Psychosoziale und Medizinische Rehabilitation, 2025.38:5-14
DOI: https://doi.org/10.2440/008-0037-e

Eudaimonia and wisdom. A survey with the Questionnaire of Eudamonic Wellbeing (QEWB) and the Multi-Dimensional Wisdom Competence Scale (MWC15)

Michael Linden, Deborah Drieschner

Charité University Medicine Berlin, Department of Psychosomatic Medicine

Abstract
Background: Since ancient philosophy and also in modern life span psychology it is controversially discussed whether human well-being and the goal of life means hedonia, i.e. a positive state of mind and freedom from suffering, or rather eudaimonia, i.e. satisfaction with what one does and has achieved, even with the acceptance of suffering. This distinction is relevant for the personal lifestyle, encounter with other persons, and even psychotherapy.
Methods: Persons on public transport were asked to answer the Questionnaire of Eudaimonic Wellbeing (QEWB), the Multidimensional Wisdom Competence Questionnaire (MWC15) and the WHO5 Wellbeing Questionnaire.
Results: The scales show good reliability and yield meaningful factors in a principal component analysis. The study population showed a medium score on the WHO5. On the eudaimonia questionnaire as well as on the wisdom questionnaire, good scores were seen in about 90% of the cases. The scales correlated at a medium level. Wisdom and eudaimonia showed no gender difference. Eudaimonia was correlated with age.
Conclusion: The data show that the QEWB and the MWC15 are instruments with good reliability and validity and produce meaningful results. The majority of persons show good eudaimonia and wisdom scores. Limitations are that the recruitment procedure favours active persons.

Keywords: well-being, life goal, eudaimonia, wisdom

Eudaimonie und Weisheit. Eine Untersuchung mit dem Questionnaire of Eudamonic Wellbeing (QEWB) und der Mehrdmensionalen Weisheitskompetenz-Skala (MWC15)

Zusammenfassung
Eine Frage, die seit der antiken Philosophie, aber auch in xder modernen Entwicklungspsychologie kontrovers diskutiert wird ist, ob menschliches Wohlbefinden und das Lebensziel vom Grad der Hedonie abhängt, d.h. guter Befindlichkeit und der Freiheit von Leiden, oder eher dem Grad der Eudaimonie, d.h. der Zufriedenheit mit dem, was man tut und erreicht hat, auch unter Inkaufnahme von Leiden. Dies hat unmittelbare Relevanz für die persönliche Lebensführung, die Erziehung, wie auch die Ausrichtung von Psychotherapie. Es wurden Personen in öffentlichen Verkehrsmitteln gebeten, den Questionnaire of Eudaimonic Wellbeing (QEWB), den Mehrdimensionalen Weisheitskompetenzfragebogen (MWC15) und den WHO5-Fragebogen zum Wohlbefinden auszufüllen. Für die eingesetzten Skalen finet sich ein gutes Cronbach Alpha. Eine Hauptkomponentenanalyse erbringt sinnvolle Faktoren. Die untersuchte Population zeigte auf dem WHO5 ein mittleres aktuelles Stimmungsniveau. Auf dem Eudaimonie-, wie auf dem Weisheitsfragebogen zeigten sich in etwa 90 % der Fälle gute Ausprägungen. Die Skalen korrelierten auf einem mittleren Niveau. Weisheit und Eudaimonie zeigten keinen Geschlechterunterschied. Eudaimonie war mit dem Alter korreliert. Die Daten der vorliegenden Untersuchung zeigen, dass der QEWB und die MWC15 Instrumente mit guter Reliabilität und Validität sind und sinnvolle Ergebnisse erbringen. Mit der Einschränkung, dass

Menschen untersucht wurden, die sich im öffentlichen Raum bewegt haben, findet sich, dass nach eigener Einschätzung eine hohe Eudaimonieorientierung und gute Weisheitskompetenzen vorliegen.

Schlüsselwörter: Wohlbefinden, Lebensziel, Eudaimonie, Weisheit

1 Background

Already in Greek philosophy there was a controversial discussion about what constitutes "well-being" (Merril, 1944; Kahn, 1985; Lutz, 1995; Bobonich, 2010; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Bergsma et al., 2008). On the one hand, there were for example Aristippus of Cyrene, Epicur and others, who saw it as central goal in life to avoid pain, to maximize pleasure and to live for the moment, i.e. to have a good time in the sense of a hedonic well-being. This corresponded to the idea of Eros, the god of sensual love. erotic desire and lust. On the other hand, Plato, Aristotle and others argued that the central goal of life must be to lead a responsible life, in following higher human values, i.e. eudaimonic well-being. This corresponds to the idea of the god Anteros, the brother of Eros, who stands for caring love.

This distinction between hedonia and eudaimonia describes a fundamental anthropological question. The difference can be seen in everyday problems. Should you eat and drink as much as you feel and "have a good time", or only as much as is "good for you", considerung yur driver's license or health. Eudaimonia can destroy hedonia. Eudaimonia characterizes a positive way of life that extends beyond the moment. It is about coping with life demands and shaping a life in view of higher values and goals with regard to oneself, fellow human beings and the environment, and this from a lifespan perspective.

Building on lifespan psychology, there is much research on eudaimonia describing how people cope with life demands in different periods of life (Viterso, 2016; Heras, 2023). It has also found its way into clinical psychology and psychotherapy as part of wellbeing therapy (Ryff, 2023; Fava & Guidi, 2020, Linden 2024 a,b). The keyword „eudaimonia" brings 67,000 search results in Google Scholar.

Eudaimonia is described from different perspectives. On the one hand, it is understood as "behavior", i.e. someone behaves decently and appropriately. It is also a "feeling", i.e. someone is satisfied with himself because of what he does and achieves. It can also be a "goal", i.e. someone strives for higher achievements. Finally, eudaimonia is also understood as an "outcome", i.e. someone has achieved higher goals (Huta, 2013; Wei & Wang, 2020; Shin et al., 2022). Eudaimonia includes the ability to adapt to the environment, i.e. life situations, rules, norms or social expectations. It includes the ability to cope with complex demands in life. It includes self-coherence, i.e. recognition of goals and values, self-knowledge, integrity, balance between one's own needs and those of others. In this sense, there are references to theories of self-actualization (Maslow, 1968; Martela, 2023), personality maturation and development (Allport, 1961, Rogers, 2000), individuation (Jung & Jung, 1945), search for meaning (Frankl, 1987), and salutogenesis (Antonovsky, 1987).

Associations of eudaimonia with age are discussed, although the results are inconsistent (Ong & Patterson, 2016; Mackenzie et al., 2018). While aspects of personality development and meaning in life tend to become less important with age, self-acceptance, environmental management, and positive social relationships remain stable or increase (Ryff & Singer, 1998, 2008). A connection of eudaimonia with hedonic well-being is discussed, although this preferably relates the dimension of satisfaction. Eudaimonia also goes beyond education and intelligence in the sense of an independent factor of resilience and coping with life (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2015; Mise & Busser, 2020; Sun et al., 2023). Data from the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study (Clark & Lee, 2021) suggest that there is a relationship between the social status of the parents, the IQ of the subject in adolescence, with the degree of eudaimonia in the seventh decade of life.

There are a number of measurement approaches for eudaimonia (Carrozzino et al., 2019; Ryff, 1989). A specific scale measuring eudaimonia orientation as well as eudaimonia behavior is the "Questionnaire for Eudaimonic Well-Being, QEWB" (Waterman, 2010). Items are "I believe I know what my best potentials are and try to develop them whenever possible", "I can say that I have found my purpose in life", „I feel my best when I'm doing something worth investing a great deal of effort in" (see Table 1).

An important question is how eudaimonia can be achieved or even taught. Here, too, the ancient philosophers already knew that wisdom is a way to eudaimonia. Aristotle understood wisdom as the ability to identify complex situations and apply one's experiences and values to those specific situations in order to make a good decision (Reuting, 2016). Parallel to eudaimonia research, there is also extensive research on wisdom in life span psychology (Erikson & Erikson, 1997; Linden 2013; Law & Staudinger, 2016; Grossmann, 2017; Jeste & Lee, 2019; Muschalla, 2023). The combined keyword "Wisdom and Psychology" brings 1,870,000 search results in Google Scholar.

It is often assumed and partially confirmed in some studies that wisdom is associated with age. But, there are young people with high wisdom

Table 1
Response distribution on the QEWB scale (# Item evaluation is reverse)

This questionnaire contains a series of statements that refer to how you may feel things have been going in your life. Read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. Try to respond to each statement according to your own feelings about how things are actually going, rather than how you might wish them to be.	Strongly disagree (1)	Somewhat agree (2)	Mostly agrees (3)	Strongly agree (4)
I find I get intensely involved in many of the things I do each day	0.6 %	14.3 %	63.1 %	22.0 %
I believe I have discovered who I really am	3.0 %	18.5 %	53.6 %	25 %
# I think it would be ideal if things came easily to me in life	24 %	13.1 %	25.0 %	59.5 %
My life is centered around a set of core beliefs that give meaning to my life	2.4 %	15.5 %	51.8 %	30.4 %
It‘ is more important that I really enjoy what I do than that other people are impressed by it.	1.2 %	10.1 %	51.2 %	37.5 %
I believe I know what my best potentials are and ttry to develop them whenever possible.	0 %	16.7 %	53.0 %	30.4 %
# Other people usually know better what would be good for me to do than I know myself	3.6 %	6.0 %	32.1 %	58.3 %
I feel my best when I'm doing something worth investing a great deal of effort in	0 %	8.9 %	46.4 %	44.6 %
I can say that I have found my purpose in life	6.5 %	17.3 %	45.2 %	31.0 %
If I did not find what I was doing rewarding for me, I do not think I could continue doing it	7.7 %	48.2 %	26.8 %	17.3 %
# As yet, I've not figuered out what to do with my life	1.8 %	6.5 %	19.6 %	72.0 %
# I can‘t understand why some people want to work so hard on the things that they do	2.4 %	8.9 %	20.2 %	68.5 %
I believe it is important to know how what I'm doing fits with purposes worth pursuing	6 %	23.8 %	47.6 %	22.6 %
I usually know what I should do because some actions just feel right to me	4.8 %	16.1 %	58.9 %	20.2 %
When I engage in activities that involve my best potentials, I have this sense of really being alive	1.8 %	14.3 %	45.2 %	38.7 %
# I am confused about what my talents really are	2.4 %	10.7 %	28.6 %	58.3 %
I find a lot of the things I do are personally expressive for me	1.2 %	7.7 %	53.0 %	38.1 %
It is important to me that I feel fullfilled by the actions that I engage in	0.6 %	12.5 %	50.6 %	36.3 %
# If something is really difficult, it probably isn't worth doing	1.8 %	7.1%	12.5 %	78.6 %
# I find it hard to get really invested in the things that I do	3.0 %	12.5 %	38.1 %	46.4 %
I believe I know what I was meant to do in life	10.7 %	25.6 %	38.7 %	25.0 %

scores, and old people with low wisdom scores (Wink & Schiff, 2002; Pasupathi, 2001). The connection with intelligence is also complex. Glück & Scherpf (2022) discuss that intelligence, which should not be confounded with formal education, is a necessary but not sufficient prerequisite for wisdom, and primarily correlates only with the cognitive subdimensions. These correlations are also different in different age groups.

For the operationalization of wisdom, Sternberg (1998, 2013) has described a "balance model", according to which wisdom encompasses an implicit knowledge of how to create a balance between intrapsychic, interpersonal, and environmental requirements, i.e. a balance between one's own needs and those of other people and situations. Ardelt (2003) proposed a three-dimensional wisdom model with a cognitive component, i.e. the ability to understand facts, a reflective component, i.e. the ability to change perspective, and an affective component, i.e. the ability to receive emotional attention. In the "Berlin Wisdom Model", Baltes & Staudinger (2000) named factual knowledge and procedural knowledge, value relativism and tolerance, lifespan orientation, contextualism, and tolerance for uncertainty as core criteria. Grossmann et al. (2013) and Kross & Grossmann (2012) name the dimensions change of perspective, knowledge, self-control, contextualism, morality, self-transcendence, tolerance of uncertainty, strategy

knowledge, compromise orientation, sustainability. Glück (2016, 2018) describes people as wise when they are characterized by unobtrusiveness, self-criticism, self-reflection, altruism, peacefulness and tolerance.

In an attempt to summarize these different research approaches and concepts, Linden et al. (2013, 2019, 2023) proposed a multidimensional wisdom model. This includes *a wise view on the world* in the sense of (1) factual and problem-solving knowledge (general and specific knowledge of problems and problem constellations, what constitutes problems and what possibilities there are for solving problems), (2) contextualism (knowledge of the temporal and situational embedding of problems and the numerous circumstances in which life is involved), (3) Value relativism (knowledge of the diversity of values and goals in life, and the need to consider each person within their value system, without losing sight of their own values). Secondly, wisdom includes a *wise view on other people* in the sense of (4) change of perspective or cognitive empathy (ability to describe a problem from the point of view of different people involved), (5) emotional empathy or compassion (ability to put oneself in the emotional experience of another person). Thirdly, wisdom includes a *wise view on oneself* in the sense of (6) self-knowledge, self-relativization and self-acceptance (ability to recognize and comprehend one's perceptions and evaluations of oneself from the point of view of other people), (7) self-relativization (ability to accept that oneself is not always the most important, and that many things do not go according to one's own will or are oriented toward one's own interests), (8) relativization of problems and demands (ability to be modest and to accept that one's own problems should not be taken so seriously compared to many problems in the world), (9) Emotion perception and acceptance (ability to perceive and accept one's own feelings), (10) Emotional serenity and humor (ability to be emotionally balanced, not to be carried away by emotions, to manage one's own emotions according to situational requirements, including the ability to look at oneself and one's own difficulties with humor). Finally, wisdom includes a *wise view on time*, i.e. past and future, in the sense of (11) sustainability (knowledge of negative and positive aspects of every event and behavior, the distinction between short-term and long-term consequences, and the many contradictory consequences.), (12) tolerance of uncertainty (knowledge of life's inherent uncertainty about the past, present and future), (13) Turning away from the past and forgiveness (ability to let things rest and accept them as they were and are, and in particular to free oneself from the compulsion to have to follow suit).

There are a number of wisdom scales in which the various scientists try to operationalize their concepts, like the "three-dimensional wisdom scale" by Ardelt (2003) or the "self-assessed wisdom scale" by Webster (2003). In our own group (Schrader & Muschalla, 2022; Meier-Credner et al., 2023a, 2023b; Muschalla, 2023; Muschalla et al., 2022; Linden et al., 2024; Tofighi et al., 2024), the "MWC15 Scale (Multidimensional Wisdom Competence Scale)" was developed in an empirical stepwise process, starting with 56 items (Linden, 2024). A pre- or analogue version is the 12WD scale (Linden et al., 2019; Muschalla, 2023), whose items ask for more general attitudes (e.g. 12-WD: In my opinion, everyone should be happy in their own way). Many people agree with such wisdom attitudes, but still can have problems to act wisely in daily life. Therefore, the MWC15 was developed, which asks for wise behavior in problem situations (e.g. MWC15: Whenever I have problems, I first take my time to clarify what exactly happened = factual knowledge). The MWC15 covers all of the aforementioned wisdom dimensions with one item each (see tab 2).

A question of theoretical interest and in need of further empirical data is the relation between eudaimonia and wisdom. In the longitudinal MIDUS study (Pancheva et al., 2021) eudaimonia and hedonia covaried in about 70% of individuals, but were independent in 30%. Higher scores were found with older age, and somewhat with higher incomes, higher levels of education, married status and female gender. Improvements in overall well-being were found over ten years especially in people with initially high hedonic and low eudaimonic well-being.

In the present study, the relationship between eudaimonia orientation, wisdom competences and subjective well-being was investigated using the QEWB, the MWC15 scale and the WHO5 scale. The hypothesis is that eudaimonia orientation, wisdom competences and psychological well-being are correlated, but at the same time can be seen as independent psychological dimensions.

2 Methods

2.1 Sample

People in city- and long-distance trains and train stations were asked to answer anonymously some questionnaires. Preferably approchaed were persons who had just boarded the train or were sitting at the window with a free seat next to them. At the train station persons were asked who sat on a bench.

2.2 Instruments

The "WHO5 Wellbeing Questionnaire (WHO5)" measures the current psychological mood with five items (Topp et al., 2015). The introduction reads: Please indicate for each of the five statements which is closest to how you have been feeling over

Table 2
Response distribution on the MWC15 scale

People react differently to problems and burdens in life. Please indicate what you are doing whenever you have a problem. There is no right or wrong.	**This is what I never do**	**This is what I sometimes do**	**This is what I often do**	**This is what I do most of the timne**	**This is exacvtly what I always do**
Whenever I have problems, I first take my time to clarify what exactly happened.	1.8 %	5.4 %	26.8 %	51.2 %	14.9 %
Whenever I have problems, I first check in detail what specific solutions there are	0.6 %	5.4 %	28.0 %	48.2 %	17.9 %
Whenever I have problems, I have to accept that there are external conditions that cannot be changed.	1.2 %	6.0 %	28.6 %	41.7 %	22.6 %
Whenever I have problems, I am aware that there can be many opinions on the same topic.	0 %	1.2 %	8.9 %	36.3 %	53.6 %
Whenever I have problems, it is important to me to understand what motivated other participants to do what happened	1.2 %	5.4 %	19.6 %	48.2 %	25.6 %
Whenever I have problems, it is important to me to realize that everyone involved can have very different feelings.	0.6 %	3.6 %	12.5 %	34.5 %	48.8 %
Whenever I have problems, I am aware that others are doing much worse.	2.4 %	9.5 %	24.4 %	38.7 %	25.0 %
Whenever I have problems, I try to be content with what I have.	5.4 %	22.0 %	33.9 %	31.5 %	7.1 %
Whenever I have problems, I accept that negative, unwanted and also painful emotions are inevitable.	2.4 %	7.1 %	28.0 %	43.5 %	19.0 %
Whenever I have problems, I do my best not to get upset.	5.4 %	15.5 %	33.9 %	31.0 %	14.3 %
Whenever I have problems, I remind myself that humor is when you laugh nonetheless	5.4 %	14.3 %	30.4 %	27.4 %	22.6 %
Whenever I have problems, I avoid rehashing past events.	1.8 %	14.3 %	32.1 %	32.1 %	19.6 %
Whenever I have problems, I accept that that many things in life can not be changed	0 %	11.9 %	32.1 %	36.3 %	19.6 %
Whenever I have problems, I keep in mind that in every crisis there can also be an opportunity.	2.4 %	8.3 %	26.2 %	38.1 %	25.0 %
Whenever I have problems, I am comforted by the fact that time heals all wounds.	7.7 %	20.8 %	36.3 %	23.2 %	11.9 %

the last two weeks. Notice that higher numbers mean better well-being.

Over the last 2 weeks..." This is followed by the items, such as "I have felt cherful and in good spirits " with the answer options "All the time (1)", "most of the time (2)", "more thn half of the time (3)", "less than jhalf of the time (4)", "at no time (5)". A score of ≤ 3 can be interpreted as indicator of good mood.

The QEWB (Questionnaire of Eudaimonic Well-being) has 21 items (Waterman et al., 2010). The opening statement reads: „This questionnaire contains a series of statements that refer to how you may feel things have been going in your life. Read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. Try to respond to each statement according to your own feelings about how things are actually going, rather than how you might wish them to be". Then follow the items, such as "I find I get intensely involved in many of the things I do each day".with the answer options: "Strongly disagree (1), "somewhat agree (2)", "mostly agree (3)", strongly agree (4)". In relation to this rating, a value > 2.5 can be interpreted as an indicator of good eudaimonia orientation.

The MWC15 scale (Multidimensional Wisdom Competencies Questionnaire) has 15 items (Linden, 2024). The opening statement reads: „People react differently to problems and burdens in life. Please indicate what you are doing whenever you have a problem. There is no right or wrong". This is then followed by items, like "Whenever I have problems, I do my best not to get upset", with the answer options "this is what I never do (1)", "this is what sometimes do (2)", "this is what I often do (3)", "this is

what I do most of the time (4)", "this is exactly what I alsways do (5)". In relation to this rating, a value >3 can be interpreted as an indicator of good wisdom skills.

For the socio-demographic characterization of the population, questions were asked about gender, age, a level of education similar to the Abitur, and whether there was a stable partner relationship.

2.3 Ethics

The study protocol was submitted to the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social and Educational Sciences at the Humboldt University of Berlin.

The subjects were informed in writing about the purpose of the study and gave their consent verbally and by their cooperation.

3 Results

3.1 Sample

A total of 168 people were recruited, including 45.2% men and 54.8% women. Their average age was 42.73 years (SD = 7.32), with a range of 15 to 88 years. 85.1% stated that they had at minimum a high school education, and 74.4% said to live in a stable partnership.

3.2 WHO5, Wellbeing

The mean value of the WHO5 scale was 3.03 (SD = 0.81), with a range of 1.4 to 5.0, showing an almost normal distribution. Cronach´ s alpha was .79. A score ≤ 3, which indicates good mood, was found in 59.5% of subjects. A factor analysis of the WHO5 showed only one factor with an eigenvalue > 1.

3.3 QEWB, Questionnaire of Eudaimonic Wellbeing

The mean value of the QEWB was 3.2 (SD = 0.34), with a range of 2.1 to 3.95, showing an almost normal distribution. Cronbach Alpha was .77. Table 1 shows the answers on the QEWB for each item. Answers with a value of 1 (strongly disagree) can be found between 0% and 10.7%, answers with a rating of 4 (strongly agree) range from 20.2% to 78.5%. A sum score > 2.5, which speaks for a general agreement with the eudaimonia statements, can be found in 95.2% of the test subjects.

A factor analysis analysis of the QEWB yielded six factors with an eigenvalue > 1. The factor 1 (coherence) includes items such as "I can say that I have found my purpose in life", "I believe I know what I was meant to do in life ", "I believe I know what my best potentials are and try to develop them whenever possible", "When I engage in activities that involve my best potentials, I have this sense of really being alive". Factor 2 (commitment) includes items such as "I feel best when I'm doing something worth investing a great deal of effort" "I find I get intensely involved in many things I do each day", "I can't understand why some people want to work so hard on the things that they do [reversed]". The factor 3 (engagement) includes "I am also involved in everyday tasks", "I belive it is important to know what I'm doing fits with purposes worth pursuing ". The factor 4 (fulfillment) includes "It is important to me that what I feel fulfilled by actions that I engage in. The factor 5 (self-determination) includes "Other people usually know better what would be good for me to do than I know myself [reversed]". The factor 6 (value orientation) includes "If I did not find what I was doing is rewarding for me, I do not think I could continue doing it".

3.4 MWC-15, Multidimensional Wisdom Competencies Questionnaire

The mean value of the MWC15 scale was 3.7 (SD = 0.46), with a range from 2.3 to 5.0, . showing an almost normal distribution. Cronbach Alpha was .76. Table 2 shows the answers on the MWC15 scale for each item. Answers with a value of 1 (this is what I never do) can be found between 0 and 7.7 %, answers with a rating of 5 (this is exactly what I always do) range from 7.1 % to 53.6 %. A sum score > 3, which speaks for a general agreement with the wisdom statements, can be found in 91% of the subjects.

A principal component analysis of MWC15 reveals five factors with an eigenvalue > 1. Factor 1 (relativization) includes: "Whenever I have problems I first take my time to clarify what exactly happened ", "Whenever I have problems, I am aware that others are doing much worse ", "Whenever I have problems I accept that many things in life can not be changed ". Factor 2 (change of perspective) includes "Whenever I have problems, it is important to me to realize that everyone involved can have very different feelings ". Factor 3 (de-escalation) includes items that also load to factor 1 "Whenever I have problems, I try to be content with what I have", "Whenever I have problems, I do my best not to get upset", "Whenever I have problems, I avoid rehashing past events". Factor 4 (emotional acceptance) includes "Whenever I have problems, I accept that negative, unwanted and also painful emotions are unevitable". Factor 5 (situation acceptance) includes "Whenever I have problems, I accept that many things in life can not be changed", "Whenever I have problems, I keep in mind, that in every crisis there can also be an opportunity".

3.5 Covariates

WHO5, MWC15 and QEWB are significantly (0.01, 2-sided) correlated (WHO5-MWC15: -.39**, WHO5-QEWB: -.40**, QEWB-MWC15: .38**). A low QEWB score and high MWC15 score is found in 4.8% of

subjects, a low MWC15 score and high QEWB score in 6.5%, a high QEWB and high MWC15 score in 98.7%, with no subject with low QEWB and low MWC15 score.

There is a statistically significant correlation of age with WHO5 (-.209**) and QEWB (.239**), but not with the MWC15 scale (.084, n.s.)

A comparison of men and women shows significant differences for the WHO5 (m=2.9, w=3.1, F=12.9, p<.001), but not for the MWC15 (m=3.7, w=3.7, n.s.) or the QEWB (m=3.1; w=3.1, n.s.),

A comparison of people with and without a higher education does not show any significant differences (WHO5: higher school education yes=3.1; no=2.8; QEWB: yes=3.2; no=3.2; MWC15: yes=3.7; no=3.6).

A comparison of persons with and without a partner does not show any significant differences (WHO5: stable partnership yes=3.0; no=3.0; QEWB: yes=3.2; no=3.1; MWC15: yes=3.7; no=3.8).

4 Discussion

The study population is an unselected sample of people using public transport. This cannot be regarded as representative for the general population in the strict sense, as this favours active people. In addition, there had to be a willingness to be approached and to support a scientific investigation. Accordingly, 85% have a higher school education. This is more than in the general population with 50% according to data from the Federal Statistical Office. Our sample can be compared, for example, with the Wisconsin study (Clark & Lee, 2021). Nevertheless, conclusion on the relation between psychological well-being, eudaimonia attitudes and wisdom competences are possible.

First of all, there is an average mood level with half in a good mood and the other half in a more negative mood. In contrast, there is a right-skewed distribution with regard to the eudaimonia orientation. About 90% agree with the QEWB statements. This is an interesting and important finding. The people in the study apparently do not only live for the day, but are more task- and future-oriented. Eudaimonia seems to be a general human attitude. This is in line with the results of the MIDUS study (Pancheva et al., 2021).

The items of the QEWB are phrased a way that face validity can be claimed for the results. In this context, the result of the principal component analysis is also of interest. The factors include a sense of coherence, commitment, engaement, fulfilment, self-determination and value orientation. These are core dimensions of all theoretical models of eudaimonia, which also underlines the validity of the QEWB.

This is similar with the MWC15 scale. It is constructed in such a way that fifteen sub-dimensions of wisdom are addressed in one item each. Of course, these are not independent of each other. In the principal component analysis, the summarizing dimensions were problem relativization, change of perspective, de-escalation, emotional acceptance, and situational acceptance, which reflect theoretical models of wisdom. Here, too, a normal distribution can be observed, but also with a pronounced right-shifted distribution. More than 90% of the participants state that they use wise strategies when confronted with life problems, i.e. ultimately approach problems considerately and do not let themselves be carried away by them. This corresponds to the results from the population-representative survey by Muschalla (2023) using the 12-WD scale, in which only about 10 to 20 percent of respondents showed a low wisdom score.

From the perspective of measurement theory, the question arises as to whether the QEWB and MWC15 should not be revised, since it is usually preferred for screening questionnaires that the mean value is approximately close to the scale average. However, this does not apply generally. For example, the Beck depression inventory (Beck et al., 1988) would show a value in the lower range of 5 in a normal population and not a value of 25, which only occurs in severe depression. For the MWC15, data are available from a sample of patients in inpatient psychosomatic rehabilitation. There, the mean value was 2.4, while in the present study it was 3.7. This suggests that the available data must be interpreted with a view to the sample of healthy and active people. The survey by Muschalla (2023) also shows significant differences between healthy and psychologically impaired people.

Regardless of the skewed distributions, the scale correlations show in accordance with theory that mood, eudaimonia and wisdom correlate. However, the correlation values of about r=.4 are in a moderate range, which suggests that the scales do not measure the same dimension. So it makes sense not only theoretically, but also empirically, to distinguish between mood, eudaimonia, and wisdom.

There are no differences depending on school education or partnership. This is opposite to what could have been expected, since intelligence is at least partially associated with eudaimonia and wisdom. Wisdom and eudaimonia could also stabilize partner relationships. Why such correlations are not found in our study cannot be said from the data.

The missing connection with age also raises questions. It would be theoretically plausible to assume that wisdom correlates with age. Our findings are in line with the results from the population survey by Muschalla (2023) and thus supports the thesis that wisdom is not an age variable. Eudaimonia orientation, on the other hand, is increasing and, interestingly, so is the general subjective mood. This supports findings on "successful ageing" and the ageing paradox (Thomas et al., 2016).

The comparison with gender, on the other hand, seems to be in line with theory. It is common knowledge that men and women differ in terms of mood. Accordingly, there is a tendency towards a more negative emotional state among women. There are no differences in eudaimonia and wisdom, which speaks for gender independence.

In summary, the data of the present study show that the QEWB and the MWC15 are reliable and valid instruments, which produce meaningful results. The main result is that the majority of people have, according to their own assessment, an eudaimonia orientation and good wisdom skills.

Literature

Allport, G. W. (1961). Pattern and growth in personality. Reinhart & Winston Holt.

Antonovsky, A. (1987) *Unraveling the mystery of health.* Jossey Bass.

Ardelt, M. (2003). Empirical assessment of a three-dimensional wisdom scale. *Research on Aging, 25*, 275–324. https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027503025003004

Ardelt, M., Pridgen, S. & Nutter-Pridgen, K. L. (2018). The relation between age and three-dimensional wisdom: Variations by wisdom dimensions and education. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 73*, 1339-1349. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbx182

Baltes, P. B. & Staudinger, U. M. (2000) Wisdom: A metaheuristic (pragmatic) to orchestrate mind and virtue toward excellence. *American psychologist, 55*, 122. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.122

Beck, A. T., Steer, R. A. & Garbin., M. G. J. (1988). Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory Twenty-five years of evaluation. *Clin. Psychol. Rev. 8*, 77–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358(88)90050-5

Bergsma, A., Poot, G. & Liefbroer, A. C. (2008). Happiness in the garden of Epicurus. *Journal of happiness studies, 9*, 397-423. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9036-z

Bobonich, C. (2010) Socrates and eudaimonia. In R. Fowler (Hrsg.), *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/ccol9780521833424.013

Carrozzino, D., Svicher, A., Patierno, C., Berrocal, C. & Cosci, F. (2019) The euthymia scale: a clinimetric analysis. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 88,* 119-22. https://doi.org/10.1159/000496230

Clark, A. E. & Lee, T. (2021). Early-life correlates of later-life well-being: Evidence from the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 181*, 360-368. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2017.11.013

Di Fabio, A. & Palazzeschi, L. (2015). Hedonic and eudaimonic well-being: the role of resilience beyond fluid intelligence and personality traits. *Frontiers in psychology, 6*, 152063. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01367

Erikson, E. H. & Erikson, J. M. (1997). *The life cycle completed.* Norton.

Fava, G. A. & Guidi, J. (2020) The pursuit of euthymia. *World Psychiatry, 19*, 40–50. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20698

Frankl, V. E. (1987). *Logotherapie und Existenzanalyse.* Piper.

Glück, J. (2018). Measuring wisdom: Existing approaches, continuing challenges, and new developments. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 73,* 1393-1403. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbx140

Glück, J. (2016) *Weisheit: Die 5 Prinzipien des gelingenden Lebens.* Kösel.

Glück, J. & Scherpf, A. (2022). Intelligence and wisdom: Age-related differences and nonlinear relationships. *Psychology and Aging, 37,* 649. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000692

Grossman, I. (2017) Wisdom in context. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12,* 233-57. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616672066

Grossmann, I., Na, J., Varnum, M. E., Kitayama, S. & Nisbett, R. E. (2013). A route to well-being: intelligence versus wise reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 142,* 944. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029560

Huta, V. (2013). Eudaimonia. In S. David, I. Boniwell & A. C. Ayers (Hrsg.) *Oxford Handbook of Happiness.* Oxford University Press.

Jeste, D. V. & Lee, E. E. (2019) Emerging empirical science of wisdom: definition, measurement, neurobiology, longevity, and interventions. *Harvard review of psychiatry, 27,* 127-140. https://doi.org/10.1097/hrp.0000000000000205

Kahn, C. H. (1985), Democritus and the origins of moral psychology. *The American Journal of Philology, 106,* 1-31. https://doi.org/10.2307/295049

Kross, E. & Grossmann, I. (2012). Boosting wisdom: distance from the self enhances wise reasoning, attitudes, and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 141,* 43. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024158

Las Heras, M., Grau, M. & Rofcanin, Y. (2023) *Human Flourishing.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-09786-7_2

Law, A. & Staudinger, U. M. (2016) Eudaimonia and Wisdom. In: J. Vittersø (Hrsg.), *Handbook of Eudaimonic Well-Being, International Handbooks of Quality-of-Life.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42445-3_9

Linden, M. (2013) Wisdom and wisdom psychotherapy in coping with stress. In K. B. Koh (Hrsg.), *Somatization and psychosomatic symptoms.* Springer.

Linden, M. (2023) *Embitterment, Posttraumatic Embitterment Disorder, and Wisdom Therapy.* Hogrefe.

Linden M (2024a) Eudaimonie vs Hedonie als Therapieziel in der Psychotherapie. *Die Psychotherapie* 69, 63-66; https://doi.org/10.1007/s00278-023-00695-1

Linden, M. (2024b) Eudaimonia as a treatment goal in psychotherapy and psychosomatic medicine. *J Clin Basic Psychosom.* https://doi.org/10.36922/jcbp.2988

Linden, M, Lieberei, B. & Noack, N. (2019). Weisheitseinstellungen und Lebensbewältigung bei psychosomatischen Patienten. *Psychotherapie Psychosomatik Medizinische Psychologie, 69,* 332-338. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0813-2040

Linden, M., Lieberei, B. & Rose, M. (2024). Improvement of wisdom skills by wisdom psychotherapy as compared to behavioral activation. *J Cogn Psychother.* (in press)

Lutz, B. (1995). Aristipp. In J. B. Metzler (Hrsg.), *Philosophen Lexikon.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-476-03642-1_19

Mackenzie, C. S., Karaoylas, E. C. & Starzyk, K. B. (2018). Lifespan differences in a self determination theory model of eudaimonia: A cross-sectional survey of younger, middle-aged, and older adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 19,* 2465-2487. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9932-4

Martela, F. (2023) Self-Determination Theory as the Science of Eudaimonia and Good Living: Promoting the Better Side of Human Nature. In M. R. Ryan (Hrsg.), *The Oxford Handbook of Self-Determination Theory.* Oxford Unversity Press.

Maslow, A. (1968) Some Educational Implications of the Humanistic Psychologies. Harvard Educational Review, *38,* 685–696. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.38.4.j07288786v86w660

Meier-Credner, A., Linden, M. & Muschalla, B. (2023a). Wisdom-related attitudes in psychosomatic patients and in a convenience sample. *Cogent Psychology, 10:* 2227443. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2023.2227443

Meier-Credner, A., Eberl-Kollmeier, M. & Muschalla, B. (2023b). Similar wisdom strategies for different life problems. *Psychotherapie, Psychosomatik, Medizinische Psychologie, 73,* 370-377. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-2109-3512

Merrill, R. V. (1944). Eros and Anteros. *Speculum, 19,* 265-284. https://doi.org/10.2307/2853330

Mise, T. R & Busseri, M. (2020), The full life revisited: Examining hedonia and eudaimonia as general orientations, motives for activities, and experiences of wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 10,* 74-86. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v10i4.951

Muschalla, B. (2023). Wisdom capacities in people with and without chronic mental health problems: A representative survey on a general German adult population. *Journal of Clinical and Basic Psychosomatics, 1,* 0945. https://doi.org/10.36922/jcbp.0945

Muschalla, B. (2023) Wisdom capacities in people with and without chronic mental health problems: A representative survey on a general German adult population. *J Clin Basic Psychosom, 1.* https://doi.org/10.36922/jcbp.0945

Muschalla, B., Falk, N. & Schulz, V. (2022). Wisdom Attitudes before and after an Informative Talk on Wisdom Competencies–A Quasi-Experimental Study. *Psychosocial and Medical Rehabilitation, 118,* 37-44.

Ong, A. D. & Patterson, A. (2016). Eudaimonia, aging, and health: A review of underlying mechanisms. In: J. Vittersø (Hrsg.), *Handbook of Eudaimonic Well-Being, International Handbooks of Quality-of-Life.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42445-3_9

Pancheva, M. G., Ryff, C. D. & Lucchini, M. (2021). An integrated look at well-being: Topological clustering of combinations and correlates of hedonia and eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 22,* 2275-2297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00325-6

Pasupathi, M. (2001). The social construction of the personal past and its implications for adult development. *Psychological Bulletin, 127,* 651. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.5.651

Reuting, D. C. (2016). Weisheit. In D. Frey (Hrsg.), *Psychologie der Werte. Von Achtsamkeit bis Zivilcourage.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48014-4

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2001) On happiness and human potential: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 141-66. https://doi.org/101146/annurev.psych.52.2.141

Ryff, C. D. (2023) In Pursuit of Eudaimonia: Past Advances and Future Directions. In M. Las Heras, M. Grau, Y. Rofcanin (2023) *Human Flourishing.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-09786-7_2

Ryff, C. D. & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry, 9,* 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0901_1

Ryff, C. D. & Singer, B. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9,* 13–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9019-0

Schrader, K. & Muschalla, B. (2022). Subjective Wisdom and Wisdom Attitudes over the Course of a Short Wisdom Training. *Psychosocial and Medical Rehabilitation, 118,* 29-36.

Shin, S., van Riper, C. J., Stedman, R. C. & Suski, C. D. (2022) The value of eudaimonia for understanding relationships among values and pro-environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 80.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101778

Sternberg, R. J. (1998). A balance theory of wisdom. *Review of general psychology, 2,* 347-365. https://doi.org/10.1037//1089-2680.2.4.347

Sternberg, R. J. (2013). Personal wisdom in the balance. In M. Ferrari, N. M. Weststrate (Hrsg.), *The scientific study of personal wisdom: From contemplative traditions to neuroscience.* Springer.

Sun, W., Liu, L., Zheng, Z., Jiang, Y. & Fang, P. (2023) Why eudemonia brings more happiness: The multiple mediating roles of meaning of life and emotions. *Current Psychology, 42,* 18749-18760. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03058-2

Tofighi, M. & Linden, M. (2024) Wisdom Training and Coping with Burdens among Refugees: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol* (in print).

Thomas, M. L., Kaufmann, C. N., Palmer, B. W., Depp, C. A., Martin, A. S., Glorioso, D. K., Thompson, W. K. & Jeste, D. V. (2016). Paradoxical trend for improvement in mental health with aging: a community-based study of 1,546 adults aged 21-100 years. *The Journal of clinical psychiatry, 77,* 8771. https://doi.org/10.4088/jcp.16m10671

Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S. & Bech, P. (2015) The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 84,* 2015, https://doi.org/10.1159/000376585

Viterso, J. (2016) *Handbook of eudaimic well-being.* Springer.

Waterman, A. S., Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., Ravert, R. D., Williams, M., Agocha, V. B., Kim, S. Y. & Donellan, M. B. (2010). The Questionnaire for Eudaimonic Well-Being: Psychometric Properties, demographic comparisons, and evidence of validity. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 5,* 41–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760903435208

Webster, J. D. (2003). An Exploratory Analysis of a Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale. *Journal of Adult Development, 10,* 13-22. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1020782619051

Wei, X. & Wang, F. (2020) Selflessness and eudaimonia: Self-based processes of wisdom. *Advances in Psychological Science, 28,* 1880-1889. https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1042.2020.01880

Wink, P. & Schiff, B. (2002). To review or not to review? The role of personality and life events in life review and adaptation to older age. In J. D. Webster & B. K. Haight (Hrsg.), *Critical advances in reminiscence work: From theory to application.* Springer.



Prof. Dr. Michael Linden
Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin
CBF, Hs IIIA, Rm 15/16, Hindenburgdamm 30,
D 12200 Berlin
michael.linden@charite.de

Deborah Drieschner
Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin