

THE SOCIAL ENCODING MECHANISM OF WELL-BEING: A CATEGORICAL TRANSITION FROM PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS TO CULTURAL DISCIPLINARY REGIMES

ZhenYu Zhao, AiLi Xie*, Ran Liu

School of Management, Guangzhou Huashang College, Guangzhou 511300, Guangdong, China.

**Corresponding Author: AiLi Xie*

Abstract: This study investigates the social encoding mechanisms of happiness, analyzing the paradigm shift from psychological metrics to cultural norms. Through historical tracing, it reveals how the concept of "happiness" has evolved—from ancient philosophical ethical ideals to modern psychological quantification, and ultimately to technical standardized measurements in global governance. The measurement mech, This paper critically examines the measurement systems of happiness, revealing how they not only reduce the diversity of individual emotions but also reinforce mechanisms of inequality and exclusion within social structures. The study further explores the institutionalization pathways of "happiness," introducing the concept of "happiness justice." It advocates for reconstructing the social significance of happiness through critical and pluralistic perspectives, while calling for breaking free from the limitations of existing measurement frameworks to drive reflective reconstruction of both the concept and measurement systems of happiness.

Keywords: Happiness; Social coding mechanism; Cultural discipline; Social governance

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Rise of Happiness in Contemporary Representation Systems: An Evolutionary Trajectory From Moral Sentiment To Political Terminology

Happiness is not an inherently existing perceptible entity, but rather a symbolic representation endowed with public significance and institutional efficacy within specific historical contexts. From the classical philosophical concept of "life of virtue" (eudaimonia) to modern quantitative expressions of satisfaction, this notion has always oscillated between ethical ideals and social evaluations. In ancient Greek political communities, happiness represented the practical state of virtue and rationality; whereas under the governance logic of modern states governed by Enlightenment rationality, happiness has gradually transformed into psychological indicators closely tied to desire fulfillment, risk aversion, and economic security [1,2]. This transformation represents not merely an evolution in cognitive paradigms, but is more deeply embedded within the process of social institutionalization [3].

In the 20th century, particularly after World War II, with the establishment of welfare state systems and the rise of humanistic psychology, "happiness" was redefined as a measurable, manageable, and attainable psychological state [4]. During this period, American sociological and psychological communities began extensively using the term "subjective well-being" (SWB) to denote individuals' comprehensive evaluation of their life circumstances. They established standardized research procedures through self-report questionnaires and measurement tools [2]. Consequently, happiness transitioned from an object of private ethical introspection to a technical tool for policy assessment and social stratification, becoming one of the legitimacy resources for "good governance" at the national level [4].

The United Nations' annual World Happiness Report, published since 2012, has formally incorporated happiness into the global development agenda. This report not only employs the Social Well-being Index (SWB) core metrics—such as life satisfaction, positive emotion frequency, and negative emotion frequency—but also incorporates external structural variables like GDP, life expectancy, and social trustworthiness for comprehensive ranking [5]. This initiative has institutionalized happiness as a "comparable" cross-national and cross-cultural social indicator, thereby endowing the emotional concept of "happiness" with unprecedented political agency and symbolic governance functions [6].

1.2 An Ontological Question about "Subjective Well-being" (SWB) as An Object of Social Research

Although the Subjective Well-being Scale (SWB) has been widely adopted in empirical research and even regarded as the "gold standard" for measuring individual well-being and social development levels, its underlying ontological premises have yet to undergo systematic reflection [7]. SWB posits that "happiness" is a self-perceived, self-reported, and structurally stable psychological state, from which standardized measurement indicators are derived [4]. However, this assumption overlooks the social generative logic of emotional experiences: happiness is not an inherent psychological essence prior to social evaluation, but rather a product of production, definition, and institutionalization within linguistic, cultural, and institutional frameworks [8,9].

From this perspective, the SWB indicators essentially constitute an "emotional coding mechanism" that quantifies complex subjective experiences into data formats usable for governance [10]. Respondents' statements about happiness

do not directly reflect their true states but rather represent "discursive outputs" shaped by specific linguistic systems, cultural norms, and social expectations [11,12]. In this process, happiness ceases to be an individual's internal perception but becomes the outcome of "socially normative responses" — The reported "happiness" or "unhappiness" is closely tied to individuals' expectations of social roles, self-value judgments, and the encoding logic of situational responses. Thus, what SWB captures is not happiness itself, but rather the discursive representation of "the forms of happiness individuals are permitted or motivated to express within their current social context" [13].

1.3 The Justice of the Concept of Happiness: An Emotional Category that has been Disciplined Becomes a Policy And Measurement System

The institutionalization of "happiness" reveals a deeper issue: who has the authority to define what constitutes happiness, which emotional states are deemed "deserving of pursuit," and which lifestyles are tacitly accepted as "forms of happiness." The so-called "conceptual justice of happiness" manifests here as a political structure of knowledge-power mechanisms [12]. The measurement indicators of the Subjective Well-being Scale (SWB) implicitly favor specific lifestyle paradigms— such as stable income, moderate social support, good health, and predominance of positive emotions—precisely the ideal life picture pursued by middle-class societies and neoliberal state governance [14,15].

Furthermore, the happiness measurement system, while claiming scientific and neutral objectives, actually exerts profound disciplinary influence. By constructing a standardized model of "good living," it guides individuals toward specific behavioral patterns, value systems, and emotional expressions [16,17]. Take the seemingly neutral question "Are you happy?" for instance—it inherently presupposes a cultural imperative that "you should be happy." Under this command, those who don't feel content are directed to self-blame ("Is there something wrong with me?") rather than questioning social structures (e.g., "Are societal mechanisms creating unhappiness?") [18]. Thus, happiness measurement serves not merely as a research tool but as a disciplinary mechanism.

In this context, the quantification of happiness has not liberated individuals but instead contributed to constructing a "must-be-happy" social atmosphere, creating moral burdens and psychological pressures regarding well-being [19]. This process subtly transforms happiness from a personal choice into a social obligation, plunging those who are unhappy into shame and isolation [20,21]. This transformation marks a paradigm shift from psychological metrics to cultural discipline — which constitutes the core theoretical issue for subsequent analysis in this study.

2 THE HISTORICAL GENEALOGY OF HAPPINESS AS A SOCIAL CATEGORY: A PATH ANALYSIS OF CONCEPTUAL INSTITUTIONALIZATION

2.1 The Evolution of the Concept of Happiness: From Ethical Ideal to Cognitive Turn to Psychological Fact

The concept of "happiness" has carried normative implications since classical philosophy. Aristotle defined happiness (eudaimonia) as the unfolding of virtue and rational living, rather than fleeting pleasure. Within this framework, happiness constitutes a practical ethical structure that permeates one's entire life journey. In contrast, the medieval Christian tradition positioned happiness as a transcendent ideal, viewing it as a divine gift rather than a state attainable through earthly pursuits.

In modern society, the Enlightenment rationality has driven the transformation of happiness from teleological ethics to empirical psychological quantification. Utilitarians like Jeremy Bentham proposed defining happiness through the net difference between pleasure and pain, attempting to measure it through computational methods. This shift signifies that happiness is no longer merely a normative ethical pursuit but has become a statistical and manageable psychological fact [4,22].

From the late 19th to early 20th century, as psychology emerged from its philosophical roots, happiness evolved into a measurable and quantifiable subjective emotional state. This conceptual shift established happiness as a formal subject in empirical social sciences, with its theoretical framework transitioning from the "value-merit" paradigm to the "emotional-satisfaction" framework. This transformation profoundly reshaped the ontological understanding of happiness [23,24].

2.2 The Scientific Process of Psychology on Happiness since the 20th century: From Maslow to Diener's Index Revolution

In the mid-20th century, Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory introduced a structural framework for understanding happiness. By establishing "self-actualization" as the ultimate path to fulfillment, it redefined happiness through psychological dynamics that emphasize potential development. The widespread adoption of this theory shifted the focus from viewing happiness as a product of social distribution to recognizing it as a manifestation of individual self-development and internal regulation.

In the 1980s, Diener and colleagues formally introduced the concept of "subjective well-being" and developed measurement tools such as the Subjective Well-being Scale (SWLS) and the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). They established an empirical analytical framework based on the tripartite model of "life satisfaction—positive emotions—negative emotions" [2]. This framework enabled the technical processing of happiness, which was subsequently incorporated into public policy, organizational management, and educational systems. It has

been recognized as a crucial indicator for evaluating governance performance and psychological capital [10]. In this process, happiness has gradually lost its experiential, contextual, and emotional complexity, being reduced to standardized scores and charts that serve as tools for governments and institutions to manage emotions. Meanwhile, happiness has been further tied to functional indicators such as performance, intimate relationships, and health status, becoming an indispensable mediating variable in the social function system. Its institutional attributes have increasingly overshadowed its emotional essence [14,18].

2.3 The Rise of Happiness as a Governing Language: The Political Significance of the World Happiness Report

In 2012, the United Nations released the *World Happiness Report*, formally incorporating happiness into the global governance framework. The report synthesized subjective self-assessment scores, per capita GDP, social support, healthy life expectancy, freedom of choice, generosity index, and perceptions of corruption to rank countries' well-being across cultural contexts. This initiative aimed to move beyond GDP-centric development paradigms and establish a people-oriented evaluation standard for global progress [5].

However, the Report remains grounded in Diener's Social Work-Based (SWB) model, whose technical framework continues to adhere to the modern psychological paradigm characterized by individualism, emotion-driven approaches, and free-choice logic. Within this framework, happiness is redefined as a behavioral feedback mechanism rather than a social experience. Its measurement system, cloaked in "scientific" pretense, effectively obscures the deconstruction of institutional oppression, class structures, and cultural disparities [15,21].

The logic of happiness rankings presented in the report abstracts well-being into a set of calculable and comparable metrics, overlooking the diversity of life experiences and contextual variations. By making life satisfaction the core indicator for measuring happiness, it implies that only when individuals can rationally "score" their current circumstances is their happiness considered "visible happiness." This constitutes cognitive compression of the concept of happiness, detaching it from real-life experiences to serve technological rationality and institutional arrangements [3,25].

Furthermore, the global ranking system constructed by the World Happiness Report exhibits pronounced cultural biases and ideological functions. Its indicator framework implicitly assumes a specific cultural understanding of "good life," overlooking the ontological differences and empirical incommensurability of happiness across social contexts. By prioritizing "life satisfaction" as the core metric, the system essentially reduces the experience of happiness to a decontextualized, ahistorical "rational scoring exercise." This fundamentally reflects a representation of societal integration capabilities and institutional identity levels rather than genuine well-being.

2.4 The Evolutionary Logic from Philosophical Ideal to Statistical Governance

The institutionalization of happiness as a social construct reflects a historical conceptual evolution from moral philosophy to psychological metrics and ultimately to technological governance. In this process, the empirical foundation of happiness has been stripped away, its socio-critical capacity undermined by technocratic discourse, ultimately becoming an emotional veneer for state performance, social order, and institutional legitimacy [16,26].

This "governed happiness" is not merely an emotional construct, but rather an institutional product shaped by the knowledge-power structure. It transforms "happiness" from a fluid emotional practice into a rigid paradigm of expression, then transfers it to expert systems and statistical agencies for evaluation and regulation through standardized metrics, questionnaires, and criteria. This process establishes a legitimacy production mechanism for the concept of happiness, further revealing that our sense of well-being exists as a political, cognitive, and institutional construct, rather than a self-revelation of empirical facts.

3 THE INDICATOR TRANSLATION MECHANISM OF HAPPINESS: MEASURING POLITICS FROM INTERNAL STATE TO EXTERNAL EXPRESSION

3.1 From Subjectivity to Objectivity: Knowledge Assumptions and Technical Structures of Happiness Measurement

Modern social science constructs a systematic framework for measuring happiness through "externalizing subjective states". This approach is grounded in the assumption that individuals possess the capacity to perceive, articulate, and quantify their well-being, with these subjective perceptions being translated into stable and reproducible measurement systems. Rooted in the empirical psychology paradigm, this framework requires complex emotional experiences to conform to linear measurement models, while overlooking the contextual, ambiguous, and unstructured nature of happiness [4,27].

Taking the Social Work Life Scale (SWLS) developed by Diener et al. as an example, individuals are required to provide standardized responses to propositions like "I am satisfied with my current life." Behind this seemingly simple language lies multiple layers of meaning compression and cognitive restructuring: participants must synthesize complex life perceptions into a singular judgment, rely on socially defined interpretations of "happiness" and "satisfaction," and incorporate expectations of others' evaluations in their responses [2,15]. Happiness measurement instruments do not authentically reflect emotional experiences but rather serve as "socially reinterpreted meanings" through measurement logic. Happiness ceases to be a freely expressed concept and becomes an institutionalized mode of expression [23].

3.2 From Individual Self-narratives to Collective Order: How Indicators Construct Social Expectations of Well-being

When happiness is measured, its significance extends beyond psychological statements to become a social representation that can be demonstrated, recorded, and compared. This transformation effect has transcended academic research boundaries, participating in shaping society's collective cognitive framework regarding "what constitutes happiness" and "who should be happy" [19].

Taking the World Happiness Report as an example, while its core metrics include subjective well-being scores, they are fundamentally interpreted and validated through a series of structural variables such as income, social support, and freedom [5]. This logic ostensibly preserves subjectivity, yet in practice incorporates individual perceptions into the happiness framework constructed by technological systems and governance models. The measurement of happiness is endowed with dual functions: serving both as a reflection of psychological responses and as a symbol of institutional legitimacy.

In this process, expressions of happiness gradually transform into responses to societal expectations. When individuals engage in measurement, they refer to the widely accepted paradigm of happiness rather than their unique life experiences. The expression of happiness becomes a form of "socially adaptive language," where its structure conforms to "acceptable subjective states" rather than genuine emotional perceptions [14].

3.3 From the Survey Tool to the Governance Mechanism: the Power Logic of Indicatorized Happiness

When happiness metrics are fully integrated into national, organizational, and educational systems, their function evolves from mere "measurement" to becoming tools for "management" and "shaping" [3,18]. The measurement mechanisms of happiness establish "soft discipline" within power structures, using self-reporting and feedback evaluation systems to compel individuals to view happiness as a self-management obligation.

In educational systems, positive psychology has become a mainstream approach, with well-being courses and emotion management forming key components of emotional governance [24]. In corporate management, the "Employee Happiness Index" is integrated into performance evaluation systems. This mechanism encourages employees to internalize organizational goals as markers of personal achievement, thereby establishing a regulatory framework for deep-seated affective structures.

More crucially, the capacity to express happiness has gradually evolved into a standard for social value judgments. Those with higher levels of happiness are perceived as socially exemplary individuals demonstrating good adaptability and psychological stability, while those with lower levels are categorized as potentially deviant groups. This evaluative framework establishes a new social stratification system based on emotional competence, transforming happiness into an emotional coordinate on the boundaries of social governance [16].

3.4 The Representation Crisis of Happiness: the Paradoxical Structure from "Being Measured" to "Being Expected"

In the repeated operation of measurement systems, happiness is no longer understood as genuine personal experience but has been preconceived as a socially prescribed symbol "to be expressed." Individuals gradually internalize emotional expression norms within institutional environments, progressively accepting happiness as a public obligation [10,26].

This mechanism creates a "happiness illusion" that serves not to reveal the social origins of well-being, but rather to obscure the structural roots of unhappiness. When happiness expression becomes a marker of institutional performance, it ceases to be an individual emotion and transforms into a social feedback mechanism. In this process, individuals gradually learn and train themselves to become "measured happiness subjects," where the authenticity of their emotional states gives way to compliance within the measurement system.

Ultimately, happiness has been institutionalized as a moral expression, a compliance metric, and a legitimate form of emotional behavior. Rather than enhancing the subjective authenticity of happiness, the measurement mechanism structurally creates a "desirable happiness," forming a closed-loop system of institutional self-regulation [14,18].

4 THE DISCIPLINE MECHANISM OF HAPPINESS: HOW TO CONSTRUCT THE TAME SUBJECT OF HAPPINESS INDEX

4.1 Starting from Foucault's Knowledge Spectrum of Power: the Positioning of Governance Function in Happiness Measurement

The measurement of happiness is not merely a neutral technical operation; its deeper political attributes should be examined through the "power-knowledge" relationship proposed by Foucault [3]. Within Foucault's theoretical framework, modern society's governance logic no longer primarily relies on external coercion and command-style sovereignty, but has shifted toward a "governance power" (governmentality) that deeply shapes individuals through discourse, technology, and expert systems [3]. The mechanism of happiness measurement exemplifies this governance model: while appearing as a "scientific evaluation" or "self-care" initiative, it actually imposes disciplinary control over emotional structures through quantification discourse [14].

Happiness has evolved from an intrinsic connection between individuals and their lived experiences into a "measurable objective existence." In daily life, people not only confront multiple pressures from economic, cultural, and identity-related factors but are also burdened with the social obligation to "feel happy". When happiness becomes a metric for functional adaptation and social integration, it transforms into a new standard for defining "normalcy," constructing a symbolic framework that determines "who deserves resource investment and who qualifies for social participation" [28]. In this context, happiness metrics have transcended their role as research tools to become classification and screening mechanisms, using the "science of happiness" to evaluate individuals' social functions.

4.2 Happiness as a "Self-technology": Internal Control Discipline under the Discourse of Positive Psychology

Since the late 20th century, positive psychology has emerged as a new paradigm in psychological discourse, rapidly integrated into institutional domains such as education, management, and public governance. Within this framework, happiness is redefined as a psychological capacity that can be cultivated through training, learning, and internal regulation, thereby establishing the governance logic that "happiness is a self-technology" [29].

The approaches advocated by positive psychology—such as "positive emotion cultivation", "self-efficacy enhancement," and "life meaning construction" —appear to emphasize individual autonomy on the surface. In reality, however, they shift the responsibility for happiness from structural environments (such as income inequality, work pressure, institutional exclusion) back onto individuals [18]. Within this disciplinary mechanism, when individuals "feel unhappy," they are compelled to retrace their self-exploration: Is it my poor mindset? My lack of gratitude? My failure to master happiness skills? The construction of this "self-blame mechanism" exemplifies the sophistication of disciplinary logic— It eliminates the possibility of identifying institutional oppression, dissolving discontent through internalized governance and emotional conditioning.

It is precisely through the widespread dissemination of this psychological discourse that "happiness" has been moralized, technologized, and burdened with responsibilities, evolving into an individual's essential psychological capital requiring constant refinement. Happiness no longer responds to social environments but has become a personal KPI for managing one's inner world. In this sense, well-being has ceased to be a private domain and has been fully incorporated into the "self-governance program" within the framework of power discourse [28].

4.3 The Social Order of "Must Be Happy": the Construction Mechanism of Moral Norms and Emotional Obedience

The normative demands of modern society regarding happiness have evolved into a covert yet potent social command structure: you must feel happy, or at least appear happy [24]. Whether it's showcasing the visual "refined lifestyle" in social media feeds or filling out self-assessment forms with "satisfied" responses at workplace psychological evaluations, happiness has become an "expected emotional expression" —a moral condition essential for maintaining social relationships [16].

The public expression of happiness has thus evolved from a psychological freedom to an obligation of conduct. It no longer reflects individuals' spontaneous emotional expressions but serves as a responsive act to societal expectations. In this context, the manifestation of happiness resembles "civic responsibility" or "team spirit," —becoming a crucial symbol for evaluating personal health, adaptability, and positivity [8]. In school education, students are guided to daily record "three small acts of gratitude"; in workplace culture, employees are encouraged to maintain positive emotions and provide upward feedback. These practices reinforce the implicit chain between "happiness, positive energy, and compliance," subtly making happiness expression a prerequisite for individuals to be recognized as "good citizens" or "qualified members."

Happiness has thus become a performance metric for emotional-behavioral complexes, forming a micro-regulation system governing individuals. Within this framework, emotional states like pessimism, fatigue, or anxiety are often dismissed as personal psychological failures rather than societal issues. This social logic transforms happiness into an unquestionable value category, negating the moral legitimacy of expressing unhappiness while systematically excluding vulnerable expressions [29].

4.4 The Institutional Labeling of "Happy Disabled" and "Emotional Failure"

In a society prioritizing happiness as its guiding principle, individuals who fail to demonstrate sufficient well-being are readily labeled as "losers". Policy evaluations often categorize low-happiness communities as "underperforming regions" in governance; organizational assessments typically include low-happiness employees in psychological intervention or performance improvement programs; educational systems refer unhappy students to counseling services. While these practices appear neutral in statistical and managerial discourse, they construct a marker system of "emotional underperformers" that systematically equates low well-being with "governance targets", "high-risk groups", or "irrational subjects" [14].

Meanwhile, individuals who actively question happiness metrics, voice social discontent, or refuse to participate in happiness measurements may be categorized as "abnormal" or "non-cooperative" within social frameworks, becoming subjects of observation, guidance, and even correction [28]. Consequently, happiness measurement mechanisms transcend their original role as status indicators, evolving into institutional boundaries that distinguish "the fit" from "the unfit." Low levels of happiness are no longer merely psychological states but have become "social behavioral risk

signals" that demand attention.

Under this mechanism, "unhappiness" becomes an emotion that cannot be openly expressed, "dismissing signs of happiness" evolves into symptomatic interventions, and "failure to express happiness" manifests as institutionalized path deviation. This emotional labeling system progressively compresses the space for emotional diversity, leading individuals to self-suppress and self-regulate under the rhetoric of institutional rationality. Ultimately, "happiness" is internalized as a legitimacy credential for personal existence [8].

5 CONCEPTUAL TRANSITION AND CRITICAL RECONSTRUCTION: FROM THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION LOGIC OF HAPPINESS INDEX TO THE DECONSTRUCTION PATH OF NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The formation of happiness as an institutional concept does not originate from purely empirical knowledge accumulation, but rather relies on the "power-knowledge-emotion" composite structure formed by modern governance rationality, psychological science discourse, and social expectations. Since "Subjective Well-being" (SWB) was established as a crucial indicator for measuring individual well-being and national performance, its conceptual evolution has undergone three major transitions: from emotional experience to statistical models, from psychological reality to behavioral norms, and from individual expression to governance logic [2,4,14]. In this process, happiness is no longer a vague ethical ideal or individual narrative, but has been integrated into macro-level indicator systems and micro-level self-governance practices, becoming a mobilizable emotional resource within institutional arrangements [3,8].

The institutionalization of happiness has not achieved universal justification for its normative foundations, but rather triggered systematic questioning of its ontological basis and cognitive premises. Firstly, the "reportability," "measurability," and "stability" inherent in the concept of subjective well-being obscure the historical, cultural, and situational mechanisms that shape emotions. As Sointu noted, happiness is not an intrinsic state divorced from context, but rather an emotional practice constrained by institutional frameworks, language, and cultural embedding[26]. Secondly, while happiness has been recognized as a marker of policy legitimacy and social progress, it has gradually become a performance mechanism for institutional discipline, constructing a social categorization logic for "qualified subjects." This logic is reinforced through specific practices like happiness surveys, performance evaluations, and public assessments, transforming happiness from a lens for critiquing social structures into a political tool for maintaining existing order [16].

It is precisely on this basis that the "conceptual justice" embedded in happiness metrics becomes increasingly prominent. When the lived experiences, cultural differences, and emotional expressions of specific social groups cannot be captured through standardized measurements, the happiness system evolves into an exclusionary mechanism. Its encoding of emotional states not only shapes standardized paradigms of "idealized happiness" but also obscures diverse understandings of "what truly merits inquiry into happiness" [15,24]. The technologized representation of happiness gains widespread acceptance through its "neutral" facade, yet conceals profound inequalities: mainstream measurement models predominantly resonate with middle-class lifestyles while neglecting the lived experiences of impoverished groups, marginalized identities, and cultural minorities [12,29].

To advance the critical reconstruction of the concept of happiness, we must transcend the psychological positivism framework underpinning current measurement systems. This requires returning to the ontological understanding of happiness as a "social construct" and reconstructing its reflective function. The reconstruction should encompass three dimensions: First, introducing discussions on the right to express emotions, redefining well-being as an expression practice within social contexts rather than a psychological entity, thereby restoring its critical tension [8]. Second, breaking the monopolistic claims of technological tools on emotional experiences by developing non-quantitative research approaches like affective ethnography and discourse analysis to capture how happiness is constructed, discussed, and applied in specific contexts [13,26]. Third, promoting the institutionalization of "happiness justice" by integrating well-being into social structural reforms and cultural equality discourse, transforming it from a "model performance" standard into a benchmark for "institutional responses" [6,20].

In essence, the evolution of happiness from an ethical concept to a technologically mediated discourse has formed a distinctive "knowledge-power-emotion" triad in modern society. Within this framework, individual expressions of well-being are neither entirely autonomous nor purely subjective, but rather normative responses shaped by institutionalized conditioning. To restore happiness's academic significance and social justice dimension, we must begin by de-technologizing, de-standardizing, and de-psychocentricizing—reestablishing it as both a critical political entry point and a fertile ground for shaping collective social imagination.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

FUNDING

We would like to express our gratitude for the funding provided by Guangdong Province Philosophy and Social Sciences Planning Project (GD24XGL030) and Guangzhou Philosophy and Social Sciences Development "14th Five-Year Plan" 2024 Annual Regular Project (2024GZGJ211).

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Zhao Zhenyu (born 2003), male, is a Guangdong native from Guangzhou. He holds a bachelor's degree and specializes in marketing research. Xie Aili (b. 1977), a female associate professor from Guangzhou, Guangdong Province with a master's degree, specializes in consumer behavior studies. Liu Lianhua (b. 1984), also from Guangzhou, holds a master's degree and teaches logistics transportation economics as an associate professor. Liu Ran (b. 2003), a marketing expert with a bachelor's degree from Qingyuan, Guangdong Province, focuses on market-oriented research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brandmeyer T, Delorme A. Meditation and the wandering mind: A theoretical framework of underlying neurocognitive mechanisms. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2021, 16(1): 39-66.
- [2] Diener E, Emmons R A, Larsen R J, et al. The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 1985, 49(1): 71-75.
- [3] Briker R, Hohmann S, Walter F. A dyadic approach toward the interpersonal consequences of time pressure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 2021, 27(3): 546-562.
- [4] Kahneman D, Krueger A B. Developments in the Measurement of Subjective Well-being. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2006, 20(1): 3-24.
- [5] Helliwell J, Layard R, Sachs J, eds. *World Happiness Reports*. New York: Sustainable Development Solutions Network, 2012-2024.
- [6] Zhang Xudong. Political Happiness and the China Model. *Open Era*, 2020(1): 14-33.
- [7] Tian Liu, Li Yumei, Feng Jingyu. The Changing Trends of Chinese Citizens' Subjective Well-being and Its Distribution—— with a Discussion on Whether China Experiences a Happiness Paradox. *Labor Economics Research*, 2024, 12(06): 70-100.
- [8] Ahmed S. *The Promise of Happiness*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.
- [9] He Qizhi, Kao Jiaqi, Liu Yanhu. Statistical Measurement and Temporal-Spatial Evolution Characteristics of Residents' Happiness Index. *Journal of Anhui University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2025, 49(04): 117-129.
- [10] Cieslik M. Not smiling but frowning: Sociology and the 'problem' of happiness. *Sociology*, 2015, 49(3): 422-437.
- [11] An Qin, Zhang Wei. Social Comparison Tendency and Subjective Well-being: The Role of Relative Deprivation and Self-Concept Clarity. *China Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 2025, 33(02): 315-319.
- [12] Zhang Jing. Measured Happiness: A Knowledge Spectrum of Subjective Well-being Research. *Social Science*, 2013(1): 1-25.
- [13] Pang Ying. From "Self-Report" to "Social Command": A Critical Analysis of Subjective Well-being Discourse. *Sociology Research*, 2017(5): 65-89.
- [14] Rose N. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [15] Christopher J C, Hickinbottom S. Positive psychology, ethnocentrism, and the disguised ideology of individualism. *Theory & Psychology*, 2008, 18(5): 563-589.
- [16] Donald J N, Bradshaw E L, Ryan R M, et al. Mindfulness and its association with varied types of motivation: A systematic review and meta-analysis using self-determination theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2020, 46(7): 1121-1138.
- [17] Pang Ying. The Governance Logic and Discipline Mechanism of Happiness. *Sociology Research*, 2017, 32(2): 99-119.
- [18] Arslan Ü, Asıcı E. The mediating role of solution focused thinking in relation between mindfulness and psychological well-being in university students. *Current Psychology*, 2022, 41(11): 8052-8061.
- [19] Cieslik M. Not Smiling But Frowning: Sociology and the 'Problem of Happiness'. *Sociological Research Online*, 2015, 20(1): 1-14.
- [20] He Xuefeng. State and Society: An Ideological Critique of Well-being Indicators. *Exploration and Controversy*, 2012(10): 1-5.
- [21] Zhang Xudong. The Cultural Logic of Happy Politics: A Case Study of the World Happiness Report. *Culture & Society*, 2020(6): 118-125.
- [22] Yu Guoliang, Wei Qingwang. A New Interpretation of Social and Mental Health: Perspectives on Social Well-being. *Journal of Nanjing Normal University (Social Sciences Edition)*, 2025(02): 72-81.
- [23] Fossas A. Psychological maturity predicts different forms of happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 2019, 20(6): 1933-1952.
- [24] Illouz E. *Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- [25] Zhang Jing. The Power of Indicators: A Cultural Sociological Examination. *Open Era*, 2013(5): 74-87.
- [26] Sointu E. The rise of an ideal: Tracing changing discourses of well-being. *The Sociological Review*, 2005, 53(2): 255-274.
- [27] Yang Congcong, Li Xuexin, Zhang Nan. Research on the Impact of Happiness-Driven Impulse Buying on Consumer Well-being. *Journal of Northeastern University (Social Sciences Edition)*, 2025, 27(01): 76-87.
- [28] Binkley S. Happiness, Positive Psychology and the Program of Neoliberal Governmentality. *Subjectivity*, 2014, 7(4): 371-394.

- [29] Cabanas E, Illouz E. *Manufacturing Happy Citizens: How the Science and Industry of Happiness Control Our Lives*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019.