SINET

Fall, November 2005
•
Number 84
ISSN 0885 6729

SOCIAL INDICATORS NETWORK NEWS

A Quarterly Review of Social Reports and Research on Social Indicators, Social Trends, and the Quality-of-Life.
News Included of Working Group 6 on Social Indicators and Social Reporting of the International Sociological Association.
Newsletter of the International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies

DANIEL KAHNEMAN AND COLLEAGUES ON NATIONAL WELL-BEING ACCOUNTS

Kahneman, Daniel, Alan B. Krueger, David Schkade, Norbert Schwarz, and Arthur Stone. 2004. "Toward National Well-Being Accounts." ***American Economic Association Papers and Proceedings*** **May:429-434.**

While all of the authors of this article are well-known scholars in their disciplines, Kahneman has been the most honored. Some readers many know that Kahneman, who is trained as a psychologist, is a key pioneer and theorist of behavioral finance, which integrates economics and cognitive science to explain seemingly irrational risk management behavior in human beings. He is famous for collaboration with Amos Tversky and others in establishing a cognitive basis for common human errors using heuristics and in developing prospect theory. Currently a faculty member at Princeton University and a fellow at Hebrew University, Kahneman is the winner of the 2002 Bank of Sweden Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel (colloquially known as the Nobel Prize in Economics) for his work in prospect theory, despite being a research psychologist and not an economist. In fact, Kahneman claims to have never taken a single economics course — indeed, he claims that what he knows of the subject he and Tversky learned from collaborators Richard Thaler and Jack Knetsch.

In any case, it is a significant day when scholars of the level of Kahnemann and his collaborators take up the banner under which many in the quality-of-life research community have been marching for some time.

Kahneman et al. begin by noting that economists traditionally have not focused on direct measures of well-being, conceptualized as utility in traditional microeconomic theory, because of the private nature of experience and the discomfort of making interpersonal comparisons. Therefore, it is easier to focus on monetary income as a proxy for opportunities and well-being. Research by psychologists such as Kahneman suggests, however, that, in a context of *bounded rationality* (due to the constraints on information and choices that most individuals face on a day-to-day basis), direct measures of experienced utility become particularly relevant. Advances in psychology and neuroscience suggest that experienced utility and well-being can be measured with some accuracy, and that robust and interpersonally consistent relationships have been observed between subjective measures of experience and both specific measures of brain function and health outcomes. These, of course, are the foundations of much work by researchers on well-being in the quality-of-life and social indicators communities. Kahneman and colleagues then note that most work on the direct measurement of well-being uses a question on overall life satisfaction or happiness. The major objective of the article is to suggest an alternative route via the use of time budgets and affective ratings of experiences.

Kahneman et al. review the literature on life satisfaction and note several findings:

- it is weakly correlated with income and religiousity
- it is uncorrelated with climate
- the age curve of satisfaction is U-shaped, rising from age 45 to 70, controlling for health
- it is low among the unemployed
- it is affected by life events such as marriage, divorce, and bereavement
- people who describe themselves as happy are likely to be extraverted, sociable, and optimistic
- they have a characteristic pattern of electrocortical activity (greater activity in the left than in the right prefrontal cortex)
- and they have a stronger response to an influenza vaccine and recover more quickly from controlled wounds.

(Continued on next page.)

In this Issue...

SOCIAL REPORTS AND TRENDS:
- Daniel Kahneman and Colleagues on National Well-Being Accounts 1-3
- Guidelines for National Indicators of Subjective Well-Being and Ill-Being 4-6

ANNOUNCEMENTS:
- ISQOLS President's Message 7
- ISQOLS Exec. Director's Message 7
- QOL: Towards Quality of Life Improvement – A Conference Report 8-11
- International Sociological Association (ISA), XVI ISA World Congress of Sociology *'The Quality of Social Existence in a Globalising World'* Durban, South Africa, 23-29 July 2006, Working Group on Social Indicators, WG06, CALL FOR PAPERS 9
- SINET Homepage 9
- ISQOLS Homepage 12

Editor's Note: This is a review of an article by Daniel Kahneman and several collaborators that may not have been widely read by members of the quality-of-life (QOL), subjective well-being, and social indicators community. The article describes a scheme for the development of "national well-being accounts." This review essay is followed by a statement on "Guidelines for National Indicators of Subjective Well-Being and Ill-Being" authored by Ed Diener and signed by a number of members of ISQOLS (including the present author) and other scientists who have done work relevant to the topic. This review of the Kahneman et al. article will help to put the Guidelines statement into perspective.

SINET

Social Indicators Network News

(Continued from previous page.)

Most of these (and related) findings are familiar to QOL researchers.

The authors next note that research using standard measures of well-being has produced two major puzzling empirical findings. The first is that there are surprising small effects of circumstances (e.g., income, marital status, etc.) on well-being and the basis of this is the extent to which people *adapt to circumstances*, even extreme circumstances. The article notes that researchers have proposed two hypotheses to explain findings on adaptation: (1) a *hedonic treadmill hypothesis* to the effect that people adapt to situations that are initially pleasant or unpleasant, much as the body adapts to a warm bath; and (2) an *aspiration treadmill hypothesis* such that pleasure or pain might persist, but the evaluation of these experiences is relative to expectations, and expectations eventually adjust. The authors note that this second hypothesis suggests that global reports of subjective well-being might exaggerate the amount of hedonic adaptation that actually occurs and that this can only be resolved by measuring the hedonic quality of experience separately from expectations – which sets up the proposed framework of the paper.

The second puzzling finding is the so-called "culture variability effect" – the consistent finding of large differences in reports of life satisfaction across seemingly similar countries. An example is Eurobarometer survey estimates to the effect that 64 percent of the Danes describe themselves as "very satisfied" with their lives compared to only 16 percent of the French. These differences are more than twice as large as the difference between the employed and unemployed in either country. The authors suggest that these differences seem implausibly large and raise additional doubts about the validity of global reports of subjective well-being.

To set up their approach to national well-being accounts, the authors recall the classical definition in 1881 by F. Y. Edgeworth of a "hedonimeter" that continuously records an individual's utility as momentary positive or negative feelings. Then *happiness* can be defined by the integral (summation) of utility over time. In other work, Kahneman and collaborators have given a formal analysis of the conditions under which global judgments of total utility of extended outcomes will satisfy temporal integration. In the present article, the authors note that global subjective evaluations of one's life are unlikely to provide an accurate representation of Edgeworth's concept of utility because (1) the durations of experiences are not adequately weighted in global assessments, and (2) these assessments are unduly influenced by the immediate context and by "irrelevant" standards of comparison such as with other people and past experiences.

Based on this criticism of global life satisfaction/happiness questions, the authors then describe the *Experience Sampling Method* (ESM), which collects information on individuals' experiences in real time. ESM is carried out by supplying respondents with an electronic diary (e.g., a specially programmed hand-held electronic device) that beeps at random times during a day and asks respondents to describe what they were doing just before the prompt and then to indicate the intensity of various feelings (e.g., happy, frustrated/annoyed, etc.) at that time. These responses then can be averaged to produce an average of daily experiences. It thus is considered the current "gold standard" for measurement of well-being in the Edgeworth tradition. Kahneman and colleagues note, however, that ESM is not a practical method for national well-being accounts because it is difficult to implement in large samples, may have high nonresponse rates, and samples infrequent activities only rarely.

This leads to the authors to suggest that data from ESM can be reasonably approximated by other more practical methods. One that the authors have developed is the *Daily Reconstruction Method* (DRM) in which respondents are asked to fill out a diary corresponding to events of their previous day, including when events began and ended, where they occurred, and with whom they were with. To obtain data on feelings during each event, respondents are asked to respond to several Likert rating scales in response to both positive adjective prompts such as "Happy" with responses going from 0 (Not at all) to 6 (Very much) and negative adjective prompts such as "Angry/Hostile" with the same scale of responses. Kahneman and colleagues in another article have shown that the method produces a complex pattern of diurnal variation in tiredness and in positive and negative affect, similar to that obtained in an ESM study. The authors state that data collected from ESM or DRM can be used to characterize the average affective experience that people perceive during particular events or situations. In particular, they define a

(Continued on next page.)

(Continued from previous page.)

"net affect" measure as the average of the Like scale values of the positive adjectives less the average of the scale values of the negative adjectives. They report data from a sample of 909 working women in Texas and find that such activities as commuting to and from work and working score relatively low on this net affect scale, while leisure activities score high. The sample data also yield estimates of the percentage of the sample that engages in each of 19 activities – ranging from intimate relations (high net affect) to shopping (medium net affect) to morning commute to work (low net affect) – as well as the average time spent per day in each activity.

The authors then propose to use net affect data in the following way to construct time-based *national well-being accounts* (MWBA). Denoting an individual's utility in discrete time as

$$U_i = \sum_i h_{ij} \mu_{ij}$$

where h_{ij} is the amount of time individual *i* engages in situation *j* (e.g., washing the dishes with one's spouse) and μ_{ij} is the net affective experience during situation *j*, Kahneman and colleagues propose that a measure of national well-being can be computed as:

$$WB = \sum_i \sum_j h_{ij} \mu_{ij} \,/\, N \qquad (1)$$

where *N* is the population size. This equation can be decomposed into:

$$\sum_j H_j \bar{u}_j + \sum_i \sum_j h_{ij} (\mu_{ij} - \bar{u}_j) \,/\, N$$

where H_j is the average of h_{ij} over people and $\bar{u}_j$ is the average net affect experienced during activity or situation *j*. The authors note that, in their data, time spent on an activity has a very low correlation with net affect across people (r = 0.01), so that NWBA can be computed by the simplified formula:

$$WB' = \sum H_j \bar{u}_j . \qquad (2)$$

This second equation has the advantage that time use data from one survey can be combined with net affect ratings from another survey. Note that, while Kahneman and colleagues use the term "accounts" to refer to this approach, Equations (1) and (2) really define index numbers for average well-being in a society and thus basically are *national well-being indices* (NWBI), not accounts.

Kahneman and colleagues note that there are a number of assumptions that must be made in order to apply this formulation, including that:

- affective experiences can be compared across people
- net affect provides a cardinal measure of utility
- utility is time separable
- and a simple measure of net affect represents the utility of an experience.

In addition, for operationalization, the situations that are relevant for well-being must be identified, time allocation among these situations must be measured, data on net affect for a representative sample of the population must be collected, and the adjectives that enter into defining affect must be specified.

Comment

In brief, the Kahneman et al. proposal for NWBA is based on a synthesis of data on time allocation (say from time budgets surveys) among the situations in which people are involved every day and data on affective responses to those situations. Given sufficiently large samples of both sets of data, comparisons can be made over time to track changes in well-being in a given country and decomposed into components due to changes in time allocation and to changes in affective responses. Sub-populations within countries also can be compared and comparisons can be made across nations, given the data resources. Kahneman and colleagues argue that their "bottom-up" approach not only is connected to the allocation of time but also avoids some of the biases of global assessments such as duration neglect.

So, what can be made of the Kahneman NWBA proposal? What is our assessment? To begin with, it certainly is the case that more, detailed data on better and larger samples usually is better in the sense of helping analysts to refine their measurements of well-being. Accordingly, there certainly would be advantages to the connection of well-being measures to time allocation. And it would be good to have positive, negative, and net affective response data to the many situations in which people are involved on a day-to-day basis. It even is likely that the allocation of time over situations with differential net affect can be affected by policies (e.g., overtime labor laws, childcare and maternity leave policies, etc.).

But the extent to which the contributions of the time-based well-being indices perform better than global life assessment questions, and under what conditions, remains a topic for research. Kahneman and colleagues have not provided evidence to this effect. It may be, for instance, that the duration neglect of global life satisfaction assessments and the undue influence of the immediate context of the respondent and her/his responses – which may be of great importance in assessing the well-being of specific individuals – are essentially averaged out in population surveys because the moment of the survey response captures respondents in many different situations and frames of response. Beyond this, questions remain about the extent to which time-based well-being indices give us information on comparative levels of well-being and trends therein over time beyond what we know from global assessments. We cannot address such questions until this research is done.

~ Kenneth C. Land

Kahneman gets warm reception after winning Nobel

GUIDELINES FOR NATIONAL INDICATORS OF SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AND ILL-BEING

Ed Diener, University of Illinois
December 1, 2005

There is increasing interest in using indicators of subjective well-being and ill-being to inform policy debates, and there are now national and international surveys of subjective well-being and ill-being in the European Union, Australia, and elsewhere. Furthermore, subjective indicators of well-being are already a significant component of monitoring important domains such as health-related quality of life. For an explanation of why the indicators of subjective well-being are needed, and why they add information beyond economic and social indicators, please refer to Diener and Seligman (2004), Diener and Tov (in press), and Kahneman and Krueger (in press). Subjective well-being measures may be used as input to discussions about national policies, and they can also be helpful to business leaders, as well as to government officials at the local and regional levels. The indicators of subjective well-being and ill-being can be used for the evaluation of policies in many domains, including health care, public health, social services, parks and recreation, work life, transportation, families, and the environment. In democratic societies the indicators provide an important source of information to leaders about the well-being and concerns of the citizens.

Measures of subjective well-being can be useful in assessing the need for certain policies, and in measuring the outcomes of policy interventions. Consideration of these indicators is particularly warranted due to the growing evidence that subjective well-being is a desirable goal for nations in that it produces beneficial societal outcomes (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, in press), whereas depression and prolonged negative states tend to produce undesirable societal outcomes. Thus, policy makers should be interested in subjective well-being not only because of its inherent value to citizens, but also because individuals' subjective well-being can have positive spillover benefits for the society as a whole. Similarly, policy makers should be keenly interested in alleviating misery as a goal in itself, but also because extremely unhappy people often function poorly.

Although the existing measures of well-being and ill-being are not yet highly sophisticated, they have proven to be helpful in analyzing policy outcomes. Although better indicators can and should be developed, the existing measures are beginning to be used in policy debates, and the following guidelines and definitions of terms are intended to guide their use.

Guidelines and Recommendations

1. Global measures of subjective well-being, such as assessments of life satisfaction and happiness, can be useful for policy debates. Although these measures have been and will continue to be informative, more specific indicators can also be helpful. It is therefore desirable to, within the available resources, assess separate facets of subjective well-being and ill-being, including moods and emotions, perceived mental and physical health, satisfaction with particular activities and domains, the subjective experience of time allocation and pressure, and other similar evaluations. These surveys should be administered to large samples to reliably detect trends or changes.

2. Measures that will be used by policymakers should be sensitive to changes in subjective well-being so that they can detect any effects of a policy intervention. The creators of subjective well-being indicators can assist policymakers when their measures have been shown to be sensitive to changes in circumstances, and when these changes, or their absence, are likely to be informative about the effects, if any, of the policy intervention. With the recognition that broad measures of subjective well-being taken on a single occasion provide useful but circumscribed information, the policy arena ideally should also employ measurements based on longitudinal designs, time-sampling and diary-recording of experiences, and the collection of data from targeted populations. Short-term and long-term changes in subjective well-being should be separately assessed whenever possible.

3. It is desirable to use instruments that have been analyzed in terms of their psychometric properties and have proven validity, for example, by demonstrating the convergence of the measure with alternative methods of assessing the same concept. When new measures are created for a specific purpose, they should be analyzed to assess their validity, reliability, scaling, and other measurement properties, as well as their relationship to earlier measures. Although new concepts and measures can be quickly created, policymakers should be cautious about using them until their contribution beyond existing measures has been demonstrated.

4. Even though the existing measures of subjective well-being are imperfect, useful conclusions can be drawn from them. All scientific measurement includes error. Thus, users of the measures should understand the biases and artifacts that are inherent in the measures, and, when possible, take steps to correct for them. Furthermore, conclusions should be reached that respect the limitations of the measures, and the conclusions should be expressed in terms of these limitations.

5. Well-being and ill-being measures should be seen as part of the democratic process, in which citizens and their leaders are given information that can be useful in policy debates. Measures of subjective well-being and ill-being do not override other sources of information, but serve as one potentially useful type of knowledge that can be used to create better policies.

Definitions and Assessment

Subjective well-being refers to all of the various types of evaluations, both positive and negative, that people make of their lives. It includes reflective cognitive evaluations, such as life satisfaction and work satisfaction, interest and engagement, and affective reactions to life events, such as joy and sadness. Thus, subjective well-being is an umbrella term for the different valuations people make regarding their lives, the events happening to them, their bodies and minds, and the circumstances in which they live. Although well-being and ill-being are "subjective" in the sense that they occur within a person's experience, manifestations of subjective well-being and ill-being can be observed objectively in verbal and nonverbal behavior, actions, biology, attention, and memory. The term *well-being* is often used instead of *subjective well-being* because it avoids any suggestion that there is something arbitrary or unknowable about the concepts involved.

(Continued from previous page.)

Positive affect denotes pleasant moods and emotions, such as joy and affection. Positive or pleasant emotions are part of subjective well-being because they reflect a person's reactions to events that signify to the person that life is proceeding in a desirable way. Major categories of positive or pleasant emotions include those of low arousal (e.g., contentment), moderate arousal (e.g., pleasure), and high arousal (e.g., euphoria). They include positive reactions to others (e.g., affection), positive reactions to activities (e.g., interest and engagement), and general positive moods (e.g., joy).

Negative affect includes moods and emotions that are unpleasant, and represent negative responses people experience in reaction to their lives, health, events, and circumstances. Major forms of negative or unpleasant reactions include anger, sadness, anxiety and worry, stress, frustration, guilt and shame, and envy. Other negative states, such as loneliness or helplessness, can also be important indicators of ill-being. Although some negative emotions are to be expected in life and can be necessary for effective functioning, frequent and prolonged negative emotions indicate that a person believes his or her life is proceeding badly. Extended experiences of negative emotions can interfere with effective functioning, as well as make life unpleasant.

Happiness has several meanings in popular discourse, as well as in the scholarly literature, For example, happiness can mean a general positive mood, a global evaluation of life satisfaction, living a good life, or the causes that make people happy, with the interpretation depending on the context. For this reason some researchers avoid using the term altogether. Scholars in some fields use the term frequently because of its important historical and popular roots, whereas scholars in other fields prefer to use more specific terms for the different aspects of well-being.

Life satisfaction represents a report of how a respondent evaluates or appraises his or her life taken as a whole. It is intended to represent a broad, reflective appraisal the person makes of his or her life. The term *life* can be defined as all areas of a person's life at a particular point in time, or as an integrative judgment about the person's life since birth, and this distinction is often left ambiguous in current measures It is preferable to instruct the respondent as to whether the question refers to his or her life since birth or to present life across all domains.

Domain satisfactions are judgments people make in evaluating major life domains, such as physical and mental health, work, leisure, social relationships, and family. Usually people indicate how satisfied they are with various areas, but they might also indicate how much they like their lives in each area, how close to the ideal they are in each area, how much enjoyment they experience in each area, and how much they would like to change their lives in each area. Assessments of specific aspects of well-being and ill-being, such as feeling positive and trusting toward one's neighbors and community, and feelings of engagement at work, should prove helpful to policymakers beyond global measures.

Quality of life usually refers to the degree to which a person's life is desirable versus undesirable, often with an emphasis on external components, such as environmental factors and income. In contrast to subjective well-being, which is based on subjective experience, quality of life is often expressed as more "objective" and describes the circumstances of a person's life rather than his or her reaction to those circumstances.

(Continued on next page.)

(Continued from previous page.)

However, some scholars define quality of life more broadly, to include not only the quality of life circumstances, but also the person's perceptions, thoughts, feelings, and reactions to those circumstances. Indexes that combine objective and subjective measures, such as happy life years and healthy life expectancy, have also been proposed.

Experience Sampling Method (ESM), also called Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA), and the *Day Reconstruction Method* (DRM), as well as other diary methods, are designed to accurately assess people's experiences "on-line" over time, including in specific activities and situations. Since global recall of moods can be biased in some instances, these time sampling methods can yield a more accurate reflection of experiences. Furthermore, DRM and ESM/EMA measures can give important information on time use – how people spend their time and how rewarding activities are – that is particularly relevant to policymakers.

Conclusion

Some experts believe that measures of subjective well-being require additional research and refinement before they should be used in policy decisions, while others believe that the use of these measures is long overdue. In a sense, both are correct. National economic measures have stronger conceptual underpinnings and are more methodologically sophisticated, based as they are on over 50 years of development and extensive government support. Although the well-being indicators have yet to be developed in the same way, the current measures do offer important insights that cannot be provided by the economic measures. Thoughtful use of the existing measures in combination with the development of improved measures will be beneficial to both private and public decision making.

These guidelines are likely to evolve over time as we gain more knowledge of the appropriate measures for policy use. Though there remain to be many unknowns regarding which types of measures might prove most beneficial, there is consensus on several broad issues. Although there are many proposals concerning the basic constituents of well-being, much research is still needed before a fundamental set of indicators can be advanced with certainty. Nevertheless, we endorse the idea of pursuing this research and seeking to develop indicators of national well-being.

Signatories:

Ed Diener
University of Illinois

Daniel Kahneman
Princeton University

Carol Graham
The Brookings Institution, and
University of Maryland

M. Joseph Sirgy
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University

Alan Krueger
Princeton University

Laura King
University of Missouri

Alex C. Michalos
Univ of Northern British Columbia

John Helliwell
Univ of British Columbia

Richard Layard
London School of Economics

Paul Dolan
University of Sheffield

Richard E. Lucas
Michigan State University

Sam Ho
University of Hong Kong

Ruut Veenhoven
Erasmus University, Rotterdam

Christopher Peterson
University of Michigan

Robert A. Emmons
University of California, Davis

Alois Stutzer
University of Zurich

David Myers
Hope College

Michael B. Frisch
Baylor University

Jim Harter
The Gallup Organization

Shigehiro Oishi
University of Virginia

Sonja Lyubomirsky
University of California, Riverside

Joar Vitterso
University of Tromso

Ulrich Schimmack
Univ of Toronto, Mississauga

Richard Eckersley
The Australian National Univ.

Nic Marks
New Economics Foundation

Frank Fujita
Indiana Univ., South Bend

Wolfgang Glatzer
Goethe-Univ Frankfurt am Main

Kenneth Land
Duke University

William Pavot
Southwest Minnesota State Univ

Norbert Schwarz
University of Michigan

Michael Eid
University of Geneva

Robin Widgery
Social Systems Research Inst.

Chris Hsee
University of Chicago

Andrew Oswald
University of Warwick

Christie Napa Scollon
Texas Christian University

Eunkook Suh
Yonsei University

David Schkade
University of California, San Diego

Arthur Stone
Stony Brook University

Richard Easterlin
University of Southern California

Felicia A. Huppert
Cambridge University

Bruno Frey
University of Zurich

Robert Cummins
Deakin University

David Moriarty
Centers for Disease Control

Tim Jackson
University of Surrey

James Jackson
University of Michigan

Bruce Headey
University of Melbourne

Andrew Clark
Paris-Jourdan Sciences Econ.

Daniel Gilbert
Harvard University

Alex Wearing
University of Melbourne

References

Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Beyond money: Toward an economy of well-being. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 5,* 1-31.

Diener, E., & Tov, W. (in press). National accounts of well-being. In K. Land (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social indicators and quality of life studies.* New York: Springer.

Kahneman, D., & Krueger, A. B. (in press). Developments in the measurement of subjective well-being. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*.

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L. A., & Diener, E. (in press). Happiness as a strength: A theory of the benefits of positive affect. *Psychological Bulletin*.

 Funding for the national indicators of subjective well-being project is provided by the John Templeton Foundation through the Positive Psychology Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

ISQOLS PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Dear Colleagues,

A great many events have occurred within ISQOLS since our last newsletter:

- under Joe Sirgy's leadership our administrative headquarters have been moved to a new, more spacious, location;
- our electronic communications systems have been substantially upgraded;
- under the joint leadership of Alex Michalos and Joe Sirgy, ISQOLS has entered into an agreement with Springer for the publication of an entirely new journal that will serve as the official journal of the Society, *Applied Research in Quality of Life* (ARQOL). The journal will be distributed without additional cost to all paid up members of the Society;
- under Ken Land's leadership work on our three-volume *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life*, also to be published by Springer in both hard copy and as a CD-ROM, is progressing as planned. Ken has hired a staff person to assist him with the many editorial tasks associated with this mammoth effort which, in time, will serve as one of the Society's many legacies to scholars working on quality of life issues.

As President I also have been promoting the following initiatives:

- Mary Joyce, Wolfgang Glatzer, and Joe Sirgy are serving as members of a By-Laws Review Subcommittee. As many as you know, the By Laws require substantial revisions in order to bring them into conformity with our current practices as an organization. A report, with appreciable recommendations for change, will be presented to the Board of Directors at our biennial conference which, this year, will be held in South Africa.
- Within a few weeks the Executive Committee will be asked to vote on the establishment of an "Academy of Certified Quality of Life Specialists" within ISQOLS. Very bold in its reach the purpose of the Academy will be to promote the highest possible standards in theory and research in quality of life research. For now, the planning group is seeking to finalize details for establishing specialized QOL certification programs in the following areas: a) Community QOL; b) Subjective QOL; and Objective QOL. Certification will involve a combination of didactic and field experiences that occur under the mentorship of an experienced QOL researcher.
- Bill Disch has agreed to serve as the chief fund raiser/development specialist for ISQOLS. A Fund Raising Committee has been put together and, with others of our colleagues, Bill's first task will be to work with Valerie Moller and Denis Huschka concerning the financial needs of the South African conference.
- And, of course, one of our most visible international activities is working to ensure the success of the Society's 7th International Conference to be held on the campus of Rhodes University in Grahmstown, South Africa (July 17-20, 2006). Valerie Moller, our President-Elect, and Denis Huschka, our Vice President for External Affairs, serve as co-chairs for the conference and, together, are working hard to make the conference our best one ever. Indeed, Denis has relocated from Berlin to Grahmstown in order to maximize his contribution to the effort.

To date, the only difficult task that we had to do at headquarters was to raise the level of our membership fees. This was necessitated by a number of financial realities including to generate additional financial resources in support of a more proactive and higher profile international organizations. Both Joe Sirgy and I agree, however, that any member for whom the increase in dues may poses a financial hardship may petition the Secretariat for a reduced membership fee.

All in all, then, ISQOLS remains vibrant and is constantly moving forward....thanks to the remarkable sense of solidarity and leadership that permeates the organization.

Richard J. Estes, President, International Society for Quality of Life Studies (ISQOLS)
University of Pennsylvania, School of Social Policy & Practice, 3701 Locust Walk, Philadelphia PA 19104-6214 USA
Telephone: 215/898-5531; Fax: 215/573-2099; E-Mail: restes@sp2.upenn.edu

ISQOLS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

Membership fees will increase for 2006. ISQOLS Executive Committee has voted in favor of the following dues:

1. Regular members: from $50 to $75
2. Student/retired members: from $25 to $50
3. Institutional members: from $100 to $125
4. Current lifetime members: a one time contribution ranging from $25-$100 to the South Africa Conference Solidarity Fund is requested
5. New lifetime members: from $300 to $300 (for the first year and $25/yr. thereafter)

The increase in dues should cover the cost of getting a new publication (*Applied Research in Quality of Life*) for free.

Membership benefits now include:

1. Three issues of *Social Indicators Network News* (SINET) and access to back issues through ISQOLS website.
2. Four issues of *Applied Research in Quality of Life* (ARQOL)—a new journal that covers applied issues in QOL research.
2. ISQOLS directory.
3. Significant subscription discounts for *Social Indicators Research* (SIR) and the *Journal of Happiness Studies* (JHS)
4. Significant discount for Springer's books in the Social Indicators Research Book series.
5. Significant discount to ISQOLS conferences and publications.
6. Communications with other QOL researchers through a listserv.
7. Putting up one's personal (or one's institute) expertise profile on ISQOLS homepage.
8. Getting recognized for important work through ISQOLS awards program.
9. Apply for research support through ISQOLS Foundation.
10. Access to lectures and presentations on important QOL research topics through ISQOLS website.

The 2006 Membership Registration system will be up and running beginning the first week of December 2005. People can register on line or print out the forms and mail (or fax) them in to the central office. If you have any problem with any aspect of membership registration (or renewal), do not hesitate to contact me at sirgy@vt.edu.

Wishing you all a wonderful holiday season and a happy new year, Joe Sirgy

QUALITY OF LIFE: TOWARDS QUALITY OF LIFE IMPROVEMENT – A CONFERENCE REPORT

Dariusz Biskup, Wroclaw University of Economics

The Conference "Quality of Life: Towards Quality of Life Improvement" was held in Wroclaw, Poland on 14-16 September 2005. It was the third quality of life conference organized by the Department of Statistics of the Wroclaw University of Economics. The first took place in 1999 and the second in 2002. This time the conference was focused on the practical aspect of quality of life measurement, that is, how to provide measures indicating areas requiring Quality of Life Improvement for governing bodies.

The conference was opened by Chairman of the Program Committee Prof. Walenty Ostasiewicz. In his speech, he welcomed all the participants and then presented briefly the history of Wroc³aw which is a city with a very rich history and much political turbulence. This is also a city of many famous scientists like Caspar Neumann, Max Born, Leopold Kronecker, Felix Hausdorff and many others including 10 Noble Prize winners.

The first session of the conference was a plenary session presented by Prof. Wolfgang Glatzer. As he was born in north of Wroclaw, Wolfgang made some personal remarks concerning Polish-German relationships. He also presented his paper "Conditions and Criteria for Improving Quality of Life". The second talk in this session was made by Prof. Francesco Carlucci and Prof. Stefano Pisani from University of Rome "La Sapienza." Most of the topics presented by the participants invoked lively discussions. One of the most controversial and widely discussed topic was the problem of subjective and objective quality of life measurement.

The topics of the papers presented during the conference were very diverse. They ranged from very theoretical aspects of QoL measurement involving axiomatic analyses to health-related QoL problems to some empirical works concerning QoL in various European countries or regions. The conference was attended by participants from Germany, Italy, USA, Poland, Russia, Great Britain, Australia, Ukraine, Romania, Spain, Lithuania and the Czech Republic. Nearly 30 papers were presented during the two conference working days.

On the third day the participants took part in a Wroclaw sightseeing trip. The main part of the trip was a visit to a museum exhibiting a famous Polish painting of Panorama Raclawicka (one of the largest paintings in the world - 15 x 114 m). After this the participants entered a ship which took them along the Oder River in order to see a panorama of the many Wroclaw sightseeing places.

Here are some photographs from the conference.

Conference proceedings

Prof. Wolfgang Glatzer and Prof. Jerzy Wawrzynek

Coffee Break

Prof. Malawski, Prof. Turkiewicz, Prof. Carlucci, Prof. Ostasiewicz

SINET WORLD WIDE WEB HOMEPAGE

SINET has a homepage entry on the World Wide Web. It is located on the homepage of the Department of Sociology at Duke University and thus can be accessed by clicking on Department Publications on the address of that page, namely, http://www.soc.duke.edu or by typing in the full address http://www.soc.duke.edu/dept/sinet/index.html. The homepage for *SINET* contains a description of the Contents of the Current Issue as well as of Previous Issues. In addition, it has Subscription Information, Editorial Information, Issue-Related Links, and a link to the homepage of ISQOLS, the International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies. The Issue-Related Links button has links to World Wide Web locations of data for the construction, study, and analysis of social and quality-of-life indicators that have been identified in previous issues of *SINET*. When you are surfing the Web, surf on in to our homepage.

Inernational Sociological Association (ISA)

XVI ISA WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY

'THE QUALITY OF SOCIAL EXISTENCE IN A GLOBALISING WORLD'

Durban, South Africa, 23-29 July 2006

Working Group on Social Indicators WG06

CALL FOR PAPERS

The next meeting of the ISA Working Group 06 will be held under the auspices of the World Congress of Sociology. This will be the first time for WG06 social-indicators and quality-of-life scholars to meet in Africa – an opportunity not to be missed.
The Working Group 06 has planned five sessions. You are cordially invited to present a paper under the following headings:
Session 1: Social reporting to guide policy
Session 2: Monitoring regional and community quality of life in a gobalising world
Session 3: Subjective and objective social indicators of life quality: The new science of happiness
Session 4: Continuity and change in quality of life trends
Session 5: Health and wellbeing

You are cordially invited to present a paper in any of the five sessions above.
Deadline: Submission of abstracts by latest 1 December 2006 to the WG06 Programme Coordinator:

Valerie Møller,
Institute of Social & Economic Research
Rhodes University
PO Box 94
Grahamstown 6140
South Africa
Fax. ++27-46-622 3948
v.moller@ru.ac.za

Congress registration: www.ucm.es/info/isa/congress2006 (before 31 May 2006) or www.sociology2006.org.za (after 31 May 2006)
We look forward to hearing from you.

The Board (2002-2006) of the Working Group on Social Indicators WG06, established in 1988: Kenneth Land, USA (*President*), Heinz-Herbert Noll, Germany (*Vice-President*), Ruut Veenhoven, Netherlands (*Secretary*); Liz Eckermann, Australia; Wolfgang Glatzer, Germany; Anna Lau, HongKong, Alex Michalos, Canada; Joachim Vogel, Sweden.
SINET, Social Indicators Network News, a quarterly newsletter. Editor: Kenneth C. Land, USA, Fax 1-919-660-5623, kland@soc.duke.edu

QOL 2005 CONFERENCE PLAN

Thursday – 15.09.05

8:00-8:45	**Breakfast**	
9:00-9:15	**Conference opening**	
Session Chair – Prof. Izabella Kudrycka		
9:15-10:00	Wolfgang Glatzer (Germany)	Plenary Talk
10:00-10:45	Francesco Carlucci, Stefano Pisani (Italy)	Well being and poverty in Europe
10:45-11:30	**Coffee Break**	
Session Chair- Prof. Francesco Carlucci		
11:30-11:55	Leigh Ann Simmons, Jennifer Swanberg (USA)	The Working Poor Blues: Work, Depression, and Labor Force Attachment among Working Poor Parents
11:55-12:20	Małgorzata Rószkiewicz (Poland)	The Saving Behaviours of Poles and the Theory of Psychological Economics
12:20-12:45	Lai Wa Keung (UK)	The impact of life events on the subjective well-being of young people: A longitudinal analysis of the British Household Panel Survey
13:00-14:00	**Lunch**	
Session Chair- Prof. Małgorzata Rószkiewicz		
14:00-14:25	Izabella Kudrycka (Poland)	Inequality and poverty in Poland at the beginning of XXI century
14:25-14:50	Marek Kośny (Poland)	Family-oriented personal income tax complying with horizontal equity principle with application to Polish data
14:50-15:15	Kazimierz Turkiewicz (Australia)	Growth and the Quality of Life
15:15-16:00	**Coffee Break**	
Session Chair – Prof. Iwona Roeske-Słomka		
16:00-16:25	Hao Yuan (Germany)	Economic Transition and Subjective Well: a comparison between China and East Germany
16:25-16:50	Tatijana Motoryna (Ukraine)	Statistical analysis air pollution influence on the illness of windpipe in the some cities of Dnepropetrovsk region of the Ukraine
16:50-17:15	Dariusz Biskup, Cyprian Kozyra, Beata Zmyślona (Poland)	The research of quality of student life in Wroclaw University of Economics
19:00	**Conference Dinner**	

Oder River

Panorama Raclawicka

Friday – 16.09.05

8:00-8:45	**Breakfast**	
Session Chair – Prof. Kazimierz Turkiewicz		
9:00-9:25	Filomena Maggino (Italy)	Definition and analysis of subjective indicators of urban quality-of-life in an “atypical” city
9:25-9:50	Silvana Schifini d'Andrea (Italy)	Differents Scales for different Survey Methods: the Quality of Life in Florence
9:50-10:15	Marcel Stoica, Vladimir Ticovschi, Razvan Beschia (Romania)	Self-Realization of Human Beings Leads to the Acceleration of the Increasement of the Quality of Life
10:15-10:40	Zofia Mielecka-Kubień (Poland)	Life Tables for Alcoholics Based on Standardized Mortality Ratio
10:40-11:10	**Coffee Break**	
Session Chair – Prof. Zofia Mielecka-Kubień		
11:10-11:35	Andrzej Malawski, Joanna Mrówka (Poland)	Axiomatic analysis of distributive justice and freedom of choice in the context of the quality of life improvement
11:35-12:00	Fermina Rojo-Perez (Spain), Gloria Fernandez-Mayoralas (Spain)	Research Projects on Quality of Life among the older people in Spain: towards a holistic approach
12:00-12:25	Donata Kurpas, Bartosz J. Sapilak, Andrzej Steciwko	The Indicators of Patients’ Satisfaction and Level of Medical Services in the Rural and Urban Environment of the Lower Silesian Region
12:25-12:50	Regina Reklaitiene (Lithuania)	An Assessment of Quality of Life (WHOQOL-100) in the Middle-Aged Kaunas Population
13:00-14:00	**Lunch**	
Session Chair – Prof. Tadeusz Gerstenkorn		
14:00-14:25	Giorgio Vittadini (Italy)	On ex- post evaluation of health structures quality: an overview
14:25-14:50	Cyprian Kozyra, Agnieszka Marciniuk, Stanislawa Ostasiewicz (Poland)	Labor market and unemployment in Wroclaw agglomeration – possibilities of improving situation of jobless people
14:50-15:15	Ruslan Motoryn (Ukraine)	Measuring poverty in Ukraine: the statistical challenges
15:15-15:50	Małgorzata Mossakowska (Poland)	Quality of life of Polish centenarians
15:50-16:10	**Coffee Break**	
Session Chair – Prof. Vladimir Ticovschi		
16:10-16:35	Bartosz J. Sapilak, Cyprian Kozyra, Donata Kurpas, Andrzej Steciwko, Monika Melon	Chronically hemodialysed patients - estimation of their QOL and mental disorders. Is it possible to improve their quality of life?
16:35-17:00	Jiri Vopravil (Czech Republic)	Estimation of the Illegal Activities (drug consumption, prostitution) and some social indicators from the area
17:25-17:50	Tadeusz Gerstenkorn (Poland)	Hesitancy as an element of life
17:50-18:15	Mario Bolzan, Marco Marozzi (Italy)	A nonparametric quality index of accessibility level of service for households
18:15-18:40	Walenty Ostasiewicz (Poland)	QOL as a State Product
19:00	**Dinner**	

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR QUALITY-OF-LIFE STUDIES: HEADQUARTERS AND WWW HOMEPAGE

The International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies (ISQOLS) was formed in the mid-1990s. The objectives of ISQOLS are: 1) to stimulate interdisciplinary research in quality-of-life (QOL) studies within the managerial (policy), behavioral, social, medical, and environmental sciences; 2) to provide an organization which all academic, business, nonprofit, and government researchers who are interested in QOL studies can coordinate their efforts to advance the knowledge base and to create positive social change; and 3) to encourage closer cooperation among scholars engaged in QOL research to develop better theory, methods, measures, and intervention programs.

The year 2006 membership fees are US$75 for regular members and $50 for students or retired persons. Prof. M. JOSEPH SIRGY (Virginia Tech and State University) is Executive Director of ISQOLS. Anyone interested in knowing more about ISQOLS should contact Prof. Sirgy at the central office.

The ISQOLS central office recently moved to new physical and virtual locations. Please note the new addresses:

International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies (ISQOLS)
1800 Kraft Drive, Suite 111
Blacksburg, Virginia 24060-6370, USA
Office tel: (540) 231-5110; fax: (540) 961-4162
E-mail: isqols@vt.edu
Website: www.isqols.org

SINET

Social Indicators Network News

Subscription Information

As a service to the world-wide social indicators community, SINET is issued quarterly (February, May, August, November). Subscribers and network participants are invited to report news of their social indicator activity, research, policy development, etc., to the Editor for publication. Deadlines are the 20th of the month prior to each issue.

Address:
SINET, Kenneth C. Land, Editor,
Department of Sociology, Box 90088,
Duke University, Durham, NC 27708-0088, USA
E-mail: kland@soc.duke.edu
Telephone: 919-660-5615
Fax: 919-660-5623

Subscriptions are on a calendar year basis; annual rates:
Libraries/Institutions .... US$26.00
Individual:
US & Canada .... US$18.00
All Others .... US$20.00

Sorry; credit cards are not accepted. Check must be in US dollars. Payment may be made through a wired money order; check with your financial institution for further information. Advance payments are always welcomed. Call or write for a multiple-year invoice.

Archived issues are available for purchase. Please call or write for prices and details.

SINET

Social Indicators Network News

Kenneth C. Land, Editor
Department of Sociology
Box 90088, Duke University
Durham, NC 27708-0088 USA
151-1057-6936-22940