<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Nr of Studies on this Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1</td>
<td>Residential career</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1.1</td>
<td>Earlier residence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1.1.1</td>
<td>. Earlier satisfaction with residence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1.2</td>
<td>Change in residence</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1.2.2</td>
<td>. change in residence characteristics</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1.2.3</td>
<td>. change in satisfaction with residence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1.4</td>
<td>Later residence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1.4.1</td>
<td>. Later attitudes to residence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2</td>
<td>Current residence context</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.1</td>
<td>Community size</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.1.1</td>
<td>. open country vs village</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.1.2</td>
<td>. rural vs urban dwelling</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.1.3</td>
<td>. sub-urban vs urban</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.1.4</td>
<td>. size of urban setting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.2</td>
<td>Modernity of community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.3</td>
<td>Planned community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.3</td>
<td>Local economic prosperity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.3.1</td>
<td>Economic growth/decline in community</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.3.2</td>
<td>Local costs of living</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.3.3</td>
<td>Local quality of housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.3.4</td>
<td>Local income level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4</td>
<td>Local facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.1</td>
<td>Actual local facilities</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2</td>
<td>Satisfaction with local facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.2</td>
<td>Satisfaction with medical services</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.3</td>
<td>Satisfaction with local police</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.4</td>
<td>Satisfaction with local recreation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.5</td>
<td>Satisfaction with local schools</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.6</td>
<td>Satisfaction with local shops</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.7</td>
<td>Satisfaction with neatness of local streets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.8</td>
<td>Satisfaction with local transport facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.5</td>
<td>Local safety</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.5.1</td>
<td>Actual safety in community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.5.2</td>
<td>Perceived safety in community</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.5.3</td>
<td>Satisfaction with safety in community</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6</td>
<td>Local social cohesion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6.1</td>
<td>Local social homogeneity</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6.2</td>
<td>Local social contacts</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6.3</td>
<td>Perceived cohesion in community</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.7</td>
<td>Local politics</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.7.1</td>
<td>Attitudes to local political issues</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.7.2</td>
<td>Attitudes to local government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.8</td>
<td>Remoteness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.9</td>
<td>Local nature</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.9.1</td>
<td>Actual local nature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.9.2</td>
<td>Attitude to local natural environment</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10</td>
<td>Attitudes to local environment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.1</td>
<td>Attitude to region</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.2</td>
<td>Attitude to community</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.3</td>
<td>Attitude to neighborhood</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.4</td>
<td>Attitude to urban life</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.6</td>
<td>Attitude to local climate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.7</td>
<td>Attitude to local costs of living</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.11</td>
<td>Joint local characteristics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.12</td>
<td>Local cultural climate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.12.1</td>
<td>Local educational level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>Happiness Items used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td>Statistics used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td>About the World Database of Happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td>Further Findings in the World Database of Happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5</td>
<td>Related Subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cite as Veenhoven, R.: Findings on LOCAL ENVIRONMENT World Database of Happiness, Correlational Findings Internet: worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2009, Netherlands
Correlational finding on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Subject code: L10

Study BRINK 1997/2

Reported in: Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Fredell, K.; Frideres, J.
Basic Minimum Needs, Quality of Life and Selected Correlates: Explorations in Villages in Northern India.
Social Indicators Research, 1997, Vol. 42, 245 - 281 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1023/A:1006834830518
Page in Report: 263

Population: Adult, general public, poor rural village, Bhopalpani, India 1991

Sample: Non-probability purposive-quota sample

Non-Response: 108
N: 0

Correlate

Authors label: Drinking water (1)

Our classification: LOCAL ENVIRONMENT, code L10

Measurement: Family needs prioritized by Paired Comparisons. Out of four basic needs, people were asked to compare two at a time and to select, which they sought 'their family needs most'.
Items were:
- food
- health
- employment
- leisure
This leads to six pairs of comparisons.
Score per need can be:
0. not mentioned
1. once
2. twice
3. three times
Needs index is the mean number of times an item is chosen.

Measured Values: 0: 1.89; 1: 9.2; 2: 24.8; 3: 33.9; M: 32.1
**Remarks:** Items for pairwise comparison were selected by participant observation and open interviews

---

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-H?/?/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.04</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/?/sq/l/5/a</td>
<td>r= -.01 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**  
**Subject code: L10**

**Study**  
**BRINK 1997/2**

*Reported in:* Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Fredell, K.; Frideres, J. 
Basic Minimum Needs, Quality of Life and Selected Correlates: Explorations in Villages in Northern India.  
Social Indicators Research, 1997, Vol. 42, 245 - 281 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1023/A:1006834830518  
Page in Report: 263

*Population:* Adult, general public, poor rural village, Bhopalpani, India 1991

*Sample:* Non-probability purposive-quota sample

*Non-Response:* 108

*N:* 0

**Correlate**

*Authors label: Bridge (1)*

*Our classification: LOCAL ENVIRONMENT, code L10*
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Measurement:
Family needs prioritized by Paired Comparisons. Out of four basic needs, subjects were asked to compare two at a time and to select, which they sought 'their family needs most.' Items were:
- food
- health
- employment
- leisure
This leads to six pairs of comparisons.
Score per need can be:
0. not mentioned
1. once
2. twice
3. three times
Needs index is the mean number of times an item is chosen.

Measured Values: 0: 1,60; 1: 10,1; 2: 36,7; 3: 36,7; M: 16,5

Remarks: Items for pairwise comparison were selected by participant observation and open interviews

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-H/?/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=-.06 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/?/sq/l/5/a</td>
<td>r=+.12 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT
Subject code: L10

Study

BRINK 1997/2

Reported in: Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Fredell, K.; Frideres, J.
Basic Minimum Needs, Quality of Life and Selected Correlates: Explorations in Villages in Northern India.
Social Indicators Research, 1997, Vol. 42, 245 - 281 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1023/A:1006834830518
Page in Report: 263
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Population: Adult, general public, poor rural village, Bhopalpani, India 1991

Sample: Non-probability purposive-quota sample

Non-Response: 108

N: 0

Correlate

Authors label: Irrigation (1)

Our classification: LOCAL ENVIRONMENT, code L10

Measurement: Family needs prioritized by Paired Comparisons. Out of four basic needs, ss were asked to compare two at a time and to select, which they sought 'their family needs most'.

Items were:
- food
- health
- employment
- leisure

This leads to six pairs of comparisons.

Score pro need can be:
0. not mentioned
1. once
2. twice
3. three times

Needs index is the mean number of times an item is chosen.

Measured Values: 0: 1,74; 1: 11,0; 2: 27,5; 3: 37,6; M: 23,9.

Remarks: Items for pairwise comparison were selected by participant observation and open interviews

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-H/?/sq/f7/a</td>
<td>r=.05 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/?/sq/l5/a</td>
<td>r=.18 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Correlational finding on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Subject code: L10**

**Study**

*Reported in:* Powdthavee N.

Put a Price Tag on Friends, Relatives, and Neighbours: Using Surveys of Life Satisfaction to Value Social Relationships


**Population:** 16-65 aged, followed 6 years, Great-Britain, 1997-2003

**Sample:** Probability stratified sample

**Non-Response:** n.a.

**N:** 54424

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Quality of accomodation and neighbourhood variables

**Our classification:** LOCAL ENVIRONMENT, code L10

**Measurement:** Answer on the question referring to quality of accomodation and neighbourhood: Does your accommodation have any of the following problems?

0 No

1 Yes

- a Shortage of space
- b Noise from neighbours
- c Street noise
- d Not enough lights
- e Lack of adequate heating
- f Condensation
- g Leaky roof
- h Damp walls, floor, etc.
- i Rot in windows, floor etc.
- j Pollution/environmental problems
- k Vandalism or crime

**Remarks:** T1=average 1997-2000, T2=2002
### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = -0.02 ns</td>
<td>Shortage of space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (-.019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = +0.01 ns</td>
<td>Noise from neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (+.007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = +0.01 ns</td>
<td>Street noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (+.006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = -0.07 p &lt; .00</td>
<td>Not enough lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (-.066)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = +0.03 ns</td>
<td>Lack of adequate heating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (+.025)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = +0.01 ns</td>
<td>Condensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (-.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = -0.02 ns</td>
<td>Leaky roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (-.017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = -0.06 p &lt; .01</td>
<td>Damp walls, floor, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (-.059)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e  B = .02  ns
i Rot in windows, floor etc.
B (-.018)

O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e  B = .02  ns
j Pollution/environmental problems
B (-.021)

O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e  B = .02  ns
k Vandalism or crime
B (-.023)

B's controlled for
- Frequency of meeting friends and relatives
- Talk to neighbours
- Socioeconomic variables
- Other indicators of quality of accommodation and neighbourhood variables
- Average district income

B's calculated by fixed effects estimations:
Change in answers from T1 to T2

---

Correlational finding on Happiness and Earlier residence
Subject code: L10.1.1

Study BRINK 1986A

Reported in: Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Jacob, J.
Quality of Life in an Alternative Lifestyle: The Smallholding Movement. Social Indicators Research, 1986, Vol. 18, 153 - 173 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00317546
Page in Report: 158

Population: 'Back to the land' mini-farmers, West USA and Canada, 198?

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response: 44%

N: 510
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

Authors label: area of origin (1)

Our classification: Earlier residence, code L10.1.1

Measurement: Childhood residence before age 18:
1. rural farm
2. small town
3. small city
4. metropolis

Measured Values: 1: Males 29% Female: 27%, 1+2: Males 56% Females 52%

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a r=+.01  ns

Correlational finding on Happiness and Earlier residence
Subject code: L10.1.1

Study BRINK 1986A

Reported in: Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Jacob, J.
Quality of Life in an Alternative Lifestyle: The Smallholding Movement.
Social Indicators Research, 1986, Vol. 18, 153 - 173 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00317546
Page in Report: 158

Population: 'Back to the land' mini-farmers, West USA and Canada, 198?

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response: 44 %

N: 510

Correlate

Authors label: years in urban area (1)
**Our classification:** Earlier residence, code L10.1.1

**Measurement:** Selfreport of years lived in urban area

**Measured Values:** Males: ranges 0-86 M=13.1, Females: range 0-70 M=12.1

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=+.05</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Earlier residence

**Subject code: L10.1.1**

**Study** ORMEL 1980

**Reported in:** Ormel, J.
Moeite met Leven of een Moeilijk Leven. (Difficulties with Living or a Difficult Life).
Konstapel, 1980, Groningen, Netherlands
Page in Report: 350

**Population:** 15-60 aged, general public, followed 12 month, The Netherlands, 1967-77

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** 18%

**N:** 296

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Earlier community size (1)

**Our classification:** Earlier residence, code L10.1.1

**Measurement:** T1 (1970) inhabitants in place of residence:

1: below 10,000
2: 10,000-100,000
3: over 100,000
Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/4/c</td>
<td>r=−.02 ns</td>
<td>T2 happiness by T1 community size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r=+.01 ns</td>
<td>T3 happiness by T1 community size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . Earlier satisfaction with residence
Subject code: L10.1.1.1

Study

HOOPE 1989

Reported in: Hoopes, L.L.; Lounsbury, J.W.
An Investigation of Life Satisfaction Following a Vacation: A Domain-Specific Approach.
Page in Report: 132, 134

Population: Working adults, USA, before and after vacation, 198?

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response: 23

N: 129

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community

Our classification: Earlier satisfaction with residence, code L10.1.1.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: Index of:
Satisfaction with friendships and social bonds:
- the number of good, close friends you have
- the people you see socially
- the religious fulfillment in your life
- how much you help people or groups in this community
Satisfaction with where you live:
- your house/apartment
- the neighborhood you live in
- the community you live in.

Assessed on a 1–7 scale: 1 delighted...7 terrible

Measured Values: N=119 M=2.53 SD=0.96

Error Estimates: alpha=.87

Remarks: Assessed for three periods:
T1: 1 or 2 weeks before vacation
T2: during vacation (retrospectively at T3)
T3: the week after vacation

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.43</td>
<td>T1 life satisfaction and T1 satisfaction with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.34</td>
<td>T1 satisfaction with community and T3 life satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.36</td>
<td>T1 life satisfaction and T3 satisfaction with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.41</td>
<td>T3 life satisfaction and T3 satisfaction with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and change in satisfaction with

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Subject code: L10.1.2.3

Study
HEADE 1982/2


Page in Report: 53

Population: Adults, general public, Melbourne, Australia, followed 25 months 1978-81

Sample: Probability sample (unspecified)

Non-Response: 0

N: 184

Correlate

Authors label: Change in satisfaction with suburb

Our classification: . change in satisfaction with residence, code L10.1.2.3

Measurement: Single question on satisfaction with this suburb and community as a place to live in, scored on a 1-9 D-T rating scale

Remarks: Both Happiness (ABS) and satisfaction with suburb were assessed at T1 and T2 (25 month interval)

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks
A-BB/cm/mq/v/2/a | Beta= +.05 ns | T1-T2 CHANGE in happiness by T1-T2 CHANGE in satisfaction with suburb

Correlational finding on Happiness and . change in satisfaction with residence

Subject code: L10.1.2.3
### Study: HEADE 1984

- **Reported in:** Headey, B., Holmström, E.; Wearing, A.
- The Impact of Life Events and Changes in Domain Satisfactions on Well-Being.
- Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol. 15, 203 - 227. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00668671
- Page in Report: 211

- **Population:** 18-65 aged, general public, followed 3 years, Melbourne, Australia, 1979-80

- **Sample:**

- **Non-Response:**

| N | 184 |

### Correlate

- **Authors label:** Satisfaction with suburb (2)

- **Our classification:** change in satisfaction with residence, code L10.1.2.3

- **Measurement:** Closed question rated on a 9-point scale (delighted ... terrible) Assessed at T2.

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>Beta $= +.05$ ns</td>
<td>Happiness T2 by satisfaction T2, controlling for happiness T1 and satisfaction T1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\beta$ can be interpreted as regression between CHANGE OF HAPPINESS and CHANGE OF SATISFACTION in time.

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Later residence

**Subject code:** L10.1.4

### Study: BACHM 1978/2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Bachman, J.G.; O'Malley, P.M.; Johnston, J.
Institute for Social Research, 1970, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

Page in Report:

Population: Public highschool boys followed 8 years from grade 10, USA, 1966-74

Sample:

Non-Response: 2.8% at T1, 17.2% at T2, 21.0% at T3, 28.9% at T4, 28.5% at T5

N: 2213

Correlate

Authors label: Urbanicity of later dwelling (1)

Our classification: Later residence, code L10.1.4

Measurement: Urbanicity of dwelling at T5
1 = rural communinity or small town or city of fewer than 50,000;
2 = medium sized city (50,000–100,000) or suburb of medium sized city;
3 = fairly large city (100,000–500,000) or suburb of fairly large city;
4 = very large city (over 500,000) or suburb of a very large city

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/g/mq/v/5/a</td>
<td>tau = ns</td>
<td>T1 happiness: tau = -.03 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T2 happiness: tau = -.02 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T3 happiness: tau = -.02 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T4 happiness: tau = -.02 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Later attitudes to residence
Subject code: L10.1.4.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study

Reported in: Hoopes, L.L.; Lounsbury, J.W.
An Investigation of Life Satisfaction Following a Vacation: A Domain-Specific Approach.
Page in Report: 132,134

Population: Working adults, USA, before and after vacation, 198?,

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response: 23

N: 129

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community

Our classification: . Later attitudes to residence, code L10.1.4.1

Measurement:
Index of:
Satisfaction with friendships and social bonds:
- the number of good ,close friends you have
- the people you see socially
- the religious fulfillment in your life
- how much you help people or groups in this community
Satisfaction with where you live, :
- your house/ apartment
- the neighborhood you live in
- the community you live in.

Assessed on a 1-7 scale: 1 delighted...7 terrible

Measured Values: N=119 M=2,53 SD=.96

Error Estimates: alpha=.87

Remarks: Assessed for three periods:
T1: 1 or 2 weeks before vacation
T2: during vacation (retrospectively at T3)
T3: the week after vacation

Observed Relation with Happiness
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.43</td>
<td>T1 life satisfaction and T1 satisfaction with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.34</td>
<td>T1 satisfaction with community and T3 life satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.36</td>
<td>T1 life satisfaction and T3 satisfaction with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.41</td>
<td>T3 life satisfaction and T3 satisfaction with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local environment

Subject code: L10.10

Study


Population: 16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:

N: 4420

Correlate

Authors label: satisfaction with living environment

Our classification: Attitudes to local environment, code L10.10
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Selfreport on single question
1: dissatisfied
2: not very satisfied
3: satisfied
4: very satisfied

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=+.30</td>
<td>N=4407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local environment**

**Subject code:** L10.10

**Study**

**AUSTR 1984/2**

**Reported in:** Austrom, D.R.
The Consequences of Being Single.
Peter Lang Publisher, 1984, New York, USA ISBN 0 8204 0095 5
Page in Report: 237

**Population:** 23-59 aged English speaking, Toronto and Ontario, Canada, 198?

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** 45%

**N:** 1038

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with place of residence etc. (1)

**Our classification:** Attitudes to local environment, code L10.10
Measurement: Closed questions rated on a 11-point scale ranging from 'completely dissatisfied' to 'completely satisfied'. The respondents were asked how satisfied they were with their: place of residence, community life, neighborhood.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/a</td>
<td>(r=)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- place of residence: (r = .35) (001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- community life: (r = .33) (001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- neighborhood: (r = .27) (001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local environment

Subject code: L10.10

Study

AUSTR 1984/2

Reported in: Austrom, D.R.
The Consequences of Being Single.
Peter Lang Publisher, 1984, New York, USA ISBN 0 8204 0095 5
Page in Report: 109/134/37

Population: 23-59 aged English speaking, Toronto and Ontario, Canada, 198?

Sample:

Non-Response: 45%

\(N\): 1038

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with living situation (1)

Our classification: Attitudes to local environment, code L10.10
**Measurement:** Factor analysis based on closed questions on satisfaction with:
- 1. place of residence;
- 2. community life;
- 3. neighborhood.
Rated on a 11-point scale ranging from completely dissatisfied to completely satisfied.

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/a | r=+.34     | ALL Ss (married (including not formally married cohabitating Ss (considered as married)) and non-married):

\[ \beta = +.13 \] after control for: gender, age, household income, marital status, being in love, desire to change dating pattern or marital status, locus of control, social support (1. instrumental: problems managing money, deciding how to spend money, not enough money to do things, unsatisfying job, not enough money to get by on; 2. expressive: no close companions, no one to depend on, unsatisfactory sex life, problems communicating, dissatisfied with marital status, not enough close friends, no one to show love/affection, too dependent on others, not having children, no one to understand problems; 3. interpersonal demands: too many responsibilities, no one to depend on, too many demands on time, problems communicating, problems with children, problems with spouse/ex-spouse, conflicts with those who are close) and satisfaction with: job and financial situation, friendships, love relationships.

**NON-MARRIED Ss ONLY:**

- males: \( \text{rpm} = +.32 \) \( \beta = +.20 \)
- females: \( \text{rpm} = +.31 \) \( \beta = +.12 \)

Beta's controlled for the same variables as above, except gender and marital status.
Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local environment
Subject code: L10.10

Study BERNO 1985

Reported in: Bernow, R
Livskvaliteten i Sverige. (Lifequality in Sweden)
Page in Report: 40

Population: 18-70 aged, general public, Sweden, 1982

Sample:
Non-Response: ?
N: 1558

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with living environment (1)
Our classification: Attitudes to local environment, code L10.10
Measurement: Single direct question

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
O-SLW/c/sqt/v/7/a r=+.31

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local environment
Subject code: L10.10

Study LAI 2005
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Page in Report: 1173-1178

Population: Elderly living in long-term care settings, Taiwan 2000

Sample: Probability simple random sample

Non-Response: 9%

N: 465

Correlate

Authors label: Environment domain

Our classification: Attitudes to local environment, code L10.10

Measurement: Selfreport on 8 questions about the environment in the last four weeks:

a. Freedom, physical safety and security.
   Q8: How safe do you feel in your daily life?

b. Physical environment: (pollution/noise/traffic/climate).
   Q9: How healthy is your physical environment?

c. Financial resources.
   Q12: Have you enough money to meet your needs?

d. Opportunities for acquiring new information and skills;
   Q13: How available to you is the information that you need in your day-to-life?

e. Participation in and opportunities for recreation/leisure activities;
   Q14: To what extent do you have the opportunity for leisure activities?

f. Home environment.
   Q23: How satisfied are you with the conditions of your living place?

g. Health and social care: accessibility and quality.
   Q24: How satisfied are you with your access to health services?

h. Transport.
Q25: How satisfied are you with your transport?

Subscale of Taiwan's abbreviated version of the WHOQOL-BREF

**Measured Values:** Range=4-20 : Mean=12,20; SD=1,74; Median=12,00; Mode=12

**Error Estimates:** Cronbach's alfa:0,75 >0,70

**Remarks:** See/cf. Environment Domain (TW)

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-QOL/cm/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>$r=+.44$</td>
<td>$p&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local environment**

**Subject code: L10.10**

**Study**

LAI 2005


**Page in Report:** 1173-1178

**Population:** Elderly living in long-term care settings, Taiwan 2000

**Sample:** Probability simple random sample

**Non-Response:** 9%

**N:** 465

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Environment domain

**Our classification:** Attitudes to local environment, code L10.10
**Measurement:** Selfreport on 8 questions about the environment in the last four weeks:

- **a. Freedom, physical safety and security.**
  - Q8: How safe do you feel in your daily life?

- **b. Physical environment:** (pollution/noise/traffic/climate);
  - Q9: How healthy is your physical environment?

- **c. Financial resources.**
  - Q12: Have you enough money to meet your needs?

- **d. Opportunities for acquiring new information and skills.**
  - Q13: How available to you is the information that you need in your day-to-life?

- **e. Participation in and opportunities for recreation/leisure activities.**
  - Q14: To what extent do you have the opportunity for leisure activities?

- **f. Home environment.**
  - Q23: How satisfied are you with the conditions of you living place?

- **g. Health and social care:** accessibility and quality.
  - Q24: How satisfied are you with your access to health services?

- **h. Transport.**
  - Q25: How satisfied are you with your transport?

- **I. Eating/food.**
  - Q28: (Question not reported)

Subscale of Taiwan's abbreviated version of the WHOQOL-BREF

**Measured Values:** Range 4-20: Mean=12,47; SD=1,65; Median=12,44; Mode=12.

**Error Estimates:** Cronbach's alfa:0,78 > 0,70

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-QOL/cm/sq/v/5/a  \( r=+.41 \)  \( p<.001 \)  
Addition of the national question Q29 about "Eating/food" created a slight increase in correlation

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local environment

Subject code: L10.10

Study  
MOLLE 2004


Population: 55+ aged, 6 European nations, 2000

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: 45%

N: 3950

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with living area

Our classification: Attitudes to local environment, code L10.10

Measurement: Selfreport on single question: All in all, how satisfied are you with your local environment? Rated on 11-point numeral scale

Measured Values: Finland: Urban: M=8,7; SD=1,3; Rural: M = 8,6; SD=1,4; ns; Netherlands: Urban=7,4; SD=1,7; Rural:M =8,1; SD=1,3; p>.001; Germany West: Urban: M=7,7; SD=2,3; Rural: M=9,0; SD=1,4; p<.001; Germany East: Urban: M=8,0; SD=1,8; Rural: M=8,1; SD=2,2; ns; Hungary: Urban: M=7,9; SD=2,5; Rural M=7,0; SD=2,6; p<.001; Italy: Urban: M=8,3; SD=2,0; Rural M=8,0; SD=2,1; p<.05

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure  Statistics  Elaboration/Remarks
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

- Finland (urban areas): Beta = ns
- Finland (rural areas): Beta = +.13, p<.05
- Netherlands (urban areas): Beta = ns
- Netherlands (rural areas): Beta = ns
- Germany West (urban areas): Beta = ns
- Germany West (rural areas): Beta = ns
- Germany East (urban areas): Beta = +.22, p<.05
- Germany East (rural areas): Beta = ns
- Hungary (urban areas): Beta = ns
- Hungary (rural areas): Beta = ns
- Italy (urban areas): Beta = ns
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Italy (rural areas)

Beta's controlled for:
- Age
- Gender
- Environment: Housing:
  - housing amenities
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
- Mobility:
  - car in household
  - satisfaction with public transportation
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Services:
  - medical services
  - services and shops
  - satisfaction with services
- Culture:
  - Cultural amenities
  - natural environment
  - satisfaction with leisure
- Security:
  - security
- Social Environment:
  - living together
  - division social network
  - friends/kin nearby
- Economic situation:
  - Income per person
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health:
  - ADL
  - satisfaction with health

Only standardized regression coefficient significant at a maximum error rate of alpha=.05 are shown.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region
Subject code: L10.10.1

Study  ABRAM 1972
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Abrams, M.; Hall, J.
Page in Report: 21

Population: 15+ aged, general public, Britain, 1971

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 213

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with district (1)

Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1

Measurement: Closed question rated on an 11-point self-anchoring scale, based on Cantril (1965)

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/l11/b</td>
<td>r=+.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region
Subject code: L10.10.1

Study

Reported in: Batista-Foquet, J.M.; Coenders, G.; Sureda-Pascual, J.
Satisfaction in Catolania, Spain.
Eötvös University Press, 1996, Hungary, 155 - 174 ISSN:963 463 0812
Page in Report: 159+168

Population: 16+ aged, general public, Catalonia, Spain, 1989

Sample: Probability stratified sample
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response: not reported

N: 406

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with place of residence (1)
Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1
Measurement: Single question:
"How satisfied are you recently with your place of residence?"
1. completely dissatisfied
2. dissatisfied
3. neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. satisfied
5. completely satisfied

Measured Values: M= 3.78; SD= 1.14 Scale % 1. 4.9 2. 9.1 3. 21.7 4. 32.0 5. 32.2

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/ea</td>
<td>r=+.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/ea</td>
<td>rp=+.24</td>
<td>rp corrects for random and systematic measurement error.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region
Subject code: L10.10.1

Study: HALL 1973
Reported in: Hall, J.
Measuring the Quality of Life Using Sample Surveys.
Page in Report: 100

Population: Adults, general public, Britain, 1971
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample:
Non-Response:

N: 593

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with district (1)

Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1

Measurement: Question rated on a 7-point self-anchoring scale, based on Cantril (1965)

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks
O-SLW/c/sq/l/7/a  | r=+.24     |

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region
Subject code: L10.10.1

Study

HALL 1976


Population: Adults, general public, Great Britain, 1971-75

Sample:
Non-Response: ?

N: 593
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors label:  Satisfaction with town (1)
Our classification:  Attitude to region, code L10.10.1
Measurement:  Direct closed question rated on a 11-point scale.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>r=+.31</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>r=+.25</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region
Subject code: L10.10.1

Study  HALL 1976

Reported in:  Hall, J.
Social Trends, 1976, Vol. 7,.47 - 60
Page in Report: 50

Population:  Adults, general public, Great Britain, 1971-75

Sample:
Non-Response:  ?
N: 593

Correlate

Authors label:  Satisfaction with district (1)
Our classification:  Attitude to region, code L10.10.1
Measurement:  Direct closed question rated on a 11-point scale.
Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>r=+.23</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>r=+.27</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>r=+.28</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region
Subject code: L10.10.1

Study: HARRY 1976

Reported in: Harry, J.
Evolving sources of happiness for men over the life cycle: A structural analysis
Page in Report: 292

Population: 18+ aged males, living with family, USA, 1973

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 374

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with city (1)

Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1

Measurement: Single item self-rating on how much satisfaction one receives from the city or place one lives in.
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>$r=+.06$ ns</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>$r=+.16$ ns</td>
<td>Married, no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>$r=+.19$ p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Married, pre-school children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>$r=+.09$ ns</td>
<td>Married, schoolage children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>$r=+.27$ ns</td>
<td>Married, teenage children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>$r=+.32$ p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Married, children grown up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region

**Subject code: L10.10.1**

**Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEADE 1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reported in:** Headey, B., Holmström, E.; Wearing, A. The Impact of Life Events and Changes in Domain Satisfactions on Well-Being. Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol. 15, 203 - 227. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00668671

**Population:** 18-65 aged, general public, followed 3 years, Melbourne, Australia, 1979-80

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

| N: 184 |

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with suburb (4)

**Our classification:** Attitude to region, code L10.10.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: Closed question rated on a 9-point scale (delighted ... terrible) Assessed at T2.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A-BB/cm/mg/v/2/a   | Beta=+.05 ns | Happiness T2 by satisfaction T2, controlling for happiness T1 and satisfaction T1. 
β can be interpreted as regression between CHANGE OF HAPPINESS and CHANGE OF SATISFACTION in time.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region

Subject code: L10.10.1

Study LEVY 1975/1


Population: 18+ aged, general public, urban areas, Israel, 1973

Sample:

Non-Response: -

N: 1940

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with life in one's town (1)

Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1

Measurement: Closed question ranging from 'not at all satisfied' to 'very satisfied'.
Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/?/6/a</td>
<td>mc=+.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/c/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>mc=+.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region
Subject code: L10.10.1

Study MACRA 1980

Reported in: MacRae, D.; Carlson, J.R.
Collective Preferences as Predictors of Interstate Migration.
Social Indicators Research, 1980, Vol. 8, 15 - 32. ISSN 0303 8300. DOI:10.1007/BF00364599
Page in Report: 22

Population: 18+ aged, general public, North Carolina, USA, 1977

Sample:

Non-Response: About 25%

N: 1081

Correlate

Authors label: Preference to live in own state (1)

Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1

Measurement:
Single direct question: "If you could live anywhere in the United States that you wanted to, what state would you choose?"
0 other state
1 own state

Observed Relation with Happiness
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks
--- | --- | ---
O-HL/c/sq/v/3/ad | D%+= | % very happy:
other state | 22% |
own state | 31% |

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region
Subject code: L10.10.1

Study

MICHA 1980


Population: University staff members, Guelph Canada, 1979

Sample:
Non-Response: 59%
N: 357

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with the area you live in (1)
Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1
Measurement: Closed question rated on a 7-point scale.

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**O-HL/u/sq/v/7/a**  
r=+.23  
p<.01

Controlled for 1  $\beta$ : ns  
Controlled for 1+3  $\beta$ : ns

1= Satisfaction with health, financial security, family life, friendship, housing, job, free time activity, education, self-esteem, area you live in, security from crime.

3= Demographic factors (sex, age, marital status, education, family income)

---

**O-DT/c/sq/v/7/aa**  
r=+.28  
p<.01

Controlled for 1  $\rho_c$ =+.05 (ns)  
Controlled for 1+2  $\rho_c$ =+.06 (ns)  
Controlled for 1+3  $\rho_c$ =+.06 (ns)  
Controlled for 1+2+3  $\rho_c$ =+.08 (ns)

Controlled for 1+2  $\rho_c$ =+.06 (ns)  
Controlled for 1+3  $\rho_c$ =+.06 (ns)  
Controlled for 1+2+3  $\rho_c$ =+.08 (ns)

Controlled for 1  $\rho_c$ =+.05 (ns)  
Controlled for 1+2  $\rho_c$ =+.06 (ns)  
Controlled for 1+3  $\rho_c$ =+.06 (ns)  
Controlled for 1+2+3  $\rho_c$ =+.08 (ns)

1= Satisfaction with health, financial security, family life, friendships, housing, job, free time activity, education, self-esteem, ability to get around, security from crime.

2= Global happiness (indicator 2, HAP 1.1)

3= Demographic factors (sex, age, marital status, education, family income)

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region

**Subject code: L10.10.1**

**Study**  
MICHA 1982

**Reported in:** Michalos, A.C.  
Page in Report: 24

**Population:** 60+ aged, rural townships, Southern Huron County, Ontario, Canada, 198?

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** 37%

**N:** 392
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors label: Satisfaction with area you live in (1)

Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1

Measurement: Closed question on the local area, rated on a 7-point scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>Beta= +.01</td>
<td>All ß's are controlled for satisfaction with family life, friendships, financial security, self-esteem, spouse, health, transportation, recreation, housing, religion, government services; and for sex, age and education. Males N:149 ß:+.10 Females N:121 ß:-.06 Farmers N:130 ß:+.04 Non-farmers N:141 ß:ns Age 60-74 N:170 ß:+.07 Age 75-up N:102 ß:-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/c/sq/v/7/aa</td>
<td>Beta= +.01</td>
<td>All ß's controlled for satisfaction with family life, friendships, financial security, self esteem, spouse, health, transportation, recreation, housing, religion, government services; and for sex, age, formal education. Males: N:149 ß:+.12 Females N:121 ß:-.07 Farmer N:130 ß:-.02 Non-farmer N:141 ß:+.06 Aged 60-74 N:170 ß:+.02 Aged 75-up N:102 ß:-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region
Subject code: L10.10.1

Study: MICHA 1983

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Michalos, A.C.
Satisfaction and Happiness in a Rural Northern Resource Community.
Social Indicators Research, 1983, Vol. 13, 225 - 252. ISSN 0303 8300. DOI:10.1007/BF00318099
Page in Report: 233

Population: 18+ aged, rural community, N.Ontario, Canada, 1982

Sample:
Non-Response: 8%
N: 598

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with area you live in (1)

Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1

Measurement: Closed question on the local area, rated on a 7-point scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/c/sq/v/7/aa</td>
<td>Beta = +.15</td>
<td>All ß's controlled for satisfaction with health, financial security, family relations, paid employment, friendships, housing, recreation activity, religion, self esteem, transportation, government services, and for the demographic factors: sex, age, formal education, language, work status, marital status, time in area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males : N: 173 ß: +.08
Females: N: 154 ß: +.19
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

All β's controlled for satisfaction with health, financial security, family relations, paid employment, friendships, housing, recreation activity, religion, self esteem, transportation, government services; and for sex, age, formal education, language, work status, marital status, time in area.

Males : N: 173 β: +.06  
Females: N: 154 β: +.05

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to region

Subject code: L10.10.1

Study PEIL 1984


Population: Adult, general public, urban areas (Freetown, Bo and Kenema), Sierra Leone, 1981

Sample: Non-Response: 5% (on some items up to 60%)  
N: 640

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with town (1)  
Our classification: Attitude to region, code L10.10.1  
Measurement: Direct question: "How do you feel about your town?"

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2

Study
BHARA 1977
Reported in: Bharadwaj, L.; Wilkening, E.A.
The Prediction of Perceived Well-Being.
Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 421 - 439 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353143
Page in Report: 430

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin, USA, 197?

Sample:
Non-Response: 12%
N: 1423

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community (1)
Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2
Measurement: direct closed question rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from "completely satisfied" to "completely dissatisfied".

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
O-SLW/u/sqt/v/7/a r=+.36
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/u/sqt/v/7/a  Beta = +.14

All β's controlled for satisfaction with family-life, standard of living, work, health, spare time activities, income, housing, food, spiritual matters, education, organizational involvement, natural environment, national government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>β: +.09</td>
<td>under $4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>β: +.20</td>
<td>$4000 - 7999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>β: +.19</td>
<td>$8000 - 15999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 65</td>
<td>β: +.09</td>
<td>over $16000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENDER

males β: +.17
females β: +.13

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2

Study  BUTTE 1977


Population: 18+ aged, general public, Winconsin USA, 1974

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 548

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community (1)

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Single closed question rated on a 7-point scale: Now tell me, how satisfied are you with (name city - or if respondent lives in rural open country, name county) as a place to live in: completely satisfied / very satisfied / satisfied / satisfied-dissatisfied / dissatisfied / very dissatisfied / completely dissatisfied?

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-A/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.22</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.33</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.16</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community**

**Subject code: L10.10.2**

**Study** CAMPB 1981


**Population:** 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized USA, 1978

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** about 20 %

**N:** 3692

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with community (1)
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

Measurement: Single closed question on amount of satisfaction with community, rated on a 7-point scale ranging from completely dissatisfied to completely satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure
Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a r=+.29

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2

Study

FORTI 1983

Reported in: Forti, T. J.; Hyg, M.S.
A Documented Evaluation of Primary Prevention through Consultation. Community Mental Health Journal, 1983, Vol. 19, 290 - 304. ISSN p 0010 3853; ISSN e 1573 2789 DOI:10.1007/BF00755410
Page in Report:

Population: Catholic nuns, re-organized cloister, followed 4 years, Louisiana, USA, 1977-1981

Sample:

Non-Response: T1: 18%, T2: 14%, T3: 23%

N: 137

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community (1)

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Single closed question: 'How do you feel about the community?', rated on a 7-point Delighted-Terrible scale, ranging from (1) Delighted to (7) Terrible. (8) Neutral. (order reversed)

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>T1: 1977 r= +.21 (01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T2: 1979 r= +.28 (01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T3: 1981 r= +.20 (01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both variables assessed at T1, T2, and T3. Correlation concerns same time measures.

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community**

**Subject code:** L10.10.2

**Study**

GLENN 1981C


**Population:** Marrieds, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973-78

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

N: 9000

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with community (1)

**Our classification:** Attitude to community, code L10.10.2
**Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

**Measurement:** Direct question: "For each area of life I am going to name, tell me the number that shows how much satisfaction you get from that area? 1.a very great deal, 2.a great deal, 3.quite a lot, 4.a fair amount, 5.some, 6.a little, 7.none"

---

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>Married persons working full-time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- white men: r=+.18  ß=+.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- black men: r=+.37  ß=+.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- white women: r=+.24 ß=+.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- black women: r=+.10 ß=+.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All married women:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- white: r=+.26  ß=+.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- black: r=+.20  ß=+.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa  | r=+        | Married persons working full-time |
|                   |            | - white men: r=+.18  ß=+.06 |
|                   |            | - black men: r=+.37  ß=+.24 |
|                   |            | - white women: r=+.24 ß=+.08 |
|                   |            | - black women: r=+.10 ß=+.09 |
|                   |            | All married women |
|                   |            | - white: r=+.26  ß=+.09 |
|                   |            | - black: r=+.20  ß=+.09 |

| O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa  | Beta=+     | ß controled for marital happiness, satisfaction with: work, financial situation, nonworking activities, family life, friendships and health |

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community**

**Subject code:** L10.10.2

**Study**

Goudy 1981

---

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Goudy, W.J.; Goudeau, J.F.
Social Ties and Life Satisfaction of Older Persons: Another Evaluation.
Page in Report: 41/43

Population: 50+ aged, general public, North-Central Iowa, USA, 1975

Sample:
Non-Response: 11.3%
N: 2321

Correlate

Authors label: Community attachement (1)
Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2
Measurement: Three items combined in community attachement scale (3-9);
Would you say you feel at home in this community? probably not or definitely not (1), probably (2), definitely (3)
What interest do you have in knowing what goes on in this community? none (1), some (2), much (3)
Suppose that for some reason you had to move away from this community; how sorry or pleased would you be to leave? very pleased, pleased or no difference (1), quite sorry (2), very sorry (3)

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>r=+.30</td>
<td>Beta=+.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>controlled for age, income, education, marital status, relatives in community, friends in community, local people known, organizational memberships, quality of life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study HEADE 1981

Reported in: Headey, B.
The Quality of Life in Australia
Social Indicators Research, 1981, Vol. 9, 155 - 18. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573
0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00286195
Page in Report: 166

Population: Adults, general public, Australia 1978

Sample: Probability sample (unspecified)

Non-Response: not reported

N: 679

Correlate

Authors label: Suburb/neighborhood

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

Measurement: 1 single question on satisfaction with this suburb and
community as a place to live in

Measured Values: M = 6.8 SD = 1.5

Remarks: Item scored on the same rating scale as the question on
happiness.

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
O-DT/u/sqt/v/9/a r=+.26
p<.001

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study: HEADE 1984


Population: 18-65 aged, general public, followed 3 years, Melbourne, Australia, 1979-80

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 184

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with suburb (1)

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

Measurement: Closed question rated on a 9-point scale (delighted ... terrible) Assessed at T2.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mg/v/2/a</td>
<td>Beta= +.05 ns</td>
<td>Happiness T2 by satisfaction T2, controlling for happiness T1 and satisfaction T1. $\beta$ can be interpreted as regression between CHANGE OF HAPPINESS and CHANGE OF SATISFACTION in time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community

Subject code: L10.10.2

Study: HOOPE 1989
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Hoopes, L.L.; Lounsbury, J.W.
An Investigation of Life Satisfaction Following a Vacation: A Domain-Specific Approach.
Page in Report: 132,134

Population: Working adults, USA, before and after vacation, 198?,

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response: 23
N: 129

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

Measurement: Index of:
Satisfaction with friendships and social bonds:
- the number of good, close friends you have
- the people you see socially
- the religious fulfillment in your life
- how much you help people or groups in this community
Satisfaction with where you live:
- your house/ apartment
- the neighborhood you live in
- the community you live in.

Assessed on a 1-7 scale: 1 delighted...7 terrible

Measured Values: N=119 M=2.53 SD=.96

Error Estimates: alpha=.87

Remarks: Assessed for three periods:
T1: 1 or 2 weeks before vacation
T2: during vacation (retrospectively at T3)
T3: the week after vacation

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure  Statistics  Elaboration/Remarks
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject code: L10.10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study**

**KALIT 2006**


*Page in Report:* 12

**Population:** 18+aged, Croatia, 2003

**Sample:** Probability multi-stage cluster sample

**Non-Response:** 0

**N:** 1242

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with Acceptance by community

*Our classification:* Attitude to community, code L10.10.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: Selfreport of satisfaction with Acceptance by community
1: not at all satisfied
10: extremely satisfied

Measured Values: M=8.3 SD=1.75

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-FH/q/sq/v/10/a</td>
<td>Beta=+.03  ns</td>
<td>Beta controlled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-standard of living,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-health,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-achievement in life,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-relationship with family and friends,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-feelings of physical safety,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2

Study KEYES 1998

Reported in: Keyes, C.L.
Social Well-Being.
Social Psychology Quarterly 1998, Vol. 61, 121 - 140. ISSN 0190 2725
Page in Report: 132

Population: 18 + aged, Dane County, Wisconsin USA, 1994

Sample: Probability simple random sample

Non-Response: 37%

N: 373

Correlate

Authors label: Social Integration (1)

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: Respondents indicated (dis)agreement with the following statements: You think/believe/feel
a) you do not belong to a community (-)
b) you are an important part of your community (+)
c) people in your community listen to you (+)
d) close to other people in your community (+)
e) your community as a source of comfort (+)
f) your community does not take you seriously (-)
g) other people value you as a person
Items with (-) are reverse scored on scale ranging from 1. strongly disagree 2. moderately disagree 3. slightly disagree 4. slightly agree 5. moderately agree 6. strongly agree

Measured Values: M = 33.0 SD = 6.4

Error Estimates: Metric Loading ranging from 1.0 to 1.3 Validity Coefficients ranging from .46 to .66 Alpha Reliability .81

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/cm/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=+.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/h/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=+.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2

Study KEYES 1998

Reported in: Keyes, C.L.
Social Well-Being.
Social Psychology Quarterly 1998, Vol. 61, 121 - 140. ISSN 0190 2725
Page in Report: 132

Population: 18 + aged, Dane County, Wisconsin USA, 1994

Sample: Probability simple random sample

Non-Response: 37%
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 373

Correlate

Authors label: Social Contribution (1)

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

Measurement: Respondents indicated (dis)agreement with the following statements: You think/believe/feel
a) Your behavior has impact on others (+)
b) You have something valuable to give to the world (+)
c) Your daily activities do not produce anything worthwhile for your community (-)
d) You don't have time or energy to give anything to your community (-)
e) Your work provides an important product for society (+)
f) You have nothing important to contribute to society (-)
Items with (-) are reverse scored on scale ranging from
1. strongly 2. moderately 3. slightly disagree 4. slightly 5. moderately 6. strongly agree

Measured Values: M = 30.3 SD = 5.2

Error Estimates: Metric Loading ranging from .86 to 1.2 validity coefficient ranging from .49 to .65
Alpha Reliability .75

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/cm/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/h/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2

Study LEVY 1975/1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Levy, S.; Guttman, L. 
On the Multivariate Structure of Well-Being. 
Social Indicators Research, 1975, Vol. 2, 361 - 388. ISSN 0303 8300. DOI:10.1007/ 
BF00293253 
Page in Report: 372 

Population: 18+ aged, general public, urban areas, Israel, 1973 

Sample: 
Non-Response: - 
N: 1940 

Correlate 

Authors label: Want to continue living in one’s town (2) 
Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2 
Measurement: Closed question ranging from 'definitely no' to 'definitely yes'. 

Observed Relation with Happiness 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/76/a</td>
<td>mc=+.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/c/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>mc=+.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community 
Subject code: L10.10.2 

Study LEVY 1975/1 

Reported in: Levy, S.; Guttman, L. 
On the Multivariate Structure of Well-Being. 
Social Indicators Research, 1975, Vol. 2, 361 - 388. ISSN 0303 8300. DOI:10.1007/ 
BF00293253 
Page in Report: 372 

Population: 18+ aged, general public, urban areas, Israel, 1973
Sample:

Non-Response: -

N: 1940

Correlate

Authors label: Want to move to an other town (1)

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

Measurement: Closed question ranging from 'definitely no' to 'definitely yes'.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/?/6/a</td>
<td>mc=-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/c/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>mc=-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2

Study: PALIS 1986B


Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1974-1982

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 7542
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors label: Satisfaction derived from the community (1)

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

Measurement: Single closed question on satisfaction received from the city or place lived in, rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from "a very great deal" to "none" (order reversed).

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=+.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community
Subject code: L10.10.2

Study

SHINN 1978

Reported in: Shinn, D.C.; Johnson, D.M.
Avowed Happiness as the Overall Assessment of the Quality of Life. Social Indicators Research, 1978, Vol. 5, 475 - 492. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00352944
Page in Report: 483/487


Sample:

Non-Response: 17%

N: 665

Correlate

Authors label: Assessment of community (1)

Our classification: Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

Measurement: Single closed question rated on a scale ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied or from excellent to very poor
### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=+.06</td>
<td>When controlled for: - assessments only $\beta = +.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>- resources and assessments $\beta = +.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- assessments and comparisons $\beta = +.03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- assessments, recources and comparisons $\beta = +.03$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Assessments': satisfaction with: standard of living, leisure time, housing, health, education, government;  
'Recources': race, sex, age, income, education, home ownership, marital status, number of children, number of household members;  
'Comparisons': perception of being happier then others and perceived financial improvement in the past few years.

---

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community

**Subject code: L10.10.2**

**Study**

**WESSM 1956**

- **Reported in:** Wessman, A.E.  
  A Psychological Inquiry into Satisfaction and Happiness.  
  Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Princeton University, 1956, USA  
  Page in Report: 200

- **Population:** 21+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1946

- **Sample:**

- **Non-Response:** -

- **N:** 2377

**Correlate**

- **Authors label:** Satisfaction with community (1)
**Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

**Our classification:** Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

**Measurement:** Closed question:
0 Would rather live somewhere else
1 Like living in this community

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

**Happiness Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/g/sq/v/3/c</td>
<td>G = +.34</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to community**

**Subject code:** L10.10.2

**Study**

**ZEHNE 1977**

**Reported in:** Zehner, R.B. Indicators of the Quality of Life in New Communities. Ballinger, 1977, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. ISBN 0 88410 461 3

**Page in Report:** 112

**Population:** Residents communities, planned and unplanned, USA, 1973

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

N: 3894

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with community (1)

**Our classification:** Attitude to community, code L10.10.2

**Measurement:** Single closed direct question rated on a 5-point scale.

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a</td>
<td>Beta=.01</td>
<td>ß controlled for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Socio-demographic variables: age, sex, education, marital status, family income, dwelling unit value, tenure, length of residence, number of children in the household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Satisfaction with: standard of living, family life, use of leisure time, marriage, health, housework, job, dwelling unit, neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unplanned communities are left out.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood

Subject code: L10.10.3

Study ANDRE 1976/1


Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972/75

Sample:

Non-Response: 24%

N: 1297

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:**
Index of questions: "How do you feel about ....?"
1. neighbors
2. community members
3. outdoor space
4. location
5. safety
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>$E^2 = .31$</td>
<td>Unaffected by sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood**

**Subject code:** L10.10.3

**Study**

ANDRE 1976/3

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non institutionalized, USA, 1972/11

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 38%

*N:* 1072

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with neighborhood (1)

*Our classification:* Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about this community as a place to live?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study

ANDRE 1976/3

Page in Report: 156

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non institutionalized, USA, 1972/11

Sample:

Non-Response: 38%
N: 1072

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with neighborhood (2)

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about this community as a place to live?" Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted
### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLV/u/sq/t/101/a</td>
<td>r=+.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood

**Subject code: L10.10.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>ANDRE 1976/5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page in Report:</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population:</strong></td>
<td>18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N:</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authors label:</strong></td>
<td>Satisfaction with neighborhood (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our classification:</strong></td>
<td>Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Measurement:** | 3-item index of questions "How do you feel about....?"
1. your neighbors
2. your neighborhood
3. with the community as a place to live
   Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted |

### Observed Relation with Happiness
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=+.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/cy/sq/l/9/a</td>
<td>r=+.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>r=+.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/u/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood

Subject code: L10.10.3

Study ANDRE 1976/6


Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972-73

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 2727

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with neighbors and neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Index of closed questions, asked in different samples: "How do you feel about...
1. the people who live in the houses/apartments near yours (asked in July 1973)
2. this particular neighborhood as a place to live (asked in July 1973)
3. this community as a place to live (asked in November 1972 and July 1973)?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/unhappy/mostly dissatisfied/mixed/mostly satisfied/pleased/delighted

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood**

**Subject code: L10.10.3**

**Study**

**BAKKE 1974**


**Population:** 20-65 aged, general public, The Netherlands, 1968

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** 34% refusal and unattainable.

**N:** 1552

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with neighborhood. (1)

**Our classification:** Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
Measurements: Single direct question rated on an open graphic scale ranging from 'very dissatisfied' to 'very satisfied'.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/g/q/sq/ol/7/a</td>
<td>G = +.42</td>
<td>Unaffected by age and sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>No relation among those of highest or lowest S.E.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No relation among high educational level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study

BBC 2006

Reported in: BBC
Page in Report: 79

Population: 15+ aged, UK, 2005
Sample: Probability sample (unspecificated)
Non-Response: ??

N: 1001

Correlate

Authors label: Neighbourhood

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement:
Self-report on single question:
Thinking now about your neighbourhood, would you say it is more or less friendly nowadays than it was ten years ago?
1: Less friendly
2: More friendly
- Can't say/not living here 10 years ago

Measured Values: 1: N=427; 2: N=220

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/g/sq/v/4/g</td>
<td>DM=</td>
<td>1: M=3,25 CI95=3,19-3,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: M=3,24 CI95=3,13-3,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/g/sq/v/4/g</td>
<td>BMCT=</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/ab</td>
<td>DM=+</td>
<td>1: M=7,26 CI95=7,09-7,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: M=7,50 CI95=7,26-7,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/ab</td>
<td>BMCT=</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study BULAT 1973

Reported in: Bulatao, R.A.
Measures of Happiness among Manila Residents.
Philippine Sociological Review, 1973, Vol. 21, 229 - 238
Page in Report: 234-235

Population: 21+ aged, general public, Metro Manila, Philippines, 1972

Sample: -

Non-Response: -
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 941

Correlate

Authors label: Living conditions in the neighbourhood (1)

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement: Respondent's own evaluation.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>G = +</td>
<td>Males: G = +.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: G = +.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Index of Positive Affects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males: G = +.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: G = +.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Index of Negative Affects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males: G = -.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: G = -.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/4/b</td>
<td>G = +</td>
<td>Males: G = +.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: G = +.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/f</td>
<td>G = +</td>
<td>Males: G = +.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: G = +.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study BUTTE 1977

Reported in: Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B.
Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life.
Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138
Page in Report: 358
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin USA, 1974

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 548

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement: Single closed question rated on a 7-point scale: How satisfied are you with this neighborhood as a place to live: completely satisfied / very satisfied / satisfied / satisfied-dissatisfied / dissatisfied / very dissatisfied / completely dissatisfied?

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-A/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.27</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.34</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.27</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study

CAMPB 1981

Reported in: Campbell, A.
The Sense of Well-Being in America.
Page in Report: 154
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized USA, 1978

Sample:
Non-Response: about 20%
N: 3692

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with neighbourhood (1)
Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
Measurement: Single closed question on amount of satisfaction with neighbourhood, rated on a 7-point scale ranging from completely dissatisfied to completely satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks
--- | --- | ---
O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a | r=+.29 |

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study HEADE 1981

Reported in: Headey, B.
The Quality of Life in Australia
Social Indicators Research, 1981, Vol. 9, 155 - 18. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00286195
Page in Report: 166

Population: Adults, general public, Australia 1978
Sample: Probability sample (unspecified)
Non-Response: not reported
N: 679
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

Authors label: Suburb/neighborhood

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement: 1 single question on satisfaction with this suburb and community as a place to live in

Measured Values: M = 6.8 SD = 1.5

Remarks: Item scored on the same rating scale as the question on happiness.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/9/a</td>
<td>r=+.26</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study

KAINU 1998


Sample: Probability sample (unspecified)

Non-Response: not rep

N: 2682
Correlate

Authors label: Disagreements with neighbours (1)

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement: Have you experienced disagreements with neighbours
(a) during the last year?
(b) ever in your life?
Answers: No (=0) or Yes (=1).

Measured Values: Never: N = 2066 Ever in your life: N = 380

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/g</td>
<td>r = -.08</td>
<td>during the last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/g</td>
<td>r = -.08</td>
<td>ever in your life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/g</td>
<td>DM =</td>
<td>never: M = 3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ever in your life: M = 3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI for difference: [0.07 ; 0.27]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study

KASL 1975

Reported in: Kasl, S.V.; Harburg, E.
Mental Health and the Urban Environment: Some Doubts and Second Thoughts.
Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1975, Vol. 16, 268 - 282. ISSN 0022 1465
Page in Report: 277

Population: 25-60 aged married adults, Detroit, USA, 197?

Sample:

Non-Response: 17%
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 1000

Correlate

Authors label: Appreciation of Neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement: Single direct question: How do you feel about living in this neighborhood? (bad vs good)

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/d</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>High stress area - Low stress area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black males r = +.21 - +.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White males r = +.46 - +.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black females r = +.06 - +.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White females r = -.12 - +.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood

Subject code: L10.10.3

Study KASL 1975


Page in Report: 277

Population: 25-60 aged married adults, Detroit, USA, 197?

Sample:

Non-Response: 17%

N: 1000
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Correlate

Authors label: Wish to move (1)

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement: Single direct question: How much would you want to move to a different neighborhood? (not much - much)

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/d</td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>High stress area - Low stress area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black males r = -.30 - -.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White males r = -.29 - -.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black females r = -.10 - -.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White females r = +.04 - -.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood

Subject code: L10.10.3

Study

KENNE 1985


Page in Report: 108

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Edmonton, Canada, 1977-84

Sample: Probability multi-stage cluster sample

Non-Response:

N: 3440

Correlate

Authors label: Neighbourhood satisfaction (1)
Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement: Question on satisfaction with neighborhood.
   Rated:
   1. very dissatisfied
   .
   .
   7. very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/7/b</td>
<td>Beta = .10</td>
<td>Stepwise regression by age-group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>age group 17-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta controlled for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- standard of living satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- friendship satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- family satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- financial better/worse than year ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- health satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- year of significant social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- things wanted to do satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-SLu/c/sq/n/7/b</th>
<th>Beta = .07</th>
<th>age group 26-45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta controlled for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- standard of living satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- friendship satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- family satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- health satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- non work activities satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- financial better/worse than year ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- year of significant social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- things wanted to do satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
# Subject code: L10.10.3

## Study
- **LEVY 1975/1**

  *Reported in:* Levy, S.; Guttman, L.  
  On the Multivariate Structure of Well-Being.  
  Social Indicators Research, 1975, Vol. 2, 361 - 388. ISSN 0303 8300. DOI:10.1007/BF00293253  
  Page in Report: 372

  *Population:* 18+ aged, general public, urban areas, Israel, 1973

  *Sample:*
  - **Non-Response:** -
  - **N:** 1940

## Correlate
- **Authors label:** Evaluation of neihgborhood (1)
- **Our classification:** Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
- **Measurement:** Closed question ranging from 'not at all good' to 'very good'.

## Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/?.6/a</td>
<td>mc=+.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/c/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>mc=+.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood

**Subject code: L10.10.3**

## Study
- **MERED 1984**
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Meredith, W.H.
Level and Correlates of Perceived Quality of Life for Lao Hmong Refugees in Nebraska.
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol. 14, 83 - 97. ISSN 0303 8300 DOI:10.1007/BF00315723
Page in Report: 91

Population: 16+ aged, recent refugees from Laos, USA, 1982

Sample:
Non-Response: 0%
N: 145

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with neigbourhood (1)
Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
Measurement: Single direct question rated on a 7-point Delighted-Terrible scale: How do you feel about your neighbourhood?

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.07</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study

Reported in: Mookherjee, H.N.
Assessment of Happiness among the Elderly Population in the United States.
Chrakravarty, I.; Ed.: "Life in Twilight Years", Kwality Book, 1997, Calcutta, India, 327 - 343
Page in Report: 336
**Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

**Population:** 60+ aged, general public, USA 1982-91  
**Sample:** Probability multi-stage cluster sample  
**Non-Response:** not reported  
**N:** 3049

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with neighbours (1)  
**Our classification:** Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3  
**Measurement:** Single question on satisfaction with neighbours:  
1. not satisfied  
2. somewhat satisfied  
3. well satisfied

**Measured Values:**  
N: 1= 282 2= 923 3= 1844

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>DM=+</td>
<td>1. M= 1.83 SD=.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.00</td>
<td>2. M= 2.11 SD=.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. M= 2.37 SD=.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r=+.26</td>
<td>p&lt;.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beta controlled for  
- socio-demographic variables:  
  - Gender  
  - Race  
  - Marital status  
  - Education  
  - Financial status  
  - Place of residence  
  - Religious membership  
  - Religious attendance  
- satisfaction with:  
  - Non-working activities  
  - Family
Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study

NEAR 1978

Reported in: Near, J.P.; Rice, R.W.; Hunt, R.G.
Work and Extra-Work Correlates of Life and Job Satisfaction.
Page in Report: 253

Population: Adult, general public, Western New York State, USA, 1975

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 384

Correlate

Authors label: Respondent's rating of neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement: Single direct question

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>$R^2 = .04$</td>
<td>Explained variance in ANOVA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>Positively related</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Study**

**PEIL 1984**

*Reported in:* Peil, M.
African Urban Life: Components of Satisfaction in Sierra Leone.
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol. 14, 363 - 384. ISSN p 0303 8300;ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00692990
Page in Report: 372

*Population:* Adult, general public, urban areas (Freetown, Bo and Kenema), Sierra Leone, 1981

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 5% (on some items up to 60%)

*N:* 640

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with neighbourhood (1)

*Our classification:* Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

*Measurement:* Direct question: "How do you feel about your neighbourhood?"

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/l/7/a</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>Males : r = +.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood**

**Subject code: L10.10.3**

**Study**

**WHITE 1979**

*Reported in:* White, L.K.
Sex Differentials in the Effect of Remarriage on Global Happiness.
Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, Vol. 41, 869 -876. ISSN 0022 2445
Page in Report: 874
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population:  Adult, general public, married and divorced, Nebraska, USA, 1977

Sample:    

Non-Response:    

N: 1085

Correlate

Authors label:  Liking of neigh- berhood (1)

Our classification:  Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3

Measurement:  Single closed question: "How well do you like your neighborhood?"

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/ad</td>
<td>r=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: first marriage men</td>
<td>r = +.21</td>
<td>(05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: first marriage women</td>
<td>r = +.15</td>
<td>(05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: remarriage men</td>
<td>r = +.34</td>
<td>(05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: remarriage women</td>
<td>r = +.10</td>
<td>(ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study ZEHNE 1977

Reported in:  Zehner, R.B.
Indicators of the Quality of Life in New Communities.
Ballinger, 1977, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. ISBN 0 88410 461 3
Page in Report: 112

Population:  Residents communities, planned and unplanned, USA, 1973

Sample:    

Non-Response:    

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 3894

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with neighbourhood (2)
Our classification: Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
Measurement: Single closed direct question rated on a 7-point scale.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a</td>
<td>Beta=+.03</td>
<td>β controlled for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Socio-demographic variables: age, sex,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education, marital status, family income,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dwelling unit value, tenure, length of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residence, number of children in the household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Satisfaction with: standard of living, family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>life, use of leisure time, marriage, health,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>housework, job, dwelling unit, community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unplanned communities are left out.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood
Subject code: L10.10.3

Study ZEHNE 1977

Reported in: Zehner, R.B.
Indicators of the Quality of Life in New Communities.
Ballinger, 1977, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. ISBN 0 88410 461 3
Page in Report: 112

Population: Residents communities, planned and unplanned, USA, 1973
Sample:
Non-Response:

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

$N$: 3894

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with neighbourhood (1)  
*Our classification:* Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3  
*Measurement:* Single closed direct question rated on a 5-point scale.

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a</td>
<td>$r=+.23$</td>
<td>Only planned communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to neighborhood**  
**Subject code:** L10.10.3

**Study**  
*ZUMA 1989*

*Reported in:* Zentrum fur Umfrageforschung Mannheim (ZUMA)  

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, West-Germany, 1978-88

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* ?

*N:* 2100

---

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with neighbourhood (1)  
*Our classification:* Attitude to neighborhood, code L10.10.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Single direct question rated on 11-point scale.

---

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/ba</td>
<td>SNR=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eta</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>+.27</td>
<td>+.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>+.20</td>
<td>+.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ß's controlled for age, gender, perceived class and marital status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-HL/c/sq/v/4/b</th>
<th>SNR=</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eta</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>+.11</td>
<td>+.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>+.15</td>
<td>+.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ß's controlled for age, gender, perceived class and marital status.

---

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to urban life

**Subject code:** L10.10.4

**Study**

PEIL 1984

**Reported in:**
Page in Report: Extra info

**Population:** Adult, general public, urban areas (Freetown, Bo and Kenema), Sierra Leone, 1981

**Sample:**

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response: 5% (on some items up to 60%)

N: 640

Correlate

Authors label: Attitude towards urban life (1)

Our classification: Attitude to urban life, code L10.10.4

Measurement: Direct question: "Is urban life better than rural on the following aspects?"
- income
- job
- social
- other
- costs
- moral
- other

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/l/7/a</td>
<td>DMt=</td>
<td>Happiness level in Mt' (0-10):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>income  males: 6.6 females: 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>job  7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>social  7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other  7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cost  6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moral  6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other  6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to urban life
Subject code: L10.10.4

Study PEIL 1984

**Reported in:** Peil, M.  
African Urban Life: Components of Satisfaction in Sierra Leone.  
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol. 14, 363 - 384. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00692990  
Page in Report: Extra info

**Population:** Adult, general public, urban areas (Freetown, Bo and Kenema), Sierra Leone, 1981

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** 5% (on some items up to 60%)

**N:** 640

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Attitude towards citylife (1)

**Our classification:** Attitude to urban life, code L10.10.4

**Measurement:** Direct question: "Which is more secure/ happier?"  
- village  
- city  
- village/city  
- city/village  
- no difference

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/l7/a</td>
<td>DMt=</td>
<td>Happiness level in Mt' (0-10):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>village males: 6.9 females: 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>city 7.6 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>village/city 6.8 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>city/village 7.0 6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no difference 7.5 6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to urban life**  
**Subject code:** L10.10.4
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Study**
*PEIL 1984*

*Reported in:* Peil, M.
African Urban Life: Components of Satisfaction in Sierra Leone.
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol. 14, 363 - 384. ISSN p 0303-8300; ISSN e 1573-0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00692990
Page in Report: Extra info

*Population:* Adult, general public, urban areas (Freetown, Bo and Kenema), Sierra Leone, 1981

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 5% (on some items up to 60%)

*N:* 640

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Happiness with kin (3)

*Our classification:* Attitude to urban life, code L10.10.4

*Measurement:* Direct question: "Is it important for people living in town to keep up contacts with their rural kin or is it better to concentrate on their family in town? Why?"

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/l7/a</td>
<td>D Mc=</td>
<td>Happiness level in Mt' (0-10):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rural: information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>males: 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>females: 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>help me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>males: 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>females: 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>help them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>males: 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>females: 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>males: 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>females: 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>males: 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>females: 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>town: help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>males: 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>females: 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>males: 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>females: 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>males: 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>females: 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>males: 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>females: 7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to urban life**

*Subject code:* L10.10.4
### Study WESEM 1956

**Reported in:** Wessman, A.E.  
A Psychological Inquiry into Satisfaction and Happiness.  
Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Princeton University, 1956, USA  
Page in Report: 210

**Population:** 21+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1946

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** -

**N:** 2377

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Unfulfilled aspirations: move to country, become farmer (1)

**Our classification:** Attitude to urban life, code L10.10.4

**Measurement:** Open ended question on unfulfilled aspirations:
- 0 Other aspirations
- 1 Aspirations mentioned

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/g/sq/v/3/c</td>
<td>G =+.00</td>
<td>Computed for those having unfulfilled aspirations only (N = 1646)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local climate

**Subject code:** L10.10.6

**Study ANDRE 1976/1**

**Reported in:** Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.  
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality  
Page in Report: 113
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972/75

Sample:

Non-Response: 24%

N: 1297

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with the weather (1)

Our classification: Attitude to local climate, code L10.10.6

Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about the weather in this part of the state?" Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/unhappy/mostly dissatisfied/mixed/mostly satisfied/pleased/delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>$E^2 = +.12$</td>
<td>Unaffected by sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local climate

Subject code: L10.10.6

Study ANDRE 1976/5

Reported in: Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/7

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 222
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Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with the weather (1)
Our classification: Attitude to local climate, code L10.10.6
Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about the weather in this part of the state?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/cy/sq/l/9/a</td>
<td>r=+.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>r=+.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/u/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local climate
Subject code: L10.10.6

Study ANDRE 1976/6

Reported in: Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 156

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972-73

Sample:

Non-Response:
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N: 2727

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with local weather (1)
Our classification: Attitude to local climate, code L10.10.6
Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about the weather in this part of the state?"
(asked in July 1973)
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local climate
Subject code: L10.10.6

Study

HULIN 1969

Reported in: Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:
Non-Response: 24%
N: 470

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with the weather. (1)
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Our classification: Attitude to local climate, code L10.10.6

Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither satisfied nor dissatisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>Males : r = +.25 (01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Females: r = +.23 (05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local costs of living

Subject code: L10.10.7

Study HULIN 1969

Reported in: Hulin, C.L.  
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.  
Page in Report: 285

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:

Non-Response: 24%

N: 470

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with cost of living in the community. (1)

Our classification: Attitude to local costs of living, code L10.10.7

Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither satisfied nor dissatisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied
Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-SLu/g/sq/fi7/a   | r = +      | Males: $r = +.23$ (01)  
                           Females: $r = +.08$ (ns) |

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local costs of living

Subject code: L10.10.7

Study

Reported in: Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:
Non-Response: 24%
N: 470

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with costs of housing in the community. (1)

Our classification: Attitude to local costs of living, code L10.10.7

Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither satisfied nor dissatisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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O-SLu/g/sq/f/7/a    r=+.09 (ns)
Females: r = +.15 (ns)

---

Correlational finding on Happiness and Joint local characteristics
Subject code: L10.11

Study

KASL 1975

Reported in: Kasl, S.V.; Harburg, E.
Mental Health and the Urban Environment: Some Doubts and Second Thoughts.
Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1975, Vol. 16, 268 - 282. ISSN 0022 1465
Page in Report: 275

Population: 25-60 aged married adults, Detroit, USA, 197?

Sample:

Non-Response: 17%

N: 1000

Correlate

Authors label: Environmental stress (1)

Our classification: Joint local characteristics, code L10.11

Measurement:

Low vs high stress in the area. Four parts of the town were selected on the basis of average education, income unemployment, residential instability, density and adult and juvenile crime (census data). The four parts concern high and low stress in white and black areas.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Unaffected by ethnicity.
Unrelated among males, negative among females.
Answers to questions on subjective stress show in fact hardly any difference between the environments characterized as high or low stress on the basis of census data.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Joint local characteristics
Subject code: L10.11

Study

RICE 1979

*Reported in:* Rice, R.W.; Near, J.P.; Hunt, R.G.
Unique Variance in Job and Life Satisfaction associated with Work-Related and Extra-Workplace Variables.
Human Relations, 1979, Vol. 32, 605 - 623. ISSN 0018 7267
Page in Report: 615

*Population:* Adult, general public, Western New York State, USA, 1975

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:*

\[ N: 1041 \]

Correlate

*Authors label:* Geographic variables (1)

*Our classification:* Joint local characteristics, code L10.11

*Measurement:* - Stratum: rural, urban, suburban, or no response
- Area of socialization: rural, urban, suburban, or no response
- Quality of living environment, interviewers rated both the house and the neighborhood on a 10-point scale

Observed Relation with Happiness
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>$R^2=0.03$</td>
<td>When entered after &quot;satisfaction other than life satisfactions&quot; and &quot;demographic variables&quot; no increment in $R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p&lt;0.01$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local cultural climate

Subject code: L10.12

Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>MOLLE 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td>55+ aged, 6 European nations, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>Probability stratified sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Response:</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>3950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlate

| Authors label: | Cultural amenities |
| Our classification: | Local cultural climate, code L10.12 |
| Measurement: | Selfreport on single question: Are there cultural amenities available in the vicinity 0: no 1: yes Question not found AUTHOR, Please verify question! |
| Measured Values: | 1: Finland: Urban=48,6%; Rural=36,7%; $p<0.01$; Netherlands: Urban=27,6%; Rural=32,7%; ns; Germany West: Urban=71,7%; Rural=53,8%; $p<0.001$; Germany East: Urban=29,7%; Rural=18,8%; $p<0.001$; Hungary: Urban=38,3%; Rural=39,8%; ns; Italy: Urban=17,6%; Rural=6,6%; $p<0.001$ |
## Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Finland (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finland (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany West (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = +.11</td>
<td>Germany West (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Germany East (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany East (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Hungary (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = +.14</td>
<td>Italy (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Italy (rural areas)

Beta's controlled for:
- Age
- Gender
- Environment:Housing:
  - housing amenities
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
  - satisfaction with living area
- Mobility:
  - car in household
  - satisfaction with public transportation
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Services:
  - medical services
  - services and shops
  - satisfaction with services
- Culture:
  - natural environment
  - satisfaction with leisure
- Security:
  - security
- Social Environment:
  - living together
  - division social network
  - friends/kin nearby
- Economic situation:
  - Income per person
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health:
  - ADL
  - satisfaction with health

Only standardized regression coefficient significant at a maximum error rate of alpha=.05 are shown.

---

Correlational finding on Happiness and Current residence context
Subject code: L10.2

Study  CSIKS 2003
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Reported in:** Csikszentmihalyi, M.; Hunter, J.  
Happiness in Everyday Life: the Uses of Experience Sampling.  
Journal of Happiness Studies, 2003, Vol. 4, 185 - 199. ISSN p 1389 4978; ISSN e 1573 7780. DOI 10.1007/s11205-005-0805-6  
Page in Report: 192,195

**Population:** Teenagers, USA, 1998

**Sample:** Non-probability purposive sample

**Non-Response:**  
N: 828

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Social class of community

**Our classification:** Current residence context, code L10.2

**Measurement:**  
1 Poor  
2 Working class  
3 Middle class  
4 Upper-middle class  
5 Upper class

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-ARE/mi/sqr/n/7/a</td>
<td>F=+8.1, p&lt;.0001</td>
<td>Participants were beeped at random moments eight times a day from 7:30 am to 10:0 pm for one week. At each beep they answered questions about: a: what activity they where doing on the moment b: whom they were with c: how they felt at that moment (various feelings, one of which happiness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A-ARE/mi/sqr/n/7/a | AoV=−.08, p<.002 | ANOVA controlling for:  
- age  
- gender  
- SES  
- % time in flow |
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Correlational finding on Happiness and Current residence context

Subject code: L10.2

Study

CUMMI 2005A

Page in Report: 45+46+47

Population: 18+ aged, Australia, 2004

Sample: Probability area sample

Non-Response: 0

N: 2000

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community

Our classification: Current residence context, code L10.2

Measurement: community

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.35</td>
<td>in highly accessible cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>Beta=+.06</td>
<td>controlled for satisfaction with: standard of living health achievements personal relationships safety and future security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In accessible cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/</th>
<th>r=+.35</th>
<th>controlled for satisfaction with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td></td>
<td>standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safety and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In moderately cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/</th>
<th>r=+.35</th>
<th>controlled for satisfaction with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td></td>
<td>standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safety and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In remote cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/</th>
<th>r=+.32</th>
<th>controlled for satisfaction with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td></td>
<td>standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safety and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In very remote cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/</th>
<th>r=+.34</th>
<th>controlled for satisfaction with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td></td>
<td>standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safety and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlational finding on Happiness and Current residence context
Subject code: L10.2

Study

KAINU 1998

Reported in: Kainulainen, S.
Elämäntapahtumat ja Elämään Tyytyväisyys eri Sosiaaliluokissa. (Life Events and Satisfaction with Life in Different Social Classes; Summary).
Kuopio University Publications, 1998, Finland
Page in Report: 261

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, former province Kuopio, Finland, 1991-’96.

Sample: Probability sample (unspecified)

Non-Response: not rep

N: 2682

Correlate

Authors label: Restless neighbourhood (1)

Our classification: Current residence context, code L10.2

Measurement: Have you experienced restless neighbourhood
(a) during the last year ?
(b) ever in your life ?
answers: No (=0) or Yes (=1).


Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/g</td>
<td>r=-.09</td>
<td>during the last year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/g   r=-.10  ever in your life
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

never: \( M = 3.90 \)
ever in your life: \( M = 3.69 \)
95% CI for difference: \([0.12 ; 0.30]\)

Correlational finding on Happiness and Current residence context
Subject code: L10.2

Study

MOLLE 2002

Reported in: Mollenkopf, H.
Mobilität und Lebensqualität im Alter - Objektive Vorraussetzungen und subjektive Bedeutung in der mobilen Gesellschaft (Mobility and Quality of Life in Old Age)
Glatzer, W; et al; Eds.: "Sozialer Wandel und gesellschaftliche Dauerbeobachtung",
Page in Report: 268

Population: 55+ aged, East and West Germany, 1995 and 1999

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:

\( N: 1216 \)

Correlate

Authors label: satisfaction with local environment

Our classification: Current residence context, code L10.2

Measurement: Selfreport on single question
Rated on 11-point numerical scale

Measured Values: A: N=400; B:N=404; C: N=205; D:N=207

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure

\( O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/ba \)

Statistics  Elaboration/Remarks

**Beta**=.05  Mannheim (big city West Germany)  ns
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Chemnitz (big city East Germany)  
\( \text{Beta} = +0.03 \text{ ns} \)

Hunrück (rural area West Germany)  
\( \text{Beta} = -0.01 \text{ ns} \)

Lausitz (rural area East Germany)  
\( \text{Beta} = +0.07 \text{ ns} \)

Beta's controlled for satisfaction with:
- financial situation
- housing
- health
- living area
- leisure possibilities
- travelling possibilities
- mobility possibilities

Correlational finding on Happiness and Current residence context
Subject code: L10.2

Study  
MOLLE 2005A

Reported in: Mollenkopf, H.; Kaspar, R.  
Ageing in Rural Areas of East and West Germany: Increasing Similarities and Remaining Differences.  
Page in Report: 125,127

Population: 55+, general public, rural areas, East and West Germany, 2000

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: 41,6%

\( N: 762 \)

Correlate

Authors label: Neighbourhood features

Our classification: Current residence context, code L10.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Sum score of a total of 10 desirable neighbourhood features

**Measured Values:** West Germany: M=7.5; SD=1.8; East Germany: M=6.3; SD=2.0; p<0.001

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/ba</td>
<td>Beta=-.02</td>
<td>Beta controlled for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>- Socio-demographic:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfaction with finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Health-related:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- activities of daily living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- visu-motoric coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- affect balance score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfaction with health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social network:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- household type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- network variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Housing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- basic household features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- home ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfaction with housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Living area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- available services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfaction with living area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mobility:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- car use as passenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- car use as driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfaction with public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfaction with mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Leisure time activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- outdoor leisure activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfaction with leisure activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No interaction with region (East/West Germany)

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

**Subject code: L10.2.1**
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study | ALGEM 1982

Reported in: Algemeen Dagblad
Geluk in Nederland. (Happiness in the Netherlands).
Unpublished Research Report nr. 3810, Centrum voor Marketing Analyses en Sociaal
Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, 1982, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Page in Report: t62

Population: 18+ aged, general public, The Netherlands, 1982

Sample:
Non-Response: 5%
N: 300

Correlate

Authors label: Urbanization (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:
1. country
2. small town
3. medium cities
4. metropolitan areas

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-FH/u/sq/v/3/b</td>
<td>G = .06</td>
<td>% happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-FH/u/sq/v/3/b</td>
<td>tc = .02</td>
<td>Mt' = 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Mt' = 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 85.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: ALGEM 1988

Reported in: Algemeen Dagblad
Actualiteitsmeting Geluk in Nederland. (Actual Happiness in the Netherlands).
Unpublished Research Report nr. 7640, Centrum voor Marketing Analyses en Sociaal
Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, 1988, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Page in Report: t28

Population: 18+ aged, general public, The Netherlands, 1988

Sample:
Non-Response: 5%
N: 600

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:
1. country
2. small towns
3. medium cities
4. metropolitan areas

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-FH/u/sq/v/3/b</td>
<td>G = -0.13</td>
<td>% happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-FH/u/sq/v/3/b</td>
<td>tc = -0.03</td>
<td>1. 88.0 Mt' = 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 92.2 Mt' = 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 88.8 Mt' = 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 85.8 Mt' = 9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Study**

**ATKIN 1979/1**

**Reported in:** Atkinson, T.H.
Trends in life satisfaction among Canadians 1968-1977
Institute for Research on Public Policy, Occasional paper nr7, Montreal (Quebec), 1979

**Page in Report:**

**Population:** 18+ aged, Canada, 1968

**Sample:** Probability sample (unspecified)

**Non-Response:** ?

**N:** 2734

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Community size

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1

**Measurement:**

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

**Happiness Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/g/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>( r = 0.0 ) ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/g/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>( rpc = -0.05 ) ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

**Subject code:** L10.2.1

---

**Study**

**ATKIN 1979/2**

**Reported in:** Atkinson, T.H.
Trends in life satisfaction among Canadians
Institute for Research on Public Policy, vol. 7, Montreal (Quebec), 1979

**Page in Report:**

**Population:** 18+ aged, Canada, 1974
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample: Probability simple random sample
Non-Response: ?
N: 1234

Correlate

Authors label: Community size
Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1
Measurement:

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/4/d</td>
<td>r=-.04 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/4/d</td>
<td>rpc=.01 ns</td>
<td>rpc controlled for: Income ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

ATKIN 1979/3

Reported in: Atkinson, T.H.
Trends in Life Satisfaction among Canadian.
Institute for Research on Public Policy, vol. 7, Montreal (Quebec), 1979
Page in Report:

Population: 18+ aged, Canada, 1977
Sample: Probability stratified sample
Non-Response: 33%
N: 3289
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors label: Community size
Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Relation with Happiness</th>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/10/b</td>
<td>$r = -.05$ ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/10/b</td>
<td>$rpc = -.09$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .01$ rpc controlled for: Income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study BAKKE 1974


Sample:
Non-Response: 34% refusal and unattainable.

N: 1552

Correlate

Authors label: Community size. (1)
Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1
Measurement: Less than 5000 / 5000-20,000 / 20,000-50,000 / 50,000-100,000 / more than 100,000
Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/g/sq/ol/7/a</td>
<td>G = +.06</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

Subject code: L10.2.1

Study


Population: 16+ aged, general public, Catalonia, Spain, 1989

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: not reported

N: 406

Correlate

Authors label: town size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:
1. <10 000
2. 10 000 – 50 000
3. 50 000>

Measured Values: 1. 14.5% 2. 59.4% 3. 26.1%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/ea  Beta=-.19  p<.05

1. <10 000     Ma = 3.84
2. 10 000 - 50 000 Ma = 3.87
3. 50 000>     Ma = 3.47

beta and Ma controlled for
-gender
-age
-education

O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/ea

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B.
Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life.
Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138
Page in Report: 362

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin USA, 1974

Sample:
Non-Response:
N: 548

Correlate

Authors label: Place of residence (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: Rural / under 2500 / 2500-10000 / 10000-50000 / 50000-100000 / 100000+

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure  Statistics  Elaboration/Remarks

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size  
**Subject code: L10.2.1**

### Study

*Reported in:* Cantril, H.  
The Pattern of Human Concern.  
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA  
Page in Report: 365

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, Brazil, 1960-61

*Sample:*  
*Non-Response:* -

*N:* 2168

### Correlate

*Authors label:* Community size (1)  
*Our classification:* Community size, code L10.2.1  
*Measurement:* Rural / 2,000-10,000 / 10,000-500,000 / 500,000+

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>DMT=+</td>
<td>Mt = 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Mt = 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 – 50,000</td>
<td>Mt = 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000 – 500,000</td>
<td>Mt = 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500,000+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study CANTR 1965/4

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 366

Population: 20+ aged, general public, urban areas, Cuba, 1960

Sample:
Non-Response: -

N: 992

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)
Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1
Measurement: -5,000 / 5,000-10,000 / 10,000-20,000 /
20,000-50,000 / 50,000+ / Havana

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>D Mt=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>Mt = 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000 - 10,000</td>
<td>Mt = 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 - 20,000</td>
<td>Mt = 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>Mt = 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000+</td>
<td>Mt = 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt = 6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study CANTR 1965/7
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 368

Population: Adults, general public, India, 1962

Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 2366

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: Rural / 5,000 - 99,999 / 100,000+

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l11/a</td>
<td>DMt= +</td>
<td>Rural: Mt = 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000-99,999: Mt = 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000: Mt = 4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study CANTR 1965/8

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 369

Population: Adults, general public, Israel, 1961-62

Sample:
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response: -
N: 1170

Correlate

Authors label: Region (2)
Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1
Measurement: Coop. settlement / new urban / long settled urban / Tel Aviv, Haifa / Jerusalem

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a DMt=</td>
<td>Coop. settlement</td>
<td>Mt = 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New urban</td>
<td>Mt = 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long settled urban</td>
<td>Mt = 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel-Aviv, Haifa</td>
<td>Mt = 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Mt = 5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study CANTR 1971

Reported in: Cantril, A.H.; Roll, C.W.
Hopes and Fears of the American People.
Page in Report: 66

Population: 21+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1964-71

Sample:

Non-Response:
N: 1588
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: under 2500 / 2500 - 49,999 / 50,000 - 499,999 / over 500,000

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>DMt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2500</td>
<td>Mt = 6.1 (1964) 5.6 (1971)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 - 49,999</td>
<td>Mt = 6.3 (1964) 5.8 (1971)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 499,999</td>
<td>Mt = 5.8 (1964) 6.0 (1971)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000+</td>
<td>Mt = 5.8 (1964) 5.7 (1971)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

CANTR1965/10


Sample:

Non-Response: -

N: 1200

### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Rural / 5,000 - 20,000 / 20,000 - 100,000 / 100,000+

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>DMt=0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Mt = 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000 - 20,000</td>
<td>Mt = 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>Mt = 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000+</td>
<td>Mt = 4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

**Subject code:** L10.2.1

**Study**

- **CANTR1965/13**

  - **Reported in:** Cantril, H.
  - The Pattern of Human Concern.
  - Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
  - Page in Report: 374

  - **Population:** 18+ aged, general public, Poland, 1962

  - **Sample:**

    - **Non-Response:** -
    - **N:** 1464

### Correlate

- **Authors label:** Community size (1)
- **Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1
- **Measurement:** -2,000 / 2,000 - 10,000 / 10,000 - 100,000 / 100,000+

### Observed Relation with Happiness
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a DMt= + Village : Mt = 4.3
<10,000 : Mt = 4.3
10,000 - 20,000 : Mt = 4.5
20,000 - 100,000 : Mt = 4.7
100,000 > : Mt = 4.6

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study CANTR1965/14

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 376

Population: Adults, general public, West-Germany, 1957

Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 480

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: -2,000 / 2,000 - 10,000 / 10,000 - 100,000 / 100,000+

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a  
DMt= +  
<2,000 : Mt = 5.2  
2,000 - 10,000 : Mt = 5.3  
10,000 - 100,000 : Mt = 5.4  
100,000 > : Mt = 5.3

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study  
CBS 2004

Reported in: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS)  
Page in Report: 1

Population: 12+ aged, The Netherlands, 2002

Sample: Probability multi-stage cluster sample

Non-Response:

N: 37482

Correlate

Authors label: urbanisation

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:  
1: not urbanized  
2: not much  
3: moderately  
4: strongly  
5: very strongly urbanized

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure  Statistics  Elaboration/Remarks

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size  
Subject code: L10.2.1

**Study**  
CHAMB 2000

**Reported in:** Chambers, C.  
Americans are Overwhelmingly Happy and Optimistic about the Future of the United States.  
Page in Report: 3

**Population:** 18+ aged, USA, 2000

**Sample:** Probability simple random sample

**Non-Response:**

*N*: 1052

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Urbanisation

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1
**Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

*Measurement:*  
1: rural  
2: suburban  
3: city dwellers/urban

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/g/sq/v/3/c</td>
<td>D%=</td>
<td>% very happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: city dwellers/urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**  
**Subject code: L10.2.1**

*Study*  
**CUMMI 2004A**

Page in Report: 10

*Population:* 18+aged, Australia, 2003

*Sample:* Probability area sample

*Non-Response:*  
**N:** 2000

---

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Cities

*Our classification:* Community size, code L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:**
- a: Metropolitan (Capital City)
- b: Non-Metropolitan (Non-Capital City)

**Measured Values:**
- N = a: 5014; b: 4853

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca | D\(_M_\)t=+ p<.242 | a \( \text{Mt} = 7,00; \text{SD} = 1,64 \)  
|                   |            | b \( \text{Mt} = 7,80; \text{SD} = 1,75 \) |

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

**EUROP 1975/1**

**Reported in:**
- European Commission
  - European Men and Women. A Comparison of Their Attitudes and Some of the Problems Facing Society.
  - European Commission, 1975, Brussels, Belgium
  - Page in Report: 139/153

**Population:**
- 15+ aged, general public, EU, 1975

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**
- -

**N:**
- 9605

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Size of locality (1)

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1

**Measurement:** Village / small town / big town
Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>$G = -.02$</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLL/u/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>$G = -.04$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

FERNA 1981

*Reported in:* Fernandez, R.M.; Kulik, J.C.
A Multilevel Model of Life Satisfaction: Effects of Individual Characteristics and Neighborhood Composition.
Page in Report: 845-847

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973-74

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* ?

*N:* 5916

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Urban living (1)

*Our classification:* Community size, code L10.2.1

*Measurement:* Interviewer rating of residence: 1: rural area or farm
2: town
3: suburb
4: city
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/c</td>
<td>r=-.07</td>
<td>Disattenuated $r = -0.10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/c</td>
<td>Beta=-.04</td>
<td>$\beta$ controlled for family size, sex, age, education, race, health, marital status, family income, and neighbourhood characteristics (relative income, income inequality, cost of living, relative age, and percentage white). Disattenuated $\beta = -0.06$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

FERRE 1984


Page in Report: 1070

Population: White married women, USA, 1971-76

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:

N: 2541

Correlate

Authors label: Size of place

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

B = +.05  ns

B = +.07  ns

B's controlled for:
- Age
- N of children
- Having child < 6
- Employment
- Education
- Family income
- Husband's job status
- respondents present or last job status
- social desirability
- time pressure

Reversed coding in paper : 1 = completely satisfied, 7 = completely dissatisfied
1 = very happy, 3 = not too happy

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FESSE 1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Reported in:* Fessel, W.D.
Soziologische und Psychologische Ursachen des Wertwandel Phänomens.
(Sociological and Psychological Determinants of Value Change).
Research Report, Institut für Empirische Sozialforschung, IFES, 1985, Vienna, Austria
Page in Report: 111

*Population:* 14+ aged, general public, Austria, 1985

*Sample:
Non-Response: ?

*N: 1027

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Community size (1)

*Our classification:* Community size, code L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: Number of inhabitants about or above
1. 2,000
2. 50,000
3. 1,000,000

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/g/sq/v/3/d</td>
<td>G =+.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/g/sq/v/3/d</td>
<td>tc =+.07</td>
<td>% often happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>1. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study
FISCH 1973/1

Reported in: Fischer, C.S.
Urban Malaise.
Social Forces, 1973, Vol. 52, 221 - 235. ISSN 0037 7732
Page in Report: 226

Population: Adults, general public, USA, 1952

Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 2970

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)
Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:**
1. country
2. < 25,000
3. 25,000 - 500,000
4. > 500,000

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/g/sq/v/3/b</td>
<td>( \text{tb} = .03 )</td>
<td>( \text{p} &lt; .01 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. ( M' = 2.40 )</td>
<td>Strongest among the well-to-do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ( M' = 2.40 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ( M' = 2.41 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. ( M' = 2.29 ) (( M' 1-3 ))</td>
<td>Reversed among blacks and low-income whites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

**FISCH 1973/2**

*Reported in:* Fischer, C.S.
*Urban Malaise.*
*Social Forces, 1973, Vol. 52, 221 - 235. ISSN 0037 7732*
*Page in Report: 226*

*Population:* Adults, general public, USA, 1957

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* -

*N:* 1605

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Community size (1)

*Our classification:* Community size, code L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement:
1. country
2. < 25.000
3. 25.000 - 500.000
4. > 500.000

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/g/sq/v/3/b</td>
<td>( t_b = 0.01 )</td>
<td>1. ( M' = 2.47 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; 0.05 )</td>
<td>2. ( M' = 2.60 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. ( M' = 2.51 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. ( M' = 2.47 ) (( M' ) 1-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongest among the well-to-do.
Reversed among blacks and low-income whites.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study: FISCH 1973/3

Reported in: Fischer, C.S.
Urban Malaise.
Social Forces, 1973, Vol. 52, 221 - 235. ISSN 0037 7732
Page in Report: 226

Population: Adults, general public, USA, 1963

Sample:

Non-Response: -

\( N \): 1555

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1
Measurement: 1. country  
2. < 25,000  
3. 25,000 - 500,000  
4. > 500,000

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/g/sq/v/3/b</td>
<td>tb = .01</td>
<td>1. M' = 2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. M' = 2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. M' = 2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. M' = 2.40 (M' 1-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongest among the well-to-do.  
Reversed among blacks and low-income whites.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size  
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study  
FISCH 1973/4

Reported in: Fischer, C.S.  
Urban Malaise.  
Social Forces, 1973, Vol. 52, 221 - 235. ISSN 0037 7732  
Page in Report: 226

Population: Adults, general public, USA, 1968

Sample:  
Non-Response: -

N: 1440

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (3)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement:
1 Out of SMSA
   a. rural
   b. town
2 In SMSA
   a. ring
   b. center
3 Large SMSA
   a. ring
   b. center

(SMSA short for Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area)

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-SLL/c/sq/v/3/a   | tb=-.07    | 1a. M'=2.19
                | p<.01      | 1b. M'=2.12
                |            | 2a. M'=2.18
                |            | 2b. M'=2.06
                |            | 3a. M'=2.14
                |            | 3b. M'=2.00 (M' 1-3) |

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; _ = -.06 (ns). Those living in the center of towns and cities were less happy than those living in the outskirts: _ = -.07 (001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-SLL/c/sq/v/3/a</th>
<th>r=.06</th>
<th>ß controling: income, education, occupation, race, age, religion, stage in life-cycle, region of birth, fathers occupational status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study FISCH 1973/5

Reported in: Fischer, C.S.
Urban Malaise.
Social Forces, 1973, Vol. 52, 221 - 235. ISSN 0037 7732
Page in Report: 227

Population: Adults, general public, France, 1967

Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 2175

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:
1. Rural
2. under 20,000
3. 20,000-100,000
4. over 100,000
5. metropolitan Paris

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-SLC/c/sq/l/21/a | tb=-.01 ns | 1. M'=12.6
2. M'=12.5
3. M'=12.4
4. M'=12.8
5. M'=12.7 (M' 0-20) Negative relationship among the well-to-do (05). |
| O-SLC/c/sq/l/21/a | tb=+.03 ns | Controlling income and religiosity of region |

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

Reported in: Gehmacher, E.
Ungleichheit in Wien. (Inequality in Vienna).
Page in Report: 90

Population: Adult, general public, Austria, 1989

Sample:

Non-Response: ?
N: 0

Correlate

Authors label: Region (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:
a. metropolis (Vienna)
b. big cities (>50.000)
c. middle sized cities (50.000-10.000)
d. small cities (10.000-5.000)
e. surrounding country
f. country
g. Average Austria

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure

Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

Beta=.07 Control variables not enumerated p<.01
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**O-Sum/c/mq/v/5/a**  
D% = % deviation from nation average
a. +0.04  
b. -0.13  
c. +0.15  
d. -0.09  
e. +0.10  
f. -0.06  
g. 0.00

**O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/a**  
D% = % satisfied
a. 67  
b. 66  
c. 78  
d. 65  
e. 69  
f. 65  
g. 67

**O-HL/c/sq/v/5/a**  
D% = % happy
a. 63  
b. 58  
c. 68  
d. 59  
e. 66  
f. 58  
g. 61

**A-AOL/c/sq/v/5/c**  
D% = % feeling well
a. 56  
b. 48  
c. 62  
d. 51  
e. 54  
f. 55  
g. 55
### Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

*Reported in:* Gehmacher, E.  
*Coping, Happiness and Ideology. Some Suggestions for the Application of Happiness Research in Politological Research.*  
*Paper Presented at the International Conference "Towards the Good Society: Applying the Social Sciences", 1992, Rotterdam, Netherlands*  
*Page in Report: 11*

**Population:** 16+ aged, general public, Austria, 1989

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** ?

**N:** 2000

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Community size (1)

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1

**Measurement:**

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-FH/c/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Sum/c/mq/v/5/a</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Betas controled for:
- education
- age
- cultural participation (attendance and amateur activity)

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

*GURIN 1960*

ISBN 0 405 1191 86
Page in Report: 229

Population: 21+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1957

Sample:

Non-Response: 13%; 5% not at home, 8% refusals

N: 2460

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: Rural, small town, small city / suburb / metropole.
## Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>$G = -.06$</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

### Subject code: L10.2.1

### Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported in:</th>
<th>HAYO 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


| Page in Report: | 207,210 |

### Population:

18+ aged, Eastern European Countries, 1991

### Sample:

Probability multi-stage cluster sample

### Non-Response:

$N$: 5592

### Correlate

| Authors label: | Community size |

| Our classification: | Community size, code L10.2.1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement:</th>
<th>1 &lt;5000 inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 5001-20000 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 20001-100000 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 &gt;100000 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measured Values: | 1: $M = 0.36$; $SD = 0.48$; 2: $M = 0.17$, $SD = 0.37$; 3: $M = 0.18$, $SD = 0.38$; 4: $M = 0.29$, $SD = 0.46$ |

### Observed Relation with Happiness
### Findings on Happiness and Local Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLL/u/sq/v/3/b</td>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td>1 &lt;5000 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>r</em> =+0,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 5001-20000 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>r</em> =-0,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 20001-100000 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>r</em> =+0,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 &gt;100000 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>r</em> =-0,04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| O-SLL/u/sq/v/3/b  | *lgt*     | 5001-20000 inhabitants (vs<5000) SE = .08 |
|                   | *p*       | 5001-20000 inhabitants (vs<5000) SE = .08 |
|                   | 20001-100000 inhabitants (vs<5000) SE = .08 |
|                   | >100000 inhabitants (vs<5000) SE = .07 |

lgt's controlled for:
- country
- age
- gender
- marital status
- education
- type of employment
- income
- church attendance
- religion

No substantial changes in reduced logit model

---

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

*Study HEERE 1969*

*Reported in:* Heeren, S.D.
Entrepreneurial vs. Bureaucratic Fathers as Related to Family Structure, Happiness, and Two Measures of Independence.
Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1969, USA
Page in Report: 28

*Population:* Male undergraduates, University of Kansas, USA, 1967

*Sample:*
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response: 5% incomplete information.

N: 103

Correlate

Authors label: Size of home town. (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: Less than 1000 / 1000-5000 / 5000-10,000 / 10,000-50,000 / 50,000-100,000 / over 100,000

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

O-HL/g/sq/n/9/b r= ns

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study HEERE 1969


Population: Male undergraduates, University of Kansas, USA, 1967

Sample:

Non-Response: 5% incomplete information.

N: 103

Correlate

Authors label: Living in an urban area. (1)
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: Rural / suburban / urban.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/g/sq/n/9/b</td>
<td>r = ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

HYNSO 1975


Population: 60+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 319

Correlate

Authors label: Urban living (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: Number of inhabitants in place of residence:
1 Less than 2,500
2 Between 2,500 and 250,000
3 Over 250,000
Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>G = -.25</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

Subject code: L10.2.1

Study


Population: Homeless in cities, The Netherlands, 2004

Sample: Non-probability sample (unspecified)

Non-Response:

N: 66

Correlate

Authors label: Dwelling

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:

A: Arnhem
B: Apeldoorn
C: Nijmegen
D: Tilburg
E: Utrecht
F: Den Haag

Remarks: Ordered by size of the population (from low to high)
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

#### Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-HL/u/sq/n/10/a</th>
<th>DM=</th>
<th>Small:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Arnhem M=6,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B Apeldoorn M=6,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C Nijmegen M=6,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D Tilburg M=5,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E Utrecht M=6,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big:</td>
<td></td>
<td>F Den Haag M=5,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

**LEE 1982B**


*Population:* Parents with unmarried children at home, South Korea, 1980

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:*

\[ N: 1500 \]

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Urban living (1)

*Our classification:* Community size, code L10.2.1

*Measurement:* 1. Rural area 2. Middle size cities 3. Largest cities

**Observed Relation with Happiness**
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-Sum/u/mg/*0/b</td>
<td>DM=+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. M slightly lower than average (DM = -0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. M about average (DM = +0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. M slightly higher than average (DM = +0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same study reported in SHINN 1986/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

MANNI 1972

Reported in: Manning Gibbs, B.A.
Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1972, University of Texas at Austin, USA.
Page in Report: 56

Population: Adults, general public, USA, 1946-66

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 25617

Correlate

Authors label: Community size. (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:

1: farm
2: rural nonfarm and under 2500
3: 2500–9999
4: 10,000 – 99,999
5: 100,000 – 499,999
6: 500,000 and over

Observed Relation with Happiness
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SL/g/sq/n/10/a</td>
<td>G = ± G'</td>
<td>G' based on proportion very happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response formats of happiness question very slightly over the years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1946: blacks: G' = -.07 (ns)  
whites: G' = -.02 (ns)  
1956: blacks: G' = -.13 (05)  
whites: G' = +.02 (ns)  
1966: blacks: G' = -.30 (01)  
whites: G' = +.01 (ns)  

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size  
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study  
MASTE 1984/2

Reported in: Mastekaasa, A.; Moum, T.  
The Perceived Quality of Life in Norway: Regional Variations and Contextual Effects.  
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol 14, 385 - 419. ISSN 0303 8300 DOI:10.1007/BF00300450  
Page in Report: 411

Population: Adults, general public, non-institutionalized, Norway, 1981

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 1521

Correlate

Authors label: Degree of urbanization (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: 5-point scale ranging from 1 for rural areas to 5 for the larger cities.

Observed Relation with Happiness
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

### Happiness Measure

**Statistics**  
**Elaboration/Remarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/?/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>+.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/?/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>+.05 ns</td>
<td>$eta$ controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, number of friends, occupationally active, marital status. Unaffected by both traditionalism and economic level of the county.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

**Subject code:** L10.2.1

**Study**

**MASTE 1984/3**

**Reported in:** Mastekaasa, A.; Moum, T.  
The Perceived Quality of Life in Norway: Regional Variations and Contextual Effects. Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol 14, 385 - 419. ISSN 0303 8300 DOI:10.1007/BF00300450  
Page in Report: 412

**Population:** 18-79 aged, general public, Norway, 1982

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** 22%

**N:** 972

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Degree of urbanization (1)

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1

**Measurement:** Five-point scale.

### Observed Relation with Happiness

**Happiness Measure**  
**Statistics**  
**Elaboration/Remarks**
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

\[ O_{-HL}/c/sq/v/4/d \] \( \beta = +0.05 \)

\[ O_{-SL}/?/sq/l/10/a \] \( \beta = +0.02 \)

\[ O_{-HL}/c/sq/v/4/d \] \( \beta = +0.03 \text{ ns} \)

\( \beta \) controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, occupational prestige, occupationally active, marital status.

Unaffected by both traditionalism and economic level of the county.

\[ O_{-SL}/?/sq/l/10/a \] \( \beta = +0.01 \text{ ns} \)

\( \beta \) controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, occupational prestige, occupationally active, marital status.

Unaffected by both traditionalism and economic level of the county.

---

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

**Study**

**MCNAM 1978**


*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1971

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 20%

*N:* 2164

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Urban living (1)

*Our classification:* Community size, code L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement:

1. Rural places, outlying, not in Metropolitan Area
2. Rural places, Not in SMSA, adjacent to SMSA
3. Rural places, <2.500 in SMSA
4. Places 2.500 to 10.000
5. Cities 10.000 to 100.000 suburbs excluded
6. Cities over 100.000 12 largest SMSA's excluded
7. Suburbs in 12 largests SMSA's
8. Central cities of 12 largest SMSA's

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>G = +0.13</td>
<td>% very happy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>1. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

MOOKH 1997

Page in Report: 335

Population: 60+ aged, general public, USA 1982-91
**Sample:** Probability multi-stage cluster sample

**Non-Response:** not reported

**N:** 3049

---

## Correlate

**Authors label:** Place of residence (1)

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1

**Measurement:** Based on US "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area" (SMSA)
- 1. non-Metropolitan
- 2. metropolitan

**Measured Values:** N: 1 = 945  2 = 2104

---

## Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>DM = ns</td>
<td>1. M = 2.25 SD = .64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. M = 2.22 SD = .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = +.04 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>Beta = -.03</td>
<td>Beta controlled for socio-demographic variables:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Marital status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Financial status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Religious membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Religious attendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Beta = .01 ns
Beta controlled for
- socio-demographic variables:
  - Gender
  - Race
  - Marital status
  - Education
  - Financial status
  - Religious membership
  - Religious attendance
- satisfaction with:
  - Neighbours
  - Non-working activities
  - Family
  - Friends
  - Health
  - Finance

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study NEAR 1978


Population: Adult, general public, Western New York State, USA, 1975

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 384

Correlate

Authors label: Stratum (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:
1 Rural
2 Urban
3 Suburban
### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>$R^2=.03$</td>
<td>Explained variance in ANOVA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p&lt;.01$</td>
<td>More favorable for respondents living in suburban areas than for respondents residing in either urban or rural areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

NOELL 1977/5


**Population:** 14+ aged, general public, West-Germany, 1976-

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

$N$: 7965

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Size of town (1)

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1

**Measurement:**

1 villages
2 small town
3 medium town
4 big town
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Happiness Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-CA/mh/ri/v/2/b</td>
<td>G = -0.02</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t = -0.01</td>
<td>% happy face:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>1. 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

NUVOL 2004/1

**Reported in:**
Nuvolati, G.
The Italian Case. Commuting and Quality of Life.
Paper 6the Congress ISQOLS, 2004, Philadelphia, USA
Page in Report: 7

**Population:**
15+ aged. Italy, 1996

**Sample:**
Probability sample (unspecified)

**Non-Response:**
1.7%

**N:**
3561

**Correlate**

**Authors label:**
Community

**Our classification:**
Community size, code L10.2.1

**Measurement:**
1: rural commune
2: small town
3: medium city
4: large city

**Observed Relation with Happiness**
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SQL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>D%=-</td>
<td>% Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rural commune: 84,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small town : 82,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medium city : 81,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large city : 79,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

ORMEL 1980

Reported in: Ormel, J. Moeite met Leven of een Moeilijk Leven. (Difficulties with Living or a Difficult Life). Konstapel, 1980, Groningen, Netherlands Page in Report: 350

Population: 15-60 aged, general public, followed 12 month, The Netherlands, 1967-77

Sample:
Non-Response: 18%
N: 296

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)
Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1
Measurement: T1 (1970) inhabitants in place of residence:
1: below 10,000
2: 10,000-100,000
3: over 100,000

Observed Relation with Happiness

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study
PALIS 1986B

Reported in: Palisi, B.J.
Urbanism and Psychological Well-Being: A Test of Three Theories.
Page in Report: 369-370

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1974-1982

Sample:
Non-Response:
N: 7542

Correlate

Authors label: Urbanism (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:
1. Rural (with no town of 10000 or more)
2. Other urban counties with towns of 10000 or more
3. Suburbs of the remaining 100 largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's)
4. Suburbs of the 12 largest SMSA's
5. Central city of the remaining 100 largest SMSA's
6. Central city of the largest SMSA's

Observed Relation with Happiness

### Findings on Happiness and Local Environment

#### Happiness Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = -.09, p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r = -.07 (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r = -.16 (1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r = -.05 (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r = -.09 (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r = -.05 (1982)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa  | E² = .10                |
| O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa  | rpc = -.06, p < .01     |
| rpc controlled for income, occupation, educational degree, children, age, marital status, race, sex |

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

PALIS 1987

**Reported in:** Palisi, B.J.

Effects of Urbanism, Race and Class on Happiness and Physical Health.


Page in Report: 278

**Population:** 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972-1983

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

N: 15320

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Urbanism (2)

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1
**Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

**Measurement:**
1. Counties with towns of 10,000 or more and rural counties
2. Suburbs of either the 12 largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) or of the remaining 100 largest SMSA's
3. Central city of the remaining 100 largest SMSA's
4. Central city of the largest SMSA's

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

PALIS 1987

*Reported in:* Palisi, B.J.
Effects of Urbanism, Race and Class on Happiness and Physical Health.
Page in Report: 278

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972-1983

*Sample:

*N:* 15320

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Urbanism (1)

*Our classification:* Community size, code L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement:
1. Counties with towns of 10,000 or more and rural counties
2. Suburbs of either the 12 largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) or of the remaining 100 largest SMSA's
3. Central city of the remaining 100 largest SMSA's
4. Central city of the largest SMSA's

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = -0.07</td>
<td>Whites, less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = -0.06</td>
<td>Blacks, less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = -0.05</td>
<td>Whites, high school graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = -0.07</td>
<td>Blacks, high school graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = -0.05</td>
<td>Whites, college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = -0.05</td>
<td>Blacks, college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linear relationships

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study PHILI 1966
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Philips Nederland N.V.
De Nederlandse Huisvrouw. (The Dutch Housewife.)
Research Report NIPO assigned by Philips Nederland, 1966, Eindhoven, Netherlands
Page in Report: 66

Population: Housewives, The Netherlands, 1964

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 450

Correlate

Authors label: Community size. (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: 0 Less than 500,000 inhabitants
1 More

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>r=-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study SCHUL 1985B

Reported in: Schulz, W.; Költringer, R.; Norden, G.; Tüchler, H.
Lebensqualität in Österreich. (Quality-of-Life in Austria).
Research paper nr 10/1, Institut für Soziologie, University of Vienna, 1985, Austria
Page in Report: 18,30,T21

Population: Adults, non-institutionalized, Austria, 1984

Sample:

Non-Response: ?
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 1776

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.1

Measurement:
1 Village
2 Small city or suburb
3 Large city

Remarks: Inhabitants of small cities and suburbs report slightly more 'high' happiness

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/c/mg/*/0/a</td>
<td>G =+.01</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>β controlled for: gender, age, marital status, education, professional status, and income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Sum/c/mq/v/5/a</td>
<td>G =+.02</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/c/mq/*/0/a</td>
<td>tc =+.01</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Sum/c/mq/v/5/a</td>
<td>tc =+.01</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/c/mq/*/0/a</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Sum/c/mq/v/5/a</td>
<td>r =-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Sum/c/mq/v/5/a</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

Subject code: L10.2.1

Study SHINN 1986/1

Reported in: Shinn, D. C.
Education and the Quality of Life in Korea and the United States: A Cross-Cultural Perspective.
Page in Report: 367

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, South Korea, 1980

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 1215

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:

1. Rural area
   (isolated villages, rural towns)
2. Middle size cities
   (25,000 to 500,000)
3. Largest cities
   (>500,000)

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/c/mq/*0/a</td>
<td>r=+.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/c/mq/*0/a</td>
<td>r=-.04 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/c/mq/*0/a</td>
<td>Beta=+.15</td>
<td>8 controlled for education, income, age, gender, married status and own house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Signs reversed in original. Probably wrong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study
SHINN 1986/2

Reported in: Shinn, D. C.
Education and the Quality of Life in Korea and the United States: A Cross-Cultural Perspective.
Page in Report: 367

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1978

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 3642

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement:
1. Rural area
   (isolated villages, rural towns)
2. Middle size cities
   (25.000 to 500.000)
3. Largest cities
   (>500.000)

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/c/mq/*/0/a</td>
<td>r=-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/c/mq/*/0/a</td>
<td>r=+.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

\[ \beta = -0.06 \quad p < 0.05 \]

Beta controlled for education, income, age, gender, married status and own house.

Signs reversed in original. Probably wrong.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

**Subject code: L10.2.1**

**Study**

**Study**

**VENTE 1995**

*Reported in:* Ventegodt, S.
Livskvalitet i Danmark. (Quality of Life in Denmark).
Forskningscentrets Forlag (The Quality of Life Research Center), København, Denmark, ISBN 8790190017 http://www.livskvalitet.org/t1/index.asp
Page in Report: 70

*Population:* 18-88 aged, general public, Denmark, 1993

*Sample:* Non-probability purposive sample

*Non-Response:* 39%

*N:* 1494

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* residence(country/town) (1)

*Our classification:* Community size, code L10.2.1

*Measurement:* Single question:
"Where do you live?"
1: In the country
2: In a small town
3: In a large town or suburb
4: In Copenhagen


**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/m/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>DMt=</td>
<td>Mt=7.98</td>
<td>Mt=7.81</td>
<td>Mt=7.79</td>
<td>Mt=7.48</td>
<td>Mt=7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/e</td>
<td>DMt=</td>
<td>Ms=7.59</td>
<td>Ms=7.48</td>
<td>Ms=7.55</td>
<td>Ms=6.99</td>
<td>Mt=7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/5/h</td>
<td>DMt=</td>
<td>Ms=7.13</td>
<td>Ms=6.94</td>
<td>Ms=7.01</td>
<td>Ms=6.61</td>
<td>Mt=6.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/m/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/e</td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/5/h</td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

Subject code: L10.2.1

Study VENTE 1996


Page in Report: 74

Population: 31-33 aged, Denmark 1993, born in University Hospital in Copenhagen

Sample: Non-probability chunk sample

Non-Response: 39%
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 4500

Correlate

Authors label: residence (country/town)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: Single question:
Where do you live?
1: In the country
2: In a small town
3: In a large town or suburb
4: In Copenhagen

Measured Values: N: all:4538, 1:323 2:565, 3:1919, 4:1731,

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A-AOL/m/sq/v/5/a   | r=-.03     | 1: Mt=7.91
                 | p<.09      | 2: Mt=7.73
                 |            | 3: Mt=7.79
                 |            | 4: Mt=7.68
| O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/e   | r=-.05     | 1: Mt=7.68
                 | p<.00      | 2: Mt=7.51
                 |            | 3: Mt=7.48
                 |            | 4: Mt=7.29
| O-HL/c/sq/v/5/h    | r=-.05     | 1: Mt=7.26
                 | p<.00      | 2: Mt=7.08
                 |            | 3: Mt=7.08
                 |            | 4: Mt=6.91

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1
### Study

**Reported in:** Veroff, J.; Douvan, E.; Kulka, R.A.  
The Inner American: A Self-Portrait from 1957 to 1976.  
Page in Report: 427

**Population:** 21 aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1976

**Sample:**

- **Non-Response:** 29%
- **N:** 2264

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Population density (1)

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1

**Measurement:**
1. Rural
2. Town
3. Small city
4. Suburb
5. Metro

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>G = .04</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>tc = .03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>G = .05</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-HL/c/sq/v3/aa</th>
<th>tc=-.03</th>
<th>% very happy:</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small City</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect persists after control for age, sex and education. Interaction effects exist.

---

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1

Study

WILKE 1978/2


Page in Report: 229

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, Wisconsin, USA, 1974

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 534

Correlate

Authors label: Living environment (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1
**Measurement:**

A rural living
- 1 unincorporated and open country
- 0 other

B medium city
- 1 10,000 - 50,000 inhabitants
- 0 other

C large urban area
- 1 urban area > 50,000
- 0 other

D metropolis
- 1 metropolis
- 0 other

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>Beta = -.03</td>
<td>A: rural ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = .00</td>
<td>B: medium city ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = .02</td>
<td>C: large urban area ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = .12</td>
<td>D: metropolis p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bet as controlled for:
- education
- occupation
- income
- marital status
- living alone
- contact with relatives
- contact with friends
- church attendance
- organization membership
- gender
- age

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size**

Subject code: L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study: WILLI 1978


Population: Highschool pupils, rural area, followed 25 years, Pennsylvania, USA, 1946-71

Sample:

Non-Response: 26%

N: 2081

Correlate

Authors label: Miles to metropolis (1)

Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Measurement: Linear distance from subject's residence at T2 (1971) to the nearest population center of 100,000 inhabitants. Converted to logarithm for analysis.

Remarks: Happiness assessed at T2.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>Beta=-.03</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>Beta=-.06</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>$ controlled for father's occupation, highschool grade point average and education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size

Subject code: L10.2.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study

Reported in: Willits, F.K.; Bealer, R.C.; Crider, D.M.
Migrant Status and Success: A Panel Study
Rural Sociology, 1978, Vol. 43, 386 - 402
Page in Report: 394/395

Population: Highschool pupils, rural area, followed 25 years, Pennsylvania, USA, 1946-71

Sample:
Non-Response: 26%
N: 2081

Correlate

Authors label: Population size (1)
Our classification: Community size, code L10.2.1

Remarks: Happiness assessed at T2.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>Beta=+.07</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>Beta=-.01</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>$ controlled for father's occupation, highschool grade point average and education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Community size
Subject code: L10.2.1
### Study

**ZUMA 1989**


**Page in Report:**

**Population:** 18+ aged, general public, West-Germany, 1978-88

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** ?

**N:** 2100

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Urbanity (1)

**Our classification:** Community size, code L10.2.1

**Measurement:**
1. country house
2. rural village
3. village near city
4. small rural town
5. small industrial town
6. medium-size town, little industry
7. medium-size town, much industry
8. city suburb
9. big city

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/ba</strong></td>
<td>DM =</td>
<td>1. 7.83 7.39 7.75 7.50 7.88 2. 7.98 7.75 7.97 8.04 8.02 3. 7.69 7.71 7.77 7.98 8.09 4. 7.90 7.69 8.11 8.06 7.94 5. 7.59 7.82 7.74 7.88 7.88 6. 7.80 7.75 7.55 7.99 7.94 7. 7.94 7.58 7.46 7.62 7.93 8. 7.91 7.67 7.52 7.97 7.78 9. 7.71 7.41 7.81 7.44 7.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlational finding on Happiness and open country vs village
Subject code: L10.2.1.1

Study: HALMA 1987/2

Reported in: Halman, L.; Heunks, F.; DeMoor, R.; Zanders, H.
Traditie, Secularisatie en Individualisering. (Tradition, Secularization and Individualisation:- A Study into the Values of the Dutch within a European Context.
Page in Report: 369

Population: 18+ aged, general public, 10 EU nations, 1981

Sample:
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response:

N: 12464

Correlate

Authors label: Urban living (1)

Our classification: open country vs village, code L10.2.1.1

Measurement: Direct question: What would you say: "Do you live in a ......?" (Order reversed)
1 Rural region
2 Small town/village
3 City

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>r=-.03 ns</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=+.01 ns</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>r=+.08 p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Great-Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=+.05 p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Great-Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>r=+.02 ns</td>
<td>West Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=-.04 ns</td>
<td>West Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>r=+.10 p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=+.03 ns</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Correlation (r)</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>+.10</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>+.12</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>+.08</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>+.11</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>+.00</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>+.05</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>+.04</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>+.03</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>+.01</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>+.03</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa</td>
<td>DMt=</td>
<td>EC (stratified sample)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Mt' = 6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>Mt' = 6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Mt' = 6.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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O-HL/u/sq/v/4/a  

DMt= EC (stratified sample)
Rural     Mt' = 6.89
Small town Mt' = 7.00
City      Mt' = 6.78

O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/a  

Beta= In none of the european countries, β weights of this variable reached .10 level in multiple regression analysis, when controlling for:
life satisfaction (HAPP 2.1), affect (AFF 2.3);
satisfaction with income, health and family life;
age, income, male sex, marital status, having children, work; type of dwelling, own home,
religiousness, social participation; uncertainty about future, expected negative changes in income;
satisfaction 5 years in past and future;
tolerance, loneliness, misantropy, hopeless about life and sense of control.

Correlational finding on Happiness and . open country vs village
Subject code: L10.2.1.1

Study  WILKE 1978/1

Page in Report: 225

Population: 18+aged, general public, NW Wisconsin-residents, USA, 1974

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample:

Non-Response: 12%

N: 1423

Correlate

Authors label: Rural living (1)

Our classification: . open country vs village, code L10.2.1.1

Measurement:
1: open country
0: village (less than 10.000 inhabitants)

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure

Statistics

Elaboration/Remarks

O-SLW/u/sqt/v/7/a

Beta = +.01 ns

β controlled for 1+2+3+4+5:
1: education, occupation, income, level of living
2: live alone, married, children, contact with relatives, contact with friends, church attendance, organizational membership.
3: health problems, recent move, separated/divorced, unemployed.
4: retired, widowed.
5: urban living, female.

β in different age groups:
under 30: +.17 (05) 30-49 : +.04 (ns)
50-64 : -.13 (05) over 64 : -.08 (ns)

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study AMOS 1982
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Amos, O.M.; Hitt, M.A.; Warner, L.
Life Satisfaction and Regional Development: A Case Study of Oklahoma. Social Indicators Research, 1982, Vol. 11, 319 - 331. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00351840
Page in Report: 325

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Oklahoma, USA, 1978

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:

N: 2734

Correlate

Authors label: Urbanization of area were S grew up (1)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: Five county groups with different proportion of urbanized population:

1: <30%
2: 30-50%
3: 50-70%
4: 70-90%
5: >90%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/101/a</td>
<td>AoV=-p&lt;.05</td>
<td>1: M = 87.6 (Ms' = 8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: M = 89.7 (Ms' = 8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: M = 87.1 (Ms' = 8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: M = 96.7 (Ms' = 9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: M = 86.7 (Ms' = 8.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study BACHM 1977
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT


Page in Report:

Population: Public highschool boys followed 8 years from grade 10, USA, 1966-74

Sample:

Non-Response: 2.8% at T1, 17.2% at T2, 21.0% at T3, 28.9% at T4, 28.5% at T5

N: 1628

Correlate

Authors label: Urbanicity of later dwelling (1)

Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: Urbanicity of dwelling at T5
1 = rural community or small town or city of fewer than 50,000;
2 = medium sized city (50,000-100,000) or suburb of medium sized city;
3 = fairly large city (100,000-500,000) or suburb of fairly large city;
4 = very large city (over 500,000) or suburb of a very large city

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/g/mq/v/5/a</td>
<td>tau = ns</td>
<td>T1 happiness: tau = -.03 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T2 happiness: tau = -.02 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T3 happiness: tau = -.02 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T4 happiness: tau = -.02 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study

**BAKKE 1985**

*Reported in:* Bakker, S.; Landsmeer, M. 
Unpublished Research Report, Interview B.V., 1985, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Page in Report: Table 1.2

*Population:* 15+ aged, general public, The Netherlands, 1985

*Sample:

*Non-Response:

*N:* 1500

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Metropolitan living (1)

*Our classification:* rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

*Measurement:* 0 Rest of the Netherlands.
1 The large city agglomerations in the western part of the country.

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-PL/u/sq/n/5/a</td>
<td>G = -.14</td>
<td>p &lt; .02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling**

*Subject code: L10.2.1.2*

Study

**BOHN 1972**

*Reported in:* Bohn, C.J. 
Unpublished Master Thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1972, USA
Page in Report: 31
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Population: Adult, general public, Dominican Republic, Panama and Yugoslavia, ± 1960

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 5228

Correlate

Authors label: Urban residence (1)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: 0 Rural dwelling
1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks
---|---|---
C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a | DM=+ p<.01 | Dominican Republic:
- Lower among those who have children (01)
- Stronger among those who have no children (01)

Panama:
- Stronger among those who have children (01)
- Lower among those who have no children (ns)

Yugoslavia:
- Stronger among those who have children (01)
- Lower among those who have no children (ns)

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study BOHNK 2008

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Böhnke, P.; Kohler, U.  
Well-being and Inequality  
WZB Discussion Paper no. SP I 2008-201, 2008, Berlin, Germany ISSN 1612 3468  
http://www.wzb.eu  
Page in Report: 24

Population: 18+ aged, in 28 European nations, 2003  
Sample: Mixed samples  
Non-Response:  
N: 18600

Correlate

Authors label: Type of community  
Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2  
Measurement:  
0 = rural (reference)  
1 = urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b</td>
<td>B = -.01</td>
<td>No controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b</td>
<td>B = +.21</td>
<td>B controlled for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>-gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-class/occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b</td>
<td>B = +.13</td>
<td>B additionally controlled for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>-marital status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-contacts with friends/neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-voluntary work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b  B=+.13  p<.05  B additionally controlled for
  -church attendance
  -internet use

O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b  B=+.11  p<.05  B additionally controlled for
  -long term illness and health satisfaction

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study  CANTR 1965/1

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 259

Population: Adults, general public, 14 countries ±1960

Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 18653

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: 0 Rural
1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>G=+.14</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study CANTR 1965/2

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 378-380

Population: 21+ aged, general public, USA, 1959

Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 1549

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)
Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2
Measurement: 0 Rural
1 Urban dwelling

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a G = .01 ns

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study CANTR 1965/3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 378-380

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Brazil, 1960-61

Sample:

Non-Response: -

N: 2168

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: 0 Rural 1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure  Statistics  Elaboration/Remarks

C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a  G =+.30  p< .01

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study CANTR 1965/4

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 378-380

Population: 20+ aged, general public, urban areas, Cuba, 1960

Sample:

Non-Response: -
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 992

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement:
0 Rural
1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure

Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a G = .20
p < .01

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study

CANTR 1965/5

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 378-380

Population: 21+ aged, general public, Dominican Republic, 1962

Sample: Probability sample (unspecified)

Non-Response: -

N: 814

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement:
0 Rural
1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>G = +.56</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study
CANTR 1965/6

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 378-380

Population: 15+ aged, general public, Egypt, 1960
Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 499

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)

Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2
Measurement:
0 Rural
1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness
Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>CANTR 1965/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page in Report:</td>
<td>378-380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td>Adults, general public, India, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Response:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>2366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors label:</th>
<th>Urban dwelling (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our classification:</td>
<td>rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement:</td>
<td>0 Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>G =+.28</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study: CANTR1965/10

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 378-380


Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 1200

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)
Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2
Measurement: 0 Rural
1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure
C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a

Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
G = .01
ns

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study: CANTR1965/11

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 378-380
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population: 21+ aged, general public, Panama, 1962

Sample:

Non-Response: -

N: 642

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: 0 Rural
1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>G =+.29</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study CANTR1965/12

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 373/78-380

Population: 21+ aged, general public, Philippines, 1959

Sample:

Non-Response: -

N: 500
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: 0 Rural
1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l11/a</td>
<td>G = .20</td>
<td>Rural: ( M_t = 4.8 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .01 )</td>
<td>Semi-urban: ( M_t = 5.3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban: ( M_t = 5.2 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling

Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study CANTR1965/14

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 378-380

Population: Adults, general public, West-Germany, 1957

Sample: Non-Response: -
        \( N = 480 \)
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: 0 Rural
       1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>G = -0.03 ** ns **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling

Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study

Reported in: Cantril, H.
The Pattern of Human Concern.
Rutgers University Press, 1965, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
Page in Report: 378-380

Population: 21+ aged, general public, Yugoslavia, 1962

Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 1523

Correlate

Authors label: Urban dwelling (1)

Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: 0 Rural
       1 Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

#### Happiness Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>G = +.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling

**Subject code: L10.2.1.2**

**Study**

- **CBS 1984A**
  - Page in Report: 127

**Population:** 18+ aged, general public, Netherlands, 1980

**Sample:** Non-probability accidental sample

**Non-Response:**

- N: 2100

#### Correlate

**Authors label:** urbanisation

**Our classification:** rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

**Measurement:**

- 1: rural
- 2: urbanized rural
- 3: commuter towns
- 4: small cities
- 5: big cities
- 6: very big cities

**Measured Values:** N = 2109 1 = 268 2 = 489 3 = 276 4 = 570 5 = 301 6 = 205

#### Observed Relation with Happiness
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Mt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling**

**Subject code: L10.2.1.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>FISCH 1973/4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page in Report:</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td>Adults, general public, USA, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Response:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>1440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors label:</th>
<th>Community size (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our classification:</td>
<td>rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Measurement: | 1 Out of SMSA  
  a. rural  
  b. town  
  2 In SMSA  
  a. ring  
  b. center  
  3 Large SMSA  
  a. ring  
  b. center |

(SMSA short for Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area)
Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-SLL/c/sq/v/3/a   | \( t_b = -.07 \) \( p < .01 \) | 1a. \( M' = 2.19 \)
|                   |            | 1b. \( M' = 2.12 \)
|                   |            | 2a. \( M' = 2.18 \)
|                   |            | 2b. \( M' = 2.06 \)
|                   |            | 3a. \( M' = 2.14 \)
|                   |            | 3b. \( M' = 2.00 \) (M' 1-3) |

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; \( = -.06 \) (ns).
Those living in the center of towns and cities were less happy than those living in the outskirts: \( = -.07 \) (001).

| O-SLL/c/sq/v/3/a   | \( r = -.06 \) \( p < .05 \) |  |
|                   | \( \beta = -.05 \) \( p < .05 \) |

\( \beta \) controlling: income, education, occupation, race, age, religion, stage in life-cycle, region of birth, fathers occupational status

---

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study: HAAVI 1971

*Reported in:* Haavio-Mannila, E.
Page in Report: 587

*Population:* 15-64 aged, general public, Finland, 1966

*Sample:*
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response:

N: 948

Correlate

Authors label: Living in an urban setting. (1)

Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: 0 Rural communes 1 Big city (Helsinki)

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks
------------------|------------|------------------------
O-SLW/?/sq/v/3/b   | G = +.18 p< .01 | O. M' = 2.12
                  |             | 1. M' = 2.44

Males: G' = +.12 (ns)
Females: G' = +.25 (01)

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study

KIVET 1976

Reported in: Kivett, V.R.
The Aged in North Carolina: Physical, Social and Environmental Characteristics and Sources of Assistance. (The Guilford Study)
Technical Bulletin No.237, North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, 1976, USA
Page in Report: 37

Population: 65+ aged, North Carolina, USA, 1970-71

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 469
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

Authors label: Urban living (1)

Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement:
0 - Rural areas including small towns
1 - 2 Cities of 63,000 and 144,000 inhabitants.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/ba</td>
<td>Beta=+04 ns</td>
<td>ß controlled for sex, race, marital status, social position, age, education and work at age 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B=ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling

Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study: KNAUD 2000

Reported in: Knauder, S.
Ashgate, 2000, USA. ISBN 18401 8438
Page in Report: 195-197

Population: Households, 18 areas, Mozambique, 1991

Sample: Probability area sample

Non-Response: 8.3%

N: 420
Authors label: Urbanization

Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: a: rural
b: peri-urban
c: urban

Measured Values: a: N=39; b: N=325; c: N=56

Remarks: Overall

---

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/u/sq/v/5/g</td>
<td>D%=+</td>
<td>(very) happy D% (very) unhappy D%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a: rural 5         69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b: peri-urban 14 +9 48 -21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c: urban 41 +27 23 -25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/u/sq/v/5/g</td>
<td>DM=+</td>
<td>a: rural M=2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b: peri-urban M=2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c: urban M=3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/u/sq/v/5/g</td>
<td>t=+</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-TH/u/sq/v/5/b</td>
<td>D%=+</td>
<td>almost every day cheerful D% not cheerful for a long time D%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a: rural 8 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b: peri-urban 19 +11 15 -24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c: urban 28 +7 4 -11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-TH/u/sq/v/5/b</td>
<td>DM=+</td>
<td>a: rural M=2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b: peri-urban M=2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c: urban M=3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-TH/u/sq/v/5/b</td>
<td>t=+</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling

**Subject code: L10.2.1.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>MOLLE 1989/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Reported in:** | Moller, V.; Schlemmer, L.  
South African Quality of Life: A Research Note.  
Social Indicators Research, 1989, Vol. 21, 279 - 291. ISSN 0303 8300. DOI:10.1007/BF00303787  
Page in Report: 282 |
| **Population:** | Adult, general public, urban areas, South Africa, 1983 |
| **Sample:** | |
| **Non-Response:** | |
| **N:** | 5587 |

#### Correlate

| **Authors label:** | Urban living (1) |
| **Our classification:** | rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2 |
| **Measurement:** | 0 rural blacks  
1 urban blacks |

#### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Happiness Measure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Statistics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Elaboration/Remarks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-Sum/c/mg/*0/b        | DM=+           | Median happiness, range 1-100:  
rural: median 61.0  (range 0-10: 5.1)  
urban: median 64.7  (range 0-10: 5.5) |

---

### Study

**MOLLE 1989/B2**

**Reported in:** Moller, V.  
Can't get no Satisfaction.  
Page in Report: 22 (Rep.)

**Population:** Adult, general public, urban areas, South African, 1983

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

* N: 5587

---

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Urban living (1)

**Our classification:** Rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

**Measurement:**

0 rural areas
- rural fringe blacks
- homeland rural blacks
- "white farm" blacks
1 urban areas
- township blacks
- hostel blacks

---

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/d   | G = +.10 p < .01 | "satisfied" or "very satisfied":  
0: 41%  
1: 46%  
Computed for blacks only. |

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling**
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study


Population: 55+ aged, 6 European nations, 2000

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: 45%

N: 3950

Correlate

Authors label: Urbanization

Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement:

0: rural
1: urban

Measured Values:

Finland: Rural N=301, Urban N=309; Netherlands: Rural N=314, Urban N=302; Germany West: Rural N=383, Urban N=368; Germany East: Rural N=379, Urban N=389; Hungary: Rural N=300, Urban N=305; Italy: Rural N=300, Urban N=300

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks
--- | --- | ---
O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d | DM+= ns | 
  - Finland:  
    - rural: M= 8,4  
    - urban: M= 8,5  
  Difference: +0,1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

- Netherlands:
  - rural: M = 8.0
  - urban: M = 7.8
  Difference: -0.2

- Germany West:
  - rural: M = 7.7
  - urban: M = 7.4
  Difference: -0.3

- Germany East:
  - rural: M = 7.0
  - urban: M = 7.3
  Difference: +0.3

- Hungary:
  - rural: M = 6.0
  - urban: M = 6.5
  Difference: +0.5

- Italy:
  - rural: M = 7.4
  - urban: M = 7.7
  Difference: +0.3

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling

Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study OOSTE 2008

Reported in: Oosterhof, S.F.
Maakt Vrije Tijd Gelukkig? De Invloed van Vrije Tijd op de Geluksbeleving van Nederlanders. (Does Leisure Time Make you Happy? The Influence of Leisure Time on the Happiness Experience of the Dutch.)
Master Thesis, Faculty Social Sciences, Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2008, Netherlands
Page in Report: 33

Population: 12+ aged, Netherlands, 2005

Sample: Probability multi-stage cluster sample
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response: 11%

N: 2204

Correlate

Authors label: Urban living environment

Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: Urbanization of living environment
1 Little/ not
2 Moderate (reference category)
3 Strong/ very strong

Measured Values: N = 1: 658 2: 360 3: 946

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/u/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>D%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very happy</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not happy</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| O-HP/u/sq/v/5/a    | OR         |                    |
|                    |            | UNHAPPY (vs happy) | VERY HAPPY (vs happy) |
|                    |            | observed | controlled | observed | controlled |
| Strong             | 1,10       | 1,04     | 0,74*     | 0,75*    |
| Moderate           | 1          | 1        | 1         | 1        |
| Little             | 1,02       | 1,11     | 0,82      | 0,82     |

Control variables are:
- gender
- education
- family stage
- situation
- self reported health
- self reported stress
* = p<.05

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling

**Subject code: L10.2.1.2**

**Study**

ORMEL 1980

*Reported in:* Ormel, J.
Moeite met Leven of een Moeilijk Leven. (Difficulties with Living or a Difficult Life). Konstapel, 1980, Groningen, Netherlands
Page in Report: 350

*Population:* 15-60 aged, general public, followed 12 month, The Netherlands, 1967-77

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 18%

*N:* 296

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Urban living (1)

*Our classification:* rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

*Measurement:* Assessed at T2 (1976)

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/4/c</td>
<td>r=−.03 ns</td>
<td>T2 happiness by T2 urban living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/4/c</td>
<td>r=+.03 ns</td>
<td>T3 happiness by T2 urban living</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling**

**Subject code: L10.2.1.2**

**Study**

PEIL 1984
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Peil, M.
African Urban Life: Components of Satisfaction in Sierra Leone.
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol. 14, 363 - 384. ISSN p 0303 8300;ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00692990

Page in Report:

Population: Adult, general public, urban areas (Freetown, Bo and Kenema), Sierra Leone, 1981

Sample:

Non-Response: 5% (on some items up to 60%)
N: 640

Correlate

Authors label: Urban background (2)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement:
0. Rural
1. Urban

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics  | Elaboration/Remarks |
--- | --- | --- |
O-SLW/u/sq/l7/a | D Mt=+ | Happiness level in Mt' (0-10):
- village males: 7.0 females: 6.9
- town 6.9 7.3
- city 7.5 7.6
- mix rural/urban 7.7 7.6
- mix town/city 7.3 -

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study SIMON 2007
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT


Population: Residents of cities and rural areas, Netherlands, 2006

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response:

N: 140

Correlate

Authors label: rural versus urban dwelling

Our classification: rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: Population density
1 = rural
2 = urban
(original: 1,2,3 = urban, 4,5 = rural)


Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/u/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>D% = -0.6</td>
<td>%happy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rural: 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>urban: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difference -6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and rural vs urban dwelling

Subject code: L10.2.1.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Study**

**TAYLO 2006**


*Population:* Adults, general public, USA, 2005

*Sample:* Probability simple random sample

*Non-Response:*

\[ N = 3014 \]

### Correlate

*Authors label:* Location

*Our classification:* . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

*Measurement:* a. Urban  
   b. Suburban  
   c. Rural

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-HL/c/sq/v/3/ca   | D% = 0     | % Very Happy  
   - Urban 31%  
   - Suburban 36%  
   - Rural 34% |

**Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling**

**Subject code:** L10.2.1.2

**Study**

**UNICE 2001**
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: UNICEF
Speaking Out! Voices of Children and Adolescents in East Asia and the Pacific. A Regional Opinion Survey.
Page in Report:

Population: 9-17 aged children, 17 countries/regions East Asia and Pacific 2001
Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response:

N: 10073

Correlate

Authors label: Rural/urban

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement: 1: rural
2: urban


Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-TH/g/sq/v/4/e</td>
<td>DM ++</td>
<td>Rural M=3,4 SD=0,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Urban M=3,5 SD=0,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difference +0,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . rural vs urban dwelling
Subject code: L10.2.1.2

Study WILKE 1978/1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Wilkening, E.A.; McGranahan, D.
Correlates of Subjective Well-Being in Northern Wisconsin.
Social Indicators Research, 1978, Vol. 5, 211 - 234. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00352930
Page in Report: 225

Population: 18+aged, general public, NW Wisconsin-residents, USA, 1974

Sample:

Non-Response: 12%

N: 1423

Correlate

Authors label: Urban living (1)

Our classification: . rural vs urban dwelling, code L10.2.1.2

Measurement:
1: 10,000 inhabitants and over
2: less than 10,000 (village)

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure  Statistics  Elaboration/Remarks

O-SLW/u/sqt/v/7/a  Beta=-.01  ß controlled for 1+2+3+4+5 :
ns
1: education, occupation, income, level of living
2: live alone, married, children, contact with relatives, contact with friends, church attendance, organizational membership.
3: health problems, recent move, separated/divorced, unemployed.
4: retired, widowed.
5: rural living, female.

ß in different age groups:
under 30: +.16 (05)  30-49 : -.03 (ns)
50-64 : -.04 (ns)  over 64 : -.03 (ns)

Correlational finding on Happiness and . sub-urban vs urban
Subject code: L10.2.1.3

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study FISCH 1973/4

Reported in: Fischer, C.S.
Urban Malaise.
Social Forces, 1973, Vol. 52, 221 - 235. ISSN 0037 7732
Page in Report: 226

Population: Adults, general public, USA, 1968

Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 1440

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (2)

Our classification: sub-urban vs urban, code L10.2.1.3

Measurement: 1 Out of SMSA
a. rural
b. town
2 In SMSA
a. ring
b. center
3 Large SMSA
a. ring
b. center

(SMSA short for Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area)

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

\[ t_b = .07, p < .01 \]

1a. \( M' = 2.19 \)
1b. \( M' = 2.12 \)
2a. \( M' = 2.18 \)
2b. \( M' = 2.06 \)
3a. \( M' = 2.14 \)
3b. \( M' = 2.00 \) (M' 1-3)

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; \( _ = - .06 \) (ns).
Those living in the center of towns and cities were less happy than those living in the outskirts: \( _ = - .07 \) (0.01).

\[ r = .06, p < .05 \]

\[ \beta = .05, p < .05 \]

\( \beta \) controlling: income, education, occupation, race, age, religion, stage in life-cycle, region of birth, fathers occupational status

Correlational finding on Happiness and sub-urban vs urban
Subject code: L10.2.1.3

Study KNAUD 2000

Reported in: Knauder, S.
Ashgate, 2000, USA. ISBN 18401 8438
Page in Report: 195-197

Population: Households, 18 areas, Mozambique, 1991

Sample: Probability area sample

Non-Response: 8.3%

N: 420
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Urbanization  

*Our classification:* sub-urban vs urban, code L10.2.1.3  

*Measurement:*  
- a: rural  
- b: peri-urban  
- c: urban  

*Measured Values:*  
- a: N=39; b: N=325; c: N=56  

*Remarks:* Overall

---

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/sq/v/5/g</td>
<td>D%+=</td>
<td>(very)happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a: rural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b: peri-urban</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c: urban</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| O-HP/sq/v/5/g | DM+= |  |
| a: rural | M=2,1 |  |
| b: peri-urban | M=2,4 |  |
| c: urban | M=3,1 |  |

| M-TH/sq/v/5/b | t=+ | a |
| almost every day cheerful |  |
| not cheerful for a long time |  |
| a: rural | 8 | 39 |
| b: peri-urban | 19 | +11 | 15 | -24 |
| c: urban | 28 | +7 | 4 | -11 |

| M-TH/sq/v/5/b | DM+= | a: rural | M=2,1 |  |
| b: peri-urban | M=2,7; |  |
| c: urban | M=3,6; |  |
Correlational finding on Happiness and sub-urban vs urban
Subject code: L10.2.1.3

Study          KNAUD 2000

Reported in: Knauder, S.
Ashgate, 2000, USA. ISBN 18401 8438
Page in Report: 201

Population: Households, 18 areas, Mozambique, 1991

Sample: Probability area sample

Non-Response: 8,3%

N: 420

Correlate

Authors label: Maputo vs Beira

Our classification: sub-urban vs urban, code L10.2.1.3

Measurement:

a: City of Maputo
b: City of Beira

Measured Values: N: unknown

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and . sub-urban vs urban

**Subject code:** L10.2.1.3

**Study**

*PALIS 1983*


*Page in Report:* 537

*Population:* Males, metropolitan areas England, USA, Australia, 1977-1980

*Sample:

*Non-Response:* 67%

*N:* 752

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Living in city center (1)

*Our classification:* . sub-urban vs urban, code L10.2.1.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement:
0 Suburban
1 City centre

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>r=-.16 ns</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>rpc=.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>r=-.06 ns</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>rpc=.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>r=-.03 ns</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>rpc=.02</td>
<td>rpc controled for: Age, frequency of visits to friends, frequency of visits to kin and perceived crowding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . sub-urban vs urban
Subject code: L10.2.1.3

Study
ZUMA 1989


Population: 18+ aged, general public, West-Germany, 1978-88

Sample:
Non-Response: ?
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 2100

Correlate

Authors label: Community size (1)

Our classification: sub-urban vs urban, code L10.2.1.3

Measurement:

- 0 outskirts of city  100 - 500.000
- 1 centre of city     100 - 500.000
- 2 outskirts of city  > 500.000
- 3 centre of city     > 500.000

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11</td>
<td>SNR=</td>
<td>eta G r ß</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ß's controlled for age, gender, perceived class and marital status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>SNR=</td>
<td>eta G r ß</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and size of urban setting

Subject code: L10.2.1.4

Study           BAMUN 1980
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Bamundo, P.; Kopelman, R.E.
The Moderating Effects of Occupation, Age, and Urbanization on the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction.
Page in Report: 112

Population: Heads of households, USA, 1977

Sample:

Non-Response: 59 %: overrepresentation of high income, high educated metro-politans

N: 911

Correlate

Authors label: Residential City Size (1)

Our classification: size of urban setting, code L10.2.1.4

Measurement:

< 50.000
50.000 to 250.000
250.000 to 500.000
500.000 to 1.000.000
1.000.000 to 2.000.000
2.000.000 >

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

O-S.LL/g/sq/v/3/a r=-.03 ns

Correlational finding on Happiness and size of urban setting
Subject code: L10.2.1.4

Study PEIL 1984

Reported in: Peil, M.
African Urban Life: Components of Satisfaction in Sierra Leone.
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol. 14, 363 - 384. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00692990
Page in Report: 366
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population: Adult, general public, urban areas (Freetown, Bo and Kenema), Sierra Leone, 1981

Sample:

Non-Response: 5% (on some items up to 60%)

N: 640

Correlate

Authors label: Size of town (1)

Our classification: size of urban setting, code L10.2.1.4

Measurement: Freetown (capital: 274.000 inhabitants)
Bo (second town: 40.000 inh.)
Kenema (provincial town: 30.000 inh.)

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
O-SLW/u/sq/l/7/a DMt=
Happiness level in Mt' (0-10):
Freetown males: 7.0 females: 6.7
Bo 7.2 7.5
Kenema 7.8 7.8

Correlational finding on Happiness and Modernity of community
Subject code: L10.2.2

Study MASTE 1984/1

Reported in: Mastekaasa, A.; Moum, T.
The Perceived Quality of Life in Norway: Regional Variations and Contextual Effects.
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol 14, 385 - 419. ISSN 0303 8300 DOI:10.1007/BF00300450
Page in Report: 411

Population: 15-64 aged, general public, non-institutionalized, Norway, 1971

Sample:
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response: 15%
N: 854

Correlate

Authors label: Traditionalism of the county (1)
Our classification: Modernity of community, code L10.2.2
Measurement: Factor loading highly on:
- divorce rate
- alcohol consumption per capita
- electoral support for Christian People's Party
- emigration per 1000 inhabitants
- immigration per 1000 inhabitants
- percentage with no religious denomination

The counties of southern and western Norway are most traditionalistic in this respect.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/4/d</td>
<td>Beta= .04</td>
<td>β controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, occupational prestige, number of friends, occupationally active, marital status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Modernity of community
Subject code: L10.2.2

Study MASTE 1984/2

Reported in: Mastekaasa, A.; Moum, T.
The Perceived Quality of Life in Norway: Regional Variations and Contextual Effects.
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol 14, 385 - 419. ISSN 0303 8300 DOI:10.1007/BF00300450
Page in Report: 411

**Population:** Adults, general public, non-institutionalized, Norway, 1981

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

N: 1521

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Traditionalism of the county (1)

**Our classification:** Modernity of community, code L10.2.2

**Measurement:** Factor loading highly on:
- divorce rate
- alcohol consumption per capita
- electoral support for Christian People's Party
- emigration per 1000 inhabitants
- immigration per 1000 inhabitants
- percentage with no religious denomination

The counties of southern and western Norway are most traditionalistic in this respect.

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

**Happiness Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/?/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>Beta=+.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/?/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>Beta=+.12</td>
<td>$\beta$ controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, number of friends, occupationally active, marital status, degree of urbanization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Modernity of community**

**Subject code:** L10.2.2

**Study**

MASTE 1984/3
Population: 18-79 aged, general public, Norway, 1982

Sample:
Non-Response: 22%
N: 972

Correlate

Authors label: Traditionalism of the county (1)
Our classification: Modernity of community, code L10.2.2
Measurement: Factor loading highly on:
- divorce rate
- alcohol consumption per capita
- electoral support for Christian People's Party
- emigration per 1000 inhabitants
- immigration per 1000 inhabitants
- percentage with no religious denomination

The counties of southern and western Norway are most traditionalistic in this respect.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/4/d</td>
<td>Beta=.04</td>
<td>p&lt;.05 controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, occupational prestige, occupationally active, marital status, degree of urbanization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

\( \beta = .04 \) ns

\( \beta \) controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, occupational prestige, occupationally active, marital status, degree of urbanization.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Planned community
Subject code: L10.2.3

Study

ZEHNE 1977


Population: Residents communities, planned and unplanned, USA, 1973

Sample:

Non-Response:

\( N: \) 3894

Correlate

Authors label: Planned community (1)

Our classification: Planned community, code L10.2.3

Measurement: 0. Unplanned community
1. Planned community

Remarks:

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a  G = +.01 ns
Planned; Comprehensively planned
Unplanned; Conventionally developed community

For each planned community a conventionally developed one was selected nearby that provided singular housing. Inhabitants of the communities are alike in socio-demographic characteristics.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local economic prosperity
Subject code: L10.3

Study

AMOS 1982

Reported in: Amos, O.M.; Hitt, M.A.; Warner, L.
Life Satisfaction and Regional Development: A Case Study of Oklahoma. Social Indicators Research, 1982, Vol. 11, 319 - 331. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00351840
Page in Report: 322

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Oklahoma, USA, 1978

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:

N: 2734

Correlate

Authors label: Economic prosperity of region (1)

Our classification: Local economic prosperity, code L10.3

Measurement:

Per capita income:
1:southeastern Oklahoma: $ 5263
2:remainder of Oklahoma: $ 7376
3:USA (1978) : $ 7854

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

1: Oklahoma, Southeastern: \( M_t = 8.83 \)
2: Oklahoma, remainder: \( M_t = 8.72 \)
3: USA: \( M_t = 7.90 \)
1-2 difference ns

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local economic prosperity
Subject code: L10.3

Study

POWDT 2007

Reported in: Powdthavee N.
Putting a Price Tag on Friends, Relatives, and Neighbours: Using Surveys of Life Satisfaction to Value Social Relationships
Page in Report: 40

Population: 16-65 aged, followed 6 years, Great-Britain, 1997-2003
Sample: Probability stratified sample
Non-Response: n.a.
N: 54424

Correlate

Authors label: Average district income
Our classification: Local economic prosperity, code L10.3
Measurement: In £ 1000
Remarks: \( T_1 = \) average 1997-2000, \( T_2 = 2002 \)

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure

Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Controlled for:
- Frequency of meeting friends and relatives
- Talk to neighbours
- Socioeconomic variables
- Indicators of quality of accommodation and neighbourhood

B estimated by fixed effects estimation

Correlational finding on Happiness and Economic growthdecline in community

Subject code: L10.3.1

Study BRADB 1965/1


Population: Adult, general public, 4 towns, varying in economic prosperity, Illinois, USA, 1962

Sample:

Non-Response: -

N: 2006

Correlate

Authors label: Economic depression of local environment (1)

Our classification: Economic growthdecline in community, code L10.3.1

Measurement: Comparison of 4 communities:
- two economically depressed
- one improving from a depression
- one economically well-off
Reversed among <50 aged and high S.E.S.

Observed Relation with Happiness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A-BB/cw/mg/v/4/e   | G = -0.12  | Index of Positive Affects: G' = -0.12 (01)  
- Stronger among <50 aged  
- Positive among low S.E.S.  
- Not among high S.E.S.  

Index of Negative Affects: G' = +0.02 (ns)  
- Negative among 50+ aged and lower S.E.S. only.  
- Reversed among <50 aged and higher S.E.S. |

| O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa   | G = -0.17  | Negative among low S.E.S. only.  
- Strongest among age 50+ and low S.E.S.  
- Slightly reversed among age 50+ and high S.E.S. |

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Economic growth decline in community**  
**Subject code: L10.3.1**

**Study**  
BRADB 1965/1  

**Reported in:** Bradburn, N.M.; Caplovitz D.  
Aldine Publishing Company, 1965, Chicago, USA  
Page in Report: 62

**Population:** Adult, general public, 4 towns, varying in economic prosperity, Illinois, USA, 1962

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** -

**N:** 2006

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Improving economic climate of local environment (1)

**Our classification:** Economic growth decline in community, code L10.3.1

**Measurement:** Properious and improving community compared. (Both depressed community left out  N = 1005)
# Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

## Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>G=+.10 ns</td>
<td>Positive among those of lower S.E.S. only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Correlational finding on Happiness and Economic growthdecline in community

**Subject code: L10.3.1**

**Study**

**HOCHS 1968**


*Page in Report:* 1020

**Population:** Adults, general public, Oakland California, USA, 1960-65

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

*N:* 2580

## Correlate

**Authors label:** Lives in poverty area (1)

**Our classification:** Economic growthdecline in community, code L10.3.1

**Measurement:**

0 Non-poverty area

1 Poverty area (census treats with male unemployment rates of 9 % or higher in 1965)

## Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

\[ G = .26 \text{ } p < .05 \]

Poverty area: 16 % "not too happy"
Non poverty area: 10 % "not too happy"

Correlational finding on Happiness and Economic growth decline in community
Subject code: L10.3.1

Study

MASTE 1984/1

Reported in: Mastekaasa, A.; Moum, T.
The Perceived Quality of Life in Norway: Regional Variations and Contextual Effects.
Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol 14, 385 - 419. ISSN 0303 8300 DOI:10.1007/BF00300450
Page in Report: 411

Population: 15-64 aged, general public, non-institutionalized, Norway, 1971

Sample:

Non-Response: 15%

N: 854

Correlate

Authors label: Economic level of the county (1)

Our classification: Economic growth decline in community, code L10.3.1

Measurement: Factor loading highly on:
- mean taxable income
- inequality of taxable income
- electoral support for Conservative Party
- electoral support for Progress Party
The capital and the area surrounding it (Oslo and Akershus) and some of the western counties have relatively high scores. The county with the highest score on this dimension, Rogaland, has by far the greatest income inequality in Norway, and it comes third in terms of average income.
**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/4/d</td>
<td>Beta=-.07</td>
<td>β controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, occupational prestige, number of friends, occupationally active, marital status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Economic growth/decline in community**

**Subject code: L10.3.1**

**Study**

- **MASTE 1984/2**

  **Reported in:** Mastekaasa, A.; Moum, T. The Perceived Quality of Life in Norway: Regional Variations and Contextual Effects. Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol 14, 385 - 419. ISSN 0303 8300 DOI:10.1007/BF00300450
  
  **Page in Report:** 411

  **Population:** Adults, general public, non-institutionalized, Norway, 1981

  **Sample:**

  **Non-Response:**

  **N:** 1521

**Correlate**

- **Authors label:** Economic level of the county (1)

  **Our classification:** Economic growth/decline in community, code L10.3.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:**
- mean taxable income
- inequality of taxable income
- electoral support for Conservative Party
- electoral support for Progress Party

The capital and the area surrounding it (Oslo and Akershus) and some of the western counties have relatively high scores. The county with the highest score on this dimension, Rogaland, has by far the greatest income inequality in Norway, and it comes third in terms of average income.

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/?/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>Beta=-.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/?/sq/v/4/a</td>
<td>Beta=-.03</td>
<td>ns controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, number of friends, occupationally active, marital status, degree of urbanization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Economic growth decline in community**

**Subject code: L10.3.1**

**Study**

MASTE 1984/3

**Reported in:** Mastekaasa, A.; Moum, T.
The Perceived Quality of Life in Norway: Regional Variations and Contextual Effects. Social Indicators Research, 1984, Vol 14, 385 - 419. ISSN 0303 8300 DOI:10.1007/BF00300450
Page in Report: 412

**Population:** 18-79 aged, general public, Norway, 1982

**Sample:**

Non-Response: 22%

N: 972
Correlate

Authors label: Economic level of the county (1)

Our classification: Economic growth/decline in community, code L10.3.1

Measurement: Factor loading highly on:
- mean taxable income
- inequality of taxable income
- electoral support for Conservative Party
- electoral support for Progress Party

The capital and the area surrounding it (Oslo and Akershus) and some of the western counties have relatively high scores. The county with the highest score on this dimension, Rogaland, has by far the greatest income inequality in Norway and it comes third in terms of average income.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/4/d</td>
<td>Beta=.02</td>
<td>ns controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, occupational prestige, occupationally active, marital status, degree of urbanization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SL/?/sq/l/10/a</td>
<td>Beta= +.05</td>
<td>ns controlled for education, income, age, sex, household size, occupational prestige, occupationally active, marital status, degree of urbanization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local costs of living

Subject code: L10.3.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study FERNA 1981

*Reported in:* Fernandez, R.M.; Kulik, J.C.  
A Multilevel Model of Life Satisfaction: Effects of Individual Characteristics and Neighborhood Composition.  
Page in Report: 845-847

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973-74

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* ?

*N:* 5916

Correlate

*Authors label:* Cost of living in neighborhood (1)

*Our classification:* Local costs of living, code L10.3.2

*Measurement:* Logarithm of real costs of living as observed in cities/counties of comparable socio-demographic composition.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/c</td>
<td>r = -.09</td>
<td>Disattenuated r = -.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beta = -.08  
p<.05*  
β controlled for family size, sex, age, education, race, health, marital status, family income and further neighborhood characteristics (income inequality, racial composition, age composition). Disattenuated β = -.13

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local quality of housing  
*Subject code:* L10.3.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study NEAR 1978

Reported in: Near, J.P.; Rice, R.W.; Hunt, R.G.
Work and Extra-Work Correlates of Life and Job Satisfaction.
Page in Report: 253

Population: Adult, general public, Western New York State, USA, 1975

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 384

Correlate

Authors label: Interviewer's rating of neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Local quality of housing, code L10.3.3

Measurement:

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>$R^2=.00$</td>
<td>Explained variance in ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p&lt;.01$</td>
<td>In neighborhoods receiving ratings of 'very well maintained' Ss we happier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local facilities

Subject code: L10.4

Study BRINK 1997/1

Reported in: Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Fredell, K.; Frideres, J.
Basic Minimum Needs, Quality of Life and Selected Correlates: Explorations in Villages in Northern India.
Social Indicators Research, 1997, Vol. 42, 245 - 281 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1023/A:1006834830518
Page in Report: 262
Population: Adult, general public, poor rural village, Barasi, India 1991

Sample: Non-probability purposive-quota sample

Non-Response: 0

N: 234

Correlate

Authors label: irrigation (1)

Our classification: Local facilities, code L10.4

Measurement: Village needs prioritized by Paired Comparisons. Out of four basic needs, people were asked to compare two at a time and to select, which they sought 'their family needs most'. Items were:
- food
- health
- employment
- leisure
This leads to six pairs of comparisons.
Score pro need can be:
0. not mentioned
1. once
2. twice
3. three times
Needs index is the mean number of times an item is chosen.

Measured Values: 0: 1.36%; 1: 23.5%; 2: 35.0%; 3: 23.5%; M: 17.9%

Remarks: Items for pairwise comparison were selected by participant observation and open interviews

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-H/?/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=-.07 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/?/sq/l/5/a</td>
<td>r=-.07 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities

**Subject code: L10.4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>AUSSE 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Population:</em></td>
<td>16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sample:</em></td>
<td>Probability stratified sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Non-Response:</em></td>
<td>N: 4420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Correlate

- **Authors label:** number of facilities
- **Our classification:** Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1
- **Measurement:** Number of facilities per district; range 16-99.
- **Remarks:** Included were facilities for sport, culture, nature, children, and community work.

#### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=.26 ns</td>
<td>ALL (N=4420)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>rpc=.02 ns</td>
<td>rpc ontrolled for income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPLIT-UP BY INCOME LEVEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

\[ r = +0.09 \] ns Income level 1 (N=409)

\[ r = -0.04 \] ns Income level 2 (N=672)

\[ r = -0.05 \] ns Income level 3 (N= 993)

\[ r = -0.01 \] ns Income level 4 (N=1165)

\[ r = -0.01 \] ns Income level 5 (N=384)

\[ r = -0.02 \] ns Income level 6 (N= 631)

\[ rpc = -0.05 \] ns rpc controlled for income

SPLIT-UP BY INCOME SOURCE

\[ r = -0.06 \] ns No income of own (N=585)

\[ r = -0.02 \] ns Employee, own business (N= 2318)

\[ rpc = -0.02 \] ns rpc controlled for income

\[ r = -0.01 \] ns Retired pay (N= 944)

\[ rpc = -0.04 \] ns rpc controlled for income

\[ r = -0.04 \] ns Unfit for work pay (N= 177)

\[ rpc = -0.04 \] ns rpc controlled for income

\[ r = -0.01 \] ns Unemployment benefit (N=220)
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab rpc=-.00 ns rpc controlled for income

O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab r=-.07 ns Scholarship (N=172)

O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab rpc=+.07 ns rpc controlled for income

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities**

**Subject code: L10.4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>AUSSE 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td>16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>Probability stratified sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>4420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** number of sportfacilities

**Our classification:** Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

**Measurement:** Number of sportfacilities per district; range 1-41.

**Remarks:** Included were sportcentra, tenniscourts, swimmingpools etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

- **O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab**
  - \( r = -0.01 \) ns  
  - All (N=4420)

- **O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab**
  - \( rpc = -0.01 \) ns  
  - Rpc controlled for income

- **O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab**
  - \( r = -0.07 \)  
  - \( p < 0.05 \)  
  - Active sporters only (N= 809)

- **O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab**
  - \( rpc = -0.01 \) ns  
  - Rpc controlled for income

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities**

**Subject code: L10.4.1**

**Study**

- AUSSE 2008

**Reported in:**
- Geluk in Rotterdam (Happiness in Rotterdam)
- Page in Report: 30

**Population:**
- 16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007

**Sample:**
- Probability stratified sample

**Non-Response:**
- \( N: 4420 \)

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** facilities for children

**Our classification:** Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

**Measurement:**
- Number of facilities for children per district, only for parents with inliving children.

**Remarks:**
- It concerned after school care, playgrounds.
### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=-.06</td>
<td>Parents only (N=1811)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>rpc=-.04</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Two-parent families only (N=1529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=-.07</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rpc controlled for income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>rpc=-.06</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>One-parent families only (N=282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=-.02</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities

**Subject code: L10.4.1**

**Study**  
*AUSSE 2008*

*Reported in:*  
Geluk in Rotterdam (Happiness in Rotterdam)  
Page in Report: 36, 37, 86, 97

*Population:*  
16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007

*Sample:*  
Probability stratified sample

*Non-Response:*  
*N:* 4420

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* participation in local facilities in general
**Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

**Our classification:** Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

**Measurement:** Frequency of participation a year
1: 1–50
2: 51–100
3: 101–150
4: 151–200
5: 201–250
6: 251–300
7: 301–365

**Remarks:** Included were facilities for sport, culture, nature, children, and community work.

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=+.05</td>
<td>N= 3938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>rpc=+.04 ns</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities**

**Subject code:** L10.4.1

**Study**

**AUSSE 2008**


**Population:** 16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007

**Sample:** Probability stratified sample

**Non-Response:**

**N:** 4420
Correlate

Authors label: number of cultural facilities

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement: Number of cultural facilities per district; range 0-37.

Remarks: It concerned cinemas, musea, music and art lending, language and culture clubs, theaters and concert halls

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=+0.02 ns</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>rpc= +0.00 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study AUSSE 2008


Population: 16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:

N: 4420
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors label: number of nature facilities

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement: Number of nature facilities per district; range 2-28.

Remarks: Included were centra for nature and milieu education, allotment gardens, marinas, child farms, scouting grounds, recreation grounds etc.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=.01 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>rpc=.01 ns</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study


Population: 16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:

N: 4420

Correlate

Authors label: other facilities
Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement: Number of other facilities; range 0-44.

Remarks: It concerned community centers etc.

---

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>$r = -0.05$ $p &lt; 0.01$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>$rpc = -0.03$ $p &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study

AUSSE 2008


Population: 16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:

N: 4420

Correlate

Authors label: participation in nature facilities

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: Frequency of participation in nature facilities a year
1: 1-50
2: 51-100
3: 101-150
4: 151-200
5: 201-250
6: 251-300
7: 301-365

Remarks: Included were centra for nature and milieu education, allotment gardens, marinas, child farms, scouting grounds, recreation grounds etc.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=+.01</td>
<td>N=3938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>rpc=+.01</td>
<td>Participation only in neigbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study AUSSE 2008


Population: 16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:

N: 4420

Correlate

Authors label: participation in other facilities

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement: Frequency of participation a year
1: 1-50
2: 51-100
3: 101-150
4: 151-200
5: 201-250
6: 251-300
7: 301-365

Remarks: It concerned community centers etc.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=-.06 p&lt;.05</td>
<td>N=3873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>rpc=-.03 ns</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study MOLLE 2004
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT


Population: 55+ aged, 6 European nations, 2000

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: 45%

N: 3950

Correlate

Authors label: Services and shops

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement:
Selfreport on single question:
Do you have access to fundamental services and shops access in your neighborhood?
0: no
1: yes
Question not found
AUTHOR, Please verify question!

Measured Values: 1: Finland: Urban: =70,4%; Rural= 49,7%; p<.001; Netherlands: Urban= 58,8%; Rural=62,4%; ns; Germany West: Urban= 90,0%; Rural= 77,3%; p<.001; Germany East: Urban= 80,8%; Rural = 54,7%; p<.001; Hungary: Urban= 92,8%; Rural= 86,4%; p<.05; Italy: Urban=62,5%; Rural=50,8%; p<.01

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks
---|---|---
O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d | Beta = ns | Finland (urban areas)
O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d | Beta = ns | Finland (rural areas)
O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d | Beta = ns | Netherlands (urban areas)
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Netherlands (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Germany West (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Germany West (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Germany East (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Germany East Rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Hungary (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta=-.15  Hungary (rural areas)  p<.05

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Italy (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Italy (rural areas)

Beta's controlled for:
- Age
- Gender
- Environment: Housing:
  - housing amenities
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
  - satisfaction with living area
- Mobility:
  - car in household
  - satisfaction with public transportation
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Services:
  - medical services
  - satisfaction with services
- Culture:
  - Cultural amenities
  - natural environment
  - satisfaction with leisure
- Security:
  - security
- Social Environment:
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT
- living together
- division social network
- friends/kin nearby
- Economic situation:
  - Income per person
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health:
  - ADL
  - satisfaction with health

Only standardized regression coefficient significant at a maximum error rate of alpha=.05 are shown.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study MOLLE 2004


Population: 55+ aged, 6 European nations, 2000

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: 45%

N: 3950

Correlate

Authors label: Medical services

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement: Selfreport on single question:
0: no medical amenities available
1: medical amenities available
Question not found.
AUTHOR, Please verify question!
### Measured Values

1: Finland: Urban = 72.4%; Rural = 49.7%; p < .001; Netherlands: Urban = 53.2%; Rural = 60.8%; ns; Germany West: Urban = 95.5%; Rural = 83.5%; p < .001; Germany East: Urban = 86.5%; Rural = 61.5%; p < .001; Hungary: Urban = 93.0%; Rural = 84.3%; p < .001; Italy: Urban = 60.9%; Rural = 48.2%; p < .01

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Finland (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Finland (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Netherlands (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Netherlands (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Germany West (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Germany West (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Germany East (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Germany East (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Hungary (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Hungary (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta = ns</td>
<td>Italy (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Beta** = +.20
p<.05

Italy (rural areas)

Beta's controlled for:
- Age
- Gender
- Environment:Housing:
  - housing amenities
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
  - satisfaction with living area
- Mobility:
  - car in household
  - satisfaction with public transportation
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Services:
  - services and shops
  - satisfaction with services
- Culture:
  - Cultural amenities
  - natural environment
  - satisfaction with leisure
- Security:
  - security
- Social Environment:
  - living together
  - division social network
  - friends/kin nearby
- Economic situation:
  - Income per person
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health:
  - ADL
  - satisfaction with health

Only standardized regression coefficient significant at a maximum error rate of alpha=.05 are shown.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study MOLLE 2005A
Reported in: Mollenkopf, H.; Kaspar, R.
Ageing in Rural Areas of East and West Germany: Increasing Similarities and Remaining Differences.
Page in Report: 125,127

Population: 55+, general public, rural areas, East and West Germany, 2000

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: 41,6%

N: 762

Correlate

Authors label: Available services

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement: Sum score of a total of 21 service facilities
Single question: I'll name a series of shops and institutions (cultural institutions etc.). Please tell me if these institutions are available in your neighbourhood (within 15 minutes distance)?

Measured Values: West Germany: M=15,1; SD=5,0; East Germany: M=11,3; SD=6,1; p<0,001

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/ ba</td>
<td>Beta=+.19 p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Beta controlled for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Socio-demographic:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfaction with finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Health-related:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- activities of daily living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- visu-motoric coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- affect balance score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfaction with health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social network:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- household type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- network variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Housing:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

- basic household features
- home ownership
- satisfaction with housing
- Living area:
  - neighbourhood features
  - satisfaction with housing
- Mobility:
  - car use as passenger
  - car use as driver
  - satisfaction with public transport
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Leisure time activities:
  - outdoor leisure activities
  - satisfaction with leisure activities

No interaction with region (East/West Germany)

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study MOLLE 2006


Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002

Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response:

N: 2200

Correlate

Authors label: Interrupted/Uninterrupted water supply

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: 1. Daily interruption of piped water  
2. Uninterrupted piped water supply

Measured Values: a: 5%, b: 3%

Observe Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>D%+</td>
<td>% happy % neutral % unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interrupted</td>
<td>46 11 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uninterrupted</td>
<td>55 12 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ gH = +0.21 \]
\[ p < 0.000 \]

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities

Subject code: L10.4.1

Study MOLLE 2006

Reported in: Moller, V.
Satisfied and Dissatisfied South Africans: Results From The General Household Survey in the International Comparison.
Page in Report: 400-2

Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002
Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample
Non-Response:
\[ N: 2200 \]

Correlate

Authors label: Main electricity supply
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Our classification:** Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

**Measurement:** Main electricity supply (vs not)

**Measured Values:** 71%

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>( D% = + )</td>
<td>% happy 54 (sample mean 52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% unhappy 34 (sample mean 36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Happiness of Ss with no main electricity not reported.

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities**

**Subject code: L10.4.1**

**Study**

**MOLLE 2006**

**Reported in:** Moller, V. Satisfied and Dissatisfied South Africans: Results From The General Household Survey in the International Comparison. Social Indicators Research, 2007, Vol. 81, 389 - 415. ISSNp 0303 8300; ISSNl 0921 DOI:10.1007/s11205-006-9004-3

**Population:** Adults, South Africa, 2002

**Sample:** Probability multistage stratified area sample

**Non-Response:**

\( N: 2200 \)

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Toilet in dwelling 1

**Our classification:** Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement:
- a. Flush toilet in dwelling
- b. Pit/bucket latrine

Measured Values: % Sample a: 21, b: 34

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>D% = +</td>
<td>%happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush Toilet dwelling</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit/bucket latrine</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c  gH =
+ .22
p < .000

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study
- MOLLE 2006


Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002

Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response:
- N: 2200

Correlate
- Authors label: Toilet in dwelling 2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement:
- a. Flush toilet in dwelling
- b. Toilet off-site

Measured Values: %Sample a:21, b:4

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>D%⇒+</td>
<td>% happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet in dwelling</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet off-site</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>gH=</td>
<td>+.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study
- MOLLE 2006
- Reported in: Moller, V.
  Satisfied and Dissatisfied South Africans: Results From The General Household Survey in the International Comparison.
  Page in Report: 400-2

Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002

Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response:
- N: 2200
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors label: Mail delivery

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement:
- a. Mail delivered to neighbour/school
- b. Mail delivery to dwelling

Measured Values: a: 60%, b: 16%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>D%+=</td>
<td>% happy % Neutral % unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail to neighbour 46 11 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail to dwelling 55 12 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c

\[ gH = +.21 \]

\[ p < .000 \]

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities

Subject code: L10.4.1

Study

MOLLE 2006

Reported in: Moller, V.
Page in Report: 403

Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002

Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response:

\[ N = 2200 \]
Correlate

Authors label: Social welfare services

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement: 1: Dissatisfied with social welfare services received
               2: Satisfied with social welfare services received

Measured Values: a:1%, b:6%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>D%+=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%happy</td>
<td>%Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diss. with social serv.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sat. with social serv.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c

$gH = 0.3$

$p < 0.00$

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study

MOLLE 2006


Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002

Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response:

N: 2200
Correlate

Authors label: Water supply

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement: 
a: Piped water in dwelling  
b: Water from neighbourhood tap  
c: Water from public tap

Measured Values: a: 25%, b: 3%, c: 17%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n11/c</td>
<td>D%+=</td>
<td>% happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water in dwelling</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbourhood tap</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public tap</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities

Subject code: L10.4.1

Study MOLLE 2006


Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002

Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response:

N: 2200
Correlate

Authors label: Usage of drinking water

Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1

Measurement: a: Uses unsafe drinking water
b: Water is cut off due to non-payment
c: Long delays in restoring piped water

Measured Values: a: 12%, b:0.5%, c:0.5%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</strong></td>
<td>D%=-</td>
<td>%happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe drinking water</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut off due to non-pay</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay in restoring</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study MOLLE 2006

Reported in: Moller, V.

Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002

Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response:

N: 2200
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors label: Removal of rubbish
Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1
Measurement: No Rubbish removal vs rubbish removal

Measured Values: 7%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/gSq/n/11/c</td>
<td>D%+</td>
<td>% happy 49 (sample mean 52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% unhappy 39 (sample mean 36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Happiness of Ss with rubbish removal not reported

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.1

Study SCHUL 1985B

Page in Report: 114,T41

Population: Adults, non-institutionalized, Austria, 1984

Sample:
Non-Response: ?

N: 1776

Correlate

Authors label: Accesibility of leisure time activities (1)
Our classification: Actual local facilities, code L10.4.1
**Measurement:** Eight item index of direct questions on accessibility of leisure time activities (cinema, theatre, cafe, clubs, etc.). Answer categories yes/no.

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-Sum/c/mg/v/5/a</td>
<td>r=+.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with local facilities**

**Subject code: L10.4.2**

**Study**

*FANG 2002*

    Validation of the World Health Organization Quality of Life Instrument in Patients with HIV Infection.
    Quality of Life Research, 2002, Vol. 11, 753 - 762. ISSN 0962 9343 DOI:10.1023/A:1020870402019
    Page in Report: 758

*Population:* HIV-infected patients, Taipei, Taiwan, 2000

*Sample:* Non-probability chunk sample

*Non-Response:* 1%

*N:* 136

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* environmental domain

*Our classification:* Satisfaction with local facilities, code L10.4.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: Self report of satisfaction with:
- physical safety and security
- home environment
- financial resources
- opportunities for schooling
- recreation
- physical environment (pollution, noise)
- transport
- eating out
All rated on 5-points scales, ranging from "not at all" to "an extreme amount" with a higher score indicating a higher quality of life.

Error Estimates: Cronbach alpha . 92

Remarks: Environment subscale of WHOQOL-BREF

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/5/i</td>
<td>r=.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.2

Study: MOLLE 2002


Population: 55+ aged, East and West Germany, 1995 and 1999

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response:
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 1216

Correlate

Authors label: satisfaction with living area

Our classification: Satisfaction with local facilities, code L10.4.2

Measurement:
Selfreport on single question: All in all, how satisfied are you with your local environment?
Rated on 11-point numerical scale

Measured Values: A: N=400; B:N=404; C: N=205; D:N=207

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/ba</td>
<td>Beta=-.07</td>
<td>Mannheim (big city West Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/ba</td>
<td>Beta=+.01 ns</td>
<td>Chemnitz (big city East Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/ba</td>
<td>Beta=.06</td>
<td>Hunsrück (rural region West Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/ba</td>
<td>Beta=+.03</td>
<td>Lausitz (rural area East Germany)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beta's controlled for satisfaction with:
- financial situation
- health
- local environment
- housing
- leisure possibilities
- travelling possibilities
- mobility possibilities

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.2

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study MOLLE 2004


Page in Report: 16,28

Population: 55+ aged, 6 European nations, 2000

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: 45%

N: 3950

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with services

Our classification: Satisfaction with local facilities, code L10.4.2

Measurement: Selfreport on single question: All in all, how satisfied are you with your actual local facilities? Rated on 11-point numerical scale

Question not found! AUTHOR, please give question.

Measured Values: Finland: Urban: M=7.4; SD=2.2; Rural: M=7.1; SD=2.7; ns; Netherlands: Urban=M=6.7; SD=1.9; Rural: M=7.2; SD=1.2; p<.001; Germany West: Urban: M=7.7; SD=7.1; Rural: M=7.2 SD=2.4; p<.001; Germany East: Urban: M=7.3; SD=2.1; Rural: M=5.7; SD=2.7; p<.001; Hungary: Urban: M=7.9; SD=2.4; Rural M=7.3; SD=2.3; p<.01; Italy: Urban: M=6.7; SD=2.7; Rural M=6.2; SD=2.8; p<.05

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Finland (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Finland (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Netherlands (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d \( \beta = \text{ns} \) Netherlands (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d \( \beta = +.16 \) Germany West (urban areas) \( p<.05 \)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d \( \beta = \text{ns} \) Germany West (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d \( \beta = \text{ns} \) Germany East (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d \( \beta = \text{ns} \) Germany East (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d \( \beta = \text{ns} \) Hungary (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d \( \beta = +.24 \) Hungary (rural areas) \( p<.05 \)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d \( \beta = \text{ns} \) Italy (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d \( \beta = \text{ns} \) Italy (rural areas)

Beta's controlled for:
- Age
- Gender
- Environment:Housing:
  - housing amenities
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
  - satisfaction with living area
- Mobility:
  - car in household
  - satisfaction with public transportation
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Services:
  - medical services
  - services and shops
- Culture:
  - Cultural amenities
  - natural environment
  - satisfaction with leisure
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

- Security:
  - security
- Social Environment:
  - living together
  - division social network
  - friends/kin nearby
- Economic situation:
  - Income per person
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health:
  - ADL
  - satisfaction with health

Only standardized regression coefficient significant at a maximum error rate of alpha=.05 are shown.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.2

Study MOLLE 2004

Page in Report: 13,28

Population: 55+ aged, 6 European nations, 2000

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: 45%

N: 3950

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with mobility

Our classification: Satisfaction with local facilities, code L10.4.2
**Measurement:** Selfreport on single question: All in all, how satisfied are you with your possibilities to go where you want - by feet, bicycle or by car? 
Rated on 11-point numerical scale

**Measured Values:**
- **Finland:** Urban: M=8.5; SD=1.7; Rural: M=8.1; SD=2.0; p<.01; 
  Netherlands: Urban=7.5; SD=2.0; Rural: M=7.8; SD=1.6; ns; 
  Germany West: Urban: M=7.8; SD=2.3; Rural: M=7.6 SD=2.5; ns; 
  Germany East: Urban: M=7.6; SD=2.4; Rural: M=7.7; SD=2.3; ns; 
  Hungary: Urban: M=7.9 SD=2.3; Rural M=6.0; SD=2.9; p<.001; 
  Italy: Urban: M=8.1; SD=2.4; Rural M=7.0; SD=2.4; p<.001

---

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
<td>Finland (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
<td>Finland (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
<td>Netherlands (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
<td>Netherlands (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
<td>Germany West (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
<td>Germany West (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta= ns</td>
<td>Germany East (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta= +.14 p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Germany East (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta= +.23 p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Hungary (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = ns  Hungary (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = ns  Italy (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = +.17  p<.05  Italy (rural areas)

Beta's controlled for:
- Age
- Gender
- Environment: Housing:
  - housing amenities
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
  - satisfaction with living area
- Mobility:
  - car in household
  - satisfaction with public transportation
- Services:
  - medical services
  - services and shops
  - satisfaction with services
- Culture:
  - Cultural amenities
  - natural environment
  - satisfaction with leisure
- Security:
  - security
- Social Environment:
  - living together
  - division social network
  - friends/kin nearby
- Economic situation:
  - Income per person
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health:
  - ADL
  - satisfaction with health

Only standardized regression coefficient significant at a maximum error rate of alpha=.05 are shown.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with local facilities
Subject code: L10.4.2
### Study

**MOLLE 2005A**

*Reported in:* Mollenkopf, H.; Kaspar, R.  
Page in Report: 125, 127

*Population:* 55+, general public, rural areas, East and West Germany, 2000

*Sample:* Probability stratified sample

*Non-Response:* 41.6%

*N:* 762

### Correlate

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with living area

*Our classification:* Satisfaction with local facilities, code L10.4.2

*Measurement:* Self report on an 11-point scale  
Single question: All in all, how satisfied are you with the your living area?

*Measured Values:* West Germany: M=9.0; SD=1.5; East Germany: M=8.1; SD=2.2; p<0.001

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Beta = +.16**

**p<.01**

Beta controlled for:
- Socio-demographic:
  - sex
  - age
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health-related:
  - activities of daily living
  - visu-motoric coordination
  - affect balance score
  - satisfaction with health
- Social network:
  - household type
  - network variety
- Housing:
  - basic household features
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
- Living area:
  - available services
  - neighbourhood features
- Mobility:
  - car use as passenger
  - car use as driver
  - satisfaction with public transport
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Leisure time activities:
  - outdoor leisure activities
  - satisfaction with leisure activities

No interaction with region (East/West Germany)

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with medical services**

**Subject code: L10.4.2.2**

**Study**

**ANDRE 1976/3**

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non institutionalized, USA, 1972/11

*Sample:*
### Correlate

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with goods and services available in area (1)

*Our classification:* Satisfaction with medical services, code L10.4.2.2

*Measurement:* Closed question: "How do you feel about the goods and services you can get when you buy in this area - things like food, appliances, clothes?"

  Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>E²=.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with medical services**

**Subject code:** L10.4.2.2

**Study**

BRINK 1997/1

*Reported in:* Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Fredell, K.; Frideres, J.

Basic Minimum Needs, Quality of Life and Selected Correlates: Explorations in Villages in Northern India.

Social Indicators Research, 1997, Vol. 42, 245 - 281 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1023/A:1006834830518

Page in Report: 262

*Population:* Adult, general public, poor rural village, Barasi, India 1991

*Sample:* Non-probability purposive-quota sample

*Non-Response:* 0

*N:* 234
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

*Authors label:* Health (1)

*Our classification:* . satisfaction with medical services, code L10.4.2.2

*Measurement:* Family needs prioritized by Paired Comparisons. Out of four basic needs, ss were asked to compare two at a time and to select, which they sought 'their family needs most'. Items were:
- food
- health
- employment
- leisure
This leads to six pairs of comparisons.
Score pro need can be:
0. not mentioned
1. once
2. twice
3. three times
Needs index is the mean number of times an item is chosen.

*Measured Values:* 0: 1,40%; 1: 19,7%; 2: 35,0%; 3: 30,8% M: 14,5%

*Remarks:* Items for pairwise comparison were selected by participant observation and open interviews

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-H/?/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+1.11</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/?/sq/l/5/a</td>
<td>r=-.00</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with medical services

*Subject code:* L10.4.2.2

*Study:* BUTTE 1977
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B. 
Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life. 
Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138 
Page in Report: 358

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Winconsin USA, 1974

Sample:

Non-Response:
N: 548

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with quality of medical services (1)

Our classification: satisfaction with medical services, code L10.4.2.2

Measurement: Single closed question rated on a 5-point scale: How good are the medical services, including doctors, hospitals, for people around here: very good / fairly good / both good and bad / not very good / not good at all.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-A/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.14</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.15</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.11</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with medical services
Subject code: L10.4.2.2

Study HULIN 1969
Reported in: Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:
Non-Response: 24%
N: 470

Correlate
Authors label: Satisfaction with community's medical facilities. (2)
Our classification: Satisfaction with medical services, code L10.4.2.2
Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLg/sq/f7/a</td>
<td>r=+ns</td>
<td>Males : r = +.09 (ns) Females: r = +.05 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with medical services
Subject code: L10.4.2.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:

Non-Response: 24%

N: 470

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with availability of doctors in the comm. (1)

Our classification: . satisfaction with medical services, code L10.4.2.2

Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.13</td>
<td>Males only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with medical services
Subject code: L10.4.2.2

Study

HULIN 1969

Page in Report:

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:

Non-Response: 24%

N: 470
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with availability of dentists in the community (1)

Our classification: Satisfaction with medical services, code L10.4.2.2

Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.13</td>
<td>Males only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with medical services
Subject code: L10.4.2.2

Study

LEVY 1975/2


Population: 18+ aged, general public, urban areas, Israel, 1973

Sample:

Non-Response: -

N: 1830

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with medical services (1)

Our classification: . satisfaction with medical services, code L10.4.2.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: Direct closed question

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/c/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>mc=+.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/?/6/a</td>
<td>mc=+.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local police
Subject code: L10.4.2.3

Study

ABRAM 1972

Reported in: Abrams, M.; Hall, J.
Page in Report: 21

Population: 15+ aged, general public, Britain, 1971

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 213

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with the way the police and the courts work (1)

Our classification: . satisfaction with local police, code L10.4.2.3

Measurement: Closed question rated on an 11-point self-anchoring scale, based on Cantril (1965)
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/l11/b</td>
<td>r=+.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local police**

**Subject code: L10.4.2.3**

**Study**

**Reported in**: Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B. 
Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life. Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138 
Page in Report: 358

**Population**: 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin USA, 1974

**Sample**: 

**Non-Response**: 

**N**: 548

**Correlate**

**Authors label**: Satisfaction with quality of crime prevention & control (1) 
**Our classification**: . satisfaction with local police, code L10.4.2.3 
**Measurement**: Single closed question rated on a 5-point scale: How good is the crime prevention and control around here: very good / fairly good / both good and bad / not very good / not good at all.

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.19</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C-A/u/sq/v/7/a  r=+.21  p<.05
O-HL/c/sq/v/7/a  r=+.18  p<.05

**Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with local recreation**

Subject code: L10.4.2.4

**Study**

**ANDRE 1976/1**

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972/75

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 24%

*N:* 1297

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with recreation facili- ties (1)

*Our classification:* . satisfaction with local recreation, code L10.4.2.4

*Measurement:* Index of questions:"How do you feel about....?'
1. outdoor places and sport
2. recreation facilities.
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>E²=+.22</td>
<td>Unaffected by sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local recreation
Subject code: L10.4.2.4

Study
ANDRE 1976/3

Reported in: Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non institutionalized, USA, 1972/11

Sample:
Non-Response: 38%
N: 1072

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with nearby places of re-creation and sports (1)
Our classification: satisfaction with local recreation, code L10.4.2.4
Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about nearby places you can use for recreation or sports?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure

Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a \( E^2=+.27 \)

Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local recreation
Subject code: L10.4.2.4

Study
ANDRE 1976/5
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B. 
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality 
Page in Report: 113

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/7

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 222

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with sport and recreation facilities (1)

Our classification: . satisfaction with local recreation, code L104.2.4

Measurement: 3-item index of quetions "How do you feel about....?" 1. outdoor places you can go in to your spare time 2. nearby places you can use for recreation or sports 3. the sport or recreation facilities you use or would like to use (parks, bowling alleys, beaches) Rated on a 7-point scale:terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with local recreation
Subject code: L10.4.2.4

Study BRINK 1997/1
Reported in: Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Fredell, K.; Frideres, J. 
Basic Minimum Needs, Quality of Life and Selected Correlates: Explorations in Villages in Northern India. Social Indicators Research, 1997, Vol. 42, 245 - 281 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1023/A:1006834830518 
Page in Report: 262

Population: Adult, general public, poor rural village, Barasi, India 1991

Sample: Non-probability purposive_quota sample

Non-Response: 0 
N: 234

Correlate

Authors label: leisure (1)

Our classification: satisfaction with local recreation, code L10.4.2.4

Measurement: Family needs prioritized by Paired Comparisons. Out of four basic needs, were asked to compare two at a time and to select, which they sought 'their family needs most'

Items were:
- food
- health
- employment
- leisure

This leads to six pairs of comparisons.
Score pro need can be:
0. not mentioned
1. once
2. twice
3. three times

Needs index is the mean number of times an item is chosen.

Measured Values: 0: 0,94%; 1: 37,2%; 2: 36,8%; 3: 21,4% M: 4,7%

Remarks: Items for pairwise comparison were selected by participant observation and open interviews

Observed Relation with Happiness
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-H?/?/sq/f7/a</td>
<td>r=+.20</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/?/sq/l5/a</td>
<td>r=+.03 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local recreation

**Subject code:** L10.4.2.4

**Study**

**BUTTE 1977**

**Reported in:** Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B. Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life. Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138 Page in Report: 358

**Population:** 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin USA, 1974

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

**N:** 548

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with quality of indoor recreation (1)

**Our classification:** satisfaction with local recreation, code L10.4.2.4

**Measurement:** Single closed question rated on a 5-point scale: How good is the indoor recreation, such as movies, dancing, and bowling, around here: very good / fairly good / both good and bad / not very good / not good at all.

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlate</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-A/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.03</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.05</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.02</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with local recreation
Subject code: L10.4.2.4

**Study**
BUTTE 1977

*Reported in:* Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B. Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life. Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138
Page in Report: 358

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin USA, 1974

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:*

*N:* 548

Correlate

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with quality of outdoor recreation (1)

*Our classification:* . satisfaction with local recreation, code L10.4.2.4

*Measurement:* Single closed question rated on a 5-point scale: In general, how good are the opportunities for outdoor recreation around here: very good / fairly good / both good and bad / not very good / not good at all.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

C-A/u/sq/v/7/a  \( r=+15 \)
\( p<0.05 \)

O-HL/c/sq/v/7/a  \( r=+11 \)
\( p<0.05 \)

O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/b  \( r=+20 \)
\( p<0.05 \)

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local recreation**  
**Subject code: L10.4.2.4**

**Study**  
HOOPE 1989

*Reported in:* Hoopes, L.L.; Lounsbury, J.W.  
An Investigation of Life Satisfaction Following a Vacation: A Domain-Specific Approach.  
Page in Report: 132, 134

*Population:* Working adults, USA, before and after vacation, 198?

*Sample:* Non-probability purposive sample

*Non-Response:* 23

*N:* 129

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with nature

*Our classification:* . satisfaction with local recreation, code L10.4.2.4

*Measurement:* Self report on satisfaction with:  
- outdoor places you can go in your spare time round here  
- nearby places you can go in your spare time around here  
- the condition of the natural environment around here - the air, land, and water in this area  
Assessed on a 1-7 scale: 1 delighted... 7 terrible

*Measured Values:* \( N=121 \) \( M=2.27 \) \( SD=.86 \)

*Error Estimates:* alpha =.84

**Remarks:** Assessed for three periods:
- T1: 1 or 2 weeks before vacation
- T2: during vacation (retrospectively at T3)
- T3: the week after vacation

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>$r=+.19$ ns</td>
<td>T1 Life satisfaction by T1 satisfaction with nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>$r=+.28$ p&lt;.05</td>
<td>T3 Life satisfaction by T3 Satisfaction with nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>$r=+.11$ ns</td>
<td>T1 Satisfaction with nature by T3 Life satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>$r=+.26$ p&lt;.05</td>
<td>T1 Life satisfaction by T3 Satisfaction with nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local recreation

**Subject code: L10.4.2.4**

**Study**

HULIN 1969

**Reported in:**

Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

**Population:**

White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

**Sample:**

Non-Response: 24%

$N$: 470
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Correlate

Authors label: Sat. with adult recreational facilities in the commun. (1)

Our classification: . satisfaction with local recreation, code L10.4.2.4

Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>Males : r = +.22 (01) Females: r = +.20 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with local recreation
Subject code: L10.4.2.4

Study

HULIN 1969

Reported in: Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:

Non-Response: 24%
N: 470

Correlate

Authors label: Sat. with adult recreational facilities in the commun. (1)

Our classification: . satisfaction with local recreation, code L10.4.2.4
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/fj7/a</td>
<td>$r = +$ Males: $r = +.27$ (05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .05$ Females: $r = +.12$ (05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local recreation

**Subject code:** L10.4.2.4

**Study**

*MOLLE 2004*


*Population:* 55+ aged, 6 European nations, 2000

*Sample:* Probability stratified sample

*Non-Response:* 45%

*N:* 3950

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with leisure possibilities

*Our classification:* satisfaction with local recreation, code L10.4.2.4

*Measurement:* Selfreport on single question: All in all, how satisfied are you with your leisure possibilities? Rated on 11-point numerical scale
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measured Values:**
- Finland: Urban: $M=8.4; SD=1.8$; Rural: $M=7.8; SD=2.3$; $p<.001$
- Netherlands: Urban: $M=7.5; SD=1.8$; Rural: $M=7.5; SD=1.8$; ns
- Germany West: Urban: $M=7.3; SD=2.6$; Rural: $M=7.5; SD=2.4$; ns
- Germany East: Urban: $M=7.0; SD=2.5$; Rural: $M=6.1; SD=2.8$; $p<.001$
- Hungary: Urban: $M=7.8; SD=2.5$; Rural: $M=5.9; SD=2.8$; $p<.01$
- Italy: Urban: $M=7.8; SD=2.0$; Rural: $M=6.8; SD=2.2$; $p<.001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=ns$</td>
<td>Finland (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=+.16$</td>
<td>Finland (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p&lt;.05$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=ns$</td>
<td>Netherlands (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=ns$</td>
<td>Netherlands (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=+.20$</td>
<td>Germany West (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p&lt;.05$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=ns$</td>
<td>Germany West (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=+.29$</td>
<td>Germany East (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p&lt;.05$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=+.25$</td>
<td>Germany East (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p&lt;.05$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=ns$</td>
<td>Hungary (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>$\beta=ns$</td>
<td>Hungary (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Beta = +.30
p < .05

Italy (urban areas)

Beta = +.15
p < .05

Italy (rural areas)

Beta's controlled for:
- Age
- Gender
- Environment:Housing:
  - housing amenities
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
  - satisfaction with living area
- Mobility:
  - car in household
  - satisfaction with public transportation
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Services:
  - medical services
  - services and shops
  - satisfaction with services
- Culture:
  - cultural amenities
  - natural environment
- Security:
  - security
- Social Environment:
  - living together
  - division social network
  - friends/kin nearby
- Economic situation:
  - income per person
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health:
  - ADL
  - satisfaction with health

Only standardized regression coefficient significant at a maximum error rate of alpha=.05 are shown.

Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local schools
Subject code: L10.4.2.5
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Study**  
**ANDRE 1976/1**

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.  
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality  
Page in Report: 113

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972/75

*Sample:
Non-Response:* 24%

*Measurement:*  
Closed question: "How do you feel about the schools in this area?"  
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqrt/v/7/a</td>
<td>$E^2 = +.17$</td>
<td>Unaffected by sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local schools**  
**Subject code:** L10.4.2.5

**Study**  
**ANDRE 1976/5**

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.  
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality  
Page in Report: 113
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Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/7

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 222

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with school facilities in the area (2)
Our classification: Satisfaction with local schools, code L10.4.2.5
Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about the schools in this area?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness
Measure

Statistics   Elaboration/Remarks

O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a   r=+.41

Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with local schools
Subject code: L10.4.2.5

Study  
BRINK 1997/1

Reported in: Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Fredell, K.; Frideres, J.
Basic Minimum Needs, Quality of Life and Selected Correlates: Explorations in Villages in Northern India.
Social Indicators Research, 1997, Vol. 42, 245 - 281 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1023/A:1006834830518
Page in Report: 262

Population: Adult, general public, poor rural village, Barasi, India 1991
Sample: Non-probability purposive-quota sample
Non-Response: 0
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 234

Correlate

Authors label:  boys school facilities (1)

Our classification:  satisfaction with local schools, code L10.4.2.5

Measurement:  Village needs prioritized by Paired Comparisons. Out of four basic needs, subjects were asked to compare two at a time and to select, which they sought 'their family needs most'. Items were:
- food
- health
- employment
- leisure
This leads to six pairs of comparisons. Score pro need can be:
0. not mentioned
1. once
2. twice
3. three times
Needs index is the mean number of times an item is chosen.

Measured Values:  0: 1.96%; 1: 9.9%; 2: 20.9%; 3: 35.0%  M: 35.0%

Remarks:  Items for pairwise comparison were selected by participant observation and open interviews.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-H/?/sq/f7/a</td>
<td>r=.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/?/sq/l5/a</td>
<td>r=.06 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local schools
Subject code: L10.4.2.5
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study BRINK 1997/1

Reported in: Brinkerhoff, M.B.; Fredell, K.; Frideres, J.
Basic Minimum Needs, Quality of Life and Selected Correlates: Explorations in Villages in Northern India.
Social Indicators Research, 1997, Vol. 42, 245 - 281 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1023/A:1006834830518
Page in Report: 262

Population: Adult, general public, poor rural village, Barasi, India 1991

Sample: Non-probability purposive-quota sample

Non-Response: 0

N: 234

Correlate

Authors label: school facilities for girls (1)

Our classification: satisfaction with local schools, code L10.4.2.5

Measurement: Village needs prioritized by Paired Comparisons. Out of four basic needs, ss were asked to compare two at a time and to select, which they sought 'their family needs most'
Items were:
- food
- health
- employment
- leisure
This leads to six pairs of comparisons.
Score pro need can be:
0. not mentioned
1. once
2. twice
3. three times
Needs index is the mean number of times an item is chosen.

Measured Values: 0: 1,64% 1: 8,5%; 2: 34,2% 3: 41,5%; M: 15,8%

Remarks: Items for pairwise comparison were selected by participant observation and open interviews

Observed Relation with Happiness
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-H?/?/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.1 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/?/sq/l/5/a</td>
<td>r=+.13 p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local schools

**Subject code: L10.4.2.5**

**Study**

**BUTTE 1977**

**Reported in:** Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B.
Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life.
Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138
Page in Report: 358

**Population:** 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin USA, 1974

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

N: 548

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with quality of public schools (4)

**Our classification:** satisfaction with local schools, code L10.4.2.5

**Measurement:** Single closed question rated on a 5-point scale: How do you feel about the quality of public schools in this school district, do you think they are: very good / fairly good / both good and bad / not very good / not good at all.

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

\[ r = +.19 \quad p < .05 \]

\[ r = +.19 \quad p < .05 \]

\[ r = +.07 \quad ns \]

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local schools**

**Subject code: L10.4.2.5**

**Study**

HULIN 1969

*Reported in:* Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

*Population:* White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 24%

*N:* 470

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with community's school facilities. (2)

*Our classification:* satisfaction with local schools, code L10.4.2.5

*Measurement:* Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local schools
Subject code: L10.4.2.5

Study
HULIN 1969

Reported in: Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:
Non-Response: 24%
N: 470

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with school teachers in the community. (2)

Our classification: . satisfaction with local schools, code L10.4.2.5

Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>Males : r = +.15 (01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: r = +.07 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local shops**  
Subject code: L10.4.2.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>ANDRE 1976/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reported in: | Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.  
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality  
Page in Report: 113 |
| Population: | 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972/75 |
| Sample: | |
| Non-Response: | 24% |
| N: | 1297 |

**Correlate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors label:</th>
<th>Satisfaction with consumer facilities (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our classification:</td>
<td>satisfaction with local shops, code L10.4.2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Measurement: | Index of questions: "How do you feel about the way you can get around to  
1. work, school, shopping, etc.;  
2. doctors, clinics and hospitals;  
3. the goods and services one can buy in the area.  
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted |

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>$E^2=+.31$</td>
<td>Unaffected by sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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\[ \beta = 0.06 \]

\( \beta \) controlled for 11 domain satisfactions (efficacy, family, money, amount of fun, house/apartment, spare time activities, national government, things do with family, time to do things, health, job).

\[ \beta = 0.07 \]

\( \beta \) controlled for sociodemographic variables (family life cycle, age, family income, education, race, sex) and 11 domain satisfactions.

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local shops**

**Subject code: L10.4.2.6**

**Study**

ANDRE 1976/5

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/7

*Sample*

*Non-Response:*

*Non-Response:*

\( N = 222 \)

---

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with services (1)

*Our classification:* . satisfaction with local shops, code L10.4.2.6
**Measurement:** 2-item index of questions "How do you feel about....?"

1. the services you get when you have someone come in to fix things around the home (like painting, repaires)
2. the goods and services you can get when you buy in this area (things like appliances, food, clothes)

Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>$r=+.27$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local shops**

**Subject code: L10.4.2.6**

**Study**

**BUTTE 1977**

*Reported in:* Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B.
Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life.
Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138
Page in Report: 358

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin USA, 1974

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:*

*N:* 548

---

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with quality of stores & retail services (1)

*Our classification:* . satisfaction with local shops, code L10.4.2.6
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Single closed question rated on a 5-point scale: How would you rate the stores and retail services in this area, would you say they are: very good / fairly good / both good and bad / not very good / not good at all.

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v7/a</td>
<td>r=+.07</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-A/u/sq/v7/a</td>
<td>r=+.15</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v7/b</td>
<td>r=+.14</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local shops**

**Subject code: L10.4.2.6**

**Study**

HULIN 1969

Reported in: Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:
Non-Response: 24%
N: 470

**Correlate**

Authors label: Satisfaction with shopping facilities in the community. (1)

Our classification: satisfaction with local shops, code L10.4.2.6
**Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

**Measurement:** Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLg/sq/f7/a</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>Males : r = +.22 (01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: r = +.10 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with neatness of local streets**

**Subject code:** L10.4.2.7

**Study**


**Page in Report:** 112

**Population:** 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/3

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** 26%

**N:** 1433

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with neatness (1)

**Our classification:** satisfaction with neatness of local streets, code L10.4.2.7

**Measurement:** Closed question: "How do you feel about how neat, tidy, and clean things are around you?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased delighted
Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with neatness of local streets
Subject code: L10.4.2.7

Study

\textit{ANDRE 1976/5}

\textit{Reported in:} Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.  
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality  
Page in Report: 112

\textit{Population:} 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/7

\textit{Sample:}

\textit{Non-Response:}

\textit{N:} 222

Correlate

\textit{Authors label:} Satisfaction with neatness (1)

\textit{Our classification:} satisfaction with neatness of local streets, code L10.4.2.7

\textit{Measurement:} Closed question: "How do you feel about how neat, tidy and clean things are around you?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l l}
\textit{Happiness Measure} & \textit{Statistics} & \textit{Elaboration/Remarks} \\
O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a & \textit{E²}=+.38 & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l l}
\textit{Happiness Measure} & \textit{Statistics} & \textit{Elaboration/Remarks} \\
O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a & \textit{r}=+.34 & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with neatness of local streets

Subject code: L10.4.2.7

Study BUTTE 1977

Reported in: Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B.
Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life.
Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138
Page in Report: 358

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin USA, 1974

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 548

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with quality of streets and roads (1)

Our classification: satisfaction with neatness of local streets, code L10.4.2.7

Measurement: Single closed question rated on a 5-point scale: How about the streets and roads around here, would you say their condition is: very good / fairly good / both good and bad / not very good / not good at all.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-A/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.05</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.03</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.05</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local transport facilities
Subject code: L10.4.2.8

Study
ANDRE 1976/1

Reported in: Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972/75

Sample:
Non-Response: 24%
N: 1297

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with mobility (1)

Our classification: satisfaction with local transport facilities, code L10.4.2.8

Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about the way you can get around to work, schools, shopping, etc.?
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local transport facilities
Subject code: L10.4.2.8

### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

#### Study

**Reported in:** Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.  
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality  
Page in Report: 113

**Population:** 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/7

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

\[ N: 222 \]

---

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with mobility (1)  
**Our classification:** satisfaction with local transport facilities, code L10.4.2.8

**Measurement:** Closed question: "How do you feel about the way you can get around to work, schools, shopping, etc.?”  
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

---

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/cy/sq/l/9/a</td>
<td>r=+.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>r=+.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=+.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/u/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with local transport facilities

### Subject code: L10.4.2.8

#### Study

**ANDRE 1976/6**

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 156

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972-73

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:*

*Non-Response:*

*N: 2727*

---

#### Correlate

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with mobility (1)

*Our classification:* . satisfaction with local transport facilities, code L10.4.2.8

*Measurement:* Closed question: "How do you feel about the way you can get around to work, schools, shopping, etc."
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

---

#### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with local transport facilities**

**Subject code: L10.4.2.8**

#### Study

**BACH 1993**
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Bach J.R., Tilton M.C
Life Satisfaction and Well-Being Measures in Ventilator Assisted Individuals With traumatic Tetraplegia
Page in Report: 627-629

Population: Tetraplegia patients and controls, USA, 1985
Sample: Non-probability purposive sample
Non-Response: 40%
N: 87

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with transportation
Our classification: . satisfaction with local transport facilities, code L10.4.2.8
Measurement: Self report on single question:
1 completely dissatisfied
.
.
7 completely satisfied

Measured Values: Patients ventilator assisted M = 4.48 SD = 2.27 Patients autonoom breathing M = 4.57 SD = 2.01 Controls M = 5.73 SD = 1.58

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/aPatients ventilator assisted</td>
<td>r = +.17 ns</td>
<td>Patients ventilator assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/aPatients autonoom breathing</td>
<td>r = +.41 p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Patients autonoom breathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/aHealthy controls</td>
<td>r = +.16 p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Healthy controls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and . satisfaction with local transport facilities

Subject code: L10.4.2.8

Study

BALAT 1993

Reported in: Balatsky, G.; Diener, E.
Subjective Well-Being among Russian Students.
Social Indicators Research, 1993, Vol. 28, 225 - 243 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF01079019
Page in Report: 235

Population: Students, Moscow and Glazov (Ural), Russia, 1990

Sample: Non-probability chunk sample

Non-Response: not reported

N: 116

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with transportation (1)

Our classification: Satisfaction with local transport facilities, code L10.4.2.8

Measurement:

Single question: "How do you feel about transportation right now?"
Rated on 7-point scale from:
1. Terrible........to
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. Delighted.

Measured Values: M = 2.91; SD = 1.72

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r = +0.22</td>
<td>p two-tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/c/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r = +0.27</td>
<td>p two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local transport facilities
Subject code: L10.4.2.8

Study

Reported in: Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:
Non-Response: 24%
N: 470

Correlate

Authors label: Sat. with locat. of the com. in terms of isol. and remote loc (1)
Our classification: . satisfaction with local transport facilities, code L10.4.2.8
Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither satisfied nor dissatisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/fi7/a</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>Males : r = +.30 (01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Females: r = +.29 (01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local transport facilities
Subject code: L10.4.2.8

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study

**MICHA 1982**

*Reported in:* Michalos, A.C.  
The Satisfaction and Happiness of Some Senior Citizens in Ontario.  
Social Indicators Research, 1982, Vol. 11, 1 - 30. ISSN 0303 8300. DOI:10.1007/  
BF00353590  
Page in Report: 24

*Population:* 60+ aged, rural townships, Southern Huron County, Ontario, Canada, 198?

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 37%  
*N: 392

Correlate

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with transportation (1)

*Our classification:* . satisfaction with local transport facilities, code L10.4.2.8

*Measurement:* Closed question on satisfaction with public and private transportation-facilities

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>Beta=+.05</td>
<td>All β's are controlled for satisfaction with family life, friendships, financial security, self-esteem, spouse, health, recreation, housing, religion, area you live in, government services; and for sex, age and education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males N:149 β:-.02  
Females N:121 β:+.08  
Farmers N:130 β:+.11  
Non-farmers N:141 β:ns  
Age 60-74 N:170 β:+.16  
Age 75-up N:102 β:-.05
Correlational finding on Happiness and satisfaction with local transport facilities
Subject code: L10.4.2.8

Study

MICHA 1983

Reported in: Michalos, A.C.
Satisfaction and Happiness in a Rural Northern Resource Community. Social Indicators Research, 1983, Vol. 13, 225 - 252. ISSN 0303 8300. DOI:10.1007/BF00318099
Page in Report: 233

Population: 18+ aged, rural community, N.Ontario, Canada, 1982

Sample:
Non-Response: 8%
N: 598

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with transportation (1)

Our classification: . satisfaction with local transport facilities, code L10.4.2.8

Measurement: Closed question on satisfaction with public and private transportation- facilities

Observed Relation with Happiness

### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/c/sq/v/7/aa</td>
<td>Beta=+.06</td>
<td>All β's controlled for satisfaction with health, financial security, family relations, paid employment, friendships, housing, area you live in, recreation activity, religion, self esteem, government services, and for the demographic factors: sex, age, formal education, language, work status, marital status, time in area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males: N: 173 β: +.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: N: 154 β: +.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>Beta=-.02</td>
<td>All β's controlled for satisfaction with health, financial security, family relations, paid employment, friendships, housing, area you live in, recreation activity, religion, self esteem, government services; and for sex, age, formal education, language, work status, marital status, time in area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males: N: 173 β: +.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: N: 154 β: -.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Local safety

**Subject code: L10.5**

**Study**

KAINU 1998


*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, former province Kuopio, Finland, 1991-'96.

*Sample:* Probability sample (unspecified)

*Non-Response:* not rep
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 2682

Correlate

Authors label: Risky and dangerous surroundings (in housing) (1)

Our classification: Local safety, code L10.5

Measurement: Have you experienced risky and dangerous surroundings (in housing)
(a) during the last year ?
(b) ever in your life ?
Answers: No (=0) or Yes (=1).

Measured Values: Never: N = 2310 Ever in your life: N = 138


Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/g</td>
<td>r=-.12</td>
<td>during the last year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1991/'92 r = -0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1996 r = -0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r=-.10</td>
<td>ever in your life:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1991/'92 r = -0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1996 r = -0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DM=-</td>
<td>never: M = 3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ever in your life: M = 3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI for difference: [0.20 ; 0.56]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local safety
Subject code: L10.5

Study MOLLE 2006

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Moller, V.
Satisfied and Dissatisfied South Africans: Results From The General Household Survey in the International Comparison.
Page in Report: 403

Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002

Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response:
N: 2200

Correlate

Authors label: Safety in neighbourhood

Our classification: Local safety, code L10.5

Measurement: 1:Feels unsafe in neighbourhood
2:Feels safe in neighbourhood

Measured Values: a:36%, b:56%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>D%=.+</td>
<td>% happy  % neutral  % unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsafe in neighborhood 29 12 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safe in neighborhood 68 9 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.1

Study LEHMA 1988

Correlate

Authors label: Assaulted

Our classification: Actual safety in community, code L10.5.1

Measurement: self report of being assaulted during the last year yes/no

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=-.23 p&lt;.0001</td>
<td>Los Angeles: mentally ill residents of 30 large board-and-care homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=.05 ns</td>
<td>Rochester: chronically mentally ill inpatients at the Rochester(N.Y.) Psychiatric Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+0.0 ns ns</td>
<td>Rochester: chronically mentally ill residents of various supervised community residences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.1

Study MOLLE 2006
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Moller, V.
Satisfied and Dissatisfied South Africans: Results From The General Household Survey in the International Comparison.
Page in Report: 403

Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002
Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample
Non-Response:
N: 2200

Correlate

Authors label: Walking at night
Our classification: Actual safety in community, code L10.5.1
Measurement:
1: Feels ‘very unsafe’ walking at night
2: Feels ‘very safe’ walking at night

Measured Values: a:32%, b:23%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>D%=+</td>
<td>% happy % neutral % unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very unsafe at night 37 13 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very safe at night 70 7 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.2

Study BOELH 1999
**Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

*Reported in:* Boelhouwer, J.; Stoop, I.
Measuring Well-Being in the Netherlands.
Social Indicators Research, 1999, Vol. 48, 51 - 75 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1023/A:1006931028334
Page in Report: 62

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, The Netherlands, 1974-1997

*Sample:* Probability sample (unspecified)

*Non-Response:* N: 3500

---

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Housing: scary environment (1)

*Our classification:* Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2

*Measurement:* Single question: "Is there a scary spot in the neighbourhood?"
1 No
2 Yes

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HP/u/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>r=+.05</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community**

**Subject code: L10.5.2**

**Study**

*Reported in:* Bulatao, R.A.
Measures of Happiness among Manila Residents.
Philippine Sociological Review, 1973, Vol. 21, 229 - 238
Page in Report: 234-235

*Population:* 21+ aged, general public, Metro Manila, Philippines, 1972
Sample:
Non-Response: -
N: 941

Correlate

Authors label: Estimate of changes of being robbed (1)
Our classification: Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2
Measurement: Respondent's own evaluation.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cw/mq/v4/b</td>
<td>G=</td>
<td>Index of Positive Affects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males : G = +.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females : G = +.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Index of Negative Affects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males : G = +.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females : G = +.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l11/a</td>
<td>G=</td>
<td>Males : G = -.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females : G = -.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v3/f</td>
<td>G=</td>
<td>Males : G = +.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females : G = +.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.2

Study COHEN 1982
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Page in Report: 384

Population: 18-55 aged, general public, New York City, 1979

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 602

Correlate

Authors label: Perceived danger in neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2

Measurement: 5-item index of questions on the degree of danger experienced by respondents in their neighborhood:
1. In this area, many people I know are afraid to go out at night.
2. You are taking a big chance in this neighborhood if you walk around alone after dark.
3. A lot of people in this neighborhood stay home after dark because they are afraid to go outside by themselves.
4. People should not walk alone in this neighborhood.
5. This neighborhood is really a safe place to live.

Rated on four-point scales, ranging from "not at all like it is" to "exactly like it is".

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure A-BC/cm/mq/v/4/a

Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

r=-.22
p<.01

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study: COHEN 1982

Reported in: Cohen, P.; Struening, E.L.; Muhlin, G. L.; Genevie, L. E; et al
Community Stressors, Mediating Conditions and Well-Being in Urban Neighbourhoods.
Page in Report: 384

Population: 18-55 aged, general public, New York City, 1979

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 602

Correlate

Authors label: Percieved social problems in the neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2

Measurement:

5-item index of ratings of social problems in the neighborhood.
1: drug addicts in the neighborhood.
2: alcoholics in the street.
3: rundown buildings.
4: burglary of homes and apartments.
5: crazy people on the streets
6: unemployment

Responses were rated on four-point scales, ranging from "not at all like it is" (1) to "exactly like it is" (4).

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure

Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

A-BC/cm/mq/v/4/a r=.23
p<.01

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.2
Findings on Happiness and Local Environment

Study

**COHEN 1982**


*Page in Report:* 384

*Population:* 18-55 aged, general public, New York City, 1979

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:*

*Non-Response:*

*N:* 602

Correlate

*Authors label:* Perceived danger in neighborhood (2)

*Our classification:* Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2

*Measurement:* 5-item index of questions on the degree of danger experienced by respondents in their neighborhood:

1. In this area, many people I know are afraid to go out at night.
2. You are taking a big chance in this neighborhood if you walk around alone after dark.
3. A lot of people in this neighborhood stay home after dark because they are afraid to go outside by themselves.
4. People should not walk alone in this neighborhood.
5. This neighborhood is really a safe place to live.

Rated on four-point scales, ranging from "not at all like it is" to "exactly like it is".

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BC/cm/mq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=-.22</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community

**Subject code: L10.5.2**

**Study**


**Population:** 18-55 aged, general public, New York City, 1979

**Non-Response:**

\[ N: 602 \]

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Perceived crime in the neighborhood (2)

**Our classification:** Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2

**Measurement:** 5-item index of questions on extent to which respondents had witnessed or personally heard of local violent crimes.

1: a fight in which a weapon was used.
2: violent arguments between neighbors.
3: people being hit by the police.
4: someone murdered.
5: someone committing suicide.

Responses rated on a four-point scale, ranging from "never" (1) to "frequently" (4).

###Observed Relation with Happiness


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BC/cm/mq/v/4/a</td>
<td>( r = .21 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .01 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community**
Subject code: L10.5.2

Study

HOLLO 1999

Reported in: Holloway, F. ; Carson, J.
Subjective Quality of Life, Psychopathology, Satisfaction with Care and Insight: an Exploratory Study.
Page in Report: 262

Population: Mental patients, followed 3 years, UK 1990-1993

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response: 0

N: 70

Correlate

Authors label: Legal/safety

Our classification: Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2

Measurement: Selfreport on two questions
   How satisfied are you with:
   - your general personal safety?
   - the safety of this neighbourhood?

Remarks: Satisfaction Subscale of Lancashire Quality of Life Profile (LQOLP) [Oliver 1991].

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>rpc=+.28</td>
<td>rpc controled for depression as measured with Beck Depression Inventery (BDI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.2

Study KALIT 2006


Population: 18+ aged, Croatia, 2003

Sample: Probability multi-stage cluster sample

Non-Response: 0

N: 1242

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with Feelings of physical safety

Our classification: Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2

Measurement: Selfreport of satisfaction with Feelings of physical safety
1: not at all satisfied
.
.
10: extremely satisfied

Measured Values: M=8.1 SD=1.89

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-FH/q/sq/v/10/a</td>
<td>Beta=+.06, p&lt;.05</td>
<td>Beta controlled for satisfaction with: standard of living, health, achievement in life, relationship with family and friends, acceptance by community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.2

Study KASL 1975

Reported in: Kasl, S.V.; Harburg, E.
Page in Report: 277

Population: 25-60 aged married adults, Detroit, USA, 197?

Sample:
Non-Response: 17%
N: 1000

Correlate

Authors label: Perceived danger for crime (1)
Our classification: Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2
Measurement: 7 item index of which:
- 5 items on perceived danger
- 2 items on perceived protection in the neighborhood.

Remarks:

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/d</td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>High stress area - Low stress area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black males</td>
<td>r = +.04</td>
<td>- +.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White males</td>
<td>r = +.27</td>
<td>- +.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black females</td>
<td>r = +.14</td>
<td>- -.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White females</td>
<td>r = -.05</td>
<td>- +.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

#### Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community
**Subject code: L10.5.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>LEVY 1975/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Page in Report:</em></td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Population:</em></td>
<td>18+ aged, general public, urban areas, Israel, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sample:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Non-Response:</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N:</em></td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlate**

- **Authors label:** Perceived safety (1)
- **Our classification:** Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2
- **Measurement:** Direct question on whether it is safe to walk at night.

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/?/6/a</td>
<td>mc=+.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/c/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>mc=+.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community
**Subject code: L10.5.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>MOLLE 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Correlate

**Authors label:** Security at night

**Our classification:** Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2

**Measurement:** Single question: Do you feel secure in your neighborhood at night?
0: no
1: yes

AUTHOR, please verify question!

**Measured Values:**
1: Finland: Urban=90,9%; Rural= 95,7%; p<.05; Netherlands: Urban= 78,1%; Rural=91,8%; p<.001; Germany West: Urban= 68,4%; Rural= 93,7%; p<.001; Germany East: Urban= 60,9%; Rural = 78,4%; p<.001; Hungary: Urban= 82,4%; Rural= 59,7%; p<.001; Italy: Urban=62,2%; Rural=61,9%; ns

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Finland (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Finland (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Netherlands (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = .19  Netherlands (rural areas)  
                 p<.05

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = ns  Germany West (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = ns  Germany West (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = ns  Germany East (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = ns  Germany East (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = ns  Hungary (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = ns  Hungary (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = ns  Italy (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta = .11  Italy (rural areas)

Beta's controlled for:
- Age
- Gender
- Environment: Housing:
  - housing amenities
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
  - satisfaction with living area
- Mobility:
  - car in household
  - satisfaction with public transportation
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Services:
  - medical services
  - services and shops
  - satisfaction with services
- Culture:
  - Cultural amenities
  - natural environment
  - satisfaction with leisure
- Social Environment:
  - living together
  - division social network
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

- friends/kin nearby
- Economic situation:
  - Income per person
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health:
  - ADL
  - satisfaction with health

Only standardized regression coefficient significant at a maximum error rate of alpha=.05 are shown.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.2

Study

POWDT 2007

Reported in: Powdthavee N.
Putting a Price Tag on Friends, Relatives, and Neighbours: Using Surveys of Life Satisfaction to Value Social Relationships
Page in Report: 40

Population: 16-65 aged, followed 6 years, Great-Britain, 1997-2003

Sample: Probability stratified sample

Non-Response: n.a.

N: 54424

Correlate

Authors label: Quality of accommodation and neighbourhood variables

Our classification: Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2
**Measurement:** Anwer on the question referring to quality of accommodation and neighbourhood: Does your accommodation have any of the following problems?

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

  a. Shortage of space
  b. Noise from neighbours
  c. Street noise
  d. Not enough lights
  e. Lack of adequate heating
  f. Condensation
  g. Leaky roof
  h. Damp walls, floor, etc.
  i. Rot in windows, floor etc.
  j. Pollution/environmental problems
  k. Vandalism or crime

**Remarks:** T1=average 1997-2000, T2=2002

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = -0.02</td>
<td>Shortage of space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>B (-0.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = +0.01</td>
<td>b Noise from neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>B (+0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = +0.01</td>
<td>c Street noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>B (+0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B = -0.07</td>
<td>d Not enough lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.00</td>
<td>B (-0.66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

- Lack of adequate heating
  - $B = +.03$
  - $ns$
  - $B (+.025)$

- Condensation
  - $B = .01$
  - $ns$
  - $B (-.013)$

- Leaky roof
  - $B = .02$
  - $ns$
  - $B (-.017)$

- Damp walls, floor, etc.
  - $B = .06$
  - $p < .01$
  - $B (-.059)$

- Rot in windows, floor etc.
  - $B = .02$
  - $ns$
  - $B (-.018)$

- Pollution/environmental problems
  - $B = .02$
  - $ns$
  - $B (-.021)$

- Vandalism or crime
  - $B = .02$
  - $ns$
  - $B (-.023)$

B's controlled for:
- Frequency of meeting friends and relatives
- Talk to neighbours
- Socioeconomic variables
- Other indicators of quality of accommodation and neighbourhood variables
- Average district income

B's calculated by fixed effects estimations:
Change in answers from T1 to T2

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived safety in community

**Subject code: L10.5.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>UGLAN 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported in:</td>
<td>Uglanova, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Independent Institute for Social Policy, 2006, Russia <a href="http://sofist.socpol.ru">http://sofist.socpol.ru</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page in Report: question 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td>16+ aged, Russia, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>Probability multi-stage cluster sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Response:</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Perceived safety in community

**Our classification:** Perceived safety in community, code L10.5.2

**Measurement:**

- Do you feel yourself safe in the streets?
  - 1 no
  - 2 rather not
  - 3 rather yes
  - 4 yes
  - DK/NA

**Measured Values:**

- N: 1: 30,5% 2: 36,3% 3: 19,7% 4: 8,2% DK/NA: 6,6%

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/4/q</td>
<td>DM=+</td>
<td>1: M = 2,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: M = 2,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: M = 2,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: M = 2,92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs=+.18
p<.000
Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study  
**ANDRE 1976/1**

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972/75

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 24%

*N:* 1297

Correlate

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with security from theft (1)

*Our classification:* Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

*Measurement:* Closed question: "How do you feel about how safe you feel in this neighborhood?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqrt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Study: ANDRE 1976/3

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non institutionalized, USA, 1972/11

*Sample:

*Non-Response:* 38%
*N:* 1072

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with security from theft (2)

*Our classification:* Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

*Measurement:* Closed question: "How do you feel about how secure you are from people who might steal or destroy your property?"
Rated on a 7-point: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqtv/7/a</td>
<td>E²=+.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community**

*Subject code: L10.5.3*
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non institutionalized, USA, 1972/11

Sample:

Non-Response: 38%

N: 1072

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with security from theft (1)

Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about how secure you are from people who might steal or destroy your property?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/unhappy/mostly dissatisfied/mixed/mostly satisfied/pleased/delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLV/u/sq/t/101/a</td>
<td>r=+.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community

Subject code: L10.5.3

Study

ANDRE 1976/4

Reported in: Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 112

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/3

Sample:

Non-Response: 26%
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 1433

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with safety (2)

Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about your safety?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly
dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqrt/v/7/a</td>
<td>$E^2 = +.38$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community**

**Subject code: L10.5.3**

**Study**

ANDRE 1976/5

Reported in: Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality
Page in Report: 113

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/7

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 222
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement:
3-item index of questions "How do you feel about....?"
1. how safe you feel in your neighborhood
2. your safety
3. how secure you are from people who might steal or destroy your property
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=+.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/cy/sq/l/9/a</td>
<td>r=+.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mq/v/2/a</td>
<td>r=+.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/u/sq/fi/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study ANDRE 1976/6

Page in Report: 156

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972-73

Sample:

Non-Response:
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 2727

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with safety (1)

Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

Measurement: Index of closed questions, asked in different samples: "How do you feel about...
1. how safe you feel in this neighborhood (asked in July 1973)
2. your safety (asked in April 1973 and July 1973)
3. how secure you are from people who might steal or destroy your property (asked in November 1972 and July 1973)?"
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a r=+.36

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study BALTA 2004

Page in Report: 11

Population: 18+ aged, Bihor County, North-West Romania, 2003
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample: Probability area sample
Non-Response: 38%
N: 368

Correlate

Authors label: Safety
Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3
Measurement: Single question:
How satisfied are you with how safe you feel?

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>Beta=+.01 p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Beta controlled for satisfaction with community, security, standard of living, health, achievement, relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study

COHEN 1982


Population: 18-55 aged, general public, New York City, 1979
Sample:

Correlate

Authors label: Perceived crime in the neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

Measurement: 5-item index of questions on extent to which respondents had witnessed or personally heard of local violent crimes.
1: a fight in which a weapon was used.
2: violent arguments between neighbors.
3: people being hit by the police.
4: someone murdered.
5: someone committing suicide.
Responses rated on a four-point scale, ranging from "never" (1) to "frequently" (4).

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BC/cm/mq/v/4/a</td>
<td>$r = -0.21$</td>
<td>$p &lt; 0.01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study

Reported in: Cummins, R.A; Eckersley, R.; Pallant, J.; Okerstrom, E.; et al
Page in Report: 107

Population: 18+ aged Australia, 2002
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample: Probability area sample
Non-Response: 70%
N: 2110

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with Safety
Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3
Measurement: Single question:
How satisfied are you with how safe you feel?

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>Beta=+.04</td>
<td>§ controled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.036</td>
<td>- community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study

CUMMI 2002B

Work and Leisure 2. The Impact of September 11 One Year Later.
edu.au/research/acqol/index.htm
Page in Report: 91

Population: 18+aged, Australia, 2002
Sample: Probability area sample
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response: 88%
N: 2003

Correlate

Authors label: Safety
Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3
Measurement: Single question: How satisfied you with how safe you feel?

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>Beta = +0.01 p&lt;.841</td>
<td>β controled for satisfaction with.. in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study CUMMI 2003A


Population: 18+aged, Australia, 2002
Sample: Probability area sample
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response: 75%
N: 1999

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with Safety
Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3
Measurement: Single question:
How satisfied are you with how safe you feel? Rated on 0-10 scale.

Measured Values: M = 7.58 ; SD = 1.92

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ ca r=+.25

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study CUMMI 2003B

Page in Report: 117+121

Population: 18+ aged, Australia, 2003
Sample: Probability area sample
Non-Response: 88%
N: 1979
Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with feeling of safety

Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

Measurement: Single question: How satisfied are you with how safe you feel? Rated on 0–10 scale.

Measured Values: M = 7.69; SD = 1.85

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r = +.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>Beta = -.02</td>
<td>β controlled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>R² = +.00</td>
<td>Additional variance explained above satisfaction with the domains of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community

Subject code: L10.5.3
**Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

**Study**


*Page in Report:* 45+46+47

**Population:** 18+ aged, Australia, 2004

**Sample:** Probability area sample

**Non-Response:** 0

**N:** 2000

---

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with safety

*Our classification:* Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

*Measurement:* Selfreport on single question

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.25</td>
<td>In highly accessible cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>Beta=_.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.24</td>
<td>In accessible cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>Beta=_.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.34</td>
<td>In moderately accessible cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

\[ \text{O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca} \]

\[ \text{Beta=} +.01 \]

\[ \text{O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca} \]

\[ r=+.35 \quad \text{In remote cities} \]

\[ \text{O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca} \]

\[ \text{Beta=} +.02 \]

\[ \text{O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca} \]

\[ r=+.22 \quad \text{In very remote cities} \]

\[ \text{O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca} \]

\[ \text{Beta=} -.07 \]

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community**

**Subject code: L10.5.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>CUMMI 2005B/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Population:</em></td>
<td>Adults, Argentina, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sample:</em></td>
<td>Sampling not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Non-Response:</em></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N:</em></td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors label:</th>
<th>Satisfaction with safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our classification:</td>
<td>Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement:</td>
<td>Self report on single question: How satisfied are you with your safety? Rated on 0–10 numerical scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/</td>
<td>$r = +.37$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/</td>
<td>$\beta = +.37$</td>
<td>Beta controled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td>$p &lt; .02$</td>
<td>- community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- future security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- personal relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community

**Subject code: L10.5.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>CUMMI 2005B/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported in:</strong></td>
<td>Cummins, R.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page in Report:</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population:</strong></td>
<td>Adults, Argentina 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample:</strong></td>
<td>Sampling not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Response:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N:</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Satisfaction with safety  

**Our classification:** Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Selreport on single question:
How satisfied are you with your safety?
Rated on 0–10 numerical scale

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>( r = +.47 )</td>
<td>Beta controled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- future security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = .11</td>
<td>- health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; -.06 )</td>
<td>- achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- personal relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community**

**Subject code: L10.5.3**

**Study**

**Cummi 2005B/3**

*Reported in:* Cummins, R.A.
Page in Report: 12

**Population:** adults, Argentina 2004

**Sample:** Sampling not reported

**Non-Response:** 0

**N:** 268

---

Correlate
Authors label: Satisfaction with safety

Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

Measurement: Self report on single question:
How satisfied are you with your safety?
Rated on 0–10 numerical scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca               | Beta=+.01 p<.01 | Beta controled for satisfaction with:
- community
- future security
- standard of living
- health
- achievements
- personal relationships

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study
CUMMI 2005B/4

Reported in: Cummins, R.A.
Page in Report: 12

Population: Adults, Hong Kong-China 2003

Sample: Sampling not reported

Non-Response: 0

N: 78
Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with safety

Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

Measurement: Self report on single question:
How satisfied are you with your safety?
Rated on 0-10 numerical scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.34</td>
<td>Beta controled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta=+.38</td>
<td>- future security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.798</td>
<td>- standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- personal relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study

Reported in: Cummins, R.A.
Page in Report: 13

Population: adults, Slovakia 2003

Sample: Sampling not reported

Non-Response: 0

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with safety  
Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3  
Measurement: Self report on single question:  
How satisfied are you with your safety?  
Rated on 0-10 numerical scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.37</td>
<td>Beta controled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- future security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta=+10</td>
<td>- health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.11</td>
<td>- achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- personal relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community  
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study  
HEADE 1981  
Reported in: Headey, B.  
The Quality of Life in Australia  
Social Indicators Research, 1981, Vol. 9, 155 - 18. ISSN p 0303 8300;ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00286195  
Page in Report: 166

Population: Adults, general public, Australia 1978
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample: Probability sample (unspecified)
Non-Response: not reported
N: 679

Correlate

Authors label: Safety from violence, theft
Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3
Measurement: 1 single question on satisfaction with how safe from violence, theft and other dangers you and your family are

Measured Values: M = 5.5 SD = 1.6
Remarks: Item scored on the same rating scale as the question on happiness.

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
O-DT/u/sqt/v/9/a r=+.11 ns

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study LEHMA 1988

Reported in: Lehman, A.F.
A Quality of Life Interview for the Chronically Mentally Ill.
Evaluation and Program Planning, 1988, Vol. 11, 51 -52. ISSN 0149 7189
Page in Report: 57

Population: Chronic mental patients, USA,1981
Sample: Non-probability purposive sample
Non-Response:

N: 469

Correlate

Authors label: satisfaction with safety

Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

Measurement: question not reported

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.42</td>
<td>Los Angeles: mentally ill residents of 30 large board-and-care homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.50</td>
<td>Rochester: chronically mentally ill inpatients at the Rochester (N.Y.) Psychiatric Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.33</td>
<td>Rochester: chronically mentally ill residents of various supervised community residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study


Population: University staff members, Guelph Canada, 1979
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample:
Non-Response: 59%
N: 357

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with security from crime (1)
Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3
Measurement: Closed question rated on a 7-point scale.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-HL/u/sq/v/7/a    | r=+.08     | Controlled for 1  $\beta = -0.05$
|                   | ns         | Controlled for 1+2 $\beta = -0.05$
|                   |            | 1= Satisfaction with health, financial security, family life, friendships, housing, job, free time activity, education, self-esteem, area you live in, ability to get around.
|                   |            | 2= Demographic factors (sex, age, marital status, education, family income) |

| O-DT/c/sq/v/7/aa   | r=+.14     | Controlled for 1 rpc= +.03 (ns)
|                   | p<.01      | Controlled for 1+2 rpc= +.05 (ns)
|                   |            | Controlled for 1+3 rpc= +.03 (ns)
|                   |            | Controlled for 1+2+3 rpc= +.05 (ns)
|                   |            | Controlled for 1 $\beta = -0.05$
|                   |            | Controlled for 1+3+4 $\beta = -0.05$
|                   |            | 1= Satisfaction with health, financial security, family life, friendships, housing, job, free time activity, education, self-esteem, area you live in, ability to get around.
|                   |            | 2= Global happiness(indicator 2, HAPP 1.1)
|                   |            | 3= Demographic factors (sex, age, marital status, education, family income)
|                   |            | 4= Workstatus. |
Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community
Subject code: L10.5.3

Study: MOLLE 2006


Population: Adults, South Africa, 2002
Sample: Probability multistage stratified area sample

Non-Response: N: 2200

Correlate

Authors label: Public safety
Our classification: Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3
Measurement: a: Dissatisfied with public safety
b: Satisfied with public safety

Measured Values: a:40%, b:49%

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c</td>
<td>D% =</td>
<td>%happy %Neutral %unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diss. with public safety 31 11 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sat. with public safety 71 9 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c  

gh = 0.9
p < 0.000
### Correlational finding on Happiness and Satisfaction with safety in community

**Subject code:** L10.5.3

#### Study

**WILLS 2006**

*Reported in:* Wills, E.
Personal Well Being Index-Adults for Bogotá- Colombia, March 2006.
Paper Management School, University de los Andes, 2006, Bogotá, Colombia
Page in Report: 4

*Population:* Adults, Bogotá, Colombia, 2006

*Sample:* Probability area sample

*Non-Response:* -

*N:* 830

#### Correlate

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with safety in community

*Our classification:* Satisfaction with safety in community, code L10.5.3

*Measurement:* Single question:
How satisfied are you with how safe you feel?

Rated 10 very satisfied to 0 very dissatisfied

*Measured Values:* $M=7.99; SD=1.57$

#### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>$r=+.26$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Beta = +.19
p < .01

Beta controlled for satisfaction with:
- health
- achieving in life
- standard of living
- relationships
- community
- future security

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social homogeneity
Subject code: L10.6.1

Study

DIENE 1995B

Reported in: Diener, E.
Subjective Well-Being in Cross-Cultural Perspective.
Page in Report: 10

Population: general population, 43 nations, 1946-1992

Sample: Non-probability sample (unspecified)

Non-Response:

N: 43

Correlate

Authors label: Homogeneity

Our classification: Local social homogeneity, code L10.6.1

Measurement: Sum of three variables:
  a The percenta of people speaking the dominant language
  b the percent of people sharing the dominant religion
  c the percent of people sharing the dominant ethnic/racial group

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure | Statistics | Elaboration/Remarks

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlate</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-Mix/<em>sq</em>/11/a</td>
<td>r=+.13</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/<em>sq</em>/11/a</td>
<td>r=-.09</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/<em>sq</em>/11/a</td>
<td>r=+.21</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social homogeneity
Subject code: L10.6.1

Study
FERNA 1981

Reported in: Fernandez, R.M.; Kulik, J.C.
A Multilevel Model of Life Satisfaction: Effects of Individual Characteristics and Neighborhood Composition.
Page in Report: 845-847

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973-74

Sample:

Non-Response: ?

N: 5916

Correlate

Authors label: Relative age (1)

Our classification: Local social homogeneity, code L10.6.1

Measurement: Difference between own age and mean age of neighbourhood:
1: younger
2: older

Observed Relation with Happiness
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/c  r=+.06  Disattenuated r = +.09

O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/c  Beta= +.03 ns  β controlled for family size, sex, age, education, race, health, marital status, family income and other neighbourhood characteristics (income inequality, cost of living, relative income, percent while).
Disattenuated β = +.05

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social homogeneity
Subject code: L10.6.1

Study  FERNA 1981

Reported in: Fernandez, R.M.; Kulik, J.C.
A Multilevel Model of Life Satisfaction: Effects of Individual Characteristics and Neighborhood Composition.
Page in Report: 845-846

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA,1973-74

Sample:

Non-Response: ?

N: 5916

Correlate

Authors label: Relative income (1)

Our classification: Local social homogeneity, code L10.6.1

Measurement: Difference between own income and neighbourhood mean income:
1: less
2: more.

Observed Relation with Happiness
Findings on Happiness and Local Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/c</td>
<td>r = +.08</td>
<td>Disattenuated r = +.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = +.05 ns</td>
<td>β controlled for family size, sex, age, education, race, health, marital status, family income and other neighborhood characteristics. Disattenuated β = +.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social homogeneity

Subject code: L10.6.1

Study

FERNA 1981

Reported in: Fernandez, R.M.; Kulik, J.C.
A Multilevel Model of Life Satisfaction: Effects of Individual Characteristics and Neighborhood Composition.
Page in Report: 845-847

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973-74

Sample:

Non-Response: ?

N: 5916

Correlate

Authors label: Inequality ratio (1)

Our classification: Local social homogeneity, code L10.6.1

Measurement: Ratio of the geometric mean to the arithmetic mean of the income distribution in the neighbourhood. (Atkinson's measure; Atkinson 1975)

Observed Relation with Happiness

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/c</td>
<td>r = -0.00</td>
<td>Disattenuated r = -0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta = -0.02</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social homogeneity
Subject code: L10.6.1

Study
FERNA 1981

Reported in: Fernandez, R.M.; Kulik, J.C.
A Multilevel Model of Life Satisfaction: Effects of Individual Characteristics and Neighborhood Composition.
Page in Report: 845-847

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973-74

Sample:

Non-Response?: ?

N: 5916

Correlate

Authors label: Racial composition of neighbourhood (1)

Our classification: Local social homogeneity, code L10.6.1

Measurement: Percentage of white residents in the neighbourhood.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

\[ r = +0.06 \]
Disattenuated \( r = +0.09 \)

\[ \text{Beta} = +0.04 \text{ ns} \]
\( \beta \) controlled for family size, sex, age, education, race, health, marital status, family income, and neighborhood characteristics (cost of living, age composition, relative income, and income inequality).
Disattenuated \( \beta = +0.05 \)

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social homogeneity
Subject code: L10.6.1

Study
MORAW 1977


Population: Adults, two villages (one equal in incomes, one unequal), Israel, 1976

Sample: Non-probability purposive-expert sample

Non-Response: 38%

\( N: 109 \)

Correlate

Authors label: Income-equality in two small communities

Our classification: Local social homogeneity, code L10.6.1

Measurement: 0 unequal (Anisos)
1 equal (Isos)

Remarks: Moshav is zero-one dummy variable for moshav (zero for Anisos respondents, one for Isos respondents)

Observed Relation with Happiness
### Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social homogeneity

**Subject code:** L10.6.1

**Study**

*ROSEN 1962*

*Reported in:* Rosenberg, M.  
The Dissonant Religious Context and Emotional Disturbance.  
The American Journal of Sociology, 1962, Vol. 68, 1-10. ISSN 0002 9602  
Page in Report:

*Population:* High school pupils, New York, USA, 1960

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 1% because of inadequate answers

*N:* 1618

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Religious dissonance of social context
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Our classification: Local social homogeneity, code L10.6.1

Measurement:
0 Mixed/Consonant
1 Dissonant neighbourhood

The neighbourhood were one lived (longest) when one grew up was rated as either "dissonant" or "consonant" on the basis of a direct open question on the religious affiliation of most of the people in that neighbourhood (more than 50% different from ones own religion rated "dissonant", less than 50% "mixed" or "consonant").

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-AO/g/mq/v/5/a</td>
<td>G = .24</td>
<td>Stronger among Protestants and Jews than among Catholics (G' respectively -.40, -.36, -.07).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lower when controlled for recall of prejudice experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable with cultural similarity:
- Catholics who grew up in Protestant area happier than those who grew up in Jewish area,
- Protestants who grew up in Catholic area happier than those who grew up in Jewish area,
- Jews who grew up in Protestant area happier than those who grew up in Catholic area.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts

Subject code: L10.6.2

Study: ADAMS 1988

Reported in: Adams, R.G.
Which Comes First: Poor Psychological Well-Being or Decreased Friendship Activity? Activities, Adaptation and Aging, 1988, Vol. 12, 27 - 41
Page in Report: 35/36
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population: 62+ aged, white, non-married, females, middle class suburb of Chicago, USA. 1981-84

Sample:

Non-Response: Dropout: 27% due to incapacity, 13% refusal

N: 70

Correlate

Authors label: Number of local friends (1)

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Ss were asked to list the persons they consider as friends. Next they indicated which of these lived in the same town.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mg/v2/a</td>
<td>( r = +0.22 )</td>
<td>Synchronic correlation at T1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mg/v2/a</td>
<td>( r = +0.06 )</td>
<td>Synchronic correlation at T2. The correlation has decreased between T1 and T2 (difference in r .16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mg/v2/a</td>
<td>( rpc = +0.00 ) ns</td>
<td>Diachronic correlation: T1 local friends by T2 happiness, controlled for T1 happiness. Rpc indicates the effect of earlier local friends on later CHANGE IN HAPPINESS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diachronic correlation: T1 happiness by T2 local friends, controlled for T1 local friends. Rpc indicates the EFFECT OF EARLIER HAPPINESS on later change in local friends.

The effect of local friends on happiness appears considerably smaller than the effect of happiness on local friends (difference in rpc .30).

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts
Subject code: L10.6.2

Study
ADAMS 1988


Population: 62+ aged, white, non-married, females, middle class suburb of Chicago, USA. 1981-84

Sample:
Non-Response: Dropout : 27% due to incapacity, 13% refusal

N: 70

Correlate

Authors label: Number of local friends (2)

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Ss were asked to list the persons they consider as friends. Next they indicated which of these lived in the same town.

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Diachronic correlation at T1. 

\[ r = +.22 \quad p < .05 \]

Diachronic correlation at T1.

**The correlation has decreased between T1 and T2**

\[ (\text{difference in } r = .16) \]

Synchronic correlation at T2.

\[ r = +.06 \quad \text{ns} \]

Diachronic correlation: T1 local friends by T2 happiness, controlled for T1 happiness.

\[ r_{pc} = +.00 \quad \text{ns} \]

Diachronic correlation: T1 local friends by T2 happiness, controlled for T1 local friends.

\[ r_{pc} = +.30 \quad p < .10 \]

Diachronic correlation: T1 happiness by T2 local friends, controlled for T1 local friends.

 Rpc indicates the effect of earlier local friends on later CHANGE IN HAPPINESS.

 Rpc indicates the EFFECT OF EARLIER HAPPINESS on later change in local friends.

The effect of local friends on happiness appears considerably smaller than the effect of happiness on local friends (difference in rpc .30).

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts**

**Subject code: L10.6.2**

**Study**

**AUSSE 2008**


**Page in Report:** 38,86

**Population:** 16-75 aged, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2007

**Sample:** Probability stratified sample

**Non-Response:**

\[ N = 4420 \]
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

Authors label: contact with neighbours

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Frequency of contact with neighbours a year
1: 1–50
2: 51–100
3: 101–150
4: 151–200
5: 201–250;
6: 251–300
7: 301–365

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>r=+.10</td>
<td>N=4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/u/sq/v/4/ab</td>
<td>rpc=+.08</td>
<td>rpc controlled for income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts
Subject code: L10.6.2

Study BOHNK 2008

Reported in: Böhnke, P.; Kohler, U.
Well-being and Inequality
WZB Discussion Paper no. SP I 2008-201, 2008, Berlin, Germany ISSN 1612 3468
http://www.wzb.eu
Page in Report: 24

Population: 18+ aged, in 28 European nations, 2003

Sample: Mixed samples

Non-Response:

N: 18600
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

*Authors label:* Contacts friends/neighbours

*Our classification:* Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

*Measurement:* 0 = no (reference)
1 = yes

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b</td>
<td>B=+.33</td>
<td>No controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b</td>
<td>B=+.34</td>
<td>B controlled for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>-gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-type of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-class/occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-rooms per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-accomodation problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-separated/divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-single, never married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-voluntary work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b</td>
<td>B=+.32</td>
<td>B additionally controlled for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>-church attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-internet use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b</td>
<td>B=+.26</td>
<td>B additionally controlled for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>-long term illness and health satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts

*Subject code: L10.6.2*
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Study**

**COHEN 1982**


*Population:* 18-55 aged, general public, New York City, 1979

*Sample:

*Non-Response:*

* N: 602

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Frequency of visits (1)

*Our classification:* Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

*Measurement:* Direct questions on frequency of visits to friends or relatives in the neighborhood.

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BC/cm/mq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=.07 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts**

*Subject code: L10.6.2*

**Study**

**GOUDY 1981**


*Population:* 50+ aged, general public, North-Central Iowa, USA, 1975
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample:
- Non-Response: 11.3%
- N: 2321

Correlate

Authors label: Relatives in community (1)

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Closed question: "How many of all your adult relatives and in-laws live in this community? none (1), half or less (2), most (3), all (4)"

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>( r = +0.02 ) ns</td>
<td>( \beta ) controlled for age, income, education, marital status, friends in community, local people known, organizational memberships, community attachment, quality of life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts
Subject code: L10.6.2

Study Goudy 1981

- Population: 50+ aged, general public, North-Central Iowa, USA, 1975
- Sample: Non-Response: 11.3%
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 2321

Correlate

Authors label: Friends in community (2)

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Question: "How many of all your friends live in this community? none (1), half or less (2), most (3), all (4)"

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>r = +.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>Beta = +.05</td>
<td>Ø controlled for age, income, education, marital status, relatives in community, local people known, organizational memberships, community attachment, quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts
Subject code: L10.6.2

Study

GOUDY 1981


Population: 50+ aged, general public, North-Central Iowa, USA, 1975

Sample:

Non-Response: 11.3%

N: 2321
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

Authors label: Friends in community (1)

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Question: "How many of all your friends live in this community? none (1), half or less (2), most (3), all (4)

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>r=+.17</td>
<td>$\beta$ controlled for age, income, education, marital status, relatives in community, local people known, organizational memberships, community attachment, quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>$\beta$=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts
Subject code: L10.6.2

Study

GOUDY 1981


Population: 50+ aged, general public, North-Central Iowa, USA, 1975

Sample:

Non-Response: 11.3%

N: 2321
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Question: "How many people would you say you know who live in this community? none (1), a few (2), many (3), very many (4)"

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>r=+.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>Beta=+.07</td>
<td>$ controlled for age, income, education, marital status, relatives in community, friends in community, organizational memberships, community attachment, quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts
Subject code: L10.6.2

Study GOUDY 1981


Population: 50+ aged, general public, North-Central Iowa, USA, 1975

Sample:

Non-Response: 11.3%

N: 2321

Correlate

Authors label: Local people known (1)

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Measurement:** Question: "How many people would you say you know who live in this community? none (10, a few (2), many (3), very many (4)"

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d</td>
<td>$r=+.16$</td>
<td>$\beta=+.07$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p&lt;.001$</td>
<td>$p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\beta$ controlled for age, income, education, marital status, relatives in community, friends in community, organizational memberships, community attachment, quality of life.

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts**

**Subject code: L10.6.2**

**Study**

**GRANE 1975**

**Reported in:** Graney, M.J.
Happiness and Social Participation in Aging.
Journal of Gerontology, 1975, Vol. 30, 701 - 706. ISSN 0022 1422
Page in Report: 703

**Population:** 62-89 aged females, followed 4 years, USA, 1967-71

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:** 27%; 24% unattainable, 3% incomplete.

**N:** 44

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Contacts with neigh-bors. (1)

**Our classification:** Local social contacts, code L10.6.2
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**Measurement:** Direct question on frequency of face-to-face interaction: less than daily / about once a day / more than once a day. Assessed at T2.

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BB/cm/mq/v2/a</td>
<td>( tb = +.28 )</td>
<td>Happiness assessed at T2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .01 )</td>
<td>Age 66-72: ( tb = +.14 ) (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age 82-92: ( tb = +.23 ) (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stronger among age 76-81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts**

**Subject code: L10.6.2**

**Study**

KENNE 1978


*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, Edmonton, Canada, 1977

*Sample:* Probability multi-stage cluster sample

*Non-Response:* not reported

*N:* 335

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* proportion of neighbours known (1)

*Our classification:* Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

*Measurement:* proportion of neighbours known.
## Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/7/b</td>
<td>G = -.23</td>
<td>sexe: male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/7/b</td>
<td>G = -.24</td>
<td>sexe: female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/7/b</td>
<td>G = -.41</td>
<td>age 18–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/7/b</td>
<td>G = ns</td>
<td>age 31–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/n/7/b</td>
<td>G = ns</td>
<td>age 51+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts

**Subject code: L10.6.2**

**Study**

*PHILL 1967A*

*Reported in:* Phillips, D.L.  
Social Participation and Happiness.  
ISSN 0002 9602  
Page in Report: 483-484

*Population:* Adult, general public, New Hampshire, USA, 196?

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* -

*N:* 600

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Number of neighbors known (1)

*Our classification:* Local social contacts, code L10.6.2
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**Measurement:** Direct question on number of neighbors known well enough to visit with 0 / 1-3 / 4 or more.

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A-BB/cm/mq/v/2/a   | G=+        | Index of Positive Affects: G = +.12  
High S.E.S. : d = +.04  
Medium S.E.S. : d = +.04  
Low S.E.S. : d = +.10  
Index of Negative Affects: G = +.01  
High S.E.S : d = -.10  
Medium S.E.S. : d = +.02  
Low S.E.S. : d = +.09 |

(see PHILL 69, p. 8)

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts**

**Subject code: L10.6.2**

**Study**

**POWDT 2007**

**Reported in:** Powdthavee N.  
Putting a Price Tag on Friends, Relatives, and Neighbours: Using Surveys of Life Satisfaction to Value Social Relationships  
Page in Report: 33, 34, 39

**Population:** 16-65 aged, followed 6 years, Great-Britain, 1997-2003

**Sample:** Probability stratified sample

**Non-Response:** n.a.

**N:** 54424
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Correlate

Authors label: Talking to neighbours

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: How often do you talk to your neighbours?

1 Never and Less often than once a month
2 Once or twice a month
3 Once or twice a week
4 On most days

Measured Values: Range=a-d:1-4 M=3.02 SD=0.76 Frequencies in %: All Men Women Age<=30 Age>30 1: 10 10 9 16 7 2: 15 16 14 17 14 3: 40 42 38 36 41 4: 36 33 39 31 38

Remarks: Due to a small number of respondents Less often than once a month is considered as Never

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B=+.03</td>
<td>2 once or twice a month (vs. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B=+.14</td>
<td>3 once or twice a week (vs. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>B=+.27</td>
<td>4 on most days (vs. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B's controlled for:
- frequency of meeting friends
- gender
- age
- socioeconomic variables:
  - real household income
  - marital status
  - employment status
  - look after home
  - health status
  - education level
  - household size
  - home ownership
  - days spent in hospital
  - number of children

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts**  
**Subject code: L10.6.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>POWDT 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population:</strong></td>
<td>16-65 aged, followed 6 years, Great-Britain, 1997-2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample:</strong></td>
<td>Probability stratified sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Response:</strong></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N:</strong></td>
<td>54424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlate**

- **Authors label:** Change in Talking to neighbours  
- **Our classification:** Local social contacts, code L10.6.2  
- **Measurement:** T1-T2 change in selfreport on single question: How often do you talk to your neighbours?  
  1 never or less often than once a month  
  2 once or twice a month  
  3 once or twice a week  
  4 on most days  
  Change in talking to neighbours from T1 to T2  
  a Remain the same  
  b Increased in frequency  
  c Reduced in frequency
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Measured Values: Range=a-d: 1-4 M=3.02 SD(within)=0.48 Frequencies in %: All Men Women Age<=30 Age>30 1: 10 10 9 16 7 2: 15 16 17 14 3: 40 42 36 41 4: 36 33 39 31 38

Remarks: Due to a small number of respondents Less often than once a month is considered as Never

T1=average 1997-2000, T2=2002

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e</td>
<td>DM=+</td>
<td>INCREASE IN TALKING TO NEIGHBOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average change in happiness</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2:</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3:</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4:</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3:</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4:</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4:</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| O-SLW/u/sq/n/7/e  | DM=-       | NO CHANGE IN TALKING TO NEIGHBOURS |
|                   |            |                     |
|       | Average change in happiness | SD | N |
| 1 to 1: | -.08 | 1.32 | 1.376 |
| 2 to 2: | -.03 | 1.13 | 2.024 |
| 3 to 3: | -.02 | 1.08 | 9.287 |
| 4 to 4: | -.03 | 1.26 | 12.098 |
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average change in happiness</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 1:</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 1:</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 2:</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 1:</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 2:</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 3:</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B's are estimated by means of fixed effects estimators instead of OLS.

B's controlled for:
- frequency of talking to neighbours
- gender
- age
- real household income
- marital status
- employment status
- look after home
- health status
- education level
- household size
- home ownership
- days spent in hospital
- number of children

Adittional control variables about quality of accommodation and neighbourhood do not make a difference:
- shortage of space
- noise from neighbours
- street noise
- not enough lights
- lack of adequate heating
- condensation
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- leaky roof
- damp wall, floors, etc.
- rot windows, floors, etc
- pollution/environmental problems
- vandalism or crime
- average district income

Fixed effect estimators differ significantly from OLS estimators denoting a positive inborn personality bias on the observed relationship between frequency of social contacts, income and life satisfaction.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts
Subject code: L10.6.2

Study
SNIDE 1980

Reported in: Snider, E.L.
Explaining Life Satisfaction: It's the Elderly's Attitudes that Count.
Social Science Quarterly, 1980, Vol. 61, 253 - 263. ISSN 0038 4941
Page in Report: 257-258

Population: 65+ aged, retired whites, Edmonton, Canada, 1976

Sample: Probability systematic sample

Non-Response: 10%

N: 428

Correlate

Authors label: Number of kin in city (1)

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Direct question rated on a 3-point scale with the choice statements: '5 or less', '6-10' and '11 plus'.

Observed Relation with Happiness
### Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/v/3/a</td>
<td>r=+.00</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tb=-.00</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyx=-.00</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts

**Subject code: L10.6.2**

**Study**

*SNIDE 1980*

*Reported in:* Snider, E.L.

*Explaining Life Satisfaction: It's the Elderly's Attitudes that Count.*

*Social Science Quarterly, 1980, Vol. 61, 253 - 263. ISSN 0038 4941*

*Page in Report: 257-260*

*Population:* 65+ aged, retired whites, Edmonton, Canada, 1976

*Sample:* Probability systematic sample

*Non-Response:* 10%

*N:* 428

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Number of friends in city (1)

*Our classification:* Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

*Measurement:* Direct question rated on a 3-point scale with the choice statements: '5 or les', '6-10' and '11 plus'.

*Remarks:* Controlled for: self-rated health, lonely, marital status and adjustment to retirement. B = .07
Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/v/3/a</td>
<td>r=+.19</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tb=+.17</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyx=+17</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts

Subject code: L10.6.2

Study: WILLS 2006

Reported in: Wills, E.
Personal Well Being Index-Adults for Bogotá- Colombia, March 2006.
Paper Management School, University de los Andes, 2006, Bogotá, Colombia

Page in Report: 4

Population: Adults, Bogotá, Colombia, 2006

Sample: Probability area sample

Non-Response: -

N: 830

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Single question:
How satisfied are you with feeling part of your community?

Rated 10 very satisfied to 0 very dissatisfied

Measured Values: M=7.59; SD=1.96
## Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca | r=+.23     | Beta controlled for satisfaction with  
|                   |            | - health  
|                   |            | - achieving in life  
|                   |            | - standard of living  
|                   |            | - relationships  
|                   |            | - safety  
|                   |            | - future security |

## Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts

**Subject code: L10.6.2**

**Study**

**WONG 1985**

- Reported in: Wong, N.W.
  Effects of Individual Sources of Support on Well-Being in Employed Parents.
  PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1985, USA
  Page in Report: 50, 67, 74, 133, 138

- Population: Working parents with children <16, USA, 1984

- Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

- Non-Response: 59-79%

- N: 651

**Correlate**

- Authors label: Support from Friends, Neighbors and Relatives

- Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2
**Measurement:** Think back to your experiences as a working parent over the last two months. How have your friends, neighbors and relatives helped you to manage? How often in the past two months did friends, neighbors and relatives do each of the following?

Verbal support:
- a. Shared ideas or advice.
- b. Listened to my problems.
- c. Was understanding or sympathetic.
- d. Helped me to figure out how to solve a problem.

Instrumental support:
- a. Handled child's sickness or other emergency.
- b. Took care of some of my responsibilities when I was especially tired or busy.
- c. Took care of children before or after school.

 Rated: 1= Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Very often, 8 = not applicable

**Measured Values:** Married Fathers: M=1.9, SD=.69, Married Mothers M = 2.4 SD = .76, Single Mothers M=2.6 SD=.82

**Error Estimates:** alpha=.83 Verbal support: alpha=.89, Instrumental support alpha = .71

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=-.13 ns</td>
<td>Married fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/4/i</td>
<td>r=+.33 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=+.03 ns</td>
<td>Married Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/4/i</td>
<td>r=+.03 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=+.07 ns</td>
<td>Single Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/4/i</td>
<td>r=+.03 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Married Fathers

\( O-\text{HL}/c/sq/v/3/aa \quad \beta = \text{ns} \)

Married Mothers

\( O-\text{SLW}/u/sq/v/4/i \quad \beta = \text{ns} \)

Single Mothers

\( O-\text{HL}/c/sq/v/3/aa \quad \beta = \text{ns} \)

Beta's controlled for:
- age
- education
- income
- organization (place of employment)
- stress
- support from spouse
- support from co-workers
- support from supervisors

Married fathers

\( O-\text{HL}/c/sq/v/3/aa \quad B = \text{ns} \)

Married Fathers

\( O-\text{SLW}/u/sq/v/4/i \quad B = \text{ns} \)

Married Mothers

\( O-\text{HL}/c/sq/v/3/aa \quad B = \text{ns} \)

Single Mothers

\( O-\text{SLW}/u/sq/v/4/i \quad B = \text{ns} \)

B's additionally controlled for:
- resentment of spouse,
- resentment of friends/neighbors/relatives
- resentment of co-workers and supervisor
Correlational finding on Happiness and Local social contacts  
Subject code: L10.6.2

Study  
WONG 1985

Reported in: Wong, N.W. 
Effects of Individual Sources of Support on Well-Being in Employed Parents. 
PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1985, USA 
Page in Report: 50, 133, 138, 141, 143

Population: Working parents with children <16, USA, 1984

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response: 59-79%

N: 651

Correlate

Authors label: Resentment from Friends, Neighbors and Relatives

Our classification: Local social contacts, code L10.6.2

Measurement: Think back to your experiences as a working parent over the last two months. How have your friends, neighbors and relatives helped you to manage? How often in the past two months did friends, neighbors and relatives do each of the following?  
1. Held my job responsibilities against me. 2. Showed resentment of my needs as a working parent. 3. Was critical of my efforts to combine work and family.

Rated: 1= Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Very Often, 8 = Not Applicable

Measured Values: Married Fathers: M=1,2, SD=.45, Married Mothers M = 1,4 SD = .62, Single Mothers M=1,6 SD = .81

Error Estimates: alpha = .78

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure  Statistics  Elaboration/Remarks
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = .26</td>
<td>Married Fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/4/i</td>
<td>r = -.08</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = -.10</td>
<td>Married Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/4/i</td>
<td>r = -.02</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r = -.13</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/4/i</td>
<td>r = +.10</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community**

**Subject code: L10.6.3**

**Study**

- BALTA 2004

**Reported in:** Baltatescu, S.M.; Cummins, R.A.
- Subjective Wellbeing in a Post-Communist Country: Romania's International Wellbeing Index.
- Powerpoint presentation at 6th Conference ISQOLS, November 2004, Philadelphia, USA
- Page in Report: 11

**Population:** 18+ aged, Bihor County, North-West Romania, 2003

**Sample:** Probability area sample

**Non-Response:** 38%

**N:** 368

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Community

**Our classification:** Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3

**Measurement:** Single question:
- How satisfied are you with the feeling of your community?
Observed Relation with Happiness

### Happiness Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>Beta= +.05, p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Beta controlled for satisfaction with - standard of living - health - achievement in life - relationships - security - safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community

**Subject code: L10.6.3**

**Study**

*COHEN 1982*

  - Page in Report: 384

- **Population:** 18-55 aged, general public, New York City, 1979

- **Sample:**

- **Non-Response:**
  - **N:** 602

**Correlate**

- **Authors label:** Perceived social cohesion in neighborhood (1)

- **Our classification:** Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3
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Measurement: 6-item index measuring the extent to which respondents see their local neighborhood as a positive source of help.
1: most of the people around here know their neighbors well.
2: the people in the neighborhood often share things to help each other out.
3: people in this neighborhood talk to each other about things that bother them.
4: in this neighborhood you can always find somebody to help you out when you need it.
5: a lot of people in this area are friendly and helpful.
6: people in this neighborhood sometimes lend each other money when things are tight.
respondents were given on a four-point scale, ranging from "not all like it is" (1) to "exactly like it is" (4).

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BC/cm/mq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r==.13 p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study           COHEN 1982

Reported in:    Cohen, P.; Struening, E.L.; Muhlin, G. L.; Genevie, L. E; et al
Community Stressors, Mediating Conditions and Well-Being in Urban Neighbourhoods.
Page in Report: 384

Population: 18-55 aged, general public, New York City, 1979
Sample:
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Non-Response:

\[ N: 602 \]

Correlate

Authors label: Perceived social problems in the neighborhood (1)

Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3

Measurement: 5-item index of ratings of social problems in the neighborhood.
1: drug addicts in the neighborhood.
2: alcoholics in the street.
3: rundown buildings.
4: burglary of homes and apartments.
5: crazy people on the streets
6: unemployment

Responses were rated on four-point scales, ranging from "not at all like it is" (1) to "exactly like it is" (4).

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BC/cm/mq/v/4/a</td>
<td>r=-.23</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study

CUMMI 2002A

Page in Report: 107

Population: 18+ aged Australia, 2002
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample: Probability area sample
Non-Response: 70%
N: 2110

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with Community
Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3
Measurement: Single question:
How satisfied are you with feeling part of your community?

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>Beta = +.03</td>
<td>ß controlled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .101</td>
<td>- standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study CUMMI 2002B


Population: 18+ aged, Australia, 2002
Sample: Probability area sample
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Non-Response: 88%
N: 2003

Correlate

Authors label: Community

Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3

Measurement: Single question:
How satisfied are you with feeling part of your community?

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca | Beta= +.07 p<.000 | $^*$ controlled for satisfaction with..
- standard of living
- health
- achievement in life
- relationships
- safety

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study | CUMMI 2003A
---|---
Page in Report: 126

Population: 18+aged, Australia, 2002
Sample: Probability area sample
Non-Response: 75%
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

N: 1999

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community

Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3

Measurement:
Single question:
How satisfied are you with feeling part of your community?
Rated on 0–10 scale.

Measured Values: M = 7.00 ; SD = 2.01

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ ca r=+.33

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study CUMMI 2003B

Page in Report: 117+121

Population: 18+aged, Australia, 2003

Sample: Probability area sample

Non-Response: 88%

N: 1979
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors label: Satisfaction with feeling part of community

Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3

Measurement: Single question:
How satisfied are you with feeling part of your community? Rated on 0–10 scale.

Measured Values: M = 7.10; SD = 1.97

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r = +.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca | Beta = +.06 | β controlled for satisfaction with: 
|                   | p < .001   | - Future security 
|                   |           | - Standard 
|                   |           | - Health 
|                   |           | - Achieve 
|                   |           | - Relationships 
|                   |           | - Safety |

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study CUMMI 2005B/1

Reported in: Cummins, R.A.
Page in Report: 11

Population: Adults, Argentina, 2002
Sample: Sampling not reported
Non-Response: 0
N: 492
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community

Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3

Measurement: Self report on single question:
How satisfied are you with your community?
Rated on 0-10 numerical scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.32</td>
<td>Beta controled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- future security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta=</td>
<td>- standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+.16</td>
<td>- health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;110</td>
<td>- achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study CUMMI 2005B/2

Reported in: Cummins, R.A.
http://acquol.deakin.edu.au
Page in Report: 12

Population: Adults, Argentina 2003
Sample: Sampling not reported
Non-Response: 0
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

$N$: 189

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community

Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3

Measurement: Selfreport on single question:
How satisfied are you with your community?
Rated on 0–10 numerical scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/</td>
<td>$r=+.45$</td>
<td>Beta controled for satisfaction with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td></td>
<td>- future security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta=$.23$</td>
<td>- standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p&lt;.15$</td>
<td>- health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study

CUMMI 2005B/3

Reported in: Cummins, R.A.
Page in Report: 12

Population: adults, Argentina 2004

Sample: Sampling not reported

Non-Response: 0
N: 268

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community
Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3
Measurement: Self report on single question:
How satisfied are you with your community?
Rated 0-10 numerical scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca | Beta=+.02, p<.02 | Beta controled for satisfaction with: 
- future security 
- standard of living 
- health 
- achievements 
- personal relationships 
- safety |

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study

Page in Report: 12

Population: Adults, Hong Kong-China 2003
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Sample: Sampling not reported
Non-Response: 0
N: 78

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community
Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3
Measurement: Self report on single question:
How satisfied are you with your community?
Rated on 0-10 numerical scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ ca</td>
<td>r=+.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ ca | Beta=+.07 p<.446 | Beta controled for satisfaction with: 
future security
standard of living
health
achievements
personal relationships
safety

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study

Reported in: Cummins, R.A.
Page in Report: 13
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Population: adults, Slovakia 2003
Sample: Sampling not reported
Non-Response: 0
N: 133

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with community
Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3
Measurement: Self report on single question:
How satisfied are you with your community?
Rated on 0-10 numerical scale

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca</td>
<td>r=+.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/ca | Beta=+.14 p<.14 | Beta controlled for satisfaction with:
  - future security
  - standard of living
  - health
  - achievements
  - personal relationships
  - safety

Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community
Subject code: L10.6.3

Study MARTI 1984
Population: 18+ aged, general public, N.W. Wisconsin, USA, 1974

Sample:
Non-Response: 12%
N: 1423

Correlate

Authors label: Community solidarity (1)
Our classification: Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3
Measurement: 3 item index of closed questions, rated on a 5 point Likert scale.
   a. Usually I feel free to stop and visit with most people around here.
   b. I know the people living around here quite well.
   c. Most of the time I do not really feel like a member of this community

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.23</td>
<td>age &lt;30: r = +.10 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>30 - 49: r = +.39 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 64: r = +.21 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 64: r = +.23 05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

$\beta$ controlled for: powerlessness, health, days too sick to work, recent move, separated/divorced, unemployed, contact with relatives, contact with friends, church attendance, organizational membership, education, family income.

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Perceived cohesion in community

**Subject code: L10.6.3**

#### Study

**MARTI 1985**


*Page in Report:* 309

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, NW Wisconsin, USA, 1974

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* 14%

*N:* 1423

#### Correlate

*Authors label:* Community solidarity (1)

*Our classification:* Perceived cohesion in community, code L10.6.3
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Measurement: 3 item index of closed questions, rated on a 5-point Likert scale.

a. Usually I feel free to stop and visit with most people around here.
b. I know the people living around here quite well.
c. Most of the time I do not really feel like a member of this community.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>Beta=+</td>
<td>$\beta$ of different age groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under 30 : +.06 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-49 : +.32 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-64 : +.18 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over 64 : +.15 05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\beta$ controlled for: negative life change, degree of disability, days lost due to illness, powerlessness, recent migrant, contact with friends, contact with relatives, organizational affiliation, church attendance, separated / divorced, sex, unemployed, family income, education.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local political issues

Subject code: L10.7.1

Study LOUNS 1979

Reported in: Lounsbury, J.W.; Sundstrom, E.; Shields, M.
The Relationship of Avowed Life Satisfaction to Public Acceptance of and Expectations about a Nuclear Power Plant.
Journal of Community Psychology, 1979, Vol 7, 298 -304

Population: Adults, general public, Hartsville/Trousdale County, Tennessee, USA, 1975

Sample:

Non-Response:
Correlate

Authors label: Perceived effects of nuclear plants new in town (1)
Our classification: Attitudes to local political issues, code L10.7.1
Measurement: Ss were shown a list of 27 events that might accompany the construction or operation of a nuclear plant at five miles of the centre of the town. The likelihood of these events was rated as a 7-point scale ranging from (1) 'certain' to (7) impossible'.

1. Social disruption: a.o. traffic congestions, more bars, crowding in schools, increasing noise, crime, drugs problems, increasing taxes and housing shortage.


3. Increased business: a.o. more stores, more public entertainment, etc.


5. Individual economic benefit: a.o. increased land value, more jobs, better paying jobs and better schools.

Remarks: Likelyhood scores: all happy unhappy

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a  \( r = -0.02 \)  \( ns \)  2.45  2.50  2.50

C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a  \( r = +0.10 \)  \( ns \)  3.88  3.95  3.80

C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a  \( r = -0.01 \)  \( ns \)  2.99  2.97  3.00

C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a  \( r = -0.05 \)  \( ns \)  2.82  2.80  2.81

C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a  \( r = +0.05 \)  \( ns \)  2.87  2.90  2.86

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local political issues**

**Subject code: L10.7.1**

**Study**  
LOUNS 1979

**Reported in:**  
Lounsbury, J.W.; Sundstrom, E.; Shields, M.  
The Relationship of Avowed Life Satisfaction to Public Acceptance of and Expectations about a Nuclear Power Plant.  
Journal of Community Psychology, 1979, Vol 7, 298 -304  
Page in Report: 302

**Population:**  
Adults, general public, Hartsville/Trousdale County, Tennessee, USA, 1975

**Sample:**

**Non-Response:**

\( N: 288 \)
## Correlate

**Authors label:** Consistency of attitude to nuclear plant in town (2)

**Our classification:** Attitudes to local political issues, code L10.7.1

**Measurement:** Correlation between acceptance of the building of a nuclear plant and perceptions of hazards and benefits.

1. acceptance - disruption
2. acceptance - health hazards
3. acceptance - increased business
4. acceptance - attention for town
5. acceptance - economic benefit

### Remarks:

## Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a</td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>r=+.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r=+.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>r=+.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>r=+.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>r=+.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>r=+.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>r=+.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r=</td>
<td>r=+.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mr=</td>
<td>mr=+.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mr=+.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local political issues

**Subject code:** L10.7.1

Study LOUNS 1979

Page in Report: 302

Population: Adults, general public, Hartsville/Trousdale County, Tennessee, USA, 1975

Sample:

Non-Response:
N: 288

Correlate

Authors label: Acceptance of a nuclear plant near town (2)

Our classification: Attitudes to local political issues, code L10.7.1

Measurement: Direct question; "If it were up to you, would you permit construction of the TV1 powerplant near Hartsville". Rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 'definitely yes'(1) to 'definitely no'(4).

69% would 'definitely' or 'probably' permit, 31% is opposed

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks

C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a $r=-.03$ ns

C-BW/c/sq/l/11/a DM=- ns mean acceptance score:
- happy 2.23
- unhappy 2.24

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local political issues

### Subject code: L10.7.1

**Study**

**MAKAR 1962**

- *Reported in:* Makarczyk, W.  
  Factors affecting Life Satisfaction among People in Poland.  
  Page in Report: 109

- *Population:* Adults, general public, students and peasants excluded, Poland, 1960

- *Sample:*
  - *Non-Response:* 5%
  - *N:* 2387

**Correlate**

- *Authors label:* Getting on well with the local authorities (1)

- *Our classification:* Attitudes to local political issues, code L10.7.1

- *Measurement:* Single question: how do you get on with the local authorities?  
  - very badly / rather  
  - badly / average / fairly well /  
  - very well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td><em>T</em> = 16</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farm owners and family only.

### Observed Relation with Happiness

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitudes to local government

**Subject code: L10.7.2**

**Study**

**SHINN 1978**
**Reported in:** Shinn, D.C.; Johnson, D.M.
Avowed Happiness as the Overall Assessment of the Quality of Life.
Social Indicators Research, 1978, Vol. 5, 475 - 492. ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00352944
Page in Report: 483/487

**Population:** Heads of households, Illinois, USA, 1975

**Sample:**
Non-Response: 17%

**N:** 665

### Correlate

**Authors label:** Assessment of quality of local government (2)

**Our classification:** Attitudes to local government, code L10.7.2

**Measurement:** Single closed question rated on a scale ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied or from excellent to very poor

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa</td>
<td>r=+.09 p&lt;.05</td>
<td>When controlled for: - assessments only β = +.02 - recourses and assessments β = +.01 - assessments and comparisons β = ? - assessments, recourses and comparisons β = +.01 'Assessments': satisfaction with: standard of living, leisure time, housing, health, education, community; 'Resources': race, sex, age, income, education, home ownership, marital status, number of children, number of household members; 'Comparisons': perception of being happier than others and perceived financial improvement in the past few years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Remoteness
Subject code: L10.8

Study CUMMI 2005A


Population: 18+ aged, Australia, 2004

Sample: Probability area sample

Non-Response: 0

N: 2000

Correlate

Authors label: ARIA index

Our classification: Remoteness, code L10.8

Measurement:
ARIA: Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia
a: Highly Accessible (ARIA score 0-1.84) relatively unrestricted accessibility to a wide range of goods and services and opportunities for social interaction
b: Accessible (ARIA score >1.84-3.51) some restrictions to accessibility of some goods, services and opportunities for social interaction
c: Moderately Accessible (ARIA score >3.51-5.86) - significantly restricted accessibility of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction
d: Remote (ARIA score >5.86-9.08) - very restricted accessibility of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction
e: Very Remote (ARIA score >9.08-12.0) - very little accessibility of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT interaction

**Measured Values:** N = a:13483; b:2345; c:749; d:180; e:273

**Remarks:** Uneffected on age, gender and income

---

### Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/</td>
<td>M&lt;sub&gt;t&lt;/sub&gt; = 7.74; SD = 1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca</td>
<td>b M&lt;sub&gt;t&lt;/sub&gt; = 7.81; SD = 1.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c M&lt;sub&gt;t&lt;/sub&gt; = 7.91; SD = 1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d M&lt;sub&gt;t&lt;/sub&gt; = 7.61; SD = 1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e M&lt;sub&gt;t&lt;/sub&gt; = 7.63; SD = 1.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all M&lt;sub&gt;t&lt;/sub&gt; = 7.75; SD = 1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/   | AoV<sub>α</sub> = b>a; p<.005 |
| ca                | c>a; p<.001 |
|                   | c>d; p<.028 |
|                   | c>e; p<.009 |

| O-SLW/u/sq/n/11/   | E<sub>²</sub>=.00 |
| ca                | partial eta squared controled for - age - gender - income |

---

### Correlational finding on Happiness and Actual local nature

**Subject code: L10.9.1**

**Study**

- **MOLLE 2004**


  **Population:** 55+ aged, 6 European nations, 2000
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

**Sample:** Probability stratified sample

**Non-Response:** 45%

**N:** 3950

---

**Correlate**

**Authors label:** Natural environment

**Our classification:** Actual local nature, code L10.9.1

**Measurement:** Sum score of recreational/national features of the living area including park/green areas, living in an area with greenery/at the edge of town, and clean environmental condition (range 0-3). Questions not found!

AUTHOR, please give questions.

---

**Measured Values:**

- Finland: Urban: M=2.8; SD=0.5; Rural: M=2.9; SD=0.3; p<.001
- Netherlands: Urban:1.8; SD=1.1; Rural: M=2.3; SD=0.9; p<.001
- Germany West: Urban: M=2.2; SD=0.9; Rural: M=2.5; SD=0.7; p<.001
- Germany East: Urban: M=2.3; SD=0.9; ns
- Hungary: Urban: M=2.5; SD=0.8; Rural: M=2.0; SD=0.9; p<.001
- Italy: Urban: M=2.1; SD=1.0; Rural M=2.5; SD=0.7; p<.001

---

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Finland (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Finland (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Netherlands (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Netherlands (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d</td>
<td>Beta=ns</td>
<td>Germany West (urban areas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Germany West (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Germany East (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Germany East (rural area)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Hungary (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Hungary (rural areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= ns  Italy (urban areas)

O-SLW/c/sq/n/11/d  Beta= -0.14 p<.05  Italy (rural areas)

Beta's controlled for:
- Age
- Gender
- Environment: Housing:
  - housing amenities
  - home ownership
  - satisfaction with housing
  - satisfaction with living area
- Mobility:
  - car in household
  - satisfaction with public transportation
  - satisfaction with mobility
- Services:
  - medical services
  - services and shops
  - satisfaction with services
- Culture:
  - Cultural amenities
  - satisfaction with leisure
- Security:
  - security
- Social Environment:
  - living together
  - division social network
  - friends/kin nearby
- Economic situation:
  - Income per person
  - satisfaction with finances
- Health:
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- ADL
- satisfaction with health

Only standardized regression coefficient significant at a maximum error rate of alpha=.05 are shown.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local natural environment 
Subject code: L10.9.2

Study ANDRE 1976/1

Reported in: Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B. 
Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality 
Page in Report: 113

Population: 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1972/75

Sample: 
Non-Response: 24%
N: 1297

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with condition of natural environment (1)
Our classification: Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2
Measurement: Closed question: "How do you feel about the condition of the natural environment- the air, land and water in this area?" Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure  Statistics  Elaboration/Remarks
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\[ O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a \quad E^2=+1.13 \quad \text{Unaffected by sex} \]

---

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local natural environment**

**Subject code: L10.9.2**

**Study**

*Reported in:* Andrews, F.M.; Withey, S.B.  
*Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans’ Perceptions of Life Quality*  
*Page in Report: 113*

*Population:* 18+ aged, general public, non-institutionalized, USA, 1973/7

*Sample:*

*Non-Response:* N: 222

**Correlate**

*Authors label:* Satisfaction with natural environment (1)

*Our classification:* Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2

*Measurement:* Closed question: "How do you feel about the condition of the natural environment – the air, land and water in this area?"  
Rated on a 7-point scale: terrible/ unhappy/ mostly dissatisfied/ mixed/ mostly satisfied/ pleased/ delighted

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-DT/u/sqt/v/7/a</td>
<td>( r=+.21 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Study BHARA 1977

Reported in: Bharadwaj, L.; Wilkening, E.A.
The Prediction of Perceived Well-Being.
Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 421 - 439 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353143
Page in Report: 430

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin, USA, 197?

Sample:
Non-Response: 12%
N: 1423

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with natural environment (1)
Our classification: Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2
Measurement: direct closed question rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from "completely satisfied" to "completely dissatisfied".

Observed Relation with Happiness

Happiness Measure Statistics Elaboration/Remarks
O-SLW/u/sqt/v/7/a r=+.24 If controlled for satisfaction with family-life, standard of living, work, health, spare time activities, income, community, housing, food, spiritual matters, education, organizational involvement, national government, β:+.13 for age over 65.

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local natural environment
Subject code: L10.9.2

Study BUTTE 1977
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Reported in: Buttel, F.H.; Martinson, O.B.
Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life.
Social Indicators Research, 1977, Vol. 4, 353 - 369 ISSN p 0303 8300; ISSN e 1573 0921 DOI:10.1007/BF00353138
Page in Report: 358

Population: 18+ aged, general public, Wisconsin USA, 1974

Sample:

Non-Response:

N: 548

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with environment (1)

Our classification: Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2

Measurement: Single closed question rated on a 7-point scale: In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the environment around here - the land, woodland, water, air, quietness, and scenery: completely satisfied / very satisfied / satisfied / satisfied-dissatisfied / dissatisfied / very dissatisfied / completely dissatisfied?

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-A/u/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.27</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/b</td>
<td>r=+.34</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/7/a</td>
<td>r=+.18</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local natural environment
Subject code: L10.9.2
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**Study**: FORTI 1983


*Page in Report:*

*Population*: Catholic nuns, re-organized cloister, followed 4 years, Louisiana, USA, 1977-1981

*Sample:*

*Non-Response*: T1: 18%, T2: 14%, T3: 23%

*N*: 137

**Correlate**

*Authors label*: Satisfaction with closeness to nature (1)

*Our classification*: Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2

*Measurement*: Single closed question: 'How do you feel about closeness to nature?', rated on a 7-point Delighted-Terrible scale, ranging from (1) Delighted to (7) Terrible, (8) neither. (order reversed)

**Observed Relation with Happiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O-DT/u/sq/f/7/a    | r=+        | T1: 1977 r= +.21 (01)  
T2: 1979 r= +.28 (01)  
T3: 1981 r= +.30 (01)  
Both variables assessed at T1, T2, and T3. Correlation concerns same time measures. |

**Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local natural environment**

*Subject code*: L10.9.2

**Study**: HULIN 1969
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Reported in: Hulin, C.L.
Source of Variation in Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Community and Job-Related Variables.
Page in Report: 285

Population: White collar workers, living in company towns, Columbia Canada, 196?

Sample:
Non-Response: 24%
N: 470

Correlate

Authors label: Satisfaction with attractiveness. (1)

Our classification: Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2

Measurement: Question rated on a graphic rating scale very dissatisfied / somewhat dissatisfied / neither satisfied nor dissatisfied / somewhat satisfied / very satisfied.

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/g/sq/f/7/a</td>
<td>r=+</td>
<td>Males : r = +.24 (01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females: r = +.09 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local natural environment
Subject code: L10.9.2

Study

Reported in: Ventegodt, S.
Livskvalitet i Danmark. (Quality of Life in Denmark).
Forskningscentrets Forlag (The Quality of Life Research Center), København, Denmark, ISBN 8790190017 http://www.livskvalitet.org/t1/index.asp
Page in Report: 366
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Population: 18-88 aged, general public, Denmark, 1993

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response: 39%

N: 1494

Correlate

Authors label: relations with nature (1)

Our classification: Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2

Measurement: Single question:
"How are your current relations with nature ?"
1: very bad
2: bad
3: neither good, nor bad
4: good
5: very good


Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/m/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>r=+.13</td>
<td>1: Mt=6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.00</td>
<td>2: Mt=7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Mt=7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: Mt=7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: Mt=8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Mt=7.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/e   | r=+.19     | 1: Mt=5.96          |
|                   | p<.00      | 2: Mt=6.96          |
|                   |            | 3: Mt=6.93          |
|                   |            | 4: Mt=7.41          |
|                   |            | 5: Mt=7.96          |
|                   |            | All Mt=7.45         |
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Subject code: L10.9.2

Study

VENTE 1995

Reported in: Ventegodt, S.
Livskvalitet i Danmark. (Quality of Life in Denmark).
Forskningscentrets Forlag (The Quality of Life Research Center), København,
Page in Report: 368

Population: 18-88 aged, general public, Denmark, 1993

Sample: Non-probability purposive sample

Non-Response: 39%

N: 1494

Correlate

Authors label: satisfaction with local natural environment (1)

Our classification: Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2

Measurement: Single question:
"How satisfied are you at present with the local natural environment?"
1: very dissatisfied
2: dissatisfied
3: neither/nor
4: satisfied
5: very satisfied

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A-AOL/m/sq/v/5/a   | \( r = +.12 \) \( p < .00 \) | 1: Mt=7.34  
|                   |            | 2: Mt=7.31  
|                   |            | 3: Mt=7.59  
|                   |            | 4: Mt=7.75  
|                   |            | 5: Mt=8.16  
|                   |            | All Mt=7.78 |
| O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/e   | \( r = +.17 \) \( p < .00 \) | 1: Mt=6.59  
|                   |            | 2: Mt=6.79  
|                   |            | 3: Mt=7.26  
|                   |            | 4: Mt=7.40  
|                   |            | 5: Mt=7.96  
|                   |            | All Mt=7.45 |
| O-HL/c/sq/v/5/h    | \( r = +.12 \) \( p < .00 \) | 1: Mt=6.59  
|                   |            | 2: Mt=6.49  
|                   |            | 3: Mt=6.84  
|                   |            | 4: Mt=6.90  
|                   |            | 5: Mt=7.31  
|                   |            | All Mt=6.96 |

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local natural environment

Subject code: L10.9.2

Study VENTE 1996


Population: 31-33 aged, Denmark 1993, born in University Hospital in Copenhagen

Sample: Non-probability chunk sample

Non-Response: 39%

N: 4500
Correlate

Authors label: relations with nature

Our classification: Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2

Measurement: Single question:
"How are your current relations with nature?"
1: very bad
2: bad
3: neither/nor
4: good
5: very good

Measured Values: N: All: 4365: 1:1,8; 2:5,4; 3:26,4; 4:73,2; 5:76,4

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/m/sq/v/5/a</td>
<td>r=+.19</td>
<td>1: Mt=6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.00</td>
<td>2: Mt=7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Mt=7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: Mt=7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: Mt=8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/e</td>
<td>r=+.20</td>
<td>1: Mt=6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;+.20</td>
<td>2: Mt=6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Mt=6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: Mt=7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: Mt=8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-HL/c/sq/v/5/h</td>
<td>r=+.20</td>
<td>1: Mt=5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.00</td>
<td>2: Mt=6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Mt=6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: Mt=7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: Mt=7.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational finding on Happiness and Attitude to local natural environment
Subject code: L10.9.2
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Reported in: Ventegodt, S.  
Liskvalitet hos 4500 31-33-arige. (The Quality of Life of 4500 31-33-Years-Olds).  
Page in Report: 390

Population: 31-33 aged, Denmark 1993, born in University Hospital in Copenhagen  
Sample: Non-probability chunk sample  
Non-Response: 39%  
N: 4500

Correlate

Authors label: satisfaction with the local natural environment  
Our classification: Attitude to local natural environment, code L10.9.2  
Measurement: Single question:  
" How satisfied are you at present with the local natural environment ?"  
1: very dissatisfied  
2: dissatisfied  
3: neither/nor  
4: satisfied  
5: very satisfied

Measured Values: N: All:4596; %:1:5,0; 2:11,6; 3:23,4; 4:40,6; 5:19,5

Observed Relation with Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Elaboration/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A-AOL/m/sq/v/5/a   | r=+.11 p<00| 1: Mt=7.10  
|                   |            | 2: Mt=7.61  
|                   |            | 3: Mt=7.50  
|                   |            | 4: Mt=7.81  
|                   |            | 5: Mt=8.11  |
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O-SLu/c/sq/v/5/e  \[ r=+.14 \]
\[ p<.00 \]
1: Mt=6.48
2: Mt=7.18
3: Mt=7.16
4: Mt=7.53
5: Mt=7.88

O-HL/c/sq/v/5/h  \[ r=+.14 \]
\[ p<.00 \]
1: Mt=6.45
2: Mt=6.78
3: Mt=6.73
4: Mt=7.10
5: Mt=7.50

Appendix 1: Happiness Items used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Item Code</th>
<th>Full Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-AOL/c/sq/v/4/b</td>
<td>Selfreport on single closed question:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                     | "How is your mood these days....?"
|                     | 4 very good all the time
|                     | 3
|                     | 2
|                     | 1 not good almost all the time |
| A-AOL/c/sq/v/5/c     | Selfreport on single question: |
|                     | How well do you feel these days? Is your current well-being....?
|                     | 0 very low
|                     | 1
|                     | 2
|                     | 3
|                     | 4 very high |
| A-AOL/g/sq/v/3/d     | Selfreport on single question: |
|                     | I now mention some experiences, moods. Please tell me how often you feel so .......
|                     | happy." (one of several moods)
|                     | 1 seldom or never
|                     | 2 sometimes
|                     | 3 often |
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A-AOL/m/sq/v/5/a Single direct question:

- How are you feeling now....?
- 5 very good
- 4 good
- 3 neither good nor poor
- 2 poor
- 1 very poor

A-ARE/mi/sqr/n/7/a Selfreport on single question repeated several times a day.

- ".. mood .."
- Full lead question not reported
- 7 happy
- 6
- 5
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1 sad

A-BB/cm/mq/v/2/a Selfreport on 10 questions:

- During the past few weeks, did you ever feel ....? (yes/no)
- A Particularly exited or interested in something?
- B So restless that you couldn't sit long in a chair?
- C Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done?
- D Very lonely or remote from other people?
- E Pleased about having accomplished something?
- F Bored?
- G On top of the world?
- H Depressed or very unhappy?
- I That things were going your way?
- J Upset because someone criticized you?

Answer options and scoring:
- yes = 1
- no = 0

Summation:
- Positive Affect Score (PAS): A+C+E+G+I
- Negative Affect Score (NAS): B+D+F+H+J
- Affect Balance Score (ABS): PAS minus NAS

Possible range: -5 to +5

Name: Bradburn's 'Affect Balance Scale' (standard version)
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Selfreport on 10 questions:

"During the past week, did you ever feel.....?"

A So restless that you could not sit long in a chair
B Proud, because someone had complimented you
C Very lonely or remote from people?
D Pleased about having accomplished something
E Bored
F On top of the world?
G Depressed
H That things were going your way?
I Upset because someone criticized you?
J Could not do anything, simply because you could not start?

Answer options and scoring:
- yes = 1
- no = 0

Summation:
Positive Affect Score (PAS): summed scores on B,D,F,H
Negative Affect Score (NAS): summed scores on A,C,E,G,I,J
Affect Balance Score (ABS): PAS minus NAS

Possible range -6 to +4

Name: Bradburn's `Affect Balance Scale' (adapted version)

Selfreport on 8 questions:

"During the past week, did you ever feel.....?"

A Particularly interested in or excited about something
B Pleased about having accomplished something
C On top of the world
D Pity for some people you know
E Helpless, with no control over situations
F Bored
G Vaguely uneasy about something without knowing why
H Angry about something that usually wouldn't bother you

Rating options:
0 never
1 once
2 several times
3 often

Summation: Factorially derived clusters:
A+B+C+D (Enhancement)
E+F+G+H (Discomfort)
Affect Balance Score: Enhancement minus Discomfort.
Possible range: +16 to -16

Name: Bradburn's `Affect Balance scale' (modified version)

A-BB/cw/mq/v/4/c Selfreport on 8 questions:

"In the past few weeks did you ever feel.....?"

A Pleased about having accomplished something
B Upset because someone criticized you
C Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done
D That things are going your way
E So restless you couldn't sit long in a chair
F Unhappy or depressed
G Particularly interested in something
H Lonely and remote from other people

Response options:
0 not at all
1 sometimes
2 often
3 very often

Scoring: a = 0........d = 3

Summation:
Positive Affect Score (PAS): summed scores on A, C, D, G
Negative Affect Score (NAS): summed scores on B, E, F, H
Affect Balance Score (ABS): PAS minus NAS

Name: Bradburn's Affect Balance Scale (variant)

A-BB/cw/mq/v/4/e Selfreport on 9 questions:

We are interested in the way people are feeling these days. The following list describes some of the ways people feel at different times. Please indicate how often you felt each way during the last week.

How often last week did you feel .....?
A On the top of the world
B Very lonely or remote from other people
C Particularly excited or interested in something
D Depressed or very unhappy
E Pleased about having accomplished something
F Bored
G Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done
H So restless you couldn't sit long in a chair
I Vaguely uneasy about something without knowing why

Answer options:
0 not at all
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1 once
2 several times
3 often

Summation:
Positive Affect Score (PAS): summed scores on A, C, E, G
Negative Affect Score (NAS): summed scores on B, D, F, H, I
Affect Balance Score (ABS): PAS minus NAS

Possible range: -15 tot +12

Name: Bradburn's `Affect Balance Scale' (modified version)

A-BC/cm/mq/v/4/a Selfreport on 13 questions:

"During the past month, did you ever feel.....?"

A. Exited or pleased about something you were doing
B. That important things in life are going your way
C. Happy, satisfied, or pleased with your personal life.
D. Exited or pleased with something you did or a problem you solved
E. That you have a lot of friends you can count on
F. Nervous or tense
G. So restless and irritated you couldn't sit still
H. Down-hearted or depressed
I. Felt concerned or worried about your health
J. Guilty about something you shouldn't have done
K. Unable to get a good night's sleep
L. That your mind was not working the way it should
M. Miserable or discouraged about your future

Answer options:
1 none of the time
2
3
4 most of the time

Summation:
Positive Affect Scale (PAS):A+B+C+D+E
Negative Affect Scale (NAS):F+G+H+I+J+K+L+M
Affect Balance Scale (ABS): PAS minus NAS
Possible range: -32 to +20

Name: Bradburn's Affect Balance Scale (variation by Cohen)
Interviewer-rating of cheerfulness:

Altogether the respondent looks.....
2 quite cheerfull
1 not too cheerful
- difficult to say

Part of the 8 item Allensbacher Ausdrücktest which also involves ratings of cheerful appearance in: look, mouth, posture, movements, eyes, elbows and lips. This general rating is the last item in the test.

Selfreport on single question:

"How do you feel about what you are accomplishing in life...?"
7 completely satisfied
6 very satisfied
5 satisfied
4 satisfied-dissatisfied
3 dissatisfied
2 very dissatisfied
1 completely dissatisfied.

Selfreport on single question:

"Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you and the bottom represents the worst possible life for you. Where on the ladder do you feel you personally stand at the present time?"

[ 10 ] best possible life
[ 9 ]
[ 8 ]
[ 7 ]
[ 6 ]
[ 5 ]
[ 4 ]
[ 3 ]
[ 2 ]
[ 1 ]
[ 0 ] worst possible life

Preceded by 1) open questions about what the respondent imagines as the best possible life and the worst possible life. 2) ratings on the ladder of one's life five years ago and where on the ladder one expects to stand five years from now.

Name: Cantril's self anchoring ladder rating of life (original)
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C-BW/cy/sq/1/9/a Selfreport on single question:

"Here is a picture of a ladder. At the bottom of the ladder is the worst life you might reasonably expect to have. At the top is the best life you might expect to have. Of course, life from week to week falls somewhere in between. Where was your life most of the time during the past year?"

[ 9 ] best life you might expect to have
[ 8 ]
[ 7 ]
[ 6 ]
[ 5 ]
[ 4 ]
[ 3 ]
[ 2 ]
[ 1 ] worst life you might expect to have

Name: Cantril's self anchoring ladder rating (modified version)

M-AO/c/mq/*/0/a Selfreport on 4 questions:

A For the past five years, how much have you accomplished of what you planned in your life?
1 completely failed
2
3
4
5
6
7 completely accomplished
B How much are you satisfied with your life as a whole these days?
1 completely dissatisfied
2
3
4
5
6
7 completely satisfied
C How much do you enjoy your life these days?
3 a great deal
2 a fair amount
1 not very much
D How happy have you been for the past five years?
1 completely unhappy
2
3
4
5
6
7 completely happy
Summation: % positive answers

Response options A, D and C not reported in full detail

M-AO/g/mq/v/5/a Selfreport on 6 questions:

A On the whole, how happy would you say you are?
B On the whole, I think I am a quite happy person.
C In general, how would you say you feel most of the time - in
good or in low spirits?
D I get a lot of fun out of life.
E I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.
F How often do you feel downcast and rejected?

Response options: not reported

The items of this scale were randomly distributed in the questionnaire.

Name: Rosen 'Depressive Affect Scale'

M-AO/u/sq/f/7/a Selfreport on single question:

Which (of the faces) best described how you feel about your life as a whole?
7 completely happy
6
5
4 neither happy nor unhappy
3
2
1 completely unhappy

M-CO/u/mq/v/7/a Selfreport on 3 questions:

A How do you feel about what you are accomplishing in life?
B How do you feel about your life as a whole?
C In general, how happy would you say you are these days?
Answer options:
7 completely satisfied
6 very satisfied
5 satisfied
4 satisfied - dissatisfied
3 dissatisfied
2 very dissatisfied
1 completely dissatisfied

Possible range 3 - 21
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M-FH/c/sq/v/5/a  Selfreport on single question:

How do you feel yourself at the time being? Is your present wellbeing.....?
5 very high
4 high
3 moderate
2 rather low
1 low

M-FH/g/sq/v/10/a  Selfreport on single question:

Use the list below to answer the following question: IN GENERAL, HOW HAPPY OR UNHAPPY DO YOU USUALLY FEEL? Check the one statement that best describes your average happiness.
10 extremely happy (feeling ecstatic, joyous, fantastic!)
9 very happy (feeling really good and elated!)
8 pretty happy (spirits high, feeling good)
7 mildly happy (feeling fairly good and somewhat cheerful)
6 slightly happy (just a bit above neutral)
5 slightly unhappy (just a bit below neutral)
4 mildly unhappy (just a bit low)
3 pretty unhappy (somewhat "blue", spirits down)
2 very unhappy (depressed, spirits very low)
1 extremely unhappy (utterly depressed, completely down)

Name: Fordyce's overall happiness item.

M-FH/u/sq/v/3/b  Selfreport on single question:

If you had to say whether you feel happy or not, what would you answer.....?
3 happy
2 neither happy nor unhappy
1 unhappy

M-PL/u/sq/n/5/a  Selfreport on single question:

"I have a lot of pleasure in my life"
1 totally disagree
2
3
4
5 totally agree

M-TH/g/sq/v/4/e  Self report on single question

In general, would you say that you feel happy
4 most of the time
3 only sometimes
2 almost never
1 never
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M-TH/u/sq/v/5/b  Selfreport on single question:

With which of the following statements can you identify best?
1 I have not been cheerful for a long time
2 I am rarely cheerful
3 I am cheerful some times
4 I am cheerful not every day, but frequently
5 I am cheerful almost every day

O-DT/c/sq/v/7/aa  Selfreport on single question:

How do you feel about your life as a whole right now.....?
7 delightful
6 very satisfying
5 satisfying
4 mixed
3 dissatisfying
2 very dissatisfying
1 terrible
No opinion

Name: Andrews & Withey's `Delighted-Terrible Scale' ( modified version)

O-DT/c/sq/v/7/b  Selfreport on single question:

How do you feel about your life as a whole right now.....?
1 terrible
2 unhappy
3 mostly dissatisfied
4 mixed (about equally satisfied and dissatisfied)
5 mostly satisfied
6 pleased
7 delighted
- neutral (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied)
- I never thought about it
- does not apply to me

Name: Andrews & Withey's `Delighted-Terrible Scale' (modified version by Michalos)
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Selfreport on single question:

Which face comes closest to expressing feeling about life as a whole?
7 delighted
6 very satisfying
5 satisfying
4 mixed
3 dissatisfying
2 very dissatisfying
1 terrible
- No opinion

Name: Andrews & Withey's "Delighted-Terrible Scale" (modified version)

Selfreport on single question:

How do you feel about your life as a whole.....?
7 delighted
6 pleased
5 mostly satisfied
4 mixed
3 mostly dissatisfied
2 unhappy
1 terrible

Name: Andrews & Withey's `Delighted-Terrible Scale' (original version)

Selfreport on single question, asked twice in interview:

How do you feel about your life as a whole......?
7 delighted
6 pleased
5 mostly satisfied
4 mixed
3 mostly dissatisfied
2 unhappy
1 terrible

Summation: arithmetic mean

Name: Andrews & Withey's "Delighted-Terrible Scale" (original version)
Also known as Lehman's 'Global lifesatisfaction'
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O-DT/u/sqt/v/9/a Selfreport on single question asked twice

'How do you feel about your life as a whole?'
1 terrible
2 very unhappy
3 unhappy
4 mostly dissatisfied
5 mixed feelings
6 mostly satisfied
7 pleased
8 very pleased
9 delighted

O-H?/?/sq/f/7/a Selfreport on single question:

Lead item not reported
Rated on a 7-step pictorial faces scale, presented on a card
(pictures not shown here)
7 smiling face, very happy
6
5
4
3
2
1 frowning face, very unhappy

O-HL/*/sq/*/11/a Self report on single question

Various items using the term happiness

Responses transformed to common 0 to 10 scale
- scores on verbal response scales transformed using Thurstone's technique of expert weighing
- scores on numerical scales shorter than 11 step transformed by linear stretching

O-HL/c/sq/?/6/a Selfreport on single question:

"Generally speaking, are you happy these days......?"
6 very happy
5
4
3
2
1 very unhappy
(Response options not fully reported)
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O-HL/c/sq/v/3/aa  Selfreport on single question:

Taken all together, how would you say things are these days? Would you say that you are....?  
3 very happy  
2 pretty happy  
1 not too happy

O-HL/c/sq/v/3/ad  Selfreport on single question:

Taking all things together, how would you say you are these days? Would you say you are..........?  
3 very happy  
2 pretty happy  
1 not too happy

O-HL/c/sq/v/3/ba  Selfreport on single question:

All in all, how much unhappiness would you say that you find in life today.......?  
1 a great deal  
2 some  
3 almost none

O-HL/c/sq/v/3/ca  Selfreport on single question:

Generally speaking; how would you say, you are these days.....?  
1 very happy  
2 pretty happy  
3 not too happy

O-HL/c/sq/v/3/d  Selfreport on single question:

Now thinking about your life these days in general, would you say, you are.....?  
3 very happy  
2 fairly happy  
1 unhappy

O-HL/c/sq/v/3/f  Selfreport on single question:

Considering everything that has happened to you recently, how would you say things are with you - would you say you are.....?  
3 very happy  
2 pretty happy  
1 not too happy

O-HL/c/sq/v/4/b  Selfreport on single question:

Is your life at this moment .....?  
4 very happy  
3 fairly happy  
2 fairly unhappy  
1 very unhappy
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Selfreport on single question:
Do you feel that your life at present is.....?
4 very happy
3 quite happy
2 unhappy
1 very unhappy

Taking all things together in your life, how would you say things are these days?
Would you say you are ....? 
5 very happy
4 happy
3 neither happy nor unhappy
2 unhappy
1 very unhappy

Taking your life as a whole now, are you.....?
5 very happy
4 quite happy
3 more happy than unhappy
2 more unhappy than happy
1 quite unhappy

How happy are you now?
5 very happy
4 happy
3 neither happy nor unhappy
2 unhappy
1 very unhappy

Original text in Danish:
'Hvor lykkelig er du for tiden?'
5 meget lykkelig
4 lykkelig
3 hverken eller
2 ullykkelig
1 meget ullykkelig
O-HL/c/sq/v/5/i  Selfreport on single question:
In general, how do you feel in terms of happiness in your current life?
1 very unhappy
2 unhappy
3 moderate
4 happy
5 very happy

O-HL/c/sq/v/7/a  Selfreport on single question:
In general, how happy would you say you are these days.....?
7 extremely happy
6 very happy
5 pretty happy
4 not too happy
3 a bit unhappy
2 pretty unhappy
1 very unhappy

O-HL/g/sq/n/9/b  Selfreport on single question:
"How happy would you say your life is in general.....?"
1 very unhappy
2
3
4 neither happy
5 nor
6 unhappy
7
8
9 very happy

O-HL/g/sq/v/3/b  Selfreport on single question:
In general, how happy would you say you are.....?
3 very happy
2 pretty happy
1 not very happy

O-HL/g/sq/v/3/c  Selfreport on single question:
"In general, how happy would you say you are.....?"
3 very happy
2 fairly happy
1 not too happy
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Selfreport on single question:
If you were to consider your life in general, how happy or unhappy would you say you are on the whole?
4 very happy
3 fairly happy
2 fairly unhappy
1 very unhappy

Selfreport on single question:
Are you happy or unhappy?
1 unhappy
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 happy

Selfreport on single question:
"Taking all together: how happy would you say you are? Would you say you are.....?"
3 very happy
2 pretty happy
1 not too happy

Selfreport on single question:
Taking all things together, would you say you are.....?
4 very happy
3 quite happy
2 not very happy
1 not at all happy.

Selfreport on single question:
Taking all together, how happy would you say you are/
1 not happy at all
2 not too happy
3 happy
4 very happy
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O-HL/u/sq/v/5/a Selfreport on single question:

How happy or unhappy do you think you are.....?
5 very happy
4 happy
3 moderately happy
2 fairly unhappy
1 very unhappy

O-HL/u/sq/v/7/a Selfreport on single question:

Considering your life as a whole, would you describe it as.....:?
1 very unhappy
2 unhappy
3 an even mixture of unhappiness and happiness
4 happy
5 happy
6 very happy
no opinion

O-HL/u/sq/v/7/b Selfreport on single question:

How do you feel how happy you are.....?
7 delighted
6 pleased
5 mostly satisfied
4 mixed (about equally satisfied and dissatisfied)
3 mostly
2 unhappy
1 terrible

O-HP/g/mq/v/5/a Selfreport on 6 questions:

"Describe the kind of person you are. Please read each sentence, then mark how often it is true for you"
1 I feel like smiling
2 I generally feel in good spirits
3 I feel happy
4 I am very satisfied with life
5 I find a good deal of happiness in life
6 I feel sad

Response options:
5 almost always true
4 often true
3 sometimes true
2 seldom true
1 never true
Summation: average
Possible range: 1 to 5

O-HP/g/sq/ol/7/a Selfreport on single question:

"Generally speaking are you a happy person.......?"

Responses were made on an open line scale, and were later coded in 7 categories:
1 very unhappy
2
3
4
5
6
7 very happy.

O-HP/u/sq/v/5/a Selfreport on single question:

To what extend do you consider yourself a happy person....?
5 very happy
4 happy
3 neither happy nor unhappy
2 not very happy
1 unhappy

O-HP/u/sq/v/5/g Selfreport on single question:

With which of the following statements can you identify best?
1 I am very unhappy, very miserable
2 I am unhappy, miserable
3 I am neither happy noot unhappy
4 I am happy, I am fine
5 I am very happy, very fine

O-Mix/*/sq/*/11/a Self report on different single questions

Responses transformed to common 0 to 10 scale
- scores on verbal response scales transformed using Thurstone's technique of expert weighing
- scores on numerical scales shorter than 11 step transformed by linear stretching
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O-QOL/cm/sq/v/5/a Selfreport on single question:

We ask you to think about your life in the last two weeks....

How would you rate your quality of life?
1 very poor
2 poor
3 neither poor nor good
4 good
5 very good

Item 1 in WHOQOL-Bref

O-SL?/sq/l/10/a Selfreport on single question:

Ss were asked to rate themselves on an 1 - 10 rating ladder in terms of their self-perceived life satisfaction.
(Full question not reported).

[ 10 ] +
[ 9 ]
[ 8 ]
[ 7 ]
[ 6 ]
[ 5 ]
[ 4 ]
[ 3 ]
[ 2 ]
[ 1 ]--

(labels of scale extremes not reported)

O-SL/g/sq/n/10/a Selfreport on single question:

"In general, how happy would you say you are....."?

Response options not reported

O-SLC/c/sq/l/21/a Selfreport on single question:

There are moments you feel your work and your personal affairs are going well. Sometimes without any specific reason you feel good and confident towards the future. There are also moments that things seem to go bad; that you feel anxious and worried about the future. Now here is a picture of a ladder running from 0 to 20. Suppose 0 represents the time in you life you felt most miserable and 20 represents the best time you ever had. Where on the ladder are you now?

[ 20 ] best time you ever had
[ 19 ]
[ 18 ]
[ 17 ]
[ 16 ]
[ 15 ]
[ 14 ]
Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Name: Cantril's self anchoring ladder rating (modified version)

O-SLL/c/sq/v/3/a Selfreport on single question:

In general how satisfying do you find the way you are spending your life these days. Would you call it.....?
3 completely satisfying
2 pretty satisfying
1 not very satisfying

O-SLL/g/sq/v/3/a Selfreport on single question:

"In general, how satisfying do you find the way you're spending your life these days? Would you call it ......?"
3 completely satisfying
2 pretty satisfying
1 not very satisfying

O-SLL/u/sq/v/3/b Selfreport on single question:

On the whole, how satisfied are you with the life you lead?
1 not at all satisfied
2 not very satisfied
3 very satisfied

O-SLL/u/sq/v/4/b Selfreport on single question:

On the whole how satisfied are you with the life you lead?
4 very satisfied
3 fairly satisfied
2 not very satisfied
1 not at all satisfied
- Don't know
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O-SLu/?/sq/l/5/a Selfreport on single question:

"..... satisfaction with life ......"
(full lead item not reported)

Rated on a wooden miniature ladder, handed to the respondent

[ 5 ] very satisfied
[ 4 ]
[ 3 ]
[ 2 ]
[ 1 ] very dissatisfied

O-SLu/c/sq/n/10/b Selfreport on single question:

All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your life these days?
Please tell me on a scale of 1 to 10, where one means very dissatisfied and 10 means very satisfied

10 very satisfied
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1 very dissatisfied

O-SLu/c/sq/n/7/b Selfreport on single question:

"All in all, how satisfied are you with your life these days.....?"

1 very dissatisfied
2
3
4
5
6
7 very satisfied
Selfreport on single question:

'How satisfied are you with your life now?'
5 very satisfied
2 satisfied
3 neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
2 dissatisfied
1 very dissatisfied

Original text in Danish:
'Hvor tilfreds er du med dit liv for tiden?'
5 meget tilfreds
4 tilfreds
3 hverken tilfreds eller utilfreds
2 utilfreds
1 meget utilfreds

Self report on single question:

How satisfying do you find your life at the moment.....?
1 very dissatisfying
2 quite dissatisfying
3 not satisfying not dissatisfying
4 quite satisfying
5 very satisfying

Selfreport on single question:

"...... satisfaction with life in general........"
(Full question not reported.)

Responses scored on pictorial scale consisting of seven smilies, expressing variations from very unhappy to very happy.
1 unhappy face
2
3
4 neutral face
5
6
7 unhappy face
(Pictures not reproduced here.)

Name: Kunin's 'Faces Scale'.
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O-SLu/g/sq/n/11/c  Selfreport on single question:

How satisfied are you with your life in general?
10 completely satisfied
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0 completely dissatisfied

O-SLu/g/sq/v/3/a  Selfreport on single question:

"On the whole, how satisfied would you say you are with your life.....?"
1 not very satisfied
2 fairly satisfied
3 very satisfied

O-SLu/h/sq/v/4/a  Selfreport on single question:

Ss were asked to pretend for a moment that their life would end next week end then indicate how happy they felt about the life they been able to live. (Full question not reported)
4 very satisfied
3 somewhat satisfied
2 a little satisfied
1 not at all satisfied

O-SLV/u/sq/t/101/a  Selfreport on single question:

Where would you put your life as a whole on a feeling thermometer?
Rated on 'thermometer scale' (in grades)
0 degrees: very cold, negative
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100 very warm, positive
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O-SLW/*/sq/*/11/a Self report on single question
Various items using the term 'satisfaction with life'
Responses transformed to common 0 to 10 scale
- scores on verbal response scales transformed using Thurstone's technique of expert weighing
- scores on numerical scales shorter than 11 step transformed by linear stretching

O-SLW/?/sq/v/3/b Self report on single question:
".....satisfaction with overall life....."
(Full questions not reported)
3 very satisfied
2 fairly satisfied
1 not satisfied
- NA

O-SLW/?/sq/v/4/a Self report on single question:
".......satisfaction with life-as-a-whole....."
(Full question not reported.)
1 very dissatisfied
2 somewhat dissatisfied
3 very satisfied
4 extremely satisfied

O-SLW/c/sq/l/11/a Self rating on single question:
"All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you overall with your life as a whole these days?"
Rated on ladder scale
[ 10 ] completely satisfied
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ 0 ] completely dissatisfied
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O-SLW/c/sq/l/11/b Selfreport on single question:

"How dissatisfied would you say you are with things in general today?"
Rated on ladder scale
[ 10 ] completely satisfied
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ 0 ] completely dissatisfied

O-SLW/c/sq/l/7/a Selfreport on single question:

"How satisfied are you with your life-as-a-whole these days.....?"
7 completely satisfied
6
5
4
3
2
1 completely dissatisfied

O-SLW/c/sq/n/10/aa Selfreport on single question:

All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as-a-whole now.....?
1 dissatisfied
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 satisfied
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Self-report on single question:
All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as-a-whole these days?
1 not satisfied at all
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 completely satisfied

Self-report on single question:
What do you think, how satisfied are you at this moment - all in all - with your life?
If for instance you are totally satisfied with your life, please mark a '10'. If you are totally unsatisfied with your life, mark a '0'. If you are not completely unsatisfied nor totally satisfied range yourself somewhere between '1' and '9'
10 completely satisfied
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0 completely dissatisfied

Self-report on single question:
Taking all things together, how satisfied are you with your life these days? Please answer with the help of this scale. For instance, when you are totally satisfied with your life, please tick '10'. When you are totally unsatisfied with your life, please tick '0'. You may use all values in between to indicate that you are neither totally satisfied nor totally unsatisfied.
10 totally satisfied
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0 totally unsatisfied
Selfreport on single question:

When you consider your life-as-a-whole, are you..........?
0 quite dissatisfied
1
2
3
4 very satisfied

Selfreport on single question:

We have talked about various parts of your life, now I want to ask you about your life as a whole. How satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days.....?
7 completely satisfied
6
5
4 neutral
3
2
1 completely dissatisfied

Selfreport on single question:

Let's think about your life as a whole: would you say that you are with your life right now
4 very satisfied
3 fairly satisfied
2 a little dissatisfied
1 very dissatisfied

Selfreport on single question:

How satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?
4 quite satisfied
3 rather satisfied
2 rather unsatisfied
1 not at all satisfied
- no answer
- hard to say

Selfreport on single question:

Taking everything into consideration: how satisfied are you with your life in general at the present time.....?
1 not satisfied
2 slightly satisfied
3 fairly satisfied
4 very satisfied
5 extremely satisfied

Findings on Happiness and LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/d  Selfreport on single question:

Taking everything into consideration, how satisfied are you with life in general at the present time? Would you say you are......?
5 extremely satisfied
4 very satisfied
3 fairly satisfied
2 slightly satisfied
1 not satisfied

O-SLW/c/sq/v/5/ea  Selfreport on single question:

How satisfied are you recently with your life as a whole.....?
1 completely dissatisfied
2 dissatisfied
3 neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 satisfied
5 completely satisfied

O-SLW/c/sqt/v/7/a  Selfreport on single question, asked twice during the interview:

Are you at this moment satisfied or dissatisfied with life in general......?
7 very satisfied
6 for the greater part satisfied
5 rather more satisfied than dissatisfied
4 neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
3 somewhat more dissatisfied than satisfied
2 for the greater part dissatisfied
1 very dissatisfied
- Do not know, difficult to say

O-SLW/cm/sq/v/4/a  Selfreport on single question

'...satisfied with global life right now...'  
(full question not reported)
4 very satisfied
3 somewhat satisfied
2 a little satisfied
1 not at all satisfied

O-SLW/g/sq/v/4/b  Selfreport on single question:

Please tell me how satisfied you are with your life overall. Would you say that you are..
4 very satisfied
3 mostly satisfied
2 mostly dissatisfied
1 very dissatisfied
- don't know
Selfreport on single question:

How do you feel about your life as a whole?
Rated on a seven step quality of life ladder was marked with a smiling face and marked "GOOD". The bottom marked with a frowning face and the word 'BAD'
[ 7 ] Good, picture of smiling face
[ 6 ]
[ 5 ]
[ 4 ]
[ 3 ]
[ 2 ]
[ 1 ] Bad, picture of frowning face
(Pictures not reproduced here)

Selfreport on single question:

Please look at this satisfaction scale and tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your life as a whole
10 satisfied
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1 Dissatisfied
Numbers were presented in different order (1 satisfied…10 dissatisfied).

Selfreport on single question:

Ss were asked to indicate their satisfaction in 17 areas of life and with ....."life as a whole"
(Full question not reported)
0 completely dissatisfied
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100 completely satisfied
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Selfreport on single question:

All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your life as a whole?
10 completely satisfied
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0 completely dissatisfied

Selfreport on single question:

Thinking about your own life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?
1 very dissatisfied
2
3
4
5 neutral
6
7
8
9
10 very satisfied

First item in Cummins' 'Personal Well-being Scale' (labels used until 2005)

Selfreport on single question:

Tell me how much you are satisfied or dissatisfied with your life as a whole
1 very dissatisfied
2
3
4
5
6
7 very satisfied

Last item in a series of questions about satisfaction with various domains in life
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Selfreport on single question:

How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with.. Your life overall?
1 not satisfied at all
2
3
4
5
6
7 completely satisfied

Selfreport on single question:

All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your life as a whole?
1 not at all satisfied
2 not too satisfied
3 very satisfied
4 extremely satisfied

Selfreport on single question:

"On the whole, are you satisfied with your life.....?"
5 definitely yes
4 rather yes
3 don't know
2 rather no
1 definitely no
- no reply

Selfreport on single question:

'How satisfied would you say you are with your life as a whole ....?'
4 completely satisfied
3 very satisfied
2 moderately satisfied
1 slightly satisfied
0 not satisfied at all

Selfreport on single question:

Taking your life as a whole, are you .......
5 very satisfied
4 quite satisfied
3 more satisfied than discontented
2 more discontented than satisfied
1 quite dissatisfied
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O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/a  Selfreport on single question:
Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your life as whole.....?
7 completely satisfied
6 satisfied
5 mostly satisfied
4 satisfied/dissatisfied
3 dissatisfied
2 very dissatisfied
1 completely dissatisfied

O-SLW/u/sq/v/7/b  Selfreport on single question:
How do you feel about your life as a whole.....?
7 completely satisfied
6 very satisfied
5 satisfied
4 satisfied/dissatisfied
3 dissatisfied
2 very dissatisfied
1 completely dissatisfied

O-SLW/u/sqt/v/7/a  Selfreport on single question, asked twice in interview:
Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole........?
7 completely satisfied
6
5
4
3
2
1 completely dissatisfied

Summation: both scores added
Possible range: 2 to 14

O-SQL/u/sq/v/4/a  Selfreport on single question:
All in all, how do you judge your quality of life?
4 very satisfactory
3 sufficiently satisfactory
2 not too satisfactory
1 unsatisfactory
- don't know
Selfreport on 5 questions:

A  Taking all things together, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days? On the whole would you say you are.
5 very satisfied,  
4 satisfied  
3 neither, nor, don't know  
2 dissatisfied  
1 very dissatisfied

B  Would you tell me which one word in each pair of words best describes the life you are leading now? 
1 miserable  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 happy

C  "Would you tell me which one word in each pair of these words best describes the life you are leading now?"
1 rewarding  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 frustration

D  "Do you often, sometimes, seldom or never feel that life is very good?"
3 often  
2 sometimes  
1 never

E  "Taking all things together in your life, how would you say things are these days? Would you say you are."
5 very happy  
4 happy  
3 neither, nor, don't know  
2 unhappy  
1 very unhappy

Summation: not reported
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O-Sum/c/mq/v/5/a Selfreport on 3 questions:

A When you consider your present life as-a-whole, would you say you are....?
5 very happy
4 fairly happy
3 rather happy than unhappy
2 rather unhappy than happy
1 very unhappy
- DK/NA

B When you consider your present life as-a-whole, would you say you are.....?
5 very satisfied
4 fairly satisfied
3 rather satisfied than dissatisfied
2 rather dissatisfied than satisfied
1 fairly dissatisfied
- DK/NA

C How do you feel right now? Is your well-being.....?
5 very high
4 high
3 moderate
2 rather low
1 very low
- DK/NA

Summation: The summed scores were divided in three strata: low, medium and high quality of life

O-Sum/u/mq/*/0/b Selfreport in 2 questions:

A. "How satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?"
10 completely satisfied
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0 not at all satisfied

B. "Where would you place your life as a whole?"
Rated on a thermometer scale.
100 perfect, as good as you can imagine it being
90
80
70
60
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50
40
30
20
10
0 terrible, as bad as you can imagine it being

Summation: factor loading
### Appendix 2: Statistics used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AoV    | ANALYSIS of VARIANCE (ANOVA)  
Type: statistical procedure  
Measurement level: Correlate(s): nominal, Happiness: metric.  
In an ANOVA, the total happiness variability, expressed as the sum of squares, is split into two or more parts, each of which is assigned to a source of variability. At least one of those sources is the variability of the correlate, in case there is only one, and always one other is the residual variability, which includes all unspecified influences on the happiness variable. Each sum of squares has its own number of degrees of freedom (df), which sum up to Ne -1 for the total variability. If a sum of squares (SS) is divided by its own number of df, a mean square (MS) is obtained. The ratio of two correctly selected mean squares has an F-distribution under the hypothesis that the corresponding association has a zero-value.  
NOTE: A significantly high F-value only indicates that, in case of a single correlate, the largest of the c mean values is systematically larger than the smallest one. Conclusions about the other pairs of means require the application of a Multiple Comparisons Procedure (see e.g. BONFERRONI's MULTIPLE COMPARISON TEST, DUNCAN's MULTIPLE RANGE TEST or STUDENT-NEWMAN-KEULS) |
| B      | REGRESSION COEFFICIENT (non-standardized) by LEAST SQUARES (OLS)  
Type: test statistic  
Measurement level: Correlate: metric, Happiness: metric  
Theoretical range: unlimited  
Meaning:  
B > 0 A higher correlate level corresponds with, on an average, higher happiness rating.  
B < 0 A higher correlate level corresponds with, on an average, lower happiness rating.  
B = 0 Not any correlation with the relevant correlate. |
**Beta**

(B) STANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENT by LEAST SQUARES (OLS)  
Type: test statistic.  
Measurement level: Correlates: all metric, Happinessl: metric.  
Range: [-1 ; +1]

Meaning:  
beta > 0 « a higher correlate level corresponds with, on an average, higher happiness rating.  
beta < 0 « a higher correlate level corresponds with, on an average, lower happiness rating.  
beta = 0 « no correlation.  
beta = + 1 or -1 « perfect correlation.

**Remark:**  
Mean of observations is subtracted from all observations if standardized.

**BMCT**

BONFERRONI's MULTIPLE COMPARISON TEST  
Type: statistical procedure  
Measurement level: Correlate: nominal, Happiness: metric

Meaning: if the correlate is measured at c levels, the c mean happiness values can be ranked from low to high. A multiple comparison procedure judges for each of the \( \frac{c(c-1)}{2} \) pairs whether or not they differ significantly. A convenient way to represent the results is by ranking the c means and by underlining them in such a way that means which have a common underlining do NOT differ significantly.

When added by us, this test is performed at the 95% confidence level for all the differences together.

**D%**

DIFFERENCE in PERCENTAGES  
Type: descriptive statistic only.  
Measurement level: Correlate level: dichotomous, but nominal or ordinal theoretically possible as well. Happiness level: dichotomous  
Range: [-100; +100]

Meaning: the difference of the percentages happy people at two correlate levels.

**DM**

DIFFERENCE of MEANS  
Type: descriptive statistic only.  
Measurement level: Correlate: dichotomous, Happiness: metric  
Range: depending on the happiness rating scale of the author; range symmetric about zero.

Meaning: the difference of the mean happiness, as measured on the author's rating scale, between the two correlate levels.
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**DMs**

**STANDARDIZED DIFFERENCE of MEANS (CRITICAL RATIO)**
- **Type:** test statistic.
- **Measurement level:** Correlate: dichotomous, Happiness: metric
- **Theoretical range:** unlimited

**Meaning:** DMs is the ratio of the difference of the, either untransformed or transformed, means and its standard error.

**DMt**

**DIFFERENCE of MEANS AFTER TRANSFORMATION**
- **Type:** descriptive statistic only.
- **Measurement level:** Correlate: dichotomous, Happiness: metric
- **Theoretical range:** [-10; +10]

**Meaning:** the difference of the mean happiness (happiness measured at a 0-10 rating scale) between the two correlate levels.

**Dyx**

**SOMERS' ASYMMETRIC TEST STATISTIC**
- **Type:** test statistic
- **Measurement level:** Correlate: ordinal, Happiness: ordinal
- **Range:** [-1; +1]

**Meaning:**
- Dyx = 0 «no rank correlation
- Dyx = +1 «strongest possible rank correlation, where high correlate values correspond with high happiness ratings.
- Dyx = -1 «strongest possible rank correlation, where high correlate values correspond with low happiness ratings.

**E²**

**CORRELATION RATIO (Elsewhere sometimes called h² or ETA)**
- **Type:** test statistic
- **Measurement level:** Correlate: nominal or ordinal, Happiness: metric
- **Range:** [0; 1]

**Meaning:** correlate is accountable for $E^2 \times 100 \%$ of the variation in happiness.
- $E^2 = 0$ «knowledge of the correlate value does not improve the prediction quality of the happiness rating.
- $E^2 = 1$ «knowledge of the correlate value enables an exact prediction of the happiness rating.

**F**

**F-STATISTIC**
- **Type:** asymmetric standard test statistic.
- **Range:** nonnegative unlimited

**Meaning:** the test statistic is also called the "Variance Ratio" and is the ratio of two independent estimators of the same variance with $n_1$ and $n_2$ degrees of freedom respectively. The critical values of its probability distribution are tabulated extensively in almost any textbook on Statistics.
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G
GOODMAN & Kruskal's GAMMA
Type: test statistic
Measurement level: Correlate: ordinal, Happiness: ordinal
Range: [-1; +1]

Meaning:
G = 0 « no rank correlation
G = +1 « strongest possible rank correlation, where high correlate values correspond with high happiness ratings.
G = -1 « strongest possible rank correlation, where high correlate values correspond with low happiness ratings.

gH
Hedges's COEFFICIENT FOR GROUP DIFFERENCES
Type: descriptive statistic only
Measurement level: Correlate: dichotomous, Happiness: metric
Range (theoretical): unlimited

Meaning: effect size indicator for difference of means.

lgt
LOGIT COEFFICIENT
Type: descriptive statistic only
Measurement level: Correlate: dichotomous, Happiness level: dichotomous
Range: unlimited

Meaning:
lgt = 0 « no association at all;
lgt -> -/+ infinite « at least one level of the correlate allows a perfect prediction of the happiness.

mc
Guttman's monotonicy coefficient.
Range: [-1, +1].
Measurement level: Both correlate and happiness ordinal or interval
Based on the multiplication of signed differences within one variable with the corresponding difference in the second variable and summation over all possible differences.
Seldom used in happiness research. See excerpted report.

mr
Mean correlation coefficient (r).
For r, see PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION

OR
ODDS RATIO
Type: descriptive statistic only.
Measurement level: Correlate: dichotomous, Happiness level: dichotomous
Range: nonnegative unlimited

Meaning:
OR = 1 « no association at all;
OR = 0 or infinite « at least one level of the correlate allows an error-free prediction of the happiness.
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**PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT** (Also "Pearson's correlation coefficient" or simply 'correlation coefficient')
Type: test statistic.
Measurement level: Correlate: metric, Happiness: metric
Range: [-1; +1]

Meaning:
- \( r = 0 \) « no correlation,
- \( r = 1 \) « perfect correlation, where high correlate values correspond with high happiness values, and
- \( r = -1 \) « perfect correlation, where high correlate values correspond with low happiness values.

**POLYCHORIC CORRELATION**
Variant of \( r \)
Seldom used in happiness research. See excerpted report for further reference.

**PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENT**
Type: test statistic
Measurement level: Correlate: metric, Happiness: metric
Range: [-1; +1]

Meaning: a partial correlation between happiness and one of the correlates is that correlation, which remains after accounting for the contribution of the other influences, or some of them, to the total variability in the happiness scores.
Under that conditions
- \( rpc > 0 \) « a higher correlate level corresponds with a higher happiness rating,
- \( rpc < 0 \) « a higher correlate level corresponds with a lower happiness rating,

**SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT**
Type: test statistic
Measurement level: Correlate: ordinal, Happiness: ordinal.
Range: [-1; +1]

Meaning:
- \( rs = 0 \) « no rank correlation
- \( rs = 1 \) « perfect rank correlation, where high correlate values are associated with high happiness ratings
- \( rs = -1 \) « perfect rank correlation, where high correlate values are associated with low happiness ratings

**COEFFICIENT of DETERMINATION**
Type: test statistic
Measurement level: Correlates: all metric, Happiness: metric
Range: [0; 1]

Meaning:
- \( R^2 = 0 \) « no influence of any correlate in this study has been established.
- \( R^2 = 1 \) « the correlates determine the happiness completely.

**SNR**
Statistic Not Reported
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**T**
Tschuprow's T  
Type: test statistic. 
Measurement level: Correlate: nominal, Happiness: ordinal 
Range: $[0; \sqrt{\frac{\min(r,c)-1}{\max(r,c) -1}}]$, c and r being the numbers of columns resp. rows in a cross tabulation.

Meaning:  
$T = 0$ « no association  
$T \to 1$ « strongest possible association.

NOTE: sometimes the square value is reported instead!

**t**  
t-Statistic (Student's t-statistic)  
Type: symmetric standard test statistic.  
One parameter: $n$ (= number of degrees of freedom (df); range df: $[1; +\infty)$  
Range for t: unlimited

Meaning: the test statistic is the ratio of a difference between a statistic and its expected value under the null hypothesis and its (estimated) standard error with n degrees of freedom.  
The critical values of its probability distribution are tabulated extensively in almost any textbook on Statistics.

**tau**  
Goodman & Kruskal's Tau  
Type: descriptive statistic only.  
Measurement level: Correlate: nominal, Happiness: ordinal  
Range: $[0; +1]$  

Meaning:  
$\tau = 0$ « knowledge of the correlate value does not improve the prediction quality of the happiness rating.  
$\tau = 1$ « knowledge of the correlate value enables a perfect (error-free) prediction of the happiness rating.

**tb**  
Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient Tau-B  
Type: test statistic  
Measurement level: Correlate: ordinal, Happiness: ordinal  
Range: $[-1; +1]$  

Meaning:  
$tb = 0$ « no rank correlation  
$tb = 1$ « perfect rank correlation, where high values of the correlate correspond with high happiness ratings.  
$tb = -1$ « perfect rank correlation, where high values of the correlate correspond with low happiness ratings.
KENDALL'S TAU-C (Also referred to as Stuart's tau-c)
Type: test statistic
Measurement level: Correlate: ordinal, Happiness: ordinal
Range: [-1; +1]

Meaning:
tc = 0 « no rank correlation
tc = 1 « perfect rank correlation, where high values of the correlate correspond with high happiness ratings.
tc = -1 « perfect rank correlation, where high values of the correlate correspond with low happiness ratings.

Appendix 3: About the World Database of Happiness

**Structure of the collections**

The World Database of Happiness is an ongoing register of scientific research on the subjective enjoyment of life. It brings together findings that are scattered throughout many studies and provides a basis for synthetic work.

World literature on Happiness
Selection on subject

- Bibliography and Directory

Selection on empirical studies
Selection on valid measurement: Item Bank

Abstracting and classification of findings

- How happy people are, distributional findings
  - Happiness in Nations, Happiness in Publics

- What goes together with happiness
  - Correlational Findings

- Listing of comparable findings in Nations
  - States of Nations, Trends in Nations
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Size of the collections
1226 Happiness measures (Item Bank)
4258 Nations surveys in 206 Nations
149 Distinguished publics in 1199 studies
12032 Correlational findings in 1196 studies

Appendix 4 Further Findings in the World Database of Happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Subjects</th>
<th>Subject Description</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>ACTIVITY: LEVEL (how much one does)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>ACTIVITY: PATTERN (what one does)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>AFFECTIVE LIFE</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>AGGRESSION</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>ANOMY</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>APPEARANCE (good looks)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>ATTITUDES</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>AUTHORITARIANISM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>BIRTH CONTROL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>BIRTH HISTORY (own birth)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>CHILDREN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>CHILDREN: WANT FOR (Parental aspirations)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>CHILDREN: HAVING (parental status)</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>CHILDREN: CHARACTERISTICS OF ONE'S CHILDREN</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>CHILDREN: RELATION WITH ONE'S CHILDREN</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>CHILDREN: REARING OF ONE'S CHILDREN (parental behavior)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>COMMUNAL LIVING</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>CONCERNS</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>COPING</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>CREATIVENESS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>CULTURE (Arts and Sciences)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>DAILY JOYS &amp; HASSLES</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>ETHNICITY</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>EXPRESSIVE BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>FAMILY OF ORIGIN (earlier family for adults, current for young)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>FAMILY OF PROCREATION</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>FAMILY OF RELATIVES</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>FARMING</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>FRIENDSHIP</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>GRIEF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>HABITS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>HANDICAP</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>HAPPINESS: VIEWS ON HAPPINESS</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>HAPPINESS: DISPERSION OF HAPPINESS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>HAPPINESS: CAREER</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>HAPPINESS: CORRESPONDENCE OF DIFFERENT MEASURES</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>HAPPINESS OF OTHERS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>HAPPINESS: REPUTATION OF HAPPINESS</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>HEALTH-BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>HELPING</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD: COMPOSITION</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD: WORK</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14</td>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL LIVING</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>INTELLIGENCE</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>INTERESTS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>INTERVIEW</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I6</td>
<td>INTIMACY</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>LEISURE</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>LIFE APPRAISALS: OTHER THAN HAPPINESS</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>LIFE CHANGE</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>LIFE EVENTS</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>LIFE GOALS</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>LIFE HISTORY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9</td>
<td>LIFE STYLE</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>LOTTERY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>LOVE-LIFE</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>MARRIAGE: MARITAL STATUS CAREER</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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M2 MARRIAGE: CURRENT MARITAL STATUS 543
M3 MARRIAGE: RELATIONSHIP 115
M4 MARRIAGE: PARTNER 46
M5 MEANING 23
M6 MEDICAL TREATMENT 81
M7 MENTAL HEALTH 218
M8 MIGRATION: TO OTHER COUNTRY 29
M9 MIGRATION: MOVING WITHIN COUNTRY (residential mobility) 17
M10 MIGRATION: MIGRANT WORK 3
M11 MILITARY LIFE 7
M12 MODERNITY 6
M13 MOOD 246
M14 MOTIVATION 7
N1 NATION: NATIONALITY 29
N2 NATION: ERA (temporal period) 41
N3 NATION: NATIONAL CHARACTER (modal personality) 29
N4 NATION: CONDITION IN ONE'S NATION 430
N5 NATION: POSITION OF ONE'S NATION 1
N6 NATION: ATTITUDES TO ONE'S NATION 152
N7 NATION: LIVABILITY OF ONE'S NATION 17
N8 NATION: ATTITUDES IN 1
N9 REGION IN NATION 59
N10 NUTRITION 23
N21 ERA 0
O1 OCCUPATION 178
O2 ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION 17
P1 PERSONALITY: HISTORY 48
P2 PERSONALITY: CHANGE 10
P3 PERSONALITY: CURRENT ORGANIZATION 7
P4 PERSONALITY: CURRENT TRAITS 462
P5 PERSONALITY: LATER 23
P6 PHYSICAL HEALTH 427
P7 PLANNING 11
P8 POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR 231
P9 POPULARITY 26
P10 POSSESSIONS 60
P11 PRISON 1
P12 PROBLEMS 25
P13 PSYCHO-SOMATIC COMPLAINTS 62
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>PETS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>RELIGION</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>RETIREMENT</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>ROLES</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>SELF-IMAGE</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SEX-LIFE</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>SLEEP</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>SOCIAL MOBILITY</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: PERSONAL CONTACTS</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: TOTAL (personal + associations)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>SOCIAL SUPPORT: RECEIVED</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>SOCIAL SUPPORT: PROVIDED</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>SPORTS</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>STIMULANTS</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>SUICIDE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>SUMMED DETERMINANTS</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>THERAPY</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>TOLERANCE</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>VALUES: CAREER</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>VALUES: CURRENT PREFERENCES (own)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>VALUES: CLIMATE (current values in environment)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>VALUES: SIMILARITY (current fit with others)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>VICTIM</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>WAR</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>WISDOM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>WORK: CAREER</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>WORK: CONDITIONS</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>WORK: ATTITUDES</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6</td>
<td>WORK: PERFORMANCE (current)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7</td>
<td>WORRIES</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>UNCLASSIFIED</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 5: Related Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Related Subject(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L10 LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>N9.1 Area in nation (geographic region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1 Residential career</td>
<td>M9.1 Moving career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.1.1 Earlier residence</td>
<td>F1.8.2 Rural upbringing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.1 Community size</td>
<td>L10.10.4 Attitude to urban life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.1.2 rural vs urban dwelling</td>
<td>F1.8.2 Rural upbringing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.2.2 Modernity of community</td>
<td>N4.13 Overall development (modernity) of nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.3 Local economic prosperity</td>
<td>N4.3.1 Economic affluence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.3.2 Local costs of living</td>
<td>L10.10.7 Attitude to local costs of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.3.3 Local quality of housing</td>
<td>H14 HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.2 satisfaction with medical services</td>
<td>M6.5.2 Satisfaction with health-services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.3 satisfaction with local police</td>
<td>L10.5.3 Satisfaction with safety in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.4.2.4 satisfaction with local recreation</td>
<td>L3.4.3.2 satisfaction with leisure activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.5.1 Actual safety in community</td>
<td>N4.9.2 Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.5.2 Perceived safety in community</td>
<td>W7.2.1 Amount of worrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.5.3 Satisfaction with safety in community</td>
<td>L10.4.2.3 satisfaction with local police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6.1 Local social homogeneity</td>
<td>E3.5 Attitudes to one's ethnic status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6.1 Local social homogeneity</td>
<td>V4 VALUES: SIMILARITY (current fit with others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6.2 Local social contacts</td>
<td>S6 SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: PERSONAL CONTACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6.2 Local social contacts</td>
<td>S7 SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6.2 Local social contacts</td>
<td>S8 SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: TOTAL (personal + associations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.6.3 Perceived cohesion in community</td>
<td>L10.10 Attitudes to local environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.7 Local politics</td>
<td>P8 POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.7.1 Attitudes to local political issues</td>
<td>P8.4 Attitudes to basic political issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.7.2 Attitudes to local government</td>
<td>L10.4.2 Satisfaction with local facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.7.2 Attitudes to local government</td>
<td>P8.6 Attitudes to political system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.8 Remoteness</td>
<td>L10.2.1 Community size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.9 Local nature</td>
<td>N9.4.2.1 Nature in region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.9.2 Attitude to local natural environment</td>
<td>N6.3.7 Satisfaction with natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10</td>
<td>Attitudes to local environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.1</td>
<td>Attitude to region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.2</td>
<td>Attitude to community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.4</td>
<td>Attitude to urban life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.10.7</td>
<td>Attitude to local costs of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10.11</td>
<td>Joint local characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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