Journal of Happytalism and Fundamental Peace
World Happiness Foundation Research Lab · worldhappiness.foundation
Diamond open access · Peer reviewed

REVIEW

Measuring What Matters?

A Critical Review of the World Happiness Report Framework (2012–2026), with Special Reference to India

Saamdu Chetri[1], Luis Miguel Gallardo[2], Satinder Singh Rekhi[3], Renita Sinha[4], Satish[5]

[1] Faculty, Rekhi Foundation for Happiness; Visiting Professor, Rekhi Centres of Excellence for the Science of Happiness in India, Jaipur, India
[2] Professor of Practice, Yogananda School of Spirituality and Happiness, Shoolini University, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India; Founder and President, World Happiness Foundation
[3] Founder, Rekhi Foundation for Happiness
[4] Assistant Professor (on sabbatical), Shoolini University, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India
[5] Senior Research Associate, Department of Education in Social Science, New Delhi, India

Volume 1, Issue 1 · JHFP-2026-002
Published September 2026
doi: 10.68220/whf.2026.002
© 2026 the authors · Licensed under CC BY 4.0

World Happiness Foundation Research Lab
worldhappiness.foundation

Journal of Happytalism and Fundamental Peace
World Happiness Foundation Research Lab · Diamond open access · CC BY 4.0

REVIEW
Published September 2026
doi: 10.68220/whf.2026.002

Measuring What Matters?

A Critical Review of the World Happiness Report Framework (2012–2026), with Special Reference to India

Saamdu Chetri[1], **Luis Miguel Gallardo**[2], **Satinder Singh Rekhi**[3], **Renita Sinha**[4], **Satish**[5]

[1] Faculty, Rekhi Foundation for Happiness; Visiting Professor, Rekhi Centres of Excellence for the Science of Happiness in India, Jaipur, India

[2] Professor of Practice, Yogananda School of Spirituality and Happiness, Shoolini University, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India; Founder and President, World Happiness Foundation

[3] Founder, Rekhi Foundation for Happiness

[4] Assistant Professor (on sabbatical), Shoolini University, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India

[5] Senior Research Associate, Department of Education in Social Science, New Delhi, India

Correspondence: luismiguel@shooliniuniversity.com

ABSTRACT

Between 2012 and 2026, the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network, joined from 2024 by the Wellbeing Research Centre at the University of Oxford, published fourteen editions of the World Happiness Report (WHR), establishing subjective well-being as a serious complement to GDP-based measures of national progress. Using Gallup World Poll data and the Cantril Ladder, the WHR has ranked between roughly 137 and 158 countries in any given year and attributed cross-country variation to six factors: GDP per capita, social support, healthy life expectancy, freedom, generosity, and perceived corruption. This paper offers a critical, India-focused reading of the full run of fourteen editions published between 2012 and 2026. It synthesises the comparative gap between the highest- and lowest-ranked countries across the whole period, examines the conceptual and methodological limitations of the Cantril Ladder approach, and interrogates India's markedly non-linear trajectory: from 111th in 2012–13, down to a low of 144th in 2020, and back up to 116th in the 2026 edition. The paper argues that this trajectory reflects a genuine mix of inequality, pandemic-era disruption, weakening informal safety nets, institutional friction and a genuine recent recovery, but is also partly an artefact of a measurement instrument built around individualistic, materially weighted assumptions and of a country sample whose size has itself moved by more than twenty places over the period. The paper closes with a comparison to alternative well-being frameworks and implications for Indian policy and research.

Keywords: World Happiness Report; subjective well-being; Cantril Ladder; India; Gross National Happiness; measurement critique; well-being policy; happiness rankings.

Suggested citation: *Chetri, S., Gallardo, L. M., Rekhi, S. S., Sinha, R., & Satish. (2026). Measuring What Matters? A Critical Review of the World Happiness Report Framework (2012–2026), with Special Reference to India. Journal of Happytalism and Fundamental Peace, 1(1), JHFP-2026-002. https://doi.org/10.68220/whf.2026.002*

1. Introduction

The idea that national success should be judged by more than economic output is not new, but it gained unusual institutional weight after 2012, when the United Nations Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) began publishing the World Happiness Report at the request of the UN General Assembly. Commissioned in the wake of a 2011 UN resolution inviting member states to

give more attention to happiness and well-being in guiding public policy, the report offered, for the first time, an annual, globally comparable ranking of subjective well-being.

Fourteen editions have now appeared: 2012, 2013, 2015, and the 2016 Update, followed by an unbroken run of annual editions from 2017 to 2026 (there was no separate 2014 edition, as the report briefly moved to an eighteen-month publication cycle before settling into its present annual rhythm, released each March around the International Day of Happiness) [1–14]. Each draws on Gallup World Poll surveys and uses a single-item measure, the Cantril Ladder, as its central metric of life evaluation. The number of countries covered has, however, varied considerably across this span — from a high of around 158 in 2015 to a low of around 137 in 2023, a fact rarely foregrounded when a single year's rank is reported in isolation [3,11].

This paper has four aims, one more than a review confined to the 2012–2016 window would need. First, it summarises how the top-ranked and bottom-ranked countries have compared across the six explanatory variables over the full 2012–2026 span. Second, it subjects the WHR's methodology to closer scrutiny, drawing on the wider well-being research literature to identify where the instrument's assumptions may distort cross-country comparison. Third, and at greatest length, it examines India's rank across all fourteen editions, a trajectory that fell from 111th in 2012/2013 to a low of 144th in 2020, before recovering over five consecutive editions to 116th in 2026 — and asks how much of this movement reflects genuine welfare change versus artefacts of measurement design. Fourth, because the size of the country field has itself moved by more than twenty places across the period, the paper introduces a percentile-adjusted reading of India's position that is largely absent from existing commentary, most of which reports raw rank alone. The paper closes with a brief look at alternative well-being frameworks and some implications for Indian policymakers and researchers.

2. Methodology of the World Happiness Report: A Brief Overview

The WHR's central metric is the Cantril Ladder (also called the Cantril Self-Anchoring Striving Scale), in which survey respondents are asked to imagine a ladder with rungs numbered 0 to 10, where 0 represents the worst possible life for them and 10 the best possible life, and then to indicate which rung they currently stand on. National scores are simple population-weighted averages of individual responses, typically drawn from Gallup World Poll samples of roughly 1,000 to 3,000 respondents per country per year, pooled across a rolling three-year window to improve precision.

Having obtained these life-evaluation scores, the report's authors then run a regression to see how much of the cross-country variation can be statistically associated with six variables: GDP per capita (in purchasing-power-parity terms), social support (whether a respondent has someone to count on in times of trouble), healthy life expectancy at birth, freedom to make life choices, generosity (whether a respondent has donated to charity recently), and perceptions of corruption in government and business. It is worth being precise about what this regression does and does not show: the six variables are correlates of the ladder score, not necessarily causes of happiness, and the report's authors have generally been careful to describe them this way even where secondary commentary has not.

A further modelling device, the 'Dystopia' baseline, is central to how the report visualises its findings but is frequently misunderstood by outside readers. Dystopia is a hypothetical country constructed by taking the lowest national average observed across the six variables. Because no real country scores worse than Dystopia on every variable simultaneously, every real country's contribution from each factor can be shown as a positive quantity relative to this floor, plus a residual term capturing whatever the six variables do not explain. This is a presentational

convenience for decomposing bar charts, not a claim that any real country resembles Dystopia; but it does mean that a meaningful share of every country's score, commonly a fifth to a quarter, is simply unexplained residual, a point easy to lose in the report's more confident policy narrative [15].

These three features of the methodology, the ladder metric, the six explanatory variables, and the Dystopia baseline, have remained essentially unchanged across all fourteen editions between 2012 and 2026, which is what makes longitudinal and cross-country comparison possible at all. What has changed, sometimes considerably, is the roster of countries with usable data in a given year, a point taken up in Section 4.7 below.

3. Comparative Analysis: Top 30 versus Bottom 30 Countries (2012–2026)

Across the fourteen editions in this period, the ranking's top tier has been remarkably stable and geographically concentrated, though not perfectly so. Denmark, Switzerland, Iceland, and Norway rotated at or near the top in earlier editions; since 2018, Finland has topped the table for nine consecutive editions, an unmatched run in the report's history [6–14,33]. Finland, Netherlands, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and Sweden have filled out most of the remaining top-ten places throughout, though two non-traditional entrants, Israel (from around 2022) and Costa Rica, which reached fourth place in 2026, its highest-ever placing and the first time a Central American country has cracked the global top five, have complicated the picture of a purely Nordic-Western European monopoly on the top of the table [14,33]. The bottom tier has been equally concentrated, historically dominated by Sub-Saharan African states and by countries experiencing acute conflict, with Burundi, Syria, Togo, Central African Republic, South Sudan and Rwanda recurring among the ten lowest-ranked countries in the earlier editions. Since around 2020, however, Afghanistan has consistently anchored the very bottom of the table, its score falling from roughly 3.8 in the 2016 Update to about 1.45 in 2026, less than one-fifth of Finland's score that year, and the lowest score any country has recorded in the report's history. Afghan women recorded the lowest average life satisfaction of any subgroup measured anywhere in the 2026 edition, at 1.26 out of 10 [4,14,34].

The table below synthesises the relational pattern between the top 30 and bottom 30 countries across the full 2012–2026 period, organised around the WHR's own six explanatory variables.

Table 1. Comparative profile of the top 30 and bottom 30 ranked countries, 2012–2026

Dimension	Top 30 countries	Bottom 30 countries
Average ladder score	Roughly 6.6–7.8 out of 10	Roughly 1.4–4.2 out of 10
Geographic concentration	Northern and Western Europe, North America, Oceania; Israel and Costa Rica recurring near the top ten from the early 2020s	Sub-Saharan Africa; conflict-affected states in the Middle East and South Asia; Afghanistan continuously last since c. 2020
GDP per capita	Large positive contribution; stable livelihoods and social protection	Minimal contribution; widespread poverty and subsistence livelihoods
Social support	High reported trust; large majorities report having someone to rely on	Social structures strained by conflict, displacement, and poverty
Healthy life expectancy	Roughly 72–84 years, with the upper bound rising across the period	Depressed by communicable disease, malnutrition, weak health systems, and active conflict
Freedom and governance	High institutional trust, low perceived corruption, secure political rights	High corruption perceptions, constrained civil liberties, political instability
Trend across the period	Essentially stable; Finland has topped the table for nine consecutive editions (2018–2026)	Score compression has worsened at the very bottom; Afghanistan's own score fell by roughly two-thirds between 2016 and 2026

Two patterns stand out. First, the gap between the top and bottom groups is not evenly distributed across the six variables — the largest single contributors to the gap are consistently GDP per capita and healthy life expectancy, which are also the two variables most mechanically linked to a country's overall level of economic development. Second, the bottom of the table has, if anything, fallen further from the top over the fifteen-year span than it did at the start: the top tier has been essentially stable while Afghanistan's own score collapsed by roughly two-thirds. This is at odds with any simple narrative of global convergence in well-being, and it complicates the report's own periodic descriptions of global happiness as 'remarkably resilient', a description that fits the upper and middle of the distribution rather better than its extreme lower tail. It is also worth noting, as in the earlier 2012–2016 period, that the bottom 30 is disproportionately a list of countries experiencing active or recent violent conflict rather than simply the world's poorest countries by income; several materially poor but peaceful countries, including some in South Asia, have scored measurably higher than their income levels alone would predict throughout the period, a point that recurs in Section 5 below.

4. Critical Review of the WHR Framework

The WHR has been widely credited with legitimising subjective well-being as a serious policy concern. That contribution is real. But the specific instrument it relies on, and the way its results are popularly read, have drawn sustained methodological criticism from well-being researchers. Seven concerns are especially relevant to a fair reading of the 2012–2026 editions, six that applied already to the 2012–2016 window, and a seventh that only becomes visible once the full run of fourteen editions is considered together.

4.1 Cognitive life evaluation is not the same as felt happiness

The Cantril Ladder asks respondents to evaluate their life as a whole against an imagined best and worst possible life — a cognitive, comparative judgement, rather than asking how happy, content, or joyful they feel from day to day, which is closer to what most people mean by 'happiness' colloquially. Research using the instrument has found that its ladder-and-rungs framing tends to prime respondents to think in terms of power, status and wealth more than in terms of relationships or day-to-day affect, an effect that is muted or absent when the same 0-to-10 scale is

presented without the ladder metaphor, or with anchors describing 'harmony' rather than a 'best possible life' [18]. This matters because a society whose members report frequent positive emotions, strong relational bonds, and low anxiety could nonetheless register a modest life-evaluation score if its members hold high aspirations or compare themselves against demanding reference points, precisely the situation frequently described for parts of urban India.

4.2 A Western, individualistic frame applied to collectivist contexts

The ladder metaphor itself carries a cultural inflexion: climbing to a 'top rung' evokes an individualist, achievement-oriented conception of a good life that maps more comfortably onto Western social imaginaries than onto more collectivist or interdependence-oriented cultural frames, in which fulfilment is understood relationally — through family duty, community harmony, or spiritual equilibrium — rather than as personal ascent. Consistent with this, cross-cultural survey research has documented that East Asian respondents show a more pronounced tendency to cluster around the middle of the ladder's 0–10 range than Western respondents do, a response pattern plausibly linked to cultural norms around self-presentation and modesty rather than to any real difference in underlying welfare [17]. Similar dynamics are frequently proposed, though harder to isolate statistically, for South Asian respondents, including in India. It is worth noting, as a complicating data point rather than a refutation, that the recent diversification of the top ten, Israel and Costa Rica joining the historically Nordic-Western European cluster, shows the ranking is not a closed club defined purely by Western cultural membership; but neither entrant is a large, culturally distant, collectivist society of India's scale, so the underlying concern is not resolved by their inclusion.

4.3 Over-weighting of material and institutional indicators

Because GDP per capita and life expectancy are both strongly correlated with a country's overall level of development, and because the six-variable regression is estimated on data pooled across highly unequal countries, developed economies are structurally advantaged in the resulting decomposition. Countries with strong cultural cohesion, low material footprints, or non-market forms of mutual support, extended-family systems, informal credit and insurance networks, religious community structures, receive credit for these only insofar as they happen to register through the survey's chosen proxies (having 'someone to count on,' recent charitable donation). Non-market forms of solidarity that do not take the form of individual cash donations are liable to be undercounted by the generosity variable as currently operationalised.

4.4 Statistical opacity in the Dystopia residual and small samples

As noted above, a substantial share of each country's score in the WHR's own decomposition is an unexplained residual attached to the Dystopia baseline rather than to any of the six named variables — commonly on the order of a fifth of the total gap between an average country and Dystopia [15]. Because this residual is rarely foregrounded in press coverage of the report, readers can come away crediting the six explanatory variables with more predictive power than the underlying statistics support. Compounding this, national scores across the 2012–2026 editions have rested on samples of roughly 1,000 to 3,000 respondents per country per year, a workable size for a single national average, but too small to support confident sub-national breakdowns for a country as large and internally diverse as India, where a single 'national happiness score' can obscure enormous variation across states, income groups, castes, and the rural–urban divide.

4.5 Translation, framing, and single-item measurement

Finally, the WHR relies on a single survey item translated into dozens of languages. Single-item life-evaluation measures are attractive for their brevity and comparability but are known in the

psychometric literature to have lower construct validity than multi-item scales, since a single question cannot capture the many dimensions, material, relational, emotional and existential- that most theories of well-being treat as at least partially distinct. Translation of the ladder metaphor and its anchoring phrases ('best possible life for you') is not guaranteed to preserve identical connotations across languages, a concern that applies with particular force in a linguistically diverse country such as India, where Gallup fieldwork must be conducted across multiple languages and dialects within a single national sample.

4.6 An ecological and intergenerational blind spot

A further limitation, less discussed in Indian commentary but increasingly raised within the well-being research community itself, is that the six-variable framework says little about ecological sustainability or the welfare of future generations. A country can register a high current-period ladder score while drawing down natural capital — depleting groundwater, degrading air quality, or accelerating climate risk, in ways that will constrain the well-being of its own citizens' children. For India, where several major cities rank among the most polluted in the world and where climate-linked agrarian stress is a live policy concern, a purely present-oriented life-evaluation snapshot risks understating longer-run welfare pressures that are already visible in the data on health and livelihoods, even if they are not yet fully reflected in the aggregate ladder score.

4.7 A moving denominator: sample coverage has itself fluctuated

A seventh concern becomes visible only when the full 2012–2026 run is considered together, and it is largely absent from the critique literature written during the report's first four editions. The number of countries with usable WHR scores has ranged from a peak of around 158 in 2015 to a low of around 137 in 2023, rising again to 147 in the 2025 and 2026 editions [3,11,13,14]. Some of this movement reflects disruption to Gallup World Poll fieldwork: the Covid-19 pandemic curtailed in-person surveying in numerous countries for the 2020 and 2021 editions, and subsequent access constraints, including in Russia and several conflict-affected states, removed other countries from the sample in various years. Because a country's rank is a position within a changing denominator, a raw year-on-year rank comparison, the format overwhelmingly favoured in Indian press coverage of the report each March, conflates genuine movement in life evaluation with mechanical movement in the size of the field. Section 5 below applies a percentile correction to India's own trajectory in order to separate these two effects, a step the paper is not aware of having been taken systematically in existing Indian commentary on the report.

5. Why Has India's Rank Moved Between 111th and 144th, and Back to 116th, During 2012–2026?

India's trajectory across the full run of WHR editions is a more instructive test case than the 2012–2016 window alone suggests, because it is not monotonic: an initial decline gave way to a pronounced trough around 2020, followed by a five-edition recovery. Table 2 sets out India's rank, the size of the country field, and the resulting percentile position, rank divided by the number of countries ranked that year, expressed as a percentage, where a lower number is better, for every edition published between 2012 and 2026.

Table 2. India's rank in the World Happiness Report, 2012–2026

Edition	Countries ranked	India's rank	Percentile position*	World's top-ranked country
2012	156	111	71%	Denmark
2013	156	111	71%	Denmark
2015	158	117	74%	Switzerland
2016 Update	157	118	75%	Denmark
2017	155	122	79%	Norway
2018	156	133	85%	Finland
2019	156	140	90%	Finland
2020	153	144	94%	Finland
2021	149	139	93%	Finland
2022	146	136	93%	Finland
2023	137	126	92%	Finland
2024	143	126	88%	Finland
2025	147	118	80%	Finland
2026	147	116	79%	Finland

** Percentile position = (India's rank ÷ number of countries ranked) × 100. A lower figure indicates a relatively better position; the calculation is the paper's own and is not an official WHR statistic. Sources: [1–14, 22–32].*

Two things stand out from Table 2. First, on a percentile basis, which corrects for the fact that the country field has expanded and contracted by as much as twenty-one places across the period — India's position worsened almost continuously from 2012 to a peak of 94 per cent in 2020, before improving for five consecutive editions to 79 per cent in 2026, a level last seen in 2017. Second, the raw-rank story that dominates Indian press coverage each March, a single number moving up or down against an unstated and shifting denominator, systematically overstates the volatility of India's underlying position. The move from 144th in 2020 to 139th in 2021, for instance, reads as a five-place improvement, but corresponds to a shift from the 94th to the 93rd percentile: a far smaller change than the headline figure implies, because the country field itself shrank from 153 to 149 over the same year.

5.1 The per-capita paradox

The WHR's headline variable is GDP per capita, not aggregate GDP. India's economy grew rapidly in absolute terms across this period, but its population also continued to grow, and its starting per-capita base was low; the resulting per-capita figure, even adjusted for purchasing power, remained modest relative to the small, wealthy states that dominate the top of the ranking. A national growth story can therefore coexist with a stagnant or even worsening ranking whenever population growth and a low starting base dilute the per-capita gains that the WHR's regression rewards most heavily.

5.2 Rising inequality and economic anxiety

Aggregate and even per-capita growth figures say nothing about distribution. Rapid urbanisation, widening income and wealth disparities, intense competition for a limited supply of good jobs and higher-education seats, and rising costs of housing and living in major cities are widely cited as

sources of economic anxiety for large segments of the urban and aspirational middle class across this period, a form of status anxiety that a life-evaluation measure anchored on relative comparison (a 'best possible life') is, by the ladder-elicits-status-thinking finding noted in Section 4.1, arguably well suited to pick up, even where average material conditions were nominally improving.

5.3 Erosion of informal social safety nets

Historically, joint-family structures, caste and community networks, and close-knit village ties functioned as informal insurance against illness, job loss, and old age in much of India. Rural-to-urban migration, the nuclearisation of families, and the pace of urban modernisation have plausibly weakened some of these informal buffers faster than formal state-provided social protection has expanded to replace them, a gap that could depress the WHR's 'social support' variable even where measured household income is rising. This is consistent with survey-based findings that many Indian respondents, even in fast-growing cities, report weaker confidence in having someone to rely on in a crisis than respondents in countries with more developed formal welfare states.

5.4 Institutional friction and perceived corruption

India's scores on institutional variables, perceived corruption, ease of dealing with everyday bureaucracy, environmental quality in major cities, and access to public health infrastructure have consistently been weak drivers of its life-evaluation score over the period. Everyday friction with public institutions is precisely the kind of chronic, low-grade stressor that a whole-of-life evaluation question is designed to register, even when it does not show up clearly in economic growth statistics.

5.5 Cultural response style and 'happiness talk'

A further, harder-to-quantify factor is cultural response style. In many Indian cultural and religious traditions, openly declaring one's own life to be at or near the maximum possible, a literal '10 out of 10' sits uneasily with norms of modesty, contentment as a virtue independent of circumstance, and a general reluctance toward overt self-congratulation. If Indian respondents are, on average, more reluctant than respondents in some other cultural contexts (Latin America is often cited as an example of the opposite tendency, reporting relatively high life evaluation for its income level) to select the top rungs of the ladder even when their underlying life circumstances are comparable, national comparisons will systematically understate India's position relative to countries with more expressive response norms. This is a real methodological confound, but it is also extremely difficult to separate cleanly from genuine welfare differences using cross-sectional survey data alone, and it has now been proposed, largely unresolved, across fourteen editions of the report.

5.6 The pandemic trough and its aftermath, 2019–2022

India's lowest-ever recorded position, 144th of 153 in the 2020 edition, and its near-repeat at 139th of 149 in 2021 and 136th of 146 in 2022, coincide closely with the Covid-19 pandemic and its economic aftermath: widespread livelihood disruption during the 2020 lockdowns, a severe second wave of infections and mortality in early 2021, and a slow recovery in employment and informal-sector incomes through 2022 [8,9,10]. Because the 2020–2022 editions each pool three years of Gallup fieldwork that substantially overlap the pandemic window, India's scores for social support, healthy life expectancy and freedom to make life choices in this period plausibly capture some of the most acute disruption the country experienced across the entire 2012–2026 span, rather than a stable new baseline. This does not fully explain the trough; India's relative position had already been worsening since 2012, for the reasons given in Sections 5.1–5.5, but it is a plausible amplifier that existing Indian commentary on the report's 2020–2022 editions has, in this

paper's reading of that commentary, generally underplayed [20].

5.7 The 2023–2026 recovery: genuine improvement or measurement noise?

India's subsequent recovery, from a percentile position of 93–94 per cent (2020–2022) to 79 per cent (2026), is too large to be dismissed as an artefact of the country field's own fluctuation over the same window: the field moved only marginally, from 146 countries in 2022 to 147 in 2026. Some of the recovery is plausibly genuine. India's GDP growth resumed at a relatively rapid pace after 2022, and the 2025 edition's supplementary breakdown of prosocial ('benevolent') behaviour placed India 10th in the world on self-reported volunteering — far above its overall rank of 118th that year, alongside 57th on charitable donation and 74th on helping a stranger, though only 115th on the 'wallet returned by a neighbour' measure of generalised trust [13]. This pattern, comparatively strong performance on relational and prosocial indicators, weaker performance on the aggregate ladder score and on generalised (as opposed to community-based) trust, is consistent with the cultural-framing critique in Section 4.2: India may be a genuinely high-benevolence society whose ladder-based aggregate score continues to understate this, even as the aggregate score itself improves. Some of the recovery may also reflect the unwinding of pandemic-era disruption discussed in Section 5.6 rather than a durable structural improvement, a distinction that will only become clear in editions published after this review.

5.8 A demographic blind spot: the 2024 age-disaggregated data

A further data points unavailable to the original 2012–2016 literature is the age-disaggregated analysis introduced in the 2024 edition, the report's most comprehensive treatment yet of happiness across generations [12]. That edition found a marked dip in happiness among under-30s across South Asia, the Middle East and North Africa, in contrast to more age-neutral or even elderly-favouring patterns elsewhere; globally, the youngest cohort's happiest country was Lithuania, while the oldest cohort's was Denmark. Because India's population is unusually young relative to the wealthy states that dominate the top of the ranking, if this regional dip in youth happiness applies within India as it appears to across the wider region, it would mechanically depress India's national average more than it would a country with an older population structure, a compositional effect that Section 4.4's critique of thin, non-disaggregated national samples did not previously have the data to make concrete. The WHR's own India-specific age breakdowns remain too coarse to confirm this with confidence, and it is flagged here as a hypothesis meriting dedicated sub-national research rather than as an established finding.

5.9 Gender, mental health, and under-reporting

Two further factors deserve mention even though they are harder to substantiate directly from the WHR's published data. First, gendered patterns of household labour, decision-making autonomy, and mobility restrictions in parts of India could plausibly depress life evaluation among women respondents specifically, in ways that a single national average obscures; the WHR's India-level scores are still not routinely disaggregated by gender in public reporting, which limits what can be said with confidence here. The scale of what such disaggregation can reveal at the extreme end of the distribution is illustrated starkly by Afghanistan, where women recorded the lowest average life satisfaction of any subgroup measured worldwide in the 2026 edition, at 1.26 out of 10 [14,34]. Second, mental-health stigma remains substantial in much of India, and survey respondents dealing with anxiety, depression, or chronic stress may under-report distress to an unfamiliar interviewer, or may not have the vocabulary or social permission to frame personal difficulty as something worth naming to a stranger conducting a poll. Both factors are plausible contributors to India's low score, but both cut in a direction opposite to the 'measurement artefact' critiques raised in Section 4, they suggest India's true welfare position could, if anything, be somewhat worse than

the raw ladder score implies for some sub-populations, even as cultural response modesty pulls the aggregate score in the other direction. The two effects are not necessarily offsetting, and disentangling them is an open empirical question rather than one this review can resolve.

5.10 The Easterlin Paradox and regional heterogeneity

Taken together, these dynamics echo what economists call the Easterlin Paradox: within a country over time, rising income does not reliably translate into a proportional rise in reported life satisfaction once a basic threshold is passed, especially where growth is accompanied by rising inequality, shifting aspirations, and social dislocation [19]. India's experience across 2012–2026 fits this pattern closely, though the 2023–2026 recovery is a reminder that the relationship need not be permanently one-directional. It is also worth stressing that a single national score flattens enormous internal variation, between, for instance, higher-income southern and western states and lower-income states in the Hindi heartland and the east, and between urban and rural India, variation that the WHR's national sample sizes are generally too small to resolve with confidence, but that Indian policymakers should not lose sight of when interpreting a single national number.

6. Alternative Frameworks: A Brief Comparative Note

India's ambivalent WHR performance has prompted sustained interest, both academically and in Indian policy circles, in alternative well-being frameworks better tailored to the country's own priorities and cultural context. Bhutan's Gross National Happiness (GNH) Index, though not directly comparable in scope, is instructive: it is built from nine domains, including psychological well-being, time use, community vitality, cultural resilience, and ecological diversity, alongside more conventional living-standards and governance measures, collected through an extensive multi-item household survey rather than a single ladder question, explicitly designed around a non-Western conception of flourishing [35]. Domestically, India's own NITI Aayog has continued to develop the SDG India Index, tracking states and union territories against the UN Sustainable Development Goals across successive editions through the 2020s; while it is not a subjective well-being measure, it offers the kind of sub-national, multi-dimensional resolution that a single WHR ladder score cannot provide, and could in principle be paired with a well-being module to build a more India-appropriate composite measure over time [36].

7. Implications for Indian Policy and Research

None of the methodological concerns raised in Section 4 are grounds for dismissing India's WHR performance, whether low or recently improving, as mere measurement noise. They are, instead, grounds for building better-suited instruments alongside continued engagement with the global ranking. Six directions follow from the analysis above.

- Invest in state- and district-level well-being surveys with sample sizes large enough to support sub-national analysis, rather than relying solely on the WHR's thin, single-item national sample, which cannot distinguish a prosperous southern state from a stressed northern one, nor a young respondent from an old one, with any confidence.
- Pair a life-evaluation item with affect-based measures of day-to-day mood, stress, and worry, to separate cognitive evaluation from felt experience, following the WHR's own supplementary positive- and negative-affect indices, which receive far less public and media attention than the headline ladder ranking but may be more diagnostically useful for domestic policy.
- Track informal social-support and benevolence indicators explicitly, including access to community and family networks among urban migrant populations, and generalised trust of the kind the WHR's own 'wallet returned by a stranger' measure attempts to capture, given the gap

between India's strong volunteering rank and its weaker generalised-trust and aggregate scores documented in Section 5.7.

- Treat perceived-corruption and governance-friction indicators as policy-actionable levers, since these appear to be persistent, addressable drags on India's score that are largely independent of aggregate GDP growth.
- Report and interpret India's WHR position on a percentile basis, alongside the raw rank, given that the size of the country field has varied by more than twenty places across the 2012–2026 period; commentary that treats a five- or ten-place raw-rank shift as inherently meaningful, without reference to the size of the field in that particular year, risks manufacturing a volatility in the story that the underlying data may not fully support.
- Interpret cross-cultural ranking comparisons cautiously in academic and policy writing, explicitly flagging the response-style, translation, framing, and sample-coverage confounds discussed in Section 4, rather than treating the raw rank as a direct, culture-free welfare indicator.

8. Limitations of This Review

This review is itself subject to important limits. It synthesises secondary commentary and the WHR's own published methodology notes rather than re-analysing the underlying Gallup microdata, so claims about specific mechanisms, for instance, the precise contribution of cultural response style to India's score, or the demographic effect proposed in Section 5.8, should be read as plausible hypotheses supported by the wider well-being literature rather than as findings independently verified here. The percentile-adjustment method used in Table 2 and Section 5 is the paper's own construction, offered as an interpretive corrective to raw-rank reporting; it is not an official WHR statistic, and it assumes that a simple rank-over-field ratio is a reasonable proxy for relative position, which becomes less reliable when the composition of the field, not merely its size, changes materially from year to year. The editorial rosters attributed to each edition in the reference list reflect the paper's best effort to identify the named editors of each report and may not capture every contributing author in every year. Where explanations for India's ranking (inequality, institutional friction, eroding informal safety nets, cultural response norms, pandemic disruption, demographic composition, and gendered and mental-health under-reporting) point in different directions, this review has not attempted to statistically weight their relative contributions, since the published national-level data do not permit this with confidence. A fuller empirical treatment would require access to unit-level survey data disaggregated by state, income group, age, and gender, which lies beyond the scope of a literature-based critical review.

9. Conclusion

The World Happiness Report's fourteen editions between 2012 and 2026 have done real work in placing subjective well-being on the global policy agenda, and the broad pattern they document, a large, structural gap between peaceful, high-income, socially trusting societies and conflict-affected, low-income ones, a gap that has, if anything, widened at its extremes- is not in serious dispute. India's trajectory across this period is best read not as a single, static verdict but as a fifteen-year arc: a genuine decline from 2012 to a pandemic-era trough around 2020, followed by a genuine and only partly understood recovery through 2026. Both halves of that arc are best explained by a mix of two things: real and important welfare shifts (rising inequality, institutional friction, an informal social safety net under strain, pandemic disruption, and a plausible post-pandemic recovery aided by resumed growth and strong prosocial behaviour) and the predictable output of a measurement instrument whose ladder metaphor, single-item design,

materially weighted regression, and as this review has emphasised, shifting country sample, travel imperfectly into a large, culturally diverse, collectivist, demographically young society with modest self-reporting norms. Neither reading should be used to dismiss the other. For Indian researchers and policymakers, the more useful response to the WHR is not to argue about whether a given year's rank is 'fair', but to build the finer-grained, multi-dimensional, percentile-aware, and culturally attentive measurement infrastructure that a country of India's scale and diversity actually requires.

References

1. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. D. (Eds.). (2012). World Happiness Report 2012. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
2. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. D. (Eds.). (2013). World Happiness Report 2013. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
3. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. D. (Eds.). (2015). World Happiness Report 2015. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
4. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. D. (Eds.). (2016). World Happiness Report 2016 Update. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
5. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. D. (Eds.). (2017). World Happiness Report 2017. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
6. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. D. (Eds.). (2018). World Happiness Report 2018. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
7. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. D. (Eds.). (2019). World Happiness Report 2019. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
8. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., & De Neve, J.-E. (Eds.). (2020). World Happiness Report 2020. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
9. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., & De Neve, J.-E. (Eds.). (2021). World Happiness Report 2021. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
10. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., De Neve, J.-E., Aknin, L. B., & Wang, S. (Eds.). (2022). World Happiness Report 2022. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
11. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., De Neve, J.-E., Aknin, L. B., & Wang, S. (Eds.). (2023). World Happiness Report 2023. New York: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
12. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., De Neve, J.-E., Aknin, L. B., & Wang, S. (Eds.). (2024). World Happiness Report 2024. New York/Oxford: UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network & Wellbeing Research Centre, University of Oxford.
13. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., De Neve, J.-E., Aknin, L. B., & Wang, S. (Eds.). (2025). World Happiness Report 2025. Oxford: Wellbeing Research Centre, University of Oxford.
14. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., De Neve, J.-E., Aknin, L. B., & Wang, S. (Eds.). (2026). World Happiness Report 2026. Oxford: Wellbeing Research Centre, University of Oxford.
15. World Happiness Report. (n.d.). Frequently Asked Questions: What is Dystopia? Retrieved from worldhappiness.report/faq.
16. Helliwell, J. F., & Wang, S. (2012). The state of world happiness. In World Happiness Report 2012.
17. Veenhoven, R. (2012). Cross-national differences in happiness: Cultural measurement bias or effect of culture? International Journal of Wellbeing, 2(4), 333–353.
18. Nilsson, A. H., Eichstaedt, J. C., Lomas, T., Schwartz, H. A., & Kjell, O. N. E. (2024). The Cantril Ladder elicits thoughts about power and wealth. Scientific Reports, 14, 2642.
19. Easterlin, R. A. (1974). Does economic growth improve the human lot? Some empirical evidence. In P. A. David & M. W. Reder (Eds.), Nations and Households in Economic Growth: Essays in Honor of Moses Abramovitz (pp. 89–125). New York: Academic Press.
20. Governance Now. (2021). Why India's ranking on the Happiness Index has been falling.
21. Malay Mail. (2016, 17 March). Denmark is the happiest country in the world, report shows.

22. Yourstory. (2015). India ranks 117 on the World Happiness Index.
23. Business Standard. (2017, 20 March). World Happiness Index: India falls to 122nd rank, Norway tops the list.
24. Business Standard / ANI. (2018, 15 March). India ranked 133rd in World Happiness Index 2018.
25. BusinessToday. (2019, 22 March). India's happiness ranking drops to 140; way behind Pakistan, China, Bangladesh.
26. Careers360. (2020). What is the rank of India in the World Happiness Index 2020?
27. BusinessToday. (2021, 20 March). India ranks 139th in World Happiness Report 2021; Finland tops the list.
28. Current Affairs Adda247 / Civilsdaily. (2022). UN World Happiness Report 2022: India ranks 136th.
29. Onmanorama. (2023, 20 March). World Happiness Index: Finland top, India ranked 126th, below Pakistan and Sri Lanka.
30. Forbes India. (2024). World Happiness Report 2024: Finland is the world's happiest country. Where does India rank?
31. Deccan Herald / PTI. (2025, 20 March). India ranks 118th in World Happiness Report, Afghanistan is last.
32. India TV / SPM IAS Academy. (2026, March). World Happiness Report 2026: India ranks 116th.
33. CNBC. (2026, 20 March). Finland ranks as the world's happiest country for the ninth straight year: They do 'a lot of things right'.
34. KabulNow. (2026, April). Afghanistan named the saddest country in the world again.
35. Centre for Bhutan Studies & GNH Research. Gross National Happiness Index methodology documents.
36. NITI Aayog. SDG India Index and Dashboard, various editions.