FAMILY HAPPINESS, SOCIOECONOMICS, AND SOCIODEMOGRAPHY: FACTS IN INDONESIA

Ahmad Chafid Alwi & Endang Mulyani
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
ahmadchafidalwi@uny.ac.id, endang_mulyani@uny.ac.id

Abstract: Socioeconomics and sociodemographic these days are often used as a measure of people's happiness in a country. This study took data from the World Values Survey from Indonesia, with 3200 participants from various work backgrounds, ages, etc. This design research used explanative. A quantitative approach and type of analyzes use the probit method to see the modeling of happiness, socio-economic and socio-demographic variables. The results showed that age and gender are not determinants of happiness. It appears that the happiness of the Indonesian people is still primarily determined by their income. Low, medium, and high job class variables have a significant influence. Furthermore, marital status, which is described by the existence of marriage, living together like married, divorced, separated, widowed/widowed, and unmarried, influences the happiness variable of family living standards. Still, the exciting thing is that Indonesian society is more likely to have a high standard of living, not to be a determinant of happiness. Indonesia's high standard of living looks different from some research in other countries and previous research that can be a determinant of happiness. These facts certainly impact government policy considerations in realizing public welfare, as stated in the foundation of the state ideology of Pancasila.

Keywords: Happiness, Socio-Economic, Socio-Demographic

KEBAHAGIAAN KELUARGA, SOSIAL EKONOMI DAN SOSIO DEMOGRAFI: FAKTOR-FAKTOR DI INDONESIA

Abstrak: Ilmu sosial ekonomi dan sosiodemografi akhir-akhir ini sering dijadikan ukuran kebahagiaan masyarakat di suatu negara. Studi ini mengambil data dari World Values Survey dari Indonesia, dengan peserta 3200 orang dari berbagai latar belakang pekerjaan, usia, dll. Desain penelitian ini menggunakan eksplanatif. Pendekatan dan jenis analisis kuantitatif menggunakan metode probit untuk melihat pemodelan variabel kebahagiaan, sosial ekonomi dan sosial demografi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa usia dan jenis kelamin bukanlah penentu kebahagiaan. Tampaknya kebahagiaan masyarakat Indonesia masih ditentukan terutama oleh pendapatan mereka. Variabel kelas pekerjaan rendah, sedang, dan tinggi memiliki pengaruh yang signifikan. Selanjutnya, status perkawinan yang digambarkan dengan adanya perkawinan, hidup bersama seperti menikah, cerai, berpisah, janda/duda, dan belum menikah, mempengaruhi variabel kebahagiaan taraf hidup keluarga. Namun yang menarik, masyarakat Indonesia lebih cenderung memiliki taraf hidup yang tinggi, bukan menjadi penentu kebahagiaan. Standar hidup Indonesia yang tinggi terlihat berbeda dengan beberapa penelitian di negara lain dan penelitian sebelumnya yang bisa menjadi penentu kebahagiaan. Fakta-fakta tersebut tentunya berdampak pada pertimbangan kebijakan pemerintah dalam mewujudkan kesejahteraan masyarakat, sebagaimana tertuang dalam dasar ideologi negara Pancasila.

Kata kunci: Kebahagiaan, Sosial Ekonomi, Sosial Demografi

INTRODUCTION

Since the European Commission convened the Beyond GDP conference in November 2007, there have been various alternative measures to correct GDP, the Sustainable well-being index, indicators of real progress, green GDP, native wealth (Costanza et al., 2009) and the Social Progress Index. Enter size psychological indicators are happiness indicators, Gallup-Healthways Happiness Index and Happy Living Years Index. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

and Sustainability Indicators are complementary GDP measures. These different sizes have not been widely used, except for the MDGs.

The well-being index that policymakers are currently considering is the happiness index. In 2011, the United Nations (UN) General Assembly initiated using the index and later expanded to the United Kingdom, France, Australia, Malaysia, and Thailand.

Singapore has the highest position in the ASEAN region in the happiness ranking, followed by Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines. Some of the predictors used in calculating the average happiness figure above are *Gross Domestic Product* per capita, social support, healthy life expectancy at birth, freedom to make choices in life, *generosity,* and perceptions of corruption. During the two reporting periods, Indonesia's position was still in the 70s with an increasing trend, as did other *ASEAN* countries except Malaysia among 156 countries worldwide. *The New Economic Foundation (NEF)* published the *Happy Planet Index* of 151 countries in the world using indicators of life expectancy, *experienced well-being,* and *ecological footprint*. This index shows efficiency in the use of resources and does not fully describe the welfare in a country. Table 1 presents Indonesia's position among *ASEAN* countries in 2013 and 2015.

Table 1. World Happiness Report

ASEAN Countries	2013	2015
Philippines	92	90
Indonesian	76	74
Vietnam	63	75
Malaysia	56	61
Thailand	36	34
Singapore	30	24

Source: World Happiness Report

In the past two decades, many studies have begun to look at happiness in various ways. It is interesting that in East Asia, there is a phenomenon where East Asian countries such as China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Korea, Japan, and Singapore have excellent economic performance but are inversely proportional to their happiness. It was thought that there were social value factors that influenced it in the form of mediation, but some findings actually caused some relationships to be insignificant. On the other hand, happiness is thought to also be influenced by one's religiosity. However, the facts in the United States show that religiosity has little effect, even concluding that religion is not important in determining happiness. (By, 2002, 2022) (Praise, 2016) (Cragun &; Speed, 2022).

Happiness is almost everyone's goal in life. Most understandings say that after income meets basic needs, then additional income can be used to improve welfare. The additional income is often intended to buy secondary and even tertiary needs. It is a surprising fact that money has a weak effect on happiness. It is recommended in use that consumers (1) buy more experience and fewer material goods; (2) use their money to benefit others rather than themselves; (3) buy many small pleasures rather than fewer big pleasures; (4) avoid extended warranties and other forms of

insurance that are too expensive; (5) delay in consumption; (6) consider how peripheral features of their purchases might affect their daily lives; (7) beware of comparison shopping; and (8) pay attention to the happiness of others (Mogilner &; Norton, 2016) (Dunn et al., 2017).

The economic perspective looks at happiness not only from income, but also from employment status, marriage, and trust. A more detailed concept of happiness in micro econometrics sees that happiness comes from socio-demographic and socio-economic variables. This article seeks to see family happiness from the socio-demographic, socio-economic, and economic perspectives of households which include food, health, security, and savings. The religious perspective, assessing human happiness, is divided into two, namely world happiness and hereafter happiness, where achievement is based on the basis of religion. Because happiness is obtained from two elements, namely the world and the hereafter, happiness can be obtained by religious activities such as upholding religious values and getting closer to God. This is also different from happiness based on the perspective of marginalized communities, happiness based on mental conditions, skills, personal motivation, and local government contributions. Of course, this expands the scope of happiness from human subjectivity because it is related to psychology formed from within as well as from outside. (Graham, 2005) (Mahfud et al., 2020) (Ilham et al., 2019).

Many studies still show confusion in describing happiness. If we look at Maslow's hierarchy of needs, it is said that the satisfaction of needs will end with self-actualization. The term subjective well-being has lately been used as a substitute term for happiness.

Happiness can be interpreted from the emapt axis, including well-being, emotions, being (to be) and having (to have). Of course, this is a consequence of fulfilling basic needs. Happiness is constructed from social and health Although socio-economic microeconometrics affect happiness, it is interesting that in research that has been conducted in Indonesia, socio-economic status has no relationship with happiness. An individual's SES index includes respondents' income, education, and employment status. The household SES index includes total household income as well as household characteristics such as asset ownership (i.e., whether the household owns certain assets such as washing machines and stoves) and infrastructure (i.e., access to electricity, toilet facilities, and so on). The subjective SES contains items that measure respondents' perceptions of a household's SES relative to other households (e.g., the household's perceived income position compared to other households in the neighborhood). (Aburto et al., 2017) (Bennett et al., 2015) (Damongilala et al., 2014) (Botha et al., 2018).

Sociodemographics have traits that describe societal differences based on age, gender, occupation, education, religion, ethnicity, income, family type, marital status, geographic location, and social class (Kotler & Amstrong, 2001). But it is the relationship with happiness, aspects of age and work alone that have an impact on happiness. Sociodemographics in Malaysia see that family income, paternal education, and maternal education have a significant influence on

happiness. (Junet Tomasoa et al., 2017) (Hashim et al., 2015). Specifically, this article aims to know variable socioeconomic affect happiness and to know sociodemographic affect happiness.

METHOD

This study used a quantitative approach. The data in this study was obtained from Indonesian data conducted by the *World Value Survey* (WVS) in the 7th wave, namely between 2017 – 2020, then analyzed using the Logit Regression method. Researchers did not develop their own research instruments but used existing and questions contained in the survey conducted by WVS in wave 7. The sample from Indonesian state data amounted to 3200 respondents. In the happiness variable, recoding is done by only making two possibilities, namely Happy (1 and 2) and Unhappy (3 and 4). The logit model is estimated as follows:

$$n\left(\frac{P_i}{1-P_i}\right) = b_0 + b_1X_{1i} + b_2X_{2i} + b_3X_{3i} + b_4X_{4i} + b_5X_{5i} + b_6X_{6i} + b_7X_{7i} + b_8X_{8i} + b_9X_{9i}$$

Information:

$ln\left(\frac{P_i}{1-P_i}\right)$ = Happiness

X1 = Financial Situation

X2 = Family Standard of Living

X3 = Job Class

X4 = Gender

X5 = Age of Respondent

X6 = Marital Status

X7 = Status of Primary Revenue Source

X8 = Financial Expense Status

X9 = Family Income

The logit model used is to see the probability of someone feeling happy in his family is:

$$P_i = \frac{1}{1+e^{-Z_i}} \qquad (2)$$

And for people who are not part is:

$$1 - P_i = \frac{1}{1+e^{Z_i}} \qquad (3)$$

The Maximum Likelihood method is used to determine the regression coefficient so that the probability in the model can be maximized. This method was used in consideration of a considerable sample size (3200 respondents). Significance test using Z test. Questions on WVS used in this study can be seen in table 2.

Table 2. Research question indicators

Variable	Question indicator	Answer
	Happiness	
And	Q46. Taking all things together, would you say you are (*read out and code one answer*):	1. Very happy 2. Rather happy 3. Not very happy 4. Not at all happy
	Socioeconomics	
X1	Q50. How satisfied are you with the financial situation of your household? Please use this card again to help with your answer (*code one number*):	1. Completely dissatisfied 1-10 2. Completely satisfied.
X2	Q56. Comparing your standard of living with your parents' standard of living when they were about your age, would you say that you are better off, worse off or about the same?	1. Better off, 2. Worse off, 3. Or about the same.
X3	Q287. People sometimes describe themselves as belonging to the working class, the middle class, or the upper or lower class. Would you describe yourself as belonging to the (*read out and code one answer*):	1. Upper class 2. Upper middle class 3. Lower middle class 4. Working class 5. Lower class
	Demographic	
X4	Q260. Respondent's sex (*Code respondent's sex by observation, don't ask about it*):	1. Male 2. Female
X5	Q262. This means you are _____ years old (*write in age in two digits*).	
X6	Q273. Are you currently (*read out and code one answer only*):	1. Married 2. Living together as married 3. Divorced 4. Separated 5. Widowed 6. Single
X7	Q285. Are you the chief wage earner in your household? (Code one answer):	1. Yes 2. No
X8	Q286. During the past year, did your family (readout and code one answer):	1. Saved money 2. Just get by 3. Spent some savings 4. Spent savings and borrowed money
X9	Q288. On this card is an income scale on which 1 indicates the lowest income group and 10 the highest income group in your country. We 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. (*Code one number*):	1. Lowest group 1-10 Highest group

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Probit regression calculation using likelihood.

Table 3. Probit regression results

Dependent Variable: Y
Method: ML - Binary Logit (Newton-Raphson/Marquardt steps)
Date: 05/04/22 Time: 14:52
Sample: 1 3200

Dependent Variable: Y
Method: ML - Binary Logit (Newton-Raphson / Marquardt steps)
Date: 05/04/22
Time: 15:18
Sample: 1 3200
Included observations: 3200
Convergence achieved after 4 iterations
Coefficient covariance computed using observed Hessian

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	2.078870	0.566391	3.670380	0.0002
X1	0.237583	0.029535	8.044058	0.0000
X2	-0.175879	0.081623	-2.154762	0.0312
X3	-0.132852	0.066935	-1.984802	0.0472
X4	0.086333	0.188116	0.458937	0.6463
X5	-0.009770	0.005967	-1.637254	0.1016
X6	-0.149490	0.040122	-3.725879	0.0002
X7	0.523476	0.199020	2.630264	0.0085
X8	-0.183708	0.078932	-2.327403	0.0199
X9	0.112263	0.040985	2.739096	0.0062

McFadden R-squared	0.136255	Mean dependent var	0.939062
S.D. dependent var	0.239253	S.E. of regression	0.230302
Akaike info criterion	0.402777	Sum squared resid	169.1944
Schwarz criterion	0.421749	Log likelihood	-634.4433
Hannan-Quinn criter.	0.409579	Deviance	1268.887
Restr. deviance	1469.052	Restr. log likelihood	-734.5259
LR statistic	200.1651	Avg. log likelihood	-0.198264
Prob (LR statistic)	0.000000		

Obs with Dep=0	195	Total obs	3200
Obs with Dep=1	3005		

Thus, X4 and X5 are insignificant, while X1, X2, X3, X6, X7, X8, X9 are significant with probabilities below 0.05. At *a goodness of fit* or LR statistic of 200. Furthermore, the value of Prob (LR statistic) can be interpreted as all variable X together can explain variable Y. Then from these results if calculated the predicted value is:

$$\widehat{Zi} = b_0 + b_1X_{1i} + b_2X_{2i} + b_3X_{3i} + b_4X_{4i} + b_5X_{5i} + b_6X_{6i} + b_7X_{7i} + b_8X_{8i} + b_9X_{9i} \qquad (4)$$

$\hat{Z} = 2{,}07 + 0{,}23X_{1i} - 0{,}17X_{2i} - 0{,}13X_{3i} + 0{,}08X_{4i} - 0{,}009X_{5i} - 0{,}149X_{6i} + 0{,}52X_{7i} - 0{,}183X_{8i} + 0{,}112X_{9i}$

Measure the Likelihood ratio with the following formula:

$$LR = 2(LL_{UR} - LL_r)$$

Value at df = 9 – 1 = 8. When viewed from the results of table 2, LR shows a significant value.$LR \sim X^2$.

Table 4. Hosmer-Lemeshow test Results

Goodness-of-Fit Evaluation for Binary Specification
Andrews and Hosmer-Lemeshow Tests
Equation: LOGIT
Date: 05/04/22 Time: 21:02
Grouping based upon predicted risk (randomize ties)

Quantile of Risk			Beautiful=0		Beautiful=1	Total	H-L
Low	High	Current	Expect	Current	Expect	Obs	Value
0.5185	0.8479	75	73.1690	245	246.831	320	0.05940
0.8482	0.9076	36	37.9608	284	282.039	320	0.11491
0.9078	0.935	30	24.5090	290	295.491	320	1.33222
0.9368	0.9538	13	17.4086	307	302.591	320	1.18069
0.9539	0.9652	12	12.8532	308	307.147	320	0.05901
0.9652	0.9735	8	9.72120	312	310.279	320	0.31430
0.9735	0.9801	11	7.43457	309	312.565	320	1.75056
0.9801	0.9851	3	5.55297	317	314.447	320	1.19445
0.9851	0.9899	5	4.01322	315	315.987	320	0.24572
0.9899	0.9978	2	2.37735	318	317.623	320	0.06034
	Total	**195**	**195.000**	**3005**	**3005.00**	**3200**	**6.31161**

H-L Statistic	6.3116	Prob. Chi-Sq (8)	0.6124
Andrews Statistic	9.0946	Prob. Chi-Sq (10)	0.5232

The Hosmer-Lemeshow test shows a ci square probability of 0.6124 > 0.05 which means that the model is able to predict the value of the observation, or it can be said that the estimation model is acceptable.

Table 5. Prediction Accuracy Test Results

Expectation-Prediction Evaluation for Binary Specification
Equation: PROBIT5
Date: 05/05/22 Time: 05:27
Success cutoff: C = 0.5

	Estimated Equation			Constant Probability		
	Beautiful=0	Beautiful=1	Total	Beautiful=0	Beautiful=1	Total
P(Dep=1) <=C	0	0	0	0	0	0
P(Dep=1)>C	195	3005	3200	195	3005	3200
Total	195	3005	3200	195	3005	3200
Correct	0	3005	3005	0	3005	3005
% Correct	0.00	100.00	93.91	0.00	100.00	93.91
% Incorrect	100.00	0.00	6.09	100.00	0.00	6.09
Total Gain*	0.00	0.00	0.00			
Percent Gain**	0.00	ON	0.00			

The accuracy of the prediction based on these results reached 93.91%. This means that the model can predict correctly.

Based on the test results show that a person's age and gender are not determinants of happiness. Some sociodemographic-related studies that include **gender** in the variability show negative results. Humanly speaking, age and gender are not something that humans can strive for. It is a gift from the creator. Of course, this breaks the opinion of certain parties who want to get happiness by changing their gender status. Nowadays there are also some who think changing sex is part of human rights. It is precisely if you look further, the one who has the right to man is God, not man himself. (Although et al., 2017; Junet Tomasoa & Peter Soegijono, 2017).

This finding shows that **family income** is still one of the factors that determine a happy person. This finding shows that secondary data obtained from WVS still provide the same information as data on determinants of happiness using IFLS (*Indonesian Family Life Survey*). Social status in these findings described in a standard of living showed a significant influence. These results also turned out to be different in the data with small respondents who showed no significant association.(Praise, 2016) (Maniku et al., 2014).

The variable of **financial situation**, which is explained by the level of respondents' satisfaction with the financial situation in their family which is described as very unsatisfactory to very satisfactory with an assessment of 1-10 shows a significant influence in determining whether respondents are happy or not. There are at least 3 ways to manage finances in order to provide satisfaction for family members, including planning expenses, doing management with a particular model and finally by supervising (Salirawati & Si, 2004).

The variable **standard of living** of families has an influence but the exciting thing is that Indonesian society is more likely to have a high standard of living not to be a determinant of happiness. This means that even people with low standards can get happiness in their lives. It is also explained in research that people with low-income classes can feel a part when their basic

needs have been met. Of course, this is somewhat different and can be a considerable discussion when a person's happiness (studies on developing countries) can affect his standard of living (Aburto et al., 2017) (Eijdenberg & Thompson, 2020).

Low, medium, and high **job class**/work class variables have a significant influence. Although in Indonesian society there is some stigma that being a civil servant is better than working as an honorary, research on teachers in Indonesia shows there is no difference in the happiness of honorary teachers with civil servants. That is, what determines happiness is not formal legal status, but class based on wages received (Meiza, 2016).

Marital status variables described by the existence of marriage, living together like married, divorced, separated, widowed/widowed, and unmarried turned out to have an influence on happiness. Married people tend to be happier than before marriage. This happiness will also have an impact on one's survival, even people who are married and happy will have more health and longevity (Hamplova, 2009) (Lawrence et al., 2019).

The variables of status of the main source of income and the variable level of family income in this study had a significant influence in predicting a person's happiness. Using the same data source, WVS, the research is similar to South Korea and Taiwan but not significant to Thailand and the Philippines (Lim et al., 2020).

Financial spends status variables have a significant influence on a person's assessment of happiness. Although the data obtained from WVS does not look at the expenditure variable, based on various experiences eudemonistic spending will have more impact on happiness than consumption which leads to hedonistic The construction of this understanding seems to be also reinforced When a person has income then spends it not on material (hedonic) but on investing, enjoying free time, self-expression and generosity in helping others. Of course, this adds to people's meaning of the function of money in achieving one's happiness (Pham, 2015). (Aknin et al., 2018).

SIMPULAN

Their gender or age does not influence people's happiness in Indonesia. The biggest determinants are financial situation variables and variables related to income. This shows that in Indonesia happiness still revolves around meeting basic needs. As a suggestion to the wider community, income should be utilized if it can meet basic needs, then start using income to invest, express yourself, and realize generosity so that happiness in life can be achieved. Although gender is included in socio-demographic characteristics, the use of sex variables in seeing one's happiness seems to need to be ruled out. Unless the variability is moderated/mediated with other variables related to sex such as Health by sex and others.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Aburto, K. H., Rioseco, M. M., & Moyano-Díaz, E. (2017). Concept of happiness in adults from low-income class. *Paideia*, *27*, 386–394. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-432727s1201703

Aknin, L. B., Wiwad, D., & Hanniball, K. B. (2018). Buying well-being: Spending behavior and happiness. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *12*(5). https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12386

Bennett, P. N., Weinberg, M. K., Bridgman, T., & Cummins, R. A. (2015). *THE HAPPINESS AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING OF PEOPLE ON HAEMODIALYSIS*.

Botha, F., Wouters, E., & Booysen, F. (2018). Happiness, Socio-economic Status, and Family Functioning in South African Households: a Structural Equation Modelling Approach. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, *13*(4), 947–989. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-017-9568-x

Cragun, R. T., & Speed, D. (2022). Religiosity and happiness. In *Religious and Non-Religious Perspectives on Happiness and Wellbeing* (pp. 167–191). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003045540-11

Damongilala, S., Opod, H., Sinolungan, J. S. v, Psychology, B., Medicine, F., Sam, U., & Manado, R. (2014). THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND FAMILY HAPPINESS IN THE COMMUNITY OF BETELEN 1 VILLAGE, TOMBATU DISTRICT, SOUTHEAST MINAHASA REGENCY. In *Journal of e-Biomedicine (eBM) (* Vol. 2, Issue 2).

Desi, Agustina, N., &; Adi, B. P. S. (2017). Well-Being; Sociodemographics in Getasan. *Muhammadiyah Journal of Nursing*, 2(2), 2017.

Dunn, E. W., Gilbert, D. T., & Wilson, T. D. (2017). *If Money Doesn't Make You Happy Then You Probably Aren't Spending It Right*.

Eijdenberg, E. L., & Thompson, N. A. (2020). Jump for joy: happiness as the route to increased living standards of entrepreneurs in Zambia. *Small Enterprise Research*, *27*(2), 240–257. https://doi.org/10.1080/13215906.2020.1751691

Graham, C. (2005). *The Economics of Happiness Insights on globalization from a novel approach*.

Hamplova, D. (2009). *Life Satisfaction, Happiness and Marital Status in Four Central Europea Countries*.

Hashim, N. A., Abdullah, N. L., Isa, R. M., &; Janor, H. (2015). WhatsApp Messenger Application among Business Students In Malaysia – An Exploration. *Student Personnel Journal*.

Ilham, L., Farid UIN Sunan Kalijaga, A., &; Adisucipto, S. (2019). HAPPINESS IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES (Community Study of Hadipolo Argopuro Kudus Village, Central Java). *Scientific Journal of the Sociology of Religion and Social Change*, *13*(2), 1978–4457. https://doi.org/10.14421/| JSA

Junet Tomasoa, S., &; Peter Soegijono, S. (2017). Well-being: A Socio-demographic Study in Ambon. *Muhammadiyah Journal of Nursing*, 2(2), 2017.

Junet Tomasoa, S., Peter Soegijono, S., &; Nursing Studies, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Satya Wacana Christian University, P. (2017). Well-being: A Socio-demographic Study in Ambon. *Muhammadiyah Journal of Nursing*, 2(2).

Kotler, P., & Armstrong. (2001). *Principles of Marketing* (8th ed.). Erlangga Publishers.

Lawrence, E. M., Rogers, R. G., Zajacova, A., & Wadsworth, T. (2019). Marital Happiness, Marital Status, Health, and Longevity. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *20*(5), 1539–1561. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-018-0009-9

Lim, H. E., Shaw, D., Liao, P. S., & Duan, H. (2020). The Effects of Income on Happiness in East and South Asia: Societal Values Matter? *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *21*(2), 391–415. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00088-9

Mahfud, C., Amalia, R., Son, D., Tibet, N., Muqorobin, H., Zabihullah, F., &; Khoirunnisa, D. (2020). *THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGION ON THE HAPPINESS OF MILLENNIALS IN INDONESIA AND SINGAPORE*. *04*(02), 144–159. https://doi.org/10.33852/jurnalin.v4i2.221

Maniku, S. F. S., Sinolungan, J. S. V., &; Opod, H. (2014). THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HAPPINESS AND SOCIAL STATUS IN FAMILIES IN TANJUNG BATU VILLAGE. *Journal of E-Biomedicine (EBM), 2*(3).

Meiza, C. (2016). Differences in Happiness in Civil Servant and Honorary Teachers. *Scientific Journal of Psychology*, *9*(2).

Mogilner, C., & Norton, M. I. (2016). Time, money, and happiness. In *Current Opinion in Psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 12–16). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.10.018

Ng, Y.-K. (2002). *THE EAST-ASIAN HAPPINESS GAP: SPECULATING ON CAUSES AND IMPLICATIONS*.

Ng, Y.-K. (2022). The East-Asian Happiness Gap: Causes and Implications. In *Happiness—Concept, Measurement and Promotion* (pp. 133–143). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-33-4972-8_13

Pham, M. T. (2015). On consumption happiness: A research dialogue. In *Journal of Consumer Psychology* (Vol. 25, Issue 1, pp. 150–151). Elsevier Inc. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.10.001

Praise, T. (2016). *DETERMINANTS OF HAPPINESS IN INDONESIA* (Vol. 19, Issue 1).

Salirawati, D., &; Si, M. (2004). *FAMILY FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT* *.