International Journal of Contemporary Business and Economics 2025, Vol. 03 (02) 31-51

ISSN-Print: 3005-5350, ISSN-Online: 3005-5369.

Determinants of Multidimensional Well-Being: Evidence from Pakistan

Hafiz Muhammad Irfan[1] | Muhammad Umar Farooq[2] | Abdul Majeed Nadeem[3]*

[1] Mphil Scholar, Department of Economics, Government College University Faisalabad.
mirfanmanzoor4@gmail.com

[2.] Department of Economics, Government College University, Faisalabad. Pakistan
umarfarooq@gcuf.edu.pk

[3.] Department of Economics, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan
majeednadeem@gcuf.edu.pk
(Corresponding Author)

Article History

Received: 21-08-2025
Accepted: 11-09-2025
Online: 26-12-2025

ABSTRACT:

This study investigates the determinants of multidimensional well-being in Pakistan, aiming to provide a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing multi-facet happiness. Drawing on a rich literature review, the research identifies key influencing factors of well-being, including economic, social, cultural, and psychological factors for analysis. Utilizing data from the World Value Survey and employing Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and ordered probit regression, the study finds that health status is the strongest predictor of well-being, followed by security, social values, and trust. These results align with existing theories that emphasize the importance of social connections and personal security in enhancing life satisfaction. Interestingly, perceptions of income factors also appear to significantly affect well-being, underscoring the need for policies that promote economic equity The analysis reveals varying results in the impact of factors such as ethical values and innovation on well-being dimension, suggesting areas for further exploration. The study highlights the urgent need for culturally relevant frameworks to measure well-being, calling for policymakers to consider not just economic indicators but also social and emotional dimensions. Based on these findings, the research offers several policy recommendations, including enhancing healthcare access, strengthening social security programs, fostering trust and social capital, and promoting inclusive economic policies. By implementing these strategies, policymakers can create a supportive environment that enhances well-being and aligns with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Pakistan.

Keywords: Multi-dimensional well-being, World Values Survey, Principal Component Analysis, ordered probit,

How to cite this paper: Irfan, H. M., Farooq, M. U., & Nadeem, A. M. (2025). Determinants of multidimensional well-being: Evidence from Pakistan. *International Journal of Contemporary Business and Economics, 3*(2), 31–51.

1. Introduction

The sensation of pleasant emotions such as joy, pleasure, and contentment is referred to as well-being. This idea, articulated by the great Greek philosophers more than 2,000 years ago, remains highly relevant in contemporary literature. Well-being has been measured and interpreted in numerous ways by philosophers and social scientists. Broadly, philosophical perspectives on well-being are divided into two groups. According to the first group, well-being is defined as the experience of pleasant feelings associated with favorable life circumstances. In contrast, the second group argues that well-being arises from engaging in what is ethically good, meaningful, and authentic to one's true self. The first perspective laid the foundation for the concept of subjective well-being, which has been widely used to assess well-being across various domains, including employment, health, and education (Fisher, 2010). As the term implies, subjective well-being reflects how individuals feel about and evaluate their own lives, capturing the extent to which they believe their lives are going well. The term "subjective" is used to clarify that this construct focuses specifically on individuals' own assessments of their quality of life. This distinction is important because many theories of well-being are not subjective in nature, and subjective well-being is often mistakenly conflated with broader notions of well-being. Consequently, clarifying this conceptual boundary remains an important issue in the literature (Hurka, 2014; Tamir and Millgram, 2017).

Happiness is closely linked to pleasure and well-being and is commonly studied within the framework of subjective well-being (SWB), which comprises life satisfaction, a sense of purpose, and experiences of joy and pleasure. While everyone can experience happiness, its meaning and determinants vary across social, temporal, and personal contexts. Well-being extends beyond positive feelings to include effective functioning, personal development, life control, purpose, and healthy social relationships. Moreover, social and physical environments, particularly well-planned communities that promote active living, play a significant role in enhancing both individual and community well-being (Tamir & Millgram, 2017; Clark et al., 2018; Inglehart & Klingemann, 2000; Huppert, 2009; Gallegos & Chilton, 2019).

1.1 Well-being and Religious values

Research on multidimensional well-being highlights a strong connection between well-being and religious values. Evidence shows that religious beliefs, practices, and spiritual orientations are often associated with higher life satisfaction, positive emotions, and overall well-being. This relationship may be explained by factors such as social support, a sense of meaning and purpose in life, and effective coping strategies for stress and adversity. Religious values can also foster prosocial behavior and moral norms that benefit individuals and communities. However, the strength and nature of this relationship vary across cultural contexts and religious traditions (Diener et al., 2011; Lim & Putnam, 2010).

1.2 Well-being and Security

A substantial body of evidence shows a strong overlap between security and both individual perceptions and social engagement, indicating a close and consistent relationship between the two. In general, broader and more comprehensive measures of well-being are closely linked to individuals' perceptions of safety in their social relationships, as well as their sense of financial and physical security.

Literature consistently demonstrate that self-reported happiness is higher in communities that are perceived as secure and moving in a positive direction. Moreover, cross-national evidence reveals a strong association between higher well-being and greater social security, reflected in political stability, low crime rates, and strong social safety nets (Inglehart et al., 2008; Webb & Wills-Herrera, 2012).

1.3 Well-being and Trust

Trust, as a fundamental social asset, plays a crucial role in shaping individual behavior and the functioning of society. It enables social relationships, cooperation, and mutual support, all of which are essential for well-being. Individuals with higher levels of trust in others tend to report greater happiness, life satisfaction or well-being. This relationship can be explained by the fact that trustful social environments reduce stress and anxiety while creating more opportunities for social support, participation, and positive social interactions (Helliwell & Wang, 2010; Tokuda et al., 2010).

1.4 Well-being and social values

Social values and well-being share a complex and multidimensional relationship that reflects the interaction between societal norms and individual experiences. Well-being is strongly influenced by the social values prevalent within a particular culture or group. These values shape individuals' beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions, which in turn affect their perceived well-being. For example, collectivist societies often emphasize social bonds and shared responsibilities, providing strong social support and a sense of belongings. Such features can enhance emotional well-being by strengthening social cohesion and fostering a shared sense of purpose (Diener et al., 2018; Triandis, 2018).

1.5 Well-being and Economic values

Economic value, commonly measured through indicators such as per capita income and GDP per capita has long been considered an important determinant of well-being. Traditional economic theory suggests that higher economic resources enhance well-being by enabling individuals to better meet their needs and preferences. Consistent with this view, empirical evidence shows a positive relationship between economic indicators and various measures of subjective well-being, particularly in low-income countries and among individuals with lower income levels (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2002; Stevenson & Wolfers, 2013).

1.6 Well-being and Confidence level

Beyond the individual and institutional dimensions, the relationship between well-being and confidence also has a strong economic component. The overall state of the economy and the quality of financial institutions influence individuals' perceptions of financial security. Higher levels of confidence are often associated with increased investment, entrepreneurship, and consumer spending, which can strengthen economic conditions and, in turn, improve material well-being. Moreover, greater economic confidence can enhance mental health by reducing financial insecurity, stress, and anxiety (De Neve et al., 2018; Stevenson & Wolfers, 2008).

1.7 Well-being and Ethical values & Norms

The relationship between ethical values, social norms, and well-being is a key area of inquiry in multidimensional well-being. The rigorous empirical analysis shows that ethical values and norms—including beliefs about right and wrong and societal

expectations of behavior—significantly influence both individual and societal well-being. Studies find that adherence to ethical principles such as justice, compassion, and honesty is positively associated with higher levels of happiness and life satisfaction. Societies characterized by strong ethical standards also tend to exhibit greater civic engagement, higher social trust, and stronger well-being. Moreover, alignment between individual values and prevailing social norms can foster a sense of belonging and purpose, which are essential for mental well-being (Helliwell & Wang, 2012; Diener & Tov, 2007).

1.8 Well-being and Innovation

Innovation, broadly defined as the introduction of new ideas, products, or processes, has been shown to positively impact on multiple dimensions of well-being at both the individual and societal levels. Research claims that societies experiencing higher levels of innovation report greater life satisfaction and overall happiness. Since innovation is linked to expanded economic opportunities, improved quality of life, technological progress, and enhanced problem-solving capabilities. Additionally, it is associated with better health outcomes, higher educational attainment, and greater environmental sustainability (Dolan & Metcalfe, 2012; Binder & Coad, 2013).

1.9 Well-being and Information

The impact of information on well-being extends beyond individuals to broader social outcomes. Researchers explore the links between media freedom, information flows, and various societal well-being indicators. For example, countries with diverse information systems and higher levels of press freedom tend to have stronger democratic institutions, more effective governance, and higher levels of social trust, all of which contribute to overall societal well-being. Moreover, the digital revolution and the widespread availability of information and communication technologies have transformed access to information, with significant implications for well-being. Across diverse cultural and socioeconomic contexts, research has shown that digital connectivity and internet access are closely associated with multiple dimensions of well-being (Norris & Inglehart, 2009; Graham & Nikolova, 2013).

1.10 Well-being and Corruption

Corruption, commonly defined as the use of public power for personal gain, is widely recognized as harmful to well-being in multiple ways. Numerous studies have shown that higher perceived levels of corruption are significantly associated with lower subjective well-being, including self-reported happiness and life satisfaction. This negative impact is linked to factors such as slowed economic development, weakened social cohesion, and diminished trust in institutions. Corrupt practices undermine the efficiency of public services, distort the allocation of resources, and increase perceptions of injustice and inequality, all of which contribute to reduced citizen well-being (Helliwell, 2006; Tavits, 2008).

1.11 Well-being and Tolerance

Tolerance plays a crucial role in enhancing well-being, as it enables individuals to coexist harmoniously with people who hold different beliefs, values, or lifestyles. In culturally diverse countries, tolerance is shaped by cultural, religious, and other social differences. True tolerance goes beyond merely “putting up” with others; it involves

appreciating and respecting differences (Wuthnow, 2005). It requires openness to engage with others, understand their perspectives, and embrace their views (Habermas, 2003). By fostering social cohesion, tolerance strengthens interpersonal relationships and contributes to a more harmonious and well-functioning of the society.

1.12 Well-being and Health status

Numerous studies have highlighted significant barriers to accessing adequate and quality healthcare services, particularly for rural and minority populations (Mumtaz et al., 2020; Haider et al., 2017). In addition, public health challenges such as communicable and non-communicable diseases, malnutrition, and maternal and child health require urgent attention due to their substantial impact on population well-being (Zaidi et al., 2019; Bhutta et al., 2018).

1.13 Research Gap

There is no universally accepted way to measure well-being, which often leads to inconsistencies and confusion in relevant research-based conclusions (Huppert, 2017). Most existing studies tend to focus on a single dimension of well-being, overlooking its multidimensional nature that encompasses various economic, social, and psychological factors contributing to a good life (Ruggeri et al., 2022). Moreover, limited attention has been given to the interaction between objective conditions and subjective experiences (such as happiness and life satisfaction) that jointly shape overall well-being (Stiglitz et al., 2009). Cultural and social contexts also play a critical role, yet these are frequently neglected in empirical analyses. Despite the growing interest in the determinants of well-being, significant research gaps still remain. Many studies examine influencing factors in individual capacity, failing to capture how they interact and collectively affect well-being (Alarcon Garcia et al., 2022; Bhattacharya et al., 2023). Furthermore, variations in cultural and economic environments are often overlooked, limiting the generalizability of research findings (Fisher, 2025). Emerging factors such as ethical values, access to information, and digital engagement have gained recognition, but their specific pathways of influence the reported well-being require deeper exploration (Shiba et al., 2022). It is equally important to investigate how intersecting factors—such as gender, age, and socioeconomic status—shape diverse well-being experiences (Huppert, 2017).

There is also an urgent need for consistent, cross-culturally valid measurement frameworks that can capture well-being comprehensively across different populations (van Zanden, 2020; Ruggeri, 2020). Finally, translating academic insights into actionable policies remains a key challenge. Policy frameworks should move beyond the narrow focus on economic growth to embrace social, environmental, and ethical dimensions that foster sustainable and inclusive well-being (Stiglitz et al., 2009).

1.14 Significance of the Study

Understanding the determinants of multidimensional well-being has become increasingly important, especially for developing countries like Pakistan, where social, economic, and environmental challenges are deeply interconnected. In Pakistan, traditional measures of progress such as economic growth fail to fully capture people's quality of life, social inclusion, and psychological well-being. Despite periods of economic improvement, persistent

issues like poverty, inequality, limited access to education and healthcare, gender disparities, and environmental degradation continue to constrain overall human well-being. This highlights the need for a broader and more inclusive assessment framework that goes beyond material prosperity to incorporate social, emotional, cultural, innovations and information and geo-political environmental dimensions.

Studying multidimensional well-being in Pakistan is particularly relevant to achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Several SDGs such as Goal 1 (No Poverty), Goal 3 (Good Health and Well-Being), Goal 4 (Quality Education), Goal 5 (Gender Equality), Goal 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), and Goal 10 (Reduced Inequalities)—directly relate to improving people's lives in a holistic manner. Moreover, Goal 13 (Climate Action) and Goal 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) emphasize environmental and governance dimensions that are also critical for sustainable well-being.

By empirically analyzing the economic, social, structural, and digital determinants of well-being, this research provides insights into how different factors interact to shape the quality of life in Pakistan. The data & evidence-based findings can guide policymakers in designing strategies that promote inclusive and sustainable development, aligning national priorities with the SDGs. Ultimately, this study underscores that achieving sustainable development requires not only economic growth but also improvements in social equity, environmental protection, and individual happiness.

1.15 Objectives of Study

• To study how the economic, social, cultural, religious, health & demographic and digital innovation factors affects the multidimensional well-being in Pakistan.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Lin et al. (2024) assessed the happiness of populations and sustainable development performance in 34 countries from 2013 to 2017, examining comprehensive economic, environmental, social, and well-being efficiency indicators. The study employed the exponential weighting method to aggregate 220 indicators from the OECD Better Life Index into economic, environmental, social, and well-being categories.

Xie and Jin (2023) studied the impact of digitalization, sustainable environment, natural resources, and political globalization on economic growth in China, Japan, and South Korea (1990–2019). They found that sustainability and reduced reliance on natural resources boost economic well-being, while digitalization and early stages of political globalization can hinder it due to inequality and rent-seeking. Strengthening political globalization and sustainable practices can enhance economic growth in these countries.

Wang et al. (2023) examined the effects of globalization, ecological footprint, and innovation on subjective well-being (happiness) in OECD countries from 2008 to 2020. The study found a nonlinear relationship: high levels of globalization and ecological footprint negatively affect subjective well-being. However, innovation moderates these effects, helping to mitigate the negative impacts. The findings highlight the importance of investing in sustainable innovation to enhance both subjective well-being and economic growth, offering valuable insights for policymakers and future research on happiness.

Trabelsi (2023) examined the determinants of

happiness in 137 countries for period 2017-2019, analyzing GDP per capita, social support, perceived corruption, freedom of choice, and healthy life expectancy using principal component analysis and linear regression. The study found that social support, perceived corruption, personal freedom, and healthy life expectancy are key drivers of well-being, highlighting their positive role in improving living standards and overall social well-being.

Nadeem et al. (2021) studied the impact of water access on farmer welfare in rural Faisalabad, Pakistan, surveying 300 households across ten villages. Using ordered probit and OLS methods, the study found that drinking water quality, irrigation availability, the share of agricultural water needs met, and water costs significantly influence household welfare and life satisfaction. The findings underscore the need to revise rural water supply policies to improve livelihoods and support local economic development.

Rani et al. (2021) examined the impact of social capital on household subjective well-being in Faisalabad, Pakistan. Using probit estimation technique, the study found that social capital positively influence subjective well-being, life satisfaction, and civic participation, though social involvement and neighborhood cohesion were exceptions. Education showed a weak positive link to social capital. The findings suggest that strengthening social capital can enhance quality of life, reduce poverty, and improve health, offering guidance for policymakers to promote societal well-being.

Blanchflower (2021) examined the well-being using cross-sectional data from individuals across 145 countries, including 109 developing nations. Controlling for factors like marriage, wages, and education, the study found a U-shaped pattern of happiness. Middle-aged individuals, particularly those who are poorer or less educated, experienced higher stress, depression, and vulnerability to economic shocks, such as the 2008 financial crisis. This U-shaped pattern was consistent across continents and both developed and developing countries, highlighting a global midlife dip in well-being.

Vulpiani et al. (2020) analyzed the socioeconomic determinants of well-being using data from 2005 to 2016, covering 130 indicators from the Italian National Institute of Statistics. Life satisfaction was the dependent variable, while factors such as income per capita, cultural heritage costs, material deprivation, leisure satisfaction, family relationships, mobility, housing security, job satisfaction, renewable energy use, social inclusion, and cultural engagement were examined using stepwise regression. Results showed that income, mobility satisfaction, family relationships, and job satisfaction positively influence well-being, whereas material deprivation, home theft, and dissatisfaction with leisure negatively affect it.

İnce (2019) examined the impact of social capital on subjective well-being in Turkey using data from 1990 to 2014. Happiness and life satisfaction were used as measures of well-being, with trust representing social capital. Demographic controls included age, gender, education, employment, income, and confidence in government and political institutions. By analyzing the determinants of happiness, life satisfaction, and social capital over time, the study provides insights to guide policymakers in improving the well-being of Turkish citizens.

Despite extensive research on well-being, significant gaps remain. Most studies examine economic,

social, or environmental determinants individually, with limited integrated analysis of multidimensional well-being within a single framework. Additionally, few studies explore the interactions between these factors, such as how social capital may buffer the negative effects of economic or environmental stressors. Country-specific research often focuses on either urban or rural populations, neglecting comparative insights across different contexts, and the temporal dynamics of well-being determinants over time are underexplored. This highlights the need for an in-depth, comprehensive study to understand the combined and context-specific influences on well-being.

3.METHODOLOGY

3.1 DATA

Data for this study were drawn from the 7th wave of the World Values Survey (WVS), covering the period 2017 to 2022 in Pakistan. The survey was conducted nationwide using a random probability sampling technique. The dataset comprises 1,995 respondents and is publicly available at www.worldvaluessurvey.com. The WVS is a global research project that collects comprehensive information on individuals' beliefs, attitudes, and values, including social, ethical, political, cultural, and economic dimensions. Since its inception in 1981, the WVS network of social scientists has conducted national surveys in nearly 100 countries, providing a valuable resource for cross-national and longitudinal research on human values and well-being.

Variables Description and Classification

Variable Description	Questions	Measurement scale
Well-being	Taking all things together, describe your level of happiness using likert scale of 1 to 4	4= Very Happy 1= Not at all happy
Tolerance	Could you please mention any group from the below listed groups that you would not like to have as neighbors? Immigrants/foreign workers; Homosexuals; People of a different religion; Heavy drinkers; Unmarried couples living together; People who speak a different language	1= mentioned (yes) 0= Not mentioned (No)
Trust	Describe the level of trust on your family, your neighborhood, people you know personally, people you meet for the first time, people of another religion, and people of another nationality	1= Trust completely 4= Do not trust at all
Social value	Rate the importance of Family members, Friends, Leisure time, Work in your life	1= very important 4=not at all important1
Economic Value- is the worth based on individual perceived benefit from a good or a service	Describe the level of agreeness to the following statements: 1. Incomes should be made more equal Vs There should be greater incentives for individual effort 2. Private ownership of business and industry should be increased VS Government ownership , 3- Government should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for VS People should take more responsibility to provide for themselves 4. Competition is good VS Competition is harmful, 5.In the long run, hard work usually brings a better life VS Hard work doesn't generally bring success it's more a matter of luck and connections	1= completely disagree 10= completely agree

Confidence level	How confident you are in the armed forces, the press, Television, Labor unions, The police, The courts, The government, Political parties, Parliament, The civil service, Universities, Elections, Major companies, Banks, Environmental organizations, Women's organizations, Charitable or humanitarian organizations	4= A great deal 1= None at all 1
Ethical values and norms	Please indicate whether you believe in each of the following actions; Claiming government benefits to which you are not entitled, Avoiding a fare on public transport, Stealing property, Cheating on taxes if you have a chance, Someone accepting a bribe in the course of their duties, Homosexuality, Prostitution, Abortion	10= Always justifiable 1= never justified 1
Information	People learn about national and global events from various sources. Describe the access to each of these sources: Daily newspaper, TV news, Radio news, Mobile phone, Email, Internet, Social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)	1= Daily 5= never 11111111
Corruption	Which of the following groups do you believe are involved in corruption State authorities, Business executives, Local authorities, Civil service providers (police, judiciary, civil servants, doctors, teachers), Journalists and media	1= none of them 4= all of them
Religious value	Apart from weddings and funerals, about how often do you pray?	1= Several times a day 8= Never, practically never 1
Security	Could you tell me how secure do you feel these days?	4= Very secure 1= Not at all secure
Health status	All in all, how would you describe your state of health these days? Would you say it is…?	1= Very good 5= Very poor
Innovation	All things considered, would you say that the world is better off, or worse off, because of science and technology? Please tell me which comes closest to your view on this scale: 1 means that "the world is a lot worse off," and 10 means that "the world is a lot better off."	1= A lot worse off 10= A lot better off
Income	People often identify themselves as part of the working class, middle class, upper class, or lower class. How would you describe your own social class?	1= Upper class/Upper middle class 1= Lower middle class 3= Working class/Lower class 1
Gender	Respondent's sex	1= Male 0= Female 1
Age	This means you are ,,,,,,,,,,, years old.	1= 0/35 2= 36/50 3= 51/150 Q#161
Education	What is the highest educational level that you have attained?	1= early to upper secondary 2= Post-secondary to Bachelor 3= Master & Doctoral

3.2 Econometric Technique

3.2.1 Principal Component Analysis

To create indices for the dependent variable and independent variables as described in variable description section we applied Principal Component Analysis (PCA) in its standardized form (the correlation matrix) to determine the eigenvalues and related eigenvectors (weights) associated with each factor. PCA efficiently converts a large number of correlated variables into smaller, uncorrelated variables known as principal components. These additional variables are linear combinations of the original variables. The PCA minimize the dimensionality of the data for easier analysis, maintain variance in the original data set through the generated aggregate indices, and provide the highest possible level of explanation power and has been widely used in research literature to develop indices.

The method is especially useful in research methodology because it helps overcome statistical analysis challenges, improves model interpretation, reduces computational complexity, and minimizes information loss when dealing with high-dimensional data, making it a must-have tool in modern quantitative research across multiple disciplines (Dunteman 1989; Jolliffe 2002; Matshe et al. 2013; Chatfield and Collins 1980; Jollands et al. 2004).

3.2.2 Econometric Model: Ordered probit

Choosing ordered probit regression for analyzing well-being as a dependent variable is justified due to the ordinal nature of the well-being variable, which categorizes responses into ranks (4 to 1: very happy to not at all happy). This method is particularly suitable because it respects the ordinal characteristics of the data, allowing for the interpretation of how independent variables influence the likelihood of respondents falling into higher or lower categories of well-being without assuming equal distances between them. Linear regression is inappropriate for this analysis because it assumes a continuous and interval-scaled dependent variable, potentially leading to misleading interpretations by treating ordinal categories as equidistant. Similarly, logistic regression is designed for binary outcomes and does not adequately capture the ordinal nature of well-being. Multinomial logistic regression also fails to account for the inherent order of the categories, which can distort the analysis. Generalized linear models (GLMs) may be adaptable but lack the specificity that ordered probit provides for ordinal data (Gujarati & Porter, 2009; Stock & Watson, 2020).

3.3 Econometric equation

$$Well\ being = \alpha + \beta_1 Tolerance + \beta_2 Religius\ value + \beta_3 Security + \beta_4 Health\ status + \beta_5 Trust + \beta_6 Social\ value + \beta_7 Economic\ Values + \beta_8 Confidence\ level + \beta_9 Ethical\ values\ and\ norms + \beta_{10} Innovation + \beta_{11} Information + \beta_{12} Corruption + \beta_{13} Income + \beta_{14} Gender + \beta_{15} Age + \beta_{16} Education + \varepsilon_\circ$$

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 PCA results

The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) results for the Tolerance Index reveal that the first component, representing attitudes toward immigrants and foreign workers, has an eigenvalue of 21.453 and explains 40.9% of the total variance, underscoring its primary role in shaping overall tolerance perceptions. The second component, associated with attitudes toward homosexuals, holds an eigenvalue of 0.984 and accounts for 16.4% of the variance, bringing the cumulative explained variance to 57.3%. The third component, related to people of different religions, contributes an additional 13.3%, raising the cumulative variance to 70.6%. The remaining components—pertaining to heavy drinkers (10.6%), unmarried couples cohabiting (10.1%), and individuals who speak a different language (8.7%)—each contribute progressively smaller portions to the total variance.

Table 4.1 Tolerance index

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Immigrants /foreign workers	2.453	1.469	0.409	0.409
Homosexuals	0.984	0.184	0.164	0.573
People of a different religion	0.800	0.163	0.133	0.706
Heavy drinkers	0.637	0.034	0.106	0.812
Unmarried couples living together	0.603	0.079	0.101	0.913
People who speak a different language	0.524	.	0.087	1.000

Table 4.2 Information Index

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Daily newspaper	3.047	1.941	0.435	0.435
TV news	1.105	0.158	0.158	0.593
Radio news	0.948	0.264	0.135	0.729
Mobile phone	0.684	0.115	0.098	0.826
Email	0.569	0.113	0.081	0.908
Internet	0.456	0.265	0.065	0.973
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)	0.191	.	0.027	1.000

The results of the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) for the Information Index show that the first component, which represents daily newspapers, has a significant eigenvalue of 3.047 and accounts for 43.5% of the total variation. This highlights its major influence on information consumption patterns. The second component, related to TV news, has an eigenvalue of 1.105 and explains 15.8% of the variance, bringing the cumulative total to 59.3%. The third component, which focuses on radio news, contributes an additional 13.5%, increasing the cumulative variation to 72.9%. The subsequent components mobile phone usage (9.8%), email (8.1%), internet (6.5%), and social media (2.7%) provide progressively smaller contributions, yet they still illustrate the diverse range of information sources utilized.

The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) results for the Ethical Values and Norms Index show that the first component, associated with claiming government benefits unlawfully, has a high eigenvalue of 5.042, accounting for 63.0% of the total variation. This signifies its crucial influence on ethical perceptions. The second component, related to fare evasion on public transport, has an eigenvalue of 0.850, making up 10.6% of the variation and bringing the cumulative total to 73.7%. The third component, which addresses property theft, contributes an additional 7.8%, pushing the cumulative variation up to 81.5%. The following components cheating on taxes (5.7%), accepting bribes (3.9%), and attitudes toward homosexuality, prostitution, and abortion

contribute progressively less, with the final component explaining only 2.5%.

Table 4.3 Ethical values and norms Index

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Claiming government benefits to which you are not entitled	5.042	4.192	0.630	0.630
Avoiding a fare on public transport	0.850	0.223	0.106	0.737
Stealing property	0.627	0.170	0.078	0.815
Cheating on taxes if you have a chance	0.457	0.143	0.057	0.872
Someone accepting a bribe in the course of their duties	0.314	0.051	0.039	0.911
Homosexuality	0.263	0.020	0.033	0.944
Prostitution	0.243	0.040	0.030	0.975
Abortion	0.203	.	0.025	1.000

The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) results for the Corruption Index reveal that the first component, associated with state authorities, has a significant eigenvalue of 2.746, which explains 54.9% of the total variation. The second component, related to business executives, has an eigenvalue of 0.713, accounting for 14.3% of the variation, thus contributing to a cumulative total of 69.22%. The third component, concerning local authorities, adds an additional 11.9%, increasing the cumulative variation to 81.1%. The fourth component, encompassing civil service providers such as police and teachers, accounts for 10.1%, while journalists and media contribute 8.8%.

Table 4.4 Corruption Index

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
State authorities	2.746	2.033	0.549	0.549
Business executives	0.713	0.118	0.143	0.692
Local authorities	0.595	0.092	0.119	0.811
Civil service providers (police, judiciary, civil servants, doctors, teachers)	0.503	0.060	0.101	0.911
Journalists and media	0.443	.	0.088	1.000

Table 4.5 Economics value Index

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Incomes should be made more equal vs there should be greater incentives for individual effort	1.889	0.793	0.378	0.378
Private Ownership of business of business and industry should be increased vs. Government ownership and industry should be increased.1	1.096	0.302	0.219	0.597
Government should take more responsibility more responsibility To ensure that everyone is provided for	0.795	0.088	0.159	0.756

themselves VS People should take more responsibility to provide for themselves				
Competition is good VS Competition is harmful	0.707	0.193	0.141	0.897
In the long run, hard work usually brings a better life VS Hard work doesn't generally bring success—it's more a matter of luck and connections	0.513	.	0.103	1.000

The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of Economic Values reveals that the first component reflecting the debate between income equality and incentives for individual effort has the highest eigenvalue of 1.889, explaining 37.8% of the total variation. This highlights its key role in capturing the essential economic values. The second component, which contrasts the increased private ownership of business and industry with increased government ownership, has an eigenvalue of 1.096, accounting for 21.9% of the variation, thus contributing to a cumulative total of 59.7%. The third component, addressing the balance of governmental responsibility versus personal responsibility for provision, adds an additional 15.9%, raising the cumulative variance to 75.6%. The fourth component, evaluating whether competition is beneficial or harmful, contributes 14.1%, while the fifth component discussing the relationship between hard work and success versus luck and connections adds the least at 10.3%, completing the total variance at 100%. The significance of the first two components in defining economic values is evident, while the subsequent components also play important roles in forming a well-rounded understanding of the index.

Table 4.6 Confidence level Index

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
The armed forces	6.602	5.260	0.388	0.388
The press	1.343	0.152	0.079	0.467
Television	1.190	0.246	0.070	0.537
Labor union	0.944	0.131	0.056	0.593
The police	0.814	0.100	0.048	0.641
The court	0.714	0.023	0.042	0.683
The government	0.691	0.067	0.041	0.724
Political parties	0.624	0.033	0.037	0.760
Parliaments	0.591	0.052	0.035	0.795
The civil service	0.539	0.038	0.032	0.827
Universities	0.501	0.014	0.029	0.856
Elections	0.487	0.039	0.029	0.885
Major companies	0.448	0.027	0.026	0.911
Banks	0.421	0.028	0.025	0.936
Environmental organizational	0.392	0.042	0.023	0.959
Women organizational	0.351	0.004	0.021	0.980
Charitable or humanitarian organizations	0.347	.	0.020	1.000

The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) results for the Confidence Level Index reveal that the first component, associated with the armed forces, has the highest eigenvalue of 6.6022, accounting for 38.8% of the total variation. This highlights its significant role in shaping public confidence. The second component, related to the press, has an eigenvalue of 1.343 and explains 7.9% of the variation, contributing to a cumulative total of 46.7%. The third component, concerning television, adds another 7.0%, bringing the cumulative variation to 53.7%. Subsequent components, including labor

unions (5.6%), police (4.8%), and courts (4.22%), further enhance the overall understanding of confidence levels. The remaining components reflect smaller yet still important influences from government, political parties, and various organizations.

Table 4.7 Trust Index

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Your family	1.769	0.811	0.442	0.442
Your neighborhood	0.958	0.221	0.239	0.682
People you know personally	0.737	0.201	0.184	0.866
People you meet for the first time	0.536	.	0.134	1.000

The Principal Component Analysis results for the Trust Index indicate that the first component, related to trust in one's family, has a notable eigenvalue of 1.769, accounting for 44.1% of the total variation. This emphasizes its crucial role in shaping trust dynamics. The second component, concerning trust in one's neighborhood, has an eigenvalue of 0.958 and explains 22.9% of the variation, contributing to a cumulative total of 68.2%. The third component, which focuses on trust in individuals known personally, adds another 18.4%, raising the cumulative variance to 86.6%. Finally, the fourth component, related to trust in people met for the first time, accounts for 13.4%.

Table 4.8 Social value Index

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Family	1.405	0.436	0.351	0.351
Friends	0.969	0.100	0.242	0.593
Leisure time	0.868	0.110	0.217	0.810
Work	0.759	.	0.190	1.000

The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) results for the Social Value Index show that the first component, associated with family, has the highest eigenvalue of 1.405, explaining 35.1% of the total variation. This highlights its critical importance in shaping social values. The second component, related to friends, has an eigenvalue of 0.969, accounting for 22.4% of the variance, which brings the cumulative total to 59.3%. The third component, concerning leisure time, contributes an additional 22.7%, raising the cumulative variation to 81.0%. Lastly, the final component focused on work accounts for 19.0%, bringing the total variation to 100%. This analysis emphasizes the primary role of family in influencing social values, while also recognizing the significant contributions of friendships, leisure, and work in understanding the dynamics of social values.

Table 4.9 Ordered probit regression

Well-being	Coef.
Tolerance	116*** (.041)
Religious value	.09*** .031)
Security	.221*** (.06)
Health status	.429*** (.429)
Trust	.119*** (.038)
Social value	.125*** (.043)
Economic value	.077* (.041)
Confidence level	.086** (.042)
Ethical value and Norms	.034 (.04)
Innovation	.002 (.015)
Information	.018 (.041)
Corruption	.047 (.041)
Income	.142** (.056)
Gender	.081 (.089)
Age	.011 (.062)
Education	.029 (.079)

Mean dependent var	1.602	SD dependent var	0.716
Pseudo r-squared	0.113	Number of obs	901
Chi-square	199.310	Prob > chi2	0.000
Akaike crit. (AIC)	1604.530	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	1695.796

**** p<.01, ** p<.05, * p<.1*

The results of ordered probit are reported in table 4.9 where the coefficient value of **tolerance** index is 0.116 (p = 0.004) which indicates that individuals who accepted to have an immigrant as his/her neighbors is more likely to have higher well-being by 0.116. **Religious Value** with a coefficient of **0.09** (p = 0.004), shows that individuals who engages in religious practices more frequently report greater wellbeing. **Security** the coefficient of **0.221** (p < 0.001) indicates a strong positive relationship between feelings of security and wellbeing. It shows that being secure is more likely to enhance well-being by 0.221. **Health Status** the highest coefficient at **0.429** (p < 0.001), indicates that better health is strongly associated with higher wellbeing. Health status is related with an improved well-being, assuming a transition from 'Poor' to 'Fair'. Individuals who perceive their health positively are significantly impact on well-being. **Trust** index the coefficient of **0.119** (p = 0.002) indicates that trust contributes positively to wellbeing. **Social Value** index with a coefficient of **0.125** (p = 0.004), this variable reflects that individuals who prioritize social values experience increased wellbeing 0.125. It shows that social value enhances well-being. **Economic Value** index the coefficient of **0.077** (p = 0.062) shows a marginally significant positive effect on wellbeing. This indicates that perceptions regarding economic fairness and responsibility may enhance well-being. **Confidence Level** index the coefficient of **0.086** (p = 0.039) indicates that higher confidence correlates with greater wellbeing. Individuals who feel more confident level in themselves report enhance the levels of well-being.

Ethical Values and Norms index the coefficient of **0.034** (p = 0.391) is not statistically significant, suggesting that ethical beliefs do not have impact on wellbeing. Coefficient of Innovation **0.002** (p = 0.891) shows no significant relationship with wellbeing, indicating that perceptions of innovation a lot worse off influence well-being. **Information** index with a coefficient of **0.018** (p = 0.656), this variable also shows no significant impact on wellbeing, suggesting that the frequency of information consumption does not correlate with well-being levels. **Corruption** index the negative coefficient of **-0.047** (p = 0.254) indicates that perceptions of corruption do not significantly affect wellbeing. **Income** the coefficient of **0.142** (p = 0.011) indicates that higher income levels are positively associated with wellbeing. Individuals from higher income report greater well-being. **Gender**, **Age**, and **Education** these demographic variables do not show significant effects on wellbeing. Coefficients of **0.081** (p = 0.361), **0.011** (p = 0.856), and **0.029** (p = 0.715), respectively, shows that these aspects may not significantly contribute to well-being in this analysis.

5. CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

The literature review underscores the multidimensional nature of well-being, incorporating economic, social, cultural, and psychological factors. Key themes emerge, such as the significance of security, trust, social values, and health status, which have been shown to correlate positively with individual well-being across diverse contexts. Traditional measures, such as income and economic growth, while important, are insufficient on their own to capture the full spectrum of well-being.

This research on the determinants of multidimensional well-being in Pakistan highlights the complex interplay of various factors influencing individual and collective happiness. By synthesizing insights from existing literature, applying a rigorous methodology, and analyzing the results of Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and ordered probit regression, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of well-being dynamics. Utilizing data from the World Value Survey and applying the PCA methodology allowed for the identification of crucial variables that shape well-being. The results reveal that health status is the strongest predictor of well-being, followed by security, social values, and trust. These findings align with existing theoretical frameworks that assert the importance of social connections and personal security in enhancing life satisfaction. Interestingly, perceived income levels also have a significant positive impact on well-being, reinforcing the need for policies aimed at economic equity and sustainable development.

However, the analysis indicates that certain factors, such as ethical values and innovation, show no significant impact on well-being in the context of this study. This highlights gaps in both the theoretical framework and empirical research, suggesting that further exploration of emerging factors and their interrelations is warranted.

The urgent need for more holistic, culturally relevant frameworks for measuring well-being becomes evident, as does the necessity for policymakers to move beyond narrow economic indicators. Instead, efforts should aim at fostering social capital, trust, and a sense of belonging, all of which are essential for improving the overall quality of life. Ultimately, this research contributes valuable insights into how different determinants interact to shape the well-being of individuals in Pakistan. It emphasizes that

achieving multidimensional well-being requires comprehensive, inclusive approaches that consider not just economic outcomes but also social and emotional dimensions. These findings can help guide policymakers in designing effective strategies that align with national priorities and international goals, such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), ultimately fostering a more equitable and vibrant society.

5.2 Policy Recommendations

Specific policy recommendation are:

i. **Improve Healthcare Access:** Invest in quality healthcare infrastructure, especially in rural areas, and promote preventive care.

ii. **Strengthen Social Security:** Expand safety nets like pensions, health insurance, and unemployment benefits to enhance financial and social security.

iii. **Build Trust and Social Capital:** Encourage community engagement, volunteerism, and civic participation to strengthen social cohesion.

iv. **Promote Economic Equity:** Reduce income inequality through progressive taxation, education access, and support for small businesses.

v. **Integrate Social Values in Education:** Emphasize ethical norms, community participation, and cultural appreciation in curricula.

vi. **Combat Corruption:** Enhance transparency, accountability, and institutional integrity to improve public trust.

vii. **Expand Digital Access:** Increase digital literacy and access to information technologies, bridging urban-rural divides.

viii. **Support Community Initiatives:** Incentivize local programs that reflect cultural and social contexts.

ix. **Research Emerging Determinants:** Study evolving factors like ethical values and innovation to guide policy.

x. **Monitor Well-Being:** Regularly assess indicators using surveys and community feedback for evidence-based policymaking.

References

Alarcón-García, G., Buendía-Azorín, J. D., & Sánchez-de-la-Vega, M. D. M. (2022). Infrastructure and subjective well-being from a gender perspective. *Administrative Sciences*, *12*(1), 32.

Argan, M., Argan, M. T., & Dursun, M. T. (2018). Examining relationships among well-being, leisure satisfaction, life satisfaction, and happiness. *International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences, 7*(4), 49-59.

Bhattacharya, S., Bhattacharya, S., Vallabh, V., Marzo, R. R., Juyal, R., & Gokdemir, O. (2023). Digital well-being through the use of technology–a perspective. *International Journal of Maternal and Child Health and AIDS, 12*(1), e588.

Bhutta, Z. A., Hafeez, A., Rizvi, A., Ali, N., Khan, A., Ahmad, F., ... & Jafarey, S. N. (2018). Reproductive, maternal, newborn, and child health in Pakistan: challenges and opportunities. *The Lancet, 381*(9884), 2207-

2218

Binder, M., & Coad, A. (2013). Life satisfaction and self-employment: A matching approach. *Small business economics, 40*, 1009-1033.

Blanchflower, D. G. (2021). Is happiness U-shaped everywhere? Age and subjective well-being in 145 countries. *Journal of population economics, 34*(2), 575-624.

Chatfield, C., & Collins, A. J. (1980). Principal component analysis. In Introduction to multivariate analysis (pp. 57-81). Boston, MA: Springer US.

Churchill, S. A., & Mishra, V. (2017). Trust, social networks and subjective wellbeing in China. *Social Indicators Research, 132*(1), 313-339.

Clark, A. E., Flèche, S., Layard, R., Powdthavee, N., Ward, G., Clark, A. E., & Ward, G. (2018). Income. The Origins of Happiness, The Science of Well-Being over the Life Course, 33-50.

Cook, D., & Davíðsdóttir, B. (2021). An appraisal of interlinkages between macro-economic indicators of economic well-being and the sustainable development goals. *Ecological Economics, 184*, 106996.

De Neve, J. E., Ward, G., De Keulenaer, F., Van Landeghem, B., Kavetsos, G., & Norton, M. I. (2018). The asymmetric experience of positive and negative economic growth: Global evidence using subjective well-being data. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 100*(2), 362-375.

Diener, E., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2002). Will money increase subjective well-being?. *Social indicators research, 57*, 119-169.

Diener, E., & Tov, W. (2007). Subjective well-being and peace. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*(2), 421-440.

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L (2018).Advances in subjective well-being research.*Nature human behaviour, 2(*4), 253-260.

Diener, E., Tay, L., & Myers, D. G. (2011). The religion paradox: If religion makes people happy, why are so many dropping out?. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 101*(6), 1278.

Dolan, P., & Metcalfe, R. (2012). The relationship between innovation and subjective wellbeing. *Research Policy, 41*(8), 1489-1498.

Dunteman, G. H. (1989). Principal components analysis (Vol. 69). Sage.

Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at work. *International journal of management reviews, 12*(4), 384-412.

Fisher, J. (2025). Sociocultural context and intersectionality are vital to women's reproductive mental health. *World Psychiatry, 24*(2), 218.

Gallegos, D., & Chilton, M. M. (2019). Re-evaluating expertise: principles for food and nutrition security research, advocacy and solutions in high-income countries. *International journal of environmental research and public health, 16*(4), 561.

Graham, C., & Nikolova, M. (2013). Does access to information technology make people happier? Insights from well-being surveys from around the world. *The Journal of Socio-Economics, 44*, 126-139.

Gujarati, D. N. (2009). Basic econometrics.

Habermas, J. (2003). Intolerance and discrimination.

International Journal of Constitutional Law, 1(1), 2-12. doi: 10.1093/icon/1.1.2

Haider, S. I., Ansari, Z., Vaughan, L., Matters, H., & Emerson, E. (2017). Prevalence and factors associated with polypharmacy in Victorian adults with intellectual disability. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 63*, 156-167

Helliwell, J. F. (2006). Well-being, social capital and public policy: what's new?. *The economic journal, 116*(510), C34-C45.

Helliwell, J. F., & Wang, S. (2010). Trust and well-being (No. w15911). *National Bureau of Economic Research*.

Helliwell, J. F., & Wang, S. (2012). The state of world happiness. World happiness report, 10-57.

Huppert, F. A. (2017). Challenges in defining and measuring well-being and their implications for policy. In M. A. White, G. R. Slemp, & A. S. Murray (Eds.), Future directions in well-being: Education, organizations and policy (pp. 163-167). Springer.

Huppert, F. A. (2009). Psychological well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied psychology: health and well-being, 1(*2), 137-164.

Hurka, T. (2014). Objective goods. In: Adler, M. D., & Fleurbay, M. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Well-Being and Public Policy, 379*-402, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

İnce, D. (2019). The impact of social capital on subjective well-being (Master's thesis, Dokuz Eylul Universitesi (Turkey)).

Inglehart, R., & Klingemann, H. D. (2000). Genes, culture, democracy, and happiness. *Culture and subjective well-being, 4,* 165-83.

Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson, C., & Welzel, C. (2008). Development, freedom, and rising happiness: A global perspective (1981-2007). *Perspectives on psychological science, 3*(4), 264-285.

Jollands, N., Lermit, J., & Patterson, M. (2004). Aggregate eco-efficiency indices for New Zealand—a principal components analysis. *Journal of environmental Management, 73*(4), 293-305

Jolliffe, I. T. (2002). Graphical representation of data using principal components. In Principal component analysis (pp. 64-91). New York, NY: Springer New York.

Lim, C., & Putnam, R. D. (2010). Religion, social networks, and life satisfaction. *American sociological review, 75(*6), 914-933.

Lin, T. Y., Chiu, Y. H., Xie, X. H., & Chang, T. H. (2024). Economic Performance, Happiness, and Sustainable Development in OECD Countries. *Social Indicators Research, 171*(1), 159-188.

Matshe, I., Moyo-Maposa, S., & Zikhali, P. (2013). Water poverty and rural development: Evidence from South Africa. *African Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 8*(2), 136-156.

Müller, U. K., Stock, J. H., & Watson, M. W. (2019). An econometric model of international long-run growth dynamics (No. w26593). *National Bureau of Economic Research*.

Mumtaz, Z., Salway, S., Bhatti, A., Shanner, L., Zaman, S., Laing, L., & Ellison, G. T. (2020). Addressing invisibility, inferiority, and powerlessness to achieve gains in maternal health for low-income women in Pakistan. Social Science & Medicine

Nawaz, M. A., Ayub, M., & Bashir, F. (2023). Role of

Economic Values, Social Capital, Security and Religiosity in Happiness and Well-being: Evidence from World Value Survey. *Annals of Social Sciences and Perspective, 4(*1), 271-284.

Ngoo, Y. T., Tan, E. C., & Tey, N. P. (2021). Determinants of Life Satisfaction in Asia: A Quantile Regression Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 22*(2).44-56

Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2009). Cosmopolitan communications: Cultural diversity in a globalized world. Cambridge University Press.

Rani, A., Quddoos, A., Yaseen, M. R., Tabassum, S., & Asif, A. (2021). The Impact of Social Capital on Household Well-being in Pakistan. *Social Indicators Research, 158*(3), 927-946.

Rowan, A. N. (2022). World happiness report 2022. *WellBeing News, 4*(3), 2.

Ruggeri, K., Garcia-Garzon, E., Maguire, Á., Matz, S., & Huppert, F. A. (2020). Well-being is more than happiness and life satisfaction: a multidimensional analysis of 21 countries. *Health and quality of life outcomes, 18*(1), 192.

Shiba, K., Cowden, R. G., Gonzalez, N., Lee, M. T., Lomas, T., Lai, A. Y., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2022). Global trends of mean and inequality in multidimensional wellbeing: analysis of 1.2 million individuals from 162 countries, 2009-2019. *Frontiers in Public Health, 10,* 824960.

Stevenson, B., & Wolfers, J. (2008). Economic growth and subjective well-being: Reassessing the Easterlin paradox (No. w14282). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Stevenson, B., & Wolfers, J. (2013). Subjective well-being and income: Is there any evidence of satiation?. *American Economic Review, 103*(3), 598-604.

Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J. P. (2009, September). Report by the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress.

Stock, J. H., & Watson, M. W. (2020). Slack and cyclically sensitive inflation. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 52*(S2), 393-428.

Tamir, M., & Millgram, Y. (2017). Motivated emotion regulation: Principles, lessons, and implications of a motivational analysis of emotion regulation. In Advances in motivation science (Vol. 4, pp. 207-247). Elsevier.

Tavits, M. (2008). Representation, corruption, and subjective well-being. *Comparative political studies, 41*(12), 1607-1630.

Tokuda, Y., Fujii, S., & Inoguchi, T. (2010). Individual and country-level effects of social trust on happiness: The Asia barometer survey. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*(10), 2574-2593.

Trabelsi, M. A. (2023). What is the impact of social well-being factors on happiness?. *European Journal of Management Studies, 28*(1), 37-47.

Triandis, H. C. (2018). Individualism and collectivism. Routledge.

van Zanden, J. L., Rijpma, A., Malinowski, M., & d'Ercole, M. M. (2020). How's Life? 2020: Measuring Well-being.

Vulpiani, M., Croci, E., & Caiffa, M. (2020). Economic

and sociological determinants of well-being in Italy: A regional perspective. *Journal of Governance and Regulation/Volume, 9*(2).34-54

Wang, Y., Arshed, N., Ghulam Shabeer, M., Munir, M., Rehman, H. U., & Khan, Y. A. (2023). Does globalization and ecological footprint in OECD lead to national happiness. Plos one, 18(10), e0288630.

Webb, D., & Wills-Herrera, E. (Eds.). (2012). Subjective well-being and security (Vol. 46). Springer Science & Business Media.

.

Xie, C., & Jin, X. (2023). The role of digitalization, sustainable environment, natural resources and political globalization towards economic well-being in China, Japan and South Korea. *Resources Policy, 83*, 103682.

Zaidi, S., Saligram, P., Ahmed, S., Sonderp, E., & Sheikh, K. (2019). Expanding access to healthcare in South Asia. *BMJ, 366*, l5175