

# THE MODERATING EFFECT OF INCOME ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HAPPINESS AND TRUST IN PEOPLE

NGUYEN TRAN THUY AN<sup>1</sup>, NGUYEN THI KHANH VAN<sup>2\*</sup>, PHAN THI  
MINH ANH<sup>3</sup>, VO THI THANH THUY<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>DONG A UNIVERSITY, VIETNAM

<sup>2\*</sup>FPT UNIVERSITY, VIETNAM - CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

<sup>3</sup>FPT UNIVERSITY, VIETNAM

<sup>4</sup>HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM INSTITUTE, DUY TAN UNIVERSITY, VIETNAM

**Abstract.** Happiness has become an important factor in economics, public policy, and psychology. Many people try to work for happiness. There are many factors that influence happiness, including a good income, health, and life satisfaction. Trust, an important aspect of social relationships, plays a significant role in happiness, though its real-world impact can sometimes be limited. In this research, the World Values Survey Wave 7 dataset 2017–2022 including 51,580 respondents living in many countries around the world was used to show that higher levels of social trust are associated with better life evaluations, more positive feelings, and fewer negative emotions. This study proposes two hypotheses: (1): The trust in people is positively associated with the individual happiness, and (2) Income has a positive interaction effect on the relationship between trust in familiar people and Happiness; and (3): Income has a negative interaction effect on the relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and Happiness.

**Keywords:** Happiness, Trust, Income, Life Satisfaction, World Values Survey

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, happiness has become a topic of great interest in public policy, economics, and psychology. In 2011, happiness was measured and used to help guide public policy by the United Nations (UN) General Assembly. And the value of happiness has been extolled in many economic books as well as psychology books (Steptoe, 2019). An individual's happiness is their (positive) feeling of good in a given period of time (Ng, 2022). In terms of emotions (hedonic), happiness represents positive feelings as well as mood states such as joy, elation, and avoidance of distressing and sad states (Steptoe, 2019).

In today's society, people highly value happiness, so they desire to get lots of money or do whatever they can to make themselves happier. Money is not very important if more money does not significantly increase people's happiness. (Ng, 2022). Therefore, most people consider happiness to be one of their ultimate personal goals.

There are many reasons why a person feels happy, such as high income, having a better life, having good health, and being satisfied with their life. (Priebe, 2020; Ugur, 2019), the level of individual social capital, or an individual's pattern and intensity of social contact with others (Arampatzi, Burger, & Novik, 2016), and so on. During any given stage, a person can be concerned about their happiness time and consider how it will affect their happiness in the future. In addition, they are not only interested in maximizing their own happiness but may also be concerned about the happiness of others or helping others be happy (Ng, 2022).

Trust (part of Social Capital) and happiness, although these concepts have flourished over the years, have often limited practical value. Therefore, it is unsurprising that many researchers are trying to determine how happiness and trust relate. Through a study based on European Social Survey data in 2006 and 2008, trust along with social interactions and norms (social capital) are all positively related to personal happiness, even when individual characteristics and macroeconomic factors are controlled (Pose & Berlepsch, 2014)

In most countries worldwide, high levels of social trust are associated with higher life evaluations, more positive feelings, and the absence of negative feelings (Calvo, Zheng, Kumar, Olgiati, & Berkman, 2012). One cross-sectional study of 197,888 individuals (14–99 years) from 83 countries evaluated between 1981 and 2007 and a nationally representative sequential three-wave cohort study (spanning 4 years) on 1,230 individuals in the United States (aged 18–89) showed that (a) higher trust predicted higher well-being and (b) higher trust predicted to increase well-being longitudinally and vice versa (Poulin & Haase, 2015)

From previous studies on trust and happiness, I propose the main hypothesis of this study is **H1 (+):** The trust in people is positively associated with the individual happiness.

Income is one of the factors closely related to personal happiness. People with a high income may be willing to buy the material that satisfies them. In addition, satisfaction can lead to personal happiness. While a person has a low income, they often have to consider things when buying any material, which can make them unsatisfied. Low income can also lead to poverty. Their poverty causes pain in the social sense to find themselves without status, that is, outside and not accepted by the society in which they live. That hurts no less, although the pain is different (Scitovsky, 1975). The research model of income, working hours, and happiness by (Pouwels, Siegersa, & Vlasblom, 2008) showed that an individual's happiness increases with their own income.

Nevertheless, there have been no studies examining the moderating role of income variables on the relationship between trust in people and happiness. Therefore, I have proposed two hypotheses to consider this role: **H2 (-)**: Income has a positive interaction effect on the relationship between trust in familiar people and Happiness: **H3 (-)**: Income has a negative interaction effect on the relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and Happiness.

Although there have been many studies on trust and happiness as well as income and happiness, all studies have studied trust along with other independent variables that affect happiness. There are not many studies that independently investigate the relationship between trust in people and happiness and examine the moderating role of income in this link. Thus, I conducted this study with the aim of examining the link between belief in people and happiness. In addition, the moderating role of income is also considered.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

To analyze the relationship between trust in people and happiness, the World Values Survey Wave 7 dataset 2017–2022 was used to measure all variables as well as collecting data, then using Jamovi software (version 2.0) to analyze linear regression and interaction effects of income on the relationship between trust in people and happiness.

The World Values Survey (WVS) is an international research program that grew out of the European Values Study, which was started in 1981 and has been operating in more than 120 world societies. WVS is devoted to the scientific and academic study of the social, political, economic, religious, and cultural values of people around the world with the objective of assessing which effects have stabilized or changed over time on the social, political, and economic development of countries and societies. A globally representative comparative social survey every 5 years is the main instrument of the project.

The most recent 7th World Value Survey was conducted from mid-2017 to December 2021. In the WVS 7 survey, many aspects of society were reported, including social values, happiness, social capital, trust, economic values, corruption, migration, national security, and global governance in many regions and societies.

The samples must represent all persons 18 years of age or older residing in private households in each country, regardless of their nationality or language. The minimum sample size in most countries is 1200. Countries with larger populations have samples from N = 1500 to N = 5000. Countries with populations less than 2 million use the N = 1000.

My sample included 51,580 respondents living in many countries around the world. Since the data in WVS7 was used for sociological investigation, I cleaned the data before including it in the data analysis for my research (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Data cleaning

Variables	Variable name	Initial code	Data cleaning
Outcome	Happiness	Q46	Reverse code R's answer: (scale range +1) – Q46
Predictors	Trust in familiar people	Q58, Q59, Q60	Reverse code R's answer: (scale range +1) – Mean (Q58, Q59, Q60)
	Trust in unfamiliar people	Q61, Q62, Q63	Reverse code R's answer: (scale range +1) – Mean (Q61, Q62, Q63)
Control variables	R is female	Q260	Recode R's answer: Female=1; Male=0
	Age	X003R2	
	R is a citizen	Q269	Recode R's answer: Yes=1; No=0
	R does not live with parents	Q271	Recode R's answer: No=1; Others=0
	R is married	Q273	Recode R's answer: Married=1; Others=0
	Number of people in household	Q270	

	Number of children	Q274	
	Education	Q275	
	R is a fulltime employee	Q279	Recode R's answer: Full time=1; Others=0
	Working for a private non-profit organization	Q284	Recode R's answer: Private non-profit organization=1; Others=0
	Social class	Q287	Reverse code R's answer: (scale range +1) – Q287
	Income	Q288R	
	R is White	Q290	Recode R's answer: White=1; Others=0

### Happiness

In my research, happiness was measured using a 4-point scale of happiness in response to the question, “*Taking all things together, would you say you are*”, 1-Not at all happy, 2-Not very happy, 3-Quite happy and 4-Very happy

### Trust in people

With the trust in people variable, I divided it into trust in familiar people and trust in unfamiliar people. In which, trust in familiar people and unfamiliar people was measured by 6 following questions: *I'd like to ask you how much you trust people from various groups. Could you tell me for each whether you trust people from this group completely, somewhat, not very much or not at all?* (Read out and code one answer for each):

**Table 2.** Measuring independent variables

<b>Familiar group</b>	<b>Do not trust at all</b>	<b>Do not trust very much</b>	<b>Trust somewhat</b>	<b>Trust completely</b>
Your family	1	2	3	4
Your neighborhood	1	2	3	4
People you know personally	1	2	3	4
<b>Unfamiliar group</b>	<b>Do not trust at all</b>	<b>Do not trust very much</b>	<b>Trust somewhat</b>	<b>Trust completely</b>
People you meet for the first time	1	2	3	4
People of another religion	1	2	3	4
People of another nationality	1	2	3	4

### Control variables

In my analysis, I included control variables that could confound the relationships between trust in people and happiness. The control variables included in the analysis R is female, Age, R is a citizen, R does not live with their parents, R is married, number of people in the household, number of children they have, education, R is a full-time employee, R is working for a private non-profit organization, social class, income, and R is White. These control variables were chosen because they are potentially important confounders for the relationship between trust in people and happiness and/or are generally considered important determinants of happiness. Controlling for these factors is essential to accurately assess the relationship between happiness and trust in people.

The summary statistics and the correlation matrix of the variables included in the analysis can be found in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

**Table 3.** Descriptive statistics

	<b>N</b>	<b>Missing</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Happiness	70437	430	3.1499	3.00	0.713	1	4
Trust in familiar people	70052	815	3.1290	3.33	0.552	1	4
Trust in unfamiliar people	66863	4004	2.1102	2.00	0.699	1	4
R is female	70816	51	0.5259	1.00	0.499	0	1

Age	70549	318	2.0812	2.00	0.769	1	3
R is a citizen	65874	4993	0.9606	1.00	0.194	0	1
Number of people in household	70160	707	3.9874	4.00	2.216	1	63
R does not live with parents	69670	1197	0.7061	1.00	0.456	0	1
R is married	70528	339	0.5803	1.00	0.494	0	1
Number of children R has	70035	832	1.8091	2.00	1.750	0	24
Education	70273	594	3.4563	3.00	2.034	0	8
R is a full-time employee	70021	594	3.4563	3.00	0.479	0	1
R is working for a private non-profit organization	51580	19287	0.0794	0.00	0.270	0	1
Social class	69201	1666	2.6932	3.00	0.970	1	5
Income	69145	1722	1.8192	2.00	0.569	1	3
R is White	61754	9113	0.1192	0.00	0.324	0	1

**Table 4.** Correlation matrix of all variables included in the analysis

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
(1) Happiness	—															
2) Trust in familiar people	0.11***	—														
(3) Trust in unfamiliar people	0.03***	0.43***	—													
(4) Number of people in household	0.06***	-0.02***	-0.11***	—												
(5) Social class	0.15***	0.08***	0.1***	-0.03***	—											
(6) R is White	-0.03***	0.00	0.00	-0.17***	0.03***	—										
(7) R is female	0.02***	-0.04***	-0.05***	-0.02***	-0.01*	0.02***	—									
(8) Age	-0.06***	0.08***	0.06***	-0.19***	-0.05***	0.08***	-0.00	—								
(9) R is a citizen	-0.02***	-0.03***	-0.05***	0.01*	0.01	-0.12***	0.00	0.06***	—							
(10) R does not live with parents	-0.01*	0.03***	0.04***	-0.29***	-0.04***	0.07***	0.05***	0.45***	-0.05***	—						
(11) R is married	0.04***	0.12***	0.01	0.12***	0.00	-0.04***	-0.02***	0.29***	0.01*	0.31***	—					
(12) Number of children R has	0.02***	0.01***	-0.05***	0.29***	-0.11***	-0.08***	0.05***	0.42***	0.02***	0.31***	0.36***	—				
(13) Education	0.03***	0.05***	0.14***	-0.14***	0.33***	0.08***	-0.05***	-0.15***	0.04***	-0.08***	-0.09***	-0.28***	—			
(14) R is a full-time employee	0.01	0.03***	0.05***	-0.08***	0.09***	0.05***	-0.16***	-0.06***	-0.01**	0.01**	0.02***	-0.13***	0.26***	—		

(15) R is working for a private non-profit organization	-0.00	-0.02***	0.01*	0.07***	-0.03***	-0.06***	0.03***	-0.05***	-0.1***	-0.02***	-0.01**	0.04***	-0.08***	-0.09***	—	
(16) Income	0.13***	0.051***	0.06***	0.02***	0.44***	0.04***	-0.02***	-0.09***	0.01**	-0.06***	0.01	-0.11***	0.24***	0.11***	-0.03***	—

Note. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

### 3. RESULTS

After cleaning and analyzing the data, I obtain the following results:

*a. Without adding 13 control variables*

The coefficient of trust in familiar people is 0.122 with a significance level of  $p < .001$ , and the coefficient of trust in unfamiliar people is 0.021 with a significance level of  $p < .001$ ; both Trust in familiar and unfamiliar people are positively associated with Happiness. Therefore, my hypothesis 1 is supported (Table 5 and Table 6).

**Table 5.** The relationship between trust in familiar people and happiness without control variables (Model 1)

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	2.786	0.02059	135.3	< .001
Trust in familiar people	0.122	0.00654	18.6	< .001

**Table 6.** The relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and happiness without control variables (Model 1)

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	3.1223	0.01201	260.02	< .001
Trust in unfamiliar people	0.0211	0.00540	3.90	< .001

*b. With adding 13 control variables:*

In both models, the relationship between trust in familiar/ unfamiliar people and happiness has no difference in the direction of the influence of control variables on happiness (Table 7 and Table 8).

Compared to males, females feel happier. This may explain why men are often associated with economic pressures, earning money to support the family. As a result, it is possible that men often get tired of those pressures and are less happy than women

With age and education, they have a negative effect on happiness. It means that those who have higher education or older are not as happy as others. It is very obvious that people with higher education often have to face lots of pressure regarding education. They frequently need to improve their knowledge and qualifications by studying or attending training courses, so they may not be as happy as those with less education. As for age, there is absolutely no denying that people find age is an issue that bothers many people. As people get older, they will face many health issues and life pressure, so most of them lose their happiness.

However, the number of people in the household and the number of children respondents has affected positively on Happiness. Social class and income are also positively associated with happiness, it means that those who have higher social class or higher income will be happier than others. Income is one of the factors that greatly affect happiness. When people have a high income, they have enough mean to buy material things or experiences that make them satisfied and happy. In other words, we can hardly be happy if we are struggling in poverty.

**Table 7.** The relationship between trust in familiar people and happiness with control variables (Model 2)

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	2.51980	0.03257	77.372	<.001
Trust in unfamiliar people	0.11756	0.00655	17.955	<.001
R is female	0.04233	0.00729	5.804	<.001
Age	-0.09322	0.00595	-15.673	<.001
Number of people in household	0.01037	0.00194	5.339	<.001
R is married	0.03118	0.00813	3.834	<.001
Number of children R has	0.02069	0.00267	7.745	<.001
Education	-0.01098	0.00201	-5.452	<.001
Social class	0.06629	0.00425	15.583	<.001
Income	0.11535	0.00712	16.206	<.001
R is White	-0.07351	0.01098	-6.694	<.001
R does not live with parents	0.02665	0.00969	2.750	0.006
Working for private non-profit organization	-0.01931	0.01316	-1.467	0.142
R is a full time employee	-0.00364	0.00766	-0.475	0.635
R is a citizen	-0.00181	0.01712	-0.106	0.916

In addition, those who do not live with their parents are happier, maybe because they are more freedom to do what they want when they do not live with their parents. Compare to other marital status, respondent is married be happier. When people get married, they get a companion to share their problems, feelings, thoughts, and opinions. Marriage gives them security and stability. In any case, no matter how difficult or sick, they always have someone to take care of and help them. This might explain why respondents said marriage had a positive effect on happiness. However, compared to other races, Whites are less happy, possibly because they feel pressured and require a higher quality of life than other races.

**Table 8.** The relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and happiness with control variables (Model 2)

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	2.82654	0.02913	97.025	< .001
Trust in unfamiliar people	0.02041	0.00542	3.767	< .001
R is female	0.03705	0.00745	4.975	< .001
Age	-0.08623	0.00607	-14.213	< .001
Number of people in household	0.01154	0.00198	5.838	< .001
R is married	0.04701	0.00826	5.691	< .001
Number of children R has	0.01886	0.00272	6.924	< .001
Education	-0.00985	0.00207	-4.761	< .001
Social class	0.06646	0.00434	15.315	< .001
Income	0.11779	0.00726	16.218	< .001
R is White	-0.06769	0.01135	-5.964	< .001
R does not live with parents	0.02236	0.00988	2.264	0.024
Working for private non-profit organization	-0.02515	0.01339	-1.879	0.060
R is a citizen	-0.01514	0.01755	-0.863	0.388
R is a full time employee	-0.00228	0.00783	-0.291	0.771

Finally, working for a private non-profit organization, as a full-time employee, or as a citizen does not significantly affect happiness. This means whether you work in a private nonprofit you have a full-time job, or you are a city resident, this has absolutely no effect on your feelings of happiness.

*c. With adding interaction effects (Moderator- income)*

According to the interaction effect analysis, income moderates the relationship between trust in familiar people and happiness at -0.032 ( $p=0.003$ ). Specifically, income has a negative effect on the relationship between trust in familiar people. However, income does not significantly affect the relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and happiness is  $-3.22e-4$  ( $p=0.972$ ). (Table 9 and Table 10).

**Table 9.** The moderating role of income on the relationship between trust in familiar people and happiness with control variables (Model 3)

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	2.34044	0.06823	34.3034	< .001
Trust in unfamiliar people	0.17575	0.02053	8.5627	< .001
R is female	0.04249	0.00729	5.8263	< .001
Age	-0.09306	0.00595	-15.6468	< .001
Number of people in household	0.01037	0.00194	5.3389	< .001
R is married	0.03095	0.00813	3.8063	< .001
Number of children R has	0.02073	0.00267	7.7584	< .001
Education	-0.01077	0.00202	-5.3448	< .001
Social class	0.06649	0.00425	15.6286	< .001
Income	0.21412	0.03377	6.3396	< .001
R is White	-0.07307	0.01098	-6.6543	< .001
R does not live with parents	0.02694	0.00969	2.7797	0.005
Working for private non-profit organization	-0.01939	0.01316	-1.4731	0.141
R is a citizen	-0.00367	0.00766	-0.4797	0.631



R is a full time employee	-0.00167	0.01712	-0.0978	0.922
Trust in familiar people * Income	-0.03230	0.01080	-2.9916	0.003

Thus, it was analyzed that income level has a moderating effect on the relationship between trust in familiar people and happiness but no moderating effect on the relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and happiness; H2 is supported, but H3 is not supported.

**Table 10.** The moderating role of income on the relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and happiness with control variables (Model 3)

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	2.34044	0.06823	34.3034	< .001
Trust in unfamiliar people	0.17575	0.02053	8.5627	< .001
R is female	0.04249	0.00729	5.8263	< .001
Age	-0.09306	0.00595	-15.6468	< .001
Number of people in household	0.01037	0.00194	5.3389	< .001
R is married	0.03095	0.00813	3.8063	< .001
Number of children R has	0.02073	0.00267	7.7584	< .001
Education	-0.01077	0.00202	-5.3448	< .001
Social class	0.06649	0.00425	15.6286	< .001
Income	0.21412	0.03377	6.3396	< .001
R is White	-0.07307	0.01098	-6.6543	< .001
R does not live with parents	0.02694	0.00969	2.7797	0.005
Working for private non-profit organization	-0.01939	0.01316	-1.4731	0.141
R is a citizen	-0.00367	0.00766	-0.4797	0.631
R is a full time employee	-0.00167	0.01712	-0.0978	0.922
Trust in familiar people * Income	-0.03230	0.01080	-2.9916	0.003

Income is one of the variables that has a great impact on happiness; in the role of a moderating variable, it is more strongly associated than the trust in people variable. Hence, with the relationship between trust and happiness, income will have a weakening effect on this relationship. In other words, income will have a negative impact on the relationship between trust and happiness. This completely coincides with the obtained results in the study.

The reason for this is that individuals with higher incomes tend to rely less on social relationships to achieve happiness, as they already have financial security, autonomy, and access to necessary resources (such as healthcare, education, and entertainment). In such cases, trust in others becomes less essential in contributing to their well-being. In contrast, for those with lower incomes, social trust continues to play a significant role, as they often rely on social networks for support and a sense of security.

At high income levels, individuals may prioritize career advancement and the enjoyment of material comforts, leading to a reduction in time spent on family relationships, that is a mechanism explained by the relational goods theory. Becchetti, Londono Bedoya, and Trovato (2009) found that at the highest income levels, the time spent on social relationships tends to decrease. As income increases, people may allocate less time to "relational goods," such as communication with family and friends. In contrast, for lower-income groups, an increase in income allows them to spend more time on these relationships.

"For mothers, striving for professional excellence and maintaining intense involvement in children's lives can produce tremendous psychological distress... For fathers, career demands can impede their physical and emotional availability to the family." (Luthar, 2003, p. 1585)

Besides, high income may generate psychological stress for the primary caregiver, thereby weakening the quality of interactions and trust within the family, as suggested by the Family Stress Model.

The family stress model shows how poverty and economic pressure affects the quality of interparental relationships, which in turn impacts on child outcomes. Longitudinal evidence shows that poverty or economic pressure impacts on parents' mental health, which can cause parental conflict and difficulties with parenting. These then negatively impact on child outcomes and their future life chances, including externalising and internalising problems, academic and physical health difficulties, and social and interpersonal relationship problems.

Finally, overly strong family cohesion can unintentionally reduce broader social trust, as individuals may place their trust solely within the narrow circle of family—especially in contexts where institutional trust is weak.

Trust in familiar people is actually the quality of their relationships; when someone says, “I trust my neighbors,” or “I believe in the family,” it means they have good relationships. The good relationships will make them feel happy. The relationship will weaken when they have high income because money makes people happy and relationships will become less important. However, these relationships are not meaningful to strangers, so income is not significant as a moderator variable in the relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and happiness.

Firstly, trust in unfamiliar people is a type of generalized social trust, which is often shaped by cultural factors, educational environment, social safety levels or community norms rather than by individual economic conditions. Unlike trust in familiar others, which is tied to close personal relationships, trust in strangers reflects a generalized social attitude that tends to remain stable over time and is not easily influenced by material factors such as income.

An individual with a high income may still remain cautious or skeptical toward for many reasons such as life experiences, social environment, or a culture. Meanwhile, those with lower incomes do not necessarily lack trust in strangers; rather, they prioritize earning more money over expecting trust from others. Therefore, when analyzing the moderating role of income, the statistically insignificant result is reasonable.

Research has indicated that income does not significantly moderate the relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and subjective well-being. For example, Kim (2024) found that while income is linked to institutional trust, it has limited influence on trust in strangers, which tends to be shaped more by local social and cultural factors. Similarly, Oishi, Kesebir, and Diener (2011) noted that income inequality weakens generalized trust, but this impact is often indirect, stemming from perceptions of injustice or social fragmentation. Elgar and Aitken (2011) also argued that stranger trust is more closely associated with perceived fairness and community cohesion than with individual income. Barone and Mocetti (2016) further suggested that income’s effect on trust may be mediated through satisfaction with life, rather than through a direct link—especially in the context of trust in strangers.

#### 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the above analysis results, it is known that trust in people is positively associated with happiness, whether it is trust in familiar people (such as family, friends, and neighbors) or trust in unfamiliar people (like someone meeting for the first time, people in another area, people in another country). Other factors that significantly affect happiness include gender, age, number of people in the household, marital status, education, social class, race, number of children, not living with parents, and income.

Furthermore, my analysis of the interaction effects of the income variable with the relationship between trust in familiar/unfamiliar people and happiness showed that income has a moderating effect on the relationship between trust in familiar people and happiness, but there is no significant moderating effect on the relationship between trust in unfamiliar people and happiness. This is explained by the fact that when a person has a high income, money has a higher important role in influencing happiness, which makes trust in familiar people less important in relation to happiness. For strangers; however, income was not significant in influencing the relationship between trust in the unfamiliar and happiness.

This result is completely consistent with the findings of a study on trust and happiness in Serbia. Interpersonal trust is a significant predictor of life satisfaction (VeljkoJovanović, 2016) In most countries around the world, a high level of social trust is associated with a more positive life assessment and a higher prediction of happiness (Poulin & Haase, 2015).

However, in a study on the effects of social capital on personal happiness by studying service industry employees, the author suggested that there are three independent variables affecting personal happiness, including social network, social trust, and social norms. In this case, social trust means how much people trust in neighbors in the same local area. The results of this study show that social trust doesn't have the same effect on happiness as other two variables, social network, and social norms. They have a statistically significant influence on personal happiness (Jung, 2019). The difference between the results of this study and my study may be due to the following reasons: First, this study is quite small in size (281 samples), and second, the scope of the study was rather narrow (In specific regions of Korea). In another study on factors of happiness in Indonesia, the results showed that absolute income, relative income, education, health, and social capital are the determinants of happiness in Indonesia. All factors have a positive impact on happiness. However, trust in the same ethnicity and trust in neighbors do not have a significant effect on happiness (Rahayu, S.E., & MSi, 2016). This finding also differs from the findings in my study, possibly due to the difference in the selection of control variables. In addition, the results of this study could not capture happiness over time because cross-sectional data were used.

This is the first study to examine the relationship between trust and happiness based on the WVS7 dataset, but some limitations should be noted. First, I cannot draw causal inferences due to cross-sectional data. It is possible that

individuals with a high level of trust in people lead to a high level of happiness or individuals with a high level of happiness lead to a high level of trust in people. Second, I only evaluated 13 control variables that have a great risk of affecting happiness, not being able to control all factors that can affect individual happiness.

## REFERENCES

1. Arampatzi, E., Burger, M. J., & Novik, N. (2016, 10 20). Social Network Sites, Individual Social Capital and Happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19, 99- 122.
2. Becchetti, L., Londono Bedoya, D. A., & Trovato, G. (2009). Income, relational goods and happiness. *Applied Economics*, 43(3), 273–290.
3. Calvo, R., Zheng, Y., Kumar, S., Olgiati, A., & Berkman, L. (2012, 8). Well-Being and Social Capital on Planet Earth: Cross- National Evidence from 142 Countries. *Plos One*, 7(8).
4. Jung, M.-H. (2019, 11 15). The Effect of Social Capital on Personal Happiness: A Focus on Service Industry Employees. *Journal of Asian Finance*, 7(1), 291-299.
5. Kim, D. (2024). Income, trust, and psychological well-being: A comparative analysis during COVID-19. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(5), 404.
6. Luthar, S. S. (2003). The culture of affluence: Psychological costs of material wealth. *Child Development*, 74(6), 1581–1593.
7. Ng, Y.-K. (2022). *Happiness—Concept, Measurement and Promotion*. Singapore, Singapore: Springer, Singapore.
8. Oishi, S., Kesebir, S., & Diener, E. (2011). Income inequality and happiness. *Psychological Science*, 22(9), 1095–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417262>
9. Pose, A., & Berlepsch, V. (2014). Social Capital and Individual Happiness in Europe. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15, 357-386.
10. Poulin, M. J., & Haase, C. M. (2015, 3 2). Growing to Trust: Evidence That Trust Increases and Sustains Well-Being Across the Life Span. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 6, 614-621.
11. Pouwels, B., Siegersa, J., & Vlasblom, J. (2008, 4). Income, working hours, and happiness. *Economics Letters*, 99(1), 72-74.
12. Priebe, J. (2020, 03 07). Quasi-experimental evidence for the causal link between fertility and subjective well-being. *Population Economics*.
13. Rahayu, T., S.E., & MSi. (2016, 3). The Determinants of Happiness in Indonesia. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(2).
14. Scitovsky, T. (1975). Income and Happiness. *Akadémiiai Kiadó*, 15(1), 45-53. Steptoe, A. (2019). Happiness and Health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 40, 339-359.
15. Ugur, Z. B. (2019, 05 24). Does Having Children Bring Life Satisfaction in Europe? *Happiness Studies*.
16. VeljkoJovanović. (2016, 4 27). Trust and subjective well-being: The case of Serbia. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 98, 284-288.