

Quality of Life

Among Korea, China and Philippines: A Comparative Study

Changcheng Zhou, Professor

Department of Sociology

Wuhan University

Email: czhou@whu.edu.cn

Introduction

Quality of life (QOL) is an offshoot of the social indicators movement first originated in economics and sociology. The impetus behind the social indicators movement is the fact that many economists and sociologists grew increasingly dissatisfied with traditional economic measures (e.g., Gross National Product, Gross Domestic Product) as indicators of societal development. Social indicators researchers coined the term “quality of life” as a construct of societal development, and many social measures of QOL were developed.

Nor is the quality of life concept any easier to work with because of its all-embracing nature. In terms of human well-being it is an objective of development, while in terms of human resources it is a measure whereby development may be pursued. In this regard, basic, secondary and tertiary human needs, a hierarchy that remains open to challenge, can be considered. Basic needs, which some identify as “food, clothing and shelter”, are primary biological concerns; their satisfaction is a universally accepted condition for a minimally acceptable quality of life. Secondary needs include such common social concerns as employment, education, safety and security. Tertiary needs include more abstract and intangible considerations, of widely varying interpretation, such as freedom, justice, opportunity, fulfillment and comfort.

Three types of measures are generally used for monitoring the QOL: (a) the gross national product (GNP) and related monetary measures, as derived from the System of National Accounts; (b) measures of social conditions, or “objective social indicators”; (c) and measures of people’s perceptions or assessments of well-being, or “subjective social indicators”. The System of National Accounts—Per capita income, which is

derived from the GNP, remains the most popular QOL indicator, arising out of the concept of income as generalized purchased power; Objective Social Indicators—The research for QOL indicators other than income reflects the view that income does not adequately represent the concepts of a society. To some extent, other data are already available; however; Subjective Social Indicators research has limited the concept of QOL only to subjective social indicators.

Figure 1. System–theory structure of quality of Life Concepts and Causes

INPUT THROUGHPUT OUTPUT

(Environment, Public Policy) (Individual Choices) (Happiness, Survival, Contribution)

Personality, SES Marriage, Children Family and Friends

Public Education Service Educational Level Emotional Well Being

GDP/capita Consumption Material Well Being

Health Services Personal Health Health

Freedom Job Choice Work and Productive Acts

Income Inequality Expectations, Standards Local Community

Personal Safety

In order to specify how quality of life is related to exogenous and endogenous variables, a system–theory approach will be used in this research. Figure 1 displays the analysis diagram of the approach. The first column of the figure contains input variables, which denote exogenous environmental variables affecting citizens QOL. Common measures of this are objective indicators of QOL, and examples are listed in that column as GDP/capita, extent of freedom, income inequality, etc. Many of these indicators can be controlled by policy to improve QOL, and are much studied by policy analysts to learn how to improve them. Second column of the figure contains throughput variables, which describe the individual's response to this environment (e.g., education achieved, marriage choice). There are also often measured as "objective indicators", but reflect the

individual' s choice in response to the environment and to public policy. Third column contains output variables, which is the result of input and throughout. These output variables are called happiness (or SWB), personal survival, and contribution to the human heritage. It is noted that all presented in the third column are partition of SWB into domains of life.

The social concerns of quality of life are economy, education and health. The main indicators are GNP per capita, poverty (percentage of people living on less than \$1 a day), infant mortality rate (per 1,000 live births), adult illiteracy rate (percentage of people 15 and above) and access to sanitation (percentage of population).

I. QUALITY OF LIFE IN KOREA

As sated–above, there are different methods to appraise quality of life. The economic element is still very important in developing countries, particularly in Asia countries. GNP, the broadest measure of national income, measures the total domestic and foreign value added claimed by residents. GNP comprises GDP plus net receipts of primary income from nonresident sources. The World Bank uses GNP per capita in u.s. dollars to classify countries for analytical purpose and to determine borrowing eligibility.

I. GNP per capita

GNP per capita

Year 1989 1991 1992 1993 1994

GNP per capita 4,400 6,330 6,790 7,660 8,220

Source: World Bank International Economics Department, September, 1990; April 1992; April 1993; April 1994; April 1995; April 1996.

In 1989, GNP per capita in Asia is 540 dollars, in upper middle income countries is 3,810, in next higher income group is 18,340, which means GNP per capita in Korea is 3,960 dollars higher than in Asia countries, is 580 dollars higher than in upper middle income countries, is 13,940 dollars lower than in next higher income group.

In 1991, GNP per capita in East Asia is 650 dollars, in upper middle income countries is 3,820, in next higher income group is 20,570, which means GNP per capita in Korea is 5980 dollars higher than in Asia countries, is 2510 dollars higher than in upper middle income countries, is 13,240 dollars lower than in next higher income group.

In 1992, GNP per capita in East Asia is 760 dollars, in upper middle income countries is 5980 dollars higher than in Asia countries, 3,870, in next higher income group is 21,965, which means GNP per capita in Korea is 6,030 dollars than in East Asia countries, is 2510 dollars higher than in upper middle income countries, is 13,240 dollars lower than in next higher income group.

In 1993 GNP per capita in East Asia is 820 dollars, in upper middle income countries is 4350 dollars, in next higher income group is 23,680, which means GNP per capita in Korea is 6,840 dollars than in East Asia countries, is 3310 dollars higher than in upper middle income countries, is 16,020 dollars lower than in next higher income group.

In 1994 GNP per capita in East Asia is 890 dollars, in upper middle income countries is 4710 dollars, in next higher income group is 24,030, which means GNP per capita in Korea is 7330 dollars than in East Asia countries, is 3510 dollars higher than in upper middle income countries, is 15,810 dollars lower than in next higher income group.

II. Infant mortality rate

Infant mortality rate is the number of deaths of infants under one year of age during the indicated year per 1,000 live births in the same year.

Infant mortality rate from 1989 to 1999

Year	1989	1991	1987-92	1988-93	1989-94	1995	1998	1999
IMR	23.5	16	12.8	10.6	12	10	9	8

Source: World Bank International Economics Department, September, 1990; April 1992; April 1993; April 1994; April 1995; April 1996.

Infant Mortality Rate International Comparison

Infant Mortality Rate

1. 1990 1998 1999

Korea, Rep. 46 12 9 8

World 98 61 54 54

Low Income 113 88 68 54

Middle Income 87 38 31 31

Low & middle income 107 66 59 59

High Income 21 8 6 6

Sources: 2000 World Development Indicators, . 2001 World Development Indicators

III. Life expectancy at birth

Life expectancy at birth is the number of years a newborn infant would live if prevailing patterns of mortality at the time of its birth were to stay the same throughout its life.

Life expectancy at birth

Year 1989 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995

Overall 69.8 70 71 71 71

Female 73.0 1.09? 8.0? ? 7.5? ? 8.3? ?

Sources: Source: World Bank International Economics Department, September, 1990; April 1992; April 1993; April 1994; April 1995; April 1996.

Life Expectancy International Comparison

1980 1998

Korea, Rep. 67 73

World 61 67

Low Income “ 63

Middle Income 65 69

Low & middle income 58 65

High Income 74 78

Sources: 2000 World Development Indicators.

Before 1989, life expectancy at birth in Korea was changed from 56.7 to 63.9. In 1989, the life expectancy rate is 69.8 while it is 64.4 in Asian countries and it is 67.4 in upper-middle income countries, which means that life expectancy rate in Korea is higher than in Asian Countries and in upper-middle income, but it is lower than next higher income group. Even until the end of 1990s, the situation is still the same.

IV. Adult illiteracy rate

Adult illiteracy rate is the percentage of people ages 15 and over who cannot, with understanding, read and write a short, simple statement about their everyday life (2001 World Development Indicators, the World Bank).

Adult illiteracy rate

Year 1970-75 1980-85 1987-92

Total 12 5 4

Female “ 9 7

Sources: Source: World Bank International Economics Department, September, 1990; April 1992; April 1993; April 1994; April 1995; April 1996.

Education outcomes international comparison

Adult illiteracy rate

Male Female

1980 1990 1998 1999 1980 1990 1998 1999

Korea, Rep. 3 2 1 1 11 7 4 4

World 28 18 46 32

Middle Income 15 13 10 9 22 26 15 20

Low & middle income 29 18 18 18 48 39 33 32

Sources: 2000 World Development Indicators, . 2001 World Development Indicators

V. Access to sanitation

Percentage of population with access to safe water is the share of the population with reasonable access to an adequate amount of safe water (including treated surface water and untreated but uncontaminated water, such as from springs, sanitary wells, and protected boreholes). In urban areas the source may be a public fountain or standpipe located not more than 200 meters away from the dwelling. In rural areas the definition implies that members of the household do not have to spend a disproportionate part of the day fetching water. An adequate amount of safe water is that needed to satisfy metabolic, hygienic, and domestic requirements?usually about 20 liters a person a day. The definition of safe water has changed over time.

Percentage of population with access to sanitation is the share of the population with at least adequate excreta disposal facilities that can effectively prevent human, animal, and insect contact with excreta. Suitable facilities range from simple but protected pit latrines to flush toilets with a sewerage connection. To be effective, all facilities must be correctly constructed and properly maintained (World Bank, 2000).

Access to sanitation

Year 1989 1993 1994

Access to safe water 76.0 78.4 78.4

Urban 90.0 91.0 91.0

Rural 48.0 49.0 49.0

Access to health care 100.0 100.0

Access to safe water and sanitation: International Comparison

Access to safe water Access to sanitation

1982–85 1990–96 1982–85 1990–96

Korea, Rep. 83 83 100 100

Philippines 65 83 57 77

Thailand 66 89 47 96

Japan 99 96 99 100

Sources: 2000 World Development Indicators, . 2001 World Development Indicators

II. QUALITY OF LIFE IN PHILIPPINES

Quality of Life indicators system development in the Philippines can be divided three stages, namely, the social indicators project in 1970s, Philippine development report in 1980, and human development in 1990s. In this section, we will discuss these three phases respectively.

In the early 1970s, the Development of the Philippines pursued a Social Indicator Project to promote and improve measure of the quality of life. Social indicators were further developed in the late of 1970s, under the Economic and Social Impact Analysis?Women in Development Project of the National Economic and Development Authority and the Philippine Institute for Development Studies, to trace and quantify the social impact of development at the macro and project levels.

The social indicators project of the Development Academy of the Philippines aimed to formulate a measurement system capable of objectively depicting periodic changes in national development. It identified the following as basic Philippine social concern: (1) Health and Nutrition, (2) Learning, (3) Income and Consumption, (4) Employment, (5) Non-human Productive Resources, (6) Housing, Utilities, and the environment, (7) Public Safety and Justice, (8) Political Values, and (9) Social Mobility.

The Indicators regarding quality of life include, among them, per capita gross national product; unemployment rate; telephone density (%); housing; coverage of adequately served water (%); enrolment (elementary, secondary, tertiary, post secondary and higher education); life expectancy; infant mortality rate; social welfare and social security.

Philippine Human Development Index

Development must enable the people to enlarge their choices, acquire education, live a healthy life, enjoy a decent life, and fulfill their aspirations based on political freedom, guaranteed human rights, and self-respect (UNDP, 1994). Sustainable human development is a concept in which growth is not only generated but is equitably distributed, people's capabilities to engage in productive employment are enhanced, people are empowered to participate in making decisions that affect their lives, and the environment is regenerated rather than destroyed (UNDP, 1994).

The Philippine Human Development Report analyzes the three components of the HDI, i.e., knowledge, health, and standard of living. The index system includes four domains, which are physical survival and health, education, income and consumption, and environment.

Indicators regarding physical survival and health are (1) life expectancy; (2) per capital health spending; (3) infant mortality (per 1,000 live births); (4) child mortality rate; (5) with access to sanitary toilets (%); (6) with access to safe drinking water (%); (7) population per physician; and (8) population per hospital bed.

Table 2-9 GDP Per capita (in current pesos)

1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
19,595	20,685	22,013	24,671	27,123	30,208	33,003	35,458	38,772	42,114

Source: National Statistical Coordination Board.

The unemployment picture initially looked promising as the number of unemployed decreased during 1986–1990 by an annual average of five percent or a decrement of 471,000 during the period. However, in 1991 the unemployment rate reached 10.5 percent. In particular, the April 1991 unemployment rate reached 14.4 percent—the highest since 1978. In 1992, however, the employment rate declined to 9.8 percent, or about 2.6 million unemployment workers.

Table 2-10 Rate of Unemployment, 1991-2000

Year	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Philippines	9.0	8.6	8.9	8.4	8.4	7.4	7.9	9.6	9.4	10.1
Urban	11.9	11.4	22.8	22.6	22.2	9.6	20.5	12.1	12.1	13.3

Rural 6.2 6.1 6.1 5.4 5.8 5.5 5.5 7.4 6.9 7.1

Source: National Statistical Office

Poverty Alleviation and the Promotion of Equity and Social Justice

Table 2-11 Annual Per Capita Thresholds and Incidences of Families, 1985-2000

Year Annual PC Poverty Threshold/a Magnitude of Families/b Incidence/c

A. (%)

1985 3,744 4,355,052 44.2

1988 4,777 4,230,484 40.2

1991 7,350 4,879,620 40.7

1994 8,885 4,431,170 35.5

1997 11,319 4,511,151 31.8

2000 13,916 5,215,412 34.2

/a The annual per capita income required or the amount to be spent to satisfy the nutritional requirements (2,000 calories) and other basic needs.

/b The number of families whose annual per capita income fall below the annual per capita poverty threshold.

/c The Proportion of families whose annual per capita fall below the annual per capita poverty threshold.

Source: National Economic and Development Authority, 1993; Philippine Statistical Yearbook 2001.

Table 2-12 Percentage Distribution of Total Family Income by Income Decile

Decile 1985 1988 1991

First Decile 2.0 2.0 1.8

Second Decile 3.2 3.2 2.9

Third Decile	4.1	4.1	3.7
Fourth Decile	5.0	5.0	4.6
Fifth Decile	6.0	6.0	5.6
Sixth Decile	7.3	7.3	6.9
Seventh Decile	8.9	9.0	8.7
Eighth Decile	11.4	11.6	11.3
Ninth Decile	15.7	16.0	16.0
Tenth Decile	36.4	35.8	38.6
Max. Equalization Index	33.5	33.4	35.9
Gini ratio	0.446	0.441	0.4

Source: National Statistic Office

Table 2-13 Gini Concentration Ratios

1985	1988	1991	1994	1997	2 000
0.4466	0.4446	0.468	0.4507	0.4872	0.4507

Sources: National Statistical Office; UNDP, 1994.

Health

Table 2-14 Life Expectancy (years), 1970-1992

1970	1980	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
58.1	61.6	63.1	63.4	63.7	64.0	64.3	64.6	64.9	65.2

Source: Philippine Human Development Report, 1994.

Table 2-15 Life Expectancy at Birth by Sex (years), 1995-2000

Sex	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Female 70.08 70.38 70.68 70.98 71.28 71.58

Male 64.83 65.13 65.43 65.73 66.03 66.33

Source: National Statistical Coordination Board, Philippine Statistical Yearbook 2000.

Table 2-16 Infant Mortality Rate and Child Mortality Rate, 1990-1995

1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995

Infant Mortality Rate 57 55 54 52 50 49

Child Mortality Rate 24 23 22 21 20 19

Source: NSCB Technical Working on Maternal and Child Mortality.

Education

Education is the fundamental like to national progress. It is the key to liberate people from poverty and enable them to fully utilize their human faculties to contribute most effectively to the economic and social development of society. As embodied in the Philippine Constitution, “The State shall protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and shall take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all.” Thus, the government recognizes education as one of the most essential social services that have to be adequately provided and improved in order to achieve the goals of development and people empowerment.

III. COMPARISONS AMONG THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA AND THE PUBLIC OF PHILIPPINES

Social indicators work has switched from a technocratic model to an enlightenment model (Land, 1996). The technocratic model aims for data to promote technical solutions for social problems. The enlightenment model seeks to place QOL issues on the political agenda by supplying data for public debate through the mass media?which according to Vodel (1997) is actually “the original purpose of social indicators: to send signals to governments, business, other organizations and the general public” .

As discussed previously, determining the domains of quality of life is very difficult task. We will focus on objective indicators of quality of life in order to compare among three countries.

The most basic level of human well-being is the state of a person's health and nutrition, or the length of human life itself. Health is a key aspect of the quality of life not only in its own right but in its implications for all other quality-of-life components. The wide range of health standards among three countries is reflected in variations in life expectancy, morbidity.

People's achievements depend up the extent of their understanding of their natural, social, and cultural environment. Like health, education is not only a key component of the quality of life but has pervasive implications for all others as well. In this regard, education must be viewed as all its dimensions: The acquisition of formal education, as represented by literacy, as well as non-formal education, relating to socialization and culturalization process, are both essential contributors to the quality of life. Major indicators of quality of formal education are the literacy rate and years of schooling.

The national accounts play a crucial role in quality of life in developing countries,

such as China and Philippines. Incomes may be used to invest further in health, education, training, and other forms of human capital. Thus Gross Domestic Products (GDP) and GDP per capita capture a potential improvement in quality of life.

Table 3-1 Selected Quality of Life Indicators International Comparison

Country	Life expectancy (years)	Adult Literacy (%)	Mean Year of Schooling	Real GDP per Capita (PPP\$)	Human Development Index
1990	1990	1990	1989		
South Korea	70.1	96.3	8.8	6,117	0.876
China	70.1	73.3	4.8	2,656	0.612
Philippines	64.9	93.5	7.0	2,269	0.600

Source: UNDP, 1994. *The Philippine Human Development Report 1994*.

Socio-Economic Indicator

Table 3-2 GDP per capita (1995 US\$)

Country	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	1998
South Korea	“	“	“	“	9700	
Philippines	974	1,166	967	1,064	1050	1,092
China	138	168	261	349	620	727

Source: UNDP, 2000. *Human Development Report 2000*. NY.: Oxford University Press; World Bank, 1997. *World Development Indicators*. Washington: The World Bank,

From 1960–1994, average annual rate of change of GDP per capita among Philippines and China is 0.5 percent and 7.5 percent respectively. According to Human Development Report 2001, GDP per capita in 1999, Philippines is 3805 and China is 3617. Average GDP per capita in the world is 6980, and in East Asia and the Pacific is 3950. Therefore, to develop economy is crucial task for two countries.

China is 780 US dollars in terms of Gross National income per capita in 1999, the rank is 142, Philippines is 1050, rank is 133 while Korea is 8490, the rank is 54 in the world..

Health

The direct relevance of health to the quality of life is incontestable. People require a reasonable standard of health to be able to work, support them and their families, contribute to society, and take advantage of the recreational and cultural

opportunities which their environment offers.

The overall assessment of health of the quality of life in the ESCAP region is one of dramatic improvement. Life expectancy figures, for instance, reveal a substantial overall drop in mortality rates. Child mortality alone has fallen from 280 to 160 per 1,000 in the past 40 years. Moreover, the rate of decline in the mortality figures has accelerated over the past 30

years, with child mortality declining by 2 per cent a year in the 1960s, 3 percent in the 1970s and 5 percent in the 1980s (World Bank, 1993).

Table 3-3

Life expectancy at birth (years) Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) Public expenditure on health (as % of GDP)

Country 1970-75 1995-2000 1970 1994 1999 1990 1996-1998

Korea 62.5 74.3 43 5 5.4

Philippines 57.8 68.3 60 36 31 1.5 1.7

China 63.2 69.8 85 43 33 1.2 0.7

Sources: UNDP, *Human Development Report* 2001; 2000; 1997. World Bank, 1997. *World Development Indicators*. Washington: The World Bank,

Table 3-4 Life expectancy at birth (years)

Country 1960 1980 1991 1995 1997 1998 1999

China 47.1 66.9 70.4 69.2 69.8 70.1 70.2

Philippines 52.8 61.0 67.0 67.4 68.3 68.6 69.0

Korea 66.8 70.5 74.7

Source: ESCAP, 1994; *Social Indicators* 1995-1999;

Life expectancy figures would generally be expected to correlate positively with per capita income figures. However, the causal relationship is not clear. Through the twentieth century life expectancy has been strongly associated at the national level with income per capita... [and it] rises rapidly with income at low levels of income, particularly when income per capita is less than \$3,000. The relationship has shifted upward over each thirty-year period, so that more health is realized for a given income... This upward shift shows that health depends on more than

income alone (World Bank, 1993). The average life expectancy at birth of East Asia and the Pacific Region (EAP) is 69.2 in 1999, while the average level in the world is 66.7. Only Philippines is below the average level of EAP.

Table 3-5 Mortality Rate, 1980, 1991 and 1998

Country Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 live births)

1960 1970 1980 1991 1994 1998 1999

China 150 85 56.0 28.0 43 38 33

Philippines 79 60 63.2 41.0 36 32 31

Republic of Korea 43 17.3 12.0 5

Source: ESCAP, 1995: Table 2.2; *Human Development Report 2001*.

In terms of mortality rate, although China increased slightly, Philippines declined to 7.3 per 1,000 and in 1991 from 8.7 per 1,000 in 1980. In comparative terms, the record relating to infant mortality shows particularly rapid advance in China, relatively slow progress in Philippines.

The infant mortality rate in the world in 1999 is 56; the average rate of East Asia and the Pacific is 34. The infant mortality rates of all three countries are below 34, China 33, Philippines 31 and Korea 5, which are close to middle income countries (32).

Access to safe water varies considerably across the three countries. The Philippines has extended its coverage to 100 per cent of the urban population in the end of 1980s, while Korea has extended its coverage to 91 per cent. The population giant China is with 87 per cent of the urban population served by water supply systems.

Rural areas generally have lower levels of access to safe than the urban centers. Although 66 per cent of rural population in China has access to safe water, compared to an estimated 58 per cent in 1985, implying a considerable improvement in rural coverage in the second half of the 1980s, there is a bigger gap between the urban area and the rural areas, as can be seen from the table, compared with Korea.

Table 3-6 with access to safe drinking water and sanitation services (percentages)

Country Safe drinking water Sanitation services

Urban (1988) Rural (1988) Urban (1988) Rural (1988)

China 87 66 100 95

Philippines 100 75 98 85

Republic of Korea 91 49 99 100

Source: ESCAP, 1994.

Education

Education is universally recognized as an essential aspect of quality of life and as a precondition for human resources and overall development. Improvement in any aspect of quality of life, whether health, environment or working life, is likely to be partially if not mainly anchored in education (ESCAP, 1995). There is clear evidence, for example, of a positive correlation between education of girls and family health and between education of mothers and fertility decline, improved family nutrition and the emergence of a more supportive environment for the young. Education is also a key means of equalizing development opportunities between disadvantaged and privileged social groups.

Literacy is a primary indicator of quality of life in that it measures the extent of access to available knowledge sources and, to some degree, the ability to participate effectively in society.

Table 3-7 Adult literacy Rate (% age 15 and over)

Country 1970 1980 1990 1995 1997 1998 1999

China 73.3 81.5 82.7 82.8 83.5

Philippines 83 89.7 94.4 94.6 94.6 94.8 95.1

Republic of Korea 87.6 96.3 97.6

Sources: UNDP, 1990–2001; ESCAP, 1995.

From the development point of view, all of three countries make the striking point that a low development base and large population numbers

need not deter rapid improvement in adult literacy. Adult literacy rate in East Asia and the Pacific is 85.3 per cent. Korea and Philippines were over the average level of the EAP in 1980. Only adult literacy in China has been below the average level.

Table 3-8 Illiteracy rates, rural and urban population age 15+by sex.

Country Urban Rural Male Female Total

China 1987 20.4 33.7 16.9 40.6 28.6

1990 15.9 38.2 26.7

1999 16.5

Philippines 1980 7.7 23.9 16.1 17.2 16.7

1990 10.0 10.3 13.3

1999 4.9

Republic of Korea 1970 5.7 17.8 12.4

1990 0.9 6.5 3.7

1999 2.4

Source: ESCAP, 1993, Table D5; Human Development Report 2001.

The popular understanding of education equates it with formal education. The average combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio (6–25 year old) in 1999 is 65 per cent; the ratio in East Asia and the Pacific is higher than the average level, which is 71 per cent.

Table 3-9 Indicators of educational attainment

Country Mean years Combined primary Children not in primary

of schooling and secondary enrolment ratio or secondary school (mil.)

1980 1990 1970 1987–1990 1991

China 4.8 4.8 66 88 28.4

Philippines 6.6 7.4 0.6

Republic of Korea 6.6 8.8 87 90 0.2

Source: UNDP, 1991: Table 1; UNDP, 1993: Table 1, 3 and 4.

Table 3-11 Indicators of secondary and tertiary education

Country Secondary enrolment Tertiary enrolment

(per cent of age group) (of 20–24mage group)

1970 1990 1997 1970 1990

China 24 48 70 1 2

Philippines 46 73 77.8 3 27

Republic of Korea 42 87 16 39

Sources: World Bank, 1993; UNDP, 1998.

Comparing tertiary and secondary enrolments, the wide variations suggest that policy factors are at work. For example, the Philippine' s one-third; and China' s one-twenty-fourth. It can be deduced that, comparatively speaking, China has emphasized primary-level education and literacy programs rather than tertiary-level education, while Korea, with relatively higher tertiary level enrolment

Table 3-12 Public expenditure on education as proportion of GNP

Country 1980 1985–87 1993–94 1995–97

China 2.5 2.3 2.6 2.3

Philippines 1.7 2.1 2.4 3.4

Republic of Korea 3.8 3.7

Sources: UNDP, 1997–2001.

It is noted that the impact of education on quality of life derives in large part more from the content and quality of education than from its quantity.

Employment

Work contributes to the quality of life in a number of ways. The first is through its income generating role, which provides for basic needs, and, as economic development proceeds, for additional improvement in material well-being. Second contribution of work lies in its key role in determining the structure and functioning of society, particularly with respect to the differentiation of participants' social functions. A third is through the personal satisfaction that individuals derive from the productive or contributory opportunities that work can provide. These contributions of work to the quality of life are particularly important because a substantial part of most people's lives is spent at work, and the quality of that work and the working environment have a major impact on the overall quality of their lives (ESCAP, 1995).

One of the important working lives is get access to employment, which is a basic right for people. We deal with rate of employment or unemployment rate. Table 3-13 summarizes the official data on unemployment trends in the three countries.

Table 3-13a Unemployment rate, 1980s (percentages)

Country	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
China	3.8	3.2	2.3	1.9	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.6	2.5	
Philippines	5.4	5.5	4.9	7.0	6.4	6.4	9.1	8.3	8.4	8.1
Republic of Korea	4.5	4.4	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.1	2.5	2.6	2.4

Source: ESCAP, 1995.

The unemployment rate in Korea from 1996-98 is 6.8, Philippines is 9.6, China is 3.1. Although open unemployment rate are relatively low in the three countries, the incidence of underemployment is severe. However, because of its hidden nature, underemployment is extremely difficult to measure accurately or on a comprehensive census basis, for example, one of China's main problems in the post-reform years has been the problem

of labor absorption, with surplus labor being established at anywhere between 30 and 40 percent of the labor force (Mukhopadhyay, 1992).

IV. CONCLUSION REMARKS

Of course, economic development, to certain extent, influences quality of life. There is a positive correlation between economic development and specific components of the quality of life, such as health, education and shelter, but the correlation is partial, i.e., it does not cover the full spectrum of quality of life components. Many social problems confronting China, Korea and Philippines are closely associated with or directly attributable to economic development and thus represent the negative side of “progress” . This is not to say that all, or even most, of the three countries’ social problem have arisen in the context of economic development. Major societal problems such as poverty, rigid social stratification, gender discrimination, illiteracy, high morbidity, low life expectancy, unconstrained population growth and environmental depredation have been long-standing throughout much of the three countries and are susceptible to massive amelioration and even eradication in the foreseeable future under well-managed development policy regimes. In considering the rising incidence of problems such as drug abuse, suicide, domestic violence, juvenile delinquency, abandoned dependents, HIV/AIDS and so on, we can conform that some social problems indeed represent, to some extent, the negative of development in the three countries. While such social problems have an important impact on the quality of life of individuals, families and communities, one cannot assume on this basis either that the dynamics of development are pushing society in the wrong direction or that the quality of life is everywhere and in all respects deteriorating. All change?and economic progress is but one aspect of change?requires social adjustment.

Table 4-1 Human Development Index (HDI)

Country	1975	1980	1985	1990	1994	1995	1998	1999
South Korea	0.876							
Philippines	0.648	0.682	0.685	0.713	0.672	0.677	0.744	0.749
China	0.518	0.548	0.584	0.619	0.626	0.650	0.706	0.718

Sources: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1991–2001*.

Policy implications:

China and Philippines have to face challenge of poverty. Alleviating poverty is main task for them during twenty-first century. Poverty alleviation measures must be provided the most vulnerable of the poor. Preference must be given to programs that are decentralized, area-based, and participatory. Aside from the aggregate targets of reducing total poverty incidence, verifiable targets are needed in the provision of health services, access to and use of clean water, sanitary toilets, and hospitals and doctors in rural areas.

Poverty and social inequality

Table inequality of per capita welfare

Period Gini index Quintile 1 Quintile 2 Quintile 3 Quintile 4 Quintile 5

Philippines

1988 0.445 5.2 9.1 13.3 20.6 51.8

China

1994 0.445 4.27 9.12 14.35 22.13 50.13

Sources: NESDB, 1999; UNDP, 1994; Zhou, 2001.

Philippines will focus on enhancing economic growth and improving health conditions.

From 1960–1994, average annual rate of change of GDP per capita among Thailand, Philippines and China is 4.9 percent, 0.5 percent and 7.5 percent respectively. Philippine average annual rate of change of GDP growth during 1965–1980 is 5.9 per cent, while other ASEAN is 8.0 per cent and East Asia is 7.3 per cent. During 1980s, average annual rate of change of GDP growth in other ASEAN is 5.8 per cent and East Asia is 7.9, but Philippines is just 0.9 per cent, which means that Philippine economic performance from the middle of 1960s to the end of 1980s is worse in international perspectives. There should be more determined effects to revive the economy and follow a sustainable growth path. If growth average only 3–4 percent a year, the conditions of the poor are bound to worsen (UNDP, 1994).

As stated previously, life expectancy in Philippines is lower than China and Thailand. Doctors per 100,000 people in Philippines (1992–1995) are 11, but Thailand is 24, China is 115 respectively. Nurses per 100,000 people in Philippines are 43, while Thailand is 99 and China is 88.

The budget for healthcare should be increased. With overall limits to spending, budget of other line agencies must be realized to provide the poor with basic needs in health. Targeted programs for nutrition of school age children and for nutrition education must be introduced to eliminate severe malnutrition or substantially reduce it.

China will focus on education, (1) Adult literacy rate in 1998, China is 82.8, and Philippines is 94.8. In terms of youth literacy rate (15–24) in 1998, China is 97.2, and Philippines is 98.2.

(2) In terms of public education expenditure as percent of GNP, Philippines is 2.3 and China is 2.3 percent during 1985–1987. But in 1990, Thailand is 3.6, Philippines is 2.9, both of them have increased public education expenditure, Philippines increased 0.6 percent, but China is still 2.9 percent of GNP, no increasing at all. As of total government expenditure, the public education expenditure in Philippines 15.7 percent of total government expenditure, but in China just 12.2 percent.

Finally, clearly, working life has important implications for the overall quality of life through its income–generating function, role in social stratification and provision of a sense of self–fulfillment to the individual. Since a substantial part of most people’ s lives is spent at work, the quality of that work and the working environment have an important impact on the overall quality of their lives and the many facets that comprise it ensure that gains in economic growth are not achieved at the expense of social development. All three countries should improve employment condition, letting more people can find employment opportunity.

REFERENCE

Baldwin, Sally, Christine Godfreg, and Carol Propper, 1990 . Quality of Life: Perspectives and Policies. London: Routledge.

Carley, M. J., 1979. Recent Development in Social Indicator System. *European Research* Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 2–9.

Carley, M. J., 1979. Social Theory and Models in Social Indicator Research. *International Journal of Social Economics* Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 33–44.

DAP, 1976. Measuring the Quality of Life: Philippines Social Indicators, Tagayty, Philippines: Development Academy of the Philippines.

Demery, Lionel, 1998. *Are Poverty Reduction and Other 21 Century Social Goals Attainable?* Washington D. C.: The World Bank.

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, 1990. *Study on the Development of Quality of Life Indicators in Asia and Pacific*. NY: United Nations.

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, 1995. *Quality of Life ESCAP Region*. NY: United Nations.

Fayers, Peter M., 2000. *Quality of Life: Assessment, Analysis and Interpretation*. Chichester: Wiley.

Hayden, F. G., 1977. Toward a Social Welfare Construct for Social Indicators. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 129–146.

Hentschel, Jesko. 2000. *The City Poverty Assessment: A Primer*. Washington D. C.: The World Bank.

Horn, R. V., 1978. Assessment of Living Level–The Social Indicator Approach. *International Journal of Social Economics* Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 169–178.

Horn, R. V. 1980. Social Indicators: Meaning, Methods and Applications. *International Journal of Social Economics* Vol. 7, No. 8, pp. 421–460.

Kim, Kyeong and Doh C. Shin, 1984. "Monitoring Perceived Quality of Life in Korea" in ESCAP, 1984.

Land, K. C., 1996. Social Indicators and the Quality of Life: Where Do We Stand in the Mid-1990s? *SINET*, 45: 5-8.

Magdaluyo, R., 2001. An Inquiry Into the Comptitiveness of Emerging Philippine Cities. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.

Mangahas, Mahar. 1977. The Philippine Social Indicators Project. *Social Indicators Research* 4: 67-96, pp: 67-96.

Manghas, Mahar, 1991. Monitoring the Economic and Social Weather in the Philippines, in Kenneth J. Arrow (ed.) *Issues in Contemporary Economics*. Vol. 1: Market and Welfare, London: Macmillan.

Mangahas, Mahar. 1994. *The Philippine Social Climate: From the SWS Survey*. Manila: Anvil Publishing.

Mangahas, Mahar. (ed.). 1996. *Measuring Philippine Development*. Development Academy of the Philippines, Metro Manila.

Mangahas, Mahar and Linda Luz Guerrero. 1998. Self-sustained Quality of Life Monitoring: The Philippine Social Weather Reports, presented at *the Second Annual Conference of the International Society for Quality of Life Studies*, Willamsburg, Virginia, USA, December 3-6, 1998.

Mazumdar, Krishna, 1996. An Analysis of Causal Flow between Social Development and Economic Growth: The Social Development Index. *American Journal of Sociology and Economics* Vol. 55, No. 3, pp. 361-383.

National Economic and Development Authority of Republic of the Philippines in solidarity with the World Summit on Social Development, 1995. *Social Development in the Philippines: Vision, Challenges and Imperatives*. Demark, Copenhagen.

National Economic and Development Authority of Republic of the Philippines, 1993. *Philippine Development Report, 1987-1992*.

Polo, Jaime, 2001. *In the Realm of the Wretched: Masa negotiates Power*. Monograph published by Pulse Asia. PSSC, Quezon City, Philippines.

Pongsapich, Amara and Chantana Banpasirichote, 1989. *A Review of Quality of Life Indicators in Thailand*. Unpublished paper prepared for ESCAP.

Schwartz, Carolyn E., 2000. *Adaptation to Changing Health: Response Shift in Quality of Life*. Washington D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Sen, Amartya K. 1997. From Income Inequality to Economic Inequality. *Southern Economic Journal*, Vol.64, No. 2. pp. 384-401.

Sinden, J. A., 1982. Application of Quality of Life Indicators to Socioeconomic Problem: An Extension of Liu' s method to Evaluate Policies for 26 Australian Towns. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 41, No. 4.

Sirgy, Joseph, 1996. Strategic Marketing Planning Guided by the Quality of Life (QOL) Concept *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 15, No. 3, pp.241-259.

Slottje, Daniel, Gerald W. Scully, Joseph G. Hirschberg, and Kathy J. Hages. 1991. *Measuring the Quality of Life Across Countries*. Oxford: Westview.

UNDP, 1990. *Human Development Report 1990*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1991. *Human Development Report 1991*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1992. *Human Development Report 1992*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1993. *Human Development Report 1993*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1994. *Human Development Report 1994*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1995. *Human Development Report 1995*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1996. *Human Development Report 1996*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1997. *Human Development Report 1997*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1998. *Human Development Report 1998*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1999. *Human Development Report 1999*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 2000. *Human Development Report 2000*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 2001. *Human Development Report 2001*. NY.: Oxford University Press.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 1994. *Philippine Human Development Report 1994*, Makati, Philippines.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 1997. *Philippine Human Development Report 1997*, Makati, Philippines.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2000. *Philippine Human Development Report 2000*, Makati, Philippines.

Vogel, Joachim, 1997. The Future Direction of Social Indicators Research. *Social Indicators Research* 42: 103–116.

World Bank, 1993. *World Development Report 1993*, New York: Oxford University Press.

World Bank, 1997. *World Development Indicators*, Washington: the World Bank..

World Bank, 2000. *World Development Indicators*, Washington: the World Bank..

World Bank, 2001. *World Development Indicators*, Washington: the World Bank..

World Bank, 1990. *Social Indicators of Development 1990*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

World Bank, 1991. *Social Indicators of Development 1990*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

World Bank, 1992. *Social Indicators of Development 1990*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

World Bank, 1993. *Social Indicators of Development 1990*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

World Bank, 1994. *Social Indicators of Development 1990*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

World Bank, 1995. *Social Indicators of Development 1990*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

World Bank, 1996. *Social Indicators of Development 1990*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Zhou , Changcheng. 2001. *Social Development and Quality of Life*. Beijing: Social Science Documentation Press.

Zhou, Changcheng and Wu Shufeng. 2001. The Theories and Analytic Frame of Quality of Life Research. *The Journal of Wuhan University* (Social Science Edition). No. 3.

Zhou, Changcheng et al. 2001. Quality of Life in China: Situation, approval and policy implications. Research Report. Wuhan University.