Quality of Life of Kazakhstan's Population: Assessment of the Main Parameters and Identification of Problem Areas

Zaure K. Chulanova (✉ zzaure555@gmail.com)

Institute of Economics <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9333-7582>

Research Article

Keywords: Quality of Life, Income, Consumption, Socio-Economic Differentiation, Social Services

Posted Date: February 23rd, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1385263/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

The purpose of the article is to study the main parameters characterizing the quality of life of the population of Kazakhstan in modern economic conditions and develop proposals for its improvement. The methodology of the study is based on a holistic approach, including the use of objective indicators of the quality of life that determine the material conditions and means of human livelihood, and subjective assessments of the population, social groups of their material and social well-being. Measuring and evaluating the level and quality of life of the population of Kazakhstan based on an integrated approach includes the use of the following methods: component analysis, normative and stratification, integral indicators, and subjective assessments of the population.

The leading blocks of the life support system are considered, including the assessment of income and consumption in the conditions of maintaining socio-economic income differentiation; the social qualitative parameters of the life support system of the population, the most important indicators of the implementation of priority areas of development of labor potential in the innovative economy, modernization of housing policy are given.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the concept of "quality of life" has taken a strong position in scientific circulation, along with the concepts of "standard of living and lifestyle of the population". Interest in the issue of quality of life is observed primarily in economically and socially prosperous countries and regions. Research shows that the quality of life fully reflects the effectiveness of the social policy. The Government of these countries is concerned not only with the tasks of social protection and support for the poor but also with the problems of socially sustainable development, in which each next generation of people will live in better conditions than the previous one.

Improving the quality of life of the population is the most important strategic task of the development of society at the present stage, which determined the relevance of the topic of this study. In the model of economic development with the dominance of the innovative component, an important role belongs to improving the level and quality of life of society as a whole. The course taken by Kazakhstan on the formation and development of an innovative economy should significantly increase the potential for the development of society, which is reflected in the efficiency and quality of economic processes and characterizes the social orientation of the country.

The main tasks of social sustainability of the society are associated with improving the quality of life of the population. The influence of social factors on the development of the economy is carried out through human capital, the quality of which directly depends on the state and level of development of the leading spheres of life support of the population, such as the system of income and wages, the social and labor sphere, education, and health care system, housing, ensuring environmental safety of living conditions of the population.

The concept of life quality reflects the totality of socio-economic conditions of life that determine the material and social well-being of the population. The diversity of the structure and content of the socio-economic category "quality of life" is determined both by the level of development of the main spheres of life support and vital activity - material, social, environmental, 3 and - by the quality of the socio-economic potential of the population, a certain social group, an individual.

In the context of Kazakhstan's transition to innovative development, it is necessary to change the vectors in the formation of priorities, institutions, and the use of new mechanisms in the implementation of social policy from the standpoint of ensuring the welfare standards of developed countries. The choice of a social strategy that ensures the stability of the economy and society as the most important basis for the socially-oriented development of the state is associated with a fundamentally new approach to solving the problems of providing decent conditions for the development and realization of the spiritual, intellectual potential and physical perfection of every citizen of the country.

The purpose of the article is to study the main parameters characterizing the quality of life of the population of Kazakhstan in modern economic conditions and develop proposals for its improvement.

2. Literature Review

Currently, there is no generally accepted scientific definition of the concept of "quality of life". There are many studies of this category, and each researcher focuses on one or another side of this concept. Various approaches to assessing the quality of life are investigated in the works of Weizseker & Lovins (2000), Kvyatkovsky (2002), Sukharev (2013), Kondo (2001), Tatochenko (2011), Zholudeva & Melnichenko (2018).

Analysis of various definitions of the quality of life shows that, as a rule, they contain substantive and operational parts. In the substantive part, the very meaning of the concept is revealed, and in the operating part, the method of quantifying the level of quality of life is specified.

The substantive part of all definitions refers to the degree of satisfaction of material, cultural, spiritual, and other human needs. Thus, Cheung, Felix & Lucas (2014), Owczarek (2010), Chaturvedi & Muliya (2016), and others focus on healthcare. It should be noted that earlier the indicator of the quality of life was considered from the standpoint of calculating life expectancy (World Bank, 2007). However, this indicator does not fully disclose all aspects of the phenomenon under study. A more detailed description of the level of quality of life can be obtained using integral indicators for monitoring various socio-economic processes.

Suzilawati, Mohamed, Syahriah & Faris (2018) pay great attention to the possibility of participation in solving social problems, forming a picture of the world and the rules of human behavior. Social belonging, full participation in social and cultural life in all forms is explored in the works of Galloway (2005), Frolova (2016). Massam (2002), McLaren, Shorokhova & Sirotina (2015) study the relationship between the quality of life and the quality of education. Chulanova (2017) considers the availability of

new knowledge, education, and professional skills as the most important part of the quality of life (2017), as well as the creation of favorable social and labor relations (2019). The issues of improving the quality of working life, comfortable working conditions, providing opportunities for creative self-realization of the individual are revealed in the works of Srivastava & Kanpur (2014), the relationship of cultural values is studied by Dudding, Hoffman & Hastings (2018).

In the CIS countries, when assessing the quality of life, the issues of ensuring an acceptable volume of consumption of goods and services, guaranteed access to material and social benefits, the consumer potential of households (Rossinskaya, 2009), and providing the population with affordable housing (Seliverstov & Shevchenko, 2018) are investigated. Gerasimov (2004), Nagimova (2010) investigate this problem on a regional scale.

Practical issues of improving the quality of life are reflected in the works of Sen (1998), Weber (1978), Gorodnova & Samarskaya (2019).

A special place in the research of the quality of life of the population is occupied by the rating assessment of its various aspects. The British research center " The Economist Intelligence Unit " (2005, 2013) developed The Quality of life Index (The Quality of life Index), which links the results of the subjective assessment with objective determinants. Also, the calculation of various indices takes into account the development of the economy, the social environment, and the information structure of the state, including in developing countries (The Legatum Institute, 2019, White, 2020).

In the post-Soviet space, for the first time, the methodology for constructing a system of indicators for analyzing the development of the socio-political situation and assessing the consequences of neoliberal reforms was developed by Lokosov (1998). This system includes 22 indicators for such sections as economic relations; social sphere; demographic situation; environmental situation; deviant behavior; political relations; spiritual sphere.

Bobkov (2007) developed an approach based on a system of normative consumer budgets of different levels of material and social consumption. The advantage of this method is that any social indicator determined by the normative method, for example, the subsistence minimum, the minimum wage, or the standards of provision of social services, not only represent an objective value and become a social norm but also serve as a basis for calculating the total volume and structure of material goods and services necessary for the population of the country.

3. Research Methodology

The methodology of our study of the quality of life of the population of Kazakhstan is based on a holistic approach, including the use of objective indicators of the quality of life that determine the material conditions and means of human livelihood, and subjective assessments of the population, social groups of their material and social well-being. Measuring and evaluating the level and quality of life of the population of Kazakhstan based on an integrated approach includes the use of the following methods:

component analysis, normative and stratification, integral indicators, and subjective assessments of the population.

The leading place in the system of methodological approaches to the study of the quality of life belongs to the method of component analysis, the use of which is due to the diversity of the structure, composition, and different content of the main components of the quality of life of the population. This method allows not only to determine the degree of differences in the level of development of individual components of the quality of life but also to identify the factors that determine their positive dynamics (Gaisina, 2017). The study of the quality of life of the population based on component analysis makes it possible to obtain a holistic view of this complex socioeconomic category (Manova, 2009).

Based on previous studies and taking into account the peculiarities of the region, we have identified the following components of the quality of life for evaluation and analysis (Fig. 1).

To assess the main components of the quality of life, the method of normative analysis of the well-being of various population groups was used. The advantage of this method is that any social indicator determined by the normative method, for example, the subsistence minimum, the minimum wage, or the standards of provision of social services, not only represent an objective value and become a social norm (standard) but also serve as the basis to calculate the total volume and structure of material goods and services necessary for the population of the country.

Comparative analysis and assessment of the quality of life by its main components allow, firstly, to identify those components of the quality of life, the level of which does not meet modern standards of human life support. Second, to identify the components of a new quality of life that are formed as a result of the impact of social innovation. In this case, we are talking about the quality of the labor force, in particular, the development of the intellectual potential of the country's labor resources, which is a key factor in improving the competitiveness of the national economy in the conditions of a knowledge-intensive economy. This also applies to the production of new types of consumer goods and services that create favorable conditions for all periods of human life, to ensure the environmental sustainability of the environment and safe conditions for human life through the introduction of advanced technologies, the production of environmentally friendly food, consumer goods, and services.

Another common approach is to clarify the essence of the concept of quality of life based on opinion polls, i.e. quality of life is considered as a subjective indicator. The close coincidence of life stereotypes and the possibility of their implementation gives the maximum values for this indicator.

Both of these approaches, taken separately, do not give the desired result, i.e. an integrated approach is needed, which will include the study of both objective and subjective indicators that define the concept of "quality of life".

4. Results

The level of development of the leading spheres of life support and vital activity of the population of Kazakhstan is carried out based on indicators that determine the level of development of such main areas as the system of income and wages, social and labor sphere, education, and health care system, housing, ensuring environmental safety of living conditions of the population.

The key component largely determining the level and quality of life of the population is *income*. According to the Committee on Statistics of the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, in 2020 the nominal cash income of the population amounted to 104,389 tenge[1] (USD 274.7), the average monthly nominal wage was 186,815 tenge (USD 491.6).

In 2005-2020, nominal cash incomes increased 5.3 times, and nominal average monthly wages increased 4.8 times, its nominal and real indices grew steadily (Fig. 2). During this period, real monetary income increased 2.3 times, real wages - 1.7 times, real pensions - 2.1 times. The consumer price index in 2020 increased by 2.9 times compared to 2005.

In 2020, during the period of pandemic restrictions, as can be seen from Figure 2, despite the growth in nominal income, the growth rates of both real and nominal income decreased. A certain increase in nominal income is associated with the implementation of government anti-crisis measures. More than 4.5 million people who temporarily lost their income received assistance in the amount of 42,500 tenge monthly. More than 550 thousand families were covered by the one-time financial support of the “Birgemiz” (We are together) foundation.

The most important component of the quality of life of the population is the *sphere of material and social consumption*. The income of the population as the most important parameter of the resource potential of various social groups should be considered from the standpoint of their influence on the level of consumption and lifestyle. This conclusion is confirmed by a comparative analysis of indicators of income and consumer spending of households on material goods and social services. At the same time, there is an obvious trend towards an increase in the cost of food products and a decrease in the cost of non-food and paid services. This was especially clear during the pandemic. (Fig. 3).

Currently, to measure the quality of the consumer potential of the population, social groups differing in the level of material security, the structure of consumer spending of the population is used. Based on the classification of consumer spending on food, non-food products, and especially on services, and their correlation with the socially necessary level of consumption, households and social groups with a real level of material consumption are distinguished. This allows us to determine the structure of consumer demand of the population, which is the basis for calculating the need for consumer goods and services of the required volume and the corresponding range.

Of particular importance for assessing the quality of the consumer potential of the population is the definition of the socially necessary level of consumption that the majority of the population should have. It includes goods and services that have received universal distribution, that is, to a certain extent, it should reflect the average level of consumption prevailing in a given period.

Social groups of the population with such a standard of consumption, as the most representative in the social structure of developed countries, have the greatest influence on the formation of the country's consumer market, stimulating the development of the production of consumer goods and services. However, at present, the actual level of consumption of the population of the republic differs in all parameters from the socially necessary level of consumption, which we calculated using the normative method.

Of particular importance for assessing the state of the income sphere are indicators and indicators that measure the degree of their *socio-economic differentiation*. Their excess leads to an increase in social stratification and a decrease in social stability in society.

Against the background of growth in real incomes of the population, the share of incomes of 20% of the population with the highest incomes, which in 2005 amounted to 39.5% of total income, in 2020 decreased by only 0.4%, that is, remained at the same level. The share of incomes of 20% of the population with the lowest incomes increased by 0.8%, which indicates a fairly high level of socio-economic differentiation of the population's income.

In the context of households with different material levels, the incomes of the population of 10% of the poorest population amounted to 28,427.6 tenges (USD 81,2), 10% of the most prosperous population - 109,388 tenges (USD 287,9), 20% of the poorest population - 31,335.5 tenges (USD 82,5), 20% of the most prosperous population - 96,097.7 tenges (USD 252,9). Income indicators of social groups of the population to the socially necessary level of consumption, except the most affluent 10% and 20% of the population groups, do not reach their level (Table 1).

Table 1 Key indicators of household income and consumer spending (average per capita) for 2020

Indicator	Income of the population		Consumer spending of the population	
	Income, tenge	Income to socially necessary level, %	Expenses, tenge	Expenses to the socially necessary level, %
10% of the poorest population	28427.6	29.2	22195.5	22.8
10% of the wealthiest population	109388	112.2	136011.1	139.5
20% of the poorest population	31335.5	32.1	24532.3	25.2
20% of the wealthiest population	96097.7	98.6	107338.9	110.1

Source: Calculated as per data of the Bureau of National statistics of Kazakhstan

Even though the incomes of 10% and 20% of the richest households exceed the socially necessary level of consumption, the structure of consumer spending of these households is irrational and does not

correspond to the social standards of human life support. First of all, the share of food expenses is high, which was 47% for 10% of the richest group, and 48.3% for 20% of the richest group. For comparison: the share of expenditures on food in the developed countries of Europe is in the range from 8.7% in Luxembourg to 13.4% in Germany.

For the poorest groups of the population, the indicators of expenditures on the consumption of material goods and services for 10% of the poorest population and 20% of the least affluent population reflect a very low level of personal consumption, which directly affects the quality of human potential and the provision of socially necessary conditions for its reproduction. The share of food spending for 10% of the poorest population was 60.2%, for 20% of the poorest population - 57.6%, for non-food products - 22.2 and 24.9% respectively, for services - 17.5 and 17.6%.

According to the sample household surveys of the population of Kazakhstan for 2020, only 36.5% of respondents have enough money for food and clothing, but they cannot buy durable goods. It should be noted that it is the reduction in spending on food and the increase in spending on non-food products and, especially on services, that determines the quality of the consumer potential of the population in modern conditions.

A comparative analysis of the consumer potential of the population shows that the most negative trends have developed in the consumption of basic food products, especially in low-income families. The high proportion of expenditures on food, the persisting differentiation in the level of consumption of basic foodstuffs and the lack of consumption of basic food products in terms of energy value and the composition of the most important components in the diet reflect the structure of consumer spending on food for low-income families. In the absence of a shortage of basic types of food, the main factor hindering an increase in the level and quality of consumption of essential food is income restriction, which negatively affects the state of human health.

In the sphere of consumption in social terms, a special group of consumer goods and services is of great importance, creating favorable conditions for human development at any period of life and associated with social needs.

The development of the latest technologies has led to an increase in the population's needs for information products and services, an increase in the level of education, the acquisition of new knowledge and professional skills. With the advent of new types of services, their share in consumer spending will grow, which is an indicator of improving the quality of life.

A comparative analysis of the RIA Rating (2020) calculations based on the data of the national statistical services gives a certain idea of the share of expenses on services that directly affect the quality and development of the potential of an individual and society as a whole. The share of family budget expenditures on leisure and cultural activities directly depends on the living standards of the population of different states. The leaders here are such developed countries as Sweden, where this figure was

18.7%, the United Kingdom - 13.0%, Austria - 11.5%. Kazakhstan ranks 37th in this indicator, while Russia and Belarus are in the middle of the rating, taking 22nd and 23rd places, respectively.

The presence of restrictions in access to material and social resources indicates that a certain part of the households of the population of the republic in various aspects of the quality of life does not have a level of consumption that meets modern social standards.

The quality of the social and labor sphere as an essential component of the quality of life is determined by the high quality of working life: the presence of a decent job, a high level of labor income, the ability to develop professional abilities, a high level of protection of the interests of workers, respect for their rights in the sphere of labor and employment.

In an innovative economy, the requirements for the quality of labor potential, for the level of education and qualifications of workers, for the ability to work in a competitive environment, to quickly respond to ongoing technological changes, to master new social and production functions are especially increasing. The innovative vector of economic development forms new conditions for the life of a modern worker and new production and social functions performed by them.

The presence of a special resource potential among representatives of this category of workers allows them to provide them with a decent level of material well-being and a high social status, a high social position in conditions of free competition.

The professional competitiveness of the labor force is ensured not only by a complex of factors, including obtaining high-quality vocational education and professional training, ensuring demand in the labor market but also by creative thinking, a developed system of economic interests and values, innovative abilities, professional competence, and mastery modern skills in work, adequate to the conditions of a changing market, the ability of a highly qualified workforce to continuously enrich knowledge and qualifications, etc.

In this regard, such a social group as specialists-professionals is of particular importance for assessing the quality of the qualification level. It should be noted that among the specialists, the largest share is accounted for by those employed in science and technology, their share in this group was 13.8%, education – 36.5, business and administration – 23.6%. In the information technology industry, professional specialists accounted for 2.8%, in healthcare - 10.6%, in law, humanities, and culture - 12.6%. The low share of professionals in the field of information technology is due to the small number of people employed in this industry, their share of the total employed population was 1.9%.

Of particular importance in the social and labor sphere is the protection of labor income and ensuring their decent level. The basis of the monetary income of the population of the republic is labor income – wages and income from self-employment and entrepreneurial activity, but the main share in the income structure is wages of employees, which for the period 2005-2020 was in the range from 64 to 70%. As a result, the differentiation of the population's income is largely influenced by the factors that cause

differences in wages, and its value depends on the complex interaction of demographic, economic, and social factors that have different directions.

The current situation is largely due to a fairly high level of intersectoral wage differentiation in the country's economic sectors, as evidenced by the dynamics of wage ratios by industry and sector of the economy. The level of wages of workers in the manufacturing industry to the average for the sectors of the economy of the republic in 2005 amounted to 104.0%, in 2020 - 114.4%, in mining, respectively - 193.1 and 228.5%, in the rural economy - 43.4 and 60.2%, in financial activities - 233.5 and 205.5%, in education - 59.7 and 63.2%, in health care - 53.0 and 68.7% (Fig. 4).

The analysis of the cited data on the prevailing wage levels reflects the strengthening of the inter-sectoral differentiation of wages, especially in the manufacturing industry and the social sphere. It should be noted that the existing imbalances in the levels of wages in the sectors of the economy of the republic are a serious factor limiting the development of industries producing consumer goods, creating conditions for the social reproduction of the population, providing employment, and budget revenues.

Remuneration, overall income level, and social protection largely depend on the sector of the economy, the region, and the financial condition of the enterprise. As a result, in material terms, the positions of a significant part of highly qualified specialists and skilled workers have significantly decreased, which negatively affects the quality of human capital. This leads to the objective need to compare different types of work, taking into account their volume, complexity, and professional qualifications of the employee, which affect the differences in wages, which are fair from the standpoint of the real cost of labor.

The main direction to strengthen the regulatory role of wages in coordinating the demand for labor and its supply in the Kazakhstan labor market is the development of measures to ensure the real cost of various types of work, taking into account their volume, complexity, level of education and professionalism of the employee based on creating equal conditions for the reproduction of labor resources at the cross-sectoral and intra-sectoral levels, between the public and private sectors, as well as within enterprises, the development of a new system of social standards in the field of income and wages, etc.

The quality of the social sphere, as the most important component of the quality of life of the population, is determined by the high level of consumption of high-quality social services and their availability for the majority of the population. Among these indicators, the key one is the volume of financing of social expenditures as a percentage of GDP directed to social protection, education, health care, science, environmental safety, the amount of which is directly dependent on the level of economic development of the country. Share of state budget expenditures on the social and cultural sphere in 2005 amounted to 13.5%, in 2020 - 10.7%, including education, respectively, 3.4% and 3.3%, health care - 2.4% and 2.0%. For comparison: the share of social spending as a % of GDP in OECD countries ranges from 18.7% in the United States to 31.2% in France (OECD, 2020).

Priority in the set of indicators that reflect the level and quality of use of various types of services is given to indicators of the housing conditions. Along with such traditional indicators that determine the provision of the population with housing, such as the size of living space per capita, the degree of improvement of the housing stock, the volume of housing commissioned, the average size of apartments, the number of rooms and others, indicators are needed to reflect new trends in the 16 living standards of various groups. population, and in the current model of providing housing for the population.

According to the Bureau of National Statistics, the provision of housing per capita in 2020 was 21.8 square meters, including 24.4 square meters in urban areas and 18.4 square meters in rural areas. Statistical data reflect rather high indicators of the housing stock equipped with water supply, which amounted to 98.4%, with gas - 87.8%. However, the indicators that determine the quality of housing conditions are rather low. According to the data of sample household surveys for 2020, the proportion of respondents satisfied with the quality of housing in which they live amounted to 51.1%, including in urban areas - 47.2%, in rural areas - 57.5%, the indicator of satisfaction with the housing area was 52.5%, in urban areas - 46.2%, in rural areas - 63.4%.

The share of the population that can independently purchase housing was 8.6%. The main problems with the purchase of housing and improvement of housing conditions, according to respondents, are associated with a lack of money, it was noted by 32.3%, with high-interest rates of mortgage loans – 30.3% of respondents.

A special place in the system of indicators of the quality of life of the population is occupied by the parameters of a person's subjective perception of their well-being. In studies of the quality of life, such a generalized social indicator as “life satisfaction” is of great importance. This indicator is complex since it includes satisfaction with various material and socio-cultural conditions of life support and human activity.

The indicator of satisfaction with the personal well-being of Kazakhstanis, according to the data of sample surveys of households for 2020, was 60,0%, satisfaction with living conditions – 53,2% (Fig. 5). For comparison: the average indicator of satisfaction with their lives in the OECD countries on a scale from 1 to 10 points was 6.5 points, in such a socially-oriented state as Sweden - 7.3 points.

It should be noted that the degree of satisfaction with living conditions directly depends not only on the level of material well-being of the family but also in many respects - on the quality of the individual's potential, the system of his socio-economic values, and claims that form his priorities. The indices of the quality of the provided material goods and social services and their availability for the population are among the necessary indicators of the social welfare of the population. According to sample household surveys for 2020, the share of respondents satisfied with the quality of social services at various levels of education was 45.7% of preschool, 46.9% of general secondary education, 41.3 of secondary vocational education, 39 of higher education. 9%, the quality of healthcare services - 32.2%. Indicators of the availability of necessities and social services were as follows: 9.6% of households are not able to buy clothing and pay for housing, 31.4% of households cannot buy durable goods. Only 18.3% of households

can buy their own housing. The availability of education services ranges from 38.2% in higher education to 58.5% in general secondary education. The main indicators that determine the quality and availability of the most important social services for the population of Kazakhstan are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Parameters of the quality and availability of social services to the population of Kazakhstan in 2020, in %

Social services	Share of the population satisfied with the quality of social services	Share of the population who have access to social services
<i>Field of education</i>		
Preschool education	45.7	47.1
General secondary	46.9	58.5
Secondary professional	41.3	45.9
Higher and postgraduate education	39.9	38.2
<i>Healthcare sector</i>	32.3	37.9
<i>Housing</i>		
Share of the population who can purchase housing	67.6	18.3

Source: Calculated as per data of the Bureau of National statistics of Kazakhstan

In general, any of the approaches and indicators taken separately does not allow obtaining a sufficiently correct assessment. Therefore, a combination of several approaches is an indispensable condition for increasing the reliability and efficiency of the results obtained.

[1] Tenge is the national currency of Kazakhstan (KzT)

5. Conclusion

In the current difficult socio-economic situation caused by the pandemic and the crisis, the role of the protective functions of the state's social policy, aimed at solving both current and future social problems, increases. Its most important direction is to ensure the sustainability of the functioning of the life support system of the population. The use of various methodological approaches to studying the processes of forming a qualitatively new standard of living of the population of Kazakhstan allows us to give a real assessment of the level and quality of life of various social groups, the degree of socio-economic inequality in terms of welfare, quality of potential, accessibility of social services, life and professional opportunities and prospects, which contributes to the development of real mechanisms to achieve social standards of developed countries.

The formation of social standards of living depends entirely on the economic policy of the state. Ensuring a decent quality of life that corresponds to modern progressive views is a priority task of the state, the role of which has been significantly increasing in recent years. State social policy should be focused on the formation of an adequate concept of the quality of life and a model of a just society that meets the interests of citizens of Kazakhstan. From the above, it is obvious that improving the quality of life of Kazakhstanis and achieving the level of developed countries should be among the priority tasks, as well as monitoring their implementation, facing the state and society.

Declarations

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Bobkov, V.N. (2007). *Quality and standard of living of the population in the new Russia*. M.: VTsUZh.
2. Cheung, F., & Lucas R.E. (2014). Assessing the Validity of Single-Item Life Satisfaction Measures: Results from Three Large Samples. *Quality of Life Research: An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and Rehabilitation*, 23, 2809–18.
3. Chulanova, Z.K. (2017). *Effective model of social and labor relations: approaches to regulation*. Proceedings of the International Conference on Business and Economics (ICBE 2017). (pp.103–105). Seoul, Korea: KODISA.
4. Chulanova, Z.K. (2019). Regulating Kazakhstan's Labor Relations under New Socio-economic Conditions. *E-Journal of International and Comparative Labour Studies*, 8(3), 47–67.
5. Dudding, A., Hoffman, T., & Hastings, A. (2018). *Quality of Life survey 2018: Nielsen Topline report*. Wellington, New Zealand
6. Frolova, O.I. (2016). Components of high quality of working life. *Economic Sciences*, 9 (51), 90–161.
7. Gaisina, S.N. (2017). Quality of life of the population in conditions of social modernization. *Society and economy*, 9, 189–201.
8. Galloway, S. (2005). *Quality of Life and Well-Being: Measuring the Benefits of Culture and Sport*. Information and Analytical Services Division. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research.
9. Gerasimov, B.I. (2004). *Integral assessment of the quality of life of the population of the region*. Tambov: Publishing house of State Tech. University.
10. Gorodnova, N.V., & Samarskaya, N.A. (2019). Improving the quality of life of the population in the modern economic conditions of Russia. *Discussion*, 9(4), 48–58.
11. Kondo, E. (2001). Hoshin kanri - one of the approaches of Japanese quality management. *Quality management methods*, 5, 11–15.
12. Kvyatkovsky, S. (2002). Intellectual entrepreneurship and stable economic development in the postsocialist countries of Europe. *Problems of management theory and practice*, 3(2), 21–27.

13. Lokosov, V.V. (1998). The stability of society and the system of critical indicators of its development. *Sociological research*, 4, 86–94.
14. Massam, B.H. (2002). Quality of life: public planning and private living. *Progress in Planning*, 5(8), 141–227.
15. McLaren, N.B., Shorokhova, M.A., & Sirotina I.L. (2015). Quality of life and quality of education. *Integration of education*, 19(4), 75–77. DOI:10.15507/1991-9468.081.019.201504.07272-77
16. Manova, N.V. (2009). Component Analysis. *Modern problems of science and education*, 9(1). Retrieved Mars 7, 2020, from <http://science-education.ru/ru/article/view?id=913>
17. Nagimov, A.M. (2010). *Sociological analysis of the quality of life of the population: a regional aspect*. Kazan: Kazan state university.
18. OECD (2020). Social spending in OECD countries. Retrieved September 1, 2020, from <https://data.oecd.org/socialexp/socialspending.htm>
19. Owczarek, K. (2010). The concept of quality of life. *Acta Neuropsychologica*, 8(3), 207–213.
20. Rossinskaya, G. (2009). Household consumer potential as a factor in economic development. *Human. Economy. Society*, 9(1), 119–124.
21. Santosh, K.C., & Muliya K.P. (2016). The Meaning in Quality of Life. *Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation and Mental Health*, 3, 47–49.
22. Seliverstov, Y.I., & Shevchenko M.A. (2018). The economic model of providing the population with affordable housing. *Bulletin of BSTU*, 10, 149–156.
23. Sen, A.K. (1998). Development as Capability Expansion. *Journal of Development Planning*, 19, 41–58.
24. Suzilawati, R.N., Mohamed, O.M., Syahriah, B., & Faris, A.M. (2018). Perceptual study on conventional quality of life indicators. *Planning Malaysia* 16(5), 59–66. DOI: 10.21837/pmjournal.v16.i5.433
25. Srivastava, S., & Kanpur, R. (2014). A Study on Quality of Work Life: Key Elements & It's Implications. *Journal of Business and Management*, 16(3), 54–59.
26. Sukharev, O.S. (2013). Level and quality of life of the population as criteria for measuring the results of economic development. *Digest Finance*, 2(28), 57–64.
27. Tatochenko, T.V. (2011). Methodology for assessing the quality of life in the region. *Bulletin of the Stavropol State University*, 75, 185–195.
28. Zholudeva, V.V., & Melnichenko N.F. (2018). Statistical assessment of the quality of workers' working life. *Statistics and Economics*, 15(4), 42–51. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21686/2500-3925-2018-4-42-51>
29. The Bureau of National statistics of the Agency for Strategic planning and reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2021). *The living standard of the population in Kazakhstan, 2015–2019. Remuneration for labor in the Republic of Kazakhstan. About housing stock*. Retrieved September 1, 2020, from <https://stat.gov.kz/> The Economist Intelligence Unit's Quality-of-Life Index (2019).
30. The Economist Intelligence Unit. Retrieved June 5, 2020, from <http://www.eiu.com/>

31. The Legatum Institute (2019). The Legatum Prosperity Index 2019. Retrieved September 1, 2020, from <https://www.prosperity.com/rankings>

32. Weber M. (1978). *Economy and Society*. Vol. I. Berkeley, University of California Press.

33. Weizsäcker, E., Lovins, E., & Lovins, L. (2000). *Factor four: double. New report to the Club of Rome*. Academia.

34. White, A.G. (2020). University of Leicester: The Satisfaction with Life Index. *Social Progress Index*, 7. Retrieved October 5, 2020, from <https://www.socialprogress.org/>

35. World Bank (2007). *World Development Report 2007: Development and the Next Generation*. The World Bank: Washington DC.

Figures

Figure 1

Key components of quality of life

Note: Compiled by the author

Figure 2

Indicators of average monthly per capita nominal monetary income for 2015-2020, KzT

Source: Calculated as per data of the Bureau of National statistics of Kazakhstan

Figure 3

Structure of consumer spending of the population

Source: Calculated as per data of the Bureau of National statistics of Kazakhstan

Figure 4

Average monthly nominal wages by type of economic activity, in USD

Source: Calculated as per data of the Bureau of National statistics of Kazakhstan

Figure 5

Respondents ' opinion about their life satisfaction

Source: Calculated as per data of the Bureau of National statistics of Kazakhstan