



International Journal of Psychology and Psychoanalysis

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Feeling Good Vs. Living Well: A Deeper Look at Human Flourishing

Aman Aher, MBBS^{1,*} and Manisha Jaywant Aher, MBBS, DGO, MA²

¹Robert J. Trulaske, Sr. College of Business, University of Missouri, United States of America

²Arias Maternity and High-Risk Obstetric Care Center, India

*Corresponding author: Aman Aher, Robert J. Trulaske, Sr. College of Business, University of Missouri, United States of America



Abstract

Happiness and well-being are frequently conflated in both academic and public discourse, yet they constitute distinct psychological constructs with unique theoretical and practical implications. While happiness is typically operationalized as transient affective states or global life satisfaction [1], well-being encompasses more enduring aspects of psychological functioning, including purpose, personal growth, and social connectedness [2]. This paper systematically examines three critical aspects of this distinction: (1) the operational definitions differentiating these constructs, (2) their respective measurement approaches, and (3) the practical implications for interventions across educational, organizational, and policy contexts. Emerging evidence indicates that well-being measures demonstrate superior predictive validity for long-term outcomes such as resilience, career stability, and social contribution compared to traditional happiness metrics. Moreover, intervention studies reveal divergent effects based on whether programs target hedonic (happiness-focused) or eudaimonic (well-being-focused) dimensions. By clarifying these conceptual and empirical distinctions, the authors advocate for a more nuanced framework in positive psychology.

Keywords

Happiness, Well-Being, Positive psychology, Measurement, Intervention.

Introduction

Happiness and well-being are often considered to be the same, yet they represent distinct but interconnected dimensions of human flourishing. While happiness typically refers to transient emotional states or life satisfaction [1], well-being encompasses a

deeper, more enduring sense of purpose, psychological functioning, and social fulfillment [2]. This paper argues that treating happiness and well-being as separate but complementary constructs can refine their application in education, work culture, and policy. By distinguishing between momentary happiness and sustained well-being, outdated metrics of success such as productivity or material wealth can be reimagined to prioritize holistic human development. Positive Psychology offers a framework for this integration, emphasizing strategies that cultivate both emotional joy and long-term fulfillment [3,4]. Recognizing their unique roles enables more nuanced approaches to fostering flourishing individuals and societies, moving beyond superficial indicators toward meaningful, long-lasting well-being states.

Discussion

Happiness and well-being are interconnected concepts that reflect the quality of a person's life. Happiness is typically defined as a state of positive emotion, contentment, and satisfaction with life. It includes transient feelings of joy as well as a deeper sense of fulfillment. Well-being, on the other hand, is a broader and more holistic measure that encompasses not only emotional states but also physical health, social relationships, purpose, and the ability to manage stress. Psychological theories often distinguish between hedonic well-being (focused on pleasure and the absence of pain) and eudaimonic well-being (centered on meaning, personal growth, and self-



Citation: Aher A, Aher MJ (2025) Feeling Good Vs. Living Well: A Deeper Look at Human Flourishing. Int J Psychol Psychoanal 11:076. doi.org/10.23937/2572-4037.1510076

Submitted: October 01, 2025 : **Accepted:** November 08, 2025 : **Published:** November 12, 2025

Copyright: © 2025 Aher A, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

realization). Together, happiness and well-being offer a comprehensive view of what it means to live a good life.

The fundamental distinction between happiness and well-being becomes particularly salient when examining their respective measurement approaches. Happiness scales, which dominate much of positive psychology research, primarily focus on assessing subjective affective states through widely used instruments such as the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) and the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS). These measures excel at capturing either momentary emotional experiences (in the case of PANAS) or global cognitive evaluations of life satisfaction (with SWLS), with strong demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .86-.90$) for these specific constructs [1]. However, their very strength in measuring transient emotions or surface-level evaluations represents their key limitation that they provide little insight into the deeper, more complex aspects of human psychological functioning that characterize true flourishing.

The concept of the hedonic complex further complicates this measurement landscape, as it encompasses not just momentary pleasure but also the pursuit and attainment of pleasurable experiences over time [5]. While traditional happiness measures focus on snapshots of affect or global satisfaction judgments, the hedonic complex acknowledges the dynamic interplay between immediate gratification and longer-term pleasure-seeking behaviors. This complexity suggests that even within hedonic measurement approaches, there exists untapped nuances that current happiness scales may be an oversimplification. However, even this more sophisticated hedonic framework still fails to capture the eudaimonic dimensions of meaning and growth that characterize comprehensive well-being.

In contrast, well-being measurement instruments like Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scales and the more recent Flourishing Index take a fundamentally different approach. Grounded in eudaimonic philosophy and self-determination theory, these comprehensive tools operationalize multi-dimensional constructs including autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationships, purpose in life, and self-acceptance [2]. Where happiness measures might ask respondents to rate their current mood or general life satisfaction, well-being assessments uncover whether individuals feel they are realizing their potential, growing as a person, and contributing meaningfully to society.

A growing body of research reveals a counterintuitive phenomenon: the active pursuit of happiness may inadvertently diminish well-being [6]. This paradox emerges when individuals equate happiness with constant positive affect, leading to unrealistic expectations and self-monitoring that cause dissatisfaction [7]. Experimental studies show that participants instructed to focus on maximizing

happiness during pleasant activities (e.g., listening to uplifting music) report lower enjoyment than those who engage naturally [8], suggesting that hyper-awareness of emotional states disrupts the very experiences meant to foster well-being. Crucially, this effect is most pronounced when happiness is framed as a personal goal rather than a byproduct of meaningful actions. In contrast, eudaimonic pursuits such as contributing to others or developing competence avoid this pitfall by shifting focus from internal states to outward growth [9].

The predictive validity of these different measurement approaches reveals striking differences. Well-being metrics demonstrate 2-3 times greater explanatory power for important life outcomes compared to happiness scales ($\beta = 0.52-0.61$ Vs. $0.19-0.28$ respectively) when examining factors like long-term resilience, career stability, and relationship quality [3]. This pattern holds even when controlling baseline happiness levels, suggesting that well-being measures capture unique variance that is both conceptually distinct from and practically more important than simple happiness assessments.

Current organizational and policy practices reveal a troubling measurement gap. While 73% of workplace interventions rely exclusively on happiness-centric metrics like employee satisfaction surveys (which may simply reflect transient mood states), only 12% incorporate genuine well-being indicators such as assessments of purpose alignment or personal growth [10]. This measurement mismatch leads to potentially inflated claims of intervention success when short-term mood improvements are mistaken for meaningful, lasting changes in employee flourishing. Similar issues plague educational and public health interventions where program evaluations frequently default to happiness measures due to their brevity and ease of administration, potentially masking null or even negative effects on participants' deeper well-being.

The methodological imperative is clear: researchers and practitioners must exercise far greater precision in aligning their theoretical constructs with appropriate measurement tools. Happiness scales have their place in affective research and momentary assessment contexts, while well-being scales are essential for studies examining sustained flourishing and meaningful life outcomes. This distinction carries ethical as well as scientific implications such as the continued conflation of these constructs risks invalidating research findings and the development of policies and interventions that may fail to address (or even inadvertently undermine) the very aspects of human experience they aim to enhance. Future work should focus on developing hybrid assessment approaches that can efficiently capture both hedonic and eudaimonic dimensions while

maintaining conceptual clarity between these distinct but interrelated aspects of human experience.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the authors reemphasize the critical importance of distinguishing between happiness and well-being as separate yet interrelated psychological constructs. The evidence demonstrates that while happiness measures effectively capture transient emotional states and global life evaluations, they consistently fail to assess the deeper dimensions of psychological functioning that characterize sustained well-being. More importantly, the research shows that well-being metrics demonstrate significantly greater predictive power for long-term life outcomes, including resilience, career stability, and meaningful social contribution.

These findings carry substantial implications across multiple domains of practice. In organizational psychology and public policy, the prevalent overreliance on happiness-centric approaches has frequently yielded interventions that produce short-term affective benefits without fostering enduring personal growth or societal improvement. The paradox of happiness pursuit further complicates this picture, revealing how direct attempts to maximize happiness may inadvertently undermine well-being.

The current state of research highlights several crucial needs for advancement. First, there is an urgent requirement for more precise measurement approaches that respect the unique contributions of both constructs while maintaining their conceptual distinction. Second, the field must develop integrated yet nuanced frameworks that strategically employ happiness measures for understanding immediate affective states while utilizing well-being assessments to evaluate lasting flourishing. Such differentiated approaches would not only enhance the scientific rigor of positive psychology research but also lead to more effective interventions.

Ultimately, by maintaining this crucial conceptual distinction while exploring their synergistic relationships, researchers and practitioners can move beyond superficial notions of happiness. This will enable the cultivation of deeper, more sustainable forms of well-being that truly align with our fundamental human capacities for meaning, connection, and personal growth. The path forward lies in recognizing that while happiness and well-being are related, they require distinct yet complementary approaches in both research and application to fully understand and promote human flourishing [11-20].

Acknowledgements

Ethics Statement: Not applicable.

Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Funding Declaration: The authors received no financial support/NIH grants for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Competing Interests Statement: There are no competing interests.

References

1. Diener E, Oishi S, Tay L (2018) Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nat Hum Behav* 2: 253-260.
2. Ryff CD, Keyes CLM (1995) The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 69: 719-727.
3. Seligman MEP (2011) *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Free Press.
4. Fredrickson BL (2009) *Positivity: Top-notch research reveals the 3-to-1 ratio that will change your life*. Crown publishers.
5. Kahneman D, Diener E, Schwarz N (1999) *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology*. Russell Sage Foundation.
6. Mauss IB, Tamir M, Anderson CL, Nicole S Savino (2011) Can seeking happiness make people unhappy? Paradoxical effects of valuing happiness. *Emotion* 11: 807-815.
7. Ford BQ, Shallcross AJ, Mauss IB, Nicole S Savino (2014) Desperately seeking happiness: Valuing happiness is associated with symptoms and diagnosis of depression. *J Soc Clin Psychol* 33: 890-905.
8. Schooler JW, Ariely D, Loewenstein G (2003) The pursuit and monitoring of happiness can be self-defeating. In: J Carrillo, I Brocas, *The Psychology of economic Decision*. 41-70.
9. Ryff CD (2014) Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychother Psychosom* 83: 10-28.
10. Helliwell JF, Layard R, Sachs JD, Aknin LB, De Neve JE, et al. (2023) *World Happiness Report 2023*. Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
11. Diener E, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, S Griffin (1985) The satisfaction with life scale. *J Pers Assess* 49: 71-75.
12. Diener E, Wirtz D, Tov W, Kim-Prieto C, Choi Dw, et al. (2010) New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research* 97: 143-156.
13. Donaldson SI, Lee JY, Donaldson SI (2019) Evaluating positive psychology interventions at work: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology* 4: 113-134.
14. Huppert FA, So TT (2013) Flourishing across Europe: Application of a new conceptual framework for defining well-being. *Soc Indic Res* 110: 837-861.
15. Lyubomirsky S, King L, Diener E (2005) The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychol Bull* 131: 803-855.
16. Ryff CD (1989) Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57: 1069-1081.

17. Ryff CD, Singer BH (2008) Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 9: 13-39.
18. Steger MF, Kashdan TB, Oishi S (2008) Being good by doing good: Daily eudaimonic activity and well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality* 42: 22-42.
19. Vanhove AJ, Harms PD (2015) Reconceptualizing workplace well-being: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 20: 226-238.
20. Watson D, Clark LA, Tellegen A (1988) Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 54: 1063-1070.