

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	vi
<i>List of Tables</i>	vii
<i>Foreword</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	x
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xii
1 Human Well-being: Issues, Concepts and Measures <i>Mark McGillivray</i>	1
2 Human Well-being: Concepts and Conceptualizations <i>Des Gasper</i>	23
3 Income-based Measures of Average Well-being <i>Steve Dowrick</i>	65
4 Social and Political Indicators of Human Well-being <i>Susan Harkness</i>	88
5 Composite Indexes of Human Well-being: Past, Present and Future <i>Mark McGillivray and Farhad Noorbakhsh</i>	113
6 Indicators of Inequality and Poverty <i>S. Subramanian</i>	135
7 Gender-related Indicators of Well-being <i>Stephan Klasen</i>	167
8 Sustainability and Well-being Indicators <i>Eric Neumayer</i>	193
9 Subjective Measures of Well-being <i>Ruut Veenhoven</i>	214
10 Participatory Approaches and the Measurement of Human Well-being <i>Sarah White and Jethro Pettit</i>	240
<i>Index</i>	269

1

Human Well-being: Issues, Concepts and Measures

Mark McGillivray

Introduction

National governments, civil society organizations and international agencies have for many years assembled and reported data on achieved human well-being, be it for individuals, families, regions or countries. Human well-being achievement at the level of countries receives special attention. It is now commonplace for international agencies, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank, to publish annual reports that rank countries according to various well-being or well-being related indicators.

These eagerly awaited reports receive much attention, in particular from national governments wanting to see where their country ranks internationally, and especially relative to neighbouring countries or those with which they have links. It is not uncommon for a positive outcome, be it a move up the league tables or consistently high rankings, to be attributed to specific policy interventions. Poor outcomes are linked either to an absence of appropriate policies, or the presence of inappropriate ones – or both. While one can question whether such attribution is always valid, achieved well-being measures are seen as important tools, used in the design and evaluation of policies, both domestic and international.

Well-being indicators are also used to measure progress towards various benchmarks or goals set by the international community. These include the 'Education for All' and 'Health for All' goals set in 1978 and 1990, respectively. More recently and ambitiously, the international community agreed at the United Nations Millennium Summit in 2000 to adopt the now very well-known Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Unanimously adopted by the UN member states, these goals involve the attainment of various well-being or related benchmarks or targets, defined in terms of corresponding indicators. The Education for All and Health for All goals involved achieving universal primary education and universal access to health care, worldwide,

by 2000. The MDGs are more ambitious, both in the nature and number of targets. Fundamentally, they aim at reducing worldwide the proportion of people living in extreme income poverty and suffering from hunger to half the levels of 1990 by 2015. They also aim to achieve various targets in education and health by 2015 (UN Millennium Project Report 2005).

Countries that fall well short of agreed targets or benchmarks as such can expect, *ceteris paribus*, to receive more support from the international community, in the form of aid and other interventions aimed at increasing levels of achieved well-being. International donors are often urged to increase aid levels based on gaps between these benchmarks and actual well-being levels. The UN Millennium Project Report in 2005, for instance, called on the international donor community to double official aid levels so that the MDGs can be achieved. More generally, the agencies of international aid donors make much use of well-being indicators in the design, implementation and evaluation of aid and related policies.

Human well-being achievement has not only been the focus of the above-mentioned organizations; it has for many decades been extensively researched, attracting attention from numerous academic disciplines within the social sciences. This research has come a long way in recent years, responding to changing global conditions, new research priorities, more sophisticated conceptualizations and improved data resources. Yet many measurement and conceptual issues still require attention and some of the most widely used well-being measures should be interpreted with great care. There is, in particular, no one conceptualization or measure that is accepted above all others.

Human Well-being: Concept and Measurement aims to provide insights into how human well-being might be better conceptualized and measured. It does this by taking stock of – and reviewing – research directions, assessing efforts over recent decades to conceptualize and, in particular, measure human well being achievement. The main focus of this volume is national human well-being achievement, cross-country comparisons in particular. Given its overall survey orientation, the volume does not set out substantively to develop new measures or conceptualizations. It does, however, point to many new areas that subsequent research should address, with a view to developing better ways of understanding and measuring achieved well-being. The volume also provides some cautions on the use of existing measures. These pointers and cautions are original contributions to the research literature.

This first chapter provides a broad descriptive sketch of well-being research, focusing primarily on attempts to measure achieved well-being, but also on various well-being conceptualizations. This sketch is intended to: (i) describe and compare various well-being conceptualizations that have emerged in recent decades; (ii) provide a brief history of research on developing well-being measures; (iii) describe and compare characteristics of various well-known or widely-used well-being and related measures; (iv) discuss how the

construction of various well-being measures relate (or should relate) to the intended application; and (v) provide a backdrop for the nine chapters that follow, each of which picks up and examines in much more detail a number of the concepts or measures introduced.

The coverage of the sketch, and the volume as a whole, therefore, is selective. But it is intended to focus on the main issues examined in the research literature in recent decades and, in particular, on those measures that have been most widely reported and used internationally by policy makers and other practitioners. The coverage also reflects the fundamental premise that well-being should be seen as a multidimensional concept, encompassing many diverse dimensions. It is no coincidence, therefore, that much of the research examined in this volume has been motivated by the recognition that income-based measures of well-being, which have for many decades been dominant in well-being assessments, do not adequately capture these dimensions and a number of related factors.

The remainder of this chapter is structured as follows. The next two sections provide the above-mentioned sketch of the literature, looking at conceptualization and measures. A brief outline of the contents of Chapters 2 to 10 then follows, before highlighting some of the recommendations for future research provided for herein. The final section offers some additional recommendations.

Well-being conceptualizations

Many different well-being conceptualizations have been provided but, as Gasper (2002), Travers and Richardson (1997) and others point out, the term 'well-being' is a concept or abstraction used to refer to whatever is assessed in an evaluation of a person's life situation or 'being'. In short, it is a description of the state of individuals' life situation. An array of different terms has appeared in the research literature to label this situation. Along with well-being, the most common ones include the quality of life, living standards and human development. Others include welfare, social welfare, well-living, utility, life satisfaction, prosperity, needs fulfilment, development, empowerment, capability expansion, poverty, human poverty and, more recently, happiness. Some have distinct meanings, but there is usually a high degree of overlap in underlying meanings. Individual studies tend to adopt a particular term, others use different terms interchangeably. Easterlin (2001), for example, goes so far as to equate explicitly happiness, subjective well-being, satisfaction, utility, well-being, and welfare. Similarly, McGillivray (2005) equates human well-being, quality of human life, human development and basic human needs fulfilment.

Early well-being conceptualizations were utilitarian, often reducing well-being to well-feeling (or pleasure) and further reducing it to the scalar

of unitary pleasure or utility (Gasper 2004). It subsequently became more common, and arguably appropriate, to treat well-being as a multidimensional concept. Better known multi-dimensional conceptualizations include the capabilities approach (Sen 1982, 1985, 1993, among many other publications), the basic human values approach (Grisez *et al.* 1987), the intermediate needs approach (Doyal and Gough 1991, 1993), the universal psychological needs approach (Ramsay 1992), the axiological categories approach (Max-Neef 1993), the universal human values approach (Schwartz 1994), the domains of subjective well-being approach (Cummins 1996), the dimensions of well-being approach (Narayan *et al.* 2000), and the central human capabilities approach (Nussbaum 2000). Other contributions to the literature include Andrews and Withey (1976), Stewart (1985), Lasswell (1992), Allardt (1993), Rawls (1993), Galtung (1994) and Qizilbash (1996a, 1996b).¹

Many well-being dimensions have been identified. The list is extremely diverse, covering such aspects as knowledge, friendship, self-expression, affiliation, bodily integrity, health, economic security, freedom, affection, wealth, and leisure (Alkire 2002). The fundamental nature of dimensions has received much attention. Finnis (1980) argues that dimensions are: (i) self evident, in that they are potentially recognizable by anyone; (ii) incommensurable, in the sense that all of the desirable qualities of one are not present in the other; (iii) and irreducible, as there is no one denominator to which they can be totally reduced; and (iv) non-hierarchical, since at any point in time any one dimension can seem to be the most important (Alkire 2002). Doyal and Gough (1991: 5) consider universal needs, which 'apply to everyone in the same way'. As in Alkire (2002), these needs are not seen as well-being itself, but preconditions of well-being. Doyal and Gough conclude that universal needs do exist, and that vectors of basic and intermediate needs and degrees of need satisfaction can be identified. They identify two universal basic needs: physical health and autonomy of agency, the latter defined as the capacity to initiate and act through the formulation of aims and beliefs (Doyal and Gough 1991).

The most influential well-being conceptualization, arguably, is the above-mentioned capabilities approach of Amartya Sen. A person's capability, according to this approach, reflects the alternative combinations of 'functionings' a person can achieve, and from which they can choose a particular collection. Functionings, in turn, are the 'parts of the state of person – in particular the things that he or she manages to do or be in leading a life' (Sen 1993: 31). Well-being is assessed in terms of the capability to achieve valuable functionings. In contrast to much of the literature, Sen resists identifying a set of capabilities on the grounds it is a value judgement that needs to be made explicitly, in many cases through a process of public debate (Sen 1999).²

Well-being measures

Attempts to measure well-being achievement have largely followed developments in the conceptualization of well-being. These include attempts to measure this achievement at the level of nations, often using national averages of chosen variables. Early attempts to assess these achievements, dating back to the 1940s, relied on some measure of national income per capita. This is consistent with the utilitarian conceptualization of well-being. Higher income allows for higher consumption and this provides greater utility. Income was thus the metric that conveyed utility. These attempts were also consistent with the national economic strategies that sought to maximize growth of income per capita, with some correction for externalities and distribution (Alkire 2002). The most popular measures of national income per capita are Gross National Income (GNI) per capita or Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita. The former is also known as Gross National Product (GNP) per capita. Data for these measures are very widely reported and extensively used. The World Bank, for example, in its *World Development Reports*, for many years since 1977 ranked countries in terms of achieved GNPs or GNIs per capita measured in United States dollars using weighted average prices and exchange rates (World Bank 1977–2004). It has also reported comprehensive cross-country income per capita data since 1969 in its *World Bank Atlas* (World Bank 1969–2004).

Differences in domestic price levels between countries are obviously important in income-based assessments of well-being achievement between countries. For this reason, purchasing power parity (PPP) estimates of national income per capita are being used increasingly. GNIs and GDPs per capita are converted into international dollars using PPP conversion factors. One international dollar, at the PPP rate, has the same purchasing power over domestic GNI as the US dollar has over US GNI. PPP conversion factors are currently derived from price surveys in 118 countries (World Bank 2004). The *World Development Report 2004* reports PPP GNI per capita data for 170 countries while the *Human Development Report 2004* reports PPP GDP per capita data for 177 countries (World Bank 2004, UNDP 2004). For many countries, these data are obtained using estimated PPP conversion factors. The most recent conversion factors for OECD countries are based on surveys conducted in 2000, with the remainder either based on surveys conducted in 1993, 1996 or earlier years (World Bank 2004).

Limitations of income per capita as an indicator of human well-being are well-known and often repeated. If we accept that well-being is multidimensional, then it at best captures only one of its many dimensions. It might well be correlated with other measures, but even then one would realistically expect that it cannot fully capture the essence of the various well-being conceptualizations (McGillivray 2005). Sen (1985) points out that the use of income per capita reduced well-being to being well-off or, put differently,

to having much. What was important to Sen is not the level of income per capita per se but how income is used or what it finances. Will expenditure on tobacco, gambling, narcotics, and alcohol necessarily increase well-being at all levels of expenditure? One would think not. A broadly similar criticism of income as a measure of well-being has been expressed by the UNDP in its early *Human Development Reports*. In the 1990 report it emphasized that 'income is a means, not an end', observing that an excessive pre-occupation among policy makers and others with GNP growth had obscured that perspective (UNDP 1990: 9–10). In making this point, the UNDP invoked the teachings of Aristotle, who warned that 'wealth is evidently not the good we are seeking, for it is merely useful and for the sake of something else' (UNDP 1990: 9). While wealth and income are different concepts, the same basic message applies to both.

Hicks and Streeten (1979: 568) observe that 'problems inherent in using GNP as a measure of social welfare have been recognized almost since the inception of national income accounting'. They point to a long history of endeavours to address this issue quantitatively, including adjustments to GNP and the development of non-monetary measures of social progress in the form of so-called social indicators. The former adjustments include PPP conversions, which date back to the work of Clark (1940). Nordhaus and Tobin (1972) adjusted GNP to obtain the Measure of Economic Welfare (MEW). The MEW was obtained by deducting from GNP an allowance for defence expenditure, pollution, congestion, and crime, and adding an estimate for the value of leisure and services of consumer durables (Hicks and Streeten 1979). There have also been attempts to adjust GNP per capita according to how it is distributed among population sub-groups. This is an explicit acknowledgement that per capita income, as many other indicators, is simply a national mean or average that says nothing about how the total cake of a country is divided. An early attempt to adjust GNP in this way is that of Ahluwalia and Chenery (1974), who proposed measures based on weighted shares of the growth rate of GNP by population sub-groups. The weights are interpreted as welfare weights, and can be defined either in terms of the share of total income or population of each group (divided into quintiles), or in terms of the priorities assigned to improving the welfare of each group. There have been many subsequent attempts to modify GNP and other per capita national income measures.³ Yet, despite these attempts and the well-known weaknesses of such measures, and alternative non- or non-exclusively income-based measures, 'GNP per capita continues to be regarded as the "quintessential" well-being indicator' (Dasgupta 2001: 53).

Broadly similar measures to those of Ahluwalia and Chenery (1974) have resulted not from attempts to adjust GNP per capita or other national income measures, but from efforts to construct better income based measures per se. They are consistent to varying degrees with the utilitarian conceptualization. Some are explicit well-being or welfare measures; others are income poverty

measures. The latter provide well-being information only on those people living in poverty, but not others. As such, they are only partial measures of well-being achievement if applied at the national level. A general class of the former treats well-being as an increasing function of mean income and a decreasing function of the measured level of inequality.⁴ A well-known example of these measures is the Shorrocks (1983) Generalized Lorenz Curve (GLC), which takes the standard Lorenz curve and scales it by the mean income of the distribution. As such, the GLC defines social welfare in terms of both equity and efficiency, the latter defined by the level of mean income.

The best known and most widely used income poverty measure is the headcount, typically defined as the number or proportion of the national population whose income falls below the chosen poverty line. A headcount measure of extreme income poverty, used to track progress towards the MDG poverty target, is the number of people living on less than one US\$ PPP per day. The headcount does not provide information on the extent to which the incomes of those living in poverty fall below the poverty line. Put differently, it does not indicate the extent of immiseration, merely its existence. The poverty (or income) gap measure attempts this, by adjusting the headcount on the basis of the gap between the poverty line and the average income of those living below the line, in the population group under consideration. As such, it is interpreted as both a measure of poverty and of the amount of money required to raise the incomes of the poor to the poverty line (Blackwood and Lynch 1994). More elaborate measures have been proposed by Sen (1976) and Foster *et al.* (1984), among others. The Sen Index combines the income gap, the headcount, and the distribution of income among those living below the poverty line (measured by the Gini coefficient). Foster *et al.* provide a class of parametric poverty measures that are sensitive to changes in the income gap, changes in inequality, and changes in the number of poor (Blackwood and Lynch 1994).

The use of non-monetary measures gathered momentum in the mid- to late 1970s when a number of prominent international agencies compiled various sets of what have been described, rather loosely, as social indicators. Often interpreted as measures of basic human needs fulfilment, these indicators sought to capture achievements in such areas as health, education, the environment, culture, and politics. Specific indicators therefore include life expectancy, child mortality, access to health services, access to water, access to sanitation, infant mortality, calorie intake, literacy, years of schooling, and school enrolment ratios. While some of these indicators reflect the progress countries are making towards attaining fundamental well-being or developmental goals, others act primarily as intermediate indicators of progress. There is also a wide range of variables that address political participation, civil liberties, and human and labour rights.

Data on social indicators are now widely published, often for large country samples. The UNDP, in its *Human Development Report 2004*, publishes data on

life expectancy, adult literacy, and school enrolment ratios for 177 countries. There remain, however, concerns regarding the reliability and comparability of these indicators. Most of the widely used social indicators are based on information obtained from national censuses. It is well-known that many countries do not have the resources to conduct accurate censuses. No country conducts a yearly national census and some countries conduct them at irregular intervals. Data for the intervening years have to be estimated. Given these and a number of methodological problems, the data tend to be incomparable both between countries at a given point in time and within given countries over time. As a consequence, differences among countries in the values of social indicators are difficult to interpret. Yet, these problems do not provide grounds against the use of social indicators per se, but grounds for attempting to improve their reliability.

Income per capita or any single social indicator is only a partial measure of well-being if we treat well-being as a multidimensional concept. They alone capture a single well-being dimension, or part thereof. A number of composite measures aim to provide more comprehensive, multidimensional assessments of well-being.⁵ One of the better known indexes is the Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI), which was intended as a complement to GNP per capita in the measurement of human well-being at the national level. Proposed in 1979 by the Overseas Development Council, the PQLI combines infant mortality, life expectancy, and adult literacy into a single index. PQLI values for up to 150 countries were published (Morris 1979). While the PQLI has been criticized heavily, perhaps one of its most important contributions (and certainly one intended by its designers) was to combine variables measuring achieved well-being. That is, these variables measure the results or outcomes of efforts to improve human well-being, rather than combining measures of attempts to improve human well-being. As such, it avoided variables such as expenditure on education and, instead, focused on an aim of this expenditure; namely, higher literacy.

The PQLI received much attention in the years immediately following its inception. Yet interest in composite human well-being indicators tended to wane, and income per capita, especially GNP per capita, remained the most widely used and reported indicator. This changed with the UNDP *Human Development Report 1990*, which launched the Human Development Index (HDI) (UNDP 1990). The HDI, which has been revised a number of times since 1990, currently combines US\$ PPP GDP per capita, life expectancy at birth, adult literacy, and the combined primary, secondary, and tertiary education enrolment ratio. The inclusion of US\$ PPP GDP per capita has been controversial. The UNDP has made it clear that its inclusion in the HDI is intended to capture a material dimension to human development or well-being. US\$ PPP GDP per capita is therefore transformed to reflect diminishing returns to the conversion of income or purchasing power into well-being, and hence to better capture this dimension. Various transformations have

been employed since 1990, some rather drastic involving capping this variable at an international poverty line income. Currently, the logarithm of US\$ PPP GDP per capita is employed (UNDP 2004). While the HDI has received often heavy criticism from researchers on numerous grounds, it is used extensively in research and policy work, and is quite possibly the best known well-being or human development index. HDI values are currently available for 173 countries, with some extending back to 1960 for a number of countries (UNDP 1994, 2004).⁶

In the *Human Development Report 1995* the UNDP first introduced the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) and the Gender related Development Index (GDI) (UNDP 1995). These composite indexes are an attempt to incorporate gender dimensions into well-being measurement. The GEM contains information on: (i) percentage of women parliamentarians; (ii) the number female legislators, senior officials and managers as a percentage of the total number of people holding such positions; (iii) the number of female professional and technical workers as a percentage of the total number of such workers; and (iv) female earned income relative to that of males. The GDI adjusts the HDI on the basis of gender disparity in each of its four indicators (UNDP 2004). Any such disparity in these indicators for a country results in its GDI value being lower than its HDI value. The UNDP was not the first to adjust or disaggregate well-being indicators on the basis of gender disparities, as there is a long history of doing so. Three of the four variables on which the HDI is based (life expectancy, adult literacy, and the combined education enrolment ratio), had been available in gender disaggregated form for a number of years. The contribution of the GDI was to combine these variables, along with a gender disaggregated GDP per capita. There are also a number of gender specific well-being indicators, such as the maternal mortality rate.⁷

As with gaps in incomes between population groups, few would deny that gender gaps are irrelevant to achieved well-being assessments. Yet, the gender disparity adjusted indicators are subject to the same criticisms as the variables on which they are based. For instance, the gender adjusted or disaggregated social indicators are obviously subject to the same methodological and measurement error problems as their non-adjusted or disaggregated counterparts, given that the former are obtained from the latter. This is not, of course, an argument against using gender specific or gender adjusted indicators, merely one for improving their accuracy and comparability. Gender specific or gender adjusted indicators tend to be very highly rank-correlated with their non-specific or adjusted counterparts, and with other well-being indicators, including income per capita (McGillivray and Pillarisetti 2006). This has led to questions regarding the empirical contribution of these indicators, although such a correlation is not an argument for not monitoring changes in them, or for simply assuming that changes in the gender related indicators will necessarily follow those in their non-gender related counterparts. Conceptual problems also arise. Should gender equality in all indicators

be the underlying well-being goal? Relatedly, what constitutes equality?⁸ There is also the issue of whether gender empowerment can be considered as well-being. Sen (1999) makes the distinction between female agency (a very similar concept to empowerment) and female well-being, arguing that strengthening the former is a separate goal alongside improving the latter. From this it might be inferred that increasing female empowerment will lead to increasing female well-being achievement, but leaves open the question of whether empowerment is well-being.

There are ongoing attempts to incorporate notions of sustainability into well-being assessment. Anand and Sen (2000b) provide a conceptual basis for this, viewing sustainability as a concern for inter-generational equity and treating its demand as a reflection of the universality of claims, applied to future generations vis-à-vis the current one. Anand and Sen argue that this universalism is an ethical one, characterized as an elementary demand for impartiality, applied both within generations and between them. They assert that 'not working towards guaranteeing the basic capabilities to the future generations would be scandalous', but also that not 'bringing those elementary capabilities within the reach of the deprived in the present generation would also be outrageous' (Anand and Sen 2000b: 2030). These comments might be interpreted as a case for integrating sustainability measurement into achieved well-being measurement.

There is a long history of attempts to integrate well-being and sustainability measures. The MEW, mentioned above, attempted this, through including a measure of pollution (Nordhaus and Tobin 1972). Another early such attempt was the Economic Aspects of Welfare measure, which deducts the costs of air pollution damage and pollution and solid waste control costs (Zolotas 1981). A more recent attempt is the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) (Daly and Cobb 1989). The GPI deducts from selected expenditure components of GDP the depreciation of environmental assets and natural resources, reduction of stocks of natural resources – such as fossil fuels or other mineral deposits, and effects of wastes and pollution.⁹ Attempts to adjust well-being indexes using sustainability measures have been criticized. Neumayer (2001), for instance, considers this issue in the context of 'greening' the HDI through the inclusion in the index of sustainability variables. Rather than such inclusion, Neumayer instead favours simply comparing a well-being achievement measure with a measure of sustainability, to assess whether this achievement is potentially sustainable.

Arguably the most thriving area of well-being research in recent years is that on subjective well-being or, as it is otherwise known, happiness.¹⁰ Subjective well-being has been defined as people's multidimensional evaluation of their lives, including cognitive judgements of life satisfaction and affective evaluations of emotions and moods (Diener 1984, Argyle 1987, Diener and Larsen 1993, and Eid and Diener 2003). People are surveyed to obtain their self-assessments of well-being in a number of pre-determined

domains or dimensions. The World Health Organization Quality of Life assessment (the WHOQOL), for instance, focuses on 100 variables representing different life domains. The quality of life is defined in the WHOQOL as 'an individual's perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live, and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards, and concerns' (WHOQOL Group 1994, cited in Skevington *et al.* 2004: 299). Respondents are required to self-assess their lives according to such factors as pain and discomfort, sexual activity, self-esteem, mobility, work capacity, freedom, physical safety and security, work satisfaction, and financial resources (WHOQOL Group 1998).¹¹ Another approach is simply to ask respondents to self-assess, on a finite scale, their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with life. For instance, scores reported on the World Happiness Database (WHD) are based on responses to the question 'All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your life-as-a-whole now?' (Veenhoven 2004).

Easterlin (1974), in a landmark study, examined links between income and happiness. Easterlin found that while individuals with higher incomes were happier than those with lower incomes at a particular point in time, the happiness of a particular cohort did not increase with income over time. Happiness levels actually appeared to remain constant even in light of substantial increases in income. This result was confirmed in later work by Easterlin. Known as the 'Easterlin paradox', this finding has been extensively examined, with many studies drawing the same conclusion or reporting broadly consistent results. A number of theoretical explanations for stable happiness over time has been put forward. Easterlin postulated that absolute income levels matter up to the point at which basic needs are met, and beyond that relative incomes are more important. If an individual's income remains constant relative to the incomes of that person's reference group, their happiness may remain unchanged. Another explanation put forward by Easterlin is that an individual's aspirations might rise with increases in income, offsetting an increase in well-being (Easterlin 2001). Cummins (1998) has proposed a specific theory to explain relatively constant happiness over time. Labelled the theory of subjective well-being homeostasis, this theory proposes that, in a manner similar to the homeostatic maintenance of blood pressure or temperature, happiness is actively controlled and maintained by a set of psychological devices that function under the control of personality. This theory predicts that good or bad events will cause a short-term change in subjective well-being, but that these psychological devices will return life satisfaction or happiness to its previous level. This level is seen as a 'set point', around which well-being varies, and is thought to be within the satisfied range of a satisfaction-dissatisfaction continuum (Cummins *et al.* 2003).

A challenge in measuring subjective well-being concerns the sensitivity of survey responses to momentary or immediate mood swings. As Campbell

et al. (1976), Eid and Diener (2003), among many others, have pointed out, the information provided by these surveys should instead relate to changes in the conditions in which people live. Diener (1984), Veenhoven (1993) and others have considered this question and as Easterlin (2001) points out, the general conclusion is that happiness scores are not perfect but do accurately reflect substantive feelings of well-being. International comparisons of happiness levels are also an issue. France, Japan, and Austria have happiness scores of 6.4, 6.3 and 6.1, respectively, out of a possible 10, according to the WHD (Veenhoven 2004). Yet, according to the WHD, Nigeria has a happiness score of 6.3, despite the fact that 70 per cent Nigerians live below the US\$ PPP1 per day poverty line and 91 per cent live below the US\$ PPP2 per day line (Veenhoven 2004, UNDP 2004). Such an apparent anomaly might provide a case not to use a happiness score to compare well-being across countries at a point in time, but instead to confine the use of these scores to monitor changes in well-being over time. This view is seemingly countered by Easterlin (2001), who argues such comparisons have credence, given a similarity of feelings about the sources of happiness across individuals, in diverse cultures and living in countries in different stages of socio-economic development.

A criticism of most indicators, including those discussed above, concerns the related issues of ownership and relevance. Attempts to increase a country's HDI score, for example, might be half-hearted if the relevant decision makers were not involved in the selection of the variables on which the index is based. Similarly, citizens of a particular country might not support a drive to lift their country's HDI value if they think the index is irrelevant to their own circumstances. In general, of course, there is a need to ensure that measures are directly relevant to the well-being circumstances and aspirations of the individuals whose well-being is under consideration. The underlying issue here is one of country-level ownership. Without ownership of the indicators, there is no guarantee that they will be used effectively for the design of policy interventions or will be relevant to the circumstances of the citizens to whom they apply. The UNDP has seemingly recognized these points, especially the second, through the preparation of *Human Development Reports* and country-specific HDIs (see, for example, UNDP 2003).

The same argument can, of course, be made regarding individual or household level indicators, and there have been many attempts to build poverty or well-being indicators using participatory methods. These methods can be viewed as a process enacted either by the people whose living standards are being assessed, for those people (initiated by an agency, but based on participation or consultation), or with those people (Laderchi 2001). They have their origins in Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA). Chambers (1994: 954) describes PRA as methods intended for 'local people to share, enhance and analyse their knowledge of life and conditions'. Participatory Poverty Assessments (PPAs), increasingly common in attempts to assess the life conditions

of individuals or households in developing countries, have their origins in PRA. Examples of the indicators produced using participatory assessments include whether the individual lives in a cement block house, whether they own a bullock and whether they have to always rely on borrowed clothing (Hanmer *et al.* 1997). The *Voices of the Poor* study, emanating from the World Bank, is a well known study that employed PPA (Narayan *et al.* 2000)

Overview of the volume

Human Well-being: Concept and Measurement contains a further nine chapters. As mentioned previously, these chapters look in far more detail at a number of the concepts or measures discussed in the preceding section.

Chapter 2, by Des Gasper, looks at well-being concepts and conceptualizations. Its basic premise is that prior to measuring something, we need to think hard about what it is that we wish to measure.¹² More broadly, before acting, we should think hard about purposes. Various legitimate but different purposes underlie the available conceptualizations of well-being. Chapter 2 seeks to clarify this variety of purposes, and the corresponding differences of focus and conceptualization, in a number of approaches to well-being which are influential in or very relevant to development theory and policy. It looks inter alia at: Sen's capability approach, Nussbaum's theory of human functional capabilities, Finnis's theory of core motives, and Alkire's attempted synthesis of these; as well as Dasgupta's specification of well-being, and Max-Neef's matrix of human needs. The chapter will consider how far one can integrate the various approaches.

Chapter 3, by Steve Dowrick, looks at issues relating to income per capita, focusing on GDP per capita. It was mentioned above that international comparisons of well-being are commonly made in terms of GDP per capita. Such comparisons might appear in newspaper articles examining the latest country rankings, quality of life, or in development reports assessing national well-being achievement or in economics journals analyzing the relative performance of countries. Yet, these comparisons are open to criticism, further to those mentioned above, on the grounds that GDP is more properly regarded as a partial measure of aggregate output than as an indicator of either current or future well-being. International GDP comparisons make no allowance for environmental differences, for resource depletion, for leisure, for household production of goods and services, for black market activities or for external costs and benefits associated with production and consumption. They are also bedevilled by index number problems. Chapter 3 suggests ways of combining working hours and life expectancy with income comparisons, and shows that the fixed-price indexes of real income, such as those in the Penn World Tables, substantially understate the income gaps between the poorest and richest countries.

Chapter 4, by Susan Harkness, critically surveys the vast range of indicators used to assess social and political well-being at the level of countries. It considers what contribution these indicators can make towards our understanding of human well-being. While many social and political indicators exhibit wide variations across countries, the chapter argues that the interpretation of these differences is not always clear. The chapter examines sources of cross-country variations, highlighting differences in data availability and measurement issues. Finally, the chapter examines the links and correlations between these various indicators of development across countries and their interpretation as measures of development.

Chapter 5, by Mark McGillivray and Farhad Noorbakhsh, surveys the various composite well-being indexes that have been inter-country assessments over the last 40 or so years. It pays particular attention to the HDI. A number of issues are considered, including the choice of components, component weights, scale equivalence, non-linearity, correlations among components, and the policy relevance of such measures. Several of these issues are examined in the context of a critical review of the many criticisms of the HDI and the UNDP's responses to these criticisms (some involving changes to the design of the index). A basic premise of the chapter is that indexes used for international well-being comparisons should be relevant to the policies and individual priorities of countries. Possible directions for the future design and application of composite well-being indicators are identified, including adoption of country specific variables, participatory, country and time variant component weighting schemes, and the inclusion of a human security vector.

Chapter 6, by S. Subramanian, aims at a broad, mainstream account of the literature on inequality and poverty measurement in the space of income and, additionally, deals with measures of disparity and deprivation in the more expanded domain of capabilities and functionings. In addition to introductory and concluding parts, the chapter has four sections. The first of these sections, on measurement of income inequality, deals with preliminary concepts and definitions; a visual representation of inequality (the Lorenz curve); real-valued indexes of inequality; properties of inequality indexes; some specific inequality measures; and the relationship between Lorenz, welfare and inequality orderings. The second section, on poverty, deals with the identification and aggregation exercises; properties of poverty indexes; some specific poverty measures; the problem of plurality and unambiguous rankings; poverty measures and anti-poverty policy; and other issues in the measurement of poverty. The third section considers aspects of both congruence and conflict in the relationship amongst poverty, inequality and welfare. The final substantive section advances the rationale for a more comprehensive assessment of human well-being than is afforded by the income perspective, it briefly reviews measurement concerns relating to generalized indexes of deprivation and disparity, and it discusses the data

and policy implications of the more expansive view of well-being adopted in the section.

Chapter 7, by Stephan Klasen, discusses the rationale, as well as the challenges, involved when constructing gender related indicators of well-being. It argues that such indicators are critically important but that their construction involves a number of conceptual and measurement problems. Among the conceptual issues the chapter examines is the space in which gender inequality in well-being is to be measured, whether the indicators should track well-being of males and females separately or adjust overall measures of well-being by the gender inequality in well-being, whether gender equality in every indicator is necessarily the goal, how to assess gender inequality that is apparently desired by males and females, and what role indicators of agency or empowerment should play in gender-related indicators of well-being. Among the most important measurement issues to be addressed are the role of the household in allocating resources, the question of stocks versus flows, as well as significant data gaps when it comes to gender inequalities. Where appropriate, remedies to the conceptual and measurement issues are proposed. The chapter also briefly reviews UNDP's gender related indexes to illustrate some of the challenges involved.

Chapter 8, by Eric Neumayer, provides a review and critical discussion of indicators that attempt to combine the measurement of sustainability with that of well-being. It starts with some commonly agreed definitions of sustainability, showing how most well-being indicators tell us little, if anything at all, about this issue. Sustainability is most commonly defined in economics as non-declining utility or well-being over time. Yet, due to its future orientation, most indicators of sustainability such as Genuine Savings (GS) have merely focused on the capacity to provide utility in the future, but have not included the measurement of current well-being. Indicators of well-being such as the HDI, on the other hand, have typically failed to account for sustainability in their measurement of current well-being. The chapter then critically reviews the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) and the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), which are the most prominent examples of an indicator that attempts to fully integrate the measurement of welfare with that of sustainability into one single indicator. Such an integration, whilst seemingly attractive, is rendered difficult by the fact that what contributes to current well-being need not contribute at all, or in the same way, to sustainability and vice versa. He also reviews various proposals of extending a welfare indicator – namely, the HDI – with sustainability considerations without full integration of both concepts. All of these proposals suffer from a range of fundamental conceptual problems. As one possible alternative, he proposes a combination of the HDI and GS, which holds great promise for an assessment of well-being and its sustainability, particularly in developing countries.

Chapter 9, by Ruut Veenhoven, looks at measures of subjective well-being. It addresses three questions: What are 'subjective' measures?; What is 'well-being'?; Are subjective measures of well-being of use for policy making, in particular in developing nations? The first question is answered by making a distinction between two kinds of 'subjectivity': subjective substance and subjective assessment. On that basis, nine types of indicators are discerned, varying in degree of subjectivity. The second question is answered by discerning four kinds of well-being. Examples are presented of indicators for each of these well-being variants. It is argued that there is little sense in combining these variants in one sum score of overall well-being, since this is the equivalent of adding apples and oranges. The much-used HDI is questioned on these grounds. In answer to the third question, a case is made for subjective measures of well-being, in particular for using 'happy life years' as an indicator of final policy effectiveness.

Chapter 10, by Sarah White and Jethro Pettit, considers the use of participatory methods in international development research, and asks what contribution they can make to the definition and, in particular, measurement of well-being. It draws on general lessons arising from the project level, two large-scale policy research processes sponsored by the World Bank, and the experience of quality of life studies. It also considers emerging experiments with using participatory methods to generate quantitative data. The chapter closes by assessing the future trajectory of participatory approaches in well-being research, and reflects on some dilemmas regarding the use of participatory data on well-being in the policy making process.

Well-being concepts and measures: looking ahead

A number of conclusions emerge from the body of this volume. Each is clearly articulated in the chapters that follow, but it is useful at this early stage to briefly mention some of them, together with some additional comments.

With regard to well-being conceptualizations, it is evident that there are many well-being concepts and conceptualizations. The relevant literature is both diverse and rich. One wonders whether some degree of consolidation is possible; in particular, looking for commonality in the various well-being dimensions that have been proposed. Ideally, this might provide some sort of overall, definitive multidimensional well-being concept. A particular line of enquiry is how one might combine subjective and objective well-being measures or whether, indeed, this is at all appropriate. Conceptual work is required on how this might be done, but consideration could be given to augmenting composite indexes, containing objective measures, with a subjective measure or measures, such as a self-assessed happiness rating. One such augmentation might be to interact the two types of measures in some way, on the premise that achievement in objective well-being is conditional on happiness and *vice versa*.

A recurring theme throughout this volume concerns the availability and quality of national well-being data. International price level data, permitting comparisons of incomes across countries, need to be improved; in particular, data on social indicators. Not only do data on the commonly used social indicators (such as life expectancy, adult literacy, and infant mortality) need to be made more precise, but the country coverage of other such indicators needs to be expanded. This might perhaps allow for the inclusion of additional dimensions into indices such as the HDI without significantly compromising country coverage. Data on subjective well-being also need to be improved.

In addition to improving the precision of data, recent advances in statistics could be used to assign standard errors to social indicators and degrees of confidence in comparisons of inter-country well-being achievement. Confidence degrees could also be assigned in judging whether countries have achieved particular targets or benchmarks. This has obvious relevance to the MDGs. Can we be certain that a given country has achieved the MDGs? It could be the case that some countries might be judged to have achieved the MDGs, when in reality they have not. The opposite also applies. Assigning degrees of confidence to the MDG target variables would at least allow for more informed answers to the preceding question. More precise data would also, quite obviously, allow for more efficient monitoring of progress towards the MDGs. A case for assigning standard errors and degrees of confidence in inter-country comparisons can of course be made for most well-being indicators.

It is often said that we live in an increasingly insecure world. It is also said that individuals are becoming increasingly sensitive to their own personal security. Irrespective of whether these claims have empirical support, it is clear that individuals do place a high value on personal security and that this security would appear to be a universal human value. If we accept these points, then there is a strong, indeed compelling, case for including a human security vector in well-being indexes. An obvious candidate for this treatment is the HDI. Better data on human security are required. Just as importantly, consideration needs to be given to the conceptual issue of how one might augment an index like the HDI. Should a vector of human security variables simply be added to the index, with an appropriate weighting? Should this vector interact with one or more of the vectors already included? Or should it enter some other way? One might be able to argue that a given threshold level of security exists. Below that level, well-being increases only slightly with increases in the variables capturing the other well-being dimensions; above that level, well-being increases by a greater margin in response to increases in those variables. Other possibilities will, of course, exist and it is up to both the research and practitioner communities to consider all viable alternatives.

The topics covered in this volume provide a good illustration of the range of current research on national well-being achievements, in particular its

measurement. It is hoped that the chapters that follow will stimulate further research along similar lines. Just as importantly, or perhaps more so, it is hoped that they better inform the agencies that compile and disseminate well-being achievement statistics and the policy makers and others who base decisions on them.

Notes

The author is grateful for the excellent and comprehensive comments on an earlier draft of this chapter provided by three anonymous referees. The usual disclaimer applies.

- 1 Alkire (2002) provides an excellent survey of research on well-being (human development) dimensions and discussion of related issues.
- 2 See Qizilbash (1996a) for an excellent survey of related material. Alkire (2002) provides a succinct, more detailed coverage of this issue.
- 3 Anand and Sen (2000a) provide an excellent discussion of conceptual and measurement issues in relation to the use of income per capita as a human development measure, including inter alia formulations which reflect diminishing marginal returns to the conversion of income into human development or well-being.
- 4 See Lambert (2001) for an incisive treatment of such indexes.
- 5 It should be noted that GNP is a composite measure, in the sense that it is obtained by aggregating values of all goods and services purchased in an economy over a given period of time. Similar comments can be made of GDP per capita and many other well-being measures. The term 'composite measure' in the context of this volume refers to an indicator that has been obtained by combining measures of achievement in different well-being dimensions.
- 6 The HDI has generated a large academic literature. Among the reviews of the index are: Kelley (1991), McGillivray and White (1993), Acharya and Wall (1994), Ivanova *et al.* (1998), Noorbakhsh (1998), Sagar and Najam (1998), and Morse (2003). Anand and Sen (1992) and UNDP (1993) provide a survey of a number of early reviews.
- 7 See Saith and Harriss-White (1999) for an analysis of the gender sensitivity of well-being indicators, Bardhan and Klasen (1999) for a review of the GDI and GEM, and Pillarisetti and McGillivray (1998) for a review of the GEM.
- 8 Interestingly, the GDI defines equality in life expectancy as males having an expectancy five years lower than that of females (UNDP 1995).
- 9 The GPI is also known and the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW). See Neumayer (1999) for a review.
- 10 This should not imply that research on subjective well-being is new. As Easterlin (2001) observes, the bibliographic survey of Veenhoven (1993) contains approximately 2,500 references, and the measurement and analysis of various notions of subjective well-being in the social sciences has a history dating back 50 years. It does, however, imply that in recent years the amount of research on happiness has increased very substantially.
- 11 WHOQOL (1998) reports quality of life assessments for 15 urban centres. Ignoring sampling errors, Beer Sheva and Melbourne have the highest assessments (14.8 and 14.7, respectively), while St Petersburg and Harare have the lowest (11.5 and 11.3, respectively). Other assessments include those for New Delhi, Paris and Tokyo, which were 13.3, 13.6 and 14.0, respectively.

- 12 This was the central premise of the lead paper in a broadly similar publication to this current volume, published in 1969 as a special issue of the *Journal of Development Studies*. That paper was entitled 'What are we Trying to Measure?', Seers (1972).

References

- Acharya, A. and H. J. Wall (1994) 'An Evaluation of the United Nations' Human Development Index', *Journal of Economic and Social Development*, 20(1): 51–65.
- Ahluwalia, M. and H. Chenery (1974) 'The Economic Framework', in H. Chenery, M. S. Ahluwalia, C. L. G. Bell, J. H. Duloy and R. Jolly (eds), *Redistribution with Growth* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Alkire, S. (2002) 'Dimensions of Human Development', *World Development*, 30(2): 181–205.
- Allardt, E. (1993), 'Having, Loving, Being: An Alternative to the Swedish Model of Welfare Research', in M. Nussbaum and A. Sen (eds), *The Quality of Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press for UNU-WIDER) 88–94.
- Anand, S. and A. Sen (1992) 'Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement', Background Paper for *Human Development Report 1993* (New York: UNDP).
- Anand, S. and A. Sen (2000a) 'The Income Component of the Human Development Index', *Journal of Human Development*, 1(1): 83–106.
- Anand, S. and A. Sen (2000b) 'Human Development and Economic Sustainability', *World Development*, 28(12): 2029–49.
- Andrews, F. M. and S. B. Withey (1976) *Social Indicators of Well-being: Americans' Perceptions of Life Quality* (New York: Plenum Press).
- Argyle, M. (1987) *The Psychology of Happiness* (London: Routledge).
- Bardhan, K. and S. Klasen (1999) 'UNDP's Gender-Related Indices: A Critical Review', *World Development*, 27(6): 985–1010.
- Blackwood, D. L. and R. G. Lynch (1994) 'The Measurement of Inequality and Poverty: A Policy Makers Guide to the Literature', *World Development*, 22(4): 567–78.
- Campbell, A., P. E. Converse and W. L. Rodgers (1976) *The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations and Satisfactions* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation).
- Chambers, R. (1994) 'The Origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal', *World Development*, 22: 953–69.
- Clark, C. (1940) *Conditions of Economic Progress* (London: Macmillan).
- Cummins, R. A. (1996) 'Domains of Life Satisfaction: An Attempt to Order Chaos', *Social Indicators Research*, 38(3): 303–28.
- Cummins, R. A. (1998) 'The Second Approximation to an International Standard of Life Satisfaction', *Social Indicators Research*, 43: 307–34.
- Cummins, R. A., R. Eckersley, J. Pallant, J. van Vugt and R. Misajon (2003) 'Developing an Index of Subjective Well-being: The Australian Unity Well-being Index', *Social Indicators Research*, 64: 159–90.
- Daly, H. and H. E. Cobb (1989) *For the Common Good* (Boston: Beacon Press).
- Dasgupta, P. (2001) *Human Well-being and the Natural Environment* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Diener, E. (1984) 'Subjective Well-being', *Psychological Bulletin*, 95: 542–75.
- Diener, E. and R. J. Larsen (1993) 'The Experience of Emotional Well-being', in M. Lewis and J. M. Haviland (eds), *Handbook of Emotions* (New York: Guilford).
- Doyal, L. and I. Gough (1991) *A Theory of Human Need* (Basingstoke: Macmillan).

- Doyal, L. and I. Gough (1993) 'Need Satisfaction as a Measure of Human Welfare', in W. Blass and J. Foster (eds), *Mixed Economies in Europe* (London: Edward Elgar).
- Easterlin, R. A. (1974) 'Does Economic Growth Improve the Human Lot? Some Empirical Evidence', in P. A. David and M. W. Reder (eds), *Nations and Households in Economic Growth. Essays in Honour of Moses Abramovitz* (New York: Academic Press).
- Easterlin, R. A. (2001) 'Income and Happiness: Towards a Unified Theory', *Economic Journal*, 111(473): 465–84.
- Eid, M. and E. Diener (2003) 'Global Judgements of Subjective Well-being: Situational Variability and Long-term Stability', *Social Indicators Research*, 65: 245–77.
- Finnis, J. (1980) *Natural Law and Natural Rights* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Foster, J., J. Greer and E. Thorbecke (1984) 'A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures', *Econometrica*, 52: 761–6.
- Galtung, J. (1994) *Human Rights in Another Key* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Gaspar, D. (2002) 'Is Sen's Capability Approach an Adequate Basis for Considering Human Development?', *Review of Political Economy*, 14(4): 435–61.
- Gaspar, D. (2004) 'Human Well-being: Concepts and Conceptualizations', WIDER Discussion Paper 2004/06 (Helsinki: UNU-WIDER).
- Grisez, G., J. Boyle and J. Finnis (1987) 'Practical Principles, Moral Truth and Ultimate Ends', *American Journal of Jurisprudence*, 32: 99–151.
- Hanmer, L., G. Pyatt and H. White (1997) *Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa: What Can we Learn from the World Bank's Poverty Assessments* (The Hague: Institute of Social Studies Advisory Service).
- Hicks, N. and P. Streeten (1979) 'Indicators of Development: The Search for a Basic Needs Yardstick', *World Development*, 7: 567–80.
- Ivanova, I., F. J. Arcelus and G. Srinivasan (1998) 'An Assessment of the Measurement Properties of the Human Development Index', *Social Indicators Research*, 46: 157–79.
- Kelley, A. C. (1991) 'The Human Development Index: "Handle with Care"', *Population and Development Review*, 17(2): 315–24.
- Laderchi, C. R. (2001) 'Participatory Methods in the Analysis of Poverty: A Critical Review', QEH Working Paper Series 62 (Oxford: Queen Elizabeth House).
- Lambert, P. J. (2001) *The Distribution and Redistribution of Income* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press).
- Lasswell, H. D. (1992) *Jurisprudence for a Free Society: Studies in Law, Science and Policy* (New Haven: New Haven Press).
- Max-Neef, M. (1993) *Human Scale Development: Conception, Application, and Further Reflections* (London: Apex Press).
- McGillivray, M. (2005) 'Measuring non-Economic Well-being Achievement', *Review of Income and Wealth*, 51(2): 337–64.
- McGillivray, M. and R. Pillarissetti (2006) 'Adjusting Well-being Indicators for Gender Disparities. Empirically Insightful?', in M. McGillivray and M. Clarke (eds), *Understanding Human Well-being* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press for UNU-WIDER).
- McGillivray, M. and H. White (1993) 'Measuring Development? The UNDP's Human Development Index', *Journal of International Development*, 5(2): 183–92.
- Morris, M. D. (1979) *Measuring the Conditions of the World's Poor: The Physical Quality of Life Index* (New York: Pergamon).
- Morse, S. (2003) 'For Better or for Worse, till the Human Development Index do us Part?', *Ecological Economics*, 45(2): 281–96.
- Narayan, D., R. Chambers, M. K. Shah and P. Petesch (2000) *Voices of the Poor: Crying out for Change* (New York: Oxford University Press for the World Bank).

- Neumayer, E. (1999) 'The ISEW: Not an Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare', *Social Indicators Research*, 48: 77–101.
- Neumayer, E. (2001) 'The Human Development Index and Sustainability – A Constructive Proposal', *Ecological Economics*, 39(1): 101–14.
- Noorbakhsh, F. (1998) 'A Modified Human Development Index', *World Development*, 26(3): 517–28.
- Nordhaus, W. and J. Tobin (1972) 'Is Growth Obsolete?', *Economic Growth* (New York: NBER and Columbia University Press).
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2000) *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Pillarsetti, J. R. and M. McGillivray (1998) 'Human Development and Gender Empowerment: Conceptual and Measurement Issues', *Development Policy Review*, 16(2): 197–203.
- Qizilbash, M. (1996a) 'Capabilities, Well-being and Human Development: A Survey', *Journal of Development Studies*, 33(2): 143–62.
- Qizilbash, M. (1996b) 'Ethical Development', *World Development*, 24(7): 1209–21.
- Ramsay, M. (1992) *Human Needs and the Market* (Aldershot: Avebury).
- Rawls, J. (1993) *Political Liberalism* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Sagar, A. and A. Najam (1998) 'The Human Development Index: A Critical Review', *Ecological Economics*, 25: 249–64.
- Saith, R. and B. Harriss-White (1999) 'The Gender Sensitivity of Well-being Indicators', *Development and Change*, 30(3): 465–97.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994) 'Are there Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human Values?', *Journal of Social Issues*, 50(4): 19–45.
- Seers, D. (1972) 'What are we Trying to Measure?', *Journal of Development Studies*, 8(3): 21–36.
- Sen, A. K. (1976) 'Poverty: An Ordinal Approach to Measurement', *Econometrica*, 44: 219–13.
- Sen, A. K. (1982) *Choice, Welfare and Measurement* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- Sen, A. K. (1985) *Commodities and Capabilities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Sen, A. K. (1993) 'Capability and Well-being', in M. Nussbaum and A. Sen (eds), *The Quality of Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press for UNU-WIDER).
- Sen, A. K. (1999) *Development as Freedom* (New York: Knopf).
- Shorrocks, A. F. (1983) 'Ranking Income Distributions', *Economica*, 50: 3–17.
- Skevington, S. M, M. Lotfy and K. A. O'Connell (2004) 'The World Health Organization's WHOQOL-BREF Quality of Life Assessment: Psychometric Properties and Results of the International Field Trial. A Report from the WHOQOL Group', *Quality of Life Research*, 23(2): 299–310.
- Stewart, F. (1985) *Basic Needs in Developing Countries* (Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Travers, P. and S. Richardson (1997) 'Material Well-Being and Human Well-Being', in F. Ackerman, D. Kiron, N. R. Goodwin, J. M. Harris and K. Gallagher (eds), *Human Well-Being and Economic Goals* (Washington DC: Island Press).
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1990–2004) *Human Development Report* (New York: Oxford University Press for UNDP).
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2003) *Latvia Human Development Report 2002/2003* (Riga: UNDP).
- UN Millennium Project Report (2005) *Investing in Development: A Practical Plan for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals* (New York: UNDP).

- Veenhoven, R. (1993) *Happiness in Nations. Subjective Appreciation of Life in 56 Nations, 1946–1992* (Rotterdam: Erasmus University).
- Veenhoven, R. (2004) *World Happiness Database*, www.eur.nl/fsw/research/happiness
- WHOQOL Group (1994) 'Development of the WHOQOL: Rationale and Current Status', *International Journal of Mental Health*, 23: 24–56.
- WHOQOL Group (1998) 'The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment (WHOQOL): Development and General Psychometric Properties', *Social Science and Medicine*, 46: 551–8.
- World Bank (1969–2004) *World Bank Atlas* (Washington, DC: World Bank).
- World Bank (1977–2004) *World Development Report* (New York: Oxford University Press for the World Bank).
- Zolotas, X. (1981) *Economic Growth and Declining Social Welfare* (New York: New York University Press).

Index

Notes: f = figure; n = note; t = table; **bold** = extended discussion or heading emphasized in main text.

-
- Abeysekera, S. 264(n14), 266
abortion (sex-selective) 168, 181,
183–4, 186(n2–3)
Abraham, K. G. 74, 86
absenteeism 224
Abul Naga, R. M. 103, 109
accidents 195, 225
Acharya, A. 18(n6), 114, 131
achievement 52, 54t
adaptive preferences 35, 60(n13)
Addison, T. ix
Adivasi 264(n15)
adjusted savings (World Bank) 201,
210(n5)
'advantage' 41, 53
affiliation (Nussbaum) 47t, 56
Afghanistan 169t
Afriat, S. N. 81, 86
Afriat index 83f, 83, 84f, 85t, 85,
86(n3)
'true welfare measure' 82, 84f
Africa 97, 98, 180, 207
'Africa Poverty Status Report'
(1999) 96
African Gender Status Index (ECA) 177
age 67, 102, 103, 145, 188(n24),
245, 257
agencies 1, 18, 160, 230
agency 15
autonomy of 4, 35
female 10
gender gaps 189(n30)
'key characteristic' of social exclusion
(Atkinson) 89
agency achievement (AA, Sen) 43t, 53t,
53, 187(n16)
agency freedom (AF, Sen), 53t, 187(n16)
agency versus well-being (Sen) **174–6**,
187–8(n16–19)
aggregate headcount 153
aggregate under-nutrition
'very responsive to income gains' **104**
aggregation 37, 38, 58, 82, 139, **145**, 155
limits **235**
properties of poverty indexes **147–8**
specific poverty indexes **148–50**
aggregation, disparities, dynamics
103–6, 109(n13–15)
aggregate and individual level data
103–4, 109(n13–14)
chronic poverty and income dynamics
105–6
disparities 104–5, 109(n15)
agriculture 115, 199, 247t
'peasant farming' 65
Ahluwalia, M. 6
aid 2, 51, 58, 207, 263(n5), 264(n16)
Aigner, D. J. 140, 161
air 195, 199
Akmal, M. 79, 86, 86(n2)
Albania 205t
alcohol 6, 225
alcoholism 26, 31, 34, 176, 187(n13),
224, 264(n15)
Alderman, H. 190
Algeria 169t, 205t
Alkire, S. 4, 13, 18(n1–2), 23, 55,
61(n19), 61, 131
synthesis for project management
57, 58, 61(n21)
Allardt, E. 4, 227–8, 237(n4), 237
Allen quantity index 80–1
Anand, S. 18(n6), 91, 102, 109, 116, 117,
121, 125, 127–8, 131, 136, 139, 144,
159, 161n, 161, 207, 210(n4), 210
ethical universalism 130(n3)
use of income per capita as human
development measure 18(n3)
well-being (notions of
sustainability) 10

- Andrews, F. M. 4, 214, 224, 237
 Angola 73f, 206t
 anthropology 40t
 anthropometry 99, 103, 104, 173
 Antigua and Barbuda 204t
 'appropriate imprecision' 244
 Arab States 154–5
 Arcelus, F. J. 20, 132
 Argentina 84f, 203t
 Aristotelian standpoint/tradition 24,
 25, 26, 55
 Aristotle 6
 Arivazhagan, A. 161n
 Armenia 204t
 Arrow, K. J., *et al.* (2003) 207, 210
 Dasgupta, P. 207, 210
 Mäler, K-G. 207, 210
 Asheim, G. B. 207, 210
 Asia 98, 235
 Asia barometer 235, 237
 Asian Development Bank 264(n16)
 aspirations 11, 58, 90, 234, 236
 assets 38, 48t, 247t, 248t, 249
 environmental (depreciation) 10
 Atkinson, A. B. 92, 100, 101, 108, 110,
 136, 140, 149, 151, 153, 161n, 161,
 188(n20), 189
 'constant elasticity of marginal
 utility' 141
 'equally distributed equivalent
 achievement' 177–8, 188(n20)
 'equally distributed equivalent
 income' 150
 'ethical' measure of inequality 141,
 144, 159
 three key characteristics of social
 exclusion 89
 Atkinson, G. 196, 210
 Atkinson formulation 121
 attitudinal matters 231–2
 Australia 12, 65, 68t, 69f, 195, 200,
 203t
 Austria 68t, 84f, 195, 203t
 autonomy 4, 38, 42t, 45t, 47t, 56,
 60(n8), 230
 Azerbaijan 205t

 Bahamas 203t
 Bahrain 74f, 203t
 Bailey, M. A. 63

 Balassa, B. 75, 78, 86
 Balassa–Samuelson result 78
 Balamoune-Lutz, M. ix
 Bangalore 264(n15)
 Bangladesh 27, 28, 73f, 169t, 183t,
 188(n23), 206t, 207, 263(n4)
 Barahona, C. 252, 255, 264(n14), 264
 Barbados 203t
 Bardhan, K. 18(n7), 182–5, 188(n20,
 n26), 189(n29–30, 32), 189
 bargaining power 184, 189(n30)
 Barro, R. 110, 170n, 189
 'unreliable data' used 109(n5)
 basic needs 4, 7, 38, 56, 57, 88, 90–1,
 130(n1), 155
 'minimum needs' 146–7
 'needs' 42t
 'needs theory' 37–8
 basic human values approach (Grisez
 et al.) 4
 Basu, K. 152, 153, 161–2
 Basu, K., *et al.* (2002) 188(n23), 190
 Narayan, A. 190
 Ravallion, M. 190
 Baulch, B. 42–8t, 60(n17), 61, 105, 110
 human development (focus and
 assumptions) 42–8t
 poverty concepts 38
 Becker, G. 173, 175, 188(n19), 190
 Beer Sheva 18(n11)
 behaviour 187(n13), 216, 222
 deviant 225
 job-satisfaction indicators 224
 behavioural science 24, 25
 Behrman, J. 99, 103, 109(n8), 110
 be-ing 57
 being
 prerequisite for well-being 27
 terminology 25
 'being irreplaceable' 227, 227f, 228
 'being reassured' 26
 Belarus 204t
 Belgium 68t, 69, 69f, 84f, 203t
 Belize 73f, 204t
 Benin 96, 206t
 Berger-Schmitt, R. 90, 110
 Bhutan 206t, 237(n6)
 bias 243, 246, 257
 cultural 233
 Bidani, B. 94, 104, 110

- binary classifications 148
 binary relations 138, 139
 biodiversity loss 201
 biological differences 170, 171, 173
 biologists 217, 218
 Bird, B. 266
 Birdsall, N. 111
 births 106
 Biswas-Diener, R. 62
 black market 13
 black workers 27
 Blackorby, C. 140, 150, 162
 Blackwood, D. L. 145, 146, 162
 Body Mass Indexes 99
 body size 104, 173
 Bolivia 84f, 205t
 Borda rule 143
 Botswana 74f, 74, 84f, 183t, 205t
 Bourguignon, F. 92, 110, 151, 153, 162
 Bowlby, J. 61
 attachment theory 56
 Boyle, J. 20
 brain function 33t
 Brandt, R. 61
 theory of the good 60(n11)
 Brazil 84f, 104, 204t
 Brent, R. J. 154, 162
 Brighton: International HIV/AIDS
 Alliance 264(n14)
 Brock, K. 248, 260, 261, 263(n9),
 265, 266
 Brunei Darussalam 203t
 Bruno, M., *et al.* (1996) 102, 110
 Ravallion, M. 110
 Squire, L. 110
 Bruton, G. 82, 86
 Bulgaria 204t
 Burkina Faso 206t
 Burundi 206t
- Cahill, M. 114, 122, 130(n11), 131
 calorie intake 7, 98–9, 109(n8), 115, 146
 Cambodia 205t
 Cameroon 84f, 205t
 Camfield, L. 29, 33–4, 56, 61, 263n
 Camp, S. L. 131
 Campbell, A., *et al.* (1975/6) 11–12, 19,
 214, 237
 Converse, P. E. 19, 237
 Rodgers, W. L. 19, 237
- Canada 68t, 69, 69f, 84f, 203t
 capabilities approach (Sen) 4, 10, 13,
 14, 32, 40t, 45t, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57,
 102, 103, 115, 116, 117, 128, 136,
 172, 173, 175, 181, 186, 187(n12,
 n16), 218, 220, 229
 comprehensive 222
 criticism 91
 mental and physical 221
 reckoning of disparity 158
 capability expansion 3
 Capability Failure Ratio (Majumdar and
 Subramanian) 156
 capability to function 160
 capability poverty (Sen) 39, 42t
 Capability Poverty Measure 113, 156
 Cape Verde 205t
 capital
 all forms (investment minus
 depreciation) 201
 broadening of concept 195
 capital depreciation 86(n1)
 capital flows 78
 capital investment 196
 capital stock 208
 per capita 207
 total 197
 carbon dioxide emissions 94t, 196,
 197, 199, 200, 202
 care work 171, 182, 184
 carers 27, 60(n8)
 Caribbean countries 73, 170t
 caste 34, 159
 Castles, I. 69, 86
 Cavendish, W. 265
 censuses 8, 182
 Central African Republic 206t
 Central Asia 170t
 central banks 66
 central human capabilities approach
 (Nussbaum) 4, 13
 Chad 206t
 Chakraborty, A. 59n
 Chakravarty, S. R. 153, 162
 set of indexes (1983) 150
 Chakravarty, S. R., *et al.* (2002) 153, 162
 Kanbur, R. 162
 Mukherjee, D. 162
 challenge 230
 Chamberlain, K. 223, 237

- Chambers, R. 12, 20, 34, 262n, 263(n6, n9), 264(n15–16), 265, 266
- Chamie, J. 110
 data on life expectancy 'weak' 97–8
- Chattopadhyay, R. 190
- Chen, L. C. 168, 190
- Chenery, H. 6
- Chiappori, P.-A. 188(n22), 190
- child-care 66
- child health 105
- child labour 160, 188(n24)
- child mortality 103, 117, 128
 data coverage (1990–95) 95t
 reduction (MDG) 93t
- child survival rates 91
- childhood 176
- children 32, 36, 49, 93t, 172, 173, 174, 175, 180, 187(n11, n18)
 additional 179
 anthropometry 104
 data comparability (problems) 97
 health status 99
 malnutrition (adult outcomes) 103, 105
 orphaned 247t
 'rarely used as unit of analysis' 105
 under-five (under-nourished) 156
- Chile 84f, 195, 202, 203t
- China 29, 79, 100, 154, 158, 167, 168, 181, 205t, 207, 264(n17)
 missing women (because of sex-selective abortion) 169t
 rural 255
- chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) 94t, 199
- choice 30, 32, 37, 39, 40t, 50, 51, 54, 56, 89
- Chow test 71, 72n
- Chowdhury, M. 111
- chronic poverty 90
- churches 194
- Cigno, A., *et al.* (2003) 188(n24), 190
 Rosati, F. 190
 Tzannatos, Z. 190
- citizenship 34, 223
- civil liberties 7, 42t, 45t, 48t, 50, 51, 106, 107
- civil society 1, 158
- Clark, C. 6
- Clark, D. 59n, 60(n13), 61
- Clark, S., *et al.* (1981) 150, 162
 Hemming, R. 150, 162
 Ulph, D. 150, 162
- Clarke, M. ix
 class 231, 264(n18)
 'middle class' 214
- climate 65, 200
- clothing 172, 178, 179, 184, 247t
- Coale, A. 173, 190
- Cobb, C. W. 196, 210
- Cobb, J. B. 60(n18), 61, 196, 210
- Colombia 84f, 204t
- Combined Consumption Level Index 114
- Combined Quality of Life Indexes (CQLI) 113, 117, 128
- 'Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Development Research' (conference, Swansea, 2002) 264(n14)
- Commission of the European Communities (CEC) 76, 87
- Commission of European Communities – Eurostat, *et al.* (1993) 210(n1), 210
 IMF 210
 OECD 210
 UN 210
 World Bank 210
- commitment 54t, 55
- commodities 40t, 53, 54, 58, 91
- 'common homothetic preferences' (hypothesis) 82
- common tastes hypothesis 78, 82
- common utility function 78, 80
- communists 29
- community 105, 172, 244, 263(n7)
 forging of 257
 'indeed a myth' 257
- commuting 27, 60(n18), 195
- Comoros 206t
- competence 45t, 56
- competition 76
- competitive spirit 57
- composite indexes
 component choice 114
 component transformations 114
 core issue 127
 country rankings 117, 119, 122, 123, 128, 130(n12)

- country-level 113
 cross-country comparability 117, 128
 design 128
 human well-being (past, present future) 14, 113–34
 mean and standard deviation of re-scaled variables 119, 119t
 means and ends 117
 non-economic well-being indicators 117
 scaling and weighting problems 70
 treatment of income 114
 computers 75
 Comte-Sponville, A. 25, 61
 congestion 6, 195
 Congo (Congo-Brazzaville) 206t
 Congo Democratic Republic (Congo-Kinshasa) 206t
 constitutions, legal (Nussbaum) 55, 58
 ‘Consultations with Poor’ 263(n1)
 consumer durables 6, 195, 248t
 ‘durable goods’ 179
 service value 196
 consumer price index (USA) 74
 consumer theory (Marshallian) 91
 consumers 74, 76, 77
 purchasing power 75
 consumption 26, 28, 34, 39, 40t, 45t, 46t, 47t, 50, 80, 91, 98, 99, 104, 180–1, 189(n30)
 domestic 75
 EKS index 85
 ‘excessive’ 201
 household 184, 189(n30)
 medical 233
 personal expenditure 195
 pressures-on-environment threshold 199
 private 38
 satisfaction from 35
 consumption expenditure 39, 159
 consumption goods 184
 consumption poverty 180
 continuity axiom 139, 143t, 147
 contraception 93t, 95t
 contract theory 49
 Converse, P. E. 19, 237
 Cooke, B. 256, 265
 Cork: IARIW (International Association for Research in Income and Wealth) conference 186
 Cornell 264(n13)
 Cornwall, A. 244, 256, 263(n6), 264(n17), 265
 correlation coefficients 126, 130(n11)
 correlations and weights
 composite indexes 114, 121–7, 130–1(n6–14)
 zero- and rank-order coefficients 123
see also weighting/weights
 corruption 106
 cost of living 74–5, 220
 cost–benefit analysis 50, 52, 91
 Costa Rica 73, 74f, 154, 158, 203t
 Côte d’Ivoire 73f, 84f, 206t
 Coudouel, A., *et al.* (2001) 42–8t, 61
 Hentschel, J. 61
 Wodon, Q. 61
 countries/nations viii, 221, 229
 former Communist 59(n5)
 high human development 117, 123, 124t, 128, 202, 203–4t
 low human development 98, 117, 123, 124t, 128, 202, 206t
 medium human development 117, 123, 124t, 128, 204–5t
 rich and populous 79
 Country Poverty-Alleviation Method (China) 264(n16)
 Cowell, F. A. 101, 110, 143, 162
 Crafts, N. 196, 210
 crime/criminality 6, 105, 195, 225
 data availability 100
 Crisp, R. 31, 37, 61
 Croatia 204t
 Csikszentihalyi, M. 24, 64
 Cuba 204t
 cultural studies 40t
 cultural transmission 48t
 culture 248, 249, 253, 254, 262
 Culyer, A. J. 26, 40t, 61
 Cummins, R., *et al.* (2002) 35, 61
 Gullone, E. 61
 Lau, A. 61
 Cummins, R. A. 11, 211, 237, 266
 domains of subjective well-being approach 4

- cumulative density function 136
 currency 74, 76
 Cyprus 203t
 Czech Republic 84f, 203t
- D'Onofrio, C. 63
 D'Souza, S. 168, 190
 Dahme, K., *et al.* (1998) 199, 200–1, 210
 Hinterberger, F. 210
 Schütz, H. 210
 Seifert, E. K. 210
- Dalits
 'having to drink out of separate glasses' 264(n15)
 'made to carry dead bodies or dead animals' 264(n15)
- Dalton, H. 140, 162
 Daly, H. 60(n18), 61
 Das, V. 259, 265
 Dasgupta, P. S. 23, 41, 56, 58, 59(n2–3), 62, 103, 107, 110, 116, 131, 136, 146, 154, 162, 202, 207, 210(n5), 210
 basic needs approach 91
 'cultural divide' 39
 human development (focus and assumptions) 42–8t
 'input' and 'output' measures of well-being 90–1
 specification of well-being 13
 technically superior substitutes for GNP 49–51
- Dasgupta, P. S., *et al.* (1973) 144, 162
 Sen, A. 162
 Starrett, D. 162
- data 2, 92, 155, 254, 258
 aggregate 108
 cross-sectional 105
 international comparisons 108
 macro-level 261
 microeconomic 99
 needed for targeting purposes 108
 numerical versus non-numerical (Kanbur) 254, 255t, 260
 panel 105–6
 qualitative 249, 263(n9)
 quantitative 16, 251, 252, 255
 robustness tests 101
 socioeconomic 107
- data analysis
 micro-economic approach 107–8
- data collection 107, 255
 efforts to improve quality 99–101, 109(n10–11)
- data deficiencies/limitations 8, 13, 14–15, 17, 88, 92, 94–101, 105, 109(n5–11), 148, 159, 184, 186, 189(n30–1)
- comparability problems 97, 108
 comparative research 94, 95–7
 disaggregation required 104
 education 99, 109(n9)
 environmental degradation 201–2
 GEM 189(n34)
 gender inequality across space and time 168
 gender-related indicators of well-being 181–2, 188(n27)
 Genuine Savings (GS) 207, 208, 209
 greater transparency required 101, 108
 health and demography 97–9, 109(n7–8)
 hours of work (ILO) 70
 measurement errors 101
 methods to counter 101
 national income accounting 65–6, 67
 pollution 199
 SWB (developing countries) 235–6
 variations in sampling and information collected 97, 101
- Datt, G. 153, 162, 168, 191
 Davies, J., *et al.* (1999) 252, 265
 Cavendish, W. 265
 Richards, M. 265
- Dayal, P. 111
- De la Vega, M. C. L. 211
 environmental behaviour indicator (EBI, De la Vega and Urrutia) 199, 200
- Dean, H. 35, 62
- death 106, 226
 see also quality of death
- Deaton, A. 179, 190
- debt relief 109(n2)
- Deci, E. L. 26, 56, 59(n1), 64
 human development (focus and assumptions) 42–8t
- decision-makers 12

- decision-making
 intra-household 179, 182,
 188(n22)
- decomposability axiom 140, 143t,
 143, 148
- defence expenditure 6
- 'defensive expenditures' 60(n18)
- demand management (Keynesian
 short-run) 66
- democracy 107, 232, 234, 240, 241
 protective power 106
- demographic data 97–9, 109(n7–8)
- demographic transition 160
- Denmark 68t, 69f, 74f, 84f, 203t
- Denmark: Royal Ministry of Foreign
 Affairs ix
- density function 136
- Deolalikar, A. 103, 109(n8), 110
- deprivation 14, 34, 60(n17), 128,
 146–7, 241, 249, 262
 'adjusted' measures 158–9
 aggregate 158, 159
 'Benthamite' rule 159
 cross-country distribution 159
 generalized indicators 155–6, 158
 group-specific 158
 inter-group disparity 158–9
 multidimensional indicators 92
 multidimensional measurement 153
 reckoning inter-group disparities
 158–9
- deprivation and disparity: more
 inclusive approach 136, 154–60
 comparisons (inter- and intra-country)
 154
 generalized well-being/deprivation
 indicators 155–6
 Human Poverty Index 156–8
 orientation, policy, data 159–60
 reckoning inter-group disparities
 158–9
 well-being (expanded interpretation)
 159–60
 well-being beyond income 154–5
- deprived people
 present and future generations 207
- Desai, M. 211
 'index of intensity of environmental
 exploitation' 199, 200
- descriptive inequality index 140
- desire theories 30–1, 60(n9)
 libertarian stream 30–1, 32
- desire-fulfilment 39, 40t, 42t, 43t, 56
- despair 225
- developed countries 89, 106, 207, 209,
 233, 235
 approximate synonyms: 'advanced
 nations' 227; 'affluent countries'
 28; 'high-income countries' 46t,
 69; 'industrial countries' 117,
 120, 177; 'OECD countries' 5,
 67, 68t, 69f; 'rich countries' 50,
 60(n18), 85, 189(n29, n34), 195,
 207–8, 231; 'richer countries' 66,
 71, 72–3, 101, 185; 'richest
 countries' 71, 73
 general: gender gaps 185;
 resource-importing 208
- Développement et Insertion Internationale*
 (DIAL) 111
- developing countries 13, 15, 16, 89–90,
 92, 94, 96, 105, 106, 117, 168, 180,
 185, 207, 208, 209, 227
 approximate synonyms:
 'less-developed countries (LDCs)'
 97, 98, 103; 'low-income
 countries' 27, 46t, 49, 102;
 'lower income countries' 41;
 'lower-middle-income countries'
 102; 'middle-income countries'
 28; 'poor countries' 28, 50, 73,
 73f, 107, 109(n2), 208, 231;
 'poorer countries' 36, 70, 72–3,
 83, 85; 'poorest countries' 71
 general: data gaps 95;
 microeconomic data sets
 99–100; mortality rates 103;
 relative income (biased
 comparisons) 75; use of
 subjective measures of well-being
 235–6, 237(n6)
- development 38
 economic growth models 262
 international 240–1, 243
- development agencies 250
- development economists 89, 108
- development organizations 246
- development plans 127
- development policy 257
- development programmes 254

- development research 244, 264(n14)
 developmental psychology 29
 DHS (demographic and health survey)
 methodology 96
 Diener, E. 12, 28, 29, 33, 62, 63, 128, 132
 human development (focus and
 assumptions) 42–8t
 diet 36, 146
 dignity 38, 40t, 42t, 43t, 47t
 Dijkstra, A. G. 190
 Relative Status of Women Index
 (Dijkstra and Hanmer) 177
 Standardized Index of Gender Equality
 (SIGE, Dijkstra) 177
 Dimensions of Welfare (Allardt) 227–8,
 237(n4)
 dimensions of well-being approach
 (Narayan *et al.*) 4
 disability 40t, 249
 Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs)
 225, 229
 disciplinary framework 255t
 disease 32, 176, 233
 ‘epidemics’ 27
 ‘illness’ (indicators Types 1–9) 216
 ‘morbidity’ 35, 60(n16), 90, 98
 disparities
 social development 104–5, 109(n15)
 dissatisfaction 60(n17)
 divorce 106, 195
 Djibouti 206t
 doing 27
 ‘doing interesting things’ 227, 227f,
 228, 237(n4)
 domains of subjective well-being
 approach (Cummins) 4
 domestic involvement 28
 domestic violence 171, 182, 186(n7),
 187(n10), 264(n15)
 ‘dominance conditions’ 151
 dominance tests 101
 Dominica 73f, 84f, 204t
 Dominican Republic 205t
 Donaldson, D. 136, 140, 148, 150, 162
 donors 2
 Dowrick, S. x, 13, 79, 82, 86(n1–2),
 86–7, 88
 Dowrick, S., *et al.* (2003) 70–1, 87
 Dunlop, Y. 87
 Quiggin, J. 87
 Doyal, L. 4, 23, 31, 35, 39, 57, 62,
 241, 265
 bridges ‘cultural divide’ 56
 human development (focus and
 assumptions) 42–8t
 intermediate needs approach 4
 synthesis for discussing policy
 priorities 55–6
 theory of need 31
 Drewnowski, J. 127, 132
 Drèze, J. 152, 162, 190
 Duflo, E. 190
 Dunlop, Y. 87
 Dunn, J. 240, 265
 Dutta, I., *et al.* (2003) 153, 162
 Pattanaik, P. K. 162
 Xu, Y. 162
 dying 60(n8)
 dynamics
 ‘key characteristic’ of social exclusion
 (Atkinson) 89
 earnings/pay (gender gap) 167, 171,
 173, 182, 184, 185, 188(n24),
 189(n30)
 ease-of-interpretation axiom 140, 143t,
 148
 East Asia 169, 170t, 173
 Easterlin, R. A. 3, 12, 18(n10), 28, 36,
 59(n4), 62, 89, 110–11
 Easterlin paradox 11, 28, 58, 59(n6), 89
 Eastern Europe 100
 ‘ecological footprint’ 223
 ecologists 217
 econometrics 100, 264(n16)
 economic approach
 application to international income
 data 81–5
 conditions for aggregation 82
 criticism (and response) 81–2
 international income comparisons
 76–81, 86(n2–3)
 two-good model 76, 86(n2)
 Economic Aspects of Welfare (EAW,
 Zolotas) 10, 195
 Economic Commission for
 Africa (ECA) 190
 economic development 230
 relationship with human
 development 73

- economic growth 88, 101–2, 107, 262
 direction of causality 102, 107
 ‘not the only cause of falling mortality’ (Sen) 102
 threshold hypothesis (Max-Neef) 196
- economic resources 171
 gender gap 167
- economics 26, 36, 37, 39, 40t, 41, 47t, 49, 50, 52, 59, 60(n8), 193, 231
 means focus 42t
 neoclassical 255t
 ‘ordinal revolution’ 24
 utilitarian-influenced 25
- economics journals 13
- economists 30, 38, 39, 51, 60(n15), 66, 91, 100, 217, 244, 263(n2)
 income/consumption approach 34, 35
- Ecuador 84f, 154, 205t
- education 1–2, 7, 40t, 42t, 45t, 66, 90, 91, 92, 105, 116, 172, 177, 178, 182, 198, 199, 210(n4), 226, 226f, 227, 227f, 233, 248, 256t
 achieved by mothers (impact on child health) 103
 capital expenditure 210(n6)
 completion rates 99
 enrolment 8, 118, 131(n13), 170t
 female 102, 187(n15)
 ‘flows’ versus ‘stocks’ 99
 gender 93t, 167, 168, 169, 173, 174, 176, 183, 185
 MDG 93t
 opportunities for girls 103
 positive externalities 179
 primary 8, 93t, 95t, 99, 170t, 188(n28)
 data coverage (1990–95)
 secondary 8, 93t, 170t, 188(n28)
 tertiary 8, 93t, 188(n28)
 years of schooling 7, 115
- Education for All (1978–) 1
- education data 99, 109(n9)
- education expenditure 197
- educational attainment 118, 119, 119t, 123, 124t, 127, 184, 188(n28), 221
 conversion into human development (diminishing returns) 121
 HDI re-scaling 131(n13)
 indicators 92, 109(n4)
- educational attainment index 130(n2)
- efficiency 174, 187(n15), 243
- ‘efficiency wages’ (Dasgupta) 103
- Egypt 169t, 183t, 205t
- Eid, M. 12
- Eisner, R. 195, 210(n2), 211
 Total Incomes System of Accounts (TISA, Eisner) 195
- Ekins, P. 27, 62
- EKS index 84f, 85t, 85–6
 disadvantage 85
 ‘preferred OECD method’ 85
 ‘unbiased, accurate’ 85
- El Salvador 84f, 205t
- El Serafy, S. 211
- El Serafy method 202
- elections 151
- electricity 115, 160, 248t, 256t
- elitism 26, 31
- Elster, J. 60(n13), 62
- emotional intelligence 221
- empiricism
 composite indexes 113
 educational attainment 184, 188(n28)
 female altruism 187(n17)
 GEM 189(n34)
 gender inequality in the home (less measurable) 171
 ‘hard-science’ positivist 258
 HDI ‘redundant’ (McGillivray) 122
 HDI variables 128
 HPI (information conveyed) 157
 human well-being (composite indexes) 121–2
 intra-household resource allocation 174
 measurement of well-being 91–2
 personal security 17
 poverty analysis (measurement errors) 101
 problems of ‘false consciousness’ 175
 psychic outputs from inputs 39
 quality of living 27
 self-reported happiness (claims inspected) 232
 sexual division of labour 187(n15)
 ‘social and cultural construction’ of well-being 263(n4)
 social indicators 9

- empiricism – *continued*
 survival advantage 187(n13)
 total sharing rule 188(n22)
 utility as satisfaction 40t
 violence against women
 (measurement) 186(n7)
 well-being 242, 262
 well-being (multidimensional
 indicators) 94
 well-being beyond income 154–5
 employment 50, 51, 57, 89, 99, 105,
 182, 249
 gender gap 167, 168, 173, 174
 non-monetary rewards 28
 permanent 247t
 satisfactions and dissatisfactions 28
 temporary 247t
 empowerment 3, 10, 15, 34, 174–5,
 185, 189(n34), 243, 263(n7)
 endangered species 199
 ‘ends perspective’ (Kabeer) 43t
 energy/fuel 65, 94t, 160, 199, 200, 256t
 consumption per capita 115
 fossil fuels 10
 solar and wind 9
 energy (human) 228f
 enjoyment of life 217f, 218
 environment 13, 51, 227
 Environment Sensitive HDI (proposed)
 199
 environmental behaviour indicator (EBI,
 De la Vega and Urrutia) 199
 environmental conditions 228, 229
 home 228f
 physical 228f
 urban 229
 environmental damage/degradation
 10, 195–6, 199, 200, 223
 multiple counting 196–7
 environmental factors 187(n14)
 environmental quality 217, 217f
 indexes 222
 indicators 218–20
 overall 219–20
 specific 219
 environmental sustainability
 (MDG) 94t
 epistemology 33, 260
 equality 10, 227
 of life expectancy 18(n8)
 of opportunity 170, 171
 of outcomes 172–4, 187(n13–15)
 of what? 155, 164
 equally distributed equivalent (‘ede’)
 income 140–1
 Equatorial Guinea 73f, 205t
 equity/fairness 168, 219
 inter-generational 10
 equivalence scales 145
 Eritrea 206t
 Ermish, J. 178, 190
 Estes, R. 237
 Index of Social Progress (1984) 220
 Estonia 203t
 ethical inequality index 140
 ethics 30, 35, 51, 56, 256
 Ethiopia 84f, 183t, 206t, 241, 254,
 263(n4)
 ethnicity 170, 186(n1), 245
 Europe 89, 105, 170t, 186(n3)
European Social Survey (ESS) 236, 237
 European Union 90, 92, 109(n1)
 Eurostat 67
 EUROTRACE 96
 exchange rates 5, 78
 expectations 28, 250, 253
 expected-utility maximization 39
 Experience Machine (Nozick) 28
 extraversion 29
 ‘facipulators’/‘facipulation’ 257, 258
 Fagerman, B. ix
 false consciousness 175, 230
 family 24, 26, 27, 28, 36, 175,
 187(n18), 221, 224, 247t, 248t
 extended 180
 nuclear 180
 unit of observation 109(n13)
 family life 57, 58
 family status 89
 famine 108
 ‘never occurs in democratic countries’
 (Sen) 106
 Fare, R. 134
 feelings 33, 59
 Fei, J., *et al.* (1985) 90, 111
 Ranis, G. 111
 Stewart, F. 111
 Fei, J. C. S. 144, 162
 Ferriss, A. L. 211, 237, 266

- fertility 99, 102, 103, 105, 155,
160, 168
- Fields, G. S. 111, 144, 151, 162
criteria for data admissibility 97
- Fiji 204t
- Finland 65, 68t, 69f, 203t
- Finland: Ministry for Foreign Affairs ix
- Finnis, J. 4, 20
theory of core motives 13, 57
- first-moment distribution
function 136
- fish 201, 208
- Fisher, S. 151, 165
- Fisher index 80, 81, 85
- 'fitness' (biology) 218
- 'flows' versus 'stocks' 15, 99
- focus axiom 147, 150
- focus groups 242, 245t, 250, 253
- Folbre, N. 171, 190
- food 45t, 102, 178, 179, 184, 247t,
248t, 249, 256t
- foreign borrowing/lending 195
- foreign exchange 78
- foreign exchange (FX) indexes 83f,
84f, 85t
degree of bias 81
quantification of bias 82, 83f
'traded sector bias' 75
understate relative income of poorer
countries 75, 78, 85, 86
- forests/forestry 94t, 196, 199,
200, 201
'deforestation' 199
- former Soviet Union 73
- Foster, J., *et al.* (1984) 7, 20, 148,
150, 163
Greer, J. 20, 150, 163
Thorbecke, E. 20, 150, 163
- Foster, J. E. ix, 136, 140, 142, 143, 144,
146–7, 148, 149, 151, 161n, 162–3,
165, 186n
- 'framing effects' 35
- France 12, 68t, 69f, 84f, 203t
- Frank, R. H. 35, 62, 234, 237
- free-riding 188(n18)
- Freedman, L., *et al.* (2003) 98, 111
Chowdhury, M. 111
Rosenfield, A. 111
Waldman, R. 111
Wirth, M. 111
- freedom 41, 52, 54, 54t, 219
personal 115
political 116
substantive 'positive' 172,
187(n10)
- freedom of expression 91, 106
- freedom index (*HDR 1992*) 107
- Freire, P. 263(n7), 265
'Freirean paradigm of conscientization'
243, 263(n7)
- French, J. 264(n19)
- Frijters, P. 59(n2–3), 64
- Fromm, E. 26, 62
- functioning 181, 186, 188(n25)
'eufunctioning' versus 'dysfunctioning'
237(n3)
- functioning space 176
- functionings (Sen) 4, 14, 32, 33, 40t,
43t, 44t, 49, 52, 53, 54, 56, 89, 91,
92, 136, 146, 158, 172, 175, 184
- funerals/burials 29
- Gabon 74f, 205t
- Galtung, J. 4
- Gambia 206t, 264(n17)
- gambling 6, 26
- Gangopadhyay, S. 151–2, 163
- Garratt, A. M. 267
- gas 115, 201
- Gasper, D. x, 3, 16, 39, 52, 55, 62,
130n, 187(n11, n16)
- GDDS (general data dissemination
system) 96
- Geary–Khamis (GK) method 76, 78–9,
82–3, 83f, 84f, 85t, 85
'attempts to overcome bias in
exchange rate comparisons' 78
degree of bias 81
overstates relative income of poorer
countries 75, 79, 82, 85, 86
PPP 75
quantification of bias 82, 83f
substitution bias 79f
weighting 79
- Geertz, C. 258, 266
- gender 34, 67, 89, 159, 245, 249, 250,
252, 264(n18)
adjustments (impact on HDI rankings)
104

- Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM, UNDP, 1995–) 9, 18(n7), 113, 183t, 185, 226
 ‘conceptual and empirical weaknesses’ 189(n34)
- gender equality 226, 226f
 data coverage (1990–95) 95t
 MDG 93t
- Gender Equity Index (GEL, Social Watch) 177
- gender gap indices 177, 178
- Gender Gap Index (GGI, WEF) 177
- gender gaps 167, 168, 184, 187(n14), 189(n31, n34), 249
 ‘balancing out’ 177, 178, 188(n21)
- gender inequality 103
 costs 178
 in the home 171
 measurement 15
- gender-disaggregated measures 176–7, 178
- Gender-Related Development Index (GDI, UNDP, 1995–) 9–10, 18(n7–8), 113, 176, 177, 183t, 184, 185, 189(n30)
 earned income component 184, 189(n29)
 ‘implied penalties’ (vis-à-vis HDI) 183t, 183, 185
 policy implications ‘somewhat unclear’ 189(n33)
 revised (1999) 182
- gender-related indicators of well-being 15, 167–92
 agency versus well-being (Sen) 174–6, 187–8(n16–19)
 case for including gender in assessment of well-being 168–71, 186(n1–7)
 data and measurement issues 181–2, 188(n27)
 dealing with household in gender-related measures of well-being 178–81, 188(n22–5)
 education (enrolment and achievement by gender) 170t
 further research 179, 182, 186, 188(n23)
 gender-disaggregated measures, gender gap indices, and gender-sensitive aggregate measures 176–8, 186, 188(n20–1)
 goal (whether equality of outcomes) 172–4
 ‘intrinsic’ versus ‘instrumental’ view 168, 186(n1)
 issues 167–8
 literature 168, 173, 175, 179, 187(n9, n11), 189(n30)
 missing women 169t
 policy 176, 186(n1), 189(n33)
 recommendations 185, 189(n32)
 space 171–2, 187(n8–12)
 standard deviation 177
 UNDP’s gender-sensitive development indicators 182–5, 188–9(n28–34)
 weighting 177
 welfare assessments (relevant population) 181, 188(n26)
- gender-sensitive aggregate measures 177–8, 188(n20–1)
- General Index of Development (GID) 113, 115, 125
- general public 195
- Generalized Entropy Measures 143
- generations 194
 current versus future, 197
 future 201, 207, 208
see also time
- genetic factors 99, 104, 187(n14)
- genital mutilation (female) 171
- ‘genuine investment’ (Neumayer) 210(n5)
- Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) 10, 15, 18(n9), 194, 195, 197, 200
 criticized 196, 208
- Genuine Savings (GS) 15, 193, 194
 assessing sustainability of well-being 201–8, 210(n5–6)
 data problems 207
 GS test 208
- Georgia 73f, 74, 204t
- Gerard, K. 28, 64
- Germany 68t, 69f, 79, 84f, 195, 203t, 214
- Gerson, E. M. 218, 237
- Ghana 96, 205t
- Giddens, A. 259, 266
- Gini Coefficient of Inequality 7, 142, 143t, 143

- Gini-type 'descriptive' measure 159
- Giri, A. 52, 54, 62
- global partnership for development 94t, 109(n2)
- goal formation 56
- goal fulfilment 54t
- goals, clear 44t
- good life 91, 229
perceptions 252, 259
- goods 45t
characteristics 40t
in-between private and public 179
intermediate 86(n2)
new 74
non-tradable (low price) 78
private 178–9, 188(n22)
public 179
relative prices 75
traded 78
use 40t
use and usefulness (actual) 39
- goods and services 18(n5), 34, 38, 59(n3), 66, 88
household production 13
non-traded 76
traded/non-traded 75
- Gore, C. 54, 62
- Gormely, P. J. 114, 132
- Gough, I. ix, 23, 31, 35, 39, 57, 62, 241, 263n, 265
bridges 'cultural divide' 56
human development (focus and assumptions) 42–8t
intermediate needs approach 4
synthesis for discussing policy priorities 55–6
theory of need 31
- governments ix, 1, 66, 108
- Gray, J. 37, 62
- Greece 68t, 69f, 73, 74f, 84f, 203t
- greenhouse gases 199, 208, 209
- Greer, J. 20, 150, 163
- Grenada 204t
- Griffin, J. 23, 24, 30, 62
- Griliches, Z. 100, 111
- Grisez, G., *et al.* (1987) 4, 20
Boyle, J. 20
Finnis, J. 20
basic human values approach 4
- Gross Domestic Product (GDP) 60(n18), 185, 196
cross-country comparisons 66–7
'de-legitimated as well-being measure' 51, (58)
international comparison 195
national accounting definitions 67
'not intended to be an indicator of well-being' 194, 209–10(n1)
- Gross Domestic Product per capita 5, 18(n5), 77, 78, 84f, 86, 97, 181
adjusting for hours of work 67–70
adjusting for life expectancy 70–4
country rankings 65
failure accurately to capture well-being 65–6
ICP definition 85(n1)
international comparisons (open to criticism) 13
'not always satisfactory indicator of well-being' 73–4
- Gross Domestic Product per capita (PPP) 65, 71f, 72t, 117, 118, 119, 119t, 123, 124t
conversion into well-being (diminishing returns) 120–1
HDI re-scaling 131(n14)
logarithmic values 119n, 120, 121
US dollars 8, 9
- Gross National Happiness (Bhutan) 237(n6)
- Gross National Income (GNI) limitations as indicator of well-being 5–6
per capita 5
PPP 5
- Gross National Product (GNP) 34, 70, 196, 199, 200
attempts to modify 6
'de-legitimated as well-being measure' (51), 58
international comparison 195
logarithm 122
'no automatic link' with human development 101
'not intended to be an indicator of well-being' 194, 209–10(n1)
per capita 5, 6, 8, 18(n5), 23, 24, 115, 122, 127

- Gross National Product
(GNP) – *continued*
‘quintessential well-being indicator’
6, 23, 24
technically superior substitutes
(Dasgupta) 49–51
weighted by population sub-groups
(Ahluwalia and Chenery) 6
- Grosskopf, S. 134
- Grown, C., *et al.* (2003) 99, 111
- Gupta, G. 111
- Khan, Z. 111
- Guatemala 84f, 205t
- Guinea 206t
- Guinea-Bissau 206t
- Gujit, I. 267
- Gullone, E. 61
- Gupta, G. 111
- Guyana 205t
- Haddad, L., *et al.* (1997) 174,
187(n11), 190
- Alderman, H. 190
- Hoddinott, J. 190
- Hagenaars, A. 150, 154, 163
- Hagerty, M. R., *et al.* (2001) 195, 211,
237, 242, 266
- Cummins, R. A. 211, 237, 266
- Ferriss, A. L. 211, 237, 266
- Land, K. 211, 237, 266
- Michalos, A. C. 211, 237, 266
- Peterson, M. 211, 237, 266
- Sharpe, A. 211, 237, 266
- Sirgy, J. 211, 237, 266
- Vogel, J. 211, 237, 266
- Haiti 206t
- Hallböck, L. ix
- Hamilton, A. ix
- Hamilton, K. 201, 207, 211
- Hammond, B. 95n, 111
- Hanmer, L. C. 190
- Relative Status of Women Index
(Dijkstra and Hanmer) 177
- happiness 3, 10–12, 16, 18(n10), 25,
26, 29, 43t, 49, 57, 59(n1, n4), 89,
214, 215, 218, 224, 225, 234
‘can go with considerable hardship’
230
determinants 50
factors 11
‘in’ term 24
international comparisons 12
link with income 11
self-reported 220
sources 28
see also subjective well-being
- happiness ‘tests’ 225
- Happiness-Adjusted Life Years
(Veenhoven) 225, 229
- Happy Life Expectancy (HLE) 229, 230,
237(n5)
- Happy Life Years (HLY)
best indicator of well-being 229–30,
237(n5)
indicator of policy effectiveness 16
- Haq, Mahbub ul 163
- Human Deprivation Measure 156
- Harare 18(n11)
- Harkness, S. x, 14
- Harriss-White, B. 18(n7), 92, 104, 112
life-expectancy data
(disaggregation) 98
- Hart, K. 165
- Harvard University x
- Haryana 155
- Hausman, J. 74–5, 87
- having 27
- Havighurst, R. J. 238
- health 2, 4, 7, 28, 38, 42t, 45t, 47t,
49–50, 53, 57, 65, 89, 91, 92, 105,
106, 115, 116, 127, 154, 172,
188(n25), 198, 210(n4), 218, 221,
227, 227f, 228, 232, 233, 249, 253,
254, 256t
definitions 236(n1)
direction of causality 102, 107
gender gap 168, 173, 176
MDGs 93–4t
‘medium variant’ 218, 236(n1)
mental 25, 44t, 56, 222
physical 44t, 56, 228, 228f
psychological 228, 228f
public expenditure 102
relationship with income 103
research 217
self-reported 90, 99, 109(n7)
- Health for All (1990–) 1
- health care 160, 178, 217
- health care availability/access 102–3,
109(n12), 156

- health care justice 60(n8)
 health data 97–9, 109(n7–8)
 health economics 40t
 health expenditure 60(n8)
 health indicators
 disaggregation 104
 Types 1–9 (Veenhoven) 216
 health policy 60(n8), 242
 health and population surveys 96
 health sciences 25
 health status 175
 anthropometric measures 98, 103
 hedonic valuation studies 195, 210(n3)
 hedonism 30, 31
 height 99
 Heins, A. J. 140, 161
 Hemming, R. 150, 162
 Hentschel, J. 61
 hermeneutic approaches 243, 251
 Heston, A. 67, 75, 87
 heteroscedasticity 71, 72t, 72
 Hicks, D. A. 114, 132
 Hicks, N. 6, 116, 125, 132, 155, 163
 Hill, R. J. 87
 quantification of substitution bias 82
 Hinterberger, F. 210
 HIV/AIDS 93t, 95t, 128, 263(n11)
 Hoddinott, J. 190
 Hodge, J. 29, 30, 63
 Holland, J. 264(n14), 266
 home production 67, 69, 86, 97, 171
 homes for aged 220
 homotheticity 81, 82, 83
 Honduras 84f, 183t, 205t
 Hong Kong SAR 84f, 203t
 Hopkins, M. 116, 132
 hospices 29, 37, 60(n8)
 house prices 210(n3)
 household assets/income 171
 gender disaggregation problems 172
 household production 65–6, 184
 household surveys 182, 243, 252, 253
 households 13, 36, 92, 97, 105, 167,
 168, 172, 244, 246, 252, 257
 cash flow 256t
 composition 145
 data gap 182
 female-headed 249
 gender-related measures of well-being
 178–81, 188(n22–5)
- heterogeneity problem 145
 importance in generating gender
 inequality 171
 lone-parent 180
 maximization of resources 174,
 187(n15)
 resource allocation 174
 role in allocating resources 15
 sample sizes 100
 sexual division of labour 173–4, 178,
 182, 184, 187(n15)
 single-person 180
 size 145
 two-parent 180
 housework 196
 housing 13, 45t, 99, 179, 171, 172,
 184, 188(n25), 227, 227f, 233, 235,
 247t, 248t, 249, 251,
 252, 256t
 ‘shelter’ 89
 Hulin, C. L. 238
 Hulme, D., *et al.* (2001) 90, 105, 111
 Moore, K. 111
 Shepherd, A. 111
 human advantage 51, 52, 60–1(n19)
 human capability 155
 human capital 103, 174, 188(n28),
 193, 196, 202, 209
 Human Deprivation Measure (Mahbub
 ul Haq) 156
 human development 101–2, 130(n1),
 156, 185, 241
 conceptualization 88–90
 data limitations 109(n6)
 low/lower 207
 multidimensional approach 103
 ‘no automatic link’ with GNP 101
 non-monetary aspects 89
 political indicators ‘fraught with
 difficulties’ 106–7
 relationship with economic
 development 73
 unsustainable 207, 208
 Human Development Index (HDI,
 1990–) 8, 13, 15, 49, 50–1, 58,
 60(n16), 70, 89, 102, 113, 120, 123,
 125, 130(n2, n7), 131(n15), 172,
 182, 183t, 183, 184, 185, 189(n30,
 n33), 193, 194, 202, 206n, 208, 209,
 226–7

- Human Development Index (HDI, 1990–) – *continued*
- alternative weights 126
 - choice of components 90
 - comparability over time (concern) 118
 - country-level ownership 127, 128, 129
 - criticism 9, 16, 18(n6), 90, 116, 117, 198
 - criticisms (and UNDP response) 114
 - cross-country comparison 90
 - data 130(n6)
 - design 14, 17, 115
 - ‘empirically redundant’ (McGillivray) 122
 - gender-adjusted 159
 - Genuine Savings qualification (1975–2000) 203–6t
 - HDI 1990 118, 198
 - HDI 2002 126
 - ‘little value as measure of overall well-being’ 227
 - methodology 198, 199
 - ownership of the indicators 12
 - Pearson correlation coefficients 123, 124t, 130(n6)
 - pollution-sensitive 199, 200
 - rankings 119
 - re-scaling 127, 131(n13–14)
 - sustainability extensions 199
 - sustainability extensions (critical assessment) 200–1
 - time-series comparison 90
 - ‘useful measure of catch-up’ 227
 - validity disputed 198
 - weighting 90, 130(n9), 198
- Human Development Report* (UNDP, 1990–) 12, 51, 70, 88, 127, 159
- criticism 89
 - cross-country findings 157
 - ‘goal posts’ 118
 - ‘income is a means, not an end’ 6
- Human Development Report* (specific editions)
- HDR 1990* 6, 8, 115, 116–17, 122
 - HDR 1991* 50
 - HDR 1992* 107
 - HDR 1993* 101, 104, 117
 - HDR 1994* 118
 - HDR 1995* 9, 115, 182, 189(n30)
 - HDR 1996* 156
 - HDR 1997* 156, 157, 158
 - HDR 1999* 121, 189(n29), 226
 - HDR 2000* 108, 189(n29)
 - HDR 2002* 98, 99, 100, 106, 107
 - HDR 2004* 5, 7–8
- human development theorists 49–57, 60–1(n19–21)
- Alkire (synthesis for project management) 57, 58, 61(n21)
 - Dasgupta (technically-superior substitutes for GNP) 49–51
 - Doyal and Gough (synthesis for discussing policy priorities) 55–6
 - Nussbaum (richer exploration of human well-being) 55, 61(n20)
 - roles of lists 55–7, 61(n20–1)
 - Sen (personal advantage and quality of life) 51–5, 60–1(n19)
- Human Freedom Index 114
- human life, decent (Nussbaum) 42t
- human nature 55, 56
- human needs 241
- Max-Neef’s matrix 13, 26–7
- Human Poverty Index (HPI) 113–14, 156–8
- multidimensional 156, 157
 - ‘substitutability’ between components 157
 - weighting 157
- human resources 256t, 264(n16)
- human rights 7, 49, 107, 108, 116–17, 264(n15)
- Nussbaum 55, 61(n20)
- human security 14, 17, 116, 129
- Human Suffering Index (HSI) 113, 115
- human well-being *see* well-being
- Human Well-Being: Concept and Measurement* 1–22
- anonymous referees ix, 18n, 59n, 130n, 161n, 186n, 188(n18)
 - disaggregated pictures needed 58
 - further research viii, 2, 16–18, 107–8, 179, 182, 186, 188(n23)
 - methodological problems 8
 - ‘original contributions’ to literature 2
 - purposes 13
 - ‘recurring theme’ 17

- role of theory 57
- volume overview 2–3, 13–16, 19(n12)
- Human Well-Being and Natural Environment* (Dasgupta, 2001) 49
- Hungary 203t
- hunger 2, 93t, 95t, 146

- Ibraahim, A. 111
- Iceland 68t, 69, 69f, 203t
- ideal types 31
- identification (of poverty)
 - absolute versus relative approaches 145–7
 - problem ‘notoriously difficult to solve’ 159
- identity 215, 249, 254, 258, 264(n18)
- ideology 117
- Iduozee, T. 161n
- ill-being (Baulch) 60(n17), 155, 241, 249, 250, 255, 263(n9)
- income 26, 36, 47t, 53, 59(n3, n6), 90, 92, 103, 104, 115, 135, 136, 139, 180–1, 182, 199, 219, 227, 227f, 232, 235, 249
 - ‘cannot act as proxy’ 58
 - conversion into human development (diminishing marginal returns) 18(n3)
 - data comparability 97
 - earned 183, 184, 189(n29, n34)
 - from common property resources 38
 - from social provision/consumption 38
 - impact on nutritional intake 109(n8)
 - impact on self-reported health status 109(n7)
 - limitations as measure of well-being 88
 - link with happiness 11
 - ‘little impact on nutrition’ 109(n14)
 - national (Gini-corrected mean) 117
 - ‘no automatic link’ with life expectancy 101
 - per capita viii, 27, 34, 107
 - personal disposable 154–5
 - rank-preserving transfer 139
 - real 91
 - relationship with health 103
 - unearned 179
 - use 6, 26
 - see also* national income accounting
- income distribution 7, 140, 145, 148, 195, 197–8
 - continuous 136
 - discrete 136
 - orderings 144
- income dynamics
 - chronic poverty and 105–6
- income equality 226, 226f
- income gap 7
 - poorest versus richest countries 13
- income inequality 170, 198
 - direction of causality 102
 - measurement 14
 - understated by GK method 79
- income measures and alternative indicators of well-being 66–74, 86(n1)
 - adjusting for hours of work 67–70, 86
 - adjusting for life expectancy 70–4, 86
 - direction of causation 71
 - GDP per hour versus GDP per person 69f
 - prediction error 73, 74, 86
 - real GDP per person and life expectancy (1994–8) 71f, 72t, 73–4f, 86
 - recorded hours of work and GDP (OECD, 1990) 67, 68t
- income poverty 39, 91, 102
 - focused measure 156
- income redistribution 210(n4)
- income space 171, 187(n8)
- income transfer problem 151–2
- income transfers 140
 - international 86(n1)
- income vector 136, 137, 140, 141, 142, 148
 - non-negative 145
 - poor incomes 153
- income-earning opportunities 174
- income-gap ratio 148–9
 - per capita 149, 150
- Index of Economic Well-Being (Osberg and Sharpe) 114, 194, 196–7, 200
- ‘index of intensity of environmental exploitation’ (Desai) 199

- index number bias
 - economic approach 80
 - geometric averages 81, 83
 - international income comparisons 74–85, 86(n2–3)
- index number theory 78
- index of 'quality of life' in nations (Slottje, 1991) 220
- Index of Social Progress (Estes, 1984) 220
- Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) 15, 18(n9), 194, 195, 200
 - criticized 196, 208
- index of sustainable living (Sagar and Najam) 199, 201
- index of well-being over time (Dasgupta) 50
- India xi, 27, 84f, 90, 131(n15), 155, 159, 160, 168, 205t, 207, 259, 264(n17)
 - missing women (because of sex-selective abortion) 169t
 - North 36
 - South 26, 255
- individual deprivation functions 149–50
- individuals 97, 145, 167, 244
 - relative economic position (Easterlin) 89
 - unit of observation 109(n13)
- Indonesia 84f, 205t
- inequality 7, 14, 104, 168
 - 'ascriptive' 170–1, 186(n5)
 - between-group 159
 - economic 109(n11)
 - indicators 14–15, 135–66
 - legal and procedural 171–2
 - marriage and divorce arrangements 187(n10)
 - sub-group inequality 140
 - within-group/between group 140
- inequality aversion 141, 178, 187(n15)
- inequality indexes
 - real-valued 144
 - 'welfare theoretic normative connotation' 141
- inequality measurement 136–44
 - axioms 139
 - connections amongst different orderings 144
 - descriptive measures 140, 141–4
 - descriptive measures (properties) 143t
 - ethical measures 140
 - inequality measures (properties) 139–40, 143t
 - Lorenz curve (visual representation of inequality) 136–8
 - preliminary concepts 136
 - real-valued indexes of inequality 138–9
 - specific inequality indexes 140–4
- inequality of opportunity 173
- inequality and poverty
 - links and disjunctions 153–4
 - related, but distinct, concepts 154
- inequality and poverty: indicators 14–15, 135–66
 - 'arithmetic' and 'geometric' means 142
- deprivation and disparity: towards a more inclusive approach 136, 154–60
- inequality measurement 136–44
- inequality and poverty: links and disjunctions 153–4
- literature 136, 140, 147, 150, 160
- policy 151–2
- poverty measurement 136, 145–53
- 'preliminary overview' 161
- terminology 136
- infant mortality 7, 8, 17, 97, 102, 115, 155
 - data coverage (1990–95) 95t
 - data limitations 109(n6)
 - poor people 105
 - 'unreliable data' 109(n5)
- infant mortality rates 93t, 98, 173
- infant survival rates 91, 107
- inflation 66, 115
- information 40t, 228f, 234, 255t, 256, 258
 - full 77
 - in measures of SWB 35
 - 'new and surprising' 259
- information gap 260
- informed desire/reasoned desire 52
- infrastructure 196, 256t, 264(n16)
- inputs and outputs 90–1, 104, 109(n4, n14)
 - inputs 40t

- Inquiry into Well-Being and Destitution* (Dasgupta, 1993) 49
- Institute of Development Studies (IDS), Brighton, Sussex xi, 262n, 263(n6), 264(n14, n17)
- institutions 240, 250, 260
- intelligence 221
- interacting 27
- interaction 244, 249, 251, 260
social 242, 250
- intermediate needs approach (Doyal and Gough) 4
- 'Internal Learning System' 264(n15)
- International Comparison Project (ICP) 66, 71
data 75, 76, 79, 82, 83, 85
definition of GDP per capita 86(n1)
price surveys 75
- international income comparisons
economic approach 76–81, 86(n2–3)
index number bias 74–85, 86(n2–3)
- international income data
application of economic approach 81–5
- International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED, London) 263(n6)
- International Labour Organization (ILO) 111
basic needs approach 88
hours of work data 'often incomplete' 70
- International Monetary Fund (IMF) 96, 210
- 'international price' vector (GK method) 78–9
- 'international prices' 75
- internet 27
- interviews 233, 245, 245t, 252
- Intimate History of Humanity* (Zeldin, 1994) 25
- investment 66, 198, 207
broadening of concept 195
EKS index 85
'unreliable data' 109(n5)
- Iran 131(n15), 205t
missing women (because of sex-selective abortion) 169t
- Ireland 68t, 69, 69f, 84f, 203t
- Ismail, S. 99, 104, 111
- Israel 84f, 203t
- Italy 68t, 84f, 183t, 195, 203t
- Ivanova, I., *et al.* (1998) 18(n6), 20, 114, 132
Arcelus, F. J. 20, 132
Srinivasan, G. 20, 132
- Jahoda, M. 222, 237
- Jamaica 73f, 202, 204t
- Janakarajan, S. 26, 36, 63
- Japan 67, 68t, 69, 69f, 73, 74f, 79, 84f, 186(n3), 203t
happiness levels 12
- Jenkins, S. 136, 163
- Jennings, B., *et al.* (2003) 29, 63
Bailey, M. A. 63
D'Onofrio, C. 63
Ryndes, T. 63
- Job Descriptive Index (Smith *et al.*, 1969) 224
- job satisfaction 224
- job-security 224
- Jodha, N. S. 36, 63
- Johnson, S. 252, 266
- Jordan 205t
- Jordan, J. 264(n18), 266
- Journal of Development Studies* 19(n12)
- Journal of Economic Perspectives* 74
- Joyless Economy* (Scitovsky, 1976) 24
- judges 55
- judicial independence 107
- Jupp, D. 261, 266
- justice 168
- Kabeer, N. 27, 28, 38, 42–8t, 56, 63
human development (focus and assumptions) 42–8t
- Kagan, S. 35, 63
personal well-being 32–3
- Kakande, M. 266
- Kakwani, N. C. 147, 149, 153, 161n, 163
concepts and definitions 136
- Kalmijn, W. M. 238
Equality Adjusted Happiness (Veenhoven and Kalmijn) 225
- Kanbur, R. 90, 100, 102, 107–8, 109, 111, 153, 161n, 162, 163, 165, 188(n26), 190, 241, 264(n13), 266
numerical versus non-numerical data 254, 255t, 255

- Kant, I. 194, 211
 Kauppinen, M. ix
 Kazakhstan 204t
 Kazandjian, A. ix
 Keen, M. 149, 163
 Kelley, A. C. 18(n6)
 Kendall, L. H. 238
 Kenya 84f, 158, 205t, 264(n17)
 Kerala (India) 90, 155
 Khan, Z. 111
 Klasan, S. x, 15, 18(n7), 130n, 167,
 168, 169n, 172, 173, 175, 177, 181,
 182–5, 189, 186(n2–3, n6),
 187(n8–9, n13, n15), 188(n21, n26),
 189(n29–32, 34), 190–1
 Knorr-Cetina, K. 248, 266
 knowledge 252, 263(n10)
 HPI 156
 ‘inter-subjective’ production 258
 philosophies of 35
 Koch-Schulte, S. 63
 Kolm, S. Ch. 140, 163
 Korea, Republic of 84f, 168, 169t, 183t,
 185, 203t
 Kothari, U. 256, 265
 Kundu, A. 148, 163
 Kuwait 202, 203t
 Kyrgyzstan 205t
- labelling 257
 labour force growth 115
 labour force participation 171, 178
 ‘labour market participation’ 173,
 174, 182
 sex-specific rates 184
 labour market 171, 172
 labour market access 86
 labour market externality 188(n23)
 labour market returns 187(n15)
 labour productivity 69, 76, 77, 79, 86
 labour rights 7
 Laderchi, C. R. 102, 111, 252, 256, 258,
 261, 266
 ‘challenges assumption of correlation
 between income and other
 indicators of development’ 102
 Laderchi, C. R., *et al.* (2003) 92, 102,
 111
 Saith, R. 111
 Stewart, F. 111
- Lamanna, F. 168, 191
 Lambert, P. J. 18(n4)
 Land, K. 211, 237, 266
 Lane, R. E. 28, 29, 63, 234, 237
 ‘economistic fallacy’ 41
 Lao People’s Democratic Republic 206t
 Larson, D. A. 122, 123, 125, 132
 Laspeyre index 77f, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83f,
 83
 Lasswell, H. D. 4
 Latin America 59(n5), 170t, 235
 Latino barometro 235, 237
 Latvia 204t
 Lau, A. 61
 law of diminishing utility 227
 law of one price 78
 law and order 106
 lawyers 55
 Lebanon 204t
 Lee, J-W. 110, 170n, 189
 ‘unreliable data’ used 109(n5)
 leisure 6, 13, 29, 65, 67, 69, 86, 195,
 196, 224
 ‘recreation’ 28, 57
 Lengm, M. 267
 Lesotho 205t
 Level of Living Index (LLI, UNRISD)
 113, 125
 Levine, R., *et al.* (2003) 103, 111
 Birdsall, N. 111
 Dayal, P. 111
 Ibraahim, A. 111
 Levy, S. 252, 255, 264(n14), 264
 Lewis, G. W. 154, 163
 ‘lexicographic maximin solution’ 152
 Libyan Arab Jamahiriya 204t
 life
 monetizable inputs 39
 ‘quantity as well as quality’ 25, 27
 subjective outcomes 219
see also quality of life
 life-ability (ability to cope with life)
 217f, 218, 227, 236(n1)
 indicators 220–2, 236–7(n2–3)
 overall 222
 specific capabilities 221
 life-chances 217, 217f, 218, 226f, 227,
 227f, 228, 228f
 life expectancy 7, 9, 13, 17, 50,
 60(n16), 66, 86, 90, 91, 102, 107,

- 108, 115, 117, 118, 119, 119t, 124t, 128, 130(n7), 154, 155, 176, 177, 181, 196, 226, 226f, 227, 229
- at birth 8
- data disaggregation required 98
- data limitations 109(n6)
- 'equality' 18(n8)
- female advantage 173
- GDP adjustment 70–4
- HDI re-scaling 131(n14)
- international data 'weak' (Chamie) 97–8
- 'no automatic link' with income 101
- poor people 104–5, 109(n15)
- prediction error 73, 74
- 'unreliable data' 109(n5)
- life-results 217, 217f, 226f, 227, 227f, 228, 228f
- Life Satisfaction Index (Neugarten *et al.*, 1961) 225
- life-satisfaction/satisfaction with life 37, 219, 227, 227f, 228, 229, 231, 233, 236
- aspects of life 224
- 'flawed' approach 225
- indicators 224–6
- life-as-whole 224–6
- overall 232
- self-report 225
- life spheres, not only the market 36–7, 60(n14–16)
- 'lifeboat dilemma' 154
- linear expenditure system 82
- literacy/adult literacy 7, 9, 17, 38, 89, 91, 92, 93t, 102, 105, 115, 117, 118, 130(n2), 130(n5), 154, 155, 156, 160, 221, 226, 263(n7), 264(n15)
- 'aim of expenditure on education' 8
- data availability 100
- functional 109(n9)
- gender gap 188(n28)
- HDI re-scaling 131(n13)
- rates 95t, 99
- Lithuania 204t
- 'livability' 217
- livelihood 249, 256t, 264(n16)
- living conditions 217, 217f, 226
- objective measures 89
- overall quality 219–20
- Living Planet Report* (WWF 2002) 223
- living standards *see* standards of living
- Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS) 94, 96, 100
- local perspectives 249
- local planning 57
- location 252
- London: Overseas Development Institute 264(n14)
- longevity 33, 35, 53, 89, 115, 117, 128, 154, 156, 160, 172, 173, 182, 198, 199, 225, 229, 232, 233
- gender gaps 183, 185
- Lorenz, M. O. 136, 164
- Lorenz curve 7, 143, 153
- properties 138
- visual representation of inequality 136–8
- Lorenz dominance 137–8, 153
- 'generalized' 151
- Lorenz partial order 144
- Lotfy, M. 21
- lottery winners 28
- Loup, J., *et al.* (2000) 94, 96, 108, 111
- Développement et Insertion Internationale* (DIAL) 111
- Naudet, D. 111
- Lüchters, G. 114, 132
- Lundberg, S., *et al.* (1997) 174, 179, 191
- Pollack, R. 191
- Wales, L. 191
- Luxembourg 68t, 69, 69f, 73, 74f, 84f, 118, 200, 203t
- Luxembourg Income Study 219
- luxury 26
- Lynch, R. G. 145, 146, 162
- Lynn, R. 237
- index of distress in nations 225
- Maasoumi, E. 114, 132
- Macdonald, L. M. 267
- Macedonia TFYR 204t
- macroeconomic stabilization 194
- macroeconomics 66
- Madagascar 73f, 84f, 206t
- Majumdar, M. 114, 132, 136, 164, 165
- Capability Failure Ratio 156, 159
- malaria (MDG) 93t
- Malawi 84f, 206t, 255
- Malaysia 96, 183t, 204t

- Maldives 204t
 Mäler, K-G., 207, 210
 Mali 84f, 96, 206t
 GDP (versus USA) 75–6, 82, 83f, 83
 malnutrition 47t, 103, 105
 Malta 203t
 man-made capital 202, 210(n6)
 manufactured capital 193, 209
 manufactured goods 76, 77f, 78, 79f
 manufacturing 115
 Marcoux, A. 168, 180, 191
 Margen, S. 146, 165
 marginal propensity to save 198
 market, the 36–7, 60(n14–16), 158
 market access 109(n2)
 market behaviour 23, 24
 market dependence 253
 market economies 234
 markets 184
 marriage 174, 233
 Marshall, A. 29, 51
 Marxists 214
 Maslow, A. 24–5
 Masset, E. 105, 110
 maternal health (MDG) 93t
 maternal mortality 9
 data coverage (1990–95) 95t
 under-reporting 98
 Mathur, A. ix, 59(n6)
 Mauldin, W. P. 96
 Mauritania 206t
 Mauritius 204t
 Max-Neef, M. 58, 63, 211
 axiological categories approach 4
 matrix of human needs 13
 model of human needs 26–7
 ‘needs theorist’ 37–8
 ‘poverties’ 37–8, 60(n17)
 threshold hypothesis 196
 McCloskey, D. 59(n6), 63
 McGee, R. 249, 252–3, 261, 265, 266
 McGillivray, M. i, iv, x, 3, 14, 18n,
 18(n6–7), 59n, 114, 120, 122, 123,
 125, 130(n6–8), 132, 136, 156,
 161n, 164, 186n, 198, 209n, 211
 mean-independent
 inequality index property 140
 ‘meaning of life’ 218, 225
 means of production 215
 means–end chain 45t, 47t
 means-testing 152
 Measure of Economic Welfare (MEW,
 Nordhaus and Tobin) 6, 10, 195
 measurement 135
 measurement bias 96
 media 194–5, 231
 ‘newspaper circulation’ 115
 ‘press freedom’ 107
 ‘television’ 27
 ‘transistor radios’ 36
 medical insurance 102
 medicine 40t, 91, 216, 253–4
 Melbourne 18(n11)
 men 26
 self-destructive (Russia) 176
 Menkhoff, L. 114, 132
 mental attitude 55
 mental currency 26
 mental money of utility 39
 mentally infirm 49
 meta production function 125
 Mexico 183t, 204t, 264(n17)
 Michalos, A. C. 211, 237, 242, 266
 Micklewright, J. 99, 104, 111
 micro-credit 246
 micro-level methods 260
 microeconomic datasets 94, 96, 99
 Middle East 169, 170t, 200
 migration 99, 247t
 Mill, J. S. 51
 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)
 viii, 1–2, 17, 92, 98, 103
 education 99
 educational enrolment (gender
 equality) 176
 indicators 109(n3)
 poverty target 7
 targets and indicators 93–4t
 minerals 10, 201
 modernization 262
 Moldova 205t, 230
 money 59(n3), 249
 money supply 66
 ‘money-tarianism’ 37, 60(n16)
 Mongolia 205t
 monotonicity axiom 147, 149, 150
 Moore, K. 111
 moral argument 32
 moral hazard 258
 Morocco 84f, 205t

- Morris, M. D. 8, 117, 133, 136, 155, 164
- Morse, S. 18(n6), 114, 133
- mortality 102, 153, 173, 182, 183
- gender gap 167, 168, 176, 181
- 'key indicator' (Sen) 97
- Mozambique 183t, 206t
- Muellbauer, J. 165
- Mukherjee, D. 153, 162, 163, 164, 188(n26), 190
- Mulkay, M. 248, 266
- Murphy, M. 188(n19), 190
- Murray, C. J. L. 114, 133
- Myanmar 205t
- Myers, D. G. 28, 29, 63
- Nagasundari, S. 264(n15)
- Najam, A. 18(n6), 114, 133, 198, 201, 212
- index of sustainable living (Sagar and Najam) 199, 201
- Namibia 73f, 205t
- Narayan, D., *et al.* (1999) 263(n9), 266
- Chambers, R. 266
- Petes, P. 266
- Shah, M. K. 266
- Narayan, D., *et al.* (2000) 13, 20, 241, 245n, 266
- Chambers, R. 20, 266
- Petes, P. 20, 266
- Shah, M. K. 20, 266
- dimensions of well-being
- approach 4
- see also* *Voices of Poor*
- Narayan, D., *et al.* (2000) 38, 63
- Koch-Schulte, S. 63
- Patel, R. 63
- Rademacher, A. 63
- Schafft, K. 63
- see also* *Voices of Poor*
- narcotics 6, 105
- 'drug-abusers' 50
- Naroll, R. 223, 237
- national accounts 96, 210(n6)
- revised UN system 209–10(n1)
- National Health Service (UK), 109(n12)
- national income accounting 28, 182
- adjusting for hours of work 67–70
- adjusting for life expectancy 70–4
- limitations 39, 60(n18), 65–6, 85
- potential adjustments 66
- semi-log model 70
- standard deviation 72t
- see also* income
- natural capital 193–4, 201, 202, 208
- degradation 49
- depreciation 202, 207
- 'mining' (Dasgupta) 50
- substitutability 209
- natural resources 10, 48t, 208
- depletion 201, 202, 207
- Naudet, D. 111
- Nayaran, A. 190
- Nelson, H. L. 63
- Nepal 169t, 176, 206t, 207, 264(n17)
- Netherlands xi, 68t, 69f, 84f, 203t
- Neugarten, B. L., *et al.* (1961) 225, 238
- Havighurst, R. J. 238
- Tobin, S. S. 238
- Neumayer, E. x, 10, 15, 18(n9), 114, 133, 196, 201, 202, 211–12
- 'genuine investment' 210(n5)
- New Delhi 18(n11)
- New Entity for Social Action (NESA) 264(n15)
- New Zealand 68t, 69f, 203t
- Nicaragua 205t
- Nickelsburg, G. 114, 132
- Niger 206t
- Nigeria 12, 84f, 206t
- Noll, H-H. 90, 110
- non-governmental organizations (NGOs) 246, 249, 260, 264(n15)
- non-linearity 120–1, 130(n5)
- non-renewable resources 196, 223
- depletion 197, 209
- Noorbakhsh, F. x-xi, 14, 18(n6), 114, 121, 123, 127, 130(n6), 131(n15), 133, 198, 212
- Noponen, H. 264(n15)
- Nordhaus, W. D. 196, 212
- Measure of Economic Welfare (MEW) 6, 10, 195
- normalization axiom 139, 143t, 147
- normalization property 139
- North (global) 27
- North Africa 170t
- Norton, A. 249, 266

- Norton, A., *et al.* (2001) 245n, 250, 263(n10), 266
 Bird, B. 266
 Brock, K. 266
 Kakande, M. 266
 Turk, C. 266
 Norway 68t, 69f, 84f, 183t, 200, 203t
 Norway: Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs ix
 nourishment 89
 Nozick, R. 63, 171, 191
 Experience Machine 28
 Nussbaum, M. C. 23, 25, 31, 32, 35, 54–8, 63, 241, 242, 267
 central human capabilities approach 4, 13
 ‘complex picture of well-being’ 60(n10)
 human development (focus and assumptions) 42–8t
 latest work (1999–) supersedes earlier papers 61(n20)
 richer exploration of human well-being, for backing human rights 55
 nutrition 40t, 50, 91, 92, 99, 102, 104, 105, 109(n8), 154, 160, 172, 175, 184, 188(n25), 210(n4), 217
 data (‘focus on consumption rather than outcomes’) 98
 ‘efficiency wages’ (Dasgupta) 103
 gender gap 173, 176
 O’Connell, K. A. 21
 objective list theory 31, 32, 39, 60(n10)
 objective well being (OWB) 41, 50, 54t, 57, 214, 263(n2)
 measures 33–5, 60(n12)
 ‘must be considered’ 35–6, 60(n13)
 non-income 36
 ‘normative concept’ 35
 objectives
 potential for attainment (Sen) 53t
 observation (limits) 235
 Occam’s razor 125
 occupations 245
 manual 173
 ODA 109(n2)
 OECD 5, 67, 68t, 69f, 210, 238
 OED 25
 Ok, E. A. 142, 153, 163, 164
 old age 105, 173, 249, 257, 263(n11)
 life-satisfaction 227
 Oman 204t
 ophelimity 25, 26
 opportunity 28, 41, 52, 54
 state’s responsibility (Dasgupta) 49
 optimism 29
 ‘optimum ignorance’ 244
 ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions 70, 72t
 Osberg, L. ix, 212
 Index of Economic Well-Being (Osberg and Sharpe) 194, 196–7, 200
 Osmani, S. R. 146, 164
 Oswald, A. 41, 64
 outcomes 98, 172
 anthropometric measures 99
 equality 172–4, 187(n13–15)
 well-being 179
 Overseas Development Council (Washington, DC) 8
 Paasche index 77–83
 pain 29, 59(n1), 228f
 Pakistan 38, 84f, 169t, 183t, 206t, 207, 259, 264(n17)
 Panama 84f, 204t
 panel data 182
 Papua New Guinea 73f, 205t
 Paraguay 84f, 205t
 parents 247t
 Paretian welfare economics 37
 Pareto, V. 25
 Pareto efficiency 188(n22)
 Parfit, D. 64
 categorization of conceptions of well-being (‘needs to be extended’) 30–2
 Paris 18(n11)
 Parker, S. 28, 64
 parliaments 93t, 106, 177
 participation
 civic 50
 labour market 67
 political 106, 107
 social 28

- participatory action research (PAR) 263(n7)
- participatory approaches 16, 35, 240–67
- characterisation 245–8, 263(n8)
- characteristics of qualitative and quantitative poverty appraisal 255t
- ‘code of good practice’ 256
- contested concepts 262
- contributions 243–5
- definition of well-being 248–51, 263(n9)
- disaggregation by region and gender 253
- interconnections with well-being 241–5, 263(n3–7)
- ‘key issue’ 252
- measurement of well-being 251–6, 260–1, 263–4(n10–16)
- micro-level 249, 261
- ‘myth of hands-free research’ 258
- numerical data (meaning and interpretation) 261
- practice 256, 264(n14)
- principles 246[–]248
- ‘process as important as outcome’ 248
- research design 255
- validity and limitations 256–9, 264(n17–18)
- participatory poverty assessments (PPAs) 12–13, 241, 244, 249, 250–1, 261
- national policy processes 260
- principal methods 245t
- ‘second generation’ 250
- Uganda 252–3
- participatory poverty index (PPI, China) 255, 256t, 264(n16)
- Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) 12–13, 242, 243, 246, 248, 250, 252, 256–7, 260, 261, 263(n6)
- delivery of the people’s views (credibility of promise) 258–9
- methods 257, 258, 264(n16–17)
- positivist aims 258
- Patel, R. 63
- Pathways to Participation* (project) 256, 263(n6), 264(n17)
- Patient-Generated Index 263(n12)
- Pattanaik, P. K. 162
- Pearson (zero-order) coefficients 123, 124t, 126t, 130(n6)
- pedagogy of oppressed (Freire) 263(n7)
- Penn World Table* (PWT) 13, 67, 79, 85
- overstates relative income of poorer countries 75
- pensioners 247t, 248n
- people
- handicapped, elderly, sick 27
- mentally infirm 56
- mentally retarded 27
- very young/very old, 56
- perception 11, 33, 34, 35, 36, 55, 106, 214, 215, 216, 219, 223, 224, 228, 242, 244, 251, 253, 260, 262
- ‘good life’ 252, 259
- person-generated index (PGI, Ruta *et al.*) 253–4, 263(n12)
- personal advantage 32
- personal growth 29
- personal relations 24, 40t, 44t
- Peru 84f, 102, 158, 204t, 263(n4)
- Peterson, M. 211, 237, 266
- Petes, P. 20, 266
- Pettit, J. xi
- Pettit, S. 16
- Philippines 84f, 158, 204t, 235
- philosophers 39, 40t, 41
- philosophy
- academic 24
- analytic tradition 32
- meaning of life 222
- Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI) 60(n16), 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 123, 127, 129
- ‘criticized heavily’ 8
- ‘redundant’ 122
- physicians 236
- physiological indicators 33t
- Pigou, A. C. 29, 51
- Pigou–Dalton principle of transfer 139
- Pillarsetti, J. R. ix, 18(n7)
- pleasure 3–4, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 49, 59(n1)
- caused by others’ situations 53
- plurality 51
- Poland 183t, 203t
- policy 52, 56
- monetary and fiscal 66
- public 174

- policy-makers 18, 101, 108, 160, 228,
 231, 234, 250, 261
 policy-making 16, 240, 250
 political extremism
 'behavioural indication of despair'
 224
 political freedom/liberties 40t, 42t, 45t,
 48t, 50, 51, 230
 political leaders 32
 political marketing 234
 political participation 7
 political representation 174
 political rights 116
 objective measures 106
 subjective measures 106, 107
 political stability 220
 political support 227, 227f
 politics/politicians 117, 217
 politics of development 258
 Pollack, R. 191
 pollutants 208–9
 pollution 6, 10, 60(n18), 65, 195, 197,
 200, 202, 209, 220
 poor people 109(n8), 147, 148–9,
 153–4, 198, 210(n4), 258, 261
 direct transfers to 151
 poorest/'richest' of 152
 population 144, 207, 255t
 deprived section 156
 economically active 115
 homogeneous 139
 as a whole 156
 Portugal 68t, 69f, 84f, 203t
 'positional objectivity' 90
 'positive psychology' movement
 24, 58
 'poverties' (Max-Neef) 37–8, 60(n17)
 poverty 2, 3, 6, 34–5, 37, 226, 240,
 241, 242, 243, 244, 249, 250, 255t,
 257, 263(n9)
 absolute 248n
 causes 263(n7)
 chronic (and income dynamics)
 105–6
 comparisons (cross-country) 146
 comparisons (inter-temporal and
 cross-sectional) 146
 conceptualization 38
 'cross-cultural comparison'
 issue 231
 cross-section variations 160
 definition (participatory approaches)
 262n
 escape routes 103, 149
 fewer than two dollars per day 12,
 109(n15)
 'flexibly absolute' 146
 gender disaggregation 180
 gender gap (UNDP claim 'lacks
 evidence') 180
 headcount measure 7, 148, 153, 154,
 156–7, 158, 160
 household as whole 180
 income-based measures 158, 181
 income-gap ratio 148–9
 Indian literature 160
 indicators 14–15, 135–66
 less than a dollar a day 7, 12, 93t,
 95t, 157–8
 monetary measures 102
 'multidimensional' 38, 89, 90–4,
 105, 108, 109(n1–4)
 outcomes versus processes 153
 real-valued indexes 145, 148
 South Africa 247t
 subjective 214
 time-series variations 160
 trends 251
 'union' and 'intersection'
 approaches 90
 poverty-alleviation
 top-down strategies, 260
 poverty-alleviation planning (China)
 255
 poverty: means–ends divide
 (comparative and integrative
 framework) 38–49, 60(n18)
 chain-narrative 39, 40t
 comparative overview (selected
 writers) 41, 42–8t
 inputs, intermediate events, outcomes
 39, 40t, 41
 studies of well-being: alternative levels
 of focus 39, 40t
 poverty analysis 88, 101
 poverty eradication (MDG) 93t
 poverty gap measure/ratio 7, 93t, 95t
 poverty indexes 113
 additively separable 149–50
 aggregation 147–50

- anti-poverty policy 151–2
- distribution-sensitivity 149, 152, 153
- ‘ethical’ 150
- properties 147–8
- specific 148–50
- weighting system 149
- poverty lines 7, 9, 120, 121, 148, 152, 153, 157, 246, 255
 - absolute versus relative approaches 145–7
 - arbitrariness 160
 - ‘biological’ conceptualization 146
 - crossing 154
 - plurality and ranking 150–1
 - range of plausible 150–1
- poverty measurement 14, 136, 145–53
 - aggregation: properties of poverty indexes 147–8
 - aggregation: specific poverty indexes 148–50
 - comparability 145
 - fuzzy approaches 152–3
 - ‘generic problem’ 151
 - identification: absolute versus relative approaches 145–7
 - plurality and ranking 150–1
 - poverty indexes and anti-poverty policy 151–2
 - twofold exercise (identification and aggregation) 145
- Poverty Measurement manual (World Bank) 42t
- ‘poverty profile’ dominance 151
- poverty research 254
- poverty-reduction
 - gender gap 168
- Poverty-Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs, World Bank) 243, 263(n5)
- power 38, 45t, 249, 250, 257, 261
 - economic and political 175
 - gender gap 167
- practical reason (Nussbaum) 47t
- Pratt, G. 256, 263(n6), 264(n17), 265
- preference 38, 51
- preference-fulfilment 26, 30, 35, 39, 43t, 53, 60(n9), 208
- Pretty, J., *et al.* (1995) 245, 263(n8), 267
- Gujit, I. 267
- Thompson, J. 267
- Scoones, I. 267
- price deflators 160
- prices 5, 17, 66, 78, 81, 83
 - relative 82
- ‘primary goods’ (Rawls) 155, 187(n8)
- principal component analysis 125–6, 130(n10)
- principle of diminishing transfers 140
- private goods
 - gender inequality 188(n18)
- private spending 105
- production 48t, 91, 210(n1)
- production function framework 90
- productivity 103, 173, 224
- project management (Alkire) 57, 61(n21)
- psychiatric disorders 225
- psychiatric hospitals 222
- psychic ‘currency’ 37, 60(n14)
- psychic outputs 39
- psychic poverties 38
- psychological well-being (eudaimonic)
 - research 25, 37
- psychologists 40t, 41, 49, 50, 218, 263(n2)
- psychology 24, 29, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42t, 56, 60(n11), 214, 221
 - existential 222
- psychometric testing 253
- public goods 184
 - gender gap 188(n18)
 - household-specific (insurmountable problems of assigning use) 179–80
- public opinion 220, 233–4
- public spending 92, 102, 105
- public sphere 171
- purchasing power 116
- purchasing power parity (PPP) viii, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 65, 71f, 72t, 85, 93t, 95t, 109(n15), 117, 118, 119, 119t, 119n, 120–1, 123, 124t, 129, 131(n14), 157–8
 - GDP per capita (logarithm) 115
 - Geary-Khamis method 75
- purdah 171
- pure preference 32
- Pyatt, G. 154, 164

- Q-squared dialogue 255
- Qatar 204t
- Qizilbash, M. ix, 4, 18(n2), 59n, 130n, 136, 164, 200, 212
- Quality-Adjusted Life Years (QALY) 60(n8)
- quality of death 25, 29, 57
- quality of life (QOL) 11, 13, 16, 25, 29, 35, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 58, 88, 130(n1), 155, 217, 228, 229, 231, 241, 242, 245
- cross-country index 220
- empiricism 27
- local standards 249
- non-self-report indicators 59(n2)
- non-self-report measures 41
- objective 40t
- physical 32
- self-report indicators 59(n2)
- self-report judgements 33
- subjective 254
- threshold hypothesis (Max-Neef) 196
- urban centres 18(n11)
- quality of life research 55, 56, 253, 263n
- questionnaires 34, 216, 219, 220, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 228, 251, 252
- Quiggin, J. 82, 87
- race 89, 104, 170, 171, 186(n1), 186(n6)
- racism 233
- racists
'often fail to acknowledge their own opinions' 232
- Rademacher, A. 63
- Ramanathan, B. 200, 212
environment endangerment index (EEI) 199
- Ramirez, A. 111
- Ramsay, M.
universal psychological needs approach 4
- Ranis, G. 111, 168, 191
- Ranis, G., *et al.* (2000) 103, 111
Ramirez, A. 111
Stewart, F. 111
- rank-order weighting 177
- rapid rural appraisal (RRA) 242–3, 243–4
- rational choice 77, 78
- Ravallion, M. 89, 94, 96–7, 101–2, 103–4, 91–2, 102, 109, 109(n14), 110, 111–12, 120, 133, 136, 152, 153, 162, 164, 168, 180, 190, 191
- raw materials
abiotic versus biotic 199
- Rawls, J. 4, 143, 155, 164, 194, 212
primary goods 37, 187(n8)
reckoning aggregate deprivation in terms of deprivation of worst-off group 159
- Ray, D. 146, 154, 162, 191
- Reading: Centre for Statistical Services 264(n14)
- real estate 210(n3)
- Real Index of Consumption 114
- reason 60(n15)
practical 55
- reasoned desire 53, 54
- Redefining Progress 212
- regions 104, 109(n13), 146
- relatedness 45t, 56
- Relative Status of Women Index (Dijkstra and Hanmer) 177
- relativity
'key characteristic' of social exclusion (Atkinson) 89
- religion 24, 26, 29, 31
'spirituality' 253, 263(n11)
- renewable resources 196, 201
depletion 208
- replication invariance axiom 140, 143t, 148, 150
- reproduction 48t
- reproductive health
data coverage (1990–95) 95t
- research 240
cross-cultural 259
- researchers 160
concerns 258
external 251
- resource allocation 57
intra-household (by gender) 179, 188(n22)
Pareto-efficient 188(n22)
- resource depletion 13, 196, 197, 201
- resource extractors 208
- resources 39
gender gaps 185

- response shift 35
 revealed preference theory 30, 40t, 77f,
 77, 82
 rich people 28, 198, 257
 Richards, M. 265
 Richardson, S. 3, 28, 64
 roads 160, 256t
 Robbins, L. 25
 Rodgers, W. L. 19, 237
 Rogerson, R. 238
 QOL (British counties) 220
 Rojas, M. ix
 Romania 204t
 Ronsenzweig, M. 99, 110
 Rosati, F. 190
 Rosenfield, A. 111
 Rothschild, M. 144, 164
 rule of law 106, 220, 230
 Ruohonen, A. ix
 rural areas 65–6, 102, 104, 242, 249
 ‘agrarian society’ 229
 Russell, I. T. 267
 Russia 108, 176
 Russian Federation 183t, 204t
 Ruta, D. A., *et al.* (1994) 253–4, 267
 Garratt, A. M. 267
 Lengm, M. 267
 Macdonald, L. M. 267
 Russell, I. T. 267
 Ruwanpura, K. 186n
 Rwanda 206t
 Ryan, R. M. 26, 56, 59(n1), 64
 human development (focus and
 assumptions) 42–8t
 Ryndes, T. 63

 safety 219, 220, 228f
 gender gap 167
 safety nets 249
 Sagar, A. 18(n6), 114, 133, 198, 212
 index of sustainable living (Sagar and
 Najam) 199, 201
 Sagoff, M. 31, 64
 Saint Kitts and Nevis 203t
 Saint Lucia 204t
 Saint Vincent and Grenadines 205t
 Saith, R. 18(n7), 92, 104, 105, 111, 112
 life-expectancy data
 (disaggregation) 98
 salaries 219

 Samoa (Western) 205t
 sample sizes 100, 108
 sample surveys (poverty and inequality)
 159
 Samuelson, P. 75, 78, 87
 sanitation 7, 94t, 160, 235, 249
 São Tomé and Príncipe 205t
 satisfaction 30, 31, 39, 40t, 41, 43t,
 44t, 47t, 49, 51, 52, 53, 89, 218
 health, self, life 228f
 marital 29
 Saudi Arabia 183t, 184, 204t
 savings 99, 198, 202
 scalar concepts 38
 scalar indexes 37
 scale equivalence 114, 118–20,
 130(n4)
 scale-invariance 140
 scale-invariance axiom 140, 143t,
 148, 150
 Scandinavia 227
 Scanlon, T. 64
 well-being theories (relevance for
 decision-makers) 32
 ‘substantive good theories’ 31
 scarce resources 219
 Schadenfreude 52
 Schafft, K. 63
 school enrolment 105
 gross ratio 115, 130(n2)
 ratio 7, 8, 9
 schooling 36, 218, 226, 227, 229, 247t
 completion rates 95t
 enrolment data versus completion
 rates 92, 109(n4)
 Schultze, C. L. 74, 87
 Schütz, H. 210
 Schwartz, S. H.
 universal human values approach 4
 science 223, 248
 Scitovsky, T. 24, 37, 64
 Scoones, I. 267
 Scotland 195
 SDDS (special data dissemination
 system) 96
 Seabright, P. 26, 36, 63
 seasonality 249
 Seckler, D. 146, 164
 Second World War 102
 sector of residence 159

- security 51
- Seers, D. 19(n12), 112, 127
 basic needs approach 88
- Seidl, C. 136, 164
- Seifert, E. K. 210
- self-confidence 222, 236(n2)
- self-determination 55–6
- self-employment 247t
- self-esteem 29, 249
- self-interest 51
- self-management skills 29
- self-realization 59(n1)
- self-reliance 222
- self-report 215, 216, 224, 225, 228
 intelligence 221
 life-ability 222
 misgivings 231, 232
 random error 233
 reliability doubts 233
- self-respect 53
- Seligman, M. 24, 64
- Sen, A. K. viii, 7, 18(n6), 23, 24, 35, 36,
 56, 58, 59(n2), 63, 64, 88–90, 104,
 106, 108, 110, 112, 116, 117, 121,
 125, 127–8, 129, 131, 133, 135, 136,
 139, 141, 142, 143, 145–7, 148, 149,
 152, 159, 161n, 161, 162, 163,
 164–5, 168, 172, 173, 186(n5),
 187(n8–9), 191, 207, 210(n4), 210,
 218, 238, 241, 267
- agency versus well-being 174–6,
 187–8(n16–19)
- capabilities approach 4, 13, 88–9, 91,
 103, 115, 155
- capability approach (really a theory of
 well-being?) 52, 60–1(n19)
- categories for ranking a person's
 situation 52, 53t, 54
- 'criterion of range of valued
 options' 41
- criticised 54, 91, 187(n16)
- distinction between well-being and
 QOL 49
- ethical universalism 130(n3)
- framework for welfare economics 39
- 'functioning approach' 92
- functioning 'a state of being or doing'
 155
- human development (focus and
 assumptions) 42–8t
- income per capita (limitations as
 measure of well-being) 5–6
- 'informed rational preferences' 32
- life expectancy/mortality rates 102–3
- life-expectancy data (disaggregation)
 98
- mortality data 'key indicator of
 well-being' 97
- Nobel lecture 60–1(n19)
- personal advantage and quality of life
 (conceptual backdrop) 51–5
- 'rather narrow concept of well-being'
 187(n16)
- towards a replacement vocabulary 54t
- types of information used in
 evaluation of well-being 55
- 'unreliable data' used 109(n5)
- usage of term 'well-being' (too
 utilitarian?) 52–5
- use of income per capita as human
 development measure 18(n3)
- well-being (notions of
 sustainability) 10
- 'well-having' 26
- Sen, A. K., *et al.* (1987) 136, 155, 165
- Hart, K. 165
- Kanbur, R. 165
- Muellbauer, J. 165
- Williams, B. 165
- Senegal 84f, 206t
- Sen index 7, 149, 150, 153–4
- 'badly behaved' (Pyatt) 154
- 'fails condition of sub-group
 consistency' (Subramanian) 150
- services
 cheaper labour-intensive 75
 non-traded 76, 77f, 79f
- sex 145, 169
- sex ratios 169t, 181
- sex-change 186(n4)
- Seychelles 204t
- Shaffer, P. 34–5, 64
- Shah, M. K. 20, 266
- Sharpe, A. 211, 212, 237, 266
 Index of Economic Well-Being
 (Osberg and Sharpe) 194,
 196–7, 200
- Shazam package 72n
- Shepherd, A. 111

- Shorrocks, A. F. viii, ix, 136, 143–4, 148, 149, 151, 152, 161n, 163, 165
 ‘basic’ properties of inequality index 139–40
- Shorrocks Generalized Lorenz Curve (GLC) 7
- Short Treatise on Great Virtues (Comte-Sponville, 2002) 25
- Sierra Leone 73f, 206t
- Simanowitz, A. 248n, 252, 263(n8), 267
- Singapore 73, 74f, 203t
- single parents/lone parents 180, 247t
- Sirgy, J. 211, 237, 266
- Skevington, S. 29, 33–4, 56, 61
- Skevington, S. M., *et al.* (2004) 11, 21
 Lotfy, M. 21
 O’Connell, K. A. 21
- skills 45t
- Slottje, D. J. 114, 133, 238
 index of ‘quality of life’ in nations 220
- Slovakia 203t
- Slovenia 203t
- slum-dwellers 94t
- Smith, P. C., *et al.* (1969) 224, 238
 Hulin, C. L. 238
 Kendall, L. H. 238
- Smith, T. E. 148, 163
- smoking 187(n13), 232
- Smutna, K. 186n
- social anthropology 246, 258
- social capital 48t, 105, 193, 194
- social development 102, 103
 data coverage (1990–95) 95t
 disparities 104–5, 109(n15)
- social equality 217, 219, 226
- social evaluation function 150
- social exclusion 34, 35, 56, 90, 105, 160, 250, 261
 three key characteristics (Atkinson) 89
- social expenditure/spending 102, 105
- social group 231, 257
- social illfare 135
- social indicators 7–8, 25, 32, 40t, 86, 108, 215, 230, 235, 242, 253, 263(n2)
 assignment of standard errors 17
 criticism 105
- data ‘poor quality’ 100
- gender differences 104
- interpretation 101–3, 109(n12)
- issues of ownership and relevance 12–13
- measurement issues, 14
 non-monetary 6
 precision 108
 purposes 103
 reliability and comparability concerns 8, 17, 97
 variations across countries 14
- social policy 90, 222, 230, 235
- social policy process: use of subjective indicators 233–4
 assessing policy success 233–4
 selecting policy goals 234
- social prestige/status 50, 232, 233, 245
- social processes 249, 251
- social relations 227, 227f, 228
- social science/s 2, 18(n10), 24, 25, 36, 39, 42t, 59, 193, 245, 255t, 257
 hermeneutic approaches 243
- social surveys 235, 236
- Social Watch 177, 191
- Social Weather Station (Philippines) 235
- social welfare 7, 207
 loss 140, 141
- social welfare function (SWF) 144
 ‘equity-conscious’ 154
- socialization 174, 175
- Socioeconomic Development Index (SDI, UNRISD) 113, 115
- sociologists 41, 50, 217, 263(n2)
- sociology 25, 40t
- sociology of science 248
- Sofaya (South African village) 246, 247–8t
- soil 199, 201, 208
- Solomon Islands 205t
- South Africa 27, 60(n13), 74f, 74, 183t, 186(n6), 205t, 246, 247–8t
- South Asia 167, 169, 170t, 173, 175, 176
- Social Policy Association (SPA): Working Group on Social Policy 96
- space 182, 186
- Spain 67, 68t, 69, 69f, 84f, 203t

- Spearman (rank-order) coefficients 123, 126t, 130(n6), 158
- Speidel, J. J. 131
- Spencer, B. 151, 165
- Squared Coefficient of Variation 142, 143t
- Squire, L. 110
- Sri Lanka 73f, 74, 84f, 101, 183t, 205t
missing women (because of sex-selective abortion) 169t
- Srinivasan, G. 20, 132, 209n
- Srinivasan, P. 190
- Srinivasan, T. N. 91, 95, 98–9, 100, 108, 109(n5), 112, 188(n27), 191
- St Petersburg 18(n11)
- stakeholders 255, 260–1
- standard deviation 177
- standard errors 72, 73, 101, 108
- standard of living (SOL)/living standards 12, 52, 53t, 53, 115, 156, 199, 217
international comparisons 65, 66
poor-country/rich-country 27
- Standardized Index of Gender Equality (SIGE, Dijkstra) 177
- Starrett, D. 162
- state, the 49, 174
- state intervention 158
- 'states of being and doing' (Sen) 89
- statistical analysis/methods 253, 260
standard 255
- statisticians 39
- statistics 17, 18, 59(n6), 67, 123, 223
external trade 96
financial and economic 96
human development 96
India 36
national aggregates 226
national income 219
objective information 231
redundancy issue 125
social 40t
- Staveren, I. van 64
- Stewart, F. 4, 111, 158, 165, 168, 191
- Stigler, G. 175, 190
- Stiglitz, J. 144, 164
- stimulants, stress-related 225
- Stone–Geary utility function 82
- Strauss, J. 99, 112
- Streeten, P. 6, 90, 112, 116, 125, 131(n15), 132, 133, 155, 163
- sub-group consistency axiom 140, 143t, 143, 148, 150
- sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) 73, 128, 202, 207
missing women (because of sex-selective abortion) 169t
education (enrolment and achievement by gender) 170t
- Subbarao, K. 153, 163
- subjective well-being (SWB) 3, 17, 24–5, 28, 30, 40t, 41, 42t, 43t, 47t, 50, 54t, 58, 235, 263(n2)
- eudaimonic 25, 26–7, 31, 37, 56, 59(n1)
- former Communist countries 59(n5)
- hedonic 25, 26, 59(n1)
- measures 33–5, 60(n12)
- 'must be considered' 35–6, 60(n13)
- terminology 59(n4)
- see also* happiness
- subjectivism 142, 216
- subjectivity 116
'subjective assessment' versus 'subjective substance' 16
- Subramanian, S. xi, 14–15, 103, 112, 114, 132, 135, 136, 143, 148, 151–2, 154, 161n, 163, 164, 165
- Capability Failure Ratio 156, 159
- 'substantive good theories' (Scanlon) 31
- substitution bias 78, 79f, 80, 82
- Sudan 206t
- Sugden, R. 112
critique of Sen 91
- suicide 224, 225
- Sukhatme, P. V. 146, 165
- Summers, R. 67, 75, 87
- Sumner, A. 186n, 188(n27), 191
- Sumner, L. W. 24, 64
- Sunstein, C. 35, 64
- supremacy, need for 234
- Suriname 204t
- surveys 214, 232, 260
'best place to live' 220
data 233–4
intrusive 178
- survival 38, 168, 176
female advantage 173, 187(n13)

- sustainability 105, 113
 definitions 15, 193–4
 ‘future-oriented concept’ 193
 ‘strong’ versus ‘weak’ forms 194
 weak 207, 209
- sustainability measures 10
- sustainability and well-being indicators 15, 193–213
 assessing sustainability of well-being with Genuine Savings 201–8, 210(n5–6)
 conceptual problems 194
 definitions 193–4
 fully integrated indicators of well-being and sustainability 194–8, 209–10(n1–4)
 HDI with Genuine Savings qualification (1975–2000) 203–6t
 indicators combining well-being and sustainability without full integration 198–201
 methodology 195, 198, 199, 208
 terminology 193, 210(n5)
- sustainable development 94t, 223
- Sustainable Human Development Index (SHDI, Dahme *et al.*) 199, 200–1
- Swallow, A. ix, 161n
- Swansea: Centre for Development Studies 264(n14)
- Swaziland 73f, 205t
- Sweden 68t, 69, 69f, 73, 74f, 195, 203t
 ‘level of living’ tradition 230
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) ix
- Switzerland 68t, 69, 69f, 203t, 230
- Sydney 69
- symmetry axiom 139, 143t, 147
- sympathy 52, 54, 54t, 55
- Syrian Arab Republic 169t, 169n, 205t
- System of National Accounts 66
- ‘tacit understandings’ (Giddens) 259
- Tadesse, B. ix
- Taiwan 169t
- Tajikistan 73f, 205t
- Takayama, N. 149, 165
- Tamil Nadu (India) 36
- Tanzania 84f, 206t
- targeting (‘imperfect’) 152
- Task Force on Child Health and Maternal Health 98
- taxes 219
- Thailand 195, 204t, 263(n4)
- Theil, H. 165
- Theil’s ‘Entropy’ Index 142, 142–3, 143t
- theorem of incomparable utilities 231
- theories
 of good (Brandt) 60(n11)
 of justice 170, 171, 186(n5)
 of need (Doyal and Gough) 31
 of personhood 54
 of subjective well-being homeostasis 11
- Thomas, D. 99, 112, 175, 179, 191
- Thompson, J. 267
- Thon, D. 165
 variant of Sen index 149
- Thorbecke, E. 20, 150, 163
- threshold hypothesis (Max-Neef) 196
- time viii, 18(n5), 27–8, 29, 50, 66, 67, 89, 94, 96, 98–9, 105, 106, 108, 109(n10), 114, 118, 119–20, 122, 125, 127, 128, 129, 146, 168, 186, 193, 194, 196, 198, 199, 202, 219, 221, 231, 249
 future 15, 225
 ‘stable happiness’ 11
see also generations
- time use 171, 174, 178, 182
 gender gaps 167, 185
- tobacco 6, 179
- Tobin, J. 212
 Measure of Economic Welfare (MEW) 6, 10, 195
- Tobin, S. S. 238
- Togo 206t
- Tokyo 18(n11), 69
- Total Incomes System of Accounts (TISA, Eisner) 195
- total sharing rule 188(n22)
- Townsend, P. 145, 166, 241, 267
- trade 115, 207
- trade unions 106, 194
- ‘traded sector bias’ 75
- traffic accidents 195
- traffic behaviour 187(n13)
- transfer axiom 139, 140, 143t, 144, 147, 149, 150, 153

- transfer sensitivity axiom 140, 143t, 143, 147, 149, 150
- transition countries 177
- transport/transportation 40t, 78, 228f
- Travers, P. 3, 28, 64
- triangulation 245, 258
- Trinidad and Tobago 202, 204t
- trust 215, 231
- truth 230
- Tsui, K-Y. 153, 166
- tuberculosis 94t
- Tunisia 84f, 205t
- Turbyne, J. 263(n3), 267
- Turk, C. 266
- Turkey 68t, 69f, 73f, 82, 169t, 169n, 204t
- Turkmenistan 204t
- two-good model 76, 86(n2)
- Tzannatos, Z. 190
- Uganda 252–3
- Ukraine 204t
- Ulph, D. T. 150, 154, 162, 163
- underemployment 195
- unemployment 28, 66, 69, 86, 220, 247t
 - indicator of deprivation 109(n1)
 - long-term 105
- unhappiness 25, 43t
- UNHS (national household survey, Uganda) 253
- United Arab Emirates 204t
- United Kingdom x, xi, 27, 68t, 69, 69f, 84f, 195, 203t, 264(n14)
 - county QOL (Rogerson) 220
 - mortality rates 102
- United Kingdom: Department for International Development (DFID) ix
- United Nations 76, 87, 96, 210
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) 1, 6, 8, 12, 18(n6), 34, 64, 70, 88, 89, 113, 115, 116, 117, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 129, 134, 156, 166, 167, 176, 177, 180, 188(n20), 191, 193, 198, 199, 206n, 208–9, 213, 226–7, 238
- gender-related indexes 15
- gender-sensitive development indicators 182–5, 188–9(n28–34)
- human development approach 51
- response to criticism 14, 114, 118
- United Nations Division for Advancement of Women 186(n7), 191
- United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) 109(n9)
- United Nations Millennium Project Report (2005) 2, 21
- United Nations Millennium Summit (2000) 1
- United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) 134, 192
 - Level of Living Index (LLI) 113, 125
 - Socioeconomic Development Index (SDI) 113, 115
- United Nations Task Force on Education and Gender Equality 92, 99
- United Nations University – World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER, Helsinki) i, x, 186n
- ‘Measuring Human Well-Being’ (Social Development Indicators project) viii, ix, 59n
- workshop (Helsinki, May 2003) 59n, 129–30n
- United States of America 27, 28, 35, 68t, 69, 69f, 73, 74f, 79, 84f, 89, 90, 98, 173, 183t, 186(n3), 187(n14), 195, 200, 203t, 214, 229, 231
- CPI 74
- GDP (versus Mali) 75–6, 82, 83f, 83
- mortality rates among blacks 102–3
- non-cash-cost of bringing up children 66
- US dollar viii, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 93t, 95t, 109(n15), 157–8
- United States: National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Mothers (NLSCM) 97
- universal human values approach (Schwartz) 4
- universal psychological needs approach (Ramsay) 4
- universalism 114, 116, 117, 127, 129, 194, 207, 261, 262
- ethical 130(n3)

- universities x–xi
- University of Bath 263n, 263(n4)
- University of Munich 186n
- Uphevals of Thought (Nussbaum) 25
- urban areas 104, 249
 - 'disamenities' 195, 210(n3)
 - 'orderliness' (Sen) 102
 - population growth 115
 - society 65–6
- Urrutia, A. M. 199, 200, 211
 - environmental behaviour indicator (EBI, De la Vega and Urrutia) 199, 200
- Uruguay 84f, 203t
- usufruct rights 194
- utilitarian moral philosophy 218
- utilitarianism 25, 26, 54
- utilities, not utility 36–7, 60(n14–16)
- utility 3–4, 5, 6, 25, 26, 28, 31, 39, 40t, 49, 51, 53, 58, 59(n4), 60(n15), 80, 81, 82, 139, 155, 193
 - psychic 26
- utility function 140
 - concave individual 144
- Uzbekistan 205t
- value fulfilment 39
- value judgement 4
- value principle 60(n16)
- values 52, 90, 248, 252, 254, 259, 262
 - universal 17
- van Praag, B. 59(n2–3), 64
- van Staveren, I. 37, 52, 59n, 62
- Vanuatu 205t
- Varian, H.R. 86(n3), 87
- Variance of Incomes 142
- Variance of Log Incomes 142
- varlog measure 142
- Vaughan, R. N. 154, 166
- Veenhoven, R. xi, 12, 16, 18(n10), 60(n12), 90, 112, 117, 126, 134, 229, 230, 232, 234, 238, 242, 267
 - Equality-Adjusted Happiness (Veenhoven and Kalmijn) 225
 - Happiness-Adjusted Life Years 225
 - livability of a society (measure) 220
- Vehmaanperä, A. ix
- Venezuela 84f, 204t
- Victoria-Feser, M. 101, 110
- Viet Nam 205t, 264(n17)
- villages/villagers 36, 257, 264(n15–16)
- Vimalathan 264(n15)
- violence 116, 176, 187(n13), 249
- Vogel, J. 211, 237, 266
- voice 38
- Voices of Poor* (Narayan *et al.*, 2000) 13, 28, 29, 38, 59, 63, 241, 244, 250, 252, 261, 262, 263(n1, n9)
 - principal methods 245t
- volunteer work 196
- vulnerability 249, 250
- wage employment 151, 152
- wages 66, 76, 103
 - optimal 151
- Waldman, R. 111
- Waldron, I. 173, 187(n13), 192
- Wales, L. 191
- Wall, H. J. 18(n6), 114, 131
- waste 195, 209
- water 7, 45t, 91, 94t, 115, 156, 160, 195, 199, 200, 201, 208, 249, 256t
- Watts, H. 152, 166
 - poverty index (1968) 150
- Weale, M. 107, 110
- wealth 47t, 51, 215, 226, 226f, 227, 252
 - 'affluence' 28, 220, 232, 234
 - 'comprehensive measure' (Dasgupta) 49
 - 'five levels' (Sofaya) 246, 247–8t
 - 'merely useful' (Aristotle) 6
 - 'opulence' 27, 28, 29, 47t
- wealth ranking 245t, 246, 262
- websites
 - Asia barometer 235, 237
 - China Development Brief 267
 - global income inequality 86
 - Latino barometro 235, 237
 - MDGs 94n
 - 'Pathways to Participation' project 264(n17)
- poverty and inequality (conceptual challenges) 111
- poverty measurement 61
- premature mortality and poverty measurement 163
- Veenhoven, R. 238
- well-being (multidimensional assessment) 162

websites – *continued*

- Well-being in Developing Countries (WeD) 263(n4)
- World Bank (green accounting) 213
- World Database of Happiness* 225–6, 229, 239
- World Development Indicators 72n
- World Happiness Database 11, 12, 22
- weighting/weights 6, 58, 70, 79, 90, 126, 177, 130(n9), 149, 157, 177, 198, 220, 221, 235, 253, 264(n16)
see also correlations and weights
- Weldon, J. 256n, 267
- welfare 14, 36, 49–50, 193, 207, 217
 - aggregate 139
 - monetary measures superseded 107
 - multidimensional approaches 88
 - multidimensional indicators 107
 - relative 78
 - subjective measures 89
 - terminology 25, 59(n3–4)
- welfare assessments
 - absurd outcomes 181
 - relevant population 181, 188(n26)
- welfare economics 26, 51, 54
 - Sen's framework 39
- welfare functions 144
- welfare orderings 144
- welfare studies (Germany) 214
- well-becoming 29, 59(n7)
- well-being (WB)/human well-being
 - aggregate 135, 156, 158, 178, 188(n21)
 - 'ambiguous umbrella term' 55
 - assessments (variety of purposes) 41
 - beyond income 154–5, 159
 - 'category' 25
 - composite measures 8, 9, 14, 16, 18(n5)
 - concepts and conceptualizations 13, 23–64
 - conceptual problems 15
 - conceptualization viii, 2, 3–4, 16, 18(n1–2)
 - constituents versus determinants 39
 - core-aspects 57
 - country-level achievement viii, 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 17–18, 108
 - current 197, 198, 200
 - current versus future 208
 - definition (Dasgupta) 49
 - definition (participatory approaches) 262–3n
 - dimensions 4
 - distribution 244
 - diversity 23, 24
 - economic (data coverage, 1990–95) 95t
 - 'economic' and 'non-economic' indicators 113
 - eudaimonic 43t, 52
 - existentialist work 55
 - extent 244
 - 'external' versus 'internal' states 217, 217f, 226f, 227, 227f, 228f
 - female 10
 - four kinds 16, 217f, 218, 226
 - gender-disaggregated measures, gender gap indices, and gender-sensitive aggregate measures 176–8, 188(n20–1)
 - gender-related indicators 15, 167–92
 - generalized indicators 155–6
 - hedonic 43t, 51
 - literature 3–4, 14, 16, 18(n1–2, n6, n18), 24, 25, 32, 39, 42–8t, 49–57, 59(n3), 60–1(n18–21), 90, 103, 114, 123, 127, 136, 140, 147, 150, 160, 168, 173, 175, 179, 187(n9, n11), 189(n30)
 - main meanings 217, 217f
 - measurement 'without adequate theoretical frame' 23
 - measures 1, 2–3, 5–13, 16, 18, 18–19(n3–12), 59(n6)
 - 'more than material enrichment' 113, 122, 127, 130(n8)
 - 'multidimensional concept' viii, 3, 4, 5, 8, 25–6, 29–30, 59(n3–4), 89, 113
 - non-income measures 92
 - participatory research methods 16
 - philosophy 242
 - policy interventions 1
 - 'positional objectivity' 90
 - 'prudential value' 53–4
 - research priorities 2
 - self-assessment 10–11, 16, 27
 - self-report versus non-self-report measures 33, 33t

- 'social and cultural construction' 263(n4)
- sustainable 10, 51
- terminology 3, 59(n3–4), 130(n1), 136, 193, 210(n5), 216–18
- terminology (standardization lacking) 59(n2)
- types of indicator 33, 60(n12)
- 'universalist' versus 'relativist' measures 34
- utilitarian conception 3–4, 5
- well-being: concepts and conceptualizations 13, 23–64, 187(n11, n16)
- attempts to theorize and categorize 30–8, 60(n9–17)
- bridging the means-ends divide 38–49, 60(n18)
- comparative and integrative framework 38–49
- comparative overview (selected writers) 41, 42–8t
- human development theorists 49–57, 60–1(n18–21)
- income 'cannot act as proxy' 58
- literature 24, 25, 32, 39, 42–8t, 49–57, 60–1(n19–21), 59(n3)
- measurement focus 23, 57–9
- nature of well-being: terms, foci, and blind-spots 23, 24–30, 59–60(n1–8)
- normative claims 58
- 'numerous concepts and measures' required 58
- qualitative description 59
- qualitative and quantitative methods 34
- role of theory 57
- well-being: income-based measures 13, 65–87, 88, 97
 - guidelines for using and interpreting international income comparisons 85–6
 - income measures and alternative indicators of well-being 66–74, 86(n1)
 - index number bias in international income comparisons 74–85, 86(n2–3)
 - limitations of national income accounting data 65–6, 85
- well-being: measures 218–26
 - comparability 219
 - indicators of ability to cope with life 220–2, 236–7(n2–3)
 - indicators of quality of environment 218–20
 - indicators of satisfaction with life 224–6
 - indicators of worth for world 222–3
 - mixed indicators (Type 2) 219, 220, 221, 222, 223
 - mixed indicators (Type 5) 222, 236(n2)
 - mixed indicators (Type 8) 224, 225
 - mixed indicators (Types 2, 5, 8) 216f, 216
 - objective indicators (Type 1) 219, 220, 221, 222, 223
 - objective indicators (Type 4) 222, 236(n2)
 - objective indicators (Type 7) 224–5
 - objective indicators (Types 1, 4, 7) 216f, 216, 218
 - subjective indicators (Type 3) 219, 220, 221, 222, 223
 - subjective indicators (Type 6) 222, 236(n2)
 - subjective indicators (Type 9) 224, 225–6, 229
 - subjective indicators (Types 3, 6, 9) 216f, 216, 218
 - weighting 220, 221, 235
- well-being: nature (terms, foci, blind-spots) 23, 24–30, 59–60(n1–8)
 - 'organizing frameworks' needed 30
 - 'three major aspects' 25
 - 'umbrella term' 29–30
- well-being: objective indicators (shortcomings) 234–5
 - limits to aggregation 235
 - limits to observation 235
- well-being: social and political indicators 14, 88–112
 - aggregation, disparities, and dynamics 103–6, 109(n13–15)
 - conceptualizing human well-being and development 88–90

- well-being: social and political indicators – *continued*
- data availability and choice of indicator variables 94–101, 109(n5–11)
 - further research 107–8
 - literature 90, 103
 - measuring well-being 94–101, 109(n5–11)
 - methodologies 92
 - multidimensional approaches to poverty (application) 90–4, 109(n1–4)
 - policy 89, 91, 94t, 101, 102, 105, 108
 - political indicators of development 106–7
 - social indicators (interpretation) 101–3, 109(n12)
 - trade-off of economic and political rights (challenged) 107
- well-being: subjective measures 16, 60(n12), 214–39
- assessment 215, 215f, 216f
 - comparative study (limited by data deficiencies) 235–6
 - distinguished from ‘objective’ indicators 214–16
 - indicators of overall well-being 226–30, 237(n4)
 - measures of well-being 218–26, 236–7(n2–3)
 - mixed category 215, 237(n6)
 - policy 228–9, 230, 231, 233–4, 236
 - substance 214, 215f, 216f
 - terminology 216–18, 236(n1)
 - use 230–6, 237(n6)
- well-being: subjective measures (qualms) 231–3
- attitudinal matters 231–2
 - ‘cross-cultural comparison’ issue 231
 - reliability doubts 233
 - self-reports 231, 232
 - validity doubts 232
- well-being: subjective measures (use) 230–6, 237(n6)
- developing countries 235–6, 237(n6)
 - policy process 233–4
 - shortcomings of objective indicators 234–5
- well-being: theorization and categorization 30–8, 60(n9–17)
- desire theories 30–1
 - hedonism 30
 - objective list theories 31
 - standard philosophy categorization 30–3, 60(n9–11)
 - ‘subjective versus objective’ well-being measures (language misused) 33–5, 60(n12)
 - SWB and OWB ‘must be considered’ 35–6, 60(n13)
 - ‘tendentious assumptions’ 33
 - well-being is vector 36–8, 60(n14–17)
- well-being: ‘vector’ 36–8, 60(n14–17)
- life spheres, not only the market 36–7
 - poverties, not poverty 27–8
 - utilities, not utility 36–7, 60(n14–16)
- well-being (measurement): participatory approaches 16, 240–67
- comparability 251, 252, 254
 - contributions of participatory approaches 243–5
 - controversies 242
 - cross-cultural legitimacy 242
 - defining well-being 240, 242, 244, 248–51, 263(n2, n9)
 - expert ‘bias and ignorance’ 243
 - ‘local knowledge’ 243
 - measuring well-being 240, 241, 243, 244, 251–6, 263(n2), 263–4(n10–16)
 - methodologies 243, 246, 248, 250, 252, 254, 255t, 255, 257, 259, 263(n7, n9)
 - participatory methods 245–56, 263–4(n8–16)
 - participatory methods (validity and limitations) 256–9, 264(n17–18)
 - policy 240, 241, 245, 258, 260, 263(n5)
 - qualitative methods 241, 244, 249, 251, 252, 254, 255t, 260, 264(n13–14)
 - quantitative methods 241, 244, 246, 251, 252, 254, 255t, 255, 260, 264(n13–14)
 - trajectories and challenges 259–62, 264(n19)
 - weighting 253, 264(n16)

- well-being and participatory research:
 - interconnections 241–5, 263(n3–7)
- well-being (overall): indicators 226–30, 237(n4)
 - Allardt's welfare index 227–8, 237(n4)
 - happy life years (best indicator) 229–30, 237(n5)
 - shortcomings 228–9
 - UNDP HDI 226–7
 - WHO Quality of Life scale 228, 228f
- well-being (past, present, future):
 - composite indexes 14, 70, 108, 113–34
 - correlations and weights 114, 121–7, 130–1(n6–14)
 - literature 114, 123, 127
 - non-linearity 120–1, 130(n5)
 - policy relevance 114, 117, 125, 127–8, 129, 131(n15)
 - scale equivalence 114, 118–20, 130(n4)
 - structure and components 114–17, 130(n2–3)
- well-being achievement (WBA) (Sen) 53t, 53
- Well-being in Developing Countries (WeD, Bath) 263n, 264(n19)
 - ESRC Research Group x, xi, 263(n4)
- well-being freedom (WBF, Sen) 53t
- well-being indicators
 - gender sensitivity 18(n7)
- Well-Being Measurement* (World Bank) 42t
- well-being measurement: data
 - availability and choice of indicator variables 94–101, 109(n5–11)
 - data coverage for core indicators (1990–95) 95t
 - developments in data collection, reporting and analysis, 99–101, 109(n10–11)
 - education data 99, 109(n9)
 - health and demographic data 97–9, 109(n7–8)
- well-being production function 116
- well-being ranking 245t, 246, 252, 259, 262, 263(n10)
- well-being theories
 - relevance for decision-makers (Scanlon) 32
- well-doing 26
- well-dying 29
- well-feeling 25, 26, 33
- 'well-having' (Sen) 26, 28
- 'well-lived life' (Dasgupta) 49
- well-living 26, 33
 - 'includes well-becoming and well-dying' 29
 - superior term to 'well-being' 26–7
 - work involvement, domestic involvement (not just consumption) 28
- well-thinking 26
- West Asia 169t
- Western Political Theory* (Dunn) 240
- Weymark, J. A. 136, 148, 162
- 'What are we Trying to Measure' (Seers) 19(n12)
- White, H. 18(n6), 114, 120, 122, 123, 130(n7), 132, 136, 156, 164, 198, 211
- White, K. J. 87
- White, S. xi, 16
- widowers 180
- widows 180, 247t
- Wilford, W. T. 122, 123, 125, 132
- Williams, B. 37, 64, 165
- wind and solar energy 196
- Wink, C. 167, 168, 169n, 173, 181, 186(n2), 187(n13), 191
- Wirth, M. 111
- Withey, S. B. 4, 214, 224, 237
- Wodon, Q. 61
- women 9, 26, 69, 106, 160, 189(n34), 252, 256t, 257, 259, 264(n15)
 - biological differences 170, 173
 - births attended by health professionals 93t, 95t, 98
 - comparative advantage (child-bearing and child-rearing) 173–4
 - 'consenting agents of their own discrimination' (contested) 176
 - double burden 184
 - empowerment (MDG) 93t
 - health 172
 - investment in children 187–8(n18)
 - 'missing' (because of sex-selective abortion) 168–9, 169t

- women – *continued*
 political representation 174–5
 right to vote 106
 sacrifices for children 172, 175,
 187(n11)
 seats held in parliament 93t,
 106, 177
 survival advantage 183
 textile workers in Bangladesh 27, 28
- Wood, G. 257, 267
- work 45t, 47t, 224
- work capacity 228f
- work effectiveness 47t
- work in home 182
- work involvement 28
- workers 214
 low-income 28
- working hours 13, 27, 28, 65
 GDP adjustment 67–70
- World Bank x, 1, 13, 38, 42t, 65, 67,
 117, 167, 168, 174, 179, 187(n11,
 n15), 192, 193, 202, 206n, 207, 209,
 210, 213, 240, 245, 249, 261,
 263(n5), 264(n16), 267
 life expectancy data 70
- World Bank: Environment
 Department 201
- World Database of Happiness* 225–6,
 229, 239
- ‘Item Bank’ 226
- World Development Indicators
 170n, 201
- World Development Report* (World Bank)
 5, 96
WDR 2000–01 241, 250, 263(n9)
WDR 2004 5
WDR on ‘Development and Equity’
 (2005) 186(n5)
- World Economic Forum (WEF)
 177, 192
- World Happiness Database (WHD) 11,
 12, 22
- World Health Organization (WHO) 192
 definition of health 236(n1)
 well-being (social, emotional,
 physical) 40n
- World Health Organization Quality of
 Life (WHOQOL) 11, 18(n11), 22,
 228, 228f, 239, 242, 263(n11)
 WHOQOL-BREF 253
- World Values Survey* 225, 239
- worth for world 217f, 218
 aspects of worth 223
 indicators 222–3
 overall 223
- WTP (Willing to pay, Dajgupta) 43t
- WWF 223, 239
- xenophobia 233
- Xu, Y. 162
- Yemen 183t, 206t
- young people 105, 257
- Zaim, O., *et al.* (2001) 114, 134
 Fare, R. 134
 Grosskopf, S. 134
- Zambia 84f, 206t
- Zeldin, T. 25, 64
- Zheng, B. 136, 166, 151
 ‘constant distribution-sensitivity’
 indexes 150, 151
- Zika, S. 223, 237
- Ziliak, S. 59(n6), 63
- Zimbabwe 73f 84f, 158, 205t
- Zolotas, X. 195, 213
 Economic Aspects of Welfare
 (EAW) 195