gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Mitglied der
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

From Object to Praxis: A Narrative of Shifts in Child Well-Being Research

Tobia Fattore

Abstract
This paper presents a broad outline of intellectual developments in child well-being research. Four intellectual currents are identified, the 'objective', 'subjective', 'standpoint' and 'praxeological' approaches. The narrative developed emphasises the role that critical contests over epistemological, ontological and methodological issues serve for developments in research. Drawing upon the various approaches identified, the paper concludes by discussing well-being in terms of social integration and system integration, advancing a concept of well-being that is nether relativist nor culturally monopolizing.

Keywords: child well-being research, objective well-being, subjective well-being, standpoint theory, praxeology, methodology

Von ‚objektiven' zu praxeologischen Ansätzen: Eine Darstellung von Verschiebungen in der Wohlergehensforschung zu Kindern.

Zusammenfassung
Der Artikel gibt einen Überblick über intellektuelle Entwicklungen im Bereich der Wohlergehensforschung zu Kindern. Es werden folgende vier intellektueller Strömungen identifiziert: ‚objektive', ‚subjektive', ‚standpunkttheoretische' sowie ‚praxeologische' Ansätze. Betont wird in der Darstellung die Rolle, die kritische Auseinandersetzungen über epistemologische, ontologische und methodische Fragen als Motor für diese Entwicklung im Forschungsbereich spielen. Ausgehend von den verschiedenen identifizierten Ansätzen diskutiert der Beitrag abschließend ein Verständnis von Wohlergehen im Sinne sozialer Integration und Teilhabe und leistet damit einen Beitrag zu einem Konzept von Wohlergehen, das weder relativistisch noch kulturell monopolisierend ist.

Schlagwörter: Wohlergehen von Kindern, objektives Wohlergehen, subjektives Wohlergehen, Standpunkttheorie, Praxeologie, Methodologie

1 Introduction

Research on children's well-being is characterised by multiple interpretations and approaches. While the term 'child well-being' is a frequently used concept in popular, aca-

demic and policy discourse, it is inconsistently defined, and there is little agreement among researchers on how it should be measured or whether it should be measured at all. In their introduction to this special issue, *Fegter* and *Hunner-Kreisel* (2020) describe one attempt to characterise the diverse approaches that exist in the field, that of *Asher Ben-Arieh*, who describes fundamental shifts that have occurred in well-being research– from survival to well-being; from negative to positive well-being; from well-being to well-becoming; from traditional to new domains; and from a focus on adult to child perspectives (*Ben-Arieh* 2010).

The focus of this paper is an alternative set of developments in the child well-being field, based on the emergence of distinct analytical approaches in child well-being research that parallel broader developments in the social sciences. These analytical approaches can be termed the 'objective', 'subjective', 'standpoint' and 'praxeological' approaches. In particular, the paper will focus on the emergence of praxeological approaches, which have challenged more established traditions in the field – questioning the positivism of 'objective' approaches and the risks of reification in 'subjective' and 'standpoint' approaches. The existence of different approaches suggests that the field has come to accommodate a diversity of ways that children's well-being can be researched. However, there have been few attempts to assess how these approaches represent developments in knowledge production, and whether various approaches represent different epistemological and ontological positions. By assessing the epistemological and ontological underpinnings of approaches to researching child well-being, the effects of these underpinnings can better be understood. For example, what constitutes valid knowledge in each approach, what are the assumed parameters of the problem to be researched, what counts as appropriate to research, how are children conceptualised within different approaches and what role do children have to play in research on their well-being. These factors implicitly construct different concepts of the 'child' and of 'well-being', which then become the focus of policy responses to children and can have significant effects on children and their families.

The main purpose of this paper, therefore, is to provide an overview of some of these intellectual developments in child well-being research. Unlike other narratives of transitions in well-being research, which have focused on how the emergence of children's rights, monitoring functions of the state and the changed status of children has shifted the emphasis in well-being research (*Ben-Arieh* et al. 2014), the narrative provided here suggests that in tandem with these developments, we can also observe how well-being research has progressed through a contest of ideas. The paper commences by mapping out these intellectual shifts. Without suggesting that there is a linear sense of progression, the emphasis is on how various approaches have developed on the basis of asserting distinctions from preceding traditions. Three shifts are discussed, from objective to subjective, from subjective to standpoint, and from standpoint to praxeological approaches.

The paper concludes by describing a provisional framework that draws upon the objective, subjective, standpoint and praxeological approaches. This framework understands well-being in terms of system and social integration. Social integration highlights the importance of norms and values and thus draws upon insights gained from praxeological approaches. System integration emphasises the role that the distribution and possession of material social resources has for well-being, thus building on insights provided by standpoint, subjective and objective approaches.

2 Objective and Subjective Well-being Approaches: The Foundations of Well-being Research

One of the most significant developments in well-being research has occurred as part of debates about the relative merits of objective verse subjective approaches to well-being. Although 'State of the Child' reports were published as early as the 1940s, social indicator research on children's well-being emerged in the mid 1970's as part of a broader social indicators movement. Increasing dissatisfaction with the use of GDP as a proxy for the well-being of nations intensified during the 1960s and 1970s, highlighting that factors beyond basic standard of living were important to well-being (*Ben-Arieh* 2008). As a response, objective and subjective approaches to measuring social progress in general, and well-being in particular, emerged.

Objective approaches comprise material indicators that measure the social conditions of populations or sub-populations. Objective approaches to well-being "refer to things that are relatively easily observable and measurable, e.g., the height and weight of people, numbers of people admitted to hospital, numbers of people dying per year" (*Michalos* 2004, p. 30). These can be contrasted with subjective approaches, that rely on individual's assessments of the quality of different life domains, which include both cognitive and affective evaluations of one's life as a whole. Subjective assessments "refer to personal feelings, attitudes, preferences, opinions, judgments or beliefs of some sort" (*Michalos* 2004, p. 30). Social indicators that combine objective and subjective approaches are now used extensively by transnational institutional actors, such as the OECD, the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank and IMF. For example, the *OECD* (2020) has a multi-dimensional monitoring report on well-being, which combines objective and subjective measures and provides international comparisons across well-being domains. 'Objective' indicators include income and wealth measures, housing conditions, work and job quality, health, knowledge and skills, environmental quality and homicide rates. Subjective measures include self-reported health status, self-reports on the quality of relationships, social connections and overall life satisfaction. The range and number of indicators of well-being has proliferated, so much so that rather than discussing specific indicators of well-being, the approach is usually to measure indicators which are then aggregated into specific life domains, interpreted as constituting a multi-faceted definition of well-being. These developments have continued apace through what has been described as the 'new science of happiness', the agenda of which is to promote happiness as the proper measure of social progress and goal of public policy (*Seligman* 2011).

Despite early debates regarding the scientific status of subjective measures, subjective measures are increasingly used in well-being research (*Rees* 2019). Objective measures of child well-being have been critiqued on various fronts, including that they overly focus on child development outcomes, that they monitor the prevalence of behaviour problems; or measure children's performance according to the goals of child institutions, such as school, measures which only tangentially relate to well-being (*Ben-Arieh* 2000, *Fattore* et al. 2007). Whilst demonstrating a concern for child outcomes, objective approaches often construct the child as an *adult in deficit*, suggesting that well-being can only be achieved through appropriate socialization, thus denying the significance of experiences of well-being for children in the present. Moreover, given the priority given to future outcomes, there is resistance to considering the opinions of children as reliable and valid, with adults

often used as proxies to report on child well-being. An influential example of this approach is the Kids Count Index of Children's Well-being published by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Kids Count presents data on the educational, social, economic and physical well-being of children across the United States. The index explicitly adopts a developmental perspective on children's well-being, from birth through early adulthood (*Annie E. Casey Foundation* 2019). The index comprises 16 key indicators grouped into four domains (Economic well-being; Education; Health; and Family and Community). While the index provides valuable data on the objective status of children in the United States, none of the indicators match the transitions described by *Ben-Arieh* (focus on well-being, use of positive indicators, focus on new domains, focus on child perspectives). For example, the health domain comprises four indicators – the percentage of low birth-weight babies; children without health insurance; rate of child and teen fatalities; and teens who abuse alcohol or drugs. Similar kinds of indicators comprise the other domains. Kids Count is not exceptional in this sense. Many indicator frameworks of children's well-being are comprised of similar kinds of indicators which focus on risks to children's health and safety, the performance of children in institutions, on children who occupy some kind of marginal status, and children's attainment of developmental milestones (for example see the Children's Headline Indicators used by the Australian Government, *AIHW* 2018). *Betz* (2013) in her analysis of well-being frameworks makes a similar assessment of these frameworks. She finds that "the dominant focus is still on children's performance according to the goals of institutions for children (in the educational system) or of adult child experts (in the domains of health, psychology or safety)." (*Betz* 2013, p. 653).

Consequently, studies of child well-being have increasingly focused on obtaining the perspectives of children on their well-being, highlighting the significance of individual perceptions in relation to measures of satisfaction, happiness and quality of life. Some of the most widely used and influential of these measures include those developed by Huebner and colleagues (for example the *Multidimensional Student Life Satisfaction Scale*, *Huebner/Gilman* 2002) and the *Personal Well-Being Index-School Children* developed by *Cummins/Lau* (2005). These scales include measures of global and domain specific Quality of Life. However, the flagship of children's subjective well-being (SWB) research is the International Survey of Children's Well-Being (ISCWeB), otherwise known as the *Children's Worlds* study (see http://www.isciweb.org/). This study collects subjective well-being data from tens of thousands of children and has been conducted in approximately 47 countries.

Ben-Arieh (2010) has argued that the increasing use of SWB measures reflect the influence of the new childhood studies; the more general acceptance that children have rights, and the demands from government for measures of SWB to inform transparent and accountable decision-making. In this research children are seen as able to assess the quality of their lives and their assessments may be different from important adults in their lives, thus contributing different perspectives from studies that rely on proxy measures of children's well-being (*Mason/Watson* 2014). SWB research therefore represents a major shift in child well-being research, where data is obtained from children on topics which have not traditionally been collected as part of objective well-being frameworks. We also see the influence of hedonic traditions in SWB research, especially in the premise of this research that subjective assessments are the best measure of well-being. In this respect SWB research is consistent with the utilitarian theories of Jeremy Bentham, who argued

that it is subjective preferences that should take precedence in matters of personal welfare (*Bentham* 1789).

3   From Subjective to Child Standpoint Approaches

Despite focusing on children's assessments, the SWB approach has been critiqued as relying on a positivist model of knowledge. While emphasizing subjective perceptions, the SWB approach methodologically employs quantitative measures of SWB[1]. While data is obtained directly from children, so at face value it appears children's opinions are being directly measured through the use of SWB scales, these measures are based on standardised measures of satisfaction identified as important by researchers and policy-makers. Children have no or little input into these scales. Whether these domains are important to children's well-being from children's perspectives is rarely considered. While the measures are subject to cognitive piloting with children, this piloting assesses whether the measures are understandable to children, not whether they are pertinent measures of children's well-being in the first place. In this respect SWB studies merely replace one adult-determined set of measures of well-being (objective indicator frameworks) with another set of adult-determined measures of well-being. Therefore, one of the critiques of the SWB approach is that despite its focus on children, it does not adequately reflect children's evaluations on their own lives (*Mason/Watson* 2014).

Holger Ziegler (2010) also notes that SWB seems to be high where there is a lack of comparative referents upon which an individual might be able to assess their relative position, thus suggesting that SWB is higher for individuals experiencing social isolation or who live in homogenous social conditions. As *Ziegler* notes, a focus that individuals are best placed to assess their SWB risks being indifferent to social circumstances and policy interventions that actively reproduce inequalities. Thus, measuring how satisfied individuals are with their life, may serve instead as a gauge of how well people have adapted to their existing circumstances. If SWB reflects adaptive preferences, it also becomes highly problematic to use SWB as an evidence base for progressive social change.

These critiques have provided impetus for a second development in child well-being research, seen in the increasing prominence of well-being studies from a child standpoint. This third approach involves an in-depth exploration of what children think and feel about various aspects of their life, basing knowledge of what well-being is and how it is experienced from the actors themselves (for example *Adams* et al. 2019; *Fattore/Mason* 2016; *Gabhainn/Sixsmith* 2005; *McAuley* 2019; *McAuley* et al. 2010; *Tonon* 2013). These studies use various qualitative methods which ask children to define what well-being is and how they experience it in contrast to SWB approaches, which seek children's responses to pre-determined scales. Standpoint approaches are inductive, developing findings about well-being from children's understandings, perceptions and experiences of their own lives. These perspectives are used as the basis for formulations about what is important to children's well-being, how well-being might be defined and how these perspectives might be translated into well-being measures. Standpoint approaches also differ from SWB approaches epistemologically, in that children are considered 'reflexive and critical agents' and therefore children's knowledge of well-being is considered to represent expertise based on lived experience.

Studies informed by a standpoint approach have found that children prioritize some areas of well-being similar to those which are identified as well-being domains in SWB studies. However, they also extend and challenge these domains. For example, children's involvement in activities is routinely measured in SWB studies through measures of activity level or degree of satisfaction with the type of activities children are involved in. Where children are asked about the role of activities for their well-being in standpoint studies, these scales mean are given a thick description. For example, these studies have found that children value leisure when it provides experiences of freedom from everyday rules, where leisure facilitates the development of competence, feelings of self-worth or provides a basis for social esteem (*Fattore/Mason* 2016). Similar phenomenological contributions exist for a range of well-being areas, including children's experience of school (*Kutsar* et al. 2019), use of digital media (*Nadan/Kaye-Tzadok* 2019), material well-being (*Hunner-Kreisel/März* 2019; *Redmond/Skattebol* 2019), agency and rights (*Thomas/Stoecklin* 2018), relationships (*McAuley* 2019), self-concept (*Ahmed/Zaman* 2019), engagement with community (*Akkan* et al. 2019) and environment (*Adams* et al. 2019).

Child standpoint approaches have been critiqued as potentially relying too much on the common-sense categories produced in lay person accounts, in this case of children's accounts, of social concepts. *Hunner-Kreisel* and *Kuhn* (2010) argue that these studies risk reproducing taken-for-granted categories and fail to go beyond the overt meanings provided by participants, thus not interpreting the tacit dimensions of well-being discussed by participants. A related critique is that these studies romanticize children's perspectives, overemphasising the importance of children's standpoint on well-being without adequately accounting for the effects of other dimensions such as their class or gender position (*Hunner-Kreisel/Kuhn* 2010).

The premise that children have a unique perspective on their well-being also risks essentialising the distinction between 'adult' and 'child', which may unwittingly reproduce structural inequalities between adulthood and childhood by overemphasising the differences between adults and children. By focusing on the explicit, overt meaning that children give to well-being, such approaches have been criticized as being overly descriptive, reneging on the difficult work of analysis required to find meaning beyond the overt descriptions provided in participants' accounts. As one critic, *Arnd-Michel Nohl* (2019) suggests: "– it is not only important what they bring forward as 'definitions,' but also how they tackle these problems; that is, how and in which frame they take up the issue of well-being. In this sense, qualitative research should ask for the practical modus operandi of children's accounts and activities" (pp. 411f.).

4   The Praxeological turn

This brings us to the third major shift, from standpoint to praxeological approaches to researching children's well-being. Praxeological approaches analyse children's expressions of well-being, as 'situated accomplishments' that must be interpreted as manifestations of 'implicit cultural codes' (*Fegter* 2015, p. 530). Well-being is not so much a state that is achieved, but emotional experiences that are expressions of social practices, through which a subject position associated with a sense of well-being emerges.

Praxeological approaches emphasise well-being as performative, that well-being is always a doing and a thing done (*Horanyi* 2013). For example, *Fegter* and *Mock* (2019) reconstruct the spatial constitution of well-being as a cultural construct of discursive practices that children participate in. *Fattore* and *Fegter's* work on children and class, "focuses on the concrete and situated performative acts of 'doing difference' (*Fattore* and *Fegter* 2019, p. 68). This shifts the focus from 'differences' to 'processes of differentiation' and from an analysis of differences between pre-existing social groups to an analysis of everyday practices through which different social groups emerge (*Fegter* 2015).

Praxeological approaches have been informed by the linguistic and post-structural turn in the social sciences. However older traditions in sociology and anthropology also emphasise the performative in social interactions. *Erving Goffman* (1974 [1959]) focuses on the banal performances of self in everyday life. For *Goffman* performance involves the unconscious presentation of the self and conscious 'impression management' in social situations. In terms of well-being, we see this approach where the analytical focus of research is on what individuals do, which cannot be separated from discourses of well-being. Well-being is therefore produced in the interaction between individuals who participate in creating embodied social meanings.

Butler also emphasises that our capacity to understand the body cannot be separated from the social. *Butler* argues that social expectations are so embedded into our existence as to "produce a set of corporeal styles which appear as the natural confirmation of bodies" (*Lemert* 2013, p. 389). For *Butler*, this is most explicit and perhaps most developed theoretically in her argument that there is no identity behind expressions of identity; identity is performatively constituted by the very "expressions" that are said to be its results' (*Butler* 1990, p. 25). While *Butler* discusses gender identifications, one could usefully extend this to well-being. Well-being as a mode of self is only constituted in social discourse. Moreover, internal feeling states such as subjective well-being are always ascribed, because "the ascription of interiority is itself a publicly regulated and sanctioned form of essence fabrication." (*Butler* 1998, p. 528)

The concept of context creates somewhat of a challenge for praxeological approaches. In the act of doing or speaking, there is always something beyond the act of doing or speaking that is invoked by the act of doing or speaking itself, so that the performative can be meaningful. Context is conceptualised in various ways in these theories, including, quite influentially, as language structures. *Austin's* concept of the performative stresses the importance of considering the speech act in its entirety, which allows the context of the utterance to be considered as integral to the meaning of the utterance (*Horanyi* 2013, p. 377). *Derrida* takes *Austin's* insight further suggesting that while meaning is always context bound, the parameters of context are endless (*Culler* 1981). It is therefore always possible to add further contextual information that may change the meaning of particular utterances. However ordinary language must be repeatable to form a system of communication that is meaningful amongst interlocutors. This depends not only on what is included but also what is excluded in the system of language.

This analysis focuses our attention on the fact that words do something in the world. Butler might analyse how the category of well-being is constructed in such a way that well-being is constitutive of subjectivities, in that language shapes our understanding of the world and the limits of our thinking. Moreover, the emphasis on the constitutive and differentiating power of language means that, as *Fegter* and *Mock* (2019) point out, an

analysis of well-being must involve how the terms 'well' and 'being' are premised on a distinction from other meanings. It is only on the basis of this difference that the concept of 'well-being' has any meaning (*Fegter/Mock* 2019). However, without some understanding of the characteristics of the context or the structure of the language in which the term 'well-being' is used, then any subject position identified will be necessarily unstable (*Horanyi* 2013, p. 388). For well-being research, this raises a significant problem. If there is no essential subject preceding or separate to individual acts then notions of freedom, individual choice, responsibility and agency rest on unstable foundations. Given that these concepts- of freedom, individual choice, responsibility and agency- have traditionally also been central to notions of well-being, praxeological approaches challenge any essential definition of what well-being might be.

5   An alternative frame

One might complement this approach with a framework that explicitly engages with forms of materiality, the kind of approach offered by objective and subjective, approaches to well-being. The focus on language in praxeological approaches risks overlooking the material aspects of inequalities in well-being that many of these analysts wish to understand, because of a linguistic idealism that does not sufficiently attend to economic and political dimensions of well-being. Nonetheless, a focus on performance as the contingent, embodied reiteration of cultural scripts, that allows analysis of how quotidian acts are performances of social norms, is worthwhile to understanding how well-being is constructed through ongoing interactions.

An alternative frame might draw upon the advantages of the various movements in well-being research that have been outlined in this paper. Objective approaches draw our attention to the distribution of material resources. Subjective approaches provide measures of individual preferences at a population level, and standpoint approaches provide 'insider' perspectives on factors that are important to a sense of well-being. If we consider the necessity for both 'objective' standards from which we can evaluate well-being and that well-being is experiential and normative, we could conceive well-being as constituted through two forms of integration: as *social integration* – which focuses on the importance of language as expression and constitutive of social norms in culture, which is the focus of praxeological approaches; and as *system integration* – which emphasises the material distribution of well-being and well-being resources, which is the focus of objective, subjective and standpoint approaches.

The concept of integration is a foundational one in sociology and has been used in social theory in a variety of ways. For example, *Durkheim* (*Durkheim* 1893/1964) described how social integration in modern societies is achieved through a complex division of labour. Modern society, in *Durkheim's* view, is held together by the specialization of people and their need for the services provided by others. More recent theorists examine the relationship between structures of social relationships, that is, the concrete connections among social actors and social integration. For instance, *Jürgen Habermas* (1984) distinguishes between social integration of the life-world and system integration of markets and the state. The categorisation of well-being as social and system integration referred to in this paper draws influence from *Thomas Weisner's* (2014) cultural approach, which

shares some affinity with praxeological approaches; and the work of *Andrew Sayer* (2005) on the classed basis of socially-valued resources.

Weisner defines well-being as "the engaged participation in activities that are deemed desirable and valued in a cultural community and the psychological experiences that are produced by such engagement" (*Weisner* 2014, p. 90). This definition of well-being makes a clear link between having socially valued goods and well-being; however, what these socially valued goods are cannot be specified in advance. They must be identified through empirical analysis. Here the value of praxeological approaches is especially pertinent, in their ability to identify the performative reiteration of social norms that sediment into culturally specific forms of well-being – that is of culturally specific socially valued goods. One might identify what these socially valued goods are via observation of the performative acts of doing well-being, including emotional expressions which constitute subject positions related to doing well-being – for example of being positioned as a moral actor, of demonstrating certain kinds of taste, of having physical prowess; which always involve a process of differentiation from implicit positions of, for example being immoral, lacking style or being lazy. In so doing, praxeological approaches identify cultural forms which are constitutive of well-being. We might deem this possession of socially valued goods, as expressions of valued cultural practices, social integration.

However, a further step is required that examines how definition and possession of culturally specific socially valued goods (well-being) is contested within a society, and a source of inequality between groups. This level of analysis would focus on how forms of well-being are deployed as a source of power by groups in dominant positions to maintain their status. This maintenance of status and power could be achieved by monopolising definitions of what is socially valued (e.g. hegemony), or by controlling the stocks of socially valued goods (e.g. politics and law). Here, *Andrew Sayer's* work on the moral dimensions of class is particularly helpful. According to *Sayer*, those who are deemed economically disadvantaged, poor or socially excluded are disadvantaged because they "lack the means to live in ways which they, as well as others, value" (2005, p. 948f.). Well-being, as activities that are deemed desired and valued in a cultural community, also reflects such inequalities. We might ask how certain resources become socially valued and others not, and therefore through which processes does the universalisation and naturalization of a particular set of norms as being valuable occur, and in whose interests does this universalisation and naturalization serve. Here we might refer to the ways in which the steering mediums of money and power facilitate the unequal distribution of such goods – what we can describe in terms of system integration. A key role for the analyst of well-being is to determine how systems of power reproduce taken-for-granted concepts and in so doing distribute modes of advantage, through the determination and allocation of socially valued goods. Standpoint approaches would help identify what these socially valued resources are; subjective well-being approaches might provide information on how individuals assess their own well-being in terms of possession of these resources; and objective approaches might measure the distribution of socially valued resources across the population.

6   Conclusion

The narrative outlined in this paper is not one of a linear shift in well-being research. All the approaches described in this paper can be identified in the work of various social scientists, who continue to contribute to the child well-being research field. Yet, developments in child well-being research have occurred, the impetus of which has, in part, been intellectual critiques offered by different academic actors in the field. This paper has merely provided a broad outline of some of these developments, with a proper accounting of these developments still to be undertaken. Such an undertaking would require not only an analysis of the relationship between the various approaches outlined in this paper, but how different traditions have emerged in response to material, historical and social circumstances.

To offer some initial thoughts, objective, subjective and standpoint approaches maintain a belief in forms of progress and in the integrity of the stable subject - being part of intellectual traditions that are a product of modernist drives in social science. These intellectual traditions were highly influenced by post-WWII critical theory and developed in parallel with the welfare state. These approaches therefore maintain a belief in scientific rationality as providing a foundation for social progress. Praxeological approaches could be interpreted within the context of larger debates regarding developments in post-industrial capitalism. As *Frederic Jameson* (1984) has argued, the intellectual traditions of post-structuralism and postmodernism have their societal counterpoints in the cultural logic of late capitalism.

Note

1   There have also been recent developments associated with SWB approaches that are still primarily concerned with seeing children in terms of 'well-becoming', that is framing well-being in terms of the attainment of developmental milestones. While not strictly adopting a SWB approach, they are part of the new approaches in child well-being research described by *Ben-Arieh*. An important example that uses an explicitly developmental approach within a subjective well-being frame is evident in economics of child well-being research (*Conti/Heckma*n 2014), that focuses explicitly on the acquisition of a set of cognitive, biological and psychological capacities essential for future productivity. Similar developmental concerns are evident in other disciplinary approaches to child well-being, including in the fields of neuroscience (*Jabès/Nelson* 2014), educational sciences (*Andresen* 2014), public health (*Brinkman/Stanley* 2014) and criminology (*Ajzenstadt* 2014).

References

A*dams, S./Savahl, S./Florence, M./Jackson, K.* (2019): Considering the Natural Environment in the Creation of Child-Friendly Cities: Implications for Children's Subjective Well-Being. Child Indicators Research, 12, 2, pp. 545-567. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-018-9531-x

Ahmed, M./Zaman, M. (2019): Children's Self-Concept of their Well-Being in Rawalpindi and Islamabad: Actor's Perspectives of Identity and Existence' Child Indicators Research, 12, 2, pp. 501-523. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-018-9552-5

Ajzenstadt, M. (2014): Well-Being of Children: A Criminologic Perspective. In: *Ben-Arieh, A./Casas, F/Frønes, I./Korbin, J. E.* (Eds.): Handbook of Child Well-Being: Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective. – Dordrecht, pp. 351-361. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_19

Akkan, B./Müderrisoglu, S./Uyan-Semerci, P. (2019): How Do Children Contextualize Their Well-Being? Methodological Insights from a Neighborhood Based Qualitative Study in Istanbul. Child Indicators Research, 12, 2, pp. 443-460. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-018-9532-9

Andresen, S. (2014): Educational Science and Child Well-Being. In: *Ben-Arieh, A./Casas, F./Frønes, I./Korbin, J. E.* (Eds.): Handbook of Child Well-Being: Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective. – Dordrecht, pp. 249-278. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_11

Annie E. Casey Foundation (2019): Kids Count Data Book 2019: State Trends in Child Well-being. – Baltimore.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) (2018): Children's Headline Indicators. Online available at:
https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/children-youth/childrens-headline-indicators/contents/overview, date: 28.04.2020.

Ben-Arieh, A. (2000): Beyond welfare: measuring and monitoring the state of children–new trends and domains. Social indicators research, 52, 3, pp. 235-257. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007009414348

Ben-Arieh, A. (2008): The child indicators movement: Past, present, and future. Child Indicators Research, 1, 1, pp. 3-16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-007-9003-1

Ben-Arieh, A. (2010): From Child Welfare to Children Well-Being: The Child Indicators Perspective. In: *Kamerman, S. B./Phipps, S./Ben-Arieh, A.* (Eds.): From Child Welfare to Child Well-Being: An International Perspective on Knowledge in the Service of Policy Making. – Dordrecht, pp: 9-22. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-3377-2_2

Ben-Arieh, A./Casas, F./Frønes, I./Korbin, J. E. (2014): Multifaceted concept of childwell-being. In: *Ben-Arieh, A./Casas, F./Frønes, I./Korbin, J. E.* (Eds.): Handbook of Child Well-Being. Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective. – Dordrecht, pp. 1-28.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_134

Bentham, J. (1789): Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. – Oxford.

Betz, T. (2013): Counting What Counts. How Children are Represented in National and International Reporting Systems. Child Indicators Research, 6, 4, pp. 637-657.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-013-9198-2

Brinkman, S./Stanley, F. (2014): Public Health Aspects of Child Well-Being. In: *Ben-Arieh, A./Casas, F./Frønes, I./Korbin, J. E.* (Eds.): Handbook of Child Well-Being: Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective. – Dordrecht, pp. 317-350.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_16,%20

Butler, J. (1988): Performative acts and gender constitution: an essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. Theatre Journal 40, 4, pp. 519-31. https://doi.org/10.2307/3207893,%20

Butler, J. (1990): Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. – New York.

Conti, G./Heckman, J. J. (2014): Economics of Child Well-Being. In: *Ben-Arieh, A./Casas, F./Frønes, I./Korbin, J. E.* (Eds.): Handbook of Child Well-Being: Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective. – Dordrecht, pp. 363-401. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_21,%20

Culler, J. (1981): Convention and meaning: Derrida and Austin. New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation, 13, 1, pp. 15-30. https://doi.org/10.2307/468640

Cummins, R./Lau, A. (2005): Personal Wellbeing Index – School Children (PWI-SC) English. – Deakin.

Durkheim, E. (1893/1964): The Division of Labor in Society. – New York.

Fattore, T./Fegter, S. (2019): Children, social class and social practices: A theoretical analysis of children's practices of class distinction. Children and Youth Services Review, 97, pp. 67-75.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.06.032

Fattore T./Mason, J. (2016): Children and Well-Being: Towards a child standpoint. –Dordrecht.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-0829-4_9

Fattore, T./Mason, J./Watson, E. (2007): Children's Conceptualisation(s) of their well-being. Social Indicators Research 80, 1, pp. 5-29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-006-9019-9

Fegter, S. (2015): Räumliche Ordnungen guter Kindheit. Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 60, 4, pp. 520-534.

Fegter, S./Hunner-Kreisel, C. (2020): Editorial for Special Issue - The Narrative of Major Shifts in Child Well-being Research. Diskurs Kindheits- und Jugendforschung.

Fegter, S./Mock, C. (2019): Children´s Emotional Geographies of Well-being: The Cultural Constitution of Belonging(s) in the Context of Migration and Digital Technologies. International Journal of Emotional Education, 11, 1, pp. 13-30.

Gabhainn, S. N./Sixsmith, J. (2005): Children's understandings of well-being. – Dublin. https://doi.org/10.1037/e531242013-001

Goffman, E. (1974 [1959]): The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. – Harmondsworth.

Habermas, J. (1984): The theory of communicative action. Reason and the rationalization of society. – Boston.

Horanyi, R. (2013): Performance and performativity. In: *Elliott, A.* (Ed.): Routledge Handbook of Social and Cultural Theory. – London, pp. 374-396.

Huebner, E. S./Gilman, R. (2002): An Introduction to the Multidimensional Students. Life Satisfaction Scale. Social Indicators Research, 60, pp. 115-122. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021252812882

Hunner-Kreisel, C./Kuhn, M. (2010): Children's perspective: Methodological critiques and empirical studies. In: *Andresen, S./Diehm, I./Sander, U./Ziegler, H.* (Eds.): Children and the good life: New challenges for research on children. – Dordrecht, pp. 115-118.

Hunner-Kreisel, C./März, S. (2019): Children and Participation: Mapping Social Inequalities within Concepts of Well-Being in Qualitative Research. Child Indicators Research, 12, 2, pp. 425-442. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-018-9598-4

Jabès, A./Nelson, C. A. (2014): Neuroscience and Child Well-Being. In: *Ben-Arieh, A./Casas, F./Frønes, I./Korbin, J. E.* (Eds.): Handbook of Child Well-Being: Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective. – Dordrecht, pp. 219-247. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_10

Jameson, F. (1984): Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. New Left Review, 146, pp. 53-92.

Kutsar, D./Soo, K./Mandel, L.-M. (2019): Schools for well-being? Critical discussions with schoolchildren. International Journal of Emotional Education, 11, 1, pp. 49-66.

Lemert, C. (2013): Cultural and social things: Is there a difference? In: *Elliott, A.* (Ed.): Routledge Handbook of Social and Cultural Theory. – London, pp. 209-217.

Mason, J./Watson, E. (2014): Researching Children: Research on, with, and by Children. In: *Ben-Arieh, A./Casas, F./Frønes, I./Korbin, J. E.* (Eds.): Handbook of Child Well-Being: Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective. – Dordrecht, pp. 2757-2796. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_109,%20

McAuley, C. (2019): Exploring eleven-year-old children's understanding of well-being using wellbeing maps: Commonalities and divergences across areas of varying levels of deprivation and ethnic diversity in an English Qualitative Study. Children and Youth Services Review, 97, pp. 22-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.09.015,%20

McAuley, C./Morgan, R./Rose, W. (2010): Children's views on child well-being. In: *McAuley, C./Rose, W.* (Eds.): Child well-being: Understanding children's lives. – London, pp. 39-66.

Nadan, Y./Kaye-Tzadok, A. (2019): The Virtual Arena: A Call for a New Domain of Child Subjective Well-Being. Child Indicators Research, 12, 2, pp. 461-477. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-018-9530-y,%20

Nohl, A-M (2019): Country Comparison and Multi-Level Analysis in Qualitative Research – Methodological Problems and Practical Solutions. Child Indicators Research, 12, 2, pp. 409-423. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-017-9497-0

OECD (2020): How's Life? 2020: Measuring Well-being, OECD Publishing. – Paris.

Redmond, G./Skattebol, J. (2019): Material deprivation and capability deprivation in the midst of affluence: The case of young people in Australia. Children and Youth Services Review, 97, pp. 36-48. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-017-9497-0,%20

Rees, G. (2019): Variations in Children's Affective Subjective Well-Being at Seven Years Old: An Analysis of Current and Historical Factors' Child Indicators Research, 12, 1, pp. 141-160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-017-9516-1,%20

Sayer, A. (2005): The moral significance of class. – Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511488863,%20

Seligman, M. (2011): Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being. – New York.

Thomas, N./Stoecklin, D. (2018): Recognition and Capability: A New Way to Understand How Children Can Achieve Their Rights? In: *Baraldi, C./Cockburn, T.* (Eds.): Theorising Childhood: Citizenship, Rights and Participation. – Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72673-1_4,%20

Tonon, G. (2013): Young People's Quality of Life and Construction of Citizenship. – Dodrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2996-4,%20

Weisner T. S. (2014): Culture, Context, and Child Well-Being. In: *Ben-Arieh, A./Casas, F./Frønes, I./Korbin, J.* (Eds.): Handbook of Child Well-Being. – Dordrecht, pp. 87-103. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_3

Ziegler, H. (2010): Subjective Well-Being and Capabilities: Views on the Well-Being of Young Persons. In: *Andresen, S./Diehm, I./Sander, U./Ziegler, H.* (Eds.): Children and the Good Life New Challenges for Research on Children. – Dordrecht, pp. 91-101. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9219-9_7