

УДК 351.862.8

### ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF LIFE QUALITY ACROSS THE WORLD

**E.B. Gerasimova, E.V. Nizhegorodov**

*Finance Academy under the Government  
of the Russian Federation (University), Moscow;  
Tambov State Technical University, Tambov*

*Represented by Doctor of Economics, Professor L.V. Parkhomenko*

**Key words and phrases:** economic analysis; index of development of human potential; index of education; index of life expectancy; index of a gross domestic product; life quality.

**Abstract:** The article shows the connection between the life quality and the social-economic development, between the life quality and the index of development of human potential. It is described the mechanism of the index of development of human potential. The article represents classifications of the countries by the index of development of human potential. Countries are compared by different indexes of human development. It is analyzed trends of human development.

It is possible to estimate the results of the social-economic development of Russian Federation like any other country of the world on the basis of the dynamic of people's life quality index. It is also possible to estimate the dynamic of the life quality, using the index of development of human potential (IDHP). Many scientists believe that this is the same thing as the index of life quality [1; 2, p. 92].

IDHP consists of three parts: life expectancy after the born, level of education and level of income, which estimates on the value of gross product per human. Methodology of calculation of IDHP is possible to use for estimation of people's life quality, for comparison of indexes between different cities and countries, for exploitation of strategy of their increasing.

The index of development of human potential is based on following formula (1) [1, p. 95]:

---

Герасимова Е.Б. – доктор экономических наук, профессор кафедры «Экономический анализ» Финансовой академии при Правительстве Российской Федерации, e-mail: gerasim\_ova@inbox.com; Нижегородов Е.В. – кандидат экономических наук, старший преподаватель кафедры «Экономический анализ и качество» ТамбГТУ, e-mail: enizhegorodov@yandex.ru.

$$IDHP = (I_{le} + I_{gdp} + I_e)/3, \quad (1)$$

where  $I_{le}$  – index of life expectancy;  $I_{gdp}$  – index of gross domestic product;  $I_e$  – index of education.

Specialists of UNDP make estimation of human potential of many countries of the world and estimate the place of each of them among others every year.

Depending on the quantity of IDHP, UNDP divides the countries of the world into four groups. Index more than 0.900 characterizes countries with very high level of development; from 0.800 to 0.899 – with high level of development; from 0.500 to 0.799 – with medium; less than 0.499 – with low level of development [3].

The data about trends in the sphere of IDHP in different countries of the world in period from 1975 to 2008 years are represented in Table 1.

Table 1

**Dynamics of index of development of human potential [4]**

Rating of countries	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	2003	2008	Change
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>Countries with high index of human development</b>								
1. Norway	0.868	0.888	0.898	0.912	0.936	0.963	0.968	1.00
2. Iceland	0.863	0.886	0.896	0.915	0.919	0.956	0.968	1.05
3. Australia	0.848	0.866	0.879	0.893	0.933	0.955	0.962	1.14
4. Luxemburg	0.840	0.851	0.858	0.884	0.911	0.949	0.944	1.04
5. Canada	0.869	0.886	0.909	0.929	0.934	0.949	0.961	0.92
6. Sweden	0.864	0.874	0.886	0.897	0.929	0.949	0.956	0.92
7. Switzerland	0.879	0.890	0.896	0.910	0.921	0.947	0.955	0.76
8. Ireland	0.811	0.826	0.845	0.870	0.894	0.946	0.959	1.48
9. Belgium	0.846	0.863	0.878	0.899	0.929	0.945	0.946	1.00
10. USA	0.867	0.887	0.901	0.916	0.929	0.944	0.951	0.84
11. Japan	0.857	0.882	0.895	0.911	0.925	0.943	0.953	0.96
12. Netherlands	0.867	0.879	0.893	0.908	0.928	0.943	0.953	0.86
13. Finland	0.841	0.861	0.879	0.901	0.914	0.941	0.952	1.11
14. Denmark	0.874	0.882	0.890	0.898	0.913	0.941	0.949	0.75
15. Great Britain	0.845	0.854	0.863	0.883	0.921	0.939	0.946	1.01
16. France	0.853	0.869	0.881	0.903	0.921	0.938	0.952	0.75
17. Austria	0.843	0.858	0.871	0.894	0.914	0.936	0.948	1.05
18. Italy	0.842	0.858	0.866	0.889	0.907	0.934	0.941	0.99
19. New Zealand	0.848	0.854	0.868	0.875	0.905	0.933	0.943	0.95
20. Germany	–	0.861	0.869	0.888	0.913	0.930	0.935	0.74
21. Spain	0.837	0.854	0.868	0.886	0.904	0.928	0.949	1.12
22. Hong Kong	0.761	0.800	0.827	0.862	0.882	0.916	0.937	1.76
23. Israel	0.795	0.819	0.840	0.858	0.880	0.915	0.932	1.37
24. Greece	0.835	0.850	0.864	0.872	0.876	0.912	0.926	0.91
25. Singapore	0.725	0.761	0.784	0.822	0.861	0.907	0.922	1.97
26. Slovenia	–	–	–	–	0.853	0.904	0.917	0.64
27. Portugal	0.787	0.802	0.826	0.849	0.878	0.904	0.897	1.10
57. Panama	0.710	0.737	0.747	0.749	0.772	0.804	0.812	1.02

Table 1 Continued

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>Countries with medium index of human development</b>								
58. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	–	–	–	–	–	0.797	0.818	0.21
59. Macedonia	–	–	–	–	–	0.797	0.801	0.04
60. Antigua and Barbuda	–	–	–	–	–	0.797	0.815	0.18
61. Malaysia	0.615	0.659	0.695	0.721	0.760	0.796	0.811	1.96
62. Russian Federation	–	–	–	0.817	0.770	0.795	0.802	–0.15
63. Brazil	0.645	0.682	0.698	0.719	0.747	0.792	0.800	1.55
64. Romania	–	–	–	0.772	0.768	0.792	0.813	0.41
65. Mauritius	–	0.659	0.690	0.724	0.747	0.791	0.804	1.45
66. Grenada	–	–	–	–	–	0.787	0.777	–0.10
67. Belorussia	–	–	–	0.787	0.751	0.786	0.804	0.17
68. Bosnia and Herzegovina	–	–	–	–	–	0.786	0.803	0.17
69. Colombia	0.662	0.691	0.708	0.727	0.752	0.785	0.791	1.29
70. Dominica	–	–	–	–	–	0.783	0.798	0.15
71. Oman	0.494	0.547	0.641	0.699	0.738	0.781	0.814	3.20
72. Albany	–	–	0.693	0.703	0.702	0.780	0.801	1.08
73. Thailand	0.614	0.652	0.678	0.714	0.749	0.778	0.781	1.67
74. Samoa	–	–	0.723	0.732	0.742	0.776		0.43
75. Venezuela	0.718	0.732	0.740	0.759	0.767	0.772	0.792	0.74
76. Saint Lucia	–	–	–	–	–	0.772	0.795	0.23
77. Saudi Arabian	0.603	0.659	0.673	0.708	0.741	0.772	0.812	2.09
78. Ukraine	–	–	–	0.799	0.747	0.766	0.788	–0.11
79. Peru	0.643	0.674	0.698	0.707	0.734	0.762	0.773	1.30
<b>Countries with low index of human development</b>								
147. Swaziland	0.530	0.562	0.584	0.624	0.603	0.498	0.547	0.17
148. Cameroon	0.416	0.463	0.505	0.514	0.494	0.497	0.532	1.16
149. Lesotho	0.461	0.510	0.534	0.571	0.573	0.497	0.549	0.88
150. Djibouti	–	–	–	–	0.477	0.495	0.516	0.39
151. Yemen	–	–	–	0.393	0.436	0.489	0.508	1.15
152. Mauritania	0.340	0.363	0.384	0.388	0.424	0.477	0.550	2.10
153. Haiti	–	0.499	0.458	0.446	0.450	0.475	0.529	1.30
154. Kenya	0.461	0.509	0.530	0.546	0.524	0.474	0.521	0.60
155. Gambia	0.284	–	–	–	0.424	0.470	0.502	2.18
174. Mali	0.230	0.256	0.263	0.283	0.307	0.333	0.380	1.50
175. Burkina Faso	0.253	0.273	0.297	0.305	0.311	0.317	0.370	1.17
176. Sierra-Leone	–	–	–	–	–	0.298	0.336	0.38
177. Niger	0.236	0.252	0.242	0.249	0.256	0.281	0.374	1.38

There are some conclusions, which we can be made on the basis of the data in Table 2. The most important one is, that almost in every country the life quality gradually increases. This fact makes it possible to say, that human civilization is on the right way, increasing the human potential.

The number of countries varies in each group. For example, the quantity of countries with high level of human development is 57, with medium level of human development is 87, with low level of human development is 31. Gradually, the quantity of countries with high and medium development is increasing, and the quantity of countries with low level of human development is decreasing.

The common data about countries with the biggest and the lowest level of increase in IDHP are represented in Table 2.

As we can see, a more stable group is a group of countries with high level of human development of IDHP, in which all countries have made a progress. A less stable group is a group of countries with medium level of human development of IDHP. On the one hand, we can see countries where growth of IDHP is the highest, but on the other hand – there're countries showing the decrease in IDHP.

In addition, there is a very big difference between the most and the least developed countries. On average, IDHP of the 10-th most developed countries is as twice as big as that of the 10-th least developed countries. And in such countries as: Sierra-Leone, Burkina-Faso, Niger, IDHP is as three times little as the medium level of IDHP in the most developed countries (Table 3).

Table 2

**Changing of IDHP level of different countries  
from 1975 to 2008 years [6, p. 64]**

Countries with the biggest progress of increasing of IDHP		Countries with the least progress of increasing of IDHP	
Country	Changing	Country	Changing
<b>Countries with high index of human development</b>			
Singapore	0.197	Slovenia	0.64
Hong Kong	0.176	Germany	0.74
Ireland	0.148	France	0.75
Israel	0.137	Denmark	0.75
Australia	0.114	Switzerland	0.76
<b>Countries with medium index of human development</b>			
Oman	0.320	Russian Federation	-0.015
Saudi Arabia	0.209	Ukraine	-0.011
Malaysia	0.196	Grenada	-0.010
Thailand	0.167	Macedonia	0.004
Brazil	0.155	Dominica	0.015
<b>Countries with low index of human development</b>			
Gambia	0.218	Swaziland	0.017
Mauritania	0.210	Sierra-Leone	0.038
Mali	0.150	Djibouti	0.039
Niger	0.138	Kenya	0.060
Haiti	0.130	Lesotho	0.088

Table 3

**IDHP of the most and the least developed countries [6, p. 65]**

Country	IDHP	Country	IDHP	Different
1. Norway	0.968	177. Sierra-Leone	0.336	0.632
2. Iceland	0.968	176. Burkina-Faso	0.370	0.666
3. Australia	0.962	175. Niger	0.374	0.588
4. Canada	0.961	174. Mali	0.380	0.581
5. Ireland	0.959	173. Gambia	0.502	0.457
6. Sweden	0.956	172. Yemen	0.508	0.448
7. Switzerland	0.955	171. Djibouti	0.516	0.439
8. Japan	0.953	170. Kenya	0.521	0.432
9. Netherlands	0.953	169. Haiti	0.529	0.424
10. Finland / France	0.952	168. Cameroon	0.532	0.420
Total	0.959	Total	0.457	0.502

For a better estimation of life quality in different countries of the world it is necessary to find out the components on which it is based. The data about economic development of different countries of the world are shown in Table 4. The connection between the life quality and the level of income of human is positive. The highest rating of IDHP is in those countries, which have the biggest income per human, and low rating is in those countries, which have the least income per human.

Table 4

**Level of economic development of different countries [4]**

Rating of country by IDHP	GDP		GDP per human	
	Bill. of US doll.	Bill. of US doll.	US doll.	US doll.
	2003	2008	2003	2008
1	2	3	4	5
<b>Countries with high index of human development</b>				
1. Norway	220.9	388.4	48 412	82480
2. Iceland	10.5	20	36 377	64190
3. Australia	522.4	821	26 275	39066
4. Luxembourg	26.5	49.5	59 143	103042
5. Canada	856.5	1329.9	27 079	40329
6. Sweden	301.6	454.3	33 676	49662
7. Switzerland	320.1	424.4	43 553	56207
8. Ireland	153.7	259	38 487	59324
9. Belgium	301.9	452.8	29 096	42609
10. USA	10 948.5	13751.4	37 648	45592
11. Japan	4 300.9	4384.3	33 713	34313
12. Netherlands	511.5	765.8	31 532	46750
13. Finland	161.9	244.7	31 058	46261
14. Denmark	211.9	311.6	39 332	57051
15. Great Britain	1 794.9	2772	30 253	45442
16. France	1 757.6	2589.8	29 410	41970

Table 4 Continued

1	2	3	4	5
17. Austria	253.1	373.2	31 289	44879
18. Italy	1 468.3	2101.6	25 471	35396
19. New Zealand	79.6	135.7	19 847	32086
20. Germany	2 403.2	3317.4	29 115	40324
21. Spain	838.7	1436.9	20 404	32017
22. Hong Kong	156.7	207.2	22 987	29912
23. Israel	110.2	164	16 841	22835
24. Greece	172.2	313.4	15 608	27995
25. Singapore	91.3	161.3	21 492	35163
26. Slovenia	27.7	47.2	13 909	23379
27. Portugal	147.9	222.8	14 161	20998
57. Panama	12.9	19.5	4 319	5833
<b>Countries with medium index of human development</b>				
58. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	4.7	7.7	2 277	3767
59. Macedonia	0.8	1	9 629	11664
60. Antigua and Barbuda	103.7	186.7	4 187	7033
61. Malaysia	432.9	1290.1	3 018	9079
62. Russian Federation	492.3	1313.4	2 788	6855
63. Brazil	57.0	166	2 619	7703
64. Romania	5.2	6.8	4 274	5383
65. Mauritius	0.4	0.6	4 199	5724
66. Grenada	17.5	44.8	1 770	4615
67. Belorussia	7.0	15.1	1 684	4014
68. Bosnia and Herzegovina	78.7	207.8	1 764	4724
69. Colombia	0.3	0.3	3 639	–
70. Dominica	–	35.7	–	14031
71. Oman	6.1	10.8	1 933	3405
72. Albany	143.0	245.4	2 305	3844
73. Thailand	0.3	0.5	1 505	2894
74. Samoa	85.4	228.1	3 326	8299
75. Venezuela	0.7	0.5	4 314	10795
76. Saint Lucia	214.7	381.7	9 532	15800
77. Saudi Arabian	49.5	141.2	1 024	3035
78. Ukraine	60.6	107.3	2 231	3846
<b>Countries with low index of human development</b>				
147. Swaziland	5.5	7.4	324	375
148. Cameroon	1.8	2.9	1 669	2521
149. Lesotho	12.5	20.7	776	1116
150. Djibouti	1.1	1.6	635	798
151. Yemen	0.6	0.8	886	997
152. Mauritania	10.8	22.5	565	1006
153. Haiti	1.1	2.6	384	847
154. Kenya	2.9	6.7	346	699
155. Gambia	14.4	24.2	450	645
174. Mali	0.4	0.6	278	377
175. Burkina Faso	4.3	6.9	371	556
176. Sierra Leone	4.2	6.8	345	458
177. Niger	0.8	1.7	149	284

However, this high level of income cannot guarantee the high life quality. For example, Luxemburg, which has the highest level of GDP per human, occupies the 11th place at IDHP, at the same time, countries, where GDP is in 1.5–2.1 times lower, remains higher in the classification. Very good example shows such a country as Equatorial Guinea, in which GDP per human is 19 552 US dollars and at the same time, it occupies 118th place at IDHP.

Life expectancy plays an important role in the estimation of IDHP. The data about this index, and also some other data, which characterize the situation in public health care in different countries of the world are represented in Table 5.

Table 5

**Situation in the public health care in different countries of the world [4]**

Rating of country by IDHP	Estimate life expectancy		Fertile index		Expenditures on public health care per human (PPP in US doll., 2006)
	1970–1975	2007	1970–1975	2000–2005	
1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>Countries with high index of human development</b>					
1. Norway	74.4	80.5	2.2	1.8	3780
2. Iceland	74.3	81.7	2.8	2.2	2758
3. Australia	71.7	81.4	2.5	1.7	2097
4. Luxemburg	70.7	79.4	2.0	1.7	5233
5. Canada	73.2	80.6	2.0	1.5	2585
6. Sweden	74.7	80.8	1.9	1.6	2533
7. Switzerland	73.8	81.7	1.8	1.4	2598
8. Ireland	71.3	79.7	3.8	1.9	2413
9. Belgium	71.4	79.5	1.9	1.7	2264
10. USA	71.5	79.1	2.0	2.0	3074
11. Japan	73.3	82.7	2.1	1.3	2067
12. Netherlands	74.0	79.8	2.1	1.7	2768
13. Finland	70.7	79.5	1.6	1.7	1940
14. Denmark	73.6	78.2	2.0	1.8	2812
15. Great Britain	72.0	79.3	2.0	1.7	2434
16. France	72.4	81,0	2.3	1.9	2833
17. Austria	70.6	79.9	2.0	1.4	2729
18. Italy	72.1	81.1	2.3	1.3	2022
19. New Zealand	71.7	80.1	2.8	2.0	1905
20. Germany	71.0	79.8	1.6	1.3	2548
21. Spain	72.9	80.7	2.9	1.3	1732
22. Hong Kong	72.0	82.2	2.9	0.9	–
23. Israel	71.6	80.7	3.8	2.9	1477
24. Greece	72.3	79.1	2.3	1.3	1317
25. Singapore	69.5	80.2	2.6	1.4	413
26. Slovenia	69.8	78.2	2.2	1.2	1507
27. Portugal	68.0	78.6	2.7	1.5	1494
57. Panama	66.2	75.5	4.9	2.7	495

Table 5 Continued

1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>Countries with medium index of human development</b>					
58. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	52.8	73.8	7.6	3.0	189
59. Macedonia	67.5	74.1	3.0	1.5	446
60. Antigua and Barbuda	–	–	–	–	439
61. Malaysia	63.0	74.1	5.2	2.9	226
62. Russian Federation	69.7	66.2	2.0	1.3	404
63. Brazil	59.5	72.2	4.7	2.3	367
64. Romania	69.2	72.5	2.6	1.3	433
65. Mauritius	62.9	72.1	3.2	2.0	292
66. Grenada	–	75.3	–	–	387
67. Belorussia	71.5	69	2.3	1.2	428
68. Bosnia and Herzegovina	67.5	75.1	2.6	1.3	454
69. Colombia	61.6	72.7	5.0	2.6	534
70. Dominica	–	–	–	–	311
71. Oman	52.1	75.5	7.2	3.8	321
72. Albany	67.7	76.5	4.7	2.3	127
73. Thailand	61.0	68.7	5.0	1.9	223
74. Samoa	56.1	71.4	5.7	4.4	188
75. Venezuela	65.7	73.6	4.9	2.7	196
76. Saint Lucia	65.3	73.6	5.7	2.2	237
77. Saudi Arabian	53.9	72.7	7.3	4.1	468
78. Ukraine	70.1	68.2	2.2	1.1	298
79. Peru	55.5	73	6.0	2.9	171
<b>Countries with low index of human development</b>					
147. Swaziland	44.9	59.9	6.7	5.4	21
148. Cameroon	49.6	45.3	6.9	4.0	219
149. Lesotho	45.7	50.9	6.3	4.6	23
150. Djibouti	49.8	44.9	5.7	3.6	88
151. Yemen	44.4	55.1	7.2	5.1	75
152. Mauritania	39.9	62.5	8.5	6.2	38
153. Haiti	43.4	56.6	6.5	5.8	31
154. Kenya	48.5	61	5.8	4.0	65
155. Gambia	53.6	53.6	8.0	5.0	51
174. Mali	38.0	55.7	6.5	4.7	33
175. Burkina Faso	38.0	48.1	7.6	6.9	34
176. Sierra Leone	43.8	52.7	7.8	6.7	50
177. Niger	35.4	47.3	6.5	6.5	20



For the last 30 years, the dynamics, depending on the growth of people' life expectancy in the most explored countries is positive. The rate of growth of life expectancy for countries with high, medium and low level of human development is not the same thing.

Countries with high human development have almost the same rate of growth of life expectancy, which accounts for 6–8 years for a period of 30 years. This is explained by the fact, that the most developed countries traditionally have the high level of life expectancy.

More progress in the life expectancy has been achieved in the countries with low and medium level of human development. For example, in Gambia – by 17.7 years, in Yemen – by 23.5 years, in Madagascar – by 15 years, in Peru – by 17.5 years, in Libyan Arab Jamahiriya – by 21 years. At the same time, it is possible to find out some countries, where life expectancy has decreased, for example, in Russia – by 3.5 years, in Belorussia – by 2.5, in Ukraine – by 1.9 years, in Swaziland – by 4.3 years, in Lesotho – by 4.9 years.

Except for the difference in the life expectancy, there is a very big difference in expenditures on the public health care between highly developed and not developed countries. The data about expenditures on the public health care in the countries with the biggest and the least rates of IDHP are listed in Table 6. As a whole, 10 more developed countries spend on the public health care in 72 times more than 10 less developed countries.

There are also some changes in the sphere of education for the last time (Table 7). State expenditures on education are increased; the level of literacy after 15 years is also increased. More difficult situation in the sphere of education is in the countries with low level of human development: Niger, Sierra-Leone, Burkina-Faso, Mali and some others, where the rate of literacy is from 14 to 30 %.

Table 6

**Comparison of expenditures on public health [5, c. 96; 6, c. 71]**

Country	Amount of expenditures (PPP in US doll.)	Country	Amount of expenditures (PPP in US doll.)	Difference in expenditures
1. Luxemburg	5233	177. Niger	14	5219
2. Norway	3780	176. Sierra-Leone	20	3760
3. USA	3074	175. Mauritania	31	3043
4. Iceland	2758	174. Gambia	33	2725
5. Switzerland	2598	173. Mali	34	2564
6. Canada	2585	172. Yemen	38	2547
7. Sweden	2533	171. Kenya	51	2482
8. Ireland	2413	170. Burkina-Faso	50	2363
9. Belgium	2264	169. Haiti	65	2199
10. Australia	2097	168. Djibouti	75	2022
Average	2934	Average	41	2893

Table 7

**Situation in education in different countries of the world [4]**

Rating of country by IDHP	State expenditures on education (in % from GDP)		Students of technical and humanity sciences (% from all students )	Level of literacy of people (% , 15 years and older)	
	1990	2008		1990	2008
1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>Countries with high index of human development</b>					
1. Norway	7.0	7.7	18	–	–
2. Iceland	5.4	8.1	17	–	–
3. Australia	4.9	4.7	24	–	–
4. Luxemburg	3.1	3.6	18	–	–
5. Canada	6.5	5.2	20	–	–
6. Sweden	7.1	7.4	27	–	–
7. Switzerland	4.9	6.0	25	–	–
8. Ireland	4.8	4.8	25	–	–
9. Belgium	5.0	6.1	19	–	–
10. USA	5.1	5.9	–	–	–
11. Japan	–	3.6	20	–	–
12. Netherlands	5.7	5.4	16	–	–
13. Finland	5.5	6.5	38	–	–
14. Denmark	–	8.5	20	–	–
15. Great Britain	4.8	5.4	21	–	–
16. France	5.3	5.9	–	–	–
17. Austria	5.3	5.5	25	–	–
18. Italy	3.1	4.7	24	97.7	–
19. New Zealand	6.1	6.5	19	–	–
20. Germany	–	4.6	29	–	–
21. Spain	4.2	4.3	31	96.3	–
22. Hong Kong	2.8	4.2	30	–	–
23. Israel	6.3	6.9	31	91.4	96.9
24. Greece	2.4	4.3	30	94.9	91.0
25. Singapore	3.1	3.7	–	88.8	92.5
26. Slovenia	–	6.0	22	99.6	99.7
27. Portugal	4.0	5.7	29	87.2	–
57. Panama	4.7	3.8	22	89.0	91.9
<b>Countries with medium index of human development</b>					
58. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	–	2.7	31	68.1	81.7
59. Macedonia	–	3.5	27	–	96.1
60. Antigua and Barbuda	–	3.8	–	–	–
61. Malaysia	5.1	6.2	40	80.7	88.7
62. Russian Federation	3.5	3.6	–	99.2	99.4
63. Brazil	–	4.4	–	82.0	88.6
64. Romania	2.8	3.4	27	97.1	97.3

Table 7 Continued

1	2	3	4	5	6
65. Mauritius	3.8	4.5	25	79.8	84.3
66. Grenada	5.1	5.2	–	–	–
67. Belorussia	4.8	6.0	–	99.5	99.6
68. Bosnia and Herzegovina	–	–	–	–	94.6
69. Colombia	2.4	4.8	32	88.4	94.2
70. Dominica	–	1.8	–	–	–
71. Oman	3.1	3.6	–	54.7	74.4
72. Albany	5.9	2.9	11	77.0	98.7
73. Thailand	3.5	4.2	–	92.4	92.6
74. Samoa	3.2	4.5	14	98.0	98.7
75. Venezuela	3.0	–	–	88.9	93.0
76. Saint Lucia	–	5.8	–	–	90.1
77. Saudi Arabian	5.8	6.8	17	66.2	79.4
78. Ukraine	5.1	6.4	27	99.4	99.4
79. Peru	2.8	2.4	–	85.5	87.7
<b>Countries with low index of human development</b>					
147. Swaziland	2.1	3.2	20	58.0	70.6
148. Cameroon	5.8	6.2	11	71.6	79.2
149. Lesotho	3.2	1.8	–	57.9	67.9
150. Djibouti	6.2	13.4	6	78.0	81.4
151. Yemen	3.5	7.9	22	–	–
152. Mauritania	–	9.6	–	32.7	49.0
153. Haiti	–	2.3	10	34.8	51.2
154. Kenya	1.5	6.7	–	39.7	51.9
155. Gambia	6.7	6.7	29	70.8	73.6
174. Mali	3.8	2.0	–	–	–
175. Burkina Faso	–	4.3	–	18.8	24.0
176. Sierra Leone	2.4	4.7	–	–	23.6
177. Niger	–	4.6	8	–	34.8

Comparative analysis of life quality in different countries of the world shows us trends in the social-economic development in the world.

To change the situation in the world, «Declaration of century» was accepted in 2000. The main aims of this declaration are:

1. Liquidation of extreme poverty and famine. Reduction by two times the share of the population, who has the income less than 1 dollar a day. Reduction by two times the famine.

2. Maintenance of comprehensive elementary education. To achieve this all children must receive the primary school education in full.

3. Encouragement of equality of men and women and expansion of the rights and possibilities of women. By 2015 gender inequality in primary and secondary education must be eliminated.

4. Reduction in children's death rate. The death rate among five-year-old children must be reduced by two thirds.

5. Improvement of the motherhood's protection. The parent death rate must be reduced by three quarters.

6. Maintenance of ecological stability. The segment of people, who do not have the constant access to pure potable water and the water drain, must be reduced by half.

7. Formation of global partnership aimed at the development and reforming of the assistance and trade with the special account of interests of the poorest countries [4].

### *References*

1. Брынцева, Г. Курс по топору / Г. Брынцева, Е. Скиба // Рос. газ. – 2002. – 30 июля.

2. Косинский, П.Д. Управление качеством жизни населения региона: системный подход (на примере Кемеровской области) : монография / П.Д. Косинский. – Красноярск : [б. и.], 2004. – 211 с.

3. Гордон, Р. Научные догмы и действительность в изменяющейся институциональной среде / Р. Гордон // Мировая экономика и международные отношения. – 1976. – № 12. – С. 85–95.

4. Human Development reports. – URL : <http://www.hdr.undp.org>.

5. Нижегородов, Е.В. Оценка влияния на качество жизни институциональных резервов : дис. ... канд. экон. наук : 08.00.05 : защищена : 03.11.2006 : утв. : 23.03.2007 / Нижегородов Евгений Валерьевич. – Тамбов, 2006. – 253 с.

6. Спиридонов, С.П. Институциональные индикаторы качества жизни / С.П. Спиридонов, Е.В. Нижегородов, Б.И. Герасимов. – Тамбов : Изд-во Тамб. гос. техн. ун-та. – 2010. – 136 с.

---

## **Экономический анализ качества жизни стран мира**

**Е.Б. Герасимова, Е.В. Нижегородов**

*ФГОУ ВПО «Финансовая академия при Правительстве Российской Федерации (университет)», г. Москва;  
ГОУ ВПО «Тамбовский государственный технический университет», г. Тамбов*

**Ключевые слова и фразы:** качество жизни; показатель ожидаемой продолжительности жизни; показатель уровня ВВП; показатель уровня образования; показатель уровня развития человеческого потенциала; экономический анализ.

**Аннотация:** Показана связь между качеством жизни и социально-экономическим развитием, а также между качеством жизни и индексом уровня развития человеческого потенциала, описан механизм формирования индекса развития человеческого потенциала, представлена классификация стран как по индексу развития человеческого потенциала, так и по составляющим его компонентам. Проанализирована динамика изменения человеческого потенциала.

---

© Е.Б. Герасимова, Е.В. Нижегородов, 2010