

CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

For discussion and  
recommendations

Meeting of the 2019/2020 Bureau  
Geneva (Switzerland), 16-17 October 2019

Item 2 (b) of the Provisional  
Agenda

**PRELIMINARY DOCUMENT FOR IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF  
MEASURING WELL-BEING IN THE ERA OF THE ‘DIGITAL SOCIETY’:  
IMPLICATIONS FOR OFFICIAL STATISTICS**

**Prepared by Canada**

*The paper identifies key issues which need to be considered for defining and measuring well-being in the digital era and begins to take stock of initiatives that NSOs and international organizations have undertaken.*

*The document is intended to stimulate and guide discussion at the October 2019 meeting of the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians, and generate feedback on the direction and issues to be addressed in the final paper that will provide the basis for a planned in-depth review of this topic at the February 2020 meeting.*

*The Bureau is invited to discuss and provide recommendations for the final in-depth review paper.*

**I. BACKGROUND**

1. It is now widely recognized that technological change – the transformations associated with information and communication technologies (ICT), automation, artificial intelligence, and other technologies – continues to transform the lives of individuals and reshape communities and society. The breadth of the digital transformation is immense, affecting virtually all aspects of peoples’ lives. The impacts of the digital transformation are also varied, ranging from minor adaptations in daily life to potentially transformative changes in fundamental values and processes. And while many individuals already live “tech-saturated” lives, technological change is both rapid and ongoing.

2. There are divergent views regarding the opportunities and risks that the digital transformation poses to individual well-being. For example, of the approximately 1,150 technology experts, health specialists, and other key informants who participated in the Pew Research Center’s 2018 assessment of “The Future of Well-being in a Tech-Saturated World”, 47% expected individual well-being “to be more helped than harmed by digital life in the next decade”, while 32% expected well-being to be more harmed than helped (Pew Research Center, 2018).<sup>1</sup> More broadly, questions regarding the impacts of technological change are being raised across many quarters, highlighting how much is still unknown and how wide ranging the data needs are. One important question is whether these data gaps can be filled with traditional instruments or whether new models of well-being and new instruments for data collection need to be considered.

<sup>1</sup> The remaining 21% did not expect much change in well-being compared to now.

3. The digital transformation is a source of both risks and opportunities for well-being, but how these risks and opportunities are distributed within populations and across countries is not well-established. As digital technologies continue to advance and spread, new classes of have and have-nots could emerge in both national and international contexts. At least, the distributions of risks and opportunities can be expected to depend on factors such as levels of connectivity, digital skills and technological development. There is a “digital divide” in horizontal (between groups) and vertical inequalities (between individuals) that stem from differences in the availability of digital infrastructure, access to digital technologies, the skills needed to use these technologies, and the human capital needed to capitalize on the opportunities these technologies present, while mitigating the risks (OECD, 2019).

4. In parallel with the many challenges and questions posed by the digital transformation, national statistical offices (NSOs) and other stakeholders are working to broaden our understanding and measurement of individual and societal well-being. The limitations of traditional economic measures, such as GDP, have long been recognized, and various alternative approaches to well-being have been launched over the decades. Overlaying and integrating the many challenges and questions associated with well-being and with the digital transformation puts us, in the words of Gluckman and Allen (2018), in “new and uncharted terrain.”

5. This review identifies key issues which need to be considered for defining and measuring well-being in the digital era and begins to take stock of initiatives that NSOs and international organizations have undertaken. Given that work in this area is still at early stages, much of the focus is on conceptual frameworks and emerging challenges and opportunities for adapting statistical infrastructures in the face of the digital transformation and its impacts on well-being. The themes of (i) conceptual frameworks, (ii) indicators and measurement, and (iii) data collection are used to structure section IV. The document is intended to stimulate and guide discussion at the October 2019 meeting of the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians, and generate feedback on the direction and issues to be addressed in the final report that will be presented for discussion at the February 2020 meeting.

6. This preliminary review is organized into the following sections. Sections II and III introduce the purpose and scope of the review. Section IV outlines the conceptual issues that NSOs and other stakeholders need to consider in evaluating whether traditional approaches to data collection are adequate for measuring well-being in the digital era. Section V presents a brief overview of some of the key initiatives that international organizations have already undertaken to re-define and measure well-being. Sections VI and VII present a partial assessment of the activities of NSOs in this area. The document concludes with the next steps and consultations that will be taken to produce the in-depth review paper.

## **II. INTRODUCTION**

7. The Bureau of the Conference of European Statistics (CES) regularly reviews selected statistical areas in depth. The aim of the reviews is to improve coordination of statistical activities in the UNECE region, identify gaps or duplication of work, and address emerging issues. The review focuses on strategic issues and highlights concerns of statistical offices of both a conceptual and a coordinating nature. The current paper provides the basis for the review by summarising the international statistical activities in the selected area, identifying issues and problems, and making recommendations on possible follow-up actions.

8. The CES Bureau selected “Measuring well-being in the era of the digital society’: Implications for official statistics” for an in-depth review for its February 2020 meeting. Statistics Canada, with the assistance of the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), was requested to prepare the paper providing the main basis for the review. The topic is an amalgam of two topics previously suggested to the CES: (i) Digital society and (ii) Measuring well-being.

### **III. SCOPE/DEFINITION OF THE STATISTICAL AREA COVERED**

#### **Economic aspects of the digital transformation**

9. Broadly differentiating the impacts of the digital transformation on economic activities (i.e., the digital economy) and all other domains of life, broadly labelled as “social”, helps to map out the terrain.

10. In terms of economic activities, digitization has fundamentally disrupted society by transforming business models and how households consume and interact. The digital economy has introduced a shift in the way households consume goods and services: items that were once paid for are now obtainable at a lower-cost, such as through online shopping and peer-to-peer services, or for free, such as online journals. Other transactions are more subtle, as consumers exchange personal information for access to digital goods or services. This new activity has fundamentally changed consumer surplus for households, in some cases, that is not sufficiently captured in our current economic estimates. This shift will impact the well-being of individuals and society.

11. Sufficiently capturing the digital economy has important implications on the indicators employed to measure the status of an economy. Statistics Canada has focused this effort on four main themes which help frame the estimates of the impact on GDP, its potential under-coverage and the impact on well-being. Global consumption such as international trade, as consumers can purchase directly from anywhere in the world, or through the platform economy where an exchange of goods or services is facilitated outside of the country. Household production and income which examines the changing role of the household sector from consumer to producer, impacting well-being. The new DIY household and how it affects the way goods and services are consumed. Finally, the shift in the type of capital investments including valuation of data and estimation of stock of data. Recently released experimental estimates of the value of data and related activities estimated an upper bound of \$40 billion in 2018. The stock of these activities is estimated to be larger than the stock of other intangible assets, such as software and research and development.

12. The economic and social implications of the digital transformation cannot always be clearly demarcated. For example, automation and gig employment have potential implications for job security, job quality, and personal finances. Nonetheless, the focus below is on issues beyond the economic impacts of digitalization.

### **IV. CONCEPTS AND ISSUES**

#### **A. Conceptual frameworks**

13. Conceptual frameworks relevant to the impacts of the digital transformation on well-being are varied in their scope and level of abstraction. The level of abstraction is an essential point as it defines: (i) the mechanisms through which digital technologies impact well-being;

(ii) the aspects of well-being that warrant concern in the short to medium run; and (iii) how digital technologies and the digital divide (i.e., individual- and group-level differences in access to ICT and ICT skills) may deepen (or perhaps reduce) pre-existing inequalities in well-being and/or generate new sources of inequalities in well-being.

14. In their paper prepared for OECD, Gluckman and Allen (2018) posit three fundamental considerations for framing discussions about well-being in the digital age. First, well-being should not be viewed through a narrow lens, such as a focus on a single factor, a composite indicator, or even a suite of indicators. Well-being is a diffuse concept that spans multiple domains and potentially includes a constellation of variables. Narrow definitions of well-being, they contend, lack the necessary sensitivity to monitor and assess the breadth of risks that digital technologies pose and cannot capture their cumulative impact. Second, digitalization is itself a multifaceted phenomenon that consists of different types of technologies. Understanding the relationship between digitalization and well-being requires that the distinct impacts of particular technologies, as well as their combined impacts, be considered. Third, it cannot be expected that the risks and opportunities of digitalization would be evenly distributed within and across populations. The digital divide in ICT access, skills, and security will also define what constitutes a risk (or an opportunity) and who is most vulnerable to risks or best positioned to seize upon opportunities.

15. Gluckman and Allen present an analytical instrument that aims to re-cast the scope and the focus of discussions about the core issues that digital technologies pose for well-being. The analytical focus of their instrument is not on digital technologies per se, but rather on how these technologies are reshaping or disrupting individual behaviors and social institutions, and the potential consequences of this for well-being. Their analytical instrument identifies three abstract “human institutions” and defines these institutions using a partial list of more concrete concepts:

*Institutions of the self*, which is comprised of concepts such as human development, self-worth, self-actualization, personal health care, privacy, autonomy, and self-sufficiency.

*Institutions of social life*, which include the domains of social interaction and social relationships, family relations, public education, population health, and societal values.

*Institutions of civic life*, of which the news media, political participation, and governance and public service are among the most fundamental components.

16. In turn, the concepts that comprise Gluckman and Allen’s high-level concepts can be operationalized into measurable indicators, although the authors provide limited guidance on the procedures to accomplish this. The high-level of abstraction that Gluckman and Allen propose is useful because of its sensitivity to all the possible challenges that the digitalization poses. Many of these technologies are still in their infancy, especially artificial intelligence and automation, and there is thus much uncertainty about how well-being might be impacted. Besides tuning our thinking toward anticipating some of these uncertainties, Gluckman and Allen’s instrument is also useful for drilling down to lower levels of abstraction and generating ideas about the mostly likely pathways through which digital technologies may impact on well-being in the present or near-term future.

17. Another approach to well-being is the multi-domain framework and constituent sets of indicators. Indicators of circumstances or outcomes in areas such as health, employment, education, and social supports are provided in an effort to measure well-being in ways that go “beyond GDP”. Numerous examples could be cited, most notably the OECD *How’s Life* initiative and similar dashboards launched by a growing number of countries over the last

decade. The extent to which the impacts of the digital transformation have been considered or incorporated within these dashboards will be addressed in the final version of this report. The recent OECD publication *How's life in the digital age* (OECD, 2019) is a first step in this direction.

18. OECD provides a practical approach for organizing the concrete aspects of well-being at a lower-level of abstraction, dividing well-being into the following components: **doing well** (material conditions), **being well** (individual-level states), **relating well** (the relational aspects of well-being), and the **forms of capital** that are needed to sustain well-being. This approach helps bridge the gap between higher-level concepts and the practical need to focus on a selection of variables as opposed to a constellation of variables.

19. Within the research literature, the impacts of the digital transformation on well-being are also approached using narrower disciplinary frameworks, with analytical emphasis on specific outcomes. For example, a growing body of research on the impacts of technology on physical and mental health is emerging, with recent studies examining outcomes such as cortisol levels (Affi et al., 2018), quality and quantity of sleep (Carter et al., 2016), eye strain (Rosenfield, 2016), musculoskeletal problems (Al Abdulwahab, 2017) cardiorespiratory fitness (Lepp et al., 2013), depression and anxiety (Shensa et al., 2017; Maras et al., 2015), perceived social isolation (Primack et al., 2017), and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (Ra et al., 2018). Such focused, robust research provides the necessary empirical foundation upon which the selection of well-being indicators and higher-level reporting can be based.

## **B. Indicators and measurement**

20. Measuring the impacts of technology on well-being poses challenges to NSOs in terms of scope. The range of domains in which the impacts of new technologies could be assessed is immense, meaning that NSOs face a wide range of data demands and difficult decisions regarding data collection priorities. Recommendations for steps in the short-term have already been voiced. A recent expert panel identified five aspects of well-being that appear susceptible to the impacts of technology but that have received little or no attention in well-being frameworks. These include: human development (including early childhood learning), mental health across the life span, social inclusion, personal and public security, and governance (Gluckman and Allen, 2018). Additional priorities would no doubt be identified through NSO consultations with national stakeholders, including government policy departments.

21. Other aspects of life in a “tech-saturated” world pose measurement challenges. Digital technologies are now an integral and ongoing part of daily life for many individuals. Quantifying the frequency and intensity of usage may require new approaches and perspectives. Challenges of depth and nuance also arise in terms of the impacts of technology on well-being. For example, while use of social media platforms may be gauged through household surveys, individuals’ exposure to unrealistic social comparisons and the impacts of these on their sense of worth or identity are likely to be more difficult to capture.

22. The unit of analysis – whether the individual or the group – is a further consideration in measurement. As discussed in chapter 6 of the 2019 World Happiness Report (Bellet and Frijters, 2019), the use of big data, such as Google search terms and Facebook “likes”, does not improve the “generally low predictability of individual-level satisfaction.” In contrast, greater predictive power is yielded from group-level data, such as geographic-area data (e.g., counties) within or across countries. Measuring well-being using alternative data sources (see below)

may thus offer new potential to quantify the impacts of local changes in policy or other “shocks” on well-being across regions or over time.

### **C. Data collection**

23. NSOs continue to adapt and develop elements of their statistical infrastructures in order to keep pace with economic, social, and environmental change. The scope and rapidity of technological change poses new challenges in this respect, but also offers new opportunities for data collection. This raises questions regarding how NSOs ought to conceptualize, develop, and coordinate data collection through different vehicles to best capture information on new technologies and their impacts. Traditional household surveys, for example, may be assigned a different role in the years ahead if information on individuals’ frequency and intensive of technology use becomes available through alternative sources.

24. Social media platforms, satellite imagery, administrative data, and information collected through online apps are just a few of the vehicles offering new potential to strengthen statistical infrastructures in a digital world. Such approaches could address the on-going challenge of the timeliness of data in the face of increasing demand for real-time information. Given the rapid pace of technological innovation, gaps of even one or two years can pose challenges for comparability across groups (e.g., countries) and for monitoring the pace and impacts of technological change in a timely way. However, the utilization of such data raises a broad set of issues regarding individual privacy, data acquisition, and NSO communication strategies with the public. Given different legislative environments and cultural contexts across different countries, this takes on added complexity in an international context.

25. In terms of household surveys, one of the challenges of the intersection of digitalization and well-being is that there is no clear data source or data collection mechanism to cleanly build indicators on the impacts of one on the other. In some cases, NSOs must make a clear delineation between the practice of collecting ICT use indicators on surveys of well-being or collecting data on well-being through ICT use surveys. If this distinction is not clear, the risk of collecting the data twice and producing conflicting indicators exists. The possibility for greater integration between household surveys of well-being and household surveys of ICT use should be explored. With the proper coordination between subject matter areas and well thought out sampling methodology, data linkage can offer greater insight and efficiencies. Currently, international model surveys conducted by both Eurostat and OECD on ICT adoption and use by individuals do not expressly collect information on well-being although some indicators could be used in the construction of well-being metrics. Other countries, such as Canada below, have experimented with asking questions more directly related to the effects of technology on the well-being of individuals. Nonetheless, the rapidity of technological change and the increasing demand for real-time information may diminish the role played by household surveys in understanding the relationships between the digital transformation and well-being.

## **V. OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL ACTIVITIES IN THE AREA**

### **A. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)**

26. OECD has created a “digital well-being wheel” and published a corresponding report that compares 36 countries on their performance in harnessing the opportunities and reducing the risks associated with the digital transformation. The digital well-being wheel includes 33

indicators than span factors such as ICT utilization and skill level and the impact of ICT on employment and earnings, social connections, e-government, and subjective well-being. These indicators are derived from multiple data sources, including the OECD Survey of Adult Skills and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). The PISA provides a rare source of comparative data that contains measures of ICT usage and skill levels and also has explicit measures of well-being, such as students' life satisfaction, sense of belonging, and school engagement.

27. **Measuring the Digital Transformation (MDT):** As part of the OECD's "Going Digital" project, a measurement roadmap was developed, outlining key areas for further development of data collection and methods. This document outlines nine key actions, two of which are directly relevant to this work. The first is to "Encourage measurement of the digital transformation's impacts on social goals and people's well-being". This identifies the need for this data and also lays out steps to potentially advance the work including the implementation of new subject matter questions on ICT adoption and use surveys as well as ICT-use variables on household surveys. The development of new statistical survey tools, as well as improved linkages with environmental impacts are also highlighted. The second, "Design new and interdisciplinary approaches to data collection" identifies the need to use digital technologies as part of the solution to capturing the full magnitude of the digital transformation. This is relevant to the work on digitalization and well-being and although examples of this already exist, they will continue to need to be explored and exploited within the context of privacy limitations in order to properly measure these phenomena.

28. At OECD, the Working Party on Measurement and Analysis of the Digital Economy (WPMAD) is responsible for the Model Survey of ICT Adoption and Use by Individuals. Currently, this questionnaire collects very little information directly related to the impacts of digitalization on well-being. The survey was last revised in 2015 but has the potential to be revamped in order to better reflect changing societal issues related to digitalization.

## **B. European Commission**

29. Since 2003, Eurostat has provided a model questionnaire on ICT usage in households and by individuals. The questionnaire is revised annually to respond to changing data needs. To date, the primary focus of the survey has been on ICT utilization and skills, on-line activities, and privacy and security issues. Eurostat has published a Digital Skills Indicator (DSI) that is populated with data from its ICT usage survey. DSI measures factors such as digital communication skills, data literacy, and problem solving in digital environments. The European Commission has also created the International Digital Economy and Society Index (I-DESI). I-DESI is a composite index that consists of 24 indicators and is used for comparing and benchmarking the digital performance of 45 countries from 2013 to 2016. I-DESI has five components: connectivity, human capital, citizen internet use, business technology integration, and public services.

30. Eurostat is in the process of testing innovative tools and data sources for time use surveys as well as household spending surveys. Time Use Surveys (TUS) in particular have traditionally been an important source of information on ICT use and well-being measures such as life satisfaction in many countries; and the hope is that Eurostat will be able to advise countries on the best technologies and approaches to data collection for these types of household surveys.

### **C. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs**

31. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) has developed the E-Government Development Index (EDGI) and the Measurement and Evaluation Tool for Citizen Engagement and E-Participation (METEP). EDGI is a composite index that consists of an online services index, telecommunication infrastructure index, and human capital index. United Nations has conducted a biannual survey since 2001 that assesses the e-government status of United Nations Member States. The 2018 survey examines the trend toward higher levels of online government services and the impact of digitalization on the public sector and the implications for inclusion. METEP is an analytical framework and tool for measuring and evaluating aspects of the state of e-participation readiness of government institutions.

### **D. United Nations Statistics Division**

32. United Nations Statistics Division and the Expert Group on Innovative and Effective Ways to Collect Time-Use Statistics (chaired by Statistics Canada) will be conducting an international assessment of country practices for time use data collection in 2019-20. “The objective of the questionnaire is to gather information about the collection of time-use data at the national level to inform the development of methodological guidelines on how to produce time-use statistics in innovative and effective ways, using the latest technologies and in line with the International Classification of Activities for Time Use Statistics (ICATUS 2016), as requested by the United Nations Statistical Commission at its forty-eighth session in 2017 in its decision 48/109.” This assessment will include a question asking if countries gather data on ICT use, on well-being questions as well as mode, providing a source of information on well-being and digitization measurement approaches.

## **VI. COUNTRY PRACTICES – IMPACTS OF THE DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION ON WELL-BEING**

### **A. Canada**

33. The Canadian Internet Use Survey (CIUS) underwent a major revision for the 2018 reference year, resulting in new content that goes beyond the previous indicators designed only to measure ICT adoption and use. New indicators were included which will provide an indication of the effects of digitalization on well-being. These include measures of Canadians who have taken a break from using the Internet to improve their mental well-being and those Canadians who are expected by their employers to respond to requests outside of their normal office hours. Future iterations of the survey, and potential linkages with other household surveys, would offer the opportunity to build on this work.

34. In Canada’s General Social Survey there are well-being measures such as work-life balance and stress management that, along with life satisfaction data, can be combined with other measures that explore digitization in society. For example, data is collected on: amount of time on the Internet, cyber bullying and cyber stalking, being the recipient of threatening e-mails or instant messages, with other questions being, “overall, would you say that your life is better, about the same or worse as a result of your technology use?” and “overall, how often does your use of technology: help you to communicate with other people? interfere with other things in your life? help you to make more informed decisions? save you time? help you to be more creative?”

## **B. The Netherlands**

35. The Gender and Generations Program, housed within the Dutch Royal Academy of Science, and started under the umbrella of UNECE, provides data on a wide range of topics related to families. The questionnaire has undergone an update which now makes more explicit reference to digital life course elements than previous versions of the survey. A large component of this update is the “how you met your partner” question which includes online options. There are also questions about how frequently respondents have digital contact with non-residential family members including parents and children. The labour market and income sections have also been amended to specifically refer to access to the Internet and the use of digital technologies for work. All of this can be compared with responses to a range of well-being measures such as “I experience a general sense of emptiness”, “There are many people I can count on completely”, and “In the previous week I felt sad.”

## **C. United States of America**

36. In the United States, there are some federally funded surveys that include questions related to well-being in the digital society. The 2014 Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) administered some time diaries that have detailed data on exact website visited by children, and summary information on the amount of time spent on social media overall. The 2019 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey includes questions on the occurrence of cyberbullying and on time spent gaming and other computer use that is not for school. In 2017, the Current Population Survey “Contingent Worker Supplement” asked people if they have used online platforms to arrange jobs. And since 2009, the Monitoring the Future Survey has asked questions about participating in social networks. Since 2013, the survey has included questions about time spent on social networks. The Bureau of Labour Statistics has an initiative that looks at the impacts of artificial intelligence on labor market outcomes.

## **VII. COUNTRY PRACTICES – USE OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES FOR DATA COLLECTION**

### **A. Canada**

37. Statistics Canada is piloting a first use of an app for smartphones that will test this new mode of data collection along with a new method, the Experience Sampling Method (ESM). ESM will generate data on subjective well-being measured in the moment against the activity of the respondent at the moment. Alternative data sources are also being used in ways relevant to well-being, such as new estimates of gig employment using Canadian administrative data and a methodology adapted from Abraham et al. (2018) and estimates of Canadians’ residential proximity to green space, public transit, and services using administrative and open data.

### **B. The Netherlands**

38. The Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Brussels, Belgium) hosts the Modular Online Time Use Survey (MOTUS) which can be fielded on an app. This cutting-edge platform is used for a range of research purposes such as how teachers use their time and can collect data on well-being in addition to time use activities.

### C. United Kingdom

39. Work on well-being has been conducted in Britain by researchers using the Mappiness app. This technology can collect information on a range of activities, including use of social media and texting, measured against the effects of these activities on individual, momentary happiness. Early work with this technology at the London School of Economics in 2013 demonstrated that people are happiest in nature for example.

### VIII. NEXT STEPS

40. As part of the review, a stocktaking exercise is proposed in conjunction with the OECD Working Party on Measurement and Analysis of the Digital Economy to gather information on the current activities undertaken by NSOs to collect and/or aggregate information to produce indicators of well-being (see Appendix for sample questionnaire). Although preliminary work has been done in this area, as part of the publication of *How's Life in the Digital Age*, the proposed stocktaking will monitor progress toward meeting the goals of the MDT Measurement Roadmap and also inform the need for potential changes to the Model Survey of ICT Use and Adoption by Individuals. This stocktaking exercise will be limited to the delegates represented within the OECD and is expected to be completed by mid-November. A critical additional step will be to ensure that other UNECE countries are included in the exercise.

41. Through the process described above, NSOs could be consulted on the following issues and questions regarding data collection and the relationship between digitalization and well-being.

#### Digitalization and well-being

1. Does your organization produce indicators on the impact of digitalization on well-being?

- a. Yes
- b. No

If yes, what indicators are currently produced?

Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

2. How is this information to build this indicator collected?

*Select all that apply*

- a. ICT Adoption and use survey
- b. Other household surveys (e.g. health, social, etc.)
- c. Other data source
  - i. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

3. Has your organization revised household surveys or technology use surveys in past three years to better capture impacts of digitalization and/or well-being?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. No, but we plan to within the next year

If yes, what steps were taken to revise these surveys?

---

4. Does your organization currently adhere to or produce any of the following?

*Select all that apply*

a. A standard definition of well-being

If yes, what definition is currently used? Please specify

---

b. A well-being framework

If yes, what framework is currently used? Please specify

---

Or

c. Neither of the above

Other possible questions:

- What, if any, research or data gaps is your organization trying to address in the area of digital and well-being? How are you trying to address these gaps?
- Question about awareness of other international groups working in this area that could be a source of collaboration?

## References

- Abraham, Katharine G., John C. Haltiwanger, Kristin Sandusky, and James R. Spletzer. (2018). "Measuring the gig economy: Current knowledge and open issues." NBER, Working paper 24950.
- Affi, Tamara, et al. (2018). "WIRED: The impact of media and technology use on stress (cortisol) and inflammation (interleukin IL-6) in fast paced families." *Computers in Human Behavior*, 81 (April), 265-273.
- Al Abdulwahab, S. S., S. J. Kachanathu, and M. S. Al Motairi. (2017). "Smartphone use addiction can cause neck disability." *Musculoskeletal Care*, 15(1), 10-12.
- Bellet, Clement, and Paul Frijters. (2019). "Big data and well-being." In *World Happiness Report*, J. Helliwell, R. Layard, and J. Sachs (Eds.). New York: Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
- Carter, Ben, Philippa Rees, Lauren Hale, et al. (2016). "Association between portable screen-based media device access or use and sleep outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis." *JAMA Paediatrics*, 170(12), 1202-1208.
- Gluckman, Sir Peter, and Kristiann Allen. (2018). "Understanding wellbeing in the context of rapid digital and associated transformations." The International Network for Government Science Advice.
- Helliwell, John F., and Haifang Huang. (2013). "Comparing the happiness effects of real and on-line friends." *PLOS ONE*, 8(9).
- Helliwell, John F. (2018), "What's special about happiness as a social indicator?" *Social Indicators Research*, 135(3), 965-968.
- Lepp, A., J. E. Barkley, G. J. Sanders, M. Rebold, and P. Gates. (2013). "The relationship between cell phone use, physical and sedentary activity, and cardiorespiratory fitness in a sample of US college students." *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10(1), 79.
- Maras, D., M. F. Flament, M. Murray, A. Buchholz, K. A. Henderson, N. Obeid, and G. S. Goldfield. (2015). "Screen time is associated with depression and anxiety in Canadian youth." *Preventive Medicine*, 73, 133-138.
- OECD. (2019). *How's Life in the Digital Age: Opportunities and Risks of the Digital Transformation for People's Well-being*. OECD Publishing: Paris.
- Pew Research Center, April 2018. "The Future of Well-being in a Tech-Saturated World."
- Primack, B. A., et al. (2017). "Social media use and perceived social isolation among young adults in the US." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 53(1), 1-8.
- Ra, C. K., J. Cho, M. D. Stone, et al. (2018). "Association of digital media use with subsequent symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder among adolescents." *JAMA*, 320(3), 255-263.
- Rosenfield, M. (2016). "Computer vision syndrome (aka digital eye strain)." *Optometry in Practice*, 17(1), 1-10.
- Samaha, M., and N. S. Hawi. (2016). "Relationships among smartphone addiction, stress, academic performance, and satisfaction with life." *Computers in Human Behavior*, 57, 321-325.
- Shakya, H. B., and N. A. Christakis. (2017). "Association of Facebook use with compromised well-being: A longitudinal study." *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 185(3), 203-211.

- Shensa, A., C. G. Escobar-Viera, J. E. Sidani, N. D. Bowman, M. P. Marshal, and B. A. Primack. (2017). "Problematic social media use and depressive symptoms among US young adults: A nationally-representative study." *Social Science & Medicine*, 182, 150-157.
- Tromholt, M. (2016). "The Facebook experiment: Quitting Facebook leads to higher levels of well-being." *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 19(11), 661-666.
- Twenge, J. M., G. N. Martin, and W. K. Campbell. (2018). "Decreases in psychological well-being among American adolescents after 2012 and links to screen time during the rise of smartphone technology." *Emotion*, 18(6), 765-780.
-