FOUR DECADES OF MONITORING SOCIAL CONDITIONS
AND TRENDS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY: THE GENERAL

In a chapter published in the classic Land and Spilerman (1975) volume on theoretical perspectives, data sources (replicated sample surveys and panel studies), and approaches to the analysis of social indicators and social trends, James A. Davis stated (1975) “Thanks to a little pamphlet (Duncan 1969) and a lot of money, social indicator research will probably take the route of replication rather than invention. Instead of developing brand new measures of the ‘Gross National This and That,’ we are more likely to see the exact replications of previous benchmark studies.” Actually, the subsequent four decades have seen work on both of these approaches to social indicators, including 1) the development of a number of general societal indices to measure well-being that go beyond the traditional Gross National Product, of which the Human Development Index (Land 2014) perhaps is the most widely known and used, and 2) the development and analysis of population surveys that are replicated periodically.

Davis (1975) demonstrated the empirical application and estimation of log linear models, which were a relatively new statistical method at the time, to data from the 1972 United States General Social Survey (GSS) conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago that replicated a classic 1954 sample survey study of American opinions on civil liberties conducted under the leadership of mid-20th century sociologist Samuel A. Stouffer. The 1972 survey was the initial wave of the GSS, comprising a 1,613-case personal interview multistage probability sample of the continental U.S. noninstitutionalized population 18 years of age and over.

Davis and subsequent leaders of the GSS, including Tom W. Smith, Peter V. Marsden, and Michael Hout, have succeeded in obtaining funds to continue waves of the GSS usually on annual or biennial cycles ever since. The GSS is widely regarded as the single best source of data on U.S. societal trends. The 1972-2012 GSS has 5,545 variables, time-trends for 2,072 variables, and 268 trends having 20+ data points (see http://www.norc.org/GSS+Website/).

The GSS has become a national treasure of data on many social conditions (demographic and social structures, behaviors, and opinions) and, now with many replications in the bank, social trends in the U.S. over four decades: the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s.

(Continued on next page.)
The GSS has proven to be such a valuable data source in this respect that it has been used as a model for the development of similar surveys in other countries. Cross-national data are collected as part of the International Social Survey Program (ISSP). ISSP was established in 1984 by NORC and other social science institutes in the United States, Australia, Great Britain, and West Germany. The ISSP collaboration has now grown to include 49 nations (the founding four plus Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Filand, France, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea (South), Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palestine, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Swizeland, Taiwan, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, and Venezuela). The ISSP is the largest program of cross-national research in the social sciences.


The book that is the subject of this review essay is an edited collection of chapters on social trends in American society using various items from the GSS questionnaires by accomplished social scientists, each of which reports analyses that go well beyond comparison of a replication with a baseline survey. Because even a review essay can convey only a limited amount of information about the contents of a book, I begin with a listing of the 13 chapter titles (organized into three sections by the Editor) and authors:

1 Introduction and Overview, Peter V. Marsden

Trends in Social and Political Orientations

2 On the Seemingly Relentless Progress in Americans’ Support for Free Expression, 1972-2006, James A. Davis

3 The Real Record on Racial Attitudes, Lawrence D. Bobo, Camille Z. Charles, Maria Krysan, and Alicia D. Simmons

4 Gender Role Attitudes since 1972: Are Southerners Distinctive? Karen E. Campbell and Peter V. Marsden

5 Public Opinion in the “Age of Reagan”: Political Trends 1972-2006, Jeff Manza, Jennifer A. Heerwig, and Brian J. McCabe


Changes in Confidence and Connections

7 Trends in Confidence in Institutions, 1973-2006, Tom W. Smith

8 Continuity and Change in American Religion, 1972-2006, Mark Chaves and Shawna Anderson

(Continued on next page.)
I describe in detail the contents of three chapters that will be of interest to SINET readers followed by some concluding comments.

**Increasing Support for Free Expression**

In Chapter 2, James A. Davis returns to the topic of Davis (1975). Going well beyond the 1974 GSS replication of the Stouffer 1954 survey, Davis now has data from subsequent GSSs, including the 1984, 1994, 2004, and 2006 GSSs and thus reports a more thorough, long-term trend analysis. The tolerance questions in these surveys posed miniature vignettes about concrete situations in the general form, “Would you allow [controversial or unpopular target individual] to [specific form of public expression]? Table 2.1, reproduced from the chapter, shows the percentages of GSS respondents choosing tolerant responses with respect to giving speeches, authoring a book in the local public library, and teaching in a college for five categories of controversial or unpopular individuals.

From the trends in the percentages in Table 2.1, it can be seen that tolerant response percentages increased very substantially across the decades for all three forms of public expression for the Atheist, Communist, and Homosexual categories. The Militarist and Racist categories (added in 1976 because critics felt the Stouffer targets were all more palatable to liberal than to conservative respondents) also show increases but at slower rates. Generally, however, after his extensive analysis in this chapter, Davis concludes that the GSS items show that tolerance (support for free expression) increased steadily from 1972 to 2006 across the ideological spectrum. He also finds that tolerance is mostly part of a package of “liberal” positions, as liberals are more tolerant of militarists and racists than “conservatives.” Davis finds that two social forces, increasing levels of formal education and the relative liberalism of more recent birth cohorts, drive the increasing tolerance trend. Both of these drivers have slowed, however, in the most recent decades, indicating that there may be ceilings on tolerant responses well below unqualified support for free expression.
In Figure 5.1, the falling away from the liberal end (which generally views governmental operations and its role in the control of the private sector economy favorably) and the rise of the conservative end (which champions individual freedom of choice with minimal government operations and interventions in the economy) of the ideological spectrum is clearly evident from the mid-1970s to the early-1980s. By comparison, identification as moderates (who see both positive and negative, often unintended consequences both of governmental operations and the private sector economy) stays high through the early-1980s, falls in the late-1980s, followed by a subsequent slow rise into the 2000s. These trends in ideological identification can be compared with trends in partisan identification which the authors chart in Figure 5.2 reproduced below.

Political Trends – The Rise of the Moderates

In Chapter 5, Jeff Manza, Jennifer A. Heerwig, and Brian J. McCabe chart trends in responses to a number of GSS questions on political opinions. They begin by noting that by 1972, the year of the first GSS, liberalism – represented by federal government activism in the form of the New Deal in the 1930s and the Great Society in the 1960s – as a dominant governing philosophy was fraying at the seams. The 1980 election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 then launched a three-decade rise of conservatism in American politics. The chapter summarizes several key political trends in charts. To begin with, Figure 5.1, reproduced from the chapter, shows trends from 1974 to 2006 in ideological identification, with responses on a seven-point scale from extremely liberal to extremely conservative grouped into three categories: liberal, moderate, and conservative.

In Figure 5.1, the falling away from the liberal end (which generally views governmental operations and its role in the control of the private sector economy favorably) and the rise of the conservative end (which champions individual freedom of choice with minimal government operations and interventions in the economy) of the ideological spectrum is clearly evident from the mid-1970s to the early-1980s. By comparison, identification as moderates (who see both positive and negative, often unintended consequences both of governmental operations and the private sector economy) stays high through the early-1980s, falls in the late-1980s, followed by a subsequent slow rise into the 2000s. These trends in ideological identification can be compared with trends in partisan identification which the authors chart in Figure 5.2 reproduced below.
Figure 5.2 shows a rise in Republican party identification from 1972 to a peak in 1990 followed by a slow decline into the 2000s. By comparison, Democrat party identification shows a long-term decline across the entire period. And, thirdly, identification as Independent rises in the late-1970s into the early-1980s, then drifts down to 1990, followed by an increase into the 2000s.

What is notable about the trends in political party identification in Figure 5.2 is the rise in the Independent identity from 1990 into the 2000s is very consistent with the rise in the Moderate ideological identity charted in Figure 5.1. The authors of this chapter emphasize the overall rise of conservatism in the “age of Reagan” and there certainly is much evidence presented in this chapter in support of this characterization. But the rise in Moderate ideological identity and the associated rise in Independent political identity since 1990 are indicative of an American public that has become disillusioned with the governing philosophies and programs of either the Conservative-Republican or the Liberal-Democratic ends of the political spectrum. The result, increasingly noted in recent political elections, is that the swaying of Moderates towards candidates from one party or the other determines the vote outcome and winners.

**Trends in Income, Age, and Happiness**

Since the 1972 GSS, the Survey has included the following question that is of great interest as a subjective well-being question to social indicators researchers:

Taken altogether, how would you say things are these days – would you say that you are very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?

In Chapter 10, Glenn Firebaugh and Laura Tach analyze GSS data on responses to this question. They begin by exhibiting the relationship between family income in thousands of U.S. dollars and the “not too happy” and “very happy” responses in Figure 10.1 reproduced here. As social indicators researchers would expect on the basis of over four decades of research on the cross-sectional relationship of income to subjective well-being outcomes such as happiness, the chart in Figure 10.1 shows that the percentage of “very happy” responses goes up with income and the percentage of “not too happy” responses goes down.

How about changes over time in family income and happiness? Figure 10.2 reproduced from the chapter shows that average happiness, measured on a three-point scale corresponding to the three possible responses to the GSS happiness question (not too happy = 1, pretty happy = 2, and very happy = 3). The figure shows that American’s average happiness over the years from 1972 to 2006 has oscillated from about 2.1 to 2.26 – in other words, just above pretty happy but not very happy.
Figure 10.2. Average family income and average happiness in America, 1972-2006. Source: Happiness: 1972-2006 GSS, where happiness is coded "not too happy" = 1, "pretty happy" = 2, and "very happy" = 3. (Sample is adjusted for black oversamples in 1982 and 1987.) Average family income: 1972-2006 GSS, adjusted to 2000 real dollars using the Consumer Price Index. Values for income and happiness are three year moving averages.

By comparison, the Firebaugh and Tach chart average annual family income in 2000 dollars in Figure 10.2 reproduced here. This chart shows a long-term increase (in year 2000 dollars) from about $41 thousand in 1972 to about $50 thousand in 2006, albeit with some substantial ups in the mid-1970s followed by downs in the late-1970s to early-1980s and then smaller oscillations in the subsequent decades.

The empirics of these two figures are familiar to social indicators/quality-of-life researchers who study subjective well-being as measured by responses to happiness questions in sample surveys, the cross-sectional relationship of these responses to household income levels, and trends over time in income and happiness responses. Three comments: First, as Easterlin has noted in many publications (e.g., Easterlin 1974, 2012), the cross-sectional relationship of average (mean) societal happiness responses to household income is curvilinear (basically logarithmic or linear in the logarithm of income); that is, as income increases it initially has a strong positive relationship to average happiness responses, but this relationship decreases with increases in income. In addition, Easterlin long has noted that long-term secular increases over time in average household income levels do not produce corresponding long-term increases in mean happiness levels. This is the classical “Easterlin paradox”. Second, the trends in the mean GSS happiness responses in Figure 10.2 notably vary within a limited range of about 2.1 to 2.26. This also is consistent with Cummins’ “subjective well-being homoestasis” (see, e.g., Cummins, Lau, and Davern 2012) which posits that individuals have a “set point” for subjective well-being such that, in the absence of significant life events, people tend to maintain a steady level of subjective well-being, and, if an event in their lives caused their subjective well-being to change, it will tend to regain its previous level. On a zero to 10 point scale in general population sample surveys, Cummins finds mean subjective well-being responses of about 7.5 (75% of the 10-point scale) with a standard deviation of about 0.075. Since the response categories in the GSS are 1 to 3 rather than 0 to 10, the survey mean and standard deviation of the happiness responses are correspondingly truncated – to about 60 to 63 percent of the scale range. Again, however, they vary within a limited range. Thirdly, however, it should be noted that a detrended and rescaled average family income measure in Figure 10.2 would show that significant ups and downs in average family income are associated to some extent with ups and downs in mean happiness scores.

(Continued on next page.)
In additional analyses of the GSS happiness responses in this chapter, Firebaugh and Tach show that, for a given level of family income, the higher the income of others in one’s age group, the lower one’s happiness, with and without controls for age, health, education, marital status, and other correlates of happiness. That is, it is relative income within one’s age-peer group that is positively related to happiness at all income levels, not absolute income. The implication is that, since real incomes tend to increase over most of individuals’ working lives, working-age families must earn more and more over time to maintain a constant level of happiness. The authors point out that this is an example of what Brickman and Campbell (1971) called a “hedonic treadmill” – individuals must run faster and faster to maintain a constant relative status. Families with income earners in jobs with flat income trajectories are likely to become less happy over time. Connections of this finding and phenomenon with long-term income trends by socioeconomic status and/or race/ethnicity might be quite relevant to studies of political shifts and movements, the topic of Chapter 5 reviewed above.

Concluding Comments

Readers can infer from the descriptions and commentary given above that I find this volume full of interesting empirical analyses of social conditions and changes therein in American society over the past four decades. Given sufficient time and energy, I could add to this review essay similar descriptive/analytic sections on each of the other nine substantive chapters of the book. Suffice it to say that anyone seeking to understand American society, the American public, and how it has changed from the 1970s to the 2000s should thoroughly study the chapters of this book. And, since many of the social forces and social changes evident in American society are not totally unique thereto, that is, are found to some extent in other countries, the book and the contents of its chapters will be evident to some extent elsewhere as well, especially in the globalization era of the last two decades.
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This 12 volume Encyclopedia has just appeared in print – see the photo. The following description of the encyclopedia is adapted from the Preface written by Alex Michalos. Professor Michalos is well known to many members of the social indicators/quality-of-life/well-being research community. He founded the journal Social Indicators Research in 1973 and served as Editor for the first 110 volumes through December 2013. Alex has made many research contributions over the years, was a founding member of the International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies, and has served as its President. He is Professor Emeritus at the University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, BC, Canada and currently resides in Brandon, MB, Canada.

The aims of the Encyclopedia are:

1) To display in one place the vast scope and complexity of scientific and other scholarly research on quality of life over the last 50 years.

2) To bring together the works of a diverse network of scholars contributing to and drawing from a common source in order to stimulate cross-disciplinary research, leading to a greater progressive, comprehensive, and coherent vision of the field.

3) An improved vision of the field provides a rough road map giving some direction to the next 10–20 years of research, a third aim of the encyclopedia. Readers of an encyclopedia can get an overview of the density of research in different areas, where the focus has been and where it might go next. For example, in this encyclopedia, one can see that the impacts on the quality of life are profoundly understudied regarding arts-related activities, natural and human-crafted environments, sports, religion, sex, sustainability, and good governance.

4) Fourth, the encyclopedia should provide an authoritative, well-informed resource serving the needs not only of scholars and students, but of ordinary citizens, elected and unelected government officials, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and socially responsible corporations.

5) Notwithstanding the limitations just mentioned, the encyclopedia has been built with an aim (the fifth) to improving private and public policy analyses and discussions leading to better decisions and policy making concerning the quality of life of individuals and societies.

6) Sixth, Alex aimed to have an international and multidisciplinary editorial board of distinguished scholars and a collection of essays by equally distinguished authors. In this way, readers directed to this encyclopedia will find a comprehensive collection of relevant, reliable, and valid research reports.

7) Seventh is Alex’s objective of making maximum use of the latest technology to link encyclopedia essays to other works available in electronic form. The strategy of the encyclopedia is to have relatively short essays linked to relevant essays across Springer’s approximately 200 other reference works, so readers can build a package of information that most precisely fits their needs. Besides publication in hard copy and e-book versions, the encyclopedia will be open-ended and online, allowing authors to update essays and editors to insert additional essays. If and when the next edition of the encyclopedia is produced, all updated and brand-new essays will be integrated into it.

8) Finally, while the focus is on the last 50 years of research, Alex sought to build a treatise worthy of its illustrious scholarly predecessors extending at least to the fifth century BCE (recall that Alex’s doctorate...
Besides pursuing these seven relatively professional aims, Alex states that there were a couple of more personal motives for undertaking the work. One was simply the attraction of the challenge of building such a large treatise. A second motive was that building an encyclopedia would keep me as close to his first loves of learning and building as he could get at this stage of his life. Alex states that he did not aim to produce a treatise free of bias. On the contrary, his bias is toward free discussion from diverse perspectives. The encyclopedia is not intended to be free of controversial assessments or of some repetition of discussions of various topics. In a work of this sort and size, coming from authors with diverse backgrounds, interests, and perspectives, writing on topics that usually do not have established boundaries, one should not expect universal agreement. Like a great university or a great scholarly journal, Alex’s vision is that a great encyclopedia should provide a shared public space for the exploration of what is true, beautiful, and morally good.

Springer and Alex originally produced approximately 17,800 candidate topics for the encyclopedia in July 2009. In the end, the Encyclopedia has 2,165 essays, and 1,272 authors distributed across 58 countries coordinated by 154 editorial board members from 32 countries.

Suffice it to say that this is a huge reference work. Just imagining all of the time, energy, and effort that went into its creation and coordination from conceptualization to publications is more than most of us can handle. Congratulations to Alex for carrying this ball, chalice, cross (use your own referent) for all of us who are devoted to the goals of creating better social indicators for monitoring and reporting on quality-of-life and well-being.

~ Kenneth C. Land
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APPLIED RESEARCH IN QUALITY OF LIFE

THE OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR QUALITY-OF-LIFE STUDIES

The aim of this journal is to publish conceptual, methodological and empirical papers dealing with quality-of-life studies in the applied areas of the natural and social sciences. As the official journal of ISQOLS, it is designed to attract papers that have some direct implications for or impact on practical applications of research on the quality-of-life. We welcome papers crafted from inter-disciplinary, inter-professional and international perspectives. This research should guide decision making in a variety of professions, industries, nonprofit, and government sectors such as healthcare, travel and tourism, marketing, corporate management, community planning, social work, public administration, human resource management, among others. The goal is to help decision makers apply performance measures and outcome assessment techniques based on concepts such as well-being, human satisfaction, human development, happiness, wellness and quality of life. The Editorial Review Board is divided into specific sections indicating the broad scope of practice covered by the journal, and the section editors are distinguished scholars from many countries across the globe.

Authors interested in submitting manuscripts for publication should consult the website http://ariq.edmgr.com. Further information may be obtained by contacting one of the journal’s Co-Editors: Richard Estes, University of Pennsylvania (USA), restes@sp2.upenn.edu; Alex C. Michalos, University of Northern British Columbia (Canada), michalos@unbc.ca; M. Joseph Sirgy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University (USA), sirgy@vt.edu.
Research Committee 55 Social Indicators of the International Sociological Association is fortunate to have had Professor Ming-Chang Tsai as organizer of the Committee’s sessions for the forthcoming July 2014 ISA Congress in Yokohama, Japan. Ming-Chang Tsai (mtsai@mail.ntpu.edu.tw) is Distinguished Professor, Department of Sociology, National Taipei University and Convenor, the Sociology Division, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, National Science Council, 151 University Road, Sansia, New Taipei City, 23741, Taiwan. As of February 2014, Professor Tsai indicates that the RC55 ISA Sessions are as follows:

**Monday, July 14, 2014: 10:30 AM - 12:20 PM**

Changes and Dynamics: Challenges in Constructing and Defining Complex Social Indicators

Combining Economic Trend Data with Suffering Narratives for Disaster-Struck Nations. R. Anderson

Extremely Critical Indicators of a Society and Managing Socioeconomic Development with Them. V. Lokosov

Dynamics of Income and Living Standard. J. Beste

Long-Term Trends in Life Satisfaction in Europe Explained (1973-2012). M. Callens

Dynamics of Subjective Quality of Life Indicators in Romania: Challenges Posed By a Trend Analysis over 40 Years. S. Baltatescu

The Proliferation of Composite Indexes. N. Boavida

Dynamics of Social Indicators of Ukraine. N. Kharchenko and V. Paniotto

Kozminski University Index of Balanced Economic and Social Development ("IBESD") for Poland. K. Zagorski, A. K. Kozminski, A. Noga, and K. Piotrowska

**Monday, July 14, 2014: 03:30 PM - 05:20 PM**

Conditions for Happiness

Happiness and Consumption. A. Okulicz-Kozaryn

Children: Pleasure or Pain? Effects of Parenthood on Subjective Well-Being. B. Riederer

Micro and Macro Conditions for Happiness in Urban China. H. F. WU

Purposefulness, a Key to Happiness in Selected Developing Nations. R. Anderson

The Venus-Mars Difference and Its Discontents: The Contextual Effects Of Gender-Ideology Gender Gaps On Life Satisfaction. W. C. Chen and M. C. Tsai


Political Participation and Procedural Utility from a Gender Perspective: Activities in Neighborhood Associations in Japan. T. Tiefenbach and P. Holdgrün

Others' Happiness: New Evidence from Four Asian Countries. Y. Takahashi

**Monday, July 14, 2014: 05:30 PM - 07:20 PM**

Pain and Social Suffering Around the World
Suffering and Capabilities in Chile. F. Dussaillant, E. Guzman, and P. Gonzalez

Transgenerational Trauma and the "Civilizing" Process in Western Society. S. Siegel

The Advent of Vulnerability: Socioeconomic Insecurities and Feelings of Social Isolation in Contemporary Japan. C. Hommerich

A Tale of Two Sorrows: Hurricane Katrina, Parenting Trouble, and the Politics of Suffering. A. Francis

Buddhism and Critical Social Science on the Causes of Suffering: Towards a Dialogue. R. Flores

Undeserved Unhappiness: A Comparison of Philippines and Japan. L. R. Laroza


**Monday, July 14, 2014: 07:30 PM - 08:50 PM**

Quality of Life across Life Courses: Early Predictors, Mediating Processes, and Moderators

Subjective Assessment of Happiness and Dimensions of Social Support: Empirical Insights. S. Mathur

The Influence of Early Trauma on the Quality of Life in Taiwan: The Moderating Impacts of Religiosity?. W. P. Wang, G. H. Fan, T. H. Fan, and H. K. Chao

Early Family Financial Stress and Adulthood Quality of Life: An Investigation of the Mediating Process. Y. F. Chen and C. J. Chou

Reported Premarital Sex: Explaining India's Gender Divide. N. Raghunath and P. Truscott

How People Recount Their Life”: Recording and Analysis of Individual Well-Being over the Life Course. E. Lelièvre and N. Robette

**Tuesday, July 15, 2014: 08:30 AM - 10:20 AM**

Happiness in Social Theory

Why Sociological Theory of Happiness Falls Short. R. Veenhoven

The Impact of Inequality on Subjective Well-Being. G. Ivan

Exchange and Life Satisfaction: Intergenerational Reciprocations in East Asia. M. C. Tsai and W. S. Yang

Happiness in the New Unified Theory of Sociobehavioral Processes. G. Jasso

The DNA of Happiness and Satisfaction: Comparison of Logistic Models in 44 Countries. J. A. Rodriguez, J. L. C Bosch, and R. Marin

How Perceptions of Social Justice Contribute to Our Understanding of When and How Income Inequality Affects Our Life Satisfaction. a Cross-Country Comparison. S. M. Schneider

Happiness, Ideal Happiness, and Reference Point. Y. Takahashi

Educational Composition and Development of Living Unit Area Effects for Wellbeing. M. Vasile

**Tuesday, July 15, 2014: 10:30 AM - 12:20 PM**

Construction of Composite Index: Methodological Innovation

A Multidimensional Measure of Social Stratification: Composite Indicator of Inequality. P. López-Roldán and S. Fachelli

Constructing Social Cleavage Indicators Using the Mixed-Effects Model. J. Tsutsui

How to Measure Quality of Life? an Integrated Approach in the Netherlands. J. Boelhouwer

Developing Indicators for Biocapital in an Era of Bioeconomy. T. W. Chen

Workload and Wage Gain As Determinant Indicators of Constructing a Composite Index Reflecting Worker Well-Being: Evidence from Taiwan Record-Linkage Data of Manpower Surveys. J. P. Lin

Towards the Construction of a Composite Indicator of Objective Individual Living Conditions for Europe. K. Krell
An Individualistic Approach To Multidimensional Poverty. The Case Of Chile, Colombia, Peru and Ecuador.
A. Franco-Correa

**Tuesday, July 15, 2014: 03:30 PM - 05:20 PM**

Keynote Speech Session

Professor Kenneth Land: FIFTY YEARS AFTER THE SOCIAL INDICATORS MOVEMENT: HAS THE PROMISE BEEN FULFILLED? An Assessment and An Agenda for the Future

**Wednesday, July 16, 2014: 08:30 AM - 10:20 AM**

Quality of Life in Times of Recession

Social Quality in Times of Recession. P. Abbott and C. Wallace

Economic Regression and Change of Life Satisfaction of Families with Children in 18 Countries. M. Ainsaar

A Longitudinal Perspective on Quality of Life in Times of Crisis: Switzerland from the 1990s to Nowadays. C. Suter, E. Crettaz, and J. Moussa

Changes in the Social Understanding of Quality of Life As a Result of the Economic Situation. R. Cichocki

Household Wellbeing and Health in Two Types of Welfare Regimes: A Comparison of (Lower-) Middle Income Households Chile and Costa Rica. D. Vera and M. Budowski

The Quality of Life in the Agrarian Reform Communities (ARCs) in the Southern Part of a Province in Central Visayas, Philippines. B. Tan

Community Wellbeing in the Northeast of Thailand. P. Weeranakin

**Wednesday, July 16, 2014: 10:30 AM - 12:20 PM**

Physical Punishment in Japan / Wellbeing in Latin America


Who Tolerates the Use of Physical Punishment?. H. Iwai

Social Conditions of Happiness. the Case of Mexico. R. Millan

The ‘10-Excess’ Phenomenon In Responses To Survey Questions On Happiness. G. Brulé and R. Veenhoven

Qualitative Analysis for Sociological Study of Various Conditions of Happiness. A. Mita

**Wednesday, July 16, 2014: 03:30 PM - 05:20 PM**

Social Policy and Well-Being

Financial Support for Families with Children and Its Trade-Offs: Balancing Redistribution and Parental Work Incentives to Increase Well-Being of Families. A. Kurowska, M. Myck, and M. Kundera

Labour Market Re-Entry of People with Disabilities after Vocational Rehabilitation in Germany. N. Reims, S. Gruber, and A. Rauch

Expanding Labour Market Effect Measures: Measuring Distance to the Labour Market As Increase or Decrease in Barriers Hindering Access to the Labour Market for the Unemployed. S. Dencker-Larsen

Happy for How Long? How Social Capital and GDP Relate to Happiness over Time. S. Bartolini and F. Sarracino

Welfare-to-Work Programs and Social Integration in Germany: Does Subsidised Employment Combat Perceived Social Exclusion of the Unemployed?. C. Hohendanner and S. Gundert

Time, Money, Infrastructure: Young Parents' Needs and (dis)Satisfaction with Family Policies in Japan. B. Holthus
Wednesday, July 16, 2014: 05:30 PM - 07:20 PM

Sustainability of the Welfare State: Implications for Social Indicators and Quality-of-Life Studies
Welfare State or Participation Society: 40 Years of Monitoring the Social State of the Netherlands. R. Bijl
Measuring Subjective Well-Being in the European Statistical System. M. De Smedt
An Analysis of Social Indicators in Brazil after the “Real Plan” (1994) until 2012. L. Bastos
The Role and Value of the Concept of “Precarious Prosperity” in Capturing Wellbeing Dynamics in Romania. I. Precupetu and A. M. Preoteasa
Indicators for the Social Impact of Social Sciences and Humanities Research: The FP7 IMPACT-EV Project. E. Oliver and A. Vidu

Thursday, July 17, 2014: 08:30 AM - 10:20 AM

Social Quality/Social Well-Being Indicator: From Social Economic Security to Social Empowerment
Trust and Social Inclusion in Asian Societies - the Result of the First Wave SQSQ Survey. R. Chan and X. Tang
Gender Differences in Social Quality in Taiwan. L. R. WANG
Social Policy for Improvement of Standard of Living in Thailand. T. Bureekul, S. Thananithichot, and R. Sangmahamad
Dualization and Ageing Democracy in Sweden, Germany, France, Japan and South Korea. D. Chang
Comparing the Social Quality Conditions at the City Level in Mainland China: Sazhen, Xiamen and Hangzhou. Y. Xu, K. Lin, and Y. Wang
Social Exclusion and Health Outcomes of Single-Mother Households in Japan. A. Oishi
Social Quality in Cross-Cultural Media and Public Debates: Implications for Public Policy for Social Empowerment. M. Takahashi
Governance Matters?: Social Concertation and Macro-Economic Outcomes. H. Koo, J. Yang, and H. Suh

Thursday, July 17, 2014: 10:30 AM - 12:20 PM

Community, Aging, and Well-Being
Recognition Award Program: Building Healthy Communities for Active Aging (BHCAA). K. Sykes
Challenges Posed for Construction of Indicators about Older-People. A. Nuss
The Need for Personal Assistance and Care in Families: Changes in Objective Living Conditions and Subjective Well-Being of Those Affected and Family Members. S. Weick
Model Of Happiness In The Former USSR Countries. A. Shabdenova and G. Alimbekova
Spread Your Happiness: The Effect of Self-Reported Happiness of Individuals on Their Peers. the Case of Italy. L. Canova and A. Biancini
The International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies (ISQOLS) and the Free University Berlin (FU Berlin) invite researchers from all disciplines, policy makers and practitioners from across the globe to participate in the 2014 Quality of Life Conference “Sustaining Quality of Life across the Globe”.

We invite you to join an exciting convening of quality of life thinkers September 15-18, 2014. This interdisciplinary ISQOLS conference will be hosted at the Free University in Berlin, Germany in conjunction with the departments of psychology, sociology, and economics. More details about the topics, sessions, fees, and publication opportunities are available at www.isqols.org/berlin2014.

ISQOLS is a multidisciplinary society encouraging the pursuit of quality of life studies and application. This international group convenes regularly to share ideas and findings, and actively supports the dissemination of findings and thoughts via its journal and newsletter, Applied Research in Quality of Life, and Social Indicators Network News as well as its allied publications (see www.isqols.org/resources/publications).

We encourage all disciplines and perspectives to join us to promote quality of life globally via research, policy, and partnerships. Come explore new horizons in quality of life with us.

Conference Theme and Topics
Our theme is “Sustaining Quality of Life across the Globe” and we welcome papers from all related disciplines. Submissions on issues of happiness, well-being, and any dimension of quality of life are welcome.

Theoretical and Philosophical Foundation
- Foundations for quality of life and happiness
- Views on quality of life in new philosophical approaches (e.g., capability approach, new realism)
- New impacts of neurosciences and behavioral sciences on quality of life
- Preservation of living conditions and intergenerational justice

Empirical Applications
- Causes and consequences in happiness and quality of life
- Social indicators – instruments for the improvement and preservation of quality of life
- Living conditions and life domains
- Living conditions and quality of life over the life cycle

Databases and Methods
- Statistical methods and multidimensional applications for measurement of quality of life
- New survey methods for the measurement of happiness and quality of life
- Databases and -sources

Community and Regional Perspectives, and Global Trends
- Quality of life in the local and regional environment including community well-being, planning, and development
- Trends in poverty, inequality and the distribution of living conditions in cross-national perspectives
- Global impacts (increasing world population, global economics, limits of resources) on the distribution of living conditions within and between countries

Everyday Life Experiences and Political Debates
- Applications for the indication and improvement of living conditions in everyday life
- Best practices and institutional settings for the preservation of living conditions
- Civil society, welfare state, suffering and resilience, and well-being
- Beyond GDP – review of debates and agenda for action

How to Submit Your Proposal
Please submit your proposed abstract of approximately
The Quality of Life Conference cont.

500 words with a list of 3-5 keywords using the following e-mail: berlin2014@isqols.org.

If you intend to organize a session, please contact us directly at berlin2014@isqols.org.

For new sessions we need a proposal of 500-1000 words together with a list of potential papers. All submitted abstracts and session proposals will be reviewed by established ISQOLS members in collaboration with the conference organizers. There will be the opportunity to submit your paper for publication consideration in a special issue and book volume.

**Deadlines**

Conference Date: September 15–18, 2014 at the Henry Ford Building of the Free University Berlin, Germany

Submission of Abstracts: May 1, 2014

Announcement of Acceptance: May 30, 2014

Registration: June 1-August 31, 2014

Late Registration: September 1, 2014-conference (late registration fees)

**Conference Organizers**

- Prof. Dr. Petra Böhnke, Universität Hamburg
- Prof. Dr. Jan Delhey, Jacobs University Bremen/ISQOLS
- Prof. Dr. Michael Eid, Free University Berlin
- Denis Huschka, RatSWD/ISQOLS, Berlin [advisory]
- Dr. Peter Krause, DIW Berlin (SOEP)/ISQOLS
- Jessica Ordemann, M.A., Universität Hamburg
- Prof. Dr. Ronnie Schöb, Free University Berlin
- Prof. Dr. Jürgen Schupp, Free University Berlin/DIW Berlin (SOEP)

International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies (ISQOLS) Leadership

- Dr. Rhonda Phillips, President (US)
- Denis Huschka, Executive Director (Germany)
- Peter Krause, Vice President of Programs (Germany)
- Laura Camfield, Vice President of Publications (UK)
- Ferran Casas, Vice President of Professional Affairs (Spain)
- Jose de Jesus Garcia Vega, Co-Vice President of Publicity/Membership (Mexico)
- Ming-Chang Tsai, Co-Vice President of Publicity/Membership (Taiwan)
- Giampaolo Nuvolati, Vice President of Academic Affairs (Italy)
- Mariano Rojas, Vice President of Finance (Mexico)
- Graciela Tonon, Vice President of External Affairs (Argentina)
- Dr. Joseph Sirgy, Co-Vice President of Development (US)

MESSAGE FROM THE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY
FOR QUALITY OF LIFE
STUDIES

President Rhonda Phillips

Never before has there been so much interest in quality of life and related topics. ISQOLS is uniquely poised to become a leader in this arena. We are excited for a new year and new era for ISQOLS.

As a society, we invite you participate with more and expanded opportunities. In addition to the stellar Quality of Life Conference being planned for the fall, we are also looking for new ways to engage our members and partner organizations. If you're interested, let us know and we'll make sure you are linked to others via collaborative groups around topics and issues.

Other plans include a campaign to increase membership across all disciplines, and including researchers and practitioners alike. Our mission is to provide a venue for scholars in quality of life to learn and share ideas on measurement, research, reporting, and policies in quality of life. Our new website is a platform for all to gain information about ISQOLS and our efforts, including events around the globe (www.isqols.org). A resource guide is included on the site, listing publications in quality of life including our own Applied Research in Quality of Life journal, and SINET as well as allied publications spanning disciplines.

It is our intent to become the "go to" place for quality of life scholarship and policy, serving as the leading source for all interested in pushing the boundaries of research and practice. If you're already a member, we invite you to become more involved and help us achieve this goal; if not yet, then please join us in our efforts!"
THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR QUALITY-OF-LIFE STUDIES: HEADQUARTERS AND WWW HOMEPAGE

The International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies (ISQOLS) was formed in the mid-1990s. The objectives of ISQOLS are: 1) to stimulate interdisciplinary research in quality-of-life (QOL) studies within the managerial (policy), behavioral, social, medical, and environmental sciences; 2) to provide an organization which all academic, business, nonprofit, and government researchers who are interested in QOL studies can coordinate their efforts to advance the knowledge base and to create positive social change; and 3) to encourage closer cooperation among scholars engaged in QOL research to develop better theory, methods, measures, and intervention programs.

Denis Huschka is the Executive Director and Treasurer for ISQOLS from Joe Sirgy, and the ISQOLS Central Office has moved from Blacksburg, Virginia, USA to Berlin, Germany. Denis’s contact information: Denis Huschka, Executive Director, ISQOLS, Mohrenstrasse 58 10117 Berlin, Germany; Fax: +49-(0)3089789-263 E-Mail: ed@isqols.org. Denis has worked hard to update and make interactive the ISQOLS website: www.isqols.org. In particular, membership dues can be paid directly on the updated website. Anyone interested in knowing more about ISQOLS should contact Denis.

SINET

Kenneth C. Land, Editor
Department of Sociology
Box 90088, Duke University
Durham, NC 27708-0088 USA
151-1057-6936-22940

SINET

Subscription Information

As a service to the world-wide social indicators community, SINET is issued quarterly (February, May, August, November). Subscribers and network participants are invited to report news of their social indicator activity, research, policy development, etc., to the Editor for publication. Deadlines are the 20th of the month prior to each issue.

Address:
SINET, Kenneth C. Land, Editor,
Department of Sociology, Box 90088,
Duke University, Durham, NC 27708-0088, USA
E-mail: kland@soc.duke.edu
Telephone: 919-660-5615
Fax: 919-660-5623

Subscriptions are on a calendar year basis; annual rates:
Libraries/Institutions ..................... US$26.00
Individual:
US & Canada ........................... US$18.00
All Others ................................ US$20.00

Sorry; credit cards are not accepted. Check must be in US dollars. Payment may be made through a wired money order; check with your financial institution for further information. Advance payments are always welcomed. Call or write for a multiple-year invoice.

Archived issues are available for purchase. Please call or write for prices and details.