

# **Life Satisfaction, Personality and Sector of Employment**

ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM  
Erasmus School of Economics  
Department of Economics  
Master Thesis: Economics of Management and Organisation

Supervisor: Robert Dur

Name: Peter Novak  
Exam number: 381718  
E-mail address: 381718pn@eur.nl

## **Abstract**

This research looks at the relationship between personality traits, life satisfaction, and sector of employment. Does the public sector, with its worker's objective to serve the interest of other people, make for a more satisfactory life and which personality traits reinforce this? This research looks at a panel analysis for the years 1992, 2004, and 2011 using the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study. Using personalities, life satisfaction, sector of employment of graduates of the Wisconsin high school cohort, and also looking at how they interact, it is found that altruistic personality traits do sometimes contribute to a more satisfactory life with some evidence that the public sector can contribute to this. I focus on 4 personality traits: altruism, laziness, trust, and confidence.

## **Introduction**

Many individuals self select themselves to work in the public sector for various reasons. It has been studied that individuals choose to work in the public sector based on intrinsic motivations, such as wanting to help others. This has been theorized by Perry and Wise (1990), as well as others, into public service motivation theory. What kind of people have such intrinsic motivations? What are their personality attributes? And, do they report higher satisfaction in their lives? In other words, is a happier life lead by taking care of the greater good? Do people who self select into the public sector to provide services to others feel more important and therefore happier? These questions have been of interest for economists, psychologists, and policy makers.

This research focuses on further trying to disentangle the relationship between workers' self selection into the public sector, their life satisfaction, and their personality traits. It focuses on 4 main personality traits: altruism, laziness, trust, and confidence. Rainey (1982), among others, has argued that altruism has a major connection to public service motivation. Delfgaauw and Dur (2008) add that lazy people often find themselves working in the public sector, due to its provision of weaker incentives. For trust, Dohmen and Falk (2010) find that public employees, specifically teachers, trust more and are more risk averse. Confidence has been somewhat neglected in studies concerning the private sector and the public sector, which is why we look at it here. On the other hand, there have been a few studies concerning risk aversion; for example, Burman, Delfgaauw, Dur, and van den Bossche (2012) find that public sector workers are more risk averse. Thus, this paper will try to uncover which sector of employment in combination with these personality traits lead to a more happy life.

This paper uses the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study which follows a group of 10,317 graduates from the Wisconsin high school from 1957 throughout their life. Questions about income, education, personality, happiness, and much more were asked through the years 1957, 1975, 1992, 2004, and 2011. The objective of this paper is to do a panel analysis of personalities, life satisfaction, and sector of employment for the years 1992, 2004, and 2011. Through this

analysis, we derive what kind of employment do people with more satisfactory lives lead and what kind of personality traits dictate sector of employment, as well as their relative interaction.

Several hypothesis are presented. First, we expect that altruism, trust, and confidence positively affect life satisfaction but laziness negatively affects it. Since altruism and trust are usually present in the public sector, as was discussed above, we would expect that working in the public sector should also positively affect life satisfaction. Second, we build on top of public service motivation theory as well as Dur and Zoutenbier (2012) theory of altruistic and lazy workers sorting into the public sector by studying the interaction between the public sector and the 4 personality traits. The hypothesis, therefore, is that there should be a clear interaction between these personality traits and the public sector variable. Third, based on the work of Hetschko, Knabe, and Schob (2013) and Tonin and Vlassopoulos (2014), we look for happiness after retirement and whether people that volunteer after retirement are more happy, due to its similar nature of public service motivation of altruism. Fourth, if taking care of other people truly brings happiness to people's lives, we would expect that some people would switch from the private sector to the public sector in search of this sense of place. Finally, based on the work of Becker et al. (2012), we also test for the stability of personality traits throughout the years of a person's life. We expect that they are quite stable.

The first section of this paper carries through the related literature of life satisfaction, personality traits, and sector of employment. The next section presents some statistics about the data used, the method of research, and measures. Lastly, a discussion about the results concludes.

## **Related Literature**

Public service motivation was theorized by Perry and Wise (1990). They look at three possible theories of public service motivation: rational, norm-based, and affective. The rational motive explains that people working in the public sector simply maximize their individual utility because, for example, being a part of policy formulation can improve a worker's feeling of self importance. Norm-based motive is a desire to serve the public interest and not for people's personal gain. Affective motive to work in the public sector refers to personal identification with

a public program and therefore a more public inclined individual. Perry and Wise arrive at 3 main conclusions: people with higher public service motivation are more likely to work in the public sector, public service motivation allows individuals to have higher performance in the public sector, and public organizations do not have to incentivize public service motivated individuals with utilitarian incentives as much.

Deleire, Enami, and Moynihan (2011) base their research on public service motivation and life satisfaction. Using the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study and the General Social Survey they find that working in the public sector may increase life satisfaction under certain conditions. Especially for males starting in their career, life satisfaction increases when working under public administration. The authors explain that the reason the positive effect on life satisfaction due to public work shows up only for males is because females tended to be less favoured in the private sector and did not have much choice when choosing for sectors. Should they had an unrestricted choice, as the males did, certain females who have intrinsic preferences might have chosen the public sector. Personality measures are often overlooked in economics, yet they play an important role in employee self selection. It is no wonder that employers use personality tests to hire workers (Dohmen and Falk 2010). Therefore, in our paper, building on top of Deleire, Enami, and Moynihan (2011), we add 4 personality traits relevant to public service motivation and then look at life satisfaction.

Tonin and Vlassopoulos (2014) use a sample of retired workers from 12 European countries to find differences in prosocial motivation in private and public workers. They find that public sector workers, current and retired, are more prosocial. The difference in prosocial motivation, however, is negligible when looking at broad occupations. Rather, former public sector workers in education are more prosocial. Furthermore, prosocial motivation decreases over the course of one's career.

Dur and Zoutenbier (2012) use a sample of German workers to find differences of intrinsic motivations between private sector and public sector workers. They find that public sector workers are more altruistic, especially for workers starting out in their career. They also

find that public sector workers are more lazy, but this laziness is more pronounced in older workers. Furthermore, these findings are especially strong for higher educated workers.

Hetschko, Knabe, and Schob (2013) use data from the German Socio-Economic Panel for the years 1984 and 2010 to study how unemployment affects people before and after retirement. For people that were unemployed before retirement, they find that retirement creates a positive effect on that person's life satisfaction. This happens because the person feels as if he or she returns to society's norm and it is no longer expected of them to be working. Thus, unemployed people who are not expected to work (retired) are happier, whereas unemployed people who are expected to work are less happier due to loss of income and by not adhering to the social norm of society.

Becker et al. (2012) study how economic preferences are related to personality such as the Big Five personality traits: openness, neuroticism, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness. They use three data sets to research their finding: an individual choice experiment, 1000 participants from the German population, and a third data set from the German Socio-Economic Panel. Their main result is that economic preferences and personality are not substitutes but rather complement each other. Their rationale behind this is that economic preferences and personality traits are measured in very different ways, the Big Five personality traits are very broad measures of personality, and economic and psychological models are created in different ways. A second important finding is that personality traits remain relatively stable throughout ones life due to one's certain beliefs being stable.

Delfgaauw and Dur (2008) theorize that lazy workers may be better for society when they work for the public sector, as dedicated workers (workers with public service motivation) can serve the public at a lower cost (a lower wage). When effort is unverifiable, however, lazy workers may crowd out dedicated workers in the public sector. This paper supports the finding that public sector workers receive weaker incentive than private ones and therefore are a major employer for lazy workers (Delfgaauw and Dur 2008).

Dohmen and Falk (2010) take a closer look at teachers in Germany. Using the Socio-Economic Panel as well as controlled laboratory experiments, they find that teachers, as public workers, are more risk averse and more trusting than private sector workers or other public sector workers. With laboratory experiments, they find this by changing the incentive system which in turn affects the well being of teachers due to more risk. Furthermore, they show that introducing a new incentive system has a selection effect as well. Certain workers self select into jobs based on different pay schemes; fixed vs. variable pay. On the other hand, their field study also supports their main findings.

As mentioned, this paper takes into account public service motivation, life satisfaction, as well as the often overlooked personality traits. In the next section, we describe the data and methodology of the research.

## **Data and Methodology**

The data used in this paper comes from the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study which takes into account 10,317 graduates from the Wisconsin high school and follows them throughout their life time. Questions about life, income, jobs, personalities, happiness, etc. were asked for the years 1957, 1975, 1992, 2004, and 2011. The panel analysis in this paper will focus on the years 1992, 2004, and 2011 as personality questions were not asked before 1992.

The key variables for this study are: life satisfaction, the 4 personality traits, happiness, volunteering, and employment. The life satisfaction is phrased in the question, “To what extent do you agree that when you look at the story of your life, you are pleased with how things have turned out?” with a response rate of 8,493 in 1992, 6,845 in 2004, and 5,391 in 2011. The altruism question is phrased, “To what extent do you agree that people would describe you as a giving person, willing to share your time with others?” The laziness question is phrased, “To what extent do you agree that you see yourself as someone who is lazy at times?” The confidence question is phrased, “To what extent do you agree that, in general, you feel confident and positive about yourself?” The last personality trait is trust which is phrased, “To what extent do you agree that you see yourself as someone who is generally trusting?” All 4 personality

questions have a response rate of 6,875 in 1992, 6,845 in 2004, and 5,391 in 2011. The employment variable is a dummy variable; 1 if worker is in the public sector, 0 otherwise (includes if worker is unemployed, as well). This employment variable is received from the class of worker code for 5 job spells in 1992, and 8 job spells in 2004 and 2011. There are a few persons who did not have any job spells throughout certain periods and they are included in the analysis as well. We also look at broad occupations such as service worker, clerical or kindred, and professional or technical. Broad occupations are received from the 1970 major occupation code. Questions on happiness were, “During the past 4 weeks, have you been feeling happy or unhappy?” asked in 2004 and 2011. Finally, the question regarding volunteering was phrased, “Did graduate do volunteer work in the last 12 months?” in 2004 and 2011. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for these variables.

Using linear regressions, we analyze each hypothesis for each year 1992, 2004, and 2011:

$$1A.) \text{ Life Satisfaction}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{altruism})_i + \beta_2(\text{laziness})_i + \beta_3(\text{trust})_i + \beta_4(\text{confidence})_i + \beta_5(\text{public})_i + \beta_6(\text{public*altruism})_i + \beta_7(\text{public*laziness})_i + \beta_8(\text{public*trust})_i + \beta_9(\text{public*confidence})_i + X'\delta + \varepsilon$$

Regression 1A takes into account the 4 personality traits and the public sector dummy on life satisfaction and their interaction.  $X'$  is a vector of control variables such as education, marital status, and number of children (see Table 1). Rather than looking at 5 job spells in 1992 and 8 job spells in 2004 and 2011, regressions 1A and 1B will focus only on current job spells of workers.

$$1B) \text{ Life Satisfaction}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{altruism})_i + \beta_2(\text{laziness})_i + \beta_3(\text{trust})_i + \beta_4(\text{confidence})_i + \beta_5(\text{service})_i + \beta_6(\text{service*altruism})_i + \beta_7(\text{service*laziness})_i + \beta_8(\text{service*trust})_i + \beta_9(\text{service*confidence})_i + \beta_{10}(\text{clerical})_i + \beta_{11}(\text{clerical*altruism})_i + \beta_{12}(\text{clerical*laziness})_i + \beta_{13}(\text{clerical*trust})_i + \beta_{14}(\text{clerical*confidence})_i + \beta_{15}(\text{professional})_i + \beta_{16}(\text{professional*altruism})_i + \beta_{17}(\text{professional*laziness})_i + \beta_{18}(\text{professional*trust})_i + \beta_{19}(\text{professional*confidence})_i + X'\delta + \varepsilon$$

Regression 1B looks at the relationship between broad occupations and the 4 personality traits. Service is a dummy variable which equals to 1 if in the service or private household. Clerical



equals 1 if clerical or kindred worker, and professional equals 1 if worker is professional, technical or kindred, salaried.

$$2A.) \text{ Recent Happiness}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{volunteer})_i + \beta_2(\text{public})_i + \beta_3(\text{public*volunteer})_i + \beta_4(\text{altruism})_i + \beta_5(\text{altruism*public})_i + \beta_6(\text{altruism*volunteer})_i + X'\delta + \varepsilon$$

Regression 2A looks at the years 2004 and 2011 where most graduates of the Wisconsin high school were retired. We focus on these years and whether volunteering after retirement or still working in the public sector increases happiness as public service motivation theory would suggest.

$$2B.) \text{ Volunteer} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{public})_i + X'\delta + \varepsilon$$

Regression 2B, based on the work of Tonin and Vlassopoulos (2014), focuses on whether public sector workers volunteer more after retirement. Tonin and Vlassopoulos (2014) find that public sector workers are more prosocial when employed and after retirement.

3.) Switching between sectors is tested here, where the difference between previous job spell and current is measured.

4.) Finally the stability of traits are tested based on correlations with each other for the years 1992, 2004, and 2011.

## Results

Starting with regression 1A, we look at whether public service motivation leads to a more satisfactory life. For the year 1992, we find that working in the public sector does not necessarily lead to a more satisfactory life. However, as our hypothesis predicts, we find strong positive and significant effects for trust and confidence and a strong negative and significant effect for laziness. For altruism, however, we find a small and insignificant effect. Similarly, the interaction terms for the public sector and the 4 personality traits are positive (except for trust) but are not so significant, suggesting that life satisfaction does not change in a different way when having these personality traits while working in the public sector rather than in the private sector. In the year

2004, we find a few differences in the results. Now, the altruism personality trait is very positive and very significant. Furthermore, laziness is also significant but with a smaller positive effect. Most people in the year 2004 are retired which would suggest that altruism (or giving and sharing with other people) becomes more important to retirees. Similarly, laziness becoming positive could mean that it actually starts to benefit retirees' life satisfaction. The results for 2004 also apply for 2011, with altruism being even more positive. Trust, as well, becomes more positive in 2011. On the other hand, working in the public sector does not have a significant power for all the years, and this includes the interaction terms. But, this may not be a good representation of working in the public sector on life satisfaction as most graduates are retired in 2011. Nevertheless, these results may be in line with Deleire, Enami, and Moynihan (2011) where they find that public service motivation may be a strong force in creating a more satisfactory life. To dissect this further, we now turn to broad occupations and see if there is a difference.

For the year 1992, when looking at broad occupations, we find similar results as the ones found above, with no difference in the significance in the broad occupation categories or their interaction with the personality traits. For the years 2004 and 2011, we do find a clearer difference in the broad occupations. We find that clerical work in 2004 does have a negative effect on life satisfaction (and somewhat significant). Furthermore, we find several interaction terms with significant effects in 2004 and 2011. For 2004, service and clerical work is interacting with altruism in a positive and significant way. On the other hand, professional jobs maintains a negative relationship to life satisfaction. For 2011, the broad occupations alone do not have much significance but their interaction with the personality traits do. The most positive and significant interaction terms in 2011 are service, clerical, and professional work with altruism only. Thus, we may conclude that altruism does play a significant role in life satisfaction. As has been suggested that public service motivation can increase life satisfaction, we conclude that the act of giving and sharing with others may become more important later in life.

Hetschko, Knabe, and Schob (2013) provided a study that showed that conforming to the social norm of society improves life satisfaction. We look at recent happiness and whether

volunteering and working in the public sector improves this happiness for retired people in the years 2004 and 2011. We, specifically, focus on the pre-retirement job spell when looking for whether the graduate worked in the public sector. We find that working in the public sector before retirement does not increase recent happiness once retired; it has a small and insignificant effect. The interaction term as well is not so significant. We could speculate here that public sector work may not increase happiness as there could exist some shame effect created by being a public sector worker before retirement. However, when looking at broad occupations, we do find a difference. Choosing three broad pre-retirement occupations: service or private household, clerical or kindred workers, and professional, technical and kindred, salaried, we find a positive and significant effect only for service or private household workers for the year 2004. These types of workers typically include several public sector jobs such as child care workers, welfare services, health workers, protective service workers (such as policemen), etc. They also include some private sector jobs. We do not find the same effect for 2011 as most of the people have not worked since last interviewed due to their retirement. The interaction terms for these broad occupations are once again not so significant, suggesting that there is no difference in happiness between the two sectors when volunteering after retirement. On the other hand, volunteering does have a significant effect on recent happiness. It is negative, but very small in the year 2004, but much more positive and significant in the year 2011. In 2011, volunteering may result in 2.7% increase in recent happiness (see table 5). Thus, perhaps due to altruistic motivations, volunteering can help people be happier.

We now check if workers who previously worked in the public sector are more likely to volunteer when retired. Running regression 2B, we find that this is the case for the year 2004. In 2004, working in the public sector pre-retirement makes it more likely for the graduate to volunteer after retirement; by 11.4 percentage points (and is statistically significant), while controlling for education, marital status, and number of children. For the year 2011, however, the same result does not hold, in fact it becomes negative, but also significant. This is in line with the work of Tonin and Vlassopoulos (2014) where they find similar results across the two sectors but also find that prosocial motivation disappears over time for both sectors.

We would expect that people switch to the public sector if they are motivated to serve the public and/or have a desire to help others. There are five job spells in 1992. 11.9% of graduates move away from the public sector between their first and second job spell in 1992. This trend continues but at the last job spell (from fourth job spell to current), we see that 14.04% of people move towards the public sector. Overall, 4.48% of people moved towards the public sector from first job spell to current in 1992. For 2004, we find a similar trend as graduates move away from the public sector at first and continue through smaller percentages but at the end they move towards it at 14.75%. Overall, 4.55% moved towards the public sector versus 3.22% who moved away from it. For the year 2011, the same trend appears. We cannot say, however, that this is due to public service motivation or the desire to help others but we can conclude that some people, on average, do switch to the public sector when thinking of finding new jobs later in life. We can only speculate that people switch to the public sector in later years (in 2004) and this could be due to more altruism being present in their lives.

Lastly, based on the work of Becker et al. (2012), we test for the stability of personality traits. Are people more altruistic or more trusting as they grow older? See appendix for stability correlations; we find that all 4 personality traits are relatively stable. As Becker et al. (2012) pointed out, this stability could be due to certain beliefs remaining the same throughout one's life. Nevertheless, we do find that some traits are more pronounced later in life, as mentioned above, for example with retirees being more altruistic and therefore volunteering more.

## **Conclusion**

This paper has used the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study to panel analyze how life satisfaction and sector of employment is related to specific personality traits: altruism, laziness, trust, and confidence. We test several hypotheses and find that people who have public service motivation and/or a desire to help others may have a higher life satisfaction, as well as a higher propensity to volunteer. As people grow older, we find that sometimes this is the case. Additionally, we test for switching between sectors which is based on public service motivation and life satisfaction and the stability of personality traits. It should be noted that using the

Wisconsin Longitudinal Study has some limitations. For example, it is not representative of the rest of the population as all of the graduates come from one high school and thus one community.

We also find that certain occupations are interacting with public service motivation and/or the desire to help others (i.e. volunteer). This could mean that people who worked in certain occupations throughout their life that serves the public and other people may be more happy later in life. It would be interesting, then, to motivate people, in both private and public sectors, to help others and see what effect this has. This could be the basis of a future research or experiment. It could also uncover whether public sector workers are truly more helpful to others than private sector ones. Furthermore, this could have very good policy implications for employers as well as policy makers.

## References

- Becker, Anke, Deckers, Thomas, Dohmen, Thomas J., Falk, Armin and Fabian Kosse 2012 The Relationship between Economic Preferences and Psychological Personality Measures, *IZA Discussion Paper* 6470.
- Buurman, Margaretha, Delfgaauw, Josse, Dur, Robert, and Seth Van den Bossche 2012 Public sector employees: Risk averse and altruistic?, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 83(3): 279-291.
- Delgaauw, Josse and Robert Dur 2008. Incentives and Workers' Motivation in the Public Sector, *Economic Journal* 118: 171-191.
- Delgaauw, Josse and Robert Dur 2007. Signaling and Screening of Workers' Motivation, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 62(4): 605-624.
- Dohmen, Thomas and Armin Falk 2010. You Get What You Pay For: Incentives and Selection in the Education System, *Economic Journal* 120: F256-F271.
- Dur, Robert and Robin Zoutenbier 2012. Intrinsic Motivations of Public Sector Employees: Evidence for Germany, *Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper*.
- Hetschko, C., Knabe, A. and Schob R. 2013. Changing Identity: Retiring from Unemployment, *The Economic Journal* 124: 149-166.
- Moynihan, Donald P., DeLeire, Thomas, and Kohei Enami 2011. A Life Worth Living: Evidence on the Relationship Between Prosocial Values and Happiness, *The American Review of Public Administration*.
- Rainey, Hal G. 1982. Reward Preferences among Public and Private Managers: In search of the Service Ethic, *American Review of Public Administration* 16(4): 288-302.
- Perry, James L., and Lois R. Wise 1990. The Motivational Bases of Public Service, *Public Administration Review* 50(3): 367-373.
- Tonin, Mirco and Michael Vlassopoulos 2014. Are Public Sector Workers Different? Cross-European Evidence from Elderly Workers and Retirees, *IZA Discussion Paper* 8238.

## Appendix

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Year	Obs	Mean	s.d.	min	max
<b>Dependent Variables</b>						
Life Satisfaction	1992	8493	1.23278	2.341308	-3	7
	2004	6845	2.064573	1.357031	-3	6
	2011	5391	1.033945	6.0327	-29	6
Recent Happiness	2004	7265	1.035788	0.3101387	-3	2
	2011	6152	-1.857445	1.373624	-29	3
Volunteer (also dependent)	2004	7265	-0.6967653	1.735583	-5	2
	2011	6152	-1.029259	5.315119	-30	2
DifLazy	1992					
	2004					
	2011					
<b>Independent Variables</b>						
Altruism	1992	6875	1.898909	1.175639	-3	6
	2004	6845	1.71103	1.102599	-3	6
	2011	5391	0.6288258	5.965272	-29	6
Laziness	1992	6875	3.853527	1.843668	-3	6
	2004	6845	3.768006	1.839148	-3	6
	2011	5391	2.261733	7.226057	-29	6
Trust	1992	6875	1.633309	1.175505	-3	6

Variable	Year	Obs	Mean	s.d.	min	max
Confidence	2004	6845	1.639445	1.220451	-3	6
	2011	5391	0.4190317	6.442847	-29	6
	1992	6875	1.690764	1.058554	-3	6
	2004	6845	1.716143	1.140192	-3	6
Public (current job spell)	2011	5391	0.4071601	6.473598	-29	6
	1992	10317	0.1587671	0.3654765	0	1
	2004	10317	0.1476204	0.3547405	0	1
Clerical	2011	10317	0.0436173	0.2042521	0	1
	1992	10317	0.1673936	0.373345	0	1
	2004	10317	0.1237763	0.3293421	0	1
Service	2011	10317	0.0306291	0.1723189	0	1
	1992	10317	0.0757972	0.2646862	0	1
	2004	10317	0.057381	0.2325805	0	1
Professional	2011	10317	0.0181254	0.1334115	0	1
	1992	10317	0.1604148	0.3670081	0	1
	2004	10317	0.1261025	0.331981	0	1
<b>Control Variables</b>	2011	10317	0.0298536	0.1701917	0	1
	1992	8493	-0.753915	2.01454	-3	4



Variable	Year	Obs	Mean	s.d.	min	max
Marital Status	2004	7265	-0.6748796	2.057812	-2	4
	2011	6152	-1.46684	5.423493	-30	5
	1992	8493	1.45826	1.058713	-3	5
	2004	7732	1.54643	1.189699	-4	5
	2011	6152	1.710826	1.729024	-29	5
Number of Children	1992	8493	2.957848	1.709568	-3	14
	2004	7732	3.006467	1.770922	-4	10
	2011	6152	3.184818	1.772221	0	10

Table 2: Regression 1A & 1B (1992) - Life satisfaction on personality and public dummy/broad occupations

Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction		
	(1)	(2)
Altruism	-0.022 (0.027)	-0.037 (0.033)
Laziness	-0.054 (0.016)***	-0.0267 (0.021)
Trust	0.081 (0.027)***	0.068 (0.342)**
Confidence	0.235 (0.030)***	0.251 (0.038)***
Public Dummy	-0.284 (0.224)	
Public x Altruism	0.070 (0.060)	
Public x Laziness	0.017 (0.038)	
Public x Trust	-0.029 (0.061)	
Public x Confidence	0.002 (0.069)	
Service Dummy		0.016 (0.294)
Clerical Dummy		0.215 (0.222)
Professional Dummy		-0.049 (0.232)
Service x Altruism		0.059 (0.091)
Service x Laziness		-0.019 (0.053)
Service x Trust		0.087 (0.084)
Service x Confidence		-0.068 (0.090)
Clerical x Altruism		0.047 (0.065)
Clerical x Laziness		-0.070 (0.393)*
Clerical x Trust		-0.0007 (0.064)
Clerical x Confidence		-0.013 (0.070)
Professional x Altruism		0.077 (0.065)
Professional x Laziness		-0.047 (0.04)
Professional x Trust		-0.002 (0.065)
Professional x Confidence		-0.030 (0.074)
Education	-0.036 (0.014)***	-0.029 (0.015)*

Marital Status	0.238 (0.027)***	0.240 (0.027)***
Number of Children	0.016 (0.017)	0.017 (0.017)
Constant	0.5849 (0.121)***	0.500 (0.144)***
R-squared	0.0313	0.0322

Note: \*,\*\*,\*\*\* indicate significance respectively at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 level. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 3: Regression 1A & 1B (2004) - Life satisfaction on personality and public dummy/broad occupations

Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction		
	(1)	(2)
Altruism	0.356 (0.016)***	0.317 (0.019)***
Laziness	0.023 (0.008)***	0.010 (0.010)
Trust	0.037 (0.014)***	0.038 (0.0165)**
Confidence	0.428 (0.015)***	0.451 (0.017)***
Public Dummy	-0.075 (0.111)	
Public x Altruism	0.059 (0.039)	
Public x Laziness	0.002 (0.021)	
Public x Trust	0.016 (0.033)	
Public x Confidence	-0.043 (0.038)	
Service Dummy		-0.173 (0.125)
Clerical Dummy		-0.244 (0.111)**
Professional Dummy		-0.188 (0.119)
Service x Altruism		0.188 (0.054)***
Service x Laziness		0.024 (0.024)
Service x Trust		-0.041 (0.042)
Service x Confidence		-0.067 (0.050)
Clerical x Altruism		0.100 (0.041)**
Clerical x Laziness		0.046 (0.022)**
Clerical x Trust		0.003 (0.034)

Clerical x Confidence		-0.054 (0.037)
Professional x Altruism		0.085 (0.041)**
Professional x Laziness		0.012 (0.022)
Professional x Trust		0.037 (0.035)
Professional x Confidence		-0.094 (0.039)**
Education	-0.038 (0.007)***	-0.031 (0.007)***
Marital Status	0.138 (0.012)***	0.140 (0.012)***
Number of Children	0.022 (0.008)***	0.022 (0.008)***
Constant	0.259 (0.056)***	0.346 (0.064)***
R-squared	0.3424	0.3456

Note: \*,\*\*,\*\*\* indicate significance respectively at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 level. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 4: Regression 1A & 1B (2011) - Life satisfaction on personality and public dummy/broad occupations

Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction		
	(1)	(2)
Altruism	0.710 (0.011)***	0.700 (0.012)***
Laziness	0.037 (0.009)***	0.028 (0.010)***
Trust	0.168 (0.011)***	0.175 (0.012)***
Confidence	0.027 (0.007)***	0.023 (0.007)***
Public Dummy	0.076 (0.146)	
Public x Altruism	0.241 (0.041)***	
Public x Laziness	-0.040 (0.028)	
Public x Trust	-0.176 (0.040)***	
Public x Confidence	-0.042 (0.025)*	
Service Dummy		0.1614 (0.1711)
Clerical Dummy		0.003 (0.1355)
Professional Dummy		-0.077 (0.1437)
Service x Altruism		-0.168 (0.041)***

Service x Laziness		0.051 (0.041)
Service x Trust		-0.0027 (0.046)
Service x Confidence		0.138 (0.032)***
Clerical x Altruism		0.260 (0.048)***
Clerical x Laziness		-0.044 (0.028)
Clerical x Trust		-0.1243 (0.043)***
Clerical x Confidence		-0.100 (0.023)
Professional x Altruism		0.274 (0.038)***
Professional x Laziness		-0.033 (0.030)
Professional x Trust		-0.147 (0.033)***
Professional x Confidence		-0.035 (0.022)
Education	-0.024 (0.006)***	-0.021 (0.006)***
Marital Status	0.188 (0.021)***	0.183 (0.021)***
Number of Children	0.037 (0.021)*	0.033 (0.021)
R-squared	0.8055	0.8082

Note: \*, \*\*, \*\*\* indicate significance respectively at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 level. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 5: Regression 2A (2004 & 2011)

Dependent Variable: Recent Happiness		
	(2004)	(2011)
Volunteer	-0.005 (0.002)**	0.027 (0.008)***
Public Dummy	-0.006 (0.010)	-0.115 (0.081)
Public x Volunteer	-0.008 (0.005)	-0.061 (0.052)
Education	-0.003 (0.002)	0.013 (0.007)*
Marital Status	0.010 (0.003)***	0.081 (0.010)***
Number of Children	-0.001 (0.002)	0.008 (0.010)
Constant	1.021 (0.010)***	-1.971 (0.042)***
R-squared	0.0030	0.0381

Note: \*, \*\*, \*\*\* indicate significance respectively at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 level. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 6: Regression 2A (2004 & 2011)

Dependent Variable: Recent Happiness		
	(2004)	(2011)
Volunteer	-0.005 (0.003)*	0.029 (0.008)***
Professional	0.001 (0.011)	-0.072 (0.081)
Clerical	0.001 (0.011)	-0.030 (0.078)
Service	0.048 (0.016)***	0.038 (0.106)
Professional x Volunteer	0.003 (0.006)	-0.080 (0.053)
Clerical x Volunteer	0.004 (0.006)	-0.020 (0.050)
Service x Volunteer	0.006 (0.008)	-0.092 (0.063)
Education	-0.003 (0.002)	0.011 (0.008)
Marital Status	0.009 (0.003)***	0.081 (0.010)***
Number of Children	-0.001 (0.002)	0.008 (0.010)
Constant	1.017 (0.010)***	-1.972 (0.042)***
R-squared	0.0040	0.0386

Note: \*, \*\*, \*\*\* indicate significance respectively at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 level. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 7: Regression 2B (2004 & 2011) - Volunteering on public dummy

Dependent Variable: Volunteer		
	(2004)	(2011)
Public Dummy	0.114 (0.055)**	-0.432 (0.137)***
Education	0.030 (0.004)***	0.883 (0.005)***
Marital Status	-0.032 (0.014)**	0.089 (0.017)***
Number of Children	-0.009 (0.012)	0.168 (0.016)***
Constant	-0.4774 (0.056)***	-0.400 (0.070)***
R-squared	0.0101	0.8175

Note: \*, \*\*, \*\*\* indicate significance respectively at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 level. Standard errors in parentheses.

Result 4: Switching Between Sectors (only 1992 results)

From first job spell to second			
	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-1	1,229	11.91	11.91
0	8,699	84.32	96.23
1	389	3.77	100

From second job spell to third			
	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-1	579	5.61	5.61
0	9,550	92.57	98.18
1	188	1.82	100

From third job spell to fourth			
	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-1	262	2.54	2.54
0	9,941	96.36	98.90
1	114	1.10	100

From fourth job spell to current			
	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-1	3	0.03	0.03
0	8,866	85.94	85.96
1	1,448	14.04	100

Overall, from first job spell to current			
	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-1	396	3.84	3.84
0	9,459	91.68	95.52
1	462	4.48	100



## Result 5: Stability of Personality Traits

Altruism			
	Altruism 1992	Altruism 2004	Altruism 2011
Altruism 1992	1		
Altruism 2004	0.3779	1	
Altruism 2011	0.0560	0.0847	1

Laziness			
	Laziness 1992	Laziness 2004	Laziness 2011
Laziness 1992	1		
Laziness 2004	0.3171	1	
Laziness 2011	0.0647	0.1089	1

Trust			
	Trust 1992	Trust 2004	Trust 2011
Trust 1992	1		
Trust 2004	0.2630	1	
Trust 2011	0.0299	0.0620	1

Confidence			
	Confidence 1992	Confidence 2004	Confidence 2011
Confidence 1992	1		
Confidence 2004	0.3277	1	
Confidence 2011	0.0660	0.0698	1