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1. Abstract

Title

The phenomena of happiness within people living in poverty.

Keywords

Happiness, poverty, well-being and income.

Domain

The aim of this proposed research is to determine what the relation is between happiness, well-being and life satisfaction for people belonging to the base of the pyramid. Researching the criteria for happiness when it comes to people living in extreme poverty. The research may provide an answer to whether or not happiness relates to materialism which is very low for people belonging to the base of the pyramid. I will conduct a literature review of the existing literature studies over the past 10 years (2009-2019) in order to conclude the different studies that are made from different angles.

Methodology

For the purpose of this thesis I conduct a literature review taking into consideration quantitative research. While the drivers of happiness and well-being are divergent a deductive-internal will be performed in order to draw conclusions on the reasons why and the level of happiness and/or well-being people living within poverty uphold. In order to retrieve appropriate literature an online keyword research is conducted using the Web of Science.

The literature review will provide a solid answer to the mixed results that are published in previous research. By searching literature studies, papers, books and scientific publications based on quantitative research. The selection of studied works mainly consists of
research made in the last 10 years. The quality of the research is validated by parameters such as year of publication, participants living within poverty and participants of working age.
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4. Introduction

Background

Happiness and moreover the pursuit of it by us humans has always been present within human society. And in modern times, it is often expected that happiness is present within us and the people around us. Especially in those parts of the globe that are considered as wealthy and prosperous. Nevertheless, no matter our inner emotional state, we tend to let the people in our society perceive us as happy, through social media, small talk and materialism. In short, we take it for granted.

When discussing happiness, which is a subjectively perceived concept, we can start from basic questions such as: what is happiness? Can humans be happy, and if so, is it their purpose? If we can, we want to and we are expected to be happy, how do we reach happiness?

Many philosophers have studied the concept of happiness, starting with Democles, a philosopher from Hellenic history. He put forth a suggestion that, unlike it was previously thought, happiness does not result from ‘favorable fate’ (i.e. good luck) or other external
circumstances. Democritus contended that happiness was a ‘case of mind’, introducing a subjectivist view as to what happiness is (Kesebir & Diener, 2008; Heather, 2019).

Socrates and Plato introduced a more objective view on happiness. They put forth the notion that happiness was “secure enjoyment of what is good and beautiful”. Plato developed the idea that the best life is one whereby a person is either pursuing pleasure or exercising intellectual virtues. An argument which, the next key figure in the development of the philosophy of happiness, Aristotle, disagreed with (Waterman, 1993; Heather, 2019). Epicurus contended that in fact, virtue (living according to values) and pleasure are interdependent (Kesebir & Diener, 2008; Heather, 2019).

In Hellenic history, the Hedonism theory of happiness, which in short states happiness as such is the tradeoff between pain and pleasure, dominated the philosophic approach. More on Hedonism is explained later on in the theoretical framework.

Later on, Christian philosophers said that next to virtue, happiness is in the hands of God while eternal happiness is found in Heaven (Kesebir & Diener, 2008; Heather, 2019).

In the Age of Enlightenment, philosophers saw happiness as a value derived from maximum pleasure (Kesebir & Diener, 2008; Heather, 2019). Utilitarians follow the Hedonism theory of happiness as well: “maximum surplus of pleasure over pain as the cardinal goal of human striving” (Kesebir & Diener, 2008; Heather, 2019). Utilitarians believe that morals and legislation should be based on whatever will achieve the greatest good for the greatest number of people which also corresponds to the objective list theory.

In the modern era, happiness is something we take for granted. It is assumed that humans are entitled to pursue and attain happiness (Kesebir & Diener, 2008; Heather, 2019). In the U.S. Declaration of Independence, the pursuit of happiness is protected as a fundamental human right, up there with life and liberty (Conkle, 2008).
After looking into the different approaches of the most prominent philosophers, which often had different perspectives on happiness it can be said it is incredibly challenging to define happiness. Modern psychology describes happiness as subjective well-being, or “people’s evaluations of their lives and encompasses both cognitive judgments of satisfaction and affective appraisals of moods and emotions” (Kesebir & Diener, 2008, p. 118; Heather, 2019).

**Happiness and Poverty**

**Intro**

This study will research the relationship between happiness and poverty and moreover what the parameters are for happiness when living within poverty. According to the World Happiness report, income is one of the 7 main factors defining happiness. Therefore, it is safe to say that happiness for people living within poverty is subject to other factors of happiness which can be for example freedom, spirituality, health, positive relationships, … The factors however depend on the underlying theory which is discussed in the theoretical framework (chapter 3). “Countries with a higher GDP report having people with higher life satisfaction.” (Schimmel, 2009). As money is, stated by Schimmel, a prevailing factor of happiness, some questions arise that imply there is a distinction to be made relating happiness to money, wealth. When being born in poverty, how does someone know that life with more money is resulting in more happiness?

Therefore, is money also a prevailing factor for people born within poverty? Apart from that, what is it that people from countries with a higher GDP do with their money in order to reach a higher level of happiness? Hereby assuming the amount of money itself is not the prevailing reason for happiness but rather the opportunities a higher amount of money provide.
Before taking a closer look to where people living within poverty attain their level of happiness, poverty has to be somehow defined. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) defines poverty as “a lack and state of ill-being, inferior to wealth regarded as a state of abundance and well-being” (Schimmel, 2009).

Poverty is identified by families whose economic position falls below a minimum acceptance level. The international standard of extreme poverty is set to the possession of less than 1.90$ a day, set by the World Bank in 2015, with currently (by the global poverty update of the World Bank in September 2019) 734.5 million people living within poverty. However, a second threshold line is set at 3.20$ a day with 1935.8 million people falling below the second poverty line, translating in 26.2% of the world’s population as is shown in the table below (Aguilar, Fujs, Lakner, Nguyen & Prydz, 2019).

In this research people living within poverty will be considered the 26.2% of the world’s population, taking the upper global poverty threshold set by the World Bank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>$1.90</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$3.20</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of poor (mil)</td>
<td>headcount ratio (%)</td>
<td>number of poor (mil)</td>
<td>headcount ratio (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>253.8</td>
<td>253.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other high income</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>413.0</td>
<td>416.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>667.4</td>
<td>673.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World less Other High Income</td>
<td>723.7</td>
<td>727.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1919.3</td>
<td>1925.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Total</td>
<td>731.0</td>
<td>734.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1929.3</td>
<td>1935.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1. Poverty headcount and number of poor people in 2019, differences between March and September 2019** (Aguilar, Fujs, Lakner, Nguyen & Prydz, 2019).
Absolute and relative poverty

Poverty can either be defined in relative or absolute terms. Absolute poverty measures the necessary monetary amount for meeting basic needs such as food, clothing and shelter. Absolute poverty does not take into account the wider perspective on quality of life and the level of social equality. Absolute poverty does not include people’s social and cultural needs which are therefore included by the concept of relative poverty. Relative poverty covers the economic status of people within a societal context. Both concepts however focus mainly on the levels of income and consumption which is considered too narrow to define poverty. “To further develop the definition of the concept of relative poverty or relative deprivation, three perspectives are relevant; the income perspective indicates that a person is poor only if his or her income is below the country's poverty line (defined in terms of having income sufficient for a specified amount of food); the basic needs perspective goes beyond the income perspective to include the need for the provision by a community of the basic social services necessary to prevent individuals from falling into poverty; and finally, the capability (or empowerment) perspective suggests that poverty signify a lack of some basic capability to function” (Addison, 1993).

Poverty can have different reasons, depending on which perspective one takes into account, considering each perspective has its own factors.

In this research poverty will be defined as living with less than 3.20$ a day as well as taking into account that poverty can also be social, political and cultural.

Contribution

Intro

By doing a literature review of the intersection between well-being, happiness and life satisfaction for people living within poverty, I will be able to give insight in why people at
the base of the pyramid are generally happy or unhappy and which relationship that has to their position of poverty. By conducting a literature review of different research studies, it will be possible to conduct a general conclusion of which as well marketeers as humanitarian organisations will be able to get insight on the matter and use it for their purposes. Apart from them, findings on where people that have limited access to material goods find their happiness, can be beneficial for anyone that pursues happiness and/or a healthy mind.

**Current position**

Over the past decades many studies about happiness, it’s reasons and consequences have been made. Many different theories, with various angles of incidence, have been given shape (more on these different theories can be found in the theoretical framework below) and therefore, findings and approaches are very divergent. Adding to the fact that both the concepts of happiness and poverty are multifaceted and defined in various ways, it can be stated that the amount of research is vast and therefore results are often omnifarious.

Since the beginning of 2019 Google Scholar gives for the combination of “Happiness” + “Poverty” over 12.400 results which implies that research on these concepts is still topical nowadays. Therefore, a literature review is an exquisite method of research, considering it could provide a silver lining within the medley of research that has been done over the past decades.

**Relevance for academic and business context**

As mentioned above it is clear that a lot of research has been done during the past decades but due to the magnitude of the research, both an overview of what has been done recently in combination with a comparison and analysis thereof is to be given by this literature review. This could give a clearer view on the recent research as well as a verification whether or not the compared research gives similar results in which case the literature review is an affirmation of the results that have been done. However, if there would
be a low correlation of the results of the compared research, it can be a starting point for extensive research to see which findings are right or wrong and why it would be so.

Regarding the relevance towards the business environment, this research can be relevant as happiness is one of the most sought dimensions if human life. Reasons for why people are happy, especially when those reasons exclude materialism, can be very valuable for existing and future companies in order to provide the right goods and/or services which aid to the human pursuit of happiness.

In addition, from an intra-company perspective the research can provide highly relevant value. The reasons for people’s happiness, excluding money or materialism, can give insight for HR-departments in order to provide ways to attract new employees as well as motivating existing employees to be more productive and/or to be part of the company for a longer period.

5. Theoretical framework

Intro

The theoretical foundation of happiness has several theories that perceive the concept of happiness in a (slightly) different way. The research on happiness within people living in poverty, with attention to spiritualism, life satisfaction and well-being will be based on three different theories that look at happiness from a different perception. The purpose of basing the research on multiple theories is to have an objective and multi-faceted view. It is very probable that when proceeding in the research, at a certain point not all three theories will form the base of the studies. However, as happiness is an abstract and complex concept, a broad view is held by considering multiple theories.
**Hedonism theory**

The hedonism theory holds that happiness is a matter of subjective feeling, stating that a happy life maximizes pleasure while minimizing pain. This theory has its roots in ancient Greece, founded by Aristippus of Cyrene but has its modern conceptual roots in Bentham’s utilitarianism (Müller-Schneider, 2013). The Hedonism theory is in this research perhaps the least applicable when focusing on people living in poverty but forms a base of how individuals perceive happiness. “*It holds that happiness is a matter of raw subjective feeling. A happy life maximizes feelings of pleasure and minimizes pain.*”(B. M. E. P. Seligman & Royzman, 2003). Happiness in this case can be seen as the consideration between pleasure and pain. There are two constraints that have to be taken into account: first, the perception of pain and pleasure differs individually and therefore when applying the theory and measuring pain and pleasure, the possibility of subjective perception arises, taking into account the different perception of pain and pleasure between the researcher and the researched. Second, the consideration of pain and pleasure doesn’t take into account the timeline of a subject’s life. “When we wish someone a happy life (or a happy childhood, or even a happy week), we are not merely wishing that they accumulate a tidy sum of pleasures, irrespective of how this sum is distributed across one’s life-span or its meaning for the whole (Velleman, 1991). We can imagine two lives that contain the same exact amount of momentary pleasantness, but one life tells a story of gradual decline (ecstatic childhood, light-hearted youth, dysphonic adulthood, miserable old age) while another is a tale of gradual improvement (the above pattern in reverse).” (B. M. E. P. Seligman & Royzman, 2003).
Desire theory

The desire theory is somewhat more specific, filling in the gap of subjectivity that the Hedonism theory doesn’t cover. The desire theory says happiness is feeding desires. “Desire theories holds that happiness is a matter of getting what you want with the content of the want left up to the person who does the wanting” (Griffin & Hamlin, 1986). As the desire theory takes into account the subjectivity individually, it is a more complete theory. Nevertheless, it doesn’t take the tradeoff between pain and pleasure into account, which with reason defines happiness by the Hedonism theory. An incompleteness of the desire theory would be that when for example an individual’s desire would be chocolate, giving that individual an unlimited amount of chocolate wouldn’t be the cause of a happy life. One way to get around this incompleteness would be to limit a desire to what is actually worthwhile. “One move to deflect this objection is to limit the scope of Desire theory to the fulfillment of only those desires that one would have if one aimed at an objective list of what is truly worthwhile in life” (B. M. E. P. Seligman & Royzman, 2003).

Objective list theory

The Objective list theory finds its origin as well as the Hedonism theory in ancient Greece within the work of Socrates and Meno and was recently given shape by Sen and Nussbaum in 1985. The theory opposes both the Hedonism and Desire theory by stating that happiness is found regardless of emotions, feelings, desires. According to the Objective list theory, happiness is the achievement of certain things that are objectively considered ‘worthwhile’. “It holds that happiness consists of a human life that achieves certain things from a list of worthwhile pursuits: such a list might include career accomplishments, friendship, freedom from disease and pain, material comforts, civic spirit, beauty, education, love, knowledge, and good conscience” (B. M. E. P. Seligman & Royzman, 2003).
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A limitation to this theory is that it doesn’t consider any feeling as a part of happiness whereas happiness is an emotion and feelings should be considered when it comes to happiness. Nevertheless, the theory takes away the subjectivity that the Desire theory and especially the Hedonism theory have.

**Combination of theories: the authentic happiness theory**

The three theories above all explain happiness from a different perspective where each perspective holds value but also has its constraints. Therefore, the theories can be used as being complementary to each other, taking away the individual constraints of each theory. As the Hedonism theory isn’t complete because of the individual’s subjective perception it is complementary to the desire theory which does take that limitation into account. “Hedonism holds that the preponderance of pleasure over pain is the recipe for happiness even if this is not what one desires most. Desire theory holds that fulfillment of a desire contributes to one’s happiness regardless of the amount of pleasure (or displeasure).” (B. M. E. P. Seligman & Royzman, 2003)

The three ‘base’ theories are combined in the authentic happiness theory. “There are three distinct kinds of happiness: The Pleasant Life (pleasures), the Good Life (engagement), and the Meaningful Life. The first two are subjective, but the third is at least partly objective and lodges in belonging to and serving what is larger and more worthwhile than the just the self’s pleasures and desires. In this way, Authentic Happiness synthesizes all three traditions: The Pleasant Life is about happiness in Hedonism’s sense. The Good Life is about happiness in Desire’s sense, and the Meaningful Life is about happiness in Objective List’s sense. To top it off, Authentic Happiness further allows for the “Full Life,” a life that satisfies all three criteria of happiness” (B. M. E. P. Seligman & Royzman, 2003).
Below I constructed a schematic representation in order to understand clearer the relationships between happiness and it’s subjective and objective factors as made clear in the figure below.

Figure 2. The relationship between happiness and the Hedonism, Desire and Objective list theory (Eloy, 2019).

The authentic happiness theory and the well-being theory

In 2011, Seligman made a distinction between authentic happiness and well-being. He stated that authentic happiness theory is one-dimensional: “it is about feeling good and it claims that the way we choose our life course is to try to maximize how we feel. Well-being theory is about all five pillars, the underpinnings of the five elements is the strengths. Well-being theory is plural in method as well as substance: positive emotion is a subjective variable, defined by what you think and feel. Meaning, relationships, and accomplishment have both subjective and objective components, since you can believe you have meaning,
good relations, and high accomplishment and be wrong, even deluded. The upshot of this is that well-being cannot exist just in your own head: well-being is a combination of feeling good as well as actually having meaning, good relationships, and accomplishment. The way we choose our course in life is to maximize all five of these elements” (Seligman, 2011; (“Flourish: a visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being,” 2011).

The five pillars of well-being are structured in the PERMA-model as can be seen in figure below, which states that well-being is the combination of 5 elements. (M. Seligman, 2018).

![The PERMA-model (Seligman, 2018).](image)

**Figure 3.** The PERMA-model (Seligman, 2018).

a) **Positive emotions**

This would be the most straight-forward element with regard to the connection with happiness. It focusses on the mental perspective. “It is the ability to remain optimistic and view one’s past, present, and future from a constructive perspective” (Pascha, M. 2019).

b) **Engagement**

Engagement is the element of activity, moreover the activities in which we reach a flow state which absorbs us in the activity we are engaging in. “Activities that meet our need for engagement flood the body with positive neurotransmitters and hormones that elevate
one’s sense of well-being. This engagement helps us remain present, as well as synthesize the activities where we find calm, focus, and joy” (Pascha, M. 2019).

c) Positive relationships

Positive relationships are the connections we have with the people around us. Our animal nature requires us to bond with others. “We thrive on connections that promote love, intimacy, and a strong emotional and physical interaction with other humans. Positive relationships with one’s parents, siblings, peers, coworkers, and friends is a key ingredient to overall joy. Strong relationships also provide support in difficult times that require resilience” (Pascha, M. 2019). When we don’t have these connections with one another, we become isolated. “Our pain centers become activated when we are at risk of isolation. From an evolutionary perspective, isolation is the worst thing we could do for survival. These activation centers are like fire alarms in the body, discouraging people to continue feeling this pain, and ideally, reconnect socially with someone or a group. We need, neurologically, to know that we belong to a group; it helps us to feel safe and valued, and has done so for millions of years” (Pascha, M. 2019).

d) Meaning

Meaning in this context means giving purpose to what we do, to where we invest our time, energy and resources. It coincides with fulfillment in that matter and is a key element when it comes to well-being. This is also one of the main motivational factors explained in Maslow’s pyramid of needs (self-esteem). The pyramid of needs, also known as the pyramid of happiness, stated that humans go through stages in order to fulfill their needs. The stages are physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, self-esteem needs and self-actualization (Maslow, 1943). Later on, Maslow added cognitive, aesthetic and transcendence needs to his theory. The stages are divided in 2 types. The deficiency needs which if not being met, influence our psychological health and obstruct our tendency for
growth. The second type are the being needs which come forth from a desire of growth. An overview of the different needs and their categorization is given below. Even though the theory has been criticized by many, it confers with the PERMA-model in this way that self-esteem and self-actualization strongly contribute to happiness. However, this doesn’t mean that these are the only stages throughout humans reach happiness. In this well-being theory, it is not considered a stage but an equally important element of well-being.

![Maslow's Pyramid of needs](image)

**Figure 4: Maslow’s Pyramid of needs (Maslow, 1943).**

e) **Accomplishment**

Accomplishment is closely related to meaning whereas having goals & ambitions and reaching those is how we give meaning to what we do. Still there is a distinction between the purpose of what we do and meeting the goals we want to achieve.
As a base framework the authentic happiness theory and the well-being theory will be the common theme throughout the research. This because they combine previous theories, they are based on recent research and for the well-being theory in particular recent research shows the following: “Each of the elements of PERMA correlated moderately highly (range .37 to .79, mean = .61) with each other, concluded from these two findings: that PERMA does not yield a new type of well-being, and PERMA does not offer any insights beyond subjective well-being” (Goodman, Disabato, Kashdan, & Kauffman, 2018).
# 6. Literature review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Contribution/Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PERMA and the building blocks of well-being</td>
<td>The latest updated research on the well-being theory and the according PERMA model. The article reviews the earlier theory constructed by Seligman in 2003 &amp; 2008 and goes further on the findings of Goodman, Disabato, Kashdan &amp; Kaufmann (2017) reported strong evidence that subjective well-being is the final common path of such elements and their data are entirely consistent with Seligman’s hypothesis. (M. Seligman, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In Pursuit of Happiness: Empirical Answers to Philosophical Questions. Perspectives on</td>
<td>The research article gives an overview of what various philosophers throughout the ages have claimed about the nature of happiness, and we discuss to what extent psychological science has been able to substantiate or refute their claims. They first address concerns raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Money and Happiness: Rank of Income, not Income, Affects Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>Boyce, C. J., Brown, G. D. A., &amp; Moore, S. C. (2010). Money and happiness: Rank of income, not income, affects life satisfaction. <em>Psychological Science, 21</em>(4), 471–475. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610362671">https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610362671</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will money increase subjective wellbeing?</td>
<td>Diener, E., &amp; Biswas-Diener, R. (2002). Will money increase subjective well-being? A literature review and guide to needed research. <em>Social Indicators Research</em>, 57(2), 119–169. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014411319119">https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014411319119</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>From wealth to well-being? Money matters</td>
<td>Aknin, L. B., Norton, M. I., &amp; Dunn, E. W. (2009). From wealth to well-being? Money matters, but</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poverty is exclusively defined as lack and state of ill-being, inferior to wealth regarded as a state of abundance and well-being. Development |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>poverty, wealth and development.</th>
<th>111. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-007-9063-4">https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-007-9063-4</a></th>
<th>then becomes a teleological process trying to promote well-being through abundance. (Schimmel, 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Absolute Income, Relative Income, and Happiness</td>
<td>Ball, R., &amp; Chernova, K. (2008). Absolute income, relative income, and happiness. <em>Social Indicators Research, 88</em>(3), 497–529. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9217-0">https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9217-0</a></td>
<td>The paper uses data from the World Values Survey to investigate how an individual’s self-reported happiness is related to both the level of absolute income in and the level of relative income. The main findings are that both absolute and relative income are positively and significantly correlated with happiness, that quantitatively, changes in relative income have much larger effects on happiness than do changes in absolute income, and that the effects on happiness of both absolute and relative income are small when compared to the effects several non-pecuniary factors. (Ball &amp; Chernova, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tracking poverty reduction in Bhutan: Income deprivation</td>
<td>Santos, M. E. (2013). Tracking Poverty Reduction in Bhutan: Income Deprivation Alongside</td>
<td>This paper analyses poverty reduction in Bhutan between two points in time—2003 and 2007—from a multidimensional perspective. The measures estimated include consumption expenditure as well as other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Materialism, and Consumer Well-being</td>
<td>Lee, M. S. W., &amp; Ahn, C. S. Y. (2016). <em>Anti-consumption, Materialism, and Consumer Well-being</em>. <em>Journal of Consumer Affairs</em>, 50(1), 18–47.</td>
<td>Previous research indicated a negative relationship between excessive consumption, namely materialism, and consumer well-being (CWB). This article considers the relationship between and materialism, and where materialism has a negative relationship with CWB, logically,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

alongside deprivation in other sources of happiness.


indicators which are directly (when possible) or indirectly associated to valuable functioning’s, namely, health, education, access to electricity, safe water, improved sanitation, enough room per person in dwelling, access to roads and land ownership. (Santos, 2013)
| 14 | Happiness in Italy: Translation, Factorial Structure and Norming of the Subjective Happiness | Iani, L., Lauriola, M., Layous, K., & Sirigatti, S. (2014). Happiness in Italy: Translation, Factorial Structure and Norming of the Subjective Happiness Scale in a “The aim of the current paper was to investigate the psychometric properties of the Italian translation of the SHS and to provide normative data. The SHS was administered with life satisfaction items, anxiety and depression scales to a community sample of 993 participants, aged 18–85 years, living in different parts of Italy.” |
Regarding poverty, the population included 610 respondents (62.2%) that were living below the poverty line. “Respondents who were below the poverty line scored significantly lower than those who were above this threshold (p = .01)” (Iani et al., 2014).

The paper states that studies have shown a small correlation between income and happiness and that these results contradict people’s intuitions. The study found that although low, there is a correlation and therefore the rich are happier than the poor. “There is a small to medium-sized effect when comparing the top decile to the bottom decile. More importantly, these mean differences increase quite dramatically even as the correlation increases only...
slightly. The maximum difference increases to .56 standard deviations when the correlation is just .15, .82 standard deviations when the correlation is .22, and more than a full standard deviation (1.23) when the correlation is just .32. As in the GSOEP, the effect sizes are medium in size even if the rich groups are compared to the average respondent. Thus, weak correlations can translate into very large differences between the rich and the poor. Although the correlation between income and happiness is small to medium in size, this correlation has the potential to be misinterpreted. The analyses presented here show that the wealthy are considerably happier than the poor or even those with average incomes.”

(Lucas & Schimmack, 2009)

| 16 | Child Poverty as a Determinant of Life Outcomes: Evidence | Oshio, T., Sano, S., & Kobayashi, M. (2010). Child Poverty as a Determinant of Life Outcomes: Evidence from Nationwide Surveys | The study examines the extent to which poverty in childhood adversely affects success in adulthood, using micro data from nationwide surveys in Japan and taking into account the recursive structure of life outcomes. The study researches the extent to which poor people at the }
From Nationwide Surveys in Japan, Social Indicators Research, 99(1), 81–99. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9567-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9567-x)

Age of 15 consider their future educational attainment, future income class, happiness, and self-rated health. “We use retrospective assessments of income class at the age of 15, because longitudinal data on household income are not available. After controlling for its endogeneity, we confirm that children from poor families tend to have lower educational attainment, face higher poverty risks, and assess themselves as being less happy and as suffering from poorer health.” (Oshio, Sano, & Kobayashi, 2010)

The study found that children from the lower income classes have a lower estimation of future happiness than people from higher income classes.

| 17 | Poor and dissatisfied? Income poverty, poverty transitions | Samman, E., & Santos, M. E. (2013). Poor and dissatisfied? Income poverty, poverty transitions and life satisfaction in Chile. Journal | This paper explores how poverty status and transitions in and out of poverty contributed to life satisfaction in the late 2000s in Chili. “Using new data for 2006 and 2009, we find that poor people were more dissatisfied with life than the non-poor and that income gains did |
not appreciably affect the satisfaction of the poor while they remained below the poverty line. People who were not poor in either period exhibited higher satisfaction than those who were poor in both periods, while those who escaped poverty between 2006 and 2009 exhibited higher satisfaction than those who remained poor. In addition, people who fell into poverty in 2009 were no more or no less satisfied with their lives than those who were poor in both periods.” (Samman & Santos, 2013)

The mean satisfaction in 2009 for the poor (with a population of 1803) is highest for family (3.33/4) and lowest for income (2/4). In order from high mean satisfaction to low mean satisfaction: family – dignity – free choice – beliefs – ability to help – food - friends – housing – health – education – local security – work – income.

Happiness in the Poorest


This study investigated the subjective well-being (SWB) of selected adolescent waste pickers in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. It included the
| Communities: Subjective Well-Being Among Adolescent Waste Pickers in Phnom Penh, Cambodia | Well-Being Among Adolescent Waste Pickers in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. *Journal of Psychology Research*, 8(4), 133–144. | waste pickers’ concepts of subjective well-being and the factors that determine their subjective well-being as individuals (Sethul Hœur, 2018) | The study has found that the most important factors of the concept of well-being was determined by having a complete family (14), being loved and cared for (12), being supported by friends (13) and the enjoyment of being healthy (13) are the most important factors (N = 15). A distinction is made resulting in personal, interpersonal and financial factors. Personally, the respondents value a loving and caring family (14), open communication (13), involvement in the community (13) and physical health (12). Interpersonal they value helping their family (12) and help from NGO’s and Cristian churches (12). Financially the predominant factor is sense of security (12). |
| 19 | Social Activities and Subjective Well-Being of Older Adults in Ghana | Ohemeng, F., Small, B., & Molinari, V. (2019). Social Activities and Subjective Well-Being of Older Adults in Ghana. *Journal of Population Ageing*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12062-019-09251-9 | “This study describes the social activities engaged in by older Ghanaian adults and explores the relationship between social activities and subjective wellbeing.” (Ohemeng, Small, & Molinari, 2019) Participants (N = 3970) were grouped into quintiles accordingly to their income level whereas the 1st quintile was the poorest and the 5th quintile the richest. Results for happiness per quintile: 1st: 1; 2nd: 1.28; 3rd: 1.33; 4th: 1.78 and 5th: 2.30 |
7. Study framework

Research questions

1. Is there an interrelationship between happiness; well-being and poverty?
2. What are the prevailing reasons for happiness and well-being for people living within poverty?

Assumptions

1. A first assumption considering the interrelationship between happiness and/or well-being and poverty is that the interrelationship is very significant. Moreover, I assume poverty influences happiness negatively whereas contrarily, an increase in income would be a solid reason for an increase in happiness. Although the positive influence of an increase in income is assumed to have an increase in happiness, there is a threshold at which a further increase in income doesn’t result in an increase in happiness anymore. The dependence of happiness on a change in income is stronger for people in developing countries. “In richer, more developed countries income is positively correlated with happiness but with diminishing returns” (Frey & Stutzer, 2002). “However, at lower levels of income and in low-income, developing countries there is a stronger, more linear relationship suggesting that income is an important determinant of happiness when it corresponds to a better quality of life in the sense of satisfying basic needs” (Deaton, 2008). Moreover the income of others could also influence the happiness of an individual, subject to his/her social environment: “A common belief states that people make social comparisons with others in their community and their happiness declines when others have an increase in income or possessions” (Hagerty, 2000).
2. Factors of happiness, excluding monetary reasons and taking into account people that live within poverty are assumed to fall under the theories mentioned in the theoretical framework. Therefore, people living within poverty would find their happiness due to the preponderance of pleasure over pain (hedonism theory), the fulfillment of desires (desire theory) where is stated: “that happiness is a matter of getting what you want with the content of the want left up to the person who does the wanting” (Griffin & Ward, 2015) and the possible factors of the objective list theory. In case of people living within poverty an example could be friendship, freedom from disease and pain, beauty, education, love, knowledge, and good conscience. In addition, the five pillars of the well-being theory are also assumed to be the basic sources of happiness (positive emotions, engagement, positive relationships, meaning and accomplishment).

Reasons of happiness can also be subject to the geographical location, “Looking at Spain, the European Social Survey studied how there are socio-economic indicators such as GDP, but more significantly quality of life factors such as health, education, unemployment, environment and contamination.” (Cuñado & de Gracia, 2012).

Monetary reasons for happiness seem to be of less importance for people living within poverty and therefore other factors such as social relationships and leisure activities seem to be more important: “People living in Leon Nicaragua who work in the garbage dumps were interviewed to talk about their lives and life satisfaction. There were 99 people interviewed from the garbage dump whom lived in extreme poverty. All of them reported being extremely happy and had optimistic outlooks on the future. They reported their happiness did not come from their job title, or their income, but rather from the social relationships and leisurely activities they were partaking in.” (Vázquez, 2013).

Finally, it is also assumed that spirituality can be a significant factor of happiness which is in accordance with the fulfillment of the ‘meaning’ and ‘positive relationships’
pillars in the well-being theory. Whether this depends on a certain religion or a degree of engagement in religion is unsure, but “Striving to be in relationship and community with others does more than decrease feelings of loneliness. If we do community the ways God wants us to, we experience an abundance of grace and love, which in return gives us joy. We are given free will to choose to love people and when we chose to love, we enter full communion with God. Once we have entered full communion, we can reach our full potential as individuals. Ultimately there are many different factors that result in the feelings of subjective happiness, from money to leisurely activities and community” (Duncan, 2008).

8. Methodology

7.1 Intro

A quantitative literature review is a research method in which the results and conclusions of multiple preceding research studies are combined and analyzed in order to come to a more precise conclusion about a certain phenomenon. It is a quantitative research synthesis summarizing and comparing results from empirical literature. It is in this research used to confirm hypotheses that are difficult to test in a single study due to the range of approaches well-being and poverty can be looked at.

The research will be ascertained by conducting a literature review of the existing literature studies, over the past 10 years (2009-2019) in order to conclude the different studies that are made from different angles. The literature review can provide a solid answer to the mixed results that are published in previous research. The research method of literature review is favorable because of two main reasons.

First, the concept of happiness is difficult to define, measure or research. As the different approaches to the concept of happiness which were discussed in the theoretical framework display, happiness is a term that can be defined from different perspectives. One
vision on happiness is stated by Dale Carnegie, the 19th century writer and self-development coach is that happiness doesn’t depend on any external conditions but is governed by our mental attitude. Following this definition happiness is a self-controlled mental state, subject to our attitude. In the case of people with restricted access to basic needs such as food, water or shelter, one cannot just say that the happiness of a person in such situation is purely controlled by attitude. Another example of a perception on happiness is stated by the 19th century philosopher Donald Marquis who says that happiness is the interval between periods of unhappiness. Following this definition, a person is either happy or unhappy, while it is disputable that not being happy implies being unhappy or vice versa. Whichever perspective on happiness is taken, it remains subjective to perception and circumstances what actually defines happiness. Going back to why a literature review is the most favorable research method, it takes away the subjectivity of a qualitative or quantitative research when taking the actual meaning of happiness as a starting point. Conducting a literature review gives the opportunity to compare different research studies, with different perspectives on happiness or well-being, which may give the most suitable conclusion to the phenomena of happiness within people living in poverty.

A second reason why a literature review is in this case the best option is that conducting research involving people in poverty has many obstacles. There are limitations both in time and financial resources to reach people that are living within poverty. Especially when poverty would be defined as people that live below the poverty line of 1,80$, it is less efficient to spend limited time and resources to research the state of happiness within this specific group of people, especially when preceding research has already been conducted.
7.2 Group of study

The studied group are people considered living within poverty. Whereas poverty is a broad and subjective term, the group of study mainly consists of people living below the poverty line, which is defined by living with less than $3.20 daily. Apart from that poverty will also be looked at in a broader way, including research that studies the effect of changes in income on happiness, regardless of the limit of $3.20 because subject to interpretation, many people that have more than $3.20 forthcoming can still be considered as living within poverty.

Another reason why the group of study isn’t limited at $3.20 is because there is a significant difference in cost of living, which differs widely across the globe.

A third and perhaps the most applicable reason for widening the concept of poverty abroad the $3.20 threshold is that poverty is not solely quantified by money. People can be health, social, cultural, political and environmentally poor as well, even when they would earn above $3.20 daily.

7.3 literature search procedures

Several search methods were used to obtain relevant studies for inclusion. Studies were found using the electronic library databases Web of Science. Only studies written in English were applicable. Because of the amplitude of research related to happiness, well-being, poverty and income the ordinary use of these keyword and combinations of these keywords renders an oversized and unclear amount of literature results. Consequently, a specific method of searching for relevant literature was required. The most suitable query can be found hereunder, giving 299 search results for the past 10 years of which 50 researches were included after excluding irrelevant literature based on the title, abstract or the body of the papers. Reasons for exclusion were that the literature focusses on other domains such as
work-life balance, energy access, crime, microloans, not taking either poverty or happiness/well-being into account, holding samples of children or entrepreneurs, using a qualitative methodology

(happiness AND ["poverty"] OR "B* of pyramid") AND ["sample"]

7.4 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

In order to collect suitable and relevant studies, several criteria were applied:
1. A literature search for relevant studies published between January 2009 and December 2019 is conducted while keeping the possibility of including preceding research. The main part of the research used consists of research done within the last decade as the fields of sociology and psychology are more developed in the past decade then before. Nevertheless, the main part of analyzed research is as recent as possible.
2. The studies used contained either/or the following keywords: happiness, poverty, well-being and income.
3. The studies are required to have used a quantitative research method.
4. The studies have to involve participants of working age.
5. The studies have to involve participants that are considered living within poverty.

7.5 Coding

All samples that meet the inclusion criteria are coded for moderators of the poverty-happiness relationship. The moderators are: age, geographical location, data collection method, sample size, mean, standard deviation, theory, whether the study is based on happiness, well-being, life satisfaction and whether there are other determinants taken into account.
7.4 Limitations

Obtaining the relevant literature for the review can be subject to restrictions such as for example the publication bias (studies failing to find significant effects are often not published which could create a bias when conducting the literature review). Another possible bias is that for this research only studies written in English will be taken into account.

9. Plan of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2019 – 15 November 2019</td>
<td>Adjusting the exposé (theoretical framework, methodology, research questions &amp; assumptions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 November 2019</td>
<td>Collecting the correct studies to perform literature review related to the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7 December 2019</td>
<td>Further collection and in-depth selection (filtering) of the retrieved studies. Coding the literature review on the retrieved results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-31 December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-19 January 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – 22 January 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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