

INTERACTION AMONG HAPPINESS, LIVING ENVIRONMENT AND MENTAL HEALTH

Piyali Das Gupta*

[The study analyses the possible link between happiness, living environment and mental health using a primary data collected from an Indian state. The findings indicate that happiness of an individual depends on living environment and mental health of an individual, both of which are proxied by various socio-economic factors and genetic influence. The individual happiness is measured with help of Oxford happiness Questionnaire and a micro level happiness function is estimated using ordered logistic regression technique. It is found that living environment proxied by family income, employment, greater availability of modern urban amenities and family discord plays a vital role in determining happiness of an individual. The study also confirms the significance of mental health in deriving happiness in life. Mental health is measured by different forms of education and genetic factors. Education enhances happiness whereas employment related anxiety and work pressure reduce it. The person having family history of depression is less happy than others. Adequate explanations of the findings related to the interaction among happiness, mental health and living environment are provided on the basis of cultural, social and economic scenario of India.]

JEL Classification: D60, I3, O1

Keywords: happiness level; living environment; mental health; India; OLOGIT regression.]

Introduction

The inherent natures of rational human beings always compel them to drive for happiness. Happiness is a mental state, the concept of which goes on changing for different stages of life of a person (e.g. playing with toys make a child happy; enjoying cartoons or reading fairy tales make boys or girls happy; getting importance from friends make adolescents happy; good jobs make young happy and free of physical sufferings or disabilities make an aged person happy).

For person to person such as luxury private car make a rich man happy whereas food makes a hungry poor man happy and even for country to country such as peace and harmony make an Indian happy and joy and enthusiasm make an American happiness differ as it is an outcome of complex human mind and upbringing of the individuals in different socio-economic environment and culture.

In happiness research, happiness is

* Associate Professor, Department of Economics, Sarsuna College, Kolkata;
E-mail: pdg2009@rediffmail.com

synonymous with life satisfaction (Diener et al., 1985; Pavot et al., 1991; 2008; Lucas et al., 2004), subjective wellbeing (Costa et al., 1980; Diener, 2000; Diener et al., 2009; Steel et al., 2008; Veenhoven, 2008) and quality of life (Kaplan and Anderson, 1988; Strine et al., 2008; Myers, 2003). Life satisfaction refers to qualities or circumstances of life, such as personal wealth, family relationships, community participation, employment, goal achievement etc. that may cause satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Subjective well-being refers to the moods or feelings that people have of joy or elation. Quality of life refers to the absence of depression, anxiety, insecurity etc. which does not in itself constitute happiness or wellbeing. All these concepts of happiness are often mixed up and referred as 'Hedonic well-being'. In the literature, happiness and life satisfaction have been treated synonymously by the psychologists. Feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life refer to emotional well-being and it is considered as an important component of positive mental health (Keyes, 2007).

Literature Review

In the existing literature happiness has been linked to various economic and social variables. In regard to the impact of absolute income on happiness there is a fair amount of disagreement among studies. Blanchflower and Oswald (2004), Easterlin (1995), Frey and Stutzer (2002), and Di Tella et al. (2006) show in their studies that richer individuals reported higher happiness. Lakshmanasamy (2010) shows with the

Indian data, that absolute income does affect happiness positively but only till a threshold level but it is largely affected by the relative income of the individual. But, Kahneman et al. (2006) in their study explained that higher income individuals are associated with no greater happiness, on average, but with slightly higher tension and stress. However, many other studies (Easterlin, 2003; Duesenberry, 1949; Frank, 1999) relative income rather than absolute income has been identified as a determinant of happiness. Apart from the absolute and relative income, the influence of material standard of living (Scitovsky, 1976; Easterlin, 1995; 2003), unemployment (Clark and Oswald, 1994; Goldsmith et al., 1996; Winkelmann and Winkelmann, 1998; Stutzer and Lalive, 2001) and inflation rate (Di Tella et al., 2001) on happiness have been also explored.

There also exists substantial literature dealing with impact of education on happiness. Cutler et al. (2006) and Gerdtham and Johannesson (2001), found a positive association and Clark and Oswald (1994) found a negative association between education and happiness. Regarding age, a U-shaped association between age and the happiness level has been observed (Clark and Oswald 1996; Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004). Studies of Nomaguchi and Milkie (2003), Evenson and Simon (2005) and Stanca (2012) show that parenthood by itself has a substantial and enduring positive effect on life satisfaction, but these positive effects are suppressed by the financial and time costs of children. Again attitudes, family

background and racism are found by Bertrand and Mullainathan (2001) as an important determinant of happiness.

Regarding gender differences in happiness there is no clear consensus across countries. For example, Frey and Stutzer (2002) fail to find any significant gender difference whereas Gerdtham and Johannesson (2001) use Swedish data, find higher life satisfaction among females and Clark et al. (1994; 1996) using UK data find higher happiness among men. Regarding life events, marriage leads to an improvement in self-reported well-being while the experience of divorce or separation has a significant adverse effect (Clark et al., 2002; Easterlin, 2003). Apart from this, previous studies (Lykken and Tellegen, 1996; Hamer, 1996) also found that reported happiness is largely affected by genetic factors. The literature (Bruner, 1990; Inglehart and Klingemann, 2000), also acknowledge the evidence regarding impact of culture and history on happiness.

The impression given by the existing literature on the economics of happiness is that it only focuses on developed nations. This is not very far from the truth. There remains little research that draws upon happiness data from developing countries, compared to that of advanced industrialized nations simply because adequate data are more readily available for these countries. A few studies (Graham and Pettinato, 2002; Ravallion and Lokshin, 2001, 2002; Namazie and Sanfey, 2001; Lelkes, 2002; Powdthavee, 2007b) are based on happiness data taken from developing economies such as Latin

America, Kyrgyzstan, South Africa etc. and find that socioeconomic variables such as favourable relative income, differences and change in status, household income, health status age, gender, education levels, employment and marital status having similar effects on happiness to those in advanced industrialised nations. Knight, Song and Gunatilaka (2007) explain the basic reasons why most rural-dwellers in China are happy despite their low relative income, poverty and low socio-economic status.

In India, among the above-said factors related to happiness, I found only two studies – Lakshmanasamy (2010) found mainly absolute and relative income of the individuals as the important contributors to individual's happiness, where as Chakraborty et al. (2018) observed different aspects of social life and the personal situation as the significant stimulus to the happiness. Therefore, the present paper tries to explore the interaction among living environment, mental health and happiness level of the individual including genetic influences which has been largely unexplored in the existing literature.

Measures of Happiness

Self reported measures of happiness are generally used by both economists and psychologists on the basis of their belief that these techniques of measuring happiness reflect at least four factors – circumstances, aspirations, comparisons with others and a person's baseline happiness¹ (Warr, 1990; Chen and Spector, 1991). There are two ways to

measure individual happiness. The first method asks individuals to report their own well being or happiness whereas the second methods infer happiness from the actions of people. In regard to the first method, different variants have been developed to measure happiness –for instance, the three point scale of General Social Surveys (Diener,1984), World Values Surveys (Inglehart et. al. 2000), and Satisfaction with Life scale (Pavot and Diener, 1993). But, in this paper, the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (OHQ) has been used to measure the happiness level since this tool is treated as a compact scale for the measurement of Psychological well-being (Argyle and Hills, 2002). In this method happiness score have been calculated with help of the six-point Liker scale by three steps. First, Items marked (R) are scored in reverse. Then the numbers for all 29 questions are added using the converted numbers for the 12 items that are reverse scored and finally, total score is divided by 29 to get the average happiness score.

After calculating the average score for each respondent, the respondents are categorised into mainly four groups according to their happiness score. The person posses a very low score (1-2) is considered as ‘Not happy’ and they require a psychiatric treatment. The respondents having a score 2-3 are ‘Somewhat unhappy’. The persons make a moderate score (3-4) are treated as ‘Not

particularly happy or unhappy’. If an individual’s score is 4 then he is ‘Somewhat happy or moderately happy’. Actually he is satisfied and this is what the average person scores. The person having a score 4-5 is ‘Rather happy or pretty happy’. Getting a score 5-6 means the person is ‘Very happy. Therefore here happiness scores are considered as an ordinal response.

Theory and Methodology

In the present paper, following Sen (1993) and Veenhoven (2004), I adopt a simple model on the basis of the assumptions as follows: The happiness (W) of individuals is positively correlated with ‘good living environment’ and ‘good mental health’.

Living Environment

The good living environment is an outcome of various economic and non economic or socio- demographic factors. The economic factors on which the living environment depends mainly include family income as in India person lives in a collectivist way in a family and employment status represented by a dummy variable (if unemployed holding as unity , otherwise as zero), excessive work pressure and employment related anxiety. It is assumed that rise in family income and decrease in unemployment, decrease in work pressure and employment related anxiety increase happiness by improving the living

¹ A strong body of researchers believes in the concept of such a baseline for every individual. Baseline happiness refers to the stable level around which an individual’s happiness varies: while happy and sad events lead to a departure from this level the deviation is temporary and the individual soon returns to this level. (See the reference: Lucas, 2007).

environment. The employment status is positively associated with the opportunity of getting more education. The living environment depends on the noneconomic factors like region of residence, represented by five dummy variables: living in rural or urban area, poverty prone area, stress and competition arising from urbanization, use of modern urban amenities and security of women in the locality. It is also assumed that poverty and stress and competition arising from urbanization reduce the happiness level but use of modern urban amenities and security of women in the locality increase the happiness level. Again, family discord and family structure, family size are assumed to have an influence on living environment respectively as the first variable hamper the peace of the family and the second one enhance the harmony of the family.

Mental Health

Mental health has been defined by the World Health Organization (2003) as “a state of well-being in which every individual realizes his or her own potential, can cope with the normal stresses of life, work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to her or his community”. In the model, mental health is proxied by three different dummy variables in this model: skill or mental ability of enjoying reading and writing for pleasure represent the first clause of this definition; both application of knowledge for tackling sadness or loneliness and genetic factors proxied by a single dummy

variable represent the second clause; achievement of acquiring academic records represents the third clause; and caste based or religious discrimination represents the last clause of this definition. The variable, discrimination has an importance in welfare measurement of a country burdened with ethnic, religious, linguistic and caste conflicts but is still managing to survive as a viable unit.

Ordered Logit regression model

On the basis of the above theoretical framework, the simple Ordered Logit regression model incorporating happiness function of an individual is expressed as

$$W_i^* = a_j + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k X_{ik} + u_i$$

Where W_i^* is a latent variable as it is not observed. It measures continuously varying happiness level of individual i . When W_i^* crosses a thresholds one out of $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{j-1}$, takes on a different value. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} W_i^* = 1 & \quad \text{if} \quad W_i^* \leq a_1, \\ W_i^* = 2 & \quad \text{if} \quad a_1 \leq W_i^* \leq a_2, \\ W_i^* = 3 & \quad \text{if} \quad a_2 \leq W_i^* \leq a_3; \text{ and} \\ W_i^* = 4 & \quad \text{if} \quad a_3 \leq W_i^* \leq a_4. \end{aligned}$$

In the equation, X denotes all the above-said variables represent living environment and mental health of the individuals; the β 's are the associated linear coefficients; a_j denotes the constant terms; K denote the number of regressor excluding the intercept; i denotes the number of observation and u_i s are the error terms. It is assumed that the

cumulative distribution of is logistic with $F(z) = e^z / (1 + e^z)$.

Sampling technique and target population

The empirical work is based on primary data and the sample units have been chosen from the target population through purposive sampling². The main focus has been concentrated on individuals with diverse living conditions but with basic minimum capabilities. The target population consists of adults who are over 18 years and in the productive age group (up to 60 years, the age of retirement); and endowed with a certain level of education that gives them a standard capability. Therefore, the survey has been administered mainly to students and full time, part-time and contractual teachers and staff of colleges and universities in different regions of Kolkata District. All the respondents³ gave their verbal consent to participate in the study and then completed the OHQ- 29. All questionnaires were self-administered, although assistance was available from the surveyor to help if necessary. Our sample size is 600.

The reliability of happiness data

The reliability of the happiness measures (OHQ-29) was examined in relation to the instrument’s internal consistency by calculating the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient and homogeneity measured in

terms of mean inter-item correlations. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. The closer Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is to 1.0 the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale. Based upon the formula $\alpha = rk / [1 + (k - 1) r]$ where k is the number of items considered and r is the mean of the inter-item correlations the size of alpha is determined by both the number of items in the scale and the mean inter-item correlations. George and Mallery (2003) provide the following rules of thumb: “ $\alpha > .9$ - Excellent, $\alpha > .8$ - Good, $\alpha > .7$ - Acceptable, $\alpha > .6$ - Questionable, $\alpha > .5$ - Poor, and $\alpha < .5$ - Unacceptable” . In the other way, mean inter-item correlations in the 0.20 to 0.60 range were deemed to indicate good reliability (Nunnally et al, 1967). In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the whole sample is found to be 0.75. Again, the average inter-item covariance of the 29 items of the OHQ is observed as 0.258 (> 0.20).

Table 1(a). Interim covariance and Cronbach’s r

	Total
Average interim covariance	0.258
Scale of reliability coefficient	0.752
Number of items in the scale	29

² Due to cost constraint

³ I am very grateful to all the respondents who patiently answered our long survey and confided their experiences to us and the Head of the institutions and various Departments who gave the permission to carrying the survey in the working hours.

The data also met the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criteria for sampling adequacy as 0.81 which is greater than the suggested minimum of 0.6. The results are reported

in Table 1 (a) and Table 1 (b) respectively which indicate that the happiness data used in the study is reliable and valid.

Table 1(b). Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criteria for sampling adequacy

Item of OHQ	KMO	Item of OHQ	KMO
Item 1	0.6711	Item 16	0.8499
Item 2	0.5103	Item 17	0.8253
Item 3	0.8527	Item 18	0.8350
Item 4	0.8162	Item 19	0.6980
Item 5	0.6331	Item 20	0.7800
Item 6	0.7891	Item 21	0.8118
Item 7	0.8211	Item 22	0.8805
Item 8	0.8389	Item 23	0.7570
Item 9	0.8490	Item 24	0.8152
Item 10	0.7275	Item 25	0.8610
Item 11	0.8066	Item 26	0.8339
Item 12	0.8924	Item 27	0.7161
Item 13	0.5783	Item 28	0.7453
Item 14	0.7566	Item 29	0.7866
Item 15	0.8363	Over all	0.8077

Mean happiness and proportion of happy people in the sample

Table 2 presents the mean scores (M), standard deviation (SD), and minimum and maximum value.

Table 2: Mean Happiness scores, Standard Deviation and Minimum and Maximum

OHQ	SAMPLE	MEAN	SD	MIN	MAX
OHQ1	600	2.838	1.883	1	6
OHQ2	600	2.671	1.661	1	6
OHQ3	600	4.488	1.553	1	6
OHQ4	600	4.795	1.401	1	6
OHQ5	600	3.991	1.843	1	6
OHQ6	600	4.193	1.880	1	6
OHQ7	600	3.947	1.703	1	6
OHQ8	600	4.595	1.602	1	6
OHQ9	600	5.130	1.352	1	6
OHQ10	600	4.443	1.907	1	6
OHQ11	600	4.893	1.465	1	6
OHQ12	600	4.418	1.651	1	6
OHQ13	600	3.393	1.819	1	6
OHQ14	600	2.778	1.685	1	6
OHQ15	600	4.311	1.525	1	6
OHQ16	600	4.516	1.434	1	6
OHQ17	600	4.545	1.297	1	6
OHQ18	600	4.003	1.663	1	6
OHQ19	600	4.030	1.819	1	6
OHQ20	600	4.526	1.450	1	6
OHQ21	600	4.631	1.415	1	6
OHQ22	600	4.478	1.494	1	6
OHQ23	600	3.240	1.783	1	6
OHQ24	600	4.411	1.820	1	6
OHQ25	600	4.438	1.508	1	6
OHQ26	600	4.106	1.551	1	6
OHQ27	600	4.581	1.755	1	6
OHQ28	600	4.211	1.859	1	6
OHQ29	600	4.651	1.806	1	6

Table 3 shows the characteristics of the respondents on the basis of the average happiness score. Only 30.8 percent people are happy including 0.50 percent are very

happy. 11.33 percent are somewhat unhappy. 57.83 percent are reported as neither particularly happy nor particularly unhappy.

Table 3 : Overall Status of happiness in the sample

Different happiness Score	Frequency	percentage	Cumulative frequency
2	2	0.33	0.33
3	66	11.00	11.33
4	347	57.83	69.17
5	182	30.33	99.50
6	3	0.50	100.00
Total	600		

Estimation of Ordered Logit Models of Happiness

This section describes the results of estimating Ordered Logit regression equations in which individuals' happiness scores are regressed on a set of personal characteristics.

Descriptive Statistics

As a general rule, mean and standard deviation are invalid parameters for descriptive statistics as the data are on ordinal scales, so we just mention the summary statistics of the dependent variable (happiness) in Table 4 and the maximum and minimum values of the variables are stated.

Table 4: Summary statistics of dependent variables

Variable	All		Range of values	
	Std.	Dev.	Min	Max
Average happiness	4.19	0.578	2.068	5.965
Happiness	4.2	0.640	2	6

Test of multicollinearity

We use Cramer's V statistic to measure the association between nominal explanatory variables (not dichotomous)

using the formula: $V = \sqrt{\frac{X^2}{n(k-1)}}$ where X^2

is Chi-Square statistics, n is number of observation and k represents the smaller of the two numbers (the number of possible values of each variable i.e. the number of rows and columns in the data matrix). The test of multicollinearity is

used as a warning against the inclusion of highly correlated explanatory variables in a single regression equation and it helps to separate out the impacts of each of the explanatory variables on explained variables. The results of Cramer’s v test show the correlation is very negligible for all the regressor and the values approximately lay among 0.001 to 0.2⁴.

Model Specification

In each regression the dependent variable is five category ordered measure of happiness and it indicates a person’s current level of happiness. The regression results are shown in Table 5 which includes two different sets of variables in Model 1 and Model 2 to avoid inclusion of education and employment in the single equation. The result of link test⁵

for each of the model mentioned in Table 5 has failed to reject the assumption that the entire models are specified correctly. The reported R square is consistent with the log likelihood ratio test. The value of the R-squared and the pseudo R-squared are reported for all the models for showing the goodness of fit for the entire models.

The p-values of all the models (0.00) show a statistically significant relationship between happiness and the explanatory variables. It validates the reliability of explanatory variables (X) to predict the dependent variable (happiness). The values of R- square of the Model 1 and Model 2 show that the models explain 87.92 and 91.05 percent of the variance in happiness scores respectively.

Table - 5: Regression results of Ordered Logit model

Variables	Model 1	Model 2
Family income	0.189*** (0.00)	0.206*** (0.00)
unemployed = 1, 0 otherwise	x	- 0.373*** (0.003)
Unemployment related anxiety	-0.149*** (0.004)	- 0.161*** (0.002)
Education level	0.272*** (0.01)	x
post-graduation= 1 , 0, otherwise		
Surrounding poverty	0.025 (0.696)	0.038 (0.554)

⁴ Due to too many explanatory variables the result of crammers’ V statistic is not tabulated in the paper

⁵The Link test is used to detect the model specification error. It is based on the idea that if a regression is properly specified, any additional independent variables would not be found which are significant except any chance. Link test creates two new variables, the variable of prediction (happinesshat) and the value of squared prediction (happinesshatsq).

The model is then refitted using these two variables as predictors. If the p-value of _happinesshatsq is not significant then we fail to reject the null (The null hypothesis is that there is no specification error) and conclude that our model is correctly specified. We use Stata for the link test command.

Variables	Model 1	Model 2
enjoying reading and writing for pleasure	0.079 (0.17)	0.068 (0.248)
Knowledge for tackling both sadness and loneliness	0.142*** (0.01)	0.136** (0.020)
Opportunity of Getting education	0.216*** (0.001)	0.233*** (0.000)
Opportunity of having good academic records	0.063 (0.35)	0.061 (0.373)
Absence of family history of depression	0.136*** (0.007)	0.130*** (0.010)
Women security in local area	-0.016 (0.77)	-0.010 (0.841)
Family Discord	-0.143*** (0.01)	-0.157*** (0.005)
Family size	0.054 (0.25)	0.048 (0.312)
Caste Discrimination	-0.017 (0.75)	-0.012 (0.824)
Urban stress	0.0001 (0.99)	-0.011 (0.811)
Modern urban amenities	0.118*** (0.01)	x
Parenthood	0.009 (0.84)	0.004 (0.926)
Marriage	0.037 (0.45)	0.040 (0.416)
Work pressure	-0.128*** (0.009)	-0.138*** (0.005)
Gender, male=1, otherwise 0	0.116 (0.50)	-0.012 0.948
Religion, Hindu=1, otherwise 0	-0.639 (0.16)	-0.664 0.151
Caste, General =1, otherwise 0	-0.182 (0.42)	-0.212 0.357
Age, 35-60yrs=1, otherwise 0	-0.129 (0.20)	-0.151 0.141
Region, Rural=1, otherwise 0	-0.062 (0.80)	-0.147 (0.56)
Marital status married=1, otherwise 0	-0.221 (0.34)	-0.339 (0.16)
Log likelihood =	-536.15	-534.58
Number of obs	600	600
LR chi2	LR chi2(24)= 87.92	LR chi2(24)=91.05
Prob > chi2	0.000	0.0000
Pseudo R2=	0.0758	0.0785
/cut1=	-3.941	-4.791
/cut2 =	-1.970	-1.044
/cut3 =	3.014	2.179
/cut4 =	7.698	6.873
*** indicates 1% level of significance, ** indicates 5% level of significance and * indicates 10 % level of significance.		
Values in parenthesis indicates p value		

In the present study the monetary influence is measured with help of family income of the individual. The family income is included in the two regression equations as the explanatory variable. The results show that it has a positive and statistically significant impact on happiness. It implies that that increase in family income improves living environment as well as the material standard of living, thus enhancing the probability of satisfaction from life. This empirical finding is in line with previous empirical study of Lakshmanasamy (2010) shows that absolute income has significant positive impact on happiness.

The regression results of Model 2 reveal another important thing that occupational status as proxied by employment and unemployment significantly influences the happiness level of the individuals. Compared to employed individuals, unemployed individuals are less happy as the sign of the coefficient of unemployment is negative. These findings regarding occupational status are similar to the work of Clark and Oswald (1994), where they show that the effect of being jobless is, at any conventional level, statistically significant and is negatively correlated with well-being. Another important observation is that unemployment related anxiety and work pressure enter with negative and statistically significant coefficients. This finding also supports by the Chakraborty et al. (2018) where they notice that job prospects is a highly significant covariate of happiness irrespective of the gender of the student.

Regarding mental capability determining mental health, it is found that the opportunity of getting more education significantly enhances over all happiness level as this opportunity make individual more capable of being productive and more satisfied . Again, completing post-graduation compared to school level education significantly increases the overall happiness level as shown in Model 1. The opportunity of applying knowledge for tackling sadness or loneliness increases significantly overall happiness of all individuals, (Model 1 and 2) because knowledge helps individuals to cope with the adversities coming in their life. In case of good academic records and use of reading and writing as a source of pleasure, we fail to establish any significant impact of these variables on happiness. It also, in turn, raises questions that good academic results enhances the expectations of the individuals, unfulfillment of those may make individuals unhappy. Family discord significantly reduces happiness.

The regression result shows that among the socio- demographic factors such as region of residence (rural or urban area), stress arising from urbanization (due to the coexistence of opulence with sheer poverty and high population density in urban area) and facilities of modern urban amenities (which only a small percentage of population can afford), only facilities of modern urban amenities give significant rise to happiness levels. This result confirms that more urban amenities in turn assure better quality of life with more technologic connection in urban environment.

Regarding genetic influence on happiness, model 1 shows that compared to others, individuals having no such family history of depression are remaining happier.

Policy implication and conclusion

This paper attempts to answer whether and to what extent happiness of an individual is significantly related to living environment of an individuals and their mental health in a developing country like India so that policy makers may give the attentions on some major issues like environment and mental health policy, education policy constituting of institutional education as well as value education, employment policy and urbanisation.

The paper uses the Oxford happiness Questionnaire, the measurement of happiness tool which is based on western paradigms. In India the parameters of measuring happiness might be different. In the total sample, almost eighty percent individuals are representing the youth whose age lies between 18 to 35 years. This study has chosen them because this is a phase of multiple transitions involving education, training, employment and unemployment, as well as transitions from one living circumstance to another (marriage, migration etc) and all this life events as well as the living environment are supposed to play a huge role in determining their happiness, for example, a child from a more privileged upbringing is exposed to more opportunities, is likely to be good worker and is likely to derive more happiness. The study referred those

as unemployed are mainly the students who are continuing their studies in the academic institutions but perceived that they are unemployed. This limitations demand a further research in India of taking this variable by using a random sampling.

References

- Bertrand, M. & Mullainathan, S. (2001). Do people mean what they say? Implications for subjective survey data. *American Economic Review*, 91(2), 67-72.
- Blanchflower, D., & Oswald, A. J. (2004). Wellbeing over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, 1359-1386.
- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Chakraborty, B., Maji, S., & Sen, A. et al. (2018). A Study on happiness and related Factors among Indian College Students, *Journal of Quantitative Economics*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40953-018-0125-8>
- Chen, P.Y., Spector, P.E. (1991). Negative affectivity as the underlying cause of correlations between stressors and strains. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7, 398- 407.
- Clark, A.E., & Oswald, A. J. (1994), Unhappiness and unemployment, *Economic Journal*, 104, 648-659.
- Clark, A.E. and A.J. Oswald (1996), Satisfaction and comparison income, *Journal of Public Economics*, 61, 359-381.
- Clark, A. E., & Oswald, A. J. (2002). A simple statistical method for measuring how life events affect happiness. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 31, 1139-1144.

- Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being, happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 668–678.
- Cutler, D. M., & Muney, A. L., (2006). *Education and health, Evaluating theories and evidence*. NBER Working Paper No, 12352, Cambridge, MA, 02138.
- Di Tella, R., MacCulloch, R. J., & Oswald, A. J. (2006). The macroeconomics of happiness, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85 (4), 809 – 827.
- Di Tella, R., MacCulloch, R. J., & Oswald, A.J., (2001). Preferences over Inflation and Unemployment, Evidence from surveys of happiness. *The American Economic Review*, 91(1), 335-341.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well being, the science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 34–43.
- Diener, E., Scollon, C. N., & Lukas, R. E. (2009). The evolving concept of subjective well-being, the multifaceted nature of happiness. In, E Diener (ed.) *Assessing well-being, the collected works of Ed Diener*, ed E. Diener. (Dordrecht, NL, Springer), 67–100.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93, 542-575.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). *The Satisfaction with life Scale*. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Duesenberry, J. (1949). *Income, saving, and the theory of consumer behaviour*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Easterlin, R. A. (2003). Building a better theory of well-being. *Discussion Paper No. 742, IZA, Bonn, Germany*.
- Easterlin, R.A. (1995), Will raising the incomes of all increase the happiness of all? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 27, 35-47.
- Evenson, R. J., & Simon, R. W. (2005). Clarifying the relationship between parenthood and depression. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 46, 341–358.
- Frank, R. (1999). *Luxury fever*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1999.
- Frey, B. S., & Stutzer, A. (2002). What can economists learn from happiness research? *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40(2), 402-435.
- Gerdtham, U. G., & Johannesson, M. (2001). The relationship between happiness, health and socioeconomic factors: results based on Swedish micro data. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 30, 553-557.
- Goldsmith, A., Jonathan, R. V., & William, D. (1996). The impact of labor force history on self-esteem and its component parts, anxiety, alienation and depression. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 17(2), 183-220.
- Graham, C., & Pettinato, S. (2002). *Happiness and hardship, Opportunity and insecurity in new market economies*. Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Hills, P., & Argyle, M. (2002). The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire: a compact scale for the measurement of psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 1073–1082.
- Inglehart, R., & Klingemann, H. D. (2000). *Genes, culture, democracy and happiness*. Culture and subjective well-being, 165–183.
- Kahneman, D., Krueger, A., Schkade, D., Schwarz, N. & Stone, A. (2006). Would you be happier if you were richer? A focusing illusion. *Science*, 312, 1908-1910.

- Kaplan, R. M., & Anderson, J. P. (1988). The quality of well-being scale, Rationale for a single quality of life index. In, SR Walker, R Rosser (Eds.) *Quality of Life, Assessment and Application*. London, MTP Press, 51-77.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2007). *Promoting and Protecting Mental Health as Flourishing: A Complementary Strategy for Improving National Mental Health*, *American Psychologist*, American Psychological Association, 62 (2), 95-108.
- Knight, J., Song, L., & Gunatilaka, R. (2007). *Subjective well-being and its Determinants in rural China*. Discussion paper series, Number 334, Department of Economics, University of Oxford.
- Lakshmanasamy, T. (2010). Are you satisfied with your income? The economics of happiness in India. *Journal of Quantitative Economics*, 8 (2), 115-141.
- Lelkes, O. (2002). *Tasting freedom, happiness, religion and economic transition*. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.
- Lucas, R. E., Clark, A. E., Georgelis, Y., & Diener, E. (2004). Unemployment alters the set point for life satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 15, 8-13.
- Lucas, R.E. (2007). Adaptation and the Set-Point Model of Subjective Well-Being: Does Happiness Change After Major Life Events? *Directions in Psychological Science*, 16 (2), 75-79.
- Myers, D. G. (2003). Close relationships and quality of life. In, Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.), *Well-Being, The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp-374-391). New York, Russell Sage Foundation Publications.
- Namazie, C., & Sanfey, P. (2001). Happiness and transition, the case of Kyrgyzstan. *Review of Development Economics*, 5, 392-405.
- Nomaguchi, K. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2003). Costs and rewards of children, the effects of becoming a parent on adults lives. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 356-374.
- Nunnally, J. C., Bernstein, I. H., & Berge, J. M. T. (1967). *Psychometric theory* (Vol. 226). New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2008). The Satisfaction with Life Scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3, 137-152.
- Pavot, W. G., Diener, E., Colvin, C. R., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Further validation of the Satisfaction with Life Scale, Evidence for the cross-method convergence of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57, 149-161.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5, 164-72.
- Powdthavee, N. (2007a). Are there geographical variations in the psychological costs of unemployment in South Africa? *Social Indicators Research*, 80(3), 629-652.
- Ravallion, M., & Lokshin, M. (2001). Identifying welfare effects from subjective questions. *Economica*, 68, 335-357.
- Ravallion, M., & Lokshin, M. (2002). Self-rated economic welfare in Russia. *European Economic Review*, 46, 1453-1473.
- Scitovsky, T., (1976). *The Joyless economy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Sen, A.K. (1993). Capability and wellbeing, In M. Nussbaum, A.K. Sen (Eds.). *The quality of life*, Oxford, OUP.
- Stanca, L. (2012). Suffer the little children, measuring the effects of parenthood on

- well-being world-wide. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 81, 742-750.
- Steel, P., Steel, P., Schmidt, J. and Shultzet, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(1), 138-161.
 - Strine, T. W., Chapman, D. P., Balluz, L., Mokdad, A. H. (2008). Health-related quality of life and health behaviors by social and emotional support, their relevance to psychiatry and medicine. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 43(2), 151-159.
 - Stutzer, A. and Lalive, R. 2004. The role of social work norms in job searching and subjective well-being, *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2, 696-719.
 - Veenhoven, R. (2008). *Sociological theories of subjective well-being*. In, Eid, M., & Larsen, R. J. (Eds). *The science of subjective well-being* (pp- 44-61). New York, Guilford Press.
 - Veenhoven, R. (2000). Freedom and happiness, a comparative study in forty-four nations in the early 1990s. In *Culture and Subjective Well-Being* (pp-257-88). Ed Diener and Eunkook M. Suh (eds.), Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
 - Warr, P.B., 1990. The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 193-210
 - Winkelmann, L., Winkelmann, R., 1998. Why are the unemployed so unhappy? *Economica*, 65, 1 -15.
 - World Health Organization [WHO]. [2003]. *Investing in mental health*. Department of Mental Health and Substance Dependence, Non communicable Diseases and Mental Health, World Health Organization, Geneva.

