MEASURING TOURISTS HAPPINESS: THE CASE OF THE ALGARVE

Julio da Costa Mendes
Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve, Portugal
E-mail: jmendes@ualg.pt

Luís Nobre Pereira
ESGHT, University of the Algarve, Portugal
E-mail: lmper@ualg.pt

Manuela Guerreiro
Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve, Portugal
E-mail: mmguere@ualg.pt

ABSTRACT:

Happiness and Quality of Life (QoL) have been receiving attention since many of the social ills have been reduced in the Western World. Happiness is considered one of the contributors to good QoL: if a community has happy citizens, their QoL is viewed as generally good (Veenhoven, 1997). In the same way, tourists' happiness and QoL have become an important and interesting issue of research. However, measuring tourists' happiness is a changeling problem. In this paper we present research on measuring tourists' happiness. First, we have developed a model to explain the effect of different life domains on tourists' happiness. Results indicated that both satisfaction with their family life and satisfaction with their jobs and activities play a significant role in determining overall happiness. After that, we have developed a model to identify which QoL factors influence tourists' happiness. Results indicated that both present tourists' QoL and QoL of their friends have a significant effect on tourists' general happiness. A survey sample of tourists in the Algarve was used to test binary logistic regression models to detect factors affecting the probability of being at a specific level of happiness.

Keywords: tourist happiness, tourist quality of life, tourist satisfaction, logit regression.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past years, concerns on well-being, happiness and life satisfaction have become a central issue to researchers. The importance of happiness and life satisfaction arose since more people began to recognize that economic prosperity is not a synonymous of well-being.

Tourist destinations are social labs of the most importance to share values, feelings, ideas, atmospheres and ways of life. These will be decisive for thousands of tourists who dedicate some time of their lives travelling to other countries and enjoying new experiences in the destinations. Thus in a changing world, Destinations Management Organizations (DMO) should look for a better relationship with their environment and as much as possible, be aware of new roles that enable them to meet tourists expectations.

Some of the Portuguese DMO have assumed a management philosophy based on a "production optics", which means that they have focused essentially on the internal productive process. Others have been developing management strategies based on "selling optics" for survival reasons. Both referred optics don't emphasize the concerns of the customers.

In the meantime and essentially due to deep changes in the surrounding environment there are signs that DMO are changing in how they see their tourists. As a consequence, management models based on "marketing optics" have been adopted. In this context, the Algarve DMO is a paradigmatic case study. Therefore, to have a better understanding of what the tourist see as well-being and happiness is a starting point for the decision-making policies.

This exploratory research conducted at the Algarve is the first approach to this issue in the tourism policy context in Portugal. The purpose of this research is to contribute for the discussion on how to measure tourists' happiness and its relationship with tourists' quality of life. To achieve the objective, we develop two econometric models: a model to explain the effect of different life domains on tourists' happiness and a model to identify which QoL factors influence tourists' happiness. Like general Quality of Life (QoL), the specific Tourist Quality of Life (TQoL) is a complex phenomenon that is exposed to a high number of factors and happiness could be considered one of those contributors (Veenhoven, 1997). If tourists are happy, so their QoL could be viewed as generally good. In addition, overall happiness is said to depend much on satisfaction in different life domains (Glatzer, 2000). However, there is an interrelationship between happiness and QoL, since QoL can also be viewed as a determinant of general happiness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Aristotle reinforced the idea that happiness is the highest aim for human being. For this Greek

philosopher, nobody asks for happiness as a mean for something more.

In the last years, several studies on topics such as life satisfaction and happiness have had an important contribution to the growth of the knowledge about subjective well-being. Well-being is the field of behavioural sciences in which people's evaluations of their lives are studied (Diener *et al*, 2003: 188). Happiness is nowadays a topic of growing interest for philosophers, policy makers, poets and economists. The interest of this is mainly due to the interest at large extent from economics (Osvald & Powdthavee, 2006) and positive psychology (Diener 2000). The increasing importance of subjective well-being in comparison to other measures has been reviewed by Diener and Suh (1997: 189), who concluded, "Subjective well-being measures are necessary to evaluate a society, and add value to the economic indicators that are now favoured by policy makers".

The pursuit of happiness is becoming ever more global, as people seek to realize the promises of capitalism and political freedom (Freedman, 1978, Diener *et al*, 1995).

According to Coleta & Coleta (2006) it was during the last two decades that literature on subjective well-being, happiness and life satisfaction has spread. From this multidisciplinary point of view, the central concern of academic research on these topics, is to know how and why persons conduct their lives in a positive way (Snyder & Lopez, 2001; Swanbrow, 1989). For most people, "a good life is an happy life". Besides this statement, it is fair to claim if QoL is dependent on how happy one person is (Brülde, 2006:1).

It is widely agreed that happiness plays a central role on QoL. From this point of view, happiness is on of the most important "prudential value" (Haybron, 2000, cit in Brülde, 2006:1). Some investigators, however, add other final values like friendship, self-knowledge, human development or meaningful work. So the question arises: what exactly is the role of happiness in the good life or there are other final values besides happiness?

Philosophers have formally defined the notion of the good life (well-being, or QoL) in terms of what has final value for a person. This definition may involve three aspects: if it is a purely evaluative question; if it is value-for (the person itself); or if the relevant prudential values are final or instrumental values from the point of view of each individual (Brülde, 2006:2)[11].

Most of the modern discussion about well-being is based on Parfit's (1984: 493) distinction

---

[11] Like Brülde (2006:12) noted "the circumstances which are only of instrumental value for the final human good can be called 'quality of life determinants", and once we have decided what a person's well-being consists in, the question of what these determinants are can be investigated empirically".

between three kinds of conceptions of the good life: Hedonistic Theories ("what would be best for someone is what would make his life happiest"[12]), Desire-Fulfilment Theories ("what would be best for someone is what … would best fulfil his desires"[13]), and Objective List Theories ("certain things are good or bad for us, whether or not we want to have the good things, or to avoid the bad things"[14]).

Lyubomirsky *et al* (2005) recently advanced with a new model of longitudinal well-being where this investigator has identified three major determinants of well-being: the person's genetic set point - personality and temperament (this set point remains constant across the lifespan. It is stable, so it has little or no impact on variations in well-being over time); the person's current circumstances (demographic, geographic and contextual, health, income, the region where the person lives); and the person's current intentional activities (behavioural, cognitive and conative). For example, in his investigation, Brülde (2006) is concerned about what really matters when we think about what is good for the person himself.

According to Borooah (2006) subjective well-being is increasingly being measured by simply asking people about how happy they are. Diener (1984), Pavot (1991) and Watson and Clark (1991) agree that these subjective responses do reflect the respondents' substantive feelings of well-being. There is strong evidence that, in spite of the differences between cultures, people in different countries essentially want the same things: good family and social life, good personal and family health, standard of living and a good job (Campbell, 1981; Cantril, 1965). Borooah (2006) concluded that 1) "while people may find it difficult to define happiness, they know clearly and unambiguously, when they are happy or unhappy; 2) people from different backgrounds are made happy or unhappy by the same things; 3) if we knew what these were, and their relative strengths, we could fashion policy so as to influence these happiness inducing factors".

The link between happiness and good life may be related with two main aspects: a) what conception of happiness we accept and b) whether we have a pure or modified happiness theory in mind. A person's QoL is dependent on how happy that person is. Nothing but happiness has final value for a person.

---

[12] According to this theory, the good life is identical with the pleasant life. The only thing that has positive final value for a person is pleasant experiences.

[13] According to this theory, a person has a good life when she has the kind of life that she wants to have. The only thing that has positive final value for a person is that her intrinsic desires are fulfilled.

[14] According to this theory, there are objective values (besides pleasure or happiness) that make a life good for a person. "Contact with reality", "friendship", "love", "freedom", "personal development", "meaningful work" and "rational activity" are some examples of alleged objective values pointed out by the author (Brülde, 2006:4).

For Democritus, one of the earliest thinkers on the subject of happiness, the happy life was enjoyable, not because of what the happy person possessed, but because of the way the happy person reacted to her life circumstances. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle worked on Eudemonia definition of happiness in which happiness consisted of possessing the greatest goods available. For the hedonists, happiness was simply the sum of many pleasurable moments. From utility theory point of view, whose roots are in hedonism, happiness was equated with both the presence of pleasure and absence of pain. Sometimes the term *subjective well-being* is used synonymously with happiness and it emphasizes an individual's own assessment of a person's life and includes satisfaction, pleasant affect and low negative affect. In the 20th century scientists tried to understand happiness trying to find out answers to questions like: what is happiness? Can it be measured? What causes happiness? (Diener *et al*, 2003: 188-190; Tatarkiewicz, 1976).

Till now, the nature of happiness has not been defined in a uniform way. It can mean *pleasure*, *life satisfaction*, *positive emotions*, *meaningful life* or a *feeling of contentment*… Happiness may be understood in terms of frequent positive affect, high life satisfaction and infrequent negative affect, which are, according to Diener (Diener, 1984, 1994), the three primary components of subjective well-being. Happiness is primarily a subjective phenomenon that is concerned for "whoever lives inside a person's skin" (Myers & Diner, 1995:11; Diener, 1994).

Anecdotal and survey evidence alike suggest that happiness is one of the most salient and significant dimensions of human experience and emotional life (Diener *et al*, 1999) and is critical to understand the cognitive process that might serve to maintain or enhance it (Lyubomirsky *et al*, 2001).

How far may we be happy? According to Lykken and Tellegen (1996) happiness has a genetically determined set point. From this point of view the "heritability of well-being may be as high as 50% or 80%" (cit in Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2006: 56). For others (Brickman & Campbell, 1971; Frederick & Loewenstein, 1999; Kahneman, 1999; Scitovsky, 1976), the happiness is something that it is never totally achieved: "gains in happiness are impermanent, because humans so quickly adapt to change" (Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2006: 56). This belief raises the question of facing happiness like a permanent challenge in our daily life. For some researchers quoted by Sheldon & Lyubomirsky (2006: 57), happiness may be enhanced by "practicing certain virtues such as gratitude, forgiveness and self-reflection". According to

Lykken (2000), despite a genetically determined baseline for well-being, humans are capable of increasing their happiness.

It is possible to identify in the literature four main conceptions of happiness: 1) the cognitive or attitudinal view (according to this, "happiness is regarded as a cognitive state or as a positive attitude towards one's life as a whole". In this sense, good life is "a kind of mental state theory that attributes final value to other mental states besides pleasure". It is sufficient that one's life is going the way he wants it to go (Brülde, 2006:9); 2) the hedonistic view ("happiness is best regarded as a favourable balance of pleasure over displeasure" - this is the point of view of hedonism (*qua* theory of well-being); 3) the mood view or emotional state theory (to this theory "happiness is a certain kind of positive mood state … about anything in particular". Certain kind of pleasant experiences are more conductive to happiness than others; 4) and the hybrid view (happiness is regarded as a "complex mental state, in part cognitive and in part affective". So, a person's happiness is a function of how cognitively she evaluates her life as a whole in a positive manner and how that person feels good. This concept is sometimes called the *life satisfaction view*. According to this, a person's level of well- being depend directly on how satisfied she is with her life: "happiness is a complex mental state consisting both of an affective and a cognitive component" (Brülde, 2006:9-10).

Martin (2005) argues that happiness is a mental state composed by tree different elements: Pleasure (pleasant emotions and spiritual feelings like pleasure, joy, contentment exaltation or affection), "lack of unpleasure" (lack of or no unpleasant emotions and spiritual feelings like, anxiety, fear, rage, guilt, envy or shame) and satisfaction (satisfaction with life or with some particular aspects of one's life – personal connections, work, physical performance).

According to pure affective view, happiness is a kind of affective state – "to be happy is (roughly) to feel happy" (Brülde, 2006:9). Regarding to this, "happiness has no cognitive component" (so, it doesn't involve any evaluation of one's life as a whole).

We assume that "the quality of a person's life is wholly dependent on the person's mental state and not at all on the state of the world (except in casual sense)" (Brülde, 2006:10).

Besides the view of how far happiness contributes to a good life is a controversial matter between authors. Everyone agrees that happiness is an important and crucial component in the good life (Brülde, 2006:11; Diener *et al*, 2003: 188).

The main findings of the study carried out by Borooah (2006) are the identification of the

most important sources of happiness: an absence of health problems (mainly mental health problems), freedom from financial worries, and the quality of the area in which one lived.

Findings from Lyubomirsky *et al* (2005) revealed that happy people gain tangible benefits in many different life domains from their positive sate of mind, including larger social rewards: higher odds of marriage and lower odds of divorce, more friends, stronger support, and richer social interactions (Harker & Keltner, 2001; Marks & Fleming, 1999; Okun *et al*, 1984), superior work outcomes: greater creativity, increased productivity, higher quality of work (Estrada *et al*, 1994; Staw *et al*, 1995), and more activity, energy, and flow (Csikszentmihalyi & Wong, 1991). Happy people are more likely to evidence greater self-control and self-regulatory and coping abilities (Aspinwall, 1998; Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002; Keltner & Bonanno, 1997), to have a bolstered immune system (Dillon *et al*, 1985; Stone *et al*, 1994) and even to live a longer life (Danner *et al*, 2001). The literature suggests that happy persons tend to be relatively more cooperative, pro-social, charitable and "other-centered" (Isen, 1970, Kasse & Ryan, 1996; Williams & Shiaw, 1999). Happy individuals use to think relatively more positively about themselves (Campbell, 1981) and about others (Matlin & Gawron, 1979), feel more personal control (Larson, 1989), and recall more positive events from their past (Seidlitz & Diener 1993; Seidlitz *et al*, 1997). Happy people also have been found to react more positively and intensely to favourable life outcomes and positive events, to show shorter drops in affect in response to negative life events, and to interpret remembered life experiences more positively, than have unhappy people (Lyubomirsky & Tuucker, 1998; Seidlitz & Diener, 1993; Seidlitz *et al*, 1997).

Thus, we argue that enhancing people's happiness levels may indeed be a worthy scientific goal, especially after their basic physical and security needs are met. Unfortunately, however, relatively little scientific support exists for the idea that people's happiness levels can change for the better.

Research psychologists have identified many predictors of people happiness or subjective well-being. For example, well-being has been shown to be associated with a wide variety of actors, including demographic status (Argyle, 1999; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smiyh, 1999; Myers, 2000), personality traits and attitudes (Diener & Lucas, 1999) and goal characteristics (McGregor & Little, 1998).

According to Borooah (2006) it is possible to suggest ways of raising the level of happiness in society. As Borooah (2006: 428) noted, public policy usually has its focus on raising national

income. However, it may not be what people really want to be happy. From this point of view, the aim of public policy should be to maximize people's happiness (Layard, 2002). For this reason, there is a growing restlessness among social scientists about the wisdom of harnessing economic policy to the yoke of economic performance (Frank, 1997, Layard 2002, 2003). Diener (2000) argued that well-being should "become a primary focus of policymakers", and that "its rigorous measurement is a primary policy imperative".

RESEARCH METHODS

Sampling and data collection

The case of the Algarve was selected for the empirical study. The Algarve is the southernmost region of mainland Portugal. It has an area of 5,412 square kilometres with approximately 410,000 permanent inhabitants, and incorporates 16 municipalities. The Algarve is among the most popular tourist destinations in Portugal, its population more than doubles in the peak holiday season thanks to a high influx of visitors. Tourism and related activities are extensive and make up the bulk of the Algarve's summer economy.

In 2008 a questionnaire booklet was administrated through face-to-face interviews to a survey sample of 52 tourists aged 18 years or older. The interviews were conducted by an interviewer from the University of the Algarve who was selected according to his academic achievements, foreign languages knowledge and survey experiences. That questionnaire was developed by the Tourism Specific Quality of Life project (Puczkó, 2008), which has the objective of developing a Tourism Specific Quality of Life Index. The first five questions of the questionnaire were about tourist's happiness, QoL and satisfaction in different life domains. Question 1 asked respondents if they were generally happy in a five-point scale (1=very unhappy, 2= rather unhappy, 3= both happy and unhappy, 4= happy, 5= very happy); question 2 asked respondents to evaluate the degree of importance of twelve items to feel happy; question 3 asked tourists to evaluate the degree of relevance of seven items related to QoL; question 4 asked respondents to measure the degree of agreement of fifteen items about happiness; and question 5 asked tourists to evaluate the degree of satisfaction about ten general items related to general life. Questions 2 to 5 were assessed using seven-point scales, where 1 represents the lowest level and 7 represents the highest level of all scales.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed to characterize the study sample. Non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney and Kruskal–Wallis) were used to look for differences in general happiness among sociodemographic groups. These differences were considered statistically significant if p-values were less than 0.10. Furthermore, the Spearman coefficient was used to verify if the happiness was correlated with the age of the tourists. The amount of item-missing data was very low, and then no replacement or imputation was performed on missing response items.

According to the results of tourists' happiness and for purposes of this research, the respondents were later classified into two groups in terms of general happiness: very happy (n_1=25) and slightly happy (n_2=25, respondents that indicated they were not very happy). In this way, binary logistic regression models can be tested to detect factors affecting the probability of being at a specific level of happiness (Y=0 - slightly happy; Y=1 - very happy). We assumed that each individual i in the sample (i=1, 2, ..., n) had a probability π_i of be very happy and had a probability ($1-\pi_i$) of be slightly happy. The modulation of the probability π_i is based on a function of a set of attributes, X_1, X_2, ... X_p, believed to affect the level of happiness of the tourists. The probability being modelled can be denoted by π_i=$P(Y_i$=1| X_1, X_2, ... X_p). We assume that the probability of each individual be very happy can be modelled using the following binary logistic model:

$$\pi_i = P\big(Y_i = 1 \mid X_1,...X_p\big) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{X}_{i\bullet}\boldsymbol{\beta})}{1 + \exp(\mathbf{X}_{i\bullet}\boldsymbol{\beta})}, \qquad [1]$$

where $\mathbf{X}_{i\bullet} = (X_{i1}, X_{i2},...X_{ip})$ is a p-vector of known explanatory variables related to individual i and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2,...,\beta_p)'$ represents a vector of unknown parameters associated of the same dimension. The following equations may be used to estimate the model coefficients (Kleinbaum and Klein, 2002):

$$\ln\left(\frac{\pi_i}{1 - \pi_i}\right) = \mathbf{X}_{i\bullet}\boldsymbol{\beta}. \qquad [2]$$

Obviously, the sum of the probabilities for the two outcomes must be equal to one. When $\exp(\beta) > 1$, this means that a unit change in the underlying $\mathbf{X}$ causes an increase in the probability that the outcome changes category (i.e. changes the level of happiness). On the

contrary, when $\exp(\beta) < 1$, this means that a unit change in the underlying **X** causes a decrease in the probability that the outcome changes category.

Finally, all covariables used to explain tourists' happiness were recoded in three categories from the initial seven. This transformation is justified by the dimension of the sample size and by the distribution of the frequencies. Therefore, the seven items related to QoL were recoded in three categories (1=low, 2= rather high, 3= very high) and the ten items related to general life were recoded in three categories (1=not satisfied at all, 2= satisfied, 3= fully satisfied). The software used for the data analysis was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 17.0.

RESULTS

The descriptive analysis of the sample revealed that most of the tourists who were interviewed were middle-aged or older with 25% between the ages of 59 and 75 and another 25% who were 75 or older. The mean age of the respondents was 62.4. The sample was predominantly female (54.9%), married or living together with someone else (59.5%), with high educational level (45.8%). The majority of the survey participants were full-time workers (66.7%) and were employees (83.7%). Table 1 presents the demographic distribution of the sample of tourists.

Table 1: Study sample characteristics

Total sample		%
Gender	Female	54.9
	Male	45.1
Marital status	Married/living together	59.5
	Single	27.0
	Divorced/separated	11.5
	Widowed	2.0
Educational Level	Low	4.2
	Middle	50.0
	High	45.8
Employment status	Full-time worker	66.7

Part-time worker	7.9	
Student	3.9	
Pensioner	15.7	
Other (housewife, etc)	5.8	
Owner of the company	Yes	16.3
	No (employee)	83.7

The majority of the study sample was generally very happy and there were no significant differences according to gender (U=287.5; p=0.801), marital status (H=11.731; p=0.110) and educational level (H=5.827; p=0.443). Furthermore, the correlation between the level of general happiness and the age of the tourists is negative and weak, although it is not significant (ρ=-0.113; p=0.434). This suggests that the global happiness slightly decreases with the tourists' age. These findings reinforce the importance of this research since basic sociodemographic characteristics do not influence general tourists' happiness. As previously stated, this research aims both to develop a model to explain the effect of different life domains on tourists' happiness and to develop a model to identify which QoL factors influence tourists' happiness. Before the modeling is it convenient to describe tourists' evaluation about the level of seven items related to their QoL and about their degree of satisfaction about ten items related to general life. Table 2 summarizes the minimum, maximum and mean scores and the standard deviations (SD) of these issues.

Table 2: Individual items related to general life domains and QoL

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
How would you rate the following factors? (1=very low, ..., 7=very high)				
QoL of your own childhood	3	7	5.33	1.465
Present QoL	3	7	5.88	1.070
Your QoL 5-10 ago	3	7	5.60	1.125
Present QoL of your neighbours	1	7	5.15	1.351
QoL of your colleagues	2	7	5.43	1.092
QoL of your friends	2	7	5.61	1.201
QoL of your country, in general	2	7	4.74	1.103

How satisfied do you feel with: (1=not satisfied at all, ..., 7=very satisfied)				
Your job and activities	1	7	4.78	1.177
Your income	1	7	4.78	1.141
Your emotional life	2	7	5.06	1.156
Your financial state	2	6	4.75	0.935
Your family life	3	7	5.69	1.104
Your health	2	7	4.98	1.068
Your own safety	1	7	5.20	1.114
Public safety and security	1	7	4.38	1.383
The environment	2	6	4.18	1.093
The community of local residents	2	7	4.54	1.216

Table 2 shows that tourists evaluated very well all items related to their QoL, particularly their present QoL (mean=5.88, SD=1.070). The QoL of their country was the item with the lowest mean score, although it was positively evaluated. Table 2 also illustrates that tourists' mean degree of satisfaction is good with all items related to general life. The results reveal that tourists presented a very high degree of satisfaction with their family life (mean=5.69, SD=1.104). In addition, the mean degree of satisfaction with their own safety and their emotional life were also above 5.

Table 3: Logit model to explain the effect of general items related to general life on tourists' happiness

Explanatory variable	Description	Exp(b)	p-value
Intercept	-	0.002	0.006
Satisfied with your job and activities	Fully satisfied	1.852	0.048
Satisfied with your family life	Fully satisfied	1.754	0.075

The Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit statistic, which is more robust than the traditional goodness-of-fit statistic used in logistic regression, particularly for models estimated with small sample sizes like this, shows a reasonable fit ($\chi 2$ = 10.609; df = 6; p =0.101). Furthermore, the Cox-and-Snell R-square (0.191) and the Nagelkerke R-square (0.255) also indicate an acceptable fit. In Table 3 it is also possible to find the significance levels of the

Wald tests (null hypothesis assuming that the coefficients for each explanatory effect are zero) and the odds ratios (exp(*b*)).

Results presented in table 3 point out that both satisfaction with their family life and satisfaction with their jobs and activities play a significant role in determining tourists' overall happiness. Looking across rows, the odds ratios reveal that individuals very satisfied with their jobs and activities have approximately 1.75 times more chances of being very happy than individuals not satisfied at all with their jobs and activities. In addition, individuals very satisfied with their family life have approximately 1.85 times more chances of being very happy than individuals not satisfied at all with their family life. As expected, the level of tourists' happiness increases with the degree of satisfaction with these items of life domains.

Table 4: Logit model to explain the effect of QoL factors on tourists' happiness

Explanatory variable	Description	Exp(*b*)	*p*-value
Intercept	-	1.710	0.201
Present QoL	Very high	7.630	0.098
QoL of their friends	Rather high	0.212	0.376
	Very high	0.047	0.011

The Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit statistic shows a good fit ($\chi2 = 1.221$; df = 3; *p* =0.748). Furthermore, the Cox-and-Snell R-square (0.221) and the Nagelkerke R-square (0.295) also indicate an acceptable fit. Like in previous model, the significance levels of the Wald tests and the odds ratios are presented in table 4.

Results presented in table 4 point out that both present tourists' QoL and QoL of their friends have a significant effect on tourists' general happiness. Looking across rows, the odds ratios reveal that individuals with very high present QoL have 7.63 times more chances of being very happy than individuals with rather high present QoL. Finally, individuals very satisfied with friends with very high QoL have much less chances of being very happy than individuals with friends with low QoL. This last finding was not expected at all.

5. CONCLUSION

This exploratory research brings to discussion some methods that can be used to measure

tourists' happiness. The binary logistic regression model has proven useful to detect factors affecting the probability of being at a specific level of happiness. Furthermore, the research findings are important to understand if tourists on vacation in the Algarve are happy and which factors influence their happiness. First and foremost, the majority of the study sample of tourists was generally very happy. The second important finding is the independence between the tourists' general happiness and their basic sociodemographic characteristics. Finally, results from the binary logistic regression models indicated that: (*i*) both satisfaction with their family life and satisfaction with their jobs and activities play a significant role in determining overall happiness; (*ii*) both present tourists' QoL and QoL of their friends have a significant effect on tourists' general happiness.

There are a number of limitations on this study, some of which were referenced earlier. The sample size and the sampling methodology are two important drawbacks of this research. In further researches should be used a random sample and possibly a bigger sample. This exploratory research provides understanding about the effect of different life domains and QoL factors on tourists' happiness. Nevertheless, there are other factors which can influence tourists' happiness. Further studies should extent this to additional factors. Overall, however, the methodology and findings discussed earlier can help researchers move forward on the discussion how to measure tourists' happiness.

REFERENCES

Argyle, M. (1999). *"Causes and correlates of happiness"*, in D. Kahneman, E. Diener, and N. Schwartz (Eds). Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology, (pp. 353-373). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Aspinwall, L. G.(1998). *"Rethinking the role of positive affect in self-regulation".* Motivation and Emotion, 22. 1-32.

Borooah, V. K. (2006). "*What makes people happy? Some evidence from Northern Ireland".* Journal of Happiness Studies, 7, 427-465.

Brickman, P. and Donald T. C. (1971). *"Hedonic relativism and the good society",* in M.H. Appley (ed): Adaptation-Level Theory: A symposium. Academic Press.

Brülde, B. (2006). *"Happiness and the good life. Introduction and conceptual framework"*. Journal of Happiness Studies, 8, 1-14.

Campbell A. (1981). "*The sense of Well-being in America"*. McGraw-Hill. New York.

Cantril, H., (1965). "*The Pattern of Human Concerns, New Brunswick"*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Coleta, J.A., and Coleta, M.F. (2006). *"Felicidade, bem-estar subjectivo e comportamento académico de estudantes universitários"*. Psicologia em Estudo, vol.11 3, Sept/Dec.

Csiksentmihalyi, M., and Young, M.M. (1991). *"The situacional and personal correlates of happiness: A cross-national comparison"*, in F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwartz (Edits), Subjective well-being: An interdisciplinary perspective (pp. 193-212). Pergamon Press. Elmsford, NY.

Danner, D.D., Snowdon, D.A. and Fiesen, W.V. (2001). *"Positive emotions in early life and longevity: Findings from the nun study"*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80, 804-813.

Diener, E, S. N. Christie and R. E. Lucas (2003). *"The evolving concept of subjective well-being: the multifaceted nature of happiness"*. Advances in Cell Aging and Gerontology, vol. 15, 187-219.

Diener, E. (1984). "*Subjective well-being"*. Psychological Bulletin, 95, 524-575.

Diener, E. (1994). *"Assessing subjective well-being: Progress and opportunities"*. Social Indicators Research, 31, 103-157.

Diener, E. (2000). *"Subjective well-being: The science of happiness, and a proposal for a national index"*. American Psychologist, 55, 34-43.

Diener, E., and Lucas, R.E. (1999). *"Personality and subjective well-being"*, in D. Kaheneman, E. Diener, and N. Schwartz (Eds.), Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology (pp 213-229). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Diener, E., and Suh, E.M. (1997). *"Measuring Quality of life: Economic, Social, and Subjective Indicators"*. Social Indicators Research, 40 (1-2), 189-216.

Diener, E., and Suh, E.M. (2000). *"Culture and Subjective well-being"*. Cambridge: MIT.

Diener, E., Suh, E.M., Lucas, R. E., and Smith, H.L. (1999). *"Subjective well-being:Three decades of progress"*. Psychological Bulletin, 125, 276-302.

Dierner, E., E. M. Suh, H. Smith and L. Shao (1995). *"National differences in reported well-being: why do they occur?"*. Social Indicators Research, 34, 7-32.

Dillon, K.M., Minchoff, B., and Baker, K. H. (1985). *"Positive emotional states and enhancement of the immune system"*. International Journal of Psychiatric in Medicine, 15, 13-18.

Estrada, C., Isen, A.M., and Young, M.J. (1994). *"Positive affect influences creative problem solving and reported source of practice satisfaction in physicians"*. Motivation and Emotion, 18, 285-299.

Frank, R. H. (1997). *"The frame of reference as a public good"*. Economic Journal, 107, 1832-1847.

Frederick, S. and Loewenstein, G. (1999). *"Hedonic adaptation"*, in Kahenman, E. Diener, and N. Schwartz (Eds*.), Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology, (pp.302-329). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Fredrickson, B.L. and Joiner, T. (2002). *"Positive emotions trigger upward sporals toward emotional well-being"*. Psychological Science, 13, 172-175.

Freedman, J. (1978). "*Happy people: what happiness is, who has it, and why"*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. New York.

Glatzer, W. (2000). *"Happiness: Classic Theory in the Light of Current Research"*. Journal of Happiness Studies, 1, 501-511.

Harker, L. and Keltner, D. (2001). *"Expressions of positive emotions in women's college yearbook pictures and their relationship to personality and life outcomes across adulthood"*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80, 112-124.

Isen, A.M. (1970). *"Success, failure, attention and reaction to others: The warm glow of success"*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15, 294-301.

Kahneman, D. (1999). *"Objective happiness"*. In D.Kahneman, E. Diener and N. Scwarz (Eds.), Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology (pp 3-25). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Keltner, D. and Bonanno, G. A. (1997). *"A study of laughter and dissociation: Distinct correlates of laughter and smiling during bereavement"*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73, 687-702.

Kleinbaum, D. and Klein, M. (2002). *"Logistic Regression: a self-learning text"*, 2nd ed. Springer.New York.

Larson, R. (1989). *"Is feeling "in control" related to happiness in daily life?"* Psychological Reports, 64, 775-784.

Layard, R. (2003). *"Happiness: Has Social Science a Clue?"*. Lionel Robbins Memorial Lectures 2002/3. London School of Economics, London.

Layard, R. (2002). *"Rethinking Public Economics: Implications of Rivarlry and Habit"*. Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics, London.

Lykken, D. (2000). *"Happiness: The nature and nurture of joy and contentment"*. St. Msartin's Griffin. New York.

Lykken, D. and A. Tellegen (1996). *"Happiness is a stochastic phenomenon"*. Psychological Science, 7, 186-189.

Lyubomirsky S. and Tucker, K.L., (1998). *"Implications of individual differences in subjective happiness for perceiving, interpreting and thinking about life events"*. Motivation and Emotion, 22, 155-186.

Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., and Schkade, D. (2005). *"Pursuing happiness: the architecture of sustainable change"*. Review of General Psychology, 9, 111-131.

Lyubomirsky, S., Tucker, K.L., and Karsky, F. (2001). *"Responses to hedonically conflicting social comparisons: comparing happy and unhappy people"*. European Journal of Social Psychology, 31, 511-535.

Marks, G.N. and Fleming, N. (1999). *"Influences and consequences of well-being among*

Australian young people: 1980-1995". Social Indicators Research, 46, 301-323.

Martin, P. (2005). "*Pessoas Felizes"*. Editorial–Bizâncio. Lisboa.

Matlin, M.W. and Gawron, V. J. (1979). *"Individual differences in Pollyannaism"*. Journal of Personality Assessment, 43, 411-412.

McGregor, I. and Little, B.R. (1998). *"Personal projects, happiness and meaning: On doing well and being yourself"*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 494-512.

Myers, D. G. (2000). *"The funds, friends, and faith of happy people"*. American Psychologist, 55, 56-67.

Myers, D.G. and Diener, E. (1995). "*Who is Happy?"*. Psychological Science, 6, 10-19.

Okun, M.A., Sotck, W.A., Haring, M.J. and Witter, R. A. (1984). *"The social activity/subjective well-being relation: A quantitative synthesis"*, Research on Aging, 6, 45-65.

Osvald, A. J. and Powdthavee, N. (2006). *"Does happiness adapt? A longitudinal study of disability with implications for economists and judges"*. Discussion paper Nº 2208. Forschungsinstitut zur Zuhunft der Arbeit (Institute for the Study of Labour). Germany.

Parfit, D. (1984). "*Reasons and Persons"*. Oxford University Press. New York.

Pavot, W. (1991). *"Further validation of the satisfaction with life scale: Evidence for the cross-method convergence of well-being measures"*. Journal of Personality Assessement, 57, 149-161.

Puczko, L. (2008). *"Tourism-specific Quality of Life: A 10 (+2-1) country pilot study"*. TQoL Workshop, 13-14 November, Budapeste.

Scitovsky, T. (1976). "*The Joyless Economy"*. Oxford University Press. New York.

Seidlitz, L. and Diener E. (1993). *"Memory for positive versus negative life events: Theories for the differences between happy and unhappy persons"*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 654-664.

Seidlitz, L., Wyer, R.S., and Diener, E. (1997). *"Cognitive correlates of subjective well-being: The processing of valenced life events by happy and unhappy persons"*. Journal of Research in Personality, 31, 240-256.

Sheldon, K. M. and Lyubomirsky, S. (2006). *"Achieving sustainable gains in happiness: change your actions, not your circumstances"*. Journal of Happiness Studies, 7, 55-86.

Snyder, C. R., and Lopez, S. J. (2001). "*Handbook of Positive Psychology"*. Oxford: OUP.

Sone, A.A., Neale, J.M., Cox, D.S., Napoli, A., Vadlimarsdottir, V. and Kennedy-Moore, E. (1994). *"Daily events are associated with a secretory immune response to an oral antigen in men"*. Health Psychology, 13, 440-446.

Staw, B. M., Sutton; R. I. and Pelled, L.H. (1995), *"Employee positive emotion and favourable outcomes at the workplace"*. Organization Science, 5, 51-71.

Swanbrow, D. (1989). *"The paradox of happiness"*, Psychology Today, 23, 37-39.

Tatarkiewicz, W. (1976). "*Analysis of Happiness"*. Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, Netherlands.

Veenhoven, R. (1997). "*Advances in the understanding of happiness"*. Revue Québécoise de psychologie, 18, 29-47.

Watson, D. and Clark, L. (1991). *"Self versus peer ratings of specific emotional traits: Evidence of convergent and discriminant validity"*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 927-940.

Williams, S. and Shiaw, W.T. (1999). *"Mood and organizational citizenship behaviour: the effects of positive affect on employee organizational citizenship behaviour intentions"*. Journal of Psychology, 133, 656-668.