

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

L 4 LIVING ENVIRONMENT

- L 4.1 Community size
- L 4.2 Rural vs urban dwelling
- L 4.3 Geographic region
- L 4.4 Various characteristics of living environment
- L 4.5 Attitudes towards living environment see also § 1.2

L 4.1 - COMMUNITY SIZE

COMMUNITY SIZE	farm / rural nonfarm and under 2500 / 2500 - 9999 / 10,000 - 99,999 / 100,000 - 499,999 / 500,000 and over	See remarks in excerpt (Part II). in 1946: negroes: $G' = -.07$ (ns) whites: $G' = -.02$ (ns) in 1956: negroes: $G' = -.13$ (05) whites: $G' = +.02$ (ns) in 1966: negroes: $G' = -.30$ (01) whites: $G' = +.01$ (ns)	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. 56		
COMMUNITY SIZE	country / under 25,000 / 25,000 - 500,000 / over 500,000	Strongest among the well-to-do. reversed among blacks and low-income whites.	HAPP 1.1	t_{k_b}	-.03	01	National population, U.S.A. National probability sample N: 2970, date: 1952	FISCH 73/1 p. 226	
COMMUNITY SIZE	rural, small town, small city / suburb / metro-pole	U-shaped curve: Those living in suburbs being most happy. No difference between those living in a rural dwelling, a small town, or a small city was found.	HAPP 1.1	G'	-.06	Gt'	ns	Adults, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage area sample N: 2460, date: spring, 1957	GURIN 60 p. 229
COMMUNITY SIZE	Country / under 25,000 / 25,000 - 500,000 / over 500,000	Strongest among the well-to-do. Reversed among blacks and low-income whites.	HAPP 1.1	t_{k_b}	-.01		05	National population, U.S.A. National probability sample N: 1605, date: 1957	FISCH 73/2 p. 226
COMMUNITY SIZE	country / under 25,000 / 25,000 - 500,000 / over 500,000	Strongest among the well-to-do. Reversed among blacks and low-income whites.	HAPP 1.1	t_{k_b}	-.01		ns	National population, U.S.A. National probability sample N: 1555, date: 1963	FISCH 73/3 p. 226
COMMUNITY SIZE	out of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas / in SMSA / in large SMSA	Stronger among migrants and among the well-to-do. U-shaped curve among those who lived in communities of the same size as they were raised in: Those living in a SMSA being least happy. When those living in a SMSA were compared with those living in a large SMSA: $t_k = -.06$ (ns). Those living in the center of towns and cities were less happy than those living in the outskirts: $t_k = -.07$ (001)	HAPP 2.1	t_{k_b}	-.07		01	National population, U.S.A. Probability sample with double-sampling of blacks N: 1440, date: 1968	FISCH 73/4 p. 226
COMMUNITY SIZE	under 2500 / 2500 - 49,999 / 50,000 - 499,999 / over 500,000	See remarks in excerpt (Part II). under 2500 : Mean = 5.61 (6.11) 2500 - 49,999 : Mean = 5.82 (6.30) 50,000 - 499,999: Mean = 5.96 (5.83) 500,000+ : Mean = 5.72 (5.76)	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

SIZE OF HOME TOWN	less than 1000 / 1000 - 5000 / 5000 - 10,000 / 10,000 - 50,000 / 50,000 - 100,000 / over 100,000		HAPP 1.1	r _{pm}		t	ns	Male undergraduates, U.S.A. Non-probability chunk sample N: 103, date: + 1967	HEERE 69 p. 28
COMMUNITY SIZE	less than 2500 (rural) / 2500 - 250,000 / 250,000+ (large city)		HAPP 1.1	G	-0.25	Chi ²	05	Aged persons, U.S.A. National probability sample N: 319, date: 1973	HYNSO 75 p. 65
COMMUNITY SIZE	- 5000 / 5000 - 10,000 / 10,000 - 20,000 / 20,000 - 50,000 / 50,000+ / Havana	- 5000 : Mean = 5.3 5000 - 10,000 : Mean = 6.3 10,000 - 20,000: Mean = 6.0 20,000 - 50,000: Mean = 7.6 50,000+ : Mean = 6.3 Havana : Mean = 6.0	HAPP 3.1	DM				National adult population, Cuba Probability area sample N: 992, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 366
COMMUNITY SIZE	rural / 2000 - 50,000 / 50,000 - 500,000 / 500,000+	rural : Mean = 4.3 2000 - 50,000 : Mean = 4.9 50,000-500,000 : Mean = 5.6 500,000+ : Mean = 5.2	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			National adult population, Brazil Probability samples N: 2168, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 365
SIZE OF LOCALITY	village / small town / big town		HAPP 2.1	G'	-0.04	Gt'	05	National population of nine European countries Type of sample construction not reported N: 9605 (or 9543; see remarks in excerpt, Part II) date: May, 1975	COMMI 75 p. 139/153
COMMUNITY SIZE	rural / under 20,000 / 20,000 - 100,000 / over 100,000 / metro. Paris	Negative relationship among the well-to-do (05)	COMP 1.1	DM	+ 0			National population, France N: 2175, date: 1967	FISCH 73/5 p. 227
COMMUNITY SIZE	- 2000 / 2000 - 10,000 / 10,000 - 100,000 / 100,000+	- 2000 : Mean = 5.2 2000 - 10,000 : Mean = 5.3 10,000 - 100,000: Mean = 5.4 100,000+ : Mean = 5.3	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			National population, W. Germany Probability area sample N: 480, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 376
COMMUNITY SIZE	less than 5000 / 5000 - 20,000 / 20,000 - 50,000 / 50,000 - 100,000 / more than 100,000		HAPP 1.1	G	+0.06		ns	National adult population, The Netherlands Probability area sample N: 1552, date: June, 1968	BAKKE 74 p. 27
COMMUNITY SIZE	less vs more than 500,000 inhabitants		HAPP 1.1	r _{pm}	-0.11			Housewives, The Netherlands Probability area sample N: 450, date: autumn, 1964	PHILI 66 p. 66
COMMUNITY SIZE	village (rural) / up to 10,000 / 10,000 - 20,000 / 20,000 - 100,000 / 100,000+	village : Mean = 4.3 up to 10,000 : Mean = 4.3 10,000 - 20,000: Mean = 4.5 20,000 - 100,000: Mean = 4.7 100,000+ : Mean = 4.6	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			National adult population, Poland Probability samples N: 1464, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 374
COMMUNITY SIZE	rural / 5000 - 20,000 / 20,000 - 100,000 / 100,000+	rural : Mean = 4.7 5000 - 20,000 : Mean = 4.7 20,000 - 100,000: Mean = 4.6 100,000+ : Mean = 4.7	HAPP 3.1	DM	+ 0			National adult population, Nigeria Probability sample proportionally stratified by dwelling and region N: 1200, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 371
COMMUNITY SIZE	rural / 5000 - 99,999 / 100,000+	rural : Mean = 3.6 5000 - 99,999 : Mean = 4.1 100,000+ : Mean = 4.2	HAPP 3.1	DM	+			National population, India Probability sample proportionally poststratified by dwelling N: 2366, date: 1958	CANTR 65/1 p. 368

L 4.2 - RURAL VS URBAN DWELLING

URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	+0.14	Gt'	01	Adult populations of 14 countries Representative samples N: 18653, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 259
----------------	-------------------------	--	----------	----	-------	-----	----	---	----------------------

URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	-.01	Gt'	ns	National adult population, U.S.A. Probability sample N: 1549, date: <u>+</u> 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
LIVING IN AN URBAN AREA	rural / suburban / urban		HAPP 1.1	r _{pm}		t	ns	Male undergraduates, U.S.A. Non-probability chunk sample N: 103, date: <u>+</u> 1967	HEERE 69 p. 28
LIVING IN A CITY OR A TOWN	village or country vs city or town	L-shaped curve: Negative relationship among unhappier females only.	COMP 2.2		-		ns	Female college students, New York, U.S.A. N: 238, date: <u>-</u>	WASHB 41 p. 283
URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	+.56	Gt'	01	National adult population, Dominican Republic Probability samples N: 814, date: <u>+</u> 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	+.29	Gt'	01	National adult population, Panama Probability sample proportionally poststratified by dwelling and mortality N: 642, date: <u>+</u> 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	-.20	Gt'	01	National adult population, Cuba Probability area sample N: 992, date: <u>+</u> 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	+.30	Gt'	01	National adult population, Brazil Probability samples N: 2168, date: <u>+</u> 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
URBAN RESIDENCE	rural vs urban dwelling	In Dominican Republic: - Lower among those who have children (01) - Stronger among those who have no children (01) In Panama: - Stronger among those who have children (01) - Lower among those who have no children (ns) In Yugoslavia: - Stronger among those who have children (01) - Lower among those who have no children (ns)	HAPP 3.1	DM	+	DMRT	01	Adults in the Dominican Republic, Panama and Yugoslavia (married people only) Pooling of the Cantril (1965) samples of the Dominican Republic, Panama and Yugoslavia N: 4113, date: <u>+</u> 1960	BOHN 72 p. 31
LIVING IN AN URBAN SETTING	inhabitants of rural communes vs Helsinki	Lower among males : G' = +.12 (ns) Stronger among females: G' = +.25 (01)	HAPP 2.1	G'	+.18	Gt'	01	National population, Finland Probability samples N: 948, date: spring - summer, 1966	HAIVI 71 p. 587
URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	-.03	Gt'	ns	National population, W.Germany Probability area sample N: 480, date: <u>+</u> 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	+.26	Gt'	01	National adult population, Yugoslavia Probability sample N: 1523, date: <u>+</u> 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	+.22	Gt'	01	National population, Egypt Non-probability accidental sample proportionally post-stratified by dwelling N: 499, date: <u>+</u> 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	-.01	Gt'	ns	National adult population, Nigeria Probability sample proportionally stratified by dwelling and region N: 1200, date: <u>+</u> 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380

URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling		HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .28	Gt'	01	National population, India Probability sample proportionally poststratified by dwelling N: 2366, date: 1958	CANTR 65/1 p. 378-380
URBAN DWELLING	rural vs urban dwelling	Rural : Mean = 4.8 Semi-urban: Mean = 5.3 Urban : Mean = 5.2	HAPP 3.1	G'	+ .20	Gt'	01	National adult population, The Philippines Probability sample proportionally poststratified by dwelling N: 500, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 373/378-380

L 4.3 - GEOGRAPHIC REGION

REGION: LIVING IN THE SOUTH	non-south vs south	See remarks in excerpt (Part II). in 1946: negroes: G' = -.01 (ns) whites : G' = +.00 (ns) in 1956: negroes: G' = +.14 (ns) whites : G' = -.02 (ns) in 1966: negroes: G' = +.13 (ns) whites : G' = -.06 (05)	HAPP 1.1	G'		Gt'		National adult populations, U.S.A. Non-probability quota samples and probability area samples N: 25,617, date: 1946, 1947, 1948, 1956, 1966	MANNI 72 p. 53
REGION	South, Northeast, Midwest, or Far West		HAPP 1.1				ns	Non-institutionalized adults, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage sample N: 2460, date: spring, 1957	GURIN 60 p. 207/230
REGION	East, Midwest, South or West	See remarks in excerpt (Part II). East : Mean = 5.77 (5.87) Midwest: Mean = 5.83 (6.07) South : Mean = 5.58 (6.00) West : Mean = 5.95 (5.65)	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
REGION	West, East, North	West : Mean = 4.1 East : Mean = 3.6 North : Mean = 5.5	HAPP 3.1	DM				National adult population, Nigeria Probability sample proportionally stratified by dwelling and region N: 1200, date: + 1960	CANTR 65/1 p. 371

L 4.4 - VARIOUS CHARACTERISTICS OF LIVING ENVIRONMENT

REGION	coop. settlement / new urban / long settled urban / Tel Aviv, Haifa / Jerusalem	coop. settlement : Mean = 5.3 new urban : Mean = 4.5 long settled urban: Mean = 5.5 Tel-Aviv, Haifa : Mean = 5.5 Jerusalem : Mean = 5.5	HAPP 3.1	DM				National population, Israel Probability sample N: 1170, date: + 1960	CANTR. 65/1 p. 369
ECONOMIC DEPRESSION OF LOCAL ENVIRONMENT	Comparison of inhabitants of 4 communities varying in degree of economic depression (see also sample construction in excerpt, Part II)	Negative among those of lower S.E.S. only. Strongest among those of age 50+ and low S.E.S. Slightly reversed among those of age 50+ and high S.E.S. Index of Positive Affects: G' = -.12 (01) Stronger among those under the age of 50 Positive among those of low S.E.S. Not among those of high S.E.S. Index of Negative Affects: G' = +.02 (ns) Negative among those of age 50+ and lower S.E.S. only. (To be continued on next page)	HAPP 1.1	G'	- .17	Gt'	01	Inhabitants of 4 small communities, Illinois, U.S.A. Probability multi-stage samples N: 2006, date: March, 1962	BRADB 65/1 p. 62-65
			AFF 2.3	G'	-	Gt'			

IMPROVING ECONOMIC CLIMATE OF LOCAL ENVIRONMENT	living in a prosperous vs an improving economic climate	Reversed among those under the age of 50 and higher S.E.S. Not among those of age 50+ and higher S.E.S. and among those under the age of 50 and lower S.E.S. This analysis is based on a comparison of the answers of the inhabitants of two communities (N = 1005) Positive among those of lower S.E.S. only.	HAPP 1.1	G'	+10	Gt'	ns	Inhabitants of 4 small communities, Illinois, U.S.A. (see last page)	BRADB 65/1 p. 62
PERCEIVED SAFETY	Direct question on whether it is safe to walk at night		HAPP 1.1	mc	+21			Urban adult Jewish population, Israel Probability area sample using dwelling units N: 1830, date: summer, 1973	LEVY 75/2 p. 373
ESTIMATE OF CHANCES OF BEING ROBBED	Respondent's own evaluation	males : G = +.05 females : G = +.07 males : G = -.02 females : G = -.10 Index of Positive Affects: males : G = +.04 females: G = +.06 Index of Negative Affects: males : G = +.01 females: G = +.06	HAPP 1.1	G'	+			Adults, Metro Manila, The Philippines Probability area sample N: 941, date: January - April, 1972	BULAT 73 p. 234-235
GETTING ON WELL WITH THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES	Closed question: very badly / rather badly / average / fairly well / very well		HAPP 2.1	t ²	+16	Chi ²	001	Individual farmers and their families, Poland Non-probability purposive quota sample N: 1002, date: June - July, 1960	MAKAR 62 p. 109

L 4.5 - ATTITUDES TOWARDS LIVING ENVIRONMENT

see also 'Satisfaction with Living Environment' (S 1.2)

LIVING CONDITIONS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD	Respondent's own evaluation	males : G = +.15 females : G = +.19 Lower among males : G = +.17 Stronger among females: G = +.34 Index of Positive Affects: males : G = +.18 females: G = +.05 Index of Negative Affects: males : G = -.12 females: G = -.07	HAPP 1.1	G	+			Adults, Metro Manila, The Philippines Probability area sample N: 941, date: January - April, 1972	BULAT 73 p. 234-235
POSITIVE EVALUATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD	Closed question ranging from 'not at all good' to 'very good'		HAPP 1.1	mc	+28			Urban adult Jewish population, Israel Probability area sample using dwelling units N: 1940, date: spring, 1973	LEVY 75/1 p. 372
WANT TO CONTINUE LIVING IN ONE'S TOWN	Closed question ranging from 'definitely no' to 'definitely yes'		HAPP 1.1	mc	+23			See above	LEVY 75/1 p. 372
			AFF 1.1	mc	+26				
			AFF 1.1	mc	+12				

WANT TO MOVE TO AN OTHER TOWN

Closed question ranging from 'definitely no'
to 'definitely yes'

GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY

Number of times one moved his residence in
the past 10 years

HAPP 1.1	mc	-.14
AFF 1.1	mc	-.05
HAPP 3.1	r	-.05

Urban adult Jewish population, Israel
(see last page)

LEVY 75/1
p. 372

People of 46 and over, Duke, U.S.A.
Probability systematic random sample stratified by age
and sex
N: 502, date: 1968

PALMO 72
p. 70