



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

Centre
for
Wellbeing
in
Public Policy.

CWiPP Working Paper Series

No.2

GLOBAL INITIATIVES IN MEASURING HUMAN WELLBEING: CONVERGENCE AND DIFFERENCE.

J. Allister McGregor

Department of Politics, University of Sheffield

j.a.mcgregor@sheffield.ac.uk

www.sheffield.ac.uk/cwipp/working-papers

November 2015

Please cite this work as: McGregor, J.A. (2015) Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference, *CWiPP Working Paper No.2*, Centre for Wellbeing in Public Policy, University of Sheffield

CWiPP considers how people's well-being can be defined, measured and improved in ways that help policy-makers to make the best use of scarce resources; and investigates the determinants of well-being insofar as these are relevant to policy formulation. The Working Paper Series offers a medium to place relevant research material in the public domain for discussion. Each paper is internally reviewed by two members of the editorial group. The contents remain the sole responsibility of the author(s).

Abstract

This paper reviews a range of initiatives across the world to measure development and progress in terms of human wellbeing. It explores the proposition that there is a growing consensus as to how this might be done. The paper identifies a range of points around which these initiatives are converging and also a range of ways in which there are fundamental differences. The paper suggests that these differences have deeper conceptual, epistemological and ontological roots than are often recognised and that these must be confronted if the momentum of the movement to find better measures of societal development and progress are to be maintained.

Introduction

'Wellbeing' has been a popular term in public policy pronouncements for many years but it often has been used in a symbolic way, without having much real traction either in the formulation and implementation of policy or in the social sciences that are applied to understand policy issues. This has been changing and there have been important contributions from different disciplines across the social sciences that have added conceptual weight to the concept and which have developed credible methods for studying it (Kahneman, Diener and Schwarz 1992, Nussbaum and Sen 1993, Frey and Stutzer 2002, Gough and McGregor 2007).

In 2009, the Final Report of the *Commission on Measuring Economic Performance and Social Progress* signalled a major breakthrough in global thinking on human wellbeing. The Commission, instigated by President Sarkozy of France and chaired by Amartya Sen, Joseph Stiglitz and Jean-Paul Fitoussi, assembled contributions from a range of leading thinkers to address the question of what measures could be used to better assess whether economic development is actually contributing to societal progress and whether it is doing so in a sustainable way. It has for long been argued that the measurement of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the most widely used single indicator of a nation's development, is not necessarily a good indicator of whether societies are progressing in the sense of becoming better places for citizens to live and whether the benefits of a growing economy are being enjoyed equitably by all members of society. One of the main recommendations of the Final Report was to "shift emphasis from measuring economic production to measuring people's well-being." (2009, p12). The constituent reports present the arguments as to why this is conceptually well founded and is methodologically feasible. It concluded with a challenge to policy makers, academics and civil society to take up the task of developing these new measures in order that they might better inform development strategies and public policy choices.

Since then there has been an explosion of activity and research in both policy and academic spheres. The challenge has been taken up by international agencies, governments, non-governmental organisations and academics from many different academic disciplines. Initiatives have been launched across the globe, in developed and developing countries and in relation to wide range of different policy issues and at a range of different levels, from community to nation-state to global society. There has been a broad sense of common purpose in most of these efforts, but inevitably in the development of a new field there has also been some confusion. There has been a cacophony of different academic languages, terminologies, different approaches and different purposes. Confusion has arisen, for example, where contributors in debates have been talking at crossed purposes because, while they seem to be agreeing about particular issue, there have been fundamental differences in the meanings of core terms that they are using; or where there have been basic differences about what constitute

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

proper scientific methods and what constitutes data.

Nevertheless, there are signs of some clarity emerging and in her concluding speech to the 4th OECD Global Forum on Measuring Well-Being, Martine Durand, Chief Statistician of the OECD felt compelled to state that,

“We are witnessing a convergence in our understanding of well-being with a common core set of well-being dimensions, and national priorities reflected in more specific domains and measures.” (Final Report of the OECD 4th OECD Global Forum, New Delhi 2013).

While this statement is broadly borne out by a review of a wide range of different initiatives from across the globe it is helpful to take stock at this time: to identify what the main points of convergence are and also to recognise what major points of difference or dissonance remain.

The Range of Global Initiatives

Some of the wellbeing initiatives that are now gaining prominence in the literature precede the Sarkozy Commission Report but have gained new visibility because of it. This is particularly so in the field of social psychology where work on subjective wellbeing and the Quality of Life has a long history. In Australia, for example, the Australian Unity Index of Subjective Well-being embodies a longstanding body of work by Robert Cummins (2000). This is now a well established framework that has been adopted in a range of countries across the world and provides a basis for comparing the subjective wellbeing of citizens in different societal contexts. Other traditions have even longer histories and work which uses the specific notion of ‘Quality of Life’ has longstanding roots both in sociology and in healthcare which reach back to the 1970s (Schmidt and Bullinger 2007). While initially much of the work on subjective wellbeing has been conducted in relation to people in developed countries there have been increasing numbers of examples of expanding the study of human wellbeing to other cultural contexts and to less wealthy country contexts. In social psychology the work of Biswas-Diener and Diener (2001) provided a striking illustration of the power of the exploration of subjective wellbeing in the context of slums in Calcutta, while in the study of international development, the work of the Wellbeing in Developing Countries Research Groupⁱ sought to develop a universal framework and methodology to study how wellbeing was being achieved (or not) by rural and urban peoples in four different developing countries (Gough, McGregor and Camfield 2007). That research programme illustrated how a human wellbeing framework could be used systematically to explore wellbeing failures – where economic and societal development fails to produce the conditions that enable people to escape poverty (see Copestake et al 2008, 2009, McGregor, McKay and Velazco 2007, McGregor and Sumner 2010).

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

Since the publication of the Sarkozy Report, the OECD has taken a leading global role in promoting discussion on the development of new measures. The OECD 'Better Life' Initiative was launched in 2011 with a stated aim to promote "Better Policies for Better Lives". As part of that initiative the 'How's Life?' Report set out a framework for the assessment of progress in terms of human wellbeing and identifies possible statistical indicators which can be employed in country level assessments (2011a). A second 'How's Life?' Report was published in 2013, giving a detailed analysis of the performance of 28 countries in terms of the 'How's Life?' indicators.

The OECD has driven an initiative encouraging and cajoling national statistical offices around the world to take up the 'measuring progress' challenge. In recent years there have been significant government-led initiatives launched in many high income countries, most notably by the national statistical offices in Australia, France, Austria, Portugal, Italy and the UK. But government led initiatives have not been confined only to high income countries or to Europe and other initiatives have been launched or supported by the national statistical services in countries as diverse as Chile, Mexico, Morocco, the Philippines, Bolivia, Ecuador, South Africa and Korea.

This agenda to develop measures of progress however has not just been the prerogative of governments and there have been initiatives that have been academically driven, others spearheaded by non-governmental and civil society organisations and yet others that are founded in private sector thinking. In Canada, the Canadian Index of Well-being (CIW), based at the University of Waterloo, seeks to provide Canadians with an independent view of their development by offering "... clear, valid and regular reporting on progress toward wellbeing goals and outcomes Canadians seek as a nation." (CIW no date). On a global scale, two of major non-governmental organisations (the Skoll Foundation and the Legatum Institute) have each been developing their own measuring framework that can be used to compare country level performance on achieving wellbeing across the globe. The Skoll Foundation has worked with leading scholars in the US to develop the 'Social Progress Index', while the Legatum Institute, a private think-tank, has developed the 'Legatum Prosperity Index'. In the non-governmental sector, OXFAM in Scotland has developed the Humankind Index and has used that as a basis for producing a policy assessment tool, which people themselves can use to assess the wellbeing impacts of various economic and social policy options. While in the private sector, the Boston Consulting Group has developed its "Sustainable Economic Development Assessment" (SEDA) that seeks to assess how well countries are doing in translating their economic wealth into human wellbeing.

Different Intellectual Roots

Before discussing major points of convergence and difference, it is important to note that these initiatives can be distinguished by reference to their different intellectual roots. As

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

will be discussed in the conclusion the different intellectual drivers that underpin the initiatives may come to have serious implications for the possibility of reaching agreement about what it is that we are trying to measure and how that should be done.

The conclusions of the Sarkozy Commission represented a further development of Amartya Sen's work on capabilities and functionings. Prior to this report, Sen's work already had been influential in shaping the measurement of development through the UNDP's Human Development Report series. In 1990, the first Human Development Report was produced and sought to counterbalance the World Bank's World Development Reports, by providing more information on the human aspects of development. The Human Development Index (HDI) takes account of three key objective wellbeing outcomes: health (measured as longevity), income (standard of living) and education (literacy).

A number of the new wellbeing initiatives, such as that in Chile and South Africa, are still strongly attached to the HDI tradition. What they propose to measure consists broadly of an elaborated set of similar indicators of objective wellbeing outcomes. But the Sarkozy Commission Report added a new element to the work of Sen that has not yet been fully embraced in the current Human Development approach. The Report acknowledged that in any assessment of progress it was important also to incorporate measures of subjective wellbeing. The frameworks being developed by the OECD and in Mexico, Morocco, UK, Italy and Australia, all seek to combine measures of objective and subjective wellbeing. As such, all of these have direct roots in the work of the Sarkozy Commission.

There is also a cluster of other highly visible national initiatives that look quite similar to those arising from the Sarkozy Commission, but which have quite different sources of inspiration. These arise from particular cultural or religious foundations.

Bhutan has been prominent in the recent global discussion about alternatives to GNP and it has operationalised a concept of Gross National Happiness (GNH) that has become increasingly sophisticated and well developed in its applicationⁱⁱ. While, on the surface, the GNH appears to be consistent with the Sarkozy Commission approach it is important to acknowledge that the concept is infused by a particular set of spiritual values and that it thrives in Bhutan because it is well embedded within a particular national culture and polity. The notion of 'happiness' that is at the heart of the Bhutanese approach is a particularly Buddhist conception, emphasising ideas such as spiritual wellness and mindfulness, and is quite different from the modern hedonistic notion of happiness that Layard, taking from Daniel Kahnemann's work, has heralded as the 'New Science' in recent Western literature (Layard 2006)ⁱⁱⁱ. In the UK at least the gap between these two conceptions of 'happiness' is being bridged through the rise of the notion of 'mindfulness' (MAPPG 2015). The input of psychiatry and a focus that comes from a concern for mental wellbeing in a modern world in which anxiety and stress appear to be at unprecedented levels, has begun to bridge religious and secular notions of wellbeing (Williams and Penman 2011).

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

From a different cultural, historical and religious tradition both Bolivia and Ecuador have been developing initiatives based on the notion of 'buen vivir' – good living. Both of these national movements are claimed as being founded in the Andean-Qechuan cosmology of *Sumak Kawsay*. These initiatives have been driven by the rise to power of leaders from indigenous Andean cultural backgrounds and the 'buen vivir' approach seeks to establish a distance between itself and more Europeanised^{iv} notions of development (Bressa Florentin 2015). Bressa Florentin draws on the work of Salgado (2010) to explain that in, "the Andean culture's world view, the final objective of human activity is not power or money accumulation, but the nurturing of a tender, harmonious and vigorous life – a Sumaq Kawsay - (Kessel, 2006), both for humanity and Mother Earth: the Pachamama." (Salgado, 2010 p200).

The 'buen vivir' tradition places particular emphasis on the issue of 'living well with nature' and as such connects with the environmental sustainability concerns that cut across many of these initiatives. The 'buen vivir' ambition to establish a path to development that reflects indigenous societal-cultural values has had resonance across many Latin American countries, including increasingly in Brazil. With this impetus, Latin America has been one of the leading regions in pressing for the development and promotion of new thinking about how to measure development and progress (<http://mfps.inegi.org.mx/en/Default.aspx>).

Somewhat in contrast to the 'buen vivir' and other non-western traditions, two of the major non-governmental approaches that have been mentioned here the Skoll Foundation Social Progress Index and the Legatum Prosperity Index are both founded in more mainstream capitalist and liberal traditions. This emerging body of thinking can be described as taking an 'enlightened prosperity' approach. They both emphasise the continued production of prosperity in broadly conventional economic terms but with greater attention to the moral and political concerns that have been highlighted by critiques of selfish monetary wealth creation. They both emphasise the positive importance of freedoms and particularly the freedom to do business. Their selection of indicators focuses attention on the extent to which conditions within societies enable the ongoing production of wealth alongside the translation of that wealth into wellbeing and societal progress.

One final set of intellectual roots that is evident particularly in the OXFAM Humankind Index is the concern over growing inequality and social exclusion. The Humankind Index particularly sought to give voice to the poorest and those who were being excluded from national debates about what kind of development was needed and wanted. The concern for the potential damage to societal wellbeing that may be caused by increasing inequality has particularly been taken up by one of the authors of the Sarkozy report. Joseph Stiglitz' (2012) work *'The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future'*

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

explores the potential harms that increasing inequality may have for wellbeing at both societal and individual levels (Wilkinson and Pickett 2009).

Convergences

So what are the main points of convergence in the current range of wellbeing initiatives? The first and most obvious point of convergence is that the measurement of development and progress needs to focus more on people. While the slogan of 'placing people at the centre of development' has been around for many years, most of the measures of development that are dominant in policy circles have little to do with how real people are experiencing development and progress. Per capita GDP, for example, imputes a notional share of gross domestic product per citizen; while poverty rates tell us about how many people might be above or below a particular level of consumption or income. They are both highly aggregated measures that do not tell us about how development (and poverty) is really impacting in peoples' lives. The logic of the Sarkozy Commission Report was that making people the focus of how we measure societal progress should also bring people back into focus at the centre of policy debates and deliberations about the type and direction of economic and societal development that we want.

The second point of convergence is that any measure of human wellbeing must take subjective wellbeing into account. An increasing number of these initiatives now recognise that while it is important to measure human wellbeing in terms of objective outcomes it is necessary to take into account how people experience progress and development. Although often 'scientifically' devalued as 'opinions' or 'views', subjective experiences of development are still 'a reality' that must be taken into account in formulating and evaluating different policy options for development progress. There is still considerable hesitation about the measurement of subjective wellbeing as this is still a very new area for many social scientists, statisticians and policy makers, but there have been stark lessons from global events such as the 'Arab Spring', where indicators of objective wellbeing were showing an upward trend while indicators of subjective wellbeing were plummeting. It has never been politically credible to ignore the fact that how people experience the development of their society and feel about it drives their actions and as such there seems little reason why policy technocrats should not seek to take this systematically into account.

The third point of convergence is the belief that it is possible to learn from longstanding traditions in the measurement of subjective wellbeing to incorporate this into official statistical data collection activity in a systematic way. The emphasis on the 'systematic' collection of subjective wellbeing data is important since there has been a good deal of *ad hoc* collection of subjective wellbeing data. But, until now there has been little systematic

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

collection of subjective wellbeing data nor a routine place for its use in policy processes and procedures and as such it has had little or no traction in policy circles or on policy debates. As we shall discuss below there is much room for divergence around how subjective data can be collected, but the adoption and adaptation of longstanding subjective wellbeing methodologies such as around the Satisfaction With Life Survey (SWLS, Pavot and Diener 2008), Cummins's (2000) subjective wellbeing index or work by others such as Rojas (2008) in the various measuring wellbeing initiatives provides grounds for hope.

The fourth point of convergence that is emerging is on the methodology that is to be applied in order to identify what it is that matters to people in respect of the development of their nation or community. There are basically two ways in which you can decide what is important for development and progress: you can either compile a set of priorities based on theory or you can listen to people. Public policy thinking in both developed and developing countries has been dominated by 'top-down' theories of social and economic development and these define what it is that people should value from development. The emphasis on GDP as a measure of development reflects that priority has been given to having more income or more consumption, at the aggregate level. While having more income and having more and better consumption is very important for people as they seek to rise out of poverty, when one actually asks people what it is they want from development and progress this often reveals different priorities, or at least it puts income and consumption into a broader context of what people value for a good life. Contradicting the stereotypical views of the contrast between 'the rich' and 'the poor', this is true not just of people in rich countries but for all classes of people in both developed and developing countries. Aspirations such as having good relationships with family, friends and neighbours, feature alongside more abstract ideas such as having freedoms and being able to live a life with dignity, appear to be universal and can be as important (and sometimes more important) for poor people as for rich people. (Camfield et al 2012).

There has been a growing realisation that an important place to start with the development of national measures of progress and wellbeing is to ask the citizens of the country what matters for them (see Hall and Rickard 2013, McGregor *et al* 2015). This methodological innovation introduces a strong 'bottom-up' element to the process of identifying and developing the country-relevant indicators of whether progress and positive development are being achieved. This has been a prominent feature of the initiatives in countries as diverse as Morocco, the U.K., and Australia. Open national consultations or large-scale surveys have been used to elicit lists of what citizens regard as important. In Morocco, for example, the recent national survey conducted by the Planning Commission found a large proportion of respondents indicated that having access to 'spiritual, cultural and leisure activities' was important for a good life. In the UK a wide-ranging national consultation identified 'job satisfaction' and 'economic security' as

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

two important areas of concern. Of course consulting people on what matters for their lives does not preclude learning from what we already know about the pathways to successful development and probably the most sensible outcome will be a set of indicators that reflect a fusion of ‘bottom-up’ and ‘top-down’ perspectives^v.

It has been argued that there are two important by-products of a ‘bottom-up’ methodology. The first is that it can be understood to strengthen national ownership over the indicator set that is used for measuring progress. This is important in the face of discontent amongst populations who have become weary of receiving yet another list of public policy priorities and prescriptions from governments or transnational agencies dominated by northern capitalist and neo-classical economics thinking. The second is that the introduction of this methodology is seen by some as having the potential to contribute to better governance by creating another channel for dialogue between citizens and state (Hall and Rickard 2013).

Differences and Dissonance

While the picture of convergence is very positive there are also some important areas of difference between the different initiatives and some these differences may in fact turn out to be dissonance. In this final section we will explore only three of the most salient areas of difference.

The first issue of difference appears to be terminological and looks trivial but may not be so. It hinges around the interchangeable use of the terms ‘dimension’ and ‘domain’ and begins to reveal a distance between different social science disciplinary contributions. While it appears to be broadly accepted that wellbeing is a ‘multi-dimensional’ phenomenon there are important differences in how the term ‘dimension’ is used in the different frameworks that are being employed to understand wellbeing. In the parallel literature on multi-dimensional poverty, the term was used to denote the view that that in order to understand poverty it was necessary to take into account a number of other outcomes that reflect how poverty is manifested beyond income. So, for example, poverty might find expression in poor health or education outcomes or in social exclusion. The empirical observation quickly merges with philosophical discussion and the literature on Sen’s capabilities approach has generated an elaborate discussion of what important ‘dimensions’ of life must be taken into account in any examination of the human condition. This multi-dimensional train of thought was carried through in the Sarkozy Commission report, which proposed eight dimensions of wellbeing.

The OECD ‘How’s Life’ Framework is a direct descendant of the Sarkozy Report but in developing its framework it multiplies the number of dimensions. It identifies three ‘pillars’ for understanding and measuring people’s wellbeing: 1. Material Living Conditions; 2. The Quality of Life; and 3. Sustainability. The first two of these pillars are then broken down into lists of dimensions. There are three dimensions under the Material Wellbeing pillar

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

and eight dimensions under the Quality of Life pillar^{vi}. The third pillar of sustainability refers to four types of 'capitals' that are seen as necessary for the ongoing reproduction of human wellbeing: financial, social, natural and human. So the OECD framework proposes a total of eleven dimensions and intriguingly 'subjective wellbeing' is denoted as only one of the dimensions in the Quality of Life pillar.

However, the literature on Quality of Life and Subjective Wellbeing that emerge from psychology, health sciences and sociology tend to use the term 'dimension' in a very different way and, at the broadest level, have tended to distinguish between objective and subjective dimensions of human wellbeing. The term 'dimension' then has a different meaning from how it is used in the Sarkozy Report or in the OECD's 'How's Life?' framework. Distinguishing between objective and subjective dimensions of human wellbeing is intuitively attractive and indicates that it is possible to distinguish between two aspects of, or perspectives on, a single phenomenon. But this refers to something different than the 'spheres of life' that are being denoted by the use of the term 'dimension' in the other tradition.

The confusion in the terminological logic is illustrated when looking in detail at the different components of the 'How's Life?' framework. For many of what it refers to as 'dimensions', both the objective measure of the outcome and the subjective assessment of the outcome are important. For example, the Compendium of OECD Wellbeing Indicators (2011b) recommends that two indicators are used to assess the 'Health Status dimension' of the framework, one of which is objective (life expectancy) and the other of which is subjective (self-reported satisfaction with health status).

Although the new initiatives and historical subjective wellbeing approaches are talking about the same things - the spheres of life that matter for people's wellbeing - the current debate uses the terminology in a way that muddles up the substance of the concept with the epistemology of how we understand that substance. This is not a trivial difference since it inhibits the ability for cross-learning between the two schools of thought and hints at deeper ontological and epistemological differences.

Reading reports from the new initiatives for measuring wellbeing one finds that they are prone to mixing the terms 'domain' and 'dimension'. There is no space in this paper to debate the conceptual and epistemological issue that come into play here. However it would seem that, in the interim, momentum for these initiatives would benefit from the adoption of a number of conventions^{vii}. First, that there are good academic and practical reasons to identify a limited number of dimensions and that these should be universal; these might then be broken down to a number (non-fixed) of domains that are important for wellbeing; and that the outcome in any 'domain' might then be indicated by measures that are either or both objective and subjective.^{viii}

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

A second area of difference relates specifically to the assessment of subjective wellbeing. It is suggested above that wellbeing overall must be understood in terms of both objective and subjective wellbeing outcomes and must explore the relationship between the two, nevertheless there then remains considerable potential difference around what conception of subjective wellbeing should be assessed and what instrument(s) would be used to assess it.

At the moment there is a perplexing proliferation of specific research instruments that have been and are being developed to assess subjective wellbeing. We will return to this issue in the next section but for the purposes of this part of the discussion we want to focus on the fact that there are two distinct types of research instruments that can be used to assess subjective wellbeing. 'Single Construct Scales', such as the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS), typically use a small number of fairly direct questions (e.g. To what extent do you agree with the statement "In most ways my life is close to my ideal"?) to assess what is referred to as global life satisfaction. In 'Life Domain Scales', a number of important aspects or spheres of life are identified (e.g. health, education, income) and are referred to as 'life domains'. With 'Domain Scales' the assessment of subjective wellbeing is produced from the satisfaction scores that individuals give in each domain. Scores are averaged and sometimes weighted to produce an overarching measure of subjective wellbeing. Both types of instrument have their place but an increasing number of 'domain' instruments are being developed and used in respect of policy deliberations because of the perceived richness of the information that they yield.

A third area of difference is around the purpose for which new measures of wellbeing are being developed. While, as noted, there is a sense of common cause amongst these various new measurement initiatives, when one examines them more closely one begins to detect that those developing them may have a different intended purpose for the new measurement. Thus in many of the national initiatives the clear purpose is to inform national policy development about what are the priorities in development for people within that nation. As such the new measures must be particularly identified so as to be recognisable in that specific national cultural context, and as such they may be distinctive to that particular context. In some new measurement initiatives this can even be driven down further to sub-national levels and indicators for progress may be relevant to that particular sub-national locality, which may either be geographically distinctive (a mountainous area or coastal region) or may have a distinctive cultural identity. The purpose for such sub-national measures may be to assist in the formulation of specific policy measures for that particular region (for example, it may be a region that is considered backward and in which special anti-poverty measures are required). These more detailed measures are quite different from those being developed by multi-lateral international agencies, such as the OECD, whose main purpose for the new measures is to

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

compare performance between nation states. The How's Life Framework denotes a set of 'domains' (what they call 'dimensions') that is intended to be universal, but it is clear that for the purposes of some national initiatives other 'domains' will be added and some of those that are present in the OECD framework might be considered irrelevant or not applicable.

It is likely then that the different purposes for which new measurements of progress are being developed will require different levels of specificity in what things are considered important for human wellbeing. The challenge for the new movement to develop better measures of progress is to decide whether these different purposes can be contained within some overarching universal framework for understanding human wellbeing. This would allow that all specificities below the overarching universal framework (such as the number and nature of domains) can be varied in order to fit the more specific purpose that the particular form of measure is being developed for.

Conclusion

As can be seen from this brief review there are impressive signs of convergence but also problematic issues of difference in the new field of measuring human wellbeing. The convergences that are identified are important and represent a strong positive move forward in developing a coherent global approach to measuring societal development and progress. Some of the differences may be trivial and may be resolved by simple means such as reaching agreements around the terminology to be used. However, some of the differences may have deeper roots that are less easily resolved. For example, there may be disagreements around what human wellbeing is and the extent to which it can be dealt with in universal terms or whether it must always be addressed as a culture and context specific phenomenon. Similarly the different intellectual roots that were identified as lying behind the different new initiatives may actually be founded in different sets of values about what it is to be human, for example, whether the human being is or should be a competitive or cooperative animal. Deeper differences such as these may be irreconcilable and as such may become more apparent as points of dissonance as the measurement of human wellbeing advances.

REFERENCES

Alkire, S. and Foster, J.E. (2011) 'Counting and Multidimensional Poverty Measurement'. *Journal of Public Economics*. 95(7–8), 476–487.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2012) Measures of Australia's Progress. Aspirations for Our Nation: A Conversation. ABS: Belconnen.

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

Bellagio Initiative (2012) *Final Report: Human Wellbeing in the 21st Century - Meeting Challenges, Seizing Opportunities*. Institute of Development Studies, Rockefeller Foundation.
http://www.bellagioinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/BELLAGIO_WELLBEING_SPREADS.pdf.

Biswas-Diener, R. and E. Diener (2001), 'Making the best of a bad situation: Satisfaction in the slums of Calcutta', *Social Indicators Research*, 55, pp. 329-352.

Bressa Florentin, D.B. (2015) *The Politics of Buen Vivir: Between Policies and Life*. Paper to the ESRC conference on The Politics of Wellbeing, Sheffield University. UK.
<http://politicsofwellbeing.group.shef.ac.uk/>

Camfield, L., Masae, A. McGregor, J.A. and Promphaking, B. (2012) 'Cultures of Aspiration and Poverty? Aspirational Inequalities in Northeast and Southern Thailand'. *Social Indicators Research*. DOI 10.1007/s11205-012-0189-3

Canadian Index of Wellbeing (no date) Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives. CIW website.
<https://uwaterloo.ca/canadian-index-wellbeing/about-canadian-index-wellbeing/vision-mission-goals-and-objectives>

Cummins, R.A. (2000) Objective and subjective quality of life: An interactive model. *Social Indicators Research*, 52, 55-72.

Evans, J. (2010) 'Our leaders are all Aristotelians now', *Public Policy Research*, December-February, Vol. 17 (4): 214-21.

Frey, B. and Stutzer, A. (2002) *Happiness and Economics: How the Economy and Institutions Affect Wellbeing*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Gough, I. and McGregor, J.A. eds. (2007), *Wellbeing in Developing Countries: From Theory to Research*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hall, J. and Rickard, L. (2013) *People, Progress and Participation: How Initiatives Measuring Social Progress Yield Benefits Beyond Better Metrics*. Global Choices 1, Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Kahneman, D., Diener, E., and Schwarz, N. (1999) *Wellbeing: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*. Russell Sage, New York.

Layard, R. (2006) *Happiness: Lessons From a New Science*. Penguin, London.

McGregor, J.A. (2007). 'Researching Human Wellbeing: From Concepts to Methodology.' In Gough I, and McGregor J.A., (eds.) *Wellbeing in Developing Countries: From Theory to Research*, pp. 316-350. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGregor, J.A. and Sumner, A. (2010) 'Beyond Business as Usual: What Might 3-D Wellbeing Contribute to MDG Momentum?' *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 41, no.1. 104-112.

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

McGregor, J.A., Coulthard, S.C., and Camfield, L. (2015) 'Measuring what matters: The role of wellbeing methods in development policy and practice.' ODI Development Progress: Project Note 04. ODI-Gates Foundation: London.

McGregor, J. A., Camfield, L. and Coulthard, S.C. 'Competing Interpretations: Human Wellbeing and the Use of Quantitative and Qualitative Methods'. Ch 10, in Camfield and Roelen (eds) *Mixed Methods Research in Poverty and Vulnerability*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Mindfulness All-Party Parliamentary Group (MAPPG) (2015) *Mindful Nation UK: A Report by the MAPPG*.
http://www.themindfulnessinitiative.org.uk/images/reports/Mindfulness-APPG-Report_Mindful-Nation-UK_Oct2015.pdf

Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2008). The Satisfaction With Life Scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3, 137–152.

Porter, M.E., Stern, S., and Artavia Loria, R. (2013) *The Social Progress Index*. The Social Progress Imperative: Washington.

Rojas, M, (2008) "Experienced Poverty and Income Poverty in Mexico: A Subjective Well-Being Approach," *World Development*, vol. 36 (6), 1078-1093.

Salgado, F. (2010) Sumaq Kawsay: the birth of a notion? *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 198-208.

Sarkozy Commission (2009) *Final Report of the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*, Paris.
www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr/documents/rapport_anglais.pdf (accessed 12 November 2009)

Schmidt, S. And Bullinger, M. (2007) *Cross-Cultural Quality of Life Assessment: Approaches and Experiences from the Health Care Field*. Chap 10, in Gough and McGregor (eds) *Wellbeing in Developing Countries*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Stiglitz, J.E. (2012) *The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers our Future*. W. W. Norton: London.

OECD (2011a), *How's Life?: Measuring well-being*, OECD Publishing.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264121164-en>

OECD (2011b) *Better Life Initiative: Compendium of OECD Wellbeing Statistics*. OECD, Paris.

OECD (2013) *Proceedings: 4th World Forum on Statistics, Knowledge and Policy Measuring Well-Being for Development and Policy Making*. New Delhi.
<http://www.oecd.org/site/worldforumindia/OECD-World-Forum-2012-India-proceedings.pdf>

Oxfam (2012) *Oxfam Humankind Index for Scotland – Background Methodology, Consultation and Results*.
http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/~media/Files/policy_and_practice/poverty_in_uk/HKI/HKI%20con

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.

[sultation%20methods%20results%20April%202012.ashx](#)

UK Office of National Statistics (2011) *Measuring What Matters: National Statistician's Reflections on the National Debate on Measuring National Well-being*. ONS: Newport.

UNDP (1990) *Human Development Report 1990: The Concept and Measurement of Human Development*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2009) *The Spirit Level: Why More Equal Societies Almost Always Do Better*. Allen Lane: London.

Williams, M, and Penman, D. (2011) *Mindfulness: A Practical Guide to Finding Peace in a Frantic World*. Piatkus: London.

ⁱ The Wellbeing in Developing Countries Research Group (WeD) was funded by the UK ESRC between 2002 and 2008. It was a multidisciplinary research group based at the University of Bath, UK and working in collaboration with academic and policy institutions in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Peru and Thailand. (see <http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/research.htm>)

ⁱⁱ Not least is that latterly it has been brought closer to the Sen tradition by adopting aspects of the new multi-dimensional poverty methodology, as developed by Alkire (Alkire and Foster 2011).

ⁱⁱⁱ For the difference between Layard's more Benthamite-Utilitarian notion of happiness and an Aristotelean notion of wellbeing see Evans 2010.

^{iv} Or Washington consensus.

^v A version of this hybrid 'bottom-up – top-down' methodology was developed and employed in the WeD research programme (McGregor 2007).

^{vi} **Material Living Conditions** - 1) Income and wealth; 2) Jobs and earnings; and 3) Housing.

Quality of Life - 1) Health status; 2) Work and life balance; 3) Education and skills; 4) Civic engagement and governance; 5) Social connections; 6) Environmental quality; 7) Personal security; and 8) Subjective wellbeing.

^{vii} For further discussion see McGregor, Camfield and Coulthard 2015.

^{viii} McGregor and Sumner (2010) follow a longer tradition that distinguishes between 3 dimensions: the objective, the subjective and the inter-subjective. The inter-subjective or relational dimension refers to social phenomena that are neither fully objective nor are they entirely subjective, rather they are inter-subjective in the sense that their existence is a matter of agreement in relationships between people. Thus, for example, social capital is a phenomenon that falls into the relational dimension, since it does not exist independently of its manifestation in the relationships between people.

McGregor - Global Initiatives in Measuring Human Wellbeing: Convergence and Difference.