The good society: defining and measuring wellbeing

between complexity and limit

Filomena Maggino[1]

Recently, the debate on new measures of wellbeing reached a wide audience especially thanks to the big media's "ballyhoo".

That debate, very often accompanied by Robert Kennedy's word (March 18, 1968, speech at Kansas University) has been urged also thanks to many prestigious initiatives, like the commission appointed by French President in 2008 and now known through the chairs' names (Stiglitz, Sen e Fitoussi) [http://www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr/en/index.htm].

What is never said is that since many years, many researchers all over the world are continuously working on defining concepts and measures of wellbeing. Looking at this movement's outputs allows us to realize that what is reasserted by the last initiatives can be considered, in many respects, neither really original nor avant-garde (Maggino & Ruviglioni, 2010).

In many cases, the debate has been trivialized to the simple concern "what indicator can replace GDP?"

As we will see, actually defining what a good society is, and consequently its observation and monitoring, should take into account two important and interrelated concepts: complexity and limit.

1. Attempts to classify different concepts of good society

During the history of political philosophy, since Aristotle, the conceptual approaches trying to define what is good society were and are many

It is quite impossible to examine all those definitions and this work has no intention to do that exhaustively.

This work aims at providing anyone with interpretative instruments allowing us to orient ourselves among all the emerging proposals and to distinguish between serious and propagandistic ones.

(A) *Good society* **declined in terms of "structures of values"**

According to this criterion, the distinction between different definitions can be explained by the different structures of life values adopted. In this sense, three different philosophical approaches can be identified (Diener & Suh, 1997), synthesized in the following table:

What is societal wellbeing related to?	What should be observed	Observational strategies?		What measures?
		What?	At what level?	
Functioning and capability to select goods and services that one desires	**Income**, considered the main mean to achieve an acceptable standard of living	Wealth (observed or estimated)	- individual (micro) → income - community (macro) → GDP	Economic indices
Normative ideals	Set of characteristics inspired by normative aims, grounded in moral **values** or policy **goals**	Living conditions	- individual (micro) → work, … - community (macro) → social cohesion, democracy	Social indicators
Subjective experiences	Individual's cognitive and affective reactions to one's own life (or specific domains)	Subjective perceptions and attitudes	Individuale (micro) → satisfaction	Subjective indicators

[1] Professor – Statistics applied to Social Research – Università degli Studi di Firenze; President – Associazione Italiana per gli Studi sulla Qualità della Vita (AIQUAV); President-Elect – International Society for Quality of Life Studies (ISQOLS)

(B) *Good society* **declined in terms of different <u>observational perspectives</u>**

According to this criterion, the different conceptual approaches refer to one of the following perspectives:

• **PROCESS**	Societal wellbeing is seen as a function of concepts like: • **development** (often referring to qualitative dynamic change of an economic system) • **growth** (referring to quantitative expansion on the scale of physical dimensions of economic system). Both concepts refer to different but interactive components (economic, structural and technologic) that should be considered together (Horn, 1993). A term that could unify the previous ones is **progress**, indicating generally "moving forward" (from Latin "*progressus", going forward, advance*). As limits or potentialities of the process delined in terms of "moving forward" is reached, the attention could be turned towards the reverse and opposite process, "de-development", de-growth, … (Horn, 1993).
• **CONDITIONS**	Societal wellbeing is seen as a function of concepts like: • **availability of economic resources** (*manpower, equipment, budget*), • **income and wealth distribution** (and its social implications), • national **welfare** and its relationships and impacts on economics. This perspective requires that each individual: - identifies oneself in his/her own community - acquires collectively the knowledge, values and skills to so that to share and expand the community's resources for the benefit of all its members without being at the expense of other communities or of the environment (Horn, 1993). In other terms, the conditions should be sustainable.
• **GOALS**	This perspective moves the attention from the process (development, progress, growth) to the goal: - sustainability, - quality of life, - wellbeing, - and so on.

Ciò che ha caratterizzato le società occidentali del secondo dopoguerra è stato fortemente condizionato dall'adozione di un'idea di buona società fortemente centrata sulla considerazione che avviare un processo (virtuoso!) conducesse quasi automaticamente al benessere individuale e collettivo. L'oramai evidente fallimento di tale approccio non deve portare a ripetere il medesimo errore: l'idea che innescare un nuovo (più o meno virtuoso) processo di inversione (come per esempio il concetto di decrescita) conduca quasi automaticamente ad un nuovo benessere individuale e collettivo.

Il tentativo di proporre un'idea di buona società basata sull'analisi delle condizioni non ha raggiunto la possibilità di realizzarsi in modo concreto in termini di policy.

(C) *Good society* **seen in terms of <u>points of observation</u>**

According to this criterion (Berger-Schmitt & Noll, 2000), the different conceptual approaches are distinguished with reference to the point of observation, which can be centred on:
- the individual dimension (**quality of life**);
- the community dimension (**quality of societies**).

Societal well-being concepts	Approaches		Main references and inspirations		
Quality of life (conceptualised implicitly or explicitly at individual level)	Resources approach (Scandinavian level of living → objective needs)		Eriksson		
	Capabilities approach		Sen		
	Subjective well-being approach (American quality-of-life concept)		Campbell / Converse / Rodgers Andrews / Withey	Argyle Diener / Suh	
	Basic needs approach		Allardt Galtung		
	Objective living conditions and subjective well-being approach (German quality-of-life)		Zapf		
Quality of societies	Liveability and quality of nations		Veenhoven		
	Societal integration, solidarity and stability	Social cohesion	Jenson OECD Council of Europe	European Commission Club of Rome	
		Social exclusion	Silver Rodgers Gore	Figueiredo De Haan	
		Social capital	Narayan Putnam	Coleman Rossing Feldman/Assaf	
	Sustainability		OECD, Wiman Becker	Hart World Bank Pearce	
	Human development		Miles United Nations Development Programme Sen		
	Social quality		Beck / van der Maesen / Walker		

Source of this frame: Berger-Schmitt & Noll, 2000.

1.1 Good society *and complexity: towards a comprehensive definition*

From the previous synthesis it is easily deducible that each of the identified approaches is not able to fully describe what can be defined *good society*. In fact, they focus upon some aspects and do not consider the reality in its complexity.

In order to overcome partialities and incompleteness, the adopted conceptual framework should define and allow the **complexity** to be read, a **multidimensional** and **comprehensive** definition able to conciliate **micro** (individual) and **macro** (societal) level.

A possible multidimensional conceptual definition could be the following: *a good and healthy society is that in which each individual has the possibility to*

- *participate to the community life,*
- *develop skills, abilities, capabilities and independency,*
- *adequately choose and control his/her own life,*
- *be treated with respect in a healthy and safe environment and by respecting the opportunities of future generations.*

2. From definition to monitoring

In order to achieve the possibility to monitor a country consistently with the definition of progress and wellbeing, the following definitions are needed:

- the pillars and their dimensions
- the ambits to be monitored
- the indicators
- the "space" for policies

2.1 *The pillars and their dimensions*

The previous definition requires an articulated, structured and consistently complex observation of the reality, involving three pillars (Berger-Schmitt & Noll, 2000):

(i)	**quality of life**	→ **individual (micro) level**
(ii)	**economic and social cohesion**	→ **community (macro) level**
(iii)	**sustainability**	→ **relationship between the two previous levels, the environment and the future**

(i) "Quality of life" (individual level)

Recently, a large number of people expatiate upon quality of life, considered one of the main objectives to be pursued in order to obtain a healthy society. Unfortunately, as often as not, at academic level but not only, this concept has been trivialized by reducing it (or making it dovetail with) a simple subjective expression; that is typically done by who identifies quality of life with happiness, which is considered, in other approaches, related to personality traits. Actually, the concept of quality of life is more complex and, in other words, multidimensional.

Wolfgang Zapf (1975, 1984) proposed a quality-of-life model with two main dimensions:

- **objective living conditions**, referring to
    - outcomes
    - resources and capabilities
    - external circumstances.
- **subjective wellbeing**
    - cognitive and affective components,
    - positive and negative components.

    Many aspects are involved, like perceptions, attitudes, evaluations, satisfaction and subjective wellbeing expressions, and so on and could be related to different life domains.

(ii) "Economic and social cohesion" (community level)

Two different dimensions can be identified in order to define economic and social cohesion, respectively negative and positive:

- **social exclusion**, referring mainly to **welfare distribution**
    - inequalities among individuals, groups, societies (women and men, generations, social strata, disabled, races, citizenship groups, …),
    - regional disparities;
- **social inclusion** → **integration of individuals, groups and societies**
    - social and political activities and engagements (associations, organizations, …),
    - quality of relations (e.g., shared values, conflicts, solidarity),
    - social relations (informal networks),
    - trust in institutions.

(iii) "Sustainability"

Sustainability can be defined by five dimensions and two perspectives:

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="6">Dimensions of sustainability</td><td></td><td></td><td>Present generations' …</td><td>Future generations' …</td></tr>
<tr><td>physical</td><td>individual level</td><td colspan="2">…behaviours affecting individual health</td></tr>
<tr><td>social</td><td>individual and community level</td><td colspan="2">…behaviours affecting social relations and networks</td></tr>
<tr><td>economic</td><td>individual and community level</td><td colspan="2">…processes affecting welfare</td></tr>
<tr><td>human</td><td>individual level</td><td colspan="2">…processes affecting individual skills, training, education, heath</td></tr>
<tr><td>natural</td><td>community level</td><td colspan="2">…processes affecting natural resources</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td colspan="2">Perspectives of sustainability</td></tr>
</table>

Actually, the three pillars (and their dimensions) show relationships and connections as represented below:

CONCEPTS		DIMENSIONS
Quality of life		**Objective living conditions**
		Subjective wellbeing
Economic and social cohesion	⬏	**Disparities, inequalities and social exclusion**
	⬏	**Social relations and ties (social capital)**
Sustainability		**Human capital**
		Natural capital

A crossing dimension: the limit

The observation of the reality and the analytic study of information obtained by that observation (indicators) help in understanding the relationship between the pillars and the different components, in order to understand what ambits can be related to policy actions (**system analysis**).

In this perspective, an important additional concept comes into the picture: the **limit**. Each aspect characterizing the pillars shows and needs to identify where the limits are.

The limit is often seen as an aspect linked just to sustainability dimensions. Actually, the other dimensions are affected by it as well.

"Time" could represent an example: any attempt aimed at improving connections between cities (in terms of travelling time) should face a limit. Time spent to go from one city to another can be reduced thanks to new technologies and improvements of territorial structures. How ever technology could be improved, the time reduction's amount would be shorter and shorter.

An additional (contextual) dimension: the socio-economic structure

Besides the defined concepts, an additional dimension allowing the description of the whole society should be identified: the socio-economic structure, articulated in:

- demographic and socio-economic structures;
- values and attitudes.

2.2 The ambits to be monitored

The relevant concepts (pillars) and their dimensions have to be assessed and observed within each *life domain* (ambit), which typically are:

1. households and families
2. housing
3. transport
4. leisure and culture
5. participation
6. education
7. labour market and working condition
8. income, standard of living and consumption patterns
9. health
10. environment
11. social security
12. crime and safety
13. total life situation

2.3 The definition of indicators

From concept to indicators → the monitoring matrix

CONCEPTS		DIMENSIONS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Quality of life		Objective living conditions													
		Subjective wellbeing													
Economic and social cohesion	⬐	Disparities, inequalities and social exclusion													
	⬏	Social relations and ties (social capital)													
Sustainability		Human capital													
		Natural capital													

			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Socio-economic structure		Demographic and socio-economic structures													
		Values and attitudes													

For each dimension and each ambit / life domain, observable elements have to be defined: the **indicators**.

CONCEPTS		DIMENSIONS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Quality of life		Objective living conditions	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
		Subjective wellbeing	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Economic and social cohesion	⬐	Disparities, inequalities and social exclusion	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	⬏	Social relations and ties (social capital)	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sustainability		Human capital	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	
		Natural capital		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	

			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Socio-economic structure		Demographic and socio-economic structures	X					X	X		X		X	X	
		Values and attitudes	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X

2.3.1 The monitoring dimensions

As we have seen, monitoring wellbeing, defined by taking into account the complexity of reality, requires a comprehensive approach in terms of dimensions to be observed and of organization, based upon different **monitoring dimensions**:

- time dimension, concerning cadence (rate) and continuity through which information (indicators) are collected and updated; indicators will not have the same rate but will be updated with reference to the permanence of the measured phenomenon;
- territorial dimension, concerning the size of the monitored area; the size is related to the institutional/organizational level which the decisional system (policy) is sized on. National level is certainly the most relevant.
  It should be taken into account that observing a wide territory does not entail that a lower level is necessarily covered. Beyond statistical representativeness, the conceptual model (in terms of dimensions and/or indicators) and the observation approach need to be reviewed and adapted in order to monitor the lower level (e.g., province, city, …). Consequently, the approach aimed at reaching smallest area estimations from representative data collected in wider areas appears questionable. Projects calibrated on smallest areas should be urged and encouraged.
- group dimension, concerning the sample of observed individuals.

2.3.2 The monitoring perspectives

From the analytic point of view, the observed reality can be read through different **monitoring perspectives**, allowing
- comparison made for the same reality across time (years, months, …) → time perspective;
- comparison made for the same dimensions between areas (regions, provinces, …) → territorial perspective;
- comparison made for the time between groups (genders, generations, …) → group dimension.

The perspectives can be combined.

2.3.3 Criteria for indicators selection

Different issues need to be addressed in order to selecting and managing indicators, especially when this is carried out into a complex system allowing the accomplishment of functions like monitoring, reporting and accounting. Michalos (in Sirgy et al., 2006) identified 15 different issues related to the combination of social, economic and environmental indicators. As Michalos asserts, the issues collectively yield over 200,000 possible combinations representing at least that many different kinds of systems (Sirgy et al., 2006):
- Settlement/aggregation area sizes: e.g., the best size to understand air pollution may be different from the best size to understand crime.
- Time frames: e.g., the optimal duration to understand resource depletion may be different from the optimal duration to understand the impact of sanitation changes.
- Population composition: e.g., analyses by language, sex, age, education, ethnic background, income, etc. may reveal or conceal different things.
- Domains of life composition: e.g., different domains like health, job, family life, housing, etc. give different views and suggest different agendas for action.
- Objective versus subjective indicators: e.g., relatively subjective appraisals of housing and neighbourhoods by actual dwellers may be very different from relatively objective appraisals by "experts".
- Positive versus negative indicators: negative indicators seem to be easier to craft for some domains, which may create a biased assessment, e.g., in the health domain measures of morbidity and mortality may crowd out positive measures of well-being.
- Input versus output indicators: e.g., expenditures on teachers and school facilities may give a very different view of the quality of an education system from that based on student performance on standardized tests.
- Benefits and costs: different measures of value or worth yield different overall evaluations as well as different evaluations for different people, e.g., the market value of child care is far below the personal, social or human value of having children well cared for.
- Measurement scales: e.g., different measures of well-being provide different views of people's well-being and relate differently to other measures.
- Report writers: e.g., different stakeholders often have very different views about what is important to monitor and how to evaluate whatever is monitored.
- Report readers: e.g., different target audiences need different reporting media and/or formats.
- Conceptual model: e.g., once indicators are selected, they must be combined or aggregated somehow in order to get a coherent story or view.
- Distributions: e.g., because average figures can conceal extraordinary and perhaps unacceptable variation, choices must be made about appropriate representations of distributions.
- Distance impacts: e.g., people living in one place may access facilities (hospitals, schools, theatres, museums, libraries) in many other places at varying distances from their place of residence.
- Causal relations: before intervention, one must know what causes what, which requires relatively mainstream scientific research, which may not be available yet.

Choices and options selected for each issue have implications for the other issues. The issues are not mutually exclusive and are not expected to be exhaustive as other can be identified
Dealing with these issues is merely a technical problem to be solved by statisticians or information scientists. On the other side, the construction of indicators of well-being and quality of life is essentially a political and philosophical exercise, and its ultimate success or failure depends on the negotiations involved in creating and disseminating the indicators, or the reports or accounts that use those indicators. (Michalos, in Sirgy et al., 2006)
Within a system, we consider also the difficulties related to the availability of indicators (across time and space) and in harmonizing different data sources and levels of observation.

Quality of indicators

Many international institutions, like World Bank & Unesco (Patel et al., 2003) and Eurostat (2000) tried to identify the attributes of **quality** that indicators (and approaches aimed at their management) should possess and need to be considered in the process of developing of new indicators or of selecting available indicators:

a.　**(I) Methodological soundness**

This characteristic refers to the idea that the methodological basis for the production of indicators should be attained by following internationally accepted standards, guidelines, or good practices. This dimension is necessarily dataset-specific, reflecting different methodologies for different datasets. The elements referring to this characteristic are (i) concepts and definitions, (ii) scope, (iii) classification / sectorization, and (iv) basis for recording. Particularly important is the characteristic of **accuracy and reliability**, referring to the idea that indicators should be based upon data sources and statistical techniques that are regularly assessed and validated, inclusive of revision studies. This allows accuracy of estimates to be assessed. In this case accuracy is defined as the closeness between the estimated value and the unknown true population value but also between the observed individual value and the "true" individual value. This means that assessing the accuracy of an estimate involves analyzing the total error associated with the estimate: sampling error and measurement error.

b.　**(II) Integrity**

Integrity refers to the notion that indicator systems should be based on adherence to the principle of objectivity in the collection, compilation, and dissemination of data, statistics, and results. The characteristic includes institutional arrangements that ensure

(i) professionalism in statistical policies and practices,
(ii) transparency, and
(iii) ethical standards.

c.　**(III) Serviceability**

Comparability is a particular dimension of serviceability. It aims at measuring the impact of differences in applied concepts and measurement tools/procedures

- <u>over time</u>, referring to comparison of results, derived normally from the same statistical operation, at different times,

- <u>between geographical areas</u>, emphasizing the comparison between countries and/or regions in order to ascertain, for instance, the meaning of aggregated indicators at the chosen level,

- <u>between domains</u>. This is particularly delicate when involving subjective measurement (e.g. cultural dimensions).

d.　**(IV) Accessibility**

Accessibility relates to the need to ensure

(i) clarity of presentations and documentations concerning data and metadata (with reference to information environment: data accompanied with appropriate illustrations, graphs, maps, and so on, with information on their quality, availability and – eventual – usage limitations)
(ii) impartiality of access

(iii) pertinence of data

(iv) prompt and knowledgeable support service and assistance to users

In other words, it refers also to the physical conditions in which users can obtain data: where to go, how to order, delivery time, clear pricing policy, convenient marketing conditions (copyright, etc.), availability of micro or macro data, various formats (paper, files, CD-ROM, Internet…), etc.

AN INDICATOR SHOULD BE			WITH REFERENCE TO ITS CAPACITY AND POSSIBILITY TO		
	clear appropriate exhaustive	meaningful accurate well-designed		**define and describe** (concepts, definitions and scopes)	(I) METHODOLOGICAL SOUNDNESS
	measurable	stable		**observe** unequivocally and stably (in terms of space and time)	
	reliable valid repeatable robust	rigorous precise exact faithful		record by a **degree of distortion as low as possible** (explored through statistical and methodological approaches)	
	transparent	with ethical standards		**adhere** to the principle of objectivity in the collection, compilation, and dissemination	(II) INTEGRITY
	consistent	pertinent coherent		**reflect adequately the conceptual model** in terms of aims, objectives and requirements underlying its construction (knowing, monitoring, evaluation, accounting, …)	(III) SERVICEABILITY
	relevant			meet current and potential users' needs. It refers to whether all indicators that are needed are produced and the extent to which concepts used (definitions, classifications etc.) reflects user needs. The identification of users and their expectations is therefore necessary.	
	practicable revisionable	up-to-datable		**be observed** through realistic efforts and costs in terms of development and data collection (for example, short time between observation and data availability)	
	well-timed	timely periodic		reflect the length of time between its availability and the event or phenomenon it describes	
	regular	punctual		reflect the time lag between the release date of data and the target date when it should have been delivered	
	comparable discriminant	disagregable thrifty		**be analyzed** in order to record differences and disparities between units, groups, geographical areas and so on, by employing the available information as much as possible	
	believable accessible interpretable	comprehensible simple manageable		**be spread** that is, it has to be easily findable, accessible, useable, analyzable, and interpretable in order to gain also users' confidence (brand image)	(IV) ACCESSIBILITY

e.   Prerequisites of quality

Although it does not represent a dimension of quality in itself, prerequisites of quality refers to all those (institutional or not) preconditions and background conditions for quality of statistics allowing.

In other words, indicators construction is not simply a technical problem but should become part of a larger debate concerning how to construct indicators obtaining a larger legitimacy to be promoted. These prerequisites cover the following elements:
(i)   legal and institutional environment, allowing
    a.   conceptual framework to be defined
    b.   coordination power within and across different institutions to be framed
    c.   data and resources to be available for statistical work
(ii)   quality awareness informing statistical work.

2.4   The "space" for policies: the goals

After the observation stage, the decision-making level can define action/intervention proposals concerning the pillars (even if through different intensity) by taking into account that the taken decisions will influence all the ambits, even when no resolution is made on each of them.
The policy proposal is expressed through **aims** which can be:
- *Conceptual aims* (**goals**) that represent broad statements concerning what has to be achieved or which is the problem to be faced. Usually goals are placed at different levels (local, national, international, etc.).
- *Operative aims* (**objectives**) that represent the instruments identified in order to attain the conceptual aims. Objectives can have different temporal prospects (monthly, four-monthly, annual, bi-annual, etc.)
- *Planning aims* (**actions**) that represent the specific activities identified to accomplish objective. They can include developments and infrastructural changes in policies, in institutions, in management instruments, etc.

Below, some goals adoptable for each pillar:

(i) "Quality of life" (individual level)
- Improving objective living conditions
- Increasing subjective wellbeing
- …

(ii) "Economic and social cohesion" (community level)
- Strengthening informal ties

- Increasing the role of institutions in encouraging social and political participation
- …

(iii) "Sustainability" (environmental and time level)
- Increasing and enhancing human capital (education, training, …)
- Preserving natural capital
- Preserving/improving equal opportunity of different generations
- …

CONCEPTS	DIMENSIONS	GOALS	LIFE DOMAINS (AMBITS)													
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Quality of life	**Objective living conditions**	Improvement													
	Subjective wellbeing	Enhancement													
Economic and social cohesion	**Disparities, inequalities and social exclusion**	Promotion of equal opportunities													
	Social relations and ties (social capital)	Strengthening informal ties													
Sustainability	**Human capital**	Enhancement													
	Natural capital	Preservation													

| **Socio-economic structure** | **Demographic and socio-economic structures** | Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Values and attitudes** | Changes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

It is important to set clear and shared goals (in the *wellbeing for all* perspective), by giving philosophical and political debate (understandable for all) more space.

After goals, objectives and actions have been defined, concrete and observable elements allow the process to be assessed. Consequently, for each dimension, different levels of evaluation can be defined. By exemplifying the process through the two dimensions of the quality-of-life concept, the combination of the two dimensions leads to the following well-known evaluating taxonomy (Zapf, 1975, 1984):

		Subjective wellbeing	
	level → ↓	high	low
Objective living conditions	f. high	2) well-being	3) dissonance
	low	4) adaptation	5) deprivation

3. Towards the fulfilment of a good society: what is needed?

Dealing with societal wellbeing by taking into account its multidimensionality not only involves philophical/political issues but concerns each individual's and community's real life. In other words, dealing with individuals' and communities' real life means discussing by taking into account the three pillars, which should be considered together.

Are indicators enough?

As said, a complex approach is needed in order to measure and monitor societal wellbeing.

Complexity requires many indicators, designed and organized in consistent conceptual structure. The obtained system provides all the cognitive instruments allowing decisions to be taken more consciously. In any case, those decisions appertain to policy.

In this frame, we could image the policy maker like a pilot sitting at the flight desk (Maggino, 2009).

Statistics have the task of defining, constructing and developing the instruments located in the cockpit. However, that activity needs:
- a clear definition of destination (→ *goals*)
- a democratic process allowing the community to take a shared decision concerning destination (→ democracy)
- a deep knowledge of pre-conditions (→ resources, …)
- a constant monitoring of flight conditions (→ monitoring)
- a continuous transmission and sharing of information on flight conditions (→ communication and information system)
- a cultural environment available to support scientific research (basic and applied) to improve the whole system's conditions
- a system allowing the community to face and manage emergencies (→ welfare and social security, ...)

If even just one of these items is missed, achieving a *good society* is seriously damaged.

References

Berger-Schmitt R. and H.-H. Noll (2000) *Conceptual Framework and Structure of a European System of Social Indicators*, EuReporting Working Paper No. 9, Centre for Survey Research and Methodology (ZUMA) – Social Indicators Department, Mannheim.

Diener E., E. Suh (1997) "Measuring quality of life: economic, social, and subjective indicators", *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 40, 189–216.

Horn R.V., (1993) *Statistical Indicators*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Maggino F. (2009) *The state of the art in indicators construction in the perspective of a comprehensive approach in measuring well-being of societies*, Firenze University Press, Archivio E-Prints, Firenze.

Maggino F. e E. Ruviglioni (2011) "Preaching to the Choir: Are the Commission's Recommendations Already Applied?" in *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 102, Issue 1, pp. 131-156.

Sirgy M.J., A.C. Michalos, A.L. Ferriss, R.A. Easterlin, D. Patrick and W. Pavot (2006) "The Quality-of-Life (QOL) Research Movement: Past, Present, and Future", *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 76, n.3, 343-466.

Zapf W. (1975) Le système d'indicateurs sociaux: approches et problèmes", *Revue Internationale des Sciences Sociales*, Vol. XXVII, n. 3.

Zapf W. (1984) "Individuelle Wohlfahrt: Lebensbedingungen und Wahrgenommene Lebensqualität", in W. Glatzer e Zapf W. (eds.) *Lebensqualität in der Bundesrepublik*, Frankfurt a. M. – New York, Campus, pp. 13-26.