

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND LIFE SATISFACTION AMONG ADULTS IN YANGON REGION*

Than Than Maw¹ & Myat Phone Mo Oo²

Abstract

The aim of this study is to explore the relationship between demographic variables and life satisfaction among the adults in Yangon region. The participants were 1002 people from various sectors of 37 townships in Yangon region. To measure the life satisfaction of the participants, the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, (1985) was used. Demographic factors such as gender, age, education, marital status, number of children, housing, possession, occupation, income, and types of occupation were also asked. According to the results, the life satisfaction of the adults was affected by some demographic factors such as income, household positions, age, educational level, marital status. Although 4.3% participants in neutral, among 1002 of subjects, 58.8% are satisfied with their lives and 36.9% are dissatisfied. The findings illustrate that Myanmar citizens are still holding materialistic values. This study shows the awareness of lives the Myanmar population live in and a joyful life could be created and the life of an individual can also be predicted according to the demographic factors of that individual. This study can also provide the supportive information to the government and the policy makers into the path; to encourage the way to live, to have awareness of the factors influencing on life satisfaction and to create a happy life; in order to improve the life satisfaction of the community to national level of Myanmar.

Keywords: Life satisfaction, Demographic Determinants, Adults

Introduction

Life satisfaction is one of the factors that determine subjective well-being (Diener, 1984). Life satisfaction is characterized, in agreement with the cognitive theory, as “individual’s cognitive judgement about comparisons based on the compatibility of their own living conditions with the standards” (Diener, et al, 1985). This study is specifically concerned with the determinants of the cognitive-judgmental aspects of subjective well-being (SWB), as measured by the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, et al, 1985).

Diener (1984) has distinguished between bottom-up and top-down theories of SWB. Bottom-up causation is where particular variables cause SWB and top-down causation is where SWB produces certain outcomes. Bottom-up theories hold that we experience satisfaction in many domains of life, like work, relationships, family and friends, personal development, and health and fitness. Our satisfaction with our lives in these areas combines to create our overall life satisfaction. On the other hand, top-down theories state that our overall life satisfaction influences (or even determines) our life satisfaction in the many different domains. This debate is ongoing, but for most people it is enough to know that overall life satisfaction and satisfaction in the multiple domains of life are closely related (Heady, Veenhoven, & Wearing, 1991).

A great amount of empirical works has been conducted to demonstrate various sources and predictors of life satisfaction including individuals’ demographics, education level, income and the perceived role of the government, psychological characteristics, and life experiences (Brown and Duan, 2007; Ngoo et al, 2014).

The effect of income on life satisfaction, happiness or subjective well-being has not been consistent across different studies. Many studies found that higher income has positive effect on

¹ Dr, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Yangon.

² MBBS, DAPsy (2018).

* Best Paper Award Winning Paper in Psychology (2019)

life satisfaction or happiness (Ball and Chernova 2008; Clark and Oswald 1994; Peiro 2006; Dolan et al. 2008). The positive effect of higher income on happiness is stronger in the short term than in the long term (Hagerty and Veenhoven 2003). The positive income effect on happiness and life satisfaction was also found to be stronger for the poor than for the rich (Helliwell et al. 2011). The study by Vendrik and Woltjer (2007) found concavity of the income effect on life satisfaction in the United States, i.e. happiness increases with income, up to a certain level, but this does not appear to be the case in Europe and Japan (Binder and Coad 2011; Vendrik and Woltjer 2007). The curvilinear relationship between income and happiness can be attributed to the decrease in marginal utility of income on happiness (Easterlin 2005; Diener and Biswas-Diener 2002).

Studies also found a U shaped relationship between age and happiness or life satisfaction. Middle age people tend to be less happy as compared to younger and older people (Clark and Oswald 1994; Peiro 2006; Dolan et al. 2008). According to Sotgiu et al. (2011), older people are happier as they survived the unhappy moments in their mid-life and were able to adapt themselves.

The gender differential on life satisfaction, happiness or subjective well-being varies from country to country, but the differentials are generally insignificant. Only a few studies have found significant gender differential in life satisfaction or subjective well-being. For example, females are happier than males in United States, but the reverse is true in Russia (Graham 2004; Dolan et al. 2008).

Married people are happier as compared to the singles and singles are happier than the separated or divorced (Clark and Oswald 1994; Peiro 2006; Dolan et al. 2008). According to Gove et al. (1983) “family function to provide private satisfaction that makes life meaningful and rewarding for adults who live in families.”, and that “married people tend to have better mental and physical health as well as life satisfaction and well-being, and are less inclined to negative psychological behaviour such as suicide”. Patricia Frazier et al. (1996) explained that married people, especially men, tended to have more support from their family, and hence have a higher life satisfaction.

Previous studies found that higher education increases subjective well-being, life satisfaction and happiness (Chen 2012; Dolan et al. 2008). However, some studies also found that education does not automatically increase happiness but its effect is mediated through the higher opportunity created by education to earn higher income, which is an important determinant of life satisfaction, subjective well-being and happiness (Schimmel 2009).

Myanmar has been interested in worldwide in recent year and has been compared to other countries in various situations. According to the research of 2002, 10.5% in Japan and 8.8 percent in Korea were happy. 54.6% in Myanmar almost the same percentage as Malaysia (56.5%) were pretty happy. The common people in Myanmar were very happy or somewhat happy at that time (Thet Tun, 2002).

According to the data of life satisfaction research in 2005, Myanmar got 5.30 score of life satisfaction and Japan got 7.25 score and that of Korea was 6.65 score. The above data is comparing the Myanmar with the other countries but there is no increase level of Myanmar after five years. (Veenhoven, R., 2005).

Myanmar ranked 130 out of 178 countries in the global satisfaction of life index in 2006, and ranked 121st out of 156 countries in 2010. Respondents in Myanmar ranked their lives 4.4 (2010) out of 10, down from 5.3 in the earlier survey (2005), and that was the third-biggest drop in the world (World Happiness Report, 2013).

Ngoo et al. (2014) examined the differentials in life satisfaction among 28 Asia countries and analyzed the determinants of life satisfaction in the four sub-regions of Asia (East Asia; South Asia; West and Central Asia; and Southeast Asia). They found that marital status, standard of living, and the role of government have a greater influence on life satisfaction across the whole Asia as well as in the Southeast Asia countries. In addition, their findings indicated that Myanmar had the second lowest life satisfaction among Asia countries.

Myanmar has been developed much more than before and the socio-economic status has been increase within these years. The life satisfaction of Myanmar people plays important role especially in Yangon, the economic industrial capital of Myanmar. There is no doubt that the living standard of people in Yangon rises gradually. The satisfaction of life might vary corresponding with the demographic variables.

While the data comparing the rank of life satisfaction and the determinants of life satisfaction across the Asia countries are available, the data indicating the life satisfaction among Myanmar people are still lacking in current years. Therefore, this study intends to examine how much Myanmar adults in Yangon region are satisfied with their lives and which demographic factors are correlated with their life satisfaction.

Research Question

What are the demographic factors correlated to life satisfaction among adults in Yangon region?

Method

Participants

Participants were 1002 adults from 37 townships, except Seikkan and Seikkyi Khanaung To, in Yangon area. They were 403 (40.3%) males and 599 (59.7%) females. Their mean age is 35 ranged from 18 to 83.

Measures

Sociodemographic Questionnaire. Demographic variables of participants such as gender, age, township, education, marital status, years of marriage, whether having a child or not, number of children, living style, employment the household possessions, income, and types of occupation were asked.

The Satisfaction With Life Satisfaction (SWLS). The SWLS developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985 intends to measure the global cognitive judgments of one's life satisfaction. It is a 5-item scale with 7 points that range from 7 - strongly agree to 1 - strongly disagree. The possible range of scores is between 5 and 35. The SWLS is shown to be a valid and reliable measure of life satisfaction, suited for use with a wide range of age groups. Diener et al., (1985) reported a coefficient alpha of .87 for SWLS, with a 2-month test-retest correlation coefficient of .82. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient ranged from .79 to .91 across 39 countries. As additional evidence of construct validity, the SWLS scores have been shown to be negatively correlated with clinical measures of distress. The SWLS has showed high correlation coefficient with the Life Satisfaction Index with .46 (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Myanmar version of the Satisfaction With Life Scale developed by Than Than Maw & Nilar Kyu (2009) was used. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the Myanmar version was .90. Diener, et al., (1985) presented normative data cutoffs: 31 to 35 - Extremely satisfied; 26 to 30 - Satisfied, 21 to 25 - Slightly satisfied; 20 - Neutral; 15 to 19 Slightly dissatisfied; 10 to 14 Dissatisfied; and 5 to 9 Extremely dissatisfied.

Procedure

Before questionnaires were distributed, the anonymous participants were explained about the research and promised to keep the answers in confidentiality by researcher and research assistants. The voluntary participants were requested to answer honestly and to write down the tick mark (✓) in appropriate space on the paper sheet. Then the responses from each were scored according with the scoring key.

Results

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of respondents (N = 1002)

Variables	N	%	Variables	N	%
<i>1. Gender</i>			<i>9. Living Style</i>		
Male	403	40.2	Alone	51	5.1
Female	599	59.8	With Family	818	81.6
<i>2. Age</i>			With Friends	119	11.9
18 to 20	140	14	With Boy/Girlfriend	5	0.5
21 to 30	324	32.4	Others	9	0.9
31 to 40	198	19.8	<i>10. Household Assets</i>		
41 to 50	178	17.8	None	5	0.5
51 to 60	131	13.1	1 Item	80	8.0
61 to 83	31	0.31	2 Items	90	9.0
<i>3. Township</i>			3 Items	87	8.7
Urban	431	43.0	4 Items	220	22.0
Sub-urban	318	31.7	5 Items	234	23.4
Periphery	253	25.2	6 Items	192	19.2
<i>4. Education</i>			7 Items	73	7.3
Illiteracy	25	2.5	8 Items	21	2.1
Basic	59	5.9	<i>11. Income</i>		
Middle	134	13.4	No income	115	11.5
High	196	19.6	Below 100,000	63	6.3
University	172	17.2	100,000 to 300,000	493	49.3
Graduated	338	33.7	300,001 to 500,000	206	20.6
Advanced	78	7.8	500,001 to 700,000	72	7.2
<i>5. Marital Status</i>			700,001 to 1,000,000	26	2.6
Single	505	50.3	Above 1,000,000	27	2.7
Married	437	43.6	<i>12. Employment</i>		
Divorced	16	1.6	Unemployed	143	14.3
Separated	10	1	Government employed	152	15.2
Widowed	35	3.5	Private employed	371	37.0
<i>6. Years of Marriage</i>			Self employed	336	33.5
Less than 5 years	101	10.1	<i>13. Types of occupation</i>		
6 to 10 years	87	8.7	Administration	51	5.1
11 to 15 years	75	7.5	Commercial	87	8.7
16 to 20 years	81	8.1	Construction	38	3.8
More 20 years	154	15.4	Education	141	14.1
<i>7. Number of Children</i>			Food and Beverage	75	7.5
None	609	60.7	Financial	45	4.5
1 to 3	356	35.6	Production	29	2.9
4 to 9	38	3.8	Transportation	87	8.7
<i>8. Housing</i>			Others	306	30.5
Hostel	104	10.4			
Apartment	135	13.5			
Home	763	76.1			

Table 2 Means, standard deviation and correlations between measures used for the study. (N = 1002)

	Mean (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Gender	1.60 (.49)	-													
2. Age	35.33 (13.41)	.06*	-												
3. Township	2.18 (.81)	.10**	.01	-											
4. Education	4.75 (1.50)	.19**	-.21**	.26**	-										
5. Marital status	.64 (.86)	.05	.48**	-.09**	-.36**	-									
6. Yr. of Marriage	1.59 (1.93)	-.02	.69**	-.09**	-.40**	.67**	-								
7. Child	.39 (.49)	-.03	.50*	-.35**	-.35**	.60**	.76**	-							
8. No. of Children	.81 (1.26)	-.04	.54**	-.09**	-.38**	.54**	.73**	.80**	-						
9. Housing	2.10 (.51)	.00	.24**	-.11**	-.19**	.22**	.26**	.24**	.19**	-					
10. Living style	2.66 (.66)	-.02	-.15**	.01	.14**	-.15**	-.27**	-.16**	-.14**	-.27**	-				
11. Possessions	4.39 (1.76)	.04	.22**	.09**	.08*	.08*	.23**	.22**	.15**	.32**	-.24**	-			
12. Income	2.24 (1.27)	-.06	.25**	.16**	.09**	.10**	.18**	.16**	.14**	.12**	-.06	.28**	-		
13. Employment	1.90 (1.02)	-.13**	.21**	.00	-.26**	.17**	.23**	.24**	.19**	.24**	-.10**	.17**	.57**	-	
14. Occupation types	5.19 (3.36)	-.02	.06	.02	-.06	.01	.05	.03	.02	.01	.04	-.03	-.35**	.48**	-
15. SWLS	21.39 (7.13)	.03	.14**	-.14**	.04	.12**	.14**	.07*	.07*	.09**	-.04	.15**	.20**	.06*	-.03

* p < .05, ** p < .01.

Table 3 Summary of regression analysis for variables predicting Life Satisfaction (N = 1002)

Variables	Beta	R ²	Adj. R ²
1. Income	.20***	.03***	.03***
2. Township	-.20***	.07***	.07***
3. Household Possessions	.08**	.08***	.08***
4. Types of occupation	-.09**	.09**	.09**
5. Age	.07	.10*	.09*
6. Education	.10**	.10*	.01*
7. Marital status	.08*	.11*	.01*

* P < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

Correlation Analysis

Means, standard deviations and correlation matrix calculated between measures are shown in Table 2. Life satisfaction is positively correlated with the demographic variables of age (r=.14, p<.01), marital status (r=.12, p<.01), years of marriage (r =.14, p<.01), housing (r=.09, p<.01), possession (r= .15, p<.01), income (r =.20, p<.01), whether having a child or not (r=.07, p<.05), number of children (r=.07, p<.05) and occupation (r=.06, p<.05). Furthermore, life satisfaction has significant negative correlations with township (r=-.14, p<.01), meaning that people living in periphery and suburban are much satisfied with their life than people in urban area.

Regression Analysis

To examine the prediction power of demographic variables on life satisfaction, the stepwise regression analysis was calculated. Table 3 shows the summary data of regression analysis. Income, townships classified by urban-suburban-periphery, household possessions (car, aircon, motorbike, etc.), age, education, and marital status predicted life satisfaction of adults in Yangon (R² = .03%, .07%, .08%, .09%, .10%, .10% and .11%) in order respectively. The slopes were positive except the townships they live.

Analysis of Variance

To examine the predictors of life satisfaction more detail, a series of one-way ANOVA analysis was computed. Firstly, the mean difference in life satisfaction among different income levels was examined. As shown in Table 4, individuals who earned above 10 lakhs per month had highest level of satisfaction while individuals who earned below 1 lakh had least satisfaction. The lowest income group (below 100,000) is significantly lower in satisfaction with their lives from all other earner groups.

Table 4 Means and standard deviations of SWLS for the income with results of ANOVA analysis. (N = 1002)

Income Level	Number	Means (SD)	F Value
1. No income	115	20.17 (6.15) _{5,7}	8.49***
2. Below 100,000	63	17.89 (7.47) _{3,4,5,6,7}	
3. 100,001 to 300,000	493	20.92 (7.45) _{2,5,7}	
4. 300,001 to 500,000	206	22.47 (6.50) ₂	
5. 500,001 to 700,000	72	23.88 (6.00) _{1,2,3}	
6. 700,001 to 1,000,000	26	23.77 (7.34) ₂	
7. Above 1,000,000	27	26.07 (5.28) _{1,2,3}	

The subscripts indicate the number of the profile from which the given group differs significantly. *** p < .001.

Table 5 Means and standard deviations of SWLS for the types of occupation with results of ANOVA analysis. (N = 1002)

Occupation Type	Number	Means (SD)	F Value
1. Administrative	51	21.55 (6.62)	5.23***
2. Commercial	87	22.39 (7.96)	
3. Construction	38	21.87 (7.17)	
4. Education	141	24.11 (7.22) _{1,6,10}	
5. Food and Beverage	75	20.12 (6.75) ₅	
6. Financial	45	22.16 (7.04)	
7. Production	29	21.31 (8.13)	
8. Transportation	87	23.08 (6.39) _{1,10}	
9. Others	306	20.18 (7.13) _{5,9}	

The subscripts indicate the number of the profile from which the given group differs significant. *** p < .001.

Table 6 Means and standard deviations of SWLS for the level of age with results of ANOVA analysis. (N = 1002)

Age Level	N	Means (SD)	F Value
1. Less than 20	140	19.23 (6.37) _{3,4,5,6}	6.51**
2. 21-30	324	20.59 (6.76) _{3,4}	
3. 31-40	198	22.53 (7.06) _{1,2}	
4. 41-50	178	22.51 (7.08) _{1,2}	
5. 51-60	131	21.76 (8.30) ₁	
6. Above 60	31	24.23 (6.44) ₁	

The subscripts indicate the number of the profile from which the given group differs significantly. ** p < .01.

Table 7 Means and standard deviations of SWLS for the education with results of ANOVA analysis. (N=1002)

Education Level	Number	Means (SD)	F Value
1. Illiteracy	25	19.80 (7.49)	8.46**
2. Basic School	59	24.42 (7.58) _{4,5}	
3. Middle School	134	21.29 (7.76) ₅	
4. High School	196	20.67 (7.56) ₂	
5. University	172	18.78 (6.62) _{2,3,6,7}	
6. Graduated	338	22.29 (6.34) ₅	
7. Advanced	78	23.40 (6.77) ₅	

The subscripts indicate the number of the profile from which the given group differs significantly. ** $p < .01$.

Table 8 Prevalence of Life Satisfaction among respondents (N = 1002)

Level of satisfaction	Frequency	Percentage
1. Extremely dissatisfied (5-9)	76	7.6
2. Dissatisfied (10-14)	115	11.5
3. Slightly dissatisfied (15-19)	179	17.9
4. Neutral (20)	43	4.3
5. Slightly satisfied (21-25)	276	27.5
6. Satisfied (26-30)	239	23.9
7. Extremely satisfied (31-35)	74	7.4

Secondly, according to the results of ANOVA analysis, people who worked in education and the transportation sectors have the highest scores of life satisfaction. People from education were significantly higher than people from the administrative, financial sectors and unemployed group, while people from transportation were significantly higher than people from the administrative sector and unemployed group as shown in Table 5.

Thirdly, the mean difference in life satisfaction among different age levels was examined. The mean scores and standard deviations for each group were shown in Table 6. The result shows that the age group of over 60 has the most satisfaction. The second highest groups were 31 to 40 and 41 to 50. These groups have the same value of life satisfaction. The group of under 20 has the least satisfaction. This group is significantly lower than all groups of over 30 in life satisfaction, while all participants of under 30 are significantly lower than participants between age of 31 to 50.

Finally, as shown in Table 7, the participants with basic education expose the highest level of satisfaction and this group is significantly higher than people from graduated and advanced level. A group of people who with university level is significantly lower in satisfaction than all other groups except for illiteracy and high school.

Prevalence of Life Satisfaction

Table 8 illustrates the prevalence of life satisfaction among the respondents including frequency and percentage. Mean of life satisfaction of this sample is 21.39. This value indicates the sample slightly satisfied with their lives. Of the total sample, 7.6% of subjects are extremely dissatisfied while 7.4% are extremely satisfied. 11.5% dissatisfied while 23.8% are satisfied. 17.8% are slightly dissatisfied and 27.6% are slightly satisfied. To summarize, the most respondents are slightly satisfied while 4.3% in neutral. Among 1002 of subjects, 58.8% are satisfied with their lives and 36.9% are dissatisfied.

Discussion

This study attempted to examine the relations of demographic variables with life satisfaction among adults in Yangon Region. The correlational analysis, t-test, ANOVA and regression analyses were used to determine the determinants of the life satisfaction. According to the results, there is no gender difference in life satisfaction. This outcome is consistent with the studies of Brown and Duan (2007) and Nair and Gaither (1999).

Another major finding of this study is that the income factor is positively correlated with life satisfaction showing people with higher income have higher life satisfaction. Undoubtedly, according to Maslow's (1970) Theory of Needs, the basic needs or physiological needs can be bought with money. The people with higher income have wide range of life styles to choose and experience less inequality and standard discrimination. Therefore, the household possessions are also positively related with life satisfaction. Money can buy luxuries and can live a comfortable life with high income. But the previous research by Kapteyn, et al. (2009) in Netherlands and U.S presented that the income had less impact but it varies substantially according to the countries. The other studies reported that the correlation between income and life satisfaction is higher in developing countries rather than developed countries. Since our country, Myanmar, is on the state of developing, the correlation between income and life satisfaction had been still high.

People who work in education sector have the highest score of life satisfaction. Teachers are highly revered in Myanmar culture. And that could be the reason why they take immense satisfaction for their career.

In addition, the outcomes of correlation and regression analyses revealed that there was a negative significant relationship between the life satisfaction and townships the people live in. The results shows people who live in faubourg areas are much satisfied with life rather than those who live in downtown areas. The possible explanation is that people from faubourg areas would like to live in natural environment peacefully and satisfied within their small world. Most of the people who live in downtown areas are asphyxiated with the urbanization live; suffering from the noise pollution, air pollution, and less of green trees and nature.

Next, the study of Elmer Spreitzer, Snyder, (1974) reported that age played as moderator variables in life satisfaction while the study of B. Rose Huber (2014) presented the satisfaction with life was varied in different levels of age in different countries. But there is positively relationship between age and life satisfaction on the results of correlation and regression analyses in this study. Perhaps Myanmar people assume that contentment is also a kind of auspicious virtues and this assumption gets stronger with growing of age and there is a change in conception of life within growing old.

Moreover, according to the outcomes of ANOVA and regression analyses, the level of education is a significant predictor of life satisfaction. The ANOVA results shows basic level of education presents the highest level of satisfaction rather than the graduated level and advanced level. But among the higher levels of education such as university level, graduated level and advanced level, the more educated have more satisfied with their life. The possible explanation is that above the half of the individuals with basic education level lives in rural area, is self-employed and has income between one to three lakhs. It illustrates that citizens from Myanmar, one of developing countries, are more likely to incline towards materialism.

Furthermore, this study provides a significant positive relation between marital status and life satisfaction. Also the years of marriage, having children or not, and number of children have positive effect on life satisfaction. Married people are much satisfied than the single people. This result is consistent with the previous study of Kapteyn, James, and Arthur (2009) in Netherlands and U.S, which presented that social and family have the highest impact on global life

satisfaction. Humans cannot live alone; and they need society. That is why people always make connection, network and relationship with each other. The social influence, family and companionship play a part of role in life satisfaction because they become a part of life also. The individual have to make a strong and stable relationship to fulfill the life satisfaction. A strong and reliable relationship will support not only physically but also emotionally in critical time.

Finally, this research revealed the 58.8% of Myanmar adult people in Yangon region are satisfied with their lives. The previous study in 2003, 71% of Myanmar people was satisfied with their lives (Takashi Inoguchi, 2003). According to the data, the satisfaction of Myanmar people decreased within these years. This study indicates that the income is directly proportional to the life satisfaction. On the other hand 41.3% are dissatisfied and this may affect the physical and psychological well-being of them. Thus dissatisfaction should not be neglected. A joyful life might be created and can also be predicted according to the demographic factors of that individual.

In conclusion, clearly life satisfaction is a key component in the attainment of positive life and is a determinant of many life outcomes. Although research into the correlates and consequences of life satisfaction is still not enough to cover all of the variables such as physical and mental health, personality, leisure activities, etc., the findings of this study have illuminated potential applications and implications of the findings from the extant research of Myanmar people. The predictor variables of life satisfaction are also interrelated each other in many ways. Thus, the socio-demographic variables cannot be ignored while assessing the level of life satisfaction. Without investigation the role of demographic variables, it would be inadequate to assess how other factors such as personality, physical and mental health status have impact on the life satisfaction of Myanmar people. This study can also provide the supportive information to the government and the policy makers into the path to enhance the life satisfaction of Myanmar people to encounter in near future.

Some limitations in this study should not be ignored. First, although the results captured the effects of demographic variables on life satisfaction among 37 townships in Yangon region generally, the convenience sampling method used in this study may affect the representativeness of the sample. Second, using self-report questionnaire is difficult to obtain accurate answer about participants and some open-ended questions should also be used. Thus, future study will be more meaningful, interesting and beneficial for the society by examining such variables as culture, habits, mode of transportation, pollution effect, wishes, ideas, trust and belief as influential factors on life satisfaction.

References

- Ball, R., & Chernova, K. (2008). Absolute income, relative income, and happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, 88(3), 497-529.
- Binder, M., & Coad, A. (2011). From Average Joe's happiness to Miserable Jane and Cheerful John: using quantile regressions to analyze the full subjective well-being distribution. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 79(3), 275-290.
- Brown, C. Duan, C. (2007). Counselling psychologists in academia: Life satisfaction and work and family role commitments. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 20(3), 267-285.
- Chen, W.C. (2012). How education enhances happiness: Comparison of mediating factors in four East Asian countries. *Social Indicators Research*, 106(1), 117-131.
- Clark, A. E., & Oswald, A. J. (1994). Unhappiness and unemployment. *The Economic Journal*, 104(424), 648-659.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542-575.

- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J. & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Diener, E., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2002). Will money increase subjective well-being? *Social Indicators Research*, 57(2), 119-169.
- Dolan, P., Peasgood, T., et al. (2008). Do we really know what makes us happy? A review of the economic literature on the factors associated with subjective well-being. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 29, 94-122.
- Easterlin, R. A. (2005). Diminishing marginal utility of income? Caveat emptor. *Social Indicators Research*, 70(3), 243-255.
- Gove, W. R., Hughes, M., et al. (1983). Does marriage have positive effects on the psychological well-being of the individual? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24(2), 122-131.
- Graham, C. (2004). *Can happiness research contribute to development economics?* Massachusetts Avenue development seminar. Economic and Governance Studies Programs, The Brookings Institution.
- Hagerty, M., & Veenhoven, R. (2003). Wealth and happiness revisited-Growing national income does go with greater happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, 64(1), 1-27.
- Heady, B.W., Veehonven, R., & Wearing, A. J. (1991). Top-down versus bottom-up theories of Subjective well-being. *Social indicators research*, 24, 81-100.
- Helliwell, J., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. (2011). *World happiness report*. The Earth Institute: Columbia University.
- Hoi Yan Cheung and Alex W.H. Chan. (2009). University of Hong Kong, *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 55, No.1, Spring 2009, 124-136.
- Kapteyn, A., P. Smith, James. and Van Soest, Arthur. (2009). *Life Satisfaction Discussion Paper*. No. 4015, February 2009.
- Nair, K.V. & Gaither, C.A. (1999). Effects of work, nonwork, and role conflict on the overall life satisfaction of pharmacy faculty. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 63, 1-11.
- Ngoo, Y. T., Tey, N. P., & Tan, E. C. (2014). *Determinants of Life Satisfaction in Asia*. Springer. Online Publishing.
- Patricia Frazier, N. A., Benson, Sonja, Losoff, Ann, & Maurer, Steven. (1996). Desire for marriage and life satisfaction among unmarried heterosexual adults. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 13(2), 225-239.
- Peiro, A. (2006). Happiness, satisfaction and socio-economic conditions: Some international evidence. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 35, 348-365.
- Schimmel, J. (2009). Development as happiness: The subjective perception of happiness and UNDP's analysis of poverty, wealth and development. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(1), 93-111.
- Sotgiu, I., Galati, D., et al. (2011). Happiness components and their attainment in old age: A cross-cultural comparison between Italy and Cuba. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12(3), 353-371.
- Spreitzer, E., and Eldon E. Snyder (1974). *Journal of Gerontology*, 29(4), 1 July 1974, Pages 454-458.
- Than Than Maw and Nilar Kyu. (2009). *Measurement, Correlates and Consequences of Workaholism among Some White-Collar Workers*. Unpublished dissertation, Mandalay University.
- Thet Tun. (2002). The Contemporary Myanmar, Yangon: IT Myanmar Business Magazine, 139-159.
- Veenhoven, R. (2005). Average Happiness in 91 nations 1995-2005: World Database of Happiness. www.worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl.
- Vendrik, M. C. M., & Woltjer, G. B. (2007). Happiness and loss aversion: Is utility concave or convex in relative income? *Journal of Public Economics*, 91(7-8), 1423-1448.
- World Happiness Report (2013). Sustainable Development Solutions Network: A Global Initiative For The United Nations.