

**REQUISITE HOLISM OF INDIVIDUALS AS A PRECONDITION FOR THE
HUMANKIND'S WAY OUT FROM THE 2008- CRISIS**

Simona Šarotar ŽIŽEK

Faculty for Economics and Business
University of Maribor
Maribor, Slovenia
simona.sarotar-zizek@uni-mb.si

Matjaž MULEJ

Faculty for Economics and Business
University of Maribor
Maribor, Slovenia
mulej@uni-mb.si

Sonja TREVEN

Faculty for Economics and Business
University of Maribor
Maribor, Slovenia
sonja.treven@uni-mb.si

Abstract

Actions and processes leading into, or out of, crises depend on humans' decisions, including the ones taken in the name of organizations. Prerequisites for prevention of repetition of crises, as well as for their abolition, include requisitely holistic individuals. Hence the humans/organizations should look at humans as multilayered entities. In synergy, not only as a sum, we define humans as: (i) physical, (ii) mental, (iii) social, (iv) spiritual, (v) economic, and (vi) specialized professionals, i.e. entities, marked by requisitely, though not absolutely, holistic pattern of relatively permanent characteristics. All these and other attributes form synergies. This gives the basis for behaviour of individuals, including in their roles as employees. It offers a possible answer to crisis of 2008-, if the individuals evolve from being merely owners to requisitely holistic creators, who enjoy subjective and objective welfare more than the others. So far theory has covered requisite holism of approach, but not of individuals' personalities.

Keywords: crisis, individuals, requisite holism, well-being

JEL classification: E60, M12, M14

1. INTRODUCTION

The crises of 2008– still last and will go on lasting; they seemed to be financial in the first period, but they have deep socio-economic roots. They were not caused by organizations, but by their influential members, to whom the influential members of the social organs – such as the government etc. – permitted to separate their responsibilities from their rights. This behaviour of influential persons and/through their organizations supports one-sidedness against the necessary holistic decisions and actions [Bertalanffy, 1968/1979; Mulej, 1974, 1979 and later]. Maybe they caused it even intentionally (Klein 2007, sum. after: Štefančič 2009), in order to perform more easily the neo-liberal privatisation of everything, including uncontrolled seizing of most of the world's wealth in favour of a very small minority of people. Their chance to seize it all is due to the Roman law defining ownership as 'the right to use and abuse'. This opposes the A. Smith's model of liberal economy [Toth 2008]. The neo-liberals have forgotten, and made practitioners of the 20th century forget:

- (1) That the liberal capitalism had, according to the theory by A. Smith, emerged against the misuse/abuse of subordinates in feudalism, which the people resisted and liquidated as the socio-economic order, while the neo-liberal capitalism made a 'feudal capitalism' [Goerner et al., 2008; Fleissner and Wanek, editors, 2009], and
- (2) That the humans are multilayered entities. In synergy – not only in separation – they are: (i) physical/biological, (ii) mental, (iii) social, (iv) spiritual, (v) economic, and (vi) professional, not only economic entities.

Therefore humans are marked by their whole patterns of relatively permanent characteristics, making individuals differ from each other. Everybody is a specialized expert with his or her more or less developed, but mostly rare, capability of creative interdisciplinary cooperation, too. The modern over-specialization inhibits it [Assimakopoulos, Theocharopoulos, 2010; Freyer et al., 2010; Leonard, 2010; Mulej et al., 2010; Steiner, Risopoulos, 2010; etc.]. On such bases experts developed their values and knowledge over time; narrow specialization with rather deep insights is favoured over broader insights, because the latter are difficult to attain inside one single specialization. Under the influence of circumstances, exposing only the competition and economics, the individuals became increasingly spiritually apathetic specialists, as they have not implemented the essence of their existence - to be the whole, creative entities.

To settle the 2008- crisis, and to prevent similar crises from emerging, it is necessary to bring individuals nearer to the requisite holism, which enables them to create and enjoy subjective and objective wealth much more than the usual over-specialization does.

2. HOLISM AND WHOLENESS

Requisite holism has belonged to preconditions of success in every action over the entire human history. Since industrialization, business conditions have changed dramatically toward innovative society and global economy. Therefore there are too many data around, usually, and too little time to analyze them with all available knowledge of humankind of today. Hopefully, selection of data and information is not one-sided, but meeting the law of requisite holism [See: Mulej, Kajzer, 1998; Mulej et al., 2000; Potočan, Mulej, 2007]. In Tables 1 and 2 see the basic characteristics of the Law of requisite holism.

Table no. 1 - The selected level of holism and realism of consideration of the selected topic between the fictitious, requisite, and total holism and realism

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| ←-----→ | | |
| Fictitious holism/realism (inside a single viewpoint) | Requisite holism/realism (a dialectical system of essential viewpoints) | Total = real holism/realism (a system of all viewpoints) |

Table no. 2 - Law of Requisite Holism in some details

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| APPROACH TO DEALING WITH AN OBJECT AS A TOPIC OF THINKING ETC. | A single viewpoint | Dialectical system of essential viewpoints | System of all viewpoints |
| BREADTH OF THE SELECTED APPROACH | One-sidedness | Requisite holism by co-operation of all essential humans and only them | Total holism by consideration of totally all viewpoints, insights from them and synergies of all of them |
| TYPE OF APPROACH | (Too) simple | Requisitely simple | Very entangled |
| TYPE OF SYSTEM | Single-viewpoint based system | Dialectical system | Total system |
| ATTRIBUTES OF OBJECT INCLUDED IN SYSTEM | (Very) few | All essential | All |
| RESULT OF APPROACH | Fictitious holism (in most cases) | Requisite holism (good in most cases) | Total holism |
| FOCUS MADE POSSIBLE | (Too) Narrow focus (in most cases) | Requisitely holistic focus | Lack of focus |
| NUMBER OF PROFESSIONS | One single | Requisitely many | Literally all |
| TYPE OF WORK | Individual | Mixed team of all requisite and different experts | All humankind in co-operation for total synergy |
| CONSEQUENCES | Complex due to crucial oversights, dangerous | No problem due to no crucial oversights | Simple due to no oversights |
| AVAILABILITY | (Too) Frequent in real life | Possible in real life | Not possible in real life |
| HUMAN BEINGS AS INDIVIDUALS | Fictitiously holistic behavior, dangerous | Requisitely holistic behavior, best possible | Not possible in real life, even in team work |

Systemic thinking has become unavoidable in the contemporary innovative society and global economy even more than earlier, because innovation requires it: reality is too complex for inventions to become innovations without requisite holism [EU, 2000].

Competitiveness has become difficult to achieve, if requisitely holistic thinking in the form of creative interdisciplinary co-operation lacks [Huston, Sakkab, 2006; McGregor, 2006].

Example: The 2008- crisis results from the lack of requisite holism in governments' and enterprises' behavior: they tend to reduce their understanding and practice of the invention-innovation-diffusion processes to the technological innovation only, although the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and European Union have defined that every novelty that its users find in their practice to be sources of their new benefit may be called innovation [EU, 1995]. On this basis, our typology has been renewed several times to currently include 32 types visible in Table 3.

Table no. 3 - 32 basic types of inventions, suggestions, potential innovation and innovations

| 'Innovation is every (!) novelty, once its users (!) find it beneficial (!) in practice (!)'. | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------|---|------------|
| Three networked criteria of inventions, suggestions, potential innovations, and innovations | (2) Consequences of innovations | | (3) On-job-duty to create inventions, suggestions, potential innovations, and innovations | |
| (1) Content of inventions, suggestions, potential innovations, and innovations | 1. Radical | 2. Incremental | 1. Duty exists | 2. No duty |
| 1. Business program items | 1.1. | 1.2. | 1.3. | 1.4. |
| 2. Technology (products, processes, ..) | 2.1. | 2.2. | 2.3. | 2.4. |
| 3. Organization | 3.1. | 3.2. | 3.3. | 3.4. |
| 4. Managerial style | 4.1. | 4.2. | 4.3. | 4.4. |
| 5. Methods of leading, working and co-working | 5.1. | 5.2. | 5.3. | 5.4. |
| 6. Business style | 6.1. | 6.2. | 6.3. | 6.4. |
| 7. Governance & management process | 7.1. | 7.2. | 7.3. | 7.4. |
| 8. VCEN (Values, culture, ethics, and norms in interdependence) | 8.1. | 8.2. | 8.3. | 8.4. |

Mulej and co-authors [2000, 32] define the human holism as an approach as a synergy made of consideration of: (i) the whole (systemic), (ii) parts (systematic), (iii) relations (dialectics, interdependence), and (iv) realism (closeness to reality, materialism), as a dialectical system: that is, all of them in synergy.

Some other authors come close to Mulej's definition, but not entirely. »Everything starts with understanding the nature of wholes, and how parts and wholes are interrelated. Our normal way of thinking cheats us. It leads us to think of wholes as made up of many parts; in this way of thinking, the whole is assembled from the parts and depends upon them to work effectively. If a part is broken, it must be repaired or replaced. This is a very logical way of thinking about machines. But living systems are different. Unlike machines, living systems, such as your body or a tree, create themselves. They are not mere assemblages of their parts but are continually growing and changing along with their elements. [Senge et al. 2005, 5]. – The latter definition is superficial: holism means that all attributes from all viewpoints and all their relations and resulting synergies are considered [Mulej et al. 2000; Mulej 2007]. This reality can of course not be captured by humans; therefore humans need Mu-

lej/Kajzer's law of requisite holism [1998]. It requires combining the specialization and (dialectical) system style of thinking and acting into a capability, which is interdisciplinary, in order to exceed the boundaries of single sciences and poor link-up of sciences in interdisciplinary creative co-operation, yet not at any level but at a level of the "requisite holism" [Mulej et al. 2000, 65].

As mentioned above, the perfect holism is not practicable and often not indispensable, and the one-sidedness is insufficient many times. Therefore the individuals strive to be requisitely holistic, thus successful enough to be able to overcome – at least temporarily - the law of entropy. They try to find a middle way between too much complexity and uniformity, but there is no a uniform, so called scientific solution, because of intertwining of science, intuition and happiness in the everyday life [Mulej et al, 2000, 73-74].

A look at the current reality on this basis is interesting. It shows that in its international documents the Western society, e.g. European Union, requires, but tacitly and indirectly, a requisitely holistic behaviour beyond the demands caused by market pressure, but it does not follow its own documents in practice of influential humans and/through their organizations. Wholeness of outcomes is does not attained; Bertalanffy [1968/1979] as the founder of the General Systems Theory has required it as a crucial precondition of survival decades ago. The 2008- crisis is a consequence of this mismatch and causes/reflects a major threat.

3. SOME DATA ON THE CURRENT REALITY

The following data confirm the above threat clearly [Božičnik et al, 2008; Brown, 2008; Dyck, Mulej et al, 1998; Ećimović et al, 2002; Ećimović et al, 2007; Kajfež-Bogataj, 2009; Korten, 2009; Stern, 2006; Targowski, 2009; Taylor, 2008; Wilby, ed., 2009; etc.]:

- The recent two centuries have brought both un-seen socio-economic development and destruction of humankind's future. Before industrialization the rate of economic growth used to be 3 (three) % per millennium, after 1820 5500 (fifty-five times) in less than two centuries. Since then there are 6 times more humans of the Planet Earth, every person using on average +5 times more energy, having 17 times more wealth, and 1.000 times more mobility, travelling today about 40 kilometres a day.
- We can no longer afford to emit every hour four million tons of CO₂, by burning fossil fuels, cut 1.500 hectares of wood, and add 1.7 million tons of nitrogen by mineral dunging the soil, like humankind is doing today.
- In the 6 (six) decades after WWII, only, the number of humans has grown 2.5 times, use of natural resources 7 times, while the Planet Earth has not grown, but become depleted increasingly, prohibiting us to any longer talk about the developed and underdeveloped countries, but of self-destroying ones only.
- We are all on the same – sinking – boat, but on different decks. The poor ones cannot change the current trend, while the rich ones are not willing to change it. For humankind of the current civilization to survive climatologists warn of the need to reduce emissions in the air, water, and soil for 80%, which can be attained with the given technologies, but not without critical changes of the current consumption patterns and big structural changes in production and use of energy. Only the renewal of natural preconditions for our civilization to survive, after decades of competition by destruction of nature, would cost more than both world wars combined, in a best case scenario, if the action is undertaken immediately. Postponing the action may increase cost to beyond 20 % of the world-wide GDP. The current affluence makes GDP an obsolete

measure of success, because it disregards crucial aspects of human well-being and happiness. They started only to work on new measures [See: Mulej et al. 2010, and references in it; Stiglitz, 2009a, b].

The theory that the economic growth is unavoidable at any price (Baumol et al. 2007) is equally leading to a blind alley as is the neglecting of humans' natural environment and happiness; it is related to the above cited piling up of tremendous cost threatening to cause poverty and no well-being of the generations to come. What leads to poverty without well-being is their usual combination showing in synergy that only 15-20% of humankind benefit from the innovative society that ruins the natural preconditions of life of all 100%. Data that the income level of poor, making people unhappy (and poor purchasers) in the entire worldwide population is higher than ever before in history, is exact in book-keeping terms only rather than in real economic terms (references above). The good picture is monetary only. Satisfaction with it is similar to satisfaction with being alive when falling from a high skyscraper and passing the second floor alive. Data is not requisitely holistic for the theory backing it to show the way out from the current blind alley.

A similar blind alley is the destruction of ambition by affluence; it is visible in abuse of drugs etc. rather than having the motivation for creation grow, while creativity is the central human attribute [Guštin 2007; Mulej and Prosenak 2007a, b; Šek 2007; Škafar 2004 in 2006;...]. Such findings put questions that do not tackle knowledge only, but human values/culture/ethic/norms (VCEN). VCEN direct acquisition and use of knowledge in interdependence with VCEN [Mulej 1974 and later, also: Mulej et al. 2008; Potočan, Mulej 2007].

In other words: The 2008- crisis reflects the industrial paradigm of society and economy, which has helped humans for a few recent centuries to overcome their overdependence on nature and resulting poverty. But 85% of humans still live on less than 6 USD/day [Nixon, 2004; in Crowther and Caliyurt, editors 2004]. When the industrial life was introduced, the number of humans and their consumption of natural resources were a small fraction of the current ones. Now, one sees that the Planet Earth is like a bottle with no chance to become bigger, but fuller all way to the danger of disappearance of the current civilization – soon. Abuses of both humans and nature by humans have been firmly incorporated in the industrial paradigm. The remaining alternatives are three (for summary and references see: Mulej, 2010):

1. To continue the same way as in the recent decades and thus to give our children and grandchildren a dying planet Earth, if any at all.
2. To make some make-up-like correction, which we have witnessed in governmental and corporate actions in 2008, 2009 and 2010, looking like a mere reshuffling the chairs on Titanic before crashing to the iceberg.
3. To introduce a radical innovation of the paradigm, including a personal requisite holism of individual as a basis of their well-being (WB) [for WB see: Musek, 2005, 2006, 2008; Musek and Avsec, 2002, 2006; Diener 1984; Ryan and Deci, 2001; Ryff, 1989; Ryff and Keyes, 1995; Ryff, Keyes and Shmotkin, 2002; Samman 2007; Diener and Biswas-Diener, 2000; Clark and Oswald, 1994; Di Tella et al., 2001; Frey in Stutzer, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2009; Easterlin, 1995, 2001, 2003; McBride, 2001; Van Praag and Frijters, 1997, 1999; Winkelmann and Winkelmann, 1998; Wottiez and Theeuwes, 1998; Sumner, 2004; Grü and Klasen, 2001, 2003].

We opt for the 3rd way. But it poses new issues and requires innovation of habits, including holism of individuals, ownership rights and duties, and humans' WB.

4. OWNERSHIP, HOLISM AND WELL-BEING

Let us repeat a basic finding and go on from it. The crisis of 2008- was not caused by the organizations, but by their influential members, to whom the influential members of the social decision-making bodies – such as the states/governments etc. – permitted to separate their responsibility from their rights. These persons forgot that:

- 1) The liberal capitalism had emerged to implement the French revolution's triple concept – freedom, equality, and brotherhood – in synergy against the earlier feudal abuse of humans by owners, whose subordinates resisted it; feudalism was liquidated because of its failure to foster requisitely holistic rather than one-sided behavior of power-holders [Goerner et al, 2008; Fleissner and Wanek, editors, 2009; etc.]; and that:
- 2) Humans are multilayered synergetic entities. In synergy – not in separation – humans have: (i) physical/biological, (ii) professional, (iii) social, (iv) spiritual, (v) mental/emotional, and (vi) economic attributes. Therefore humans are marked by a complex pattern of relatively, but not totally, permanent characteristics, making humans differ from each other.

The French revolution's 'freedom, equality, and brotherhood' concept opposes subordination, abuse, and absence/lack of solidarity, backed by absence of the requisite holism of thinking/behavior-at-large of power-holders. The modern humans demand and promise freedom, equality, and brotherhood, in their United Nations Organization's basic documents, and in constitutions of democratic countries.

The neoliberal concept gives the upper hand to freedom and leaves the equality and brotherhood merely to legal rather than economic arena. This is one-sided and therefore dangerous and detrimental rather than holistic and beneficial, not only for subordinates, but also for power-holders, once subordinates rebel in strikes, insurrections, terrorism, etc.

Democracy is more efficient than subordination; it activates dormant capabilities. Democracy depends on, and strives for, requisite holism by cooperation. Now-a-days, every human is a specialized expert, too, hopefully capable of creative interdisciplinary cooperation; this capability is developed less with over-specialists, against which Bertalanffy has created his General Systems Theory [Bertalanffy, 1979, VII], and more with specialists aware of, and having the ethics of, interdependence with each other and other nature around us [Mulej, 1974; Mulej & Kajzer, 1998a, b]. Under the influence of circumstances, exposing only freedom with no/poor consideration of equality and brotherhood by competition without cooperation in the period of the industrial and neo-liberal paradigm over the recent few centuries, many humans became increasingly spiritually apathetic specialists, as they have not implemented the sense and essence of their existence: to be requisitely holistic, creative entities enjoying subjective and objective well-being, rather than living tools as subordinated employees or persons abused by monopolistic and/or monopsonistic organizations/humans running them [Prosenak and Mulej, 2008; Prosenak, Mulej and Snoj, 2008; Mulej and Prosenak, 2007]. This threatens human's well-being and resulting economic success [see: Diener and Seligman, 2004; Diener and Biswas-Diener, 2000; Clark and Oswald, 1994; Di Tella et al., 2001; Frey in Stutzer, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2009; Easterlin, 1995, 2001, 2003; McBride, 2001; Van Praag and Frijters, 1997, 1999; Winkelmann and Winkelmann, 1998; Wottiez and Theeuwes, 1998; Sumner, 2004; Grü and Klasen, 2001, 2003; etc.]. Over history, humans have developed their subjective starting points as a synergy of:

- Values with which they can answer the question: what sense does their action make,

- Knowledge/insight with which they can answer the question: what is going on, and
 - Knowledge/skill to answer the question: how to solve the surfacing problems/topics.
- For details see [Mulej, 1974, and later; for a new English edition see Mulej et al, forthcoming]. Application of these three interdependent attributes and resulting answers has always impacted humans' WB. Humans can accomplish subjective and objective WB by requisite holism. Thus, we can elaborate the last line in Table 2 to define the requisite holism of approach and behavior of human conscious of her-self as a synergy of her being a:
- Natural, physical and biological entity, implementing active techniques to gain physical balance (healthy food, Ayurveda, massage and aromatherapy, relaxation, breathing techniques, physical activity, observance of biological rhythm, additional medical treatments, etc.);
 - Professional entity based on a specific expertise (education, training, gaining working experience within her professional career, etc.), including the capability of interdisciplinary creative cooperation, hopefully;
 - Mental/emotional entity, enriching sentiments, perception, mind and will-power by life balancing techniques (emotional intelligence, life in the present moment, positive thinking, etc.);
 - Social entity, building quality communication with others by techniques of professional and working development and social integrity
 - Spiritual entity, longing after self-actualization and the sense-making life, realizing it by techniques of spiritual development (spiritual intelligence, meditation, mantras, yoga, logo-therapy, practical Buddhist principles for building balance, etc.),
 - Economic entity, striving to satisfy her material needs as a person, family member, as a co-worker and as a member of a wider society (partnership, parenting, employment, membership in associations and political parties, etc.).

Background for personal requisite holism of humans is hence needed, but no model is known. There must be an alternative to the neo-liberal industrial paradigm of economy and society. Otherwise the way out from the 2008- crisis will be tough, if possible at all.

5. THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE INDUSTRIAL PARADIGM AND ITS RESULTING CRISIS OF 2008

In social-economic development terms, the 2008-crisis is not only a financial and economic crisis, but it marks the end of the 2-generation cycle of about 70 years in which the values of neo-liberal economics have been prevailing [Mulej 2000]. It was causing people to forget about the fact, that the industrial socio-economic paradigm was only a phase: a necessary and extremely costly phase. If it is not overcome, the current civilization will commit suicide soon [Božičnik, 2007; Božičnik et al, 2008; Brown, 2008; Harris 2008; Korten 2009; Martin 2006; Mulej et al., 2007; Prosenak, Mulej 2008; Taylor 2008; Wilby ed., 2009].

In other words: the problems caused by the industrial age and paradigm, cannot be solved by the same paradigm.

Thus, the crisis and the problems arising with it cannot be solved by the measures from which they have emerged; it is therefore necessary to create new solutions. One option is to have organizations and the entire world led by individuals, coming close to their own requisite holism of behaviour resulting in requisite wholeness of its outcomes based on the principle of requisite holism. The individuals approach it by their personal and personality development that can be achieved by a synergic implementation of several techniques.

Having in mind that the human is (in synergy) a physical, professional, mental, social and spiritual entity, implementing devotedly different life roles, she has to be preferably holistic – she has to consider all that is important to a highest possible level. Thus, the (requisite) holism of the individual as an employee should be established by a set of techniques, all way from the techniques enabling physical balance, the techniques of life art, and techniques of personality development, to the techniques of professional and working development. The requisite holism of individuals as employees has a positive influence on the success of organisations, through the successful managing of stress, work satisfaction, and WB. Thus, the organizations should create conditions for the implementation of the mentioned techniques for developing and strengthening of the requisite holism of individuals as employees, because they will get, what they will enable and appreciate.

It all depends on influential individuals, their integrity/complexity and requisite holism.

Thus, we define the requisite holism of an employee as an individual existing and conscious of self as:

- Natural, physical and biological person respectively, implementing active techniques to gain her physical balance (healthy food, Ayurveda, massage and aromatherapy, relaxation, breathing techniques, physical activity, observance of biological rhythm, additional medical treatments etc.).
- Mental entity, enriching her sentiment, perception, mind and will-power by life balancing techniques (emotional intelligence, life in present moment, positive thinking etc.).
- Professional entity, building her expertise by following professional literature and doing research.
- Social entity, building her quality communication with others by the techniques of professional and working development and social integrity (education, training, gaining working experience within professional career, etc.).
- Spiritual entity, longing after her self-actualization and the sense of life, carrying it into effect by the techniques of spiritual development (spiritual intelligence, meditation, mantras, yoga, logo-therapy, practical Buddhist principles for building balance, etc.).
- Economic entity, striving to satisfy her material needs as a person, family member, as a co-worker and as a member of a wider society (partnership, parent-ship, employment, membership in associations and political parties, etc.).

On this basis the behaviour of individuals, who are willing and able to practice interdisciplinary co-operation, becomes socially responsible. Social responsibility offers a possible answer to crisis, arising in 2008; hence the individuals evolve from being merely owners to requisitely holistic creators, which was considered necessary already by Erich Fromm, and before him also by A. Smith; such individuals enjoy subjective and objective wellbeing more than the others do, and have a better chance to overcome the 2008- crises.

6. WELL-BEING CAUSED BY REQUISITE HOLISM OF INDIVIDUALS

6.1. SUBJECTIVE, OBJECTIVE, AND RELATIVE WELL-BEING

Well-being (WB) is a complex construct whose meaning remains contested and its key distinction is between: (i) hedonic and eudaimonic WB; and (ii) objective and subjective measures of WB [SDRN 2005, 4].

One knows also the relative WB, which depends on one's comparison with people playing important roles in one's life [Revkin, 2005]. Diener and Seligman show the following partial formula for high WB [2004, 25; summarized after Prosenak and Mulej 2007a, 3]: living in a democratic and stable society that provides material sources to meet needs, having supportive friends and family, rewarding and engaging work and an adequate income, being reasonably healthy and having treatment available in case of mental (actually: medical in general, N.B. by us) problems, having important goals related to one's values, and philosophy or religion that provides guidance, purpose and meaning to one's life. In our contribution we will use subjective well-being (SWB).

6.2. SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

SWB is the main subject in the context of positive psychology [Musek and Avsec 2006, 51]. Diener and Seligman [2004] define SWB as the evaluation of an individual's life taking into account her positive emotions, work, life satisfaction and meaning. For Musek and Avsec [2002, 10] SWB is the main notion, which combines a series of evaluations, which refer to the individual's life, cognitive and emotional, general and more specific.

The concept of SWB covers 3 components: (i) the positive emotions and humors, (ii) the absence of negative emotions and humors, and (iii) the evaluation of life satisfaction [Musek 2005, 178]. The second factor of SWB tackles the emotional aspect of WB, which is composed of 2 independent components – positive and negative affect. A measuring device had to be built for measuring the 3 above mentioned components in order to provide the requisite information. Watson, Clark & Tellegen [1988: summarized after Musek 2005, 178] mention that positive and negative affection (PA and NA) is measured by numerous instruments and mostly the PANAS questionnaire (Positive Affect Negative Affect Scale) is used.

Diener and Biswas-Diener [2000; summarized from Musek 2005, 179] claim, that the dimensions such as optimism and the feeling of fulfillment should also be considered as parts of the concept of WB. Therefore we can speak about the emotional components of SWB, which are composed of positive and negative effects, and cognitive components, which are composed of, for instance, life satisfaction. Although the mentioned components correlate, they do not have the same meaning [Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2000; summarized after Musek and Avsec 2002, 12]¹. Anyway, it is not about money only.

“Diener's research indicates that there is no sole determinant of SWB. Some conditions seem to be necessary for high SWB (e.g., mental health, positive social relationships), but they are not, in themselves, sufficient to cause happiness.” [Eid and Larsen 2008, 5].

According to Diener and Seligman [2004, 1] individual's income is becoming increasingly less relevant as far as the differences in the growth of WB are concerned; on the other hand interpersonal relations and satisfaction at work are becoming more and more relevant. As important non-economic indicators of social WB the social capital, democratic management, and human rights are mentioned, while at work non-economic indicators have effect

on both satisfaction and profitability. Diener and Seligman [2004, 1] claim that the expected (economic) results are most often the effect of WB and not vice versa. They detected that people who are at the top of the WB scale have more income and are more successful at work as those in the lower region of the WB scale. Satisfied employees are better co-workers and therefore help their colleagues in various ways. Furthermore, people with a higher level of WB have better social relations. Such people are more likely to get married, stay married, and have a successful marriage. And finally, WB is also connected with health and longer living, but the connections between them are far from being completely understood. Therefore a high level of WB is not precious only in the context of WB, but it can also be economically useful.

These facts show that information from monitoring of WB at the organization and state levels is necessary for WB to become the main topic for the creation of the policy of management; accurate measuring of WB forms a basis of such a policy [Diener and Seligman 2004, 1]. Authors suggest that for the purpose of measuring of WB, positive and negative emotions, commitment, purpose and meaning, optimism, trust, and a wide concept of a full life be used as variables. At the same time they point out that for the measuring of WB, the researches are important which refer to social conditions, income, physical health, mental disorders and social conditions. James [2007] warns about the border between well-being and the end of motivation because of the affluence combined with complacency: the border is not objective, but subjective.

It could be added that on this basis one should monitor SWB, which supports people's creative work and cooperation, which can then lead to an increased objective and personal well-being. Hornung [2006; summarized after Prosenak and Mulej, 2007b, 6] also provides an interesting common denominator: happiness counts as a humans' constant goal and also as a comprehensive synergetic indicator of comprehensive WB, good performance, physical, psychological, and social health of a person. Hornung [2006, 334–337; summarized after Prosenak, Mulej and Snoj 2008, 6] states that for the good WB the following needs should be met: material needs, informational and, at the level of individuals, psychological needs, security needs, needs for freedom and action, needs for adaptability, needs for efficiency, and needs for responsibility.

“In recent years, a form of well-being in addition to SWB has emerged from theorists such as Deci and Ryan [e. g., Ryan and Deci, 2000, 2001] and Ryff [1989] based on the idea of universal human needs and effective functioning. These approaches are labeled “psychological well-being” and are based in part on humanistic theories of positive functioning.” [Diener et al., 2009, 251].

6.3. IMPLICATIONS OF SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

Kahneman and Krueger [2006, 22] mention that acceptance of self-reported measures of SWB, despite of the many caveats that subjective measurement requires, could have profound following impacts on economics:

1. Subjective measures of WB would enable welfare analysis in a more direct way that could be a useful complement to traditional welfare analysis.
2. The currently available results suggest that those interested in maximizing society's welfare should shift their attention from an emphasis on increasing consumption opportunities to increasing social contracts.

3. Focus on SWB could lead to a shift in emphasis from the importance of income in determining a person's WB toward the importance of person's rank in society.

Although life satisfaction is relatively stable and displays considerable adaptation, it can be affected by changes in the allocation of time and, at least in the short run, by changes in circumstances.

Very important is the connection between differences in SWB and economic growth. Inglehart [1996, 518; summarized after Tomer, 2002, 29] mentions that there is a dramatic increase in SWB, when a country changes from poverty and scarcity to a productive industrial country. After a threshold, economic growth no longer seems to increase SWB significantly. Inglehart [ibid.] found that nations that have once put the highest priority on narrowly defined economic achievement became economically secure and hence place a higher priority on non-economic, life-quality considerations, such as self-expression.

Let us stress it again: many studies indicated significant life benefits for people with high SWB. For example, individuals reporting high SWB had stronger social relationships than less happy individuals [Diener & Seligman, 2002]. In longitudinal studies, people with higher levels of SWB were more likely to be married at a later measurement [Marks & Fleming, 1999; Lucas, Clark, Georgellis & Diener, 2003]. A high individual SWB is a strong predictor of marital satisfaction [Glenn & Weaver, 1981]. At work, employees higher in dispositional positive affect receive higher supervisor's ratings and better pay [Diener, Nickerson, Lucas, & Sandvik, 2001]. In stressful circumstances, positive affect is associated with more effective coping with problems and better overall outcomes [Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002]. High SWB is associated with lower levels of suicidal ideation and behavior [Diener & Seligman, 2002].

Thus, SWB is related to successful outcomes in a variety of life domains. People with high levels of SWB are more successful in relationships, more successful on the job, and better equipped to successfully cope with stress [Pavot and Diner, 2004, 116]. Therefore organizations initiated intervening strategies for providing prime quality of work life to enhance WB of employees at the workplace to attain higher productivity, improve performance, and increase retention of potential employees [Garg and Rastogi 2009, 1].

As SWB is important for several reasons, the interventions to increase SWB are important too: it feels good to volunteer more, have more positive work behavior, and exhibit other desirable characteristics [Diener et al., 2002, 69]. Few direct intervention efforts have been implemented. This is a reason for programs [Fordyce, 1977] or examples [Pavot and Diener, 2004, 129-130] designed to boost people's happiness. Kasser and Sheldon [2009, 243] propose that businesses consider the possibility of »time affluence« as an alternative model for improving employee WB and ethical business practice.

Frey and Stutzer [2001, 22] identified the following examples of influence of happiness on important economic decision:

- *Consumption activities.* Kahn and Isen [1993] argue that happy persons are most likely to save and spend different proportions of their income, to distribute differently over time, and to acquire different combinations of particular goods and services than do less happy persons.
- *Work behavior.* Researches shows that happier individuals may differ significantly in behavior on the job. Literature on job satisfaction abounds [e. g. Warr, 1999], analyzing, for example, whether more satisfied workers are also more productive [Iaffeldano and Muchinsky, 1985].

- *Investment behavior.* Happier people have a different attitude to risk-taking than less happy people. Happier people may also prefer different markets and types of financial investments.
- *Political behavior.* Happy people are likely to vote for different politicians and parties and for different alternatives in referenda.

Very important is future research on SWB. Frey and Stutzer [2003, 3-4] argue that, further analyses of survey data will be worthwhile, e.g.:

1. To research the relationship between discrimination of women on the labor market and their life satisfaction [e.g. Clark, 1997],
2. To study the interdependencies in WB at the family level,
3. To understand how various indicators of the quality of life, e.g. crime, environmental quality or commuting, are related to SWB [e.g. Michalos and Zumbo, 2000],
4. To analyze whether social capital has positive external effects on people's WB [e.g. Helliwell, 2002];
5. To study how happiness affects individual behavior – people's level of SWB may influence many important economic decisions, e.g. consumption activities, work behavior, risk taking in investment, or even political engagement and voting behavior;
6. To improve methods to research on well-being; etc.

All these issues are gaining additional importance in the times of affluence, which we have briefly mentioned above.

7. WELL-BEING AND AFFLUENCE - A NEW DILEMMA CONCERNING THE 2008- CRISES

Porter [1990] in Porter and Kramer [2006] showed already in 1990, that the development of competitiveness passed through four phases: from competitiveness with natural sources, over competitiveness with investments, to competitiveness with innovations, and then to the phase resulting from it, as the experience shows, the phase of affluence. The latter has always been an essential wish of people and at the same time also a dead alley: having all, what you consider necessary, you have no ambition any more to work in order to have more, because you already have everything [See: James, 2007]. As the historical experience in similar situations shows, affluence is followed by ruining (for instance, the ancient Rome fell from one million to only 10.000 inhabitants). It is not possible just to continue with investments, on which the traditional economy is concentrated, nor solely with innovating, without reaching the affluence.

A possible fifth phase is necessary, which we see in intertwining of the creativity (for innovating and for other life contents, including the leisure time), social responsibility (to set wider goals, rather than narrow individual ones, which are O.K. only in the short-term and the consequences of which can be very expensive and even harmful in the long term), requisite holism, and the ethic of interdependence ('I need you and you need me, as we are different due to nature and specialization; let us therefore be less selfish for selfish reasons', to complete up each other by differences). This practice and resulting ethic of interdependence is a base, that the social responsibility and creation make sense to us. In the most successful US regions [Florida 2005] the creative class prevails because there is a prevailing socio-economic concept, expressed by '3T', that is a synergy of the tolerance, which attracts talents and therefore investing in technology makes sense.

The coming economic situation of the most advanced regions of the world that face affluence means: affluence makes their economic theory and practice lose ground – covering of needs with insufficient resources is no longer necessary, being the central topic of the economic aspect of life. Supply – under affluence – reaches beyond demand, even very much so. Therefore suppliers try to find their way by creating artificial and fictitious needs [James, 2007; Prosenak, Mulej, Snoj, 2008], total quality, low prices and broad range, etc; perhaps they include consideration of the natural environment, but more often they abuse it. Hence they threaten health, WB of co-workers and other people who cannot afford everything they see with others, etc. Along with that, there is also a threatening danger that people do not experience WB in their perception.

Thus, the solution of the 2008- crises is out of reach of the given traditional economic theory, because it suits conditions that are no longer around: conditions in which people did not have enough of material goods to attain their SWB. Of course, this is true of the richer 15% of humankind, but the other 85% do not have purchasing capacity; mostly, they neither have ambitions to belong to the one-sided consumer society nor does the natural conditions of the Planet Earth allow for the consumer society. Thus, we can finish with the dilemma raised at the end of the book by Božičnik et al. [2008]:

1. If the USA standard of living is not acceptable for the capacities of the Planet Earth, which one is acceptable both for the Earth and for humans?
2. If the Planet Earth can sustain one billion people, who and what will do with the other billions of population?

8. CONCLUSIONS

Crisis results from one-sided individuals having the duty and right to make global decisions as scientists, business persons, employees, or politicians. Their impact has been reaching beyond their capacity of requisite holism, intentionally or not. Consequences require innovation of their behavior as an informal way of attainment of the requisite holism of behavior and requisite wholeness of outcomes. Times of separation of rights and duties of decision-making persons must be over for humankind's current civilization to survive. The requisite holism of individuals is an essential part of this necessary effort. Values, culture, ethics and norms must be innovated in general, not technology only; otherwise the contemporary humankind will fall victim of its own mistake, which Albert Einstein has called the danger that humankind possesses wonderful tools for unclear or even stupid objectives.

References

- [1] Assimakopoulos, N., Theocharopoulos, I. A Cybernetic Approach to Virtual Collaboration: Collaboration Platform for the Public Education. In: Trappl, R., editor: Twentieth Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research 2010, Österreichische Studiengesellschaft für Kybernetik in cooperation with International Federation for Systems Research, Vienna, 2010.
- [2] Baumol, W. J., Litan, R. E., Schramm, C. J. Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity, Yale University Press, New Haven & London, 2007.
- [3] Bertalanffy, L. v. General Systems Theory. Foundations, Development, Applications. Revised Edition. Sixth Printing, Braziller, New York, 1968, edition 1979.
- [4] Božičnik S, Ećimović T, Mulej M (eds.) Sustainable future, requisite holism, and social responsibility, ANSTED University, Penang in co-operation with SEM Institute for climate

- change, Korte, and IRDO Institute for Development of Social Responsibility: Maribor, On CD, 2008.
- [5] Božičnik, S. Dialektično sistemski model inoviranja krmiljenja sonaravnega razvoja cestnega prometa, Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor, 2007.
- [6] Brown L. R. Plan B 3.0; Mobilizing to Save Civilization, Earth Policy Institute, W. W. Norton and Co., New York, London, 2008.
- [7] Clark A. E, Oswald A. J. Unsubjective Well-Being and Unemployment, *The Economic Journal*, 104, 1994, pp. 648-659.
- [8] Clark, A. E. Job Satisfaction and Gender: Why Are Women So Happy at Work?, *Labour Economics*, 4/4, 1997, pp. 341-372.
- [9] Crowther, D., Caliyut K.T. (eds.) Stakeholders and Social Responsibility, ANSTED University, Penang, 2004.
- [10] Di Tella, R., MacCulloch, R. J., Oswald, A. J., Preferences over Inflation and Unemployment: Evidence from Surveys of Subjective Well-Being, *American Economic Review*, 91, 2001, pp. 335-341.
- [11] Diener E, Seligman E. P. M., Beyond Money; Toward an Economy of Well Being. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5/1, 2004, pp. 1-31.
- [12] Diener E., Subjective Well-being, *Psychological Bulletin*, 95/3, 1984, pp. 542-575.
- [13] Diener, E. and Seligman, M. E. P., Verry happy people, *Psychological Science*, 13, 2002, pp. 81-84.
- [14] Diener, E., Biswas-Diener, R., Income and subjective well-being: Will money make us happy?, Mimeo, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 2000.
- [15] Diener, E., Nickerson, C., Lucas, R. E., and Sandvik, E. Dispositional affect and job outcomes, Manuscript submitted for publication, 2001.
- [16] Diener, E., R. E., Lucas in Oishi, S. Subjective Well-Being. In: C. R. Snyder in S. J. Lopez (ur.), *Handbook of positive psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2002.
- [17] Diener, E., Witz, D., Biswas-Diener, R., Tov, W., Dim-Prieto, C., Choi, D.-w., Oishi, S., New measures of Well-Being. In: Diener, E., Lucas, R., Schimmack, U. and Helliwell, J. F. (eds.). *Oxford (UK) (eds.): Well-being for public policy*, Oxford University, New York, 2009.
- [18] Dyck, R., Mulej, M. and coauthors, *Self-Transformation of the Forgotten Four-Fifth*, Kendall/Hunt, Dubuque, Iowa, 1998.
- [19] Easterlin, R. A., Building a Better Theory of Well-Being. IZA DP No. 742. Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit, 2003, at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=392043>, accessed on January 9, 2010.
- [20] Easterlin, R. A., Subjective Well-Being and Economic Analysis: A Brief Introduction. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 45/3, 2001, pp. 225-226.
- [21] Easterlin, R. A., Will Raising the Incomes of all Increase the Happiness of All?, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 27/1, 1995.
- [22] Ećimović, T., Esposito M, Flint, W., Haw, R. B., Mulej, M., Shankaranarayana, M. A., Wilderer, P., Williams, L., Sustainable (Development) Future of Mankind, SEM Institute for Climate Change, Korte, 2007.
- [23] Ećimović, T., Mulej, M., Mayur, R., Systems Thinking and Climate Change System (Against a Big »Tragedy of the Commons« of All of Us), SEM Institute for Climate Change, Korte, 2002, at: www.institut-climatechange.si, accessed on January 15, 2010.
- [24] Eid, M., Larsen, R. J., Ed Diener and the Science for Subjective Well-Being. In: Eid, M. and Larsen, R. J. (eds.). *The science of subjective well-being*. The Guilford Press, cop., New York, London, 2008, 1-17.
- [25] EU, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Innovation in a knowledge-driven economy. Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, xxx, COM(2000) 567 final, 19952000, at: <http://www.euractiv.com/en/future-eu/lisbon-agenda/article-117510>, Accessed on 20.7.2009.
- [26] EU, Green Paper on Innovation. European Commissions, European Union, 1995, at: http://europa.eu/documents/comm/green_papers/pdf/com95_688_en.pdf. Accessed on 16.5.2009.

- [27] Fleissner, P. Wanek, N. (Hg.), *Bruchstücke. Kritische Ansätze zu Politik und Ökonomie im globalisierten Kapitalismus*; ISBN 978-3-89626-837-2; Trafo Verlagsgruppe Dr. Wlfgang Weist, Berlin, 2009.
- [28] Florida, R. *Vzpon ustvarjalnega razreda*. IPAK, Velenje, 2005.
- [29] Fordyce, M. W. Development of a program to increase personal happiness, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 24, 1977, pp. 511-520.
- [30] Fredericson, B. L., Joiner, T., Positive emotions trigger upward spirals toward emotional well-being, *Psychological Science*, 13, 2002, pp.172-175.
- [31] Frey B, Stutzer, A. *Glück: Die ökonomische Analyse*; Working Paper No. 417. Institut for Empirical Research in Economics, University of Zurich, Zurich, 2009.
- [32] Frey B, Stutzer, A. Measuring preferences by subjective well-being, *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, 155/4, 1999, pp. 755-778.
- [33] Frey B, Stutzer, A. Subjective well-being, economy and institutions, *Economic Journal* 100, 2000, 918-938.
- [34] Frey B, Stutzer, A. *Testing Theories of Happiness*; Working Paper No. 147. Institut for Empirical Research in Economics, University of Zurich, Zurich, 2003.
- [35] Frey B, Stutzer, A. *What can Economist learn from Happiness Research?*. CESifo Working Paper No. 503; Institut for Empirical Research in Economics, University of Zurich: Zurich and Center for Economic Studies and Ifo Institute for Economic Research, Munich, 2001.
- [36] Freyer, B., Bingen, J., Helgenberger, S., *How Transdisciplinarity becomes a Member in the Club of Science – Some Preliminary Thoughts on the Contribution of Systems Theory to Theorizing Transdisciplinarity*. In: Trappl, R., (ed.) *Twentieth Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research 2010*. Österreichische Studiengesellschaft für Kybernetik in cooperation with International Federation for Systems Research, Vienna, 2010.
- [37] Garg, P. and Rastogi, R. 2009. Effect of Psychological Wellbeing on Organizational Commitment of Employees, *The Icfai University Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. VIII, No. 2.
- [38] Glenn, N. D., Weaver, C. N. The contributions of marital happiness to global happiness, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 43, 1981, pp. 161-168.
- [39] Goerner, S., Dyck R. G., Lagerroos, D., *The New Science of Sustainability. Building a Foundation for Great Change*. Triangle Center for Complex Systems, Chapel Hill, N.C., 2008.
- [40] Grü, C., Klasen, S., *Growth, income distribution and well-being in transition countries*. *Economics of Transition* 9/2, 2001, pp. 359-394.
- [41] Grü, C., Klasen, S., *Growth, Inequality and Well-Being: Intertemporal and Global Comparisons*. CESifo Economic Studies, 49/4, 2003, pp. 617-659.
- [42] Guštin, N. *Aktiviranje ustvarjalnosti za večjo inovativnost podjetja*, Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor, 2007.
- [43] Harris, E. E. *Twenty-first Century: Democratic Renaissance, From Plato to Neoliberalism to Planetary Democracy*. The Institute for Economic Democracy Press, Sun City, AZ., and Fayetteville, PA, in cooperation with Institute on World Problems, and Earth Rights Institute. 2008.
- [44] Helliwell, J. F. *How's Life? Combining Individual and National Variables to Explain Subjective Well-Being*. NBER Working Paper. No. 9065, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, 2002.
- [45] Hornung, B. R. *Happiness and the pursuit of happiness. A sociocybernetic approach*. *Kybernetes*, 35, 3/4, 2006, 323-346.
- [46] Huston, L., Sakkab, N., (2006): *Connect and Develop*. Inside Procter & Gamble New Model for Innovation., *Harvard Business Review*, March 2006, pp. 1-9.
- [47] Iaffaldano, M. T. Muchinsky, P. M., *Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis*, *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 2, 1985, pp. 251-273.
- [48] Inglehart, R. *The Diminishing Utility of Economic Growth: From Maximizing Security Toward Maximizing Subjective Well-Being*, *Critical Review*, 10/4, 1996, pp. 509-531.

- [49] James, O. *Affluenza – a contagious middle class virus causing depression, anxiety, addiction and ennui*. Random House UK Ltd etc., Vermillion, an imprint of Ebury Publishing, London, 2007.
- [50] Kahn, B. E., Isen, A. M., *The Influence of Positive Affect on Variety Seeking among Safe, Enjoyable Products*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20, 2, 1993. pp. 257-70.
- [51] Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., *Developments in the Measurement of Subjective Well-Being*, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20, 1, 2006, pp. 3-24.
- [52] Kajfež-Bogataj, L., *Zgodovina je polna poznih lekcij iz zgodnjih svaril*. *Le Monde diplomatique v slovenščini*, 050 October: 30, 2009.
- [53] Kasser, T., Sheldon, K. M., *Time Affluence as a Path toward Personal Happiness and Ethical Business Practice: Empirical Evidence from Four Studies*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84, 2009, pp. 243-255.
- [54] Klein, N., 2009. *Doktrina šoka: razmah uničevalnega kapitalizma*. Mladinska knjiga: Ljubljana. Canadian original: 2007.
- [55] Korten, D. S., *Agenda for a New Economy; From Phantom Wealth to Real Wealth*, Berrett-Koehler Publ., Inc., San Francisco, Ca., 2009.
- [56] Leonard, A. *Spreading Systems Concepts through the Practices of Collaboration and Symbiosis*. In: Trappl, R., editor: *Twentieth Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research 2010*. Österreichische Studiengesellschaft für Kybernetik in cooperation with International Federation for Systems Research. Vienna, 2010.
- [57] Lucas, R. E., Clark, A. E., Georgellis, Y., Diener, E. *Re-examining adaptation and the set point model of happiness: Reactions to changes in marital status*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 2003, pp. 527-539.
- [58] Marks, G. N., Flemming, N., *Influences and consequences of well-being among Australian young people: 1980-1995*, *Social Indicators Research*, 46, 1999., pp. 301-323.
- [59] Martin, G., *World Revolution through World Law*. IED Institute for Economic democracy., Sun City, AZ, in cooperation with Institute on World Problems, Radford, 2006.
- [60] McBride, M., *Relative Income Effects on Subjective Well-Being in the Cross Section*. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 45, 2001, pp. 251-278.
- [61] McGregor, J., (2006): *The world's most innovative companies*. *Business Week*, 24 April, 2006, pp. 63-74
- [62] Michalos, A. C., Zumbo, B. D. 2000. "Criminal Victimization and the Quality of Life", *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 50, No.3, pp. 245-295.
- [63] Mulej, M, Potočan, V., Ženko, Z., Prosenak, D., Hrast, A., *What will come after the investment, innovation and affluence phases of social development?*, In *Systemic development: local solutions in a global environment: proceedings of the 13th Annual Australia and New Zealand Systems (ANZSYS) Conference*, Sheffield, J., Fielden, K., (eds.), Goodyear: ISCE, Auckland, 2nd-5th December, 2007.
- [64] Mulej, M. et al., *Invencijsko-inovacijski management z uporabo dialektične teorije sistemov (podlaga za uresničitev ciljev evropske unije glede inoviranja)*. Inštitut za inovacije in tehnologijo, Korona Plus d.o.o., Ljubljana, 2008.
- [65] Mulej, M., Božičnik, S., Ženko, Z., Potočan, V., *Nujnost in zapletenost ustvarjalnega sodelovanja za inoviranje in pot iz krize 2008*. In: *Delo – most za sodelovanje: zbornik prispevkov = Work - a bridge to cooperation: relations with co-workers and different generations: conference proceedings abstracts*, IRDO - Inštitut za razvoj družbene odgovornosti, Maribor, 2009.
- [66] Mulej, M., *Dialektična teorija sistemov in ljudski reki*. *Naše gospodarstvo* 21/3-4, 1974, pp. 207-212.
- [67] Mulej, M., *Entrepreneurship Experience In Slovenia / Yugoslavia Before The Break Of Communism In Europe*. (For the Course: »International Entrepreneurship – Poland, Slovenia and Austria«, contribution as a visiting professor, University of Klagenfurt, October, 2004), E-book na spletni strani, 2004.
- [68] Mulej, M., et al., *Dialektična in druge mekosistemske teorije: (podlage za celovitost in uspeh managementa)*, *Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor*, 2000.

- [69] Mulej, M., Fatur, P., Knez-Riedl, J., Kokol, A., Mulej, N., Potočan, V., Prosenak, D., Škafar, B., Ženko, Zdenka. *Invencijsko-inovacijski management z uporabo dialektične teorije sistemov: (podlaga za uresničitev ciljev Evropske unije glede inoviranja)*. 1. izd. Korona plus, Ljubljana, 2008. (CD-ROM).
- [70] Mulej, M., Hrast, A., *Delo – most za sodelovanje: zbornik prispevkov = Work - a bridge to cooperation: relations with co-workers and different generations: conference proceedings abstracts*. IRDO - Inštitut za razvoj družbene odgovornosti, Maribor, 2009.
- [71] Mulej, M., Kajzer, S. Tehnološki razvoj in etika soodvisnosti, *Raziskovalec*, 28/1, 1998a.
- [72] Mulej, M., Kajzer, S., *Ethic of interdependence and the law of requisite holism*. Rebernik M., Mulej, M. (eds.): *Proceedings of the 1rd International Conference on Linking Systems Thinking, Innovation, Quality, Entrepreneurship and Environment STIQE, EPF, Maribor, 1998b*, pp. 56-67.
- [73] Mulej, M., *Lack of requisitely holistic thinking and action – a reason for products to not become winners*, In *The winning products*, Rebernik, M., Bradač, B., Rus, M., (eds.). IRP Institute for Entrepreneurship Research, Maribor, 2009, pp. 161-175.
- [74] Mulej, M., Potočan, V., Ženko, Z., Štrukelj, T., Hrast, A., Žižek, S. *The Global 2008- Crisis and Innovation of Managers' Attributes*. In: Trappl, R., editor: *Twentieth Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research 2010*. Österreichische Studiengesellschaft für Kybernetik in cooperation with International Federation for Systems Research, Vienna, 2010.
- [75] Mulej, M., *Programski vidiki managementa*. Področje 5, UM, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor, 1992.
- [76] Mulej, M., Prosenak, D., *Družba in gospodarstvo z etiko družbene odgovornosti - možna peta faza družbeno-gospodarskega razvoja? Society and economy of social responsibility - the fifth phase of socio-economic development?* In: Hrast, A., Mulej, M., Knez-Riedl, J., uredniki (2007): *Družbena odgovornost 2007*. Maribor, IRDO Inštitut za razvoj družbene odgovornosti
- [77] Mulej, M., *Systems theory: a worldview and/or a methodology aimed at requisite holism/realism of humans' thinking, decisions and action*, *Syst. res. behav. Sci*, 24/3, 2007, pp. 347-357.
- [78] Mulej, M., *Ustvarjalno delo in dialektična teorija sistemov*, Razvojni center, Celje, 1979.
- [79] Musek J, Avsec, A., *Pozitivna psihologija: subjektivni (emocionalni) blagor in zadovoljstvo z življenjem*. *Anthropos* 34(1/3), 2002, 41-68, at: <http://www.educy.com/jmusek/Teksti/Pozitivna%20psihologija.pdf>. Accessed on 16.2.2009.
- [80] Musek, J, Avsec, A., *Osebnost, samopodoba in psihično zdravje*, *Anthropos*, 38(1/2), 2006. 51-75.
- [81] Musek, J., *Dimenzije psihičnega blagostanja*, *Anthropos*, 1(2), 2008, pp. 139-160.
- [82] Musek, J., *Dimenzije psihičnega blagostanja*. In *V. kongres psihologov Slovenije z mednarodno udeležbo*. Ljubljana, Društvo psihologov Slovenije, 2006.
- [83] Musek, J., *Psihološke in kognitivne študije osebnosti*, Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 2005.
- [84] Nixon B. *Speaking Plainly – A New Agenda for the 21st Century*. In S.R.W. *Social Responsibility World of RecordPedia 2004*, In: Crowther D, Barry DM, Sankar A, Goh KG, Ortiz Martinez E., Ansted University Asia Regional Service Center, Penang, 2004.
- [85] Pavot, W., Diener, E., *The subjective evaluation of well-being in adulthood: Findings and implications*, *Ageing International*, 29/2, 2004. pp.113-135.
- [86] Porter, M. E., Kramer, M. R., *Strategy & Society*, *Harvard Business Review*, 2-15. December, 2006.
- [87] Porter, M., *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, Basics Books, New York, 1990.
- [88] Potočan, V., Mulej, M., *Transition into an Innovative Enterprise*, Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor, 2007.
- [89] Prosenak, D., Mulej, M. *Application of Technology to Enhancing of (Co) creative (Co-operation and Socially Responsible Action of All in a Society. Murcia*”, In: *7th International Conference of Sociocybernetics “Technology and Social Complexity”*, ISA, RC 51 on Sociocybernetics, 2007a.

- [90] Prosenak, D., Mulej, M. How can marketing contribute to increase of well-being in transitional (and other) societies? In: Snoj, B., Milfelner, B. 1st International Scientific Marketing Theory Challenges in Transitional Societies Conference, EPF, Maribor, 2007b.
- [91] Prosenak, D., Mulej, M., O celovitosti in uporabnosti obstoječega koncepta družbene odgovornosti poslovanja = About holism and applicability of the existing concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR), *Naše gospodarstvo*, 54/3-4, 2008, pp. 10-21.
- [92] Prosenak, D., Mulej, M., Snoj, B., A requisitely holistic approach to marketing in terms of social well-being, *Kybernetes*, 37/9-10, 2008, pp.1508-1529.
- [93] Revkin, A. C., A New Measure of Well-Being from a Happy Little Kingdom. *The New York Times*, 4.10.2005, at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/10/04/science/04happ.html?ex=1171947600&en=5a41a93522961d05&ei=5070>, Accessed on 16.2.2009.
- [94] Ryan, R. M., Deci E. L., On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 2001, pp. 141-166.
- [95] Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *Am. Psychologist*, 55, 2000, pp. 68-78.
- [96] Ryff, C. D., Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1989, pp. 1069-1081.
- [97] Ryff, C. D., Keyes, C. L. M. The structure of psychological well-being revisited, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1995, pp. 719-727.
- [98] Ryff, C. D., Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D. Optimizing Well-Being: The Empirical Encounter of Two Traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 2002, pp. 1007-1022.
- [99] Samman, E., Psychological and Subjective Well-being: A Proposal for Internationally Comparable Indicators, *Oxford Development Studies* 35(4), 2007, pp. 459-486.
- [100] Šek, K., Kako ustvarjalne lastnosti zaposlenih vplivajo na inovativnost v organizacijah. Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor, 2007.
- [101] Senge, P., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., Flowers. B. S., *Presence – Exploring Profound Change in People, Organizations, and Society*, Currency Doubleday, New York etc., 2004.
- [102] Škafar, B. Inovativnost in motivacija na poti k poslovni odličnosti v komunalnem podjetju. Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor, 2004.
- [103] Škafar, B. Inovativnost kot pogoj za poslovno odličnost v komunalnem podjetju. Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor, 2006.
- [104] Štefančič, M., Diktatura šoka. *Mladina*. 1 January, 2008. at: http://www.mladina.si/tehdnik/200801/clanek/nar-tema--marcel_stefancic_jr/, accessed on 19.3.2009.
- [105] Steiner, G., Risopoulos, F. Creative communication management with complex entrepreneurial innovation processes: a transdisciplinary systems approach. In: Trapp, R., editor: Twentieth Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research 2010. Österreichische Studiengesellschaft für Kybernetik in cooperation with International Federation for Systems Research, Vienna, 2010.
- [106] Stern N. The Stern Review. The economics of climate change, 2006, at: http://www.hmtreasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews/stern_review_economics_climate_change/sternreview_index.cfm, accessed on 11. 3. 2007.
- [107] Stiglitz, J., Oživitev s spodbudami ali smrt. *Finance* 21 August 2009a, pp161: 12.
- [108] Stiglitz, J., Towards a better measure of well-being. Published: September 13 2009. N.B. The report of the Commission will be, 2009b, at <http://www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr/>, accessed on 11. 3. 2007.
- [109] Sumner, A., Economic Well-being and Non-economic Well-being; A Review of the Meaning and Measurement of Poverty, Research Paper No. 2004/30. United Nation University, World Institute for Development Economics Research, 2004.
- [110] Sustainable Development Research Network. Wellbeing Concepts and Challenges. 2006, at <http://www.sd-research.org.uk/wellbeing/documents/FinalWellbeingPolicyBriefing.pdf>, accessed on 11. 3. 2007.

- [111] Targowski, A. How to Transform the Information Infrastructure of Enterprises into Sustainable, Global-oriented and to Monitor and Predict the Sustainability of Civilization: The Organizational and Social Aspects. In: Cruz-Cunha, M. M., Quintela Varajão, J. E., Martins do Amaral, L. A., editors: Proceedings of the CENTERIS 2009, Conference on ENTERprise Information Systems, 7-9 October 2009 in Ofir, Portugal, organized by IPCA – Instituto Politécnico do Cavado e do Ave, and UTAD – Universidade de Tras-os-Montes e Alto Douro, 2009, pp. 17 – 28.
- [112] Taylor G. *Evolution's Edge: The Coming Collapse and Transformation of our World*. New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island, Canada, 2008.
- [113] Tomer, F. J., Human Well-Being: A New Approach Based on Overall and Ordinary Functionings, *Review of Social Economy*, LX/1, 2002, pp. 23-44.
- [114] Toth, G. *Resnično odgovorno podjetje*. GV Založba, Ljubljana, 2008.
- [115] Van Praag, B. M., Frijters, P., The measurement of welfare and well-being; the Leyden approach. In *Foundations of hedonic psychology: scientific perspectives on enjoyment and suffering*, Kahneman, D. E., Diener, E., Schwarz, N. (eds), Russel Sage Foundation, New York, 1999.
- [116] van Praag, B. M., Frijters, P.. *Choice Behavior and Verbal Behavior: A Critical Assesment of their Relevance for Practical Policy*, Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper TI1997-119/1, Tinbergen Institute, Amsterdam, 1997.
- [117] Warr, P. Well-being and the workplace. In: Kahnemann, D., Diener, E. and Schwarz, N. (Eds.). *Well-being: The foundation of hedonic psychology*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1999, pp. 392-412.
- [118] Watson, D., Clark, L. A., Tellegen, A., Development and validation of a brief measure of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1988, 1063-1070.
- [119] Wilby J. (Ed.). *ISSS 2009. Making Liveable, Sustainable Systems Unremarkable. Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting. International Society for Systems Sciences, and ANZSYS at University of Queensland, Brisbane, 2009*,
- [120] Winkelmann L, Winkelmann R. Why are the unemployed so unhappy? Evidence from a panel data. *Economica*, 65, 1998, pp. 1-15.
- [121] Wottiez, I., Theeuwes, J., *Well-Being and Labor Market Status*. In *The distribution of welfare and household production: International perspectives*, Jenkis SP, Kapteyn A, van Praag BMS (eds.), Cambridge University, Press Cambridge, New York in Melbourne, 1998, pp. 211-230.

¹ This can be presented with a case of two people, who for instance globally evaluate their SWB equally, but they have different components: one person has a higher level of positive affect, the other a lower level of negative affect. One must distinguish between emotional dimensions of SWB and satisfaction; for instance when we successfully finish a boring work we can feel satisfaction, although we would hardly speak of any higher level of positive affect.