

DEVELOPMENT AND PSYCHOMETRIC VALIDATION OF THE JEEVANVIDYA HAPPINESS ANALYZER (JVHA): A MULTIDIMENSIONAL, MOBILE-FIRST SCALE FOR FAMILIAL AND INTERDEPENDENT SOCIETIES

Rahul Palshetkar^{1*}, Mrudula Joshi², Shital Nathgosavi³, Pralhad Pai⁴, Rutuja Bhagat⁵, Nikita Bhanavse⁶, Nikhil Bhanavse⁷

^{1*} M. D. P. G. D. C. R. M. A. (Sanskrit), Ph. D. Scholar at Dr. D. Y. Patil Vidyapeeth, Pune, 411018.

Professor - HOD (Samhita Siddhant), Pt. Dr. Shivshakti Lal Sharma Ayurved Medical College, Ratlam, M. P.; <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4095-6929>; rahulpalshetkar@gmail.com

² M. D. Ph. D. B.A. M. A. (Sanskrit), Professor - HOD, Department of Samhita Siddhanta - Dr. D. Y. Patil Vidyapeeth, Pune, 411018; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3905-9475>; mrudula.joshi@dpu.edu.in

³ MD, Associate Professor -HOD (Samhita Siddhanta), SSVV Ayurveda College And Research Institute, Hingoli, Maharashtra; <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9422-7087>; vaaniigosavi@gmail.com

⁴ B. Tech (IIT - Mumbai) M. B. A TQM (Japan), Youth Mentor & Lifetime Trustee – Jeevanvidya Mission, India; <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5061-1752>; pralhad.pai@jeevanvidya.net

⁵ M.D. Scholar, Department of Rachana Sharir, Dr. D. Y. Patil Vidyapeeth, Pune, India; <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5840-2406>; rutujabhagat1599@gmail.com

⁶ M.D. Assistant Professor (Samhita Siddhant), Dr. Bhanudas Dere AMC, Sangamner, <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5104-0326>; nbhanavse@gmail.com

⁷ M.Tech Scholar, Department of Civil Engineering-Construction Technology and Management, IIT Bombay, <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7246-1748>; bhanavsenikhil@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background. Well-being instruments are largely built on Western, individualistic assumptions and under-represent the familial, financial and spiritual dimensions central to interdependent societies of India and other regions like East – South Asia, Middle East, Saharan Africa and Latin America. This paper describes the development and preliminary validation of the Jeevanvidya Happiness Analyzer (JVHA), a 47-item, 13-domain questionnaire available on paper and as a mobile web application. The designation ‘JVHA’, formally acknowledges foundational alignment with the Jeevanvidya philosophy propounded by Satguru Shri Wamanrao Pai, from which both the tool and its parent doctoral project; ‘Evaluation of Vishwa Prarthana Chanting for Mental Wellbeing in General Population’ originate.

Methods. The instrument was built through construct specification, deductive item generation, expert review and cognitive pre-testing. Items are scored 1–4 and expressed as a percentage of the maximum (188). Content validity was assessed by 12 experts (I-CVI, S-CVI/UA, modified kappa), who also rated face and construct validity. The final instrument was then administered once to 100 general-population respondents in Mumbai and Pune for item analysis, internal consistency (Cronbach’s α) and inter-domain correlations.

Results. Mean expert-rated relevance was 95.57% (SD 4.48) and clarity 93.77% (SD 5.31); all 12 experts rated face and construct validity ≥ 3 (mean 3.67 ± 0.49). Twenty-nine of 47 items (61.7%) reached universal agreement (S-CVI/UA = 0.617, below the 0.80 benchmark). In the field sample (N = 100; mean age 40.7 ± 13.6 years), the mean overall score was $68.8\% \pm 11.0\%$. Corrected item–total correlations for the 44 items in multi-item domains were 0.44–0.77; overall α was 0.92, and domain α ranged from 0.67 (Spiritual Quotient) to 0.89 (Interpersonal Relationship and Family Members’ Wellbeing). Inter-domain correlations were small to moderate ($r = -0.03$ to 0.52).

Conclusion. The JVHA is a 47-item, 13-domain instrument for assessing well-being in the Indian population and similar interdependent societies by incorporating crucial, familial, financial and spiritual dimensions, with preliminary evidence of content, face and construct validity and high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.92$). However, findings from the 100-participant field sample remain preliminary, requiring larger studies to establish test–retest reliability, convergent/discriminant validity and confirmatory factor structure.

KEYWORDS: Jeevanvidya Happiness Analyzer ;JVHA ; social well-being; questionnaire development; content validity index; internal consistency; India; positive psychology; Satguru Shri Wamanrao Pai; Vishwa Prarthana chanting ; interdependent societies.

INTRODUCTION

Health is understood as physical, mental and social well-being rather than the mere absence of disease [1], and mental health is distinct from the absence of mental illness [2]. Positive psychology shifted attention toward flourishing, life satisfaction, purpose and growth [3]. Ryff’s six-factor model [4] and Diener’s distinction between cognitive and affective well-being [5] show that well-being is multidimensional, so domain-specific assessment can reveal information that a single global score hides.

Established measures such as the Satisfaction With Life Scale [5], the Warwick–Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale [6], the WHO-5 [7] and the Ryff scales [4] were developed mostly in Western, educated, industrialized populations, and domains such as family members’ well-being, financial stability and spirituality are under-represented in them [8].

Translation and back-translation alone cannot ensure cross-cultural validity when the underlying conceptualization of well-being differs [9]. The other instruments used across the globe, including the SDQ [18], MHQoL [19], PHQ-9, GHQ and DASS [20–22], mainly assess difficulties, symptoms or distress, and the National Mental Health Survey used diagnostic and disability measures [23].

The necessity for a unified metric became evident during our post-doctoral evaluation of Vishwa Prarthana chanting for mental well-being in general population (CTRI/2024/11/0770000), which required a combination of three distinct psychometric tools to capture the multidimensional nature of eastern well-being resulting to inflated participant burden and fragmented measurement. [24–25]

A gap therefore remains for a positively framed, multidimensional well-being instrument developed within the Indian context.

The JVHA addresses this gap with a broad domain structure that includes familial, financial and spiritual domains, a four-point forced-choice format with no neutral midpoint, and percentage-based scoring. Because validity is an argument built from multiple sources of evidence rather than a property of a questionnaire [10–12], this study evaluates the JVHA through expert-based content, face and construct validity, cognitive pre-testing, and preliminary field evidence on item performance, internal consistency and internal structure. The complete questionnaire is available as Supplementary Appendix A.

The primary objective was to develop a multidimensional instrument for assessing happiness and well-being in Indian society and to establish content, face and construct validity through structured expert review. Secondary objectives were to generate the item pool systematically, quantify content validity, assess response processes, report initial field evidence, and define the further work required before unrestricted use.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Design, ethics and reporting

This instrument-development study combined expert-panel validation with a single cross-sectional field administration, following published guidance on scale construction and CVI/modified-kappa assessment [13–17]. The protocol was approved by the Dr. DYPCARC Institutional Ethics Committee, Pimpri, Pune (IEC 120-2023; 10 October 2023). Written informed consent was obtained from expert panel members and cognitive-interview participants; responses were recorded without personal identifiers.

2.2 Construct and domain framework

The construct was defined as an individual's overall subjective and functional well-being across psychological, interpersonal, physical, environmental, financial, spiritual and familial spheres. After reviewing the theoretical literature [2–7] and consulting within the development group, 13 domains were specified a priori (Table 1).

Table 1. The 13 domains and item allocation

#	Domain	Operational definition	Items
1	Life Satisfaction & Evaluation	Global cognitive appraisal of one's life against self-referenced standards	3
2	Environmental Mastery	Perceived competence in managing demands of one's surroundings	2
3	Meaningful Relationship	Close, trusting bonds characterized by warmth and mutual concern	6
4	Mind Stability	Emotional steadiness and freedom from persistent agitation	6
5	Physical Health	Subjective physical condition, energy and functional capacity	4
6	Self-Acceptance	Positive regard towards oneself, including personal limitations	3
7	Attitude of Life	Orientation towards circumstances, including optimism and gratitude	5
8	Financial Stability	Perceived adequacy and security of material resources	1
9	Resilience	Capacity to withstand and recover from adversity	1
10	Interpersonal Relationship	Quality of everyday interaction across family, work and community	6
11	Autonomy	Self-determination in decisions; independence from external regulation	1
12	Spiritual Quotient	Meaning, transcendence and connection beyond material concerns	3
13	Family Members' Wellbeing	Perceived health, harmony and welfare of family members	6

2.3 Item generation, response format and scoring

Forty-seven items were generated deductively from the operational definitions in Table 1 in Marathi, Hindi and English, using simple first-person, present-tense language suited to respondents with minimal education. Items were screened for redundancy and ambiguity before expert review. Each item is scored 1–4 (higher = greater well-being; no neutral midpoint; no reverse scoring). The total (47–188) is converted to a percentage of the maximum, and domain scores are computed likewise. A domain or total score is computed only when at least 80% of its items are completed.

2.4 Expert panel and content validity

A multidisciplinary panel of 12 experts (4 Ayurvedic researchers, 2 psychiatrists, 2 psychologists and 4 Jeevanvidya Mission domain experts) independently rated each item for relevance and clarity on a four-point scale, and rated overall face and construct validity from 1 (poor) to 4 (excellent). Acceptability thresholds were I-CVI ≥ 0.78 for 12 experts, S-CVI/Ave ≥ 0.90 , and modified kappa > 0.74 as excellent [15–17]. Decision rules specified in advance were: retain items with I-CVI ≥ 0.78 , revise and re-rate those at 0.70–0.77, and remove those below 0.70.

2.5 Cognitive pre-testing

Lay respondents from the target population completed the draft instrument and took part in semi-structured cognitive interviews (think-aloud and verbal probing) to assess comprehension, clarity of response options and ambiguity. Interviews continued until no new comprehension difficulties emerged. Mean completion time was 28 minutes.

2.6 Field sample and analysis

The finalized instrument was administered once to an independent sample of 100 general-population respondents from Mumbai and Pune (aged 18–65 years; 56 women, 41 men, 3 other). No intervention was involved, and the sample was analyzed as a single group, with no comparison by chanting, meditation or any other practice. Analyses comprised descriptive summaries of expert ratings, I-CVI, S-CVI and modified kappa; domain means and SDs; item means, SDs and corrected item–total correlations (≥ 0.30 taken as acceptable [14]); Cronbach's α for the total scale and multi-item domains; and the Pearson correlation matrix of the 13 domain scores to assess overlap between domains and to verify the absence of multicollinearity ($r < 0.80$). Significance was set at two-sided $p < 0.05$ where applicable.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Content, face and construct validity

All 12 experts responded (100%). Per-expert ratings and scale-level indices are in Tables 2 and 3. Face and construct validity were each rated 3 or above by every expert (mean 3.67 ± 0.49). Twenty-nine of 47 items (61.7%) achieved universal agreement.

Table 2. Per-expert ratings (E1–E12)

Expert	Relev. %	Clar. %	Face	Constr.	Expert	Relev. %	Clar. %	Face	Constr.
E1	92.55	91.06	4	4	E7	94.68	93.09	4	3
E2	95.74	90.42	4	3	E8	96.81	95.21	3	4
E3	100.00	100.00	3	4	E9	93.62	92.02	3	4
E4	97.87	94.68	4	4	E10	87.77	85.31	3	3
E5	87.77	85.10	4	4	E11	100.00	100.00	4	4
E6	100.00	98.40	4	4	E12	100.00	100.00	4	3
Mean $\pm$ SD	95.57 $\pm$ 4.48	93.77 $\pm$ 5.31	3.67 $\pm$ 0.49	3.67 $\pm$ 0.49					

Relevance (Relev.) and clarity (Clar.) = percentage of the 47 items rated ≥ 3 per expert; face and construct (Constr.) validity = single overall rating (1–4) per expert.

Table 3. Scale-level content validity

Parameter	Value	Benchmark
Mean relevance across experts	95.57% $\pm$ 4.48	—
Mean clarity across experts	93.77% $\pm$ 5.31	—
Mean face / construct validity (1–4)	3.67 $\pm$ 0.49 / 3.67 $\pm$ 0.49	—
Items with universal agreement	29 / 47	—
S-CVI/UA	0.617	≥ 0.80

3.2 Field sample and domain scores

The field sample comprised 100 respondents (mean age 40.7 ± 13.6 years, range 18–65; 56 women, 41 men, 3 other). The mean overall score was $68.8\% \pm 11.0\%$ of the maximum (raw score 129.2 ± 20.6 , range 91–174). Mean domain scores ranged from 66.2% (Mind Stability) to 74.0% (Resilience) (Table 4).

Table 4. Domain scores, item analysis and internal consistency (N = 100)

Domain	K	Mean % (SD)	Item mean range	Corrected item–total r	Cronbach's α
Life Satisfaction & Evaluation	3	66.3 (19.0)	2.53–2.72	0.57–0.61	0.76
Environmental Mastery	2	67.9 (21.6)	2.69–2.74	0.55–0.55	0.71
Meaningful Relationship	6	69.2 (19.6)	2.68–2.88	0.63–0.77	0.88
Mind Stability	6	66.2 (17.3)	2.56–2.78	0.60–0.69	0.85
Self Acceptance	3	67.8 (19.7)	2.67–2.76	0.63–0.66	0.80
Attitude of Life	5	66.8 (18.9)	2.50–2.75	0.64–0.71	0.86
Physical Health	4	70.8 (20.1)	2.75–2.89	0.64–0.72	0.85
Autonomy	1	71.2 (22.9)	2.85	n/a	n/a
Financial Stability	1	72.2 (22.4)	2.89	n/a	n/a
Resilience	1	74.0 (21.9)	2.96	n/a	n/a
Interpersonal Relationship	6	68.7 (18.8)	2.72–2.77	0.66–0.73	0.89
Spiritual Quotient	3	70.8 (17.2)	2.68–2.98	0.44–0.52	0.67
Family Members' Wellbeing	6	70.3 (19.0)	2.75–2.94	0.66–0.75	0.89
Overall scale	47	68.8 (11.0)	2.50–2.98	0.44–0.77	0.92

k = number of items. Item–total correlations are not estimable for single-item domains. Item-level statistics for all 47 items are in Supplementary Appendix B.

3.4 Item analysis and internal consistency

Item means ranged from 2.50 to 2.98 on the four-point scale, with no apparent floor or ceiling effects. All 44 items in multi-item domains had corrected item–total correlations of 0.44–0.77, above the 0.30 threshold, so no item needed removal or revision on this criterion. Overall α was 0.92. Domain α , computable for the ten multi-item domains, ranged from 0.67 (Spiritual Quotient) to 0.89 (Interpersonal Relationship and Family Members' Wellbeing). Autonomy, Financial Stability and Resilience are single-item domains and do not permit an internal-consistency estimate.

3.5 Internal structure

Inter-domain correlations (Table 5) were predominantly small to moderate and positive, from -0.03 (Life Satisfaction with Physical Health) to 0.52 (Autonomy with Financial Stability). No pair exceeded the $r < 0.80$ threshold, so there was no sign of redundancy or multicollinearity, and no correlation was substantially negative. The single-item domains (Autonomy, Financial Stability, Resilience) had higher median correlations with other domains (0.30 – 0.38) than Life Satisfaction, Physical Health and Spiritual Quotient (0.21 – 0.22), a pattern to be interpreted cautiously given single-item measurement.

Table 5. Inter-domain Pearson correlations (N = 100; lower triangle)

	LSE	ENV	REL	MND	SAC	ATL	PHY	AUT	FIN	RES	INT	SPQ	FAM
LSE	1												
ENV	.19	1											
REL	.27	.25	1										
MND	.17	.21	.24	1									
SAC	.32	.30	.22	.34	1								
ATL	.27	.36	.37	.33	.36	1							
PHY	−.03	.05	.19	.21	.26	.18	1						
AUT	.37	.37	.29	.46	.35	.47	.20	1					
FIN	.25	.30	.24	.46	.35	.50	.31	.52	1				
RES	.23	.26	.17	.39	.33	.29	.22	.43	.51	1			
INT	.07	.39	.24	.43	.29	.33	.25	.39	.40	.36	1		
SPQ	.00	.08	.19	.24	.26	.11	.22	.38	.22	.29	.24	1	
FAM	.12	.14	.06	.28	.25	.25	.27	.37	.35	.31	.28	.21	1

LSE = Life Satisfaction & Evaluation; ENV = Environmental Mastery; REL = Meaningful Relationship; MND = Mind Stability; SAC = Self Acceptance; ATL = Attitude of Life; PHY = Physical Health; AUT = Autonomy; FIN = Financial Stability; RES = Resilience; INT = Interpersonal Relationship; SPQ = Spiritual Quotient; FAM = Family Members' Wellbeing.

4. DISCUSSION

Our previous Ayurvedic post-doctoral work on Vishwa Prarthana chanting (**CTRI/2024/11/0770000**) highlighted a persistent challenge in health-related quality of life (HRQoL) studies within non-Western cohorts [24–25]. To capture holistic well-being without omitting vital spiritual and social domains, researchers have frequently been forced to combine multiple psychometric inventories. This multi-tool dependency not only compromises data quality through cumulative response bias but also fails to capture happiness as an integrated state. The development of the **JVHA** directly addresses this operational bottleneck by synthesizing these disparate domains into a single, validated 47-item framework.

4.1 Principal findings

Expert ratings of relevance, clarity, face validity and construct validity were favorable on average, but universal agreement was reached on less than two-thirds of items. A first field administration provided preliminary empirical evidence of acceptable item discrimination, high overall internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.92$) and a correlation pattern consistent with related but distinguishable domains. These results support the conceptual and initial empirical soundness of the item set; they do not establish test–retest stability, convergent and discriminant validity, or confirmatory factor structure.

4.2 Content validity

Content validity is the foundation for later validity evidence [13,16]. The multidisciplinary panel, spanning psychiatry, psychology, Ayurveda and applied well-being practice, was intended to appraise the items from more than one standpoint. The gap between high mean agreement (relevance 95.57%, clarity 93.77%) and modest universal agreement (S-CVI/UA 0.617) is not unusual, since universal agreement is a conservative criterion that becomes harder to meet as panels grow [17], and Polit and Beck recommend reporting both S-CVI/Ave and S-CVI/UA [16].

4.3 Field evidence and comparison with existing instruments

Overall consistency and uniformly acceptable item discrimination indicate that the 44 multi-item-domain items cohere with their intended domains. Consistently positive but moderate inter-domain correlations suggest a shared general well-being component without redundancy. The higher correlations of the single-item domains may reflect noisier single-item measurement rather than a substantive difference, and can only be resolved once each is measured with several items. Direct psychometric comparison with WEMWBS, WHO-5, SWLS and the Ryff scales awaits head-to-head data. Conceptually, the JVHA shares the SWLS's cognitive-evaluative core and the breadth of WEMWBS and the Ryff scales, but none of these has a dedicated familial domain. The JVHA is much longer than the WHO-5 and SWLS (5 items each) and WEMWBS (14 items); this is the cost of a 13-domain profile, partly offset in the mobile version by automated scoring and domain-level feedback.

5. Strengths, Limitations and Future Work

Strengths. The instrument was developed through a staged, pre-specified procedure; content validity was quantified with I-CVI/S-CVI and modified kappa; the panel was multidisciplinary; retention and removal rules were fixed before ratings were examined; cognitive pre-testing addressed response processes; the domain structure includes familial, financial and spiritual dimensions; and the questionnaire is fully published. The scope is stated precisely, with no claim beyond what a single cross-sectional sample can support.

Limitations. The study is limited by a small, single-setting cross-sectional sample, single-item domains, incomplete content-validity data, limited expert-panel representation, and incomplete cognitive pre-testing information. Further validation is needed, including test-retest, convergent/discriminant and confirmatory analyses, interviewer administration, and purpose-built studies examining practice-related differences.

6. CONCLUSION

The JVHA is a 47-item, 13-domain instrument designed to assess well-being in the Indian general population and people of East –South Asia, Middle East, Saharan Africa and Latin America, including familial, financial and spiritual dimensions that existing instruments under-represent. Review by 12 experts and cognitive pre-testing support its content, face and construct validity (mean relevance and clarity above 93%; every expert endorsing face and construct validity), although only 29 of 47 items reached universal agreement. A first field administration in 100 respondents showed acceptable item discrimination, high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.92$) and a coherent inter-domain pattern. This single-sample evidence is preliminary: test-retest reliability, convergent and discriminant validity, and confirmatory factor analysis in a larger, more representative sample remain to be established.

DECLARATIONS

Availability of data and materials. The complete instrument is provided in Supplementary Appendix A. The JVHA has been submitted for copyright (Copyright Office, Government of India, Diary No. LD-43916/2026-CO; pending) and is available on request for non-commercial research use with attribution, at no cost.

Conflict of interest

The authors state that there is no competing interests.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies or university.

Authors Contribution

Author¹ designed the instrument, conducted the trial, wrote the original manuscript and interpreted the data. Author² guided the study, summarized the statistical part and interpreted. Author³ did the medical writing part. Author⁴ assisted in recruitment of the study participants. Author⁵, Author⁶ and Author⁷ assisted the instrument construct and interview process of the field sample respondents. All authors reviewed, edited, and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Authors acknowledge spiritual leader Satguru Shri Wamanrao Pai who propounded Jeevanvidya (The science of life and art of living) and is the founder of nonprofit social organization, 'Jeevanvidya Mission'. Authors acknowledge the contribution of the content validity experts panel, field sample respondents, study coordinators, Dr. D. Y. Patil Vidyapeeth, Pimpri – Pune, Pt. Shivshakti Lal Sharma Ayurved Medical College, Ratlam, M.P. and Jeevan Vidya Mission – India to the research.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Mental health: strengthening our response. Geneva: WHO; 2022.
2. Keyes CLM. The mental health continuum: from languishing to flourishing in life. *J Health Soc Behav.* 2002;43(2):207–22.
3. Seligman MEP, Csikszentmihalyi M. Positive psychology: an introduction. *Am Psychol.* 2000;55(1):5–14.
4. Ryff CD. Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 1989;57(6):1069–81.
5. Diener E, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, Griffin S. The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *J Pers Assess.* 1985;49(1):71–5.
6. Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, et al. The Warwick–Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): development and UK validation. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2007;5:63.
7. Topp CW, Østergaard SD, Søndergaard S, Bech P. The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: a systematic review of the literature. *Psychother Psychosom.* 2015;84(3):167–76.
8. Henrich J, Heine SJ, Norenzayan A. The weirdest people in the world? *Behav Brain Sci.* 2010;33(2–3):61–83.
9. Beaton DE, Bombardier C, Guillemin F, Ferraz MB. Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine.* 2000;25(24):3186–91.
10. Messick S. Validity of psychological assessment. *Am Psychol.* 1995;50(9):741–9.
11. Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Patrick DL, et al. The COSMIN checklist for assessing the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties of health status measurement instruments. *Qual Life Res.* 2010;19(4):539–49.
12. Prinsen CAC, Mokkink LB, Bouter LM, et al. COSMIN guideline for systematic reviews of patient-reported outcome measures. *Qual Life Res.* 2018;27(5):1147–57.
13. Boateng GO, Neilands TB, Frongillo EA, Melgar-Quinonez HR, Young SL. Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: a primer. *Front Public Health.* 2018;6:149.

14. Streiner DL, Norman GR, Cairney J. Health measurement scales: a practical guide to their development and use. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015.
15. Lynn MR. Determination and quantification of content validity. Nurs Res. 1986;35(6):382–5.
16. Polit DF, Beck CT. The content validity index: are you sure you know what's being reported? Res Nurs Health. 2006;29(5):489–97.
17. Polit DF, Beck CT, Owen SV. Is the CVI an acceptable indicator of content validity? Res Nurs Health. 2007;30(4):459–67.
18. Goodman R. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note. J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 1997;38(5):581–6.
19. van Krugten FCW, Busschbach JJV, Versteegh MM, Hakkaart-van Roijen L, Brouwer WBF. The Mental Health Quality of Life Questionnaire (MHQoL). Qual Life Res. 2022;31(2):633–43.
20. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. J Gen Intern Med. 2001;16(9):606–13.
21. Goldberg DP, Hillier VF. A scaled version of the General Health Questionnaire. Psychol Med. 1979;9(1):139–45.
22. Lovibond SH, Lovibond PF. Manual for the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales. 2nd ed. Sydney: Psychology Foundation of Australia; 1995.
23. Gururaj G, Varghese M, Benegal V, et al. National Mental Health Survey of India, 2015–16: prevalence, patterns and outcomes. Bengaluru: NIMHANS; 2016.
24. Palshetkar RD, Joshi MV, Pai PW. Study protocol of “Vishwa Prarthana Chanting” for mental wellbeing in general population. Int J Sci Res. 2025;14(5):892–6. doi:10.21275/SR25510164518.
25. Palshetkar R, Joshi M, Nathgosavi S and Pai P (2026). Association of Regular Vishwa Prarthana Chanting With Multidimensional Happiness and Psychological Well-Being: A Cross-Sectional Comparative Study. *Pain Joints Spine* 16: pjs.1159.

Jevanvidya Happiness Analyzer (JVHA)

(M.C.Q. Score A=1, B=2, C=3, D=4 Higher the score higher is the level of happiness)

Domain	Qn. No.	Questionnaire (Select the most suitable choice from multiple choices A/B/C/D)	Marks
Life Satisfaction and Life Evaluation	1	Do you feel your life is pleasant / delightful? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
	2	Do you think you have achieved the standard of living and the social status that you had expected? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
Score % = n/12 X100			
	3	In comparison with the past, how do you feel about your present life ? A] Not so happy (0 – 25%) B] Moderate happy (26 – 50 %) C] Quite happy (51 – 75%) D] Very happy (76 – 100%)	
Environmental Mastery	4	Do you feel confident that in case of a crisis (anything which substantially upsets your life situation) you will be able to cope with it/face it boldly? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
Score % = n/8X100			
	6	Do you feel confident that relatives/friends will help you out if there is an emergency, e.g. if you loose what you have by fire or theft? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
Meaningful relationship	7	How do you feel about the relationship you and your children / parents have? A] Not so good (0 – 25%) B] Moderate (26 – 50 %) C] Quite good (51 – 75%) D] Very good (76 – 100%)	
Score% = n/24X100			
		Do you consider your family a source of help to you in finding solutions to most of the problems you have? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my	

		expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
	9	Do you think that most of the members of your family feel closely attached to each other? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
	10	Do you think you would be looked after well by your family in case you were seriously ill? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
	11	Do you sometimes worry about the relationship you and your wife/husband have? (Guardians or children , in case of not having wife/husband) A] Very much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Not so much (51 – 75%) D] Not at all (76 – 100%)	
Mind Stability	12	Do you sometimes feel sad without reason? A] Very much (66 -100%) B] To some extent (31-65%) C] Not so much (1-30%) D] Never (0%)	
Score% = n/24X100	13	Do you feel too easily irritated or feel too sensitive? A] Very much (66 -100%) B] To some extent (31-65%) C] Not so much (1-30%) D] Never (0%)	
		Do you feel disturbed by feelings of anxiety and tension? A] Very much (66 -100%) B] To some extent (31-65%) C] Not so much (1-30%) D] Never (0%)	
	15	Do you feel that you are focused or you can concentrate at your work / studies? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
	16	My mind is very fickle. A] Always (76 to 100 percent of the times) B] Often (36 to 75 percent of the times) C] To some extent (1 to 35 percent of the times) D] Not at all (my mind is steady/stable)	
	17	The statement “I have many thoughts in my mind every day” is true for myself. " A] Very true (76 to 100 %) B] To a large extent (51 to 75 %) C] To some extent (26 to 50%) D] Not true (0 to 25 %)	
Self Acceptance	18	Do you like your professional work / current education / daily routine? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
Score % = n/12X100		I made some mistakes in the past, but I feel that all in all, everything has worked out for the best A] Not really (0 – 25%) B] Moderately true (26 – 50 %) C] Quite true (51 – 75%) D] Very true (76 – 100%)	
	20	Do you like most of the aspects of yourself and your life? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
Attitude Towards Life	21	Do you feel your life is useless? A] Very much B] To some extent C] Not so much D] Not at all -Very Useful	
Score % = n/20 X100		Are you proactive to initiate the communication with the people in your society? A] Never B] Rarely C] Sometimes D] Always	
	23	I look for opportunities in difficulties - I see difficulties as opportunities for myself. A] Never B] Sometimes (1 -35%) C] Most of the time (36-75 %) D] Always (76 -100 %)	
	24	I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future A] Never B] Rarely C] Sometimes D] Always	
	25	I always have the following thoughts in my mind. A] Abominable-Apathetic -Destructive B] Negative – Discouraging C] Mixed (Negative and Positive) D] Inventive-Legislative-Prolific	
Physical Health	26	Do you suffer from pains in various parts of your body? A] Most of the time B] Sometimes C] Hardly ever D] Never	
Score % = n/16X100		Are you disturbed by palpitations/a thumping heart? A] Most of the time B] Sometimes C] Hardly ever D] Never	

	28	Are you troubled by disturbed sleep? A] Most of the time B] Sometimes C] Hardly ever D] Never	
	29	Are you satisfied and happy about your health? A] Not so happy B] Moderate happy C] Quite happy D] Very happy	
Autonomy Score % = $n/4 \times 100$	30	I am not afraid to voice my opinion, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people. A] I am afraid to voice my opinion B] Some times is true C] Many times is true D] Very true	
Financial Evaluation & Stability Score % = $n/4 \times 100$	31	Are you happy with your progress in terms of profession, education, business, finance? A] Not so much (0 – 25%) B] To some extent (26 – 50 %) C] Near to my expectations (51 – 75%) D] Very much (76 – 100%)	
Resilience/Compassion Score % = $n/4 \times 100$	32	In case of dispute or controversy; I also think about other people's side. A] Not really B] Sometimes C] Quite often D] Always	
Interpersonal Relationship Score % = $n/24 \times 100$	33	Are you appreciated by your senior/boss/teacher/clients at your work place or guardian? A] Not really B] Moderately C] Quite satisfied D] Very much	
	34	Are you appreciated by your colleagues / friends/ co businessmen/ society members? A] Not really B] Moderately C] Quite satisfied D] Very much	
		Do you appreciate your colleagues /friends/ co businessmen/ society members proactively? A] Not really B] Sometimes C] Quite often D] Always	
		Do you share happiness of your relatives / neighbors? A] Not really B] Sometimes C] Quite often D] Always	
	37	Do you appreciate your subordinates /house hold helpers proactively? A] Not really B] Sometimes C] Quite often D] Always	
	38	Do you sometimes feel that all of us are part of a common force? A] Not at all B] Not so much C] To some extent D] Very much	
Spiritual Quotient & Bliss Score % = $n/12 \times 100$	39	Do you sometimes experience moments of intense happiness which are difficult to describe? A] Never B] Rarely C] Sometimes D] Always	
		Do you sometimes feel disappointed for not getting what is due to you and the others are getting it easily? A] Always B] Quite often C] Sometimes D] Never	
		The people in my vicinity (home/my working place/ my society/ my education place) acknowledge me as loving, giving, forgiving and caring person. A] Not really B] Moderatly C] Quite satisfied D] Very much	
Factors Affecting Happiness Related To Family Member's Wellbeing Score % = $n/24 \times 100$	42-47	Do anyone in your family have any of the following problems? I] Financial A] Too much B] To some extent C] Not so much D] Not at all II] Physical A] Too much B] To some extent C] Not so much D] Not at all III] Mental A] Too much B] To some extent C] Not so much D] Not at all IV] Family-Marital A] Too much B] To some extent C] Not so much D] Not at all V] Educational A] Too much B] To some extent C] Not so much D] Not at all VI] Professional A] Too much B] To some extent C] Not so much D] Not at all	
TOTAL SCORE OF HAPPINESS (N) OUT OF 188			
PERCENTAGE HAPPINESS % = $N/188 \times 100$			