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Abstract: Despite the abundance of social well-being research, there is still a research gap on the topic of the relation between social advantages and personal well-being in Indonesia. This research analyses the relationship between social advantages and personal well-being, with income and education as control variables. This article provides new breakthroughs (1) in the use of a more comprehensive method to analyze personal well-being and its determinants and (2) by proving more specifically about the relationship between the vertical aspect and the horizontal aspect such as family and community support. This study uses a quantitative survey of 1250 respondents as the main method, with bivariate, multivariate, and regression analyses. In addition, the qualitative method used interviews to obtain a comprehensive explanation of the relationship between two variables. The findings show that vertical-based social advantage is significantly higher than the horizontal aspect in elevating the respondents’ personal well-being. In the context of Indonesia, horizontal social advantages are sufficient to contribute to personal well-being, but cannot be separated from their interrelation with aspects of vertical social advantages such as fulfilling economic needs as a prerequisite. Furthermore, the role of communities, friends, colleagues, and
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1. Introduction

Social advantage is a sociological concept which is closely related to the concepts of poverty and social exclusion. Poverty is basically the condition in which individuals or groups of individuals are in a position of disadvantage compared to other groups and other individuals in the society (Dean & Platt, 2016). Poverty or in sociological terms, social deprivation can be understood with absolute deprivation and relative deprivation. Absolute deprivation is where the condition of disadvantage is below the absolute poverty line, while relative deprivation is considered as still higher than the absolute poverty line.

This particular concept deals with how the processes both structurally and culturally exclude individuals and groups of individuals from getting social advantages in the society such as social participation, social progress, and social benefits. Social exclusion can be divided into vertical-based social exclusion and horizontal-based social exclusion (F.S.S.E Seda et al., 2018; F. S. S. E. Seda et al., 2020). Vertical-based social exclusion is defined as the process of social exclusion which is based on indicators of social strata such as education, work status, and income. Horizontal-based social exclusion is defined as social cleavages such as ethnicity, race, gender, and religion, as the basis for the process of social exclusion.

The concept of social advantage is closely related to both the concepts of social deprivation and social exclusion (Bhalla & Lapeyre, 2004; Veltmeyer, 2002; Yadav & Longchar, 2016). The capability approach of Amartya Sen can be used to define the concepts of both social advantage and social disadvantage, especially the multidimensional element and the focus of what people can do to improve their own lives (Dean & Platt, 2016). Although using the capability approach suggested by Amartya Sen has many advantages, including using the Multidimensional Poverty Index and the Equality Measurement Framework, this research paper focuses more on the concept of social advantage based on vertical based with its indicators of social strata and horizontal based on social cleavages existent in almost all societies. Therefore, both vertical-based and horizontal-based social advantages have significant influence on personal well-being.

Social advantage and social disadvantage are social concepts denoting two sides of the same coin. There can only be advantaged groups if there are disadvantaged groups in the same society. The relativity of the concept is also indicated by the definition of disadvantage as a consequence of a process by which some form of relative advantage has been selectively conferred or attained. Thus, social advantage and social disadvantage are social phenomena by which systemic processes advantage may accrue to some and be denied to others.

Personal well-being is a social condition of subjective well-being which sociologically, an individual experiences in his/her lifetime. Personal well-being is part of a complex of multilevel analyses of social well-being which also comprises relational well-being and societal well-being (Koo et al., 2016). Personal well-being is on the microlevel especially individually, relational well-being is on the mesoanalytical level between individuals, between groups, and between individuals with groups, and societal well-being is on the structural level. Different types of well-being can be experienced by the individual at the same time. This research paper focuses on the personal well-being or subjective well-being individually as a dependent variable and measures the influence of social advantage as an independent variable on it.
2. Literature review

The study of social well-being uncovers various sub-topics; one of them is personal well-being. It is often associated with the notion of individual happiness or subjective well-being and is correlated with the experiences of the personal. Happiness, in other words, is the capacity to produce and experience the positive trajectories in the individual's life (Caslisle et al., 2009). While the term “happiness” tends to be a subjective form of psychological experiences, various studies have coined the term “well-being” to such an inner-subjective world to quantify its traits; personal well-being, or otherwise also understood as the “quantitative response to happiness,” is formed. Individuals who had a more positive life satisfaction tend to score higher on their personal well-being and vice versa: those who had a lesser degree of life satisfaction tend to score lower.

The study of personal well-being, in this case, is contextualized within the framework of the social context. In previous studies, we have found several literature reviews and performed some research studies to understand the character of well-being on various levels of society: micro for the individual level, meso for the group or institutional level, and macro for the societal level (Koo et al., 2016; White 2009a; 2009b; White, 2019). It is often suggested that the study of well-being, as dissected into these different layers, locates the personal well-being as a subjective experience, and the rest of the components whether it is the group or societal level as the more objective experience.

To understand how the personal well-being is formed, it is important to relocate the debate of well-being studies within the Easterlin Paradox. The Easterlin Paradox claims that as a nation state progresses into further economic development, it appears that the personal well-being of individuals tends to decrease (Tibesigwa et al., 2016). Perhaps, it is due to the fact that the increasing expectation of economic goods had “desensitized” individuals, gaining a higher tolerance and expectation of financial benefits, and had made them less prone to gaining furthermore happiness (Easterlin, 2001, 2013; Li & Shi, 2019). This study has also confirmed that there is a “paradoxical” form of relation when comparing developed and developing states in the East Asian and Southeast Asian region, respectively. Developed states tend to have a lower level of trust, social interaction, and group participation as compared to developing states, where apparently the notion of “togetherness” and communities tends to resonate more with the individuals or the group (Chan, 2016; Churcil & Mishra, 2016; F.S.S.E Seda et al., 2018; Heekyung & Philips, 2018; Jetten et al., 2014; Lee & Kim, 2015).

However, the study whether it is economic or relational factors which appear to impact the personal well-being of the individual had not been fully uncovered. This particular study, which focused on the Indonesian case, will attempt to further dissect the interplay between the economic factors which often is associated with “social stratification” or vertical social advantages and the relational factors which are associated with “social differentiation” or horizontal social advantages (Haq & Zia, 2013; Lee & Kim, 2015; Pierson, 2010; Sen, 2000; Ward & Meyer, 2009). By putting the variable of social advantages in the measurement towards the personal well-being, it is expected that either or both forms of social advantages, vertical or horizontal (D Ambrosio & Fricks 2011; Maccagnan et al., 2019), will eventually has a correlation with the individual happiness.

In the context of vertical-based social advantages, basic economic and materials needs are necessary to sustain the well-being of individual (Boon & Farnsworth, 2011; Bucur, 2017; Kavanagh et al., 2016; Rodems & Pfeffer, 2021). In the context of horizontal-based social advantages (Jovanovic et al. 2019; Portella et al., 2013), one should note that it may not always be economic or materials goods alone which determines the well-being of the individual; it is, however, accompanied by group identities which comprise social relationships within their relationships (Alipour et al., 2012b; Atkinson et al., 2020; Chan, 2016; Etzioni, 1996, 2000, 2011; Urilla, 2021; Vaillant et al., 2010). Based on these previous findings, this research attempts to test the hypothesis: (1) social advantages (both vertical and horizontal) do have a significant influence on personal well-being and (2) there is a significant difference in the relationship between social
advantages and personal well-being in respondents with different income, work status, and educational levels.

3. Methodology
This study is affiliated to the Senshu Social Well-Being research studies (Sudjatmiko et al., 2018; Wirutomo et al., 2018). The approach of this research in the Indonesia case study was done since the year 2017. It began in the quantitative research whereby around 1250 respondents were selected in Java and Bali, to which the samples attempt to represent the overall Indonesian population. The respondents were selected in the simple-random sampling in these regions in year 2017. The selected samples of respondents undergo interviews to fill in quantitative data regarding their demographic, personal well-being, and various questions on perceived social advantages. Later on, in 2019, a qualitative study was conducted in the Indonesian case study, which this study focuses particularly on the island of Java. The informants were selected based on their score ranges of personal well-being. The in-depth interviews were performed once again under the scheme of the Senshu Social Well-Being research. The informants were given a set of questions to define their sources of happiness, unhappiness, and the influence of social communities on the formation of their well-being experiences. Based on both approaches, qualitative and quantitative, it is expected that a general pattern and idiographic analysis on personal well-being will be provided (Lea & Macleod, 2018).

4. Description of respondents
Table 1 presents the general group attributes of the Indonesian respondents according to their gender, religious affiliation, and participation on traditional festivals which are mostly based on ethnic groups.

The table did show that there is a balance between male (50.1%) and female (49.9%) who participated in this quantitative survey. As we proceed further to elaborating their religious group

| Table 1. Respondent characteristics based on horizontal attributes (N = 1250) |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| Gender                         | %     |
| Male                           | 50.1  |
| Female                         | 49.9  |
| Religious Group Affiliation     |       |
| Buddhism                       | .7    |
| Christianity (Roman Catholic)  | 1.9   |
| Christianity (Protestant)      | 2.2   |
| Islam                          | 91.7  |
| Hindu                          | 3.2   |
| Nature worship                 | .2    |
| Traditional Festivals          |       |
| Never attend                   | 2.8   |
| Don’t usually attend           | 7.0   |
| Sometimes attend               | 20.3  |
| Attend as much as I can        | 34.4  |
| Always attend                  | 33.9  |
| Not answered                   | 1.6   |
affiliation, we can observe that a majority of Indonesian respondents are Muslims, affiliating towards the Islamic religion (91.7%). The proportion of minority religion is further divided into Protestantism (2.2%), Catholicism (1.9%), Hinduism (3.2%), Buddhism (0.7%), and Nature worship (0.2%).

On their participative responses to ethnic or traditional festivals, we find some interesting findings that a majority of Indonesian respondents are strongly affiliated towards such cultural activities. Around 33.9% answered to having “always attend”, and another 34.4% responded to “Attend as much as I can”; an accumulation of around 78.3% of the respondents are affiliated very closely to ethnic or traditional festivals. On the moderate scale, around 20.3% respondents attend on certain occasional basis. Finally, around 7% do not usually participate in such forms of festivals and only 2.8% answered to never attend such cultural activities.

There are 1250 Indonesian respondents who participated in this research. Based on their demographic characteristics, we will first describe their educational background, work status, and income level groups. On the educational background, it appears that a majority (81%) of respondents had attained an educational level of “high school and below”, and it is only around 19% of them who have an educational level of over high school.

Table 22 presents the general group of Indonesian respondents according to their educational background, work status, and income level. On the work status, it appears that around 34% are unemployed. There are some regular workers (11%); however, these numbers only represent a minority. Workers who have a “non-permanent status” as non-regular workers are around 24% of the respondents, workers who are self-employed without being attached to any working institutions are around 28% of the respondents, and there are around 3.6% of the respondents who are looking for a job.

| Educational Background     | %     |
|----------------------------|-------|
| High school and below      | 80.9  |
| Over high school           | 19.1  |

| Work Status                |       |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Regular workers            | 11.1  |
| Non-regular workers        | 23.9  |
| Self-employment            | 27.5  |
| Looking for job            | 3.6   |
| Unemployed                 | 33.9  |

| Income Level               |       |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Prefer not to answer or don’t know | 2.8  |
| Lower group (less than Rp 2,000,000) | 23.6 |
| Middle group (Rp 2,000,000–4,999,999) | 47.2 |
| Higher group (Rp 5,000,000 or more) | 26.3 |
Table 3: Univariate analysis on personal well-being and social advantages

| Variable                     | Mean | St. Dev. | N   |
|------------------------------|------|----------|-----|
| Personal Well-Being          | 6.88 | 1.52     | 1250|
| Advantage of Gender          | 6.81 | 1.87     | 1212|
| Advantage of Ethnicity       | 6.37 | 1.95     | 1103|
| Advantage of Religion        | 7.54 | 1.96     | 1228|
| Horizontal-Based Advantage   | 6.90 | 1.64     | 1088|
| Advantage of Education       | 6.44 | 2.06     | 1220|
| Advantage of Occupation      | 6.61 | 2.03     | 1096|
| Advantage of Income          | 6.48 | 2.05     | 1140|
| Vertical-Based Advantage     | 6.54 | 1.85     | 1065|
| Social Advantage             | 6.73 | 1.58     | 960 |

On the income level, we have divided the respondents into three income groups which represent the lowest, average, and higher economic levels among the respondents. Among them, majority (47%) falls into the middle group of attaining a monthly salary of Rp 2,000,000–4,999,999, while among the lower and higher group that appeared to be “equal” in their percentage groupings, the former consists of 24% and the latter consists of 26% among the respondents. Around 3% of the respondents responded “Don’t Know” or “Prefer not to Answer”.

Based on this prior demographic information, we can deduce several points to describe the social stratification condition. First, a majority of Indonesian respondents are characterized as “middle to low level of education” that is having educational level below university. Second, it is only a minority of respondents who have attained regular or “more permanent” jobs within working institutions; for it is shown that most respondents appeared to reply having jobs which are not attached to stable working institutions, some are self-employed or even unemployed. Finally, a majority of respondents are categorized within the “middle group” of economic income, and there are less respondents who belong to the lower and higher economic income group.

While economic income may appear to be “quite sufficient” to fulfil everyday needs among the respondents, it appears that economic income may be the aspect within the vertical dimension of social stratification to compensate the lack of education and stability of jobs. Indonesian respondents appeared to focus more on attaining stable incomes or salary as compared to having higher educational levels or stable jobs.

The perception of respondents to attaining social accesses is crucial to understanding how various horizontal- and vertical-based advantages contribute to their personal well-being. In this figures on Table 3, we would like to first elaborate the univariate description of each variable. The mean score of personal well-being among Indonesian respondents is 6.88. This score index has a relatively higher score of personal well-being, slightly lower than “7”, which is considered to be “moderately high to high”.

For the horizontal access component, there are three items which are being measured in this analysis: gender, ethnicity, and religion. Religion has the highest mean score of 7.54, followed by gender with a mean score of 6.81 finally followed by ethnicity with a mean score of 6.37. The overall mean score for horizontal access is 6.90 which is slightly higher than vertical-based social advantage.


On the vertical access component, there are also three items which are being measured: education, occupation, and income. It appears that these three items might not have a drastic difference between each of them. Occupation has the highest mean score of 6.61, followed by income with a score of 6.48 and education with a mean score of 6.44. Overall, vertical access has a mean score of 6.54 which is lower than non-vertical-based social advantage. The average score of combining vertical- and horizontal-based social advantages, under the category of “social access”, is 6.73.

5. Quantitative findings

5.1. Correlation analysis

Bivariate analysis also shows a similar pattern of findings that horizontal things also show a not too different effect from vertical things on well-being conditions. Both need to be seen in an integrated manner in explaining the personal well-being condition.

Table 4 shows the correlation between social advantages as the independent variable and personal well-being as the dependent variable. There is a significant correlation between the two variables with a correlation strength of 0.38. Furthermore, as we further dissect the influence of vertical and horizontal social advantages, we find that the vertical dimension (0.41) has a stronger influence towards personal well-being of the respondents as compared to horizontal (0.26). However, the difference is not too big; it also shows the interrelation between these two dimensions of social advantages, where horizontal social advantages will have a more meaningful impact on personal well-being when combined with vertical aspects.

In this section, we would like to further elaborate the difference in influence between horizontal and vertical access towards the personal well-being of Indonesian respondents based on their educational background, economic income, and status of work. The multivariate analysis locates both forms of accesses as independent variables and personal well-being as the dependent variable while education, income, and work status are positioned as control variables.

Based on Table 5 and Table 6, the analysis shows that vertical forms of social accesses, which are the respondents’ perception of received advantage based on their education, income, and occupation, tend to have stronger correlation towards personal well-being as compared to horizontal forms of social accesses. This pattern is consistent within all three control variables. Indonesian respondents appear to experience a better sense of personal well-being when they perceived to have attained advantage through vertical forms of social resources via education (0.41), economic income (0.39–0.45), and work statuses (0.40–0.48).

This multivariate analysis indeed shows that the vertical dimension is the main contributor of personal well-being. However, it cannot be ignored that as a society that is ethnically and religiously heterogeneous, as a horizontal attribute, these horizontal factors are also an important part of forming respondents’ personal well-being, at different social layers. Indonesian

| No. | Independent Variable          | Dependent Variable | Correlation Strength |
|-----|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1.  | Social advantages             | Personal well-being| 0.38***              |
| 2.  | Horizontal social advantage   | Personal well-being| 0.26***              |
| 3.  | Vertical social advantage     | Personal well-being| 0.41***              |

***indicates significance at 0.000.
**indicates significance lower than 0.05.
*indicates significance at 0.05.
respondents appear to show a higher level of well-being when communities become the ground where individuals build network to search for new jobs (0.67). This means that the influence of horizontal factors in the form of values regarding family, participation in the community, and so on is quite important for the personal well-being of respondents in specific social context.

5.2. Regression analysis
In this regression analysis of social access towards personal well-being, we find that there is a significant correlation. The regression analysis findings will be based on Table 77, Table 88, and Table 99. The asymmetrical effect of social access towards personal well-being is having a constant of 4.58 as its basic value and a regression coefficient of 0.339. This correlation is defined by its asymmetrical value of R-square 0.41.

As we further analyse, the vertical- and horizontal-based social advantage towards personal well-being, both dimensions are accumulated to have a combined asymmetrical value of 0.155 R-Square. Both dimensions are based on the basic constant value of 4.81. On the vertically based social advantage, the regression coefficient is 0.336 with a significant value. On the horizontally based social advantage, the regression coefficient value is −0.021 without any degree of significance. This shows that vertical social access has a higher influence towards the degree of personal well-being as compared to horizontal social access in terms of regression analysis.

In this section, the findings show that there is a combined asymmetrical regression impact of R-Square 0.041. The constant coefficient for all three dimensions is 5.73. In every dimension, there is

| No. | Independent Variable                      | Control Variables                        | Dependent Variable     | Correlation Strength |
|-----|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| 1.  | Horizontal-based social advantages       | Education: Equal or lower than high school | Personal W wellbeing   | 0.29***              |
| 2.  |                                          | Education: Higher than high school       |                        |                      |
| 3.  | Horizontal-based social advantages       | Income: Lower than Rp 2,000,000          | Personal wellbeing     | 0.26***              |
| 4.  |                                          | Income: Rp 2,000,000—Rp 5,000,000         |                        | 0.27***              |
| 5.  |                                          | Income: Higher than Rp 5,000,000         |                        | 0.20***              |
| 6.  | Horizontal-based social advantages       | Work status: Regular worker              | Personal well-being    | 0.21***              |
| 7.  |                                          | Work status: Non-regular                 |                        | 0.25***              |
| 8.  |                                          | Work status: Self-employed               |                        | 0.22***              |
| 9.  |                                          | Work Status: Looking for Job             |                        | 0.67***              |
| 10. |                                          | Work Status: Unemployed                  |                        | 0.30***              |

**indicates significance at 0.000.
*indicates significance lower than 0.05.
*indicates significance at 0.05.
a significant correlation. However, among all the these dimensions, education appears to have demonstrated the strongest regression coefficient, having a value of 0.512. Household income and work status appear to have a weaker regression coefficient, having value of 0.105 and 0.112, respectively.

Based on these findings, we would like to validate the hypothesis on this research. First, it is confirmed that social access have a significant influence towards personal well-being. Second, it is only the vertically based social advantage that has a significant influence towards social well-being. Finally, all dimensions of the vertically based social advantage that is education, household income, and work status have a significant influence towards social well-being. However, it is observed that social access had only around 4% influence towards personal well-being, while the rest of 96% are derived from other sources. Also, a coefficient of 34% is derived from the vertical social advantage having a significant correlation. Finally, educational levels appear to be the

| No. | Independent Variable | Control Variables | Dependent Variable | Correlation Strength |
|-----|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1.  | Vertical-based social advantages | Education: Equal or lower than high school | Personal well-being | 0.41*** |
| 2.  | Vertical-based social advantages | Education: Higher than high school | Personal well-being | 0.41*** |
| 3.  | Vertical-based social advantages | Income: Lower than Rp 2,000,000 | Personal well-being | 0.45*** |
| 4.  | Vertical-based social advantages | Income: Rp 2,000,000—Rp 5,000,000 | Personal well-being | 0.39*** |
| 5.  | Vertical-based social advantages | Income: Higher than Rp 5,000,000 | Personal well-being | 0.24*** |
| 6.  | Vertical-based social advantages | Work status: Regular worker | Personal well-being | 0.48*** |
| 7.  | Vertical-based social advantages | Work status: Non-regular | Personal well-being | 0.40*** |
| 8.  | Vertical-based social advantages | Work status: Self-employed | Personal well-being | 0.42*** |
| 9.  | Vertical-based social advantages | Work status: Looking for job | Personal well-being | 0.70*** |
| 10. | Vertical-based social advantages | Work status: Unemployed | Personal well-being | 0.40*** |

***indicates significance at 0.000.
**indicates significance lower than 0.05.
*indicates significance at 0.05.
Table 8. Multiple regression analysis: vertical and horizontal social advantages as predictors to personal well-being

| Predictor Variable                  | R-Square | Constant | Variable Value | Sig. | T     |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------------|------|-------|
| Vertically based social advantage  | 0.155    | 4.81     | 0.336          | 0.000| 10.819|
| Horizontally based social advantage|          |          | −0.021         | 0.551| −0.597|

Table 9. Multiple regression analysis: education, income, and work status as predictors to personal well-being

| Predictor Variable       | R-Square | Constant | Variable Value | Sig. | T     |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|----------------|------|-------|
| Education                | 0.041    | 5.73     | 0.512          | 0.000| 4.611 |
| Household income         |          |          | 0.105          | 0.000| 4.779 |
| Work status              |          |          | 0.112          | 0.000| 3.650 |

strongest factor with a percentage of 51% which elevates personal well-being as compared to household income and work status although all of them have significant correlation.

6. Qualitative findings
In this section, we would like to discuss the quantitative findings on the role of vertical- and horizontal-based social advantage towards personal well-being based on qualitative data which have been obtained through in-depth interviews. There are eight (8) selected informants taken from 1250 respondents from the Senshu Social Well-being research project, who have taken part in the interview. Throughout these interviews, we attempt to obtain several key information on how the participants describe their life experience of happiness, unhappiness, and vertical- and horizontal-based social advantage. Table 10 shows the profile of each informant who have been involved in this study.

6.1. Vertical-based social advantage
We have interviewed the informants based on Table 10. In this section, qualitative findings from in-depth interviews will be quoted to further explain the quantitative findings. Based on the vertical-based aspect of social advantage, we find that the material form of economic goods, especially the financial condition, was crucial to explain the personal well-being of individuals.

“Happiness, physically, is in the form of material, but mentally it’s the family harmony. Sundanese say that family harmony is an important thing. As if there's financial problem, I can ask help from my children ... Yes, it's the family harmony. But, financially, it's not sufficient yet. I can't always ask to my children. It's a normal thing if children ask something from you, but if you do it, it's just not funny at all.” – Informant U05

“Happiness is ... having children ... It's when things are hard, having no money to buy things, having nothing.” – Informant U06
Table 10. Informants' profile

| ID  | Gender | Age | Education          | Employment | Job                                      | Personal Well-being |
|-----|--------|-----|--------------------|------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| U01 | M      | 54  | Senior high school | Employed   | Head of Cemetery Cleaning Team and Head of community association | 4                   |
| U05 | M      | 63  | Elementary school  | Employed   | Head of the community association        | 7                   |
| U06 | M      | 67  | Never completed elementary school | Not working | NA                                       | 8                   |
| U10 | F      | 60  | Junior high school | Not working | Not Applicable (NA) (Housewife)          | 5                   |
| R01 | M      | 59  | Elementary school  | Self-employed | Driver                                   | 5                   |
| R02 | M      | 59  | Junior high school | Not working | Not Applicable (NA)                      | 6                   |
| R06 | M      | 63  | Vocational high school | Self-employed | Koran teacher                           | 10                  |
| R07 | F      | 49  | Senior high school | Self-employed | Kite-making Small and Medium-Sized Enterprise | 5                   |

“The first was the state of my family … The second was economic problem.” when I only had two children. I had a proper job at the bank too, until 2002. My other kids kind of just happened, and now we’re lacking a lot … Because I lack things. Sometimes my kids cry because we have nothing. So if I have money and my kids ask for money, I can give them money and it’ll make them happy. But I don’t even have 500 [rupiah] for them” – Informant R01

Based on the quotes done by the interview, there is a set of information on the notion of happiness, otherwise known as personal well-being. First, the above informants did respond that happiness is related to the financial condition. Informant U05, U06, and R01 did state that family is indeed the pinnacle of well-being. However, the capacity to sustain the family relation is conditioned by financial and economic issues. The informants admitted that without a sustainable economic condition, it would be difficult to provide the needs of the family members. Economic conditions tend to be viewed as a means to a designated end for the good of the family. If the vertical-based social advantage, that is the material condition, is not well met—then it would imply a negative impact towards the well-being of the individual which is based on the family.

“It was the first fire. I lost everything … When the first fire happened, I still had a lot of goods. I had savings, enough for buying supplies for the kiosk … I already bought goods and my saving was in a piggybank. I had plans for that saving. They were all went with the fire.” – Informant R02
The issue of the economic condition can also be observed based on this interview when the informant had lost his material goods due to a disaster. The problem of fire which causes damage towards his asset, his goods, and savings seems to be a very catastrophic event, thus resulting in the poorer state of well-being condition. These several quotations did provide certain clues to explain the quantitative findings that the issue of economic condition does in fact have an influence on the well-being of the family and individual. A happy family provided with a sufficient economic income and good financial condition would in turn elevates the personal well-being of the individual.

Thus, these qualitative findings indicate that the vertical-based social advantage, specifically, the issue of economic condition and good financial income, influences the personal well-being of the individual and the family. The economic condition is directly related to personal well-being. The material situation is important for sustaining personal well-being and in turn for enabling a long-term stable family well-being. Family is very important, but family well-being is, in turn, highly dependent on the capacity to provide basic economic and material needs of the individual (Boon & Farnsworth, 2011; Bucur, 2017). The vertical-based social advantage is a basic requirement for personal well-being, although family is an important aspect.

6.2. Horizontal-based social advantage
Let us now observe the scope of the horizontal-based advantage which would later uplift the well-being of the individuals. In this section, we would like to present some information that focuses on the “non-economic” factors that played an important role in conditioning the experience of personal well-being.

“Happiness is relative, isn’t it? I’m telling you here that happiness is … Life is happy in my opinion … happiness is when children get their success. That is happiness. All that we aspire to and all we hope for is that children get their success … When my mom died? Maybe because she is my parents and we take care of our parents every day … And my parents used to go to the rice fields to become farm laborers for our sake and she has done that much … ” - Informant R07

“As far as I can remember, it [economic condition] never has [made me unhappy] … As I remember it. Because everything I and my wife want has always been fulfilled … The Umrah (Islamic Religious Pilgrimage) was in 2011, and then we applied for Hajj in 2012. In 2019, we did the trip. All thanks to God.” – Informant R06

The above information describes the horizontal social advantage in elevating the condition of personal well-being. The “non-economic” aspect, which describes the happiness of the individual, is once again tied towards the family as stated by Informant R07 and also religious pilgrimage by Informant R06. If we would elaborate Informant R07’s statements on happiness, it does not fully eliminate the vertical-based social advantage. The experiences of Informant R07 as a mother to have witnessed the condition of poverty at her youth and also to watch the success of her children’s success were part of her personal well-being. However, the emphasis appears that she attains such a form of happiness through her family members or significant others when they have attained better vertical-based social conditions.

As we observe further the statement provided by informant R06, we can see that the informant’s relationship with his wife, which is once again a familial connection, appears to have been the central source of happiness. Furthermore, the opportunity for the informant (and his wife) to take part in Islamic religious pilgrimage has also become the pinnacle moments of personal well-being. With religious pilgrimage “taxes much” on economic and financial assets, not all individuals are able to experience such an opportunity. One should also remember that the gap between registration for pilgrimage and experiencing the pilgrimage itself requires a long period of time; based on the informant’s statement, it requires around 6–7 years long of waiting. Thus, the combinative interplay between the well-being of family and religious experience does resonate with the
personal well-being. Horizontal forms of social advantage, particularly religion in this case, have a great influence on individual happiness.

"Because everything in my life was guaranteed. I got free treatment. I had been paid overtime. I had more than enough. I only had two children too. I think you shouldn’t have a lot of children... Well, roughly speaking, ever since I left the bank. Since then, I would do anything, including driving ajeck [motorcycle taxi]... Nope, nobody from work. Maybe if I go to Jakarta, my Chinese friend would help me out. A lot of my colleagues in Jakarta are of Chinese descent. So as long as I showed up at their door, they’d give me something, probably 200,000 [rupiah]... “Some of the neighbors helped, yes. When I was sick, they took care of my food. I had a friend lend me money, my childhood friend, who’s been with me since we took care of the farm and lives in this village. My friend helped me out.” – Informant R01

The participation of social communities through work relations appears to provide help and sustain personal well-being. Informant R01 did provide certain information that the help of a friend, from a different ethnic background, through the betterment of economic circumstances, has helped him go through life’s ordeal. The participation of neighbours and friends to assist in economic conditions apparently was an important factor which elevated his personal well-being. It is through these conditions which the informant explained that he “got free treatment” when apparently, he had lost his job and took up a “less stable” irregular job.

Furthermore, we have also found some remarks from an informant who explained the loss of well-being when one of her sons had experience substance abuse of drugs:

He was depressed and suffered from substance abuse... He would do whatever people told him to do. When he was in high school, people started giving him drugs... He would just take the drugs people were giving him, people were giving him money to take drugs, and I don’t know how he was influenced”. – Informant U10.

This finding shows that the psychological condition of family members was important too. Aside from economic well-being, the psychological and biological well-being of the family member is also crucial towards the personal well-being of the informant. If the informant’s family members are depressed or unhealthy due to several factors, it would be consequential that their well-being would decrease and vice versa.

The horizontal-based advantage based on the qualitative findings shows that the well-being of family members and the involvement of other support systems such as neighbours and people from other different ethnic groups, together with the experience of performing religious pilgrimage, are directly related to personal well-being. Thus, although material and economic needs are important (vertical-based social advantage), the importance of family, community support system, and religious experiences (horizontal based social advantage) is more important for personal well-being.

7. Discussion
Based on the quantitative findings in the univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analysis, we can deduce that the role of vertical-based social advantage is crucial to elevating the personal well-being among Indonesian respondents. Furthermore, as we attempt to find more in-depth qualitative data based on in-depth interviews, we find it consistent with the quantitative analysis. The financial and economic conditions are important, and it could increase or decrease the personal well-being of the informants.

However, there is certain information which can only be explained through the in-depth interviews. First, it should be noted that the centrality of the family is important to the personal well-being of informants. While it is true and consistent that financial income and economic condition, which is the trait of the vertical-based social advantage, are often the determining factor of well-
being, we must note that it is only relevant if it is directed to the well-being of the informants’ family. A good family requires its needs to be sufficiently provided through economic and financial goods. The vertical-based social advantage would sound to be more relevant if it is within the scope of sustaining and maintaining the happiness of the family.

Second, we find it interesting that there are several horizontal-based social advantages having an interplay with the well-being of the informants. Based on the informants’ profile, we find that it is mostly true that vertical-based social advantages, such as economic and material goods, are important to sustain the needs of family. Male informants are more likely to feel more obligated to be the breadwinner and sustain the needs of family, and thus, their definition of happiness is found in the betterment of the family financial condition. On the other hand, female informants such as Informant R07 and U10 stated that the betterment of personal well-being is more weighted on the well-being of their children, as compared to the financial condition. The loss of their significant other, whether it is due to death or psychological-biological conditioning appears to take greater tolls to their well-being. Likewise, their betterment, due to improved vertical-based social advantage, has brought brighter sense of happiness.

In addition, it is to be noted that education plays an important role in elevating personal well-being. The quantitative findings confirm that education, as a vertically based social advantage, plays a pivotal role in the respondents’ level of life satisfaction. As having attained a higher level of education would imply a better economic income and conditions, individuals would later perceive such a vertically based social advantage as one of the primary sources of well-being. The qualitative findings further describe the dynamic of how vertically based social goods such as income are pivotal to sustaining the basic needs of family members. Having done so, informants replied that a good economic condition would support a healthy relationship in the psychosociodynamic within the relational circles.

There are also various forms of sources which could increase the personal well-being. The participation of social communities, colleagues, and known friends to sustaining economic needs is central to increasing the happiness of an individual. Thus, the involvement of neighbours and people from other ethnic groups in helping the need during poverty and job losses is the horizontal social advantage which intersects with the vertical social advantage as perceived by the individual. Furthermore, the opportunity to experience pilgrimage, one of the religious attributes, has a significant impact on increasing the personal well-being of individual. While pilgrimage may “tax” a huge toil towards one’s economic condition, it is the ritual and religious experience which later retains a significant factor to further compensate and even elevate what vertical social advantage could not do to the personal well-being.

The intertwining and dynamic processes of both the vertical- and horizontal-based social advantages are highlighted in this research findings. Both the quantitative and qualitative research analyses show that both the vertical- and the horizontal-based social advantages play an important role in influencing personal well-being although there are slightly different degrees of influences based on gender relations and social strata. It is interesting to have a more longitudinal research study to try to analyze how deep and how varied these degrees of influences are influential towards personal well-being.

This research results show that the interplay between the economic factors which is often related to social stratification or vertical social advantages and the relational factors which are associated with social differentiation or horizontal social advantages are indeed related to personal well-being in the case of Indonesia (Haq & Zia, 2013; Lee & Kim, 2015; Pierson, 2010; Sen, 2000; Ward & Meyer, 2009).

Having stated this, we find that it is interesting that social well-being, which stresses much on economic income and personal happiness, may not always provide a complete picture of its
communal dynamic. Based on this study, the quantitative findings do indeed show that the vertically based social advantage, such as educational level, does impact personal well-being. However, as we further deepen our findings from the surface of quantitative analysis, qualitative findings have shown that in practice, it is demonstrated that economic income and family and social communities support individual material needs, which significantly sustain life satisfaction. While quantitative findings provide individual perception on social access and personal well-being, it is qualitative findings that open up room for group dynamics and other social relation which webs the nodes and networks of supplication to elevating personal well-being.

For vertical-based social advantages, basic economic and material needs are important and necessary for personal well-being (Boon & Farnsworth, 2011; Bucur, 2017; Kavanagh et al., 2016; Rodems & Pfeffer, 2021). In addition, for horizontal-based social advantages, it is not always material goods which influenced personal well-being (Jovanovic, et al., 2019; Portella et al., 2013). Group identities which are based on social relationships are also related to personal well-being (Alipour et al., 2012b; Atkinson et al., 2020; Chan, 2016; Etzioni, 1996, 2000, 2011; Urilla, 2021; Vaillant 2010). In the context of Indonesia, the study of personal well-being, at least on the level of individual (micro) (Koo et al., 2016; White 2009; 2009; White, 2019) is influenced and related to the social context. Both the interplay of vertical-based social advantages and horizontal-based social advantages together with the social context is influential and related to personal well-being.

The research findings show that the first hypothesis on social advantages, both vertical and horizontal, does have a significant influence towards personal well-being. Furthermore, the research results also show that in the second hypothesis, there is a significant difference between social advantages and personal well-being in respondents with different income, work status, and educational level. Both hypotheses are proven to be valid.

8. Conclusion
This study attempts to uncover the various factors which determine the personal well-being of Indonesian respondents. By taking both a quantitative data analysis and qualitative in-depth interviews, we have attempted to uncover the vertical and horizontal social advantages which influence the individuals' sense of happiness. We have also further described such a correlation through a set of control variables based on their stratification statuses: educational background, economic income level, and work status.

On the quantitative findings, we have found that the vertical-based social advantage is more significant to elevating the personal well-being of respondents. This is consistent within every form of control variables: education, income level, and job statuses. Individuals, from any educational background (University level, High school, or below), appear to find that vertical-based social advantages are crucial, respondents from the middle and lower range of income level are also described likewise, and finally, for respondents who are working appear to show similar responses —whether they are regular workers, irregular workers, or even self-employed.

On the qualitative findings based on interviews with selected informants, we find that it is indeed consistent: economic and financial conditioning is crucial when it comes to maintaining the well-being of the family. If the family is well-fed and sufficiently sustained with various vertical-based social advantages, then the personal well-being of the respondents would show familiar traits as explained in the quantitative data. Male informants show their obligation as the father and breadwinner to fulfill the economic needs of family, and female informants show their domestic role as the mother and caretaker to nurture the well-being, growth, and success of their children.

Nonetheless, we find that there are also other factors which come into play in the process of cultivating well-being, whether it is beneficial in the aspect of vertical- or horizontal-based social advantages. The role of communities, friends, colleagues, and neighbours in detect and assisting in providing economic goods in times of need is important. Furthermore, the role of religion, one that
is of a non-economic and horizontal based social advantage, also had an influence on the elevation of personal well-being. Further studies are recommended to searching how social contexts, relations to social communities, and the role of religion and tradition have a part in well-being research, particularly in the Indonesian case study.

8.1. Concluding remarks
This research focuses on the relation between social advantages and personal well-being. The quantitative analysis shows that there is a significant correlation between the two variables, especially vertically based advantages aspect. In multivariate analysis, education is the most significant control variable in relation between social advantages and personal well-being. The horizontal-based social advantage, which is denoted with gender, ethnicity, and religion, has a less influence on the personal well-being. Based on the research data, Indonesian respondents appear to experience a higher personal well-being when they perceived themselves to have achieved the vertical-based social advantage through education, economic income, and work status.

There are future recommendations based on this study. This study is an attempt to analyse the study of personal and social well-being from both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. We does find some interesting findings from both methodological approaches. Quantitative findings on the vertical social advantage may show direct and significant correlation towards personal well-being. Qualitative findings provide insights into “underground” social and group dynamic which may not be provided by a surface quantitative analysis. As most research studies still focus on the vertical-based social advantage in a quantitative manner, we suggest further that academic research could implement on how horizontal-based social advantages have an influence on personal and social-well being based on quantitative and qualitative approaches.
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