

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Emyr Williams ; Leslie Francis ; Andrew Village

Article Title: Marriage, religion and human flourishing: how sustainable is the classic Durkheim thesis in contemporary Europe?

Year of publication: 2010

Link to published version:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13674670903203766>

Publisher statement: 'This is an electronic version of an article published in Williams, E. (2010). Marriage, religion and human flourishing: how sustainable is the classic Durkheim thesis in contemporary Europe? *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*. Vol. 13, pp. 93-104. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* is available online at: <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a915714828~db=all~jumptype=rss>.

**Marriage, religion and human flourishing: how sustainable is the classic Durkheim thesis in contemporary Europe?**

Dr Emyr Williams

Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK.

Revd Canon Professor Leslie J Francis

Professor of Religions and Education, Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK.

and

Dr Andrew Village

Department of Theology and Religious Studies, York St John University, York, UK.

*address for correspondence*

Dr Emyr Williams

Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit

Institute of Education

University of Warwick

Coventry

CV4 7AL

*telephone*      024 765 22690

*e-mail*            [Emyr.Williams@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:Emyr.Williams@warwick.ac.uk)

**Marriage, religion and human flourishing: how sustainable is the classic Durkheim thesis in contemporary Europe?**

## **Abstract**

This paper draws on the three waves of the European Values Survey across five countries (Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Spain and Sweden) to investigate the relationship between indicators of positive psychology (conceptualised as feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life), religiosity (conceptualised as self-assigned religious affiliation and self-reported religious attendance) and marital status. The results demonstrate that religiosity is, in general, positively correlated with both indicators of positive psychology. Further, across all waves and all countries, the pattern emerges that those respondents who are married are likely to report higher levels of happiness and greater satisfaction in life. These data provide contemporary support for the classic Durkheim thesis linking the two institutions of marriage and religion with human flourishing.

## **Introduction**

Within the social scientific study of religion, and the social scientific study of marital status, two research traditions concerned with happiness and with satisfaction with life have pointed to both positive and negative impacts of these two variables (religion and marital status). This paper explores the relationship between religiosity, marital status and positive psychology by drawing on the European Values Survey among five countries (Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Spain, and Sweden).

## **The Durkheim thesis**

Durkheim's classic thesis on suicide (Durkheim, 2002 [1897]) postulates that four main types of suicide are present within society, all exacerbated by personal and communal issues: egoistic, anomic, altruistic and fatalistic. For Durkheim, the latter two forms of suicide were deemed as to be of secondary importance in understanding how and why people may commit suicide (Krushner & Sterk, 2005). It is the egoistic and anomic forms that provide significant catalysts.

Egoistic suicide highlights how a growing disillusionment with national institutions that were once held as central to society increases likelihood of suicide. One such institution that Durkheim (2002 [1897]) highlighted was that of the church (see, Kay & Francis, 2006). He argued that, as people move away from the security that religious institutions foster, so they are more inclined to suicide. Within Western society, in which the secularisation debate has highlighted the declining rates of church attendance (Bruce, 2002), this argument could be related in those who opt out of church experiencing higher levels of suicidal ideation (negative affect) and lower levels of happiness (positive affect).

Anomic suicide refers to the erosion of family life, especially in relation to marriage, and how this can increase the likelihood of suicide. Indeed, Durkheim identified how those who have experienced divorce and those who remained single are more likely to commit suicide than those who are married. Within Western society, in which levels of marriage are declining (Williams & Francis, in press), this could be reflected in those who opt out of marriage experiencing higher levels of suicidal ideation (negative affect) and lower levels of happiness (positive affect).

### *Positive psychology*

While the sociological position of Durkheim highlights how the demise of certain institutions within society increases the likelihood of suicide (negative affect), a recent school of psychology has sought to assess how positive affect relates to the two institutions of marriage and religion. The field of positive psychology seeks to understand the nature, correlates, antecedents and consequences of positive emotions, (Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005; Gable & Haidt, 2005). One significant area of development within the field of positive psychology relates to the conceptualisation and operationalisation of two indices of positive psychology, namely feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life. For example, Deiner, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) developed the Satisfaction with Life Scale, a five-item scale designed to tap into this aspect of positive psychology and suggests that satisfaction with life comprises five components: life being close to the ideal, conditions in life being excellent, being satisfied with one's life, getting the important things in life, and not wanting to change things in ones life. In terms of the conceptualisation and operationalisation of happiness, Argyle and Crossland (1987) suggested that happiness comprises three components: the frequency and degree of

positive affect or joy; the average level of satisfaction over a period; and the absence of negative feelings, such as depression and anxiety. Working from this definition, they developed the Oxford Happiness Inventory. Two developments of this work in positive psychology have been a focus on the association between marital status and indicators of positive psychology, and a focus on the association between religiosity and indicators of positive psychology.

### *Marital status and positive psychology*

The research tradition concerned with the relationship between marital status and happiness and satisfaction with life is reflected in five main groups of studies.

The first group of studies employed the General Social Surveys conducted by the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center. Glenn and Weaver (1981) re-analysed data collected between 1972 and 1978. Multiple regression analysis demonstrated that indicators of happiness were more strongly related to marital status than were other well-being indicators. Zollar and Williams (1987) explored the data collected between 1972 and 1984 to investigate how marital status contributed to happiness among a sub-sample of 2,228 black adults. The results demonstrated that, for both sexes, those who were married were more likely to state that they were happy than those who were not married. Further, it was demonstrated that those who were married, remained happier with their life throughout their life than those who were not married. Glenn and Weaver (1988) explored data collected between 1972 and 1986 to see if levels of happiness within those who were married and who were not married declined in this period. The results demonstrate that levels of happiness were lower among those who were married in 1986 than they were in 1972 (with 38% stating they were very happy in 1972 and 31% stating that they were

very happy in 1986), while happiness among those who were not married had increased during that period (15% stated that they were very happy in 1972 and 27% stated that they were very happy in 1986). However, the proportion of those who were married and very happy outweighed the proportion of those who were not married and very happy. Lee, Seccombe, and Shehan (1991) conducted an extension of Glenn and Weaver's (1988) study by exploring data collected between 1972 and 1989. The results demonstrated that those who were married were more likely to report that they were very happy than those who were never married.

The second group of studies employed the German Socio-Economic Panel surveys. Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, and Diener (2003) utilised the set-point model to track changes in happiness and marital status in the first 15 waves of this survey (1984 to 1996). The results demonstrated that, while marriage does increase a person's happiness, in general their level of happiness will return to a base line (or set point) soon after. It is suggested, therefore, that an increased happiness among those who are married is a short-lived phenomenon. In a follow up to Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, and Diener (2003), Zimmermann and Easterlin (2006) explored data collected between 1984 and 2004 (21 waves) to examine the relationship between happiness and marital status. The analysis demonstrated that different stages of relationship formation increased global happiness. For example, those who were cohabiting were happier than those who were single, while those who were married demonstrated higher levels of happiness than those who were cohabiting. Further, it was demonstrated that after two years of marriage, levels of happiness returned to the same level as during cohabitation. Zimmermann and Easterlin conclude that, 'the formation of unions has an enduring positive effect on life satisfaction' (p. 520).



Further examples of research in this tradition are provided by Stutzer and Frey (2006) and Andress and Bröckel (2007).

The third group of studies employed the Eurobarometer dataset. For example, Tella, MacColloch, and Oswald (2003) employed data collected by the Eurobarometer dataset between 1975 and 1992. Their analyses demonstrated that those who were married were more likely to state that they were very satisfied or fairly satisfied with life. While those who were divorced were more likely to say that they were not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with life.

The fourth group of studies employed data collected by the World Values Survey. For example, Stack and Eshleman (1998) employed data from 17 countries in wave one of this survey (collected between 1981 and 1983). Their analyses demonstrated those who were married and those who were cohabiting display higher levels of happiness with life than do people who were single. When those who were married and those who were cohabiting were compared, being married increased the likelihood of also being happy.

The fifth group of studies employed individually constructed datasets. Chilman and Meyer (1966) explored the responses of 204 married and unmarried undergraduates in the United States of America. The results demonstrated that those who were married were more likely to say that they were mostly happy than those who were unmarried. White (1979) explored the effect that re-marriage had on global happiness among a sample of 1,085 respondents in Nebraska. The results demonstrated that happiness increased with re-marriage for men, but not for women. Arrindell, Heesink, and Feij (1999) utilised the Satisfaction with Life Scale as a measure of happiness among 1,775 Dutch young people aged 18, 22 and 26. The

results demonstrated that those who were married recorded higher mean scores on the Satisfaction with Life Scale compared to those who were not married.

The consensus from empirical studies, therefore, supports the general view that there is a positive association between being married and higher levels of happiness.

### *Religion and positive psychology*

Within the general field of the psychology of religion, there has been a long-established interest regarding the relationship between religion and psychological wellbeing in its broadest sense (Wulff, 1991) and happiness in particular. Empirical studies have operationalised happiness in a variety of ways. For example, in an early study, conducted among 108 men and 102 women over the age of sixty-five in America, O'Reilly (1957) assessed happiness on a three point continuum (very happy, moderately happy, and less happy) alongside reported church attendance. He found that 55% of the very happy respondents were active in the practice of their religion, compared with 47% of the moderately happy and 44% of the less happy. Wilson (1965) assessed happiness on a ten point scale, from 1 (completely and utterly unhappy; terrible depression and gloom all of the time) to 10 (completely and supremely happy; tremendous joy and elation all of the time). He found a positive correlation of 0.33 between the happiness and religious commitment. Reanalysing data from the 1974 and 1975 National Opinion Research Centre Survey, Cutler (1976) assessed the relationship between happiness measured on a three point continuum (very happy, pretty happy, and not too happy) and church affiliation. He found church affiliation to be a significant, but weak, predictor of happiness.

Shaver, Lenauer, and Sadd (1980), in a study among 2,500 women in America between the ages of fifteen and ninety-one, assessed happiness on a seven point scale

(very happy, moderately happy, slightly happy, neither happy nor unhappy, slightly unhappy, moderately unhappy and very unhappy). When religiosity was assessed on a five point scale (very, moderately, slightly, not at all, and antireligious) a curvilinear relationship was found with happiness. The slightly religious respondents were less happy than either the very religious or the antireligious ones. Reanalysing data from the 1984 National Opinion Research Centre Survey, Reed (1991) explored the relationship between happiness and strength of religious affiliation among 1,473 respondents. Religious affiliation was divided into two categories (strong and weak), while happiness was assessed in three categories (very happy, pretty happy, and not too happy). The data demonstrate a significant positive relationship between self-reported strength of religious affiliation and happiness.

Reanalysing data from the National Opinion Research Centre Survey, Ellison (1991) assessed happiness on a three point continuum (not too happy, pretty happy, and very happy) alongside a range of religious variables. He reported a significant positive relationship between firm religious beliefs and happiness.

A series of more sophisticated recent studies have examined the association between religion and happiness as assessed by the Oxford Happiness Inventory (Argyle, Martin, & Crossland, 1989), including Robbins and Francis (1996), Francis and Lester (1997), Francis and Robbins (2000), Francis, Jones, and Wilcox (2000), Francis, Robbins, and White (2003), Francis and Katz (2002) and Francis, Katz, Yablon, and Robbins (2004). Each of these studies has demonstrated a positive correlation between religiosity and happiness scores.

The consensus from empirical studies, therefore, supports the general view that there is a positive association between being religious (in one sense or another) and higher levels of happiness.

## **Research Agenda**

Against this background the current study proposes to explore the associations with positive psychology of both religiosity and marital status by drawing on the European Values Survey, which includes two single-item indicators of positive psychology: feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life. The European Values Survey was established in 1979 to assess and measure the beliefs and values of people across Europe. According to Halman (2001:2)

The intention of EVS is to explore basic values and it does not focus so much on testing particular hypotheses. The project does not aim at rejecting or confirming specific theoretical ideas. The main purpose of the project is to attain a better insight into fundamental human values and value differences, similarities, and changes within Europe.

The European Values Survey (EVS) has been run over three waves, with the larger World Values Survey being run over four waves. The first wave (1981-1984) was distributed to ten member nations of the European Community. The next two waves (1989-1993 and 1999-2004) were distributed to all member states of the European Union, with the 1989-1993 wave also distributed in the United States of America. While the EVS sets out to cover every country in the European Community, the current paper focuses just on the five countries that participated in the first wave and have consistently participated in subsequent waves: the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Great Britain and Northern Ireland. These countries are of particular interest because they represent diverse and differing religious traditions. The Netherlands and Northern Ireland experience the influence of both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant traditions; Spain is mainly influenced by the Roman Catholic tradition; Sweden is influenced by the Protestant and Reformed traditions; and Great Britain is

influenced by the Anglican, Protestant and Roman Catholic traditions in England and the Reformed tradition in Scotland and Wales.

Drawing on these data, the current study will address three main research questions. The first question concerns the relationship between marital status and both feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life. The second question concerns the relationship between self-assigned religious affiliation and both feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life. The third question concerns the relationship between self-reported religious attendance and both feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life.

## **Method**

### Sample

For the five countries utilised in this study the following sample sizes were achieved. For wave one: the Netherlands, 1221; Spain, 2303; Sweden, 954; Great Britain, 1167; Northern Ireland, 312. For wave two: the Netherlands, 1017; Spain, 4147; Sweden, 1047; Great Britain, 1484; Northern Ireland, 304. For wave three: the Netherlands, 1003; Spain, 2409; Sweden, 1015; Great Britain, 1000; Northern Ireland, 1000. In each country data were collected by means of face-to-face interviews with a stratified sample of adults aged 18 years and over.

### Measures

*Marital Status* was assessed by the question, ‘What is your current legal marital status?’ Six possible answer categories were given: married, living as married, divorced, separated, widowed and single/never married. In wave three of the survey used in Great Britain, the living as married category was omitted. Dummy variables

were created for each area of marital status, with divorced and separated being collapsed as one.

*Self-assigned religious affiliation* was assessed by the question, ‘What is your religious denomination?’ A range of response categories was given, including major Christian denominations and other major faith groups, as well as the option none. For the purposes of the present analysis these categories were recoded to distinguish between the religiously affiliated and the religious non-affiliated

*Self reported religious attendance* was assessed by the question, ‘Apart from weddings, funerals and baptisms, about how often do you attend religious services these days?’ Respondents were asked to choose between: more than once a week, once a week, once a month, Christmas/Easter Day, other specific holy days, once a year, less often, and never or practically never. The responses were coded so that those who attended religious services more frequently recorded higher scores, and the responses ‘Christmas/Easter Day’ and ‘other specific holy days’ were collapsed into one group of ‘holy days’, while ‘more than once a week’ and ‘once a week’ were collapsed to form ‘at least weekly’.

*Happiness* was assessed by the question, ‘Taking all things together, would you say you are:’ with the possible responses: ‘very happy’, ‘quite happy’, ‘not very happy’, ‘not at all happy’, and ‘don’t know’. The responses were coded so that those who were happy recorded higher scores.

*Satisfaction with life* was assessed by the question, ‘All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?’ The responses were measured on a ten-point semantic differential scale, where 1 indicated dissatisfaction and 10 indicated satisfaction.

## **Results**

For background information, table 1 presents the percentages of those who are religiously affiliated and those who are not religiously affiliated, and the percentages relating to marital status, for all five countries over the three waves. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for feelings of happiness, satisfaction with life, and self-reported religious attendance, for all five countries over the three waves. In relation to feelings of happiness, analysis of variance demonstrates some significant shifts in all five countries from wave to wave. In Great Britain there has been a decline in happiness. In the Netherlands and Spain there has been an increase in happiness. In Sweden the highest level of happiness was recorded in wave 2, while in Northern Ireland the lowest level of happiness was recorded in wave 2. In relation to satisfaction in life, analysis of variance demonstrates stability in Great Britain and the Netherlands, decrease in Northern Ireland and Spain, and increase in Sweden. In relation to self-reported religious attendance, analysis of variance demonstrates significant decline across all five countries, with the largest decline in Spain and the second largest in the Netherlands.

Table 3 examines the bivariate associations between feelings of happiness, sex, age, self-reported religious attendance, self-assigned religious affiliation, and being married. These data demonstrate that there is generally no association between sex and happiness, apart from wave 1 in the Netherlands and wave 2 in Sweden where

women reported higher levels of happiness than men. There tends to be a decline in happiness with age, although in seven of the 15 cases this does not reach statistical significance. There tends to be a positive association between religious attendance and happiness, although in seven of the 15 cases this does not reach statistical significance. There also tends to be a positive association between religious affiliation and happiness, although this reaches statistical significance in just six of the 15 cases. The association between being married and happiness is the clearest conclusion to emerge from Table 3, with 13 of the 15 correlations reaching levels of statistical significance.

Table 4 examines the bivariate associations between satisfaction with life, sex, age, self-reported religious attendance, self-assigned religious affiliation, and being married. These data demonstrate that there is no consistent association between sex and satisfaction with life: 11 of the 15 countries are not statistically significant, two indicate a significant positive correlation and two indicate a significant negative association. In terms of age, nine of the 15 correlations are not statistically significant, four indicate a significant negative association and two indicate a significant positive correlation. There tends to be a positive association between religious attendance and satisfaction with life, although in four of the 15 this does not reach statistical significance. There also tends to be a positive association between religious affiliation and satisfaction with life, although in eight of the 15 cases this does not reach statistical significance. The association between being married and satisfaction with life is the clearest conclusion to emerge from Table 4, with 14 of the 15 correlations reaching levels of statistical significance.

Table 4 also displays the correlations between the two measures of satisfaction with life and feelings of happiness. The correlations ranging from .36 to .64



demonstrate that these are closely related but not synonymous constructs, and that the shared variance between these two constructs vary from context to context.

Table 5 takes the analysis one step further by the use of partial correlations. First, partial correlations are employed to express the association between religious attendance and feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life after controlling for sex, age and being married. These data demonstrate that there is a significant associations between religious attendance and happiness in 13 of the 15 cases and between religious attendance and satisfaction with life in 14 of the 15 cases. Second, partial correlations are employed to express the association between being married and feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life after controlling for sex, age and religious attendance. These data demonstrate that there is a significant association between being married and happiness in 10 of the 15 cases and between being married and satisfaction with life in 11 of the 15 cases.

## **Conclusion**

This paper has examined the relationship between religiosity, marital status, feelings of happiness, and satisfaction with life by drawing on data provided by the European Values Survey in five countries: the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Three main conclusions can be drawn from the paper.

The first conclusion concerns the association between being married and levels of satisfaction with life and feelings of happiness. The data demonstrated that, even after controlling for individual differences in age, sex, and religious attendance, overall there were higher levels of satisfaction with life and feelings of happiness among people who are currently married than among people who are not currently

married (supported by 13 of the 15 correlations with happiness and by 14 of the 15 correlations with satisfaction).

The second conclusion concerns the association between religious attendance and levels of satisfaction with life and feelings of happiness. The data demonstrated that, even after controlling for individual differences in age, sex and being married, overall there was evidence of higher levels of satisfaction with life and feelings of happiness among people who are currently attending religious services on a regular basis (supported by 10 of the 15 correlations with happiness and by 11 of the 15 correlations with satisfaction).

The third conclusion concerns the association between religious affiliation and levels of satisfaction with life and feelings of happiness. The data demonstrated that, overall, there was evidence of higher levels of satisfaction with life and feelings of happiness among people who currently own a religious affiliation (supported by six of the 15 correlations with happiness and by seven of the 15 correlations with satisfaction).

Taken together these three conclusions provide support among the people of contemporary Europe for Durkheim's classic thesis linking the two institutions of marriage and religion with human flourishing as accessed by the perspectives within positive psychology. Limitations with the present study include: the reliance on single-item measures of feelings of happiness and satisfaction with life (but these were the measures included in the EVS); the use of data from just five European countries (but these were the only nations that participated in all three waves of the study); the measurement of religion solely in terms of self-assigned religious affiliation and self-reported religious attendance (but these were the only indicators available in the survey); the decision to analyse the data by the 15 separate datasets

and to employ only a limited range of control variables (but this did enable the range of associations to be clearly transparent). In the light of these limitations and the importance of the findings, further research should be encouraged to continue to test the importance of the two institutions of marriage and religion for supporting the psychological wellbeing of contemporary Europe.

## References

- Andress, H-J., & Bröckel, M. (2007). Income and satisfaction after marital disruption in Germany. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 69, 500-512.
- Argyle, M., & Crossland, J. (1987). Dimensions of positive emotions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 127-137.
- Argyle, M., Martin, M., & Crossland, J. (1989). Happiness as a function of personality and social encounters. In J.P. Forgas and J.M. Innes (eds), *Recent Advances in Social Psychology: An international perspective* (pp. 189-203). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Arrindell, W.A., Heesink, J., & Feij, J.A. (1999). The Satisfaction with Life Scales (SWLS): Appraisal with 1700 healthy young adults in the Netherlands. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 815-826.
- Chilman, C.S., & Meyer, D.L. (1966). Single and married undergraduates' measured personality needs and self-rated happiness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 28, 67-76.
- Cutler, S. J. (1976). Membership in different types of voluntary associations and psychological well-being. *The Gerontologist*, 16, 335-339.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larson, R.J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Durkheim, E. (2002 [1897]). *Suicide: A study in sociology*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ellison, C. G. (1991). Religious involvement and subjective well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 32, 80-99.
- Francis, L.J., Jones, S.H., & Wilcox, C. (2000). Religiosity and happiness: During adolescence, young adulthood and later life. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 19, 245-257.

- Francis, L. J., & Katz, Y. J. (2002). Religiosity and happiness: A study among Israeli female undergraduates. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, *13*, 75-86.
- Francis, L. J., Katz, Y. J., Yablon, Y., & Robbins, M. (2004). Religiosity, personality, and happiness: A study among Israeli male undergraduates. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *5*, 315-333.
- Francis, L.J., & Lester, D. (1997). Religion, personality and happiness. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, *12*, 81-86.
- Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2000). Religion and happiness: A study in empirical theology. *Transpersonal Psychology Review*, *4*, 17-22.
- Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., & White, A. (2003). Correlation between religion and happiness: A replication. *Psychological Reports*, *92*, 51-52.
- Gable, S.L., & Haidt, J. (2005). What (and why) is positive psychology? *Review of General Psychology*, *9*, 103-110.
- Glenn, N.D., & Weaver, C.N. (1981). The contribution of marital happiness to global happiness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *43*, 161-168.
- Glenn, N.D., & Weaver, C.N. (1988). The changing relationship of marital status to reported happiness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *50*, 317-324.
- Halman, L. (2001). *The European Values Study: A third wave*. WORC: Tilburg University.
- Kay, W.K., & Francis, L.J. (2006). Suicidal ideation among young people in the UK: churchgoing an inhibitory influence? *Religion, Mental Health and Culture*, *9*, 127-140.
- Krushner, H.I., & Sterk, C.E. (2005). The limits of social capital: Durkeim, suicide, and social cohesion. *American Journal of Public Health*, *95*, 1139-1143.

- Lee, G.R., Seccombe, K., & Shehan, C.L. (1991). Marital status and personal happiness: An analysis of trend data. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 839-844.
- Lucas, R.E., Clark, A.E., Georgellis, Y., & Diener, E. (2003). Re-examining adaptation and the set point model of happiness: Reactions to changes in marital status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 527-539.
- O'Reilly, C. T. (1957). Religious practice and personal adjustment of older people. *Sociology and Social Research*, 42, 119-121.
- Reed, K. (1991). Strength of religious affiliation and life satisfaction. *Sociological Analysis*, 52, 205-210.
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L.J. (1996). Are religious people happier? A study among undergraduates. In L.J. Francis, W.K. Kay and W.S. Campbell (eds), *Research in Religious Education* (pp 207-217). Leominster: Gracewing.
- Seligman, M.E.P., Steen, T.A., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist*, 60, 410-421.
- Shaver, Y. P., Lenauer, M. A., & Sadd, S. (1980). Religiousness, conversion and subjective well-being: The healthy-minded religion of modern American women. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 137, 1563-1568.
- Stack, S., & Eshleman, J.R. (1998). Marital status and happiness: A 17-nation study. *Journal of marriage and the Family*, 60, 527-536.
- Stutzer, A., & Frey, B.S. (2006). Does marriage make people happy or do happy people get married? *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 35, 326-347.
- Tella, R.D., MacCulloch, R.J., & Oswald, A.J. (2003). The macroeconomics of happiness. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85, 809-827.

- White, L.K. (1979). Sex differentials in the effect of remarriage on global happiness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41, 869-876.
- Williams, E., & Francis, L.J. (in press). Marriage, cohabitation and divorce: The social significance of religion and the changing context of family life in Britain 1983-2005.
- Wilson, W. R. (1965). Relation of sexual behaviours, values and conflicts to avowed happiness. *Psychological Reports*, 17, 371-378.
- Wulff, D. M. (1991). *Psychology of religion: Classic and contemporary views*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Zimmermann, A.C., & Easterlin, R.A. (2006). Happily ever after? Cohabitation, marriage, divorce and happiness in Germany. *Population and Development Review*, 32, 511-528.
- Zollar, A.C., & Williams, J.S. (1987). The contribution of marriage to the life satisfaction of black adults. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 87-92.

**Table One** Percent ages of European Values Survey

	<b>Valid N</b>	<b>Religiously Affiliated %</b>	<b>Married %</b>
<b>Wave 1</b>			
Great Britain	1167	90	58
Netherlands	1221	62	65
N Ireland	312	97	62
Spain	2303	91	61
Sweden	949	93	62
<b>Wave 2</b>			
Great Britain	1484	57	61
Netherlands	1017	51	57
N Ireland	304	91	65
Spain	4147	85	61
Sweden	1047	82	52
<b>Wave 3</b>			
Great Britain	1000	85	52
Netherlands	1003	45	55
N Ireland	1000	84	54
Spain	2409	83	60
Sweden	1015	74	47



**Table Two** Means and Standard Deviations for happiness, satisfaction with life and church attendance

	Valid N	m	Happiness			Satisfaction				Attendance			
			SD	<i>f</i>	p<	m	sd	<i>f</i>	p<	m	sd	<i>f</i>	p<
<b>Great Britain</b>													
Wave 1	1167	3.33	0.57			7.56	1.89			2.64	1.96		
Wave 2	1484	3.25	0.66			7.49	1.94			2.76	2.00		
Wave 3	1000	3.21	0.68	10.78	.001	7.40	1.94	2.00	NS	2.48	2.00	5.99	.01
<b>Netherlands</b>													
Wave 1	1221	3.31	0.53			7.73	1.61			3.29	2.21		
Wave 2	1017	3.39	0.65			7.77	1.58			3.12	2.11		
Wave 3	1003	3.40	0.60	8.09	.001	7.85	1.34	1.83	NS	2.80	2.03	14.83	.001
<b>Northern Ireland</b>													
Wave 1	312	3.33	0.58			7.66	1.90			4.80	1.97		
Wave 2	304	3.29	0.63			7.88	1.80			4.73	1.93		
Wave 3	1000	3.39	0.63	3.42	.05	8.00	1.75	4.20	.05	4.31	2.19	8.94	.001
<b>Spain</b>													
Wave 1	2303	2.98	0.67			6.59	2.01			4.07	2.22		
Wave 2	4147	3.05	0.63			7.15	1.90			3.63	2.16		
Wave 3	2409	3.06	0.60	8.73	.001	7.03	1.92	54.55	.001	3.46	2.15	39.94	.001
<b>Sweden</b>													
Wave 1	954	3.24	0.54			8.01	1.74			2.57	1.62		
Wave 2	1047	3.36	0.58			7.97	1.74			2.24	1.55		
Wave 3	1015	3.29	0.63	8.68	.001	7.64	1.86	9.52	.001	2.29	1.46	8.96	.001

**Table Three** Pearson Product Moment Correlations with feelings of happiness

	Sex	Age	Attendance	Affiliation	Married
<b>Wave 1</b>					
Great Britain	.02	-.03	.04	.02	.18***
Netherlands	.08**	-.02	.08**	.07*	.20**
N Ireland	.02	-.01	.13*	-.10	.07
Spain	-.02	-.07***	.04	.08***	.18***
Sweden	.02	-.12***	.14***	-.02	.19***
<b>Wave 2</b>					
Great Britain	.01	-.01	.05	.06*	.14***
Netherlands	.00	-.09**	.04	.03	.22***
N Ireland	.06	-.09	.14*	.03	.08
Spain	-.02	-.09***	.04**	.05**	.13***
Sweden	.10***	-.07*	.04	.05	.19***
<b>Wave 3</b>					
Great Britain	.01	-.06*	.05	.07	.18***
Netherlands	.04	-.13***	.11***	.06	.23***
N Ireland	.06	-.03	.11***	.09**	.17***
Spain	-.03	-.12***	.01	.03	.11***
Sweden	.06	-.00	.07*	.10***	.18***

\* p< .05; \*\* p<.01; \*\*\*p< .001

**Table Four** Pearson Product Moment Correlations with satisfaction in life

	Happiness	Sex	Age	Attendance	Affiliation	Married
<b>Wave 1</b>						
Great Britain	.51***	-.02	-.10**	.07*	.11***	.11***
Netherlands	.43***	.10**	.04	.08**	.05	.15**
N Ireland	.64***	-.00	.09	.15**	-.08	.10
Spain	.54***	-.06**	-.03	.02	.08***	.15***
Sweden	.49***	.08*	-.01	.12***	.02	.18***
<b>Wave 2</b>						
Great Britain	.39***	-.01	.05	.13***	.10***	.11***
Netherlands	.53***	-.01	-.04	.10**	.07*	.10**
N Ireland	.36***	-.06	.13*	.04	-.05	.13*
Spain	.39***	-.05**	-.04**	.04*	.06***	.12***
Sweden	.53***	.04	.03	.02	.03	.19***
<b>Wave 3</b>						
Great Britain	.62***	-.05	.01	.15***	.10*	.13***
Netherlands	.56***	.02	-.07*	.07*	.06	.15***
N Ireland	.52***	.05	.04	.14***	.13***	.13***
Spain	.40***	-.01	-.06**	.01	.01	.09***
Sweden	.55***	-.08	.08*	.09*	.05	.18***

Table 5 Partial correlations being married by sex, age and religious attendance

	<u>Religious attendance<sup>1</sup></u>		<u>Being married<sup>2</sup></u>	
	Happiness	Satisfaction	Happiness	Satisfaction
<b>Wave 1</b>				
Great Britain	.19***	.09**	.03	.06*
Netherlands	.20***	.12***	.07**	.10**
Northern Ireland	.07	.08	.14*	.13*
Spain	.20***	.16***	.06**	.04*
Sweden	.21***	.18***	.16***	.10**
<b>Wave 2</b>				
Great Britain	.14***	.09***	.03	.12***
Netherlands	.23***	.09***	.03	.10**
Northern Ireland	.06	.12*	.14*	.01
Spain	.17***	.14***	.09**	.07**
Sweden	.23***	.19***	.01	-.01
<b>Wave 2</b>				
Great Britain	.13***	.11***	.06**	.12***
Netherlands	.24***	.16***	.12***	.07*
Northern Ireland	.18***	.12***	.10**	.11***
Spain	.16***	.11***	.06**	.03
Sweden	.19***	.15***	.05	.07

\*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Controlling for sex, age, and being married

<sup>2</sup>Controlling for sex, age, and religious attendance