  $G_s = +.14$   
 - extent of dating :  $G_s^S = +.14$   
 - hours spent on work for pay :  $G_s^S = +.12$   
 - disruption of family relationships:  $G_s^S = +.12$   
 - number of children in the family :  $G_s^S = +.10$   
 - school social class :  $G_s^S = +.12$   
 - having fun in life, and tending to be a lonely person :  $G_s = +.07$   
 - having fun in life, and self-esteem :  $G_s = +.06$   
 - tending to be a lonely person, and self-esteem :  $G_s = +.06$   
 - having faith in people, and self-esteem :  $G_s = +.07$   
 - sensitivity to criticism, and self-esteem :  $G_s = +.05$

When Ss are regrouped, so that the upper third of middle class = upper class, and the lower third of middle class = lower class :  $G = +.06$   
 When standardized on educational level of mother :  $G_s = +.04$

When standardized on:  
 - having fun in life :  $G = +.03$   
 - frequency of low mood :  $G_s^S = +.08$   
 - tending to be a lonely person :  $G_s^S = +.04$   
 - self-esteem :  $G_s^S = +.03$   
 - having faith in people :  $G_s^S = +.02$   
 - sensitivity to criticism :  $G_s^S = +.04$   
 - presenting a false self :  $G_s^S = +.06$   
 - participation in extracurricular activities :  $G = +.06$   
 - extent of dating :  $G_s^S = +.07$   
 - hours spent on work for pay :  $G_s^S = +.03$   
 - disruption of family relationships:  $G_s^S = +.05$   
 - number of children in the family :  $G_s^S = +.05$   
 - school social class :  $G_s^S = +.05$   
 - tending to be a lonely person, and having fun in life :  $G = +.04$   
 - self-esteem, and having fun in life:  $G_s^S = +.01$   
 - self-esteem, and tending to be a lonely person :  $G_s = +.02$   
 - self-esteem, and having faith in people :  $G_s = +.01$   
 - self-esteem, and sensitivity to criticism :  $G_s = +.02$

When Ss are regrouped, so that the upper third of middle class = upper class and the lower third of middle class = lower class :  $G = +.01$   
 When standardized on educational level of mother :  $G_s = .00$

Stronger in lower class :  $G = +.33$   
 Lower in middle and upper class :  $G = +.23$   
 Unaffected by social class

AFF 1.1	G	+.05	Chi <sup>2</sup>	ns
	V	.03		
HAPP 1.1	G	+.25	Chi <sup>2</sup>	.01
	V	.12		
AFF 1.1	G	+.21	Chi <sup>2</sup>	.01
	V	.10		

SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS POSITION

Closed question: lower / working / lower middle / middle / upper middle / upper class

Juniors and seniors attending public high schools in New York State, U.S.A. (see last page)

SCHOOL SOCIAL CLASS (S.E.S. of the pupils of one's school)	Score on the basis of percentage of juniors and seniors of 'upper class' status	When standardized on participation in extracurricular activities : $G_S = +.12$ Stronger in middle and upper class : $G_S = +.11$ Lower in the lower class : $G = +.05$	HAPP 1.1	G	+ .14			Juniors and seniors attending public high schools in New York State, U.S.A. (See last page)	BRENN 70 p. 113/149/ 182/346
		When standardized on participation in extracurricular activities : $G_S = +.04$ Unaffected by social class	AFF 1.1	G	+ .07				
S.E.S.	weighted score on the basis of father's occupational status, father's education, mother's education, possessions in the home, number of books in the home, number of rooms per person in the home	Happiness was measured in each of the three interview waves, while S.E.S. was measured only in the first interview. See also instrument and remarks in excerpt (Part II).  Correlation with first measurement of happiness : $r = -.00$ with second measurement : $r = +.00$ with third measurement : $r = -.01$	COMP 1.2	$r_{pm}$	$\pm 0$		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. 209
HIGH EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF FATHER	Non-graduate vs college graduate	U-shaped curve: girls with a non-graduate father reporting significantly more 'average happiness'	COMP 2.2		$\pm 0$		ns	Female college students, New York, U.S.A. Type of sample construction unclear N: 238, date: —	WASHB 41 p. 283
S.E.S.	2-item index containing occupational level and educational level (Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Position; see Hollingshead, 1957)		COMP 1.1	$r_{pm}$	+ .08		ns	White males who had experienced a first heart attack, Durham, North Carolina, U.S.A. Non-probability quota sample N: 56, date: 1970	GARRI 73 p. 201
S.E.S.	Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Position (see above)	Index of Positive Affects: $t_k = +.23$ (001) $G_k = +.34$ Index of Negative Affects: $t_k = +.03$ (ns) $G_k = +.05$	HAPP 1.1	$t_{kc}$	+ .17		.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. 97/122-123
			AFF 2.3	$t_{kc}$ $G_c$	+				

### S 5.2 - SATISFACTION WITH S.E.S

see 'Satisfaction with Socio-Economic Level' (S 1.8)

### S 5.3 - SOCIAL MOBILITY

#### INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY

SOCIAL MOBILITY	Discrepancy between the respondent's S.E.S. and his father's S.E.S.	Both upward and downward social mobility are unrelated to happiness	HAPP 1.1	G	+ .03		ns	National adult population, The Netherlands Probability area sample N: 1552, date: June, 1968	BAKKE 74 p. 28 VEENH 75 p. 13
-----------------	---	---	----------	---	-------	--	----	--	--

JOB ADVANCEMENT

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 chances 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 2.1	DR	+	BCI	Adults, urban areas, U.S.A. Probability area sample N: 2787, date: January, 1963 - January, 1964	BRADB 69 p. 199	
ACHIEVING HIGHER JOB	Closed question: no vs yes		HAPP 2.1	G	+05	Chi <sup>2</sup>	ns	Male employees of age 40 - 65, The Netherlands Non-probability chunk sample N: 13,000, date: —	SONDE 75
SELF-PERCEIVED INCREASE IN OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE, AFTER MILITARY RETIREMENT	3-item index of 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: 362, date: August, 1970	GARBE 71 p. 181

STATUS INCONSISTENCY

SOCIAL MOBILITY	Discrepancy between level of school education and actual occupational status	For over-achievement : G = +.02 (ns) For under-achievement: G = +.07 (ns)	HAPP 1.1	G	+04		ns	National adult population, The Netherlands Probability area sample N: 1552, date: June, 1968	BAKKE 74 p. 28 VEENH 75 p. 13
ACHIEVEMENT	Difference between educational level and occupational level	Positive relationship with over-achievement (ns) Negative relationship with under-achievement (ns) Only among those of medium education the under-achievers are significantly less happy (05).	HAPP 1.1			Chi <sup>2</sup>	ns	Adults, Utrecht, The Netherlands Probability sample, stratified by age N: 300, date: autumn 1967	MOSER 69 p. 21

S 5.4 - VARIOUS FACTORS CONCERNING S.E.S.

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
THINKING OFTEN ABOUT GETTING AHEAD	Closed question: not at all / sometimes / often, during last week	Gamma computed on the basis of proportion 'often' answers. (to be continued on next page).	HAPP 1.1	G'	-	Gt'	ns	Inhabitants of 4 small communities, Illinois, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage samples N: 2006, date: March, 1962	BRADB 65/1 p. 54

		high S.E.S.: G' = -.06 (ns) low S.E.S. : G' = +.01 (ns)							
PERCEIVED SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS POSITION IN FUTURE	Closed question on the general standing of expected future business or profession: below average / average / good / excellent	Stronger in middle and upper class: G = +.22 Lower in lower class : G = +.09  Unaffected by social class	HAPP 1.1	G	+.23	Chi <sup>2</sup>	01	Juniors and seniors attending public high schools in New York State, U.S.A. Probability cluster sample of 10 public high schools N: sample B= 1664, date: 1960	BRENN 70 p. 120/182/362
			V	.10					
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		AFF 1.1	G	+.15	Chi <sup>2</sup>	01	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, spring 1969	BACHM 67/70 p. 243
			V	.08					
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 <sub>pb</sub>	-.05		ns		
AMBITIOUS JOB ATTITUDE	13-item index of closed questions indicating preference or 'a job that doesn't bug me' and preference for 'a job that pays off' (see above)		COMP 1.2	r <sub>pb</sub>	+.21		001	See above	BACHM 67/70 p. 243
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 <sub>pb</sub>	+.16		001	See above	BACHM 67/70 p. 243
			COMP 1.2	r <sub>pb</sub>	-.01		ns	See above	BACHM 67/70 p. 242