
Comparison of Life Satisfaction between Urban and Rural Residents

Choi, Byoung Mohk

(Department of Social Welfare, Far East University)

Lee, Jang-Young

(Department of Sociology, Kookmin University)

Abstract: This paper analyzed the differences of the subjective evaluation of life satisfaction between the urban and rural. We used five variables of income, health, leisure, husband-wife relationship, and other family relationship. In general, the respondent of the research feel a little above average life satisfaction. They are less satisfied about income and leisure, more satisfied about husband-wife and other family relationship, and urban residents are more satisfied about health but rural residents are not.

It seems to be interpreted that the reason of little difference between urban and rural is that the rural residents do not feel the rough and objective living condition of the rural area. Thus, even if the objective condition of the rural area could not influence the subjective living condition.

To measure the relative influence of the five independent variables to the dependent variable, subjective life satisfaction, we used multiple regression analysis. In urban, the five independent variables affect to the life satisfaction after the control of other variables. However, in rural the four variables of income, health leisure, and other family relationship except husband-wife relationship affect to the life satisfaction. The importance of income for the life satisfaction from the many previous works is reaffirmed by this study.

Key words: Life Satisfaction, Subjective Evaluation of Life Satisfaction, Husband-wife Relationship, Objective Living Condition, Urban and Rural

Korean Social Science Journal, XXXV No. 2(2008): 31~54.

Development in communication and transportation has been closing the gap between the living standards of urban and rural persons. Despite these developments, tangible or objective differences in income, environment, etc., remain. The purpose of this study is to analyze how residents of urban and rural view and rate their quality of life. This is accomplished by comparing their subjective answers to questions about income, health, leisure, husband-wife relationship and other family relationship, five influential factors that contribute to one's quality of life.

Averaging the answers in all five variables, we find that people are generally satisfied with their quality of life. However, upon controlling income and leisure variables, both persons are unsatisfied. In health, urban residents are satisfied while rural are not. In husband-wife relationship and other family relationship, both urban and rural residents are satisfied.

In comparison to urban life, rural life generally has harsher living conditions (an objective factor) that affect one's subjective satisfaction evaluation. Of the five variables, health followed by family relationship and income show the biggest differences in satisfaction levels.

When considering sex, age, education, the study shows that in urban, the five independent variables are associated with dependent variables. In rural, with the exception of the husband-wife relationship, the other four independent variables are also in association with the dependent variables. After control of other variables, analysis results show that independently, each variable affects life satisfaction. For urban, the most influential variable is income followed by health, other family relationship, husband-wife relationship and leisure. For rural, income is also the most influential variable, followed by family relationship, leisure and health. The result shows that income is the most important factor in determining a person's quality of life. This same result was also found in previous studies, emphasizing once more,

the importance of income.

I . Introduction: Research Questions

Not only in Korea, but worldwide, research on life satisfaction or quality of life began to concretize as people began to pay attention to the effects of the late 1960 economic development. As discussion around development stages: underdevelopment to development, undergrowth to growth, as well as the visualization of these development stages came to, attention towards quality of life and a country's development increased. It is easy to gauge the quantitative elements of economic development through measurements such as Gross National Product (GNP). However, such measurements do not adequately represent the qualitative elements that contribute to quality of life. To remedy this and provide a more conclusive analysis, social scientists developed a comprehensive analysis comprising both economic and social indicators. (Gastil, 1970; Rogerson et al., 1989; Yoon, Jong-Ju, 1982; Jung, Yong-Hwan, 1995 Lee, Jae-Gi, Lee, Eun-Woo, and Kim, Jae-Hong (1998). Our country, Korea, has also seen an increase in material wealth as a result of economic development. With domestic and international investment, the Korean lifestyle has changed. The whole country experienced this change and both urban and rural developed in distinctive ways. However, the experiences of development within the urban and rural are vastly different. First, many investors and development projects were structured around urban areas. Opportunities distributed to the rural areas were relatively limited as living arrangements were also harsher. There are many different factors that can be introduced and analyzed in comparing the quality of life between urban and rural residents. However, in this study, we will examine income, leisure and health as they are more closely related to the discussion of quality of life.

First, the comparison of income and leisure between urban and rural residents is shown in <Table 1>. From the 1990s, the monthly average household income of an urban worker (includes independent businesses, but does not define all urban households) has and continues to exceed that of a rural worker. The average leisure expense (cultural and educational entertainment) in the 1980s for urban residents is 39,410 Won while for rural residents is 35,755 Won. The difference is small. However, in 1990, leisure expense rose to 386,412 Won and 121,304 Won respectively, leaving a 7:1 ratio difference. In 1999, leisure expense rose again to 862,200 Won and 121,304 Won respectively, continuing the 7:1 ratio for 10 years. We can see that urban residents spend much more than rural residents on leisure and entertainment.

If we examine the percentage of income spent on leisure for urban and rural residents, we can see a considerable difference. In the 1980s both groups spent about 16% of their income on leisure. From 1985, the urban saw an increase to 31.7% and continued to increase until it reached a sustaining 40%. In contrast, for rural residents, after 1980, leisure expense decreased to a sustaining 6.5%. Taking into consideration the differences in income of urban and rural residents, there is no obvious explanation as to why there is such a disparity on leisure spending. It is possible that for urban residents, entertainment and leisure is more accessible or that urban residents have a different understanding of leisure. Further analysis is needed for this disparity.

Table 1. Monthly Average Income and Leisure Expenses for Households of Urban Workers and Rural Residents

	Urban			Rural		
	Monthly Average Income	Leisure Expense	Ratio	Monthly Average Income	Leisure Expense	Ratio
1980	234,086	39,420	16.5	224,426	35,755	15.9
1985	423,788	134,148	31.7	478,021	41,222	8.6
1990	943,272	386,412	41.0	918,815	54,515	6.0
1995	1,911,064	802,176	42.0	1,816,880	126,689	7.0
1999	2,224,743	862,200	39.0	1,860,246	121,304	6.5

Data: Korea National Statistical Office, Korea's Social Index 2000. The data from the Korea National Statistical Office is collected from "Urban Household Data" and "Rural Economic Statistics"

Table 2. Urban and Rural, Individual Subjective Health Evaluation (%)

	Urban			Rural		
	Healthy	Average	Unhealthy	Healthy	Average	Unhealthy
1995	42.8	38.9	18.3	46.8	29.5	23.7
1999	42.9	39.2	18.0	42	31.9	26.1

Data: Korea National Statistical Office, Korea's Social Index 2000.

As <Table 2> illustrates, there are no considerable differences in how urban and rural residents subjectively evaluate their health. Upon analyzing the results, in 1995 and 1999, 43% of urban residents believed they were healthy, 40% believed themselves of average health and 18% deemed themselves unhealthy. Rural residents also show a similar pattern except the decrease from 47% (1995) to 42% (1999) in persons who rate themselves as healthy. There is also an increase, 23.7% (1995) to 26.1% (1999) in persons who believe they are unhealthy. The results show that in rural areas, more people believe they are unhealthy according to their subjective evaluations.

Urban and rural living conditions are different depending on the topic of research. Although the fields of sociology, political sci-

ence, economics and social science have each examined and researched quality of life or life satisfaction, there are few studies on the comparison of quality of life between urban and rural residents. There are several studies on comparisons of different groups, with the representative one written by Jo, Kyung-Ho and Kim, Mi-Sook (2000) about persons working for public and private companies. On a international level, Lee, Hyun-Song (1997) compared countries and Lee, Jae-Gi, et al., (1998), attempted to compare different cities. The advent of economic development alongside development in transportation and communication has led many to believe that the conditions of urban and rural life are now similar. However, we believe that differences remain. With this in mind, analysis of how different factors influence the disparity of how urban and rural residents view their quality of life is significant.

II . Research Background

Economic development brings material wealth along with a desire to live a more stable lifestyle. In other words, as society develops, people are less burdened by tradition and more inclined towards living a more refined and sophisticated lifestyle. One example of this is the growing importance of health, leisure and intimate family relationship, emphasizing the desire the modern person has toward finding psychological satisfaction and living a meaningful life. In Korea, Ha, Jae-Gu, 1986; Kim, Byoung-Kuk, 1989; Jung, Kyu-Hyun, Bae, Kyu-Han, Lee, Dal-Gon, Choi, Young-Myung, 1994; Kim, Wang-Bae, 1995; Jung, Chul-Hee, 1995; Lim, Hee-Sub, 1996; Lee, Jae-Gi, Lee, Eun-Wu, Kim, Jae-Hong, 1998; Lee, Hyun-Song, 1997, 2000; Bang, Ha-Nam, 2000; Jo, Kyung-Ho, Kim, Mi-Sook, 2000; etc. have researched quality of life. The topic of quality of life is not only of interest to individuals but also to research institutions. One of the main research centers that have produced reports and dissertations is “A

Study on the Quality Life for the Korean Workers (The Institute of Social Development, Yonsei University, 1995) and "Research on the Quality of Life among Korean (Office of Government Public Relations)," and Joong Ang Ilbo's 1995 "Three Dimensional Analysis of Quality of Life in 74 National Cities," etc. Upon analysis of these studies, We present the following results.

According to Kim, Wang-Bae (1995), Korea's laborers rate their quality of life between "mediocre" and "somewhat satisfied. "Within the categories of family life or residence, health and work life, people are relatively satisfied. However, in leisure, transportation, environment, government policy they are unsatisfied. Overall, we find that work life and quality of life are most intimately connected, followed by family life, residence, leisure and finally governmental policies, factors that are closely related to constructing an individual's living conditions. Social consciousness and quality of life has close association with one's social class.

Jung, Chul-Hee (1995) studied the quality of life through the focus of environment, residence and leisure. From his research, he finds that people are generally satisfied with their quality of life with the exception of transportation and environmental problems. In terms of residence, people are highly satisfied with simply owning a home. Along with this, an increasing number of people view leisure as an important element in having a higher quality of life. This is especially true for younger generations.

Lee, Hyun-Song (1997) compared life quality of Korean citizens with that of people living in OECD countries. He used 6 objective variables of income, health, education, labor, culture, government and balance. According to Lee, in comparison with other OECD nations, Korea is the most under developed in income. In the income sector, Korea is where other OECD countries were in the mid-late 1960s. In the education sector, Korea is at the same level other OECD countries were in the early 1980s. Despite Korea's rapid rate of development in income, because of the long

time it takes for the benefits of a higher income to be distributed to other sectors, the quality of life in Korea also falls behind that of other OECD countries. Lee, Hyun-Song (2000) also conducted a subjective study on the quality of life, focusing on the five variables of household income, family relationship, leisure activity, residential environment and labor activity. His study shows that 50% of a person's life satisfaction derives from the five variables, with income contributing to 40% of this percentage. Income and life satisfaction are most intimately associated.

Bang, Ha-Nam (2000) used the Korea Labor Institute's panel data to research job satisfaction and life satisfaction. According to his studies, job satisfaction and life satisfaction of Korea's wage laborers are largely influenced by their social economic status (ex. Owning property or household income level) or level of economic reward (monthly income) for their work. From this study, in comparison with other developed countries in terms of quality of life, one can see the reality of Korea's income-dependent society. Also, it is clear that the major life concerns are job-oriented rather than non-job oriented. According to this study, job satisfaction is determined by situational factors such as job position, salary level and working conditions. On the other hand, life satisfaction, in comparison with job satisfaction, is more general and also a more diffused concept, making it difficult to pinpoint or discern which specific elements or situational variables contribute to satisfaction.

Jo, Kyung-Ho and Kim, Mi-Sook (2000) used diverse variables such as country, politics, transportation, residential environment, job life, to analyze the people working in the public and private sectors. According to their study, Korea's public sector workers were less satisfied than the private sectors workers in subjective life satisfaction. Public sector laborers were especially unsatisfied with long working hours, low pay, difficulty in being promoted, pitiful work environment and short vacation days.

Upon examining earlier works of study, when comparing life

satisfaction of cities, countries and other macro level comparisons, variables such as social structure, income, and quality of environment, housing, transportation and public security are used. On the other hand, when the study is at a micro level, an individual's subjective rating of their life satisfaction is also used as a variable. Although it seems, together we could get a more accurate measurement, combining macro and micro level variables into one analytical unit is not only difficult but also ineffective.

If it is difficult to measure happiness objectively, how is it to measure happiness subjectively? First, it could be easy to measure subjective happiness because one can simply ask research respondents if they are happy. However, the problem is that one cannot accept subjective answers at face value. For example, a person who has a low level job and is poor would seem, from an objective perspective, unhappy; however, this person considers him or herself as extremely happy. Ignoring objective factors (or even accepting them) many people consider themselves happy. For example, to an ascetic searching for the meaning of life, income status or leisure activities are irrelevant to one's life satisfaction. It is clear that there are limitations to both objective and subjective measurement of life satisfaction.

Despite such difficulties surrounding the study of life satisfaction, people continue to research this topic because it is so interesting. Before measuring life satisfaction, we need to take a look at previous work to understand how life satisfaction is conceptualized. Many different ideas and concepts of life satisfaction exist. Lee, Jae Gi, et al., 1998; understood life satisfaction as desirable living conditions, thus their focus was on increasing personal and public welfare. Accordingly, they saw life satisfaction as analogous to personal welfare. Kim, Kyung-Dong (1994), believed everyone's purpose in life is to pursue perfection of self, therefore the conditions and opportunities in life are most important. Within life's conditions, material wealth and physical health are important

factors. Within opportunities in life, distribution and recognition for social justice and freedom of choice, decision-making and participation are important. Generally, condition of life is something that can be pursued and accomplished by the individual while opportunity is provided to the individual by society.

Lim, Hee Sub (1996), believed that a conceptual framework, composed of several dimensions and variables, is most important to measure the quality of life. He makes a distinction between subjective and objective dimensions of life satisfaction. Even if an objective dimension is not always a sufficient condition for subjective life satisfaction, it is a necessary condition. On the objective index, we can see that some objective conditions have a very close correlation to subjective life satisfaction. He believed that life satisfaction came from the domains of: self realization, household economy, family life, job life and local community. How an individual felt about his or her life satisfaction depended on their subjective measurement of each domain.

To summarize the discussion mentioned above, the variables that compose one's life satisfaction are first, a basic want to satisfy desires. Included in this variable, it is the desire to live a healthy life. Just as there is an old saying that life has no point if one isn't healthy, it is very important to maintain one's health. Second, the fortune or property that secures one's livelihood. Alongside health, wealth is responsible for providing the necessities in life. A secure job and income is one indicator of wealth. Third, leisure activity or hobbies that further adds to the quality of one's life. If a person already has health and wealth, they generally want to achieve a higher and more comfortable living standard. At this stage, leisure activities become more important. Fourth, the importance of close relationship between husband-wife and harmonious relation amongst family members are also important factors. Regardless of whether a person has achieved the other factors listed above, if relationships amongst fam-

ily are inharmonious one can be psychologically uneasy, affecting one's life satisfaction.

III. Research Subjects and Method

In this study we used the 1997 data from Daewoo Economic Research Center's "Korea's Household Panel Research" . In this data, the nation's adults were the subject of study and the unit of analysis was household or individual. Because it is difficult to categorize household by sex, education level, age, etc. We used the individual as the unit of analysis. The data is collected from 5,257 urban residents and 1,052 rural residents. The total is 6,309 individuals.

The Korea Household Panel Survey Data are included the household information and its individual member's information regarding to their social, economic, and cultural data. The detail information about data collection and sampling techniques of the Korea Household Panel Survey Data explained on the Report from Daewoo Economic Research Center. The sampling techniques are divided into 1, 2, 3 steps by individual steps and each individual step applied circular random statistical technique.

In this study, we will look at the correlation between the five variables of income, health, leisure, husband-wife relationship and other family relationship. Following, using the T-test, we will analyze the difference of how each variable affects life satisfaction. Also, using multiple regression analysis, we will analyze how the five variables influence the overall life satisfaction after other variables characteristic to the individual (sex, age, education) have been controlled.

IV. Research Result and Discussion

First, to see the relationship amongst the five variables, we

did a correlation test. The below <Table 3> illustrates Pearson Correlation Test. Each variable had a significance level of 0.01 meaning the result is statistically significant. When combining urban and rural, the correlation between life satisfaction and the different variables is between 0.3-0.5, meaning they have a general correlation. Amongst the variables, leisure and family relationship had the lowest correlation at 0.132 and husband-wife relationship and other family relationship maintained the highest correlation. These correlation results are the same as when urban and rural residents were separately analyzed. The high correlation between husband-wife relationship and other family relationship will be further analyzed with regression analysis.

Table 3. Correlation Test amongst Each of the Five Variables

Variable	Life satisfaction	Income	Health	Leisure	Husband-wife Relationship
Income (Total)	.468				
(Urban)	.470				
(Rural)	.453				
Health	.386 .392 .352	.266 .265 .265			
Leisure	.344 .338 .377	.302 .294 .351	.244 .230 .316		
Husband-wife Relationship	.351 .342 .404	.187 .173 .268	.260 .250 .304	.152 .143 .201	
Other family Relationship	.359 .348 .420	.177 .161 .253	.270 .266 .282	.132 .118 .210	.721 .710 .785

Each variable has a significance level of .01.

Urban is composed of Seoul, major cities and small to me-

dium cities. Rural also includes military posts. <Table 4> shows the results of urban and rural differences within the five variables. Each question is on graded scale answer category 1 is least satisfied, 2 less satisfied, 3 is satisfied, 4 is more satisfied and 5 is very satisfied. The average is 3. First, the overall satisfaction in urban is 3.10, rural is 3.05 and total is 3.09. All of the results are slightly above average. Because this is a subjective measurement of satisfaction, it is possible that the subjects felt 'satisfied' about most conditions and this is reflected in the study. In the income category, the total is less satisfied at 2.61. The total result in leisure is also less satisfied at 2.56. In health, the result is slightly above 'satisfied' at 3.10 and in husband-wife relationship and other family relationship the result is satisfied at 3.67. The results is each category vary from satisfied to less satisfied but the total average shows that people feel 'satisfied' about their general lifestyle. This is the same study result as Kim, Wang-Bae (1995).

Table 4. Comparison of Variables in Urban-Rural Life Satisfaction

Life domain	Total	Urban	Rural	Difference	T-value
Life satisfaction	3.09	3.10	3.05	0.05	1.96*
Income	2.61	2.62	2.54	0.08	2.77**
Health	3.10	3.14	2.92	0.22	6.51***
Leisure	2.56	2.57	2.50	0.07	2.15*
Husband-wife relationship	3.67	3.68	3.61	0.07	2.29*
Other family relationship	3.67	3.69	3.60	0.09	3.55***

Significance level * :p<0.05, **:p<0.01, ***:p<0.001

The analysis results of urban and total are highly correlated because urban makes up the majority (83%) of the total sample

survey. In the case of rural, income, health and leisure are 2.54, 2.92, and 2.50 respectively, all less satisfied. However, husband-wife relationship and other family relationship are 3.61 and 3.60 respectively, showing relative satisfaction.

The mean deviation of urban and rural shows that in all five variables, urban residents have a higher satisfaction level than rural residents. The biggest difference is in health, followed by other family relationship, income and leisure. Husband-wife relationship and family relationship, variables that influence a person's psychological soundness, have comparatively high satisfaction levels. Using the T-test, we find that these differences between urban and rural are statistically meaningful in significant level.

Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis of Variables that Influence Life Satisfaction

Independent variable	Urban		Rural	
	Standard mean coefficient	T-value	Standard mean coefficient	T-value
Constant	-	3.850	-	1.265
Income	.331	13.730***	.300	12.385***
Health	.242	9.834***	.188	7.348***
Leisure	.102	4.437***	.235	9.695***
Husband-wife relationship	.126	4.411***	.041	1.166
Other family relationship	.164	5.733***	.245	7.062***
Sex	.057	2.525*	.026	1.115
Age	.030	1.255	.001	.025
Education	.008	.354	.040	2.565
F Value		108.433***		98.821***
Adjusted R square		.414		.408

Significance level * :p <0.05, **:p<0.01, ***:p<0.001

<Table 5> is a regression analysis that illustrates how the many variables influence life satisfaction. The independent variables, that influence dependent variables, are the five variables in addition to sex, age and education. Because the distribution of residual does not show any specific pattern and analysis of residual values used ordinary least squares method to find the dispersibility of the variance.

We called the autoregressive for the autocorrelation values in regression analysis when the observed values showed autocorrelation with mutual reliance, and when the autoregressive situation occurs the regression coefficient value is not the optimum value even if it is achieved by the least squared method under satisfied the unskewedness and biased values (Kim Du-sub, 1993). Here we can see that using Durbin-Watson test we can analyze autocorrelation, in the urban and rural data the value price is respectively 1.836 and 1.842, an unclear area, making it difficult to know whether there is an autocorrelation.

To find the effect of independent variables, we used two different analyses. First is to find the relationship between variables and satisfaction levels in urban. Second, is to find the relationship between variables and satisfaction levels in rural. The represented regression units in standard mean coefficient and each individual independent variables specific T-value and statistical significant level is represented by the number of asterisks.

F-value and multiple regression coefficients are used to find whether the analysis model is goodness of fit. In the F-value, urban is 108.433 and rural is 98.821 with a correlation of 0.001 meaning that it has statistical value. Furthermore, independent variables'adjusted R square is respectively 0.414 and 0.408 considered degree of freedom to the multiple regression coefficients. The multiple regression coefficients show the size of explanation of dependent variable from independent variables, and it explains the ratio of variance among the total variance by dependent vari-

able in regression equation, here, the independent variables explain about 40% of urban and rural life satisfaction.

In regression analysis, besides the variables used in the T-test, controlled variables are sex, age and education. Among the three variables, while age and education had no influence over life satisfaction, the variable sex was influential for urban persons. Men were more satisfied with their quality of life than women.

In urban, when the three dependent and other independent variables are controlled we can see that income, health, leisure, husband-wife relationship and other family relationship are all statistically correlated. Because all independent variables have a positive relationship, when considering other variables we can see that life satisfaction levels are also higher. Therefore, when other independent variables are controlled, it is clear that if income is higher life satisfaction level is also higher. Other variables also show the same pattern. Through the standard mean coefficient of the five independent variables, income (0.331), health (0.242), other family relationship (0.164), husband-wife relationship (0.126) and leisure (0.102) in descending order influences dependent variables.

In rural, the three variables do not have statistical value. However, when the independent variables are controlled, income, health, leisure, other family relationship independent variables have a positive relationship with statistical correlation. Unlike in urban, husband-wife relationship has no influence on dependent variables in rural. Although it is not shown in a table, the five main independent variables and three dependent variables have statistical significant level found through a single regression analysis. In other words, husband-wife relationship still has statistical value even without considering the other variables. However, when the other variables are controlled it has no statistical value.

Also, because all independent variables have a positive relationship, we can see that once other variables are controlled, life satisfaction becomes higher. For example, with other variables controlled, it is clear that when a person's health is better, their life satisfaction is also higher. Other variables such as leisure or other family relationship can also be explained in the same way. If we see the standard mean coefficient of the four independent variables, income (0.300), other family relationship (0.245), leisure (0.235), and health (0.188) influence dependent variables in the presented order. Those are also statistically significant.

Unlike the T-test of <Table 4>, the regression analysis of <Table 5> shows the results when sex, age and education are controlled. Because of this we see that urban and rural include different age range groups. Therefore, in rural, an increase in elderly persons is shown. Also, research conducted by Lee, Hyun-Song (2000) and Bang, Ha-Nam (2000) depicts that income is important. According to Lee's research the five areas of household income, family relationship, leisure, living environment and work life explain about 50% of a person's subjective life satisfaction. Within this 50%, income explains over 40%, meaning that income and life satisfaction have a very strong correlation. Even in this study, it is clear that regardless of rural or urban, income is the most influential variable in one's life satisfaction. According to Bang, Ha-Nam (2000), job satisfaction and life satisfaction of Korea's wage laborers is largely influenced by their social economic status (ex. Owning property or household income level) or level of economic reward (monthly income) for their work. In comparison with other developed countries in terms of quality of life, one can see the reality of Korea's income-dependent society. The previous studies and this study show the importance of income in life satisfaction.

Using T-test and regression analysis we analyzed urban and rural life satisfaction. Alongside other variables, we can see how

important leisure has become to the modern person. In fact, because leisure is becoming more important it is necessary to analyze the relationship between leisure and life. In the previous <Table 4>, for both urban and rural, income and leisure show unsatisfactory. However, using other variables in <Table 6> and <Table 7> we see that there are differences in urban and rural residents and their attitude toward leisure and work.

Table 6. Intention to Work Less in Order to Spend More Time on Leisure

	Urban		Rural	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Intention	1,612	3,654	328	726
Percent	30.6	69.4	31.1	68.9

<Table 6> exhibits the answers to the question “Would you work less to increase leisure time, if your income is also decreased?” As we can see, there is no major difference between urban and rural. In both urban and rural, 70% responded that they had no intention while about 30% said they would cut work time for more leisure time. Although 70% responded very negatively to the question, the 30% that responded positively, reporting that they would work less with lower income for leisure. This indicates that there is a new attitude about leisure.

Table 7. Attitude and Life Motto Toward Leisure Activities

Variables	Urban			Rural		
	Yes	Average	No	Yes	Average	No
Regardless of cost, it is important that I do leisure activities I enjoy	16.8	28.6	54.6	12.5	23.9	63.7
I work hard in order to enjoy life	52.1	30.0	17.9	52.4	29.2	18.4

<Table 7>shows the answers to both variables “Regardless of cost, it is important that I do leisure activities I enjoy” and “I work hard in order to enjoy life.” First, the overall answer to “Regardless of cost, it is important that I do leisure activities I enjoy” is “No” in both urban and rural. However, in urban 16.8% said “Yes” and 54.6% said “No.” Contrastingly, in rural 12.5% said “Yes” and 63.7 % said “No.” Urban answered more positively than rural. Urban compared to rural residents are more willing to enjoy leisure activities even if it costs more money. Although not reflected in this table, there is statistical significant level shown through T-test result of 0.001 correlation.

This result is different from that of a study about leisure conducted by Jung, Chul-Hee (1995).According to Jung, as we modernize there will be a sharp increase in the number of people who recognize the importance of leisure. He also believed that rather than leisure cost or facilities, people would be unsatisfied with the lack of leisure time. However, in this study we find that cost is an important reason as to why people cannot enjoy leisure.

The second question, “I work hard in order to enjoy life” had comparatively positive answers from both urban and rural. In urban and rural, total 52% answered “Yes” and about 18% answered “No.” From this, we can discern the work ethic of both urban and rural residents. The value of hard work, rather than the value of the work itself, is the basis from which people live satisfied lives.

The following is an interpretation the relationship between the above T-test and regression analysis and the answers to the two questions. In the category of leisure and life, both urban and rural are unsatisfied (See <Table 4>) with their leisure life. Leisure affects a person’s quality of life (See <Table 5>). There is little intention to expand leisure time at the cost of less work and less pay (See <Table 6>). Many are not enjoying the type of lei-

sure they like because of its cost (See <Table 7>) and the value of working hard is reflected in enjoying life (See <Table 7>). Thus, people want to have more leisure time and activities but are limited because of a lack of money. However, they have a relatively optimistic outlook on life.

V. Conclusion

Despite the increased material wealth brought forward by economic development, material wealth does not transfer to a more satisfied quality of life or life satisfaction. Furthermore, economic development brought different types of changes and benefits to urban and rural. For example, income disparity between urban and rural is increasing. Particularly, in income spent on entertainment. The gap between the relative and absolute difference is widening at rapid speed. This study analyzes how individuals in urban and rural feel about their quality of life.

Through previous works, we constructed a relationship between five factors of health, income, leisure, husband-wife relationship and other family relationship and their influence on life satisfaction. Also, in this study, the concepts of life satisfaction and quality of life are the same and thus used interchangeably. This study refers to subjective satisfaction.

If we look at the average degree of satisfaction with individual self-satisfaction scale for the above 5 factors for urban and rural areas, both urban and rural are unsatisfied with income and leisure. In health, urban are satisfied while rural residents are not. Both urban and rural are satisfied with husband-wife relationship and other family relationship. In general, people are of "normal" satisfaction. This result mirrors that of Kim, Wang-Bae (1995)'s study of Korea's workers rating their overall life satisfaction as "mediocre" or "somewhat satisfied."

We used the T-test to find the differences amongst the five

variables in urban and rural residents. First, if we look at the mean disparity, we see that overall urban residents are more satisfied with their quality of life than rural residents. In general, the harsher living conditions (objective variable) of rural residents influence their satisfaction level. Of the variables, health followed by other family relationship and then income show the biggest disparities. Such differences in urban and rural are all of statistically significant as found through T-test. We also find that husband-wife relationship and family relationship, variables that induce psychological stability reflect comparatively higher satisfaction levels.

Using multiple regression analysis, We analyzed how the five independent variables responded after controlling sex, age and education. The fitness of analysis model and the power of explanation of the model are both relatively good in terms of F-value and the values of multiple regression coefficients. In urban, we find that all five independent variables are correlated with sex, age and education taken into consideration. In rural, with the exception of husband-wife relationship, the remaining four variables are of statistically significant. Each variable influenced life satisfaction even after control.

In urban, income is most influential on quality of life followed by health, other family relationship, husband-wife relationship and leisure, in descending order. In rural, income is also most influential on life satisfaction followed by other family relationship, leisure and health. This result is also found in studies by Lee, Hyun-Song and Bang, Ha-Nam (2000), emphasizes the important relationship between income and life satisfaction.

In terms of leisure, we find that people are still unwilling to cut back on work time for the sake of leisure. Furthermore, the number of people who will spend more money to enjoy the type of leisure they want is still small. This result differs from a previous result found by Jung, Chul-Hee (1995). Jung found that

persons are unsatisfied because they do not have enough leisure time rather than leisure expense or facilities. However, this study shows that leisure expense is most important.

As mentioned in the introduction, there are many differences in urban and rural further implying that there are differences in life satisfaction. Using the T-test, we found many disparities. Through the multiple regression analysis, we find that many independent variables influence the dependent variable of life satisfaction. However, through regression analysis we find that urban and rural have similar patterns. It is possible that if there is a significant difference in urban and rural, than the patterns must also be different. In this case, we must consider the conditions of analysis. Just as objective conditions and wealth of urban and rural are different, subjective perspective of urban and rural can also differ. In other words, although there are objective differences, the patterns of urban and rural are similar because of the subjective conditions.

The limitations of this study include a lack of data as well as consideration for transportation, environment, duty and work, factors that influence daily life. There is a need to combine all five variables into one index and analyze the differences between urban and rural in terms of education level and marriage intention, etc. Furthermore, this study is based on data from 1997, the year in which Korea was at its height of development. However, as we all know, Korea soon after experienced an economic financial crisis in which the International Monetary Fund provided financial assistance. To find how life satisfaction levels changed during this period, there is a need for time series research.

References

- Bang, Ha-Nam(2000). "A Study on the Main Factors and Interaction Effects for Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction," *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 23, pp.133-154.
- Daewoo Economic Institute(1997). *Economic Activities of Korean*, Seoul: Daewoo Economic Institute.
- _____ (1998). Instruction of Daewoo Panel Data, Seoul: Daewoo Economic Institute.
- Gastil, R. A.(1970). "Social Indicators and Quality of Life," *Public Administrative Review*, Vol. 30(6), pp. 641-650.
- Ha, Jae Gu(1986). "A Study on the Seoul Citizen's Quality of Life and the Direction of Public Policy," PhD Dissertation at Hanyang University.
- Institute of Social Development, Yonsei University(1995). *A Study of Korean Laborer's Quality of Life*, Seoul: Social Development Institute at Yonsei University.
- Jo, Kyung-Ho and Kim, Mi-Sook(2000). "A Comparative Study of Satisfaction of Quality of Life between Public Sector and Private Sector Workers," *Korea Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 34(3), pp. 27-45.
- Joong-Ang Ilbo(1995). *Solid Analysis of Quality of Life in 74 Cities, Korea*, Joong-Ang Ilbo .
- Jung, Chul-Hee(1995). "Korean Labor's Everyday Life and Quality of Life," *Journal of Institute of Social Development*, Vol. 1, pp. 140-172.
- Jung, Kyu-Hyun · Bae, Kyu-Han · Lee, Dal-Gon · Choi, Young-Myung (1994). *Social Development Strategy in 21 Century: Development, Social Welfare, Environmental Harmony*, Seoul: Nanam.
- Jung, Yong-Hwan(1995). "A Study on Relations between Life Quality and Urban Growth," *Journal of National Plan*, Vol.

- 30(1), pp. 29-43.
- Kim, Byoung-Kuk(1989). "A Study on the Development of Environmental Indicator Measurement for.
- Kim, Du-sub(1993). *Regression Analysis for Social Science*, Seoul: Bupmunsa.
- Kim, Kyung-Dong(1994). *Modern Sociology*, Seoul: Bakyoungsa.
- Kim, Wang-Bae(1995). "Philosophical Meaning in Everyday Life and Politics," *Problems of Everyday Life and Politics*, Seoul: Daeyun.
- Korea National Statistical Office(2001). *Social Indicators in Korea 2000*, National Statistical Office .
- Korea National Statistical Office(2006). *Social Indicators in Korea 2005*, National Statistical Office .
- Korea National Statistical Office(2008). *Social Indicators in Korea 2007*, National Statistical Office.
- Lee, Hyun-Song(1997). "Quality of Life: Focused on Objective Dimension," *Korea Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 31, pp. 269-301.
- _____(2000). "Income Effects for Subjective Level of Quality of Life," *Korea Journal of Sociolog*, Vol. 23(1), pp. 91-117.
- Lee, Jae-Gi· Lee, Eun-Woo· Kim, Jae-Hong(1998). *International and Regional Comparative Study for Quality of Life*, Seoul: Jipmundang.
- Lim, Hee-Sub(1996). "Definition of Quality of Life," *Journal of Korean Public Administration*, Vol. 5(1), Institute of Korean Public Administration.
- Rogerson, R. J., Findlay, A. M., Morris, A. S., and M. G. Coobes (1989). "Indicators of Quality of Life: Some Methodological Issues," *Environmental Planning A*, Vol. 21, pp. 1655-1666.
- Urban Life, PhD Dissertation at Kunkuk University.
- Yoon, Jong-Ju(1982). "Social Indicators in Korea: Its Problems and Solution," *Korea Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 16, pp.15-17.