

The Happiness Measurest

A Sixty Second Index of Emotional Well-Being and Mental Health

Michael Fordyce

Edison Community College

Fort Myers, Florida

1977

## Abstract

The current status of measurement in happiness' research reveals a problem of profuse and inconsistent instrumentation that hampers the cross-comparability of studies in the field. Within this context, the development of the Happiness Measures (HM) is reviewed. Perhaps the most extensively and consistently used instrument over the past twelve years, the HM has demonstrated uniformly strong validity coefficients with mood measures, mental health inventories, adjustment criteria, and measures of personality characteristics long associated with happiness instruments, as well as notable convergence with other "well-being" instruments. It appears free of response bias, shows remarkable inter-and intra-individual reliability across samples, and holds validity as both a measure of personal happiness and global mental health. Because it provides much pertinent information in a minimal amount of time, the HM appears to have potential as a touchstone for future development of measurement in happiness research, as well as utility in many other research, counseling, and clinical settings.

The Happiness Measures i  
A Sixty Second Index of Emotional Well-Being  
and Mental Health

Personal happiness is generally held to be the most important goal in life. It is the one thing the average person hopes most to achieve, and it has been considered throughout the centuries as the ultimate and implicit end of all human behavior. Aristotle's view that "Human happiness is so important, it transcends all other worldly considerations" differs little from William James' more modern, psychological observation! "... happiness is for most men at all times the secret motive of all they do and all they are willing to endure." The most current perspective is put best by Angus Campbell (1976)«

"The attraction of the concept of happiness is certainly great, coming as it does from the early Greek identification with the "good life" and having as it does the almost universal currency as a recognized, if not uniquely important, component of the quality of life experience. It is one of those indispensable psychological concepts.\*. that has meaning to almost everyone."

Surprisingly, however, despite the obvious philosophical and theoretical importance of the topic, research in psychology largely ignored happiness - at least until the last 15 years. Previously an intermittent, isolated trickle

of studies characterized the field, but in recent years "happiness" has come into its own, and studies have been accumulating quite dramatically (Diener & Griffin, Note1, cite over 650 relevant studies in their current bibliography of happiness literature).

Presently, there exists a substantial body of research based information regarding the nature of happiness, the probable causes and influences that create happiness, the understanding of happy moods, the personality and objective characteristics of happy individuals, and newly-developed theoretical models to conceptualize happiness. Research has even reached the applied stage with several recent reports successfully incorporating past findings to increase the happiness levels of normal adults (Fordyce, 1977, 1983\* Lichter, Haye, & Kammann, 1980) The volume of findings now available is quite large (due in part to the massive scope of many research efforts, e.g., Andrews & Withey, 1976| Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1975; Campbell, et al., 1976; Cantril, 1965| Gurin, et al., 1960» Wessman & Ricks, 1966} and others), and over the years a series of surveys have appeared periodically (Fordyce, 1972, Note2; Kammann, Note3| Robinson & Shaver, 1963 Wessman, 1957| Wessman & Ricks, 1966; Wilson, 1967| and the most recent, Diener , Note 4 is especially comprehensive).

From these reviews, and an examination of the numerous studies now published in the field, there can be little doubt that substantial gains toward the research understanding and enhancement of personal happiness is finally taking place. However, it takes just a cursory look at the literature to reveal one basic concern that emerges in every serious survey or report» the adequacy of happiness measurement.

In any area of research, measurement issues are critical. And in happiness research, especially considering the almost sacred importance the concept has for people, such issues have been scrutinized with even greater concern and circumspection. There has always been a great deal of skepticism regarding happiness, and this has been largely due to a widely shared cultural perception of happiness as being elusive, unexplainable, and inviolably subjective. The.se perceptions led in turn to the view that happiness was equally nonviable as a psychological construct and thus fanciful, if not impossible, to measure and study empirically. Such beliefs, of course, explain the reluctance of psychology to begin the objective study of happiness that is now taking place. And this postponement appears to have been both unfortunate and unnecessary, for despite the general perception of happiness as ephemeral - - - \_\_\_\_\_, - - \_\_\_\_\_ v

and unmeasurable, research on the topic has shown quite the opposite. Happiness appears just as amenable to meaningful measurement as any other psychological phenomenon. Overall, the reliability and validity of happiness measures has proven to be highly adequate (Diener, Note "tj Fordyce 1972, Note 21 Kammann, 1979. Note 5; Larsen, et al., Note 6) and the consistency of resultant findings has been so homogeneous over studies\* it seems that the nature of happiness and its concomitants is far more stable, understandable, and basically universal than most have ever suspected.

Thus the original concern that happiness was unmeasurable and unresearchable has been successfully buried, but in its place has arisen a new problem: an overabundance of instrumentality. Over the years, scores of different approaches and measures have been designed to study happiness and few have ever been used more than once. So the question currently is not "Can happiness be measured?" but rather, "Which way are we going to measure it?" And this is not an idle question, since the diversity of measures used in the field has been almost equal to the number of studies conducted. Single-item scaling devices have been the most popular measure, and these have taken numerous forms (e.g., Andrews & Whithey's "delighted-terrible" scale (1979), Cantril's Self-Anchoring Ladder (1965)» and Wessman & Ricks' "elation-depression" scale (1966) are among the many recent variants

emerging from dozens of earlier forerunners.) Straight-forward, three-response questions (i.e., "How happy are you these days? Very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?") have been used extensively in large, national opinion studies (Gurin, et.al., 1960, Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1965 Converse & Robinson, 1966j and other surveys conducted by the associates at the Center of Social Science Research). A numerous variety of multi-item scales and questionnaires have been periodically reported (e.g., Bradburn's Affect Balance Scale (1969)1 Tellegen's Well-Being Scale, Note 7 j Dupuy's General Well-Being Schedule, Note 81 Kammann et al.'s, Affectometer (1979)J Underwood & Froming^ Mood Survey (1980)» the Griffin Scale [Diener, et. al., Note Campbell, Converse & Rodger's Index of General Affect (1976); being the most modern entries in a series of multi-item questionnaires that go as far back as Watson's "happiness questionnaire ,," 1930). In addition to these, there are a plethora. of measures developed over the years to measure geriatric morale, life-satisfaction, clinical depression, job-and marital-satisfaction, and other affective domains related to happiness. There are also a number of published instruments for the measurement of mood states (like the Depression Adjective Checklists, the Multiple Affect Adjective Checklist, the Beck Depression Survey, the Profile of Mood States, and others). Additionally, most widely used personality inventories have some sort of emotionally-oriented

subscale included in them. Add to all the above the numerous attempts to measure "happiness" through physiological indices, behavioral or gestural observations, peer judgments, and clinical evaluations and one can begin to appreciate the scope of measures that have been used in the past as well as the frustrating number of alternatives facing any new researcher interested in furthering happiness study.

Concern about the inconsistent measurement of happiness is not new. Some 16 years ago Wilson's review of the literature (1967) cited diverse and inconsistent use of measures as a problem in the field, and this situation has remained unchanged over the years (as Campbell, 1976; Diener, Note 4; Fordyce 1977; 1983; and Harry 1976? are the most recent to address). Yet, despite these reviewers' concerns, it seems that the only satisfactory solution for the majority of researchers attracted to the field is to create yet another instrument for consideration, often with little consideration of acceptably valid instruments produced before.'

It is easy enough to understand why such proliferation has occurred. Certainly part of the reason is the relative infancy of happiness study—naturally enthusiasm is focused much more on the topic (and potential discoveries) than on the more arduous task of refining measures. Also to blame is the fact that studies (until recently) have generally been sporadic, isolated, and one-shot investigations of

or had the resultant findings not been so typically consistent between-studies, the current state of research in the area could certainly be mired in contradiction and confusion.

Still the basic problem of inconsistent measurement remains. And undoubtedly, the main reason for it is that no continuous projects have been undertaken to study and refine any particular measure thoroughly enough to serve as a standard reference, upon which the field could build.

Given this background, the present paper provides a review of research with one instrument, the Happiness Measures (Fordyce, 1972, 1977, 1983» Note 10), which unlike most tests developed before or since, has been the focus of a continuous, ongoing research effort for the last 12 years. Because it has been one of the most continuously used and extensively validated measures in the field (and because it has been a criterion measure in several important studies on happiness), it merits a more thorough reporting than it has been afforded previously, to acquaint the interested researcher with its characteristics and potential uses.

#### Development of the Happiness Measures

The Happiness Measures were originally written in 1969 to meet the research need for an optimal happiness criterion. Following the most extensive review of the

literature at that time (Fordyce, 1972), it was concluded that self-reporting devices, particularly of the scale-type, were the most valid of the happiness measuring procedures employed to that date. There appears little doubt today, in the literature that self-reports of happiness are the most valid indices. Other alternatives (like behavioral or gestural observation, physiological indices, peer reports, and ratings by professionals) rarely demonstrate as high a validity as self-reports. Irwin, in an article, whose title sums it up "If you want to know how happy I am you'll have to ask me" (1979) and later Kamman, et al., (Note 1) found, for example, that Hartmann's (1938) original disappointing findings with peer ratings and behavioral indices of happiness were confirmed in their studies, as they have been in other efforts in between.

Among the self-reporting devices, single-item scales have shown themselves to be the most psychometrically valid of the alternatives. {Obviously they provide a much greater response-range over the popularly used three-response questions used in national opinion research, but interestingly, they have consistently demonstrated criterion superiority over most multi-item questionnaires that have been written (Fordyce, 1972; Andrew & Withey, 1976; Diener, Note 4). Yet among these "happiness" scales, a myriad of alternatives are available.

Based on the collected data, the Wessman and Ricks Scale (1966) was selected as the best validated happiness measures produced to that time. It had amassed rather impressive validity data (ranging from extensive psychometric comparisons to the use of professional clinical judgements), showed respectable reliability, appeared free of a variety of response-biases, and had the singular advantage. - of written descriptions at each point'of the - scale (rather than the open scales with descriptions only at the poles that typify most otKecs,.), Yet, the scale was hampered by a very narrow response range and inconsistent point descriptions. The original HM scale ( a 1G-point scale) was written, and subsequently revised (to its present 11-points), to correct these drawbacks. The resulting scale (a) correlated strongly to the valid Wessman and Ricks scale (+.93t 2 · Fordyce, 1972), (b) produced a much greater range of subject responses, and (c) was written in language that enhanced its inter-point consistency and understandability.

A final problem with the Wessman and Ricks Scale—indeed a problem that scale shared with all previous scaling devices—was ~~if~~ that it provided only a qualitative evaluation of an individual's happiness. There was no provision for a more quantitative report of positive feelings.

In addition, as Bradburn & Caplovitz (1965) and Bradburn (1969) had shown (and Zevon & Tellegen, 1982; Bryant & Veroff, 1982; and Diener and Emmons, 1984 have found since), positive and negative affect appear to be somewhat independent of each other, it was felt an additional, more quantitative question about happiness and unhappiness should be included in the HM. Thus, the three percentage estimates (i.e., "What percent of the time do you feel happy, unhappy, or neutral?") were added. This question, incidentally, produces a wide range of response, and has remained unchanged in the HM since its origination.

The resulting HM, a qualitative scaling device, coupled with the quantitative: "percentage estimate" question provides measures of both frequency and intensity of happiness affect, both critical, according to Diener, in his' recent major review of the literature (Note 4), for a full and adequate measurement of subjective well-being (see also Diener, 1984, Notes 12, 13. & 14).

#### Description of the Happiness Measures

The Happiness Measures (HM) is a deceptively simple instrument. It is an unusually quick measure to obtain an score, yet it provides a great deal of pertinent information about the well-being and mental health status of the subject

As outlined above, the HM consists of two, self-reporting measures of emotional morale. (1) an eleven-point scale (with written descriptions at each point to provide greater cross-comparability of responding) which the subject uses to check the point that comes closest to the perceived quality of happiness; and (2) a question that asks the subject to determine the percent of time spent in happy, unhappy, and neutral moods that provides a more quantitative index of happiness.

The scale and the percentage estimates produce the four, basic HM scores— and are provided directly as the subject completes the instrument. In addition, a combination score, derived by combining the happy scale with the happy percentage estimate in equal weights, can be easily calculated and has generally shown the strongest validity and reliability coefficients.

The scale and the happy percentage estimate provide the criteria scores for "happiness" (along with the combination score which comprises each in equal weights). The unhappy percent score, though not used as a criterion, provides interesting interpretation of the data, since, as cited above, many researchers have found that unhappiness is not always the reciprocal of happiness: it often shows relationships that are both independent and different than those shown by happiness measures. The neutral percent

estimate score is not used as a criterion either--it is included to allow the happy and unhappy percent estimates to vary independently. However, since that score relates significantly (and most often negatively) to happiness, but not to unhappiness one can assume that subjects consistently perceive "neutral" as a more unhappy than happy state, and obtained relationships with that score are often of interest to examine.

Given the variety of relatively independent measures of affect the instrument provides, and the potential ways they might be combined and scored (see Kammann, Farry & Herbison, Note 5)» it would seem that the HM is amenable to many interesting and sophisticated data analyses.

The Happiness Measures are primarily designed to measure general happiness, asking "on the average, (or in general,) how happy do you feel?" However, the HM has been used to measure emotional morale for more specific periods, e.g., "this past year", "last month", "this week", "today", etc. (e.g., Fordyce, 1977). The instrument has also been rated daily by subjects over periods of time, and the subsequent scores (a) averaged to produce a general happiness index, and (b) used to analyze mood cycles (e.g., Fordyce, 1972).

### Administration and Scoring

The potential user of the HM will find it a remarkably easy instrument to administer and score. Contained on a single sheet of paper, it can be self-administered to individuals or groups. The directions for the testtaker are provided on the sheet; and although these directions are usually presented verbally by the examiner before testing, we have found that the printed directions alone are more than sufficient for the majority of examinees to complete the HM correctly and without confusion.

The time of administering is very quick. Most respondents complete the HM within a minute. Individuals taking much more time than this, are often those who experience frequent mood swings, and they should be encouraged to provide the best "average" they can.

The HM is practically self-scoring. The scale score, the happy % estimate, the unhappy % estimate, and the neutral \$ estimate are exactly the numbers the subject provides. The combination score is the only item needing calculation (this score is easily derived by multiplying the scale score by 10, adding that result to the happy % estimate and dividing the total by 2),

### Reliability of the Happiness Measures

The reliability of the HM appears very good, especially considering the changing levels of happiness many people experience over time. (Fordyce, Note 10) reports test-retest reliabilities for the combination score over several time periods« .86 over a two week period (n=105; p < .01); .81 over a one month period (n=57; p < .01); .67 (n=27; p < .01) and .62 (n=71; p < .01) over a four month interval; and an average correlation of .85 in a series of four repeated 1½ week testings (n=19; p < .01)

coefficients for the other HM scores were quite similar. In another study, the reliability of the HM taken daily (and averaged for over three weeks) compared to the a "general" or "on the average" presentation of the instrument taken several days apart .was .70 (n=81; p < .01) and taken 15 weeks apart was .60 (n=52; p < .01) (Fordyce, 1972).

It seems, however, despite the reasonable reliability data reported for the HM, it is not, in the author's opinion, a psychometric characteristic that is of a paramount concern to the efficacy of the instrument. Unlike other personality variables that are more enduring and permanent in nature, happiness for most individuals can obviously change over time. Some periods of life are certainly

much happier than others, and given the uncertainties that life often presents, a sudden series of untoward or fortuitous events could alter anyone's happiness appreciably. Thus a high reliability of happiness measurement, especially as time-periods increase, should not be expected, nor even be considered as desirable.. Indeed, the ability of a happiness instrument to be sensitive to short-term morale change (and thus be somewhat unreliable in the technical sense) could be considered more of an advantage than a disadvantage. This very advantage with the HM has been demonstrated in two recent reports of some seven studies in which the average happiness-levels of normal adult college students was elevated through experimental manipulation using the instrument as the major happiness criterion (Fordyce, 1977, 1983).

Another way to look at the reliability of the HM is in terms of its inter-individual, rather than its intra-individual, characteristics. In this sense the most remarkably reliable attribute of the HM is how consistent and similar resulting statistics with its use have been. Over 12 years of testing, with scores of different samples, the HM has shown means, variances, internal score intercorrelations, and replicated correlations with a number of other personality and mood inventories that, for practical purposes, are almost identical (see takks WW)), This high across-sample consistency indicates a strong reliability of measurement for the HM.

## Validity Studies

### Construct Validity

The construct, or face, validity of the HM is obvious, and perhaps its strongest feature. As a purported measure of happiness, items on the HM deal directly with happiness itself. The actual term "happiness" is used throughout as the key concept requested of the subject. This is quite unlike most every other measure of life satisfaction and subjective, well-being. Whether scales or multi-item inventories, most other measures either do not directly target "happiness" at all, or combine "happiness items" with a variety of other affective and/or behavioral domains. The net effect of these more indirect approaches seems to add a greater diversity to what is included in the construct measured—without any greater precision or validity to concurrent or convergent criteria that result (Fordyce, 1972, Notes 2 & 10, Diener, Note 4j Andrew & Witney, 1970). In measuring happiness (and that is the object .here) we have assumed ",,,," that being happy is what people say it is" (Kammann, et al., 1979), and not confuse its measurement with items that tap area-satisfactions, personality characteristics, and other affective domains—as has generally been the case.

From the collected data, it would appear that the term "happiness", directly and forthrightly requested, connotes to the average individual all that is necessary in providing a basic evaluation of this fundamental construct, and that additional questionings in other related areas generally adds little or no precision to a basic measure of one's happiness status, and perhaps even confounds the issue.

#### Concurrent Validity

In an ongoing series of correlational studies, Fordyce (Note 10) has found strong and consistent  $r$ s with a wide variety of mood and emotional morale indices. Over the studies the HM has been compared to the Depression Adjective Checklists (Forms A, B, C & D), the Multiple Affect Adjective Checklist, the Profile of Mood States, the Self-Description Inventory, and a variety of other personality inventories (many of which contain subscales of an affective nature). The majority of these comparisons have been replicated several times over the years. Table 1 presents the collected data from the series of studies.

Insert Table 1 about here

As the Table shows, the HM has demonstrated strong, significant, and steady validity coefficients with all these mood and emotional morale indices over many years, with different samples, and between several replications. These results provide one line of evidence supporting the validity of the instrument.

The second line of evidence for the validity of the HM as a happiness measure is the finding that the HM demonstrates regular and significant relationships with measures of personality characteristics that have been long established in past happiness research. Looking over the data in Table 1, a number of significant trends can be observed between the major inventories. Persons who scored happily on the HM had a profile on these other tests that indicate a higher level of extroversion and spontaneity; a lower level of fear, tension, guilt, hostility, depression, and other negative emotions; a healthier level of self-actualization, mental health and emotional stability; a higher level of energy and activity; and a higher level of other qualities like self-esteem, leadership, and social orientation. Likewise, recent work with the Self-Descriptive Inventory (a newer test that measures many of the characteristics associated with happiness in the past (Fordyce, 1983, Note 15) has shown that high HM scorers can be typified as

living the "happy life-style" (an involved, active, fun, social, and productive life), as possessing the "happiness attitudes and values" (high optimism, modest expectations, low worry level, and present-orientation), and as having a "happy personality" (well organized and directed; friendly and extroverted; natural and spontaneous; basically well-adjusted; and lacking negative tensions and problems). All these findings are directly in line with past research on happiness, and as such, they provide additional support for the validity of the HM. (Moreover, if we reverse the focus of these studies, assuming the HM to be a valid index of happiness, these findings add yet another in a long series of confirmations regarding the attributes of happy individuals.)

#### Convergent Validity

Recently, several investigations have conducted studies into the relative merits of the numerous, available happiness measures and indices of well-being, providing further information on the validity of the HM.

Kammann, Farry, & Herbison (Note 5) used the HM percentage estimates in a differing manner from usual use, by deriving a "net time happy" score (subtracting the unhappy % estimate from the happy % estimate). In a sample of 118 adults, intercorrelations were presented between that score and some

12 other measures of well-being, with the HM "net happiness" showing significant correlations ( $p < .01$ ) with every instrument save one. Table 2 provides the data.

Insert Table 2 about here

The findings showed a strong relationship between the HM percentage estimates and a wide variety of scales that measure, various aspects of subjective well-being and mood factors. Unfortunately the HM scale was not included in the study, and the percentage estimates were not scored in their traditional manner. Yet, on a comparative basis, the "net time" score gleaned from the HM did well. Though not demonstrating the strongest overall correlational patterns with the other instruments in the study, it was among five instruments that clustered closely at the top.

Diener, and his associates, Larson, Levine & Emmons in a series of studies (1981, Note 5 & 6) has also compared a wide variety of happiness and well-being scales and inventories. In his recent review Diener (Note 6) discusses the comparative merits of more than 20 differing scales and measures, he and his associates have examined. Based on comparative evaluations, Diener states that "The 11 point Fordyce scale showed the strongest correlations with daily

affect and with life satisfaction of any measures we assessed.,," and concerning the HM percentage estimate question! "We have found these single item positive and negative frequency estimates provide convergent, construct, and criteria validities that are equal to or superior to those found for the Bradburn scale." (Note, the Bradburn Affect Balance Scale (19^9) is the original measure of affect frequency in the field.)

It would appear from these reports that the convergent validity of the HM appears quite good. It correlates strongly (often more strongly than others) to the many measures of happiness and subjective well-being now in use, and yet, it is far less elaborate to administer and score, and much quicker to use than the majority of the more complex instruments to which it has been compared.

#### Data from Subjective Reports and Interviews

A final line of validity evidence for the HM was offered by Fordyce (1977, 1983) utilizing personal reports and private interviews obtained from subjects participating in experiments where attempts were made toward increasing happiness. The objective data from those studies, using the HM as a criteria, showed significant increments in HM scores over the experimental procedures used. To confirm the validity of the observed HM data changes, a variety of post

experiment feedback devices were employed) privately submitted, openended questionnaires! individual and groups interviews; and unsolicited reports. From these various reports and interviews, it was clearly apparant to the research staff that the changes in scores on the HM were indicative of truly felt changes in the subjective feelings of happiness experienced by the subjects.

#### Validity as a Measure of Mental Health.

Past research has found, a strong relationship between happiness and mental health, and the data to date with the HM reflects this finding.

As Table 1 indicates, significant relationships exist between the HM and a variety of health and adjustment measures. Persons scoring happily on the HM also display healthy profiles on all the tests studied, indicating the HM has a potential validity as a quick, general index of mental health.

In this vein, it is generally agreed in the literature that happiness is the primary psychological reward for achieved mental health. As Fromm has said, "Happiness is the criterion of excellence in the art of living." Indeed, of all the possible criteria of healthy adjustment, happiness is considered by many theorist and practioners to be the single, most important. The fact that the HM, as simple as it is, can

relate significantly to such a wide variety of mental health criteria tends to indicate how globally fundamental a personality construct happiness is.

### Psychometric Characteristics

#### Response Bias.

Response bias on self-reporting questionnaires is always a concern, especially the tendency of Ss to appear more socially acceptable. The HM, however, seems generally free of such biasing tendencies.

When HM scores were compared to scores on the validity scale of the Minnesota Counseling Inventory ( $n=1^6$ ), the response bias scale of the Comrey Personality Scales ( $n=8^0$ ) and the lie- scale of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire ( $n=^7$ ) correlations were nonsignificant. Comparisons between the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (SDS) and the HM have shown mixed results in one comparison ( $n=50$ ) significant positive correlations (at the .05 level) were found in two others ( $n=6j$ ) the correlations were nonsignificant. It would appear that the HM could be susceptible to a slight tendency on the part of the subject to look more socially ideal, but this interpretation is problematical. Kammann (Note 5), for example, has noted that seven of the SDS items are "hardly distinguishable from valid well-being items..." and thus they deleted them in their studies (note that we did not). Furthermore, there is ample indication

in past findings that happy individuals can indeed be described as "socially model", thus significant relationships with the SDS could be interpreted, not as a biasing attempt on the part of subjects to "look good", but as an actual reflection of the fact that they are good.

Generally it appears from the above, that the HM (administered in its typical, "in general" form) is relatively free of response bias. However it has been suggested by several investigators that an even less biased estimate of self reporting mood characteristics can be obtained by averaging scores from a prolonged period of daily administrations, rather than relying on a single, "general" rating. In a test of this hypothesis with the HM, however, averaged daily ratings for a three week period were compared to a single, general HM given some 15 weeks before or after (presentations were counterbalanced), results showed (a), the "general" estimate had better concurrent validity (as measured by the mood and emotional stability scales of the Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI), and (b) that neither administration method showed significant correlations with the validity (social desirability bias) scale of the MCI. Apparently, over time, averaging provides no better freedom from bias (and less validity) than does a one shot, "in general" administration with the HM,

The tentative conclusion is that subjects do not particularly attempt to lie or fake on the HM, and it is the investigator's feeling that there is probably less motivation to disguise one's happiness level than there is to hide other, more embarrassing and socially unacceptable behaviors and feelings. Indeed, this may be one of the more subtle advantages of HM; It gives the subject a chance to indicate that his or her life is troubled, without having to detail why.

#### Effects of Sensitization

The HM appears free of sensitization effects, and thus has value in pretest-posttest and time-series designs. In three studies (Fordyce, 1972, 1977, 1983) using Solomon designs, posttest scores on the HM were determined to be unaffected by subjects' previous taking of the instrument. It was also found in another Solomon design study that response to the "in general" administration of the HM did not bias subsequent scores on the HM administered daily over time, and vice-versa.

#### Inter-Study Stability

Finally, as mentioned earlier, the internal characteristics of the HM have remained stable over numerous

samples studied over the past twelve years. The summary statistics and inter-correlational relationships among the various measures incorporated in the instrument show great inter-sample consistency.

#### Sex Difference on the HM

In the many administrations of the HM, there has been no tendency, either observed or statistically significant, that would indicate any consistent sex differences in responding to the HM, as has been generally found in the literature.

#### Norms

Extensive normative procedures have yet to be conducted, however, Table 3 provides means and standard deviations for 1,10<sup>^</sup> community college students (and their characteristics) for preliminary use.

Insert Table 3 Here

#### Discussion

Personal happiness is perhaps the most important thing human beings wish from life, and thus it deserves a greater scientific understanding. Past research has demonstrated that happiness is a concrete phenomenon; amenable to objective research and understanding. Research in the field has grown to substantial proportions, especially in recent

within this period of time scores of instruments to measure happiness have been developed (each demonstrating relative merit). But few have received extensive, ongoing study. Upon this background, the present paper has provided a review of research with one happiness instrument, the Happiness Measures that has been consistently used and validated for over 12 years. As discussed above, this instrument was developed in the footsteps of its most valid predecessors; it has been modified to enhance its most desirable characteristics; it contains measures of both the important dimensions of intensity and frequency of happiness; it shows very acceptable intra individual, and remarkable interindividual, reliability; it has demonstrated a wealth of findings that confirm its concurrent, convergent, criteria, and construct validity as, a happiness measure; per se, as well as a quick index of global mental health; it seems relatively free of typical response biases; it shows no appreciable sensitization effects; it has consistently shown highly reliable interstudy means, variances, interscore and criteria correlations; and it is far easier to administer and score than most other instruments.

With these many desirable characteristics, the Happiness Measures would seem appropriate for a number of uses. First,

in the area of happiness research itself, it would seem advantageous for the field to have some sort of criteria to further its inevitable expansion, and provide some form of inter-study consistency of measurement. Given the background of instrument proliferation cited at the outset of this paper, some form of measurement consistency in the field would be highly desirable to assure a reasonable degree of cross-study comparability as the field develops. It is not necessarily suggested here, that the HM provides the solution to the larger problem of varied and inconsistent measurement, but it is argued that the instrument, because of its accumulated data and reliability over many years, might serve as a touchstone of comparison for the further validation and development of happiness measurement, as well as a useful criteria in many happiness studies.

Beyond this basic use in happiness research, the Happiness Measures may come to find other uses. Although not enough validity data has been collected to determine for certain, it could well be useful (because of its apparent freedom from sensitization effects) in research dealing with mood cycles, bio-rhythms, and other affect changes (as it already has been used in studies of short-term happiness increment) as well as valuable in clinical and counseling set-\*

tings where a quick, initial index of mental health functioning is sought. It also may serve quite valuably in clinical research (as an additional research variable); as part of a complete psychodiagnosis (to add greater depth to an overall, clinical evaluation); or in situations where a clinician or researcher finds more lengthy schedules either infeasible or unduly obtrusive. Obviously, the greatest apparent characteristic of the HM lies in its ability to tap a variety of complexly interrelated mental health, personality, and well-being domains in a minute. The creative possibilities of such a global measurement provides potential opportunities for meaningful personality measurement in many situations and environments heretofore inaccessible to research.

In the final analysis, research with the Happiness Measures, and the scores of other instruments designed components of subjective well-being, demonstrate one further, most significant implication,, Beyond the very exciting fact that psychological research is developing a substantial understanding of the factors that contribute to, and can apparently enhance, personal happiness, is an emerging research construct of happiness that places it, in empirical terms, equal to the philosophical and theoretical importance it has

always been afforded. The most remarkable finding regarding studies with happiness and well-being measurements is how widely and invariably they intercorrelate with indices of mental health characteristics and so many other positively valued personality attributes. The global, and seemingly universal, nature of these empirical interrelationships is creating a scientific foundation to the wisdom of ancient philosophy that "happiness is the most important thing in life." Now, however, psychology is in a position to take "happiness" from the strict province of philosophy (as it has with so many topics before) and to study it rigorously and scientifically. The possible fruit of such study can only be imagined, at this point—but the potential of psychology contributing to the greater understanding and enhancement of happiness for humanity is certainly within reach —indeed, it seems well upon the way.

#### Reference Notes

1. Diener, E., & Griffin, S. Subjective well-being: Happiness, life satisfaction and morale (Comprehensive bibliography)\* Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Department of Psychology, 1982.
  2. Fordyce, M, W. Human happiness: The findings of psychological research, Unpublished book, 1977\* (Available from M.W. Fordyce, Edison Community College, Fort Myers, FL, 33907).
  3. Kammann, R. Psychological well-being: A synopsis of three research texts. Unpublished manuscript, University of Otago, New Zealand, Department of Psychology, 1977.
- \*K Diener, E. Subjective well-being, Review submitted for publication, 1983. (Available from E. Diener, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Champaign, IL 61820.)
5. Kammann, R., Farry, M. & Herbidon, P. The measurement and content of the sense of well-being. Unpublished manuscript, University of Otago, New Zealand, Department of Psychology, 1981,
  6. Larson, R. J., Emmons, R. A., & Diener, E, Validity and meaning of measures of subjective well-being. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Convention, Chicago, 1983.

7. Tellegen, A, Differential Personality Questionnaire. Unpublished materials, University of Minnesota, 1979.
8. Dupuy, H, J, The research edition of the general psychological well-being schedule. Unpublished manuscript. Route 1, Box 124A, Vesuvius.Virginia, 1978.
9. Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, R, & Griffin, S. The Griffin Scale: A Measure of Life Satisfaction. Manuscript submitted for publication, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1983.
10. Fordyce, M,W. Research on the Happiness Measures (and tabular supplement). Unpublished manuscript, 1977» revised, 1983» (Available from M.W. Fordyce, Edison Community College, Fort Myers,Fl 33907.)
11. Kammann.R., Smith,R., & McQueen, M, Low accuracy in judgement of others' happiness (among other things), Unpublished manuscript, University of Ctago, New Zealand, Department of Psychology, 1980.
12. Diener, E,, & Larsen, R. J. Temporal stability and cross-situational consistency of positive and negative affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, in press, 198\*1-

13. Diener, E., Larsen, R.J., & Emmons, R, A, Person affect and subjective well-being. Frequency and intensity as basic dimensions. Manuscript submitted for publication, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1983.
- Ik,* Diener, E,, Larsen, R.J., Levine, S., & Emmons, R.A. Frequency and intensity» The underlying dimensions of positive and negative affect. Manuscript submitted for publication, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 1983.
15. Fordyce, M.W. The self description inventory. A multi-test to measure happiness and its concomitants. Unpublished manuscript,1980. (Available from M.W. Fordyce. Edison Community College, Fort Myers,Fl 33907.)

## References

- Andrews, F., & Withey, S. R. Social indicators of well being.  
New York. Plenum Press, 1976.
- Bradburn, N., & Caplovitz, D. Reports on Happiness. Chicago  
Aldine, 1965.
- Bradburn, N. The structure of psychological well-being.  
Chicago Aldine, 1969,
- Bryant, F. B., & Veroff, J. The structure of psychological well  
being: A sociohistorical analysis. Journal of Personality  
and Social Psychology. 1982, 42. 653-673.
- Campbell, A. Subjective measures of well-being. American Psy-  
chologist, 1976, 11, 117-121.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P., & Rogers, W, L. The quality of Am-  
erican life. New York. Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Cantril, H. The Pattern of Human Concerns. New Brunswick, N.J.»  
Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- Diener, E., & Emmons, R. A. The independence of positive and  
negative affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psy-  
chology, in press, 1982
- Fordyce, M.W, Happiness, its daily variation and its relation  
to values. (Doctoral dissertation, United States Intern-  
ational University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts Inter-  
national, 21: 1266B, (University Microfilms No. 72-23,  
\*+9D).

- Fordyce, M.W. Development of a program to increase personal happiness. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 197?, 2jf (6), 511-521.
- Fordyce, M.W. A program to increase happiness; Further studies. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1983, 30 (\*), 483-^98.
- Fordyce, M.W. The Psychology of Happiness | Fourteen Fundamentals. Fort Myerst Cypress Lake Media, 1981.  
(Also available from the author, Edison Community College, Fort Myers, FL 33907).
- Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. Americans View Their Mental Health. New Yorki Basic Books, 1960.
- Harry, J. Evolving sources of happiness for men over the life cycle; A stuctural analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1976, 38 (2), 289-296. •
- Hartmann, G, W, Personality traits associated with variations in happiness. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 193^, 12. 202-212.
- Irwin, R., Kammann, R., & Dixon, G. If you want to know how happy I am you'll have to ask me. New Zealand Psychologist, 1979, 8, 10-12.
- Kammann, R,, Christie, D,, Irwin, R,, & Dixon,G. Properties of an inventory to measure happiness (and psychological health). New Zealand Psychologist. 1979, 8, 1-1.

- Lichter, S., Hay, K., & Kammann, R. Increasing happiness through cognitive retraining. New Zealand Psychologist. 1980, 2, 57-6<sup>^</sup>.
- Robinson, J., & Shaver, P. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michi Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, 1968.
- Underwood, B., & Froming, W.J. The mood survey. A personality measure of happy and sad moods. Journal of Personality Assessment. 1980, 44, <sup>^</sup>*Ok-klk*.
- Watson, G. Happiness among adult students of education. The Journal of Educational Psychology. 1930, 21, 79-109.
- Wessman, A. E. A psychological inquiry into satisfaction and happiness (Doctoral dissertation, Princeton University, 1956). Dissertation Abstracts International. 12, 138<sup>^</sup>. (University Microfilms No. 00-20, 168).
- Wessman, A. E., & Ricks, D. F. Mood and Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966,
- Wilson, W. R. Correlates of avowed happiness, Journal of Clinical Psychology. 1967. 2J, 295-305.
- Zevon, M. A., & Tellegen, A. The structure of mood change: An idiographic/nomothetic analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1982, <sup>^</sup>2., 111-122.

Test Name	Subscales	Combination Score on HM			
		(n=98)	(n=158)	(n=58)	(n=275)
Depression Adjective Check-List	(Form A)	-.80**	-.72**	-.52**	-.76**
	(Form B)	(n=63) -.50**			
	(Form D)				
Multiple Adjective Affective Check-List	anxiety	-.63**			
	depression				
	hostility	-.53**			
Profile of Wood States		(n=98)	(n=58)	(n=158)	
	tension	-.51**	-.54**	-.52**	
	depression	-.66**	-.56**	-.63**	
	anger	-.40**	-.32*	-.50**	
	vigor	.63**	.32*	.53**	
	fatigue	-.55**	-.13	-.40**	
	confusion	-.52**	-.53**	-.51**	
Comrey Personality Scales		(n=84)			
	activity	.30**			
	emotional stability	.52**			
	extraversión	.42**			

Table 1 (continued)

	(n=98)	(n=47)	(n=58)	(n=63)	
Personal Orientation Inventory	time-competence	.59**	.46**	.47**	.51**
	inner-directedness	.49**	.55**	.50**	.29*
	self-actualizing values	.40**	.50**	.30*	.27
	existentialism	.27**	.27	.24	.11
	feeling reactivity	.24*	.31*	.42**	.24
	spontaneity	.47**	.36*	.38**	.43**
	self-regard	.56**	.60**	.60**	.50**
	self-acceptance	.39**	.20	.39**	.20
	nature of man	.30**	.29*	.19	.20
	synergy	.33**	.41**	.21	.18
	acceptance of aggression	.38**	.32*	.14	.05
	capacity for intimate contact	.34**	.45**	.38**	.25*
	Eysenck Personality Questionnaire	(n=47)			
extroversion		0.56**			
	neuroticism	-0.41**			
Meyers- Briggs indicator	(n=98)				
	extroversion	.61**			
	introversion	-.58			
16 Personality Factor Questionnaire	(n=58)	(n=47)			
	emotionally stable (ego strength)	.48**	.43**		
	venturesome (parrhia)	.29*	.38**		
	apprehensive (guilt proneness)	-.31*	-.33*		
	tense (high ergic tension)		-.37**		
	happy-go-lucky	.15	.30*		
	suspicion	-.31*	.01		
	self-concept	.40**	.20		

Table 1 (continued)

Self Description  
Inventory

		(n=63)	(n=71)	(n=53)
Form A	Achieved Happiness	.60**	.68**	.66**
	Happy Personality	.42**	.42**	.63**
	Happy Attitudes & Values	.52**	.49**	.69**
	Happy Life-Style	.37**	.46**	.58**
	Total Score	.50**	.59**	.72**
Form B	Achieved Happiness	.63**	.71**	.67**
	Happy Personality	.56**	.55**	.63**
	Happy Attitudes & Values	.55**	.34**	.69**
	Happy Life-Style	.38**	.60**	.53**
	Total Score	.62**	.63**	.74**
Form C	Achieved Happiness	.60**	.68**	.56**
	Happy Personality	.51**	.51**	.52**
	Happy Attitudes & Values	.57**	.36**	.59**
	Happy Life-Style	.56**	.60**	.47**
	Total Score	.66**	.61**	.64**
Form D	Happiness ^Achieved	.67**	.66**	.61**
	Happy Personality	.58**	.48**	.69**
	Happy Attitudes & Values	.54**	.56**	.63**
	Happy Life-Style	.42**	.54**	.53**
	Total Score	.67**	.64**	.73**

Table 1 (continued)

Minnesota Counseling Inventory	(n=146)	
family relationships		.31**
social relationships		.41**
emotional stability		.43**
conformity		.25**
adjustment to reality		.49**
mood		.47**
leadership		.41**
<hr/>		
Motivational Analysis Test	(n=98)	
unintegrated fear		-.21*
unintegrated super-ego		.25*
integrated pugnacity/ sadism		-.34**
integrated sweetheart/ spouse		.26*
<hr/>		
Greer Fear Survey Schedule	(n=87)	
		-.23*

^ or brevity only subscales with consistently significant relationships with the HM are presented, and only the correlations with the combination score given. The data, in much greater detail, is available from the author upon request (cf. Note 10).

An unpublished survey of 51 common fear-provoking situations (Greer, 1965; 1966).

\*p < .05.

\*\*p < .01.

Table 2

Correlations between the Happiness Measures Percentage Estimate  
(Net time happy)<sup>a</sup> score and Various Scales of Well-Being  
(From Kammann, Farry, & Herbison, 1981)

Scale	r with HM "net time happy score"
	(n=H8
Kammann's Affectometer (1979)	.68**
Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers Index of Affect (1976)	.66**
Andrews & Withey's "Circles" measure (1976)	.73**
Andrews & Witney's Delighted- Terrible scale (1976)	.70**
Andrews & Witney's Sum of Satisfactions (1976)	.45**
Andrews & Witney's "Faces" (1976)	.66**
Kammann's "7 step happiness scale" (1981)	.66**
Bradburn's "Affect Balance Scale" (1969)	.61**
Eysenck & Eysenck's Personality- Inventory (Neuroticism Scale) (1964)	-.50**
Gurin, Veroff, & Feld's 3 step happiness question (1960)	.46**
Wessman & Ricks' 10-point, relation-depression scale (1966)	.43**
Campbell, Converse & Rodgers' "Stress" scale (1976)	-.09

<sup>a</sup>This measure, derived by Kammann, Farry & Herbison differs from the normal scoring of the HM percentage estimates. The "net time" measure is the net differences between the Happy % score minus the Unhappy % score.

\*\*p < .01

Table 3  
Means and Standard Deviations on the Fordyce Happiness  
Measures for 1,752 Community College Students<sup>a</sup> for Preliminary Use  
(General Form)

FHM Score	Mean	Standard Deviation
Combination Score <sup>13</sup>	61.30	17.62
bcale (11 points)	6.90	1.74
Happy <i>fo</i> Estimate	53.59?»	21.30
Unhappy % Estimate	20. 5%o	14.29
Neutral % Estimate <sup>13</sup>	25.82%	21,22

<sup>a</sup>927 Females, 825 Males; age range 17-71, mean 24.9 years; for diverse social, educational, economic, and regional backgrounds.

These scores are free to vary from zero to 100.

0-sum/g/29/\*/110/a

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

AGE \_\_\_\_\_ SEX \_\_\_\_\_

### EMOTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

**PART I DIRECTIONS:** Use the list below to answer the following question: **IN GENERAL, HOW HAPPY OR UNHAPPY DO YOU USUALLY FEEL?** Check the *one* statement below that best describes *your average happiness*.

- Check just one of these boxes!
- 10. Extremely happy (feeling ecstatic, joyous, fantastic!)
  - 9. Very happy (feeling really good, elated!)
  - 8. Pretty happy (spirits high, feeling good.)
  - 7. Mildly happy (feeling fairly good and somewhat cheerful.)
  - 6. Slightly happy (just a bit above neutral.)
  - 5. Neutral (not particularly happy or unhappy.)
  - 4. Slightly unhappy (just a bit below neutral.)
  - 3. Mildly unhappy (just a little low.)
  - 2. Pretty unhappy (somewhat "blue", spirits down.)
  - 1. Very unhappy (depressed, spirits very low.)
  - 0. Extremely unhappy (utterly depressed, completely down.)

SCALE SCORE

COMBINATION IS SCALE HAPPY & UNHAPPY IN EQUAL WEIGHT

**PART II DIRECTIONS:** Consider your emotions a moment further. *On the average*, what percent of the time do you feel happy? What percent of the time do you feel unhappy? What percent of the time do you feel neutral (neither happy nor unhappy)? Write down your best estimates, as well as you can, in the spaces below. Make sure the three figures add-up to equal 100%.

**ON THE AVERAGE:**

The percent of time I feel happy \_\_\_\_\_ %  
The percent of time I feel unhappy \_\_\_\_\_ %  
The percent of time I feel neutral \_\_\_\_\_ %  
TOTAL: 100 %

percent scores

**PROFILE SHEET FOR HAPPINESS MEASURES**

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DATE TESTED \_\_\_\_\_  
 OCCUPATION \_\_\_\_\_ AGE \_\_\_\_\_ SEX \_\_\_\_\_

DESCRIPTION of SCORES:	INTENSITY (I)	FREQUENCY (F)			(I + F)	
	SCALE SCORE	% HAPPY	% UNHAPPY	% NEUTRAL	COMBINATION SCORE	
		100 ____			100 ____	80
		95 ____				70
Extremely happy	10 ____	90 ____			95 ____	
		85 ____			90 ____	
Very happy	9 ____	80 ____	0 ____	0 ____	85 ____	
		75 ____	5 ____		80 ____	
		70 ____				60
Pretty happy	8 ____	65 ____	10 ____	10 ____	75 ____	
		60 ____	15 ____		70 ____	
Mildly happy	7 ____	55 ____	20 ____	20 ____	65 ____	
		50 ____				50
Slightly happy	6 ____	45 ____	25 ____	30 ____	55 ____	
		40 ____	30 ____	40 ____	50 ____	
		35 ____			45 ____	
		30 ____	35 ____			40
Neutral	5 ____	25 ____	40 ____	50 ____	40 ____	
		20 ____			35 ____	
Slightly unhappy	4 ____	15 ____	45 ____	60 ____	30 ____	
		10 ____	50 ____	70 ____	25 ____	30
Mildly unhappy	3 ____	5 ____	55 ____		20 ____	
		0 ____	60 ____	80 ____	15 ____	
Pretty unhappy	2 ____				10 ____	
			65 ____	90 ____	5 ____	20
Very unhappy	1 ____		70 ____		0 ____	
			75 ____	100 ____		10
Extremely unhappy	0 ____					

Raw Scores \_\_\_\_\_