



Статистика, учет и аудит, 4(95)2024. стр. 39-51

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.51579/1563-2415.2024.-4.04>

Economics and Management

SRSTI: 06.58.55

UDC: 330.34

ANALYSIS OF APPROACHES TO ASSESSMENT OF THE LIFE QUALITY IN GLOBAL PRACTICE

Z.K. Shaukenova¹, Zh.G. Imangali^{2*}

¹*Institute of Philosophy, Political Sciences and Religious Studies of the CS MSHE RK, Almaty, Kazakhstan*

²*Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan*

*Corresponding author e-mail: imangali.zhansaya@gmail.com

Abstract. *The article analyzes diverse methods intended to assess life quality and indicators across global contexts. The article focuses on such parameters as the Human Development Index (HDI), the Happiness Index, and the Social Progress Index used to assess the population's well-being. The authors undertake a comparative analysis of the parameters intended to assess life quality, highlighting both such quantitative and qualitative aspects as health, education, personal safety, and environmental factors. Special emphasis is placed on subjective assessments of well-being, emphasizing the significance to engage the general population in the life quality assessment.*

The article compares Kazakhstan life quality indicators with those of developed countries. It reveals that Kazakhstan falls behind in several key parameters, including life expectancy and GDP per capita. Kazakhstan additionally exhibits encouraging trends in education and in the human development index. Finally, it is concluded that a more detailed assessment of non-material factors is required, and promising directions to develop the methods for assessment of the life quality are proposed.

Key words: *life quality, human development index, happiness index, social progress index, social indicators, Kazakhstan, life quality management.*

Main provisions. The Human Development Index, Happiness Index, and Social Progress Index are analyzed in this article as methods intended to assess life quality. Special focus is given to the comparison of Kazakhstan data with the data from the developed countries where a gap in such parameters as life expectancy and GDP per capita, and favorable trends in education are found. The authors highlight the significance to acknowledge subjective assessments of well-being and propose enhancements for life quality assessment methods incorporating psychosocial factors and resilience to environmental challenges to augment the social policy efficacy.

Introduction. The life quality is a complex category that encompasses various phenomena and directly influences the social and economic development of society. A systematic analysis of this category is required in the context of the world's rapid changes

Cite this article as: Shaukenova Z.K., Imangali Zh.G. Analysis of approaches to assessment of the life quality in global practice. *Statistics, accounting and audit.* 2024, 4(95), 39-51. DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.51579/1563-2415.2024.-4.04>



with the purpose to guarantee the legitimacy of management choices intended to enhance population well-being. Life quality is recognized as both a change level indicator and a strategic priority for the successful implementation of social and economic reforms in contemporary management and economics. The study of life quality and its dynamics enables for the recognition of both beneficial developments and significant social issues for government and social organizations to make the operational control.

The significance of a holistic approach to the life quality study originates from the multitude of elements that influence both subjective and objective perceptions of the impact. The fundamental elements that influence the life quality for individuals and society include health, education, security, access to infrastructure, and other essential requirements. The multifaceted nature of these components demands the application of various approaches to their analysis and justification. A variety of external parameters that represent both objective and subjective aspects of societal well-being can be obtained using indexes created in international practice, such as the Human Development Index (HDI), the Happiness Index, and the Progress Index. Each index provides an unique viewpoint to life quality, contributing to the overall comprehension of economic growth theory.

This study aims to analyze current approaches and indexes intended to assess life quality in global contexts. A comparative analysis of diverse methods considering the life quality assessment, and the identification of the correlation between objective indicators (e.g., GDP per capita, life expectancy) and such subjective indicators as life satisfaction and happiness measurement are specially emphasized in this article. This method will enhance the comprehension of the interrelation between numerous aspects of the general population's life and overall coverage, while also highlighting potential areas to optimize management strategies to improve social policy.

Study methodology. Comparative analysis, data systematization, and critical review methodologies are employed to assess diverse approaches and indicators of life quality utilized in worldwide practice. A comparative analysis is conducted to determine distinctions among approaches intended to assess quality of life, including the Human Development Index (HDI), the Happiness Index, and the Social Progress Index. Numerous indicators used to assess the quality of life in various countries are arranged and structured with the aid of data systematization, and the advantages and disadvantages of current approaches are assessed through critical review.

Literature Survey. The economic literature offers numerous methodologies for assessment of the population's life quality. We believe that this complex social and economic concept of "life quality" is most effectively comprehended when it is studied as a system of essential components and a set of living conditions.

The population's general well-being is broadly defined as "life quality". It encompasses both positive and negative living conditions. It characterizes life satisfaction in terms of the population's physical health, the evolution of the family institution, the accessibility and quality of education, work prospects, self-actualization, income, security, civil liberties, environmental conditions, and leisure [1]. The most important aspects of a person's life are included in this term. There are several ways to assess it because it is utilized in many studies, including those from economics and politics to ecology and health care.

Experts from All-Russian Center of Living Standards (ARCLS) classify the quality life components as follows: 1) society's quality (quality of individuals, population, separate social groupings, and civil society organizations); 2) the quality of entrepreneurial and working life; 3) the quality of social infrastructure; 4) the environmental integrity; 5) personal



safety; 6) the standard of life; 7) the satisfaction level with one's life [2].

L.A. Belyaeva demonstrates the primary content of the life quality as a multicomponent category. It includes a set of conditions essential for the development of an integral index of the population's life quality [3]. The following components are included in this indicator: 1) standard of life; 2) the social environment quality; 3) the environment integrity; 4) social well-being. In our view, the distinctive characteristics of this method intended to assess the population's level and quality of life is derived from the emphasis on assessment of life quality from the perspective of subjective well-being. Based on assessments of the population's personal well-being, the idea of subjective well-being gained popularity in the second half of the 20th century, initially in the US and later in many Western European countries.

The subjective well-being assessment is significant since population's subjective assessments serve as a sort of barometer for the success of the social and economic measures being implemented. The works of T.Y. Cherkashina are among the studies of subjective parameters of the population's life quality [4]. She believes that life quality is defined not merely by the perception of living conditions but by the actualization of opportunities afforded by these situations to particular individuals and families.

Results and Discussion. The assessment of life quality is a strategy intended to recognize and promptly address issues in the social and economic sector, enabling the formulation of policies to mitigate adverse effects and sustain beneficial trends in the country's social development. The complexity of life quality measurement and assessment caused the creation of many methodologies and the establishment of several indicators, both comprehensive and specific ones, developed by both international and local researchers and implemented in practice.

Life quality must consider emotional well-being and the subjective assessments of the population's life in contrast to GDP or living standards measured in monetary terms. It is essential to consider the unique developmental characteristics of each country during assessment of its population's life quality.

The Human Development Index (HDI), previously known as the Human Development Index until 2013, is a prominent indicator of life quality used in international practice. It has been calculated within the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) since 1990. The HDI serves as a composite indicator incorporating such various components as the life expectancy index (LEI), life expectancy at birth, education index (EI), and income index. The HDI is then calculated as the geometric mean of the three indices.

Table 1 presents the HDI data for different countries for 2022.

Table 1 – HDI of the first 30 countries in the world and Kazakhstan

Place	Country	HDI value
1	Switzerland	0.967
2	Norway	0.966
3	Iceland	0.959
4	Hong Kong, China (SAR)	0.956
5	Denmark	0.952
5	Sweden	0.952
7	Germany	0.950
7	Ireland	0.950
9	Singapore	0.949



continuation of the table 1

10	Australia	0.946
10	Netherlands	0.946
12	Belgium	0.942
12	Finland	0.942
12	Liechtenstein	0.942
15	Great Britain	0.940
16	New Zealand	0.939
17	United Arab Emirates	0.937
18	Canada	0.935
19	South Korea	0.929
20	Luxembourg	0.927
20	United States	0.927
22	Austria	0.926
22	Slovenia	0.926
24	Japan	0.920
25	Israel	0.915
25	Malta	0.915
27	Spain	0.911
28	France	0.910
29	Cyprus	0.907
30	Italy	0.906
67	Kazakhstan	0.802
Note: Derived from the source [5]		

UNDP categorizes Kazakhstan as a country exhibiting a “very high level of human development”. It should be noted that the highest human development index (HDI) for Kazakhstan was achieved in 2019 and amounted to 0.810. The increase in the Human Development Index (HDI) in Kazakhstan resulted from strategic reforms designed to enhance the population’s social and economic conditions. Nonetheless, it is important to acknowledge that certain challenges remain evident despite this success. They include regional disparities in development, variations in income levels, and differences in access to services.

Then the life quality indicators in developed countries and Kazakhstan will be considered separately. Table 2 presents a comparison of life expectancy indicators.

Table 2 – Comparison of life quality indicators in developed countries and in Kazakhstan in 2024

Country	Life expectancy (years), 2024	Education Index Value 2022	GDP adjusted for PPP per capita for 2024
Kazakhstan	74	0.82	34.534
Latvia	75.4	0.90	41.73
Lithuania	76	0.91	50.6
Slovakia	78.2	0.84	44.081
USA	78.5	0.91	85.373
Estonia	78.9	0.89	45.122
Czech	79.1	0.88	50.475
Greece	81.1	0.94	41.188



continuation of the table 2

Denmark	81.3	0.96	77.641
Slovenia	81.3	0.91	55.684
Belgium	81.4	0.94	68.079
Great Britain	81.4	0.94	58.88
Austria	81.6	0.87	69.46
Portugal	81.6	0.79	47.07
Finland	81.6	0.96	60.851
Germany	81.7	0.96	67.245
Ireland	81.8	0.92	127.750
Netherlands	81.8	0.94	74.158
Malta	81.9	0.85	72.942
New Zealand	82	0.98	53.797
Canada	82.2	0.91	60.495
Iceland	82.3	0.99	73.784
Luxembourg	82.4	0.83	151.146
Sweden	82.4	0.94	69.177
France	82.5	0.83	60.339
Israel	82.6	0.86	55.533
Norway	82.6	0.95	82.832
Australia	83	1.01	66.627
Italy	83	0.82	56.905
Cyprus	83.1	0.86	59.858
Spain	83.2	0.85	52.012
Singapore	83.2	0.87	133.737
South Korea	83.3	0.88	59.33
Switzerland	83.4	0.92	91.932
Japan	84.3	0.85	54.184
Note: Derived from sources [6, 7, 8]			

Table 2 indicates that life expectancy in the majority of developed countries surpasses 81 years. It reflects high health care standards. Life expectancy in Kazakhstan is comparable to that of developed post-Soviet countries - Latvia and Lithuania with the lag behind of 1.4 and 2 years respectively. The most significant difference is 10.3 years with Japan.

The average Education Index for each country provided in Table 2 is 0.899, suggesting a high level of educational achievement across the majority of these countries. Kazakhstan surpasses Portugal in the education index and holds equal level with Italy. Kazakhstan ranks 0.01 points behind Luxembourg and France, with a difference of 0.19 points from Australia (1.01) and 0.17 points from Iceland (0.99) which are the leaders of the ranking.

Regarding GDP per capita adjusted for purchasing power parity (PPP). The data for 2024, including forecasts, presents a comparison of Kazakhstan with the 30 most developed countries globally, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 illustrates that GDP per capita adjusted for purchasing power parity (PPP) in Kazakhstan is presently lower than that of any chosen developed country. The smallest difference is US\$6,654 with Greece, and the highest one being US\$99,203 with Singapore.

The World Happiness Report is the next method intended to assess the life quality. The report is published annually by the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network. The initial report, presented in 2012, expresses the opinions of experts in economics, psychology, political science, and statistics regarding the effective application of well-being and happiness measurements for social development. Six indicators are used to assess national happiness:



GDP per capita, social policy, life expectancy, civil liberties, generosity, attitude towards corruption. Indicators are assessed under a ten-point scale. Countries are compared to a hypothetical “Dystopia” named country. It has the lowest averages and serves as a regression benchmark. The report data for 2024 are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 – Happiness rating for 2024

Place	Country	Happiness Index
1	Finland	7.74
2	Denmark	7.58
3	Iceland	7.53
4	Sweden	7.34
5	Israel	7.34
6	Netherlands	7.32
7	Norway	7.3
8	Luxembourg	7.12
9	Switzerland	7.06
10	Australia	7.06
11	New Zealand	7.03
12	Costa Rica	6.96
13	Kuwait	6.95
14	Austria	6.91
15	Canada	6.9
16	Belgium	6.89
17	Ireland	6.84
18	Czech	6.82
19	Lithuania	6.82
20	Great Britain	6.75
21	Slovenia	6.74
22	UAE	6.73
23	USA	6.73
24	Germany	6.72
25	Mexico	6.68
26	Uruguay	6.61
27	France	6.61
28	Saudi Arabia	6.59
29	Kosovo	6.59
30	Singapore	6.52
49	Kazakhstan	6.19

Note: Derived from the source [9]

The analysis of data from Tables 1-3 suggests that countries with higher Human Development Index (HDI) levels generally exhibit higher happiness index scores. This relationship is not strictly linear. It indicates that happiness is affected by development indicators, as represented by the HDI, along with additional factors.

Such researchers as Amiel M.-H., Godefroy P., and Lollivier S. from the National Institute for Statistical and Economic Studies of France (INSEE) conducted work to develop various statistical indicators intended to assess life quality and social progress. They proposed that disposable income and actual final consumption serve as more accurate indicators of household economic status compared to GDP per capita, as they more effectively represent well-being. In 2010, the scientists tested this approach and found that changes in GDP and disposable income are uneven. For instance, GDP per capita relative to the base was 30%, while net disposable income was 25% in France. So, a change in production levels does not



necessarily correspond to a change in the well-being of the population. The researchers also studied the influence of non-monetary factors alongside the impact of living standards on life quality. The factors included the extent of social ties, daily stress levels, and psychosocial risks associated with work processes. The researchers have shown that the influence of these factors exhibits asymmetry based on the overall level of well-being; specifically, when the population's general well-being is high, the negative effects of these factors are more pronounced compared to low general well-being. [10]. Consequently, the researchers introduced supplementary psychosocial factors for assessment of life quality in conjunction with an analysis of current material factors.

INSEE studies on the development of indicators measuring life quality components are also interesting. The indicators represent individuals' subjective perceptions regarding essential aspects of human life, including living conditions, financial challenges, health, education, working conditions, civic engagement, social relationships, economic security, and physical safety [11].

The indicators are binary, taking values of 1 and 0, where 1 indicates the absence of problems with the question and 0 indicates the existence of problems. A component group may contain multiple questions, the responses to which are aggregated to identify life problem areas. Attempts have been also made to study the environmental aspect of life quality by analyzing the carbon footprint at production and consumption sites; however, empirical data regarding the efficiency and validity of this indicator remain unavailable. The INSEE Institute's methodology facilitated the identification of social issues and their origins as critical elements to assess the population's life quality.

In 2010, American psychologists - D. Kahneman and A. Deaton discovered that the impact of income on life quality assessments by respondents is non-linear. A survey of 1,000 randomly selected U.S. residents demonstrated that life quality scores increased with income, peaking at US\$75,000 per year. The score ceases to increase beyond this value, and the level of emotional satisfaction with life declines, as susceptibility to life failures, illnesses, family issues, and poverty escalates [12].

The Physical Quality of Life Index is a subsequent study concerning the life quality assessment. The value includes three parameters - basic literacy, infant mortality, and life expectancy at one year of age. Each parameter is rated from 0 to 100. The index was created by Morris David Morris for the Overseas Development Council in 1970 in response to the inadequacy of gross national income (GNI) as a life quality measure. The calculation of the index involves four steps:

1. Calculation of the literacy rate (LR) among the total population.

2. Calculation of the value of infant mortality (IM) at birth per 1,000 persons, and then the infant mortality rate (IMR) according to the formula:

$$IMR = (166 - IM) * 0.625, \quad (1)$$

3. Calculation of life expectancy index:

$$LEI = (LE - 42) * 2.7 \quad (2)$$

4. Calculation of the Physical Quality of Life Index:

$$\frac{LR + IMR + LEI}{3}, \quad (3)$$

Reliance on the arithmetic mean for its computation, the use of a narrow range of tools to assess population well-being, and the exclusion of income levels from the calculations are the significant drawbacks of the index.



The Legatum Prosperity Index is an annual rating created by the Legatum Institute, an analytical center. The assessment is based on such multiple factors as wealth, economic growth, education, health, personal well-being, and life quality. It included 167 countries in 2023. 300 indicators are used to calculate the index. They are grouped into 12 main sub-indices. These sub-indices include security, personal well-being, governance, social capital, investment environment, market conditions, access to infrastructure and markets, economic quality, housing, health, education, environment [14].

The OECD Better Life Index represents a significant effort to integrate various indicators of well-being. It is integrated with the Commission's recommendations on Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress. The index consists of two parts: "Your Better Life Index", "How's Life?". Your Better Life Index (BLI) includes 11 measures of life quality: housing conditions, income, employment, community, education, environment, public administration, health, life satisfaction, safety, work-life balance. "How's life" analyzes resource well-being both currently and prospectively, utilizing over 80 indicators for analysis [15]. The index is calculated for only 41 countries globally, excluding Kazakhstan.

The Economist Intelligence Unit's Where-to-be-born Index, previously referred to as the Quality of Life Index (QLI), seeks to assess countries which offer the most favorable conditions for a healthy, extended, and prosperous life. The index comprises of eleven factors related to life quality, in addition to projections of GDP per capita trends, to establish the country's rating. Switzerland, Australia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Singapore, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Canada, and Hong Kong are the leading ten countries based on this index. Kazakhstan ranked 74th in 2024 [16].

The Mercer Quality of Living Survey assesses individual cities rather than entire countries for the life quality within those urban areas. A novel approach suggests that the life quality in various cities within the same country can differ markedly, and assessment of life quality in these cities enhances the study precision. This study aims to aid governments, international organizations, and corporations to select branch locations [17]. Almaty ranked 181s in the 2023 study [18].

The Genuine Progress Indicator is pertinent to the assessment of living standards. This measure was proposed as an alternative or complement to the GDP indicator [19]. This assessment encompasses social, environmental, and economic factors to assess the population's well-being and life quality. The indicator is utilized in environmental economics, the green economy, and sustainable development. The indicator is determined by the following formula:

$$GPI = A + B - C - D + I, \quad (4)$$

Where, A represents income-weighted personal consumption,

B represents the cost associated with non-market services that contribute to welfare.

C represents the expenditure associated with protective measures aimed to mitigate the degradation of natural systems,

D represents the economic loss associated with the depletion of natural resources.

I represents an increase in fixed capital and the balance of international trade.

The indicator concept is utilized in various countries under diverse terminologies.

The Social Progress Index quantifies the extent to which a state fulfills the needs and requirements of its residents. It is published by the non-profit organization Social Progress Imperative, and is based on the research conducted by such economists as A. Sen, D. Norton, J. Stiglitz. The index includes many indicators. Table 4 presents a comparison of Kazakhstan indicators with those of developed countries.

**Table 4** – Comparison of the Social Progress Index indicators of Kazakhstan and developed countries for 2024

No.	Country	Indicator and its value														
		Basic needs	Foundat ions of well-being	Possibiliti es	Basic health care	Water and hygien e	Home securit y	Personal safety	Acces s to basic knowl edge	Access to informati on	Health	Environ mental quality	Person al rights	Person al freedo ms	Toleranc e and inclusive ness	Access to advance d education
2	Australia	88.73	87.78	86.80	91.09	96.97	86.44	80.43	94.77	93.30	82.65	80.41	92.24	84.52	85.63	84.80
3	Austria	91.81	85.64	82.73	93.58	95.66	92.42	85.59	96.25	87.64	81.82	76.88	95.06	82.38	78.43	75.04
4	Belgium	89.72	83.27	85.40	93.65	93.03	91.78	80.41	95.47	80.43	83.80	73.39	96.54	85.06	83.53	76.45
5	Great Britain	89.31	84.87	79.28	90.76	94.62	89.54	82.32	95.68	92.72	78.24	72.86	87.27	82.27	72.46	75.14
6	Germany	91.06	86.68	85.18	92.14	96.31	91.35	84.46	97.48	87.34	81.25	80.67	97.53	86.65	80.98	75.54
7	Greece	88.94	76.61	74.73	96.69	89.79	88.89	80.40	90.87	75.99	70.40	69.16	87.43	67.14	72.30	72.08
8	Denmark	93.19	87.93	90.02	93.85	97.21	93.70	88.00	98.27	94.28	81.48	77.71	98.12	90.29	88.33	83.34
9	Israel	89.94	80.23	74.87	96.74	92.29	87.19	83.54	91.41	80.55	79.39	69.57	89.36	75.97	63.91	70.23
10	Iceland	91.63	88.19	88.89	91.01	98.88	88.58	88.04	98.95	91.08	82.19	80.53	93.14	88.65	93.26	80.50
11	Spain	91.01	82.07	78.52	95.36	92.46	88.03	88.19	89.49	86.85	77.67	74.29	91.44	79.00	74.64	68.98
12	Italy	90.34	82.21	78.27	94.86	93.11	91.56	81.83	92.62	83.27	78.40	74.54	92.99	70.50	81.15	68.43
13	Kazakhstan	85.70	71.47	52.02	91.11	87.62	90.09	73.97	91.66	80.06	56.78	57.40	40.41	71.93	47.48	48.26
14	Canada	88.45	84.88	84.65	92.17	95.87	86.13	79.64	96.59	87.80	79.12	76.00	85.32	84.86	89.48	78.95
15	Latvia	88.41	79.30	75.64	89.42	92.91	90.44	80.89	95.02	87.79	61.42	72.98	93.77	79.88	61.72	67.18
16	Lithuania	88.34	79.54	76.64	90.68	90.89	91.50	80.28	96.64	83.61	62.16	75.74	91.57	76.34	71.15	67.52
17	Netherlands	90.13	85.89	87.18	91.66	95.98	86.77	86.12	94.99	94.16	82.13	72.27	94.25	87.66	87.33	79.47
18	New Zealand	86.80	85.28	86.08	91.73	94.47	84.63	76.37	94.40	94.00	80.49	72.25	95.61	83.68	89.10	75.95
19	Norway	92.04	88.14	90.79	92.01	98.04	89.33	88.80	99.12	91.70	84.78	76.97	97.42	90.87	89.50	85.35
20	Portugal	90.93	81.00	80.37	94.59	95.78	87.50	85.86	88.58	86.34	77.10	71.99	89.87	82.33	83.50	65.79
21	Slovenia	90.78	82.68	80.35	91.72	96.77	85.28	89.33	98.51	84.31	74.26	73.63	88.64	81.73	79.29	71.74
22	Slovakia	88.59	76.96	73.08	90.08	93.87	89.20	81.20	92.70	81.21	66.68	67.25	91.06	74.42	67.54	59.31
23	USA	87.13	80.12	77.83	91.83	94.04	88.79	73.86	92.59	88.68	70.29	68.93	80.54	80.21	73.98	76.60
24	Finland	92.60	86.71	90.56	91.06	98.38	94.77	86.19	96.31	94.26	77.00	79.26	96.78	88.80	93.82	82.85
25	France	89.16	83.07	79.42	90.54	93.04	90.61	82.46	93.41	84.78	78.91	75.16	92.29	83.55	73.44	68.42
26	Czech	89.95	82.97	81.54	90.43	95.87	90.05	83.46	97.82	83.31	76.45	74.31	95.86	81.82	78.50	69.98
27	Switzerland	92.48	87.03	87.12	91.91	97.80	91.46	88.74	98.81	88.39	87.14	73.79	93.00	86.77	85.97	82.75
28	Sweden	91.58	86.45	89.23	91.88	98.62	90.29	85.55	94.78	89.73	81.30	79.98	96.62	89.94	90.51	79.83
29	Estonia	90.63	85.58	79.30	90.85	94.79	92.11	84.79	98.16	93.63	70.87	79.68	94.63	83.24	67.02	72.31
30	South Korea	91.84	86.43	77.51	94.57	94.07	91.46	87.24	93.05	90.62	83.93	78.13	86.37	77.26	70.37	76.02
31	Japan	92.40	85.19	78.96	90.67	95.12	96.16	87.65	98.48	86.77	84.30	71.22	96.90	81.22	75.03	62.68

Note: Derived from the source [20]



Table 4 indicates that Kazakhstan coincides with developed countries in the areas of basic health care and home security. Access to information, water and hygiene, personal security, basic needs, access to basic knowledge, and personal freedoms lag slightly behind (10 points or less in the index). It significantly fails to keep pace (by over 10 index points) in all other indicators: foundations of well-being, opportunities, health, environmental quality, personal rights, tolerance and inclusion, and access to advanced education. According to the Social Progress Index, further society's development in Kazakhstan necessitates a greater focus on social aspects rather than solely economic factors. It includes enhancing the involvement of all society's members in communal life and expanding their opportunities for self-realization and fulfillment of needs.

The analysis indicates that both objective indicators and subjective indices are employed to assess life quality in international practice, facilitating a more precise assessment of the population's current level of well-being. An analysis of the Human Development Index, alongside indicators like the World Happiness Report and the Work Progress Index, highlights the necessity to focus on both economic factors and the quality of the social environment.

The subsequent step involves a thorough study of various factors, including psychological and social parameters, exemplified by the OECD Better Life Index and Mercer's Quality of Living Reports. These indices assess attachment and family conditions, social connections, and social engagement that are essential for a thorough assessment of well-being.

Conclusion. Life quality is a complex characteristic requiring a thorough analysis that encompasses both objective indicators and subjective measures expressing social well-being and individual perspectives. A multitude of studies focus on life quality assessment and analyze this concept from various perspectives. The main assessment methods include the Human Development Index (HDI), the Happiness Index, and the Social Progress Index. New assessment methods are currently under active development.

Kazakhstan has not yet achieved the indicators that distinguish developed countries according to the HDI and its components. However, the positive dynamics of its human development index suggest potential for further improvement. The GDP per capita adjusted for PPP remains lower than that of the majority of developed countries, with a minimal lag of US\$6,654 from Greece. The average life expectancy in Kazakhstan is 74 years, which is lower than that of numerous developed countries. Kazakhstan education index is comparable to that of several developed countries, including Portugal and Italy.

The analysis of the Social Progress Index indicators concludes that policy development aimed to enhance the life quality for the population in Kazakhstan should prioritize social freedoms, tolerance, inclusion, opportunities for self-realization, personal security, and environmental quality.

Future methodologies for assessment of life quality should incorporate non-monetary and psychosocial factors, including stress, social connections, and social involvement. The formulation of indicators pertaining to resilience against environmental and social challenges represents an exciting area of research.

Acknowledgement. The study was financed by the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (IRN No. AP23487450) for the project titled "Life Expectancy and Its Quality in Kazakhstan: Integrated Analysis and Forecast for the Future".



Literature cited

1. D. Teoli, A.Bhardwaj. Quality Of Life // Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing. – 2023. - № 1. – P. – 435- 41.
2. С.Н. Гайсина. Повышение качества жизни населения как социальный вектор развития Казахстана // Экономика и финансы. – 2020. - №2 (150).– С. 48-53.
3. Беляева Л.А. Уровень и качество жизни. Проблемы измерения и интерпретации // Социологические исследования. – 2009. – № 1. – С. 33-42.
4. Черкашина Т.Ю. Субъективное качество жизни населения: интегральная оценка и частные индикаторы // Регион: экономика и социология. – 2006. – № 3. – С. 97-111.
5. UNDP Human Development Insights [Electronic resource]. – Available at: <https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/country-insights#/ranks> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
6. World Life Expectancy Map [Electronic resource]. - Available at: <http://www.worldlifeexpectancy.com/world-life-expectancy-map> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
7. World Population Review 2024. Education Index by Country [Electronic resource]. - Available at: <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/education-index-by-country> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
8. List of Countries by Projected GDP per capita [Electronic resource]. - Available at: <http://statisticstimes.com/economy/countries-by-projected-gdp-capita.php> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
9. Helliwell J. F., Layard R., Sachs J. D., De Neve J.-E., Aknin L. B., & Wang S. (Eds.). World Happiness Report 2024 // University of Oxford: Wellbeing Research Centre. – 2024.
10. Amiel M.-H., Godefroy P., Lollivier S., Quality of life and well-being often go hand in hand // INSEE premiere. - 2013. – №1428.
11. Данилина Л.Е., Салин В.Н. Анализ подходов к измерению качества жизни // Статистика и экономика. – 2015. – № 4. – С. 107-114.
12. Kahneman D., Deaton A. High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being [Electronic resource]. - Available at: <http://www.pnas.org/content/107/38/16489> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
13. Morris M.D. The Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI) // Development digest. – 1980. - №18 (1). – P. 95–109.
14. The 2023 Legatum Prosperity Index Report [Electronic resource] // Legatum Institute. - Available at: https://docs.prosperity.com/9616/7756/5038/The_2023_Legatum_Pro Prosperity_Index_report.pdf (date of application: 29.09.2024).
15. OECD. How's Life? 2020: Measuring Well-being // OECD Publishing, Paris. – 2020.
16. World Population Review. Where-to-Be-Born Index by Country / Where to Be Born Index 2024 [Electronic resource]. - Available at: <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/where-to-be-born-index-by-country> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
17. Zürich mit der zweithöchsten lebensqualität weltweit [Electronic resource]. - Available at: <https://www.mercer.ch/newsroom/quality-of-living-2018.html> (дата обращения: 29.09.2024).
18. Quality of Living City Ranking 2023 [Electronic resource]. - Available at: <https://www.mercer.com/insights/total-rewards/talent-mobility-insights/quality-of-living-city-ranking/#city-ranking> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
19. Mairi-Jane V. Fox, Jon D. Erickson. Design and meaning of the genuine progress indicator: A statistical analysis of the U.S. fifty-state model // Ecological Economics. – 2020. - V. 167.
20. Social Progress Imperative. Social Progress Index [Electronic resource]. - Available at: <https://www.socialprogress.org/social-progress-index> (date of application: 29.09.2024).

References

1. D. Teoli, A.Bhardwaj. Quality Of Life. *Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing*, 2023, 1, pp. 435- 41.
2. S.N. Gajcina. Povyshenie kachestva zhizni naselenija kak social'nyj vektor razvitija Kazahstana [Improving population's quality of life as a social vector of Kazakhstan's development]. *Jekonomika i finansy*, 2020, 2 (150), 48-53 (In Russian).
3. Beljaeva L.A. Uroven' i kachestvo zhizni. Problemy izmerenija i interpretacii [The standard and quality of life. Problems of measurement and interpretation]. *Sociologicheskie issledovanija*, 2009, 1, 33-42 (In Russian).
4. Cherkashina T.Ju. Sub#ektivnoe kachestvo zhizni naselenija: integral'naja ocenka i chastnye indikatory [Subjective quality of life: integrated and particular indicators]. *Region: jekonomika i sociologija*, 2006, 3, 97-111 (In Russian).



5. *UNDP Human Development Insights*. Available at: <https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/country-insights#/ranks> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
6. *World Life Expectancy Map*. Available at: <http://www.worldlifeexpectancy.com/world-life-expectancy-map> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
7. *World Population Review 2024*. Education Index by Country. Available at: <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/education-index-by-country> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
8. *List of Countries by Projected GDP per capita*. Available at: <http://statisticstimes.com/economy/countries-by-projected-gdp-capita.php> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
9. Helliwell J. F., Layard R., Sachs J. D., De Neve J.-E., Aknin L. B., & Wang S. (Eds.). *World Happiness Report 2024*. University of Oxford: Wellbeing Research Centre. 2024.
10. Amiel M.-H., Godefroy P., Lollivier S., Quality of life and well-being often go hand in hand. *INSEE premiere*. 2013, 1428.
11. Danilina L.E., Salin V.N. Analiz podhodov k izmereniju kachestva zhizni [Approaches to quality of life analysis quantification]. *Statistika i jekonomika*, 2015, 4, 107-114 (In Russian).
12. Kahneman D., Deaton A. *High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being*. Available at: <http://www.pnas.org/content/107/38/16489> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
13. Morris M.D. The Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI). *Development digest*, 1980, 18 (1), 95–109.
14. *The 2023 Legatum Prosperity Index Report*. Legatum Institute. Available at: https://docs.prosperity.com/9616/7756/5038/The_2023_Legatum_Pro Prosperity_Index_report.pdf (date of application: 29.09.2024).
15. OECD. *How's Life? 2020: Measuring Well-being*. OECD Publishing, Paris, 2020.
16. *World Population Review*. Where-to-Be-Born Index by Country. Where to Be Born Index 2024. Available at: <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/where-to-be-born-index-by-country> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
17. *Zürich mit der zweithöchsten lebensqualität weltweit*. Available at: <https://www.mercer.ch/newsroom/quality-of-living-2018.html> (дата обращения: 29.09.2024).
18. *Quality of Living City Ranking 2023*. Available at: <https://www.mercer.com/insights/total-rewards/talent-mobility-insights/quality-of-living-city-ranking/#city-ranking> (date of application: 29.09.2024).
19. Mairi-Jane V. Fox, Jon D. Erickson. Design and meaning of the genuine progress indicator: A statistical analysis of the U.S. fifty-state model. *Ecological Economics*, 2020, 167.
20. *Social Progress Imperative*. *Social Progress Index*. Available at: <https://www.socialprogress.org/social-progress-index> (date of application: 29.09.2024).

ХАЛЫҚАРАЛЫҚ ТӘЖІРИБЕДЕ ӨМІР СҮРУ САПАСЫНБАҒАЛАУ ТӘСІЛДЕРІН ТАЛДАУ

З.Қ. Шәукенова¹, Ж. Ғ.Иманғали^{2*}

¹ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институты, Алматы, Қазақстан

²Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Түйін. Мақала халықаралық тәжірибедегі өмір сапасы мен индикаторларды бағалаудың әртүрлі тәсілдерін талдауға арналған. Жұмыста халықтың әл-ауқатын бағалау үшін қолданылатын адам даму индексі (АДИ), бақыт индексі және әлеуметтік прогресс индексі сияқты көрсеткіштерге ерекше назар аударылады. Авторлар денсаулық, білім, жеке қауіпсіздік және қоршаған орта факторларын қоса алғанда, сандық және сапалық аспектілерді анықтай отырып, өмір сапасын бағалау үшін көрсеткіштерге салыстырмалы талдау жасайды. Өмір сапасын өлшеу процесіне халықты тартудың маңыздылығын көрсететін әл-ауқатты субъективті бағалауға ерекше назар аударылады.

Мақалада сондай-ақ Қазақстандағы өмір сапасының көрсеткіштері әлемнің дамыған елдерімен салыстырылады, олар Қазақстанның өмір сүру ұзақтығы және жан басына шаққандағы ЖІӨ сияқты бірқатар негізгі көрсеткіштер бойынша артта қалғанын көрсетті. Сонымен қатар, Қазақстан білім беру саласында және адам дамуының индексіне оң динамиканы көрсетіп отыр. Қорытындылай келе, материалдық емес факторларды неғұрлым егжей-тегжейлі бағалау қажеттілігі туралы қорытынды жасалады және өмір сапасын бағалау әдістерін әзірлеудің перспективалық бағыттары ұсынылады.



Түйінді сөздер: өмір сапасы, адам даму индексі, бақыт индексі, әлеуметтік прогресс индексі, әлеуметтік индикаторлар, Қазақстан, өмір сапасын басқару.

АНАЛИЗ ПОДХОДОВ К ОЦЕНКЕ КАЧЕСТВА ЖИЗНИ В МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЙ ПРАКТИКЕ

З.К. Шаукенова¹, Ж.Г. Имангали^{2*}

¹Институт философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МНВО РК, Алматы, Казахстан

²Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

Резюме. Статья посвящена анализу различных подходов к оценке качества жизни и индикаторов в международной практике. В работе особое внимание уделяется таким показателям, как индекс человеческого развития (ИЧР), индекс счастья и индекс социального прогресса, которые используются для оценки благосостояния населения. Авторы проводят сравнительный анализ показателей для оценки качества жизни, выявляя как количественные, так и качественные аспекты, включая здоровье, образование, личную безопасность и факторы окружающей среды. Особое внимание уделяется субъективной оценке благополучия, которая подчеркивает важность вовлечения населения в процесс измерения качества жизни.

В статье также сравниваются показатели качества жизни в Казахстане с развитыми странами мира, которые показали отставание Казахстана по ряду ключевых показателей, таких как ожидаемая продолжительность жизни и ВВП на душу населения. В то же время Казахстан демонстрирует положительную динамику в сфере образования и в индексе человеческого развития. В заключение делаются выводы о необходимости более детальной оценки нематериальных факторов и предлагаются перспективные направления разработки методов оценки качества жизни.

Ключевые слова: качество жизни, индекс человеческого развития, индекс счастья, индекс социального прогресса, социальные индикаторы, Казахстан, управление качеством жизни.

Information about the authors:

Zarema Kaukenovna Shaukenova - Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Professor, Institute of Philosophy, Political Science, and Religious Studies CS MSHE RK, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: zarema_13@bk.ru.

Zhansaya Gabidenkyzy Imangali* - Researcher, PhD student, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: imangali.zhansaya@gmail.com.

Авторлар туралы ақпарат:

Шаукенова Зарема Қаукенқызы – Қазақстан Ұлттық Ғылым Академиясының академигі, социология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институты, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: zarema_13@bk.ru.

Имангали Жансая Ғабиденқызы* – PhD докторант, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: imangali.zhansaya@gmail.com.

Информация об авторах:

Шаукенова Зарема Каукеновна - академик НАН РК, доктор социологических наук, профессор, Институт философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МНВО РК, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: zarema_13@bk.ru

Имангали Жансая Ғабиденқызы* - PhD докторант, Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: imangali.zhansaya@gmail.com

Received: 18.09.2024

Accepted: 07.10.2024

Available online: 12.11.2024