Youngwha Kee
Seung Jong Lee
Rhonda Phillips *Editors*

Perspectives on Community Well-Being

Springer

Community Quality-of-Life and Well-Being

Series Editor

Rhonda Phillips, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA

The Community Quality of Life and Well-being book series is a collection of volumes related to community level research, providing community planners and quality of life researchers involved in community and regional well-being innovative research and application. Formerly entitled, Community Quality of Life Indicators: Best Practices, the series reflects a broad scope of well-being. Next to best practices of community quality-of-life indicators projects the series welcomes a variety of research and practice topics as related to overall community well-being and quality of life dimensions, whether relating to policy, application, research, and/or practice. Research on issues such as societal happiness, quality of life domains in the policy construct, measuring and gauging progress, dimensions of planning and community development, and related topics are anticipated. This series is published by Springer in partnership with the International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies, a global society with the purpose of promoting and encouraging research and collaboration in quality of life and well-being theory and applications.

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/13761

Youngwha Kee · Seung Jong Lee ·
Rhonda Phillips
Editors

Perspectives on Community Well-Being

Editors
Youngwha Kee
Soongsil University
Seoul, Korea (Republic of)

Seung Jong Lee
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea (Republic of)

Rhonda Phillips
Honors College
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN, USA

Preface

This volume provides a variety of perspectives on community well-being, from different disciplines, cultures, and frameworks. It encompasses several chapters from a conference of the International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies www.isqols.org, and convenings of the Community Well-Being Research Center, housed in Korea, www.communitywellbeing.org. Researchers from around the globe have contributed to this volume, which serves as the fourth book contribution by the editors to the topic of community well-being.[1] This is an area of growing interest that encapsulates dimensions of well-being and quality of life across a range of domains and considerations—whether from the perspective of governance, resident participation, community development, learning, or a host of myriad other influences on community well-being. Our focus is predominately on communities of place, and collectives (or what some may call communities of interest) within those places; it is also about the governing of these places, as reflected in policy and programming by local governments to explore or foster enhanced well-being.

This will be the fourth volume we have completed on community well-being, an area of interest and research that is rapidly evolving. The need for research on this topic is very high, and interest continues to accelerate. This proposed volume brings together multiple diverse perspectives on quality of life and community well-being. The purpose of this volume is to present this collection across disciplines, ideas, and perspectives to foster more interest and research in community well-being. *Perspectives on Community Well-Being* provides various insights on quality of life and well-being from a place-based perspective. Topics include surveying at the community level, child-friendly communities, collective impact, grieving, and

---

[1]The other three books by the editors are: Youngwha Kee, Seung Jong Lee, and Rhonda Phillips. (eds.) (2016). *Social Factors and Community Well-Being*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. www.springer.com/us/book/9783319299402; Seung Jong Lee, Yunji Kim and Rhonda Phillips. (eds.) (2015). *Community Well-Being and Community Development*, Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. www.springer.com/social+sciences/wellbeing+%26+quality-of-life/book/978-3-319-12420-9; and Youngwha Kee, Yunji Kim and Rhonda Phillips. (eds.) (2015). *Learning and Community Applications for Promoting Well-Being*, Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. www.springer.com/social+sciences/wellbeing+%26+quality-of-life/book/978-3-319-12438-4.

happiness. This edited volume brings together perspectives from around the globe and provides both conceptual and applied explorations. Those working in the areas of public policy, community development, community and social psychology, as well as planning and development will find this volume particularly useful for the array of perspectives, research, and analytical approaches presented.

Certainly, many aspects of an area can influence community well-being, which can include "comprehensive and integrated concepts developed by synthesizing research constructs related to residents' perceptions of the community, resident's needs fulfillment, observable community conditions, and the social and cultural context of the community" (Sung and Phillips 2016: 2). Along this same line of thinking, Haworth and Hart (2007: 95) explain community well-being as "focused on understanding the contribution of a community in maintaining itself and ful-filling the various needs of local residents." This communal aspect is especially important and considered to be a contributing aspect of social organizations and relationships; it can be considered as "something that we do together, not something that we each possess" (p. 128).

Community well-being is a complex, interconnected concept, and it is gaining increasing interest as a framework that can help explain "quality of life and hap-piness in a communal context, than that on an individual level" (Kee and Nam 2016: 39). It is sometimes described as an umbrella concept, branching out over several related aspects of collective living—community development, happiness, quality of life, sustainability, and other allied constructs or approaches influencing well-being—both abstract and multidimensional (Lee, Kim & Phillips 2015: 2). In this way, community well-being can be considered as "embedded with multidi-mensional values including the economic, social, and environmental aspects that impact people" (Phillips and Wong 2017: xxix). It is similar in concept to ideas around sustainability that encompass major dimensions or domains of life—envi-ronment, economic, and equity (social/cultural and related). Given these multiple ways to influence well-being, whether via the physical environment, economic and social conditions, health, and type of governance structure, there exists a rich array of approaches, cases, and frameworks for community well-being.

This volume provides a collection of such a rich array, with views and insight offered across a panoply of perspectives and applications. Chapter 1 begins with an exploration of how to measure and gauge happiness by Kai Ludwigs, Lena Henning, and Lidia Arends. Happiness is a vital aspect of community well-being and they begin by explaining that happiness research remains a young discipline with definitions unclear across various disciplines, with many different measure-ment techniques having been developed. They present a definition by the World Database of Happiness, and then present a comprehensive review of measurements for evaluating happiness. This is an extensive chapter that provides much needed delineation of concepts of happiness, in the context of community-level well-being. They conclude with an applied guideline for researchers to consider when mea-suring happiness.

Chapter 2, "An Indigenous Perspective on Quality of Life", by Pat Lauderdale provides a view of the interrelatedness of nature. Written from the perspective of indigenous peoples, it considers these relationships in the context of striving for improved well-being and quality of life. Traditional indigenous knowledge is held as holding much "potential for long-lasting approaches to current environment problems and provide us with ideas on how to improve our questions and, therefore, improve our potential for more equitable, less oppressive structures from which to approach the numerous problems." There is a powerful lesson here—that we focus on learning from the deep interconnection we share with nature, respecting it while learning from it as is tradition by indigenous peoples.

Our third selection is "A Participatory Process: Creating Child Friendly Environments" (Chap. 3) by Ümran Topcu and Şebnem Cana Kacar. This chapter brings together planning and design elements to consider how built environments can help improve and foster well-being in children. Using the case of Istanbul, Turkey, this chapter considers the impact of rapid urbanization and the need for building child-friendly communities in cities. It provides a case of aspects to consider for transforming urban environments into those that support children's well-being, such as mobility, and involvement in planning decisions. A design proposal and process is presented for this purpose.

While rapid urbanization is a major consideration throughout many places in the world, the opposite is of concern for others. YeonKyeong Lee and Seung Jong Lee provide a view of gauging well-being in Chap. 4, "Community Well-Being and Migration Intention of Residents". Using the case of Korea, where there is deep concern with population declines, they consider impacts on overall well-being at the local level. The study examines the intention of residents to migrant away or stay within their current communities. Looking at a range of community characteristics, they consider the influences exerted on migration intention. This is particularly relevant for those places with declining population but also will be of interest in seeing how the framework of analysis was constructed for considering the influences of objective community characteristics.

"Perceived Social Support Systems for Bereaved Students in Walter Sisulu University: A Pilot Study" (Chap. 5) by Sabine Baninzi and T. Mdleleni-Bookholane is the fifth chapter. Grief is a topic that is sometimes not given full consideration, and especially in the context of quality of life and well-being. This study considers students at the University who participated in a questionnaire and scale for perceived social support. As most are aware, social relationships (which could be considered support) are critical factors influencing well-being. It is an illuminating case showing that students often do not receive support during grieving.

Next, "Community Well-Being Data Collection Methodology, the Case of Enschede, the Netherlands" (Chap. 6) by Javier Martinez and Frans van den Bosch describes the methodology for data collection in a community well-being survey. Using a community well-being survey designed by the Community Well-being Institute previously used for a district in Seoul, South Korea, this study provides an in-depth perspective of how to collect well-being data to use in the communal context.

Chapter 7, "The Relationship Between the Types of Needs Satisfaction and Subjective Well-Being", by Young Woong Kang and Seung Jong Lee seeks to clarify relationships between satisfaction type of residents' needs and subjective well-being. As with the prior chapter, it utilizes the community well-being survey framework. With data analysis, it reveals the relationship between the type of satisfaction of residents and subjective well-being. Further, the authors suggest what can serve to influence happiness after basic needs are met and provide recommendations for the direction of local government policies to foster increased community well-being.

"Shredding the Evidence: Whose Collective Impact are We Talking About?" (Chap. 8) by Geoffrey Woolcock explores the interest in the North American-informed Collective Impact (CI) approach and intentions of achieving transformative social change at both the individual and community levels. As the author explains, that in Australia "the rise of CI's visibility has emerged alongside diminishing public funding for social change initiatives, with a corresponding and somewhat belated turn to the philanthropic sector to partially meet this funding shortfall." Issues and challenges of the CI method are considered and compared with other methods for gauging social impact and change.

Chapter 9 provides an exploration of fiscal structures and residents' well-being, by Youngkyun Oh. The author uses the case of Korea to explore local financial expenditures from the perspective of accountability. It explores ways to reorganize role apportionment for community well-being and residents' involvement in financial decision-making at the local level. Looking at this from the fiscal structure perspective, the chapter provides a way to consider an important element of governance—funding and financial resources—through the lens of community well-being.

Next, we shift our attention to the aspects of community well-being that often do not receive enough attention: the arts. This chapter, "Arts and Community Well-Being" (Chap. 10), by HeeKyung Sung first begins with an exploration of a wide array of community well-being literature, and then domains or dimensions of community well-being such as individual, social, and economic well-being are discussed. Further, the notion of arts and cultural impacts within community well-being dimensions is discussed from several different perspectives. A proposed conceptual model of arts and community well-being is then presented, along with propositions that can be used to examine the relationship between arts and cultural assets and community well-being outcomes.

The volume concludes with the chapter, "Spirituality: The Missing Link of Sustainability and Happiness as a Framework for Holistic Development" (Chap. 11), by Erica Berejnoi, Rohana Ulluwishewa, Scott Cloutier, Leah Gibbons, and Susana Puga. Another topic that needs more attention in the literature, their work brings together perspectives on the interrelationship between sustainability and happiness. And while happiness promotes sustainable behaviors, sustainable behaviors likewise enhance happiness. Happiness, as it influences overall well-being is considered. Spirituality as a crucial differentiating element is proposed both as a source of happiness and sustainability, and ultimately, enhanced community well-being.

It is our sincere hope that this volume will be both inspiring and informative to those interested in learning more about community well-being applications and approaches in a variety of contexts across communities of place and interest. There is much work to be done in this varied landscape of community well-being and we encourage you to explore how to foster better understanding and application, from a variety of perspectives.

Seoul, Korea (Republic of)	Youngwha Kee
Seoul, Korea (Republic of)	Seung Jong Lee
West Lafayette, USA	Rhonda Phillips

References

Haworth, J., & Hart, G. (2007). *Well-being: Individual, community and social perspectives.* Hampshire: Palgrave.

Kee, Y., & Nam, C. (2016). Does sense of community matter in community well-being? In Y. Kee, S.J. Lee & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Social factors and community well-being* (pp. 39–56). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. www.springer.com/us/bok/9783319299402.

Lee, S.J., Kim, Y., & Phillips, R. (2015). Exploring the intersection of community well-being and community development. In S.J. Lee, Y. Kim & Y. Phillip (Eds.), *Community well-being and community development* (pp. 1–7). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. www.springer.com/social+sciences/wellbeing+%26+quality-of-life/book/978-3-319-12420-9.

Lee, S.J., & Kim, Y. (2015). Searching for the meaning of community well-being. In S.J. Lee, Y. Kim & Y. Phillip (Eds.), *Community well-being and community development* (pp. 9–23). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Phillips, R., & Wong, C. (2016). Introduction. In R. Phillips & C. Wong (Eds.), *The handbook of community well-being* (pp. xxix–xxxviii). Dordrecht: Springer.

Sung, H., & Phillips, R. (2016). Conceptualizing a community well-being and theory construct. In S.J. Lee, Y. Kee & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Social factors and community well-being* (pp. 1–12). Dordrecht: Springer.

Acknowledgements

Contents

Editors and Contributors

About the Editors

Youngwha Kee is Professor in the Department of Lifelong Education at Soongsil University. She has served as the President of the Association of Adult and Continuing Education of Korea and Director of the Korea Institute of Local Development Education. Currently, she serves on the editorial board of Springer's Community Quality-of-Life and Well-Being book series, the *International Journal of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning* (Hong Kong), the Lifelong Education Magazine (Taiwan), and Lifelong Education (China). Her research interests include educational gerontology, community and civic education, community well-being, community development, and governance.

Seung Jong Lee is a Professor and Dean of the Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University. Previously, he served as the president of the Korean Association for Public Administration and as chief editor of several academic journals in related fields. He has frequently advised local and national governments through such positions as Chairman of the Local Government Administration Joint Evaluation Committee, Vice-Chairman of the Presidential Committee on Local District Reorganization Plans, and member of the presidential transition committee. He has not only done extensive research on citizen participation and local autonomy but has also been a strong advocate and educator in the field. He is the author of *Theories of Local Autonomy,* and *Democratic Politics and Citizen Participation.*

Rhonda Phillips, Ph.D., FAICP is a member of the College of Fellows of the American Institute of Certified Planners (FAICP). At Purdue University, she is inaugural Dean of the Honors College, and Professor, Agricultural Economics Department at Purdue University. She is author or editor of several books, including *The Handbook of Community Well-Being* (2017, Springer) and *The Handbook of Community Development, Perspectives from Across the Globe* (2018, Routledge).

She is editor of two book series, *Community Quality of Life and Well-Being*, www. springer.com/series/13761, and editor of *Community Development Research and Practice,* www.routledge.com/Community-Development-Research-and-Practice-Series/book-series/CDRP. She served as president of the International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies, www.isqols.org and on the Board of Directors for the Community Indicator Consortium, http://communityindicators.net/. Along with Seung Lee, she is co-editor of the new Springer journal, *The International Journal of Community Well-Being,* www.springer.com/social+sciences/wellbeing+& +quality-of-life/journal/42413.

Contributors

Lidia R. Arends Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Sabi Baninzi Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Law, Department of Social Work and Psychology, Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha, Eastern Cape, South Africa

Erica Berejnoi Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

Frans van den Bosch Faculty ITC—PGM, University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands

Scott Cloutier Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

Leah Gibbons Tempe, AZ, USA

Lena Henning Happiness Research Organisation, Dusseldorf, Germany

Sebnem Cana Kacar Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Kuzey Kampüsü, Mimarlık ve Tasarım Fakültesi, Abbasağa Mahallesi, Beşiktaş, İstanbul, Turkey

Young Woong Kang Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea

Pat Lauderdale Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

Seung Jong Lee Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea

YeonKyeong Lee Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea

Kai Ludwigs Happiness Research Organisation, Dusseldorf, Germany

Javier Martinez Faculty ITC—PGM, University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands

T. Mdleleni-Bookholane Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Law, Department of Social Work and Psychology, Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha, Eastern Cape, South Africa

Youngkyun Oh Humanities & Social Science College, Suwon University, Gyeonggi, South Korea

Susana Puga Tempe, AZ, USA

HeeKyung Sung Department of Recreation and Tourism Management, California State University, Northridge, CA, USA

E. Ümran Topcu Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Kuzey Kampüsü, Mimarlık ve Tasarım Fakültesi, Abbasağa Mahallesi, Beşiktaş, İstanbul, Turkey

Rohana Ulluwishewa Palmerston North, New Zealand

Anura Uthumange Center for Spirituality in Sustainable Business Management, Faculty of Management Studies and Commerce, University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Gangodawila, Sri Lanka

Geoffrey Woolcock Institute for Resilient Regions, University of Southern Queensland, Springfield/Toowoomba, MA, Australia

Chapter 1
Measuring Happiness—A Practical Review

Kai Ludwigs, Lena Henning and Lidia R. Arends

Abstract In times of increasing depression rates, happiness has gained interest as a goal for individuals and society instead of merely increasing gross domestic product. Unfortunately, happiness research remains a young discipline; thus, the definition of the term happiness is unclear across various disciplines, and many different measurement techniques have been developed and used thus far. This book chapter reviews different happiness definitions and ultimately selects the one used by the World Database of Happiness to then review which measurements are used and how frequently and to then evaluate their psychometric quality by reviewing published research thus far. In the end, the chapter presents a practical guideline of what a researcher should be aware of when measuring happiness.

Keywords Happiness · Measurements · World database of happiness · Happiness psychometrics

1.1 Introduction

Psychological diseases such as burnout and depression are on the rise these days. Accordingly, the World Health Organisation (WHO) forecasts that in 2030, depression will be the most common disease in high-income countries (Allianz & RWI, 2011; Mathers & Loncar, 2006). But this is not a problem that individuals must address on their own; rather, it is also of tremendous relevance for the economy. Indeed, psychological diseases already cause yearly economic costs of at least 7

K. Ludwigs (✉) · L. Henning
Happiness Research Organisation, Grafenberger Allee 342, 40235 Dusseldorf, Germany
e-mail: ludwigs@happiness-research.org

L. Henning
e-mail: info@happiness-research.org

L. R. Arends
Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, Netherlands
e-mail: arends@fsw.eur.nl

billion euro, as calculated, for example, for the German population (DGPPN, 2013). The main reasons for high massive expenditures are the direct costs of therapy and indirect costs caused by general productivity loss (Allianz & RWI, 2011).

1.1.1   Beneficial Effects of Happiness

By comparison, people who live a happy and fulfilling life exhibit various positive characteristics. They are less likely to get sick, and they have a better immune system (Pressman & Cohen, 2005). Moreover, happy people tend to live longer (Danner, Snowdon, & Friesen, 2001; Diener & Chan, 2011), and states with happier citizens have lower suicide rates (Koivumaa-Honkanen, Honkanen, Koskenvuo, & Kaprio, 2003). Additionally, happiness is a crucial factor for job and general satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993), and in turn, higher job satisfaction predicts lower job turnover rates (Clark, Georgellis, & Sanfey, 1998; Frijters, 2000). Happy people also put more effort into their work and thus work harder (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). Overall, it is thus not surprising that numerous surveys show a positive relationship between people's happiness and their productivity in different contexts (Cropanzano & Wright, 1999; Haas & Janssen, 2012; Harter, Schmidt, Asplund, & Kilham, 2010; Isen, Daubman, & Nowicki, 1987; Lyubomirsky, King & Diener, 2005; Oishi, 2012; Oswald, Proto, & Sgroi, 2009; Wright & Cropanzano, 2004; Wright & Staw, 1999). Concerning the economy, happy people are associated with increased health, effort and innovative actions, which ultimately leads to better long-term economic welfare. But the list of benefits that happy people may bring continues. In fact, such people are more sociable (George, 1991), more engaged in prosocial behaviours (Cunningham, Steinberg, & Grev, 1980; Isen, 1970), more likely to volunteer more often (Thoits & Hewitt, 2001), more likely to donate (Priller & Schupp, 2011) and more likely to give more money to charities (Aknin, Sandstrom, Dunn, & Norton, 2011). Therefore, happy people influence not only economic factors positively but also social progress.

Against this background, it is completely rational and understandable that some nations have worked on implementing (e.g., Great Britain, England's Prime Minister David Cameron: Cameron, 2006; Stratton, 2010; White, 2007; France, Former President Nicolas Sarcozy: Jolly, 2009; Stiglitz, Sen, & Fitoussi, 2009) or have clearly announced and prioritized (Bhutan, King Jigme Singye Wangchuck: Pfaff, 2011; Priesner 1999) a more intense focus on happiness when measuring economic performance and social progress. Accordingly, the European Commission, European Parliament, Club of Rome, OECD, and WWF discussed in 2007 how to improve progress and conditions of societies differently from merely focusing on economic factors (Commission of the European Communities, 2009). Many researchers have also intensely discussed this topic in the scientific community (Diener, 2000, 2012; Diener & Seligman, 2004; Di Tella & MacCulloch, 2008; Dolan & White, 2007; Frey & Stutzer, 2002; Kahneman & Krueger, 2006; Kahneman, Krueger, Schkade, Schwarz, & Stone, 2004a; MacKerron, 2012).

It can be concluded that pursuing a happier society, that is, achieving a higher level of happiness for everyone (Veenhoven, 2010), seems to be worthwhile. But the following question remains: what can we do to reach this goal? To answer this question, we need to investigate the important factors and their interrelations that determine happiness. However, to be able to do so, some premises need to be met: (i) We need to know what we mean by happiness. Thus, we need a clear definition of this construct. (ii) We need measures that capture the defined concept of happiness as valid and as feasible as possible. Consequently, we need to investigate existing measures in terms of their (psychometric) quality and their applicability in various situations (e.g., research questions; populations). By doing so, we can determine the best way to assess happiness depending on the current context. The current book chapter aims to contribute to meeting these 2 premises in future studies.

1.2 Definition of Happiness

For a long time, scholars have immensely engaged with the topic of happiness and the pursuit thereof. Ancient philosophy was concerned with the question of what is a good life, which was typically considered a morally good life denoted with the term happiness. For instance, Aristotle described striving for happiness as the most important of all goals and as the goal of life itself, as articulated in the following quotation: "Happiness is the meaning and the purpose of life, the whole aim and end of human existence" (as cited in: Bacon, Brophy, Mguni, Mulgan, & Shandro, 2010, p. 10). Other thinkers of ancient times, such as the Indian intellectual Dhammapada or philosophers from Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2011; Lu, 2001), were also concerned with this question. In the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas stated that happiness was "the ultimate goal of the rational being" (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2011, p. 31) and therewith underlined the importance of striving for happiness. Finally, the American Declaration of Independence (1776) names the pursuit of happiness as one of the unalienable rights besides life and liberty and thus as one of the ultimate rights and goals of every human being. This follows the idea of Jeremy Bentham, who stated in his doctrine: "Create all the happiness you are able to create; remove all the misery you are able to remove" (as cited in: Layard, 2005, p. 235).

1.2.1 Divergent Use of the Word

In sum, talking about happiness is not new at all, but the meaning of the word might have changed somewhat. However, research in this field remains very young and has particularly expanded since the 1990s (MacKerron, 2012; OECD, 2013). This is also reflected in the relatively recent launch of the *Journal of Happiness Studies,* which has published papers on happiness since 2000 (Journal of Happiness Studies, 2016).

As the discipline is so young, final agreement about the relevant terminology and definitions is currently lacking. In Easterlin (2003) posited that for him, happiness could be equated with utility, well-being, life satisfaction, and welfare. Other researchers have added additional terms that have often been used synonymously with happiness, such as "pleasure, life satisfaction, positive emotions, a meaningful life, or a feeling of contentment" (Diener, Scollon, & Lucas, 2003, p. 188). In their paper, Diener, Scollon, & Lucas (2003) use happiness and subjective well-being (SWB) interchangeably, and in accordance such usage, Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi (2000) stated that the term SWB is actually just "a more scientific-sounding term for what people usually mean by happiness" (p. 9; also cp. Diener, 2000, p. 24).

1.2.2   Need for a Clear Definition

Overall, this inconsistency in terminology can only cause confusion. To be clear in meaning in this book chapter, we will exclusively rely on the term happiness throughout to be consistent with the general tone of the entire book. In addition, we prefer the term happiness because we perceive it to be more easy-going and understandable for all readers. Concerning the abovementioned challenge in definition, it must be said that there is no consensus between researchers in their different disciplines for a common definition of happiness (cp. Lu, 2001; Veenhoven, 1984, 2010). Here, a definition for happiness is presented with the aim of (i) integrating the most common definition but also (ii) differentiating the adopted definition from definitions that are relatively vague and probably too broad to capture happiness alone. This definition serves as a basis for the following selection and review of happiness measures. By choosing such a clear concept of happiness, we can assure that the measure selection contains only measures that really fit this definition.

1.2.3   What Happiness Means from Our Point of View

In general, research and survey literature has often emphasized two aspects related to happiness (Busseri & Sadava, 2011; Clark & Senik, 2011; Diener, 2000; Diener, Scollon, & Lucas, 2003; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999; Dolan & White, 2007; Lucas, Diener, & Suh, 1996; OECD, 2013; Stiglitz et al., 2009): (1) the emotional or affective aspect ("a person's feelings or emotional states, typically measured with reference to a particular point in time": OECD, 2013, p. 10) and (2) the rational, cognitive or evaluative aspect ("a reflective assessment on a person's life or some specific aspect of it": OECD, 2013, p. 10). On the one hand, some happiness definitions especially concentrate on the emotional aspect, as with the one of Bradburn (1969, p. 9), who referred to happiness as the "resultant of the individual's position on two independent dimensions – one of positive affect and the other of negative affect." Another well-known definition is the one of Goldings, who stated in (1954, p. 31)

that happiness for him "embraces feelings of elation, contentment, satisfaction, and pleasure at the positive pole and feelings of depression, discontent, and unpleasure at the negative pole."

Further, affect-focused happiness definitions can also be found in Flügel (1925), Fordyce (1977) and Wessman and Ricks (1966). On the other hand, happiness definitions pay particularly attention to the evaluative aspect. Lemon, Bengtson, & Peterson (1972, p. 513), for example, referred to happiness as "the degree to which one is presently content or pleased with his general life situation," whereas Tatarkiewicz (1966, p. 1) merely briefly stated that happiness can be equated with "satisfaction with one's life as a whole." Another, evaluation-focused happiness definition can, for instance, be found in Michalos (1980). In addition to these either affect- or evaluation-focused happiness definitions, some definitions do not have a clear emphasis and combine both aspects instead. One exemplary and well-noticed definition comes from Diener, who wrote in (2000, p. 34) that happiness for him means "people's cognitive and affective evaluations of their lives" (adapted versions can be found in Diener, 2012; Diener, Scollon, & Lucas, 2003; Diener et al., 1999). Another frequently cited definition of happiness was launched by the OECD (2013, p. 29), which considers happiness to refer to "Good mental states, including all of the various evaluations, positive and negative, that people make of their lives, and the affective reactions of people to their experiences." Further happiness definitions have also been proposed by Busseri and Sadava (2011), Dolan and White (2007) and Sumner (1996).

In sum, all the suggested happiness definitions deal with either feelings or cognitions or combine them both. But none of them assumes the affective and cognitive aspect as components of or views on happiness. In contrast to these previous definitions, our happiness definition does exactly this. Although our approach differs from previous ones in this manner, it is nevertheless generally aligned with the vast majority of literature using an affective and/or cognitive aspect in the definition of happiness (see above for single definitions). Thus, we define *Overall Happiness* as "the overall enjoyment of one's life as-a-whole" (Veenhoven, 2010, p. 611; cp. Veenhoven, 1984, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2008).

This general evaluation is then "based on both affective and cognitive appraisals of life" (Veenhoven, 2010, p. 611, cp. Veenhoven, 1984) or a "dual evaluation system" (Veenhoven, 2000, p. 14). The *Affective Happiness Component* of this system is meant to evaluate "the degree to which the various affects a person experiences are pleasant; in other words: how well he usually feels" (Veenhoven, 1991, p. 10; cp. Veenhoven, 1984, 2010). The *Cognitive Happiness Component* of this system is then meant to evaluate "the degree to which an individual perceives his aspirations to have been met. In other words: to what extent one perceives oneself to have got what one wants in life" (Veenhoven, 1991, p. 10; cp. Veenhoven, 1984, 2010). Although this dual evaluation system composes the overall happiness evaluation, the latter should be considered separately in surveys. Given this idea, the construct of happiness should in sum be considered "a kind of trinity" (Veenhoven, 1984, p. 28). This approach makes sense when considering the following examples (derived from Veenhoven, 1984, p. 32), in which the calculation of overall happiness using only individuals' affective and cognitive judgments is rather unclear: (i) someone is more or less dissatisfied

with what he/she has achieved in life but nevertheless feels tremendously good; (ii) someone obtained everything he/she wanted but nevertheless feels downhearted. Although research results suggest that affective aspects usually influence overall life evaluations more than cognitive ones (Schwarz & Strack, 1991; Veenhoven, 1997, 2000, 2010), we do not know the exact weighting of the factors. Besides this content-related reason, pragmatics play a role when favouring an additional overall happiness evaluation in surveys, as most researchers use overall happiness indicators in their studies (Veenhoven, 1984).

1.2.4   What Happiness Does not Mean from Our Point of View

To create a clear definition of our happiness construct, it does make sense to define not only what happiness is but also what happiness is not in our understanding. We already fulfilled the first aspect in discussing what we exactly understand by the term happiness. To meet the second aspect, we first collected conditions that are regularly associated with the word happiness today and arranged them in a 2 × 2 matrix (Veenhoven, 2000, 2008, 2010; see Table 1.1). As Table 1.1 shows, happiness in our understanding is something that is judged in "the eye of the beholder" (Veenhoven, 2010, p. 608) and that concerns actual life (not only pre-conditions for a happy life).

   Similarly, Table 1.2 shows the relation of our happiness definition with other kinds of satisfaction that can be expressed by persons. In accordance with this visualization, happiness in our understanding concerns life evaluations that are not momentary and thus fleeting—but rather enduring (Veenhoven, 1997). Additionally, our happiness concept entails an evaluation focusing on overall life, not single life aspects, such as work and marriage (Veenhoven, 1984, 1997). Yet, studies have investigated the contribution of life domains to overall happiness. For example, Van Praag, Frijters, & Ferrer-i-Carbonell (2003) found that finance, health, and job satisfaction influence overall happiness in individuals to the highest extent. However, remarkably, the authors included only 6 life domains in their analysis. Consequently, they may not

Table 1.1 Conditions regularly associated with the word happiness today, classified into a 2 × 2 matrix

	Outside the person	Inside the person
Possibilities	Liveability of the environment	Life-ability
Outcomes	Utility of life	*Happiness*

Notes Adapted from Veenhoven (2010, p. 608). Closer explanation of the terms used (p. 608): *Liveability of the Environment* = "good living conditions"; *Life-ability* = extent to which the person is "equipped to cope with the problems of life"; *Utility of life* = "a good life must be good for something more than itself", e.g., for "ecological preservation or cultural development"; *Happiness* = as we understand and defined it above

Table 1.2 Various kinds of satisfaction that can be expressed by persons, classified into a 2 × 2 matrix

	Passing	Enduring
Part of life	Pleasure	Part happiness
Life as a whole	Peak experience	*Happiness*

Note Adapted from Veenhoven (2010, p. 609). Closer explanation of the terms used (p. 609): *Pleasure* = "can be sensoric, such as a glass of good wine, or mental, such as the reading of this text"; *Part happiness* = "can concern a domain of life, such as working-life, and an aspect of life, such as its variety"; *Peak experience* = "intense and oceanic" experience, also known as "enlightenment"; *Happiness* = as we understand and defined it above

cover all relevant life domains. Accordingly, Dolan and White (2007) have criticized that how all the different life domains relatively contribute to overall happiness remains unclear today. But even if a researcher considered all important life domains, he still would not be able to calculate a precise overall happiness score because the importance weighting of every life domain for overall happiness has been shown to be highly individual (Diener, Lucas, Oishi, & Suh, 2002; Diener, Scollon, & Lucas, 2003). Thus, it currently remains unclear (i) which domains should be of relevance for overall happiness and (ii) how an overall happiness score can be gained from domain evaluation judgments. Life domains are therefore unsuitable as indicators for overall happiness in a precise happiness definition. Nevertheless, they can deliver valuable insights for researchers who are especially interested in particular life domains. These indicators could then even prove more meaningful than global judgments of happiness in such cases (see also Diener, Scollon, & Lucas, 2003 for this opinion).

Another topic that needs to be discussed and distinguished from our happiness concept is *eudaimonia*. The term was originally created by Aristotle, who is today considered "the father" (Bruni, 2010, p. 391) of the eudaimonian happiness approach. According to him, eudaimonia can be equated with happiness. Similarly, "happiness is the final, or ultimate, end of life: [It] is the 'highest good' for the human being" (Bruni, 2010, p. 392). It is characterized as "something like flourishing human living, a kind of living that is active, inclusive of all that has intrinsic value, and complete, meaning lacking in nothing that would make it richer or better" (Nussbaum, 2005, p. 171). Consequently, happiness can be reached by practicing virtues not in an instrumental way but in an intrinsically motivated way, where virtues are internalized and thus perceived as important and good to follow (*Aristotle's happiness paradox*; Bruni, 2010). Against this philosophical background, some researchers have suggested that not only affective and cognitive aspects but also eudaimonian aspects should be considered when defining happiness (e.g., Clark & Senik, 2011; Diener et al., 2010; Huppert et al., 2009; OECD, 2013; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Such aspects are meant to add individual judgments about the perceived degree "of meaning and purpose in life, or [of] good psychological functioning" (OECD, 2013, p. 10).

In general, the importance of considering the concept of eudaimonia in a definition of happiness should be discussed in the future. However, to date, little research has confirmed its relevance for a definition of happiness, in addition to the affective and

cognitive components. Instead, current research literature indicates that eudaimonia should be considered a moderating or influencing factor with respect to actual happiness rather than a clear component of happiness itself. For example, the OECD (2013) admits that the eudaimonian view on happiness brings a "more instrumental focus" (p. 32) with it than the perspective on affective and cognitive components. Further evidence for this point of view can be derived from investigations conducted in the context of *Self-Determination Theory* (SDT; Ryan & Deci 2000). According to this theory, three factors that are associated with self-realization or eudaimonia (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) basically contribute to an individual's degree of happiness (Ryan & Deci 2000, 2001). In addition to this content-related argumentation, further findings on the reliability and validity of eudaimonic measures are required (Dolan, Peasgood, & White, 2006; OECD, 2013) to be able to guarantee high psychometric quality when assessing eudaimonia in individuals.

In sum, no definition of happiness that is generally accepted currently exists. Thus, a concept that is as precise as possible and that fits with most common literature on affective and/or cognitive aspects of happiness is presented here. In our view, Overall Happiness can be equated with "the overall enjoyment of one's life as-a-whole" (Veenhoven, 2010, p. 611; cp. Veenhoven, 1984, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2008). Further, the Affective Happiness Component evaluates "the degree to which the various affects a person experiences are pleasant; in other words: how well he usually feels" (Veenhoven, 1991, p. 10; cp. Veenhoven, 1984, 2010). By contrast, the Cognitive Happiness Component covers "the degree to which an individual perceives his aspirations to have been met. In other words: to what extent one perceives oneself to have got what one wants in life" (Veenhoven, 1991, p. 10; cp. Veenhoven, 1984, 2010). These definitions now serve as a basis for our selection of appropriate happiness measures to investigate them in terms of quality and applicability.

Measures of Happiness

The World Database of Happiness (WDOH; Veenhoven, 2016a) constitutes a library that fairly exhaustingly collects publications on happiness. In addition, it offers distributional and correlational findings that are calculated by the author and his co-workers themselves. In the context of this article, the WDOH is particularly helpful because it also offers a collection of happiness measures that are based on the above-mentioned happiness definition (Veenhoven, 2016b). Currently,[1] 2,118 measures are listed, and most are self-reports on single questions (1,516 measures, equalling 71.58%).

Classification

All accepted measures in the WDOH are classified by the (i) kind of happiness addressed, (ii) time frame, (iii) measure technique, and (iv) scaling. Each classification category is described in the following, based on Veenhoven (2015). Illustrative item examples are also given.

---

[1]As assessed on January 31st, 2017.