

**Comparison for reference group in life satisfaction:  
Who will choose “Classmates” “Relatives” and “Family of children’s classmates” as their  
reference group?<sup>1</sup>**

Mengyuan Zhou<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract:**

This paper is a study of reference groups by using data from Preference Parameters Study of Osaka University’s 21st Century COE Program. As shown in the results, the frequencies of reference groups are distinct over Japan, USA and China. It is confirmed that Japanese and American women hold different preference against men, when they compare their life satisfaction with. This paper is trying to observe what kind of people will choose a specific reference group by conducting multinomial logit regression.

*JEL Classification Number:* Z13, D03

*Keywords:* Reference groups

---

<sup>1</sup> This research uses micro data from the Preference Parameters Study of Osaka University’s 21st Century COE Program ‘Behavioral Macrodynamics Based on Surveys and Experiments’ and its Global COE project ‘Human Behavior and Socioeconomic Dynamics’. I acknowledge the program/project’s contributors: Yoshiro Tsutsui, Fumio Ohtake, and Shinsuke Ikeda.

<sup>2</sup> Graduate school of Economics, Keio University, Email: campanula.syuu@z6.keio.jp

## 1. Introduction

40 years ago, Easterlin posted an interesting statement by using American Institute of Public Opinion (AIPO) survey, showing that income and happiness is incoherent. The Easterlin paradox was disputed.

Eduardo (2009) argued the reference group does affect person's happiness significantly. He compared the peoples' income with those who possess a same characteristic, such as in the same age group, same political views etc. He also debates that educational attainment doesn't affect people's life satisfaction. Limited to the survey data, in his paper, other reference groups affect on life satisfaction like classmates, friends, family of your children's classmates can't be observed.

One explanation for the paradox is relative income hypothesis, which claims that people care about the reference income. However, how people choose their reference group is still shrouded in mystery.

Clark and Claudia (2010) estimated the preference of reference group by using European Social Survey data. They find that 36.3% people choose "Work colleagues" rather than "Family members" (5.8%), "Friends" (14.9%), "Others" (7.2%) and "Don't compare" (35.9%) when they compare their income with others. They operate Multinomial logit regression to detect the tendency for the preference of reference group by estimating the coefficient of gender, age, education, occupation and etc.

## 2. Data and Methodology

### 2.1 Data

This paper mainly examines how one's reference group is determined by using the data set from Osaka University Global COE program. Due to the questionnaires are distinct over the years across the countries, the assumption that people's preference for reference group doesn't change much during the years allowed the flexibility to choose discrete years data for the research own purpose across these three countries.

For the reason that educational attainment is unavailable in some years, questionnaire 2011 was selected for Japan and USA, 2012 for China. There are 466 observations with no education background in 2012 China survey, but this information was captured in 2010 survey. Thus the variable of the highest level of education was merged by these two datasets for China. (Note: Education information is from survey 2010, when `sample_type_china` equals 1)

## 2.2 Methodology

The Global COE program contains “15.a In Q.15, with whom did you compare your standard of living?” in the survey. All 13 choices are shown in Table1.

Table 1 Frequency of reference groups (USA, Japan and China)

Country	USA 2011			Japan 2011			China Urban 2012		
M/F/T	Male Perc.	Female Perc.	Total Perc.	Male Perc.	Female Perc.	Total Perc.	Male Perc.	Female Perc.	Total Perc.
Neighbor	34.91	34.57	34.73	37.99	36.91	37.41	36.81	42.32	39.57
Classmates <sup>3</sup>	<b>5.60</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>12.17</b>	<b>9.62</b>	<b>10.81</b>	<b>12.61</b>	<b>12.61</b>	<b>12.61</b>
Relatives	<b>10.88</b>	<b>14.49</b>	<b>12.86</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>7.47</b>	<b>5.75</b>	<b>15.80</b>	<b>14.35</b>	<b>15.07</b>
FCC <sup>4</sup>	2.23	2.97	2.63	3.16	<b>12.84</b>	8.33	1.59	1.16	1.38
SCAG <sup>5</sup>	5.69	5.52	5.60	7.82	3.07	5.28	9.86	8.26	9.06
SCSJ <sup>6</sup>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>9.09</b>	<b>9.16</b>	<b>9.13</b>	<b>4.93</b>	<b>5.94</b>	<b>5.43</b>
ACAG <sup>7</sup>	1.05	0.45	0.72	1.98	0.34	1.11	3.62	2.03	2.83
ACSJ <sup>8</sup>	0.46	0.60	0.53	2.90	0.46	1.60	3.33	2.32	2.83
Avg. nation <sup>9</sup>	<b>18.30</b>	<b>14.34</b>	<b>16.13</b>	<b>16.03</b>	<b>11.96</b>	<b>13.86</b>	<b>6.81</b>	<b>4.78</b>	<b>5.80</b>
Avg. world	2.00	1.43	1.69	0.26	0.11	0.18	0.00	0.29	0.14
Friend	<b>9.42</b>	<b>11.64</b>	<b>10.64</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>6.09</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>4.64</b>	<b>5.80</b>	<b>5.22</b>
Others	1.46	1.43	1.44	0.57	0.46	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.00
I don't know	4.10	4.69	4.42	1.05	1.49	1.29	0.00	0.14	0.07
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Obs.	2,197	2,664	4,861	2,277	2,609	4,886	690	690	1,380
USA	Pearson chi2(12) =		49.2210	Pr = 0.000					
Japan	Pearson chi2(12) =		339.3165	Pr = 0.000					
China Urban	Pearson chi2(11) =		15.9183	Pr = 0.144					

<sup>3</sup> Your own classmates when you were in school

<sup>4</sup> Families of your children's classmates

<sup>5</sup> Worker in your company who is in your age group, has similar academic background, or who started working in the same year

<sup>6</sup> Worker in your company who is assigned to a similar job as yours, regardless of their age, academic background, year in which he or she joined the company

<sup>7</sup> Worker in another company in the same industry who belongs to the same age group, has similar academic background, or who started working in the same year

<sup>8</sup> Worker in another company in the same industry who is assigned to a similar job as yours, regardless of his or her age, academic background, and year in which he or she joined a company

<sup>9</sup> Average person in USA / Japan / China

Clark and Claudia (2010) assume that “if reference groups are to an extent endogenous, they will likely depend on the respondent’s age, marital status, labor market status, and so on.”<sup>10</sup>

The multinomial logit model was used to output the result. This research will examine the effect of subject’s background information (such as educational attainment, occupational information, and the ideas on what determines / should determine people’s incomes and standards of living in their nations) on their decision of a specific reference group.

### 3. Result

As showed in the table 1, distinction of preference for the reference group between male and female is statistically insignificant in China urban area ( $p=0.144$ ), but significant at 1% level in America and Japan. Table 1 also provides the distribution of the reference group and the difference of the preference over 3 countries. “Your own classmates when you were in school” was cited much more frequently in Japan and China than USA. It seems that Japanese men are not interested in comparing with their relatives, while American and Chinese are. Japanese women are most likely to choose FCC (Families of your children’s classmates) than any other people.

Due to the observations are so limited from China, convergence is not achieved by the multinomial logit regression. In appendix A, we show 8 speculations for the result of classmate, relatives and FCC for USA and Japan.<sup>11</sup> The information of the Americans’ place of residence is not available in the survey, the speculation for cities is only provided for Japan.

As shown in the appendix, educated people are more likely to choose “classmates” but less “relatives” than “other” in USA. Full-time workers show the same tendency as educational attainment does. For Japanese, people in sales and service occupation compare less to their classmates. And those who are doing overtime work with no pay are less tended to choose “classmates” as their reference group. Though dummy variables for contract and part-time workers do not significantly explain why people choose FCC in multinomial logit regression, they show the tendency of the possibility of FCC to be chosen.

To predict the possibility after the multinomial model, marginal effects were conducted for FCC. As showed in the Table 2 that a one unit changes in the part-time dummy variable increases the probability of FCC by 0.069. And it is significant at 1% level. Being from full-time dummy variable, decreases the probability of FCC by 0.014.

---

<sup>10</sup> Clark and Claudia (2010)

<sup>11</sup> “Others” was taken as base outcome. Other 9 outputs were omitted in this paper.

Table 2 Marginal effects: Change in probability of choosing FCC as reference group

	dy/dx	Std. Err.	P>z
female11	0.0421574	0.0121704	0.001
age11	0.0457994	0.0062713	0
age*age/100	-0.0547565	0.0070639	0
Employment Status (omitted : Other)			
Full-time	-0.0136484	0.0177532	0.442
Part-time	0.0694638	0.023499	0.003
Student part-time	0.0738641	0.036148	0.041
Temporary work	0.0058185	0.0385369	0.88
Contract worker	0.0073882	0.0247455	0.765

Appendix A

USA: mlogit reg. of reference group - Your own classmates								Japan: mlogit reg. of reference group - Your own classmates							
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.
female11	-0.153	-0.0838	0.0197	-0.0462	-0.104	0.487	-0.277	-0.0434	-0.13	-0.0893	0.173	0.0948	-0.159	0.0324	-0.0169
age11	-0.310***	-0.314***	-0.301***	-0.392***	-0.239***	-0.485***	-0.273***	-0.105	-0.157	-0.11	-0.202	-0.198	-0.00943	-0.108	-0.096
age*age/100	0.240***	0.263***	0.218***	0.335***	0.169***	0.398***	0.207***	0.0725	0.11	0.0762	0.191	0.171	-0.0311	0.0844	0.0636
edu11	0.158**							0.0733							
Employment Status (omitted : Other)															
Full-time		1.315*							-0.581						
Part-time		1.351*							0.0917						
Student part-time		17.89							-2.137*						
Temporary work		16.24							-1.77						
Contract worker		1.911							14.24						
City (omitted : Hokkaido)															
Tohoku										-0.493					
Kanto										0.464					
KATE										15.13					
Hokuriku										0.532					
Tokai										15.23					
Kinki										0.452					
Chugoku										0.281					
Shikoku										-0.62					
Kyusyu										0.532					
Type of Employment (omitted : Government employee)															
Employee of private company			0.305								0.473				
Manager or private company			-0.0814								0.0848				
Self-employed			1.113								0.714				
Family employee			16.15								-0.971				
Employed year 11				-0.0357								0.146			
Occupation (omitted: Office and administrative support)															
Sales and related occupations				0.658									-0.74		
Managerial occupations				-0.0461									-2.233*		
Specialist/Technical Experts				0.215									-0.268		
Service occupations				-0.416									-2.067*		
Industrial occupations				0.17									-1.308		
Farming, fishing, and forestry				15.85									14.64		
Housewives / Househusbands				-1.287									-0.254		
Student				0.255									-2.071		
Retired				0.226									-0.687		
Unemployed				16.65									-1.968		
Other				-1.203									-2.393*		
Working hours and payment															
Working hours per week11					-0.0102									0.0144	
Paid OT 11					0.0365									0.528	
Unpaid OT 11					0.0194									-0.0643**	
Determination of people's incomes and standards of living															
Effort							-0.0249								-0.259
Luck							0.13								0.0208
Talent or abilities							0.202								-0.0587
Personal connection							0.232								-0.06
Family environment							-0.00639								0.386
Education							0.191								0.327
Family of origin							0.0746								-0.237
Effort should							-0.0279								-0.238
Luck should							-0.212								0.390*
Talent or abilities should							-0.159								0.0837
Personal connection should							0.0295								-0.444**
Family environment should							-0.0317								0.0713
Education should							-0.470**								-0.221
Family of origin should							-0.137								-0.205
_cons	9.042***	8.212***	9.707***	11.62***	8.108***	14.58***	9.592***	5.902**	8.537**	6.009**	7.896*	7.928**	5.712*	5.507	7.765***
N	4794	2948	2944	2873	3762	2467	3447	4828	3147	4886	3059	3180	4462	3050	4885
pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.036	0.037	0.031	0.025	0.051	0.032	0.054	0.082	0.082	0.088	0.083	0.071	0.102	0.075	0.091

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

Appendix A (continue)

	USA: mlogit reg. of reference group - Relatives							Japan: mlogit reg. of reference group - Relatives							
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.
female11	0.386	0.294	0.358	0.292	0.485	0.661*	0.171	0.923**	0.739	0.918**	0.847	0.884	0.659	0.736	0.981**
age11	-0.130**	-0.157*	-0.156**	-0.265***	-0.0786	-0.279**	-0.102*	0.063	-0.021	0.0542	-0.0898	-0.0672	0.161	0.061	0.0694
age*age/100	0.109**	0.150*	0.125*	0.254**	0.0567	0.231*	0.0861	-0.04	0.0424	-0.0288	0.14	0.104	-0.144	-0.0285	-0.0426
edul1	-0.128*							-0.0291							
Employment Status (omitted : Other)															
Full-time		-0.0785							0.0652						
Part-time		0.298							0.654						
Student part-time		16.06							-1.133						
Temporary work		15.04							-2.386						
Contract worker		-0.405							14.31						
City (omitted : Hokkaido)															
Tohoku									0.0708						
Kanto									0.919						
KATE									16.02						
Hokuriku									0.877						
Tokai									15.67						
Kinki									1.195						
Chugoku									0.845						
Shikoku									0.764						
Kyusyu									1.197						
Type of Employment (omitted : Government employee)															
Employee of private company			0.175						0.463						
Manager or private company			-0.683						-0.272						
Self-employed			0.873						0.517						
Family employee			15.78						-0.985						
Employed year 11				0.066								0.133			
Occupation (omitted: Office and administrative support)															
Sales and related occupations				0.0215									-0.735		
Managerial occupations				-0.691									-2.408**		
Specialist/Technical Experts				-0.669									0.0147		
Service occupations				-0.482									-1.582		
Industrial occupations				0.249									-1.023		
Farming, fishing, and forestry				17.4									15.22		
Housewives / Househusbands				-0.462									0.425		
Student				-1.423									-2.208		
Retired				-0.0693									-0.421		
Unemployed				16.87									-1.568		
Other				-0.838									-2.436*		
Working hours and payment															
Working hours per week11					-0.0125								0.0204		
Paid OT 11					0.0484								0.494		
Unpaid OT 11					0.0164								-0.108***		
Determination of people's incomes and standards of living															
Effort															-0.223
Luck															0.094
Talent or abilities									0.0648						-0.0289
Personal connection									0.241						-0.172
Family environment									0.107						0.243
Education									0.159						0.349
Family of origin									-0.153						-0.178
Effort should									0.249						0.0741
Luck should									-0.152						0.283
Talent or abilities should									0.00209						0.037
Personal connection should									0.00733						-0.414*
Family environment should									-0.125						0.27
Education should									-0.263						-0.306
Family of origin should									-0.168						-0.112
_cons	6.143***	5.757***	6.307***	8.246***	4.615***	10.08***	5.532***	-0.16	1.969	-1.148	2.67	2.176	-1.116	-1.057	0.288
N	4794	2948	2944	2873	3762	2467	3447	4828	3147	4886	3059	3180	4462	3050	4885
pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.036	0.037	0.031	0.025	0.051	0.032	0.054	0.082	0.082	0.088	0.083	0.071	0.102	0.075	0.091

\* p < 0.1. \*\* p < 0.05. \*\*\* p < 0.01

Appendix A (continue)

USA: mlogit reg. of reference group - FCC								Japan: mlogit reg. of reference group - FCC							
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.	Coef.
female11	0.448	0.0537	0.16	0.291	0.299	0.703	0.314	1.644***	0.808	1.612***	1.571**	1.461**	1.221**	0.744	1.626***
age11	-0.022	0.103	-0.0479	-0.0774	-0.00564	-0.019	0.0577	0.718***	0.761***	0.703***	0.689***	0.735***	0.851***	0.947***	0.714***
age*age/100	-0.0162	-0.15	0.00145	0.0341	-0.0382	-0.079	-0.106	-0.837***	-0.887***	-0.820***	-0.777***	-0.835***	-0.979***	-1.083***	-0.832***
edul1	0.0792							0.0433							
Employment Status (omitted : Other)															
Full-time		-0.499							-0.52						
Part-time		0.397							1.368						
Student part-time		15.87							-0.753						
Temporary work		15.67							-1.661						
Contract worker		0.365							14.42						
City (omitted : Hokkaido)															
Tohoku									-0.767						
Kanto									0.69						
KATE									14.74						
Hokuriku									-0.368						
Tokai									15.09						
Kinki									0.484						
Chugoku									-0.32						
Shikoku									-0.713						
Kyusyu									0.206						
Type of Employment (omitted : Government employee)															
Employee of private company			0.176						0.321						
Manager or private company			-0.523						-0.183						
Self-employed			0.585						0.603						
Family employee			15.51						-0.7						
Employed year 11				0.121								-0.00981			
Occupation (omitted: Office and administrative support)															
Sales and related occupations				0.0408									-0.571		
Managerial occupations				-0.661									-2.647**		
Specialist/Technical Experts				0.0274									-0.443		
Service occupations				-0.371									-1.676		
Industrial occupations				0.527									-1.387		
Farming, fishing, and forestry				16.73									14.11		
Housewives / Househusbands				0.668									0.521		
Student				-1.217									-25.58		
Retired				-0.389									-13.41		
Unemployed				17.24									-2.04		
Other				0.143									-2.311*		
Working hours and payment															
Working hours per week11									-0.0275*					-0.0147	
Paid OT 11									0.0402					0.458	
Unpaid OT 11									0.017					-0.100***	
Determination of people's incomes and standards of living															
Effort									-0.623**						-0.0873
Luck									0.0274						0.0678
Talent or abilities									0.116						-0.145
Personal connection									0.302						0.116
Family environment									-0.145						0.317
Education									0.211						0.256
Family of origin									0.0535						-0.0922
Effort should									0.463						-0.247
Luck should									-0.0447						0.329
Talent or abilities should									-0.192						-0.00423
Personal connection should									0.0295						-0.393*
Family environment should									-0.0704						0.118
Education should									-0.454*						-0.299
Family of origin should									-0.0827						-0.181
_cons	1.552	-0.501	2.855	3.027	1.749	4.295	1.373	-12.94***	-12.99***	-12.78***	-12.73***	-13.35***	-14.08***	-16.83***	-11.38***
N	4794	2948	2944	2873	3762	2467	3447	4828	3147	4886	3059	3180	4462	3050	4885
pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.036	0.037	0.031	0.025	0.051	0.032	0.054	0.082	0.082	0.088	0.083	0.071	0.102	0.075	0.091

\* p < 0.1. \*\* p < 0.05. \*\*\* p < 0.01



## References

- Clark, Andrew E., and Claudia S., 2010. Who Compares to Whom? The Anatomy of Income Comparisons in Europe. *The Economic Journal* 120.544, 573-594.
- Easterlin R.A., 1974. Does Economic Growth Improve the Human Lot? Some Empirical Evidence. *Nations and Households in Economic Growth* 89, 89-125.
- Eduardo P.A., 2011. If Happiness is Relative, Against Whom do We Compare Ourselves? Implications for Labor Supply. *Journal of Population Economics* 24.4, 1411-1442.
- 松浦・マッケンジー, 2009. *ミクロ計量経済学*. 東洋経済新報社. 東京.
- Osaka University, 2003-2012. Preference Parameters Study of Osaka University.  
[http://www.iser.osaka-u.ac.jp/coe/journal/eng\\_journal.html](http://www.iser.osaka-u.ac.jp/coe/journal/eng_journal.html)