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Recommendations about quality of life (1)

Quality of life depends on people’s objective conditions and capabilities
Quality of life indicators should assess inequalities in a comprehensive way
Surveys should be designed to assess the links between various quality-of-life domains for each person
    this information should be used when designing policies in various fields
Statistical offices should provide information needed to aggregate across quality-of-life dimensions, allowing the construction of different indexes
Measures of both objective and subjective well-being provide key information about people’s quality of life. Statistical offices should incorporate questions to capture people’s life evaluations, hedonic experiences and priorities in their surveys.
Dimensions of the QoL recommended by the SSF and the Franco-German reports

- Material living conditions
- Health
- Education
- Productive and valued activities
- Governance and basic rights
- Leisure and social interactions
- Natural and living environment
- Economic and physical safety
- Overall experience of life
A quick implementation

In Europe
An Eurostat-Insee sponsorship with 4 Task Forces
Recommendations about QoL for the short term and the Eurostat middle term (2015)

En France
Integration of SSF variables in existing surveys
A new multimodal survey
Many publications
  2010 : France Portrait Social
  2010-2011 Bad housing conditions
  2011 : Subjective dimensions
  2011-2012 : Quality of time in the French 2010 TUS survey
**The quality of Life Survey**

Gathering questions of existing surveys to cover most dimensions in the same questionnaire

- Living conditions: EQLS 2007, EU-SILC
- Environment and insecurity: EQLS 2007, EU-SILC
- Labour satisfaction: EQLS 2007 and taking into account of recommendations of the French « collège Risques psychosociaux »
- Health: EU-SILC
- Welfare: Gallup’s type question
- WHO5 module about stress
- Confidence in society and in public decision-makers: adaptation of EQLS 2007
Implementation of the QoL survey

Multimodal (Internet+paper) survey concerning 10 000 persons persons 18 years or more:

Contact by mail

Response rate: 38%

Statistical operations for non responses

Reweighting based on external socio-demographic information

Imputations
Construction of synthetic indicators by dimension

Computation of scores by addition of binary items (privations) in the same dimension. As usual, this method assumes that:

- items provide useful information for the dimension
- cumulating hides specificities of given items
- bad quality of life in the dimension increases with the number of « privations »
- addition is an easy way of computation
  - When items have a good correlation, the weighting scheme has no impact on the result

A person cumulating enough privations has a poor quality of life in the corresponding dimension:

- the indicator equals « 1 » when the score exceeds a given threshold
- … with the question of the determination of the level of the threshold
  - About 10% of the individuals
Example: rich vs. poor people
An other example: urbanization
Welfare

An usual question: «what about your life, on a scale from 0 to 10, from the worst to the best possible?»
The scale from 0 to 10 corresponds to the OECD recommendations

Socio-demographic explanatory variables

- Strong increase with the decile of income from Q01 to the median
- More satisfaction before 25 and after 65 and with High diploma
- Less satisfaction in greater Paris
- No effect of gender and country of birth
Welfare and Quality of life

An important interaction with:
- Social relationships, financial restrictions and stress

Less correlations with:
- Physical health, housing difficulties, insecurity

No link with:
- Environmental conditions and confidence in the society

Few interactions with socio-demographic variables
- Low increase in welfare with income
- Less welfare between 25 and 64
- Gender, country of birth and urbanization are not significant
- Diploma over « baccalaureat »
Low welfare and quality of life

Low welfare = 0 to 4 on the scale (about 7% of people)

Most important interaction
   « poverty » in social links

Other important interactions
   Financial restrictions
   Housing difficulties
   Physical health
   Stress

Usual socio-demographic variables are not significant (income…)!
Happiness and quality of life

High welfare: 9 and 10 on the scale (13% of people)

Most important interaction
  Stress

Then
  Social links and physical health

Then
  Financial restriction and housing difficulties

No effect of insecurity, confidence in society or environmental conditions

Socio-demographic variables
  9th and 10th income deciles, more than 65, bachelor and more
  No effect of gender, urbanization or country of birth
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