

Research Paper

## Is Feeling Good, Enough? Impact of Hedonic and Eudaimonic Happiness on Dyadic Satisfaction

Nidhi Pandey<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Rubi Singh<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Happiness and positive state of mind are often considered a prerequisite for individuals looking at establishing good relationships. Hedonia, which is pursuit of pleasure and enjoyment while avoiding pain, and eudaimonia which is living well encompassing a meaningful and moral, life are important components of this happiness. A balance between these two dimensions of individual happiness is what an 'instagram-able' perfect life looks like. Pictures of couples travelling, celebrating, going for retreats etc., on social media are naturally suggestive of their couple and family happiness to the people viewing them. But does this perceived state of eudaimonia and hedonia actually percolate to dyadic satisfaction for a couple is what this research paper investigates. This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional survey research design using convenience sampling. Data from 75 couples (N=150) were collected through two standardized self-report questionnaires viz Hedonic and Eudaimonic Motives for Activities (HEMA) by Huta which measures hedonic and eudaimonic wellbeing and Dyadic Adjustment Scale by Spanier which measures dyadic satisfaction of married couples. Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) and couple level linear regressions were employed to assess dyadic interdependence and actor - partner associations. The findings suggest that these two dimensions of individual happiness—whether hedonic, eudaimonic, or total—does not directly translate into dyadic satisfaction. No significant actor - partner effects were identified, indicating that there is more to dyadic satisfaction than individual wellbeing alone. Results indicated that neither individual hedonia nor eudaimonia demonstrated significant actor or partner effects on dyadic satisfaction. Sum of eudaimonia and hedonia at couple level resulted in a weak, non-significant association with dyadic satisfaction. Notably, differences in partners' internal balance between hedonia and eudaimonia emerged as a marginally significant predictor, and this suggests that complementarity rather than similarity in overall hedonic and orientations may be more relevant for relationship outcomes. These findings challenge the assumption that an individual's happiness (in this case hedonic and eudaimonic) automatically percolates to dyadic satisfaction. The study is expected to contribute to dyadic well-being literature by highlighting the limited power of individualistic eudaimonic or hedonic happiness shaping dyadic satisfaction, particularly within the Indian cultural context.

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Banasthali Vidyapith, Tonk, Rajasthan, India

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Banasthali Vidyapith, Tonk, Rajasthan, India

\*Corresponding Author

Received: February 1, 2026; Revision Received: March 27, 2026; Accepted: March 31, 2026

**Keywords:** *Eudaimonic Happiness, Hedonic Happiness, Dyadic Satisfaction, Actor–Partner Interdependence Model (APIM), Couple Well-Being, Individualistic Happiness, Indian Married Couples, Other Side of Happiness, Collectivism*

**H**appiness, both individually as well as together as a couple, is pivotal in creating the emotional quality of a marriage. It is believed to be that one dimension that has a profound influence on the way partners understand and experience each other and their relationship. People who measure high on happiness are said to have a more positive outlook towards life, and this is proven by existing studies that have established a dynamic interplay between both happiness and mental health as well as happiness and marital satisfaction. It has also been established that diminished satisfaction and happiness often leads to mental health challenges (Fusar-Poli et al., 2020; Hennagan, 2023; Kryvenko & Petryk, 2019; Salinger et al., 2021).

Happiness, as conceptualised in subjective well-being, encompasses not only gratification through pleasure (hedonic happiness) but also a more enduring sense of meaning, purpose, and fulfilment (eudaimonic happiness). Individuals who report higher levels of happiness tend to interpret relationship events more positively, express gratitude more frequently, and exhibit greater resilience during conflict, which strengthens marital bonding over time. A happy partner contributes to an uplifting and emotionally safe environment where affection, humour, kindness, and optimism become foundational relationship behaviours, fostering overall satisfaction in the marriage. Moreover, happiness promotes proactive coping strategies, constructive communication efforts, and collaborative approaches to problem-solving all of which are crucial when dealing with routine marital stressors (financial pressures, parenting challenges, work-life balance, in-law dynamics, etc.). Couples wherein both partners experience higher levels of individual happiness are more likely to support each other's growth, celebrate each other's victories, and bounce back more effectively from setbacks; whereas lower levels of happiness are often associated with irritability, withdrawal, and negative emotional transactions, which can corrode intimacy and contribute to chronic dissatisfaction over time. Thus, personal happiness acts not merely as a pleasant internal state but as a powerful psychological resource that influences the day-to-day emotional exchange between partners, enhancing the long-term trajectory of marital satisfaction and adjustment.

However, this all-round assumption that individual happiness would also mean couple happiness and in turn translate into dyadic satisfaction, is a concept that still needs to be empirically. Modern researchers have started questioning the all-encompassing positivity associated with happiness, but there is way more to go, especially because today's cultural shift is increasingly prioritizing individual happiness, both in terms of personal pleasure as well as deeper feelings, over happiness that comes from shared purpose and family goals. Social media and self-help trends promote individual happiness above all else. This creates the risk that couples may each feel personally happy while emotionally disconnected from each other. Without deeper shared goals like building a family legacy or supporting each other's growth, marriages are set to suffer. People become "happy individuals" living parallel lives rather than true partners.

The present study addresses this, using APIM analyses of 75 couples to test whether eudaimonic happiness, hedonic happiness, their balance, or their combination significantly predict dyadic satisfaction.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### *Eudaimonia in Happiness:*

The term eudaimonia was used in ancient Greece and popularized by Aristotle in the 4th century BCE in his essay called *Nicomachean Ethics* (see *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, 2001), (Huta V. 2013) He explained it as a deeper form of well-being that emphasizes purpose in life, virtue in personality, and self-actualization rather than fleeting momentary pleasures (Waterman, 1993). Positive psychology advocates achievement of this well-being through constructs like personal growth, autonomy, and meaningful relationships (Ryff, 1989; Ryan & Deci, 2001). In empirical work, eudaimonic well-being correlates with sustained life satisfaction and resilience, which is distinct from hedonic pursuits (Huta & Waterman, 2014). This distinction places eudaimonia as that pathway which endures well-being by facilitating the understanding of human connections that go much further, beyond the limitations of transient pleasures. In marital contexts, for instance, couples who pursue intrinsic goals together, have reported better adjustment and resilience. This highlights eudaimonia's role in fostering authentic flourishing where partners support each other's self-actualization (Peterson et al., 2005). Many longitudinal studies also show that eudaimonic activities like pursuing intrinsic goals, predict lower depression rates over time (e.g., Ruini & Fava, 2019; Wood & Joseph, 2010; Grouden & Jose, 2014).

### *Hedonia in Happiness:*

At the same time, i.e during 3rd and 4th century, when Stoicism had taken roots and the likes of Plato were talking about eudaimonia, another pupil of Socrates, Aristippus came up with the concept of minimizing pain and maximizing pleasure, including immediate physical gratification, for a good life (Huta, V. 2013). This later came to be known as hedonism. The perspective also aligns with early philosophical roots in Epicureanism [Epicurus believed that “the greatest good was to seek modest, sustainable pleasure in the form of a state of ataraxia (tranquility and freedom from fear) and *aponia* (the absence of bodily pain)” source: [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Epicureanism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Epicureanism)] which emphasized sensory gratifications with emotional equilibrium. Modern psychologist Kahneman et al. (1999) further outlined the experience of hedonia as something that distinguishes daily affective peaks of gratification from cognitive life evaluations. Luhmann et al. (2012) highlighted hedonia's role during life transitions like marital stress, highlighting its role more as a buffer than a sustainer. Keyes (2002) integrated the concept into broader models that talk of psychological and social well-being for holistic assessment. Further, researchers came up with studies that confirmed weaker long-term outcomes when compared to eudaimonia. (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005; Pressman et al., 2010). Huta and Ryan (2010) empirically dissected hedonic motives into pleasure-seeking and comfort orientations, and inferred that both predict positive affect and carefreeness across trait and state measures, however, comfort motives show neutral or weaker links to vitality. Sooki (2021) dived deeper into its relational contexts, and demonstrated that happiness, tested using hedonic approach is the strongest predictor of women's marital satisfaction among demographic and stressor variables. Stafford (2024) similarly reported hedonic tone mediating 13% of marital satisfaction variance amid other mental health factors. Brickman & Campbell, (1971) proposed the concept of hedonic treadmill, which explains how individuals rapidly adapt to pleasurable stimuli, and then start yielding lower returns on lasting happiness. Thus, hedonia energizes positivity through daily functioning but requires eudaimonic meaning to make that last.

Recently, Gruber et al. (2011) dived into on the "dark side" of happiness, challenging its unadulterated positivity by identifying four risks: wrong degree of happiness, when excessive happiness impairs creativity and risk assessment; wrong time of happiness, when

## Is Feeling Good, Enough? Impact of Hedonic and Eudaimonic Happiness on Dyadic Satisfaction

untimely happiness disrupts appropriate emotional responses (e.g., showing joy at the time of grief); wrong way to pursue happiness, when forced pursuit increases a person's susceptibility to self-judgment; and wrong types of happiness when in forms like euphoria, pride it triggers self-centeredness, and in the form of mania hinders caution, and gives recklessness. Complementing this, Thorsteinsen and Vittersø (2018) differentiate hedonia and eudaimonia's roles in goal dynamics: hedonic states (pleasure, carefreeness) boost post-achievement satisfaction but weaken effort toward challenging goals, while eudaimonic engagement (vitality, meaning) creates and sustains pursuit of difficult objectives, aligning with self-determination theory's intrinsic motivation framework. Together, these studies caution against heightened happiness informing hedonia's short-term energizing limits and eudaimonia's utility for sustained relationships and personal growth.

### ***Dyadic Satisfaction:***

The concept of dyadic satisfaction depends significantly on eudaimonic and hedonic well-being dimensions, and this has been analyzed via deep diving models like the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM; Kenny et al., 2006). The dyadic data analysis indicates that individual happiness spills over to partners' satisfaction, suggesting interventions like emotion-focused therapy (Johnson, 2004).

Studies further show that couples high in purpose report greater marital adjustment (Pavot & Diener, 2009; Neff & Karney, 2009), and that dyadic bonds are enhanced by eudaimonia through shared empathy and meaning. Bradbury et al., 2000 concluded that hedonia contributes via positive affect reciprocity, where one partner's pleasure uplifts the other, predicting satisfaction in marriage, in cross-cultural samples. Studies for integrated effects of eudaimonia and hedonia show complementary effects, i.e. eudaimonic couples (high purpose/meaning) maintain relationship stability when hedonic pleasure drops during arguments, and this acts as a buffer. Conversely, hedonia (positive affect/pleasure) provides the emotional energy needed to motivate partners towards eudaimonic growth activities like self-development and shared goals (Huta et al., 2013; Impett et al., 2014).

Thus, eudaimonia and hedonia emerge as reciprocal yet individual parts of well-being that seem to have considerable impact on human beings.

Gruber et al. (2011) identify the "dark side" of happiness, where excessive positivity impairs creativity, disrupts context-appropriate emotions, and risks mania-linked recklessness, challenging happiness maximization assumptions. Thorsteinsen and Vittersø (2018) reveal hedonia energizes post-achievement satisfaction but weakens effort toward challenging goals, while eudaimonia sustains pursuit of meaningful objectives. Veenhoven (2020) further complicates the happiness dichotomy, arguing *hedonic* happiness (life satisfaction) provides a clearer, more universal moral criterion for well-being than complex eudaimonic constructs, as it directly reflects lived quality across cultures. Collectively, these studies caution against simplistic happiness prescriptions: hedonia risks shallow satisfaction and dysfunction when overpursued, eudaimonia demands sustained effort with uncertain relational translation, and their moral utility depends on pragmatic measurability rather than philosophical purity. Veenhoven (2020) further concluded that "hedonic happiness (life-satisfaction) is the most clear and practicable criterion and the most universally applicable". Collectively, these studies caution against simplistic ideas of happiness prescriptions.

### **Research Gap:**

Despite extensive research on happiness and well-being, several critical gaps remain in understanding how eudaimonic and hedonic happiness operates within marital relationships. While it is largely assumed that happy individuals will have a happy married life, adequate research to prove the same is missing. Also, literature has not examined the impact of eudaimonia and hedonia on a dyadic relationship, while simultaneously examining actor partner effects. This limits our understanding of whether happiness affects only the individual experiencing it or also percolates to the partner. The present empirical evidence for the same is scarce, especially within India, where relational norms, expectations, and interdependence may differ from western settings that dominate the existing literature.

### **Rationale:**

All human actions, whether inward or outward are directed towards reaching a state of happiness and contentment. Inward actions focus on meaning, purpose and personal growth (eudaimonia), while outward actions focus on pleasure and comfort (hedonia). Both the dimensions contribute towards overall well-being and happiness of individuals, and the area is well researched. However, in times where the world has shrunk from community to family, and from family to individual, the pursuit of happiness is also becoming individualistic, thus putting the larger good of families and community at stake. A study of how these dimensions of happiness impact the interdependent relationship between a husband and a wife and their mutual satisfaction in the relationship would help understand their importance in a marriage.

Also, literature is mostly available on happiness as a unidimensional construct, but these two dimensions which seem to hold a strong ground of impacting the dyadic couple relationship have not been much delved into. To give an example, a hedonic female coupled with a eudaimonic male are assumed to have a lower dyadic satisfaction compared to a set of both eudaimonic partners. Empirical evidence examining these distinctions within married couples, especially in culturally contextualised communities, remains limited. This study intends to test whether happiness shows a “dark side” and orients a person towards individualism, or it is beneficial for dyadic relationships and in turn family units. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to offer practical insights for marital counselling and couple-based interventions.

## **MATERIALS AND METHOD**

### **Research Questions:**

1. Is there a relationship between eudaimonia and dyadic satisfaction?
2. Is there a relationship between hedonia and dyadic satisfaction?
3. Does a difference between eudaimonia and hedonia predict dyadic satisfaction?
4. Do Eudaimonia and hedonia together predict dyadic satisfaction?

### **Hypothesis:**

- **H1:** Individual eudaimonia will be positively associated with own dyadic satisfaction.
- **H2:** Individual hedonia will be positively associated with own dyadic satisfaction.
- **H3:** Individual eudaimonia will be positively associated with partner’s dyadic satisfaction.
- **H4:** Individual hedonia will be positively associated with partner’s dyadic satisfaction.

## Is Feeling Good, Enough? Impact of Hedonic and Eudaimonic Happiness on Dyadic Satisfaction

- **H5:** Total couple happiness will be positively associated with dyadic average satisfaction.
- **H6:** Within couple differences in overall happiness (combined eudaimonia and hedonia) between partners will significantly predict couple's average dyadic satisfaction.
- **H7:** Inter-partner differences in the internal balance between eudaimonic and hedonic orientations will significantly predict couple's average dyadic satisfaction.

### *Design:*

The study employs a quantitative, cross-sectional, correlational dyadic design.

### *Sample*

A total of 200 Indian, married, heterosexual couples, married for years ranging from 1 to 35, were approached through convenience sampling. 75 couples out of the total agreed to participate and completed both the questionnaires. All participants were educated till Class 12 at least, and were sufficiently proficient in English so as to comprehend and respond to the self-report measures.

### *Variables:*

- Predictor Variables - Eudaimonia, Hedonia,
- Criterion Variable - Dyadic Satisfaction.

### *Tools:*

- a) The HEMA-R scale** (Hedonic and Eudaimonic Motives for Activities-Revised) by Veronika Huta is a self-reporting, 10 item questionnaire that requires participants to rate their reasons for doing things on a scale, from 1 to 7. Out of these ten items, 5 assess eudaimonia and 5 hedonia. The tool is used to determine if a person's pursuits in life are oriented more towards feeling good, or being good, or is there a balance. The total scores are calculated by adding all the points for items under hedonic motives and items under eudaimonic motives separately, which are then compared to understand the overall bent of the participant.
- b) Dyadic Adjustment Scale** built by Gram B Spanier, is a self-reporting questionnaire that needs to be filled by both the partners for assessment of the quality of marriage and other similar dyads. It has 32 items, which are further divided into four subscales viz. consensus, affectional expression, satisfaction, and cohesion. While the scale measures individual's perception of the quality of marriage, adding the male and female scores and dividing by two give the dyadic score. The scale has two items (18 and 19, which are reversed scored), and the total score is calculated by adding the scores of all the subscales.

### *Analysis of Data*

Data was analysed using Actor Partner Interdependence Model and Couple Level Regression using R - Software, (package lavaan).

## **RESULTS**

This section presents descriptive statistics, correlation outcomes, and actor partner analysis to assess the relationship between eudaimonia, hedonia and dyadic satisfaction.

**Descriptive Statistics:**

Data was computed to examine the distribution of individual and couple level variables, and to ensure that further dyadic analysis would be suitable.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables:**

S. No.	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	Dyadic Satisfaction (Individual)	110.113	22.596
2	Dyadic Average (Individual)	110.273	20.539
3	Total Happiness	52.000	7.780
4	Eudaimonia (Individual)	26.600	5.508
5	Hedonia (Individual)	25.800	5.04
6	Difference b/n Hedonia and Eudaimonia	2.333	3.890
7	Eudaimonia (Male)	26.160	5.579
8	Eudaimonia (Female)	27.040	5.438
9	Hedonia (Male)	24.960	5.493
10	Hedonia (Female)	26.640	4.425
11	Dyadic Satisfaction (Male)	110.706	21.276
12	Dyadic Satisfaction (Female)	109.520	23.973
13	Dyadic Average (Couple)	110.113	20.713

Results of Table 1 indicate that (!) Mean levels of happiness and dyadic satisfaction were moderate to high; (2) Individual well-being scores indicate slightly higher eudaimonic orientation at 26.6; (3) Gender-wise descriptives suggest marginally higher hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (at 27.04 and 26.64) among females; and (4) Individual dyadic satisfaction and dyadic average scores reported by male and female partners are comparable (values at 110). This indicates alignment in perceived relationship satisfaction.

**APIM and Regression Analysis:**

To test the hypothesis, Actor–Partner Interdependence Models (APIM) were employed for H1 to H4 and actor - partner effects of individual hedonic and eudaimonic happiness on dyadic satisfaction were analysed. Couple-level associations between difference / sum of eudaimonia and hedonia with dyadic satisfaction (N5 - N7) were computed and analysed using couple level linear regression methods. The calculated values and results are given in the following table 2.

**Table 2: Summary of Hypothesis Testing for Associations Between Happiness Dimensions and Dyadic Satisfaction.**

Hypo Thesis	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Analysis	Estimate (B)	Significance p < 0.05	Status
H1 Actor	Female Eudaimonia	Own Dyadic Satisfaction	APIM	0.798	0.078 (significant)	Supported
H1 Actor	Male Eudaimonia	Own Dyadic Satisfaction	APIM	0.113	0.836 (non significant)	Not supported
H2 Actor	Female Hedonia	Own Dyadic Satisfaction	APIM	-0.200	0.685 (non significant)	Not supported
H2 Actor	Male Hedonia	Own Dyadic Satisfaction	APIM	0.257	0.569 (non significant)	Not supported
H3 Partner	Female Eudaimonia	Male Dyadic Satisfaction	APIM	0.045	0.914 (non significant)	Not supported

## Is Feeling Good, Enough? Impact of Hedonic and Eudaimonic Happiness on Dyadic Satisfaction

Hypo Thesis	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Analysis	Estimate (B)	Significance $p < 0.05$	Status
H3 Partner	Male Eudaimonia	Female Dyadic Satisfaction	APIM	0.429	0.359 (non significant)	Not supported
H4 Partner	Female Hedonia	Male Dyadic Satisfaction	APIM	0.234	0.580 (non significant)	Not supported
H4 Partner	Male Hedonia	Female Dyadic Satisfaction	APIM	-0.683	0.209 (non significant)	Not supported
H5	Eudaimonia + Hedonia (couple mean happiness)	Average Dyadic Satisfaction	Couple Level Linear Regression	0.20	0.06 (non significant)	0.05 – 0.10 = suggestive
H6	Difference between Eudaimonia and Hedonia	Average Dyadic Satisfaction	Couple Level Linear Regression	-0.01	0.974 (non significant)	Not supported
H7	Inter-partner imbalance in hedonic–eudaimonic orientation	Average Dyadic Satisfaction	Couple Level Linear Regression	1.02	0.050 (just significant)	Supported

### APIM for H1 - H4:

Results shown in Table 2 for actor (self-influence) and partner (cross-influence) effects are estimated simultaneously, while controlling for the other, so as to identify the true dyadic patterns (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). Here, they demonstrate that individual eudaimonia and hedonia do not have statistically significant actor effects on one's own dyadic satisfaction for either husbands or wives. Similarly, partner effects were also non-significant. Overall, the findings indicate that individual eudaimonia and hedonia when considered in isolation, were not strong predictors of dyadic satisfaction. Comparable null or weak associations between indicators of individual well-being and relationship outcomes have been reported in prior dyadic and well-being research (Diener & Seligman, 2002; Lucas et al., 2003).

### Couple Level Linear Regression (H5 – H7):

A regression analysis at the couple level examined whether total hedonia and eudaimonia predicted dyadic average satisfaction. Results showed that total happiness was not a significant predictor, however a positive B at 0.20 and p value of 0.06 is suggestive of a weak positive orientation on couple average dyadic satisfaction. This finding aligns with prior research suggesting that aggregated individual well-being may not straightforwardly translate into relationship-level outcomes (Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003).

When examining within-couple differences, a difference in partners' total eudaimonia and hedonia levels (called total happiness here) did not significantly predict dyadic satisfaction. (H6). However, a more refined measure partner imbalance, calculated with difference in individual eudaimonia–hedonia for both partners, showed a marginally significant positive association with dyadic average satisfaction. Couples in which partners differed more in their internal balance of eudaimonic and hedonic orientations reported slightly higher

## Is Feeling Good, Enough? Impact of Hedonic and Eudaimonic Happiness on Dyadic Satisfaction

average dyadic satisfaction. This model accounted for negligible proportion of variance ( $R^2 < .01$ ) and approximately 5% of variance in dyadic satisfaction (H7). Similar patterns emphasizing complementarity rather than similarity in relational functioning have been observed in prior relationship research (Markey & Markey, 2007; Gonzaga et al., 2007). This thus, can be interpreted as neither individual nor combined happiness reliably predict dyadic satisfaction.

### **Summary of Findings:**

Taken together, the results indicate that neither individual-level happiness dimensions nor their aggregate reliably predicted dyadic satisfaction. Instead, differences in partners' internal happiness orientations for eudaimonia and hedonia, show comparatively greater relevance.

## **DISCUSSION**

The findings of this study challenge a widely accepted assumption of positive psychology, that higher individual happiness naturally leads to better relationship outcomes. Although both eudaimonia (meaning, purpose) and hedonia (pleasure, enjoyment) are central components of well-being, assessment of neither of them at individual levels emerged as a strong predictor of marital satisfaction. This is indicative of the widely accepted fact that what benefits individuals may not automatically benefit relationships. Plethora of philosophical and relational theories, right from Aristotle's conception of eudaimonia (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 2009) to Bowen's family systems (Bowen, M., 1978) and interdependence theories Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978), all have emphasized that flourishing relationships, and individual interests may not directly translate into relational satisfaction (Seligman, 2011) *Flourish*.

While in mainstream positive psychology, both dimensions are said to contribute positively to individual well-being and, this, it is expected, would naturally extend to the human being's relationship quality with people at large. In this research, the concept is weakly supported with a positive and trending relationship between female eudaimonia and their own dyadic satisfaction (actor effect). However, the same is not true for their partner effect and both actor and partner effects of men. This could be attributed to the assumption that when women have a sense of purpose and meaning in life, it seeps into their relationships also. If they are able to establish a coherence between their values, self acceptance and lived roles (Ryff & Singer, 2008, Impett et al., 2005), they are able to derive satisfaction for themselves in their marriage as well.

Additionally, the marginal positive association of partner imbalance difference (difference between the difference of male Eudaimonia & Hedonia and female Eudaimonia & Hedonia) offers an insight which works at a more subtle level. It suggests that the more the difference, the better the dyadic satisfaction. This points toward the possibility of complementing partners, where differing orientations may add balance in the dyad, viz one partner orients towards meaning and long-term purpose, while the other contributes enjoyment and in-the-moment emotional uplifts. This also explains the fact that when both partners hedonia and eudaimonia is summed up, it shows a positive trend towards average dyadic satisfaction.

Thus, this study provides evidence that individual happiness—whether hedonic or eudaimonic—is not, by itself, a reliable predictor of marital satisfaction. Instead, relational outcomes appear to be shaped by dyadic processes, particularly the ways in which partners' orientations toward happiness differ, complement, and balance one another. By highlighting

the limited explanatory power of individual happiness constructs for marital outcomes, the findings offer a counter-narrative to dominant positive psychology frameworks that prioritize individual well-being as the primary route to relational health.

### **CONCLUSION**

Eudaimonia and hedonia are broadly regarded as two distinct dimensions of happiness. Hedonia reflects the pursuit of pleasure and comfort while staying away from pain, and eudaimonia emphasizes meaning, personal growth, purpose, and value-driven living. Analysing partner relationships in line with this, the present findings demonstrate that neither individual hedonia nor individual eudaimonia, when considered independently, exert a significant influence on dyadic satisfaction. This also suggests that happiness, when viewed with individualistic orientation largely prevalent in the present era, might enhance individual functioning, but at the same time, it might not necessarily translate into relational well-being, particularly in the context of marriages or romantic relationships.

Marriages operate as interdependent systems in which personal fulfillment may at times coexist with, or even compete against, needs of relationships, shared goals, and also role expectations. From this perspective, individualistic orientation towards either eudaimonia and hedonia may function more as intrapersonal resources than as predictors of dyadic outcomes.

Also, the marginal effects observed at the dyadic level indicate that it is not the absolute level of hedonic or eudaimonic orientation that matters most for marital satisfaction, but rather how these orientations are distributed, balanced, and negotiated between partners. These findings invite a shift away from individualistic models of happiness toward a relational understanding of well-being, wherein marital satisfaction emerges from complementarity, coordination, and mutual regulation rather than from the accumulation of individual happiness alone.

The results underscore the need for a systems-oriented understanding of marital well being, where there is a balance between individualistic as well as collectivistic goals, especially in the context of marriage and family life.

### ***Limitations and Future Research***

- The present study has certain limitations that should be acknowledged, because they also give directions for future research.
- This research uses a cross-sectional design, which limits causal interpretation. Studies that use longitudinal design could examine if changes in eudaimonic or hedonic orientations over time (creating different age groups) could predict subsequent changes in dyadic satisfaction, or vice versa.
- This study relied exclusively on self-report measures, which may be influenced by personal biases and under reporting of dissatisfactions. Future research could incorporate partner reports, behavioural observations, or qualitative interviews to provide for a richer understanding.
- The present constructs of assessment of eudaimonia and hedonia, were examined at a global level. It is possible that specific components of eudaimonia (e.g., purpose in life, personal growth, autonomy) or hedonia (e.g., positive affect, pleasure seeking) may show different associations in the context of relationships. Future research could

## Is Feeling Good, Enough? Impact of Hedonic and Eudamonic Happiness on Dyadic Satisfaction

analyse and identify any changes in dimensions that are more relevant for couple dyadic analysis.

- This research analysed 75 couples (N=150). A larger sample size across all age groups, could help understand couple relationships through age and stage related milestones.

### REFERENCES

- Aristotle. (2001). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). In R. McKeon (Ed.), *The basic works of Aristotle* (pp. 935–1126). Modern Library. (Original work published ca. 350 BCE)
- Bradbury, T. N., Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2000). Research on the nature and determinants of marital satisfaction: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62*(4), 964–980. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00964.x>
- Brickman, P., & Campbell, D. T. (1971). Hedonic relativism and planning the good society. In M. H. Appley (Ed.), *Adaptation-level theory: A symposium* (pp. 287–302). Academic Press.
- Christopher, J. C. (1999). Situating psychological well-being: Exploring the cultural roots of its theory and research. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 77*(2), 141–152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02434.x>
- Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin, 122*(1), 5–37. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.122.1.5>
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*(3), 542–575. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542>
- Fitzpatrick, J., Gareau, A., Lafontaine, M.-F., & Gaudreau, P. (2016). How to use the Actor–Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) to estimate different dyadic patterns in Mplus: A step-by-step tutorial. *The Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 12*(1), 74–86. <https://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.12.1.p074>
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Harvard University Press.
- Gruber, J., Mauss, I. B., & Tamir, M. (2011). A dark side of happiness? How, when, and why happiness is not always good. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(2), 222–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691611406927>
- Huta, V. (2013). Eudaimonia. In S. David, I. Boniwell, & A. C. Ayers (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of happiness* (pp. 201–213). Oxford University Press.
- Huta, V., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). Pursuing pleasure or virtue: The differential and overlapping well-being benefits of hedonic and eudaimonic motives. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 11*(6), 735–762. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-009-9171-4>
- Huta, V., & Waterman, A. S. (2014). Eudaimonia and its distinction from hedonia: Developing a classification and terminology. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 15*(6), 1425–1456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9485-0>
- Kagitcibasi, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*(4), 403–422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022105275959>
- Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.). (1999). *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. Guilford Press.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2002). The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 43*(2), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3090197>

## Is Feeling Good, Enough? Impact of Hedonic and Eudamonic Happiness on Dyadic Satisfaction

- Luhmann, M., Hofmann, W., Eid, M., & Lucas, R. E. (2012). Subjective well-being and adaptation to life events: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*(3), 592–615. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025948>
- Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(6), 803–855. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803>
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224–253. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>
- Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R. (2009). Stress and reactivity to daily relationship experiences: How stress hinders adaptive processes in marriage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(3), 435–450. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015663>
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2009). Review of the Satisfaction with Life Scale. In E. Diener (Ed.), *Assessing well-being* (pp. 101–117). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2354-4\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2354-4_5)
- Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Orientations to happiness and life satisfaction: The full life versus the empty life. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 6*, 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-004-1278-z>
- Pressman, S. D., & Cohen, S. (2005). Does positive affect influence health? *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(6), 925–971. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.925>
- Ruini, C., & Fava, G. A. (2019). Spotlight on eudaimonia and depression: A systematic review. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management, 12*, 717–726. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S178255>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 141–166. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141>
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(6), 1069–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>
- Ryff, C. D., Morozink Boylan, J., & Kirsch, J. A. (2021). Eudaimonic and hedonic well-being: An integrative perspective. In M. T. Lee et al. (Eds.), *Measuring well-being* (pp. 92–135). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197512531.003.0005>
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Free Press.
- Sooki, Z. (2021). Happiness as a significant predictor of women’s marital satisfaction. *Nursing & Healthcare International Journal, 5*(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.23880/nhij-16000239>
- Thorsteinsen, K., & Vittersø, J. (2018). Striving for well-being: The different roles of hedonia and eudaimonia. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 8*(2), 89–109. <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v8i2.733>
- Veenhoven, R. (2020). ‘Hedonic’ and ‘eudaimonic’ happiness: Which qualifies best as a moral good? *International Journal of Happiness and Development, 6*(2), 123–141. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJHD.2020.109194>
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(4), 678–691. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.4.678>
- Wood, A. M., & Joseph, S. (2010). The absence of positive psychological well-being as a risk factor for depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 122*(3), 213–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2009.07.007>

***Acknowledgment***

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

***Conflict of Interest***

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

***How to cite this article:*** Pandey, N. & Singh, R. (2026). Is Feeling Good, Enough? Impact of Hedonic and Eudamonic Happiness on Dyadic Satisfaction. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 14(1), 3029-3041. DIP:18.01.303.20261401, DOI:10.25215/1401.303