KADIR HAS UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HAPPINESS AND PERCEIVED INCOME INEQUALITY AS WELL AS SOME SOCIAL INDICATORS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON TURKEY AND SELECTED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

GRADUATE THESIS

SİMGE GÜNAY

June, 2016

Simge Günay M.A Thesis 2016

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HAPPINESS AND PERCEIVED INCOME INEQUALITYAS WELL AS SOME SOCIAL INDICATORS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON TURKEY AND SELECTED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

SİMGE GÜNAY

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in

ECONOMICS.

KADİR HAS UNIVERSITY

June, 2016

KADİR HAS UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HAPPINESS AND PERCEIVED INCOME INEQUALITYAS WELL AS SOME SOCIAL INDICATORS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON TURKEY AND SELECTED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

SİMGE GÜNAY

APPROVED BY:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meltem Ucal (Advisor)	(Kadir Has University)	
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Akkemik	(Kadir Has University)	
Assoc. Prof. Dr Bekir Kayacan	(Istanbul University)	

APPROVAL DATE: 07.06.2016

I, Simge Günay, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

SİMGE GÜNAY

TABLE of CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The Relationship between Happiness and Perceived Income Inequality as well as Some Social Indicators: A Comparative Analysis on Turkey and Selected European Countries

Simge Günay

Master of Social Sciences in Economics

Advisor: Associate Professor Meltem Ucal

June, 2016

In recent years, the relationship between happiness and income distribution has become an important issue in the economics literature. Underlying reason of this situation is the widening income gap between the rich and the poor since 1980s. Several studies have traced the link between happiness and income inequality especially since the last two decades. It is also very important to study "perceived" income distribution and inequality because they may show different approaches to income distribution and inequality from many individuals. The aim of this study will be to explore the relationship between perceived happiness level and perceived income inequality in Turkey and the other selected OECD countries using the World Values Survey data. The main question will be whether and to what extent perceived income inequality affects happiness level of individuals who live in those countries. In addition, some social characterictics and socio-demographic variables will be used to learn whether they affect people's happiness or not in Turkey and other selected countries more or less than their perceptions to income inequality. Generalized ordered logit model analysis will be used in the study because it fits to the nature of our data. This study is expected to contribute to the literature in the sense that it will give relevant people a point of view about the relationship between perceived happiness of people who live in selected countries and perceived income inequality as well as selected variables, because a similar comprehensive and comparative study has not been found in the literature, which especially addresses Turkey yet. At the end of the empirical analysis, it is seen that perceptions to income inequality impact on happiness level positively, however, its impact is weaker than other social and demographic variables in the analysis.

Keywords: happiness, perceived income inequality, generalized ordered logit models, comparative analysis, Turkey.

ÖZET

BAZI SOSYAL GÖSTERGELERİN YANI SIRA ALGILANAN GELİR EŞİTSİZLİĞİNİN MUTLULUK İLE İLİŞKİSİ: TÜRKİYE İLE SEÇİLMİŞ AVRUPA ÜLKELERİ ÜZERİNE KIYASLAMALI BİR ANALİZ

Simge Günay

Ekonomi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Danışman: Doçent Doktor Meltem Ucal

Haziran, 2016

Mutluluk ve gelir dağılımı ilişkisini konu edinen çalışmalar dünya literatüründe yer almaktadır. Kişiler arasındaki gelir eşitsizliğinin özellikle 1980 yıllarından bu yana artmakta olduğunu gösteren yayınların konuyla ilgili çalışmaların yapılmasındaki etkisi kanıksanamaz bir gerçektir. Ekonomistler iki değişken arasındaki olası ilişkiyi araştırırken ekonometrik yöntemlerden yararlanmakta ve eşitsizliğin belirlenmesinde özellikle Gini katsayısı'ndan faydalanmaktadırlar. Günümüzde, kişilerin mutluluk seviyeleri ve gelir eşitsizliği arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesinde, kişilerin perspektifleri önem kazanmaktadır. Bu araştırma, gelir dağılımını bireylerin bakış açısıyla görmek, farklı perspektiflerin mutluluk seviyeleri üzerindeki etkisinde oluşabilecek değişiklikleri irdeleyebilmek açısından dikkate değerdir. Bu çalışmada, algılanan gelir eşitsizliği ile kişilerin mutlulukları arasındaki ilişki, hazır anket verisi kullanılarak incelenecektir. Yapılacak çalışma, Türkiye ile anketten seçilmiş olan

Ekonomik İşbirliği ve Kalkınma Örgütü’ne üye -bazı veri sınırları nedeniyle- yedi ülkenin karşılaştırmalı bir analizini konu edinmektedir. Konuyu incelerken, algılanan gelir eşitsizliğinin mutluluk üzerinde herhangi bir etkisinin olup olmadığı ve diğer demografik ve sosyal değişkenlerin mutluluk seviyeleri üzerinde gelir eşitsizliğine kıyasla ne kadar etkili olduğu gibi soruların üzerinde durulacaktır. Değişkenler arasındaki ilişkinin, veri setiyle uyumlu olduğu belirlenen genel sıralı logit yöntemiyle çözülmesi kararlaştırılmıştır. Çalışmanın literatüre ve ilgililere sağlaması beklenen en önemli katkı, Türkiye ve seçilmiş ülkelerdeki algılanan gelir eşitsizliği ve mutluluk seviyeleri arasındaki ilişki hakkında bir fikir verebilmesidir. Özellikle Türkiye’deki mutluluk literatüründe hissedilmekte olan çalışma eksikliği ve konunun bu çalışmada kullanılan değişkenler ve analiz yöntemiyle ilgili benzer bir araştırmasının olmayışı, bu çalışmanın literatüre sağlayacağı beklenen katkının temelini oluşturmaktadır. Bazı demografik ve sosyal değişkenler kullanılarak konunun kıyaslamalı şekilde incelenecek olması, çalışmada sadece gelir eşitsizliği algılamasına odaklanılmadığını, ayrıca incelenecek ilişkiyle ilgili perspektifi genişletmeye çalışıldığını göstermek istemektedir. Yapılan analiz sonucunda, bireylerin gelir eşitsizliğine bakış açısının mutlulukları üzerinde pozitif bir etkiye sahip oldukları görülmüş fakat bu etkinin diğer bazı sosyal ve sosyo-demografik değişkenlere göre etkisinin oldukça zayıf olduğu gözlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: mutluluk, algılanan gelir eşitsizliği, genel sıralı logit yöntemi, Türkiye ile bazı Avrupa ülkelerinin karşılaştırmalı analizi.

This thesis is dedicated to my family, my mother and my father, for their unlimited trust and priceless support and love, and to my aunt, Hikmet Dalgıç. I wish she could have a chance to get a higher education instead of being obliged to work for her family. If she accept this thesis as a little gift for her invaluable sacrifice, I will be very pleased with this situation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis advisor Associate Professor Meltem Ucal of Graduate School of Social Sciences at Kadir Has University. Professor Ucal gave me a direction by lighting the challenging way of my thesis. If she did not push me for improving my rough way, I would not be able to find my true path. I hope she would accept these modest lines as a token of my sincere appreciation.

I would also like to thank Associate Professor Ali Akkemik of Graduate School of Social Sciences at Kadir Has University. At the very beginning of my study, he provided me a deep understanding of clarifying the topic of my thesis. Thank you very much Professor Akkemik. Your suggestions and support are very important to me.

I would also like to thank Associate Professor Bekir Kayacan of the Department of Economic Development and International Economics at Istanbul University for his deep concern and valuable opinions about my thesis study.

It would be an unfortunate mistake if I forgot to thank Assistant Professor Özge Gökdemir of the Department of Economic Development and International Economics at Istanbul University for her invaluable help and support. I appreciate her time and concern.

I owe a lot to Uğur Kaplan of the School of Business Administration at Atılım University. I appreciate his time in helping me about organizing the data set and showing me how to overcome data difficulties.

Finally, I am greatly indebted to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Richard Williams of the Department of Sociology at University of Notre Dame for his interest to my study and help me about some questions, which relate to generalized ordered logit models. His help means a lot to me. Thank you so much, Dear Professor Williams.

LIST of TABLES[1]

[1] Note: Table 3 indicates the first table in text in Chapter 3. Table B.1 indicates the first table in Appendix B. Table C.1 indicates the first table in Appendix C. Table D.1 indicates the first table in Appendix D.

LIST of ABBREVIATIONS

OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
HDI	Human Development Index
I-HDI	Inequality- Adjusted Human Development Index
WISP	The Index of Social Progress
WBI	Well-Being Index
SDI	Social Development Index
GNI	Gross National Income
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
TUIK	Turkish Statistical Institute
TURSTAT	Turkish Statistical Institute
LSS	Leisure Satisfaction Scale
LTEQ	Godin Leisure Time Exercise Questionnaire
QHS	Oxford Happiness Scale
MR hypothesis	Meltzer- Richard Hypothesis
POUM	Prospect for Upward Mobility
ISSP	International Social Survey Program
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
EU	European Union

SHARE	Survey on Health, Aging and Retirement in Europe
WVS	World Values Survey
CEECs	Central and Eastern European countries
Gologit	Generalized Ordered Logit
PO Model	Proportional Odds Model
VIF	Variance Inflation Factor

INTRODUCTION

In the economic literature, actual level of income inequality has been considered as a very important issue since 1980s because it has been thought as a negative determinant in people's lives in many respects, such as physically and psychologically. In 1980s, increasing inequality among household income distribution in the UK and the USA drew people's attention to the problem of inequality (Atkinson and Piketty, 2007). European Union had also noticed the inequality issue because of existing poverty and social exclusion(Atkinson et al. , 2002). In addition to this, Amartya Sen's article, which is named as " On Economic Inequality " (1973) and Anthony Atkinson's article, which is named as " The Economics of Inequality " (1975) increased people's interest to the subject of economic inequality in the past. Also, the establishment of Britain's Royal Commission on the Distribution of Income and Wealth provided a contribution to the issue approximately at the same time. From that time, research on the subject of inequality has been increased comprehensively. Besides income inequality, happiness is a notion that is found in the middle of people's lives because people care about it. However, the studies about perceived income inequality and happiness have not been proliferated yet although this concept is also important for individual happiness in the sense that people's perceptions to income inequality may shape their happiness level. Therefore, this study seeks to understand the impact of people's perceptions to income inequality on their happiness levels on its own way. Regarding the economic literature about perceived income inequality and happiness, this study will be divided into four chapters and there will also be subcategories of some of these chapters.

Structure of the Paper

In the first chapter, it will be mentioned about the definitions of perceived income distribution and perceived income inequality, and the notion of happiness. Definitions of perceived income distribution and perceived income inequality will be considered in section 1.1. After the definitions, methods of measurement of perceived income inequality and the lack of these methods, it will be informed about the concept of happiness in section 1.2. In the sub-sections of 1.2, it will be mentioned about the definitions of happiness from past to the present, the purpose of using happiness data, methods of measurement of happiness, determinants of happiness and determinants of happiness with regard to selected European countries, namely, Germany(The East and The West region of Germany will be examined dividedly.), Finland, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey, and finally scope and limits of happiness literature.

The literature about perceived income distribution and perceived income inequality will be reviewed in subsection 2.1 of the second chapter. In addition, it is important to look at the literature on the relationship between social characteristics and perceived happiness in section 2.2 because they provide an information about variables, which affect individual happiness in a society differently from perceived income inequality. Finally, in section 2.3, it will be considered the literature on the relationship between perceived income inequality and happiness through the limited available studies on the subject.

In the third chapter, it will be explained the methodology of this study. Theoretical framework of the study will be mentioned in section 3.1. It will strenghten the structure of this study by providing an insight into the model/ theory to use in order to get an answer to underresearched subject in this study. The nature of generalized ordered logit models will be explained in the subsection 3.1.1. In this way, readers might be acquainted with the model to use for the econometric method of the study. In the section 3.2, empirical analysis will be mentioned. Before this, scope and limits of data and model will be mentioned in section 3.2.1. ‘Scope and limits’ part is important in the sense that they provide an insight about the strength and blind sides of the study and make people think about possible alternative methods. In addition, pointing out the limitations of the subject studied is very important in the sense that it provides an opportunity to comprehend the obstacles and to reach a more concrete research outcomes in the next studies. Then, in section 3.2.2, data to use will be explained. In doing so, it is aimed to familiarize the econometric data, which is used to examine the relationship between income inequality and happiness. More specifically, dependent variable will be happiness in this study. Independent variables will be perceived income inequality, importance of leisure time, the frequency of attending to religious services, trust to the other people, perceived hardwork, and some socio-demographic variables such as sex, age, the highest educational level attained, scales of income, and marital status of people. Some of these variables will also be used to control the relationship between perceived income inequality and happiness. In this study, survey data will be used in order to mitigate the effects of lack of data in regard to happiness and the other social variables in Turkey. In section 3.2.3, expected outcomes will be mentioned. In section 3.2.4, empirical strategy of the study will be explained.

Then, empirical results will be explained in section 3.2.5, and in sub-section 3.2.5.1, obtained regression results by countries will be shared. In section 3.2.6, result comparisons between Turkey and the other European countries will be made. There will be a discussion part at the end of this chapter, in section 3.2.7.

Finally, the fourth chapter will be the conclusion part. Things, which were done during the study will be summarized. It will be again mentioned the importance of this study and why doing such study is important.

CHAPTER 1

1.1 PERCEIVED INCOME DISTRIBUTION and PERCEIVED INCOME INEQUALITY

1.1.1. How is Perceived Income Distribution Defined?

Perceived income distribution is explored to understand the effect of this concept on the reaction of people to redistributive policies(Cruces, Perez-Truglia and Tetaz, 2013). This notion is about the judgement of individuals on their own place of an income distribution scale. According to some studies, which will be mentioned in the literature review part, this perception may be biased due to some reasons.

1.1.2 How is Perceived Income Inequality Defined?

While objective income distribution is obtained from official data, perceived income distribution is obtained from individuals' perceptions to income distribution and from their placement on an income scale. In this sense, people have some beliefs (perceptions) about income inequality. This is known as perceived income inequality (Engelhardt and Wagener, 2014). Binelli et al. (2014) describe perceived income inequality as perceptions of people to the distribution of disposable income. The measurement of subjective approach to income inequality takes its source from the need of inquiry about people's opinions and the attempt to derive particular ways of measuring income inequality from these opinions (Amiel, 1998).

1.1.3 Methods of Measurement of Perceived Income Inequality

In the literature, there are some measurement methods used in order to grasp the extent of perceived income inequality. First, it can be simply asked people to give an evaluative judgment on the subject of their perceptions about income inequality through a question of the questionnaire study. Evaluative judgment refers to evaluate the degree of fairness in the income distribution. Second, it can be asked people to locate themselves on an income distribution scale in order to learn their positions in a society. After responses are aggregated on a country level (individual level), it is calculated a mean- to- median ratio for each country (individual), and then, these perceived mean – to – median ratios are divided by the objective mean – to – median ratios. Third and finally, it can be used perceptions of income distribution in order to calculate perceived income inequality. In this method, people again locate themselves on an income distribution scale. In this way, an average perception of income distribution is created and aggregated individual answers are placed into it. A pay- off value is assigned to each income class and then a standardized subjective Gini coefficient is measured based on it. It can also be calculated mean – to – median ratios as a measure of perceived income inequality. However, this measure may not change the relation between perceived income inequality and related variables. Based on a final approach, Schalembier uses a different method in order to calculate perceived income inequality. He alters pay- off values in the previous approach because he seeks to reach a more realistic society (2015). Another paper makes a study about the Amiel and Cowell method for understanding perceived income inequality. The paper also mentions about the questionnaire method of Amiel and Cowell and replicates their study in order to improve its methodology. For this purpose, respondents are invited to an interview in order to gain a better insight about their choices (Jancewicz, 2015). In another study, Amiel mentions about some significant methods of measuring income inequality. He distinguishes between two methods of measurement. According to him, the first method relies on individual welfare functions and the second one stresses basic axioms. Results of questions about opinions of individuals on the subject of their income level is important in the sense that they lead to an estimation of individual welfare functions through an estimated income scale, which varies from bad to excellent. This method includes questionnaires or interviews. In another method, students are used to respond the questionnaires or participate to the experiments. This method searches out people's agreements with the basic axioms of measurement of inequality. The basic axioms of income inequality measurement can be divided into two approaches: The first one is a direct approach and the second one is an indirect approach. Direct comparisons about income inequality levels can be made through the first approach while a social welfare function or ordering can be made through the second approach in order to evaluate different income distributions (1998).

1.1.4 The Lack of Methods of Measurement of Perceived Income Inequality and Solution Offers

Because perceived income inequality is obtained from questionnaires or surveys, perceptions of respondents of questionnaires (surveys) may be biased. In addition, if questions of any survey (questionnaire) are long and difficult, there will be some misunderstandings and inconsistencies while answering the questions. It is also important to limit the number of questions in the survey (questionnaire) because they may distract respondents. It should be paid attention about asking the repetitious questions because they are often unnecessary. Therefore, the survey (questionnaire) should be well- constructed. Bar charts can be used to present money distributions. A formal and abstract language may make the survey / questionnaire difficult to understand. Verbal questions can be used as a complement of the survey / questionnaire because they can shorten possible answers. It may be helpful if an option is added among the other options of the survey (questionnaire) such as “ I don’t know” or “ I don’t have an opinion”. Since the most of these solution offers are valid only in the case of making a survey (questionnaire) about perceived income inequality, the order of verbal and numeric questions are also important in the sense that it may make the comparisons about numerical and verbal questions easier. It may be helpful if verbal questions follow numerical ones, which are counterparts of verbal questions (Jancewicz, 2015). Amiel also considers about possible drawbacks such as the misunderstanding of questions, making mistakes in people’s own calculations or simply not answering the questions for some unknown reason (Amiel, 1998).

“*Happiness is the meaning and the purpose of life, the whole aim and end of human existence”.*

Aristotle

1.2 THE NOTION of HAPPINESS

Both of the studies mentioned in the ‘Introduction’ part are very important in the sense that they provide an understanding about global income inequality, and about how inequality has changed in some significant years. In addition, income inequality in OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development) countries is also an important issue specifically in terms of learning the extent of inequality in these countries and of applying some policy implications about it. Besides these studies, recently, the relationship between income inequality and happiness started to gain importance. More precisely, relevant people started to search about how income inequality affects individual happiness especially in a European or American society. In addition, which other (e.g. social) variables can affect people’s happiness both in Turkey and the other countries? How can the results of analysis be compared? According to the results of research, what may the policy implications be? In what way they can be suggested? These are the important questions asked and are required concrete justification for implications of their studies. Therefore, this chapter will be about the concept of happiness and some considerations of its literature. After that, it will be mentioned some approaches/studies about the relationship between perceived income inequality/the other social indicators and happiness of societies. The presence of such studies are also important in the sense that they can fill in the spaces, which come from the macroeconomic part of the literature, and can provide an awareness about solving social problems in order societies to be happier. These studies will also provide an information about the extent of effects of income inequality on happiness of people in a society or on a greater life satisfaction. Most importantly, do people's perceptions to income inequality matter when it comes to their happiness levels, if so, in what ways? Does perceived income inequality cause to a bitter unhappiness or do the other variables such as perceived leisure, perceived trust, frequency of attending to religious services, the highest educational level attained and some socio-demographic variables such as sex, age, marital status, employment status and perceived income (scales of income) impact on people's happiness more? The aim of this study is to explore this subject and understand the relationship between happiness and these variables considering differences between countries.

1.2.1 Various Definitions of Happiness

According to the World Happiness Report (2013), happiness can be defined at least in two ways. First of all, it can be defined as an emotion. 'Emotion' is related to being happy at a certain time, e.g. yesterday. Second, it can be defined as an evaluation. 'Evaluation' is related to being happy in life as a whole. To the report, people are very successful in the sense that they easily distinguish the two meanings of happiness. For instance, one of very poor people expresses that he / she is happy at a certain time, but he/she may express himself/ herself unhappy if life satisfaction as a whole come into the picture. The report's approach will be accepted as the basic definition of happiness in this study.

In addition, Graham traces various definitions of happiness and its meaning in her book. She explains that 'happiness', 'well-being', 'subjective well-being' and 'life satisfaction’ can be used interchangebly in the literature. However, psychologists differentiate these terms. For instance, in order to understand happy feelings of people about their own lives as a whole, some questions can be asked. Life satisfaction is also related with happiness but happiness can be thought as a more general term compared to life satisfaction because life satisfaction has a little bit more correlation with income if it is compared to happiness. Subjective well-being is the most comprehensive term among the other terms. It includes happiness, life satisfaction etc. on the subject of health, education, work etc. On the other side, happiness has also been an important subject for philosophers for years. Notion of “objective good” is referred to happiness especially by philosophers (2011). In “Discordant Definitions”- a chapter of Sissela Bok’s book, Aristotle’s approach to happiness is mentioned. According to him, happiness is “the highest human good”. To him, pleasures become different with regard to the quality and human action cannot be explained by only pleasure (Bok, 2010). Also, Graham explains Aristotelian and Benthamite approach to happiness in her book. According to Aristotelian approach, happiness is defined as an “opportunity to lead a fulfilling life”. According to the Bentham’s approach to happiness, it is a “contentment”. In addition, she mentions about Stoics’ approach to happiness. To this approach, happiness is considered as an emotional state, which endures over people’s entire lives. Epicurus attaches great importance to the pleasures, which are perceived through the senses such as food, music, etc. because things are good thanks to these pleasures. John Rawls adopts a different happiness approach. To him, happiness is both defined as pursuing a purposeful life and fulfilling this life (2011).

Because happiness had not been measured empirically, notion of happiness remained unclear. It can be said that apparent quality of life are indicated by happiness.

Veenhoven defines happiness as, with his own words, “the degree to which a person evaluates the overall quality of his present life – as - a whole positively” in his article which is named as “Advancing in Understanding Happiness” (Veenhoven 1997: 5). In addition, he mentions in his paper about the synonym of happiness, which is life-satisfaction. Different from happiness, life satisfaction reflects subjectivity (Veenhoven, 1997). According to the Stanford University’s website, although happiness is not sufficient for explaining well- being of a person, it is still important for well- being theories. The first reason of this is that happiness is an important part of well- being of a person. For instance, Sumner describes well- being, which inholds authentic happiness. This kind of happiness is autonomous and is informed. The second reason is that happiness can be at a central point of “family of two or more kinds of prudential value” (1996). More precisely, well- being theory will not be a unitary theory (Haybron, 2011). In this way, the place of happiness in well-being theory is explained.

1.2.2 Understanding the Purpose of Using Happiness Data

Relevant people use happiness data in several reasons. The first reason for using happiness data is to measure quality of life. Measuring quality of life is important in the sense that it provides relevant people information about whether there is any social problem in a society. In this way, government may offer a solution. This is called “policy intervention” (Veenhoven, 1997). The second reason for using happiness data is to monitor social progress. In monitoring social progress, it is understood that there is a positive relationship between happiness and quality of life. Easterlin’s (1974) analysis was about the development of happiness and economic growth in postwar decades in the United States. This study can be shown as an example for monitoring social progress at the national level. The third reason for using happiness data is to do policy evaluation. This can be used to improve the quality of life. The last reason for using happiness data is to make an identification of conditions for a good life. Identification is very important because ideas about conditions for a good life and ideas about a good society sometimes can be fallacious. For example, some people may not express themselves happy just because they have a proper house (Veenhoven, 1997).

1.2.3 On the Measurement of Happiness

The neoclassicals approach to the subject of the measurement of happiness with suspicion. In other words, they do not believe that happiness can be measured. Because they believed that deriving data from observed demand is a valid way to estimate this data properly, they concluded that cardinal- utility happiness functions are nonmeasurable. Therefore, they ignored the data, which came from interviews with people. Data, which comes from a questionnaire, survey, interviews etc. is an example of "stated preferences" and it is contrary to "revealed preferences" (Van Praag and Ferrer-i Carbonell, 2011). In order to measure happiness, survey research has carried out at first in the 1960s in the United States. The reason of this survey was to search about mental health. Gurin et. al (1960) and Bradburn (1969) published very important books about this issue. In those days, happiness revealed itself in the cross-national studies on "human concerns", which were studied by Cantril (1965) [Veenhoven, 1997]. At that time, discussions about the validity of survey questions and interviews on the subject of happiness came into the picture. During a long time, people had understood the measurement of happiness as an 'objective' and 'external' evaluation. However, it has been understood that measurement of happiness cannot be carried out in this way. It is most probable that happiness is not explained by physiological correlations or there are no apparent behaviours found with regard to happiness. Therefore, asking questions in a survey is the best method to explore happiness of people. In these surveys, one can ask people about their enjoyment of life as a whole. “Clinical interviews” or “common survey interviews” can be used as a tool for asking questions or “life- review questionnaries” can be prepared. The questions about happiness/life satisfaction can be asked directly or indirectly and they can be single or multiple. Single direct questions are most common types of survey interviews. Concerns about the validity of surveys are based on the thought that many people do not have any opinion about their happiness. However, Veenhoven argues that most people know whether they enjoy their life or not (Veenhoven, 1997). The other concern about surveys is that there may be systematic bias in people’s responses. The meaning of this bias is that people understand the questions very well but their responses are not correct because they apt to anwer this question as if they are really happy even if they are not. However, Veenhoven mentions that if people who report themselves as happy rather than unhappy are more than the people who report themselves as unhappy, it does not imply that there is an over- report of happiness. Despite the fact that such over-report of happiness may arise because of people’s perceptions of happiness, it is not impossible that the number of people who feel happy are more than the others. In addition, to Veenhoven, some people perceive unhappiness as a rule because they are like critical scientists. If people who are happy suffer from headaches and worry about life, this does not mean that they cause to a “response distortion”. There can be a balance between happiness and unhappiness. According to Veenhoven, these are the “ validity doubts ”. Also, he mentions about biases in appraisal and responses. They are called “ reliability doubts ”. Sissela Bok, who is the writer of ‘Exploring Happiness From Aristotle to Brain Science’ traces the path, which goes to the measurement of happiness in the fifth chapter of her book. According to the book, social scientists claim that they find some methods for measuring happiness in quantitative terms by using " testable hypotheses". Then, she mentions about some studies, which were done by various philosophers in order to measure happiness. The first one was carried out by Jeremy Bentham, who was a jurist and also a philosopher. He invented a measurement method that was called "Felicific Calculus" in order to measure happiness. According to Bentham, the notions such as "benefit, advantage, pleasure, good or happiness" were the same like the notions "mischief, pain, evil or unhappiness". Therefore, Bentham saw the measurement of these notions as the matter of "account and calculation, of profit and loss, just as [for] money" (Bok 2010: 85). He thought that the only necessary thing was to compute the value of each possible pleasure or pain of an individual in order to measure its "intensity", "duration", the "certainty or uncertainty", "propinquity and remoteness", "fecundity", and its "purity" . Bentham states that courage is important in the sense that it helps people to make use of their own understanding and it is also necessary for human happiness. During his life, Bentham defended his felicific calculus and its usefulness. To him, his calculus enabled to greater specificity in terms of measurement than the methods of various predecessors. After a while, he accepted that the term 'happiness' made summing up pleasures and pains difficult. Bok also mentions about John Stuart Mill's approach to the measurement of happiness in her book. Mill took into consideration the effects of poetry on the subject of happiness different from Bentham (Bok, 2010). He still accepted Bentham's 'Greatest Happiness Principle' because he thought that this principle was still the basis of morals. Also, he totally agreed that quantitative methods such as arithmetic help to evaluate happiness. However, he thought that Bentham's calculus was not well-developed in order to measure happiness. Therefore, different from Bentham, he took into consideration the qualitative differences of pleasure forms. For instance, he considered the pleasure from reading, using the power of imagination, carrying on an intimate relationships. In this way, Mill departed from the central claim of Bentham, which was about the simplicity of carrying out of the calculus "for unlearned as well as philosophers" and he accepted the approach of Aristotle. To Aristotle, qualifications of people were not the same in terms of measuring happiness. The other person who was interested in happiness was Francis Edgeworth, who was a lawyer and also a political economist. He was one of the promoters of the Greatest Happiness Principle. However, his thoughts were different than those of Bentham and Mill. For this reason, his purpose was to make some correction on their conclusions and create strong and certain 'hedonic calculus' whose function was to lead to choices about morality, politics and legality. He disapproved the notion of "greatest happiness of the greatest number". He also claimed that comparison in the estimates of quantities of pleasure is possible without using any numbers. According to him, anyone can make a quantitative calculation of a pleasure at a certain time and then can compute "just perceivable increments" to the calculation of pleasure. To him, these pleasure units could only be inferred, but 'greater number of measurements' would compensate for this uncertainty in the calculations. He assumed that increments, which were experienced by any sentient had the same value but he also believed that every people have different capacities in terms of reflecting pleasure. He mentioned that people who have the greatest capacity with regard to happiness has a priority. Therefore, he disagreed with Mill's approach, which accepted the requirement for equality of people's capacities in the Greatest Happiness Principle. He believed that people have different capacities with regard to sexes, education, wealth, etc. He mentioned about a metaphor of a ‘ hedonimeter ’, which is a ‘psychophysical machine’ in order to show how quantitative estimation will take shape in the future. This machine can calculate ‘ units of happiness ’ as precise as possible (Bok, 2010).

In addition, Daniel Kahneman, who is a psychologist and also a winner of Nobel Prize in economics, mentions about the U- Index in measuring well-being of a society in his paper that is called “Developments in the Measurement of Subjective Well- being”. After collecting the survey data, psychologists use the U-Index in order to handle the problem about people’s self- descriptions in a survey. More precisely, responses to question may differ with respect to the characteristics of people. The question is generally asked as follows: “All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?” A person may respond to a survey question as “very satisfied” while the other person respond the same question as “satisfied”. This situation is, of course, possible. However, the only thing one should be aware of is that whether the first person does really feel more satisfied than the other one. This self- description of the first person may take its source from, using superlatives in contrast to the first person. On the other hand, the second person may be using these types of superlatives rarely while describing himself/ herself. There are some steps in order to compute U- Index. The first step is to determine the episode as pleasant or unpleasant. The second one is to describe U-Index as the fraction of time, which is spent in an unpleasant condition. According to calculations of the U-Index, states of each individuals can be learnt. He also mentions the importance of time use in measuring subjective well- being. Then, he points out that national well-being index is one of developments in measuring it (Kahneman and Krueger, 2006).

Richard Easterlin also points out the subject of measurement of happiness in his paper. He mentions two types of data in measuring happiness. The first one is based on responses to a survey. This survey is similar to the Gallup Poll survey. The second type of data is based on the Cantril's (1965) study, which was about people's emotions such as fears, hopes, and happiness. This study involves 14 countries. Cantril invented a technique, which was called "Self- Anchoring Striving Scale". According to this scale, the numbers were ranged from zero (0) to ten (10). 0 represents "the worst possible life" and 10 represents "the best possible life". Current evaluations of past and expected personal status were taken into consideration in the Cantril's study (Easterlin, 1974).

Yemişcigil and Dolan mention about two methods of subjective well-being measurement. These are "Experience Sampling Method" and "Day Reconstruction Method". In "Experience Sampling Method", interviewers ask participants randomly throughout the day about what they had been doing and how they had been feeling in a last one hour. In "Day Reconstruction Method", respondents cut into sections their previous days so far as committed activities and as time spent for these activities. Despite the fact that evaluations based on memory destroy credibility, still, "Day Reconstruction Method" can be used because it interrupts daily life less than "Experience Sampling Method". The other frequently used method for subjective well-being measurement is to ask individuals about how they felt yesterday or nowadays. These questions can be categorized as a mixture of both measurements based on experience and evaluations. Because they can be measured with only one question, such questions can be easily adopted to large –scaled questionnaires. Therefore, OECD advocates for "pridian" questions in order them to be integrated in national surveys (Yemişcigil and Dolan, 2015).

Delhey and Kroll (2012) argue that whether new measures of national well-being are better at predicting people's quality of life than GDP. GDP is criticized because it is assumed that it provides a narrow scope for the measurement of people's quality of life. After they mention several new measures of well-being, which are named as Human Development Index (HDI), Inequality- Adjusted Human Development Index (I-HDI), OECD Better Life Index, The Index of Social Progress (WISP), Well-Being Index (WBI), and Social Development Index (SDI), they claim that the performance of new quality of life measures is not better than Gross National Income (GNI) except the performance of Better Life Index. He finds correlation between better life index and well-being as 0.67, which is a highly significant percent. The performance between other quality of life measures and well-being is not better than the performance of GDP (Delhey and Kroll, 2012).

1.2.4 Determinants of Happiness

Tracing and finding determinants of happiness are really important in the sense that it provides a path to people in a society in order to reach happiness. More precisely, they make people understand about what they feel or why they feel in that way. The first determinant that affects people's happiness is life chances. At the macro level, happiness is affected by the quality of society because happiness varies from nations to nations. Wealth is also a determinant of happiness. If it increases, so will happiness of people. Poor nations felt the curvilinear relationship with purchasing power more prominently than rich nations. To Veenhoven, the frontier is 20.000$. When this frontier exceeded, the regression line become flat and diminishing returns come into the picture. Secure countries have higher happiness level than insecure ones. According to Veenhoven's study, the relationship with feeling of physical safety and legal security is independent from economic affluence of a society. There is a weak relationship with social security, which is provided by the state, and according to the study, this relationship does not exist if the affluence of a society is controlled. Autonomy is the other determinant of happiness. Happiness level is high in the places where autonomy exists. It is found that the relationship with political freedom is very strong but the relationship with personal freedom is not very strong. However, the correlation is still positive. Perceived freedom affects the relationship positively. Thus, it can be understood that the relationship with perceived freedom is fairly high. In order to fight against injustice and assault, political freedom is very important and it affects happiness of people. Personal freedom is also important in the sense that it enables individuals to choose life styles they want. To Veenhoven's study, the correlation is not strong between income inequality and happiness. However, social inequality such as "gender inequality" and "the absence of class inequality" has to do with happiness of people. Gender inequality affects individual happiness negatively. He also adds that some kinds of inequality may affect happiness positively and this can also be searched for income inequality case. Education and information also affect happiness of people positively. To the Veenhoven's study, the relationship with education and information cannot be thought independent from economic wealth. It is still not very accurate that how knowledge influences happiness. In other words, there are no exact findings about the relationship between knowledge and happiness. Veenhoven also mentions about the religion and its positive effect on happiness in his paper. "Belief in God" affects happiness of people positively. Religious participation does not affect happiness in a similar manner according to him. To the study, people tend to be happier in the countries where individualism exists and authoritarianism is not accepted. People also tend to be happier in countries where tolerance exists. Prejudice harms happiness. There is no strong link between happiness and trust but it has still a positive correlation between them. According to the studies, people are happier in countries where unemployment rates are very high. "Social participation" has become a contradictory area in order to decide whether there is a meaningful relationship with happiness. However, there can be a more meaningful relationship with membership in voluntary organizations. The study also indicates that peace in a country affects people positively. However, militarism affects them negatively. These relationships are independent from economic affluence. According to the Veenhoven's study, there is no correlation between happiness and population density/population growth. If people live in a modern world, they tend to be happier than the other ones. In addition, some situations such as discrepancies of social status, age, gender, income, and education influence happiness of a society with regard to individual level. Also, if people have intimate relations and social ties, they tend to be happier compared to the other people who have not these kinds of relationships (Veenhoven, 1997). Similar to Veenhoven, Richard Layard, who is a labour economist at London School of Economics and interested in economics of happiness, points out seven factors that influence happiness of a society in his paper, which is called ' Has Social Science a Clue? What would Make a Happier Society? ' These factors are income, work, private life, community, health, freedom and a philosophy of life (2003). Easterlin is an economist, who is interested earlier in happiness research. To him, his study (1974) was the first attempt to look at the actual evidence of happiness. Therefore, his paper has an important place in happiness literature, and also is one of the most cited article. The main concern of his paper was the income-happiness relationship. He searched the concept and measurement methods of happiness, and then made some comparisons. He found a positive correlation between income and happiness as a result of within- country comparisons. According to this result, people who were at the highest income group were happier than people who were at the lowest income group. This correlation was not clear for among countries. To his study, national time series studies presented the evidence that there had been no association of higher income and greater happiness in the United States. A very weak association was found between income and happiness as a result of national comparisons between countries and over time. Because of this reason, he offered the Duesenberry- type model. This model involves 'relative status considerations'. Such considerations are very important in terms of determining happiness. In addition, data does not indicate the presence of a relationship between international differences of happiness and inequality. He remarks that it is necessary to do more research on people's judgements about their own definitions of happiness, and on effects of social forces in order to present a consistent public policy (Easterlin, 1974). Besides this general information above, the subject will be reviewed considering selected countries separately below.

1.2.5 Determinants of Happiness in Selected Countries

Based on the third and the fifth wave of the World Values Survey, Turkey will be compared to some European countries, which will be mentioned briefly due to their determinants of happiness level below. The reason why these countries have been chosen is that it will be aimed making a balanced analysis because there were some drawbacks about finding appropriate data to use and making a clear comparison with regard to Turkey. In other words, methodological reasons forced us to choose these countries.

1.2.5.1 Germany[2]

Jacquemond (2012) explores the relationship between happiness and inequality in Germany. He is interested in the material determinant (actual income inequality) of happiness, which can be calculated through Gini coefficients like numerous studies in the literature. He used GSOEP (German Socio Economic Panel) data, which includes both East and West Germany data, separately. Because East German residents moves to the West side of the country between 1991 and 2006, The West Germany sample takes a larger place in the total sample compared to the East German sample. He refers to Blanchflower and Oswald (2008) on the subject of lower life satisfaction in Germany over the years compared to Nordic European countries such as Denmark and Netherlands. In addition, despite the fact that income has been increasing over the years in Germany, life satisfaction has been going in opposite direction. Unemployment has also been an important predictor of life satisfaction in East and West Germany over the years. According to the results, between the years 2005 and 2009, income rank had been an important determinant of life satisfaction in both East and West Germany. At this point, it is important to mention that East Germans have not very much affected by changes in income rank. Instead, they have affected by changes in income rank across different individuals. To the article, the reason of changes in income rank in Germany can be explained by Germany's recent developments in political and social history. Noll and Weick explore the subjective well-being in Germany by focusing correlates and determinants of well-being (Noll and Weick 2010: 69). They mention that Germany has a long tradition on the subject of measuring and reporting subjective well- being, but these subjects were not taken into consideration as a priority in political debate of

[2] Germany will be examined considering its east and the west region in this study. Therefore, this part will consist the information, which is about both the East and the West region of Germany.

Germany. Before they explain e subjective well-being of Germany, they inform readers about welfare- regime type of Germany and its quality of life conditions. The conservative welfare regime type is assumed as the adopted regime type in Germany. State has an active role in this regime type. Therefore, market and family has a less important role. Insurance systems facilitate people of the country to utilise welfare state benefits. Consequently, this system is assumed to "preserve inequalities", which are based on the class and status. Germany faced with some economic difficulties such as unemployment and slow growth rate after the reunification of the East and the West side of the country. In 1991, West Germany's unemployment rate was 6.2%, however, this percent increased to 11 in 2005. The unemployment rate of East Germany was 10.2% in 1991, and was 20.6% in 2005. After welfare system was improved, the unemployment rate decreased to 7.2% in West Germany, and 14.7 in East Germany in 2008 (Noll and Weick 2010: 70). Noll and Weick also mention about the demographic change of Germany. According to the information given, East Germany has a faster ageing compared to West Germany. In 1990, the population percentage of 66 years and older was 15 (%) in West Germany. This percentage increased to 20 (%) in 2007. East Germany's percent was 14(%) in 1990, and 22(%) in 2007. Therefore, East and West Germany differ from each other due to these difficulties(Noll and Weick 2010: 70-71). According to Noll and Weick, region, gender, marital status, education level, main activity, income, religious denomination, feeling of safety and social capital have an impact on subjective well-being of Germany. According to bivariate correlation, happiness and satisfaction level of West Germans are higher than those of East Germans. If happiness is taken into consideration, difference is lower but it is higher when it comes to life satisfaction with democracy. To Noll and Weick, there is no much difference between men and women in Germany on the subject of well- being level. In other words, difference between sexes is not significant. Similarly, there is no significant difference between couples who are married and those who are not married but live together on the subject of well-being. There is a positive but weak correlation between education level and happiness/life satisfaction/satisfaction with standard of living in Germany. There is a negative association between unemployment and subjective well-being of people. When it comes to the income effect from a cross sectional perspective of a single society, there is a strong positive relationship between equivalised household income and subjective well-being in Germany. If relative income is high, then subjective well-being of individuals will also be higher. This correlation is very strong for satisfaction with standard of living. Life satisfaction follows it. In Germany, there is a positive relationship between religious denomination and subjective well-being. However, German data does not reveal any difference between subjective well-being of Catholics and Protestants. There is a positive association between feeling of safety and subjective well-being of people in Germany. Finally, if an individual does not interact with life and his/ her friends, then he/she is more unhappy than those who have more interaction with their friends, etc.(Noll and Weick 2010: 77- 78- 80).

1.2.5.2 Finland

Böckerman and Ilmakunnas explore the effect of unemployment on happiness of the Finns (2005). They use cross- section data for the years 1990, 1996, 2000 from the World Values Survey. According to their results, if national unemployment rate increases unprecedentedly, this does not produce a decrease in the mean subjective well-being of the Finns. However, if one experiences unemployment personally, this reduces the level of subjective well-being. It is important to note that ordered logit estimation does not give a significant relationship between unemployment and happiness. Besides ordered logit model, if generalized ordered logit is used, it shows the negative effect of unemployment on happiness if one has lower level of happiness. People who have higher level of happiness are not impacted by the effects of unemployment. To the study, Finnish females have not higher level of happiness than Finnish males. There is a U-shaped relationship between happiness/life satisfaction and age. If education level increases, happiness/ life satisfaction also increases. There is a positive relationship between marriage and happiness. Belief in God increases the level of happiness and of life satisfaction. According to the study, part – time workers have lower level of life- satisfaction. Housewives and managers have higher level of happiness. Happiness and life- satisfaction levels are higher in 1996 and 2000 compared to the year 1990. Another study explores the happiness of university students in Finland. Three important questions are asked to the students during the research. These are: “Overall, I am happy with my university life.”, “Overall, university life has been good for me.”, and finally “Overall, I am happy with my life”. According to the results, university students are really happy with 87 percent. They are also happy with their university lives with 86.6 percent. At this point, it is also important to mention determinants of students’ happiness. These are social relations, quality of study resources, and some leisure activities. According to these determinants, people who have good social relations with other people, and have an access to good study resources are happier than those who have not. In addition, if one spends too much time on leisure activities, this prevents him/her from studying. This reduces satisfaction level of the students (Hirvonen and Mangeloja, 2006). This may stem from the fact that the students have been getting away from their future goals. Brulè and Veenhoven (2014) explore the impact of freedom on happiness level of individuals in Finland in comparison to that of France. According to the study, although their GDP levels are similar to each other, people who live in Finland are happier than those in France. They claim that freedom (social, potential and psychological) makes a difference on happiness levels of Finns.

1.2.5.3 Norway

Hellevik (2003) explores the Norwegian's level of happiness based upon the arguments of Easterlin Paradox. The aim of this paper is to understand incompatible relationship between increasing income and stable or somehow decreasing happiness level in Norway between the years 1985 and 2001. Hellevik explains this relationship by value orientation in the first instance. This means Norwegians tended to give great importance to income and the other material possessions and this situation caused to an adverse effect on happiness. Besides this explanation, it is important to touch on the other issues, which are mentioned and discussed by the author. These are the lack of validity of happiness measures (methodological issues), stable personality traits (the belief that happiness should not be changed over time), the belief that the presence of little importance of the objective or subjective economic situations on people's happiness. The other explanation is as follows: Even if objective economic situation improves, people may not realize their economic situation or the decreasing effect of economic variables on happiness may affect the impact of positive progress on the economic variables. Finally, after he rejects these explanations for decreasing/ stable happiness, he expresses an opinion about it. According to him, it is possible that relativity for the trends of economic conditions matters on the subject of determinant of happiness level. For instance, people's relative judgments about their income level may not be as positive as improvements in their actual income. This opinion is confirmed by Norwegians' stable perceptions about their positions.

1.2.5.4 Spain

Cunădo and Pèrez de Gracia (2011) consider the relationship between education and happiness using Spain's individual data from the European Social Survey. They examine the relationship using Ordinal Logit Model. According to their results, education has a direct and indirect effect on happiness. Indirect effect could be understood by looking at income and labor status. To this result, if people get a higher education level, then they will earn higher income compared to those who do not get and they will more likely find a job. Therefore, their happiness level will be high. After that, they control this relationship by income, labor status and other socio- economic variables and find that there is a positive and direct effect of education on happiness. They attribute this result to people's "self-confidence" or "self- estimation" effect because people can obtain information through education. In addition, they claim that there is no relationship between the direct impact of education on happiness and the level of education such as primary, secondary or tertiary. In another study, Pedersen and Schmidt (2009) explore the differences of countries on the subject of determinants of subjective well-being. According to the 7^{th} wave of European Household Community Panel, Southern European countries including Spain have the lowest level of well-being. In addition, using a demographic variables, a gender dummy, they find that there is a significantly negative relationship between a female dummy and happiness in Spain.

1.2.5.5 Sweden

Gerdtham and Johannesson (1997) consider the impact of some socio- economic variables and health on happiness using Swedish micro-data. They examine the relationship by using ordered probit model. According to their results, income and education both have a positive effect on happiness. However, unemployment, urbanisation, being single and male gender have a negative effect on happiness. They found a U- shaped relationship between age and happiness. Happiness is at the lowest level between the ages 45-64. Fors (2010) explores life satisfaction in Sweden from a comparative perspective. He uses the 3rd wave of the European Social Survey data and 17 European countries are included in the analysis. Ordinary least squares method is used to examine the relationship (Fors 2010: 126). According to the results, there is no significant difference between marital status of European people and of Swedish people and life satisfaction of them. The impact of having children on life satisfaction of people is negative in Europe, but in Sweden, it is not found any impact of having children on life satisfaction. There is no any difference between sexes in Sweden and the other European countries in terms of life satisfaction. The impact of unemployment on life satisfaction is both negative in Europe and Sweden. On the other hand, retired people have a lower life satisfaction compared to those who have a job. Religious participation has a positive impact on life satisfaction of both European and Swedish people. In Europe, there is a positive relationship between volunteering and life satisfaction but the same relationship cannot be found in Sweden. Friendship has a positive impact on life satisfaction in both Europe and Sweden. However, seeing friends regularly has a stronger impact on life satisfaction in Europe than that of Sweden. Educational level has a positive impact on life satisfaction in Europe. This impact is not valid for Sweden. In Sweden, there is a negative relationship between educational level and life satisfaction. Being an immigrant has a negative impact on life satisfaction of both European and Swedish people (Fors 2010: 127-128).

1.2.5.6 Switzerland

Krause (2010) examines the impact of unemployment on life satisfaction in Switzerland considering differences in cultures, which exist in the country using the 2000-2007 waves of the Swiss Household Panel data. According to her results, there is a significant negative relationship between individual unemployment and life satisfaction. She does not find any interregional difference in Switzerland. To the study, men who are from the non-German speaking part of the country are impacted more by the deteriorating effect of unemployment. There is also a negative relationship between satisfaction with the financial situation and unemployment. Still, there is a positive impact of unemployment on satisfaction with free time. Depression affects Swiss Germans more, independently of their gender. She cannot find any relation between unemployment and other health issues. Stutzer (2003) explores the relationship between absolute income, consumption and individual well-being based on a survey data, which is collected from the residents of Switzerland. The study also explores the impact of individual income aspirations on subjective well- being. According to the results, if one has higher income aspirations, his/her well-being(utility) will decrease. To the article, this situation stems from the positive relationship between income and aspirations. In addition, people who have higher income than the others are happier than those who have relatively low income. This result is at odds with the neo-classical economics thought because this thought gives importance to the impact of absolute income on utility (2003). Bjørnskov (2003) explores determinants of happiness in five Nordic countries and the Netherlands together with Switzerland using the data, which is based on the World Values Survey. According to his findings, social capital – generalized trust- is an important determinant of nations' happiness. Switzerland has an advanced level of social capital. This leads the country to the higher level of happiness.

1.2.5.7 Turkey

Caner (2015) searches determinants of happiness in Turkey. She uses comparison effects such as income that are relative to the other people's income and relative to people's own past income in order to understand the determinants of happiness and expectations related to people's own future income. She also uses cross sectional data, which is found from Turkish surveys between the years 2003- 2011. According to the results of research, income comparisons and expectations related to future income both have a positive impact on the level of happiness. There is an asymmetric relation between comparisons/expectations and happiness. There is no consistency between the findings of research and the literature in the sense that the finding of research indicates that people who live in Turkey do not expect higher income because the estimated effect is not very much high. In addition, there is a business cycle effect in terms of the effects of comparisons and expectations. To the research, Turkish people are much more interested in their relative position in the society rather than thinking it is important to have higher income in the future. In her another study, Caner (2015) examines the factors, which determine happiness and life satisfaction in Turkey in recent years based on 2007-2011 data of the World Values Survey. She concludes that some of the determinants of happiness depend on the period of time, control variables and the sample used. On the other hand, findings of other determinants are consistent with the literature, which are written earlier. According to her article, unemployment status, marital status, relative income and gender are found to be similar to the earlier research in the literature. However, age, absolute income and education are found to be different from the literature. Kangal

(2013) makes an assessment on the concept of happiness/subjective well- being and determinants of it based on a literature review and also aims to find a happiness profile of Turkish households by using the Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK) 2004-2010 Life Satisfaction Survey data. In the study; age, gender, education level, income and personality are considered as factors that affect the level of subjective well- being. According to the results, women are happier than men. Age does not give a consistent result in terms of determining the happiness level of Turkish household. For instance, Kangal refers to Selim's paper (2008) in order to give an example about the negative effect of age on people's happiness in Turkey. According to the study, older people are less happy than younger ones. Bülbül and Giray (2011) are also referred to show the positive relationship between education level and happiness in Turkey. People who graduated from a university are more happy than people who graduated from elementary school and high school. Married people are also more happy than divorced, widowed and single people. There is no distinct difference between genders in terms of happiness level. Eren and Aşıcı (2015) make a study about changes in people's subjective well-being and happiness as well as their changing determinants between the years 2004- 2013. They use Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜRKSTAT) data. According to the preliminary results, happiness does not increase with income over time in Turkey. It is constant although real income significantly increases. This situation is consistent with Easterlin's findings, which are mentioned in the literature about happiness- income paradox. After people's basic requirements are met through a significant income level ($10000), happiness, freedom and justice gain importance. Köksal and Şahin (2015) explore the relationship between income and happiness considering the impact of income comparisons (relative income) on happiness. They study with 2012 Turkish

Statistical Institute data. According to the hierarchical regression analysis, which is used to understand the main and interaction effects of income and income comparisons on happiness, if people perceive their welfare as higher than others, their happiness is not affected by income as before (2015). Dumludağ et al. (2016) explore the relationship between income comparisons and life satisfaction in Turkey. Using ordered logit model based on the "Life Satisfaction Survey" data from TÜİK, they find a significant relationship between the variables. In other words, it is seen that life satisfaction in Turkey is impacted by most of the income comparison, interaction variables and socio-economic variables. According to their findings, there is a relationship between income comparisons and reference group's life satisfaction levels in Turkey. Kaya (2016) explores the impact of the attendance of college students to leisure activities and the impact of leisure satisfaction levels of these college students on their happiness levels in Turkey. Based on the Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS), Godin Leisure Time Exercise Questionnaire (LTEQ) and Oxford Happiness Scale (QHS), descriptive statistical techniques, t-test, MANOVA[3], ANOVA, and Pearson Correlation are used in order to find the relationship in this study. According to his findings, leisure satisfaction has a positive impact on college students' levels of happiness.

1.2.6 Scope and Limits of Happiness Literature

In the literature, it can be seen that various disciplines such as psychology, philosophy, and economics are interested in the subject of happiness, itself, and its determinants. These studies involve the meaning of happiness, pursuit of it, the

[3] MANOVA is an abbreviation for Multivariate Analysis of Variance. French et al.(2008) explains MANOVA as a method, which is comparable to the ANOVA technique, but they are different in the sense that MANOVA makes an analysis with several dependent variables. In other words, while ANOVA looks at the mean differences between two or more groups, MANOVA looks at the difference in two or more vectors of means.

question about which things make us happy, and thus, they give a different point of view about the subject. This literature has some challenges although it has strengths. One of the most important methodological challenges in the happiness literature that Graham (2011) mentioned is the bias of individuals' answers for the surveys. More precisely, individuals answer the surveys according to their characteristics, expectations, or countries they live in. This situation makes comparison of (for instance) two different individual's response harder because one of them may be happy because he/she may be a "destitute peasant" who lives in a rural area, and has lower expectations or has a cheerful characteristics, and the wealthy one may say that he/she is unhappy because he/ she has high expectations or has a bad-tempered characteristics. It is also important to clarify that what happiness do we explore: Is it "happiness per se" or "the pursuit of happiness"? (Graham, 2011). Nevertheless, Graham mentions that determinants of happiness can be explored in keeping with large samples of cross-section data. In this way, it can be reached consistent findings. Besides this study, Maffioletti, Maida and Scacciati (2014) explore the terminological and methodological problems of measuring happiness. As for the terminological challenges of the happiness literature, they consider whether the notions of happiness, life satisfaction and well-being are used interchangeably. If they are not used interchangeably, the authors ask about the presence of the other factors, which determine different self-evaluations of respondents in the surveys. In addition, according to them, it is also important to be sure about the word (happiness, life satisfaction or well-being) in the sense that researchers use it in the same meaning and respondents understand it in the same way as researchers mean. According to Maffioletti et al., translation is very important in understanding the true meaning for the countries, which do not speak English as their native language.

Besides these issues, there are also some methodological challenges such as using cardinal values for the answers in the surveys while questions asked in the surveys have a numeric scale. Even if this issue is laid away, some challenges still exist. For example, it is important to know that whether the respondent answers by thinking about the numbers or he/she responds to a verbal scale such as “Very Happy” or “Not at All Happy”. According to the authors, the quality of scales has also an important place on the subject. More precisely, ordering the degree of happiness may cause to a difference among the responses. How is it known that the respondents answer in the same way if the degree of happiness goes from “very unhappy” to “very happy” or from “not at all happy” to “very happy”? They also argue that the verbal scales should be bipolar in order to resolve the ambiguity of unipolar scales, and using negative numbers in these scales is very important because they indicate unhappiness. To them, a numerical scale is reliable when an answer in a verbal scale corresponds to the answer given in a numerical scale. Finally, they challenge the notion of self- valuation. In other words, they argue about respondents’ self valuations in the sense of their subjective nature in public decision making in order to improve any society’s happiness. Can any objective factor be more helpful to the public policies on the subject of improving happiness of a society than a subjective one? Therefore, they offer a mixed solution, which involves both subjective and objective factors on the subject of advancing society in terms of their happiness, life-satisfaction or well-being.

“ There are things known and there are things unknown, and in between are the doors of perception.”

Aldous Huxley

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Individuals’ perceptions about inequalities are an important subject to explore because people’s attitudes and behaviours are changed by these perceptions. In addition, people’s perceptions about inequalities and decision about civic and political participation are strongly correlated each other. Also, perceptions about income inequality and its social effects are interrrelated. When “perceived inequalities” are expressed, it can be understood educational inequality, social inequality, income inequality, gender inequality etc. (Han, Janmaat, Hoskins and Green, 2012). It will be interested in perceived income inequalities in this part. There may be various reasons of income inequalities, namely, “social class”, “ethnicity”, “gender”, “wealth” and “rural-urban divide”(Han et al., 2012: 13).

2.1 Studies about Perceived Income Distribution and Perceived Income Inequality

Although perceived income inequality is a relatively new area for research, there are some studies about this subject. The reason of studying about people’s perceptions about income inequality as a measurement method may be the studies, which show the lack of power of assumptions of actual inequality measures such as Gini index, Theil measure, Atkinson index etc. One of these studies is Amiel and Cowell’s study

(Jancewicz,2015). Medgyesi (2013) searches for the answer of this question: Are opinions or valuations of income inequality responsive to differences and changes in inequality? Using World Values Survey data, this paper explores the theoretical accounts of attitudes toward income inequality. The paper also searches different opinions about income inequality between post-socialist countries and market economies. At the end of the research, paper claims that there is a convergence on the subject of attitudes toward income inequality between post- socialist countries and market economies. In other words, when inequality (Gini coefficient) increases, discontent with inequality also increases in both countries. Engelhardt and Wagener (2014) mention about Meltzer- Richard hypothesis (henceforward MR hypothesis) and Prospect of Upward Mobility (POUM) hypothesis on the subject of perceived income inequality. According to these hypotheses, there is a positive relationship between perceived income inequality and perceived upward mobility and the extent of redistribution in democratic countries. However, this relationship cannot be found when measuring income inequality and social mobility in objective terms. In other words, MR hypothesis states that if income inequality gets larger, this leads to greater redistribution policies in democracies. However, POUM hypothesis mentions that if people have incomes, which are below average income levels, then they might not support redistribution policies because they think that in the future, they may become richer than now and progressive tax system may hurt them. According to Engelhardt and Wagener, the impact of perceptions about income inequality and social mobility on preferences and choices is higher than facts and actual data. According to some evidence, there are erroneous beliefs on the subject of income inequality among individuals. They underestimate the extent of income inequality and they think that they are relatively richer than the others, although they are not richer than them in reality. This means that their perceptions are biased. These misperceptions may differ across countries. Keller et al. (2010) probe values and norms on the subject of income inequality because they are important in the sense that they provide a determination of pre-tax incomes and the extent of redistribution. Using 2009 Special Eurobarometer data on the subject of poverty and social exclusion, they make a country level analysis in order to find a relationship between measured levels of inequality and inequality tolerance redistributive preference. According to their findings, European Union (EU) countries are different in terms of their attitudes toward income inequality. Inequality tolerance can be used as a proxy for perceived income inequality. Measured income inequality indicators and income inequality tolerance do not always correspond to each other. The paper also mentions that general political attitudes and subjective evaluation of the personal situation of respondents of the survey impact on attitudes to income inequality on a personal level. Socio- economic factors such as education and labour market are not as effective as political attitudes and the subjective evaluation of the personal situation of the respondents. Tóth and Keller (2011) examine the relationship between redistributive preferences and income inequality perceptions at the country level in their paper. Their study involves European countries. According to their findings, The Czech Republic, Denmark, United Kingdom and the Netherlands have lower level of redistributive preferences compared to the average level. On the other hand, Greece, Hungary and Cyprus have higher levels of redistributive preferences compared to the average. Gimpelson and Treisman (2015) claim that according to large, cross- national surveys, people have a little information about income distribution (inequality) despite the studies, which assume that people understand the extent of income inequality quite well, know about its changing patterns, and put themselves in the income distribution properly. Because of this reason, studies mention that there is a positive relationship between income inequality and redistribution preferences in democracies, and negative relationship between income inequality and democratization. In other words, if income inequality gets higher, then, the demand for income redistribution will be higher, too. However, Gimpelson and Treisman claim that there is no relationship between actual income inequality and redistribution preferences but there is a relationship between perceived income inequality and preferences for redistribution. Niehues takes cognizance of the views on income inequality and redistributive preferences because they are important in the sense that they are helpful designing tax and transfer systems. For instance, income distribution is very similar in Germany, France and Switzerland. However, perceptions about income differences in these countries become varied. It is seen that the actual income distributions and subjective evaluations of income differentials are independent of each other. In other words, there is almost no link between these two variables. According to the article, many countries assume that there is less equality than it really is. In addition, according to her findings, perceived income inequality impacts on redistributive preferences more than the actual income inequality (2014). Cruces et al. (2013) also mention about the relationship between perceived income inequality and redistribution preferences. According to the article, people form biased perceptions on the subject of their relative places in the income distribution. The evidence of this finding is a tailored household survey. Cruces et al. claim that people who had overestimated their relative position in the income distribution demanded more redistribution, when they learnt their actual position in the income distribution. According to the article, this finding is an alternative for POUM (Prospect of Upward Mobility) hypothesis. Osberg and Smeeding (2006) probe different perceptions of American people to income earnings compared to the other countries. Using ISSP (International Social Survey Program), they also aim to find attitudes in comparisons between countries on the subject of what people should earn. According to their findings, estimated differences in earnings of people who are from different occupational status are much smaller than actual differences in earnings of people. This leads to an underestimation of income inequality. Ebert and Welsch (2009) make a research about the evaluation of income distributions of Europeans. This research is based on happiness surveys. They use social welfare function in order to estimate the extent and characteristics of inequality aversion of Europeans. Subjective well- being is used as an empirical measure of welfare and they examine the relationship between subjective well- being and average income. In this way, their purpose is to estimate how income inequality is measured by subjective well- being. They use Gini and Atkinson index as measurement methods, and logit regressions. In this paper, it is important to obtain information about which measurement method is appropriate as a representation of the welfare function. At the end of the research, they decide that Gini coefficient, Atkinson 0.5 and 1.0 measures are not very good at the subject of reflecting evaluation of income distributions of Europeans. According to their study, appropriate inequality measures are more inequality averse than these conventional inequality measurement methods (2009). At this point, it is important to mention about De Maio's study (2007) about the lack of some income inequality measures. For instance, he expresses that the main weakness of Gini coefficient as a measurement method for income inequalities is that it cannot being able to distinguish the right kind of inequality from between different kinds of it. This lack causes to some difficulties in comparing different values of Gini coefficient and some confusions in the findings of income inequality hypothesis tests. To De Maio, it is very important to know that Gini coefficient can differentiate the middle part of the income distribution the best. As for another example, Kurowski (2014) refers three things on the subject of the weaknesses of Gini coefficient. These can be considered as the lack of differentiation in valuation of one dollar earned and one dollar, which is received in transfers, the lack of inclusion of unregistered wealth or income, and the lack of precision in the sense that increased income equality makes poor people poorer. In a somewhat different study, Grimsley (2015) explores the impact of perceived income inequality and actual income inequality on American voters' choice for Congressional candidates in the 2012 election. When they use some control variables, it is seen that there is a significant relationship between voters' choices and their perceptions about income inequality in contrast to the relationship between Gini measurement of income inequality and their choices. This situation shows that perceptions about income inequality have a more impact on voters' choices than actual income inequality. Han et al. (2012) mention about how people's perceptions are shaped on the subject of income inequality. Making estimates about the magnitude of inequality can be given as an example on the subject of the effect of judgments on the formation of perceptions. In addition, people believe that there should be a degree of inequality and some principles, which should determine income in the society. People might make a judgment about existing inequality and according to their judgments, they think that inequality is too large or too small. As it is understood from these examples, judgments and beliefs lead to the formation of perceptions. They also touch on the perceptions of Eastern and Western Europe on the subject of income inequality. According to Han et al.'s findings, Eastern Europe changed their beliefs about the legitimite degrees of income inequality in the sense that they started to accept larger level of inequalities.

However, Western Europe has not changed their beliefs in the sense that they have accepted larger level of inequalities for a long time. Binelli and Loveless (2014) explore the relationship between income and perceptions of inequality for twelve Central and Eastern European countries in 2007. In their study, they claim that rural or urban area determines people's inequality perceptions and income perceptions are impacted by the rural-urban divide. According to their study, there is a negative relationship between income and perceptions about inequality of people, who live in only urban areas. Thus, when they control the relationship with urbanity, the independent effect of income on perceptions about income comes to a halt. Although some of policy makers think that income inequality remains constant or decreases in their countries, most of policy makers think that inequality has increased over 10 years. On a scale, which goes from 'very high' to 'very low', 79% of policy makers in the survey perceive inequality as 'very high' or 'high', 17% of policy makers perceive it as 'moderate' and finally 4% of policy makers perceive it as 'very low' or 'low'. According to the article, if one forgets about high levels of inequality and focus on only downward trend in it, then, some negative cases may occur (UNDP, 2013: 199-200). Tay (2015) explores the relationship between income inequality issue and people's perceptions about it. Based on the evidence from Japan and China between the years 1995-2007, the article claims that people's perceptions and evaluations about income inequality are not impacted by the change in their country's income inequality level. The article also claims that the determinant of people's perceptions and evaluations of income inequality are socio-psychological factors. Frey (2008) also points out people's evaluations of income inequality in relative terms. It is important to consider about people's perceptions to income inequality because according to the happiness literature, an increase in absolute income is not efficient in the sense that it is not sustainable in order to increase utility. More specifically, utility, which is increased by a growing income disappears quickly. The reasons of this situation can be counted as follows: Adaptations to the absolute income level lead to higher income aspirations. At this point, relative income takes part in the situation. This means that people start to compare their income with others. In this way, literature shows that people do not consider income in absolute terms but rather in relative terms. From this article, it is understood that relative income matter (Frey et al., 2008). It also affects people's perceptions to income inequality. Clark and D'Ambrosio (2014) explore the literature on the subject of attitudes to income inequality based on the surveys and experimental findings. Their findings can be classified into two categories of people's attitudes to income inequality such as the normative and the comparative view. They claim that while normative approach shows individual's "disinterested" evaluation of income inequality, comparative approach shows people's self-interest. In other words, individuals perceive income inequality with regard to their relative income level beyond their absolute income level. Bjørnskov et al. (2009) mention that individuals' perceptions of income inequality become more positive with "increased expected" fairness. If one country has low actual social mobility, then inequality is perceived more negatively by individuals who live in this country. According to their findings, there is a positive relationship between fairness perceptions and subjective well-being. On the other hand, there is a negative relationship between fairness perceptions and more income equality demand. Kaltenthaler et al. (2008) explore the differential attitudes of individuals on the subject of the distribution of income in European Union (EU) countries by taking into account some variables such as political attitudes, economic self-interest, and general attitude toward society.

According to their findings, people's perceptions to income inequality are impacted by their ideas about politics and society. However, economic self-interest has no impact on people's perceptions to income inequality. To be more precise, according to their economic utilitarian hypotheses, they find that the probability of supporting elimination in income inequality policies is low among the individuals who have higher level of education. In the same way, the probability of supporting these policies is low among the individuals who have higher level of income. Unemployed people are more likely to support these policies compared to people who are employed. Similarly, retired people are more likely to support eliminating income inequalities. Individuals who belong to a union are very likely to support eliminating income inequalities.

2.2 Studies about the Relationship between Perceived Happiness and Some Social Characteristics

Besides these subjects, it is also considered the relationship between happiness and education. Some empirical studies show that there is a positive relationship between education and happiness. In other words, education impacts people's happiness positively. This impact is the same at both regional and worldwide scale (Castriota, 2006). Castriota examines the relationship between absolute income and people's well- being by their education level. He uses the World Value Survey dataset from World Bank. According to the dataset, he found that if education level increases, the importance of absolute income for people's life satisfaction declines. He explains that if income is higher, people are more happy but if everything else is equal, less educated people can benefit from the marginal utility of absolute income more. According to him, this situation can be an explanation for the Easterlin Paradox. In another study, Cuñado and Perez de Gracia (2011) consider in their article about how education impacts people's happiness in Spain by using the dataset from European Social Survey. Ordinal logit model is applied for this research. According to their findings, there are direct and indirect effects of education on people's happiness. The indirect effect of education on happiness is through income and labor status. This means that if people are highly educated, their income levels will be higher. In addition, employment levels will also be higher among these people. Furthermore, they have higher levels of happiness. They found that the impact of education on people's happiness is positive and direct. This impact is independent from people's education level such as primary, secondary and tertiary level (2011). Argyle (1999) mentions that according to scientific studies, the effect of education is higher in poorer countries than the affluent ones. Education has a small effect in most European countries. To Argyle, income and occupational status are the outcomes obtained through educational level. It is also important to explore the impact of education on happiness without the effect of income and occupational status. Argyle explains that the effect of education is smaller if income is held constant but the effect is still present. It is also important to note that the impact of education on happiness is smaller or the effect disappears completely when the occupational status is also controlled. Argyle also addresses the causality on the subject of the relationship between happiness and education. He mentions it is possible that education may be impacted by happiness through the feelings of optimism and self-esteem, which are the components of happiness despite the fact that this impact has not been shown yet. Noval and Garvi (n.d) examine the relationship between education and happiness using a large micro data from the Survey on Health, Aging and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). According to the results, education is an important determinant of happiness. There is no weak relationship between them in contrast to the relationship between happiness and income. Educational attainment is the reason of greater happiness.

Cunado et al. (2011) explore the relationship between happiness and the religious belief and practices. They use the first three waves of European Social Survey data (2002/2003, 2004 and 2006) for 24 countries. The ordered logit model with robust standard errors, which include country and time fixed effects is used for the analysis. They add country fixed effects in their paper because they want to control unobservable country differences. They focus on three important questions on the subject of religious belief such as “Do you belong to a particular religion?”, “What religion or denomination do you belong to?” and finally “How religious are you?” In order to understand some indicators for religious practices, they focus on two questions such as “How often do you attend religious services, apart from special occasions?”, and “How often do you pray apart from religious services?” According to the results of survey, there is a positive relationship between happiness and religious belief and practices. In other words, religion has a positive impact on people’s happiness. Okulicz- Kozaryn (2010) explores the relationship between religion and life satisfaction between 79 nations. He uses World Values Survey data. He adopts a random coefficient multilevel model in order to solve some methodological issues of previous work such as the overlook of the effect of both individuals and societies on this subject. According to this study, there is a bimodal relationship between life satisfaction and religion. This means religious people may be satisfied or dissatisfied with their lives. Also, according to Okulicz- Kozaryn, religiosity per se is not the only determinant for happiness of people, social setting is also very important on this subject. For instance, in religious nations, people who are religious are more happy than those who are not religious. Argyle (1999) touches upon the impact of religion on happiness. To him, its positive effect is small but this effect is stronger for the elderly and for members of some churches. Eichhorn examines the relationship between individual religiosity and life satisfaction considering the country-level effects. He uses World Values Survey data for 43 European and Anglo-Saxon societies. According to his findings, there is an insignificant positive effect of personal religiosity on people's life-satisfaction if "conceptualization effects" are considered. There is a significant positive correlation between life satisfaction and personal religiosity only if individuals live in a highly religious societies. Finally, according to Eichhorn, societal conformity mechanisms appear to be more effective on life satisfaction compared to individual religiosity (2012).

Nawijn and Veenhoven (2011) explore the effect of leisure activities on people's happiness controlling for personality traits, health and socio- demographic variables such as age, gender, marriage, education, work, and income. This subject has not widely explored yet. According to them, happiness depends on change one's view on life and on change one's way of life. They use the four waves of German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) data. Their method is same- time analysis. In order to do that, they use Pearson correlations. There is a strong correlation between life satisfaction and five leisure activities such as holiday trips, attending church, handicrafts, home repairs, and attending cultural events. Holiday trips are the first one, which affect happiness of people. Its correlation with happiness is strong in each year (1990, 1995,1998 and 2003). The most important limitation for this study is that leisure activities are not measured every year. Also, the level of leisure activities are measured ordinally, and categories are not chosen very well. Therefore, reports may be inaccurate. Van Hoorn (2008) explores the income- leisure tradeoff in the income-happiness debate. He uses multilevel or hierarchical linear modeling in order to investigate the relationship between them. According to the study, there is a positive effect of leisure on happiness. However, the effect of per capita GDP on self-reported happiness is lowered by leisure. Argyle (1999) touches upon leisure as an important determinant of happiness. To him, its importance comes from the “voluntary control”. He also mentions that marriage and employment are important for happiness as well as leisure activities and the lack of them causes unhappiness. Lu and Hu (2005) examine the relationship between happiness and leisure involvement, leisure satisfaction and peronality of Chinese university students drawing conclusions from psychology. According to their results, all kinds of leisure involvement and extraversion are highly correlated. However, neuroticism prevents leisure activities. There is a significant positive relationship between leisure satisfaction and extraversion. However, the relationship between neuroticisim and leisure satisfaction is significantly negative. According to Lu and Hu, whether individuals are happy can be understood through extraversion and neuroticism (2005). Lloyd and Auld (2002) found that quality of life is best predicted through person-centred leisure attribute and leisure satisfaction. According to their results, quality of life cannot be predicted place-centred indicators such as “the frequency of leisure facility usage” (Lloyd and Auld 2002: 43). To further studies, people who are interested in social activities derive most from leisure psychologically. Cheng and Furnham (2003) touch upon the importance of leisure on people’s overall satisfaction giving examples from various articles. For instance, according to Argyle and Lu (1990), there is a correlation between social activities and happiness. There is also a correlation between the frequencies of participation of social activities and happiness. Solitary activities also impact on people’s happiness positively.

In the literature, it is usually seen that there is a positive relationship between social trust and happiness level. Rodríguez-Pose and Berlepsch (2014) mention that trust is commonly examined while exploring the social capital literature. They refer to some studies, which were made in the past about the relationship between trust and happiness and state that the relationship between these two variables are positive. According to Helliwell and Wang (2011), world-wide data shows that trust is strongly correlated with higher well-being levels. Bjǿrnskov claims that well-being is impacted mostly by social trust from between the other social capital forms (Rodríguez-Pose and Berlepsch, 2014). There is a strong robust and positive relationship between social and institutional trust and happiness in Europe. This is the case for all four regions of Europe. The coefficients of trust have really high significance levels and have a positive correlation with happiness levels in these regions. In another study, Rothstein (2010) mentions about social trust and happiness relationship and states that there is a positive relationship between social trust, which is at high levels and subjective well-being as well as some social outcomes such as health, education, participation in public life etc. Social trust is not an easy concept to be understood because most people cannot decide whether they should really trust the other people they do not know or not. He refers to Uslaner's remarks about the meaning of the social trust. According to Uslaner (2002), some qualifications such as "optimism about the future" and controlling over their own destiny are indications of social trust. Therefore, it can be implied that social trust and happiness are positively correlated because individuals who look at their future optimistically and think that they live in a society that has high moral standards are happier than those who have not these kinds of qualifications. Growiec and Growiec (2013) explore the joint impact of social capital and trust on people's happiness levels based on the World

Values Survey 2000 data, which is about the Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs). These countries have low levels of social capital and trust. Therefore, the authors mention that this situation is an obstacle in front of these countries on the subject of catching- up EU-15 countries. According to their findings, there is a positive relationship between trust and happiness after controlling the relationship with social capital and earnings. However, Growiec and Growiec find a negative impact of the mean level of trust in one's reference group on individuals' happiness. Bjørnskov (2003) explores the reasons of happiness in five Nordic countries, Switzerland and the Netherlands. According to the article, generalized trust as a direct factor of social capital especially has an important factor in determining national happiness of Switzerland because social capital is in an advanced stage in Switzerland. To analysis of the article, its effect is greater than that of income. Leung et al. (2013) examine the relationship between social capital and happiness based on the Canadian General Social Survey of Social Engagement Cycle 17 data. According to their findings, social capital has an important impact on the levels of individuals' happiness. This relationship still persists when they control for major demographic and individual characteristics.

There is no extensive literature on the subject of the relationship between hard work and happiness levels. However, Bjɷrnskov et al. (2013) touch upon hard work when they explore the relationship between inequality and happiness levels. In their study, they refer to the study of Corneo and Gruener (2002) on the subject of the importance of hard work. According to this citation, if people think that hard work is important for individuals to earn an income, then, they are more likely to oppose redistribution. For instance, in the same study, people reduce their demand for equalizing incomes because of the "generalized fairness perceptions" and "perceived past social mobility". Bjørnskov et al. also mention that the question "Hard work is the key [to success]." in the surveys to measure fairness perceptions of people. This study is important for our study in the sense that it shows hardwork will most likely be helpful for understanding the relationship between perceived income inequality and happiness levels because hard work can also be used to capture perceptions of people about upward mobility along with understanding perceptions about fairness.

2.3 Studies about the Relationship between Happiness and Perceived Income Inequality

In the literature, there are limited available studies, which show the relationship between happiness and perceived income inequality. Chapple et al. (2009) give some insights on the subject of income inequality and well-being in OECD countries. The aim of this study is to understand the link between actual inequality, desired inequality and overall social well- being. They mention about perceptions of people- who live in different countries to income inequality. According to the ISSP (International Social Survey Program), two-thirds or ninety-percent of people think that income inequalities are large in their countries. Eighty-five percent of people who live in the former centrally planned countries in Central and Eastern Europe and in Southern Europe perceive that income inequality is too high. However, sixty-five percent of American people think in the same way. In addition, the article highlights the fact that people's perceptions of income inequality and actual income inequality are not the same. For instance, English- speaking countries, which have high inequality levels perceive that inequality is low. Southern European countries and Poland have high inequality levels and they also perceive that their income inequality is high. Central European countries, France and Austria have low levels of inequality. However, they perceive that their income inequalities are high. Germany and some Nordic countries have low levels of income inequality with low inequality perceptions. According to the article, income comparisons between reference groups cause an increasing demand for redistribution. In European countries, income comparisons are really important and there is a negative relationship between income comparisons and self – declared happiness. Age boosts this negative relationship while income lowers it. The impact of income comparisons on people’s happiness may change depend on the situation. For instance, if an income of an individual falls short of others, then this person may think that his / her income may increase in the future and accordingly, the impact will be positive. However, they may think that they are not as good as their peers and the impact may be negative. Smyth and Qian (2008) explore the effect of perceived income inequality on people’s happiness in Urban China. According to the findings of large- scale survey for 31 cities, people who perceive that there is unequal income distribution are more unhappy than those who do not perceive in the same way. However, results may be different between low and high income individuals. For instance, the top 20 per cent of income earners perceive that income distribution is unequal. But, their level of happiness is higher than the bottom quintile of the income earners. This means that perceived income inequality generates a status effect among the rich and generates a jealousy effect among the poor. Smyth and Qian use some personal characteristics variables such as gender, education level, age, income level and health in order to control the relationship. According to them, females, the better- educated people, those who are older, those who have higher income and those who have a better health are more happy than the others. Unemployment has a negative impact on people’s self-reported happiness. In addition, people who are unhappy in their marriages report lower levels of happiness. According to Smyth and Qian, the impact of reference group income on happiness is negative. According to Graham and Felton (2005), there is a negative relationship between income inequality and happiness in Latin America. Persistent unfairness has an important place in this relationship. In addition, according to their findings, relative status of people in the income distribution is a very important subject for people's perceptions about income inequality in Latin America in case of considering their relationship with happiness. Mixed findings can be found about the relationship between inequality and happiness in the US and Europe because inequality can be both a signal of income mobility and opportunity and a signal of injustice. Labor markets and public institutions are not very efficient in Latin America. Therefore, gaps between poor and rich people are larger and more persistent, and inequality provides an advantage for wealthy people while it is a disadvantage for poor people. This means income inequality does not provide any future opportunities for poor people who live in Latin America. According to them, people who are richer than those who live in rural places do not feel higher levels of happiness because they compare their relative position with wealthy people in their city. This example shows the importance of relative income. Using cross- sectional data, which is collected from a survey in Japan, Oshio and Urakawa (2014) also examine the relationship between perceived income inequality and well- being of people. According to their findings, first, there is a negative relationship between perceived income inequality and subjective well- being in Japan. Second, there is a link between perceived income inequality and subjective well- being and income status. Third, income status lowers the effect of the relationship between perceived income inequality and subjective well- being. However, the effect is not perfect for perceived happiness (2014). While arguing the differences about happiness and income inequality between American people and

European people, Alesina et al. (2003) mention that the rich people in the United States are not happy about income inequality instead of poor people because poor people in the United States think that they live in mobile society and have a chance to become rich in the future. According to Alesina et al., this perception of upward mobility is the reason of this thought among poor people and left side of Americans. However, Europeans do think that they live in a less mobile societies. At this point, one of our study's objects is to infer whether perception of upward mobility has an influence on people's perceptions to income inequality in Turkey and the other selected European (OECD) countries.

CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Theoretical Framework

Happiness may be affected on many variables including micro (such as personal characteristics), macro and social ones. This study examines the relationship between perceived income inequality and happiness by using some social indicators such as trust level to the other people, the importance of leisure time, the frequency of attending to religious services, and also using some individualistic characteristics such as gender, marital status, scale of incomes, the highest educational level attained and employment status as a macro variable. The aim of using some social indicators in exploring happiness is to understand the extent of the effect of these indicators on happiness level of people. The main question is this: Is it possible that social/socio-demographic indicators have a larger impact on happiness rather than perceived income inequality? Generalized ordered logit model will be used in order to understand this relationship because dependent variable and some other variables have an ordinal nature. The model will be explained below in detail.

3.1.1 Generalized Ordered Logit Models

Subject of model selection criteria are very important in determining which model is appropriate for the data to use if there are more than one model to fit the data. The reason of the importance of selecting an appropriate model comes from the fact that the appropriate model estimates the data properly. Therefore, it is crucially important to examine the established model within the process (Ucal, 2006).

In this study, we selected generalized ordered logit model to examine the relationship between happiness and perceived income inequality because ordered logit model did not fit our data. Proportional odds assumption was violated according to the results of “omodel” and “Brant test” used. Generalized ordered logit model (with gologit2 function) fits our data because it can be reached a more consistent result by using it, when it is compared to mlogit and ologit because of some methodological reasons, which will be explained in the next lines. We cannot use multiple linear regression analysis because first of all, this analysis cannot provide an accurate answer when the predicted probabilities of the model do not fall between 0 and 1. Second, multiple linear regression analysis cannot be used if the dependent variable is not normally distributed. If the normal distribution is considered as an approximation for the binomial model, the variance of the dependent variable will not be the same. The variance will be higher if the probability is near 0.5 rather than 0 or 1 (Patel, MIT Lecture Notes). Instead of using ordered logit models, we could use a probit model because these two models come from a common basis. The only difference between these two models is their distribution. Logit models have a “cumulative standard logistic distribution” while probit models have a “cumulative standard normal distribution”. Their results are similar (http://dss.princeton.edu/training/). In addition, multinomial logistic models could be used for ordinal multiple categorical outcomes. However, these models are not appropriate for clarifying the ordinal nature of the outcome. Hence, this affects estimated odds ratios negatively because they may not be able to address the questions, which are asked in the analysis. Ordinal logistic regression analysis is appropriate for taking the rank ordering of outcomes (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 2000). Because of all these reasons, we decided to use the generalized ordered logistic regression model.

Marginal effects should be used in logistic regressions because it shows probability changes in the analysis when the independent variable increases by one unit. This means an "instantaneous change" for continuous variables if it is assumed that the unit is very small. Probabilities may vary depend on the changes in responses of any survey, which is indicated as "very happy", "not too happy" etc. Therefore, marginal effects are important in any logistic regression analysis (Reyna, n.d.). In our study, their importance comes from the fact that it shows us the change in the share of individuals who belong to a specific happiness level when any of independent variables increase by one category. Therefore, we can easily capture the effect of all categories of the independent variables we used in our regression analysis on people's happiness level.[4]

The proportional odds (PO model now during the section) model is widely used by scholars / statisticians in order to estimate an ordinal outcome (dependent) variable (Liu and Koirala, 2012). For clarity purpose, it is intended to elaborate the aim of the model and its assumptions. The PO model estimates the cumulative probability of being at a particular level of a dependent variable or, being beyond (below) that particular level of a dependent variable. The assumption of the PO model is that the impact of each explanatory variable is the same across the different categories of the ordinal response variable. In other words, the PO assumption restricts each

[4] You could find marginal effects of each categorical independent variable on each category of the response variable, happiness in Appendix C.

independent variable in the sense that their effects on the odds of being at a particular variable or, being beyond (below) the particular variable have to be the same (Liu and Koirala, 2012). The other name of the PO assumption is the parallel lines assumption. However, this assumption is very likely to be violated with the real world data (http://www.theanalysisfactor.com/generalized-ordinal-logistic-regression/). The issue stems from the fact that the sample size of the data or "the number of covariate patterns" (Liu and Koirala 2012: 242) affects the PO assumption. Ordered logit model applies parallel lines assumption in a very strict manner for each independent variable (Fu 1998; Williams 2006). As for the multinomial logit model, it relaxes the assumption very much and consequently, suppresses the ordinal nature of the response variable. In addition, it is hard to interpret. The unconstrained generalized ordered model estimates the same number of parameters with multinominal logit model. Parallel-lines model, which is mentioned above is a special case of the generalized ordered logit model and is used in a very strict form in ordered logit model. The mathematical formula for parallel-lines (proportional odds) model could be seen below:

$$P(Y_i > j) = g(X\beta) = \frac{\exp(\alpha_j + X_i \beta)}{1 + \{\exp(\alpha_j + X_i \beta))} \quad , \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1 \qquad \textbf{(1)}$$

The formula is the same with that of generalized ordered logit model. The only difference is that this time β's will be the same for all values of j, instead of the α's. However, parallel-lines model has a problem of violated assumptions. Therefore, partial proportional odds model can be used instead of parallel-lines model. The formula of it can be written as follows:

$$P(Y_i > j) = \frac{\exp(\alpha_j X1_i \beta 1 + X2_i \beta 2 + X3_i \beta 3_j)}{1 + \{\exp(\alpha_j X1_i \beta 1 + X2_i \beta 2 + X3_i \beta 3_j)\}} \quad , \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1 \qquad \textbf{(2)}$$

In this formula, β's are the same for X1 and X2 (for all values of j) but the last β for X3 can differ. Thus, the parallel-lines model will be relaxed. Fu's gologit1 was not compatible with parallel-lines model or the partial proportional odds model. Gologit2 can fit these models and it is a developed version of gologit1 in terms of model estimation and interpretation (Williams, 2006).

Because of all these reasons, generalized ordered logistic regression (gologit2 version) will be applied to examine the relationship between happiness and perceived income inequality in this study. It is easier to interpret than multinomial logistic regression and is more flexible than ordered logistic regression (Williams, 2006). Fu (1998) and Williams (2006) created the generalized ordered logit model in order to relax the assumptions of the PO model. This feature of the model allows the effect of each independent variable to variate across different catagories (cut points) of the ordinal response variable (Liu and Koirala, 2012). Williams' gologit2 model has more power compared to Fu's gologit model. Gologit2 model can be thought as a non-linear probability model that allows users to estimate the determinants and probability of each result generated without using the idea of latent variable (y*). Because gologit models provide users an option in constraining some variables that meet the parallel- lines assumption and in allowing some variables that violate parallel- lines assumption to vary, there may be a possibility about the presence of multiple y*'s, which causes to the presence of single observed y (Williams, 2006). It can be seen mathematical form of the (unconstrained) generalized ordered logit (gologit) model below:

$$\mathrm{P}(Y_i > j\ ) = g\big(X\beta_j\big) = \frac{\exp\big(\alpha_j + X_i\, \beta_j\big)}{1 + \{\exp\big(\alpha_j + X_i\, \beta_j\big)\}} \ , \qquad j = 1, 2, \dots, M-1 \qquad \textbf{(3)}$$

This form makes the comparison between logit, ologit and gologit model easier and much more interpretable. In this formula, M indicates the number of categories of the ordinal response variable. The probabilities of Y for 1, 2, …, M can be written in three different ways below:

1) P(Y_i=1) = 1- g($X_i\beta_1$)

2) P(Y_i= j) = g($X_i\beta_{j-1}$) – g($X_i\beta_j$) j= 2, … , M – 1

3) P(Y_i=M) = g($X_i\beta_{M-1}$)

If M takes a value of 2, then the generalized ordered regression model will be equal to the logistic regression model. If M takes a value, which is greater than 2, then the generalized ordered logistic regression model will be equal to a series of binary logistic regression model. In this type of regression model, dependent variable has a combined categories. For instance, if J is equal to 1, then, 1 will be contrasted with 2, 3 and 4. If J is equal to 2, then 1 and 2 will be contrasted with 3 and 4. If J is equal to 3; then, 1, 2 and 3 will be contrasted with 4 (Williams, 2006).

3.2 EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

3.2.1 Scope and Limits of The Analysis in This Study

As noted earlier, this study is interested in the meanings of happiness from past to present, how to measure happiness, why we use happiness data and what things impact on it. At the same time, the focus of this study is the relationship between perceived income inequality and happiness in Turkey and selected European countries. We had to examine this relationship with only 7 countries, including Turkey because we could only expand the data in the World Values Survey up until this point. We had difficulty with applying appropriate panel data because of the lack of continuous years and their incompatibility with using variables in the analysis, so, we had to use a limited version of pooled data from the World Values Survey longitudinal data set. The lack of using panel data causes not to be able to control for individual-level effects and selection bias[5] (Graham and Felton, 2005). In addition, causality between response variable an explanatory variables cannot be detected if panel data is not used. This may be another study, which will be explored in the future. In addition, we did not use weight when we looked at the descriptive statistics of the variable. Therefore, we cannot infer that the results of our analysis can be generalized to population, it is limited to the sample size of the data used. The presence of the negative predicted probabilities issue is another problem we faced in our analysis, which was done only for Sweden and Switzerland. This problem may rarely occur because of using complex (complicated) data sets or studying with small samples of some categories of the dependent variable in gologit2 models. (If the data is simplified, this issue may be solved.) On the other hand, if the negative predicted probabilities are not many in number with regard to the sample size, then this obstacle can be ignored. We ignored this problem because they are not many in number in our sample and they also disappear when we control the relationship with the some variables used in these countries. In addition, if we solve the regression analysis with autofit (.01) option in Sweden, 74 in-sample negative probabilities issue has solved. Finally, we also faced the failure of Wald test on the subject of proving whether the proportional-odds assumption is met. On advice of Williams (2016), it is tried to use *autofit* option with .01 significance level instead of using .05 level for Norway. Thus, our problem has solved.

Apart from these limitations mentioned above, at first we used ordered logit regression analysis in this study, however, brant test showed us that the parallel-lines

[5] (Sample) selection bias results from not using random data for the analysis made. If there is any flaw in the sample selection process such as excluding a subset of data, then, this bias will occur.

assumption was violated in our analysis. We changed it with gologit2 analysis in order to examine the relationship because it has relaxed the proportional odds assumption thanks to the partial proportional odds model used with the gologit2 command and it is more parsimonious than mlogit analysis. The *autofit* option makes the partial proportional odds model estimation simplier and shows us whether the model used fit the data or not. In addition, *autofit* option enables users not to set free all the variables across categories of dependent variable as the default gologit and gologit2 did it. One of the disadvantages of gologit2 analysis in contrast with the proportional odds model (ordered logit) is its interpretation difficulties. Ordered logit model has a straightforward estimation method. On the other hand, there are three sets of coefficients in gologit2 (a version of generalized ordered regression model) model, which may confuse users. In addition, factor variables could not be used in Stata 12 because this version of Stata did not allow us to use them. This issue might have a negative impact on the robustness of the results.[6] With *vce (robust)* option, gologit2 model has not permitted to be used *lrtest* command, because using this option, we mean that we do not trust the "valid specification" of the gologit2 model (StataCorp., 2013). In addition, when we used *margins* command in order to get marginal effects, Stata 12 were producing an error message about the failure of perform check for estimable functions although we did not face it when using a more recent version of Stata (Stata 13). Also, it can be checked / compared the relationship in the analysis with life satisfaction variable for a more robust study.

[6] We tried our results by using factor variables later on. No change occurred in the results. Our results are robust to the implementation of factor variables.

3.2.2 Data

Table 3 Dependent, Independent, and Control Variables in the Regression Analysis[7]

Dependent variable	Independent Variables	Control Variables
Feeling of Happiness(State of Mind)> A008	People's Approach to Income (In) Equality > (E035)	Gender(X001)
	Leisure Time > (A003)	Marital Status(X007)
	Highest Education Level Attained > (X025)	Employment Status(X028)
	Trust > (A165)	Scale of Incomes(X047)
		Age (X003)
		Hard work or luck bring a better life. (E040)
		Religious Activities(F028)

This study uses the third and the fifth wave of World Values Survey (WVS) longitudinal data (1989- 2013) for happiness analysis of 7 OECD countries, including Turkey. This data allows user to make a time series analysis but our purpose is to use a (time-invariant) cross-sectional data by separating it by the two waves both, and also by 7 countries. We chose OECD countries in Europe in order to compare them with Turkey on various subjects because Turkey is also one of the OECD countries and this makes comparison between countries easier and more sense. In addition, we chose this data because it covers many subjects about social indicators as well as respondents' feeling of happiness and their approaches to income (in)equality.

[7] Those with parentheses represent codes of the independent variables in World Values Survey. A008 represents the code of Feeling of Happiness / State of Mind. "State of Health" and "Competition is good or harmful." are excluded from the analysis because they are very likely to reduce the significancy of the regression analysis. All control variables will also be used as independent variables in the base model for regression analysis.

Dependent Variable – Happiness Data

The survey asks respondents a question in order to learn their level of happiness: "Taking all things together, would you say you are…" The choices are divided into four categories: "very happy", "quite happy", "not very happy", and "not at all happy" ("Don't know" and "No answer" were not taken into consideration).

Argument about the Reliability of Happiness Data

Although there are some concerns in using happiness data in any statistical research, it is known that many psychological studies have been done about happiness / well-being. Therefore, if any data is not appropriate for the studies in happiness literature, they will not be used by psychologists. Furthermore, there are some validation tests in order to check appropriateness of happiness data (Alesina et.al 2004). One of validation test methods is written by Perez-Truglia (2015). He mentions that the validation tests, which can be found in the literature are used to determine a possible positive correlation between subjective measures such as well- being and life satisfaction data and objective measures such as suicide rates and smiling. Besides these studies, his paper proposes an alternative method for happiness data. First, he uses regression analysis in order to try to understand the preferences of respondents of the survey questions. Second, he uses estimated parameters in order to predict the acting behavior of a rational utility-maximizer individual. Finally, he compares predicted behavior with actual behavior. According to him, this method will be compelling for economists in the sense that it compares decision utility to reported utility (Perez-Truglia, 2015). These information shows readers that using survey data for happiness studies is a reliable methods because it reflects people's approaches to it. Graham (2012) also mentions that happiness surveys are reliable in the sense that they provide us to be able to compare various countries through their open-ended nature. The best part of the open-endedness is that it enables respondents to define happiness for themselves rather than it defines the notion for them. In addition, it is important to mention that the reliability of life satisfaction and subjective well-being questions are supported by neurobiological proofs. For instance, people who specify they feel happy or satisfied with their lives will be less ill and live longer. According to the findings related to the field of neuroscience, there are some parts of subjective well-being, which correspond to the activities in different regions of the brain and these activities differ to the individuals who have different characteristics and to the changing circumstances in time (Yemişcigil and Dolan, 2015).

It is also important again to note that happiness data is based on expressed (stated) preferences of people in contrast to revealed preferences[8], which have their origins in neoclassical approach. In addition, happiness studies claim that happiness can be measured (cardinal approach) in contrast to the ordinal approach of neoclassicals. At this point, Graham exemplifies this situation with a poor Bolivian peasant. She mentions that this peasant has no many alternatives with the exception of emigrating and protesting when it comes to reveal preferences. Therefore, she claims that only expressed preferences, which are captured by survey data help policy makers to observe welfare consequences of these type of institutional arrangements (2012). She also points out that happiness surveys provide wide opportunities on the subject of measuring income inequality’s welfare effects in contrast to the incapability of revealed-preferences approach because individuals are incapable of demonstrating macroecononomic variables such as inequality (Graham and Felton, 2005).

[8] Revealed preferences can be considered as a method for analyzing individual choices under different circumstances related with income and price. In other words, revealed preferences theory is interested in purchasing behaviour of individuals.

3rd Wave:

Table 3.1 Frequencies, Percents and Cumulatives of Happiness Data in the Third Wave (All / Missing Values Excluded.)

Happiness	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative
Very Happy	2,965	31,48	31,48
Rather/Quite Happy	5,487	58,26	89,74
Not Very Happy	818	8,69	98,43
Not at All Happy	148	1,57	100
Total	9,418	100	

As you see above, respondents in the third wave of the survey tend to choose "Rather/Quite happy" category because frequency and percentage is higher than the other categories of happiness. According to the table 3.1, 5,487 individuals (58,26%) out of 9,418 individuals are "rather/quite happy". "Very Happy" people (31.48%) follow them.

Table 3.2 Happiness Data by Countries (Frequencies, Percents, Cumulatives / Missing Values Excluded.)

Countries	Happiness Level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative
East Germany	Very Happy	336	16,33	16,33
	Rather/Quite Happy	1,264	61,42	77,75
	Not Very Happy	390	18,95	96,70
	Not at All happy	68	3,3	100
Finland	Very Happy	531	26,71	26,71
	Rather/Quite Happy	1,299	65,34	92,05
	Not Very Happy	135	6,79	98,84
	Not at All Happy	23	1,16	100
Norway	Very Happy	712	33,15	33,15
	Rather/Quite Happy	1,338	62,29	95,44
	Not Very Happy	88	4,1	99,53
	Not at All Happy	10	0,47	100
Spain	Very Happy	390	16,24	16,24
	Rather/Quite Happy	1,761	73,34	89,59
	Not Very Happy	224	9,33	98,92
	Not at All Happy	26	1,08	100
Sweden	Very Happy	822	41,14	41,14
	Rather/Quite Happy	1,088	54,45	95,60
	Not Very Happy	75	3,75	99,35
	Not at All happy	13	0,65	100
Switzerland	Very Happy	982	40,21	40,21
	Rather/Quite Happy	1,326	54,30	94,51
	Not Very Happy	121	4,95	99,47
	Not at All happy	13	0,53	100
Turkey	Very Happy	1,440	44,31	44,31
	Rather/Quite Happy	1,427	43,91	88,22
	Not Very Happy	278	8,55	96,77
	Not at All happy	105	3,23	100
West Germany	Very Happy	408	21	21
	Rather/Quite Happy	1,232	63,41	84,41
	Not Very Happy	267	13,74	98,15
	Not at All happy	36	1,85	100

In the table 3.2, individual happiness data is divided into four categories with respect to the selected countries. According to the table, individuals tend to choose “Rather/ Quite Happy” category through four categories of happiness question in the survey. On the other hand, it is important to mention that “Very Happy” and “Rather/Quite Happy” categories are pretty much close to one another in Turkey in contrast to responses of individuals in other countries.

Table 3.3 Descriptive Statistics of Happiness (3rd Wave – 1995, 1996, 1997)

Descriptive Statistics(Third Wave: 1995,1996,1997)				
		Mean	**S.D.**	**N**
Outcome Variable				
Happiness				9418
	Very Important	.3148227	.4644699	
	Rather/Quite Important	.5826078	.4931549	
	Not Very Important	.086855	.2816373	
	Not at All Important	.0157146	.1243756	

In the table above, happiness data is divided into four categories with respect to the 3rd wave. According to the table, it is seen that the percent of the calculated mean for “Rather/Quite Important” category is higher than the percent of other categories. The calculated mean for “Very Important” category follows it. N indicates the number of observations of perceived happiness in this wave.

5th Wave:

Table 3.4 Frequencies, Percents and Cumulatives of Happiness Data in the 5th Wave (All / Missing Values Excluded.)

Happiness	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative
Very Happy	2,656	30,15	30,15
Rather/Quite Happy	5,248	59,57	89,72
Not Very Happy	760	8,63	98,34
Not at All Happy	146	1,66	100
TOTAL	8,810	100	

From the table above, it can be understood that the percent of “Rather/Quite Happy” people (59.57%) is higher than the percent of other categories of happiness in the 5th wave. The percent of “very happy” individuals (30.15%) follows them. The number of total respondents is 8,810.

Table 3.5 Descriptive Statistics of Happiness (5th Wave - 2005, 2006, 2007)

Descriptive Statistics(Fifth Wave: 2005,2006,2007)				
		Mean	S.D.	N
Outcome Variable				
Happiness				8810
	Very Important	.3014756	.4589248	
	Rather/Quite Important	.5956867	.4907865	
	Not Very Important	.0862656	.2807718	
	Not at All Important	.0165721	.1276687	

According to table 3.4, it can be observed that the means of perceived happiness question are pretty much the same as those of the 3rd wave. N indicates the number of observations of perceived happiness in this wave.

Perceived Income Inequality Data

Table 3.6 Perceived Income Inequality Data in the 3rd Wave (All / Missing Values Excluded.)

Inequality	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative
1	1,445	15,50	15,50
2	579	6,21	21,71
3	1,035	11,10	32,81
4	905	9,71	42,52
5	1,191	12,78	55,30
6	882	9,46	64,76
7	1,079	11,57	76,34
8	1,151	12,35	88,68
9	368	3,95	92,63
10	687	7,37	100
TOTAL	9,322	100	

According to the table 3.3, respondents in the third wave of the survey tend to choose the first category of perceived income inequality question. Therefore, we can understand that most of respondents in the survey desire a more equal income. The fifth category follows this choice.

Table 3.7 Descriptive Statistics of Perceived Income Inequality (3rd Wave – 1995, 1996, 1997)

Descriptive Statistics(Third Wave: 1995,1996,1997)				
		Mean	S.D.	N
Perceived Income Inequality				9322
	Incomes should be made more equal	.1550097	.3619333	
	2	.0621111	.2413702	
	3	.1110277	.3141833	
	4	.0970822	.2960855	
	5	.1277623	.3338428	
	6	.0946149	.292698	
	7	.1157477	.3199393	
	8	.1234714	.3289951	
	9	.0394765	.1947362	
	We need larger income differences as incentives for individual effort	.0736966	.2612906	

In the table 3.6, perceived income inequality data is divided into ten categories. As it is seen above, the calculated mean of the first category is higher than the other categories. The fifth category follows it. N indicates the number of observations for perceived income inequality in this wave.

Table 3.8 Perceived Income Inequality Data in the 5th Wave (All/Missing Values Excluded.)

Inequality	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative
1	1,123	12,90	12,90
2	772	8,87	21,77
3	1,196	13,74	35,51
4	919	10,56	46,07
5	1,181	13,57	59,63
6	777	8,93	68,56
7	1,024	11,76	80,32
8	960	11,03	91,35
9	351	4,03	95,38
10	402	4,62	100
TOTAL	8,705	100	

From this table, it can be understood that respondents tend to choose the third category frequently (13.74%). The fifth category follows the third one because it is chosen by respondents at the rate of 13.57% in the fifth wave.

Table 3.9 Descriptive Statistics of Perceived Income Inequality (5th Wave – 2005, 2006, 2007)

Descriptive Statistics(Fifth Wave: 2005,2006,2007)				
		Mean	S.D.	N
Perceived Income Inequality				8705
	Incomes should be made more equal	.1290063	.3352262	
	2	.0886847	.2843044	
	3	.1373923	.3442808	
	4	.1055715	.3073061	
	5	.1356692	.3424566	
	6	.089259	.2851337	
	7	.1176335	.3221922	
	8	.1102814	.3132582	
	9	.0403217	.1967238	
	We need larger income differences as incentives for individual effort	.0461804	.2098876	

In table 3.8, the calculated mean of the third category is higher than the other categories of perceived income inequality data in the 5th wave. The fifth category follows this category.

Table 3.10 Perceived Income Inequality Data by Countries (Frequencies, Percents, Cumulatives/Missing Values Excluded)

Perceived Income Inequality Data by Countries				
Countries	**Inequality**	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Cumulative**
	1	359	17,59	17,59
	2	193	9,46	27,05
	3	361	17,69	44,73
	4	248	12,15	56,88
	5	291	14,26	71,14
East Ger	6	193	9,46	80,60
	7	167	8,18	88,78
	8	150	7,35	96,13
	9	29	1,42	97,55
	10	50	2,45	100
	TOTAL	**2,041**	**100**	
	1	254	12,83	12,83
	2	154	7,78	20,61
	3	314	15,86	36,46
	4	263	13,28	49,75
	5	311	15,71	65,45
Finland	6	201	10,15	75,61
	7	241	12,17	87,78
	8	155	7,83	95,61
	9	52	2,63	98,23
	10	35	1,77	100
	TOTAL	**1,980**	**100**	
	1	175	8,18	8,18
	2	121	5,66	13,84
	3	254	11,87	25,71
	4	260	12,16	37,87
	5	353	16,50	54,37
Norway	6	262	12,25	66,62
	7	353	16,50	83,12
	8	258	12,06	95,18
	9	49	2,29	97,48
	10	54	2,52	100
	TOTAL	**2,139**	**100**	
	1	241	10,20	10,2
	2	131	5,54	15,74
Spain	3	245	10,37	26,11
	4	207	8,76	34,87
	5	309	13,08	47,95

	6	222	9,39	57,34
	7	296	12,53	69,87
	8	369	15,62	85,48
	9	146	6,18	91,66
	10	197	8,34	100
	TOTAL	**2,363**	**100**	
Sweden	1	95	4,78	4,78
	2	72	3,62	8,4
	3	167	8,40	16,79
	4	173	8,70	25,49
	5	277	13,93	39,42
	6	243	12,22	51,63
	7	364	18,30	69,93
	8	372	18,70	88,64
	9	119	5,98	94,62
	10	107	5,38	100
	TOTAL	**1,989**	**100**	
Switzerland	1	521	21,65	21,65
	2	297	12,34	34
	3	384	15,96	49,96
	4	226	9,39	59,35
	5	240	9,98	69,33
	6	148	6,15	75,48
	7	157	6,53	82
	8	219	9,10	91,11
	9	87	3,62	94,72
	10	127	5,28	100
	TOTAL	2,406	**100**	
Turkey	1	770	24,24	24,24
	2	255	8,03	32,26
	3	269	8,47	40,73
	4	204	6,42	47,15
	5	276	8,69	55,84
	6	191	6,01	61,85
	7	247	7,77	69,63
	8	331	10,42	80,04
	9	164	5,16	85,21
	10	470	14,79	100
	TOTAL	**3,177**	**100**	
West Germany	1	153	7,92	7,92
	2	128	6,63	14,54
	3	237	12,27	26,81
	4	243	12,58	39,39
	5	315	16,30	55,69
	6	199	10,30	65,99

	7	278	14,39	80,38
	8	257	13,30	93,69
	9	73	3,78	97,46
	10	49	2,54	100
	TOTAL	**1,932**	**100**	

Note: 'East' and 'West' specifies regions of Germany.

As it can be seen in table 3.9, perceived income inequality data is divided into ten categories with respect to the selected countries. According to the table, Germans who live in the East region of the country and the Finns often tend to choose the third category in the survey. Individuals who live in the West region of Germany tend to choose the fifth category. Norwegian people choose the fifth and the seventh category equally. Spanish and Swedish people frequently choose the eighth category of the question in the survey. The Swiss and Turkish people often choose the first category as a response to the perceived income inequality question in the survey.

Independent Variables Data

In order to understand the effect of social outcomes as well as the effect of perceived income inequality on happiness, we decided to use some social indicators such as the importance of leisure time, frequency of attending to religious services, perceived trust and perceived hard work as well as some socio-demographic variables such as respondents' sex and age, the highest educational level attained, employment status, marital status and respondents' scales of income.

In the World Values Survey, the question about approaches to income equality (perceived income inequality) is as follows: "How would you place your views on the scale? The first category (1) means you agree completely with the statement on the left; the tenth category (10) means you agree completely with the statement on the right." Statement 1 is "Incomes should be made more equal." and Statement 10 is

“There should be greater incentives for individual effort.” or “We need larger income differences as incentives for individual effort.” Respondents can choose any number in between.

In the survey, the question about frequency of attending religious services is as follows: “Apart from weddings, funerals and christenings, about how often do you attend religious services these days?” The choices are divided into seven categories: More than once a week (1), Once a week (2), Once month (3), Only on special holy days (4), Once year (5)[9], Less Often (6), Never, practically never (7), No Answer (-2) and Don’t Know (-1).

In the survey, question about the importance of leisure time (perceived leisure time) is as follows: “Please say, how important leisure time is in your life?” The choices are divided into five categories: Very Important (1), Quite Important (2), Not Very Important (3), Not at All Important (4), Don’t Know (-1) and No Answer (-2).

In the survey, question about trust (perceived trust) is as follows: “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” The answer categories are divided into three parts: Most people can be trusted (1), Can’t be too careful (2), Don’t Know (-1) and No Answer (-2).

In the survey, question about the highest educational level attained is as follows: “What is the highest educational level attained?” The categories are “Inadequately completed elementary education”, “Completed(compulsory) elementary education”, “Complete Secondary: university-preparatory type/Full secondary”, “Complete Secondary: technical/vocational type”, “University with degree/Higher Education-

[9] The category of 5 is not found in the data set.

upper-level tertiary", "Some university without degree/Higher education-lower-level", "Don't Know" and "No Answer".[10]

In the survey, question about people's employment status is as follows: "Are you yourself employed or not? If Yes: Full Time or Part Time? If more than one job: only for the main job".

"Has paid employment: (1) Full Time, (2) Part Time, (3) Self-Employed".

If no paid employment: (4) Retired / pensioned, (5) Housewife not otherwise employed, (6) Student, (7) Unemployed, (8) Other Please Specify, (-1) Don't Know and (-2) No Answer.

In the survey, the question about marital status is as follows: "Are you currently… (1) Married, (2) Living as married, (3) Divorced, (4) Separated, (5) Widowed, (6) Single, (-1) Don't Know, (-2) No Answer.

In the survey, the question about the scales of income (perceived income) in the third wave is as follows: "Here is a scale of incomes and we would like to know in what group your household is, counting all wages, salaries, pensions and other incomes in. Just give the letter of the group your household falls into, before taxes and other deductions." At this point, it is important to say that incomes are scaled from the lowest decile (1) to the highest decile (10) in the third wave. There are numbers, which vary from 2 to 9 in between. In the fifth wave, the question about a scale of incomes is as follows: "On this card is a scale of incomes on which 1 indicates the "lowest income decile" and 10 the "highest income decile" in your country. We

[10] The codes for the variable 'the highest educational level attained' may vary to the selected countries. For more information, please look at the documentation/downloads part of the World Values Survey for the third and the fifth wave of the Survey and country- specific documents. Website: http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSContents.jsp.

would like to know in what group your household is. Please specify the appropriate number, counting all wages, salaries, pensions and other incomes that come in."

In the survey, sex of respondent is categorized as "Male" (1), and "Female" (2).

In the survey, respondents' opinions about hard work (perceived hard work) are also considered. Respondents may choose one of the choices related to the question. One of the choices is "In the long run, hard work usually brings a better life" (1). The other one is "Hard work doesn't generally bring success- it is a more matter of luck" (10). Respondents may choose the numbers in between.

3.2.3 Expected Outcomes

In this study, we expect that people who choose the option of "Incomes should be made more equal" in each country are less happy than those who choose the option of "there should be greater incentives for individual effort" because of various destructive effects of perceived income inequality. We will also look at the relationship between happiness and the highest educational level attained, employment status, perceived leisure time, the frequency of attending to religious services, perceived trust, sex, age/age squared, and marital status of people. We expect a positive relationship between educational level and happiness because education is also one of important things for an individual in the sense that it improves people's quality of life through raised wages, changing point of view, learning new things etc. Therefore, it may impact people's happiness positively. We expect a positive relationship between trust and happiness because people mostly look for relationships, which are based on trust, and they feel safe if they find it. This feeling may also make them happy. We expect a positive relationship between perceived leisure time and happiness because people may want to spare time themselves because of workload. Therefore, if they perceive leisure time as an important thing, it may be inferred that they are happy while doing some leisure activities. We expect a positive relationship between frequency of attending to religious services and happiness because these services may provide people a stronger mental health through the strong belief system. Belief always keeps alive hope. We expect a negative relationship between age and happiness because aging is usually perceived negatively by people in the sense that they feel as they get pressed for time. Finally, we also expect some changes after controlling the relationship between happiness levels and people's perceptions about income inequality with some explanatory variables[11], which will be used as control variables.

3.2.4 Empirical Strategy of the Study

People's level of happiness may be impacted on different variables, which are micro, macro and social. Therefore, we will explore people's happiness level using some variables such as their approaches to income (in) equality in what extent they care about leisure time and frequency of attending to religious activities, their perceived trust level, as well as some demographic variables (personal characteristics) such as their gender, age, marital status, and some macro variables such as highest education level attained, employment status such as unemployed people and their scales of income.

On the purpose of examining the relationship between happiness and the other variables, we will establish a model by using the 3rd and the 5th wave of the survey data. Then, we will re-examine the same model in order to understand whether there

[11] Many explanatory variables in the model were used to control the relationship between happiness and perceived income inequality with respect to selected countries in this study.

is any difference in terms of the extent of impacts of variables when we look at impacts of variables separately with respect to countries.

$$\mathrm{HAPPINESS}_{si} = f\,(\mathrm{PERCEIVEDINEQUALITY}_i, \mathrm{RELACT}_i, \mathrm{HARDWORK}_i, \mathrm{LEISURE}_i, \mathrm{TRUST}_i, \mathrm{SEX}_i, \mathrm{AGE}_i, \mathrm{AGE\hat{\ }2}, \mathrm{MARSTAT}_i, \mathrm{EMPSTAT}_i, , \mathrm{EDUCATION}_i, \mathrm{INCOME}_i).$$

Our (base) generalized ordered logistic regression model will be run as follows:

$$\mathrm{Happiness}_i = \alpha\mathrm{Inequality}_i + \beta\mathrm{Social}_i + \ +\gamma\mathrm{Macro}_i + \delta\mathrm{Demog}_i + \varepsilon_i \qquad \textbf{(1)}$$

Our general strategy is to compare Turkey and the other selected OECD countries, which are located in Europe and we relate individual happiness level in Turkey and in other OECD countries (The East and The West Region of Germany, Finland, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey) to their approaches to income inequality as well as some social outcomes such as perceived leisure time, perceived trust, frequency of attending to religious activities, some (socio) demographic variables such as their gender, marital status, their scales of income and finally their highest educational level attained and employment status as a macro variable. i refers to individuals, and ε refers to the error term. Scales of income and perceived hard work are planned to control the relationship between perceived happiness level and income inequality perceptions of individuals. We choose “perceived hard work” in order to control the relationship because our purpose is to be informed of fairness perceptions of respondents in the survey. The variable of perceived hard work will provide us to understand whether individuals’ belief about hard work does bring success has an impact on their happiness level or not. We also choose “scales of income” because our second aim is to have information about the (possible) impact of income perceptions on individual happiness level. It is also important to mention that we will use different control variables, which are found in our model in the event of the presence of an insignificant relationship between perceived income inequality and individual happiness level in order to see whether there will be any change in the impact of perceived income inequality on individual happiness in countries.

In order to examine the relationship between happiness and perceived income (in) equality as well as some social outcomes, generalized ordered regression method will be used in this analysis. At first, we looked at the relationship using constrained generalized ordered logit (gologit2 with pl lrforce store ( ) option) regression analysis, which gives the same results as that of ordered logistic regression models. We will use vce (robust) option in order to get robust standard errors. It is used as Huber/White/sandwich estimator of variance in Stata in order to obtain variance-covariance matrix related with parameter estimates. This option is used to prevent some misspecification types under the condition that observations are independent. Vce(robust) function is also important in the sense that it makes statistical inference about coefficient estimation valid, if the sample of data used is not simple random or, (x_i , ε_i) has not an independent and identical distribution. Therefore, it will be useful, if standard errors are robust to deviations of the standard error case. After we got the same result with constrained gologit function as ologit function, we tried using unconstrained gologit function (with nplr lrforce store ( ) option), which gives the same outcome as multinomial logistic model (mlogit) function. After we got the two outcomes, we tested them with 'lrtest' option, and saw parallel- lines assumptions were violated. In order to relax the model assumptions, we added to the regression 'autofit lrf' option because this option only relaxes the constraint of parallel – lines assumptions for variables, which violate the assumptions and this model will be our base model. Gamma option will also be used in our regression analysis in order to test whether any independent variable's gammas are equal to zero (This option was used only for the waves). If it is equal to zero, then, it means that this variable meets the proportional odds (parallel- lines) assumption. In other words, test of parallel-lines assumption for any variable also provides a test of whether this variable's gammas are equal to zero. We also found marginal effects for each of the categories of independent variables in the regression analysis using 'margins' command in order to understand their impact on each category of the response variable.[12] The results can be found in below, respectively.

3.2.5 Empirical Results of the Study

3rd Wave[13]:

Table 3.11 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of the Third Wave[14]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1,2,3,4=not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model (3rd Wave)								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		1 vs 2+3+4	1+2 vs 3+4	1+2+3 vs 4
	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,3438984	0,0367013	0,3438984	0,0367013	0,3438984	0,0367013	*	*	*
Trust	0,003236	0,0565844	0,7864779	0,097	1,397351	0,2792913		*	*
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	0,0778425	0,0094809	0,0778425	0,0094809	0,0778425	0,0094809	*	*	*
Attendance to Religious Services	0,1143858	0,0113021	0,0434192	0,0177737	0,0374734	0,0422809	*	**	
People's Perceptions to Inequality	-0,032378	0,0100783	-0,054205	0,0154721	-0,1271788	0,0348217	*	*	*
Highest Educational Level Attained	-0,0043919	0,0130862	-0,0494997	0,020345	0,0331868	0,0455036		**	
Employment Status	-0,0004425	0,0134516	0,0787082	0,0192772	0,0862958	0,0424144		*	**
Scales of Income	-0,0330385	0,010441	-0,0330385	0,010441	-0,0330385	0,010441	*	*	*
Sex	-0,2013665	0,0486239	-0,2013665	0,0486239	-0,2013665	0,0486239	*	*	*
Age	0,0941961	0,0096613	0,0941961	0,0096613	0,0941961	0,0096613	*	*	*
Age2	-0,0008355	0,0001011	-0,0008355	0,0001011	-0,0008355	0,0001011	*	*	*
Marital Status	0,2459525	0,0142612	0,2459525	0,0142612	0,2459525	0,0142612	*	*	*
_cons	-2,996716	0,2965938	-7,095851	0,3642063	-10,19219	0,6607511			

Note: * indicates p<0.01 level, ** indicates p<0.05 level.

[12] See the Appendix C for the ' margins' command for each wave and each country and the command's findings about the effects of each category of independent variables on each happiness level.

[13] In the analysis of the third wave, at first, country effect was added. The effect was significant at .05 percent level, and it was varying across the three sets of coefficients. However, its effect was insignificant in the fifth wave. Therefore, we aimed to see whether any change would occur in the analysis after we re-estimated the model by countries, separately and we did not add 'country' as an explanatory variable to the regression analysis.

[14] In the first set of coefficients, trust, the highest educational level attained, and employment status are statistically insignificant. In the third set of coefficients, frequency of attending to religious services and the highest educational level attained are statistically insignificant. Italics denote the categories of the response variable (happiness).

According to the model in which we used to examine the relationship between happiness and perceived income (in) equality as well as other social variables, there are seven variables out of twelve variables meet the parallel-lines assumption in the 3rd wave. Thus, they can be much more easily interpreted compared to the ones, which do not meet the paralel- lines assumption. According to the gologit2 interpretation, we know that if variables do meet this assumption, they are all the same along the three sets of coefficients. For instance, we understand that perceived leisure time has a strong positive impact on respondents' happiness level because when the given importance of leisure time falls for respondents, their happiness level declines. It is important how we reached this conclusion. We thought that if one really cares about leisure time, he/ she tries to make the best of this time and consequently, their happiness level rises. This variable has the same impact on respondents who belong to different happiness categories. We may also infer that as long as the importance of leisure time diminishes in the scale (when it increases from 1 to 4), happiness variable also increases from 1 to 4, which means that it decreases. The other variables are age and age square. According to the analysis, there is a U-shaped relationship between happiness and age. U-shaped relationship means that happiness level decreases until some level of age (valid especially for young people), at some point, it bottoms out and then it starts to rise as of this point. We understand that there is a U-shaped relationship because although age has a negative impact on individual happiness level, the impact of age-squared on individual happiness is positive. When we look at the impact of marital status on happiness level, we see that married people are much more happier than the other people who live together as unmarried, separated, widowed, etc. According to the regression analysis, females are happier than males. People who believe that hardwork usually brings a better life are happier than those who think hardwork does not bring success. The belief that hardwork brings a better life may help people to work hard in order to reach better opportunities in terms of income, education, health etc. and thanks to them, they will be happier than the others. When income deciles increase, then happiness level increases. This indicates that income has a positive impact on people's happiness level.

When we look at three panels of coefficients for variables, which do not meet proportional-odds assumption, we see that the felt mistrust to other people has a negative impact on happiness level especially at the third set of coefficients. This means that people who do not trust the others are less likely to put themselves in "Very happy" and "Rather /Quite Happy" categories. Furthermore, mistrust has no significant impact at the first set of coefficients, which indicates higher happiness levels. According to the analysis, when people attend to religious services too often, their happiness level increases, but if they do not attend, their happiness level decreases. The negative impact of less attendance to religious services is stronger in the first panel of coefficients compared to the other panels. The first panel of coefficients can be thought as the first category(very happy) versus 2nd+3rd+4th categories. This means happiness is more affected by less attendance to religious services at the highest happiness level. In the second panel of coefficients, which can be recoded as 1+2 vs 3+4, this impact decreases. It means less attendance to religious services has no strong impact on happiness level at moderate happiness level (lower happiness compared to the first category). The relationship is insignificant in the third panel of coefficients (lower happiness level compared to the first, second and the third one). We may infer that people who do not attend to religious services too often are not impacted by less attendance to religious services in this panel of coefficients. When it comes to perceived inequality, we see that people who perceive income inequality as an incentive for individual effort in a society compared to the first category are happier than those who do not perceive in this way. This impact is at the highest level in the first panel of coefficients where people belong to the first ("Very Happy") category vs 2nd+3rd+4th categories. This means that the effect of people's perceptions to income equality is not strong at lower happiness levels. This impact is less strong in the second panel of coefficients, which indicates 1st+2nd categories vs 3rd+4th categories. The impact is at the lowest level in the third panel of coefficients, which indicates 1st+2nd+3rd vs. 4th category. From this, we may infer that people who perceive income inequality as an incentive for individual effort compared to the first category are more likely to put themselves in "Very Happy and "Rather Happy" categories and are less likely to put themselves in "Not Very Happy" and "Not at all Happy" categories. The impact of education is not significant in the first and the third panel of coefficients. In the second panel of coefficients, there is a significant positive relationship between the highest educational level attained and happiness. It means that the impact of education is especially valid at moderate level of happiness (1st + 2nd category vs 3rd + 4th category) or lower happiness level compared to the first level. When it comes to the employment status of people, the relationship between happiness and employment status is not significant in the first panel of coefficients. In the second panel of coefficients, this relationship become significant. To this panel, when employment status increases, happiness level decreases. This means that a one category change in employment status increase the odds of being in lower happiness levels. In the third panel of coefficients, again, there is a negative relationship between employment status level and happiness. When employment status changes by one category, happiness level decreases. This relationship is also significant. Due to these results, we understand that in the second and the third cut, the relationship between happiness and employment status is significant but in the third cut, the relationship is a little bit stronger than the second cut. From this, we can understand that individuals who move away from full- time employment status by one category are more likely to place themselves in “Not Very Happy” and “Not at all Happy” categories.

Our ultimate purpose is to use gamma option in order to see deviations from proportionality, and to see whether the variables do meet the proportional odds assumption or not.

Table 3.12 Test for Parallel Lines Assumption using *Gamma* Option

Happiness	Coef.	Std. Error	P>|z|
Beta			
leisure	0,3438984	0,0367013	0,000
perceived trust	0,003236	0,0565844	0,954
perceived hardwork	0,0778425	0,0094809	0,000
relact	0,1143858	0,0113021	0,000
perceived inequality	-0,032378	0,0100783	0,001
education	-0,0043919	0,0130862	0,737
empstat	-0,0004425	0,0134516	0,974
income	-0,0330385	0,010441	0,002
sex	-0,2013665	0,0486239	0,000
age	0,0941961	0,0096613	0,000
age^2	-0,0008355	0,0001011	0,000
marstat	0,259525	0,0142612	0,000
Gamma^2			
trust	0,7832419	0,1036506	0,000
relact	-0,0709666	0,0187968	0,000
perceived inequality	-0,021827	0,0166007	0,189
education	-0,0451078	0,0213636	0,035
empstat	0,0791507	0,0206144	0,000
Gamma^3			
trust	1,394115	0,282155	0,000
relact	-0,0769124	0,0428124	0,072
perceived inequality	-0,0948007	0,0354656	0,008
education	0,0375786	0,0459613	0,414
empstat	0,0867382	0,0432094	0,045
Alpha			
_cons_1	-2,996716	0,2965938	0,000
_cons_2	-7,095851	0,3642063	0,000
_cons_3	-10,19219	0,6607511	0,000

According to the result of this option, we again see that trust, frequency of attending to religious services, perceived inequality, education and employment status do not meet the parallel-lines assumption. In addition, we see that Gamma_2 for inequality and Gamma_3 for education are statistically insignificant, and frequency of attending to religious services is significant at 10% level. These are not very big problems since the other gammas (Gamma_3 for inequality and Gamma_2 for education) for these variables are significant. [15]

5th Wave:

Table 3.13 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of the Fifth Wave[16]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1;2,3;4= not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model (5th Wave)								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model2	Model3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		*1 vs 2+3+4*	*1+2 vs3+4*	*1+2+3 vs 4*
	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,397526	0,0449035	0,4378934	0,0671898	0,7281868	0,1250418	*	*	*
Trust	0,3081235	0,0568994	0,9793432	0,1071463	1,952098	0,3499494	*	*	*
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	0,0134684	0,0108191	0,0134684	0,0108191	0,0134684	0,0108191			
Attendance to Religious Services	0,063998	0,0121398	-0,005251	0,0187469	-0,004823	0,0436704	*		
People's Perceptions to Inequality	-0,0161147	0,0100463	-0,0161147	0,0100463	-0,0161147	0,0100463			
Highest Educational Level Attained	-0,0375186	0,0123272	-0,0375186	0,0123272	-0,0375186	0,0123272	*	*	*
Employment Status	0,0183066	0,0155147	0,1981948	0,0248473	0,2625822	0,0479245		*	*
Scales of Income	-0,0567471	0,0130631	-0,1267419	0,0230497	-0,0239043	0,0486549	*	*	
Sex	-0,2274606	0,0499167	-0,2274606	0,0499167	-0,2274606	0,0499167	*	*	*
Age	0,0874375	0,0096787	0,0874375	0,0096787	0,0874375	0,0096787	*	*	*
Age2	-0,0007553	0,0000984	-0,0007827	0,0000996	-0,0009222	0,0001108	*	*	*
Marital Status	0,2021084	0,0144811	0,2021084	0,0144811	0,2021084	0,0144811	*	*	*
_cons	-2,645354	0,3159916	-7,056052	0,3996496	-11,61096	0,9207537			

Note: * indicates $p<0.01$ level.

When we look at the 5th wave from the table 3.13, we see that 6 variables out of 12 independent variables do not meet the parallel-lines assumption. This means that these variables vary across the categories of the response variable, and accordingly across the three panels of coefficients.

At first, we looked at the effect of variables, which do meet the parallel-lines assumption. In this wave, married people are happier than the other respondents. This situation is the same as the situation in the third wave, and does not vary along three categories of the response variable. The impact of perceived hard work is not significant in this wave. When it comes to the highest educational level attained, we

[15]You could also find the regression analysis with regard to proportional odds ratios, which show the distance [(1vs 2+3+4), (1+2 vs 3+4) and (1+2+3 vs 4)] between categories, which were mentioned in parantheses used in the regression in Appendix B. For hypothetical example: The effect of sex is greater by 0,25 percent level in the first category of response variable than the other categories of the response variable.

[16] In the first set of coefficients, hardwork, people's perceptions to inequality and employment status are statistically insignificant. In the second set of coefficients, hardwork, attendance to religious activities, people's perceptions to inequality are statistically insignificant. In the third set of coefficients, hardwork, attendance to religious services, people's perceptions to inequality and income scales are statistically insignificant(Both at .05% and .10% level). Italics denote the categories of the response variable.

see a significant positive impact of the highest educational level attained on happiness of people. When the educational level changes by one category, happiness level also increases and this situation does not vary along the three categories of the response variable. Age has a negative impact on happiness in the fifth wave of the World Values Survey. In other words, if age increases, this means that happiness level will decrease. Females are happier than men in this wave as is the case with the third wave. The impact of perceived income inequality on individual happiness level is not significant in this wave in contrast to the result in the third wave.

It is also explored the impact of variables, which do not meet the parallel-lines assumption. When importance of leisure time falls for people, happiness level also falls. This impact is significant for all three panels of coefficients in the gologit2 analysis. According to this situation, we may infer that people who think that leisure time is not very important do not place themselves in the “Very Happy” and “Rather Happy” categories. The impact of given less importance of leisure time is very strong in the third cut (1st+2nd+3rd category versus 4th category), which also indicates the lowest happiness level (or lower happiness level compared to the first, second and the third ones). People who do not trust the others are more unhappy compared to those who trust the others in the fifth wave. This impact is the strongest in the third panel of coefficients (third cut of the analysis). We may infer that people who do not trust the others do not place themselves in the “Very Happy”or “Rather Happy” categories according to the size of coefficients. They are more likely to place themselves in “Not Very Happy” or “Not at all Happy” categories. The impact of less attending to religious services is significant only in the first panel of coefficients. This means that the impact is valid at the highest happiness level (1st category vs 2nd+3rd+4th category) or higher happiness level compared to the second, third and the fourth ones. According to the result, when people do not attend to religious services, their happiness levels decrease. We may infer that people who attend to religious services are more likely to place themselves in the “Very Happy” category instead of choosing the other categories of the response variable. Employment status is insignificant at the first cut of the dependent variable. This means the impact of one category increase in employment status does not impact on individual happiness level at the highest happiness level (the first panel of coefficients) or higher happiness level compared to the second, third and the fourth ones. This impact is significant in the second and the third cut and gets stronger towards the third panel of coefficients. This means that when employment status levels up, people’s happiness level falls for the respondents. People who choose any category except the first one (full time employment) are more likely to put themselves in the “Not Too Happy” and “Not at All Happy” categories. The effect of one category change in income scales is not significant in the third panel of coefficients (1st+2nd+3rd vs. 4th category). This means that the lowest happiness level (lower happiness level compared to the first and the second cut) is not affected by one category change in income scales. On the other hand, the impact of one category increase in a scale of incomes is significant in the first and the second panel of coefficients. According to this result, people who improve their income level are happier than the others and they are more likely to put themselves in the “Very Happy” and “Rather Happy” categories. Finally, the coefficient of age^2 shows us that the impact of increasing age^2 on happiness level is positive. This impact is significant in all three panels of coefficients and is at the strongest level in the third panel of coefficients. According to this result, we may infer that there is a U- shaped relationship between happiness and age. We may also infer that this positive impact is at its highest level at lower happiness levels. To the other inference, respondents are more likely to put themselves in the "Very Happy" and "Rather Happy" categories.

It can also be seen gamma results for some independent variables below:

Table 3.14 Test for Parallel Lines Asummption Using *Gamma* Option

Happiness	Coef.	Std. Error	P>|z|
Beta leisure	0,397526	0,0449035	0,000
perceived trust	0,3801235	0,0568994	0,000
perceived hardwork	0,0134684	0,0108191	0,213
relact	0,063998	0,0121398	0,000
perceived inequality	-0,0161147	0,0100463	0,109
education	-0,0375186	0,0123272	0,002
empstat	0,0183066	0,0155147	0,238
income	-0,0567471	0,0130631	0,000
sex	-0,2274606	0,0499167	0,000
age	0,0874375	0,0096787	0,000
age^2	-0,0007553	0,0000984	0,000
marstat	0,2021084	0,0144811	0,000
Gamma^2 leisure	0,0403674	0,0733894	0,582
trust	0,6712198	0,112583	0,000
relact	-0,069249	0,0202425	0,001
empstat	0,1798881	0,0257761	0,000
income	-0,0699948	0,0236375	0,003
age^2	-0,0000274	0,0000282	0,331
Gamma^3 leisure	0,3306609	0,1287691	0,010
trust	1,643975	0,3520452	0,000
relact	-0,068821	0,0443367	0,121
empstat	0,2442756	0,0486661	0,000
income	0,0328428	0,0489531	0,502
age^2	-0,0001669	0,0000571	0,003
Alpha _cons_1	-2,645354	0,3159916	0,000

When we look at the gamma option, we see that Gamma_2 for leisure is statistically insignificant but Gamma_3 for leisure is significant at 5% level. Gamma_2 for age2 is statistically insignificant while Gamma_3 for it is significant. Gamma_3 for income is statistically insignificant while Gamma_2 for it is statistically significant. These results do not cause an important problem because insignificancy is limited to only one gamma of the variables.[17]

3.2.5.1 Regression Analysis Results by Countries

Germany

Table 3.15 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of the East Region of Germany[18]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1;2,3;4= not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		1 vs 2+3+4	1+2 vs 3+4	1+2+3 vs 4
	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,4113297	0,0961697	0,4113297	0,0961697	0,4113297	0,0961697	*	*	*
Trust	0,6685262	0,1765259	1,296489	0,2326782	1,71368	0,7025387	*	*	**
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	0,0742278	0,0251672	0,0742278	0,0251672	0,0742278	0,0251672	*	*	*
Attendance to Religious Services	0,0557912	0,0319482	0,0557912	0,0319482	0,0557912	0,0319482	***	***	***
People's Perceptions to Inequality	-0,0017212	0,0273163	-0,0017212	0,0273163	-0,0017212	0,0273163			
Highest Educational Level Attained	0,0810439	0,0416623	-0,0974265	0,0403115	-0,1942668	0,0993109	***	**	***
Employment Status	-0,0139924	0,0402069	0,1705635	0,0365162	0,1078371	0,0793738		*	
Scale of Incomes	-0,0455774	0,0318591	-0,0455774	0,0318591	-0,0455774	0,0318591			
Sex	-0,196596	0,1267953	-0,196596	0,1267953	-0,196596	0,1267953			
Age	0,115655	0,0251258	0,115655	0,0251258	0,115655	0,0251258	*	*	*
Age2	-0,0010718	0,0002603	-0,0010718	0,0002603	-0,0010718	0,0002603	*	*	*
Marital Status	0,2499562	0,0372452	0,2499562	0,0372452	0,2499562	0,0372452	*	*	*
_cons	-4,006423	0,8196343	-8,244466	0,8814748	-10,60366	1,466575			

Note: * indicates p<0.01 level, ** indicates p<0.05 level, *** indicates p<0.10 level.

[17] You could also find the regression analysis with regard to proportional odds ratios, which show the distance(1vs 2+3+4), (1+2 vs 3+4) and (1+2+3 vs 4) between each category of variables used in the regression in Appendix B.

[18]In the first set of coefficients, perceived inequality, employment status, scales of income, and sex are not statistically significant. Frequency of attending to religious services is signficant at .10 percent level. In the second set of coefficients, perceived inequality, scales of income, and sex are not statistically significant. Frequency of attending to religious services is significant at.10 percent level. In the third set of coefficients, perceived inequality, employment status, scales of income, and sex are not statistically significant. Frequency of attending to religious services and the highest educational level attained (p-value= 0.050) are significant at .10 percent level.

When we look at the results in table 3.10, which relate to East Germany, we see that there are nine variables, which meet the parallel- lines assumption out of twelve independent variables. Their names are inequality (p value=0.9375), perceived income (p value=0.2841), perceived leisure time (p value=0.8251), frequency of attending to religious services (p value= 0.1352), perceived hardwork (p value = 0.0981), sex (p value= 0.8751), age (p value=0.5114), age2 (p value=0.6628), and marital status (p value=0.6244). Perceived trust (p value = 0.04920), the highest educational level attained (p value= 0.00048) and employment status (p value = 0.00044) do not meet the parallel- lines assumption. According to the results, which can be found by gologit2 analysis, the effect of one category change in perceived leisure time on individual happiness is negative and significant. If importance to leisure time starts to decrease, happiness level also decreases. Perceived hardwork has a positive significant impact on people's happiness level. According to the results, if people do not think that hardwork brings success, then people's happiness level decreases. If people believe that hardwork brings a better life, happiness level increases. The effect of frequency of attending to religious services on happiness level is positive and significant at 10 percent level in all three sets of coefficients. It means that if people do not attend to religious services frequently, their happiness level decreases. The impact of perceived income inequality is not significant at any set of coefficients. The impact of perceived income level (scales of income) is not significant at any panel of coefficients. There is no significant relationship between sex and individual happiness level. The impact of one category change in age on happiness level is negative. It means when ages of people increase, individual happiness level decreases. According to the results, there may be a U-shaped relationship between age and happiness because the effect of one category change in age2 on happiness is significant and positive. It means when ages rise, happiness of people also rises. If marital status changes by one category, the category of happiness also increases. It means that married people are happier than those who are not.

When it comes to the variables, which do not meet parallel-lines assumption, we see that if trust changes by one category, the category of happiness also increases in the first set of coefficients. It means that people who do not trust the others are more unhappy than those who think that most people can be trusted at the first cut of the response variable. To the analysis, the lack of trust has the least effect in the first cut of the response variable (very happy people vs rather/ quite happy+not very happy+not at all happy people), which also indicates the highest happiness level or the higher happiness level compared to the second and the third cut. This effect increases when it comes to the second cut (very happy+ rather /quite happy people vs not very happy + not at all happy people). It means that the lack of trust impacts people's happiness by a factor of +1,79 (or percent), which can be inferred as a more decreasing level of happiness at the second panel of coefficients compared to the first panel. This also means that one category change in trust increases the odds of being in lower happiness levels for this cut. In the third cut (very happy+rather / quite happy+ not very happy vs. not at all happy), the effect of one category change in perceived trust on happiness is at the greatest level. According to these results, we see that the coefficients of trust are positive and these coefficients increase across the cut points. It means that people who think that most people cannot be trusted are less likely to put themselves in "Very Happy" and " Rather/ Quite Happy" categories. Instead, they are more likely to place themselves in "Not Very Happy" and "Not at all Happy" categories. For the first set of coefficients, the impact of one category change in the highest educational level attained on happiness is negative and significant. It means that as educational level increases by one category, people's happiness level decreases in the first panel of coefficients. When it comes to the next set of coefficients, the impact of one category increase in educational level on happiness level is positive and gets larger across the second and the third cut of the response variable. It means that when the variable changes by one category, people's happiness level increases along the second set and its effect gets larger in the third cut of the response variable, which also indicates lower happiness levels. It may be inferred that people who have higher education level are less likely to put themselves "Not Very Happy" and "Not at All Happy" categories in the third cut. In other words, one category change in educational level increases the odds of being in higher happiness levels in this cut. For a one category change in employment status is not significant in the first and the third panel of coefficients. For the second set of coefficients, the coefficients of employment status are positive but it means that if employment status changes by one category, happiness level decreases. Thus, it may be inferred that people who have different employment status from full time are less likely to put themselves in the "Very Happy" and "Rather Happy" categories. Instead, they tend to choose "Not Very Happy" and "Not at All Happy" categories.

If we control for the relationship between happiness and perceived income inequality with attendance to the religious activities, employment status, sex, age/age2, marital status and scale of incomes, this relationship is significant at .10 percent level. However, if we control for this relationship with one of these control variables only, the p-value is not significant neither at .05 percent nor at.10 percent level. In addition, when we control this relationship with hard work -by removing the variable from the regression- the insignificancy of perceived income inequality still persists, but its p-value falls a little. At this point, the effect of coefficient gets stronger although it is insignificant. Finally, if we control this relationship with income, we see that the coefficient of the perceived income inequality is still insignificant. This means that the positive effect of the perceived income inequality in all categories is not significant.[19]

The West Region of Germany[20]

Table 3.16 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of the West Region of Germany[21]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1;2,3;4= not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		1 vs 2+3+4	1+2 vs 3+4	1+2+3 vs 4
	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,4206244	0,0877452	0,4206244	0,0877452	0,4206244	0,0877452	*	*	*
Trust	0,2347145	0,1367202	0,42825	0,172687	2,106976	0,7267188	***	**	*
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	0,0732813	0,0277738	0,0732813	0,0277738	0,732813	0,0277738	*	*	*
Attendance to Religious Services	0,0754431	0,0270067	0,0754431	0,0270067	0,0754431	0,0270067	*	*	*
People's Perceptions to Inequality	0,0030548	0,0297829	-0,0843569	0,0355316	-0,3384779	0,102671		**	*
Highest Educational Level Attained	0,0155818	0,0308315	-0,0906924	0,0378892	-0,1454762	0,0936046		**	
Employment Status	0,0651734	0,032179	0,0651734	0,032179	0,0651734	0,032179	**	**	**
Scale of Incomes	-0,0337016	0,0265328	-0,0337016	0,0265328	-0,0337016	0,0265328			
Sex	-0,1223757	0,1190072	-0,1223757	0,1190072	-0,1223757	0,1190072			
Age	0,0706423	0,0218688	0,0706423	0,0218688	0,0706423	0,0218688	*	*	*
Age2	-0,0005758	0,0002177	-0,0005758	0,0002177	-0,0005758	0,0002177	*	*	*
Marital Status	0,210021	0,0376703	0,348434	0,0395357	0,563488	0,1142464	*	*	*
_cons	-2,97372	0,7244382	-6,045164	0,753037	-11,068	1,64854			

Note: * indicates p<0.01 level, ** indicates p<0.05 level, *** indicates p<0.10 level.

According to the results, there are eight variables, which meet the proportional odds assumption. For a one category change in importance of leisure time, people's happiness level increases categorically. This means that when people do not give particular importance to leisure time, their happiness level tends to decrease. For a one category change in hardwork, people's happiness level increases categorically.

---

[19] The new result of the regression analysis could be found in Appendix D after controlling the relationship between perceived income inequality and perceived happiness with hardwork and income.

[20] You could also find the regression analysis with regard to proportional odds ratios, which show the distance(1vs 2+3+4), (1+2 vs 3+4) and (1+2+3 vs 4) between each category of variables used in the regression in Appendix B.

[21] In the first set of coefficients, perceived inequality, highest educational level attained, scale of incomes and sex are not statistically significant. Perceived trust is significant at .10 percent level. In the second set of coefficients, scale of incomes and sex are not statistically significant. In the third set of coefficients, highest educational level attained, a scale of incomes and sex are not statistically significant.

This indicates that when people do not believe that hardwork does not bring success, their happiness level tends to decrease. For a one category increase in frequency of attending to religious services, people's happiness level increases categorically. This means that people who do not attend to religious services too often, their happiness levels tend to decrease. For a one category change in employment status, people's happiness levels increase categorically. This means that as people move away from full- time employment status, their happiness level decreases. For a one category change in income scales, people's happiness levels decrease categorically. This means when people are at higher income level, their happiness tends to increase. However, the impact is not statistically significant. For a one category change in sex, people's happiness level decreases categorically. This means that females are happier than males in West Germany, too. However, this impact is also insignificant. When it comes to the effect of age, we see a negative relationship between age and happiness because when people grow older, their happiness level tends to decrease. The sign of coefficient of age2 indicates that there is a U-shaped relationship between age and happiness according to the findings of West Germany data.

When it comes to the variables, which do not meet proportional odds assumption, the coefficients of perceived trust are positive and get larger across the categories. This means that people who think that most people cannot be trusted are more likely to place themselves in the "Not Very Happy" and "Not At All Happy" categories. In the first set of coefficients, the effect of perceived inequality is statistically insignificant. On the other hand, in the second and the third set of coefficients, the effect of perceived income inequality on individual happiness is positive and gets larger across the cut-points of the response variable. This means that people who think that the society needs larger income differences as incentives are more likely to place themselves in the lower categories of happiness, which are “Rather Happy” and “Very Happy”. Perceived income inequality has the greatest positive impact on individual happiness at the highest happiness category (“Not At All Happy”) or in the third sets of coefficients. This also means that one category change in perceived inequality increases the odds of being in higher happiness levels in the second and the third cut of coefficients. In the first set of coefficients, the effect of one category change in education is not statistically significant. In the second set of coefficients, the effect of it is positive and significant. According to this result, this variable increases the odds of being in the lower categories of happiness (1-2), which are “Rather/Quite Happy” and “Very Happy”. In the third set, the effect is again statistically insignificant. The coefficients of marital status of people are positive and get larger across the cut points of the response variable. According to this finding, marital status has the greatest effect at higher categories of happiness. This means that people who are not married are more likely to place themselves in the “Not Very Happy” and “Not At All Happy” categories. In other words, one category change in marital status increases the odds of being in lower happiness levels.

If we control for the relationship between perceived inequality and perceived happiness with income by removing it from our base model, we see that the insignificancy still persists in the first set of coefficients but the size of it reduces. In addition, when we control this relationship with hard work to see whether there is any difference in the relationship between the variables, we see that insignificancy of the variable still persists in the first set of coefficients, and it is even become higher. On the other hand, p-value becomes smaller in the second and the third set of coefficients. It means that significance level increases in these sets of coefficients. In addition, the effect of the perceived income inequality gets stronger in the same sets.[22]

Finland[23]

Table 3.17 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of Finland[24]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1;2,3;4= not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		1 vs 2+3+4	1+2 vs 3+4	1+2+3 vs 4
	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,4841639	0,0898499	0,4841639	0,0898499	0,4841639	0,0898499	*	*	*
Trust	-0,0324248	0,1172878	1,152338	0,2243358	1,212953	0,5504077		*	**
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	0,078834	0,0259084	0,078834	0,0259084	0,078834	0,0259084	*	*	*
Attendance to Religious Services	0,0555053	0,0304564	0,0555053	0,0304564	0,0555053	0,0304564	***	***	***
People's Perceptions to Inequality	-0,0593762	0,0258019	0,0191702	0,0438201	0,1435934	0,0774928	**		***
Highest Educational Level Attained	-0,0190416	0,0276599	-0,0190416	0,0276599	-0,0190416	0,0276599			
Employment Status	-0,0267837	0,0275869	0,0815786	0,0449368	0,2165374	0,084467		***	**
Scale of Incomes	-0,1067939	0,0262504	-0,1067939	0,0262504	-0,106794	0,0262504	*	*	*
Sex	-0,4358172	0,1085278	-0,4358172	0,1085278	-0,435817	0,1085278	*	*	*
Age	0,1448284	0,0188668	0,1448284	0,0188668	0,1448284	0,0188668	*	*	*
Age2	-0,00131	0,0001962	-0,001167	0,0001937	-0,001399	0,0002257	*	*	*
Marital Status	0,2208318	0,0315404	0,2208318	0,0315404	0,2208318	0,0315404	*	*	*
_cons	-2,771145	0,6072751	-9,76096	0,7783044	-12,41407	1,301025			

Note: * indicates $p<0.01$ level, ** indicates $p<0.05$ level, *** indicates $p<0.10$ level.

According to the gologit2 analysis, eight variables out of twelve variables meet the parallel-lines assumptions. For a one category change in perceived leisure time decreases happiness level by .48 percent towards lower category. In other words, as people give less importance to leisure time, their happiness level decreases. For a one category change in perceived hardwork, happiness also increases categorcally. This means that if people do not believe that in the long run, hardwork usually brings a better life, then, their happiness level tends to decrease. For a one category change in

[22] The new result of the regression analysis could be found in Appendix D after controlling the relationship between perceived income inequality and perceived happiness with hardwork and income.

[23] You could also find the regression analysis with regard to proportional odds ratios, which show the distance(1vs 2+3+4), (1+2 vs 3+4) and (1+2+3 vs 4) between each category of variables used in the regression in Appendix B.

[24]In the first set of coefficients, trust, highest educational level attained, and employment status are not statistically significant. Frequency of attending to religious services is significant at .10 percent level. In the second set of coefficients, perceived inequality and the highest educational level attained are not statistically significant. Frequency of attending to religious services and employment status are significant at .10 percent level. In the third set of coefficients, highest educational level attained is not statistically significant. Frequency of attending to religous services and perceived inequality are significant at .10 percent level.

sex, people’s happiness level decreases categorically. It means females are happier than males in Finland. For a one category change in the highest educational level attained, people’s happiness level decreases categorically. This means people who have higher educational level are more happy than people who are illiterate or have lower level of education. However, this impact is not significant in Finland. For a one category change in frequency of attending to religious services, people’s happiness levels increases categorically. It means that if people do not attend to religious services too often, this affects their happiness level negatively. If age increases, people’s happiness level will be affected negatively. For a one category change in income, people’s happiness level decreases categorically. It means that as income level rises, happiness level of people increases. For a one category change in marital status, happiness level increases categorically. It means that married people are happier than those who are not.

There are four variables, which do not meet proportional odds assumption. A change in the category of perceived trust increases the odds of being in the higher category of the response variable (happiness). However, this relationship is not significant for the first panel of coefficients. For the next set of coefficients, people who do not trust the others are more likely to place themselves in the “Not very Happy” and “ Not at All Happy” categories. This means that they are less likely to place themselves in the “Very Happy” and “Rather / Quite Happy” categories. This negative impact is at the strongest level in the third set of coefficients, which indicates the lowest happiness level or lower happiness level compared to the first and the second one. For a one category change in people’s perceptions about income (in)equality, happiness level decreases categorically. This means as people think that society needs larger income differences as incentives for the individual effort, their happiness level is affected positively in the first cut of the response variable (Very Happy vs Rather / Quite Happy+Not Very Happy/ Not at All Happy). In the second panel of coefficients, as people believe that a society needs larger income differences as incentives for the individual effort, their happiness level decreases. However, this relationship is not significant in the second panel of coefficients (1+2 vs 3+4). In the third panel of the coefficients, for a one category change in people's perceptions about income inequality, their happiness level increases categorically. It means that if people believe that a society needs larger income differences as incentives for individual effort, then, their happiness level decreases. In other words, people who believe income inequalities are necessary for individual effort are more likely to place themselves in the "Not Very Happy" and "Not at All Happy" categories. The impact of one category change in perceived income inequality is positive at the highest happiness level (first cut), and the impact of it on individual happiness level is negative at the lowest happiness level (third cut). In other words, it increases the odds of being in higher levels of happiness in the first panel and decreases the odds of being in higher levels of happiness in the third panel. The impact of one category change in employment status is not significant in the first set of coefficients. In the second and the third set of coefficients, as people move away from the full time employment status, their happiness level decreases. This impact is at the highest level in the third cut. In this way, we understand that being in the different categories except for the full time employment decreases people's happiness level. People who have different employment status from full time employment are more likely to place themselves in the "Not Very Happy" and "Not at All Happy" categories. The coefficients of age2 is negative and become smaller in the second panel of coefficients. The greatest positive impact of age^2 on individual happiness level is at the lowest happiness level (3rd cut). People who have U-shaped relationship between their ages and happiness levels are more likely to place themselves in the “Very Happy” and “Rather/Quite Happy” categories.

If we control for the relationship between perceived happiness and perceived inequality with the highest educational level attained by removing the variable from the regression analysis, we see that the relationship between these two variables is significant at .05 percent level in the first and the third set of the coefficients. However, the relationship is still not significant in the second set of the coefficients. In addition, if we control this relationship with hard work by removing the variable from the regression analysis, we see that p-value in the first and the third set of coefficients falls a little and the effect of perceived income inequality on happiness gets stronger a little in these sets compared to the former one, but in the second set insignificancy still persists although insignificance level becomes smaller. Finally, if we control the relationship with income by removing it from the regression analysis, we see that the coefficient of perceived income inequality is still significant at .05 percent level in the first set of coefficients, and becomes significant at .05 percent level in the third set of coefficients in contrast to the former one. Its effect is positive in the first set and negative in the third set. In the second set, its coefficient is still insignificant.[25]

[25] The new result of the regression analysis could be found in Appendix D after controlling the relationship between perceived income inequality and perceived happiness with hardwork and income.

Norway[26]

Table 3.18 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of Norway[27]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1;2,3;4= not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		1 vs 2+3+4	1+2 vs 3+4	1+2+3 vs 4
	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,4660536	0,0847583	0,4660536	0,0847583	0,4660536	0,0847583	*	*	*
Trust	-0,0554258	0,1192556	0,5643735	0,2259697	0,9446368	0,6613321		**	
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	0,0824339	0,0229912	0,0824339	0,0229912	0,0824339	0,0229912	*	*	*
Attendance to Religious Services	0,045472	0,0251213	0,045472	0,0251213	0,045472	0,0251213	***	***	***
People's Perceptions to Inequality	-0,0508002	0,0227623	-0,0508002	0,0227623	-0,0508002	0,0227623	**	**	**
Highest Educational Level Attained	-0,0695694	0,0249103	-0,0695694	0,0249103	-0,0695694	0,0249103	*	*	*
Employment Status	-0,0252582	0,0340065	0,2537349	0,0608007	0,5794834	0,2782228		*	**
Scale of Incomes	-0,0704008	0,022062	-0,0704008	0,022062	-0,0704008	0,022062	*	*	*
Sex	-0,2981859	0,1037733	0,3630598	0,225076	2,542783	1,023259	*		**
Age	0,1161575	0,0221831	0,2342814	0,0460432	0,5749686	0,1966314	*	*	*
Age2	-0,001053	0,0002369	-0,0022699	0,0004933	-0,0059412	0,0018836	*	*	*
Marital Status	0,2609437	0,0319223	0,2609437	0,0319223	0,2609437	0,0319223	*	*	*
_cons	-2,54314	0,6721125	-11,84215	1,305885	-27,1203	6,329347			

Note: * indicates p<0.01 level, ** indicates p<0.05 level, *** indicates p<0.10 level.

According to the analysis in table 3.18, there are seven variables, which meet the proportional odds assumption out of twelve variables. Their effects do not vary to different categories of the response variable. For a one category change in people's perceptions about leisure time, people's happiness increases categorically. It means if people consider that leisure time is not important, their happiness levels decrease. This situation may occur because people do not keep time for themselves. For a one category change in perceived hardwork, individual happiness level increases categorically. This means if people think that in the long time, hardwork usually brings a better life, their happiness level improves. For a one category change in frequency of attending to religious services, happiness increases categorically. This means if people do not attend to religious services frequently, this affects their happiness negatively. For a one category change in people's marital status, individual

[26] You could also find the regression analysis with regard to proportional odds ratios, which show the distance(1vs 2+3+4), (1+2 vs 3+4) and (1+2+3 vs 4) between each category of variables used in the regression in Appendix B.

[27] In the first set of coefficients, trust and employment status are not statistically significant. Frequency of attending to religious services is significant at .10 percent level in the first set. In the second set of coefficients, sex is not statistically significant. Frequency of attending to religious services is significant at .10 percent level. In the third set of coefficients, trust is not statistically significant. Frequency of attending to religious services is significant at .10 percent level.

happiness level increases categorically. It means that married people are happier than those who are not in Norway. For a one category change in a scale of incomes, people’s happiness level decreases categorically. This means that if people are at higher income scale, their happiness level also improves. For a one category increase in perceptions about income inequality, their happiness level decreases categorically. It means as people think that the society needs larger income differences as incentives for individual effort, their happiness level also increases. For a one category change in the highest educational level attained, their happiness level decreases categorically. This means that people who have higher education level are happier than those who are illiterate or have lower level of education.

There are five variables, which do not meet the proportional odds assumption. In the first and the third panel of coefficients, the effect of lack of trust (mistrust) on happiness is not statistically significant. In the second set of coefficients, we see that mistrust affects people’s happiness level negatively. In addition, this means that people who do not trust the others tend more likely to place themselves “Not Very Happy” or “Not at All Happy” category because the effect of one category change in trust increases the odds of being in lower levels of the response variable in the second cut. In the first panel of coefficients, the positive effect of being in the upper categories of employment status is not significant. On the other hand, as people move away from full time employment, their happiness level decreases in the second and the third cuts. In other words, the coefficients of employment status are positive and get larger across the categories. This means that people who move away from full time employment are more likely to place themselves in the “Not Very Happy” and “Not at All Happy” categories. The negative effect of being upper categories in employment status on happiness level is higher in the third panel of coefficients

(1+2+3 vs. 4th category) compared to that of the second panel of coefficients. In the first set of coefficients, the effect of one category change in sex on happiness is positive. This means that females are happier than males in Norway. According to this result, females are more likely to place themselves in the “Very Happy” category. However, the effect is not very strong (0,29 %). In the second set of coefficient, the negative impact is not statistically significant. In the third set of coefficients, we see that for a one category change in sex, happiness level decreases. This means men are happier than females in this cut. We can also infer that the impact of one category change in sex is negative at the lowest level of happiness. U-shaped relationship between age and happiness has the highest effect in the third cut of the response variable. When we look at the effect of age per se, the effect is at the highest level in the third cut, which also indicates the lowest happiness level.

When we control this relationship with hard work by removing it from the regression, we see that significancy of perceived inequality increases from 0.026 to 0.004 with regard to 0.05 percent level, and the coefficient of the variable gets stronger a little bit in all sets of coefficients. If we control the relationship with income by removing it from the regression, we see that there is no much difference between the former regression and the current regression. The coefficients are still positive and significant.[28]

[28] The new result of the regression analysis could be found in Appendix D after controlling the relationship between perceived income inequality and perceived happiness with hardwork and income.

Spain[29]

Table 3.19 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of Spain[30]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1;2,3;4= not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		1 vs 2+3+4	1+2 vs 3+4	1+2+3 vs 4
	Coefficien	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,3589525	0,0909202	0,3589525	0,0909202	0,3589525	0,0909202	*	*	*
Trust	0,2118848	0,1270121	0,2118848	0,1270121	0,2118848	0,1270121	***	***	***
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	-0,0041461	0,0289328	0,0884359	0,033502	0,2322327	0,1007901		*	**
Attendance to Religious Services	0,1209444	0,0288238	-0,0234399	0,0332934	0,027843	0,0880363	*		
People's Perceptions to Inequality	-0,0285792	0,0225121	-0,0285792	0,0225121	-0,0285792	0,0225121			
Highest Educational Level Attained	-0,0079691	0,0303238	-0,0079696	0,0303238	-0,0079696	0,0303238			
Employment Status	0,0179196	0,0289365	0,0179196	0,0289365	0,0179196	0,0289365			
Scale of Incomes	-0,050972	0,0427795	-0,2019953	0,060925	-0,0719249	0,1351644		*	
Sex	-0,0022452	0,1108163	-0,0022452	0,1108163	-0,0022452	0,1108163			
Age	0,1404877	0,0231204	0,0234462	0,026082	0,1092647	0,0610752	*		***
Age2	-0,0011773	0,0002348	-0,0000828	0,0002549	-0,000753	0,0005848	*		
Marital Status	0,1948244	0,0310801	0,1948244	0,0310801	0,1948244	0,0310801	*	*	*
_cons	-3,6206500	0,7183857	-4,0664340	0,7988996	-10,3276900	2,1194950			

Note: * indicates p<0.01 level, ** indicates p<0.05 level, *** indicates p<0.10 level.

When we look at the results, we see that the seven variables out of twelve meet the parallel-lines assumption. For a one category change in leisure time, people's happiness level increases categorically. This means if people do not think that leisure time is very important, their happiness level falls. For a one category change in perceived trust, people's happiness level increases categorically. Again, this means that mistrust affects people's happiness level negatively. For a one category change in people's perceptions about income inequality, happiness level decreases categorically. This means if people think that the society needs larger income differences as incentives for the individual effort, their happiness level tends to increase. However, the impact of perceived income inequality is not statistically significant in Spain. For a one category change in the highest educational level

[29] You could also find the regression analysis with regard to proportional odds ratios, which show the distance(1vs 2+3+4), (1+2 vs 3+4) and (1+2+3 vs 4) between each category of variables used in the regression in Appendix B.

[30] In the first set of coefficients, hardwork, inequality, education, employment status, income, and sex are not statistically significant. Trust is significant at .10 percent level. In the second set of coefficients, frequency of attending to religious services, perceived inequality, highest educational level attained, employment status, sex, age and age2 are not statistically significant. Perceived trust is significant at .10 percent level. In the third set of coefficients, frequency of attending to religious services, perceived inequality, highest educational level attained, employment status, scales of income, sex, age2 are not statistically significant. Perceived trust and age are significant at .10 percent level.

attained, people’s happiness level decreases categorically. This means as people take education, their happiness level changes positively. However, this impact is also insignificant. For a one category change in employment status, happiness level increases categorically. This means if people move away from full- time employment, their happiness level tends to decrease. This impact is also insignificant. For a one category change in sex, people’s happiness level tends to increase. This means females are happier than males in Spain. However, this impact is insignificant in Spain. For a one category change in marital status, people’s happiness level increases categorically. This means that married people are happier than those who are not.

There are five variables, that do not meet parallel-lines assumption. The positive impact of perceived hardwork is not significant in the first cut of the response variable. This effect becomes negative in the second and in the third panel of coefficients. Perceptions about hardwork has the greatest negative impact on individual happiness at the lowest level of happiness (“Not at All Happy”) or in the third cut. In the first set of coefficients, for a one category change in frequency of attending to religious services, happiness level decreases. This means when people do not attend to these services frequently, their happiness level falls. As it is understood, people who do not attend to religious services too often are more likely to place themselves in higher categories of happiness (“Not Very Happy” (3), “Not at All Happy” (4)). In the second and the third set of coefficents, the impact of one category change in frequency of attending to religious services is not significant. The effect of one category change in scale of incomes is positive but it is at the weakest impact and also insignificant in the first cut. This positive effect becomes stronger in the second cut. In the third cut, the effect again weakens. According to this result, people are much more positively affected by an increase in a scale of incomes in the second set of coefficients. U- shaped relationship between age and happiness has the greatest impact at the lowest category of happiness (“Very Happy”) or in the first cut. This relationship is at the lowest level in the middle category of the response variable. In the third set of coefficients, the effect again gets higher. When we look at the impact of age on happiness per se, we see that aging affects the highest level of happiness most. This effect is negative. In the second cut, the relationship is not statistically significant. In the third cut, the impact of age again rises, the impact is lower than the first cut and is still negative.

If we remove frequency of attending religious services, sex and income scales from our base model, we see that the relationship between perceived happiness and perceived inequality is significant at .05 percent level in each of three sets of coefficients. When we control this relationship with hard work by removing it from the regression, it is not seen any difference in the relationship between the two variables in three sets of coefficients. The relationship is still insignificant. Coefficients are almost the same in both regressions for three sets of coefficents. Finally, when we control the relationship with income, we see that insignificancy of coefficients still persists except from the fact that it falls a little. On the other hand, the effect of perceived income inequality is a little bit stronger in the current regression.[31]

[31] The new result of the regression analysis could be found in Appendix D after controlling the relationship between perceived income inequality and perceived happiness with hardwork and income.

Sweden[32]

Table 3.20 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of Sweden[33]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1;2,3;4= not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		1 vs 2+3+4	1+2 vs 3+4	1+2+3 vs 4
	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,3819280	0,0863878	0,3819288	0,0863878	0,3819288	0,0863878	*	*	*
Trust	0,0143332	0,1085109	0,6473273	0,236369	2,125917	1,043011		*	**
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	0,0813987	0,0228649	0,0813987	0,022865	0,0813987	0,0228649	*	*	*
Attendance to Religious Services	0,0909477	0,0270817	0,0909477	0,0270817	0,0909477	0,0270817	*	*	*
People's Perceptions to Inequality	-0,064402	0,0242836	-0,077186	0,0525275	-0,3962217	0,1240703	*		*
Highest Educational Level Attained	-0,0037395	0,0265425	0,1056637	0,0540114	0,3546781	0,1363622		***	*
Employment Status	0,0377031	0,0289281	0,0377031	0,0289281	0,0377031	0,0289281			
Scale of Incomes	-0,0397292	0,0244477	-0,2612912	0,0548638	0,1045544	0,2098308		*	
Sex	-0,332643	0,1010134	-0,332643	0,1010134	-0,332643	0,1010134	*	*	*
Age	0,107152	0,0215648	0,107152	0,0215648	0,107152	0,0215648	*	*	*
Age2	-0,0009658	0,0002213	-0,0009658	0,0002213	-0,0009658	0,0002213	*	*	*
Marital Status	0,2462128	0,0323159	0,2462128	0,0323159	0,2462128	0,0323159	*	*	*
_cons	-3,4164870	0,6753456	-7,5157990	0,8395237	-13,325010	3,2017070			

Note: * indicates $p<0.01$ level, ** indicates $p<0.05$ level, *** indicates $p<0.10$ level.

According to the results of Sweden, there are eight variables, which meet the proportional odds assumption. For a one category change in perceived leisure, happiness level increases categorically. In other words, if people do not think that leisure is important, their happiness level tends to decrease. For a one category change in perceived hardwork, happiness level increase categorically. It means when people do not believe that in the long run, hardwork usually brings success, their happiness level decreases. For a one category change in frequency of attending to religious services, people's happiness level increases categorically. According to this result, if people do not attend to religious services too often, their happiness level tends to fall. For a one category change in employment status, people's happiness level increases categorically. It means that if people move away from full employment status, their happiness level tends to decrease. However, this

[32] You could also find the regression analysis with regard to proportional odds ratios, which show the distance(1vs 2+3+4), (1+2 vs 3+4) and (1+2+3 vs 4) between each category of variables used in the regression in Appendix B.

[33] In the first set of coefficients, trust, highest educational level attained, employment status and scales of income are not statistically significant. In the second set of coefficients, perceived inequality and employment status are not statistically significant. In the third set of coefficients, employment status and scales of income are not statistically significant.

relationship is not statistically significant in Sweden. For a one category change in sex, happiness level decreases categorically. This means that females are happier than males in Sweden. There is a negative relationship between age and happiness. When age increases, people's happiness level decreases. On the other hand, there is a U-shaped relationship between age and happiness. For a one category change in marital status, happiness level tends to decrease. This means that married people are happier than those who are not married, separated, widowed, etc.

According to the results, there are four variables, which do not meet proportional odds assumption. Coefficients of trust are positive and significant for the second and the third cut of the response variable. Coefficients get larger across the categories of happiness. This means people who do not trust the others are more likely to choose "Not Very Happy" and "Not at All Happy" categories. One category change in perceived trust has the greatest effect on individual happiness at the highest category of happiness (third cut), which is "Not at All Happy". The coefficients of perceived inequality are negative and get larger across the cut points of the response variable. This means that the greatest effect of perceived inequality on happiness is at the highest category of happiness ("Not at All Happy") or in the third cut. From this result, we can understand that as people think that the society needs larger income differences as incentives for the individual effort, their happiness level tends to increase. However, the effect of perceived inequality is not statistically significant in the second cut of the response variable. In the first set of coefficients, education has very weak but positive impact on happiness levels of people. However, in the first cut, (1st category vs 2+3+4th category), the effect of education is not statistically significant. In the second and the third set of coefficients, this effect becomes negative and gets larger. This means that in the higher categories of happiness, education has greater but negative effect on individual happiness level. In the first and the second panel of coefficients, the variable of a scale of incomes has a positive impact on happiness. However, this impact is not significant in the first cut. In the second set of coefficients, the effect is at the greatest level between the categories and it affects happiness level positively. According to this result, people with higher income levels on an income scale are more likely to choose “Very Happy” and “Rather Happy” categories of happiness because the impact of one category change in scales of income increases the odds of being in higher categories of happiness in the second cut. In the third set of coefficients, the negative effect of increasing income scales is not statistically significant.

If we put unemployed dummy instead of employment status, which includes different status in it to the regression analysis, we see that the relationship between the perceived happiness and the perceived inequality is significant at each of the three sets of coefficients. If we control the relationship with hard work, the relationship becomes more significant, and the coefficient of the perceived income inequality becomes a little bit stronger in three sets of coefficients with autofit (.01) option. If we control the relationship with hard work in .05 significance level, then we see that the effect of coefficients becomes stronger along with three sets of coefficients, and their p-values become smaller compared to the former regression. In the second set of coefficients, the relationship is significant at .10 percent level in contrast to the former one if we remove hard work from the regression. Finally, if we remove income from the regression analysis, we see that the positive impact of perceived income inequality still persists and the coefficients are still significant. It is important to mention that the second set of coefficients, the relationship becomes significant although in the former one, it is insignificant in the second set of coefficients.[34]

Switzerland[35]

Table 3.21 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of Switzerland[36]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1;2,3;4= not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		1 vs 2+3+4	1+2 vs 3+4	1+2+3 vs 4
	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,2600334	0,0744354	0,2600334	0,0744354	0,2600334	0,0744354	*	*	*
Trust	0,2841368	0,0982998	0,2841368	0,0982998	0,284137	0,0982998	*	*	*
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	0,0163218	0,0175617	0,0163218	0,0175617	0,0163218	0,0175617			
Attendance to Religious Services	0,0426226	0,0208899	0,0426226	0,0208899	0,0426226	0,0208899	**	**	**
People's Perceptions to Inequality	0,0146611	0,0176627	0,0146611	0,0176627	0,0146611	0,0176627			
Highest Educational Level Attained	-0,0199691	0,0249916	-0,0199691	0,0249916	-0,0199691	0,0249916			
Employment Status	0,0044513	0,0314903	0,1092619	0,0607819	0,3871843	0,1243517		***	*
Scale of Incomes	-0,002189	0,0232019	-0,2068796	0,049671	-0,4556835	0,2551124		*	***
Sex	-0,1956149	0,0963956	-0,1956149	0,0963956	-0,1956149	0,0963956	**	**	**
Age	0,0564917	0,020278	0,1617193	0,0463656	0,5644667	0,2025098	*	*	*
Age2	-0,000523	0,0001983	-0,0015744	0,0004583	-0,0063429	0,0022666	*	*	*
Marital Status	0,1922586	0,0281332	0,1922586	0,0281332	0,1922586	0,0281332	*	*	*
_cons	-2,2641410	0,6354883	-7,3142020	1,234625	-17,23793	4,573563			

Note: * indicates p<0.01 level, ** indicates p<0.05 level, *** indicates p<0.10 level.

According to the results in Table 3.15, there are eight variables, which meet the proportional odds assumption. For a one category change in perceived leisure time, people's happiness level increases categorically. In other words, as people think that leisure time is not important, their happiness level tends to decrease. For a one category change in perceived hardwork, people's happiness level increases categorically. This means as people do not believe that in the long run, hardwork usually brings success, their happiness tends to decrease. However, this impact is not significant. For a one category change in trust, people's happiness level increases

[34] The new result of the regression analysis could be found in Appendix D after controlling the relationship between perceived income inequality and perceived happiness with hardwork and income.

[35] You could also find the regression analysis with regard to proportional odds ratios, which show the distance(1vs 2+3+4), (1+2 vs 3+4) and (1+2+3 vs 4) between each category of variables used in the regression in Appendix B.

[36] In the first set of coefficients, hardwork, perceived inequality, highest educational level attained, employment status and income are not statistically significant. In the second set of coefficients, hardwork, perceived inequality and highest educational level attained are not statistically significant. Employment status is significant at .10 percent level. In the third set of coefficients, hardwork, perceived inequality and highest educational level attained are not statistically significant. Income is significant at .10 percent level.

categorically. Mistrust has a negative impact on people's happiness levels. For a one category change in perceived hardwork, people's happiness level increases categorically. This means if people believe that hardwork does not bring success, it is a more matter of luck, then, their happiness level decreases by a factor of 0,01 (or percent). However, this impact is insignificant. For a one category change in frequency of attending to religious services, people's happiness level increases categorically. This means if people do not attend to religious services frequently, their happiness level is affected from this situation negatively. For a one category change in perceived inequality, people's happiness level increases categorically. This means that if people think that a society needs larger income differences as incentives for individual effort, their happiness level tends to decrease. However, this impact is not statistically significant. For a one category change in the highest educational level attained, people's happiness decreases categorically. This means if people become educated, their happiness level increases. However, this impact is not significant in Switzerland. For a one category change in sex, people's happiness decreases categorically. This result indicates that females are happier than males in Switzerland. For a one category change in marital status, people's happiness level increases categorically. To this result, married people are happier than the other people who belong to different categories.

There are four variables that do not meet parallel-lines assumption. The coefficients of employment status are positive and get larger across the categories. According to this result, people who move away from full-time employment are more likely to place themselves in the " Not Very Happy" and "Not at All Happy" categories. However, this impact is not significant in the first cut. The coefficients of scales of income are negative and get larger across the categories. The relationship is not statistically significant in the first cut. This means that a rise in an income scale is more likely to affect people who are at higher categories of happiness (“rather happy” “not very happy” and “not at all happy”) positively. The coefficients of age/age2 are positive/negative and get larger across the categories. At first, this implies that when age increases, happiness level decreases, and there is a U- shaped relationship between age and happiness. Second, the effect of age/age2 has the greatest impact at the highest category of the response variable (“Not at all Happy” (4)). This means aging has a detrimental impact on individual happiness level mostly at lower happiness levels (“Rather Happy”, “Not Very Happy”, “Not at all Happy”) . In terms of U- shaped relationship, the coefficient of age2 is at the highest level in the third cut. This means that the U-shaped relationship is more likely to affect individuals who are at lower happiness levels positively.

The insignificant relationship between the perceived inequality and the perceived happiness persists even if we remove perceived leisure time, perceived hardwork and highest educational level attained from our base model. At the same time, it is important to mention that the size of insignificancy becomes smaller. When we control the relationship with hard work, we see that there is not much difference in the relationship along with the three sets of coefficients, except from the fact that insignificancy reduces a little. Finally, if we remove income from the regression in order to see whether is there any difference in the analysis, we see that the level of insignificany of the coefficients increases in all three sets of coefficients. The impact of perceived income inequality on individual happiness level is negative in all three sets. [37]

Turkey[38]

Table 3.22 Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Results of Turkey[39]

Dependent Variable=Happiness(very happy=1;2,3;4= not at all happy)	Generalized Ordered Logit Model								
	Model 1		Model2		Model3		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	1 vs 2+3+4		*1+2 vs 3+4*		*1+2+3 vs 4*		1 vs 2+3+4	1+2 vs 3+4	1+2+3 vs 4
	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Robust S.E	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Importance of Leisure Time	0,1467653	0,0535368	0,3194577	0,077817	0,5109373	0,1291053	*	*	*
Trust	0,2940079	0,1727312	0,2940079	0,1727312	0,2940079	0,1727312	***	***	***
People's Perceptions to Hardwork	0,0181779	0,012924	0,0181779	0,012924	0,0181779	0,012924			
Attendance to Religious Services	0,0954587	0,0162414	0,0954587	0,0162414	0,0954587	0,0162414	*	*	*
People's Perceptions to Inequality	-0,026255	0,0124545	-0,026255	0,0124545	-0,026255	0,0124545	**	**	**
Highest Educational Level Attained	0,0382946	0,022191	0,0382946	0,022191	0,0382946	0,022191	***	***	***
Employment Status	0,0151165	0,023902	0,1196948	0,0331633	0,1372888	0,0540352		*	**
Scale of Incomes	-0,0257457	0,0188644	-0,0257457	0,0188644	-0,0257457	0,0188644			
Sex	-0,5789346	0,0961831	-0,5789346	0,0961831	-0,5789346	0,0961831	*	*	*
Age	0,0725979	0,0182774	0,0842232	0,0185525	0,0958847	0,0195777	*	*	*
Age2	-0,0008354	0,0002093	-0,0008354	0,0002093	-0,0008354	0,0002093	*	*	*
Marital Status	0,168706	0,0229159	0,168706	0,0229159	0,168706	0,0229159	*	*	*
_cons	-1,969096	0,5786186	-5,434524	0,618607	-7,71908	0,746156			

Note: * indicates $p<0.01$ level, ** indicates $p<0.05$ level, *** indicates $p<0.10$ level.

According to the results in Table 3.16, there are nine variables, which meet the parallel-lines assumption. For a one category change in perceived trust, people's happiness level increases categorically. This means that people who do not trust the others are more unhappy than those who think that most people are trusted. For a one category change in perceived hardwork, people's happiness level increases categorically. This means if people do not believe that in the long run, hardwork usually brings a better life, their happiness level is affected negatively. However, this relationship is not statistically significant. For a one category change in the

---

[37] The new result of the regression analysis could be found in Appendix D after controlling the relationship between perceived income inequality and perceived happiness with hardwork and income.

[38] You could also find the regression analysis with regard to proportional odds ratios, which show the distance(1vs 2+3+4), (1+2 vs 3+4) and (1+2+3 vs 4) between each category of variables used in the regression in Appendix B.

[39] In the first set of coefficients, hardwork, employment status and scales of income are not statistically significant. Perceived trust and the highest educational level attained are significant at .10 percent level. In the second set of coefficients, hardwork and scales of income are not statistically significant. Perceived trust and the highest educational level attained are significant at .10 percent level. In the third set of coefficients, hardwork and scales of income are not statistically significant. Perceived trust and the highest educational level attained are significant at .10 percent level.

attendance to the religious services, people's happiness level increases categorically. This indicates that people who do not attend to religious services frequently, their happiness level decreases. For a one category change in perceived inequality, people's happiness level decreases categorically. This shows that as people move away from the thought that incomes should be made more equal, their happiness level increases. For a one category change in education, people's happiness level increases categorically. This infers that people who have higher education level than those who are illiterate or have lower education level are more unhappy in Turkey. The reason of this situation may come from the issue of unemployment, or from the education's effect that rises the expectations. For a one category change in a scale of incomes, people's happiness level decreases categorically. This indicates that there is a positive relationship between rising income scales and happiness level. However, the relationship is not significant. For a one category change in sex, people's happiness level decreases categorically. This means that females are happier than males in Turkey. For a one category change in marital status of people, their happiness level increases categorically. This signifies a positive relationship between being married and happiness level.

When it comes to the employment status, we see that it does not meet parallel-lines assumption because its effect varies across different categories. The coefficients of it are positive and get larger across the cut points of the response variable. This means that people who move away from "full-time employment" status are more likely to put themselves in the "Not Very Happy" and "Not at All Happy" categories. In the second panel of coefficients, the impact of one category change in employment status is negative. Still, one category change in employment status has the greatest impact on individual happiness level at the highest category of happiness ("Not at All

Happy”). In the first set of coefficients, the impact of one category increase in employment status is not statistically significant. Similarly, the coefficients of perceived leisure time are positive and get larger across the categories. This means that the importance of leisure time has the greatest effect on individual happiness at the highest category of happiness level (in the third cut). People who think that leisure time is not very important and think that leisure time is not important at all are more likely to place themselves in the “Not Very Happy” and “Not at All Happy” categories. When it comes to the relationship between age and happiness, we see that the coefficients of age are positive and get larger across the categories of the response variable. This means that people who are older than the others are more likely to place themselves in the “Not Very Happy” and “Not At All Happy” categories because the effect of age has a greater negative impact at the higher categories of happiness. On the other hand, the effect of age2 does not vary to categories. The effect of it on happiness is positive and this indicates a U-shaped relationship between happiness and age.

If we control the relationship with hard work, we see that there is not much difference in the relationship between perceived income inequality and happiness level in Turkey, except from the fact that significance level and the effect of explanatory variable increases a little in three sets of coefficients. If we remove income from the regression, we see that the level of significancy increases a little and the impact of perceived income inequality is positive in all three sets of coefficients.[40]

[40] The new result of the regression analysis could be found in Appendix D after controlling the relationship between perceived income inequality and perceived happiness with hardwork and income.

3.2.6 Result Comparisons on Turkey and the Other Selected Countries

3.2.6.1 Turkey vs Germany (The East Region)

According to the findings, which are mentioned above, responses of Turkey and the East region of Germany are different from each other. At first, the coefficients of the importance of leisure time do not vary across the categories of happiness in (East) Germany although its signs are positive as those of Turkey. However, the coefficients vary across the categories of the response variable, and get larger across the cut points in Turkey. In the first and the second cut, the negative impact of one category change in perceived leisure time is higher in the East region of Germany while in the third cut, the impact is higher in Turkey. Coefficients of trust are positive and get larger across the categories of the response variable in the East region of Germany in contrast to the coefficients in Turkey. The signs of trust is still positive, however, they do not vary across the categories in Turkey. The negative impact of one category change in perceived trust is higher in the East region of Germany compared to the impact of it in Turkey. The impact of one category change in perceived hard work is not significant in Turkey while it has a significant negative impact on individual happiness in the East region of Germany. The coefficients of perceived hard work do not vary across three sets of coefficients. Responses about frequency of attending to religious services only differentiate in terms of the size of its coefficients. The effect of frequency of attending to religious services in Turkey is a little higher than that of (East) Germany. While the positive impact of one category change in perceived income inequality is not statistically significant in the East region of Germany, it has a significant negative impact in Turkey. Responses about the highest educational level attained are different from each other in two countries. In Turkey, higher education has a negative impact on people’s happiness and does not vary across the categories of happiness. On the other hand, in (East) Germany, higher education reduces people's happiness level in the first set of coefficients, and then the effect of it reverses and gets larger across the categories of the response variable. In other words, one category change in the highest educational level attained increases the odds of being in higher levels of happiness in the second and the third cut but decreases the odds of being in higher levels of happiness in the first cut. One category change in employment status in Turkey has a negative impact on people's happiness level in Turkey while it increases happiness in the first set of coefficient (although it is insignificant), and then it reduces the level of happiness in the second and the third set of coefficients (insignificant impact) and coefficients of it vary across the categories of happiness in the East region of Germany. The negative impact of one category change in employment status is higher in the East region of Germany. The coefficients of income scales are lower in Turkey compared to the results of (East) Germany. The signs of them are the same (negative). The positive impact of one category change in a scale of incomes is insignificant in both countries. The effect of one category change in sex does not vary across the categories of happiness both in Turkey and in (East) Germany. In both countries, females are happier than males. The coefficients of age/age2 vary across categories and get larger in Turkey while they do not vary across the categories of happiness in (East) Germany. In both countries, the sign of coefficients is positive. In addition, there is a U-shaped relationship between age and happiness although the impact of age on individual happiness is negative. The impact of one unit change in age is higher in East Germany. The negative effect of one category change in marital status does not vary across the categories of happiness in both countries. However, the effect of it is stronger in (East) Germany than that of Turkey. It means that happiness levels of people who do not belong to the first category of marital status (married) are impacted negatively.

3.2.6.2 Turkey vs Germany (The West Region)

The coefficients of perceived leisure time do not vary across the categories of the response variable in the West region of Germany. However, the coefficients vary across the categories of the dependent variable and get larger across the cut points of happiness in Turkey. There is a negative relationship between happiness and perceived leisure time in both countries. The negative effect of the variable is stronger in (West) Germany than in Turkey in the first and the second set of coefficients. In the third set, the negative effect of it is higher in Turkey. The coefficients of perceived trust do not vary across the categories of the response variable in Turkey. The impact of perceived trust is negative in Turkey. However, the coefficients vary across the categories of happiness and get larger across the cut-points in the West region of Germany. There is a negative relationship between mistrust and happiness levels. In the first set, the negative effect is stronger in Turkey. In the second set, the negative effect is stronger in (West) Germany. Finally, in the third set, the negative effect is stronger in the West region of Germany. The highest negative impact of perceived trust is at the third set of coefficients in the West region of Germany. The coefficients of perceived hardwork do not vary across the cut-points of the dependent variable in both countries. The negative effect of one category increase in hardwork is stronger in (West) Germany than in Turkey. However, the impact of one category change in perceived hard work is not significant in Turkey. The coefficients of frequency of attending to religious services do not vary across the categories of the dependent variable in both countries. The negative effect of one category change in frequency of attending to religious services is higher in Turkey than in (West) Germany. The coefficients of perceived inequality do not vary across the cut-points of the dependent variable in Turkey. The impact of one category change in perceived inequality on individual happiness is positive. However, the coefficients of the variable vary across the categories of the dependent variable in the West region of Germany. In the first set, there is a negative relationship between happiness and perceived inequality, but this effect is insignificant. In the second set, the relationship reverses. This means respondents who perceive income inequality as an incentive for individual effort are more happy than those who perceive it negatively. In other words, the belief that the society needs larger income differences as incentives for individual effort increases the odds of being in higher happiness levels in the second set of coefficients. Finally, an increase in perceived income inequality has the greatest positive impact on individual happiness at the third set of coefficients (the lowest level of happiness). The positive impact of an increase in perceived income inequality is stronger in (West) Germany than in Turkey in the second and the third set of coefficients. The coefficients of the highest educational level attained do not vary across the categories of the response variable in Turkey. The coefficients of the highest educational level attained vary across the categories of the response variable in the West region of Germany. In the first set, there is a negative relationship between higher education and happiness, however, the relationship is not significant. In the second and the third set of the coefficients, while higher education affects people's happiness level negatively in Turkey, it affects happiness level positively in the West region of Germany. The coefficients of employment status do not vary across the categories of the response variable in the West region of Germany. However, they vary across the categories of happiness in Turkey. In the first set, negative effect of one category change in employment status is not significant in Turkey, but in the second and the third set, there is still a negative relationship between the variables and it is significant. The negative effect of one category change in employment status is greater in Turkey than in the West region of Germany in the second and the third panel. The coefficients of income scales do not vary across the categories of the dependent variable in both countries. The effect of one category change in income scale is a little bit stronger in (West) Germany than in Turkey. However, the positive effect of one category change in income scale in both countries is insignificant. The coefficients of sex do not vary across the cut-points of the dependent variable. Gender effect is stronger in Turkey in contrast to that of (West) Germany. In addition, the effect is insignificant in (West) Germany. Females are happier than men in Turkey. The coefficients of age do not vary across the cut-points of the dependent variable in the West region of Germany. However, they vary across the categories of the response variable in Turkey and get larger across the cut-points of happiness. Similar to (West) Germany, there is a negative relationship between age and happiness in Turkey. In addition, it seems that there is a U-shaped relationship between age and happiness in both countries. The coefficients of marital status do not vary across the categories of the dependent variable in Turkey while they vary across the categories of happiness and get larger in (West) Germany. The negative effect of one category change in marital status is stronger in (West) Germany for all categories of happiness than that of Turkey.

3.2.6.3 Turkey vs Finland

The coefficients of perceived leisure time in Turkey vary across the categories and leisure time has the greatest (but negative) effect at the highest categories of happiness (third cut). However, the coefficients of perceived leisure time do not vary across the categories of happiness in Finland. Its effect is more stronger in Finland than that of Turkey in the first and the second set of coefficients. In the third panel, the negative effect of perceived leisure time is stronger in Turkey than that of East Germany. The coefficients of perceived trust are positive and they are all the same for each category of happiness in Turkey. In the second and the third set of coefficients, the negative effect of perceived trust is much stronger in Finland than in Turkey. In the first set, the positive impact of one category change in perceived trust is not significant in Finland. The coefficients of perceived hardwork do not vary across categories and the signs of coefficients (positive) are the same in both countries. However, the negative effect of the variable is weaker in Turkey than that of Finland. The coefficients of frequency of attending to religious services are positive and do not vary across the categories in both countries. The effect of it is much stronger in Turkey than in Finland. While perceptions about income inequality affect Turkish people's happiness positively and do not vary across the categories of the response variable, they affect individual happiness positively in the first set of coefficients and affect individual happiness negatively in the second and the third set of coefficients in Finland. In other words, when people think that the society needs larger income differences as incentives, their happiness level decreases in Finland in the second and the third panel of coefficients. The impact of one category change in perceived income inequality has no significant impact on individual happiness level in the second set of coefficients in Finland. While higher education has a negative effect on happiness in Turkey, its effect is positive but insignificant in Finland. The negative effect of one category change in employment status gets larger in Turkey. In the first cut, the impact is insignificant. However, the effect of it is positive in Finland in the first set of coefficients and then the impact reverses and gets larger across the second and the third categories of happiness. In the second set of coeffients, the negative effect of one category change in employment status is higher in Turkey compared to that of Finland while in the third set, the effect of it is higher in Finland compared to that of Turkey. The positive effect of a higher income scale is stronger in Finland compared to that of Turkey. In addition, the positive impact is not statistically significant in Turkey. Coefficients of a scale of incomes do not vary across the categories of happiness in both countries. The gender effect is stronger in Turkey compared to that of Finland. Females are happier than males in both countries. The coefficients of age are positive (negative impact of age on invidiual happiness) and get larger across the categories of the response variable in Turkey while the negative effect of one unit change in age is the same for all categories of happiness and is stronger in Finland. It seems that there is a U-shaped relationship between age and happiness. The coefficients of age^2 vary across the categories of happiness in Finland, however, they do not vary across the cutpoints of happiness in Turkey. The negative effect of one category change in marital status is higher in Finland compared to that of Turkey. Married people are happier than the other people in both countries.

3.2.6.4 Turkey vs Norway

In Turkey, the coefficients of perceived leisure time are positive and get larger across the categories. The importance of leisure time has the greatest effect at higher categories of the response variable in Turkey while in Norway, the coefficients do not vary across the categories. In the first and the second set of coefficents, the negative effect of this variable is higher in Norway than in Turkey. The effect of it is only larger in Turkey in the third set of coefficients. While the coefficients of perceived trust vary across the categories of the response variable in Norway and get larger across them, the coefficients of this variable do not vary across the categories in Turkey. In the first set of coefficients, there is an insignificant positive relationship between mistrust and happiness in Norway. In the second and the third set of coefficients, the negative effect of mistrust is stronger in Norway (although it is insignificant in the third set and is significant at .10 percent level in the second set) The coefficients of perceived hardwork are positive and do not vary across the categories in both countries. The effect of it is higher in Norway than in Turkey. The impact of one category change in perceived hardwork is not statistically significant in Turkey. The coefficients of frequency of attending to religious services are positive in both countries. However, the negative impact of one category change in frequency of attending to religious services is stronger in Turkey than in Norway. The reason of this result stems from the fact that Turkey has a traditional culture and Turkish people bound up with religious beliefs. The coefficients of perceived inequality are negative and do not vary across the categories of the response variable in both countries. This means that one category change in perceived inequality has a positive impact on individual happiness levels in both countries. On the other hand, the belief that the society needs larger income differences as incentives affects more positively happiness level of people who live in Norway. Higher education affects happiness level of people who live in Norway positively while it affects happiness of people who live in Turkey negatively. The coefficient of employment status affects people’s happiness level positively in Norway although this effect is insignificant. The coefficients vary across the categories of the response variable and get larger across the cut points in both countries. However, the negative effect of one category change in employment status affects happiness level stronger in Norway than in Turkey. The effect of one category change in income levels affects individual happiness more positively in Norway than in Turkey. The impact is already insignificant in Turkey. The coefficients do not vary across the categories and they have both negative signs. In Turkey, the gender effect is the same at all categories of happiness and females are happier than males. However, in Norway, the gender effect vary across the categories of the response variable and have positive effect only in the first set of ceofficients. In the second and the third set of coefficients, males are more happy than females. In other words, gender has the greatest effect on behalf of men at the higher categories of the response variable. In the second cut, the relationship between one category change in sex and individual happiness is not significant. In Norway, the negative effect of one unit change in age is at the greatest level in the third set of coefficients while this negative effect is not so strong in all of the categories of the response variable in Turkey although the coefficients of age vary across three sets of coefficients in both countries. The U-shaped relationship between age and happiness is stronger in Norway than in Turkey. The negative effect of one category change in marital status affects happiness level of people who live in Norway more than those who live in Turkey. The coefficients have positive signs in both countries and do not vary across the categories.

3.2.6.5 Turkey vs Spain

The coefficients of perceived leisure time vary across the categories of the response variable and they have positive signs in Turkey. However, they do not vary across the categories in Spain although they have positive signs. The negative effect of these variables on individual happiness level is stronger in Spain than that of Turkey in the first and the second set of coefficients. In the third set, the negative effect is stronger in Turkey. The negative effect of mistrust is higher in Turkey than in Spain. The coefficients of the variable (perceived trust) do not vary across the categories of happiness in both countries. The coefficients of perceived hardwork do not vary across the categories of response variable in Turkey. It has negative but weak effect on happiness. This effect is not significant. However, in Spain, the coefficient of perceived hardwork has negative sign in the first set (but insignificant), while in the second and the third set of coefficients, hardwork has positive signs. The negative effect of perceived hardwork is stronger in Norway than in Turkey in the second and the third set of coefficients. The coefficients of frequency of attending to religious services do not vary across the categories of the response variable in Turkey and they have positive signs. The negative effect of one category change in religious services is stronger in Spain than in Turkey in the first set of coefficients. The effect of it is not significant in the second and the third set of coefficient in Spain. The coefficients of perceived inequality are negative and do not vary across the categories of happiness in Turkey. Similarly, the coefficients do not vary across the categories of happiness in Spain but they have no significant impact on individual happiness. This means that while one category change in perceived income inequality has no significant impact on individual happiness level in Spain, respondents who perceive income inequality as an incentive for individual effort in Turkey are more happy than those who perceive it negatively. While higher education impacts on happiness levels of people who live in Spain positively, it impacts on people's happiness negatively in Turkey. The positive effect of higher education is really strong but it is insignificant in Spain. The coefficients of employment status vary across the categories of the response variable and they have negative effect on happiness in Turkey in the second and the third set of coefficients. In the first set, the impact is insignificant. One category change in employment status has the greatest effect at the higher categories of happiness. Similarly, it has negative effect on people's happiness level in Spain.

However, the coefficients of it do not vary across the categories of the response variable and the impact is not statistically significant in Spain. The effect of one category change in an income scale is positive in both countries. However, it is much stronger in Spain than in Turkey. The effect of increase in income scale is insignificant in Turkey, while it is only significant in the second set of coefficients in Spain. The gender effect is much stronger in Turkey than that of Spain. Females are happier than males in both countries. In Spain, it has an insignificant effect. The coefficients of age have negative effects on people's happiness levels in Turkey, and they vary across the categories. The strongest effect (but weak) is at the highest categories of happiness. However, in the first and the third set of coefficients, the negative effect of one category change in age is stronger in Spain than in Turkey. It is not significant in the second set of coefficients in Spain. It seems that there is a U-shaped relationship between happiness and age in both countries. The negative effect of one category change in marital status is stronger in Spain than in Turkey. The coefficients of marital status do not vary across the categories of happiness in both countries.

3.2.6.6 Turkey vs Sweden

The coefficients of perceived leisure time vary across the categories of happiness and get larger across the cut-points of it in Turkey while they do not vary across the cutpoints of happiness in Sweden. In the first and the second set of coefficients, the negative effect of one category change in perceived leisure time is stronger in Sweden than in Turkey. In the third set, the effect of it is stronger in Turkey. The negative effect of one category change in perceived trust is stronger in Sweden than in Turkey. The effect is insignificant in Sweden in the first set of coefficients. It is important to mention that the coefficients of perceived trust do not vary across the categories of dependent variable while they vary across the categories of it in Sweden. The coefficients of perceived hardwork do not vary across the categories in both countries. However, the effect is stronger in Sweden than in Turkey. It is important to mention that the effect of it is not significant in Turkey. The negative effect of one category change in frequency of attending to religious services is a little bit stronger in Turkey than in Sweden. The coefficients of frequency of attending to religious services do not vary across the categories of the dependent variable in both countries. The positive effect of one category change in perceived inequality on individual happiness is much stronger in Sweden than in Turkey and the coefficients of perceived inequality vary across the categories of the dependent variable in Sweden in contrast to the coefficients in Turkey. This means that respondents who perceive income inequality as an incentive for individual effort are more happy than those who perceive it negatively compared to respondents in Turkey. However, in the second cut, the positive impact of one category change in perceived inequality is not statistically significant. The coefficients of it do not vary across the categories of the response variable in Turkey. There is a negative relationship betwen higher education and happiness levels. However, in the first set of coefficients, higher education has positive effect on happiness levels although it is insignificant in Sweden. Similar to the relationship between higher education and happiness in Turkey, there is a negative relationship between the two variables in Sweden and the coefficients of the highest educational level attained vary across the categories. The coefficients of employment status do not vary across the categories of the response variable in Sweden, however the impact of one category change in employment status is insignificant. In Turkey, the coefficients of it vary across the categories of the dependent variable and get larger across the cut-points of it. The positive effect of one category change in employment status on happiness level is insignificant in the first set of coefficients in Turkey. Then, the effect reverses and becomes significant. Employment status effect is stronger in Turkey than in Sweden in the second and the third set of coefficients. The negative effect is only stronger in Sweden in the first set of coefficients although it is insignificant. The coefficients of income scales do not vary across the categories of the response variable and they are not significant in Turkey. There is a positive relationship between income scales and happiness level in Turkey. In the first and the third set of coefficients, the income effect is not significant in Sweden. In the first cut, this impact is positive and in the third cut it is negative. The positive effect of one category change in an income scale is only significant in the second set of coefficients. This means that one category change in an income scale increases the odds of being in higher happiness levels at the second set of coefficients. The effect of income on individual happiness level is much stronger in Sweden than that of Turkey in the second panel. The coefficients of sex do not vary across the categories of the dependent variable in both countries. Gender effect is more stronger in Turkey than in Sweden. Females are happier than males in both countries. The coeffients of age vary across the categories of the response variable in Turkey while they do not vary across the categories of it in Sweden. In both countries, the effect of one unit change in age is negative. On the other hand, the negative effect of age is stronger in Sweden than in Turkey in each category of the dependent variable. The coefficients of age^2 do not vary across the cutpoints of the response variable in both countries. According to the sign of age^2, it seems that there is a U-shaped relationship between happiness and age. The negative effect for one category change in marital status is stronger in Sweden than in Turkey. The coefficients of marital status do not vary across the categories of the dependent variable in both countries.

3.2.6.7 Turkey vs Switzerland

The coefficients of perceived leisure time do not vary across the categories of the dependent variable in Switzerland and they have all positive signs. However, the coefficients of perceived leisure time vary across the categories of the response variable and get larger across the cut points in Turkey. In the first set of coefficients, the negative effect of one category change in perceived leisure time is stronger in Switzerland. In the second set and the third set, this impact is stronger in Turkey. The coefficients of perceived trust do not vary across the categories in both countries and the effect of mistrust is negative. In Turkey, the effect of mistrust is a little bit higher than that of Switzerland. The coefficients of perceived hardwork do not vary across the categories in both countries and the negative effect of one category change in perceived hardwork is a little bit lower in Switzerland than that of Turkey. However, this relationship is insignificant in both countries, the size of insignificancy is greater in Switzerland than in Turkey. The coefficients of frequency of attending to religious services do not vary across the categories in both countries. The negative effect of one category change in frequency of attending to religious services is higher in Turkey compared to that of Switzerland. The coefficients of perceived income inequality do not vary across the categories of happiness in both countries. While one category change in perceived inequality has no significant impact on happiness level in Switzerland, it increases people’s level of happiness in Turkey. This means that respondents who perceive income inequality as an incentive for individual effort are happier than those who perceive it negatively. The coefficients of the highest educational level attained do not vary across the categories of the response variable in both countries. While higher education affects people's happiness positively in Switzerland (but the relationship is not significant), it affects Turkish people's happiness level negatively. The coefficients of employment status vary across the dependent variable in both countries, and get larger across the cut-points of happiness. There is a negative relationship between one category change in employment status and happiness levels. In the first set of the coefficients, negative effect of it is not significant in Switzerland and Turkey. In the second set, this effect is stronger in Turkey than that of Switzerland. Finally, in the third set, the effect is stronger in Switzerland than that of Turkey. The coefficients of income scales do not vary across the categories of happiness in Turkey, and they are insignificant. However, the coefficients vary across the categories and get larger across the cut-points of happiness in Switzerland. In the first set, the relationship between happiness and scales of income is not significant. The positive effect of one category change in income scale is more larger in Switzerland in contrast to the result of Turkey. The gender effect is higher in Turkey in contrast to that of Switzerland. Females are happier than males in both countries. The coefficients of age vary across the categories of the dependent variable and get larger in both countries. There is a negative relationship between age and happiness in both countries, however, the negative effect is stronger in Switzerland than in Turkey. The negative impact of one unit change in age is higher only in the first cut in Turkey. The coefficients of age^2 do not vary across the cutpoints of the response variable in Turkey while they vary across the cutpoints of the response variable in Switzerland. In the first cut, the positive impact of one unit change in age^2 is higher in Turkey, however, in the second and the third cut, this impact is much more higher in Switzerland. According to the sign of age^2, it seems that there is a U-shaped relationship between age and happiness. The coefficients of marital status do not vary across the categories of the dependent variable in both countries. The negative effect of one category change in marital status is stronger in Switzerland than that of Turkey.

3.2.7 Check for Robustness[41]

In this section, first of all, it will be explained how generalized ordered logit model (gologit2 model) checks for robustness of violations of parallel-lines assumption automatically and it will also be mentioned about the advantages of this check. Then, it will be shared applied robustness methods/tests in order to strengthen each model established with regard to the third&fifth wave and to each country.

Before gologit2 gave results of its analysis, it performed a Wald test for parallel-lines assumption using the .05 percent level of significance. According to the results, it automatically showed that which variables met/ did not meet the assumption. One of advantages about its results is that it does not restrict the assumption for the variables, which do not meet the parallel-lines assumption in the way that ordered logit regression analysis does. Thanks to this test, we learnt that whether the final model violated the proportional odds / parallel-lines assumption or not. Generally speaking, if the result is insignificant, then, we understand that the parallel-lines assumption is not violated. However, it is important not to forget that this does not test the gologit2 model since the model does not impose the parallel-lines assumption already (Buis, 2014).

Then, we used robust standard errors in order to strengthen each model in the two waves and in each country and see the robust deviations from the mean by using vce (robust) command in Stata.

[41] You can reach robustness check tests of models, which were established to the third and the fifth wave and to each country in Appendix D.

We also performed a homogeneity test because our dependent and independent variable are categorical, and we also aspired to learn whether homogeneity of variance of happiness is violated or not across different categories of the explanatory variables. “wtest” is more robust than the traditional F tests in order to check homogeneity of the response variable. According to the wtest, probabilities are all significant in the third and the fifth wave. (We looked at the probability at .05 percent level.) This means that there is no problem of homogeneity in the relationship between the dependent variable and each of independent variables. (The variance of the response variable is distributed homogeneously.) However, when we look at the country side, in the East region of Germany, there is a problem at two variables. These are frequency of attending to religious services (p-value: 0.8530), and sex (p-value: 0.8976). Age and age^2 are significant at .10 percent level. In Finland, perceived inequality (p-value: 0.2566) is problematic, and frequency of attending to religious services is significant at .10 percent level. In Norway, frequency of attending to religious services, age and age^2 are significant at .10 percent level, while sex is not significant (0.1798). In Spain, hardwork (p-value: 0.4221), frequency of attending to religious services (p-value: 0.4017) and sex (p-value: 0.1546) are not significant while perceived trust and perceived inequality are significant at .10 percent level. In Sweden, the highest educational level attained (p-value: 0.1652), age (p-value: 0.7892) and age^2 (p-value: 0.7892) are not significant. In Switzerland, perceived hardwork (p-value: 0.1009), frequency of attending to religious services (p-value: 0.1201), perceived inequality (p-value: 0.4221), the highest educational level attained (p-value: 0.6350), sex (p-value: 0.2480), age (p-value: 0.4753), and age^2 (p-value: 0.4753) are not significant. In Turkey, trust (p-value: 0.1716), age (p-value: 0.1816) and age^2 (p-value: 0.1816) are not significant.

In the West region of Germany, frequency of attending to religious services (p-value: 1279), sex (p-value: 0.9398), age (p-value: 0.4191) and age^2 (p-value: 0.4191) are not significant while perceived hardwork and the highest educational level attained are significant at .10 percent level.

We also used “simanova” command, which can be used in Stata in order to obtain a more robust result on the subject of violations of homogeneity of variance, and to see that whether the variances of happiness is the same across the categories of each of the independent variables ("Stata Library: Using Stata To Deal With Violations Of The Homogeneity Of Variance Assumption In ANOVA"). In the third wave, at first, simanova test shows the results by performing an ordinary ANOVA test and then 1000 simulated ANOVA F tests. For all independent variables, ANOVA reported a p- value of 0.0000. If we compare this p-value with simulated one of 0.0000, we can understand that the actual p-value is lower than 0.05. When it comes to the countries, in the East region of Germany, at first, simanova test shows the results by performing an ordinary ANOVA test and then 1000 simulated ANOVA F tests. For the frequency of attending to religious services, ANOVA reported a p- value of 0.8119. If we compare this p-value with a simulated p-value of 0.8260, we understand that the actual p-value is not less than 0.05. For perceived income inequality, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0618. If we compare this p-value with a simulated one, we understand that the actual p-value is higher than 0.05. It is more liberal than 0.05. For the variable of sex, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.6434. If we compare this p-value with a simulated one of 0.6240, we understand that the actual p-value is not lower than 0.05. The other p-values, which are reported by ANOVA test for the East region of Germany is lower than 0.05. In Finland, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.1629 for perceived inequality. If we compare this p-value with a simulated one of 0.2290, we understand that the actual p-value is not lower than 0.05. The other p-values, which are reported by ANOVA in Finland are lower than 0.05. In Norway, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.1804 for the variable of sex. If we compare this p-value with a simulated one of 0.1910, we understand that the actual p-value is higher than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0758 for the variable of age. If we compare this p-value with a simulated one of 0.0790, we understand that the actual p-value is higher than 0.05. Similarly, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0758 for the variable of age^2. If we compare this value with a simulated one of 0.0910, we understand that the actual p-value is higher than 0.05. The other p-values, which are reported by ANOVA in Norway are lower than 0.05. In Spain, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.4453 for perceived hard work. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.5290, we understand that the actual p-value is not lower than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.5154 for the frequency of attendance to the religious services. If we compare the value with a simulated p-value of 0.5960, we understand that the actual p-value is not less than 0.05. Finally, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.1552 for the variable of sex. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.1550, we understand that the actual p-value is not less than 0.05. The other p-values, which are reported by ANOVA in Spain is lower than 0.05. In Sweden, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.1377 for the highest educational level attained. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.1800, we understand that the actual p-value is not less than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.6514 for the variable of age. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.6880, we understand that the actual p-value is not less than 0.05. Similarly, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.6514 for the variable of age^2. If we compare this value with a simulated one of 0.7110, we understand that the actual p-value is not less than 0.05. In Switzerland, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0508 for the perceived hard work. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.0480, we understand that the actual p-value is lower than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0825 for the frequency of attending to religious services. If we compare the value with a simulated p-value of 0.0780, we understand that the actual p-value is not less than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.3806 for perceived inequality. If we compare this value of a simulated p-value of 0.3800, we understand that the actual p-value is not less than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.5053 for the highest educational level attained. If we compare this value of a simulated p-value of 0.4730, we understand that the actual p-value is 47%, and it is not less than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.2489 for the variable of sex. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.2600, we understand that the actual p-value is 26% and it is not less than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.2681 for the variable of age. If we compare the value with a simulated p-value of 0.2760, we understand that the actual p-value is 27% and it is not less than 0.05. Finally, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.2881 for the variable of age^2. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.3070, we understand that the actul p-value is 31% and it is not less than 0.05. In Turkey, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0775 for the variable of perceived trust. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.0760, we understand that the actual p-value is 8% and it is not less than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0667 for the variable of scales of income. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.0570, we understand that the actual p-value is 6%, which is higher than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.2198. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.2590, we understand that the actual p-value is 26% and it is not less than 0.05. Finally, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.2261 for the variable of age^2. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.2670, we understand that the actual p-value is 27% and it is not less than 0.05. In West Germany, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0586 for the variable of perceived hard work. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.0980, we understand that the actual p-value is 10% and it is not less than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0641 for the frequency of attending to the religious services. If we compare the value with a simulated p-value of 0.0700, we understand that the actual p-value is 7% and it is not less than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0747 for the highest educational level attained. If we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.1050, we understand that the actual p-value is 11% and it is not less than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.9401 for the variable of sex. When we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.9350, we understand that the actual p-value is 94%, it is much higher than 0.05. ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0609 for the variable of age. When we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.2520, we understand that the actual p-value is 25% and it is not less than 0.05. Finally, ANOVA reported a p-value of 0.0708 for the variable of age^2. When we compare this value with a simulated p-value of 0.2520, we understand that the actual p-value is 25%, which is not less than 0.05.

We also looked at the "fstar" (f*) test in order to see the homogeneity of variance in our ordinal response variable, however, violations of homogeneity of variance is considered less sensitively in f* test. In the third wave, the p-value of age and age^2 could not be calculated by fstar test. Besides this problem, the other p-values, which are reported by fstar test are all significant at .05 percent level. In the fifth wave, age and age^2 could not be reported by fstar test. Besides this problem, the other p-values, which are reported by the fstar test are all significant at .05 percent level. In the East region of Germany, fstar test reported a p-value of 0.8894 for the relationship between frequency of attending to religious services and happiness in terms of homogeneity of variance. This is a much higher value than 0.05. The fstar test could not compute the p-values of the relationship between sex and happiness; age and happiness; age^2 and happiness in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness in the East region of Germany. The other p-values are all significant. In the West region of Germany, fstar test reported a p-value of 0.1292, which is insignificant for the relationship between happiness and perceived hard work in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.0937, which is higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and the frequency of attending the religious services in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.0709, which is higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and the highest educational level attained in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar reported a p-value of 0.9398, which is insignificant at 0.05 percent level for the relationship between happiness and sex in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test could not report p-values for the relationship between happiness and age/age^2 in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. In Finland, fstar test reported a p-value of 0.1168 for the relationship between the frequency of attending to religious services and happiness in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. It is not less than 0.05. Similarly, the p-value of the relationship between happiness and perceived income inequality is not less than 0.05. It is 0.2550. Fstar test could not compute p-values of the relationship between age and happiness and age^2 and happiness in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. Besides these problems, the other p-values are all significant. In Norway, fstar test could not compute the p-value of the relationship between happiness and the importance of leisure time and the p-value of the relationship between happiness and marital status in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.0932, which is not less than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and the frequency of attending the religious services in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.1798, which is not less than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and sex in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar reported a p-value of 0.0823, which is not less than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and age in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. This result is the same as the relationship between happiness and age^2. Fstar could not compute p-values for the relationship between age and happiness and age^2 and happiness in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness in Spain. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.0609, which is higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and perceived trust in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.3713, which is higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and perceived hard work in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.4585, which is higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and the frequency of attending to religious services in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.1546, which is higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and sex in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. In Sweden, fstar test could not compute the p-value for the relationship between happiness and the frequency of attending to religious services in terms of homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.1929, which is higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and the highest educational level attained in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.7150, which is much higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and age/age^2 in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. The other p-values, which are reported by fstar test are all significant. In Switzerland, fstar test reported a p-value of 0.0746, which is higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and perceived hard work in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.0993, which is higher than 0.05 for the relationship between happiness and the frequency of attending to religious services in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test reported a p-value of 0.5656, which is insignificant for the relationship between happiness and the highest educational level attained in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar reported a p-value of 0.2480, which is insignificant for the relationship between happiness and sex in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test could not compute p-values for the relationship between happiness and age/age^2 in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. In Turkey, fstar test reported a p-value of 0.1424, which is insignificant for the relationship between happiness and perceived trust in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. Fstar test could not report p-values for the relationship between happiness and age/age^2 in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness. In Turkey, fstar test reported a p-value of 0.1292, which is insignificant for the relationship between happiness and perceived trust in terms of the homogeneity of variance of happiness.

In addition, we looked at variance inflation factor (VIF). If it is higher than the number of 10 due to the rule of thumb, then, we understand that the multicollinearity is really high. Our data has no problem of multicollinearity since the mean value of VIF is not even 9 in both waves, and in the countries, separately. Finally, when we look at the odds ratios, we again used vce (robust) command in order to get a more robust result.

Besides these tests, we tried to use “rcheck” and “checkrob” commands for robustness analysis, however, we could not get a result because gologit2 does not count such analyses in its mind (Williams, 2016).

3.2.8 Discussion

Although our results are only limited to the sample sizes of the survey data used, they can still provide us some information to infer and discuss some things. According to the results of our analysis, despite the fact that the effects of explanatory variables vary to categories of the response variable, it is important not only to consider about the positive effects of people’s perceptions about their places on an income scale or the impact of their perceptions about income inequality on happiness level, but also it is important to consider about the negative effects of moving away from the thought that the leisure time is important or about the negative impact of most people cannot be trusted on an individual happiness level, because the second one’s impact is generally stronger than the first one’s impact in the sample size of the most countries. Therefore, we can say that it would be better if governments provided its citizens a safe place to live in and promoted them on the subject of making use of their spare time with some activities they are really interested in. At the same time, it is also important for people to think that hardwork does bring success to them. Otherwise, it may make them unhappy. Therefore, it can be helpful if individuals choose a job that fit them most and does not make them think they work a lot or they should think that it is worth it even they work. In other words, fairness perceptions, which are controlled by a hard work question in the survey, may take an important place in the lives of individuals with respect to their happiness levels. Marriage is also one of the variables that makes positive impact on people's happiness level than the effect of people's perceptions to income inequality and their income scales. At the same time, moving away from being married reduces the level of happiness. Although marriage is a long journey for two people and has some difficulties in its own way, it still enables two people to support each other and overcome hard times together. This may be the reason of the positive impact of marriage on happiness level. These results show that some social outcomes impact on people's happiness levels more than income-related things. In addition, it is important to point out that regression analysis results in this study infer that people's perceptions about income inequality and objective measures of it may cause to different consequences on the subject of the relationship between income inequality and happiness. For instance, thanks to the variable of the perceived income inequality as well as a question about hard work, we can understand whether people's belief about upward mobility or fairness perceptions has an important place in creating perceptions about income inequality. After the analysis, it is understood that significance levels and the effects of perceived income inequality becomes stronger for several countries when hard work is removed from the regression. This means people are happier from the existence of income differences when hard work, which is an indicator of fairness perceptions is removed from the regression. These countries are Finland (for the first and the third sets of coefficents), Norway (p-value is the same in all sets), Sweden (p-value is the same in all sets with autofit (.01) and the relationship is significant in all sets with autofit (.05) option but p-value changes.), Turkey (same in all sets) and West Germany (in the second and the third sets of coefficients). As is understood from this, the terms of actual income inequality and perceived income inequality should be probed separately.

In addition, we see from the literature that life satisfaction in Germany (including the East and the West region) does not depend on individual income level. For instance, although income increased over the years in Germany, life satisfaction level of individuals declined (Jacquemond, 2012). According to our findings, which are both about the East region and the West region of Germany, there is not a significant relationship between scales of income and happiness with regard to its regions of the country. Although our income indicator is not derived from actual (objective) income data, it still provides information about the relationship. The results are somewhat similar in the sense that they show us increasing income level has no positive impact on individual life satisfaction / happiness. In addition, the results are also in contradiction with our expected 'positive' outcome about the relationship between income and happiness levels. Similar to the literature about Finland (Böckerman and Ilmakunnas, 2005), we found a U-shaped relationship between happiness and age. Our findings are also consistent with this study in the sense that they imply a positive relationship between being married and individual happiness level. However, our findings are different from the study of Böckerman and Ilmakunnas (2005) on the subject of positive relationship between education level and happiness. We did not find a significant positive impact of education level on individual happiness in Finland. This finding is also in contradiction with our expected 'positive' outcome about the relationship between education level and happiness. Also, in contrast to the study (2005), we found that females are happier than males in Finland. This finding does persist along each category of happiness. In contrast to the incompatible relationship between (increasing) income levels and (stable)(or somehow decreasing) happiness level in Norway, we found a weak, but positive relationship between scales of income and happiness. This result may be due to the difference between perceived and actual income levels of individuals. We also found a positive relationship between (perceived) income inequality and individual happiness level as Hellevik (2003) suggests that relative judgments about economic conditions may have an impact on individual happiness level in Norway. In contrast to the study of Cunἄdo and Pèrez de Gracia (2011), education has no significant impact on individual happiness level in Spain in our analysis. They suggest that education has both direct and indirect impact on education level. According to Pedersen and Schmidt (2009), females are less happy than males in Spain. We could not find any significant impact of gender on individual happiness in Spain. In contrast to the study of Gerdtham and Johannesson (1997), income has only a positive impact at the second set of coefficients, which indicates 1st+2nd category vs. 3rd+ 4th category of happiness in Sweden. At the highest and the lowest happiness levels, scales of income has no significant impact on individual happiness. This may be again due to the fact that we used a perceived income data in the analysis. Individual perceptions and considering different happiness levels may cause to some differences in the relationship in comparison with using actual income data. In contrast to the same study (1997), we found that the impact of education level on individual happiness varies to each category of happiness in Sweden. For instance, education has a positive impact on individual happiness at the second and the third sets of coefficients (lower happiness levels), however, it has no significant impact at the highest happiness level (1st category vs. 2nd+3rd+4th category). Like Gerdtham and Johannesson (1997), we found a negative relationship between being male and being single on happiness level in Sweden. According to our analysis, when individuals move away from being married status by one category, their happiness level decreases. Like Fors' study (2010), we also found a U-shaped relationship between happiness and age. However, our findings about the relationship between marital status and individual happiness level is in contradiction with the study of Fors (2010). Our study shows us a positive relationship between being married and happiness level although Fors (2010) does not mention about any impact of marital status on individual happiness level in Sweden. It also does not imply a relationship between gender and happiness level. However, we found that being female has a positive impact on individual happiness level in Sweden at all happiness categories. Our findings about the relationship between religious participation and happiness level are also consistent with the literature in the sense that participation in religious services has a positive impact on individual life satisfaction level. Similar to the literature, we found a negative relationship between education level and individual happiness except from the fact that education has no significant impact on individual happiness at the highest category (1s category vs. 2nd+3rd+4th categories). In contrast to the Stutzer's finding (2004) about the relationship between income and happiness (positive), we found that scales of income has a positive impact on individual happiness level in Switzerland at the second and the third sets of coefficients (lower happiness levels) in the regression analysis. However, scales of income has no significant impact on individual happiness level at the first set of coefficients (the highest happiness level). This results from the fact that perceptions about one's own income and actual income may cause to some differences in results. Like Bjørnskov (2003), we also found that there is a positive relationship between social trust, which is an indicator of social capital and individual happiness level. Mistrust has a negative impact on individual happiness level in our study. When it comes to the results about Turkey, our findings are consistent with Eren and Aşıcı's study (2015) about the relationship between income and happiness. We could not find a significant impact of scales of income (perceived income) on individual happiness level. These results bring to mind Easterlin's finding(1974) about the inconsistent relationship between income and happiness across countries. We were also expecting that respondents who perceive income distribution more unequal will be less happy compared to those who perceived income inequality as an incentive for individual effort. The positive impact of one category change in perceived income inequality on happiness were not very strong in regression analyses. At the same time, it was still mostly consistent with our expectations although the relationship varied to the waves and to each country as well as categories of happiness levels in these countries. We also expected a positive relationship between educational level and happiness, however, we saw that this relationship varies to the waves and to each country. Besides these results, our acquired results are compatible with the results about the relationship between age and happiness; perceived trust and happiness; frequency of attending to religious services and happiness; perceived leisure time and happiness. It is expected that further studies will provide more concrete outcomes, explanations about its reasons and suggestions about policy conclusions on the subject of inconsistent relationship between happiness and other variables, which were found in these studies.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

It is a positive development that happiness studies have been proliferated day by day. This development is important in the sense that it provides a research opportunity on the subject of various meanings of happiness from past to present, and of different measurement ways and of a variety of determinants of it. Nowadays, from philosophers to psychologists and even to economists explore this notion in depth. In this way, we actually learn more about the "ultimate purpose and goal[42]" of humankind's life. It makes sense that happiness is our ultimate purpose in life and goal that we want to eventually reach because we do what we do in order to be happy and peaceful in the end. As studies proliferate, some points, which were not revealed in the past will come to the light in time.

Income inequality is another subject, which attracts the attention all over the world. There are many studies that explain the reasons and the extent of it by using some measurement techniques and make some policy inferences on it in order to resolve the issue of income inequality. However, problems, which are based on income inequality still persist in many regions of the world. On the other hand, there is a growing literature about perceived income inequality although it is not as extensive as actual income inequality. Individual perceptions are substantive in the sense that

[42] To Aristotle, happiness is described as "ultimate purpose and goal" of human existence.

they may be the reasons of results, which are different than actual income inequality. Because perceptions may be unique to each individual, the issue of income inequality should also be observed in terms of perceptions about it. This manner will also be helpful on the subject of eliminating income inequalities because we think that if we can understand the nature of perceptions and determinants of them, we can approach the matter more clearly and consciously and can provide more consistent solutions about it. Therefore, income inequality was studied in this research considering individual perceptions, which can be found in survey data. Using a comparative approach, understanding how it impacts on happiness levels of individuals who are from different waves of the survey data used and who live in different countries was the focus of the analysis that was performed. On the other hand, our purpose was to be able to compare the effects of the perceived income inequality and some social outcomes in order to understand which variables have a larger impact on happiness level of individuals in the two waves of the World Values Survey and in different countries. You could see the brief results of this subject below.

At the end of our analysis, we saw that perceived income inequality had no largest impact on individual happiness in the third wave although it had significant and positive impact on it. The result, which was obtained from the regression analysis was consistent with our expected outcomes in terms of being a positive relationship between variables about the relationship. This means that respondents who perceive the distribution of income more unequal in the third wave are less happy than those who perceived it more equal. In the fifth wave of the survey, we saw that the impact of perceived income inequality was statistically insignificant in contrast to the third wave. In the third wave, the largest positive impact is seen at the variable “sex” and the largest negative impact is seen at the variable “trust” if both of them change by one category. In the fifth wave, the largest positive impact is seen at the variable "sex" and the largest negative impact is seen at the variable "trust" if both of them change by one category.

When it comes to the interpretation of countries, we saw that perceived income inequality mostly had no largest impact on individual happiness. The largest significant and positive impact of perceived income inequality can be seen only in the third sets of coefficients in Sweden and in West Germany. The largest positive and negative impacts vary to countries and to the sets of coefficients. For clarity, positive and negative impacts will be mentioned comparatively in the following lines. While sex has the largest positive impact and trust has the largest negative impact on individual happiness in Turkey, the largest positive impact on individual happiness comes from age^2 for the first set of coefficients, and from the highest educational level attained for the second and the third sets of coefficients in the East region of Germany; the largest positive impact on individual happiness comes from the variable "sex" for all sets and the largest negative impact of individual happiness comes from the variable "leisure" for the first set and comes from the variable "trust" for the second and the third sets in Finland; the largest positive impact on individual happiness comes from the variable "sex" for the first set of coefficients and " a scale of incomes" for the second and the third sets of coefficients and the largest negative impact on individual happiness comes from the variable "perceived leisure" for the first set and "perceived trust" for the second set in Norway; the largest positive impact on individual happiness comes from the variable "age^2" for the first set and "scale of incomes" for the second set and the largest negative impact on individual happiness comes from the variable "leisure" for all sets in Spain (There are no variables, which have significant positive impact in the third set of coefficients in this country.); the largest positive impact on individual happiness comes from the variable “sex” for the first and the second cut and the largest negative impact on individual happiness comes from the variable “leisure” for all sets of coefficients in Sweden; the largest positive impact on individual happiness comes from the variable “sex”for the first cut, and “scales of income” for the second and the third cuts and the largest negative impact on individual happiness comes from the variable “trust” for the first and the second cuts and “ employment status” for the third cut in Switzerland; the largest positive impact on individual happiness comes from the variable “ sex” for all cuts and the largest negative impact comes from the variable “trust” for the first cut, and “leisure” for the second and the third cuts in Turkey; the largest positive impact on individual happiness comes from the variable “age^2” for the first cut, and “education” for the second cut and the largets negative impact on individual happiness comes from the variable “leisure” for the first cut, “trust” for the second and the third cuts.[43]

As it is understood from the results, which are mentioned above, some demographic and social outcomes were found to have larger impacts on individual happiness compared to the impact of perceived income inequality in this research. This weak impact may be due to individual perceptions about income inequality because although the results are not yet certain on this subject in the literature, perceptions about income inequality and actual income inequality methods may cause to different effects on happiness. As the data extends and improves by using a panel data and as the number of publications about this subject increase, these kinds of challenges are expected to disappear. It is important to state that the notion of happiness and income inequality should be examined comprehensively. In order to make an indepth

[43] This interpretation was made at .05 percent level for all countries.

analysis, both actual inequality in income and individuals' perceptions about the subject should be taken into consideration in a research to be held in the future. It is expected that this study will contribute to the relevant literature especially in Turkey and it will provide an insight for subsequent studies.

REFERENCES

Alesina, A., Di Tella, R. & MacCulloch, R., 2004. Inequality and happiness: Are Europeans and Americans different? *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(9), pp.2009–2042.

Alois, P., 2014. *Income inequality and happiness: Is there a relationship?*, Available at: http://www.lisdatacenter.org/wps/liswps/614.pdf.

Amiel, Y., 1999. The measurement of income inequality: The subjective approach. In *Handbook of Income Inequality Measurement*. Springer, pp. 227–243. Available at: http://darp.lse.ac.uk/subjective/amiel_1999.pdf.

Argyle, M., 1999. 18 Causes and Correlates of Happiness. *Well-Being: Foundations of Hedonic Psychology: Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*, p.353.

Argyle, M. & Lu, L., 1990. Happiness and social skills. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11(12), pp.1255–1261.

Atkinson, A.B., 2003. Income Inequality in OECD Countries: Data and Explanations. *CESifo Economic Studies*, 49(4), pp.479–513. Available at: http://cesifo.oxfordjournals.org/content/49/4/479.short?rss=1&ssource=mfc [Accessed February 23, 2016].

Atkinson, A.B. & Piketty, T., 2007. *Top incomes over the twentieth century: a contrast between continental european and english-speaking countries*, OUP Oxford.

Binelli, C., Loveless, M. & others, 2014. *The Urban-Rural Divide: Perceptions of Inequality in Central and Eastern Europe*, Available at : http://www.rcfea.org/RePEc/pdf/wp10_14.pdf.

Bjørnskov, C., 2003. The happy few: Cross--country evidence on social capital and life satisfaction. *Kyklos*, 56(1), pp.3–16.

Bjørnskov, C. et al., 2009. On the relation between income inequality and happiness : Do fairness perceptions matter ? , (495), pp.1–56.

Bjørnskov, C. et al., 2013. Inequality and happiness: When perceived social mobility and economic reality do not match. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 91, pp.75–92.

Bok, S., 2010. *Exploring happiness: From Aristotle to brain science*, Yale University Press.

Böckerman, P. & Ilmakunnas, P., 2006. Elusive effects of unemployment on happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, 79(1), pp.159–169.

Brulé, G. & Veenhoven, R., 2014. Freedom and happiness in nations: why the Finns are happier than the French. *Psychology of Well-Being: Theory, Research and Practice*, 4, p.17. Available at: http://www.psywb.com/content/4/1/17.

Buis, M. 2014. *Violated Wald test for gologit2 (generalised ordered logistic regression) - Statalist*. [online] Statalist.org. Available at: http://www.statalist.org/forums/forum/general-stata-discussion/general/3782-violated-wald-test-for-gologit2-generalised-ordered-logistic-regression [Accessed 27 Apr. 2016].

Caner, A., 2015. Happiness and Life Satisfaction in Turkey in Recent Years. *Social Indicators Research*, pp.1–39.

Caner, A., 2015. Happiness, comparison effects, and expectations in Turkey. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16(5), pp.1323–1345.

Castriota, S., 2006. Education and happiness: A further explanation to the Easterlin Paradox.

Chapple, S., Forster, M. & Martin, J.P., 2009. Inequality and well-being in OECD countries: what do we know. In *The 3rd OECD World Forum on Statistics, Knowledge and Policy, Busan, Korea*. pp. 27–30.

Cheng, H. & Furnham, A., 2003. Personality, self-esteem, and demographic predictions of happiness and depression. *Personality and individual differences*, 34(6), pp.921–942.

Clark, A.E. & D'Ambrosio, C., 2013. Attitudes to Income Inequality: Experimental and Survey Evidence. *Handbook of Income Distribution*, 2A(8136), pp.1–66. Available at: http://www.parisschoolofeconomics.com/clark-andrew/ChapterNov232013.pdf.

Corneo, G. & Grüner, H.P., 2002. Individual preferences for political redistribution. *Journal of public Economics*, 83(1), pp.83-107.

Cruces, G., Perez-Truglia, R. & Tetaz, M., 2013. Biased perceptions of income distribution and preferences for redistribution: Evidence from a survey experiment. *Journal of Public Economics*, 98, pp.100–112. Available at: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S004727271200117X.

Cuñado, J., de Gracia, F.P. & others, 2010. Education and happiness in Spain. *Investigaciones de Econom{'\i}a de la Educaci{ó}n volume 5*, 5, pp.206–222. Available at: http://repec.economicsofeducation.com/2010zaragoza/05-10.pdf.

Cuñado, J., Sison, A.J.G. & Calderón, R., How does religious belief and practice affect happiness? A European perspective. Available at: http://www.thearda.com/asrec/archive/papers/Sison_Religious_Belief.pdf.

De Maio, F.G., 2007. Income inequality measures. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, 61(10), pp.849–852.

Delhey, J. & Kroll, C., 2013. *A "Happiness Test" for the New Measures of National Well-Being: How Much Better than GDP are they?*, Springer.

Dumludag, D., Gokdemir, O. & Giray, S., 2015. Income comparison, collectivism and life satisfaction in Turkey. *Quality & Quantity*, pp.1–26.

Easterlin, R.A., 1974. Does economic growth improve the human lot? Some empirical evidence. *Nations and households in economic growth*, 89, pp.89–125.

Ebert, U. & Welsch, H., 2009. How do Europeans evaluate income distributions? An assessment based on happiness surveys. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 55(3), pp.803–819.

Eichhorn, J., 2011. Happiness for believers? Contextualizing the effects of religiosity on life-satisfaction. *European Sociological Review*, p.jcr027.

Ekici, T. & Koydemir, S., 2013. Social Capital, Government and Democracy Satisfaction, and Happiness in Turkey: A Comparison of Surveys in 1999 and 2008. *Social Indicators Research*, 118(3), pp.1031–1053. Available at: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11205-013-0464-y.

Engelhardt, C. & Wagener, A., 2014. Biased perceptions of income inequality and redistribution.

Eren, K.A. & Aşıcı, A.A., 2015. DETERMINANTS OF HAPPINESS IN TURKEY DURING 2004-2013 PERIOD.

Fors, F., 2010. Happiness in the extensive welfare state: Sweden in a comparative European perspective. In: B. Greve, ed., *Happiness and Social Policy in Europe*, 1st ed. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, pp.69-70-71-77-78-80.

Frey, B.S. & others, 2008. Happiness: A revolution in economics. *MIT Press Books*, 1.

Fu, V.K. & others, 1999. Estimating generalized ordered logit models. *Stata Technical Bulletin*, 8(44).

Gerdtham, U.G.& Johannesson, M., 2001. The relationship between happiness, health, and socio-economic factors:results based on Swedish microdata. *The Journal of Socio-Economics,*30(6), pp.553-557.

Gimpselson, V. & Treisman, D., 2015. Misperceiving Inequality. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series*, (9100).

Graham, C., 2012. *The pursuit of happiness: An economy of well-being*, Brookings Institution Press.

Graham, C. & Felton, A., 2005. Does inequality matter to individual welfare? An initial exploration based on happiness surveys from Latin America. *Center on Social and Economic Dynamics Working Paper*, (38).

Graham, C. & Felton, A., 2006. Inequality and happiness: Insights from Latin America. *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 4, pp.107–122.

Grimsley, J., 2015. *Income Inequality as a Political Issue: Does It Matter?* University of Colorado. Available at: http://scholar.colorado.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1955&context=honr_theses.

Growiec, K. & Growiec, J., 2011. Trusting only whom you know, knowing only whom you trust: the joint impact of social capital and trust on individuals' economic performance and happiness in CEE countries. *Knowing Only Whom You Trust: The Joint Impact of Social Capital and Trust on Individuals' Economic Performance and Happiness in CEE Countries (September 1, 2011)*. Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1930845.

Han, C. et al., 2012. Perceptions of Inequalities: implications for social cohesion. Available at: http://www.llakes.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/35.-Han-Janmaat-Hoskins-Green.pdf.

Haybron, D., 2011. Happiness. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/happiness/ [Accessed May 9, 2015].

Helliwell, J.F. & Wang, S., 2010. *Trust and well-being*, Available at: http://www.nber.org/papers/w15911.pdf.

Helliwell, John; Layard,Richard; Sachs, J., 2013. *World Happiness Report*, Available at: http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WorldHappinessReport2013_online.pdf.

Jancewicz, B., 2013. Measurement of Income Inequality Re-Examined. In *The Fifth ECINEQ Conference*. Bari, Italy. Available at: http://www.ecineq.org/ecineq_bari13/FILESxBari13/CR2/p27.pdf .

Jacquemond, M., 2012. *Inequality and Happiness in Germany*. [online] Available at: http://wellbeing.ihsp.mcgill.ca/publications/Jacquemond-Barrington-Leigh-report2012-inequality-happiness-Germany.pdf [Accessed 8 May 2016].

Kahneman, D.&Krueger, A.B., 2006.Developments in the measurement of subjective well-being. *The journal of economic perspectives*,20(1), pp.3-24.

Kaltenthaler, K., Ceccoli, S. & Gelleny, R., 2008. Attitudes toward eliminating income inequality in Europe. *European Union Politics*, 9(2), pp.217–241.

KANGAL, A., 2013. MUTLULUK ÜZERİNE KAVRAMSAL BİR DEĞERLENDİRME VE TÜRK HANEHALKI İÇİN BAZI SONUÇLAR. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 44(44). Available at: http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/esosder/article/view/5000068577 [Accessed April 8, 2015].

Karen Grace- Martin, Generalized Ordinal Logistic Regression for Ordered Response Variables. Available at: http://www.theanalysisfactor.com/generalized-ordinal-logistic-regression/ [Accessed March 27, 2016].

Kaya, S., 2016. The Relationship between Leisure Satisfaction and Happiness among College Students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(3), pp.622–631.

Keller, T., Medgyesi, M. & Tóth, I.G., 2010. *Analysing the link between measured and perceived income inequality in European countries*, (No.8). Research Note.

KÖKSAL , O.& ŞAHİN, F., 2015. Gelir ve Mutluluk: Gelir Karşılaştırmasının Etkisi. *Sosyoekonomi*, 23(26).

Krause, A., 2010. The Effect of Unemployment on Life and Satisfaction An Analysis for Switzerland in Its Cultural Diversity∗.

Kurowski, P., 2014. A View from the Radical Middle. Available at: http://perkurowski.blogspot.com.tr/2014/04/3-weaknesses-of-gini-coefficient-when.html.

Layard,R.2003. Happiness: has social science a clue? Lecture 3:what would make a happier society? Available at: http://cep.lse.ac.uk/_new/events/robbins.asp.

Leung, A. et al., 2013. Searching for happiness: The importance of social capital. In *The exploration of happiness*. Springer, pp. 247–267.

Liu, X. & Koirala, H., 2012. Ordinal regression analysis: using generalized ordinal logistic regression models to estimate educational data. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, 11(1), p.21.

Lloyd, K.M. & Auld, C.J., 2002. The role of leisure in determining quality of life: Issues of content and measurement. *Social Indicators Research*, 57(1), pp.43–71.

Lu, L. & Hu, C.-H., 2005. Personality, leisure experiences and happiness. *Journal of happiness Studies*, 6(3), pp.325–342.

Mangeloja, E. & Hirvonen, T., 2007. What Makes University Students Happy? *International Review of Economics Education*, 6(2), pp.27–41.

Medgyesi, M., 2011. *Increasing income inequality and attitudes to inequality: a cohort perspective*. Gini Discussion Paper, 5.1.6.

Nawijn, J. & Veenhoven, R., 2011. *The effect of leisure activities on life satisfaction: The importance of holiday trips*, Springer.

Niehues, J., 2014. Subjective Perceptions of Inequality and Redistributive Preferences : An International Comparison.

Noll, H.-H. & Weick, S., 2010. Subjective well-being in Germany: Evolutions, determinants and policy implications. *Happiness and social policy in Europe*, 7088.

Noval, B.L. & Garvi, M.G., Empirical Relationship between Education and Happiness. Evidence from SHARE. Available at: http://congresoreedes.unican.es/actas/PDFs/196.pdf.

Okulicz-Kozaryn, A., 2010. Religiosity and life satisfaction across nations. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 13(2), pp.155–169.

Osberg, L. & Smeeding, T., 2006. “Fair” inequality? Attitudes toward pay differentials: the United States in comparative perspective. *American sociological review*, 71(3), pp.450–473.

Oshio, T. & Kobayashi, M., 2011. Area-Level Income Inequality and Individual Happiness: Evidence from Japan. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12, pp.633–649.

Oshio, T. & Urakawa, K., 2013. The Association Between Perceived Income Inequality and Subjective Well-being: Evidence from a Social Survey in Japan. *Social Indicators Research*, 116, pp.755–770. Available at: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11205-013-0323-x.

Patel, N.R., Logistic Regression. Available at: http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/sloan-school-of-management/15-062-data-mining-spring-2003/lecture-notes/logreg.pdf.

Pedersen, P.J.&Schmidt, T.D.,2009. Happiness in Europe: Cross-Country Differences in the Determinants of Subjective Well-Being.

Perez-Truglia, R., 2015. A Samuelsonian validation test for happiness data. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 49, pp.74–83.

Programme, U.N.D., 2013. Humanity divided: Confronting inequality in developing countries. Available at: http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/PovertyReduction/Inclusive development/Humanity Divided/HumanityDivided_Ch6_low.pdf.

Rodriguez-Pose, A. & von Berlepsch, V., 2014. Social capital and individual happiness in Europe. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(2), pp.357–386.

Rothstein, B., 2010. Corruption, happiness, social trust and the welfare state: A causal mechanisms approach. *QoG working paper series*, 9.

Schalembier, B., 2015. Measuring perceived income inequality: an evaluation of different methods. In *Statistics and Demography: the Legacy of Corrado Gini*. Available at: http://meetings.sis-statistica.org/index.php/ginilegacy/SIS2015/paper/view/3415/725.

Selim, S., 2008. Life satisfaction and happiness in Turkey. *Social Indicators Research*, 88(3), pp.531–562.

Smyth, R. & Qian, X., 2008. Inequality and happiness in urban China. *Economics Bulletin*, 4.

Smyth, R., Qian, X. & others, 2008. Inequality and happiness in urban China. *Economics Bulletin*, 4(23), pp.1–10.

"Stata Library: Using Stata To Deal With Violations Of The Homogeneity Of Variance Assumption In ANOVA". *Ats.ucla.edu*. N.p., 2016. Web. 27 Apr. 2016.

Stutzer, A., 2004. The role of income aspirations in individual happiness. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 54(124), pp.89-109.

Tay, S., 2015. Rethinking Income Inequality in Japan and China (1995--2007) The Objective and Subjective Dimensions. *China Report*, 51(3), pp.230–257.

Torres-Reyna, O., Getting started in Logit and ordered logit regression. Available at: https://www.princeton.edu/~otorres/Logit.pdf.

Tóth, I.G., Keller, T. & others, 2011. Income distributions, inequality perceptions and redistributive claims in European societies.

UCAL, M.Ş., 2006. EKONOMETRİK MODEL SEÇİM KRİTERLERİ ÜZERİNE KISA BIR İNCELEME. , 7(2), pp.41–57. Available at: http://eskidergi.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/makale/1327.pdf.

Van Hoorn, A., 2008. *Income, leisure, and happiness*, NiCE Working Paper 08-116.Available at: www.narcis.nl/publication/RecordID/oai:repository.ubn.ru.nl:2066/74904.

Veenhoven, R., 1997. Advances in understanding happiness. *Revue Quebecoise de Psychologie*, 18, pp.29–74.

Williams, R. & others, 2006. Generalized ordered logit/partial proportional odds models for ordinal dependent variables. *Stata Journal*, 6(1), pp.58–82.

Williams, R., 2016. Understanding and interpreting generalized ordered logit models. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 40(1), pp.7–20.

Williams, R., 2016. *Check for Robustness in gologit2 analysis*. [email].

WORLD VALUES SURVEY Wave 3 1995-1998 OFFICIAL AGGREGATE v.20140921. World Values Survey Association (www.worldvaluessurvey.org). Aggregate File Producer: Asep/JDS, Madrid SPAIN.

WORLD VALUES SURVEY Wave 5 2005-2008 OFFICIAL AGGREGATE v.20140429.World Values Survey Association (www.worldvaluessurvey.org).Aggregate File Producer: Asep/JDS, Madrid SPAIN.

WORLD VALUES SURVEY 1981-2014 LONGITUDINAL AGGREGATE v.20150418. World Values Survey Association (www.worldvaluessurvey.org). Aggregate File Producer: JDSystems, Madrid, SPAIN.

Yemişcigil, A. & Dolan, P., 2015. “Mutluluk” Nedir, Nasıl Ölçülür? Kalkınma Literatüründe Teorik ve Metodolojik Yaklaşımlar. In *İktisatta Davranışsal Yaklaşımlar*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, pp. 163–175.

APPENDIX A

3rd Wave:

Table A.1 Regression Results with regard to Odds Ratios in the Third Wave

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	1.410435	.0517649	9.37	0.000	1.312541	1.515631
trust	1.003241	.0567678	0.06	0.954	.8979263	1.120908
hardwork	1.080952	.0102484	8.21	0.000	1.061051	1.101227
relact	1.121185	.0126718	10.12	0.000	1.096621	1.146298
inequality	.9681405	.0097573	-3.21	0.001	.9492043	.9874545
education	.9956177	.0130288	-0.34	0.737	.9704064	1.021484
empstat	.9995576	.0134457	-0.03	0.974	.9735489	1.026261
income	.9675013	.0101016	-3.16	0.002	.9479037	.9875042
sex	.8176127	.0397556	-4.14	0.000	.743291	.8993659
age	1.098775	.0106155	9.75	0.000	1.078165	1.11978
age2	.9991649	.000101	-8.26	0.000	.9989669	.9993628
marstat	1.278839	.0182378	17.25	0.000	1.243588	1.315088
_cons	.0499509	.0148151	-10.10	0.000	.0279307	.0893314
2						
leisure	1.410435	.0517649	9.37	0.000	1.312541	1.515631
trust	2.19565	.2125175	8.13	0.000	1.816247	2.654306
hardwork	1.080952	.0102484	8.21	0.000	1.061051	1.101227
relact	1.044376	.0185624	2.44	0.015	1.00862	1.081398
inequality	.9472379	.0146558	-3.50	0.000	.9189443	.9764026
education	.9517055	.0193624	-2.43	0.015	.9145025	.9904219
empstat	1.081889	.0208558	4.08	0.000	1.041775	1.123547
income	.9675013	.0101016	-3.16	0.002	.9479037	.9875042
sex	.8176127	.0397556	-4.14	0.000	.743291	.8993659
age	1.098775	.0106155	9.75	0.000	1.078165	1.11978
age2	.9991649	.000101	-8.26	0.000	.9989669	.9993628
marstat	1.278839	.0182378	17.25	0.000	1.243588	1.315088
_cons	.0008285	.0003018	-19.48	0.000	.0004058	.0016917
3						
leisure	1.410435	.0517649	9.37	0.000	1.312541	1.515631
trust	4.044473	1.129586	5.00	0.000	2.33953	6.991899
hardwork	1.080952	.0102484	8.21	0.000	1.061051	1.101227
relact	1.038184	.0438953	0.89	0.375	.9556194	1.127883
inequality	.8805762	.0306632	-3.65	0.000	.8224825	.9427733
education	1.033744	.0470391	0.73	0.466	.9455403	1.130175
empstat	1.090129	.0462371	2.03	0.042	1.00317	1.184625
income	.9675013	.0101016	-3.16	0.002	.9479037	.9875042
sex	.8176127	.0397556	-4.14	0.000	.743291	.8993659
age	1.098775	.0106155	9.75	0.000	1.078165	1.11978
age2	.9991649	.000101	-8.26	0.000	.9989669	.9993628
marstat	1.278839	.0182378	17.25	0.000	1.243588	1.315088
_cons	.0000375	.0000248	-15.43	0.000	.0000103	.0001368

5th Wave:

Table A.2 Regression Results with regard to Odds Ratios in the Fifth Wave

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	1.488138	.0668226	8.85	0.000	1.362766	1.625045
trust	1.360869	.0774327	5.42	0.000	1.21726	1.52142
hardwork	1.01356	.0109658	1.24	0.213	.9922933	1.035281
relact	1.06609	.0129421	5.27	0.000	1.041024	1.091761
inequality	.9840145	.0098857	-1.60	0.109	.9648284	1.003582
education	.9631765	.0118732	-3.04	0.002	.9401843	.986731
empstat	1.018475	.0158014	1.18	0.238	.9879712	1.049921
income	.944833	.0123425	-4.34	0.000	.9209493	.9693361
sex	.7965538	.0397613	-4.56	0.000	.7223139	.8784241
age	1.091374	.0105631	9.03	0.000	1.070866	1.112275
age2	.999245	.0000983	-7.68	0.000	.9990524	.9994377
marstat	1.223981	.0177246	13.96	0.000	1.18973	1.259218
_cons	.0709802	.0224291	-8.37	0.000	.0382089	.131859
2						
leisure	1.54944	.1041065	6.52	0.000	1.358259	1.76753
trust	2.662707	.2852991	9.14	0.000	2.158342	3.284932
hardwork	1.01356	.0109658	1.24	0.213	.9922933	1.035281
relact	.9947628	.0186487	-0.28	0.779	.9588754	1.031993
inequality	.9840145	.0098857	-1.60	0.109	.9648284	1.003582
education	.9631765	.0118732	-3.04	0.002	.9401843	.986731
empstat	1.2192	.0302938	7.98	0.000	1.161248	1.280044
income	.880961	.0203059	-5.50	0.000	.8420479	.9216725
sex	.7965538	.0397613	-4.56	0.000	.7223139	.8784241
age	1.091374	.0105631	9.03	0.000	1.070866	1.112275
age2	.9992176	.0000995	-7.86	0.000	.9990226	.9994127
marstat	1.223981	.0177246	13.96	0.000	1.18973	1.259218
_cons	.0008622	.0003446	-17.66	0.000	.0003939	.001887
3						
leisure	2.071322	.2590018	5.82	0.000	1.621107	2.64657
trust	7.043451	2.464851	5.58	0.000	3.547382	13.98502
hardwork	1.01356	.0109658	1.24	0.213	.9922933	1.035281
relact	.9951886	.0434603	-0.11	0.912	.9135515	1.084121
inequality	.9840145	.0098857	-1.60	0.109	.9648284	1.003582
education	.9631765	.0118732	-3.04	0.002	.9401843	.986731
empstat	1.300283	.0623155	5.48	0.000	1.183708	1.42834
income	.9763792	.0475056	-0.49	0.623	.8875716	1.074072
sex	.7965538	.0397613	-4.56	0.000	.7223139	.8784241
age	1.091374	.0105631	9.03	0.000	1.070866	1.112275
age2	.9990783	.0001107	-8.32	0.000	.9988613	.9992952
marstat	1.223981	.0177246	13.96	0.000	1.18973	1.259218
_cons	9.07e-06	8.35e-06	-12.61	0.000	1.49e-06	.0000551

By Countries:

Table A.3 Odds Ratios of East Germany

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	1.508823	.1451031	4.28	0.000	1.249621	1.821789
trust	1.951359	.3444655	3.79	0.000	1.380633	2.758013
hardwork	1.077052	.0271064	2.95	0.003	1.025214	1.131512
relact	1.057377	.0337813	1.75	0.081	.9931971	1.125704
inequality	.9982803	.0272694	-0.06	0.950	.9462389	1.053184
education	1.084418	.0451794	1.95	0.052	.9993875	1.176684
empstat	.986105	.0396483	-0.35	0.728	.9113789	1.066958
income	.9554456	.0304396	-1.43	0.153	.8976096	1.017008
sex	.8215225	.1041652	-1.55	0.121	.6407537	1.05329
age	1.122608	.0282064	4.60	0.000	1.068664	1.179276
age2	.9989288	.0002601	-4.12	0.000	.9984192	.9994386
marstat	1.283969	.0478217	6.71	0.000	1.19358	1.381204
_cons	.0181984	.014916	-4.89	0.000	.0036506	.0907207
2						
leisure	1.508823	.1451031	4.28	0.000	1.249621	1.821789
trust	3.656436	.8507727	5.57	0.000	2.317405	5.769178
hardwork	1.077052	.0271064	2.95	0.003	1.025214	1.131512
relact	1.057377	.0337813	1.75	0.081	.9931971	1.125704
inequality	.9982803	.0272694	-0.06	0.950	.9462389	1.053184
education	.907169	.0365693	-2.42	0.016	.8382528	.9817511
empstat	1.185973	.0433073	4.67	0.000	1.104059	1.273965
income	.9554456	.0304396	-1.43	0.153	.8976096	1.017008
sex	.8215225	.1041652	-1.55	0.121	.6407537	1.05329
age	1.122608	.0282064	4.60	0.000	1.068664	1.179276
age2	.9989288	.0002601	-4.12	0.000	.9984192	.9994386
marstat	1.283969	.0478217	6.71	0.000	1.19358	1.381204
_cons	.0002627	.0002316	-9.35	0.000	.0000467	.0014784
3						
leisure	1.508823	.1451031	4.28	0.000	1.249621	1.821789
trust	5.549346	3.89863	2.44	0.015	1.40036	21.99094
hardwork	1.077052	.0271064	2.95	0.003	1.025214	1.131512
relact	1.057377	.0337813	1.75	0.081	.9931971	1.125704
inequality	.9982803	.0272694	-0.06	0.950	.9462389	1.053184
education	.8234382	.0817764	-1.96	0.050	.6777935	1.000379
empstat	1.113866	.0884118	1.36	0.174	.9533886	1.301356
income	.9554456	.0304396	-1.43	0.153	.8976096	1.017008
sex	.8215225	.1041652	-1.55	0.121	.6407537	1.05329
age	1.122608	.0282064	4.60	0.000	1.068664	1.179276
age2	.9989288	.0002601	-4.12	0.000	.9984192	.9994386
marstat	1.283969	.0478217	6.71	0.000	1.19358	1.381204
_cons	.0000248	.0000364	-7.23	0.000	1.40e-06	.0004398

Table A.4 Odds Ratios of Finland

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1						
leisure	1.622818	.14581	5.39	0.000	1.360784	1.935308
trust	.9680953	.1135458	-0.28	0.782	.7692766	1.218298
hardwork	1.082025	.0280335	3.04	0.002	1.028452	1.138388
relact	1.057075	.0321947	1.82	0.068	.9958206	1.122097
inequality	.9423522	.0243145	-2.30	0.021	.8958817	.9912333
education	.9811385	.0271382	-0.69	0.491	.9293647	1.035797
empstat	.9735718	.0268578	-0.97	0.332	.9223292	1.027661
income	.8987109	.0235915	-4.07	0.000	.8536417	.9461596
sex	.6467359	.0701888	-4.02	0.000	.5228149	.8000296
age	1.155841	.021807	7.68	0.000	1.113881	1.199382
age2	.9986909	.0001959	-6.68	0.000	.998307	.9990749
marstat	1.247114	.0393344	7.00	0.000	1.172354	1.32664
_cons	.0625903	.0380095	-4.56	0.000	.0190368	.2057882
2						
leisure	1.622818	.14581	5.39	0.000	1.360784	1.935308
trust	3.165585	.710154	5.14	0.000	2.039384	4.913704
hardwork	1.082025	.0280335	3.04	0.002	1.028452	1.138388
relact	1.057075	.0321947	1.82	0.068	.9958206	1.122097
inequality	1.019355	.0446682	0.44	0.662	.9354612	1.110773
education	.9811385	.0271382	-0.69	0.491	.9293647	1.035797
empstat	1.084998	.0487564	1.82	0.069	.9935251	1.184894
income	.8987109	.0235915	-4.07	0.000	.8536417	.9461596
sex	.6467359	.0701888	-4.02	0.000	.5228149	.8000296
age	1.155841	.021807	7.68	0.000	1.113881	1.199382
age2	.9988336	.0001934	-6.03	0.000	.9984546	.9992128
marstat	1.247114	.0393344	7.00	0.000	1.172354	1.32664
_cons	.0000577	.0000449	-12.54	0.000	.0000125	.0002651
3						
leisure	1.622818	.14581	5.39	0.000	1.360784	1.935308
trust	3.363401	1.851242	2.20	0.028	1.143591	9.892055
hardwork	1.082025	.0280335	3.04	0.002	1.028452	1.138388
relact	1.057075	.0321947	1.82	0.068	.9958206	1.122097
inequality	1.154415	.0894588	1.85	0.064	.9917445	1.343767
education	.9811385	.0271382	-0.69	0.491	.9293647	1.035797
empstat	1.24177	.1048886	2.56	0.010	1.052307	1.465344
income	.8987109	.0235915	-4.07	0.000	.8536417	.9461596
sex	.6467359	.0701888	-4.02	0.000	.5228149	.8000296
age	1.155841	.021807	7.68	0.000	1.113881	1.199382
age2	.9986025	.0002253	-6.20	0.000	.9981609	.9990442
marstat	1.247114	.0393344	7.00	0.000	1.172354	1.32664
_cons	4.06e-06	5.28e-06	-9.54	0.000	3.17e-07	.000052

Table A.5 Odds Ratios of Norway

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	1.593692	.1350787	5.50	0.000	1.349765	1.881702
trust	.9460823	.1128257	-0.46	0.642	.7488905	1.195197
hardwork	1.085927	.0249668	3.59	0.000	1.038079	1.13598
relact	1.046522	.02629	1.81	0.070	.9962422	1.099339
inequality	.9504685	.0216348	-2.23	0.026	.908997	.9938321
education	.9327954	.0232362	-2.79	0.005	.8883472	.9794676
empstat	.9750581	.0331584	-0.74	0.458	.9121874	1.042262
income	.9320202	.0205622	-3.19	0.001	.8925779	.9732054
sex	.7421634	.0770167	-2.87	0.004	.6055744	.9095603
age	1.123173	.0249155	5.24	0.000	1.075386	1.173083
age2	.9989476	.0002367	-4.44	0.000	.9984838	.9994115
marstat	1.298155	.0414401	8.17	0.000	1.219422	1.38197
_cons	.0786192	.0528409	-3.78	0.000	.0210584	.293516
2						
leisure	1.593692	.1350787	5.50	0.000	1.349765	1.881702
trust	1.758346	.3973328	2.50	0.013	1.129168	2.738105
hardwork	1.085927	.0249668	3.59	0.000	1.038079	1.13598
relact	1.046522	.02629	1.81	0.070	.9962422	1.099339
inequality	.9504685	.0216348	-2.23	0.026	.908997	.9938321
education	.9327954	.0232362	-2.79	0.005	.8883472	.9794676
empstat	1.28883	.0783618	4.17	0.000	1.144042	1.451942
income	.9320202	.0205622	-3.19	0.001	.8925779	.9732054
sex	1.437722	.3235967	1.61	0.107	.9248895	2.234909
age	1.264	.0581987	5.09	0.000	1.154928	1.383373
age2	.9977327	.0004922	-4.60	0.000	.9967684	.9986979
marstat	1.298155	.0414401	8.17	0.000	1.219422	1.38197
_cons	7.19e-06	9.40e-06	-9.07	0.000	5.56e-07	.000093
3						
leisure	1.593692	.1350787	5.50	0.000	1.349765	1.881702
trust	2.571879	1.700866	1.43	0.153	.7035964	9.401074
hardwork	1.085927	.0249668	3.59	0.000	1.038079	1.13598
relact	1.046522	.02629	1.81	0.070	.9962422	1.099339
inequality	.9504685	.0216348	-2.23	0.026	.908997	.9938321
education	.9327954	.0232362	-2.79	0.005	.8883472	.9794676
empstat	1.785116	.4966599	2.08	0.037	1.034767	3.07957
income	.9320202	.0205622	-3.19	0.001	.8925779	.9732054
sex	12.71501	13.01075	2.48	0.013	1.711264	94.47491
age	1.777075	.3494287	2.92	0.003	1.20874	2.612634
age2	.9940764	.0018724	-3.15	0.002	.9904133	.9977531
marstat	1.298155	.0414401	8.17	0.000	1.219422	1.38197
_cons	1.67e-12	1.05e-11	-4.28	0.000	6.83e-18	4.07e-07

Table A.6 Odds Ratios of Spain

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	1.431829	.1301822	3.95	0.000	1.198118	1.711128
trust	1.236006	.1569877	1.67	0.095	.9636237	1.58538
hardwork	.9958624	.0288131	-0.14	0.886	.9409612	1.053967
relact	1.128562	.0325295	4.20	0.000	1.066573	1.194154
inequality	.9718254	.0218778	-1.27	0.204	.9298778	1.015665
education	.9920621	.0300831	-0.26	0.793	.9348183	1.052811
empstat	1.018081	.0294597	0.62	0.536	.961948	1.07749
income	.9503053	.0406536	-1.19	0.233	.8738747	1.033421
sex	.9977573	.1105678	-0.02	0.984	.8029673	1.239801
age	1.150835	.0266078	6.08	0.000	1.099849	1.204185
age2	.9988234	.0002346	-5.01	0.000	.9983637	.9992832
marstat	1.215098	.0377654	6.27	0.000	1.143288	1.291417
_cons	.0267653	.0192278	-5.04	0.000	.0065476	.1094114
2						
leisure	1.431829	.1301822	3.95	0.000	1.198118	1.711128
trust	1.236006	.1569877	1.67	0.095	.9636237	1.58538
hardwork	1.092464	.0365997	2.64	0.008	1.023035	1.166606
relact	.9768327	.032522	-0.70	0.481	.9151258	1.0427
inequality	.9718254	.0218778	-1.27	0.204	.9298778	1.015665
education	.9920621	.0300831	-0.26	0.793	.9348183	1.052811
empstat	1.018081	.0294597	0.62	0.536	.961948	1.07749
income	.8170988	.0497818	-3.32	0.001	.7251287	.9207338
sex	.9977573	.1105678	-0.02	0.984	.8029673	1.239801
age	1.023723	.0267007	0.90	0.369	.9727059	1.077416
age2	.9999172	.0002549	-0.32	0.745	.9994177	1.000417
marstat	1.215098	.0377654	6.27	0.000	1.143288	1.291417
_cons	.0171384	.0136919	-5.09	0.000	.0035805	.0820342
3						
leisure	1.431829	.1301822	3.95	0.000	1.198118	1.711128
trust	1.236006	.1569877	1.67	0.095	.9636237	1.58538
hardwork	1.261413	.127138	2.30	0.021	1.035296	1.536916
relact	1.028234	.0905219	0.32	0.752	.8652776	1.22188
inequality	.9718254	.0218778	-1.27	0.204	.9298778	1.015665
education	.9920621	.0300831	-0.26	0.793	.9348183	1.052811
empstat	1.018081	.0294597	0.62	0.536	.961948	1.07749
income	.9306008	.1257841	-0.53	0.595	.7140214	1.212874
sex	.9977573	.1105678	-0.02	0.984	.8029673	1.239801
age	1.115458	.0681267	1.79	0.074	.9896139	1.257304
age2	.9992473	.0005844	-1.29	0.198	.9981027	1.000393
marstat	1.215098	.0377654	6.27	0.000	1.143288	1.291417
_cons	.0000327	.0000693	-4.87	0.000	5.14e-07	.0020838

Table A.7 Odds Ratios of Sweden

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	1.465108	.1265674	4.42	0.000	1.236904	1.735414
trust	1.014436	.1100774	0.13	0.895	.8200874	1.254843
hardwork	1.084803	.0248039	3.56	0.000	1.037262	1.134524
relact	1.095212	.0296602	3.36	0.001	1.038595	1.154915
inequality	.937628	.022769	-2.65	0.008	.894047	.9833334
education	.9962675	.0264435	-0.14	0.888	.9457643	1.049468
empstat	1.038423	.0300396	1.30	0.192	.9811844	1.099
income	.9610496	.0234954	-1.63	0.104	.9160853	1.008221
sex	.7170261	.0724292	-3.29	0.001	.5882369	.8740126
age	1.113103	.0240039	4.97	0.000	1.067037	1.161159
age2	.9990347	.0002211	-4.36	0.000	.9986014	.9994681
marstat	1.279172	.0413376	7.62	0.000	1.200664	1.362813
_cons	.0328276	.02217	-5.06	0.000	.0087374	.1233371
2						
leisure	1.465108	.1265674	4.42	0.000	1.236904	1.735414
trust	1.910428	.451566	2.74	0.006	1.202079	3.036186
hardwork	1.084803	.0248039	3.56	0.000	1.037262	1.134524
relact	1.095212	.0296602	3.36	0.001	1.038595	1.154915
inequality	.9257176	.0486256	-1.47	0.142	.8351549	1.026101
education	1.111448	.0600309	1.96	0.050	.9998032	1.23556
empstat	1.038423	.0300396	1.30	0.192	.9811844	1.099
income	.7700566	.0422482	-4.76	0.000	.6915483	.8574777
sex	.7170261	.0724292	-3.29	0.001	.5882369	.8740126
age	1.113103	.0240039	4.97	0.000	1.067037	1.161159
age2	.9990347	.0002211	-4.36	0.000	.9986014	.9994681
marstat	1.279172	.0413376	7.62	0.000	1.200664	1.362813
_cons	.0005444	.000457	-8.95	0.000	.000105	.0028218
3						
leisure	1.465108	.1265674	4.42	0.000	1.236904	1.735414
trust	8.380583	8.741038	2.04	0.042	1.08508	64.72717
hardwork	1.084803	.0248039	3.56	0.000	1.037262	1.134524
relact	1.095212	.0296602	3.36	0.001	1.038595	1.154915
inequality	.6728575	.0834816	-3.19	0.001	.5276116	.8580882
education	1.425722	.1944145	2.60	0.009	1.091347	1.862544
empstat	1.038423	.0300396	1.30	0.192	.9811844	1.099
income	1.110216	.2329574	0.50	0.618	.7358667	1.675003
sex	.7170261	.0724292	-3.29	0.001	.5882369	.8740126
age	1.113103	.0240039	4.97	0.000	1.067037	1.161159
age2	.9990347	.0002211	-4.36	0.000	.9986014	.9994681
marstat	1.279172	.0413376	7.62	0.000	1.200664	1.362813
_cons	1.63e-06	5.23e-06	-4.16	0.000	3.07e-09	.0008676

Table A.8 Odds Ratios of Switzerland

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	1.296973	.0965408	3.49	0.000	1.120912	1.500689
trust	1.328615	.1306026	2.89	0.004	1.095787	1.610913
hardwork	1.016456	.0178507	0.93	0.353	.9820644	1.052051
relact	1.043544	.0217995	2.04	0.041	1.00168	1.087157
inequality	1.014769	.0179235	0.83	0.407	.9802407	1.050514
education	.980229	.0244975	-0.80	0.424	.9333717	1.029439
empstat	1.004461	.0316308	0.14	0.888	.9443404	1.06841
income	.9978134	.0231511	-0.09	0.925	.9534542	1.044236
sex	.8223289	.0792689	-2.03	0.042	.680759	.9933394
age	1.058118	.0214565	2.79	0.005	1.016888	1.101019
age2	.9994771	.0001982	-2.64	0.008	.9990887	.9998657
marstat	1.211984	.034097	6.83	0.000	1.146964	1.28069
_cons	.1039193	.0660395	-3.56	0.000	.0299066	.3610977
2						
leisure	1.296973	.0965408	3.49	0.000	1.120912	1.500689
trust	1.328615	.1306026	2.89	0.004	1.095787	1.610913
hardwork	1.016456	.0178507	0.93	0.353	.9820644	1.052051
relact	1.043544	.0217995	2.04	0.041	1.00168	1.087157
inequality	1.014769	.0179235	0.83	0.407	.9802407	1.050514
education	.980229	.0244975	-0.80	0.424	.9333717	1.029439
empstat	1.115454	.0677995	1.80	0.072	.99018	1.256578
income	.8131175	.0403884	-4.16	0.000	.7376889	.8962587
sex	.8223289	.0792689	-2.03	0.042	.680759	.9933394
age	1.17553	.0545041	3.49	0.000	1.073414	1.287361
age2	.9984269	.0004576	-3.44	0.001	.9975305	.9993241
marstat	1.211984	.034097	6.83	0.000	1.146964	1.28069
_cons	.000666	.0008223	-5.92	0.000	.0000592	.0074885
3						
leisure	1.296973	.0965408	3.49	0.000	1.120912	1.500689
trust	1.328615	.1306026	2.89	0.004	1.095787	1.610913
hardwork	1.016456	.0178507	0.93	0.353	.9820644	1.052051
relact	1.043544	.0217995	2.04	0.041	1.00168	1.087157
inequality	1.014769	.0179235	0.83	0.407	.9802407	1.050514
education	.980229	.0244975	-0.80	0.424	.9333717	1.029439
empstat	1.472828	.1831487	3.11	0.002	1.15426	1.879318
income	.6340145	.1617449	-1.79	0.074	.3845449	1.045325
sex	.8223289	.0792689	-2.03	0.042	.680759	.9933394
age	1.75851	.3561154	2.79	0.005	1.18241	2.615299
age2	.9936772	.0022522	-2.80	0.005	.9892727	.9981013
marstat	1.211984	.034097	6.83	0.000	1.146964	1.28069
_cons	3.26e-08	1.49e-07	-3.77	0.000	4.17e-12	.0002551

Table A.9 Odds Ratios of Turkey

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	1.158082	.062	2.74	0.006	1.042722	1.286204
trust	1.341794	.2317697	1.70	0.089	.9564383	1.882414
hardwork	1.018344	.013161	1.41	0.160	.9928729	1.044469
relact	1.100163	.0178682	5.88	0.000	1.065694	1.135748
inequality	.9740867	.0121318	-2.11	0.035	.9505967	.9981572
education	1.039037	.0230573	1.73	0.084	.9948145	1.085226
empstat	1.015231	.0242661	0.63	0.527	.9687676	1.063924
income	.9745829	.0183849	-1.36	0.172	.9392072	1.011291
sex	.5604952	.0539101	-6.02	0.000	.4641953	.6767731
age	1.075298	.0196536	3.97	0.000	1.037459	1.114517
age2	.999165	.0002091	-3.99	0.000	.9987552	.9995749
marstat	1.183772	.0271272	7.36	0.000	1.13178	1.238152
_cons	.139583	.0807653	-3.40	0.001	.0449067	.4338641
2						
leisure	1.376381	.1071059	4.11	0.000	1.181682	1.603159
trust	1.341794	.2317697	1.70	0.089	.9564383	1.882414
hardwork	1.018344	.013161	1.41	0.160	.9928729	1.044469
relact	1.100163	.0178682	5.88	0.000	1.065694	1.135748
inequality	.9740867	.0121318	-2.11	0.035	.9505967	.9981572
education	1.039037	.0230573	1.73	0.084	.9948145	1.085226
empstat	1.127153	.0373801	3.61	0.000	1.056219	1.20285
income	.9745829	.0183849	-1.36	0.172	.9392072	1.011291
sex	.5604952	.0539101	-6.02	0.000	.4641953	.6767731
age	1.087872	.0201827	4.54	0.000	1.049025	1.128157
age2	.999165	.0002091	-3.99	0.000	.9987552	.9995749
marstat	1.183772	.0271272	7.36	0.000	1.13178	1.238152
_cons	.0043633	.0026992	-8.79	0.000	.0012979	.0146681
3						
leisure	1.666853	.2151995	3.96	0.000	1.294204	2.146801
trust	1.341794	.2317697	1.70	0.089	.9564383	1.882414
hardwork	1.018344	.013161	1.41	0.160	.9928729	1.044469
relact	1.100163	.0178682	5.88	0.000	1.065694	1.135748
inequality	.9740867	.0121318	-2.11	0.035	.9505967	.9981572
education	1.039037	.0230573	1.73	0.084	.9948145	1.085226
empstat	1.147159	.061987	2.54	0.011	1.031879	1.275318
income	.9745829	.0183849	-1.36	0.172	.9392072	1.011291
sex	.5604952	.0539101	-6.02	0.000	.4641953	.6767731
age	1.100632	.0215479	4.90	0.000	1.059199	1.143686
age2	.999165	.0002091	-3.99	0.000	.9987552	.9995749
marstat	1.183772	.0271272	7.36	0.000	1.13178	1.238152
_cons	.0004443	.0003315	-10.35	0.000	.0001029	.0019177

Table A.10 Odds Ratios of West Germany

happiness	Odds Ratio	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	1.522912	.1336283	4.79	0.000	1.282289	1.808688
trust	1.264548	.1728892	1.72	0.086	.9672946	1.653148
hardwork	1.076033	.0298856	2.64	0.008	1.019024	1.136231
relact	1.078362	.029123	2.79	0.005	1.022766	1.13698
inequality	1.00306	.029874	0.10	0.918	.9461837	1.063354
education	1.015704	.0313157	0.51	0.613	.9561439	1.078974
empstat	1.067344	.034346	2.03	0.043	1.002106	1.136829
income	.9668599	.0256535	-1.27	0.204	.917865	1.01847
sex	.8848159	.1052994	-1.03	0.304	.700735	1.117254
age	1.073197	.0234696	3.23	0.001	1.02817	1.120197
age2	.9994244	.0002176	-2.64	0.008	.998998	.9998509
marstat	1.233704	.0464739	5.58	0.000	1.145898	1.328238
_cons	.0511128	.0370281	-4.10	0.000	.0123563	.211433
2						
leisure	1.522912	.1336283	4.79	0.000	1.282289	1.808688
trust	1.53457	.2650002	2.48	0.013	1.093944	2.152673
hardwork	1.076033	.0298856	2.64	0.008	1.019024	1.136231
relact	1.078362	.029123	2.79	0.005	1.022766	1.13698
inequality	.9191031	.0326572	-2.37	0.018	.8572742	.9853914
education	.9132986	.0346041	-2.39	0.017	.8479328	.9837033
empstat	1.067344	.034346	2.03	0.043	1.002106	1.136829
income	.9668599	.0256535	-1.27	0.204	.917865	1.01847
sex	.8848159	.1052994	-1.03	0.304	.700735	1.117254
age	1.073197	.0234696	3.23	0.001	1.02817	1.120197
age2	.9994244	.0002176	-2.64	0.008	.998998	.9998509
marstat	1.416847	.0560161	8.81	0.000	1.311203	1.531002
_cons	.0023693	.0017842	-8.03	0.000	.0005415	.0103658
3						
leisure	1.522912	.1336283	4.79	0.000	1.282289	1.808688
trust	8.223338	5.976054	2.90	0.004	1.979083	34.169
hardwork	1.076033	.0298856	2.64	0.008	1.019024	1.136231
relact	1.078362	.029123	2.79	0.005	1.022766	1.13698
inequality	.7128545	.0731895	-3.30	0.001	.5829177	.8717554
education	.8646105	.0809315	-1.55	0.120	.7196877	1.038716
empstat	1.067344	.034346	2.03	0.043	1.002106	1.136829
income	.9668599	.0256535	-1.27	0.204	.917865	1.01847
sex	.8848159	.1052994	-1.03	0.304	.700735	1.117254
age	1.073197	.0234696	3.23	0.001	1.02817	1.120197
age2	.9994244	.0002176	-2.64	0.008	.998998	.9998509
marstat	1.756789	.2007068	4.93	0.000	1.404342	2.19769
_cons	.0000156	.0000257	-6.71	0.000	6.17e-07	.0003949

APPENDIX B

3rd Wave:

Tables B.1 Marginal Effects in the Third Wave

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3553986	.0086548	41.06	0.000	.3384355	.3723618
2	.2810437	.0058253	48.25	0.000	.2696263	.2924611
3	.2170079	.0091959	23.60	0.000	.1989842	.2350316
4	.1642298	.0120607	13.62	0.000	.1405912	.1878683

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5817424	.0076014	76.53	0.000	.566844	.5966408
2	.6325276	.0062552	101.12	0.000	.6202676	.6447875
3	.6652661	.0070183	94.79	0.000	.6515105	.6790217
4	.6773786	.0065611	103.24	0.000	.6645192	.6902381

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0549937	.0029471	18.66	0.000	.0492176	.0607699
2	.075371	.0033242	22.67	0.000	.0688556	.0818864
3	.1022002	.0057183	17.87	0.000	.0909926	.1134078
4	.1366322	.0104352	13.09	0.000	.1161795	.1570849

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0078653	.0009851	7.98	0.000	.0059345	.009796
2	.0110577	.0013325	8.30	0.000	.0084461	.0136694
3	.0155258	.0019607	7.92	0.000	.011683	.0193686
4	.0217594	.0030666	7.10	0.000	.0157491	.0277698

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2976025	.0092465	32.19	0.000	.2794796	.3157254
2	.2969265	.0072157	41.15	0.000	.2827841	.311069

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6512919	.0095914	67.90	0.000	.632493	.6700908
2	.5973252	.0078442	76.15	0.000	.5819509	.6126996

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0467565	.0038602	12.11	0.000	.0391907	.0543223
2	.0883883	.0043414	20.36	0.000	.0798794	.0968972

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0043491	.0011145	3.90	0.000	.0021648	.0065334
2	.01736	.0019304	8.99	0.000	.0135764	.0211436

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3616515	.0098666	36.65	0.000	.3423134	.3809896
2	.3438811	.0080938	42.49	0.000	.3280176	.3597447
3	.3265373	.0066951	48.77	0.000	.3134151	.3396595
4	.3096554	.0058415	53.01	0.000	.2982063	.3211044
5	.2932662	.0056621	51.79	0.000	.2821687	.3043637
6	.2773959	.0060986	45.48	0.000	.2654428	.289349
7	.2620659	.0069319	37.81	0.000	.2484797	.2756522
8	.2472933	.0079492	31.11	0.000	.2317131	.2628734
9	.2330903	.0090136	25.86	0.000	.215424	.2507565
10	.2194652	.0100484	21.84	0.000	.1997707	.2391597

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5770722	.0084104	68.61	0.000	.5605882	.5935562
2	.5902091	.0072519	81.39	0.000	.5759955	.6044226
3	.6025954	.0064918	92.82	0.000	.5898717	.6153192
4	.6141775	.0061447	99.95	0.000	.6021341	.6262208
5	.6249053	.0061431	101.73	0.000	.6128651	.6369454
6	.6347335	.0063588	99.82	0.000	.6222705	.6471964
7	.6436209	.0066588	96.66	0.000	.6305699	.656672
8	.6515312	.006941	93.87	0.000	.6379271	.6651353
9	.6584323	.0071399	92.22	0.000	.6444384	.6724262
10	.6642966	.007221	92.00	0.000	.6501437	.6784495

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0536204	.003053	17.56	0.000	.0476366	.0596041
2	.0576393	.0029828	19.32	0.000	.051793	.0634855
3	.0619332	.0029557	20.95	0.000	.0561401	.0677262
4	.0665168	.003001	22.16	0.000	.060635	.0723987
5	.0714051	.0031503	22.67	0.000	.0652307	.0775795
6	.0766129	.0034298	22.34	0.000	.0698907	.0833352
7	.0821551	.003855	21.31	0.000	.0745995	.0897107
8	.0880463	.00443	19.88	0.000	.0793637	.0967288
9	.0943004	.0051519	18.30	0.000	.0842029	.1043979
10	.1009311	.0060153	16.78	0.000	.0891412	.1127209

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0076559	.0009714	7.88	0.000	.005752	.0095599
2	.0082706	.0010279	8.05	0.000	.0062559	.0102852
3	.0089341	.0010931	8.17	0.000	.0067917	.0110765
4	.0096503	.0011688	8.26	0.000	.0073596	.0119411
5	.0104234	.001257	8.29	0.000	.0079598	.012887
6	.0112577	.0013598	8.28	0.000	.0085925	.013923
7	.012158	.0014797	8.22	0.000	.0092578	.0150582
8	.0131293	.001619	8.11	0.000	.009956	.0163025
9	.0141771	.0017804	7.96	0.000	.0106876	.0176665
10	.0153072	.0019665	7.78	0.000	.0114529	.0191614

margins, at(relact==1.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4178696	.0138486	30.17	0.000	.3907269	.4450124

margins, at(relact==1.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5153653	.0137963	37.36	0.000	.488325	.5424055

margins, at(relact==1.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0581487	.005571	10.44	0.000	.0472296	.0690677

margins, at(relact==1.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0086164	.0020107	4.29	0.000	.0046755	.0125573

margins, at(relact==2.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3903335	.0112505	34.69	0.000	.3682829	.4123841

margins, at(relact==2.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5401447	.0113178	47.73	0.000	.5179622	.5623272

margins, at(relact==2.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0605794	.0048713	12.44	0.000	.0510319	.0701268

margins, at(relact==2.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0089425	.001776	5.04	0.000	.0054615	.0124234

margins, at(relact==3.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3634789	.0089142	40.78	0.000	.3460073	.3809505

margins, at(relact==3.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5641375	.0091041	61.97	0.000	.5462938	.5819812

margins, at(relact==3.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0631028	.0041851	15.08	0.000	.0549001	.0713055

margins, at(relact==3.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.0092808	.0015519	5.98	0.000	.0062391	.0123224

margins, at(relact==4.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.3374492	.0070327	47.98	0.000	.3236653	.3512331

margins, at(relact==4.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.5871972	.007345	79.94	0.000	.5728012	.6015932

margins, at(relact==4.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.0657219	.0035787	18.36	0.000	.0587077	.0727361

margins, at(relact==4.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.0096318	.0013621	7.07	0.000	.006962	.0123015

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2883412	.0056783	50.78	0.000	.2772119	.2994705

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6300271	.0061813	101.93	0.000	.617912	.6421421

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0712581	.0031452	22.66	0.000	.0650937	.0774225

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0103736	.0012541	8.27	0.000	.0079155	.0128317

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2654484	.0062793	42.27	0.000	.2531412	.2777557

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6496051	.0068699	94.56	0.000	.6361404	.6630699

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.074181	.0035866	20.68	0.000	.0671514	.0812106

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0107654	.001411	7.63	0.000	.008	.0135309

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2437506	.0072899	33.44	0.000	.2294627	.2580385

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6678665	.0080416	83.05	0.000	.6521053	.6836278

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0772109	.0044398	17.39	0.000	.068509	.0859128

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0111719	.0017028	6.56	0.000	.0078345	.0145093

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2701233	.0098614	27.39	0.000	.2507954	.2894512
2	.2765541	.0083811	33.00	0.000	.2601275	.2929808
3	.2830787	.0070623	40.08	0.000	.2692369	.2969205
4	.2896956	.0060703	47.72	0.000	.2777979	.3015932
5	.2964031	.0056452	52.51	0.000	.2853388	.3074675
6	.3031997	.0059693	50.79	0.000	.2915001	.3148994
7	.3100835	.0069883	44.37	0.000	.2963867	.3237803
8	.3170524	.0084944	37.32	0.000	.3004038	.3337011
9	.3241044	.0103075	31.44	0.000	.3039021	.3443067
10	.3312372	.0123181	26.89	0.000	.3070942	.3553802

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6313319	.0107353	58.81	0.000	.610291	.6523728
2	.6296126	.0090481	69.59	0.000	.6118787	.6473465
3	.6275966	.0076061	82.51	0.000	.612689	.6425043
4	.6252921	.0065617	95.29	0.000	.6124314	.6381528
5	.6227071	.0061219	101.72	0.000	.6107084	.6347058
6	.61985	.0064219	96.52	0.000	.6072632	.6324368
7	.6167292	.0073875	83.48	0.000	.6022499	.6312084
8	.613353	.0088201	69.54	0.000	.5960659	.6306401
9	.60973	.010549	57.80	0.000	.5890545	.6304056
10	.6058687	.0124686	48.59	0.000	.5814307	.6303068

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0813975	.0060117	13.54	0.000	.0696147	.0931803
2	.0787028	.0048509	16.22	0.000	.0691951	.0882104
3	.075977	.0039379	19.29	0.000	.0682588	.0836951
4	.0732399	.0033368	21.95	0.000	.0667	.0797799
5	.0705086	.0031057	22.70	0.000	.0644216	.0765956
6	.0677975	.0032253	21.02	0.000	.0614761	.074119
7	.0651189	.0035876	18.15	0.000	.0580873	.0721504
8	.0624828	.0040744	15.34	0.000	.0544971	.0704685
9	.0598978	.0046058	13.00	0.000	.0508706	.068925
10	.0573707	.0051373	11.17	0.000	.0473019	.0674396

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0171473	.0027409	6.26	0.000	.0117753	.0225193
2	.0151305	.0020997	7.21	0.000	.0110151	.0192459
3	.0133477	.0016494	8.09	0.000	.0101149	.0165805
4	.0117724	.0013737	8.57	0.000	.00908	.0144648
5	.0103811	.0012423	8.36	0.000	.0079462	.012816
6	.0091527	.0012076	7.58	0.000	.0067859	.0115195
7	.0080685	.0012207	6.61	0.000	.005676	.0104609
8	.0071118	.0012476	5.70	0.000	.0046665	.0095571
9	.0062678	.0012704	4.93	0.000	.0037779	.0087576
10	.0055234	.0012812	4.31	0.000	.0030122	.0080346

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.2941508	.010691	27.51	0.000	.2731968	.3151047
2	.2950635	.0085136	34.66	0.000	.278377	.3117499
3	.2959778	.0067256	44.01	0.000	.2827959	.3091597
4	.2968938	.0057195	51.91	0.000	.2856838	.3081038
5	.2978114	.0059227	50.28	0.000	.2862031	.3094197
6	.2987306	.0072451	41.23	0.000	.2845306	.3129307
7	.2996515	.0092255	32.48	0.000	.2815699	.3177331
8	.300574	.0115366	26.05	0.000	.2779627	.3231853

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.6124094	.0112936	54.23	0.000	.5902744	.6345445
2	.6156063	.0090036	68.37	0.000	.5979595	.633253
3	.6186377	.0071824	86.13	0.000	.6045604	.632715
4	.6215089	.0061922	100.37	0.000	.6093723	.6336454
5	.6242247	.0063817	97.81	0.000	.6117168	.6367326
6	.6267903	.0076334	82.11	0.000	.6118291	.6417515
7	.6292105	.0095202	66.09	0.000	.6105513	.6478697
8	.6314901	.0117301	53.84	0.000	.6084996	.6544807

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.084266	.0062627	13.46	0.000	.0719913	.0965407
2	.0798498	.0048225	16.56	0.000	.070398	.0893017
3	.0755873	.0037366	20.23	0.000	.0682636	.0829109
4	.0714729	.0031587	22.63	0.000	.065282	.0776638
5	.0675013	.0031841	21.20	0.000	.0612606	.0737421
6	.0636673	.0036701	17.35	0.000	.056474	.0708607
7	.0599655	.0043776	13.70	0.000	.0513855	.0685455
8	.0563907	.0051544	10.94	0.000	.0462883	.066493

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0091738	.0017239	5.32	0.000	.0057951	.0125526
2	.0094805	.001479	6.41	0.000	.0065816	.0123793
3	.0097972	.0012938	7.57	0.000	.0072614	.0123331
4	.0101245	.0012236	8.27	0.000	.0077262	.0125227
5	.0104625	.0013164	7.95	0.000	.0078823	.0130427
6	.0108118	.0015708	6.88	0.000	.0077331	.0138904
7	.0111725	.0019488	5.73	0.000	.007353	.014992
8	.0115452	.0024154	4.78	0.000	.006811	.0162793

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2969962	.008191	36.26	0.000	.2809421	.3130503
2	.2970886	.0064513	46.05	0.000	.2844443	.3097329
3	.297181	.0056493	52.60	0.000	.2861085	.3082535
4	.2972734	.0061641	48.23	0.000	.2851919	.3093549
5	.2973659	.0077383	38.43	0.000	.282199	.3125327
6	.2974583	.0098786	30.11	0.000	.2780967	.31682
7	.2975508	.0122934	24.20	0.000	.2734561	.3216455
8	.2976433	.0148501	20.04	0.000	.2685377	.3267489

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6337389	.008457	74.94	0.000	.6171634	.6503143
2	.6283971	.0068534	91.69	0.000	.6149647	.6418295
3	.6226918	.0061237	101.69	0.000	.6106895	.634694
4	.6166029	.0066159	93.20	0.000	.603636	.6295698
5	.6101105	.0081686	74.69	0.000	.5941003	.6261206
6	.6031941	.0103761	58.13	0.000	.5828573	.6235308
7	.5958335	.0129725	45.93	0.000	.570408	.6212591
8	.5880088	.0158356	37.13	0.000	.5569715	.6190461

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0606795	.0038284	15.85	0.000	.0531759	.0681831
2	.0651623	.0033298	19.57	0.000	.0586361	.0716885
3	.0699409	.0031027	22.54	0.000	.0638597	.0760221
4	.0750294	.0033819	22.19	0.000	.068401	.0816579
5	.0804416	.0042416	18.97	0.000	.0721283	.088755
6	.0861909	.0055783	15.45	0.000	.0752576	.0971242
7	.0922902	.007284	12.67	0.000	.0780138	.1065666
8	.0987515	.0093008	10.62	0.000	.0805222	.1169808

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0085855	.0013357	6.43	0.000	.0059676	.0112033
2	.009352	.001242	7.53	0.000	.0069177	.0117863
3	.0101863	.0012315	8.27	0.000	.0077726	.0126
4	.0110942	.0013643	8.13	0.000	.0084203	.0137681
5	.012082	.0016713	7.23	0.000	.0088064	.0153577
6	.0131567	.002147	6.13	0.000	.0089486	.0173647
7	.0143255	.0027772	5.16	0.000	.0088823	.0197686
8	.0155965	.0035552	4.39	0.000	.0086285	.0225644

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2712292	.0097658	27.77	0.000	.2520886	.2903698
2	.2778088	.0082379	33.72	0.000	.2616628	.2939548
3	.2844858	.0068996	41.23	0.000	.2709628	.2980087
4	.2912585	.0059469	48.98	0.000	.2796027	.3029142
5	.2981252	.0056497	52.77	0.000	.2870521	.3091984
6	.3050842	.0061668	49.47	0.000	.2929976	.3171709
7	.3121334	.0073791	42.30	0.000	.2976706	.3265962
8	.3192706	.009051	35.27	0.000	.3015309	.3370103
9	.3264936	.0110068	29.66	0.000	.3049206	.3480665
10	.3337998	.013146	25.39	0.000	.3080341	.3595655

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6383853	.0077363	82.52	0.000	.6232224	.6535481
2	.6344854	.0071425	88.83	0.000	.6204864	.6484845
3	.6304162	.0066194	95.24	0.000	.6174424	.64339
4	.6261808	.0062466	100.24	0.000	.6139376	.6384239
5	.6217822	.0061184	101.62	0.000	.6097903	.6337741
6	.6172239	.0063168	97.71	0.000	.6048431	.6296047
7	.6125094	.0068766	89.07	0.000	.5990315	.6259873
8	.6076422	.0077763	78.14	0.000	.5924008	.6228835
9	.6026261	.0089633	67.23	0.000	.5850584	.6201938
10	.597465	.0103816	57.55	0.000	.5771176	.6178125

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0787777	.0044379	17.75	0.000	.0700796	.0874758
2	.0764709	.0039078	19.57	0.000	.0688117	.0841302
3	.0742243	.0034966	21.23	0.000	.0673711	.0810776
4	.0720367	.0032221	22.36	0.000	.0657216	.0783519
5	.0699071	.0030943	22.59	0.000	.0638424	.0759717
6	.0678341	.0031072	21.83	0.000	.0617441	.0739242
7	.0658168	.0032384	20.32	0.000	.0594697	.072164
8	.063854	.0034567	18.47	0.000	.0570791	.0706289
9	.0619445	.0037319	16.60	0.000	.0546301	.0692589
10	.0600872	.0040402	14.87	0.000	.0521685	.0680059

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0116078	.0014967	7.76	0.000	.0086744	.0145413
2	.0112348	.0014116	7.96	0.000	.0084682	.0140015
3	.0108737	.0013388	8.12	0.000	.0082497	.0134976
4	.010524	.0012779	8.24	0.000	.0080194	.0130286
5	.0101855	.0012283	8.29	0.000	.0077781	.0125928
6	.0098577	.0011892	8.29	0.000	.007527	.0121885
7	.0095404	.0011597	8.23	0.000	.0072674	.0118135
8	.0092332	.0011389	8.11	0.000	.007001	.0114655
9	.0089359	.0011256	7.94	0.000	.0067296	.0111421
10	.008648	.0011188	7.73	0.000	.0064552	.0108407

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2764798	.0072752	38.00	0.000	.2622207	.290739
2	.3185108	.007884	40.40	0.000	.3030584	.3339632

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6352822	.0067887	93.58	0.000	.6219766	.6485877
2	.6081646	.0071091	85.55	0.000	.594231	.6220982

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0769293	.0037114	20.73	0.000	.069655	.0842035
2	.0640593	.0032398	19.77	0.000	.0577094	.0704092

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0113088	.0013815	8.19	0.000	.008601	.0140165
2	.0092653	.0011476	8.07	0.000	.007016	.0115146

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3764443	.0074036	50.85	0.000	.3619335	.390955
2	.3206861	.0058486	54.83	0.000	.3092231	.3321491
3	.2696157	.0057531	46.86	0.000	.2583397	.2808916
4	.2239966	.0064876	34.53	0.000	.2112811	.2367122
5	.1841502	.0072665	25.34	0.000	.1699081	.1983924
6	.1500217	.0077484	19.36	0.000	.1348351	.1652083

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5658338	.0068203	82.96	0.000	.5524663	.5792013
2	.6066662	.0061005	99.45	0.000	.5947095	.6186229
3	.6393241	.0062731	101.92	0.000	.6270292	.6516191
4	.6624357	.0065395	101.30	0.000	.6496185	.6752529
5	.675073	.0065532	103.01	0.000	.662229	.687917
6	.6767475	.0066725	101.42	0.000	.6636697	.6898253

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0505339	.0025767	19.61	0.000	.0454836	.0555842
2	.0634738	.0028901	21.96	0.000	.0578093	.0691384
3	.0793581	.0034592	22.94	0.000	.0725782	.0861381
4	.0986513	.0044512	22.16	0.000	.0899272	.1073755
5	.1217802	.0059885	20.34	0.000	.1100429	.1335175
6	.1490652	.008118	18.36	0.000	.1331543	.1649761

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.007188	.0008919	8.06	0.000	.0054399	.0089361
2	.0091739	.0011134	8.24	0.000	.0069917	.0113561
3	.011702	.0014066	8.32	0.000	.0089451	.014459
4	.0149163	.001799	8.29	0.000	.0113903	.0184424
5	.0189966	.0023271	8.16	0.000	.0144355	.0235577
6	.0241656	.0030387	7.95	0.000	.0182099	.0301212

5th Wave:

Tables B.2 Marginal Effects in the Fifth Wave

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3633585	.0089967	40.39	0.000	.3457252	.3809917
2	.2772101	.0065035	42.62	0.000	.2644634	.2899568
3	.2049125	.0110826	18.49	0.000	.183191	.2266341
4	.1476195	.0139172	10.61	0.000	.1203422	.1748968

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5901123	.0091089	64.78	0.000	.5722592	.6079653
2	.6524927	.0070598	92.42	0.000	.6386558	.6663297
3	.6902168	.0129966	53.11	0.000	.6647438	.7156897
4	.6987423	.0222777	31.37	0.000	.6550788	.7424059

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0420996	.0033379	12.61	0.000	.0355574	.0486417
2	.0611651	.003547	17.24	0.000	.0542131	.0681171
3	.0861385	.00812	10.61	0.000	.0702237	.1020533
4	.1156011	.017771	6.51	0.000	.0807707	.1504316

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0044297	.0009247	4.79	0.000	.0026174	.006242
2	.0091321	.0015229	6.00	0.000	.0061472	.0121169
3	.0187322	.003854	4.86	0.000	.0111785	.0262858
4	.038037	.0110298	3.45	0.001	.016419	.059655

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3415646	.0092101	37.09	0.000	.3235131	.359616
2	.2759875	.0076465	36.09	0.000	.2610005	.2909744

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6219747	.0093829	66.29	0.000	.6035845	.6403648
2	.6324774	.0083371	75.86	0.000	.6161369	.6488179

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0340363	.0033024	10.31	0.000	.0275636	.040509
2	.0747052	.0045036	16.59	0.000	.0658783	.0835321

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0024245	.0008121	2.99	0.003	.0008329	.0040161
2	.01683	.0022861	7.36	0.000	.0123494	.0213106

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3140974	.0100832	31.15	0.000	.2943348	.33386
2	.311203	.0082714	37.62	0.000	.2949914	.3274147
3	.3083234	.0068163	45.23	0.000	.2949637	.3216831
4	.3054585	.0059566	51.28	0.000	.2937839	.3171332
5	.3026087	.0059283	51.04	0.000	.2909895	.3142279
6	.2997739	.0067172	44.63	0.000	.2866084	.3129395
7	.2969544	.008067	36.81	0.000	.2811434	.3127655
8	.2941503	.0097301	30.23	0.000	.2750797	.313221
9	.2913617	.0115576	25.21	0.000	.2687093	.3140141
10	.2885887	.0134702	21.42	0.000	.2621876	.3149899

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6270759	.0087387	71.76	0.000	.6099484	.6442035
2	.6292201	.0076191	82.59	0.000	.6142871	.6441532
3	.6313407	.0068013	92.83	0.000	.6180104	.644671
4	.6334374	.0063717	99.41	0.000	.6209492	.6459256
5	.63551	.0063781	99.64	0.000	.6230091	.6480108
6	.6375582	.0067909	93.88	0.000	.6242484	.6508681
7	.6395819	.0075179	85.07	0.000	.6248471	.6543168
8	.6415808	.008456	75.87	0.000	.6250073	.6581544
9	.6435547	.0095233	67.58	0.000	.6248894	.6622199
10	.6455033	.0106633	60.54	0.000	.6246037	.666403

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0519404	.0035618	14.58	0.000	.0449594	.0589213
2	.0525978	.0033536	15.68	0.000	.0460249	.0591706
3	.0532629	.0032107	16.59	0.000	.0469701	.0595557
4	.0539358	.0031482	17.13	0.000	.0477655	.0601061
5	.0546166	.0031771	17.19	0.000	.0483896	.0608435
6	.0553053	.0033013	16.75	0.000	.0488349	.0617758
7	.056002	.0035169	15.92	0.000	.0491089	.0628951
8	.0567069	.0038144	14.87	0.000	.0492307	.064183
9	.0574198	.004182	13.73	0.000	.0492233	.0656164
10	.0581411	.0046081	12.62	0.000	.0491093	.0671729

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0068863	.0012143	5.67	0.000	.0045064	.0092662
2	.0069791	.001216	5.74	0.000	.0045957	.0093624
3	.007073	.0012222	5.79	0.000	.0046776	.0094685
4	.0071682	.001233	5.81	0.000	.0047515	.0095849
5	.0072647	.0012488	5.82	0.000	.0048171	.0097123
6	.0073625	.0012697	5.80	0.000	.0048739	.0098511
7	.0074616	.0012959	5.76	0.000	.0049217	.0100015
8	.007562	.0013274	5.70	0.000	.0049603	.0101637
9	.0076638	.0013644	5.62	0.000	.0049895	.010338
10	.0077669	.0014068	5.52	0.000	.0050095	.0105242

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.369539	.0142886	25.86	0.000	.3415339	.3975442

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5674806	.014411	39.38	0.000	.5392356	.5957257

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0555934	.0056866	9.78	0.000	.0444479	.0667389

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0073869	.0019627	3.76	0.000	.0035401	.0112338

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3547573	.0116233	30.52	0.000	.3319761	.3775384

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5825716	.0118059	49.35	0.000	.5594325	.6057107

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0553195	.0048634	11.37	0.000	.0457874	.0648516

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0073516	.0017227	4.27	0.000	.0039752	.010728

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3402476	.0092287	36.87	0.000	.3221597	.3583355

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5973889	.0094876	62.96	0.000	.5787935	.6159844

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0073165	.0015168	4.82	0.000	.0043437	.0102894

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3260316	.0072768	44.80	0.000	.3117693	.3402939

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6119113	.0076313	80.18	0.000	.5969542	.6268685

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0547755	.0035689	15.35	0.000	.0477806	.0617704

. margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0072816	.0013584	5.36	0.000	.0046191	.009944

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2985557	.005901	50.59	0.000	.2869899	.3101215

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6399957	.0064017	99.97	0.000	.6274485	.6525428

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0542364	.0031699	17.11	0.000	.0480235	.0604493

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0072122	.0012435	5.80	0.000	.0047749	.0096495

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2853283	.0067162	42.48	0.000	.2721649	.2984917

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6535252	.0072068	90.68	0.000	.6394002	.6676503

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0539687	.0034134	15.81	0.000	.0472785	.060659

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0071777	.0013006	5.52	0.000	.0046287	.0097268

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2724593	.0081013	33.63	0.000	.256581	.2883376

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.666695	.0085713	77.78	0.000	.6498955	.6834946

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0537023	.0038921	13.80	0.000	.0460739	.0613306

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0071434	.0014232	5.02	0.000	.004354	.0099329

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2903044	.0102284	28.38	0.000	.2702571	.3103518
2	.2936357	.0086417	33.98	0.000	.2766982	.3105732
3	.2969892	.0072595	40.91	0.000	.2827609	.3112175
4	.3003647	.0062475	48.08	0.000	.2881198	.3126095
5	.303762	.0058326	52.08	0.000	.2923303	.3151937
6	.3071808	.0061651	49.83	0.000	.2950974	.3192642
7	.310621	.0071652	43.35	0.000	.2965775	.3246645
8	.3140822	.0086226	36.43	0.000	.2971822	.3309822
9	.3175642	.010362	30.65	0.000	.2972551	.3378733
10	.3210668	.0122772	26.15	0.000	.297004	.3451296

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6442994	.0086916	74.13	0.000	.6272641	.6613346
2	.6419461	.0078052	82.25	0.000	.6266482	.6572441
3	.6395571	.007061	90.58	0.000	.6257178	.6533963
4	.6371325	.006538	97.45	0.000	.6243184	.6499467
5	.6346729	.006323	100.38	0.000	.6222801	.6470656
6	.6321785	.0064778	97.59	0.000	.6194822	.6448747
7	.6296498	.0070066	89.87	0.000	.6159172	.6433824
8	.6270872	.0078595	79.79	0.000	.6116828	.6424917
9	.6244911	.008967	69.64	0.000	.6069162	.6420661
10	.621862	.0102663	60.57	0.000	.6017405	.6419835

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0576934	.0039882	14.47	0.000	.0498767	.06551
2	.0568375	.0036694	15.49	0.000	.0496456	.0640295
3	.0559934	.0034191	16.38	0.000	.049292	.0626947
4	.0551608	.0032455	17.00	0.000	.0487997	.0615219
5	.0543397	.0031539	17.23	0.000	.0481582	.0605212
6	.0535299	.0031444	17.02	0.000	.047367	.0596928
7	.0527313	.0032111	16.42	0.000	.0464376	.059025
8	.0519438	.0033436	15.54	0.000	.0453904	.0584971
9	.0511672	.003529	14.50	0.000	.0442505	.0580839
10	.0504014	.0037547	13.42	0.000	.0430423	.0577605

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0077028	.001359	5.67	0.000	.0050392	.0103665
2	.0075806	.0013225	5.73	0.000	.0049887	.0101726
3	.0074604	.0012908	5.78	0.000	.0049305	.0099903
4	.007342	.001264	5.81	0.000	.0048647	.0098193
5	.0072255	.0012418	5.82	0.000	.0047916	.0096594
6	.0071108	.0012241	5.81	0.000	.0047115	.0095101
7	.0069979	.0012107	5.78	0.000	.0046249	.0093709
8	.0068868	.0012014	5.73	0.000	.0045322	.0092415
9	.0067775	.0011958	5.67	0.000	.0044338	.0091211
10	.0066698	.0011936	5.59	0.000	.0043305	.0090092

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2748822	.0108542	25.32	0.000	.2536084	.296156
2	.2824233	.0089711	31.48	0.000	.2648402	.3000064
3	.2900885	.0073031	39.72	0.000	.2757747	.3044023
4	.2978754	.0061319	48.58	0.000	.2858572	.3098936
5	.3057813	.0058732	52.06	0.000	.29427	.3172925
6	.3138032	.0067247	46.66	0.000	.300623	.3269834
7	.321938	.0084235	38.22	0.000	.3054282	.3384477
8	.3301822	.0106219	31.08	0.000	.3093636	.3510007

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6549146	.0088555	73.96	0.000	.6375582	.6722711
2	.6497834	.0078974	82.28	0.000	.6343048	.6652621
3	.6444512	.0070544	91.35	0.000	.6306248	.6582776
4	.6389224	.0064746	98.68	0.000	.6262324	.6516125
5	.6332019	.0063403	99.87	0.000	.6207751	.6456286
6	.6272945	.0067818	92.50	0.000	.6140025	.6405865
7	.6212053	.0077913	79.73	0.000	.6059347	.636476
8	.6149399	.0092594	66.41	0.000	.5967919	.633088

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0618964	.004463	13.87	0.000	.0531492	.0706437
2	.05979	.0039491	15.14	0.000	.0520498	.0675302
3	.0577495	.0035491	16.27	0.000	.0507934	.0647055
4	.0557732	.0032742	17.03	0.000	.0493559	.0621905
5	.0538594	.0031292	17.21	0.000	.0477263	.0599926
6	.0520067	.0031068	16.74	0.000	.0459174	.058096
7	.0502132	.0031876	15.75	0.000	.0439656	.0564609
8	.0484775	.0033456	14.49	0.000	.0419204	.0550347

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0083067	.0014782	5.62	0.000	.0054095	.011204
2	.0080033	.0014021	5.71	0.000	.0052553	.0107513
3	.0077109	.0013358	5.77	0.000	.0050928	.010329
4	.007429	.0012787	5.81	0.000	.0049227	.0099353
5	.0071574	.0012303	5.82	0.000	.0047462	.0095687
6	.0068957	.0011896	5.80	0.000	.0045641	.0092272
7	.0066434	.0011559	5.75	0.000	.0043778	.008909
8	.0064004	.0011285	5.67	0.000	.0041885	.0086123

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3114327	.0088902	35.03	0.000	.2940081	.3288572
2	.3075206	.0067303	45.69	0.000	.2943294	.3207117
3	.3036359	.0058306	52.08	0.000	.2922081	.3150638
4	.2997791	.0066492	45.08	0.000	.2867469	.3128113
5	.2959505	.0086609	34.17	0.000	.2789754	.3129256
6	.2921504	.0112007	26.08	0.000	.2701974	.3141033
7	.288379	.0139499	20.67	0.000	.2610378	.3157203
8	.2846368	.0167777	16.97	0.000	.2517531	.3175206

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6460399	.0089555	72.14	0.000	.6284874	.6635923
2	.6411088	.0070474	90.97	0.000	.6272962	.6549215
3	.6344304	.0063237	100.33	0.000	.6220361	.6468248
4	.6257228	.007155	87.45	0.000	.6116992	.6397463
5	.6146808	.0092371	66.54	0.000	.5965765	.6327852
6	.6009848	.0121565	49.44	0.000	.5771586	.624811
7	.5843135	.0157766	37.04	0.000	.5533919	.6152351
8	.5643637	.0201356	28.03	0.000	.5248987	.6038288

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0382052	.0031773	12.02	0.000	.0319778	.0444325
2	.0457577	.0030768	14.87	0.000	.0397272	.0517881
3	.0546475	.0031628	17.28	0.000	.0484484	.0608465
4	.0650447	.0037708	17.25	0.000	.0576541	.0724354
5	.0771114	.005171	14.91	0.000	.0669765	.0872464
6	.0909854	.0074372	12.23	0.000	.0764088	.105562
7	.1067576	.0105803	10.09	0.000	.0860206	.1274947
8	.1244428	.0146283	8.51	0.000	.0957718	.1531137

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0043223	.0009307	4.64	0.000	.0024982	.0061464
2	.0056129	.0010591	5.30	0.000	.0035371	.0076888
3	.0072861	.0012495	5.83	0.000	.0048371	.0097351
4	.0094534	.0015745	6.00	0.000	.0063674	.0125393
5	.0122572	.0021417	5.72	0.000	.0080595	.016455
6	.0158794	.0030826	5.15	0.000	.0098377	.0219212
7	.0205498	.0045507	4.52	0.000	.0116305	.0294691
8	.0265567	.0067374	3.94	0.000	.0133517	.0397616

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2599468	.0111807	23.25	0.000	.238033	.2818607
2	.2710113	.0092908	29.17	0.000	.2528016	.289221
3	.282367	.0075451	37.42	0.000	.2675788	.2971552
4	.2940066	.0062361	47.15	0.000	.281784	.3062292
5	.3059215	.0058542	52.26	0.000	.2944476	.3173954
6	.3181017	.006717	47.36	0.000	.3049366	.3312668
7	.3305359	.0085673	38.58	0.000	.3137442	.3473276
8	.3432115	.0109979	31.21	0.000	.321656	.3647669
9	.3561146	.0137636	25.87	0.000	.3291385	.3830907
10	.3692301	.0167412	22.06	0.000	.336418	.4020422

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6438308	.0121505	52.99	0.000	.6200162	.6676454
2	.6432384	.0098634	65.21	0.000	.6239065	.6625702
3	.6413112	.0079782	80.38	0.000	.6256742	.6569482
4	.6381404	.006693	95.34	0.000	.6250224	.6512584
5	.6338159	.0063423	99.93	0.000	.6213852	.6462466
6	.6284257	.0071053	88.45	0.000	.6144997	.6423518
7	.6220551	.0087641	70.98	0.000	.6048778	.6392324
8	.614786	.0109918	55.93	0.000	.5932424	.6363295
9	.6066969	.0135751	44.69	0.000	.5800902	.6333036
10	.5978626	.0163985	36.46	0.000	.5657221	.630003

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0883114	.007449	11.86	0.000	.0737116	.1029112
2	.0780248	.0054843	14.23	0.000	.0672757	.0887739
3	.0687773	.0041048	16.76	0.000	.0607321	.0768226
4	.0604854	.0033473	18.07	0.000	.0539248	.0670461
5	.0530678	.0031517	16.84	0.000	.0468905	.0592451
6	.0464466	.0033002	14.07	0.000	.0399783	.0529148
7	.0405478	.0035666	11.37	0.000	.0335573	.0475383
8	.0353023	.0038246	9.23	0.000	.0278063	.0427984
9	.0306456	.0040247	7.61	0.000	.0227572	.0385339
10	.0265179	.0041558	6.38	0.000	.0183728	.034663

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.007911	.0017856	4.43	0.000	.0044112	.0114107
2	.0077255	.0015213	5.08	0.000	.0047439	.0107072
3	.0075444	.0013339	5.66	0.000	.0049301	.0101588
4	.0073675	.0012416	5.93	0.000	.004934	.009801
5	.0071948	.0012504	5.75	0.000	.0047439	.0096456
6	.007026	.0013457	5.22	0.000	.0043886	.0096635
7	.0068612	.0015006	4.57	0.000	.0039201	.0098023
8	.0067002	.0016905	3.96	0.000	.0033869	.0100136
9	.006543	.0018982	3.45	0.001	.0028225	.0102635
10	.0063894	.002113	3.02	0.002	.002248	.0105309

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2798526	.0074875	37.38	0.000	.2651774	.2945278
2	.3278926	.0082052	39.96	0.000	.3118107	.3439745

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6515458	.0072385	90.01	0.000	.6373586	.665733
2	.6166891	.0075709	81.46	0.000	.6018505	.6315278

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0604967	.0036577	16.54	0.000	.0533277	.0676656
2	.0489516	.0031549	15.52	0.000	.0427681	.0551352

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0081049	.0014101	5.75	0.000	.0053411	.0108687
2	.0064667	.0011206	5.77	0.000	.0042703	.0086631

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3750018	.0078424	47.82	0.000	.359631	.3903726
2	.3289525	.0061293	53.67	0.000	.3169394	.3409657
3	.2859707	.0059242	48.27	0.000	.2743594	.2975819
4	.2465416	.0067794	36.37	0.000	.2332542	.2598289
5	.2109428	.0078803	26.77	0.000	.1954977	.2263879
6	.1792613	.0087913	20.39	0.000	.1620306	.196492

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5794665	.0073312	79.04	0.000	.5650977	.5938353
2	.6158802	.0063516	96.96	0.000	.6034313	.6283291
3	.6473298	.0064639	100.15	0.000	.6346609	.6599988
4	.6730212	.0069729	96.52	0.000	.6593546	.6866878
5	.6923459	.0073234	94.54	0.000	.6779923	.7066996
6	.7048757	.0073799	95.51	0.000	.6904113	.7193402

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0402673	.0025762	15.63	0.000	.0352181	.0453166
2	.0487314	.0028932	16.84	0.000	.0430609	.0544019
3	.0588335	.0033952	17.33	0.000	.052179	.065488
4	.0708263	.0041781	16.95	0.000	.0626373	.0790153
5	.0849729	.0053291	15.95	0.000	.0745281	.0954178
6	.1015331	.0069141	14.68	0.000	.0879817	.1150845

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0052643	.0009218	5.71	0.000	.0034576	.0070711
2	.0064359	.0011116	5.79	0.000	.0042571	.0086146
3	.007866	.0013489	5.83	0.000	.0052223	.0105097
4	.0096109	.0016472	5.83	0.000	.0063826	.0128393
5	.0117383	.0020238	5.80	0.000	.0077717	.015705
6	.0143298	.0025007	5.73	0.000	.0094284	.0192312

Marginal Effects of the Countries

East Germany

Tables B.3 Marginal Effects in East Germany

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1878625	.0170983	10.99	0.000	.1543504	.2213746
2	.1329309	.010267	12.95	0.000	.112808	.1530539
3	.0922373	.0123646	7.46	0.000	.0680032	.1164714
4	.0630945	.0137592	4.59	0.000	.0361269	.0900621

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6770532	.0155622	43.51	0.000	.6465518	.7075546
2	.6763591	.0159071	42.52	0.000	.6451817	.7075365
3	.6454676	.0203702	31.69	0.000	.6055428	.6853925
4	.5877478	.0383152	15.34	0.000	.5126515	.6628442

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1195196	.0133321	8.96	0.000	.0933891	.14565
2	.1674101	.0134858	12.41	0.000	.1409785	.1938417
3	.2275516	.0242592	9.38	0.000	.1800045	.2750987
4	.2976465	.0421142	7.07	0.000	.2151042	.3801887

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0155647	.0044602	3.49	0.000	.0068228	.0243066
2	.0232999	.0061341	3.80	0.000	.0112772	.0353226
3	.0347435	.0094306	3.68	0.000	.0162598	.0532272
4	.0515112	.0157557	3.27	0.001	.0206305	.0823918

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2114871	.0234377	9.02	0.000	.1655501	.2574241
2	.1208388	.0113057	10.69	0.000	.09868	.1429976

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.709407	.0263217	26.95	0.000	.6578175	.7609965
2	.6401428	.0183321	34.92	0.000	.6042125	.676073

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0726977	.0152267	4.77	0.000	.0428539	.1025416
2	.2044644	.0155085	13.18	0.000	.1740684	.2348604

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0064082	.004554	1.41	0.159	-.0025175	.0153339
2	.034554	.0066832	5.17	0.000	.0214552	.0476529

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1866693	.0210224	8.88	0.000	.1454661	.2278724
2	.1756608	.0173408	10.13	0.000	.1416735	.2096481
3	.1651697	.0143137	11.54	0.000	.1371153	.1932241
4	.1551872	.0120711	12.86	0.000	.1315282	.1788462
5	.1457028	.0107407	13.57	0.000	.1246513	.1667542
6	.1367042	.0103431	13.22	0.000	.116432	.1569763
7	.1281779	.0107086	11.97	0.000	.1071893	.1491665
8	.1201095	.0115537	10.40	0.000	.0974645	.1427544
9	.1124834	.0126227	8.91	0.000	.0877433	.1372235
10	.1052836	.0137445	7.66	0.000	.0783447	.1322224

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6773278	.0158703	42.68	0.000	.6462227	.7084329
2	.6793761	.0155652	43.65	0.000	.6488689	.7098832
3	.6804221	.015545	43.77	0.000	.6499544	.7108899
4	.6804625	.0156352	43.52	0.000	.6498181	.7111069
5	.679497	.0157438	43.16	0.000	.6486397	.7103543
6	.677529	.0158678	42.70	0.000	.6464286	.7086293
7	.6745649	.0160891	41.93	0.000	.643031	.7060989
8	.6706151	.0165626	40.49	0.000	.638153	.7030772
9	.665693	.0174873	38.07	0.000	.6314185	.6999675
10	.6598157	.0190534	34.63	0.000	.6224718	.6971597

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1203176	.0156738	7.68	0.000	.0895976	.1510376
2	.1280896	.0145609	8.80	0.000	.0995507	.1566285
3	.1362581	.013569	10.04	0.000	.1096634	.1628528
4	.144829	.0128677	11.26	0.000	.1196088	.1700492
5	.1538064	.0126737	12.14	0.000	.1289664	.1786463
6	.163192	.0131919	12.37	0.000	.1373363	.1890476
7	.172985	.0145277	11.91	0.000	.1445113	.2014587
8	.1831819	.0166533	11.00	0.000	.1505419	.2158218
9	.1937759	.0194601	9.96	0.000	.1556348	.2319169
10	.204757	.0228241	8.97	0.000	.1600225	.2494914

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0156853	.0045957	3.41	0.001	.0066779	.0246927
2	.0168735	.0047799	3.53	0.000	.0075051	.0262419
3	.0181501	.0049997	3.63	0.000	.0083508	.0279493
4	.0195213	.005265	3.71	0.000	.0092021	.0298405
5	.0209938	.0055868	3.76	0.000	.0100439	.0319438
6	.0225749	.0059771	3.78	0.000	.0108601	.0342898
7	.0242722	.0064482	3.76	0.000	.0116339	.0369104
8	.0260936	.0070129	3.72	0.000	.0123486	.0398386
9	.0280478	.0076837	3.65	0.000	.012988	.0431075
10	.0301437	.008473	3.56	0.000	.0135369	.0467506

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1824617	.0278139	6.56	0.000	.1279475	.236976

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6782166	.0161501	41.99	0.000	.646563	.7098702

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1231988	.0207029	5.95	0.000	.082622	.1637757

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0161229	.0050751	3.18	0.001	.0061759	.0260699

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1742863	.0228504	7.63	0.000	.1295004	.2190723

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6795664	.0156678	43.37	0.000	.6488581	.7102746

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1291151	.018611	6.94	0.000	.0926383	.1655919

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0170322	.0050929	3.34	0.001	.0070503	.0270141

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1664027	.0184535	9.02	0.000	.1302344	.202571

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6803496	.0155495	43.75	0.000	.6498731	.7108261

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1352558	.0165487	8.17	0.000	.1028209	.1676907

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0179919	.0051437	3.50	0.000	.0079104	.0280733

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1588071	.0147708	10.75	0.000	.1298569	.1877573

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6805647	.0155976	43.63	0.000	.6499939	.7111356

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1416236	.0146805	9.65	0.000	.1128503	.1703969

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0190046	.0052406	3.63	0.000	.0087331	.029276

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1444621	.0106357	13.58	0.000	.1236165	.1653077

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6792902	.0157602	43.10	0.000	.6484008	.7101795

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1550473	.0127185	12.19	0.000	.1301195	.1799752

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0212004	.0056319	3.76	0.000	.010162	.0322388

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1377025	.0106584	12.92	0.000	.1168125	.1585925

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6778029	.0158604	42.74	0.000	.6467171	.7088887

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.162105	.0133356	12.16	0.000	.1359678	.1882422

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0223896	.0059561	3.76	0.000	.0107158	.0340634

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1312108	.0118194	11.10	0.000	.1080451	.1543764

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6757524	.0160944	41.99	0.000	.644208	.7072967

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.169393	.0151975	11.15	0.000	.1396064	.1991796

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0236439	.0063838	3.70	0.000	.0111318	.0361559

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.141769	.0152794	9.28	0.000	.111822	.1717161
2	.1419786	.0130715	10.86	0.000	.116359	.1675981
3	.1421884	.0114087	12.46	0.000	.1198278	.1645489
4	.1423984	.0105597	13.49	0.000	.1217018	.163095
5	.1426087	.0107273	13.29	0.000	.1215837	.1636338
6	.1428193	.0118754	12.03	0.000	.119544	.1660946
7	.1430302	.0137667	10.39	0.000	.1160478	.1700125
8	.1432413	.0161473	8.87	0.000	.1115931	.1748894
9	.1434526	.0188369	7.62	0.000	.1065329	.1803723
10	.1436642	.0217249	6.61	0.000	.1010843	.1862442

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6787721	.0160216	42.37	0.000	.6473704	.7101739
2	.6788159	.0159123	42.66	0.000	.6476284	.7100034
3	.6788591	.0158363	42.87	0.000	.6478205	.7098977
4	.6789018	.0157919	42.99	0.000	.6479502	.7098534
5	.678944	.0157771	43.03	0.000	.6480214	.7098666
6	.6789856	.0157898	43.00	0.000	.6480381	.7099331
7	.6790267	.0158279	42.90	0.000	.6480045	.7100488
8	.6790672	.0158891	42.74	0.000	.6479252	.7102092
9	.6791072	.0159711	42.52	0.000	.6478044	.71041
10	.6791466	.0160718	42.26	0.000	.6476465	.7106468

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1577979	.0174698	9.03	0.000	.1235577	.1920382
2	.157581	.0153213	10.29	0.000	.1275518	.1876103
3	.1573644	.0137184	11.47	0.000	.1304768	.184252
4	.157148	.012861	12.22	0.000	.1319409	.1823551
5	.1569318	.0128931	12.17	0.000	.1316617	.1822018
6	.1567158	.0138034	11.35	0.000	.1296617	.1837699
7	.1565	.0154325	10.14	0.000	.1262529	.1867471
8	.1562845	.0175777	8.89	0.000	.1218327	.1907362
9	.1560692	.0200708	7.78	0.000	.1167312	.1954071
10	.155854	.0227947	6.84	0.000	.1111773	.2005308

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0216609	.0060741	3.57	0.000	.0097558	.033566
2	.0216245	.0059026	3.66	0.000	.0100556	.0331934
3	.0215881	.005785	3.73	0.000	.0102498	.0329264
4	.0215518	.0057239	3.77	0.000	.0103332	.0327704
5	.0215155	.0057206	3.76	0.000	.0103033	.0327277
6	.0214793	.0057747	3.72	0.000	.0101611	.0327975
7	.0214432	.005884	3.64	0.000	.0099107	.0329756
8	.0214071	.006045	3.54	0.000	.0095591	.0332551
9	.0213711	.0062532	3.42	0.001	.009115	.0336271
10	.0213351	.0065036	3.28	0.001	.0085883	.0340818

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1802212	.0242099	7.44	0.000	.1327706	.2276719
2	.1685564	.0182492	9.24	0.000	.1327887	.2043241
3	.1575015	.0136177	11.57	0.000	.1308114	.1841916
4	.1470434	.0109186	13.47	0.000	.1256433	.1684435
5	.1371667	.0106497	12.88	0.000	.1162936	.1580397
6	.1278539	.0122592	10.43	0.000	.1038264	.1518814
7	.1190862	.0146673	8.12	0.000	.0903388	.1478335
8	.1108433	.0172069	6.44	0.000	.0771183	.1445682

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5863672	.0311076	18.85	0.000	.5253975	.6473369
2	.6150102	.0240147	25.61	0.000	.5679424	.6620781
3	.6421311	.0187998	34.16	0.000	.6052843	.678978
4	.6677445	.0160926	41.49	0.000	.6362036	.6992854
5	.6918753	.0160888	43.00	0.000	.6603418	.7234089
6	.7145573	.0179868	39.73	0.000	.6793039	.7498107
7	.7358318	.0207006	35.55	0.000	.6952594	.7764041
8	.755746	.0235424	32.10	0.000	.7096038	.8018882

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1921168	.0263457	7.29	0.000	.1404802	.2437534
2	.1821799	.0201687	9.03	0.000	.1426499	.2217099
3	.1719902	.0156002	11.02	0.000	.1414143	.202566
4	.1617275	.0131131	12.33	0.000	.1360263	.1874287
5	.1515394	.0129496	11.70	0.000	.1261587	.1769201
6	.1415437	.0145033	9.76	0.000	.1131177	.1699698
7	.1318324	.0168273	7.83	0.000	.0988515	.1648134
8	.1224749	.0192967	6.35	0.000	.0846541	.1602957

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0412948	.0120196	3.44	0.001	.0177367	.0648529
2	.0342535	.0082749	4.14	0.000	.018035	.0504719
3	.0283772	.0063292	4.48	0.000	.0159722	.0407822
4	.0234846	.0057351	4.09	0.000	.0122439	.0347252
5	.0194186	.0057791	3.36	0.001	.0080918	.0307454
6	.016045	.0059368	2.70	0.007	.004409	.027681
7	.0132496	.0059975	2.21	0.027	.0014948	.0250044
8	.0109358	.0059162	1.85	0.065	-.0006597	.0225314

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1383549	.0156933	8.82	0.000	.1075966	.1691132
2	.1400314	.0125872	11.12	0.000	.115361	.1647019
3	.1417249	.0107118	13.23	0.000	.1207303	.1627196
4	.1434355	.010863	13.20	0.000	.1221444	.1647266
5	.1451632	.0130816	11.10	0.000	.1195238	.1708026
6	.1469082	.0166463	8.83	0.000	.114282	.1795344
7	.1486705	.0209523	7.10	0.000	.1076047	.1897363
8	.1504502	.0256904	5.86	0.000	.1000979	.2008024

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.736197	.0200561	36.71	0.000	.6968878	.7755063
2	.7145824	.0175014	40.83	0.000	.6802804	.7488844
3	.6903902	.0159264	43.35	0.000	.659175	.7216055
4	.6634859	.016269	40.78	0.000	.6315994	.6953725
5	.6337881	.0192121	32.99	0.000	.5961331	.6714431
6	.6012856	.0245964	24.45	0.000	.5530775	.6494937
7	.5660534	.0318547	17.77	0.000	.5036192	.6284875
8	.5282653	.0404694	13.05	0.000	.4489468	.6075838

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1088079	.0141532	7.69	0.000	.0810681	.1365476
2	.1268862	.013176	9.63	0.000	.1010617	.1527108
3	.1473217	.0126354	11.66	0.000	.1225567	.1720867
4	.1702275	.0134495	12.66	0.000	.1438669	.1965881
5	.1956617	.0163922	11.94	0.000	.1635335	.2277898
6	.22361	.0214924	10.40	0.000	.1814857	.2657344
7	.2539699	.028328	8.97	0.000	.198448	.3094918
8	.2865373	.0364431	7.86	0.000	.2151102	.3579645

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0166402	.0056762	2.93	0.003	.0055151	.0277654
2	.0184999	.0055102	3.36	0.001	.0077002	.0292997
3	.0205631	.0055687	3.69	0.000	.0096487	.0314776
4	.0228511	.0060499	3.78	0.000	.0109936	.0347086
5	.025387	.007127	3.56	0.000	.0114183	.0393557
6	.0281962	.0088846	3.17	0.002	.0107827	.0456097
7	.0313063	.0113428	2.76	0.006	.0090749	.0535377
8	.0347472	.0145137	2.39	0.017	.0063008	.0631936

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1236143	.0162158	7.62	0.000	.091832	.1553966
2	.1286372	.0139967	9.19	0.000	.1012042	.1560701
3	.133833	.0120525	11.10	0.000	.1102105	.1574555
4	.1392051	.0107561	12.94	0.000	.1181235	.1602867
5	.1447569	.010603	13.65	0.000	.1239754	.1655383
6	.1504913	.011885	12.66	0.000	.1271972	.1737854
7	.1564114	.0144419	10.83	0.000	.1281057	.1847171
8	.1625198	.0179266	9.07	0.000	.1273843	.1976553
9	.168819	.0220729	7.65	0.000	.1255569	.2120811
10	.1753113	.0267262	6.56	0.000	.1229289	.2276936

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6724788	.0169536	39.67	0.000	.6392503	.7057072
2	.6747547	.0162549	41.51	0.000	.6428956	.7066137
3	.6766586	.0159271	42.48	0.000	.6454419	.7078752
4	.678188	.0158093	42.90	0.000	.6472024	.7091737
5	.6793411	.0157705	43.08	0.000	.6484315	.7102507
6	.6801163	.0157262	43.25	0.000	.6492934	.7109392
7	.6805126	.0156438	43.50	0.000	.6498513	.711174
8	.6805296	.0155437	43.78	0.000	.6500645	.7109947
9	.6801672	.0155012	43.88	0.000	.6497854	.710549
10	.6794259	.0156452	43.43	0.000	.6487619	.71009

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1786329	.0210261	8.50	0.000	.1374226	.2198433
2	.172433	.0175496	9.83	0.000	.1380364	.2068296
3	.1663855	.014845	11.21	0.000	.1372898	.1954812
4	.1604913	.013177	12.18	0.000	.1346649	.1863177
5	.154751	.0127407	12.15	0.000	.1297797	.1797224
6	.1491647	.0134634	11.08	0.000	.122777	.1755524
7	.1437321	.015018	9.57	0.000	.1142974	.1731668
8	.1384526	.0170462	8.12	0.000	.1050426	.1718626
9	.1333254	.0192905	6.91	0.000	.0955166	.1711341
10	.1283492	.0215943	5.94	0.000	.0860251	.1706733

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.025274	.0071761	3.52	0.000	.011209	.039339
2	.0241752	.0066339	3.64	0.000	.0111729	.0371775
3	.023123	.0061999	3.73	0.000	.0109715	.0352745
4	.0221155	.0058679	3.77	0.000	.0106146	.0336164
5	.021151	.0056296	3.76	0.000	.0101172	.0321848
6	.0202277	.0054737	3.70	0.000	.0094993	.0309561
7	.0193439	.0053875	3.59	0.000	.0087846	.0299032
8	.018498	.0053572	3.45	0.001	.0079981	.0289979
9	.0176884	.0053696	3.29	0.001	.0071642	.0282126
10	.0169136	.0054127	3.12	0.002	.006305	.0275223

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1296258	.0127639	10.16	0.000	.104609	.1546426
2	.1534654	.01312	11.70	0.000	.1277507	.1791802

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6751509	.016318	41.37	0.000	.6431681	.7071337
2	.6803644	.0156535	43.46	0.000	.6496841	.7110446

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1712547	.0164828	10.39	0.000	.138949	.2035604
2	.1463948	.0138903	10.54	0.000	.1191704	.1736193

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0239686	.0066062	3.63	0.000	.0110206	.0369166
2	.0197754	.0053357	3.71	0.000	.0093176	.0302332

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1896942	.0146431	12.95	0.000	.1609942	.2183942
2	.1542102	.0111643	13.81	0.000	.1323285	.1760918
3	.1243452	.0099512	12.50	0.000	.1048412	.1438491
4	.099583	.0098848	10.07	0.000	.080209	.1189569
5	.0793053	.0099922	7.94	0.000	.059721	.0988896
6	.0628684	.009872	6.37	0.000	.0435196	.0822173

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6766129	.0154731	43.73	0.000	.6462861	.7069397
2	.6804108	.0156459	43.49	0.000	.6497454	.7110763
3	.6728381	.0160749	41.86	0.000	.6413318	.7043444
4	.6541878	.0173485	37.71	0.000	.6201853	.6881903
5	.625205	.0210515	29.70	0.000	.5839449	.6664652
6	.5871029	.0277762	21.14	0.000	.5326624	.6415433

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1183104	.0119724	9.88	0.000	.094845	.1417758
2	.1457142	.012357	11.79	0.000	.1214949	.1699336
3	.177708	.0139851	12.71	0.000	.1502977	.2051183
4	.2142186	.0175544	12.20	0.000	.1798126	.2486245
5	.2547592	.0229693	11.09	0.000	.2097401	.2997783
6	.29833	.029492	10.12	0.000	.2405268	.3561333

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0153825	.0041872	3.67	0.000	.0071758	.0235893
2	.0196648	.005238	3.75	0.000	.0093986	.029931
3	.0251088	.0066585	3.77	0.000	.0120583	.0381592
4	.0320106	.0085948	3.72	0.000	.0151652	.0488561
5	.0407304	.011233	3.63	0.000	.0187141	.0627468
6	.0516986	.0148014	3.49	0.000	.0226885	.0807088

Finland

Tables B.4 Marginal Effects in Finland

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3068648	.0170809	17.97	0.000	.2733867	.3403428
2	.2143364	.0115626	18.54	0.000	.1916741	.2369987
3	.1439151	.0170388	8.45	0.000	.1105198	.1773105
4	.0938668	.0189588	4.95	0.000	.0567082	.1310254

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6611349	.0158921	41.60	0.000	.6299869	.6922829
2	.7347476	.0125493	58.55	0.000	.7101514	.7593439
3	.7759972	.0138746	55.93	0.000	.7488035	.8031909
4	.7823403	.0144439	54.16	0.000	.7540309	.8106498

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0279076	.0041985	6.65	0.000	.0196787	.0361366
2	.0442911	.0056973	7.77	0.000	.0331245	.0554576
3	.0693808	.0107744	6.44	0.000	.0482634	.0904982
4	.1065327	.0216756	4.91	0.000	.0640494	.1490161

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0040928	.0013345	3.07	0.002	.0014771	.0067084
2	.0066249	.0021079	3.14	0.002	.0024936	.0107562
3	.0107068	.0035783	2.99	0.003	.0036936	.0177201
4	.0172602	.0063875	2.70	0.007	.004741	.0297793

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2383978	.0146945	16.22	0.000	.209597	.2671986
2	.2443348	.015873	15.39	0.000	.2132243	.2754454

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7353294	.0153665	47.85	0.000	.7052115	.7654473
2	.6769736	.0172547	39.23	0.000	.643155	.7107923

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0230222	.0047209	4.88	0.000	.0137695	.032275
2	.067842	.0086303	7.86	0.000	.0509269	.0847571

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0032505	.0016715	1.94	0.052	-.0000255	.0065266
2	.0108495	.0029472	3.68	0.000	.0050731	.016626

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2857808	.0196462	14.55	0.000	.247275	.3242866
2	.2699653	.0152764	17.67	0.000	.2400241	.2999065
3	.2547129	.0121466	20.97	0.000	.2309059	.2785198
4	.2400388	.0108269	22.17	0.000	.2188184	.2612592
5	.2259539	.0114603	19.72	0.000	.2034921	.2484157
6	.2124643	.0133932	15.86	0.000	.1862141	.2387145
7	.1995725	.0158645	12.58	0.000	.1684786	.2306663
8	.1872768	.0184295	10.16	0.000	.1511556	.2233981
9	.1755726	.0208769	8.41	0.000	.1346547	.2164905
10	.1644518	.0231097	7.12	0.000	.1191577	.2097459

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6789329	.0177617	38.22	0.000	.6441206	.7137452
2	.6919643	.014503	47.71	0.000	.6635389	.7203897
3	.7042222	.0125241	56.23	0.000	.6796754	.7287691
4	.7156771	.0119255	60.01	0.000	.6923036	.7390506
5	.7263031	.0124185	58.49	0.000	.7019633	.7506429
6	.7360781	.0134804	54.60	0.000	.709657	.7624991
7	.7449831	.0146643	50.80	0.000	.7162417	.7737245
8	.7530025	.0156924	47.99	0.000	.7222459	.7837592
9	.7601232	.0164139	46.31	0.000	.7279527	.7922938
10	.7663346	.0167548	45.74	0.000	.7334957	.7991735

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0307599	.0048044	6.40	0.000	.0213434	.0401763
2	.0331745	.004763	6.97	0.000	.0238392	.0425099
3	.0357696	.0048116	7.43	0.000	.026339	.0452001
4	.0385569	.0049999	7.71	0.000	.0287573	.0483564
5	.041549	.0053774	7.73	0.000	.0310095	.0520884
6	.0447589	.0059829	7.48	0.000	.0330326	.0564853
7	.0482002	.0068393	7.05	0.000	.0347955	.0616049
8	.0518869	.0079555	6.52	0.000	.0362943	.0674794
9	.0558333	.0093339	5.98	0.000	.0375391	.0741275
10	.0600543	.0109755	5.47	0.000	.0385428	.0815659

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0045264	.0014964	3.02	0.002	.0015935	.0074593
2	.0048959	.0015882	3.08	0.002	.0017831	.0080086
3	.0052953	.0016952	3.12	0.002	.0019727	.0086179
4	.0057272	.0018208	3.15	0.002	.0021585	.0092959
5	.0061941	.0019683	3.15	0.002	.0023362	.0100519
6	.0066987	.0021416	3.13	0.002	.0025013	.0108961
7	.0072442	.0023445	3.09	0.002	.002649	.0118394
8	.0078337	.0025814	3.03	0.002	.0027743	.0128932
9	.0084709	.0028567	2.97	0.003	.0028718	.0140699
10	.0091593	.0031751	2.88	0.004	.0029363	.0153823

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2928367	.0322984	9.07	0.000	.229533	.3561405

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6730268	.0279137	24.11	0.000	.6183169	.7277367

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0297621	.0058157	5.12	0.000	.0183635	.0411607

margins, at(relact=1.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0043744	.0015839	2.76	0.006	.0012699	.0074788

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2814761	.0259531	10.85	0.000	.2306089	.3323432

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6825093	.0225811	30.22	0.000	.6382511	.7267675

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0313917	.0054757	5.73	0.000	.0206595	.042124

margins, at(relact=2.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0046229	.0016105	2.87	0.004	.0014665	.0077793

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2703876	.0201793	13.40	0.000	.2308368	.3099384

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6916203	.0180082	38.41	0.000	.656325	.7269157

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0331066	.005175	6.40	0.000	.0229639	.0432494

margins, at(relact=3.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0048854	.0016455	2.97	0.003	.0016603	.0081106

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2595781	.0152724	17.00	0.000	.2296447	.2895116

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.7003483	.0144805	48.36	0.000	.6719669	.7287297

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0349107	.0049599	7.04	0.000	.0251896	.0446319

margins, at(relact=4.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0051628	.0016918	3.05	0.002	.001847	.0084787

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2388176	.0108802	21.95	0.000	.2174928	.2601424

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.7166136	.0119743	59.85	0.000	.6931444	.7400828

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.0388033	.0050338	7.71	0.000	.0289373	.0486693

margins, at(relact=6.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.0057655	.00183	3.15	0.002	.0021787	.0093523

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.2288743	.0124787	18.34	0.000	.2044165	.2533322

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.7241327	.0129488	55.92	0.000	.6987535	.7495119

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.0409004	.0054368	7.52	0.000	.0302445	.0515563

margins, at(relact=7.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0060926	.0019284	3.16	0.002	.0023129	.0098722

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2192258	.0155668	14.08	0.000	.1887154	.2497362

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.731232	.0146762	49.82	0.000	.7024671	.7599969

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0431042	.0061189	7.04	0.000	.0311114	.055097

margins, at(relact=8.0000) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0064381	.0020506	3.14	0.002	.002419	.0104571

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2041002	.0184602	11.06	0.000	.1679188	.2402816
2	.213915	.0155707	13.74	0.000	.183397	.2444329
3	.2240689	.0129706	17.28	0.000	.1986471	.2494908
4	.234561	.0111957	20.95	0.000	.2126178	.2565042
5	.245389	.0110217	22.26	0.000	.2237869	.2669911
6	.2565493	.0128352	19.99	0.000	.2313928	.2817058
7	.2680369	.0162329	16.51	0.000	.236221	.2998528
8	.2798453	.0206455	13.55	0.000	.2393808	.3203098
9	.2919663	.0257157	11.35	0.000	.2415644	.3423683
10	.3043905	.0312529	9.74	0.000	.243136	.3656451

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7546939	.0194025	38.90	0.000	.7166657	.7927221
2	.744115	.0165179	45.05	0.000	.7117406	.7764894
3	.7331835	.0139654	52.50	0.000	.7058117	.7605552
4	.7219001	.0122547	58.91	0.000	.6978814	.7459187
5	.7102667	.01208	58.80	0.000	.6865904	.733943
6	.6982869	.0137968	50.61	0.000	.6712457	.7253281
7	.6859653	.0170823	40.16	0.000	.6524847	.719446
8	.6733084	.0214188	31.44	0.000	.6313284	.7152884
9	.6603238	.0264509	24.96	0.000	.6084811	.7121666
10	.6470211	.0319784	20.23	0.000	.5843446	.7096976

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0378086	.0075767	4.99	0.000	.0229586	.0526587
2	.0380502	.0064689	5.88	0.000	.0253713	.0507291
3	.0382252	.005576	6.86	0.000	.0272964	.049154
4	.0383219	.0050505	7.59	0.000	.0284231	.0482208
5	.0383265	.005045	7.60	0.000	.0284385	.0482145
6	.0382233	.0055935	6.83	0.000	.0272602	.0491864
7	.0379941	.0065891	5.77	0.000	.0250796	.0509085
8	.0376182	.0078958	4.76	0.000	.0221427	.0530936
9	.0370718	.0094224	3.93	0.000	.0186042	.0555394
10	.0363279	.0111281	3.26	0.001	.0145172	.0581385

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0033973	.0014939	2.27	0.023	.0004692	.0063253
2	.0039198	.0015294	2.56	0.010	.0009223	.0069173
3	.0045224	.0015864	2.85	0.004	.0014131	.0076316
4	.005217	.001697	3.07	0.002	.0018909	.0085432
5	.0060178	.0019074	3.15	0.002	.0022793	.0097563
6	.0069406	.0022699	3.06	0.002	.0024916	.0113895
7	.0080037	.0028322	2.83	0.005	.0024527	.0135547
8	.0092282	.0036348	2.54	0.011	.0021042	.0163522
9	.010638	.0047168	2.26	0.024	.0013932	.0198828
10	.0122605	.0061233	2.00	0.045	.0002591	.0242619

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2297325	.0197531	11.63	0.000	.1910171	.2684478
2	.2331193	.0159829	14.59	0.000	.2017934	.2644453
3	.2365408	.0128397	18.42	0.000	.2113754	.2617062
4	.2399967	.0110158	21.79	0.000	.2184062	.2615873
5	.2434871	.01131	21.53	0.000	.2213199	.2656542
6	.2470117	.0136966	18.03	0.000	.2201669	.2738564
7	.2505704	.01742	14.38	0.000	.2164279	.2847129
8	.2541631	.0218767	11.62	0.000	.2112855	.2970407

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7234915	.0171236	42.25	0.000	.6899299	.7570532
2	.7209464	.0148214	48.64	0.000	.6918969	.7499959
3	.7183523	.0129982	55.27	0.000	.6928763	.7438283
4	.7157094	.0120075	59.61	0.000	.6921751	.7392437
5	.7130182	.0121889	58.50	0.000	.6891285	.736908
6	.7102789	.0136162	52.16	0.000	.6835917	.7369662
7	.707492	.0160633	44.04	0.000	.6760085	.7389754
8	.7046577	.0192319	36.64	0.000	.666964	.7423515

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0407128	.0065124	6.25	0.000	.0279488	.0534767
2	.0399847	.0058464	6.84	0.000	.028526	.0514434
3	.039269	.0053458	7.35	0.000	.0287914	.0497465
4	.0385653	.0050365	7.66	0.000	.0286941	.0484366
5	.0378737	.0049318	7.68	0.000	.0282076	.0475397
6	.0371938	.0050236	7.40	0.000	.0273476	.0470399
7	.0365255	.0052834	6.91	0.000	.0261703	.0468806
8	.0358686	.0056718	6.32	0.000	.024752	.0469851

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0060632	.0019752	3.07	0.002	.0021919	.0099345
2	.0059495	.0019082	3.12	0.002	.0022096	.0096895
3	.005838	.0018564	3.14	0.002	.0021994	.0094765
4	.0057285	.0018195	3.15	0.002	.0021624	.0092946
5	.0056211	.0017966	3.13	0.002	.0020997	.0091424
6	.0055156	.0017868	3.09	0.002	.0020135	.0090178
7	.0054122	.0017889	3.03	0.002	.0019059	.0089184
8	.0053106	.0018015	2.95	0.003	.0017797	.0088415

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2305944	.0152909	15.08	0.000	.2006247	.2605641
2	.2353807	.012387	19.00	0.000	.2111025	.2596588
3	.2402352	.010903	22.03	0.000	.2188658	.2616047
4	.2451578	.0115887	21.15	0.000	.2224443	.2678713
5	.2501481	.0142816	17.52	0.000	.2221566	.2781395
6	.2552055	.018226	14.00	0.000	.2194832	.2909279
7	.2603298	.0228765	11.38	0.000	.2154927	.3051669
8	.2655202	.0279605	9.50	0.000	.2107186	.3203218

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7322976	.015812	46.31	0.000	.7013067	.7632885
2	.7244838	.0132068	54.86	0.000	.698599	.7503686
3	.7163658	.0119531	59.93	0.000	.6929383	.7397934
4	.7079275	.0126582	55.93	0.000	.6831178	.7327372
5	.6991517	.0152292	45.91	0.000	.6693031	.7290004
6	.6900209	.019083	36.16	0.000	.6526189	.7274228
7	.6805164	.0237498	28.65	0.000	.6339676	.7270651
8	.670619	.0289808	23.14	0.000	.6138178	.7274203

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0335533	.0058151	5.77	0.000	.022156	.0449507
2	.0357253	.0052581	6.79	0.000	.0254195	.046031
3	.0379282	.0049807	7.62	0.000	.0281663	.0476901
4	.0401303	.0052207	7.69	0.000	.0298979	.0503628
5	.0422894	.0061278	6.90	0.000	.0302792	.0542996
6	.0443505	.0076847	5.77	0.000	.0292887	.0594123
7	.0462433	.0098161	4.71	0.000	.0270042	.0654824
8	.0478787	.0124896	3.83	0.000	.0233995	.0723578

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0035547	.0015159	2.34	0.019	.0005835	.0065258
2	.0044103	.0016294	2.71	0.007	.0012168	.0076038
3	.0054707	.0017756	3.08	0.002	.0019906	.0089508
4	.0067844	.0020167	3.36	0.001	.0028317	.0107371
5	.0084109	.0024587	3.42	0.001	.0035918	.0132299
6	.0104231	.0032375	3.22	0.001	.0040777	.0167686
7	.0129106	.0044948	2.87	0.004	.0041009	.0217203
8	.0159821	.0063794	2.51	0.012	.0034787	.0284855

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.185706	.0157268	11.81	0.000	.154882	.21653
2	.2023998	.0135215	14.97	0.000	.1758982	.2289013
3	.2201884	.0116369	18.92	0.000	.1973806	.2429962
4	.2390718	.0108372	22.06	0.000	.2178314	.2603123
5	.2590368	.01196	21.66	0.000	.2355957	.2824779
6	.2800553	.0150813	18.57	0.000	.2504965	.3096142
7	.3020841	.0196481	15.37	0.000	.2635745	.3405937
8	.3250632	.0251625	12.92	0.000	.2757456	.3743809
9	.3489165	.031314	11.14	0.000	.2875422	.4102907
10	.3735513	.0378961	9.86	0.000	.2992764	.4478262

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.7539893	.014088	53.52	0.000	.7263773	.7816013
2	.7430707	.0132801	55.95	0.000	.7170421	.7690992
3	.7305331	.0124005	58.91	0.000	.7062286	.7548377
4	.7164189	.0119266	60.07	0.000	.6930432	.7397946
5	.7007811	.0125038	56.05	0.000	.6762741	.7252881
6	.683685	.0145862	46.87	0.000	.6550965	.7122734
7	.6652088	.0181406	36.67	0.000	.6296539	.7007637
8	.6454448	.0228555	28.24	0.000	.6006489	.6902408
9	.6244994	.0284172	21.98	0.000	.5688027	.6801961
10	.6024927	.034578	17.42	0.000	.5347211	.6702644

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0523901	.0077079	6.80	0.000	.0372829	.0674972
2	.0474109	.0065173	7.27	0.000	.0346372	.0601846
3	.0428762	.005636	7.61	0.000	.03183	.0539225
4	.0387518	.0050295	7.70	0.000	.0288942	.0486094
5	.0350048	.0046493	7.53	0.000	.0258922	.0441173
6	.0316043	.0044365	7.12	0.000	.0229089	.0402997
7	.0285213	.004332	6.58	0.000	.0200308	.0370118
8	.0257285	.0042865	6.00	0.000	.0173271	.0341299
9	.0232006	.0042648	5.44	0.000	.0148418	.0315594
10	.0209141	.0042443	4.93	0.000	.0125954	.0292328

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0079146	.0025938	3.05	0.002	.0028308	.0129984
2	.0071187	.0022955	3.10	0.002	.0026196	.0116177
3	.0064022	.0020436	3.13	0.002	.0023969	.0104076
4	.0057575	.001831	3.14	0.002	.0021688	.0093462
5	.0051773	.0016514	3.14	0.002	.0019407	.008414
6	.0046554	.0014991	3.11	0.002	.0017173	.0075935
7	.0041858	.0013692	3.06	0.002	.0015022	.0068694
8	.0037634	.0012577	2.99	0.003	.0012984	.0062284
9	.0033835	.0011609	2.91	0.004	.0011082	.0056589
10	.0030419	.001076	2.83	0.005	.0009329	.0051508

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2027698	.0132058	15.35	0.000	.1768869	.2286527
2	.2822648	.0160286	17.61	0.000	.2508493	.3136804

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7428186	.0133407	55.68	0.000	.7166713	.768966
2	.6818556	.0150951	45.17	0.000	.6522696	.7114415

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0473091	.0062545	7.56	0.000	.0350506	.0595676
2	.0312746	.0045845	6.82	0.000	.0222891	.0402601

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0071025	.0022977	3.09	0.002	.002599	.011606
2	.004605	.0014808	3.11	0.002	.0017027	.0075072

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3145595	.0154558	20.35	0.000	.2842667	.3448524
2	.2689964	.0116407	23.11	0.000	.2461811	.2918118
3	.2278393	.0109303	20.84	0.000	.2064163	.2492624
4	.1913312	.0121881	15.70	0.000	.167443	.2152193
5	.1594648	.0137607	11.59	0.000	.1324944	.1864353
6	.1320393	.0148829	8.87	0.000	.1028694	.1612091

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6545346	.014626	44.75	0.000	.6258682	.683201
2	.6927525	.0121111	57.20	0.000	.6690151	.7164899
3	.7249039	.0121107	59.86	0.000	.7011674	.7486404
4	.7504146	.0129542	57.93	0.000	.7250248	.7758044
5	.7689165	.0134103	57.34	0.000	.7426328	.7952002
6	.7801974	.0132563	58.85	0.000	.7542155	.8061793

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.026957	.0039859	6.76	0.000	.0191449	.0347692
2	.0333312	.004502	7.40	0.000	.0245073	.042155
3	.0411285	.0052796	7.79	0.000	.0307807	.0514763
4	.0506232	.0064941	7.80	0.000	.037895	.0633514
5	.0621198	.0083394	7.45	0.000	.0457749	.0784647
6	.0759449	.0109947	6.91	0.000	.0543957	.0974942

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0039489	.0012739	3.10	0.002	.0014521	.0064457
2	.0049199	.0015687	3.14	0.002	.0018453	.0079945
3	.0061282	.0019494	3.14	0.002	.0023075	.009949
4	.007631	.0024445	3.12	0.002	.0028399	.0124222
5	.0094989	.0030912	3.07	0.002	.0034402	.0155576
6	.0118184	.0039377	3.00	0.003	.0041006	.0195362

Norway

Tables B.5 Marginal Effects in Norway

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3797799	.0170658	22.25	0.000	.3463316	.4132282
2	.2775723	.012534	22.15	0.000	.2530061	.3021384
3	.1942559	.0203673	9.54	0.000	.1543368	.2341751
4	.1313992	.0240294	5.47	0.000	.0843024	.178496

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.5993131	.0161648	37.08	0.000	.5676307	.6309955
2	.6895169	.01295	53.24	0.000	.6641354	.7148985
3	.7542995	.0174392	43.25	0.000	.7201194	.7884797
4	.7890438	.0152794	51.64	0.000	.7590968	.8189908

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0204405	.0031452	6.50	0.000	.0142761	.026605
2	.0321676	.0042582	7.55	0.000	.0238218	.0405135
3	.0502607	.0078484	6.40	0.000	.0348782	.0656432
4	.0776715	.0159409	4.87	0.000	.0464279	.1089152

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0004664	.0004292	1.09	0.277	-.0003748	.0013077
2	.0007432	.0006863	1.08	0.279	-.000602	.0020883
3	.0011839	.0011061	1.07	0.284	-.000984	.0033518
4	.0018854	.0017954	1.05	0.294	-.0016335	.0054043

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.3090571	.0132709	23.29	0.000	.2830467	.3350676
2	.3210163	.0218774	14.67	0.000	.2781374	.3638952

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.6670541	.013591	49.08	0.000	.6404162	.6936921
2	.6377264	.0221182	28.83	0.000	.5943756	.6810773

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0234094	.0038308	6.11	0.000	.0159012	.0309176
2	.0400253	.0070961	5.64	0.000	.0261172	.0539334

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0004794	.0004709	1.02	0.309	-.0004435	.0014023
2	.001232	.0011505	1.07	0.284	-.001023	.003487

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.387675	.0241692	16.04	0.000	.3403043	.4350457
2	.368297	.0192857	19.10	0.000	.3304977	.4060963
3	.349335	.0151352	23.08	0.000	.3196706	.3789994
4	.330838	.012233	27.04	0.000	.3068617	.3548143
5	.3128495	.0112324	27.85	0.000	.2908343	.3348646
6	.2954072	.0122503	24.11	0.000	.2713971	.3194174
7	.2785433	.0145678	19.12	0.000	.249991	.3070955
8	.2622836	.0174178	15.06	0.000	.2281453	.2964219
9	.2466486	.0203623	12.11	0.000	.2067392	.2865581
10	.231653	.0231876	9.99	0.000	.1862061	.2770999

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5920906	.0224302	26.40	0.000	.5481283	.6360529
2	.6097681	.0180308	33.82	0.000	.5744284	.6451077
3	.6268901	.0144935	43.25	0.000	.5984833	.6552969
4	.6433968	.0122646	52.46	0.000	.6193587	.6674349
5	.6592332	.0117094	56.30	0.000	.6362833	.6821832
6	.6743492	.0126535	53.29	0.000	.6495487	.6991496
7	.6886995	.0144575	47.64	0.000	.6603633	.7170358
8	.7022443	.0165402	42.46	0.000	.6698262	.7346624
9	.7149483	.0185513	38.54	0.000	.6785885	.7513082
10	.7267813	.0203011	35.80	0.000	.6869918	.7665707

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0197832	.003401	5.82	0.000	.0131175	.026449
2	.021445	.0034026	6.30	0.000	.0147761	.028114
3	.023243	.0034339	6.77	0.000	.0165125	.0299734
4	.0251875	.0035174	7.16	0.000	.0182935	.0320816
5	.0272901	.0036804	7.42	0.000	.0200766	.0345035
6	.0295625	.0039521	7.48	0.000	.0218166	.0373084
7	.0320176	.0043595	7.34	0.000	.0234732	.040562
8	.034669	.0049241	7.04	0.000	.025018	.04432
9	.037531	.0056613	6.63	0.000	.0264351	.0486269
10	.0406188	.006582	6.17	0.000	.0277184	.0535192

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0004511	.0004193	1.08	0.282	-.0003706	.0012729
2	.0004899	.0004539	1.08	0.280	-.0003997	.0013795
3	.000532	.0004917	1.08	0.279	-.0004317	.0014956
4	.0005776	.0005329	1.08	0.278	-.0004669	.0016222
5	.0006272	.000578	1.09	0.278	-.0005056	.0017601
6	.0006811	.0006272	1.09	0.278	-.0005482	.0019105
7	.0007396	.0006811	1.09	0.278	-.0005953	.0020745
8	.0008031	.00074	1.09	0.278	-.0006474	.0022535
9	.000872	.0008046	1.08	0.278	-.0007049	.002449
10	.0009469	.0008753	1.08	0.279	-.0007686	.0026624

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3660015	.0326743	11.20	0.000	.3019611	.4300419

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6118506	.029966	20.42	0.000	.5531183	.6705829

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0216531	.0041998	5.16	0.000	.0134216	.0298847

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0004947	.000457	1.08	0.279	-.000401	.0013905

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3555157	.0270032	13.17	0.000	.3025903	.4084411

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6213299	.0248233	25.03	0.000	.5726771	.6699828

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0226366	.0040068	5.65	0.000	.0147834	.0304899

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0005178	.0004773	1.08	0.278	-.0004178	.0014533

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3451667	.0216959	15.91	0.000	.3026435	.3876899

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6306278	.0201265	31.33	0.000	.5911805	.6700751

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0236637	.0038352	6.17	0.000	.0161469	.0311805

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0005418	.0004988	1.09	0.277	-.0004359	.0015195

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3349624	.0169652	19.74	0.000	.3017112	.3682137

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6397345	.0160972	39.74	0.000	.6081845	.6712844

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0247361	.0037038	6.68	0.000	.0174768	.0319953

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.000567	.0005217	1.09	0.277	-.0004556	.0015896

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3150166	.0113346	27.79	0.000	.2928012	.3372321

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6573379	.0117596	55.90	0.000	.6342894	.6803863

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0270246	.0036606	7.38	0.000	.0198499	.0341992

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.000621	.000572	1.09	0.278	-.0005001	.001742

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3052881	.0118694	25.72	0.000	.2820245	.3285517

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6658174	.0122604	54.31	0.000	.6417874	.6898473

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0282446	.0038006	7.43	0.000	.0207955	.0356937

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0006498	.0005996	1.08	0.278	-.0005253	.0018249

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2957304	.01438	20.57	0.000	.2675461	.3239146

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6740715	.0141966	47.48	0.000	.6462467	.7018963

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0295181	.0040741	7.25	0.000	.021533	.0375032

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.00068	.0006289	1.08	0.280	-.0005526	.0019127

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2685191	.0218637	12.28	0.000	.2256671	.3113712
2	.2786137	.0184577	15.09	0.000	.2424372	.3147902
3	.2889378	.0152548	18.94	0.000	.259039	.3188367
4	.2994857	.0126376	23.70	0.000	.2747165	.3242548
5	.3102506	.011284	27.49	0.000	.2881345	.3323668
6	.321225	.0118797	27.04	0.000	.2979412	.3445089
7	.3324006	.0143692	23.13	0.000	.3042374	.3605637
8	.343768	.0181225	18.97	0.000	.3082486	.3792875
9	.3553173	.0226188	15.71	0.000	.3109852	.3996494
10	.3670376	.0275703	13.31	0.000	.3130009	.4210743

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.697087	.0195055	35.74	0.000	.6588568	.7353171
2	.6886402	.0170224	40.45	0.000	.6552769	.7220035
3	.6798875	.0146627	46.37	0.000	.6511491	.7086259
4	.6708379	.0127417	52.65	0.000	.6458647	.6958111
5	.6615014	.0117532	56.28	0.000	.6384655	.6845373
6	.6518885	.0121932	53.46	0.000	.6279902	.6757868
7	.6420106	.0141478	45.38	0.000	.6142814	.6697398
8	.6318797	.0172785	36.57	0.000	.5980145	.665745
9	.6215087	.0211992	29.32	0.000	.579959	.6630584
10	.610911	.0256476	23.82	0.000	.5606426	.6611794

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0336161	.0055335	6.08	0.000	.0227706	.0444615
2	.0320068	.0049013	6.53	0.000	.0224003	.0416132
3	.030472	.0043891	6.94	0.000	.0218695	.0390745
4	.0290084	.0039982	7.26	0.000	.0211721	.0368448
5	.0276131	.0037263	7.41	0.000	.0203096	.0349166
6	.026283	.003565	7.37	0.000	.0192957	.0332703
7	.0250152	.0034991	7.15	0.000	.018157	.0318734
8	.023807	.0035089	6.78	0.000	.0169296	.0306844
9	.0226558	.0035734	6.34	0.000	.015652	.0296596
10	.0215589	.0036735	5.87	0.000	.014359	.0287588

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0007778	.0007169	1.09	0.278	-.0006272	.0021829
2	.0007393	.0006807	1.09	0.277	-.0005948	.0020735
3	.0007027	.0006467	1.09	0.277	-.0005648	.0019703
4	.0006679	.0006148	1.09	0.277	-.0005371	.001873
5	.0006349	.0005849	1.09	0.278	-.0005114	.0017812
6	.0006035	.0005567	1.08	0.278	-.0004877	.0016946
7	.0005736	.0005302	1.08	0.279	-.0004656	.0016128
8	.0005452	.0005053	1.08	0.281	-.0004451	.0015355
9	.0005182	.0004818	1.08	0.282	-.0004261	.0014625
10	.0004925	.0004597	1.07	0.284	-.0004084	.0013935

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2514325	.0231078	10.88	0.000	.2061421	.2967229
2	.2647514	.0196191	13.49	0.000	.2262988	.303204
3	.2785133	.0161804	17.21	0.000	.2468004	.3102263
4	.2927058	.0131761	22.21	0.000	.2668811	.3185305
5	.3073135	.0113808	27.00	0.000	.2850074	.3296195
6	.3223179	.0117773	27.37	0.000	.2992349	.345401
7	.3376978	.0144896	23.31	0.000	.3092987	.3660969
8	.3534289	.0187439	18.86	0.000	.3166914	.3901663

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.711098	.0200045	35.55	0.000	.6718899	.7503061
2	.700209	.0176439	39.69	0.000	.6656276	.7347905
3	.6887248	.0152237	45.24	0.000	.6588868	.7185627
4	.6766666	.0130818	51.73	0.000	.6510267	.7023065
5	.6640583	.0118131	56.21	0.000	.6409051	.6872115
6	.6509263	.0121374	53.63	0.000	.6271374	.6747152
7	.6372996	.0143027	44.56	0.000	.6092668	.6653324
8	.6232096	.0179123	34.79	0.000	.5881021	.658317

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0366195	.0063439	5.77	0.000	.0241856	.0490533
2	.0342466	.0054595	6.27	0.000	.0235463	.044947
3	.0320222	.004741	6.75	0.000	.0227301	.0413144
4	.0299376	.004186	7.15	0.000	.0217332	.038142
5	.0279845	.0037883	7.39	0.000	.0205597	.0354094
6	.0261553	.0035342	7.40	0.000	.0192284	.0330822
7	.0244425	.0034014	7.19	0.000	.0177759	.0311091
8	.0228391	.0033611	6.80	0.000	.0162513	.0294268

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.00085	.0007853	1.08	0.279	-.0006892	.0023893
2	.0007929	.0007313	1.08	0.278	-.0006403	.0022262
3	.0007397	.0006814	1.09	0.278	-.0005958	.0020752
4	.00069	.0006354	1.09	0.277	-.0005554	.0019354
5	.0006437	.0005929	1.09	0.278	-.0005185	.0018058
6	.0006004	.0005537	1.08	0.278	-.0004848	.0016857
7	.0005601	.0005174	1.08	0.279	-.0004541	.0015743
8	.0005225	.0004839	1.08	0.280	-.0004259	.0014709

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3055707	.014581	20.96	0.000	.2769924	.3341491
2	.3109566	.0114295	27.21	0.000	.2885553	.3333579
3	.3163942	.0123913	25.53	0.000	.2921077	.3406806
4	.3218824	.0169521	18.99	0.000	.2886568	.355108
5	.3274202	.0231952	14.12	0.000	.2819585	.372882
6	.3330066	.0301858	11.03	0.000	.2738434	.3921697
7	.3386402	.0375817	9.01	0.000	.2649815	.4122989
8	.34432	.0452424	7.61	0.000	.2556465	.4329934

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6740475	.0148044	45.53	0.000	.6450314	.7030636
2	.6629284	.0118882	55.76	0.000	.6396279	.686229
3	.6502001	.0127918	50.83	0.000	.6251286	.6752715
4	.6354747	.0171097	37.14	0.000	.6019403	.6690091
5	.618289	.0232827	26.56	0.000	.5726557	.6639223
6	.5981021	.0306629	19.51	0.000	.5380039	.6582004
7	.5743029	.0393004	14.61	0.000	.4972755	.6513302
8	.5462305	.0496015	11.01	0.000	.4490134	.6434476

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.020082	.0035967	5.58	0.000	.0130326	.0271314
2	.0255798	.003633	7.04	0.000	.0184592	.0327005
3	.0324509	.0040494	8.01	0.000	.0245142	.0403876
4	.0409397	.005507	7.43	0.000	.0301463	.0517331
5	.0512545	.0085147	6.02	0.000	.0345659	.067943
6	.063484	.0133809	4.74	0.000	.0372579	.0897102
7	.0774451	.0206367	3.75	0.000	.036998	.1178923
8	.0924199	.0316545	2.92	0.004	.0303781	.1544616

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0002998	.0003687	0.81	0.416	-.0004228	.0010225
2	.0005351	.0005274	1.01	0.310	-.0004987	.0015689
3	.0009548	.0007308	1.31	0.191	-.0004776	.0023872
4	.0017032	.0010147	1.68	0.093	-.0002856	.0036919
5	.0030363	.0016021	1.90	0.058	-.0001037	.0061764
6	.0054073	.0032219	1.68	0.093	-.0009074	.011722
7	.0096118	.0073274	1.31	0.190	-.0047497	.0239733
8	.0170297	.0165791	1.03	0.304	-.0154648	.0495241

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2500171	.0211853	11.80	0.000	.2084948	.2915394
2	.2634487	.0182346	14.45	0.000	.2277095	.2991878
3	.277335	.015355	18.06	0.000	.2472398	.3074302
4	.2916635	.0128724	22.66	0.000	.2664341	.3168928
5	.3064183	.0113818	26.92	0.000	.2841104	.3287261
6	.3215807	.0116008	27.72	0.000	.2988434	.3443179
7	.3371286	.0137038	24.60	0.000	.3102698	.3639875
8	.3530371	.0171935	20.53	0.000	.3193385	.3867358
9	.3692781	.021532	17.15	0.000	.3270761	.4114802
10	.3858207	.0263868	14.62	0.000	.3341035	.4375379

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7122407	.0187524	37.98	0.000	.6754868	.7489947
2	.7012844	.0167702	41.82	0.000	.6684155	.7341533
3	.6897165	.014745	46.78	0.000	.6608167	.7186163
4	.677559	.0129517	52.31	0.000	.6521741	.7029438
5	.6648362	.011842	56.14	0.000	.6416263	.6880461
6	.6515755	.0119605	54.48	0.000	.6281334	.6750176
7	.6378066	.013574	46.99	0.000	.611202	.6644113
8	.6235621	.0164754	37.85	0.000	.591271	.6558533
9	.6088772	.0202837	30.02	0.000	.5691219	.6486325
10	.5937893	.0246971	24.04	0.000	.5453839	.6421947

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0368857	.0059421	6.21	0.000	.0252394	.048532
2	.0344687	.0051919	6.64	0.000	.0242926	.0446447
3	.0322044	.0045876	7.02	0.000	.0232129	.0411959
4	.0300841	.0041226	7.30	0.000	.0220039	.0381643
5	.0280991	.0037868	7.42	0.000	.020677	.0355212
6	.0262414	.0035649	7.36	0.000	.0192543	.0332284
7	.0245032	.0034365	7.13	0.000	.0177677	.0312386
8	.0228773	.0033789	6.77	0.000	.0162548	.0294998
9	.0213569	.0033699	6.34	0.000	.0147519	.0279618
10	.0199353	.0033907	5.88	0.000	.0132896	.026581

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0008565	.0008004	1.07	0.285	-.0007123	.0024252
2	.0007983	.000743	1.07	0.283	-.0006579	.0022545
3	.000744	.00069	1.08	0.281	-.0006083	.0020964
4	.0006935	.0006412	1.08	0.279	-.0005632	.0019502
5	.0006464	.0005961	1.08	0.278	-.000522	.0018148
6	.0006025	.0005545	1.09	0.277	-.0004844	.0016893
7	.0005615	.0005161	1.09	0.277	-.0004501	.0015732
8	.0005234	.0004807	1.09	0.276	-.0004187	.0014655
9	.0004878	.0004479	1.09	0.276	-.0003901	.0013657
10	.0004547	.0004176	1.09	0.276	-.0003638	.0012732

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2819591	.0150626	18.72	0.000	.2524371	.3114812
2	.3460204	.0164934	20.98	0.000	.3136939	.3783469

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6945253	.0154284	45.02	0.000	.6642862	.7247643
2	.6205152	.0168307	36.87	0.000	.5875277	.6535027

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0233348	.0043463	5.37	0.000	.0148162	.0318534
2	.0311701	.005129	6.08	0.000	.0211174	.0412227

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0001808	.000223	0.81	0.418	-.0002563	.000618
2	.0022944	.0018946	1.21	0.226	-.0014189	.0060076

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3980266	.0153128	25.99	0.000	.368014	.4280393
2	.3374591	.0116175	29.05	0.000	.3146892	.360229
3	.2817937	.0117202	24.04	0.000	.2588226	.3047648
4	.2320939	.0138573	16.75	0.000	.2049341	.2592537
5	.1888547	.0159013	11.88	0.000	.1576887	.2200208
6	.1520757	.0170791	8.90	0.000	.1186013	.1855502

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5825817	.0146859	39.67	0.000	.5537979	.6113655
2	.6375123	.0118229	53.92	0.000	.6143399	.6606847
3	.685956	.0122952	55.79	0.000	.6618578	.7100541
4	.7264389	.0138994	52.26	0.000	.6991966	.7536811
5	.7579718	.0147916	51.24	0.000	.7289808	.7869629
6	.7799742	.0144754	53.88	0.000	.751603	.8083454

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0189596	.002836	6.69	0.000	.0134012	.0245181
2	.0244679	.0033748	7.25	0.000	.0178535	.0310823
3	.0315226	.0041824	7.54	0.000	.0233253	.0397199
4	.0405227	.0054405	7.45	0.000	.0298595	.0511858
5	.0519476	.007374	7.04	0.000	.0374949	.0664003
6	.0663593	.0102319	6.49	0.000	.0463052	.0864135

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.000432	.0003996	1.08	0.280	-.0003513	.0012153
2	.0005607	.0005172	1.08	0.278	-.0004529	.0015743
3	.0007278	.00067	1.09	0.277	-.0005854	.0020409
4	.0009446	.0008689	1.09	0.277	-.0007585	.0026476
5	.0012258	.0011282	1.09	0.277	-.0009853	.003437
6	.0015907	.0014662	1.08	0.278	-.001283	.0044645

Spain

Tables B.6 Marginal Effects in Spain

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1825104	.0145305	12.56	0.000	.1540311	.2109897
2	.1348916	.0086224	15.64	0.000	.117992	.1517911
3	.0982045	.0118707	8.27	0.000	.0749382	.1214707
4	.0706801	.0142412	4.96	0.000	.0427678	.0985924

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7551967	.0124639	60.59	0.000	.7307679	.7796256
2	.7782521	.0108592	71.67	0.000	.7569685	.7995357
3	.781928	.0111916	69.87	0.000	.7599929	.8038631
4	.7661368	.0177233	43.23	0.000	.7313999	.8008738

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0568373	.0069723	8.15	0.000	.0431718	.0705028
2	.0790633	.0070749	11.18	0.000	.0651968	.0929298
3	.1087466	.0129581	8.39	0.000	.0833492	.134144
4	.1473359	.0255005	5.78	0.000	.0973559	.197316

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0054555	.0015625	3.49	0.000	.0023931	.008518
2	.007793	.0021343	3.65	0.000	.0036099	.0119762
3	.0111209	.0032247	3.45	0.001	.0048007	.0174411
4	.0158471	.0052265	3.03	0.002	.0056034	.0260908

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.165624	.0162429	10.20	0.000	.1337886	.1974595
2	.1383755	.009227	15.00	0.000	.1202909	.1564601

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7648541	.0129231	59.18	0.000	.7395253	.790183
2	.7770823	.0108594	71.56	0.000	.7557982	.7983663

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0633901	.0082388	7.69	0.000	.0472423	.0795378
2	.0769743	.0072692	10.59	0.000	.062727	.0912216

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0061318	.0017905	3.42	0.001	.0026224	.0096411
2	.007568	.0020836	3.63	0.000	.0034842	.0116517

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1429731	.0144926	9.87	0.000	.1145681	.1713782
2	.1434819	.0118621	12.10	0.000	.1202326	.1667313
3	.1439922	.0097974	14.70	0.000	.1247897	.1631948
4	.144504	.0087361	16.54	0.000	.1273817	.1616264
5	.1450173	.0090636	16.00	0.000	.127253	.1627817
6	.1455322	.010674	13.63	0.000	.1246115	.1664528
7	.1460485	.0131199	11.13	0.000	.1203339	.1717631
8	.1465664	.0160376	9.14	0.000	.1151332	.1779995
9	.1470857	.0192255	7.65	0.000	.1094045	.184767
10	.1476066	.0225797	6.54	0.000	.1033512	.1918621

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin (Delta-method)	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7955117	.0162349	49.00	0.000	.7636919	.8273316
2	.7896951	.0137777	57.32	0.000	.7626914	.8166988
3	.7834544	.0118424	66.16	0.000	.7602437	.806665
4	.7767622	.0108317	71.71	0.000	.7555325	.7979918
5	.7695904	.0111591	68.97	0.000	.747719	.7914619
6	.7619107	.0129026	59.05	0.000	.7366221	.7871993
7	.7536942	.0157874	47.74	0.000	.7227514	.7846369
8	.7449121	.0195082	38.18	0.000	.7066768	.7831474
9	.7355362	.0238777	30.80	0.000	.6887367	.7823356
10	.7255388	.0288069	25.19	0.000	.6690782	.7819993

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin (Delta-method)	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.058155	.0088293	6.59	0.000	.0408499	.0754602
2	.0625882	.0079835	7.84	0.000	.0469409	.0782355
3	.0672175	.0072161	9.31	0.000	.0530743	.0813608
4	.0720125	.006745	10.68	0.000	.0587925	.0852324
5	.0769287	.0068813	11.18	0.000	.0634416	.0904157
6	.0819047	.0078808	10.39	0.000	.0664587	.0973507
7	.0868575	.0097949	8.87	0.000	.0676599	.1060551
8	.0916778	.012568	7.29	0.000	.0670449	.1163106
9	.0962243	.0162037	5.94	0.000	.0644657	.1279829
10	.1003176	.0208323	4.82	0.000	.059487	.1411483

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0033601	.0017108	1.96	0.050	7.07e-06	.0067131
2	.0042348	.0017969	2.36	0.018	.0007129	.0077566
3	.0053359	.0018577	2.87	0.004	.0016949	.0089768
4	.0067214	.0019321	3.48	0.001	.0029346	.0105082
5	.0084636	.0021447	3.95	0.000	.0042601	.012667
6	.0106525	.0027318	3.90	0.000	.0052982	.0160067
7	.0133999	.0039525	3.39	0.001	.0056531	.0211466
8	.0168438	.0060142	2.80	0.005	.0050561	.0286314
9	.0211538	.0091372	2.32	0.021	.0032451	.0390625
10	.0265369	.0136174	1.95	0.051	-.0001526	.0532265

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2270628	.0241791	9.39	0.000	.1796726	.2744531

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6840127	.0262905	26.02	0.000	.6324844	.7355411

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0825877	.0135425	6.10	0.000	.056045	.1091305

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0063367	.0031493	2.01	0.044	.0001643	.0125091

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.206539	.0186413	11.08	0.000	.1700027	.2430752

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.7064174	.0206893	34.14	0.000	.6658672	.7469677

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0805292	.0112355	7.17	0.000	.058508	.1025504

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0065144	.0027795	2.34	0.019	.0010668	.0119621

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1874204	.0140896	13.30	0.000	.1598052	.2150356

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.7273808	.016104	45.17	0.000	.6958176	.758944

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0785017	.00925	8.49	0.000	.0603721	.0966313

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0066971	.0024371	2.75	0.006	.0019205	.0114737

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1696931	.0107684	15.76	0.000	.1485873	.1907988

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.7469173	.0127904	58.40	0.000	.7218485	.7719861

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0765047	.0077237	9.91	0.000	.0613666	.0916428

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0068849	.0021567	3.19	0.001	.0026578	.0111121

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1382748	.0087479	15.81	0.000	.1211293	.1554204

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.7818496	.0108836	71.84	0.000	.760518	.8031811

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0725993	.0067743	10.72	0.000	.0593218	.0858767

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0072763	.0019986	3.64	0.000	.0033591	.0111936

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1244839	.0095368	13.05	0.000	.1057922	.1431756

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.7973464	.011861	67.22	0.000	.7740993	.8205935

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0706895	.0074301	9.51	0.000	.0561268	.0852522

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0074802	.0022066	3.39	0.001	.0031553	.0118052

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1118898	.0106957	10.46	0.000	.0909265	.132853

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.811613	.0133821	60.65	0.000	.7853845	.8378414

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0688075	.0085805	8.02	0.000	.05199	.085625

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0076898	.0025947	2.96	0.003	.0026043	.0127753

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1290167	.0143309	9.00	0.000	.1009286	.1571047
2	.1322623	.0125594	10.53	0.000	.1076464	.1568782
3	.1355769	.0109312	12.40	0.000	.1141522	.1570017
4	.1389613	.0096004	14.47	0.000	.1201449	.1577778
5	.1424163	.0087984	16.19	0.000	.1251717	.1596609
6	.1459425	.0087738	16.63	0.000	.1287462	.1631389
7	.1495409	.0096302	15.53	0.000	.130666	.1684158
8	.1532121	.0112554	13.61	0.000	.131152	.1752722
9	.1569567	.0134503	11.67	0.000	.1305947	.1833188
10	.1607755	.0160512	10.02	0.000	.1293157	.1922354

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7799713	.0112205	69.51	0.000	.7579796	.8019631
2	.7790625	.0111285	70.01	0.000	.757251	.800874
3	.7780304	.0110075	70.68	0.000	.7564562	.7996047
4	.7768753	.0108833	71.38	0.000	.7555443	.7982062
5	.7755972	.0107937	71.86	0.000	.754442	.7967524
6	.7741964	.0107873	71.77	0.000	.7530536	.7953392
7	.7726731	.0109221	70.74	0.000	.7512661	.79408
8	.7710274	.0112585	68.48	0.000	.7489612	.7930937
9	.7692598	.0118506	64.91	0.000	.746033	.7924866
10	.7673704	.0127374	60.25	0.000	.7424055	.7923354

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0828121	.0107545	7.70	0.000	.0617337	.1038906
2	.0807045	.0093992	8.59	0.000	.0622824	.0991266
3	.0786448	.0082688	9.51	0.000	.0624383	.0948513
4	.0766322	.0074107	10.34	0.000	.0621074	.091157
5	.074666	.0068717	10.87	0.000	.0611976	.0881343
6	.0727453	.0066762	10.90	0.000	.0596603	.0858303
7	.0708694	.0068058	10.41	0.000	.0575303	.0842085
8	.0690374	.0072017	9.59	0.000	.0549223	.0831524
9	.0672485	.0077883	8.63	0.000	.0519837	.0825133
10	.065502	.0084968	7.71	0.000	.0488486	.0821555

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0081999	.0024218	3.39	0.001	.0034532	.0129465
2	.0079707	.0022939	3.47	0.001	.0034748	.0124666
3	.0077479	.0021833	3.55	0.000	.0034687	.012027
4	.0075312	.0020897	3.60	0.000	.0034356	.0116269
5	.0073206	.0020123	3.64	0.000	.0033765	.0112647
6	.0071158	.0019505	3.65	0.000	.0032929	.0109387
7	.0069167	.0019031	3.63	0.000	.0031866	.0106467
8	.0067231	.001869	3.60	0.000	.00306	.0103862
9	.0065349	.0018466	3.54	0.000	.0029156	.0101543
10	.006352	.0018346	3.46	0.001	.0027562	.0099478

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.1422602	.0127637	11.15	0.000	.1172438	.1672765
2	.1432354	.0103776	13.80	0.000	.1228956	.1635752
3	.1442162	.0088997	16.20	0.000	.1267732	.1616592
4	.1452026	.0088531	16.40	0.000	.1278508	.1625544
5	.1461946	.010304	14.19	0.000	.125999	.1663901
6	.1471921	.0127892	11.51	0.000	.1221257	.1722585
7	.1481954	.01586	9.34	0.000	.1171103	.1792804
8	.1492042	.0192641	7.75	0.000	.1114473	.1869612

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.775657	.0112789	68.77	0.000	.7535508	.7977633
2	.7752802	.0109549	70.77	0.000	.753809	.7967515
3	.7748939	.0107895	71.82	0.000	.753747	.7960409
4	.7744981	.0108186	71.59	0.000	.7532939	.7957022
5	.7740927	.0110705	69.92	0.000	.7523949	.7957905
6	.7736778	.0115601	66.93	0.000	.7510204	.7963352
7	.7732534	.0122882	62.93	0.000	.749169	.7973378
8	.7728194	.0132436	58.35	0.000	.7468625	.7987763

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.074753	.0087576	8.54	0.000	.0575884	.0919176
2	.0742123	.0075772	9.79	0.000	.0593612	.0890633
3	.0736751	.0068499	10.76	0.000	.0602495	.0871006
4	.0731414	.0066995	10.92	0.000	.0600105	.0862722
5	.0726112	.0071398	10.17	0.000	.0586174	.086605
6	.0720845	.008055	8.95	0.000	.056297	.0878719
7	.0715612	.0092892	7.70	0.000	.0533547	.0897678
8	.0710414	.010719	6.63	0.000	.0500326	.0920502

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0073299	.0020861	3.51	0.000	.0032412	.0114185
2	.0072721	.0020219	3.60	0.000	.0033092	.0112351
3	.0072148	.0019815	3.64	0.000	.0033311	.0110985
4	.0071579	.001965	3.64	0.000	.0033066	.0110093
5	.0071015	.001972	3.60	0.000	.0032365	.0109666
6	.0070456	.0020011	3.52	0.000	.0031234	.0109677
7	.00699	.0020504	3.41	0.001	.0029713	.0110088
8	.0069349	.0021175	3.27	0.001	.0027846	.0110852

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1500027	.0126908	11.82	0.000	.1251291	.1748763
2	.1477322	.0102731	14.38	0.000	.1275974	.167867
3	.1454902	.0088628	16.42	0.000	.1281194	.162861
4	.1432765	.0088358	16.22	0.000	.1259587	.1605943
5	.1410909	.0101068	13.96	0.000	.121282	.1608999
6	.1389333	.0122025	11.39	0.000	.1150168	.1628499
7	.1368034	.014715	9.30	0.000	.1079625	.1656443
8	.134701	.0174157	7.73	0.000	.100567	.1688351

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.772471	.0115148	67.09	0.000	.7499025	.7950395
2	.7734502	.0110227	70.17	0.000	.7518461	.7950543
3	.7743813	.0108004	71.70	0.000	.7532129	.7955497
4	.7752642	.0107965	71.81	0.000	.7541033	.796425
5	.7760989	.0109509	70.87	0.000	.7546355	.7975622
6	.7768852	.0112043	69.34	0.000	.7549253	.7988452
7	.7776233	.0115049	67.59	0.000	.7550741	.8001725
8	.778313	.0118115	65.89	0.000	.7551629	.8014631

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0706345	.0080183	8.81	0.000	.0549188	.0863501
2	.071802	.0071815	10.00	0.000	.0577264	.0858776
3	.072987	.0067421	10.83	0.000	.0597727	.0862013
4	.0741896	.0068243	10.87	0.000	.0608142	.087565
5	.07541	.0074557	10.11	0.000	.0607971	.090023
6	.0766485	.0085561	8.96	0.000	.0598788	.0934182
7	.0779052	.0100084	7.78	0.000	.058289	.0975213
8	.0791803	.0117152	6.76	0.000	.0562188	.1021417

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0068918	.0019239	3.58	0.000	.003121	.0106627
2	.0070156	.0019294	3.64	0.000	.003234	.0107972
3	.0071415	.0019557	3.65	0.000	.0033085	.0109745
4	.0072697	.0020041	3.63	0.000	.0033418	.0111976
5	.0074002	.0020754	3.57	0.000	.0033325	.0114678
6	.007533	.0021696	3.47	0.001	.0032806	.0117853
7	.0076681	.0022864	3.35	0.001	.0031869	.0121493
8	.0078057	.0024247	3.22	0.001	.0030533	.0125581

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1251747	.017639	7.10	0.000	.090603	.1597464
2	.1308639	.014098	9.28	0.000	.1032324	.1584955
3	.1367713	.0108478	12.61	0.000	.1155101	.1580325
4	.1429015	.0088153	16.21	0.000	.1256239	.1601791
5	.1492589	.0094841	15.74	0.000	.1306705	.1678473
6	.1558477	.0129149	12.07	0.000	.1305349	.1811605
7	.1626718	.0179444	9.07	0.000	.1275014	.1978422
8	.1697346	.0238885	7.11	0.000	.1229139	.2165553
9	.1770392	.0304828	5.81	0.000	.117294	.2367844
10	.1845883	.0376207	4.91	0.000	.1108531	.2583234

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.729465	.0258971	28.17	0.000	.6787076	.7802225
2	.7471184	.0181684	41.12	0.000	.7115089	.7827279
3	.7612524	.0130325	58.41	0.000	.7357091	.7867956
4	.7721901	.0108295	71.30	0.000	.7509646	.7934156
5	.7802681	.0116473	66.99	0.000	.7574398	.8030964
6	.7858169	.0146308	53.71	0.000	.7571412	.8144927
7	.7891484	.0189244	41.70	0.000	.7520572	.8262396
8	.7905478	.0241482	32.74	0.000	.7432181	.8378775
9	.7902701	.0301537	26.21	0.000	.73117	.8493702
10	.7885395	.0368615	21.39	0.000	.7162923	.8607867

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1362757	.0219359	6.21	0.000	.0932822	.1792692
2	.1135583	.0138035	8.23	0.000	.0865039	.1406127
3	.0940994	.0085579	11.00	0.000	.0773262	.1108727
4	.0775741	.0066899	11.60	0.000	.0644621	.0906862
5	.0636442	.0073066	8.71	0.000	.0493236	.0779649
6	.0519775	.0084356	6.16	0.000	.035444	.0685109
7	.0422605	.0092391	4.57	0.000	.0241523	.0603688
8	.0342069	.0095919	3.57	0.000	.0154071	.0530068
9	.0275605	.0095616	2.88	0.004	.0088201	.0463008
10	.0220963	.0092525	2.39	0.017	.0039618	.0402308

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0090845	.00507	1.79	0.073	-.0008526	.0190215
2	.0084594	.0037707	2.24	0.025	.0010689	.0158498
3	.0078769	.0027465	2.87	0.004	.0024938	.01326
4	.0073343	.0020782	3.53	0.000	.0032611	.0114075
5	.0068288	.0018695	3.65	0.000	.0031646	.0104929
6	.0063579	.0020667	3.08	0.002	.0023072	.0104086
7	.0059192	.0024588	2.41	0.016	.0011002	.0107383
8	.0055107	.0028933	1.90	0.057	-.0001601	.0111815
9	.0051302	.0033053	1.55	0.121	-.001348	.0116085
10	.0047759	.0036712	1.30	0.193	-.0024195	.0119713

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.144514	.0106975	13.51	0.000	.1235472	.1654807
2	.1447918	.0114109	12.69	0.000	.1224269	.1671566

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7747752	.0110058	70.40	0.000	.7532043	.7963461
2	.7746638	.0112354	68.95	0.000	.7526429	.7966848

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0735133	.0076243	9.64	0.000	.0585698	.0884567
2	.0733629	.0077068	9.52	0.000	.0582579	.0884678

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0071976	.0020105	3.58	0.000	.003257	.0111382
2	.0071815	.0020105	3.57	0.000	.0032411	.011122

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1863904	.0115587	16.13	0.000	.1637358	.209045
2	.1586293	.0091514	17.33	0.000	.1406929	.1765658
3	.1343205	.0086434	15.54	0.000	.1173798	.1512612
4	.1132354	.0091378	12.39	0.000	.0953256	.1311451
5	.0950966	.0098	9.70	0.000	.075889	.1143041
6	.0796025	.0102544	7.76	0.000	.0595044	.0997007

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.7528065	.0114568	65.71	0.000	.7303517	.7752614
2	.7684427	.0107751	71.32	0.000	.747324	.7895615
3	.7784336	.0108309	71.87	0.000	.7572055	.7996617
4	.7827051	.0109586	71.42	0.000	.7612265	.8041836
5	.7812291	.0113439	68.87	0.000	.7589955	.8034628
6	.7740152	.0129017	59.99	0.000	.7487283	.7993021

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0554858	.0058818	9.43	0.000	.0439577	.0670138
2	.0664742	.006273	10.60	0.000	.0541794	.078769
3	.0794149	.0072135	11.01	0.000	.0652767	.0935532
4	.09456	.0090257	10.48	0.000	.0768701	.11225
5	.112155	.0119066	9.42	0.000	.0888185	.1354916
6	.1324198	.0159235	8.32	0.000	.1012103	.1636294

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0053174	.001492	3.56	0.000	.0023931	.0082416
2	.0064537	.0017783	3.63	0.000	.0029684	.0099391
3	.007831	.0021446	3.65	0.000	.0036278	.0120343
4	.0094995	.0026175	3.63	0.000	.0043693	.0146297
5	.0115193	.0032311	3.57	0.000	.0051864	.0178521
6	.0139624	.0040277	3.47	0.001	.0060682	.0218567

Sweden

Tables B.7 Marginal Effects in Sweden

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4587901	.0166519	27.55	0.000	.4261529	.4914272
2	.3665274	.0154529	23.72	0.000	.3362404	.3968145
3	.283113	.0281867	10.04	0.000	.2278681	.3383579
4	.2123194	.0370468	5.73	0.000	.1397091	.2849297

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5194487	.0161989	32.07	0.000	.4876993	.551198
2	.6019094	.0150626	39.96	0.000	.5723872	.6314317
3	.6713126	.023745	28.27	0.000	.6247733	.717852
4	.7222952	.0259368	27.85	0.000	.67146	.7731303

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.019413	.0033309	5.83	0.000	.0128846	.0259414
2	.0281264	.0048268	5.83	0.000	.018666	.0375868
3	.0405472	.0083762	4.84	0.000	.0241302	.0569643
4	.0580373	.0150416	3.86	0.000	.0285563	.0875182

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0023483	.0010034	2.34	0.019	.0003817	.0043149
2	.0034367	.0014565	2.36	0.018	.0005821	.0062913
3	.0050272	.0021984	2.29	0.022	.0007184	.0093359
4	.0073482	.0034246	2.15	0.032	.0006361	.0140602

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4104707	.0156014	26.31	0.000	.3798925	.4410488
2	.4070068	.0207233	19.64	0.000	.3663899	.4476237

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5683755	.0157271	36.14	0.000	.537551	.5991999
2	.5533439	.020931	26.44	0.000	.5123199	.5943679

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0198061	.004078	4.86	0.000	.0118134	.0277987
2	.0284653	.0081384	3.50	0.000	.0125142	.0444163

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0013478	.0008779	1.54	0.125	-.0003728	.0030684
2	.0111841	.0073168	1.53	0.126	-.0031565	.0255246

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4814314	.0231956	20.76	0.000	.4359689	.5268939
2	.4611516	.0185922	24.80	0.000	.4247117	.4975916
3	.4409996	.0148105	29.78	0.000	.4119716	.4700277
4	.4210402	.0125874	33.45	0.000	.3963694	.445711
5	.4013355	.012643	31.74	0.000	.3765556	.4261154
6	.3819446	.0147745	25.85	0.000	.3529871	.4109022
7	.3629227	.0180743	20.08	0.000	.3274978	.3983476
8	.3443204	.0218307	15.77	0.000	.3015329	.3871078
9	.3261833	.0256647	12.71	0.000	.2758813	.3764853
10	.3085521	.0293816	10.50	0.000	.2509652	.366139

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4986607	.0218366	22.84	0.000	.4558616	.5414597
2	.5172886	.0177073	29.21	0.000	.4825829	.5519942
3	.5356549	.0144823	36.99	0.000	.5072702	.5640396
4	.5536846	.0127553	43.41	0.000	.5286846	.5786846
5	.5713045	.0129323	44.18	0.000	.5459577	.5966514
6	.5884439	.0146981	40.04	0.000	.559636	.6172517
7	.6050351	.0173214	34.93	0.000	.5710858	.6389844
8	.6210144	.0202243	30.71	0.000	.5813755	.6606532
9	.6363219	.0230696	27.58	0.000	.5911062	.6815376
10	.6509024	.0256668	25.36	0.000	.6005964	.7012083

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0177633	.0033404	5.32	0.000	.0112162	.0243104
2	.0192337	.0034371	5.60	0.000	.0124971	.0259703
3	.0208226	.0035773	5.82	0.000	.0138112	.027834
4	.022539	.0037779	5.97	0.000	.0151344	.0299435
5	.0243924	.004057	6.01	0.000	.0164409	.0323439
6	.026393	.0044324	5.95	0.000	.0177058	.0350803
7	.0285518	.0049205	5.80	0.000	.0189078	.0381957
8	.03088	.0055354	5.58	0.000	.0200307	.0417292
9	.0333898	.0062895	5.31	0.000	.0210626	.045717
10	.036094	.0071936	5.02	0.000	.0219948	.0501931

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0021447	.0009266	2.31	0.021	.0003286	.0039607
2	.0023261	.0009957	2.34	0.019	.0003746	.0042777
3	.0025229	.0010729	2.35	0.019	.0004201	.0046256
4	.0027362	.0011592	2.36	0.018	.0004642	.0050083
5	.0029676	.0012561	2.36	0.018	.0005057	.0054295
6	.0032185	.001365	2.36	0.018	.0005431	.0058938
7	.0034904	.0014875	2.35	0.019	.000575	.0064059
8	.0037853	.0016254	2.33	0.020	.0005996	.0069711
9	.004105	.0017807	2.31	0.021	.0006148	.0075952
10	.0044516	.0019556	2.28	0.023	.0006186	.0082845

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5342045	.0393577	13.57	0.000	.4570648	.6113441

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4496187	.0370762	12.13	0.000	.3769507	.5222867

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.01444	.0032674	4.42	0.000	.008036	.020844

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0017368	.0007726	2.25	0.025	.0002225	.0032512

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.511519	.0331883	15.41	0.000	.4464712	.5765668

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4707912	.0312067	15.09	0.000	.4096273	.5319551

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0157879	.003301	4.78	0.000	.009318	.0222578

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0019019	.0008316	2.29	0.022	.0002719	.0035319

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.488786	.0270661	18.06	0.000	.4357375	.5418345

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4918725	.0254764	19.31	0.000	.4419397	.5418054

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0172589	.0033501	5.15	0.000	.0106929	.0238249

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0020826	.0008981	2.32	0.020	.0003223	.0038429

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4660993	.0212482	21.94	0.000	.4244536	.507745

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5127566	.0201638	25.43	0.000	.4732364	.5522769

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0188637	.0034305	5.50	0.000	.01214	.0255873

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0022804	.0009734	2.34	0.019	.0003725	.0041883

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4212347	.0129157	32.61	0.000	.3959205	.446549

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5535097	.0130553	42.40	0.000	.5279217	.5790977

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0225215	.0037756	5.96	0.000	.0151214	.0299216

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0027341	.0011568	2.36	0.018	.0004667	.0050014

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3992348	.0126115	31.66	0.000	.3745166	.423953

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5731714	.0128882	44.47	0.000	.547911	.5984317

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0246002	.0040949	6.01	0.000	.0165744	.0326261

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0029936	.0012687	2.36	0.018	.000507	.0054803

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3776342	.0152132	24.82	0.000	.3478169	.4074514

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5922239	.0149569	39.60	0.000	.562909	.6215389

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0268642	.004549	5.91	0.000	.0179484	.03578

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0032777	.001397	2.35	0.019	.0005397	.0060157

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3338336	.0296232	11.27	0.000	.2757732	.391894
2	.3483057	.0252323	13.80	0.000	.2988514	.3977601
3	.3630634	.0208757	17.39	0.000	.3221477	.403979
4	.3780835	.0168273	22.47	0.000	.3451025	.4110645
5	.3933413	.0136514	28.81	0.000	.366585	.4200975
6	.40881	.0123322	33.15	0.000	.3846393	.4329807
7	.4244615	.0136321	31.14	0.000	.3977431	.4511799
8	.4402659	.0170794	25.78	0.000	.4067909	.4737409
9	.4561924	.0217299	20.99	0.000	.4136025	.4987823
10	.4722089	.026982	17.50	0.000	.4193253	.5250926

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6275861	.0302964	20.71	0.000	.5682064	.6869659
2	.6158772	.0257106	23.95	0.000	.5654854	.666269
3	.6036917	.0212509	28.41	0.000	.5620406	.6453428
4	.5910649	.0171671	34.43	0.000	.557418	.6247118
5	.5780333	.0139893	41.32	0.000	.5506147	.6054518
6	.5646344	.0126369	44.68	0.000	.5398664	.5894024
7	.550907	.0138261	39.85	0.000	.5238083	.5780056
8	.5368904	.0171345	31.33	0.000	.5033074	.5704735
9	.5226249	.0216606	24.13	0.000	.4801709	.5650788
10	.5081509	.0268068	18.96	0.000	.4556106	.5606913

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0179043	.011397	1.57	0.116	-.0044335	.0402421
2	.0218104	.0080213	2.72	0.007	.0060889	.0375319
3	.023777	.0061185	3.89	0.000	.0117851	.035769
4	.0244613	.0049434	4.95	0.000	.0147724	.0341502
5	.0243167	.0042324	5.75	0.000	.0160212	.0326121
6	.0236523	.0039366	6.01	0.000	.0159368	.0313678
7	.0226762	.004006	5.66	0.000	.0148246	.0305278
8	.0215271	.0043221	4.98	0.000	.0130561	.0299982
9	.0202965	.0047544	4.27	0.000	.010978	.0296151
10	.0190437	.0052111	3.65	0.000	.0088301	.0292573

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0206759	.0107692	1.92	0.055	-.0004313	.0417831
2	.0140067	.0061832	2.27	0.023	.0018878	.0261256
3	.0094679	.0036179	2.62	0.009	.0023769	.0165589
4	.0063903	.0022715	2.81	0.005	.0019383	.0108424
5	.0043088	.0015933	2.70	0.007	.0011859	.0074317
6	.0029033	.0012236	2.37	0.018	.0005051	.0053015
7	.0019554	.0009761	2.00	0.045	.0000422	.0038685
8	.0013165	.0007806	1.69	0.092	-.0002134	.0028465
9	.0008862	.000617	1.44	0.151	-.0003231	.0020955
10	.0005965	.0004804	1.24	0.214	-.0003451	.001538

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.4050917	.0314992	12.86	0.000	.3433545	.466829
2	.4059933	.0257489	15.77	0.000	.3555264	.4564601
3	.4068954	.02037	19.98	0.000	.366971	.4468198
4	.4077982	.0157589	25.88	0.000	.3769113	.4386851
5	.4087016	.0127897	31.96	0.000	.3836342	.4337689
6	.4096056	.0126876	32.28	0.000	.3847383	.4344729
7	.4105102	.0155202	26.45	0.000	.3800911	.4409293
8	.4114154	.0200901	20.48	0.000	.3720396	.4507913

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5784226	.0310696	18.62	0.000	.5175272	.639318
2	.5757174	.025458	22.61	0.000	.5258207	.6256141
3	.5728183	.0202483	28.29	0.000	.5331323	.6125043
4	.5697055	.0158349	35.98	0.000	.5386697	.6007413
5	.5663575	.0130466	43.41	0.000	.5407866	.5919284
6	.5627507	.0129797	43.36	0.000	.5373109	.5881905
7	.5588596	.015683	35.63	0.000	.5281215	.5895976
8	.5546565	.0200919	27.61	0.000	.515277	.594036

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0159204	.0047976	3.32	0.001	.0065172	.0253235
2	.0174836	.0045208	3.87	0.000	.008623	.0263442
3	.0191379	.0042191	4.54	0.000	.0108687	.0274071
4	.0208598	.0039577	5.27	0.000	.0131029	.0286167
5	.0226093	.0038549	5.87	0.000	.0150538	.0301649
6	.0243228	.0040727	5.97	0.000	.0163405	.0323051
7	.0259022	.0047522	5.45	0.000	.016588	.0352164
8	.0272007	.0059749	4.55	0.000	.0154902	.0389113

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0005653	.0005033	1.12	0.261	-.0004211	.0015517
2	.0008058	.0006201	1.30	0.194	-.0004095	.0020211
3	.0011484	.0007521	1.53	0.127	-.0003258	.0026226
4	.0016365	.0009007	1.82	0.069	-.0001289	.003402
5	.0023316	.0010789	2.16	0.031	.000217	.0044463
6	.0033209	.0013384	2.48	0.013	.0006977	.0059441
7	.004728	.0018169	2.60	0.009	.001167	.0082891
8	.0067273	.0027699	2.43	0.015	.0012984	.0121563

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4228512	.016122	26.23	0.000	.3912527	.4544496
2	.4136776	.012769	32.40	0.000	.3886508	.4387043
3	.4045635	.0128661	31.44	0.000	.3793464	.4297806
4	.3955147	.0162286	24.37	0.000	.3637073	.4273222
5	.386537	.0212568	18.18	0.000	.3448744	.4281997
6	.3776358	.0269392	14.02	0.000	.3248359	.4304356
7	.3688163	.0328507	11.23	0.000	.3044301	.4332024
8	.3600836	.0388066	9.28	0.000	.2840239	.4361432

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5520559	.0156938	35.18	0.000	.5212967	.5828152
2	.5602905	.0129699	43.20	0.000	.53487	.585711
3	.5684313	.0130593	43.53	0.000	.5428355	.5940272
4	.5764715	.0157385	36.63	0.000	.5456247	.6073183
5	.5844042	.0198359	29.46	0.000	.5455265	.6232818
6	.5922225	.0245168	24.16	0.000	.5441704	.6402747
7	.5999201	.0293821	20.42	0.000	.5423322	.657508
8	.6074905	.0342426	17.74	0.000	.5403762	.6746049

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0223769	.0038514	5.81	0.000	.0148283	.0299254
2	.0232118	.0038811	5.98	0.000	.015605	.0308187
3	.024077	.0040196	5.99	0.000	.0161987	.0319553
4	.0249734	.0042788	5.84	0.000	.0165872	.0333596
5	.025902	.0046621	5.56	0.000	.0167645	.0350396
6	.026864	.0051662	5.20	0.000	.0167384	.0369896
7	.0278604	.0057841	4.82	0.000	.0165237	.0391971
8	.0288924	.0065082	4.44	0.000	.0161366	.0416483

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0027161	.0011502	2.36	0.018	.0004616	.0049705
2	.0028201	.0011926	2.36	0.018	.0004828	.0051575
3	.0029282	.0012422	2.36	0.018	.0004936	.0053628
4	.0030403	.0012997	2.34	0.019	.0004929	.0055878
5	.0031568	.0013659	2.31	0.021	.0004797	.0058339
6	.0032777	.0014412	2.27	0.023	.000453	.0061023
7	.0034032	.0015261	2.23	0.026	.000412	.0063944
8	.0035335	.0016213	2.18	0.029	.0003558	.0067112

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3648948	.0294731	12.38	0.000	.3071285	.4226611
2	.3741504	.024643	15.18	0.000	.3258511	.4224498
3	.383499	.0200219	19.15	0.000	.3442568	.4227412
4	.3929345	.0159361	24.66	0.000	.3617003	.4241687
5	.4024506	.0130624	30.81	0.000	.3768488	.4280524
6	.4120408	.0124307	33.15	0.000	.3876771	.4364045
7	.4216982	.0144493	29.18	0.000	.393378	.4500183
8	.4314159	.0183297	23.54	0.000	.3954902	.4673415
9	.4411866	.0231964	19.02	0.000	.3957226	.4866506
10	.4510032	.0285721	15.78	0.000	.3950029	.5070034

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5498904	.0292053	18.83	0.000	.4926489	.6071318
2	.5589179	.0238606	23.42	0.000	.5121519	.6056838
3	.5641541	.0194178	29.05	0.000	.5260959	.6022124
4	.5662643	.0157585	35.93	0.000	.5353782	.5971504
5	.5658326	.0132615	42.67	0.000	.5398405	.5918247
6	.5633561	.0127245	44.27	0.000	.5384164	.5882957
7	.5592482	.0145588	38.41	0.000	.5307135	.5877829
8	.5538472	.0182099	30.41	0.000	.5181565	.589538
9	.5474265	.0229188	23.89	0.000	.5025064	.5923466
10	.5402053	.0282117	19.15	0.000	.4849114	.5954992

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0834572	.0164975	5.06	0.000	.0511227	.1157918
2	.0649808	.0107543	6.04	0.000	.0439027	.0860589
3	.0501814	.0071091	7.06	0.000	.0362477	.064115
4	.0383976	.0051283	7.49	0.000	.0283463	.0484489
5	.029049	.0042401	6.85	0.000	.0207385	.0373595
6	.0216422	.0038419	5.63	0.000	.0141122	.0291722
7	.0157674	.0035972	4.38	0.000	.008717	.0228178
8	.0110898	.0034771	3.19	0.001	.0042748	.0179049
9	.0073394	.003634	2.02	0.043	.000217	.0144619
10	.0043	.0042372	1.01	0.310	-.0040047	.0126047

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0017576	.0019704	0.89	0.372	-.0021043	.0056195
2	.0019509	.0018144	1.08	0.282	-.0016053	.0055072
3	.0021655	.0016221	1.33	0.182	-.0010138	.0053447
4	.0024036	.001412	1.70	0.089	-.000364	.0051711
5	.0026678	.0012425	2.15	0.032	.0002325	.0051031
6	.0029609	.0012436	2.38	0.017	.0005236	.0053983
7	.0032862	.0015531	2.12	0.034	.0002421	.0063303
8	.0036471	.0021812	1.67	0.095	-.000628	.0079222
9	.0040474	.0030801	1.31	0.189	-.0019895	.0100843
10	.0044915	.0042311	1.06	0.288	-.0038013	.0127843

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3716728	.0163646	22.71	0.000	.3395988	.4037468
2	.4520468	.0182147	24.82	0.000	.4163467	.4877469

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5974325	.0161727	36.94	0.000	.5657345	.6291305
2	.5256055	.0172141	30.53	0.000	.4918665	.5593445

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0275328	.0046228	5.96	0.000	.0184723	.0365933
2	.0199348	.0035799	5.57	0.000	.0129183	.0269513

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0033619	.0014133	2.38	0.017	.000592	.0061318
2	.0024129	.0010439	2.31	0.021	.0003668	.0044589

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4976283	.0166073	29.96	0.000	.4650786	.530178
2	.4364211	.0127651	34.19	0.000	.4114019	.4614404
3	.3770914	.0129995	29.01	0.000	.3516128	.40257
4	.32123	.0162006	19.83	0.000	.2894774	.3529826
5	.2700561	.0197786	13.65	0.000	.2312909	.3088214
6	.2243402	.0224887	9.98	0.000	.1802631	.2684172

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4836899	.0158528	30.51	0.000	.4526191	.5147608
2	.5398057	.0127754	42.25	0.000	.5147663	.564845
3	.5926991	.0134162	44.18	0.000	.5664039	.6189944
4	.6404501	.0160992	39.78	0.000	.6088962	.6720039
5	.6814449	.0184803	36.87	0.000	.6452242	.7176656
6	.7144501	.0194833	36.67	0.000	.6762636	.7526366

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0166714	.0029832	5.59	0.000	.0108245	.0225184
2	.0212031	.0035865	5.91	0.000	.0141737	.0282325
3	.0269242	.0044378	6.07	0.000	.0182264	.0356221
4	.0341214	.0056681	6.02	0.000	.0230122	.0452306
5	.0431346	.0074407	5.80	0.000	.0285512	.057718
6	.054358	.0099423	5.47	0.000	.0348716	.0738445

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0020103	.0008638	2.33	0.020	.0003173	.0037034
2	.0025701	.0010916	2.35	0.019	.0004305	.0047097
3	.0032853	.0013869	2.37	0.018	.000567	.0060035
4	.0041986	.0017716	2.37	0.018	.0007264	.0076707
5	.0053644	.0022748	2.36	0.018	.0009058	.009823
6	.0068517	.0029355	2.33	0.020	.0010983	.0126052

Switzerland

Tables B.8 Marginal Effects in Switzerland

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4358456	.0178732	24.39	0.000	.4008148	.4708763
2	.3733028	.0125182	29.82	0.000	.3487676	.3978381
3	.314728	.0231525	13.59	0.000	.26935	.360106
4	.261509	.0341481	7.66	0.000	.1945799	.328438

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5294097	.0163836	32.31	0.000	.4972984	.5615209
2	.5820944	.0127109	45.79	0.000	.5571815	.6070072
3	.6281795	.0198064	31.72	0.000	.5893598	.6669993
4	.6656782	.0249565	26.67	0.000	.6167644	.7145919

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0338029	.0045734	7.39	0.000	.0248393	.0427665
2	.0433816	.0050568	8.58	0.000	.0334705	.0532927
3	.0555091	.0076116	7.29	0.000	.0405906	.0704276
4	.0707602	.0128549	5.50	0.000	.0455652	.0959553

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0009419	.0008712	1.08	0.280	-.0007656	.0026494
2	.0012213	.001141	1.07	0.284	-.001015	.0034575
3	.0015834	.001503	1.05	0.292	-.0013625	.0045292
4	.0020526	.0019902	1.03	0.302	-.0018481	.0059533

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4269512	.0175573	24.32	0.000	.3925395	.461363
2	.3592921	.0155241	23.14	0.000	.3288655	.3897187

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5370672	.0162423	33.07	0.000	.5052329	.5689014
2	.5934608	.0147222	40.31	0.000	.5646058	.6223159

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.035005	.0045735	7.65	0.000	.0260411	.0439689
2	.0459499	.005659	8.12	0.000	.0348584	.0570414

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0009766	.000911	1.07	0.284	-.0008089	.0027622
2	.0012971	.0012093	1.07	0.283	-.001073	.0036672

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4054084	.0206896	19.59	0.000	.3648575	.4459592
2	.4014801	.017338	23.16	0.000	.3674983	.4354619
3	.3975645	.0144939	27.43	0.000	.3691569	.425972
4	.3936619	.012483	31.54	0.000	.3691956	.4181282
5	.3897728	.0117122	33.28	0.000	.3668174	.4127282
6	.3858978	.012385	31.16	0.000	.3616236	.410172
7	.3820371	.0142722	26.77	0.000	.3540641	.4100101
8	.3781912	.0169494	22.31	0.000	.344971	.4114115
9	.3743607	.0200823	18.64	0.000	.3350002	.4137212
10	.3705458	.0234703	15.79	0.000	.3245449	.4165467

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5554042	.0187482	29.62	0.000	.5186584	.59215
2	.5587133	.0161194	34.66	0.000	.5271198	.5903068
3	.5620004	.013976	40.21	0.000	.5346079	.5893928
4	.5652649	.0125303	45.11	0.000	.540706	.5898238
5	.5685062	.0119945	47.40	0.000	.5449974	.5920151
6	.5717239	.0124446	45.94	0.000	.547333	.5961147
7	.5749172	.0137449	41.83	0.000	.5479777	.6018567
8	.5780857	.0156499	36.94	0.000	.5474124	.6087589
9	.5812287	.0179365	32.40	0.000	.5460738	.6163835
10	.5843457	.0204486	28.58	0.000	.5442673	.6244242

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0381203	.0051969	7.34	0.000	.0279346	.0483061
2	.038722	.0049807	7.77	0.000	.02896	.0484839
3	.0393327	.0048294	8.14	0.000	.0298673	.0487981
4	.0399527	.0047568	8.40	0.000	.0306295	.0492758
5	.0405819	.0047747	8.50	0.000	.0312238	.0499401
6	.0412207	.0048903	8.43	0.000	.0316359	.0508054
7	.041869	.0051054	8.20	0.000	.0318626	.0518753
8	.042527	.0054166	7.85	0.000	.0319107	.0531433
9	.0431949	.0058167	7.43	0.000	.0317944	.0545954
10	.0438728	.0062969	6.97	0.000	.0315311	.0562144

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0010671	.0009904	1.08	0.281	-.0008741	.0030083
2	.0010846	.001007	1.08	0.281	-.000889	.0030583
3	.0011025	.0010242	1.08	0.282	-.0009049	.0031098
4	.0011206	.0010421	1.08	0.282	-.0009218	.003163
5	.001139	.0010606	1.07	0.283	-.0009397	.0032178
6	.0011577	.0010799	1.07	0.284	-.0009588	.0032742
7	.0011768	.0010999	1.07	0.285	-.0009789	.0033324
8	.0011961	.0011206	1.07	0.286	-.0010002	.0033924
9	.0012158	.0011421	1.06	0.287	-.0010228	.0034543
10	.0012357	.0011644	1.06	0.289	-.0010465	.003518

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4337969	.0250543	17.31	0.000	.3846914	.4829024

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5311776	.0225464	23.56	0.000	.4869875	.5753677

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0340757	.0049842	6.84	0.000	.0243068	.0438446

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0009498	.0008847	1.07	0.283	-.0007843	.0026838

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4233591	.0205839	20.57	0.000	.3830154	.4637029

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.540146	.0188028	28.73	0.000	.5032931	.5769988

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0355039	.0048015	7.39	0.000	.0260932	.0449145

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0009911	.0009224	1.07	0.283	-.0008168	.002799

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4129893	.0165959	24.89	0.000	.380462	.4455166

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5489871	.0156008	35.19	0.000	.5184101	.5795641

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0369895	.0046798	7.90	0.000	.0278172	.0461617

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0010342	.0009621	1.07	0.282	-.0008516	.0029199

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4026961	.0134699	29.90	0.000	.3762955	.4290967

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5576902	.0132345	42.14	0.000	.531751	.5836294

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0385346	.0046466	8.29	0.000	.0294274	.0476418

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0010792	.0010041	1.07	0.282	-.0008888	.0030472

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3823728	.0121663	31.43	0.000	.3585273	.4062183

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.57464	.0123003	46.72	0.000	.550532	.5987481

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0418121	.0049513	8.44	0.000	.0321077	.0515166

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0011751	.0010952	1.07	0.283	-.0009715	.0033216

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3723586	.0142581	26.12	0.000	.3444132	.400304

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5828662	.0137144	42.50	0.000	.5559865	.6097459

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.043549	.0053257	8.18	0.000	.0331109	.0539871

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0012262	.0011447	1.07	0.284	-.0010173	.0034697

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3624528	.0173893	20.84	0.000	.3283703	.3965353

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5909132	.0158669	37.24	0.000	.5598147	.6220118

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0453545	.0058555	7.75	0.000	.0338779	.056831

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0012795	.0011969	1.07	0.285	-.0010664	.0036254

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4006248	.0179355	22.34	0.000	.3654718	.4357778
2	.3971095	.014965	26.54	0.000	.3677787	.4264403
3	.3936048	.0127625	30.84	0.000	.3685908	.4186188
4	.390111	.0117409	33.23	0.000	.3670993	.4131228
5	.3866284	.0121735	31.76	0.000	.3627689	.410488
6	.3831574	.0139003	27.56	0.000	.3559134	.4104015
7	.3796983	.0164983	23.01	0.000	.3473622	.4120344
8	.3762514	.0196051	19.19	0.000	.337826	.4146767
9	.3728169	.0229984	16.21	0.000	.3277409	.417893
10	.3693952	.0265532	13.91	0.000	.3173518	.4214386

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5594323	.016582	33.74	0.000	.5269321	.5919324
2	.5623815	.0143288	39.25	0.000	.5342976	.5904654
3	.5653125	.0127314	44.40	0.000	.5403595	.5902656
4	.5682249	.0120154	47.29	0.000	.5446751	.5917746
5	.5711181	.0122968	46.44	0.000	.5470167	.5952194
6	.5739918	.0134774	42.59	0.000	.5475766	.6004069
7	.5768455	.0153182	37.66	0.000	.5468224	.6068687
8	.579679	.0175843	32.97	0.000	.5452144	.6141435
9	.5824916	.0201064	28.97	0.000	.5430839	.6218994
10	.5852832	.0227761	25.70	0.000	.5406429	.6299235

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0388544	.0050204	7.74	0.000	.0290146	.0486943
2	.0394044	.0048535	8.12	0.000	.0298917	.048917
3	.0399618	.0047658	8.39	0.000	.030621	.0493026
4	.0405267	.004769	8.50	0.000	.0311796	.0498739
5	.0410993	.0048707	8.44	0.000	.031553	.0506456
6	.0416796	.0050724	8.22	0.000	.0317379	.0516213
7	.0422677	.0053705	7.87	0.000	.0317417	.0527937
8	.0428637	.0057575	7.44	0.000	.0315791	.0541482
9	.0434677	.0062241	6.98	0.000	.0312687	.0556666
10	.0440797	.0067607	6.52	0.000	.030829	.0573305

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0010885	.0010139	1.07	0.283	-.0008987	.0030757
2	.0011046	.0010284	1.07	0.283	-.000911	.0031201
3	.0011209	.0010434	1.07	0.283	-.0009242	.0031659
4	.0011374	.0010591	1.07	0.283	-.0009384	.0032132
5	.0011542	.0010754	1.07	0.283	-.0009536	.0032619
6	.0011712	.0010923	1.07	0.284	-.0009697	.0033121
7	.0011885	.0011099	1.07	0.284	-.0009869	.0033639
8	.001206	.0011282	1.07	0.285	-.0010052	.0034172
9	.0012238	.0011472	1.07	0.286	-.0010246	.0034722
10	.0012418	.0011668	1.06	0.287	-.0010451	.0035288

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3712788	.0257019	14.45	0.000	.3209039	.4216537
2	.3759521	.0207537	18.11	0.000	.3352755	.4166286
3	.3806485	.0162931	23.36	0.000	.3487146	.4125824
4	.3853674	.0129225	29.82	0.000	.3600398	.410695
5	.390108	.0117188	33.29	0.000	.3671396	.4130763
6	.3948694	.0133567	29.56	0.000	.3686907	.4210481
7	.3996508	.017088	23.39	0.000	.366159	.4331426
8	.4044514	.0219038	18.46	0.000	.3615208	.447382

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5837478	.0220027	26.53	0.000	.5406234	.6268723
2	.5799245	.0183101	31.67	0.000	.5440374	.6158116
3	.5760627	.0150695	38.23	0.000	.546527	.6055983
4	.5721633	.0127466	44.89	0.000	.5471804	.5971461
5	.5682274	.0120081	47.32	0.000	.544692	.5917628
6	.5642561	.0132259	42.66	0.000	.5383339	.5901783
7	.5602504	.0160385	34.93	0.000	.5288156	.5916852
8	.5562113	.0198386	28.04	0.000	.5173283	.5950944

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0437415	.0067493	6.48	0.000	.030513	.05697
2	.0429159	.0060106	7.14	0.000	.0311354	.0546964
3	.0421051	.0054161	7.77	0.000	.0314897	.0527205
4	.041309	.0049929	8.27	0.000	.031523	.051095
5	.0405272	.0047624	8.51	0.000	.0311931	.0498614
6	.0397596	.0047299	8.41	0.000	.0304891	.0490301
7	.0390059	.0048788	7.99	0.000	.0294436	.0485683
8	.0382659	.0051754	7.39	0.000	.0281222	.0484095

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0012319	.0011493	1.07	0.284	-.0010206	.0034844
2	.0012075	.0011249	1.07	0.283	-.0009972	.0034122
3	.0011837	.0011018	1.07	0.283	-.0009758	.0033431
4	.0011603	.0010799	1.07	0.283	-.0009563	.003277
5	.0011374	.0010593	1.07	0.283	-.0009388	.0032136
6	.0011149	.0010398	1.07	0.284	-.000923	.0031529
7	.0010929	.0010214	1.07	0.285	-.0009089	.0030948
8	.0010713	.001004	1.07	0.286	-.0008964	.0030391

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.3912759	.016901	23.15	0.000	.3581506	.4244013
2	.3902162	.0126109	30.94	0.000	.3654993	.4149332
3	.3891576	.0120411	32.32	0.000	.3655575	.4127576
4	.3881	.0155833	24.90	0.000	.3575572	.4186427
5	.3870434	.0212585	18.21	0.000	.3453775	.4287093
6	.3859879	.027777	13.90	0.000	.3315461	.4404297
7	.3849335	.0346562	11.11	0.000	.3170085	.4528584
8	.3838801	.0417098	9.20	0.000	.3021303	.4656299

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5734075	.0168535	34.02	0.000	.5403753	.6064397
2	.5705497	.0128121	44.53	0.000	.5454385	.595661
3	.567276	.0123265	46.02	0.000	.5431165	.5914355
4	.5635469	.0157801	35.71	0.000	.5326185	.5944753
5	.5593203	.0214267	26.10	0.000	.5173247	.6013159
6	.5545515	.0280888	19.74	0.000	.4994984	.6096046
7	.5491931	.0353482	15.54	0.000	.4799119	.6184744
8	.5431957	.0430913	12.61	0.000	.4587383	.6276532

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0347011	.0054568	6.36	0.000	.0240061	.0453962
2	.0383279	.0048206	7.95	0.000	.0288796	.0477761
3	.0422324	.0049781	8.48	0.000	.0324756	.0519892
4	.0463896	.006371	7.28	0.000	.0339027	.0588765
5	.050747	.0088915	5.71	0.000	.0333199	.0681741
6	.055211	.0122954	4.49	0.000	.0311126	.0793095
7	.059627	.016467	3.62	0.000	.0273522	.0919018
8	.0637514	.0214112	2.98	0.003	.0217863	.1057165

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0006154	.0006063	1.02	0.310	-.0005729	.0018037
2	.0009061	.000858	1.06	0.291	-.0007755	.0025878
3	.001334	.0012323	1.08	0.279	-.0010812	.0037493
4	.0019635	.0018003	1.09	0.275	-.0015649	.005492
5	.0028893	.0026766	1.08	0.280	-.0023567	.0081352
6	.0042496	.004044	1.05	0.293	-.0036765	.0121757
7	.0062464	.00619	1.01	0.313	-.0058859	.0183786
8	.0091727	.0095601	0.96	0.337	-.0095647	.0279102

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3871998	.0276668	14.00	0.000	.3329739	.4414257
2	.3877194	.0228066	17.00	0.000	.3430192	.4324195
3	.3882391	.0183052	21.21	0.000	.3523616	.4241167
4	.3887592	.0145069	26.80	0.000	.3603262	.4171921
5	.3892795	.0121007	32.17	0.000	.3655625	.4129964
6	.3898	.0119663	32.57	0.000	.3663464	.4132536
7	.3903208	.0141747	27.54	0.000	.3625389	.4181027
8	.3908418	.0178827	21.86	0.000	.3557924	.4258912
9	.3913631	.0223601	17.50	0.000	.3475382	.435188
10	.3918847	.0272331	14.39	0.000	.3385089	.4452605

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.5115315	.0295581	17.31	0.000	.4535987	.5694643
2	.5283489	.0233948	22.58	0.000	.482496	.5742018
3	.542427	.0183886	29.50	0.000	.506386	.5784679
4	.5541241	.0145676	38.04	0.000	.5255722	.5826761
5	.5637769	.012326	45.74	0.000	.5396184	.5879353
6	.5716915	.0122393	46.71	0.000	.5477028	.5956801
7	.5781403	.0142817	40.48	0.000	.5501486	.6061319
8	.5833613	.0177549	32.86	0.000	.5485622	.6181603
9	.5875593	.0220312	26.67	0.000	.544379	.6307397
10	.590909	.0267618	22.08	0.000	.5384569	.6433612

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0921007	.0179881	5.12	0.000	.0568447	.1273567
2	.0780996	.0124428	6.28	0.000	.0537122	.102487
3	.0656283	.0085381	7.69	0.000	.0488939	.0823627
4	.0547641	.0060968	8.98	0.000	.0428145	.0667136
5	.0454508	.004978	9.13	0.000	.0356941	.0552075
6	.0375615	.0047581	7.89	0.000	.0282359	.0468872
7	.0309383	.0048735	6.35	0.000	.0213864	.0404903
8	.025416	.0049861	5.10	0.000	.0156434	.0351886
9	.020836	.0049823	4.18	0.000	.0110708	.0306012
10	.0170531	.0048519	3.51	0.000	.0075435	.0265628

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0091679	.0081439	1.13	0.260	-.0067938	.0251297
2	.0058322	.0044316	1.32	0.188	-.0028536	.014518
3	.0037056	.0025968	1.43	0.154	-.0013841	.0087953
4	.0023526	.0017175	1.37	0.171	-.0010137	.0057189
5	.0014929	.0012529	1.19	0.233	-.0009627	.0039484
6	.000947	.0009497	1.00	0.319	-.0009143	.0028083
7	.0006006	.00072	0.83	0.404	-.0008106	.0020118
8	.0003809	.0005385	0.71	0.479	-.0006745	.0014363
9	.0002415	.0003962	0.61	0.542	-.0005349	.001018
10	.0001531	.000287	0.53	0.594	-.0004094	.0007157

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3659117	.015973	22.91	0.000	.3346053	.3972181
2	.4123688	.0167058	24.68	0.000	.3796261	.4451115

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.588114	.0149954	39.22	0.000	.5587236	.6175044
2	.5495138	.0155913	35.25	0.000	.5189555	.5800721

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0447138	.0055627	8.04	0.000	.0338111	.0556165
2	.0370805	.0047518	7.80	0.000	.0277673	.0463938

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0012606	.0011781	1.07	0.285	-.0010485	.0035696
2	.0010368	.0009647	1.07	0.282	-.000854	.0029277

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.460092	.0152047	30.26	0.000	.4302912	.4898927
2	.4128415	.0120455	34.27	0.000	.3892328	.4364502
3	.3671438	.0122397	30.00	0.000	.3431543	.3911332
4	.3237156	.0149505	21.65	0.000	.2944131	.3530181
5	.2831262	.0183066	15.47	0.000	.2472458	.3190066
6	.2457766	.0212892	11.54	0.000	.2040504	.2875028

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.5083063	.0144806	35.10	0.000	.4799249	.5366877
2	.5491126	.0121342	45.25	0.000	.52533	.5728951
3	.5871141	.0124362	47.21	0.000	.5627395	.6114886
4	.6213781	.0142142	43.72	0.000	.5935186	.6492375
5	.6510938	.0159449	40.83	0.000	.6198424	.6823452
6	.6755955	.0168142	40.18	0.000	.6426403	.7085508

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0307478	.0038815	7.92	0.000	.0231402	.0383553
2	.0370111	.0044065	8.40	0.000	.0283745	.0456477
3	.0444883	.005238	8.49	0.000	.034222	.0547545
4	.053387	.0065211	8.19	0.000	.040606	.0661681
5	.0639392	.0083959	7.62	0.000	.0474835	.0803949
6	.0763977	.0109896	6.95	0.000	.0548585	.097937

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.000854	.0007935	1.08	0.282	-.0007012	.0024092
2	.0010348	.0009627	1.07	0.282	-.0008521	.0029217
3	.0012539	.001169	1.07	0.283	-.0010374	.0035452
4	.0015193	.0014207	1.07	0.285	-.0012652	.0043038
5	.0018408	.0017279	1.07	0.287	-.0015458	.0052273
6	.0022301	.0021029	1.06	0.289	-.0018915	.0063518

Turkey

Tables B.9 Marginal Effects in Turkey

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4559763	.0145139	31.42	0.000	.4275297	.484423
2	.4198675	.010591	39.64	0.000	.3991096	.4406255
3	.3845967	.0184707	20.82	0.000	.3483949	.4207986
4	.3504987	.0288157	12.16	0.000	.2940211	.4069764

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.454085	.0142685	31.82	0.000	.4261193	.4820507
2	.4603958	.0107231	42.94	0.000	.439379	.4814127
3	.4577069	.0189554	24.15	0.000	.420555	.4948588
4	.4446119	.0326007	13.64	0.000	.3807157	.5085081

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0705797	.0067904	10.39	0.000	.0572707	.0838887
2	.0878794	.0058581	15.00	0.000	.0763976	.0993611
3	.1056996	.0114184	9.26	0.000	.08332	.1280792
4	.1211229	.0232359	5.21	0.000	.0755815	.1666644

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.019359	.0035513	5.45	0.000	.0123985	.0263194
2	.0318573	.0035493	8.98	0.000	.0249007	.0388139
3	.0519968	.0077673	6.69	0.000	.0367732	.0672203
4	.0837664	.02027	4.13	0.000	.044038	.1234948

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4971347	.0422416	11.77	0.000	.4143428	.5799267
2	.4242211	.0104097	40.75	0.000	.4038185	.4446237

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4154188	.029728	13.97	0.000	.357153	.4736847
2	.461849	.0104611	44.15	0.000	.4413457	.4823523

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.065715	.0104916	6.26	0.000	.0451518	.0862782
2	.0849858	.0057671	14.74	0.000	.0736825	.0962892

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0217314	.004407	4.93	0.000	.0130938	.0303689
2	.028944	.0034686	8.34	0.000	.0221457	.0357424

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4427567	.0146178	30.29	0.000	.4141064	.471407
2	.4382766	.0125247	34.99	0.000	.4137287	.4628245
3	.4338065	.0109847	39.49	0.000	.412277	.4553361
4	.4293472	.010238	41.94	0.000	.4092811	.4494133
5	.4248993	.0104424	40.69	0.000	.4044327	.445366
6	.4204636	.0115335	36.46	0.000	.3978584	.4430687
7	.4160406	.0132813	31.33	0.000	.3900097	.4420715
8	.4116311	.0154522	26.64	0.000	.3813454	.4419169
9	.4072358	.0178811	22.77	0.000	.3721896	.442282
10	.4028553	.0204652	19.68	0.000	.3627441	.4429664

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4507146	.0120963	37.26	0.000	.4270063	.474423
2	.4534522	.0111946	40.51	0.000	.4315111	.4753932
3	.4561546	.0106142	42.98	0.000	.4353512	.4769581
4	.4588211	.0103816	44.20	0.000	.4384735	.4791688
5	.4614507	.0104923	43.98	0.000	.4408863	.4820152
6	.4640425	.0109083	42.54	0.000	.4426626	.4854224
7	.4665955	.0115707	40.33	0.000	.4439172	.4892737
8	.4691088	.0124154	37.78	0.000	.444775	.4934425
9	.4715815	.0133847	35.23	0.000	.4453479	.4978151
10	.4740127	.014432	32.84	0.000	.4457266	.5022989

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0796325	.0061585	12.93	0.000	.0675621	.0917028
2	.0808952	.0058613	13.80	0.000	.0694073	.092383
3	.0821746	.0056778	14.47	0.000	.0710463	.0933029
4	.0834708	.0056305	14.82	0.000	.0724353	.0945062
5	.0847838	.0057339	14.79	0.000	.0735455	.0960221
6	.0861139	.0059918	14.37	0.000	.0743702	.0978576
7	.087461	.0063963	13.67	0.000	.0749244	.0999976
8	.0888254	.0069324	12.81	0.000	.075238	.1024127
9	.090207	.0075822	11.90	0.000	.0753462	.1050677
10	.0916059	.0083283	11.00	0.000	.0752827	.1079291

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0268962	.0034228	7.86	0.000	.0201875	.0336048
2	.027376	.003383	8.09	0.000	.0207455	.0340066
3	.0278642	.0033742	8.26	0.000	.021251	.0344775
4	.0283609	.0034	8.34	0.000	.0216969	.0350248
5	.0288661	.0034635	8.33	0.000	.0220777	.0356545
6	.0293801	.0035664	8.24	0.000	.02239	.0363702
7	.0299029	.0037093	8.06	0.000	.0226327	.0371731
8	.0304348	.0038918	7.82	0.000	.0228069	.0380626
9	.0309758	.0041126	7.53	0.000	.0229152	.0390363
10	.0315261	.0043699	7.21	0.000	.0229613	.0400909

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5112661	.0179064	28.55	0.000	.4761702	.546362

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4056949	.0139342	29.12	0.000	.3783844	.4330053

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0624776	.005633	11.09	0.000	.0514372	.073518

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0205615	.002823	7.28	0.000	.0150284	.0260945

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.487406	.0147911	32.95	0.000	.458416	.5163959

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4219911	.0120741	34.95	0.000	.3983263	.4456558

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0680285	.0054999	12.37	0.000	.0572489	.078808

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0225745	.0029373	7.69	0.000	.0168175	.0283315

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4636031	.0121872	38.04	0.000	.4397166	.4874897

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4376153	.010852	40.33	0.000	.4163457	.4588848

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.074002	.0054423	13.60	0.000	.0633353	.0846687

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0247796	.0030871	8.03	0.000	.018729	.0308302

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.439965	.0105301	41.78	0.000	.4193265	.4606035

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4524238	.0103656	43.65	0.000	.4321077	.47274

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.080417	.0055259	14.55	0.000	.0695866	.0912475

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0271941	.0032878	8.27	0.000	.0207502	.033638

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.393596	.0113421	34.70	0.000	.3713659	.4158261

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.479039	.0110971	43.17	0.000	.457289	.500789

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0946376	.0063875	14.82	0.000	.0821183	.1071568

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0327274	.0039131	8.36	0.000	.0250579	.040397

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3710581	.013336	27.82	0.000	.3449201	.3971961

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.4905846	.0117984	41.58	0.000	.4674601	.5137091

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1024694	.0072515	14.13	0.000	.0882566	.1166821

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0358879	.004375	8.20	0.000	.027313	.0444627

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.3490679	.0157427	22.17	0.000	.3182128	.379923

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.5007971	.0124191	40.32	0.000	.4764562	.525138

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1107939	.0084128	13.17	0.000	.094305	.1272827

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0393411	.0049601	7.93	0.000	.0296194	.0490627

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.401867	.0158086	25.42	0.000	.3708827	.4328513
2	.4081938	.013693	29.81	0.000	.3813561	.4350315
3	.4145512	.0119162	34.79	0.000	.3911959	.4379066
4	.4209372	.0106769	39.43	0.000	.4000109	.4418636
5	.4273498	.0101991	41.90	0.000	.40736	.4473397
6	.4337869	.0106081	40.89	0.000	.4129954	.4545784
7	.4402464	.0118287	37.22	0.000	.4170625	.4634303
8	.4467262	.0136566	32.71	0.000	.4199598	.4734926
9	.4532241	.0158911	28.52	0.000	.4220781	.4843701
10	.4597381	.0183892	25.00	0.000	.4236958	.4957803

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4745566	.0127182	37.31	0.000	.4496294	.4994838
2	.4710453	.0118962	39.60	0.000	.4477293	.4943614
3	.467448	.0111916	41.77	0.000	.4455128	.4893831
4	.4637672	.0106674	43.48	0.000	.4428595	.4846748
5	.4600058	.010391	44.27	0.000	.4396397	.4803718
6	.4561665	.0104216	43.77	0.000	.4357405	.4765924
7	.4522521	.010793	41.90	0.000	.4310981	.473406
8	.4482655	.0115053	38.96	0.000	.4257155	.4708155
9	.4442095	.012529	35.45	0.000	.4196531	.468766
10	.4400872	.0138195	31.85	0.000	.4130015	.4671729

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0919246	.0071427	12.87	0.000	.0779252	.1059241
2	.0899039	.0065664	13.69	0.000	.0770341	.1027738
3	.0879194	.0061192	14.37	0.000	.075926	.0999129
4	.0859709	.0058133	14.79	0.000	.074577	.0973647
5	.0840579	.0056543	14.87	0.000	.0729757	.0951401
6	.0821802	.0056381	14.58	0.000	.0711299	.0932306
7	.0803376	.0057505	13.97	0.000	.0690668	.0916084
8	.0785297	.0059705	13.15	0.000	.0668278	.0902316
9	.0767561	.0062742	12.23	0.000	.0644589	.0890533
10	.0750165	.0066391	11.30	0.000	.0620041	.088029

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0316518	.0039781	7.96	0.000	.0238549	.0394487
2	.0308569	.0037785	8.17	0.000	.0234512	.0382627
3	.0300814	.00362	8.31	0.000	.0229863	.0371765
4	.0293247	.0035017	8.37	0.000	.0224615	.036188
5	.0285865	.0034218	8.35	0.000	.0218799	.0352931
6	.0278664	.0033774	8.25	0.000	.0212468	.034486
7	.0271639	.003365	8.07	0.000	.0205687	.0337591
8	.0264786	.0033802	7.83	0.000	.0198536	.0331037
9	.0258102	.0034186	7.55	0.000	.0191098	.0325106
10	.0251582	.0034759	7.24	0.000	.0183456	.0319708

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.4556541	.0192036	23.73	0.000	.4180157	.4932925
2	.446173	.0148067	30.13	0.000	.4171524	.4751936
3	.436731	.0114635	38.10	0.000	.4142629	.459199
4	.4273345	.0102007	41.89	0.000	.4073415	.4473275
5	.4179902	.0116373	35.92	0.000	.3951816	.4407988
6	.4087044	.0149441	27.35	0.000	.3794145	.4379943
7	.3994833	.0191083	20.91	0.000	.3620317	.4369349
8	.390333	.0236181	16.53	0.000	.3440424	.4366235

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4426782	.0143404	30.87	0.000	.4145716	.4707849
2	.4486081	.0121135	37.03	0.000	.424866	.4723501
3	.4543899	.0107375	42.32	0.000	.4333447	.4754351
4	.4600148	.0103896	44.28	0.000	.4396516	.480378
5	.465474	.0110033	42.30	0.000	.4439079	.4870401
6	.4707589	.0122844	38.32	0.000	.4466818	.494836
7	.4758611	.0139134	34.20	0.000	.4485914	.5031308
8	.4807726	.0156593	30.70	0.000	.4500808	.5114643

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0761028	.0068449	11.12	0.000	.0626869	.0895186
2	.0786825	.0061633	12.77	0.000	.0666027	.0907623
3	.0813354	.0057256	14.21	0.000	.0701133	.0925574
4	.0840624	.0056554	14.86	0.000	.0729779	.0951468
5	.0868646	.0060329	14.40	0.000	.0750404	.0986888
6	.0897429	.0068477	13.11	0.000	.0763217	.103164
7	.0926981	.0080255	11.55	0.000	.0769684	.1084277
8	.0957309	.0094843	10.09	0.000	.0771419	.1143198

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0255649	.0035253	7.25	0.000	.0186555	.0324743
2	.0265364	.0034104	7.78	0.000	.0198522	.0332206
3	.0275438	.0033688	8.18	0.000	.0209411	.0341464
4	.0285883	.0034229	8.35	0.000	.0218795	.035297
5	.0296712	.0035902	8.26	0.000	.0226345	.0367078
6	.0307938	.0038792	7.94	0.000	.0231908	.0383968
7	.0319575	.004289	7.45	0.000	.0235511	.0403638
8	.0331636	.0048133	6.89	0.000	.0237298	.0425975

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4378145	.0191199	22.90	0.000	.4003402	.4752888
2	.4340974	.0144725	29.99	0.000	.4057319	.4624629
3	.4303877	.0110994	38.78	0.000	.4086333	.452142
4	.4266858	.010296	41.44	0.000	.4065059	.4468656
5	.422992	.0125304	33.76	0.000	.3984328	.4475512
6	.4193069	.0165905	25.27	0.000	.38679	.4518238
7	.4156308	.0214399	19.39	0.000	.3736093	.4576522
8	.411964	.0266301	15.47	0.000	.35977	.464158

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4780635	.0179851	26.58	0.000	.4428133	.5133137
2	.4720877	.0139575	33.82	0.000	.4447316	.4994438
3	.4651151	.0111173	41.84	0.000	.4433257	.4869046
4	.4570745	.010471	43.65	0.000	.4365517	.4775972
5	.4478963	.012447	35.98	0.000	.4235006	.4722919
6	.437515	.0162559	26.91	0.000	.4056541	.4693759
7	.4258712	.0211154	20.17	0.000	.3844859	.4672566
8	.4129139	.0266807	15.48	0.000	.3606206	.4652072

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0642173	.0078132	8.22	0.000	.0489037	.0795309
2	.0710477	.0067321	10.55	0.000	.057853	.0842423
3	.0784667	.0058408	13.43	0.000	.067019	.0899145
4	.0864927	.0057551	15.03	0.000	.075213	.0977724
5	.0951358	.0070941	13.41	0.000	.0812316	.1090399
6	.1043962	.0098207	10.63	0.000	.085148	.1236444
7	.1142614	.013613	8.39	0.000	.0875805	.1409424
8	.124704	.0182808	6.82	0.000	.0888744	.1605336

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0199047	.0041862	4.75	0.000	.0116999	.0281096
2	.0227672	.0038304	5.94	0.000	.0152597	.0302748
3	.0260304	.0035015	7.43	0.000	.0191677	.0328932
4	.0297471	.0034572	8.60	0.000	.0229712	.036523
5	.0339759	.0040811	8.33	0.000	.0259771	.0419747
6	.0387819	.0055809	6.95	0.000	.0278435	.0497204
7	.0442366	.0079331	5.58	0.000	.0286881	.0597851
8	.0504182	.0111087	4.54	0.000	.0286455	.0721909

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.409654	.0169116	24.22	0.000	.3765079	.4428002
2	.4158945	.0135829	30.62	0.000	.3892725	.4425165
3	.422162	.0111101	38.00	0.000	.4003866	.4439375
4	.4284548	.010197	42.02	0.000	.408469	.4484405
5	.4347707	.0112758	38.56	0.000	.4126706	.4568708
6	.4411079	.0139208	31.69	0.000	.4138237	.4683921
7	.4474643	.0174533	25.64	0.000	.4132565	.4816721
8	.4538379	.0214516	21.16	0.000	.4117936	.4958823
9	.4602267	.0257064	17.90	0.000	.4098431	.5106104
10	.4666286	.0301124	15.50	0.000	.4076094	.5256479

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.4702251	.012954	36.30	0.000	.4448358	.4956144
2	.4666792	.0116523	40.05	0.000	.4438412	.4895173
3	.4630538	.0107294	43.16	0.000	.4420245	.484083
4	.4593512	.0103775	44.26	0.000	.4390116	.4796908
5	.4555742	.0107382	42.43	0.000	.4345277	.4766208
6	.4517255	.0118207	38.21	0.000	.4285574	.4748935
7	.4478077	.0135142	33.14	0.000	.4213202	.4742951
8	.4438235	.0156727	28.32	0.000	.4131056	.4745413
9	.4397757	.018172	24.20	0.000	.4041592	.4753922
10	.4356671	.0209236	20.82	0.000	.3946577	.4766766

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0894441	.0073942	12.10	0.000	.0749518	.1039364
2	.0875059	.0065252	13.41	0.000	.0747167	.1002951
3	.0856021	.0059231	14.45	0.000	.073993	.0972112
4	.0837326	.0056346	14.86	0.000	.0726891	.0947761
5	.081897	.0056706	14.44	0.000	.0707828	.0930112
6	.080095	.0059925	13.37	0.000	.0683499	.0918401
7	.0783263	.0065297	12.00	0.000	.0655283	.0911242
8	.0765906	.0072099	10.62	0.000	.0624594	.0907218
9	.0748875	.0079761	9.39	0.000	.0592547	.0905204
10	.0732168	.008788	8.33	0.000	.0559926	.090441

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0306768	.0039762	7.72	0.000	.0228835	.03847
2	.0299204	.0037034	8.08	0.000	.0226618	.037179
3	.0291821	.0035147	8.30	0.000	.0222933	.0360708
4	.0284615	.0034107	8.34	0.000	.0217766	.0351463
5	.0277581	.0033868	8.20	0.000	.0211201	.0343962
6	.0270717	.0034337	7.88	0.000	.0203418	.0338016
7	.0264018	.0035388	7.46	0.000	.0194658	.0333377
8	.025748	.0036887	6.98	0.000	.0185182	.0329778
9	.02511	.0038709	6.49	0.000	.0175231	.0326969
10	.0244874	.0040748	6.01	0.000	.0165009	.0324739

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.3622965	.0142928	25.35	0.000	.334283	.39031
2	.503381	.0163569	30.77	0.000	.4713221	.5354399

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4947866	.0120007	41.23	0.000	.4712656	.5183075
2	.411146	.0130436	31.52	0.000	.385581	.436711

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1057005	.0077706	13.60	0.000	.0904705	.1209305
2	.0642665	.0054508	11.79	0.000	.0535831	.07495

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0372164	.0045946	8.10	0.000	.0282113	.0462216
2	.0212065	.0028374	7.47	0.000	.0156453	.0267677

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4896514	.0131294	37.29	0.000	.4639182	.5153846
2	.4476658	.0105375	42.48	0.000	.4270127	.4683188
3	.4064133	.0105767	38.43	0.000	.3856834	.4271432
4	.3664403	.0128812	28.45	0.000	.3411936	.391687
5	.3282249	.0160294	20.48	0.000	.2968079	.3596419
6	.2921571	.0191129	15.29	0.000	.2546964	.3296178

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.4204834	.0112722	37.30	0.000	.3983902	.4425765
2	.4476826	.0103239	43.36	0.000	.427448	.4679171
3	.4720405	.0107031	44.10	0.000	.4510629	.4930182
4	.4928204	.0115954	42.50	0.000	.4700938	.515547
5	.5093722	.0122497	41.58	0.000	.4853632	.5333813
6	.5211663	.012338	42.24	0.000	.4969843	.5453484

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0674882	.0051682	13.06	0.000	.0573588	.0776176
2	.0782708	.0053996	14.50	0.000	.0676878	.0888539
3	.0904679	.0060579	14.93	0.000	.0785946	.1023413
4	.1041587	.0073097	14.25	0.000	.0898319	.1184854
5	.1193889	.0092038	12.97	0.000	.1013499	.1374279
6	.1361572	.0116918	11.65	0.000	.1132416	.1590728

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.022377	.0028314	7.90	0.000	.0168276	.0279265
2	.0263808	.0031927	8.26	0.000	.0201233	.0326384
3	.0310782	.0037126	8.37	0.000	.0238017	.0383548
4	.0365806	.004458	8.21	0.000	.0278432	.0453181
5	.043014	.0054998	7.82	0.000	.0322345	.0537934
6	.0505194	.0069099	7.31	0.000	.0369763	.0640625

West Germany

Tables B.10 Marginal Effects in West Germany

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.2860456	.0206618	13.84	0.000	.2455492	.326542
2	.2082853	.0115541	18.03	0.000	.1856396	.230931
3	.1473025	.0153737	9.58	0.000	.1171706	.1774344
4	.101877	.0184026	5.54	0.000	.0658085	.1379454

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.6306108	.0168236	37.48	0.000	.5976371	.6635845
2	.6700903	.0138602	48.35	0.000	.6429248	.6972558
3	.6785499	.0143688	47.22	0.000	.6503876	.7067121
4	.6550469	.02226	29.43	0.000	.6114182	.6986756

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

_at	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1	.0802253	.0094775	8.46	0.000	.0616497	.0988009
2	.1168832	.0094809	12.33	0.000	.0983011	.1354653
3	.1669451	.0172555	9.67	0.000	.133125	.2007652
4	.2321484	.0340745	6.81	0.000	.1653635	.2989333

margins, at(leisure=(1/4)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0031183	.0016061	1.94	0.052	-.0000295	.0062662
2	.0047412	.0024212	1.96	0.050	-4.35e-06	.0094867
3	.0072026	.0037501	1.92	0.055	-.0001475	.0145526
4	.0109277	.0059414	1.84	0.066	-.0007173	.0225727

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2372853	.0183323	12.94	0.000	.2013545	.273216
2	.1974458	.0147471	13.39	0.000	.1685419	.2263496

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6678389	.0202519	32.98	0.000	.6281459	.707532
2	.6639884	.017975	36.94	0.000	.6287581	.6992188

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0934971	.0121137	7.72	0.000	.0697547	.1172395
2	.1273403	.0127849	9.96	0.000	.1022822	.1523983

margins, at(trust=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0013787	.0011262	1.22	0.221	-.0008286	.003586
2	.0112255	.0047761	2.35	0.019	.0018646	.0205865

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2726711	.027455	9.93	0.000	.2188603	.3264819
2	.2583823	.0220746	11.70	0.000	.2151168	.3016477
3	.2445904	.0174502	14.02	0.000	.2103886	.2787922
4	.2313051	.0139	16.64	0.000	.2040616	.2585486
5	.2185327	.0118883	18.38	0.000	.195232	.2418334
6	.2062763	.0117191	17.60	0.000	.1833073	.2292453
7	.1945361	.0130566	14.90	0.000	.1689457	.2201266
8	.1833099	.0151982	12.06	0.000	.153522	.2130977
9	.1725926	.0176129	9.80	0.000	.138072	.2071133
10	.1623774	.0200172	8.11	0.000	.1231444	.2016105

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6387666	.0197804	32.29	0.000	.5999977	.6775354
2	.6469591	.0169141	38.25	0.000	.6138081	.6801102
3	.6542816	.0150509	43.47	0.000	.6247824	.6837808
4	.6607082	.0141014	46.85	0.000	.63307	.6883463
5	.6662163	.0138188	48.21	0.000	.6391319	.6933007
6	.6707871	.0138913	48.29	0.000	.6435607	.6980134
7	.674405	.0140572	47.98	0.000	.6468534	.7019566
8	.6770578	.0141624	47.81	0.000	.6493	.7048157
9	.6787368	.0141694	47.90	0.000	.6509653	.7065083
10	.6794362	.0141567	47.99	0.000	.6516897	.7071828

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0852305	.0123668	6.89	0.000	.0609921	.1094689
2	.0910744	.011345	8.03	0.000	.0688385	.1133102
3	.0972722	.010366	9.38	0.000	.0769553	.1175892
4	.1038391	.0095866	10.83	0.000	.0850497	.1226284
5	.1107894	.0092461	11.98	0.000	.0926674	.1289114
6	.1181374	.0096143	12.29	0.000	.0992938	.136981
7	.1258966	.0108539	11.60	0.000	.1046234	.1471698
8	.1340797	.012946	10.36	0.000	.1087059	.1594535
9	.1426983	.0157723	9.05	0.000	.1117853	.1736114
10	.151763	.019215	7.90	0.000	.1141022	.1894237

margins, at(hardwork=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0033318	.0017189	1.94	0.053	-.0000371	.0067007
2	.0035843	.0018357	1.95	0.051	-.0000137	.0071822
3	.0038557	.001966	1.96	0.050	2.38e-06	.0077091
4	.0041477	.0021117	1.96	0.050	8.85e-06	.0082865
5	.0044616	.0022747	1.96	0.050	3.26e-06	.00892
6	.0047992	.0024574	1.95	0.051	-.0000172	.0096156
7	.0051623	.0026621	1.94	0.052	-.0000554	.0103799
8	.0055526	.0028916	1.92	0.055	-.0001148	.01122
9	.0059722	.0031486	1.90	0.058	-.000199	.0121435
10	.0064234	.0034364	1.87	0.062	-.0003118	.0131587

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2733256	.025694	10.64	0.000	.2229663	.323685

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6383779	.01881	33.94	0.000	.601511	.6752447

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0849756	.011712	7.26	0.000	.0620204	.1079308

margins, at(relact=(1.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0033209	.0017563	1.89	0.059	-.0001214	.0067632

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2586	.0206012	12.55	0.000	.2182225	.2989776

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6468387	.0162194	39.88	0.000	.6150493	.6786281

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0909811	.010786	8.44	0.000	.0698409	.1121212

margins, at(relact=(2.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0035802	.0018702	1.91	0.056	-.0000854	.0072458

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2444009	.0163255	14.97	0.000	.2124036	.2763983

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6543778	.0146327	44.72	0.000	.6256983	.6830574

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0973616	.0099341	9.80	0.000	.0778912	.116832

margins, at(relact=(3.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0038597	.0019963	1.93	0.053	-.0000529	.0077722

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2307389	.0132156	17.46	0.000	.2048368	.2566409

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.660967	.0139172	47.49	0.000	.6336897	.6882443

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1041333	.0093249	11.17	0.000	.0858568	.1224097

margins, at(relact=(4.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0041609	.0021361	1.95	0.051	-.0000259	.0083476

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.2050492	.0119519	17.16	0.000	.181624	.2284745

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.671202	.0139419	48.14	0.000	.6438763	.6985276

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1189136	.0097901	12.15	0.000	.0997252	.1381019

margins, at(relact=(6.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0048352	.0024655	1.96	0.050	2.90e-06	.0096676

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.193025	.0134723	14.33	0.000	.1666197	.2194302

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6748107	.0141249	47.77	0.000	.6471263	.702495

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1269522	.0112179	11.32	0.000	.1049654	.148939

margins, at(relact=(7.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.0052122	.0026596	1.96	0.050	-5.58e-07	.0104249

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.1815448	.0156148	11.63	0.000	.1509403	.2121493

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_cons	.6773951	.0142126	47.66	0.000	.6495389	.7052513

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.1354418	.0134401	10.08	0.000	.1090996	.161784

margins, at(relact=(8.0000)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.0056183	.0028767	1.95	0.051	-.0000199	.0112565

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_at						
1	.2159974	.0241544	8.94	0.000	.1686556	.2633392
2	.2154805	.0198573	10.85	0.000	.1765609	.2544002
3	.2149645	.0160317	13.41	0.000	.183543	.2463861
4	.2144495	.0130772	16.40	0.000	.1888187	.2400802
5	.2139353	.0116522	18.36	0.000	.1910975	.2367731
6	.213422	.0122789	17.38	0.000	.1893557	.2374883
7	.2129096	.0146794	14.50	0.000	.1841386	.2416807
8	.2123982	.018149	11.70	0.000	.1768269	.2479695
9	.2118876	.02218	9.55	0.000	.1684156	.2553596
10	.2113779	.0265079	7.97	0.000	.1594234	.2633324

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6241359	.0289804	21.54	0.000	.5673354	.6809365
2	.6356604	.0233436	27.23	0.000	.5899077	.681413
3	.6465509	.0186386	34.69	0.000	.61002	.6830818
4	.6568268	.0152795	42.99	0.000	.6268796	.686774
5	.6665094	.0138437	48.15	0.000	.6393762	.6936426
6	.6756212	.0145835	46.33	0.000	.6470381	.7042043
7	.6841859	.0170076	40.23	0.000	.6508516	.7175202
8	.6922281	.0203924	33.95	0.000	.6522598	.7321964
9	.6997725	.0242569	28.85	0.000	.6522298	.7473152
10	.7068442	.0283566	24.93	0.000	.6512662	.7624222

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1413503	.0214599	6.59	0.000	.0992897	.1834108
2	.1355891	.0168516	8.05	0.000	.1025604	.1686177
3	.1289887	.0131367	9.82	0.000	.1032413	.1547362
4	.121936	.0105351	11.57	0.000	.1012877	.1425844
5	.1147073	.0093426	12.28	0.000	.096396	.1330185
6	.107496	.0095524	11.25	0.000	.0887737	.1262184
7	.1004349	.0106813	9.40	0.000	.0795	.1213699
8	.0936121	.0121854	7.68	0.000	.0697292	.117495
9	.0870835	.0137322	6.34	0.000	.0601689	.113998
10	.0808819	.0151621	5.33	0.000	.0511648	.110599

margins, at(inequality=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0185165	.0075739	2.44	0.014	.0036718	.0333611
2	.0132701	.0052665	2.52	0.012	.0029479	.0235922
3	.0094958	.0038887	2.44	0.015	.001874	.0171176
4	.0067877	.0030239	2.24	0.025	.000861	.0127143
5	.0048481	.0024244	2.00	0.046	.0000963	.0095998
6	.0034608	.0019659	1.76	0.078	-.0003924	.0073139
7	.0024695	.0015935	1.55	0.121	-.0006537	.0055927
8	.0017616	.0012839	1.37	0.170	-.0007547	.004278
9	.0012564	.0010261	1.22	0.221	-.0007547	.0032676
10	.000896	.0008133	1.10	0.271	-.000698	.00249

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2225755	.0209899	10.60	0.000	.181436	.263715
2	.2198909	.0167329	13.14	0.000	.187095	.2526868
3	.2172297	.0134072	16.20	0.000	.190952	.2435074
4	.2145918	.0117009	18.34	0.000	.1916586	.2375251
5	.2119773	.012188	17.39	0.000	.1880892	.2358655
6	.2093862	.0145536	14.39	0.000	.1808617	.2379107
7	.2068184	.0179965	11.49	0.000	.1715459	.2420909
8	.2042739	.0219543	9.30	0.000	.1612442	.2473037

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6246304	.0249118	25.07	0.000	.5758041	.6734566
2	.6386889	.0196279	32.54	0.000	.6002189	.6771589
3	.6520082	.0157566	41.38	0.000	.6211258	.6828905
4	.6646138	.0139101	47.78	0.000	.6373504	.6918772
5	.6765337	.0144084	46.95	0.000	.6482938	.7047737
6	.6877973	.0167286	41.12	0.000	.6550099	.7205847
7	.6984348	.0200427	34.85	0.000	.6591519	.7377177
8	.7084772	.0238028	29.76	0.000	.6618245	.7551299

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1454216	.0182382	7.97	0.000	.1096754	.1811679
2	.1350394	.0139582	9.67	0.000	.1076818	.1623971
3	.1252405	.0109033	11.49	0.000	.1038704	.1466107
4	.1160167	.0094093	12.33	0.000	.0975748	.1344586
5	.1073555	.0094978	11.30	0.000	.0887402	.1259708
6	.0992407	.0106235	9.34	0.000	.078419	.1200624
7	.0916536	.0121561	7.54	0.000	.0678281	.1154791
8	.0845733	.0137216	6.16	0.000	.0576795	.1114671

margins, at(education=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0073725	.003681	2.00	0.045	.000158	.0145871
2	.0063807	.0030803	2.07	0.038	.0003435	.012418
3	.0055216	.0026711	2.07	0.039	.0002863	.0107569
4	.0047776	.0023997	1.99	0.046	.0000742	.009481
5	.0041334	.002218	1.86	0.062	-.0002138	.0084807
6	.0035758	.0020882	1.71	0.087	-.000517	.0076687
7	.0030932	.0019845	1.56	0.119	-.0007963	.0069827
8	.0026755	.0018913	1.41	0.157	-.0010313	.0063823

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2367564	.0164628	14.38	0.000	.2044899	.269023
2	.2251821	.0129357	17.41	0.000	.1998286	.2505356
3	.2140149	.0116111	18.43	0.000	.1912576	.2367722
4	.2032563	.0126517	16.07	0.000	.1784594	.2280531
5	.1929057	.0151855	12.70	0.000	.1631426	.2226688
6	.1829612	.0183045	10.00	0.000	.1470851	.2188373
7	.1734192	.0215235	8.06	0.000	.131234	.2156044
8	.1642748	.0246234	6.67	0.000	.1160139	.2125357

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6581515	.014779	44.53	0.000	.6291852	.6871178
2	.6634368	.0139736	47.48	0.000	.6360491	.6908245
3	.6679882	.0138197	48.34	0.000	.640902	.6950743
4	.6717933	.0139732	48.08	0.000	.6444063	.6991803
5	.6748421	.0141665	47.64	0.000	.6470762	.702608
6	.6771263	.0142544	47.50	0.000	.6491882	.7050643
7	.6786399	.0142151	47.74	0.000	.6507788	.7065011
8	.6793791	.0141497	48.01	0.000	.6516462	.7071119

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1010682	.0100948	10.01	0.000	.0812826	.1208537
2	.1070874	.0092769	11.54	0.000	.088905	.1252698
3	.1134153	.009281	12.22	0.000	.095225	.1316057
4	.1200618	.0103821	11.56	0.000	.0997133	.1404103
5	.1270361	.0125551	10.12	0.000	.1024286	.1516436
6	.1343471	.0155977	8.61	0.000	.1037761	.164918
7	.1420028	.0193243	7.35	0.000	.1041278	.1798779
8	.1500108	.0236172	6.35	0.000	.1037219	.1962996

margins, at(empstat=(1/8)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0040239	.0020888	1.93	0.054	-.0000701	.008118
2	.0042938	.0022063	1.95	0.052	-.0000305	.008618
3	.0045816	.002339	1.96	0.050	-2.85e-06	.009166
4	.0048886	.0024894	1.96	0.050	9.58e-06	.0097677
5	.0052161	.0026597	1.96	0.050	3.22e-06	.0104291
6	.0055655	.0028527	1.95	0.051	-.0000257	.0111566
7	.005938	.0030711	1.93	0.053	-.0000813	.0119573
8	.0063354	.003318	1.91	0.056	-.0001677	.0128385

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1892578	.021684	8.73	0.000	.1467579	.2317576
2	.1944831	.0186225	10.44	0.000	.1579837	.2309826
3	.1998172	.0157458	12.69	0.000	.168956	.2306784
4	.2052603	.0133262	15.40	0.000	.1791416	.2313791
5	.2108127	.0118308	17.82	0.000	.1876247	.2340006
6	.2164743	.0118099	18.33	0.000	.1933273	.2396213
7	.2222451	.0134419	16.53	0.000	.1958995	.2485908
8	.228125	.0163812	13.93	0.000	.1960184	.2602316
9	.2341136	.0201827	11.60	0.000	.1945562	.273671
10	.2402105	.0245496	9.78	0.000	.1920943	.2883268

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6757579	.0148997	45.35	0.000	.6465551	.7049607
2	.6744195	.0147285	45.79	0.000	.6455521	.7032868
3	.6728768	.0144722	46.49	0.000	.6445119	.7012418
4	.6711312	.0141772	47.34	0.000	.6433444	.698918
5	.6691836	.013915	48.09	0.000	.6419108	.6964565
6	.6670357	.0137833	48.39	0.000	.6400209	.6940505
7	.6646889	.0139013	47.81	0.000	.6374428	.6919349
8	.6621448	.0143926	46.01	0.000	.6339359	.6903537
9	.6594055	.0153587	42.93	0.000	.629303	.6895079
10	.6564728	.0168564	38.95	0.000	.6234349	.6895106

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.1296443	.0162826	7.96	0.000	.0977311	.1615575
2	.1259334	.0137873	9.13	0.000	.0989109	.152956
3	.1223122	.011721	10.44	0.000	.0993395	.1452849
4	.1187795	.0102148	11.63	0.000	.0987588	.1388002
5	.115334	.0094076	12.26	0.000	.0968955	.1337724
6	.1119744	.0093579	11.97	0.000	.0936333	.1303154
7	.1086994	.0099715	10.90	0.000	.0891556	.1282431
8	.1055076	.0110518	9.55	0.000	.0838464	.1271688
9	.1023977	.0124068	8.25	0.000	.0780809	.1267145
10	.0993683	.0138983	7.15	0.000	.0721282	.1266084

margins, at(income=(1/10)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.00534	.00279	1.91	0.056	-.0001283	.0108084
2	.005164	.0026723	1.93	0.053	-.0000736	.0104016
3	.0049937	.0025658	1.95	0.052	-.0000352	.0100226
4	.004829	.0024699	1.96	0.051	-.0000118	.0096698
5	.0046697	.0023837	1.96	0.050	-2.32e-06	.0093418
6	.0045157	.0023068	1.96	0.050	-5.50e-06	.0090368
7	.0043667	.0022382	1.95	0.051	-.0000201	.0087535
8	.0042226	.0021773	1.94	0.052	-.0000449	.0084901
9	.0040832	.0021234	1.92	0.054	-.0000787	.0082451
10	.0039484	.0020758	1.90	0.057	-.0001201	.008017

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2023633	.0157763	12.83	0.000	.1714422	.2332844
2	.2228364	.0147463	15.11	0.000	.1939342	.2517387

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6720811	.0142593	47.13	0.000	.6441334	.7000289
2	.6644398	.0143299	46.37	0.000	.6363538	.6925259

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.12064	.0121273	9.95	0.000	.0968708	.1444091
2	.1083719	.0101587	10.67	0.000	.0884612	.1282826

margins, at(sex=(1/2)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0049156	.0025328	1.94	0.052	-.0000485	.0098797
2	.0043518	.0022316	1.95	0.051	-.000022	.0087256

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.2761705	.0170927	16.16	0.000	.2426694	.3096715
2	.2362124	.0125858	18.77	0.000	.2115447	.2608801
3	.2004348	.0116227	17.25	0.000	.1776547	.2232149
4	.1688781	.0129336	13.06	0.000	.1435287	.1942274
5	.1414109	.0146506	9.65	0.000	.1126962	.1701256
6	.1177781	.0159177	7.40	0.000	.08658	.1489763

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.6528585	.0174231	37.47	0.000	.6187099	.6870071
2	.6661218	.0142263	46.82	0.000	.6382388	.6940048
3	.6666009	.0140539	47.43	0.000	.6390558	.694146
4	.6526252	.0161086	40.51	0.000	.6210529	.6841975
5	.6232008	.0205359	30.35	0.000	.5829512	.6634503
6	.5785129	.0278439	20.78	0.000	.5239398	.6330859

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0691158	.0081693	8.46	0.000	.0531043	.0851273
2	.0944111	.008731	10.81	0.000	.0772986	.1115236
3	.1272605	.0098915	12.87	0.000	.1078735	.1466475
4	.1685195	.013037	12.93	0.000	.1429674	.1940716
5	.2179918	.0191405	11.39	0.000	.180477	.2555065
6	.2735441	.0279575	9.78	0.000	.2187485	.3283397

margins, at(marstat=(1/6)) predict(outcome(4)) atmeans

	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
_at						
1	.0018552	.0012171	1.52	0.127	-.0005302	.0042406
2	.0032547	.0018326	1.78	0.076	-.0003371	.0068465
3	.0057038	.0027338	2.09	0.037	.0003456	.0110619
4	.0099772	.0040934	2.44	0.015	.0019544	.0180001
5	.0173965	.0063317	2.75	0.006	.0049866	.0298065
6	.0301649	.0104982	2.87	0.004	.0095888	.050741

APPENDIX C

Table C.1 East Germany- Regression Results after Hardwork is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.4243008	.0952661	4.45	0.000	.2375826	.611019
trust	.9255325	.1384467	6.69	0.000	.6541819	1.196883
relact	.0574452	.031714	1.81	0.070	-.0047131	.1196035
inequality	-.0055193	.0276349	-0.20	0.842	-.0596828	.0486442
education	.0916262	.042178	2.17	0.030	.0089588	.1742936
empstat	-.007251	.0408755	-0.18	0.859	-.0873655	.0728636
income	-.0408404	.0314637	-1.30	0.194	-.1025081	.0208272
sex	-.1836013	.1269932	-1.45	0.148	-.4325033	.0653007
age	.117163	.0244975	4.78	0.000	.0691487	.1651772
age2	-.0011085	.0002528	-4.38	0.000	-.001604	-.000613
marstat	.2450838	.0364263	6.73	0.000	.1736894	.3164781
_cons	-4.112206	.7716938	-5.33	0.000	-5.624698	-2.599714
2						
leisure	.4243008	.0952661	4.45	0.000	.2375826	.611019
trust	.9255325	.1384467	6.69	0.000	.6541819	1.196883
relact	.0574452	.031714	1.81	0.070	-.0047131	.1196035
inequality	-.0055193	.0276349	-0.20	0.842	-.0596828	.0486442
education	-.1126802	.039538	-2.85	0.004	-.1901733	-.0351871
empstat	.1831247	.0358927	5.10	0.000	.1127763	.2534732
income	-.0408404	.0314637	-1.30	0.194	-.1025081	.0208272
sex	-.1836013	.1269932	-1.45	0.148	-.4325033	.0653007
age	.117163	.0244975	4.78	0.000	.0691487	.1651772
age2	-.0011085	.0002528	-4.38	0.000	-.001604	-.000613
marstat	.2450838	.0364263	6.73	0.000	.1736894	.3164781
_cons	-7.146758	.7827097	-9.13	0.000	-8.680841	-5.612675
3						
leisure	.4243008	.0952661	4.45	0.000	.2375826	.611019
trust	.9255325	.1384467	6.69	0.000	.6541819	1.196883
relact	.0574452	.031714	1.81	0.070	-.0047131	.1196035
inequality	-.0055193	.0276349	-0.20	0.842	-.0596828	.0486442
education	-.2250925	.1027456	-2.19	0.028	-.4264702	-.0237148
empstat	.1194094	.0789445	1.51	0.130	-.035319	.2741378
income	-.0408404	.0314637	-1.30	0.194	-.1025081	.0208272
sex	-.1836013	.1269932	-1.45	0.148	-.4325033	.0653007
age	.117163	.0244975	4.78	0.000	.0691487	.1651772
age2	-.0011085	.0002528	-4.38	0.000	-.001604	-.000613
marstat	.2450838	.0364263	6.73	0.000	.1736894	.3164781
_cons	-8.625375	.9037746	-9.54	0.000	-10.39674	-6.85401

Table C.2 Finland- Regression Results after Hardwork is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.4877242	.0894976	5.45	0.000	.3123121	.6631363
trust	-.0312706	.1170282	-0.27	0.789	-.2606417	.1981005
relact	.0569351	.0303697	1.87	0.061	-.0025885	.1164586
inequality	-.0627505	.025814	-2.43	0.015	-.1133451	-.0121559
education	-.0221302	.0274913	-0.80	0.421	-.0760121	.0317517
empstat	-.0259166	.0275439	-0.94	0.347	-.0799017	.0280684
income	-.1118052	.0259575	-4.31	0.000	-.1626811	-.0609294
sex	-.4090898	.1076331	-3.80	0.000	-.6200467	-.1981328
age	.1465595	.0188238	7.79	0.000	.1096656	.1834535
age2	-.0013379	.0001956	-6.84	0.000	-.0017212	-.0009546
marstat	.2151187	.0315523	6.82	0.000	.1532773	.2769602
_cons	-2.469495	.6025479	-4.10	0.000	-3.650468	-1.288523
2						
leisure	.4877242	.0894976	5.45	0.000	.3123121	.6631363
trust	1.156557	.2225863	5.20	0.000	.7202954	1.592818
relact	.0569351	.0303697	1.87	0.061	-.0025885	.1164586
inequality	.0244995	.0433345	0.57	0.572	-.0604346	.1094336
education	-.0221302	.0274913	-0.80	0.421	-.0760121	.0317517
empstat	.0888416	.0449532	1.98	0.048	.000735	.1769482
income	-.1118052	.0259575	-4.31	0.000	-.1626811	-.0609294
sex	-.4090898	.1076331	-3.80	0.000	-.6200467	-.1981328
age	.1465595	.0188238	7.79	0.000	.1096656	.1834535
age2	-.0011997	.0001933	-6.21	0.000	-.0015785	-.0008208
marstat	.2151187	.0315523	6.82	0.000	.1532773	.2769602
_cons	-9.502363	.7689528	-12.36	0.000	-11.00948	-7.995243
3						
leisure	.4877242	.0894976	5.45	0.000	.3123121	.6631363
trust	1.229983	.5493995	2.24	0.025	.1531801	2.306787
relact	.0569351	.0303697	1.87	0.061	-.0025885	.1164586
inequality	.1478113	.0766995	1.93	0.054	-.002517	.2981395
education	-.0221302	.0274913	-0.80	0.421	-.0760121	.0317517
empstat	.2264563	.0842781	2.69	0.007	.0612743	.3916383
income	-.1118052	.0259575	-4.31	0.000	-.1626811	-.0609294
sex	-.4090898	.1076331	-3.80	0.000	-.6200467	-.1981328
age	.1465595	.0188238	7.79	0.000	.1096656	.1834535
age2	-.0014326	.0002249	-6.37	0.000	-.0018733	-.0009919
marstat	.2151187	.0315523	6.82	0.000	.1532773	.2769602
_cons	-12.17473	1.294563	-9.40	0.000	-14.71203	-9.637435

Table C.3 Norway- Regression Results after Hardwork is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.4527715	.084757	5.34	0.000	.2866507	.6188922
trust	-.0700618	.1185904	-0.59	0.555	-.3024947	.1623711
relact	.0472765	.0251593	1.88	0.060	-.0020348	.0965879
inequality	-.0645971	.0221659	-2.91	0.004	-.1080414	-.0211528
education	-.0736131	.0250122	-2.94	0.003	-.1226361	-.02459
empstat	-.0295524	.0341049	-0.87	0.386	-.0963968	.0372921
income	-.073499	.0220882	-3.33	0.001	-.1167911	-.0302068
sex	-.2870339	.1034872	-2.77	0.006	-.4898651	-.0842027
age	.118594	.022317	5.31	0.000	.0748534	.1623345
age2	-.0010768	.0002384	-4.52	0.000	-.0015439	-.0006096
marstat	.2615855	.0319205	8.19	0.000	.1990225	.3241485
_cons	-2.059099	.6575537	-3.13	0.002	-3.34788	-.7703171
2						
leisure	.4527715	.084757	5.34	0.000	.2866507	.6188922
trust	.5578119	.2256539	2.47	0.013	.1155383	1.000086
relact	.0472765	.0251593	1.88	0.060	-.0020348	.0965879
inequality	-.0645971	.0221659	-2.91	0.004	-.1080414	-.0211528
education	-.0736131	.0250122	-2.94	0.003	-.1226361	-.02459
empstat	.2515397	.0611044	4.12	0.000	.1317772	.3713022
income	-.073499	.0220882	-3.33	0.001	-.1167911	-.0302068
sex	.3628523	.2254427	1.61	0.108	-.0790073	.8047119
age	.2392955	.0464461	5.15	0.000	.1482628	.3303283
age2	-.0023187	.0004967	-4.67	0.000	-.0032922	-.0013451
marstat	.2615855	.0319205	8.19	0.000	.1990225	.3241485
_cons	-11.39828	1.294241	-8.81	0.000	-13.93495	-8.861616
3						
leisure	.4527715	.084757	5.34	0.000	.2866507	.6188922
trust	.9408153	.6673318	1.41	0.159	-.3671309	2.248762
relact	.0472765	.0251593	1.88	0.060	-.0020348	.0965879
inequality	-.0645971	.0221659	-2.91	0.004	-.1080414	-.0211528
education	-.0736131	.0250122	-2.94	0.003	-.1226361	-.02459
empstat	.5788817	.2827934	2.05	0.041	.0246168	1.133147
income	-.073499	.0220882	-3.33	0.001	-.1167911	-.0302068
sex	2.516878	1.033317	2.44	0.015	.4916142	4.542142
age	.5742748	.19578	2.93	0.003	.1905532	.9579965
age2	-.0059196	.0018593	-3.18	0.001	-.0095638	-.0022753
marstat	.2615855	.0319205	8.19	0.000	.1990225	.3241485
_cons	-26.52717	6.315355	-4.20	0.000	-38.90503	-14.1493

Table C.4 Spain- Regression Results after Hardwork is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.3589199	.0904561	3.97	0.000	.1816292	.5362106
trust	.2105559	.12554	1.68	0.094	-.035498	.4566099
relact	.1246869	.0285822	4.36	0.000	.0686668	.1807069
inequality	-.028101	.0218068	-1.29	0.198	-.0708415	.0146395
education	-.0072133	.0292823	-0.25	0.805	-.0646055	.0501789
empstat	.0184722	.029179	0.63	0.527	-.0387176	.0756619
income	-.1048416	.0373844	-2.80	0.005	-.1781138	-.0315695
sex	-.0011638	.1102717	-0.01	0.992	-.2172923	.2149647
age	.1409808	.0229103	6.15	0.000	.0960774	.1858841
age2	-.0011945	.0002318	-5.15	0.000	-.0016489	-.0007401
marstat	.1902665	.0312141	6.10	0.000	.129088	.251445
_cons	-3.397969	.7084473	-4.80	0.000	-4.7865	-2.009438
2						
leisure	.3589199	.0904561	3.97	0.000	.1816292	.5362106
trust	.2105559	.12554	1.68	0.094	-.035498	.4566099
relact	-.0186384	.0327026	-0.57	0.569	-.0827343	.0454575
inequality	-.028101	.0218068	-1.29	0.198	-.0708415	.0146395
education	-.0072133	.0292823	-0.25	0.805	-.0646055	.0501789
empstat	.0184722	.029179	0.63	0.527	-.0387176	.0756619
income	-.1048416	.0373844	-2.80	0.005	-.1781138	-.0315695
sex	-.0011638	.1102717	-0.01	0.992	-.2172923	.2149647
age	.0256924	.0256222	1.00	0.316	-.0245262	.075911
age2	-.0000875	.0002482	-0.35	0.725	-.0005739	.000399
marstat	.1902665	.0312141	6.10	0.000	.129088	.251445
_cons	-4.138269	.7744868	-5.34	0.000	-5.656235	-2.620303
3						
leisure	.3589199	.0904561	3.97	0.000	.1816292	.5362106
trust	.2105559	.12554	1.68	0.094	-.035498	.4566099
relact	.0266373	.0926887	0.29	0.774	-.1550292	.2083038
inequality	-.028101	.0218068	-1.29	0.198	-.0708415	.0146395
education	-.0072133	.0292823	-0.25	0.805	-.0646055	.0501789
empstat	.0184722	.029179	0.63	0.527	-.0387176	.0756619
income	-.1048416	.0373844	-2.80	0.005	-.1781138	-.0315695
sex	-.0011638	.1102717	-0.01	0.992	-.2172923	.2149647
age	.1155129	.0627465	1.84	0.066	-.0074679	.2384937
age2	-.0008993	.0006243	-1.44	0.150	-.0021229	.0003244
marstat	.1902665	.0312141	6.10	0.000	.129088	.251445
_cons	-8.941378	1.663046	-5.38	0.000	-12.20089	-5.681867

Table C.5 Sweden- Regression Results after Hardwork is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.3817704	.0862021	4.43	0.000	.2128175	.5507234
trust	.0901618	.1048207	0.86	0.390	-.115283	.2956066
relact	.0912581	.026856	3.40	0.001	.0386214	.1438948
inequality	-.0744855	.0228896	-3.25	0.001	-.1193482	-.0296227
education	.0126603	.0252417	0.50	0.616	-.0368126	.0621332
empstat	.0429465	.0289594	1.48	0.138	-.0138129	.0997059
income	-.0490174	.0245543	-2.00	0.046	-.097143	-.0008918
sex	-.3022468	.1000946	-3.02	0.003	-.4984286	-.106065
age	.1090321	.0213092	5.12	0.000	.0672668	.1507975
age2	-.0009926	.0002182	-4.55	0.000	-.0014203	-.000565
marstat	.2385837	.0320557	7.44	0.000	.1757556	.3014117
_cons	-3.183443	.6584199	-4.83	0.000	-4.473923	-1.892964
2						
leisure	.3817704	.0862021	4.43	0.000	.2128175	.5507234
trust	.0901618	.1048207	0.86	0.390	-.115283	.2956066
relact	.0912581	.026856	3.40	0.001	.0386214	.1438948
inequality	-.0744855	.0228896	-3.25	0.001	-.1193482	-.0296227
education	.0126603	.0252417	0.50	0.616	-.0368126	.0621332
empstat	.0429465	.0289594	1.48	0.138	-.0138129	.0997059
income	-.2619709	.0588269	-4.45	0.000	-.3772696	-.1466723
sex	-.3022468	.1000946	-3.02	0.003	-.4984286	-.106065
age	.1090321	.0213092	5.12	0.000	.0672668	.1507975
age2	-.0009926	.0002182	-4.55	0.000	-.0014203	-.000565
marstat	.2385837	.0320557	7.44	0.000	.1757556	.3014117
_cons	-5.875507	.7283111	-8.07	0.000	-7.302971	-4.448044
3						
leisure	.3817704	.0862021	4.43	0.000	.2128175	.5507234
trust	.0901618	.1048207	0.86	0.390	-.115283	.2956066
relact	.0912581	.026856	3.40	0.001	.0386214	.1438948
inequality	-.0744855	.0228896	-3.25	0.001	-.1193482	-.0296227
education	.0126603	.0252417	0.50	0.616	-.0368126	.0621332
empstat	.0429465	.0289594	1.48	0.138	-.0138129	.0997059
income	-.067677	.1285399	-0.53	0.599	-.3196107	.1842567
sex	-.3022468	.1000946	-3.02	0.003	-.4984286	-.106065
age	.1090321	.0213092	5.12	0.000	.0672668	.1507975
age2	-.0009926	.0002182	-4.55	0.000	-.0014203	-.000565
marstat	.2385837	.0320557	7.44	0.000	.1757556	.3014117
_cons	-8.684034	.9677289	-8.97	0.000	-10.58075	-6.787321

Table C.6 Switzerland- Regression Results after Hardwork is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.2762353	.0737032	3.75	0.000	.1317796	.420691
trust	.2656644	.0973925	2.73	0.006	.0747787	.4565502
relact	.045475	.0207253	2.19	0.028	.0048541	.0860959
inequality	.0152887	.0174279	0.88	0.380	-.0188692	.0494467
education	-.0152101	.0247337	-0.61	0.539	-.0636873	.0332671
empstat	.008493	.0308498	0.28	0.783	-.0519716	.0689576
income	-.0072036	.0225256	-0.32	0.749	-.051353	.0369459
sex	-.1824282	.0948953	-1.92	0.055	-.3684195	.0035631
age	.0516366	.0198345	2.60	0.009	.0127617	.0905115
age2	-.0004884	.0001938	-2.52	0.012	-.0008683	-.0001085
marstat	.1836851	.0278851	6.59	0.000	.1290314	.2383389
_cons	-2.055806	.6236945	-3.30	0.001	-3.278225	-.8333874
2						
leisure	.2762353	.0737032	3.75	0.000	.1317796	.420691
trust	.2656644	.0973925	2.73	0.006	.0747787	.4565502
relact	.045475	.0207253	2.19	0.028	.0048541	.0860959
inequality	.0152887	.0174279	0.88	0.380	-.0188692	.0494467
education	-.0152101	.0247337	-0.61	0.539	-.0636873	.0332671
empstat	.119034	.0590522	2.02	0.044	.0032938	.2347742
income	-.2137089	.0487582	-4.38	0.000	-.3092731	-.1181446
sex	-.1824282	.0948953	-1.92	0.055	-.3684195	.0035631
age	.1689564	.0457628	3.69	0.000	.0792629	.25865
age2	-.0016518	.0004533	-3.64	0.000	-.0025403	-.0007633
marstat	.1836851	.0278851	6.59	0.000	.1290314	.2383389
_cons	-7.412905	1.211017	-6.12	0.000	-9.786454	-5.039356
3						
leisure	.2762353	.0737032	3.75	0.000	.1317796	.420691
trust	.2656644	.0973925	2.73	0.006	.0747787	.4565502
relact	.045475	.0207253	2.19	0.028	.0048541	.0860959
inequality	.0152887	.0174279	0.88	0.380	-.0188692	.0494467
education	-.0152101	.0247337	-0.61	0.539	-.0636873	.0332671
empstat	.3702155	.1394826	2.65	0.008	.0968347	.6435964
income	-.3940493	.2394797	-1.65	0.100	-.8634209	.0753224
sex	-.1824282	.0948953	-1.92	0.055	-.3684195	.0035631
age	.4891636	.1650294	2.96	0.003	.165712	.8126153
age2	-.0055469	.0018597	-2.98	0.003	-.0091917	-.001902
marstat	.1836851	.0278851	6.59	0.000	.1290314	.2383389
_cons	-15.70836	4.074475	-3.86	0.000	-23.69418	-7.722531

Table C.7 Turkey- Regression Results after Hardwork is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.1489787	.0533809	2.79	0.005	.044354	.2536035
trust	.3174038	.1722392	1.84	0.065	-.0201789	.6549865
relact	.0992094	.0162045	6.12	0.000	.0674491	.1309697
inequality	-.0266779	.012393	-2.15	0.031	-.0509677	-.002388
education	.0387108	.0219906	1.76	0.078	-.0043899	.0818116
empstat	.0158585	.0238444	0.67	0.506	-.0308756	.0625926
income	-.0261833	.0187498	-1.40	0.163	-.0629321	.0105656
sex	-.5779212	.0958608	-6.03	0.000	-.765805	-.3900375
age	.0730421	.0182019	4.01	0.000	.0373671	.1087171
age2	-.0008338	.0002085	-4.00	0.000	-.0012425	-.0004251
marstat	.1712236	.022865	7.49	0.000	.1264091	.2160381
_cons	-1.983385	.5734767	-3.46	0.001	-3.107379	-.8593913
2						
leisure	.3262551	.0777951	4.19	0.000	.1737795	.4787308
trust	.3174038	.1722392	1.84	0.065	-.0201789	.6549865
relact	.0992094	.0162045	6.12	0.000	.0674491	.1309697
inequality	-.0266779	.012393	-2.15	0.031	-.0509677	-.002388
education	.0387108	.0219906	1.76	0.078	-.0043899	.0818116
empstat	.1180369	.0329848	3.58	0.000	.0533879	.1826859
income	-.0261833	.0187498	-1.40	0.163	-.0629321	.0105656
sex	-.5779212	.0958608	-6.03	0.000	-.765805	-.3900375
age	.0843011	.0184863	4.56	0.000	.0480686	.1205336
age2	-.0008338	.0002085	-4.00	0.000	-.0012425	-.0004251
marstat	.1712236	.022865	7.49	0.000	.1264091	.2160381
_cons	-5.437836	.6135667	-8.86	0.000	-6.640405	-4.235268
3						
leisure	.5196778	.129845	4.00	0.000	.2651863	.7741692
trust	.3174038	.1722392	1.84	0.065	-.0201789	.6549865
relact	.0992094	.0162045	6.12	0.000	.0674491	.1309697
inequality	-.0266779	.012393	-2.15	0.031	-.0509677	-.002388
education	.0387108	.0219906	1.76	0.078	-.0043899	.0818116
empstat	.1348574	.0540607	2.49	0.013	.0289003	.2408144
income	-.0261833	.0187498	-1.40	0.163	-.0629321	.0105656
sex	-.5779212	.0958608	-6.03	0.000	-.765805	-.3900375
age	.0954986	.0195076	4.90	0.000	.0572644	.1337329
age2	-.0008338	.0002085	-4.00	0.000	-.0012425	-.0004251
marstat	.1712236	.022865	7.49	0.000	.1264091	.2160381
_cons	-7.709356	.7421271	-10.39	0.000	-9.163898	-6.254813

Table C.8 West Germany- Regression Results after Hardwork is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.3866889	.0855045	4.52	0.000	.2191033	.5542746
trust	.1895933	.1345036	1.41	0.159	-.0740288	.4532154
relact	.0716279	.0265568	2.70	0.007	.0195774	.1236783
inequality	.0003812	.0288531	0.01	0.989	-.0561698	.0569322
education	-.0148239	.0253975	-0.58	0.559	-.064602	.0349542
empstat	.0706047	.0322584	2.19	0.029	.0073794	.1338301
income	-.0364987	.0260569	-1.40	0.161	-.0875693	.0145719
sex	-.1340459	.1171244	-1.14	0.252	-.3636055	.0955138
age	.0796008	.0212294	3.75	0.000	.0379919	.1212096
age2	-.0007286	.0002084	-3.50	0.000	-.0011371	-.0003202
marstat	.2139887	.0370965	5.77	0.000	.1412808	.2866965
_cons	-2.345758	.7077952	-3.31	0.001	-3.733011	-.9585044
2						
leisure	.3866889	.0855045	4.52	0.000	.2191033	.5542746
trust	.4594617	.1707552	2.69	0.007	.1247877	.7941356
relact	.0716279	.0265568	2.70	0.007	.0195774	.1236783
inequality	-.1074959	.0348726	-3.08	0.002	-.1758449	-.0391468
education	-.0148239	.0253975	-0.58	0.559	-.064602	.0349542
empstat	.0706047	.0322584	2.19	0.029	.0073794	.1338301
income	-.0364987	.0260569	-1.40	0.161	-.0875693	.0145719
sex	-.1340459	.1171244	-1.14	0.252	-.3636055	.0955138
age	.0796008	.0212294	3.75	0.000	.0379919	.1212096
age2	-.0006045	.0002079	-2.91	0.004	-.0010119	-.0001971
marstat	.3523211	.03885	9.07	0.000	.2761765	.4284658
_cons	-6.146644	.7434943	-8.27	0.000	-7.603866	-4.689422
3						
leisure	.3866889	.0855045	4.52	0.000	.2191033	.5542746
trust	2.080078	.7205389	2.89	0.004	.6678478	3.492308
relact	.0716279	.0265568	2.70	0.007	.0195774	.1236783
inequality	-.3479354	.098089	-3.55	0.000	-.5401864	-.1556844
education	-.0148239	.0253975	-0.58	0.559	-.064602	.0349542
empstat	.0706047	.0322584	2.19	0.029	.0073794	.1338301
income	-.0364987	.0260569	-1.40	0.161	-.0875693	.0145719
sex	-.1340459	.1171244	-1.14	0.252	-.3636055	.0955138
age	.0796008	.0212294	3.75	0.000	.0379919	.1212096
age2	-.0004871	.0002205	-2.21	0.027	-.0009193	-.000055
marstat	.5597452	.108783	5.15	0.000	.3465345	.7729558
_cons	-11.67138	1.615203	-7.23	0.000	-14.83712	-8.505644

Table C.9 East Germany- Regression Results after Income is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.4456946	.0927371	4.81	0.000	.2639333	.627456
trust	.8093445	.1285892	6.29	0.000	.5573143	1.061375
hardwork	.0792095	.0241238	3.28	0.001	.0319276	.1264913
relact	.036211	.0298957	1.21	0.226	-.0223836	.0948055
inequality	-.02046	.0260932	-0.78	0.433	-.0716018	.0306818
education	.0758731	.0384081	1.98	0.048	.0005946	.1511516
empstat	-.0212442	.0367499	-0.58	0.563	-.0932727	.0507843
sex	-.1153982	.1190322	-0.97	0.332	-.348697	.1179007
age	.1111565	.0234604	4.74	0.000	.0651749	.1571381
age2	-.0010482	.000244	-4.30	0.000	-.0015264	-.0005701
marstat	.2214278	.034027	6.51	0.000	.1547361	.2881195
_cons	-4.217508	.7256247	-5.81	0.000	-5.639706	-2.79531
2						
leisure	.4456946	.0927371	4.81	0.000	.2639333	.627456
trust	.8093445	.1285892	6.29	0.000	.5573143	1.061375
hardwork	.0792095	.0241238	3.28	0.001	.0319276	.1264913
relact	.036211	.0298957	1.21	0.226	-.0223836	.0948055
inequality	-.02046	.0260932	-0.78	0.433	-.0716018	.0306818
education	-.0938753	.0372553	-2.52	0.012	-.1668943	-.0208562
empstat	.1676015	.0333562	5.02	0.000	.1022246	.2329784
sex	-.1153982	.1190322	-0.97	0.332	-.348697	.1179007
age	.1111565	.0234604	4.74	0.000	.0651749	.1571381
age2	-.0010482	.000244	-4.30	0.000	-.0015264	-.0005701
marstat	.2214278	.034027	6.51	0.000	.1547361	.2881195
_cons	-7.357091	.7430541	-9.90	0.000	-8.81345	-5.900731
3						
leisure	.4456946	.0927371	4.81	0.000	.2639333	.627456
trust	.8093445	.1285892	6.29	0.000	.5573143	1.061375
hardwork	.0792095	.0241238	3.28	0.001	.0319276	.1264913
relact	.036211	.0298957	1.21	0.226	-.0223836	.0948055
inequality	-.02046	.0260932	-0.78	0.433	-.0716018	.0306818
education	-.1474404	.0868413	-1.70	0.090	-.3176462	.0227653
empstat	.1498785	.0741907	2.02	0.043	.0044674	.2952895
sex	-.1153982	.1190322	-0.97	0.332	-.348697	.1179007
age	.1111565	.0234604	4.74	0.000	.0651749	.1571381
age2	-.0010482	.000244	-4.30	0.000	-.0015264	-.0005701
marstat	.2214278	.034027	6.51	0.000	.1547361	.2881195
_cons	-9.171354	.8791537	-10.43	0.000	-10.89446	-7.448244

Table C.10 Finland- Regression Results after Income is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.4634089	.0863758	5.37	0.000	.2941154	.6327024
trust	-.0411405	.1116894	-0.37	0.713	-.2600476	.1777667
hardwork	.0804152	.0242912	3.31	0.001	.0328054	.128025
relact	.0659155	.0292342	2.25	0.024	.0086174	.1232135
inequality	-.0640849	.0242988	-2.64	0.008	-.1117098	-.0164601
education	-.0462872	.0255258	-1.81	0.070	-.0963168	.0037424
empstat	.0084782	.0251892	0.34	0.736	-.0408918	.0578482
sex	-.417379	.1035335	-4.03	0.000	-.620301	-.214457
age	.1239178	.0182588	6.79	0.000	.0881311	.1597044
age2	-.0010514	.0001898	-5.54	0.000	-.0014234	-.0006794
marstat	.2746821	.0345653	7.95	0.000	.2069353	.3424288
_cons	-3.054281	.5871582	-5.20	0.000	-4.20509	-1.903472
2						
leisure	.4634089	.0863758	5.37	0.000	.2941154	.6327024
trust	1.070747	.2036166	5.26	0.000	.6716662	1.469829
hardwork	.0804152	.0242912	3.31	0.001	.0328054	.128025
relact	.0659155	.0292342	2.25	0.024	.0086174	.1232135
inequality	-.0050936	.0402523	-0.13	0.899	-.0839867	.0737995
education	-.0462872	.0255258	-1.81	0.070	-.0963168	.0037424
empstat	.1391702	.0410093	3.39	0.001	.0587934	.219547
sex	-.417379	.1035335	-4.03	0.000	-.620301	-.214457
age	.1239178	.0182588	6.79	0.000	.0881311	.1597044
age2	-.0010514	.0001898	-5.54	0.000	-.0014234	-.0006794
marstat	.1644562	.0420025	3.92	0.000	.0821328	.2467795
_cons	-9.103955	.7131752	-12.77	0.000	-10.50175	-7.706157
3						
leisure	.4634089	.0863758	5.37	0.000	.2941154	.6327024
trust	1.219	.552277	2.21	0.027	.1365566	2.301443
hardwork	.0804152	.0242912	3.31	0.001	.0328054	.128025
relact	.0659155	.0292342	2.25	0.024	.0086174	.1232135
inequality	.1729305	.0768245	2.25	0.024	.0223571	.3235038
education	-.0462872	.0255258	-1.81	0.070	-.0963168	.0037424
empstat	.3061689	.1014081	3.02	0.003	.1074127	.5049251
sex	-.417379	.1035335	-4.03	0.000	-.620301	-.214457
age	.1239178	.0182588	6.79	0.000	.0881311	.1597044
age2	-.0010514	.0001898	-5.54	0.000	-.0014234	-.0006794
marstat	.4161795	.0865312	4.81	0.000	.2465814	.5857776
_cons	-13.88319	1.38631	-10.01	0.000	-16.6003	-11.16607

Table C.11 Norway- Regression Results after Income is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.4717054	.0851136	5.54	0.000	.3048858	.6385249
trust	.0827758	.1092162	0.76	0.449	-.131284	.2968355
hardwork	.0653828	.0219234	2.98	0.003	.0224137	.108352
relact	.0385552	.0239901	1.61	0.108	-.0084645	.0855749
inequality	-.0692671	.0213696	-3.24	0.001	-.1111508	-.0273834
education	-.0773672	.0235963	-3.28	0.001	-.1236152	-.0311192
empstat	.0116862	.0321339	0.36	0.716	-.0512951	.0746674
sex	-.2494559	.0986576	-2.53	0.011	-.4428212	-.0560905
age	.1091877	.020921	5.22	0.000	.0681833	.150192
age2	-.0009779	.0002222	-4.40	0.000	-.0014134	-.0005424
marstat	.2933004	.0286047	10.25	0.000	.2372362	.3493646
_cons	-2.935267	.6287771	-4.67	0.000	-4.167648	-1.702887
2						
leisure	.5153712	.1787825	2.88	0.004	.1649639	.8657786
trust	.0827758	.1092162	0.76	0.449	-.131284	.2968355
hardwork	.0653828	.0219234	2.98	0.003	.0224137	.108352
relact	.0385552	.0239901	1.61	0.108	-.0084645	.0855749
inequality	-.0692671	.0213696	-3.24	0.001	-.1111508	-.0273834
education	-.0773672	.0235963	-3.28	0.001	-.1236152	-.0311192
empstat	.2840539	.0580581	4.89	0.000	.1702622	.3978456
sex	.3834399	.2203936	1.74	0.082	-.0485237	.8154035
age	.229558	.0437622	5.25	0.000	.1437857	.3153303
age2	-.0021826	.0004697	-4.65	0.000	-.0031032	-.001262
marstat	.2933004	.0286047	10.25	0.000	.2372362	.3493646
_cons	-11.5502	1.26135	-9.16	0.000	-14.0224	-9.078004
3						
leisure	1.753515	.4266211	4.11	0.000	.9173529	2.589677
trust	.0827758	.1092162	0.76	0.449	-.131284	.2968355
hardwork	.0653828	.0219234	2.98	0.003	.0224137	.108352
relact	.0385552	.0239901	1.61	0.108	-.0084645	.0855749
inequality	-.0692671	.0213696	-3.24	0.001	-.1111508	-.0273834
education	-.0773672	.0235963	-3.28	0.001	-.1236152	-.0311192
empstat	.3893654	.3024357	1.29	0.198	-.2033978	.9821285
sex	2.633793	1.104839	2.38	0.017	.4683482	4.799238
age	.4405284	.1769047	2.49	0.013	.0938015	.7872553
age2	-.004523	.0016842	-2.69	0.007	-.0078239	-.001222
marstat	.2933004	.0286047	10.25	0.000	.2372362	.3493646
_cons	-25.40467	5.273845	-4.82	0.000	-35.74121	-15.06812

Table C.12 Spain- Regression Results after Income is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.3491875	.082158	4.25	0.000	.1881607	.5102143
trust	.1649229	.1120676	1.47	0.141	-.0547257	.3845714
hardwork	.0150532	.0258565	0.58	0.560	-.0356247	.065731
relact	.1272532	.0257286	4.95	0.000	.0768261	.1776803
inequality	-.0315506	.0199361	-1.58	0.114	-.0706247	.0075235
education	.0005196	.0291729	0.02	0.986	-.0566581	.0576974
empstat	.030377	.0257957	1.18	0.239	-.0201817	.0809357
sex	.0399614	.101181	0.39	0.693	-.1583498	.2382726
age	.1199351	.0217594	5.51	0.000	.0772874	.1625829
age2	-.0009466	.0002196	-4.31	0.000	-.0013769	-.0005162
marstat	.1229319	.0341497	3.60	0.000	.0559998	.1898641
_cons	-3.435335	.6722574	-5.11	0.000	-4.752935	-2.117735
2						
leisure	.3491875	.082158	4.25	0.000	.1881607	.5102143
trust	.1649229	.1120676	1.47	0.141	-.0547257	.3845714
hardwork	.0857362	.0308965	2.77	0.006	.0251802	.1462923
relact	-.0063217	.0299049	-0.21	0.833	-.0649342	.0522908
inequality	-.0315506	.0199361	-1.58	0.114	-.0706247	.0075235
education	-.135429	.0444693	-3.05	0.002	-.2225873	-.0482708
empstat	.030377	.0257957	1.18	0.239	-.0201817	.0809357
sex	.0399614	.101181	0.39	0.693	-.1583498	.2382726
age	.0347128	.024987	1.39	0.165	-.0142607	.0836864
age2	-.0001909	.0002407	-0.79	0.428	-.0006626	.0002809
marstat	.2472412	.0377799	6.54	0.000	.173194	.3212884
_cons	-4.928417	.7753677	-6.36	0.000	-6.44811	-3.408724
3						
leisure	.3491875	.082158	4.25	0.000	.1881607	.5102143
trust	.1649229	.1120676	1.47	0.141	-.0547257	.3845714
hardwork	.2384445	.0857917	2.78	0.005	.0702958	.4065933
relact	.0526517	.0808417	0.65	0.515	-.105795	.2110984
inequality	-.0315506	.0199361	-1.58	0.114	-.0706247	.0075235
education	-.0323381	.1105173	-0.29	0.770	-.2489481	.1842719
empstat	.030377	.0257957	1.18	0.239	-.0201817	.0809357
sex	.0399614	.101181	0.39	0.693	-.1583498	.2382726
age	.1157843	.0577595	2.00	0.045	.0025778	.2289908
age2	-.0007733	.0005229	-1.48	0.139	-.0017981	.0002514
marstat	.2839792	.1073092	2.65	0.008	.0736571	.4943014
_cons	-11.30489	2.093108	-5.40	0.000	-15.40731	-7.202474

Table C.13 Sweden- Regression Results after Income is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.3931917	.0847559	4.64	0.000	.2270731	.5593103
trust	.1308273	.1034919	1.26	0.206	-.0720132	.3336677
hardwork	.0850199	.0227484	3.74	0.000	.0404339	.1296059
relact	.083191	.0267696	3.11	0.002	.0307235	.1356586
inequality	-.0742592	.0227265	-3.27	0.001	-.1188023	-.0297161
education	-.0025847	.0242558	-0.11	0.915	-.0501252	.0449559
empstat	.0642909	.0286096	2.25	0.025	.0082172	.1203647
sex	-.3007114	.1001714	-3.00	0.003	-.4970438	-.1043791
age	.1123739	.0213722	5.26	0.000	.0704851	.1542628
age2	-.001014	.0002193	-4.62	0.000	-.0014439	-.0005841
marstat	.2952406	.0297644	9.92	0.000	.2369034	.3535779
_cons	-4.07026	.6620644	-6.15	0.000	-5.367882	-2.772637
2						
leisure	.3931917	.0847559	4.64	0.000	.2270731	.5593103
trust	.1308273	.1034919	1.26	0.206	-.0720132	.3336677
hardwork	.0850199	.0227484	3.74	0.000	.0404339	.1296059
relact	.083191	.0267696	3.11	0.002	.0307235	.1356586
inequality	-.0742592	.0227265	-3.27	0.001	-.1188023	-.0297161
education	-.0025847	.0242558	-0.11	0.915	-.0501252	.0449559
empstat	.0642909	.0286096	2.25	0.025	.0082172	.1203647
sex	-.3007114	.1001714	-3.00	0.003	-.4970438	-.1043791
age	.1123739	.0213722	5.26	0.000	.0704851	.1542628
age2	-.001014	.0002193	-4.62	0.000	-.0014439	-.0005841
marstat	.2952406	.0297644	9.92	0.000	.2369034	.3535779
_cons	-7.737326	.6850955	-11.29	0.000	-9.080089	-6.394563
3						
leisure	.3931917	.0847559	4.64	0.000	.2270731	.5593103
trust	.1308273	.1034919	1.26	0.206	-.0720132	.3336677
hardwork	.0850199	.0227484	3.74	0.000	.0404339	.1296059
relact	.083191	.0267696	3.11	0.002	.0307235	.1356586
inequality	-.0742592	.0227265	-3.27	0.001	-.1188023	-.0297161
education	-.0025847	.0242558	-0.11	0.915	-.0501252	.0449559
empstat	.0642909	.0286096	2.25	0.025	.0082172	.1203647
sex	-.3007114	.1001714	-3.00	0.003	-.4970438	-.1043791
age	.1123739	.0213722	5.26	0.000	.0704851	.1542628
age2	-.001014	.0002193	-4.62	0.000	-.0014439	-.0005841
marstat	.2952406	.0297644	9.92	0.000	.2369034	.3535779
_cons	-9.778492	.7390144	-13.23	0.000	-11.22693	-8.330051

Table C.14 Switzerland- Regression Results after Income is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.2807181	.0695125	4.04	0.000	.144476	.4169601
trust	.2944057	.0901269	3.27	0.001	.1177602	.4710512
hardwork	.0227834	.0159461	1.43	0.153	-.0084703	.0540372
relact	.0343084	.0191445	1.79	0.073	-.0032141	.0718309
inequality	.0093735	.0158676	0.59	0.555	-.0217265	.0404735
education	-.0058406	.0225232	-0.26	0.795	-.0499853	.0383041
empstat	.0018218	.0282788	0.06	0.949	-.0536035	.0572472
sex	-.1354179	.0884729	-1.53	0.126	-.3088215	.0379857
age	.0685577	.0182802	3.75	0.000	.0327291	.1043862
age2	-.0006278	.0001799	-3.49	0.000	-.0009803	-.0002753
marstat	.1721964	.0261603	6.58	0.000	.1209232	.2234696
_cons	-2.74818	.5703886	-4.82	0.000	-3.866121	-1.630239
2						
leisure	.2807181	.0695125	4.04	0.000	.144476	.4169601
trust	.2944057	.0901269	3.27	0.001	.1177602	.4710512
hardwork	.0227834	.0159461	1.43	0.153	-.0084703	.0540372
relact	.0343084	.0191445	1.79	0.073	-.0032141	.0718309
inequality	.0093735	.0158676	0.59	0.555	-.0217265	.0404735
education	-.0058406	.0225232	-0.26	0.795	-.0499853	.0383041
empstat	.1713343	.0541133	3.17	0.002	.0652742	.2773944
sex	-.1354179	.0884729	-1.53	0.126	-.3088215	.0379857
age	.1795626	.0418656	4.29	0.000	.0975076	.2616177
age2	-.0016773	.0004201	-3.99	0.000	-.0025007	-.0008538
marstat	.3139686	.044275	7.09	0.000	.2271912	.4007461
_cons	-9.68254	1.133767	-8.54	0.000	-11.90468	-7.460397
3						
leisure	.2807181	.0695125	4.04	0.000	.144476	.4169601
trust	.2944057	.0901269	3.27	0.001	.1177602	.4710512
hardwork	.0227834	.0159461	1.43	0.153	-.0084703	.0540372
relact	.0343084	.0191445	1.79	0.073	-.0032141	.0718309
inequality	.0093735	.0158676	0.59	0.555	-.0217265	.0404735
education	-.0058406	.0225232	-0.26	0.795	-.0499853	.0383041
empstat	.4961466	.1343891	3.69	0.000	.2327488	.7595444
sex	-.1354179	.0884729	-1.53	0.126	-.3088215	.0379857
age	.4710032	.1393071	3.38	0.001	.1979663	.7440401
age2	-.0051719	.0014838	-3.49	0.000	-.0080801	-.0022637
marstat	.326784	.1078443	3.03	0.002	.115413	.5381551
_cons	-18.68174	3.585851	-5.21	0.000	-25.70988	-11.6536

Table C.15 Turkey- Regression Results after Income is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.1446437	.0531437	2.72	0.006	.040484	.2488035
trust	.2826325	.1721305	1.64	0.101	-.0547371	.620002
hardwork	.0167088	.0128637	1.30	0.194	-.0085037	.0419212
relact	.0916449	.0160025	5.73	0.000	.0602805	.1230093
inequality	-.0271599	.0123587	-2.20	0.028	-.0513825	-.0029373
education	.024209	.019476	1.24	0.214	-.0139632	.0623812
empstat	.0154226	.0237405	0.65	0.516	-.0311079	.0619531
sex	-.5744033	.095568	-6.01	0.000	-.7617131	-.3870934
age	.0718185	.0182281	3.94	0.000	.0360921	.107545
age2	-.0008302	.0002087	-3.98	0.000	-.0012393	-.0004211
marstat	.1681836	.0228484	7.36	0.000	.1234015	.2129656
_cons	-1.950071	.5765598	-3.38	0.001	-3.080108	-.8200349
2						
leisure	.3159995	.0778949	4.06	0.000	.1633283	.4686706
trust	.2826325	.1721305	1.64	0.101	-.0547371	.620002
hardwork	.0167088	.0128637	1.30	0.194	-.0085037	.0419212
relact	.0916449	.0160025	5.73	0.000	.0602805	.1230093
inequality	-.0271599	.0123587	-2.20	0.028	-.0513825	-.0029373
education	.024209	.019476	1.24	0.214	-.0139632	.0623812
empstat	.1225149	.0331745	3.69	0.000	.0574941	.1875357
sex	-.5744033	.095568	-6.01	0.000	-.7617131	-.3870934
age	.0836684	.0184797	4.53	0.000	.0474489	.119888
age2	-.0008302	.0002087	-3.98	0.000	-.0012393	-.0004211
marstat	.1681836	.0228484	7.36	0.000	.1234015	.2129656
_cons	-5.435795	.6155435	-8.83	0.000	-6.642238	-4.229352
3						
leisure	.5076344	.1289985	3.94	0.000	.254802	.7604667
trust	.2826325	.1721305	1.64	0.101	-.0547371	.620002
hardwork	.0167088	.0128637	1.30	0.194	-.0085037	.0419212
relact	.0916449	.0160025	5.73	0.000	.0602805	.1230093
inequality	-.0271599	.0123587	-2.20	0.028	-.0513825	-.0029373
education	.024209	.019476	1.24	0.214	-.0139632	.0623812
empstat	.1406069	.0540076	2.60	0.009	.0347541	.2464598
sex	-.5744033	.095568	-6.01	0.000	-.7617131	-.3870934
age	.0952675	.0195056	4.88	0.000	.0570372	.1334977
age2	-.0008302	.0002087	-3.98	0.000	-.0012393	-.0004211
marstat	.1681836	.0228484	7.36	0.000	.1234015	.2129656
_cons	-7.717342	.7435965	-10.38	0.000	-9.174764	-6.25992

Table C.16 West Germany- Regression Results after Income is Controlled

happiness	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1						
leisure	.4259732	.0827531	5.15	0.000	.2637801	.5881663
trust	.243376	.1269435	1.92	0.055	-.0054287	.4921808
hardwork	.0625318	.0255565	2.45	0.014	.0124419	.1126217
relact	.0663706	.0254761	2.61	0.009	.0164384	.1163028
inequality	-.0054185	.0278014	-0.19	0.845	-.0599082	.0490711
education	-.010914	.0236504	-0.46	0.644	-.0572679	.0354398
empstat	.0670123	.0308384	2.17	0.030	.0065702	.1274544
sex	-.1324633	.1107006	-1.20	0.231	-.3494325	.0845058
age	.0719423	.0198016	3.63	0.000	.0331319	.1107526
age2	-.0006737	.0001956	-3.44	0.001	-.0010571	-.0002903
marstat	.2140437	.0362605	5.90	0.000	.1429743	.285113
_cons	-2.693457	.678257	-3.97	0.000	-4.022816	-1.364097
2						
leisure	.4259732	.0827531	5.15	0.000	.2637801	.5881663
trust	.6068757	.1618724	3.75	0.000	.2896116	.9241399
hardwork	.0625318	.0255565	2.45	0.014	.0124419	.1126217
relact	.0663706	.0254761	2.61	0.009	.0164384	.1163028
inequality	-.1054183	.0324826	-3.25	0.001	-.169083	-.0417536
education	-.010914	.0236504	-0.46	0.644	-.0572679	.0354398
empstat	.0670123	.0308384	2.17	0.030	.0065702	.1274544
sex	-.1324633	.1107006	-1.20	0.231	-.3494325	.0845058
age	.0719423	.0198016	3.63	0.000	.0331319	.1107526
age2	-.0005415	.0001952	-2.77	0.006	-.0009242	-.0001589
marstat	.3524597	.0369223	9.55	0.000	.2800934	.424826
_cons	-6.767909	.7145538	-9.47	0.000	-8.168408	-5.367409
3						
leisure	.4259732	.0827531	5.15	0.000	.2637801	.5881663
trust	2.217835	.7197821	3.08	0.002	.8070879	3.628582
hardwork	.0625318	.0255565	2.45	0.014	.0124419	.1126217
relact	.0663706	.0254761	2.61	0.009	.0164384	.1163028
inequality	-.3224577	.0837763	-3.85	0.000	-.4866562	-.1582592
education	-.010914	.0236504	-0.46	0.644	-.0572679	.0354398
empstat	.0670123	.0308384	2.17	0.030	.0065702	.1274544
sex	-.1324633	.1107006	-1.20	0.231	-.3494325	.0845058
age	.0719423	.0198016	3.63	0.000	.0331319	.1107526
age2	-.0003997	.0002066	-1.94	0.053	-.0008046	5.15e-06
marstat	.5510103	.0975676	5.65	0.000	.3597813	.7422394
_cons	-12.41008	1.617719	-7.67	0.000	-15.58075	-9.239411

APPENDIX D

Table D.1 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Leisure Time in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived leisure time
WStat(4, 398.17)=26.808, p=0.0000

Table D.2 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 764.68)=14.004, p=0.0000

Table D.3 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 2553.79)=14.547, p=0.0000

Table D.4 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and the Frequency of Attending to Religious Services in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 2754.02)=16.796, p=0.0000

Table D.5 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 2372.43)=6.583, p=0.0000

Table D.6 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
WStat(8, 1336.48)=4.071, p=0.0001

Table D.7 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Employment Status in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
WStat(8, 1103.38)=29.958, p=0.0000

Table D.8 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Scales of Income in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 3205.98)=7.897, p=0.0000

Table D.9 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Sex in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(1, 9411.23)=8.154, p=0.0043

Table D.10 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(77, 640.25)=1.678, p=0.0005

Table D.11 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age^2 in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age^2
WStat(77, 640.25)=1.678, p=0.0005

Table D.12 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Marital Status in the 3rd Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(6, 412,88)=59.118, p=0.0000

Table D.13 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
WStat(4, 234.68)=55.914, p=0.0000

Table D.14 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 756.69)=104.227, p=0.0000

Table D.15 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 1975.38)=2.142, p=0.0188

Table D.16 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending the Religious Services in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 2358.29)=15.899, p=0.0000

Table D.17 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 2322.17)=4.465, p=0.0000

Table D.18 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the Highest Educational Level Attained
WStat(8, 1690.99)=20.828, p=0.0000

Table D.19 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Employment Status in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
WStat(8, 523.08)=28.454, p=0.0000

Table D.20 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Scales of Income in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 2591.74)=27.540, p=0.0000

Table D.21 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Sex in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(1, 8794.11)=4.106, p=0.0427

Table D.22 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Age in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(76, 1177.16)=1.618, p=0.0009

Table D.23 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Age^2 in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age^2
WStat(76, 1117.16)=1.618, p=0.0009

Table D.24 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Marital Status in the 5th Wave

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(6, 262.72)= 44.090, p=0.0000

Table D.25 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
WStat(4, 116.61)=17.296, p=0.0000

Table D.26 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 202. 34)=31.438, p=0.0000

Table D.27 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 533. 08)=2.833, p=0.0019

Table D.28 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending the Religious Services in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 235.80)=0.474, p=0.8530

Table D.29 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 375.33)=2.244, p=0.0150

Table D.30 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
WStat(8, 197.84)=3.803, p=0.0004

Table D.31 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Employment Status in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
WStat(8, 189.84)= 8.975, p=0.0000

Table D.32 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Scales of Income in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 268.03)=3.799, p=0.0001

Table D.33 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Sex in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(2, 5329.45)=0.108, p=0.8976

Table D.34 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(73, 367.00)= 1.508, p=0.0081

Table D.35 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age^2 in the East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age^2
WStat(74, 376.99)=1.490, p=0093

Table D.36 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Marital Status in The East Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(6, 66.71)= 9.483, p= 0.0000

Table D.37 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
WStat(4, 80.88)= 9.421, p= 0.0000

Table D.38 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 372.11)= 17.984, p= 0.0000

Table D.39 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Percived Hard work in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 474.33)= 1.661, p= 0.0871

Table D.40 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending the Religious Services in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 456.09)= 1.619, p= 0.1279

Table D.41 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 489.23)= 2.243, p= 0.0146

Table D.42 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
WStat(8, 289.41)= 1.716, p= 0.0943

Table D.43 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Employment Status in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
WStat(8, 179.98)= 7.469, p= 0.0000

Table D.44 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Scales of Income in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 464.52)= 3.063, p= 0.0009

Table D.45 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Sex in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(1, 1892.29)= 0.006, p= 0.9398

Table D.46 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age in the West Region of Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(74, 324.31)= 1.031, p= 0.4191

Table D.47 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age^2 in the West Region of the Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(74, 324.31)= 1.031, p= 0.4191

Table D.48 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Marital Status in the West Region of the Germany

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(6, 107.28)= 15.944, p= 0.0000

Table D.49 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
WStat(4, 50.38)= 10.493, p= 0.0000

Table D.50 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 78.50) = 12.819, p= 0.0000

Table D.51 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 245.96)= 2.817, p= 0.0025

Table D.52 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending to Religious Services in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 94.41)= 1.914, p=0.0757

Table D.53 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 317.84)=1.253, p=0.2566

Table D.54 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
WStat(8, 122.73)= 5.097, p= 0.0000

Table D.55 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Employment Status in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Wstat(7, 231.54)= 16.562, p= 0.0000

Table D.56 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 539.02)= 8.153, p= 0.0000

Table D.57 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Sex in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(1, 1982.04)= 19.109, p=0.0000

Table D.58 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(72, 317.44)= 1.461, p= 0.0151

Table D.59 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age^2 in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(72, 317.44)= 1.461, p= 0.0151

Table D.60 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Marital Status in Finland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(5, 182.99)= 16.977, p= 0.0000

Table D.61 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
WStat(4, 81.88)= 10.611, p= 0.0000

Table D.62 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 39.97)= 5.440, p= 0.0081

Table D.63 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 281.20)=2.318, p=0.0124

Table D.64 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending the Religious Services in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 123.51)= 1.895, p= 0.0758

Table D.65 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 267.14)= 2.189, p= 0.0188

Table D.66 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
WStat(8, 171.41)= 5.125, p= 0.0000

Table D.67 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Employment Status in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
WStat(8, 72.03)= 4.710, p= 0.0000

Table D.68 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Scales of Income in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 837.50)= 8.784, p= 0.0000

Table D.69 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Sex in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(1, 2128.72)= 1.801, p= 0.1798

Table D.70 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Age in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(61, 613.36)= 1.277, p= 0.0832

Table D.71 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Age^2 in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Wstat(61, 613.36)= 1.277, p= 0.0832

Table D.72 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Marital Status in Norway

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(6, 299.00)= 17.264, p= 0.0000

Table D.73 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
WStat(4, 69.84)= 10.369, p= 0.0000

Table D.74 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 157.85)= 2.607, p= 0.0770

Table D.75 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 602.93)= 1.023, p= 0.4221

Table D.76 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending to Religious Services in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 412. 07)= 1.041, p= 0.4017

Table D.77 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 672.00)= 1.680, p= 0.0814

Table D.78 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
WStat(8,353.35)=5.289, p= 0.0000

Table D.79 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Employment Status in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
WStat(8, 36.82)= 3.745, p= 0.0027

Table D.80 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 141.28)= 5.629, p= 0.0000

Table D.81 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Sex in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(1, 2391.74)= 2.028, p= 0.1546

Table D.82 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(74, 462.31)= 1.464, p= 0.0109

Table D.83 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age^2 in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(74, 462.31)= 1.464, p= 0.0109

Table D.84 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Marital Status in Spain

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(6, 48.97)= 10.324, p= 0.0000

Table D.85 Results of 'Wtest' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
WStat(4, 17.64)= 5.765, p= 0.0038

Table D.86 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 241.36)= 3.245, p= 0.0407

Table D.87 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 314.93)= 3.746, p= 0.0001

Table D.88 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending the Religious Services in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 242.28)= 3.071, p= 0.0041

Table D.89 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 380.11)= 2.885, p= 0.0017

Table D.90 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
WStat(8, 119.50)= 1.497, p= 0.1652

Table D.91 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Employment Status in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
WStat(8, 186.12)= 2.627, p= 0.0095

Table D.92 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Scales of Incomes in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 666.98)= 7.086, p= 0.0000

Table D.93 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Sex in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(1, 1993.41)= 5.272, p= 0.0218

Table D.94 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Age in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(67, 404.07)= 0.851, p=0.7892

Table D.95 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Age^2 in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(67, 404.07)= 0.851, p=0.7892

Table D.96 Results of ‘wtest’ for Happiness and Marital Status in Sweden

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(6, 389.78)= 19.649, p= 0.0000

Table D.97 Results of’wtest’ for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
WStat(4, 80.93)= 5.795, p= 0.0004

Table D.98 Results of’wtest’ for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 368.02)= 5.982, p= 0.0028

Table D.99 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 776.74)= 1.604, p= 0.1009

Table D.100 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending the Religious Services in Swizerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 341.00) = 1.651, p= 0.1201

Table D.101 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 594.38) = 1.023, p = 0.4221

Table D.102 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
WStat(8, 146.81) = 0.764, p = 0.6350

Table D.103 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Employment Status in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
WStat(8, 225.16)= 4.237, p = 0.0001

Table D.104 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 799.24)= 2.929, p= 0.0013

Table D.105 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Sex in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(1, 2431.84)= 1.335, p= 0.2480

Table D.106 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(72, 468.61)= 1.003, p= 0.4753

Table D.107 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age^2 in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(72, 468.61)= 1.003, p= 0.4753

Table D.108 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Marital Status in Switzerland

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(6, 92.23)= 12.757, p= 0.0000

Table D.109 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
WStat(4, 144.68)= 5.018, p= 0.0008

Table D.110 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
WStat(2, 51.19)= 1.825, p=0.1716

Table D.111 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
WStat(10, 734.83)= 1.924, p= 0.0390

Table D.112 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending to Religious Services in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
WStat(7, 525.56)= 5.510, p= 0.0000

Table D.113 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
WStat(10, 888.19)= 1.980, p= 0.0325

Table D.114 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
WStat(8, 542.43)= 4.463, p= 0.0000

Table D.115 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Employment Status in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
WStat(8, 383.83)= 8.751, p= 0.0000

Table D.116 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
WStat(10, 687.82)= 2.076, p= 0.0243

Table D.117 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Sex in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
WStat(1, 3243.31)= 20.640, p= 0.0000

Table D.118 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(67, 434.86)= 1.171, p= 0.1816

Table D.119 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Age^2 in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
WStat(67, 434.86)= 1.171, p= 0.1816

Table D.120 Results of 'wtest' for Happiness and Marital Status in Turkey

WTEST
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
WStat(6, 43.16)= 15.269, p= 0.0000

Table D.121 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
3541	.64998066
N2	S2
4564	.61424387
N3	S3
1091	.74102175
N4	S4
139	.81188649

Standard ANOVA Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 9331.00)= 40.374, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	2970	0.2688-0.3264
0.1000	0.1790	0.1557-0.2042
0.0500	0.1060	0.0876-0.1268
0.0100	0.0310	0.0212-0.0437

Table D.122 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
3274	.57161754
N2	S2
5864	.69443643

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 9136.00)= 24.447, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1870	0.1633-0.2126
0.1000	0.0840	0.0676-0.1029
0.0500	0.0490	0.0365-0.0643
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.123 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1513	.67118222
N2	S2
830	.6192047
N3	S3
1163	.61766922
N4	S4
948	.58730459
N5	S5
1305	.60328513
N6	S6
779	.63949835
N7	S7
816	.63877195
N8	S8
890	.66817319
N9	S9
370	.69213068
N10	S10
615	.80850464

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 9219.00) = 17.100, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2440	0.2177-0.2719
0.1000	0.1220	0.1024-0.1439
0.0500	0.0760	0.0603-0.0942
0.0100	0.0150	0.0084-0.0246

Table D.124 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending the Religious Services in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
532	.72483921
N2	S2
873	.68814516
N3	S3
693	.5976457
N4	S4
1373	.61316317
N5	S5
980	.61904013
N6	S6
1207	.61067736
N7	S7
3211	.65784574

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
F(6, 8862.00)= 18.332, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1970	0.1728-0.2230
0.1000	0.1030	0.0849-0.1235
0.0500	0.0610	0.0470-0.0777
0.0100	0.0110	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.125 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1434	.73008937
N2	S2
571	.68523622
N3	S3
1032	.65236658
N4	S4
900	.61775625
N5	S5
1182	.64772046
N6	S6
873	.61116034
N7	S7
1076	.58821821
N8	S8
1145	.61218601
N9	S9
367	.64143914
N10	S10
684	.68484098

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 9254.00)= 7.548, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1840	0.1604-0.2094
0.1000	0.0910	0.0739-0.1106
0.0500	0.0500	0.0373-0.0654
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.126 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
722	.70934182
N2	S2
2398	.68200272
N3	S3
572	.65824139
N4	S4
1974	.62416714
N5	S5
863	.66640961
N6	S6
955	.62356645
N7	S7
377	.61028951
N8	S8
1474	.62715185

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 9327.00)= 4.671, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1910	0.1671-0.2168
0.1000	0.0890	0.0721-0.1084
0.0500	0.0410	0.0296-0.0552
0.0100	0.0040	0.0011-0.0102

Table D.127 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
3618	.61282343
N2	S2
778	.60010314
N3	S3
647	.64661777
N4	S4
1579	.70184302
N5	S5
1244	.64647567
N6	S6
654	.61701363
N7	S7
675	.72790909
N8	S8
126	.64320624

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 9313.00)= 39.964, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2100	0.1851-0.2366
0.1000	0.1170	0.0977-0.1386
0.0500	0.0540	0.0408-0.0699
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.128 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Scales of Income in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
609	.71320301
N2	S2
1148	.70581788
N3	S3
1202	.68452144
N4	S4
1300	.65080816
N5	S5
972	.63741767
N6	S6
845	.63835192
N7	S7
685	.61512572
N8	S8
598	.64725769
N9	S9
465	.5816133
N10	S10
443	.58903807

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
F(9, 8257.00) = 7.147, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1840	0.1604-0.2094
0.1000	0.0890	0.0721-0.1084
0.0500	0.0420	0.0304-0.0564
0.0100	0.0130	0.0069-0.0221

Table D.129 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Sex in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
4591	.64311051
N2	S2
4827	.66112179

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 9416.00)= 8.143, p= 0.0043

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0060	0.0022-0.0130
0.2000	0.1980	0.1737-0.22410
0.1000	0.1170	0.0977-0.1386
0.0500	0.0580	0.0443-0.0743
0.0100	0.0110	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.130 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age in the 3rd Wave

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(76, 9311.00)= 1.896, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2460	0.2196-0.2739
0.1000	0.1290	0.1088-0.1514
0.0500	0.0790	0.0630-0.0975
0.0100	0.0190	0.0115-0.0295

Table D.131 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age^2 in the 3rd Wave

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age^2
F(77, 9340.00)= 1.878, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2340	0.2081-0.2615
0.1000	0.1220	0.1024-0.1439
0.0500	0.0690	0.0541-0.0865
0.0100	0.0230	0.0146-0.0343

Table D.132 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Marital Status in the 3rd Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
5429	.62604773
N2	S2
826	.56076109
N3	S3
475	.69913179
N4	S4
111	.79710782
N5	S5
550	.73753709
N6	S6
1986	.64463162

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 9371.00)= 82.835, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2790	0.2514-0.3079
0.1000	0.1730	0.1500-0.1979
0.0500	0.0930	0.0757-0.1127
0.0100	0.0290	0.0195-0.0414

Table D.133 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the 5th Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
3649	.63451725
N2	S2
4213	.61480635
N3	S3
791	.72491413
N4	S4
115	.90704507

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 8764.00)= 97.238, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3270	0.2980-0.3571
0.1000	0.1970	0.1728-0.2230
0.0500	0.1300	0.1098-0.1524
0.0100	0.0500	0.0373-0.0654

Table D.134 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the 5th Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
3533	.56290495
N2	S2
5001	.69396406

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 8532.00)= 188.621, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1720	0.1491-0.1968
0.1000	0.0900	0.0730-0.1095
0.0500	0.0480	0.0356-0.0631
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.135 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the 5th Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
940	.744605
N2	S2
1064	.6433512
N3	S3
1370	.59874982
N4	S4
1143	.57413679
N5	S5
1287	.60822147
N6	S6
725	.62607652
N7	S7
718	.60176963
N8	S8
753	.71692121
N9	S9
287	.71504796
N10	S10
396	.78608274

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 8673.00)= 1.986, p= 0.0369

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0369	0.0640	0.0496-0.0810
0.2000	0.2560	0.2292-0.2842
0.1000	0.1400	0.1191-0.1631
0.0500	0.0820	0.0657-0.1008
0.0100	0.0240	0.0154-0.0355

Table D.136 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Frequency of Attending the Religious Services in the 5th Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
288	.72930872
N2	S2
808	.66705799
N3	S3
642	.6206345
N4	S4
1551	.66278923
N5	S5
844	.62110692
N6	S6
1074	.62496316
N7	S7
2735	.63007474

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
F(6, 7935.00)= 2.523, p= 0.0193

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0193	0.0220	0.0138-0.0331
0.2000	0.2330	0.2071-0.2605
0.1000	0.1150	0.0959-0.1364
0.0500	0.0630	0.0487-0.0799
0.0100	0.0130	0.0069-0.0221

Table D.137 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the 5th Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1111	.72753447
N2	S2
766	.68275774
N3	S3
1186	.64825892
N4	S4
912	.60705632
N5	S5
1172	.597727
N6	S6
769	.63052392
N7	S7
1019	.5810048
N8	S8
955	.63695008
N9	S9
345	.65820378
N10	S10
402	.76397985

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 8627.00)= 3.985, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2190	0.1937-0.2459
0.1000	0.1150	0.0959-0.1364
0.0500	0.0590	0.0452-0.0754
0.0100	0.0110	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.138 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the 5th Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
458	.72100717
N2	S2
2091	.67924684
N3	S3
235	.64212888
N4	S4
1942	.62872875
N5	S5
396	.59072661
N6	S6
1202	.6620869
N7	S7
563	.56877244
N8	S8
1699	.59369028

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 8578.00)= 24.025, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1800	0.1567-0.2052
0.1000	0.0980	0.0803-0.1181
0.0500	0.0500	0.0373-0.0654
0.0100	0.0040	0.0011-0.0102

Table D.139 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in the 5th Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
3346	.57506859
N2	S2
694	.61033136
N3	S3
606	.61820346
N4	S4
2040	.67433798
N5	S5
920	.70459664
N6	S6
588	.62808996
N7	S7
479	.77659237
N8	S8
107	.86549073

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 8772.00)= 40.651, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3140	0.2853-0.3438
0.1000	0.1770	0.1538-0.2021
0.0500	0.1110	0.0922-0.1321
0.0100	0.0300	0.0203-0.0426

Table D.140 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Sex in the 5th Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
4210	.63195604
N2	S2
4600	.66361076

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 8808.00)= 4.089, p= 0.0432

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0432	0.0350	0.0245-0.0483
0.2000	0.2020	0.1775-0.2282
0.1000	0.1000	0.0821-0.1203
0.0500	0.0400	0.0287-0.0541
0.0100	0.0040	0.0011-0.0102

Table D.141 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Age in the 5th Wave

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(76, 8733.00)= 1.710, p= 0.0001

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0001	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2130	0.1880-0.2397
0.1000	0.1150	0.0959-0.1364
0.0500	0.0550	0.0417-0.0710
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.142 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Age^2 in the 5th Wave

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(76, 8733.00)= 1.710, p= 0.0001

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0001	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2210	0.1956-0.2480
0.1000	0.1250	0.1051-0.1471
0.0500	0.0600	0.0461-0.0766
0.0100	0.0120	0.0062-0.0209

Table D.143 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Marital Status in the 5th Wave

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
4839	.62410527
N2	S2
718	.56730914
N3	S3
628	.70989197
N4	S4
142	.74822068
N5	S5
589	.72069645
N6	S6
1873	.6412549

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 8783.00)= 57.799, p=0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2620	0.2350-0.2904
0.1000	0.1520	0.1303-0.1758
0.0500	0.0940	0.0766-0.1138
0.0100	0.0240	0.0154-0.0355

Table D.144 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
664	.70630163
N2	S2
1097	.64106286
N3	S3
233	.71473116
N4	S4
36	.86189163

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 2026.00)= 28.328, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3050	0.2766-0.3346
0.1000	0.1890	0.1652-0.2147
0.0500	0.1170	0.0977-0.1386
0.0100	0.0310	0.0212-0.0437

Table D.145 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
531	.57435757
N2	S2
1451	.71962899

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 1980.00)= 51.303, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1540	0.1322-0.1779
0.1000	0.0640	0.0496-0.0810
0.0500	0.0230	0.0146-0.0343
0.0100	0.0020	0.0002-0.0072

Table D.146 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
163	.8044883
N2	S2
198	.67166638
N3	S3
249	.70285726
N4	S4
227	.66495562
N5	S5
300	.60676235
N6	S6
215	.62623924
N7	S7
193	.71451002
N8	S8
250	.66321599
N9	S9
91	.78958422
N10	S10
137	.73604083

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 2013.00)= 3.030, p= 0.0013

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0013	0.0020	0.0002-0.0072
0.2000	0.2350	0.2090-0.2625
0.1000	0.1340	0.1135-0.1567
0.0500	0.0770	0.0612-0.0953
0.0100	0.0220	0.0138-0.0331

Table D.147 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Frequency of Attending to Religious Services in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
21	1
N2	S2
64	.69703883
N3	S3
97	.55747807
N4	S4
210	.63890713
N5	S5
188	.72494364
N6	S6
147	.70568866
N7	S7
674	.70387411

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
F(6, 1394.00)= 0.496, p= 0.8119

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.8119	0.8260	0.8011-0.8490
0.2000	0.2690	0.2417-0.2976
0.1000	0.1650	0.1425-0.1895
0.0500	0.0970	0.0794-0.1170
0.0100	0.0360	0.0253-0.0495

Table D.148 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
353	.76191288
N2	S2
192	.69353706
N3	S3
357	.70857406
N4	S4
246	.65045834
N5	S5
284	.67930424
N6	S6
190	.65868235
N7	S7
166	.56646585
N8	S8
149	.67569017
N9	S9
29	.65465367
N10	S10
50	.78246081

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 2006.00)= 1.810, p= 0.0618

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0618	0.0680	0.0532-0.0854
0.2000	0.2120	0.1870-0.2387
0.1000	0.1080	0.0894-0.1289
0.0500	0.0510	0.0382-0.0665
0.0100	0.0110	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.149 Results of'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
158	.7586211
N2	S2
454	.76233363
N3	S3
25	.61101007
N4	S4
761	.69904047
N5	S5
37	.53552479
N6	S6
150	.53024834
N7	S7
41	.76827335
N8	S8
398	.59804457

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 2016.00)= 3.616, p= 0.0007

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0007	0.0010	0.0000-0.0056
0.2000	0.1590	0.1369-0.1832
0.1000	0.0810	0.0648-0.0997
0.0500	0.0410	0.0296-0.0552
0.0100	0.0090	0.0041-0.0170

Table D.150 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
708	.62023562
N2	S2
122	.5499689
N3	S3
71	.57303596
N4	S4
659	.71343333
N5	S5
37	.79977477
N6	S6
85	.53399819
N7	S7
312	.78130519
N8	S8
46	.80727369

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 2032.00)= 13.087, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2000	0.1756-0.2262
0.1000	0.1000	0.0821-0.1203
0.0500	0.0550	0.0417-0.0710
0.0100	0.0150	0.0084-0.0246

Table D.151 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Scales of Income in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
95	.82377875
N2	S2
212	.74379307
N3	S3
296	.69138408
N4	S4
427	.66764998
N5	S5
355	.64220667
N6	S6
188	.66260332
N7	S7
127	.71785134
N8	S8
90	.65304434
N9	S9
20	.615587
N10	S10
19	.41885391

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
F(9, 1819.00)= 3.958, p= 0.0001

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0001	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1660	0.1434-0.1905
0.1000	0.0850	0.0685-0.1040
0.0500	0.0330	0.0228-0.0460
0.0100	0.0010	0.0000-0.0056

Table D.152 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Sex in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
923	.67606145
N2	S2
1135	.70206803

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 2056.00)= 0.214, p= 0.6434

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.6434	0.6240	0.5931-0.6541
0.2000	0.1830	0.1595-0.2084
0.1000	0.0890	0.0721-0.1084
0.0500	0.0410	0.0296-0.0552
0.0100	0.0100	0.0048-0.0183

Table D.153 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age in the East Region of Germany

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(72, 1979.00)= 1.574, p= 0.0017

		1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests
Nominal P Value	**Simulated P Value**	**Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]**
0.0017	0.0160	0.0092-0.0259
0.2000	0.3410	0.3116-0.3713
0.1000	0.2110	0.1861-0.2376
0.0500	0.1390	0.1181-0.1620
0.0100	0.0530	0.0399-0.0688

Table D.154 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age^2 in the East Region of Germany

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(73, 1984.00)= 1.556, p= 0.0021

		1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests
Nominal P Value	**Simulated P Value**	**Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]**
0.0021	0.0180	0.0107-0.0283
0.2000	0.3020	0.2737-0.3315
0.1000	0.1750	0.1519-0.2000
0.0500	0.1050	0.0867-0.1257
0.0100	0.0460	0.0339-0.0609

Table D.155 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Marital Status in the East Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1164	.6635198
N2	S2
180	.59690905
N3	S3
145	.75015962
N4	S4
43	.7896058
N5	S5
201	.76033509
N6	S6
319	.67986387

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 2046.00)= 12.614, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2630	0.2359-0.2915
0.1000	0.1530	0.1312-0.1768
0.0500	0.0780	0.0621-0.0964
0.0100	0.0170	0.0099-0.0271

Table D.156 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the West Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
546	.65634292
N2	S2
1061	.61639321
N3	S3
287	.68772531
N4	S4
33	.83257544

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 1923.00)= 13.924, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3020	0.2737-0.3315
0.1000	0.1730	0.1500-0.1979
0.0500	0.0980	0.0803-0.1181
0.0100	0.0350	0.0245-0.0483

Table D.157 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the West Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
746	.577025
N2	S2
1069	.69747221

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 1813.00)= 25.681, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1890	0.1652-0.2147
0.1000	0.0880	0.0712-0.1073
0.0500	0.0430	0.0313-0.0575
0.0100	0.0070	0.0028-0.0144

Table D.158 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the West Region of West Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
97	.72879529
N2	S2
145	.69446361
N3	S3
207	.61947811
N4	S4
258	.59674662
N5	S5
314	.57515496
N6	S6
242	.61380225
N7	S7
225	.60339648
N8	S8
254	.70235932
N9	S9
92	.70963609
N10	S10
71	.82369339

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 1895.00)= 1.829, p= 0.0586

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0586	0.0980	0.0803-0.1181
0.2000	0.2670	0.2398-0.2956
0.1000	0.1520	0.1303-0.1758
0.0500	0.0830	0.0666-0.1019
0.0100	0.0220	0.0138-0.0331

Table D.159 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending the Religious Services in the West Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
41	.66258913
N2	S2
215	.66351497
N3	S3
247	.67423534
N4	S4
322	.61486554
N5	S5
184	.60446483
N6	S6
311	.64099163
N7	S7
460	.68020844

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending the religious services
F(6, 1773.00)= 1.989, p= 0.0641

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0641	0.0700	0.0550-0.0876
0.2000	0.2080	0.1832-0.2345
0.1000	0.1100	0.0913-0.1311
0.0500	0.0590	0.0452-0.0754
0.0100	0.0130	0.0069-0.0221

Table D.160 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the West Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
150	.77430779
N2	S2
120	.73792803
N3	S3
230	.68979102
N4	S4
238	.65761232
N5	S5
310	.63084412
N6	S6
193	.61395687
N7	S7
274	.56393814
N8	S8
251	.60744387
N9	S9
68	.58421588
N10	S10
49	.601161

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 1873.00)= 2.697, p= 0.0041

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0041	0.0060	0.0022-0.0130
0.2000	0.2300	0.2042-0.2574
0.1000	0.1210	0.1014-0.1428
0.0500	0.0620	0.0479-0.0788
0.0100	0.0140	0.0077-0.0234

Table D.161 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the West Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
149	.72358871
N2	S2
520	.67992234
N3	S3
54	.7258817
N4	S4
502	.60431933
N5	S5
53	.67936623
N6	S6
239	.67919499
N7	S7
56	.59869987
N8	S8
331	.57711238

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 1896.00)= 1.846, p= 0.0747

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0747	0.1050	0.0867-0.1257
0.2000	0.2420	0.2157-0.2698
0.1000	0.1370	0.1163-0.1599
0.0500	0.0700	0.0550-0.0876
0.0100	0.0170	0.0099-0.0271

Table D.162 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in The West Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
674	.61253124
N2	S2
296	.59954935
N3	S3
60	.58705431
N4	S4
433	.70016247
N5	S5
215	.59568107
N6	S6
143	.6436317
N7	S7
81	.73786479
N8	S8
16	.70415431

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 1910.00)= 10.204, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2150	0.1899-0.2418
0.1000	0.1110	0.0922-0.1321
0.0500	0.0720	0.0568-0.0898
0.0100	0.0180	0.0107-0.0283

Table D.163 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Scales of Income in the West Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
52	.85968882
N2	S2
90	.66891009
N3	S3
157	.67538798
N4	S4
289	.65437043
N5	S5
280	.63049936
N6	S6
269	.62853062
N7	S7
231	.60324115
N8	S8
171	.66867602
N9	S9
55	.67818338
N10	S10
63	.634799

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
F(9, 1647.00) = 3.337, p= 0.0005

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0005	0.0050	0.0016-0.0116
0.2000	0.2490	0.2225-0.2770
0.1000	0.1500	0.1284-0.1737
0.0500	0.0780	0.0621-0.0964
0.0100	0.0210	0.0130-0.0319

Table D.164 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Sex in the West Region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
871	.63138628
N2	S2
1072	.66225636

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 1941.00)= 0.006, p= 9401

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.9401	0.9350	0.9179-0.9495
0.2000	0.1960	0.1718-0.2220
0.1000	0.0880	0.0712-0.1073
0.0500	0.0470	0.0347-0.0620
0.0100	0.0090	0.0041-0.0170

Table D.165 Results of 'sianova' for Happiness and Age in the West Region of Germany

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(73, 1868.00)= 1.275, p= 0.0609

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0609	0.2520	0.2254-0.2801
0.2000	0.4620	0.4308-0.4935
0.1000	0.3300	0.3009-0.3601
0.0500	0.2330	0.2071-0.2605
0.0100	0.0920	0.0748-0.1116

Table D.166 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age^2 in the West Region of Germany

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age^2
F(74, 1868.00)= 1.258, p= 0.0708

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0708	0.2520	0.2254-0.2801
0.2000	0.4260	0.3951-0.4573
0.1000	0.3080	0.2795-0.3376
0.0500	0.2010	0.1766-0.2272
0.0100	0.0880	0.0712-0.1073

Table D.167 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Marital Status in the West region of Germany

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1066	.55435473
N2	S2
131	.57004911
N3	S3
120	.73316777
N4	S4
36	.90632695
N5	S5
159	.78558791
N6	S6
420	.69235104

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 1926.00)= 25.215, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3770	0.3469-0.4079
0.1000	0.2420	0.2157-0.2698
0.0500	0.1590	0.1369-0.1832
0.0100	0.0570	0.0435-0.0732

Table D.168 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
769	.57982314
N2	S2
1055	.57291526
N3	S3
133	.66218019
N4	S4
11	.70064902

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 1964.00)= 13.762, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3000	0.2717-0.3295
0.1000	0.1780	0.1548-0.2031
0.0500	0.0990	0.0812-0.1192
0.0100	0.0240	0.0154-0.0355

Table D.169 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1055	.52797151
N2	S2
903	.65296549

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 1956.00)= 24.238, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2100	0.1851-0.2366
0.1000	0.1010	0.0830-0.1214
0.0500	0.0530	0.0399-0.0688
0.0100	0.0090	0.0041-0.0170

Table D.170 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
223	.68146032
N2	S2
339	.53579682
N3	S3
428	.56953222
N4	S4
306	.58459818
N5	S5
261	.56011975
N6	S6
117	.59283966
N7	S7
132	.54769087
N8	S8
100	.68718427
N9	S9
33	.68257535
N10	S10
33	.64988345

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 1962.00)= 2.609, p= 0.0054

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0054	0.0120	0.0062-0.0209
0.2000	0.2420	0.2157-0.2698
0.1000	0.1310	0.1107-0.1535
0.0500	0.0720	0.0568-0.0898
0.0100	0.0210	0.0130-0.0319

Table D.171 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
32	.75067174
N2	S2
72	.59322596
N3	S3
149	.58201784
N4	S4
425	.61872375
N5	S5
396	.53615004
N6	S6
551	.5601812
N7	S7
356	.64359236

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
F(6, 1974.00)= 2.286, p= 0.0334

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0034	0.0560	0.0426-0.0721
0.2000	0.2540	0.2273-0.2822
0.1000	0.1350	0.1144-0.1578
0.0500	0.0730	0.0577-0.0909
0.0100	0.0200	0.0123-0.0307

Table D.172 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
249	.57462311
N2	S2
153	.66582763
N3	S3
313	.57279181
N4	S4
262	.5390352
N5	S5
309	.5538311
N6	S6
200	.63354707
N7	S7
241	.61983693
N8	S8
154	.57804817
N9	S9
51	.65079135
N10	S10
35	.75814903

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 1957.00)= 1.446, p= 0.1629

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.1629	0.2290	0.2033-.2563
0.2000	0.2720	0.2446-0.3007
0.1000	0.1470	0.1256-0.1705
0.0500	0.0780	0.0621-0.0964
0.0100	0.0150	0.0084-0.0246

Table D. 173 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
46	.56679451
N2	S2
473	.63988221
N3	S3
197	.58698899
N4	S4
660	.55551058
N5	S5
13	.43852901
N6	S6
229	.57084483
N7	S7
75	.52436149
N8	S8
283	.5972982

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 1968.00)= 5.753, p= 0.0000

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1620	0.1397-0.1863
0.1000	0.0750	0.0594-0.0931
0.0500	0.0390	0.0279-0.0529
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.174 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
816	.52600914
N2	S2
90	.54463679
N3	S3
80	.51558006
N4	S4
494	.64114803
N5	S5
90	.52419609
N6	S6
170	.5355773
N7	S7
227	.67087996
N8	S8
21	.50709254

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 1980.00)= 17.709, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1790	0.1557-0.2042
0.1000	0.0870	0.0703-0.1062
0.0500	0.0430	0.0313-0.0575
0.0100	0.0090	0.0041-0.0170

Table D.175 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
303	.63797456
N2	S2
296	.62805825
N3	S3
288	.59611434
N4	S4
247	.5457871
N5	S5
180	.52079654
N6	S6
174	.5085476
N7	S7
138	.58945382
N8	S8
83	.52079868
N9	S9
66	.48014179
N10	S10
54	.49596554

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
F(9, 1819.00)= 8.794, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1340	0.1135-0.1567
0.1000	0.0610	0.0470-0.0777
0.0500	0.0240	0.0154-0.0355
0.0100	0.0030	0.0006-0.0087

Table D.176 Results of'simanova' for Happiness and Sex in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
962	.58329189
N2	S2
1026	.59493095

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 1986.00)=19.085, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1900	0.1661-0.2157
0.1000	0.1020	0.0839-0.1224
0.0500	0.0540	0.0408-0.0699
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.177 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age in Finland

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(71, 1914.00)= 1.650, p= 0.0006

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	**Simulated P Value**	**Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]**
0.0006	0.0020	0.0002-0.0072
0.2000	0.2240	0.1985-0.2511
0.1000	0.1320	0.1116-0.1546
0.0500	0.0690	0.0541-0.0865
0.0100	0.0190	0.0115-0.0295

Table D.178 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age^2 in Finland

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age^2
F(72, 1915.00)= 1.635, p= 0.0007

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	**Simulated P Value**	**Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]**
0.0007	0.0010	0.0000-0.0056
0.2000	0.2120	0.1870-0.2387
0.1000	0.1190	0.0996-0.1407
0.0500	0.0630	0.0487-0.0799
0.0100	0.0100	0.0048-0.0183

Table D.179 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Marital Status in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
889	.55170035
N2	S2
320	.56181383
N3	S3
233	.69406241
N4	S4
21	.79582244
N5	S5
136	.61246139
N6	S6
389	.54463166

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 1982.00)= 21.137, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2930	0.2649-0.3223
0.1000	0.1810	0.1576-0.2063
0.0500	0.1100	0.0913-0.1311
0.0100	0.0420	0.0304-0.0564

Table D.180 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Norway

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
936	.55215651
N2	S2
1060	.53413761
N3	S3
139	.6248762
N4	S4
12	.98473191

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 2143.00)= 20.094, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.4440	0.4129-0.4754
0.1000	0.3170	0.2882-0.3468
0.0500	0.2330	0.2071-0.2605
0.0100	0.0990	0.0812-0.1192

Table D.181 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Norway

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1485	.54000646
N2	S2
647	.59444284

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 2130.00)= 11.890, p= 0.0006

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0006	0.0020	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2310	0.2052-0.2584
0.1000	0.1040	0.0858-0.1246
0.0500	0.0550	0.0417-0.0710
0.0100	0.0130	0.0069-0.0221

Table D.182 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Finland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
127	.61335385
N2	S2
166	.57782435
N3	S3
331	.53964835
N4	S4
317	.5313139
N5	S5
381	.52734327
N6	S6
199	.59633589
N7	S7
255	.48975927
N8	S8
231	.57247221
N9	S9
59	.54435092
N10	S10
69	.76973885

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 2125.00)= 2.928, p= 0.0019

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0019	0.0060	0.0022-0.0130
0.2000	0.2820	0.2543-0.3110
0.1000	0.1530	0.1312-0.1768
0.0500	0.0880	0.0712-0.1073
0.0100	0.0210	0.0130-0.0319

Table D.183 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Norway

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
30	.74663997
N2	S2
72	.61029249
N3	S3
148	.53016216
N4	S4
359	.54200619
N5	S5
310	.55963874
N6	S6
329	.54375255
N7	S7
890	.56129122

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
F(6, 2131.00)= 2.142, p= 0.0459

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0459	0.0620	0.0479-0.0788
0.2000	0.2820	0.2225-0.2770
0.1000	0.1530	0.1181-0.1620
0.0500	0.0880	0.0514-0.0832
0.0100	0.0210	0.0084-0.0246

Table D.184 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Norway

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
172	.63412523
N2	S2
121	.59451115
N3	S3
254	.56530237
N4	S4
260	.56351817
N5	S5
353	.51141047
N6	S6
262	.54118764
N7	S7
353	.52147728
N8	S8
258	.55706269
N9	S9
49	.65789294
N10	S10
53	.59570307

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 2125.00)= 2.681, p= 0.0043

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0043	0.0100	0.0048-0.0183
0.2000	0.2730	0.2456-0.3018
0.1000	0.1530	0.1312-0.1768
0.0500	0.0870	0.0703-0.1062
0.0100	0.0190	0.0115-0.0295

Table D.185 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Norway

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
20	.80131471
N2	S2
333	.57713091
N3	S3
168	.527542
N4	S4
428	.52298921
N5	S5
76	.56862408
N6	S6
274	.56322652
N7	S7
356	.54605144
N8	S8

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 2126.00)= 7.773, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	**Simulated P Value**	**Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]**
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3060	0.2775-0.3356
0.1000	0.1800	0.1567-0.2052
0.0500	0.1020	0.0839-0.1224
0.0100	0.0330	0.0228-0.0460

Table D.186 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in Norway

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	**S1**
1137	.52434772
N2	S2
218	.54548335
N3	S3
179	.50220782
N4	S4
359	.62822902
N5	S5
64	.77408421
N6	S6
140	.52677536
N7	S7
35	.5826627
N8	S8
10	.52704626

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 2134.00)= 6.436, p= 0.0000

	1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests	
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2640	0.2369-0.2925
0.1000	0.1520	0.1303-0.1758
0.0500	0.0860	0.0694-0.1051
0.0100	0.0310	0.0212-0.0437

Table D.187 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Norway

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
219	.64646184
N2	S2
179	.60995239
N3	S3
226	.5088982
N4	S4
170	.57020217
N5	S5
206	.50767261
N6	S6
223	.52424741
N7	S7
208	.51992536
N8	S8
202	.53554505
N9	S9
149	.514615
N10	S10
197	.52710634

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
F(9, 1969.00)= 10.632, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2040	0.1794-0.2303
0.1000	0.1050	0.0867-0.1257
0.0500	0.0590	0.0452-0.0754
0.0100	0.0170	0.0099-0.0271

Table D.188 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Sex in Norway

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1061	.52537382
N2	S2
1087	.58920705

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 2146.00)= 1.796, p= 0.1804

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.1804	0.1910	0.1671-0.2168
0.2000	0.2060	0.1813-0.2324
0.1000	0.1100	0.0913-0.1311
0.0500	0.0560	0.0426-0.0721
0.0100	0.0120	0.0062-0.0209

Table D.189 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age in Norway

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(61, 2086.00)= 1.276, p= 0.0758

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0758	0.0790	0.0630-0.0975
0.2000	0.2140	0.1890-0.2407
0.1000	0.1080	0.0894-0.1289
0.0500	0.0540	0.0408-0.0699
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.190 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age^2 in Norway

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(61, 2086.00)= 1.276, p= 0.0758

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0758	0.0910	0.0739-0.1106
0.2000	0.2430	0.2167-0.2708
0.1000	0.1200	0.1005-0.1418
0.0500	0.0550	0.0417-0.0710
0.0100	0.0110	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.191 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Marital Status in Norway

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1115	.54867053
N2	S2
349	.52608722
N3	S3
129	.58111429
N4	S4
31	.61870486
N5	S5
92	.6375531
N6	S6
431	.51179367

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 2141.00)= 22.944, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2510	0.2244-0.2791
0.1000	0.1470	0.1256-0.1705
0.0500	0.0880	0.0712-0.1073
0.0100	0.0180	0.0107-0.0283

Table D.192 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
884	.55749577
N2	S2
1182	.49771065
N3	S3
292	.62597662
N4	S4
29	.71058154

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 2383.00)= 16.345, p= 0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3210	0.2921-0.3509
0.1000	0.1920	0.1680-0.2178
0.0500	0.1130	0.0940-0.1343
0.0100	0.0240	0.0154-0.0355

Table D.193 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
581	.52220559
N2	S2
1760	.55356723

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 2339.00)= 4.879, p= 0.0273

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0273	0.0220	0.0138-0.0331
0.2000	0.1890	0.1652-0.2147
0.1000	0.0950	0.0775-0.1149
0.0500	0.0450	0.0330-0.0598
0.0100	0.0030	0.0006-0.0087

Table D.194 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
337	.55138975
N2	S2
284	.5202322
N3	S3
391	.54637396
N4	S4
295	.4600994
N5	S5
341	.52498388
N6	S6
222	.5804311
N7	S7
160	.45969638
N8	S8
144	.65845764
N9	S9
86	.5983333
N10	S10
83	.71403378

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 2333.00)= 0.991, p= 0.4453

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.4453	0.5290	0.4975-0.5603
0.2000	0.2810	0.2533-0.3100
0.1000	0.1550	0.1331-0.1789
0.0500	0.0960	0.0785-0.1160
0.0100	0.0250	0.0162-0.0367

Table D.195 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
103	.65562916
N2	S2
381	.62561476
N3	S3
219	.52824378
N4	S4
349	.48307317
N5	S5
94	.59558737
N6	S6
258	.55085534
N7	S7
949	.51562101

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
F(6, 2346.00)= 0.871, p= 0.5154

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.5154	0.5960	0.5648-0.6266
0.2000	0.2790	0.2514-0.3079
0.1000	0.1470	0.1256-0.1705
0.0500	0.0750	0.0594-0.0931
0.0100	0.0210	0.0130-0.0319

Table D.196 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
240	.61992711
N2	S2
130	.54186672
N3	S3
244	.58024961
N4	S4
206	.49597001
N5	S5
308	.58756667
N6	S6
220	.49245027
N7	S7
294	.48325253
N8	S8
369	.52596927
N9	S9
146	.53679007
N10	S10
197	.57621276

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 2344.00)= 2.023, p= 0.0333

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0333	0.0370	0.0262-0.0506
0.2000	0.2060	0.1813-0.2324
0.1000	0.1080	0.0894-0.1289
0.0500	0.0580	0.0443-0.0743
0.0100	0.0110	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.197 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
460	.58974773
N2	S2
901	.54600197
N3	S3
49	.59476173
N4	S4
221	.46767145
N5	S5
146	.42877159
N6	S6
217	.54843104
N7	S7
124	.5071609
N8	S8
249	.52511728

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 2359.00)=5.623, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1730	0.1500-0.1979
0.1000	0.0950	0.0775-0.1149
0.0500	0.0540	0.0408-0.0699
0.0100	0.0130	0.0069-0.0221

Table D. 198 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
777	.51289284
N2	S2
121	.5
N3	S3
134	.42828143
N4	S4
484	.55603331
N5	S5
475	.58461285
N6	S6
182	.58050513
N7	S7
219	.55850393
N8	S8
6	.75277263

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 2390.00)= 4.860, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2510	0.2244-0.2791
0.1000	0.1340	0.1135-0.1567
0.0500	0.0900	0.0730-0.1095
0.0100	0.0230	0.0146-0.0343

Table D.199 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
93	.7444669
N2	S2
268	.5565334
N3	S3
346	.53293943
N4	S4
425	.50434297
N5	S5
406	.51717448
N6	S6
225	.46175131
N7	S7
141	.53148109
N8	S8
59	.57819325
N9	S9
15	.53452247
N10	S10
7	.53452247

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
F(9, 1975.00)= 9.195, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2640	0.2369-0.2925
0.1000	0.1360	0.1154-0.1588
0.0500	0.0810	0.0648-0.0997
0.0100	0.0160	0.0092-0.0259

Table D.200 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Sex in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1180	.51953614
N2	S2
1221	.56811041

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 2399.00)= 2.021, p= 0.1552

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.1552	0.1550	0.1331-0.1789
0.2000	0.1970	0.1728-0.2230
0.1000	0.0970	0.0794-0.1170
0.0500	0.0590	0.0452-0.0754
0.0100	0.0150	0.0084-0.0246

Table D.201 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age in Spain

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(74, 2326.00)= 1.743, p= 0.0001

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0001	0.0010	0.0000-0.0056
0.2000	0.2750	0.2475-0.3038
0.1000	0.1520	0.1303-0.1758
0.0500	0.0890	0.0721-0.1084
0.0100	0.0220	0.0138-0.0331

Table D.202 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age^2 in Spain

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(74, 2326.00)= 1.743, p= 0.0001

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0001	0.0010	0.0000-0.0056
0.2000	0.2900	0.2620-0.3192
0.1000	0.1820	0.1585-0.2073
0.0500	0.1040	0.0858-0.1246
0.0100	0.0290	0.0195-0.0414

Table D.203 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Marital Status in Spain

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1443	.50722504
N2	S2
87	.47074249
N3	S3
27	.60151756
N4	S4
42	.53723168
N5	S5
176	.64744753
N6	S6
621	.57120395

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 2390.00)= 17.076, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2420	0.2157-0.2698
0.1000	0.1470	0.1256-0.1705
0.0500	0.0910	0.0739-0.1106
0.0100	0.0270	0.0179-0.0390

Table D.204 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1053	.58658898
N2	S2
846	.57058221
N3	S3
85	.66883403
N4	S4
10	.63245553

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 1990.00)=9.548, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2540	0.2273-0.2822
0.1000	0.1470	0.1256-0.1705
0.0500	0.0660	0.0514-0.0832
0.0100	0.0170	0.0099-0.0271

Table D.205 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1221	.56102234
N2	S2
687	.63063651

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 1906.00)= 6.410, p= 0.0114

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0114	0.0120	0.0062-0.0209
0.2000	0.2020	0.1775-0.2282
0.1000	0.1020	0.0839-0.1224
0.0500	0.0600	0.0461-0.0766
0.0100	0.0110	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.206 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Haed work in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
151	.57566547
N2	S2
214	.57913345
N3	S3
366	.55072105
N4	S4
270	.54179573
N5	S5
338	.58210033
N6	S6
174	.56239778
N7	S7
210	.63819349
N8	S8
171	.63022155
N9	S9
47	.56411332
N10	S10
36	.81455022

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 1967.00)= 4.536, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2770	0.2495-0.3059
0.1000	0.1650	0.1425-0.1895
0.0500	0.0900	0.0730-0.1095
0.0100	0.0250	0.0162-0.0367

Table D.207 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
20	.59824306
N2	S2
50	.54360849
N3	S3
115	.53582561
N4	S4
225	.5612486
N5	S5
297	.57280087
N6	S6
353	.61592364
N7	S7
937	.59076208

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
F(6, 1990.00)= 3.308, p= 0.0030

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0030	0.0010	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1770	0.1538-0.2021
0.1000	0.0870	0.0703-0.1062
0.0500	0.0390	0.0279-0.0529
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D. 208 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
94	.73073518
N2	S2
71	.58450824
N3	S3
167	.57963663
N4	S4
173	.62183464
N5	S5
275	.5646522
N6	S6
239	.57447064
N7	S7
363	.53977454
N8	S8
369	.59902269
N9	S9
119	.59228772
N10	S10
106	.5543263

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 1966.00)= 3.321, p= 0.0005

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0005	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2500	0.2234-0.2781
0.1000	0.1370	0.1163-0.1599
0.0500	0.0710	0.0559-0.0887
0.0100	0.0140	0.0077-0.0234

Table D.209 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
21	.59761429
N2	S2
374	.56396168
N3	S3
16	.7187953
N4	S4
109	.57587707
N5	S5
379	.57350492
N6	S6
305	.61448222
N7	S7
222	.60153824
N8	S8
560	.58812845

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 1978.00)= 1.577, p= 0.1377

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	**Simulated P Value**	**Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]**
0.1377	0.1800	0.1567-0.2052
0.2000	0.2500	0.2234-0.2781
0.1000	0.1320	0.1116-0.1546
0.0500	0.0720	0.0568-0.0898
0.0100	0.0140	0.0077-0.0234

Table D.210 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1040	.57031006
N2	S2
190	.58404005
N3	S3
95	.57417351
N4	S4
356	.6148451
N5	S5
13	.63042516
N6	S6
174	.55454582
N7	S7
89	.67797691
N8	S8
34	.61834693

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 1983.00)= 3.869, p= 0.0003

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0003	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2540	0.2273-0.2822
0.1000	0.1320	0.1116-0.1546
0.0500	0.0700	0.0550-0.0876
0.0100	0.0210	0.0130-0.0319

Table D.211 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
73	.66580993
N2	S2
163	.62010789
N3	S3
217	.66451907
N4	S4
293	.60351413
N5	S5
204	.55343294
N6	S6
212	.5351584
N7	S7
213	.50526506
N8	S8
152	.57528389
N9	S9
138	.56950986
N10	S10
228	.54283619

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
F(9, 1883.00)= 8.482, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2060	0.1813-0.2324
0.1000	0.1090	0.0904-0.1300
0.0500	0.0530	0.0399-0.0688
0.0100	0.0050	0.0016-0.0116

Table D.212 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Sex in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1009	.58200449
N2	S2
989	.59140712

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 1996.00)= 5.273, p= 0.0218

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0218	0.0280	0.0187-0.0402
0.2000	0.2110	0.1861-0.2376
0.1000	0.1020	0.0839-0.1224
0.0500	0.0610	0.0470-0.0777
0.0100	0.0120	0.0062-0.0209

Table D.213 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age in Sweden

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(67, 1930.00)= 0.924, p= 0.6514

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.6514	0.6880	0.6583-0.7166
0.2000	0.2740	0.2466-0.3028
0.1000	0.1440	0.1228-0.1673
0.0500	0.0900	0.0730-0.1095
0.0100	0.0360	0.0253-0.0495

Table D.214 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Age^2 in Sweden

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(67, 1930.00)= 0.924, p= 0.6514

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.6514	0.7110	0.6818-0.7389
0.2000	0.2690	0.2417-0.2976
0.1000	0.1680	0.1453-0.1926
0.0500	0.1010	0.0830-0.1214
0.0100	0.0300	0.0203-0.0426

Table D.215 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Marital Status in Sweden

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
989	.55088091
N2	S2
340	.57027411

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 1988.00)= 25.057, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2720	0.2446-0.3007
0.1000	0.1580	0.1359-0.1821
0.0500	0.0930	0.0757-0.1127
0.0100	0.0240	0.0154-0.0355

Table D.216 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Switzerland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
938	.59807199
N2	S2
1219	.58663613
N3	S3
239	.58134568
N4	S4
28	.7723735

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 2420.00)=8.174, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2700	0.2427-0.2987
0.1000	0.1620	0.1397-0.1863
0.0500	0.1040	0.0858-0.1246
0.0100	0.0320	0.0220-0.0449

Table D.217 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Switzerland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1020	.56910509
N2	S2
1288	.6144529

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 2306.00)=11.476, p= 0.0007

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0007	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1880	0.1642-0.2136
0.1000	0.0950	0.0775-0.1149
0.0500	0.0380	0.0270-0.0518
0.0100	0.0110	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.218 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Switzerland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
281	.60225385
N2	S2
273	.56497175
N3	S3
313	.57763398
N4	S4
207	.58292866
N5	S5
332	.57675368
N6	S6
166	.57437044
N7	S7
202	.59603143
N8	S8
285	.63857931
N9	S9
130	.62276435
N10	S10
180	.64899772

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 2359.00)= 1.878, p= 0.0508

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0508	0.0480	0.0356-0.0631
0.2000	0.2080	0.1832-0.2345
0.1000	0.1130	0.0940-0.1343
0.0500	0.0480	0.0356-0.0631
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.219 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
69	.55514336
N2	S2
279	.58469516
N3	S3
298	.57756549
N4	S4
522	.61153799
N5	S5
215	.56323653
N6	S6
248	.60405177
N7	S7
781	.60792452

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
F(6, 2405.00)= 1.869, p= 0.0825

	1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests	
Nominal P Value	**Simulated P Value**	**Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]**
0.0825	0.0780	0.0621-0.0964
0.2000	0.1890	0.1652-0.2147
0.1000	0.0920	0.0748-0.1116
0.0500	0.0410	0.0296-0.0552
0.0100	0.0060	0.0022-0.0130

Table D.220 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Switzerland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
518	.61620426
N2	S2
295	.6102246
N3	S3
384	.61155021
N4	S4
223	.55654311
N5	S5
239	.58766192
N6	S6
147	.57273173
N7	S7
157	.60355794
N8	S8
219	.53705239
N9	S9
86	.6465736
N10	S10
127	.5956766

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 2385.00)= 1.071, p= 0.3806

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.2806	0.3800	0.3498-0.4109
0.2000	0.1890	0.1652-0.2147
0.1000	0.0920	0.0785-0.1160
0.0500	0.0410	0.0330-0.0598
0.0100	0.0060	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.221 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
84	.63281828
N2	S2
236	.6601724
N3	S3
84	.59677368
N4	S4
1102	.58522731
N5	S5
42	.5436787
N6	S6
375	.61036795
N7	S7
22	.50323629
N8	S8
484	.58459538

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 2421.00)= 0.900, p= 0.5053

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
	1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests	
0.5053	0.4730	0.4417-0.5045
0.2000	0.1930	0.1690-0.2189
0.1000	0.0900	0.0730-0.1095
0.0500	0.0440	0.0321-0.0586
0.0100	0.0140	0.0077-0.0234

Table D.222 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in Switzerland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
969	.56253928
N2	S2
357	.62529379
N3	S3
183	.58586812
N4	S4
533	.60517317
207	.58405399
N6	S6
98	.55470747
N7	S7
34	.78078526
N8	S8
28	.86066294

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 2401.00)= 6.905, p= 0.0000

	1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests	
Nominal P Value	**Simulated P Value**	**Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]**
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3380	0.3087-0.3683
0.1000	0.2110	0.1861-0.2376
0.0500	0.1410	0.1200-0.1641
0.0100	0.0480	0.0356-0.0631

Table D.223 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Switzerland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
108	.69482338
N2	S2
140	.70568824
N3	S3
193	.65524817
N4	S4
227	.59702456
N5	S6
363	.60002434
N6	S6
273	.56224781
N7	S7
281	.54751366
N8	S8
194	.53006405
N9	
145	.5428921
N10	S10
132	.5589782

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
F(9, 2046.00)= 3.684, p= 0.0001

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0001	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2180	0.1928-0.2449
0.1000	0.1160	0.0968-0.1375
0.0500	0.0580	0.0443-0.0743
0.0100	0.0120	0.0062-0.0209

Table D.224 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Sex in Switzerland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1161	.58399963
N2	S2
1281	.60814005

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 2440.00)= 1.330, p= 0.2489

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.2489	0.2600	0.2331-0.2884
0.2000	0.2090	0.1842-0.2355
0.1000	0.1040	0.0858-0.1246
0.0500	0.0580	0.0443-0.0743
0.0100	0.0170	0.0099-0.0271

Table D.225 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age in Switzerland

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(71, 2362.00)= 1.100, p= 0.2681

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.2681	0.2760	0.2485-0.3048
0.2000	0.2120	0.1870-0.2387
0.1000	0.0990	0.0812-0.1192
0.0500	0.0470	0.0347-0.0620
0.0100	0.0160	0.0092-0.0259

Table D.226 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age^2 in Switzerland

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age^2
F(72, 2369.00)=1.088, p= 0.2881

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.2881	0.3070	0.2785-0.3366
0.2000	0.2160	0.1909-0.2428
0.1000	0.1150	0.0959-0.1364
0.0500	0.0590	0.0452-0.0754
0.0100	0.0110	0.0055-0.0196

Table D.227 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Marital Status in Switzerland

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1344	.55626446
N2	S2
130	.51344478
N3	S3
268	.67984074
N4	S4
18	.85749292
N5	S6
202	.63417059
N6	S6
469	.59708804

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 2425.00)= 18.681, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3100	0.2814-0.3397
0.1000	0.1920	0.1680-0.2178
0.0500	0.1130	0.0940-0.1343
0.0100	0.0370	0.0262-0.0506

Table D.228 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1400	.73963755
N2	S2
1257	.71027869
N3	S3
474	.86078072
N4	S4
95	.92676997

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
F(3, 3222.00)= 8.406, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3240	0.2950-0.3540
0.1000	0.1930	0.1690-0.2189
0.0500	0.1050	0.0867-0.1257
0.0100	0.0320	0.0220-0.0449

Table D.229 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
168	.71791208
N2	S2
3060	.75896668

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
F(1, 3226.00)= 3.119, p= 0.0775

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0775	0.0760	0.0603-0.0942
0.2000	0.1890	0.1652-0.2147
0.1000	0.1020	0.0839-0.1224
0.0500	0.0480	0.0356-0.0631
0.0100	0.0030	0.0006-0.0087

Table D.230 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1074	.75088507
N2	S2
275	.79917014
N3	S3
248	.66257834
N4	S4
211	.56939948
N5	S6
325	.71845829
N6	S6
169	.78652716
N7	S7
157	.72950244
N8	S8
208	.81557161
N9	
119	.75186706
N10	S10
402	.85784417

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
F(9, 3178.00)= 2.133, p= 0.0239

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0239	0.0180	0.0107-0.0283
0.2000	0.1710	0.1482-0.1958
0.1000	0.0870	0.0703-0.1062
0.0500	0.0450	0.0330-0.0598
0.0100	0.0050	0.0016-0.0116

Table D.231 Results of ‘simanova’ for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
504	.73625875
N2	S2
548	.74367094
N3	S3
62	.78608334
N4	S4
512	.79143679
N5	S6
140	.76659441
N6	S6
84	.76601285
N7	S7
899	.75781643

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
F(6, 2742.00)= 5.323, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2110	0.1861-0.2376
0.1000	0.1100	0.0913-0.1311
0.0500	0.0520	0.0391-0.0676
0.0100	0.0140	0.0077-0.0234

Table D.232 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
769	.7934491
N2	S2
255	.74224931
N3	S3
269	.70204717
N4	S4
204	.7094422
N5	S6
276	.70263946
N6	S6
191	.76995814
N7	S7
247	.66598332
N8	S8
331	.74667317
N9	
164	.73991299
N10	S10
469	.81473142

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
F(9, 3165.00)= 2.200, p= 0.0194

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0194	0.0170	0.0099-0.0271
0.2000	0.1930	0.1690-0.2189
0.1000	0.0860	0.0694-0.1051
0.0500	0.0390	0.0279-0.0529
0.0100	0.0070	0.0028-0.0144

Table D.233 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
242	.82055694
N2	S2
1198	.74216723
N3	S3
214	.7729494
N4	S4
133	.75773525
N5	S6
513	.74799216
N6	S6
368	.79714495
N7	S7
44	.65672648
N8	S8
389	.71181351

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
F(7, 3093.00)= 5.404, p= 0.0000

	1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests	
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.1900	0.1661-0.2157
0.1000	0.0990	0.0812-0.1192
0.0500	0.0480	0.0356-0.0631
0.0100	0.0050	0.0016-0.0116

Table D.234 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Employment Status in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
843	.71914107
N2	S2
78	.75117844
N3	S3
451	.76184577
N4	S4
301	.86426532
N5	S6
1063	.69795716
N6	S6
250	.75921118
N7	S7
157	.93023854
N8	S8
72	.78610289

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
F(7, 3207.00)= 10.668, p= 0.0000

	1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests	
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2530	0.2263-0.2811
0.1000	0.1390	0.1181-0.1620
0.0500	0.0720	0.0568-0.0898
0.0100	0.0170	0.0099-0.0271

Table D.235 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Scales of Income in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
418	.73554832
N2	S2
761	.81922024
N3	S3
560	.7531665
N4	S4
455	.73292142
N5	S6
236	.73197782
N6	S6
252	.73243248
N7	S7
130	.73457098
N8	S8
172	.71108645
N9	
110	.73492634
N10	S10
87	.75474089

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
F(9, 3171.00)= 1.781, p= 0.0667

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0667	0.0570	0.0435-0.0732
0.2000	0.1800	0.1567-0.2052
0.1000	0.0940	0.0766-0.1138
0.0500	0.0430	0.0313-0.0575
0.0100	0.0080	0.0035-0.0157

Table D.236 Results of 'simanova' for Hppiness and Sex in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
1634	.77236491
N2	S2
1616	.7353279

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
F(1, 3248.00)= 20.628, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.2090	0.1842-0.2355
0.1000	0.1180	0.0987-0.1396
0.0500	0.0640	0.0496-0.0810
0.0100	0.0140	0.0077-0.0234

Table D.237 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age in Turkey

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
F(66, 3170.00)= 1.132, p= 0.2198

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.2198	0.2590	0.2321-0.2873
0.2000	0.2370	0.2109-0.2646
0.1000	0.1270	0.1070-0.1492
0.0500	0.0590	0.0452-0.0754
0.0100	0.0180	0.0107-0.0283

Table D.238 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Age^2 in Turkey

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age^2
F(67, 3182.00)= 1.127, p= 0.2261

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests		
Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.2261	0.2670	0.2398-0.2956
0.2000	0.2350	0.2090-0.2625
0.1000	0.1260	0.1061-0.1482
0.0500	0.0700	0.0550-0.0876
0.0100	0.0220	0.0138-0.0331

Table D.239 Results of 'simanova' for Happiness and Marital status in Turkey

Information about Sample Sizes and Standard Deviations

N1	S1
2258	.72848827
N2	S2
7	.48795003
N3	S3
37	.91697377
N4	S4
9	12.360.331
N5	S6
97	.8208254
N6	S6
818	.76301664

Standard ANOVA F Tests
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
F(5, 3220.00)= 22.184, p= 0.0000

1000 Simulated ANOVA F Tests

Nominal P Value	Simulated P Value	Simulated P Value [%95 Confidence Interval]
0.0000	0.0000	0.0000-0.0037
0.2000	0.3560	0.3263-0.3866
0.1000	0.2300	0.2042-0.2574
0.0500	0.1480	0.1266-0.1715
0.0100	0.0700	0.0550-0.0876

Table D.240 Fstar Test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, 615.32)= 24.243, p= 0.0000

Table D.241 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(4, 615.32)= 24.243, p= 0.0000

Table D.242 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 6007.80)= 15.002, p= 0.0000

Table D.243 Fstar Test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending relgious services
Fstar(7, 5763.05)= 17.753, p= 0.0000

Table D.244 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 5301.36)= 6.772, p= 0.0000

Table D.245 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 3725.64)= 4.459, p= 0.0000

Table D.246 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(8, 2996.16)= 35.005, p= 0.0000

Table D.247 Fstar test for Happiness and Scales of Income in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 8253.31)= 7.511, p= 0.0000

Table D.248 Fstar Test for Happiness and Sex in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
Fstar(1, 9411.23)= 8.154, p= 0.0043

Table D.249 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(77, .)= , p= .

Table D.250 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(77, .)= , p= .

Table D.251 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in the 3rd Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(6, 528.61)=54.126, p= 0.0000

Table D.252 Fstar Test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, 433.98)= 55.649, p= 0.0000

Table D.253 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(2, 1179.95)= 105.030, p= 0.0000

Table D.254 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 3724.70)= 2.077, p= 0.0231

Table D.255 Fstar test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
Fstar(7, 4816.50)= 16.463, p= 0.0000

Table D.256 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 5389.55)= 4.378, p= 0.0000

Table D.257 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 3504.56)= 20.900, p= 0.0000

Table D.258 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(8, 1074.96)= 30.542, p= 0.0000

Table D.259 Fstar Test for Happiness and Scales of Income in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 6650.56)= 27.626, p= 0.0000

Table D.260 Fstar Test for Happiness and Sex in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
Fstar(1, 8794.11)= 4.106, p= 0.0427

Table D.261 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(76, .)= ., p= .

Table D.262 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(76, .)= ., p= .

Table D.263 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in the 5th Wave

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(6, 1229.48)= 47.506, p= 0.0000

Table D.264 Fstar Test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, 185.28)= 17.417, p= 0.0000

Table D.265 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(2, 285.01)= 30.381, p= 0.0000

Table D.266 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 1185.43)= 3.035, p= 0.0008

Table D.267 Fstar Test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
Fstar(7, 242.08)= 0.420, p= 0.8894

Table D.268 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 916.47)= 2.105, p= 0.0218

Table D.269 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 475.02)= 3.348, p= 0.0010

Table D.270 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(8, 419.42)= 11.703, p= 0.0000

Table D.271 Fstar Test for Happiness and Scales of Income in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 956.88)= 4.143, p= 0.0000

Table D.272 Fstar Test for Happiness and Sex in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
Fstar(2, .)= ., p= .

Table D.273 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(73, .)= ., p= .

Table D.274 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(74, .)= ., p= .

Table D.275 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in the East Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(6, 54.90)= 8.136, p= 0.0000

Table D.276 Fstar Test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in the West Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, 174.00)= 10.529, p= 0.0000

Table D.277 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in the West Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(2, 724.98)= 18.711, p= 0.0000

Table D.278 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in the West region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 839.78)= 1.514, p= 0.1292

Table D.279 Fstar Test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in the West Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
Fstar(7, 1020.82)= 1.751, p= 0.0937

Table D.280 Fstar test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in the West Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 1234.90)= 2.454, p= 0.0067

Table D.281 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in the West Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 639.00)= 1.817, p= 0.709

Table D.282 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in the West Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(8, 365.88) = 8.511, p= 0.0000

Table D.283 Fstar Test for Happiness and Scales of Income in the West region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 894.02)= 2.950, p=0.0012

Table D.284 Fstar Test for Happiness and Sex in the West region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
Fstar(1, 1892.29)= 0.006, p= 0.9398

Table D.285 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in the West Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(74, .)= ., p= .

Table D.286 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in the West Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(74, .)= ., p= .

Table D.287 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in the West Region of Germany

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(6, 191.91)= 15.456, p= 0.0000

Table D.288 Fstar test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, 77.85)= 9.460, p= 0.0000

Table D.289 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(2, 136.31)= 13.512, p= 0.0000

Table D.290 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Hard Work in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 500.21)= 2.684, p= 0.0033

Table D.291 Fstar Test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
Fstar(7, 123.31)= 1.693, p= 0.1168

Table D.292 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 678.45)= 1.251, p= 0.2550

Table D.293 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 217.64)= 5.196, p= 0.0000

Table D.294 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(7, 677.06)= 18.751, p= 0.0000

Table D.295 Fstar Test for Happiness and Scales of Income in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 1559.42)= 8.429, p= 0.0000

Table D.296 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(72, .)= ., p= .

Table D.297 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(72, .)= ., p= .

Table D.298 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in Finland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(5, 197.89)= 17.006, p= 0.0000

Table D.299 Fstar Test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, .)= . , p= .

Table D.300 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(2, 55.60)= 5.319, p= 0.0077

Table D.301 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 585.03)= 2.392, p= 0.0087

Table D.302 Fstar Test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
Fstar(7, 240.30)= 1.774, p= 0.0932

Table D.303 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 491.53)= 2.217, p= 0.0158

Table D.304 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 218.39)= 5.803, p= 0.0000

Table D.305 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(8, 107.22)= 4.667, p= 0.0001

Table D.306 Fstar Test for Happiness and Scales of Income in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 2044.72)= 9.645, p= 0.0000

Table D.307 Fstar Test for Happiness and Sex in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
Fstar(1, 2128.72)= 1.801, p= 0.1798

Table D.308 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(61, 1485.41)= 1.268, p= 0.0823

Table D.309 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(61, 1485.41)= 1.268, p= 0.0823

Table D.310 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in Norway

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(6, .)= .,p= .

Table D.311 Fstar Test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, 146.08)= 10.441, p= 0.0000

Table D.312 Fstar test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(2, 275.72)= 2.827, p= 0.0609

Table D.313 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 1224.91)= 1.084, p= 0.3713

Table D.314 Fstar Test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
Fstar(7, 917.82)= 0.961, p= 0.4585

Table D.315 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 1923.74)= 1.896, p= 0.0415

Table D.316 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 544.73)= 5.123, p= 0.0000

Table D.317 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(8, 55.87)= 3.932, p= 0.0010

Table D.318 Fstar Test for Happiness and Scales of Income in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 372.11)= 7.594, p= 0.0000

Table D.319 Fstar Test for Happiness and Sex in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
Fstar(1, 2391.74)= 2.028, p= 0.1546

Table D.320 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(74, .)= ., p= .

Table D.321 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(74, .)= ., p= .

Table D.322 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in Spain

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(6, 174.25)= 13.901, p= 0.0000

Table D.323 Fstar Test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, 50.10)= 6.880, p= 0.0002

Table D.324 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(2, 394.00)= 3.349, p= 0.0361

Table D.325 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 632.41)= 3.870, p= 0.0000

Table D.326 Fstar Test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
Fstar(7, .)= ., p= .

Table D.327 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 1047.18)= 3.001, p= 0.0010

Table D.328 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 251.75)= 1.409, p= 0.1929

Table D.329 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(8, 305.76)= 3.947, p= 0.0002

Table D.330 Fstar Test for Happiness and Scales of Income in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 1513.04)= 7.656, p= 0.0000

Table D.331 Fstar Test for Happiness and Sex in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
Fstar(1, 1993.41)= 5.272, p= 0.0218

Table D.332 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(67, 383.96)= 0.890, p= 0.7150

Table D.333 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age^2
Fstar(67, 383.96)= 0.890, p= 0.7150

Table D.334 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in Sweden

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(6, 529.15)= 22.408, p= 0.0000

Table D.335 Fstar Test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, 104.82)= 4.609, p=0.0018

Table D.336 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(2, 523.37)=5.850, p= 0.0031

Table D.337 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 1945.96)=1.703, p= 0.0746

Table D.338 Fstar Test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
Fstar(7, 878.91)= 1.727, p=0.0993

Table D.339 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 1364.54)=0.966, p=0.4714

Table D.340 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 491.29)=0.842, p= 0.5656

Table D.341 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in Swizerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(8, 313.29)=5.471, p=0.0000

Table D.342 Fstar Test for Happiness and Scales of Income in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 1774.19)= 3.306, p= 0.0003

Table D.343 Fstar Test for Happiness and Sex in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
Fstar(1, 2431.84)=1.335, p= 0.2480

Table D.344 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(72, .)= ., p= .

Table D.345 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(72, .)= ., p= .

Table D.346 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in Switzerland

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(6, 133.80)= 12.347, p= 0.0000

Table D.347 Fstar Test for Happiness and Importance of Leisure Time in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is importance of leisure time
Fstar(4, 299.40)= 5.572, p= 0.0002

Table D.348 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Trust in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived trust
Fstar(2, 88.63)= 1.993, p= 0.1424

Table D.349 Fstar test for Happiness and Perceived Hard work in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived hard work
Fstar(10, 1739.47)=1.959, p= 0.0341

Table D.350 Fstar Test for Happiness and Frequency of Attending Religious Services in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is frequency of attending religious services
Fstar(7, 1151.82)= 5.365, p= 0.0000

Table D.351 Fstar Test for Happiness and Perceived Inequality in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is perceived inequality
Fstar(10, 2073.57)= 2.046, p= 0.0257

Table D.352 Fstar Test for Happiness and the Highest Educational Level Attained in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is the highest educational level attained
Fstar(8, 1526.12)= 4.797, p= 0.0000

Table D.353 Fstar Test for Happiness and Employment Status in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is employment status
Fstar(8, 1088.22)= 8.952, p= 0.0000

Table D.354 Fstar Test for Happiness and Scales of Income in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is scales of income
Fstar(10, 1861.74)=2.035, p= 0.0267

Table D.355 Fstar Test for Happiness and Sex in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is sex
Fstar(1, 3243.31)=20.640, p= 0.0000

Table D.356 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(67, .)= ., p= .

Table D.357 Fstar Test for Happiness and Age^2 in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is age
Fstar(67, .)= ., p= .

Table D.358 Fstar Test for Happiness and Marital Status in Turkey

Fstar Test
Dependent Variable is happiness and Independent Variable is marital status
Fstar(6, 59.27)= 13.710, p= 0.0000