Social Well-Being in the Philippines: Indicators and Patterns

Emma Porio [a] **and Justin See** [a]

Abstract

This paper describes the patterns and correlates of social well-being in the Philippines. Based on a national survey of 1200 households, the study found that: 1) most Filipinos are happy and satisfied with their current life but those outside of Metro Manila have higher levels of happiness and life satisfaction, 2) slightly more than half are not satisfied with their employment, job security, and finances but have much higher levels of satisfaction with their family/married life, relationship with friends/neighbors and amount of time they have; 3) Metro Manilans compared to their regional counterparts are less happy about their residence, usage of time, hobbies and personal health. Overall, the major components of social well-being among Filipinos are: job and finance, family life and relationships and spare time and hobbies. With regards to fairness of treatment of people from different social categories, the farther they are from Manila, they feel different groups are treated more fairly. When queried about their social capital/trust networks, most of them trusted highly their family and relatives, less with neighbors, co-workers, local government, and the police. Interestingly, their trust of secondary institutions such as hospitals and local governments increases during and after disasters. While bonding social capital (with primary groups) seem high in everyday life, bridging and linking social capital with institutions become important in post-disaster situations.

Keywords: Philippines, social well-being, social capital, trust networks, climate disasters, post-disaster situations

This is an initial survey report on the International Comparative Survey of Lifestyle and Value conducted by the Ateneo de Manila University with funding support from the Center for Social Well-Being Studies, Institute for Development of Social Intelligence, Senshu University. Based on a national survey of 1200 households in the Philippines, this paper *describes* the socio-economic and demographic characteristics, the dimensions and components of social well-being and their variations across Metro Manila and the three island groups of Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao.

SURVEY AND SAMPLING METHODS

The sampling design followed the Public Opinion Poll Survey design (later to become the Social Weather Station) done by the Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University. Based on the population size, sample regions, provinces cities, towns were drawn.

Using a systematic sample, with a

[a] Ateneo de Manila University

Corresponding Authors:
Emma Porio, Ateneo de Manila University, Loyola heights, Quezon City 1108, the Philippines
Email: eporio@ateneo.edu

random start, the sample population of 1200 households was disaggregated accordingly: Metropolitan Manila (300), Luzon (300), Visayas (300) and Mindanao (300). Please see Appendix Tables 1.1 for details.

Survey Challenges

The implementation of this survey was delayed by *events* beyond our control such as: 1) political election fever from March-May 2016; 2) post-election tensions (May-July 2016); 3) typhoons, floods and tropical depressions (June-November 2016), 4) political conflicts and military offensives in Mindanao (Sept. 2016-January 2017and the 5) anti-drug campaigns of the Duterte Administration (June 2016-present).

The anti-drug campaigns have spawned fear in many Philippine cities and villages because of the many outright shootings and killings that have remained unsolved and/or not investigated to date. This had affected the project recruitment of data collectors and interviewers as well as our access to respondents in the field.

The principal investigator of the project even received several calls from mayors, barangay captains/village heads and security personnel checking on the identity of our interviewers and the legitimacy of the survey. In our decades of doing field studies, this has never happened at all before July 2016.

Socio-economic and Demographic Characteristics

The sampling frame drew an equal number of male and female respondents from the metropolitan center of Metro Manila, regional centers from the remaining two island groups, namely, Cebu City for Metro Cebu and Davao City for Metro Davao. From the regional centers, provinces, towns and villages (*barangays*) 1200 respondents were drawn (for elaborate description of sampling frame, please see Appendix Tables 1.1-1.2).

Following the sampling by socio-economic class[1], majority of the respondents came from the C (23%) and D (61%) classes;

only a small portion came from the bottom (E , 13%) and top AB (2.4%) classes. Both male (50%) and female (50%) respondents were equally represented in the sample population. For elaboration, please see Appendix Table 2.1.

Most of the respondents were married (58%), single (18%), separated and/or widowed (10%) or informal marriages or living in arrangements (15%).Majority of the respondents had some elementary and/or high school education (68%) while about 28 % had some college education. Only a negligible portion of the sample population had enjoyed vocational-technical education (4%).In terms of occupational status, most were self-employed (33%), regular (13%) or contractual employees (18%) with only 10% were unemployed. But about less than a third were not working but were not looking for jobs either (i.e., mostly housewives, retirees). This last two figures seem misleading because our field interviewers reported that majority of the unemployed, retirees or housewives were engaged in on-off informal economic activities to supplement the inadequate incomes of their spouses and other family members.

Most of the respondents came from urban areas (70%) while the remainder were from rural areas. Eighty-five percent were 18-59 years old while 15 % were 60 years old or over. More than half (59%) belong to nuclear households while 38% belong to extended households with relatives. A small percentage (3%) of the sample population reported living in extended households with non-relatives.

Summary

To summarize, majority of the respondents had ages between 18-59 years old and belong mostly to the middle (C income classification) and lower income classes (D and E income classification). Most of them had graduated from elementary or completed only partial high school education while about less than a third had college education. They were self-employed or had regular and/or contractual

employment. Most of them lived in nuclear households while a little more than a third lived in extended households with relatives.

SOCIAL WELL-BEING AMONG FILIPINOS: INDICATORS AND PATTERNS

The study surveyed Filipinos on the following indicators of social well-being: 1) level of happiness, 2) overall satisfaction with current life, 3) satisfaction with employment/ job security, current job, family life, family finances, marital life, relationships with friends and acquaintances, area of residence, amount/quality of spare time, hobbies/social contribution and current personal health. The respondents were asked to rank their levels of social well being along a 0-10 scale, with 0 with the least value and 10, the highest value. This was converted into a scale of 1 (least value) and 5 (highest value). So, for level of happiness, the following are the ranks: 1 (very unhappy), 2 somewhat unhappy, 3 (neutral), 4 (somewhat happy) and 5 (very happy). For details, please see Appendix Table 3.

Level of Happiness

Majority (72%) of Filipinos reported being quite happy and only a small portion (6%) reported being unhappy and/or very unhappy. The rest (24%) said they were neither sad nor happy--just have neutral feelings about life in general. But compared to Metro Manila (68%), those from Visayas (77%) Mindanao (76%) reported highest level of happiness followed by Luzon (69%). It seemed that the farther the respondent from the metropolitan areas of Metro Manila, the happier s/he is. Perhaps, Mindanao, were buoyed with optimism, having finally elected a president of the republic in May 2016.These results affirmed those found by the Social Weather Station (SWS) survey during the same period (SWS 2016).

Overall Satisfaction with Current Life

In general, Filipinos have a high level (71%) of overall satisfaction with their current life. It seems that people outside of Metro Manila (62%) are less satisfied compared to their counterparts in Mindanao (77%), Visayas (73%) and Luzon (71%). Distance from the metropolis seemed associated with people's overall satisfaction with their life because those from the provinces and far from the metropolis reported higher ratings of satisfaction. During the interviews, respondents from the provinces offered their perception of the metropolis as being crowded, polluted with heavy traffic and have expensive housing—factors, which they said will compromise their happiness, comfort and satisfaction with life.

Employment, Job and Finances

While a lot of Filipinos are quite happy with their overall current life situation, only slightly more than half (58%) of them are quite satisfied with their employment and job security. In terms of satisfaction in this area, Luzon (64%) topped among the regions followed by Visayas (61%), but both Metro Manila and Mindanao scored 53% satisfaction in employment and job stability. Interestingly those from the center and peripheral regions seemed to be more dissatisfied with their employment and job stability. This pattern is also reinforced with their satisfaction with the current job: overall satisfaction for the Philippines was 63% with Luzon scoring a high level of satisfaction (70%), followed by Visayas (64%)and Metro Manila (61%). Mindanao stood out as having the lowest level of satisfaction (58%). This is quite logical considering that most of the investments in infrastructure and commercial-industrial sectors are highly concentrated in Metro Manila and Calabarzon/Luzon (Habito 2017; Ang 2017).Current political tensions in the region that led to the declaration of martial law in Mindanao in May 24, 2017 seemed to support these findings.

The above "depressed pattern of satisfaction was reinforced when respondents were asked about their satisfaction with family finances. Overall satisfaction for the

four regions was only 50%, with Mindanao (47%) having the lowest satisfaction followed by Metro Manila (48%). Luzon (56%) had the highest satisfaction level with family finances. These findings seemed consistent with the findings of other studies. As pointed out earlier, Habito (2017) and Ang (2017) argued that most of the investments in infrastructure, transportation and services are concentrated in the National Capital Region (NCR), Calabarzon (Region IV-A). Moreover, most of the export processing zones (EPZs) or those declared as industrial zones by the government, happen to be located in Luzon and the regional centers of the Visayas region. Moreover, Mindanao has been plagued by a long history of competing resource claims and political conflicts as illustrated by the 40 years struggles of both indigenous peoples and Muslim groups for autonomy and control over their land.

Family Life, Married Life, Relationship with Friends and Amount of Time

Surprisingly, their lower levels of satisfaction with their jobs, employment and finances, did not spell over into their family life. Overall, they had a high (82%) satisfaction with their family life. In general, those from the Luzon (84%), Visayas (84%) and Mindanao (81%) were more satisfied than those from Metro Manila (78%). It seems that those from the metropolis have higher expectations from their families in relation to achieving a satisfactory and fulfilling life.

Compared to the respondents' satisfaction with their *family* life (84%), their overall satisfaction levels with their *marital* life is higher at 85% with Mindanao highly satisfied (92%), followed by Luzon (86%), Visayas (87%), and Metro Manila (75%). Their satisfaction with their own families and marriages is also reinforced with their good relationships with friends, neighbours and acquaintances (83%). But again those in Metro Manila scored lower satisfaction level (77%) compared to those in the Luzon (84%), Visayas (84%) and Mindanao (87%) regions. In terms of their place of residence,

those outside of the metropolis like Luzon (81%), Visayas (79%)and Mindanao (79%) had much higher levels of satisfaction with their places of residence than those in Metro Manila (73%). It seems that people think the quality of the area of residence outside the metropolis is better.

Residence, Free Time, Usage of Free Time, Hobbies and Personal Health

With regards to leisure and hobbies, more than half (61%) of the respondents were satisfied with the amount and quality of time they had. In all of these items, Metro Manila's level of satisfaction (48%) was always lower than those in the regions or provinces (Luzon 52%, Visayas 73% and Mindanao 68%). In terms of their current personal health about three-fourths of them were quite satisfied. Interestingly, the level of satisfaction across the regions and Metro Manila were almost the same in the area of health(see Appendix Table 2.3B.)

The above results show that Filipinos living outside of Metro Manila (i.e., Luzon, Visayas, Mindanao) seemed more significantly satisfied and happy in most aspects of well-being. Thus, it appears that people outside of Metro Manila seemed happier and more contented with their lives compared to those in the metropolis.

The results of the Senshu Survey of Well-Being results in the Philippines is comparable with that of the Social Weather Stations (SWS) survey results, with satisfaction rates of 87-88% and dissatisfaction rates of 12-13% from September 2016-December 2016 (SWS 2016).

COMPONENTS OF SOCIAL WELL-BEING IN THE PHILI-PPINES

The principal component analysis (PCA) showed that the major components of social well-being in Metro Manila and Luzon are satisfaction with: 1) job and finances, 2) spare time and hobbies, 3) family life. In addition to these three components, interestingly for

Visayas respondents identified locale or area of residence as additional component of their well-being in relation to their family life but not for Mindanao respondents. But for the overall results, locale or place/area of residence did not come out significant. Instead, job and finance (43%), family life and relationships (12%), spare time and hobbies were viewed as major components of social well-being among Filipinos.

Cantril's Ladder: Quality of Life

Surprisingly, when asked on a 10-point Cantril scale of the quality of their life, more than half (52%) of the population perceived their lives to be thriving while the remainder saw their life as either struggling (40%) or suffering (7%). Mindanao respondents seemed to thrive most among the island groups. Metro Manila topped all regions with miserable souls (12%), followed by Mindanao (7.5%) and Visayas (6%). This reinforces the overall findings in this survey that the farther the respondents are from the metropolis, the higher are their feelings of social well-being.

Improvement in their Life Circumstances Over Time

Compared to five years ago, majority (61%) do feel their lives improved but 24% have remained the same while 15% complained that their lives have worsened over time.

Five years from now, almost three-fourths (74%) will improve while 25% felt their lives will remain the same and only a minute portion (4%) expected their lives to be worse.

When asked about their prospects in old age, the same pattern can be observed. Majority (64%) of them think their circumstances will improve while only 12% expected no change and only a minute portion (6%) expected their old age to be worse.

Overall, then, the respondents feel quite hopeful that their lives will improve 5 years from now and/or upon reaching old age.

FAIRNESS IN TREATING PEOPLE COMING FROM DIFFERENT SOCIAL CATEGORIES

A society or social group can be judged by how fairly/unfairly they treat certain groups of people (e.g., age, gender, education, occupation, income, assets, family, ethnicity, area, region and religion). In terms of fair treatment, those from Mindanao (62%-79%) seemed to think consistently that people from different gender, age, education, occupation, income, assets, family, area, region and religion enjoyed fair treatment compared to those from Manila (scores ranged 20%-42%) who thought these groups of people are not treated so fairly by society. Meanwhile, those from Luzon (41%-54) and Visayas (51%-71%), about half or more than half of them thought that these groups are treated fairly or have equal opportunity to acquire the resources and capital. It seems that the farther one is from Metro Manila, the more people perceive of fair treatment or distributive justice among these groups. Interestingly, both Mindanao (79%) and Visayas scored high in terms of fair treatment to people of different religions. Perhaps, the presence of large Muslim populations in different areas of the Autonomous Region of Mindanao (ARM), could explain this seemingly high level of fair treatment and tolerance.

Hazards, Epidemics and Accidents

Majority of the respondents have experienced typhoons and floods (89%), more than half (58%) underwent earthquakes/volcanic eruptions but less of air/water pollution (24%) and much less of epidemic disease (13%), travel accident (6%), injury/accident at work (5%) and war (4%). This pattern seemed to hold true for Metro Manila and the three island groups.

Building adaptive capacities through social capital both in primary groups and secondary institutions (e.g., civil society, local government, police and armed forces) is highly significant because survey results

show that most of the respondents have experienced typhoons, earthquakes and air/water pollution. These are hazards which potentially could cause disastrous impacts because of failure of local governments and communities to adequately prepare and mitigate disaster risks (Porio 2017).

SOCIAL CAPITAL AND TRUST NETWORKS

When asked about their levels of trust, most of the respondents displayed high level of trust with their family and relatives (76%). Understandably, they trusted less friends and acquaintances (42%), co-workers (42%), neighbours (38%) and local government and police (29%) and most people (27%). Understandably, only 6% trusted strangers. Interestingly, Metro Manila had higher level of trust with their families (81%), compared to those in Mindanao (70%), Luzon (75%) and Visayas (78%). Interestingly, Mindanao had higher levels of trust with the local government and police (35%) compared to those from Metro Manila (23%), Visayas (30%) and Luzon (27%). This is quite a surprising result. Could the long history of low-intensity conflicts in Mindanao eroded their trust levels with primary reference groups or institutions, who may have failed to help them during these conflicts? And local government institutions (e.g., police, social work, health) have stepped up to fill this void?

Rich Bonding Capital; Weak Bridging/ Linking Capital or Associational Ties

Most of the respondents reported high attendance in the weddings/burials of their close family members, relatives, friends and neighbors. But *not so many* people attend those of their co-workers' and superiors' weddings and burials. This is consistent with their low trust levels of co-workers as shown in the previous section. The same pattern holds true for both residents in the metropolis and in the provinces. This survey results seem to reinforce the idea that Filipinos are quite rich in bonding capital (among their own families, friends, neighbors or immediate/primary trust networks) but have *weak bridging and linking capital* with other groups like civil society organizations, professional groups and local government officials (Abad 2006; Porio 2011; Porio, See and Yulo-Loyzaga 2016).

Level of Trust in Relation to Daily Problems/Issues

The survey results show that Filipinos seem to have *high levels of trust* with their family and relatives, (82% and 81% respectively), church/religious groups (68%), firefighting organization (62%),school/hospital facilities (53%), friends and acquaintances (49%), but have *low trust* with political parties (29%) local government (34%), police (44%), armed forces (50%), neighbors (44%) and their neighborhood associations (40%). Interestingly, Mindanao (55%) and Visayas (55%) registered higher trust levels in the armed forces compared to those in the other regions. Mindanao (78%) also trusted highly church and religious groups compared to those in the Visayas (58%). This is understandable because basic ecclesiastical communities (BECs) or faith-based church groups of the Catholic Church have a history of long engagements and rootedness in Mindanao (Holden, Knadeau and Porio 2017). During its long history of conflict and disasters community-based church groups and their partner humanitarian organizations have always been reliable in bringing relief support (Porio 2017).

It seems that when it comes to social services needed in their daily lives, people have higher trust with the institutions and organizations that could provide them support. They have realized that they needed material provision from groups and institutions with higher capacities and resources, which their friends and neighbours cannot provide.

Trust During Disasters

During disasters, the pattern of trust observed

in the previous section seemed to hold true. Again, family (86%), relatives (84%), church and religious groups (73%), schools and hospitals (67%), firefighting organizations (66%) and volunteers/civic groups (57%) topped the list of highly reliable groups that could provide help during disaster. Supporting this cast of "highly reliable groups were friends and acquaintances (54%), army forces (54%) and local government (53%). Political parties (33%) seemed to be highly unreliable during disasters. During fieldwork, respondents commented that even in ordinary circumstances, politicians cannot be relied upon as they are only amiable to them or make their presence during election season.

The above level of trust pattern seemed to be consistent in Metro Manila and across the three island groups as well. In Metro Manila, however, several studies show that after a series of flooding disasters (e.g., Ketsana in2009; Habagat floods in 2012, 2013, 2014), urban poor communities have increasingly relied on the local disaster risk reduction and management officers (DRRMOs), NGOs, CSOs, and other humanitarian organizations for evacuation, security and food/medical assistance (Porio 2011, 2014).

Social capital is a critical component of adaptation and resilience building initiatives of communities and local governments before, during and after disasters. In Metro Manila, before the series of climate–related disasters, the informal sector relied primarily on *bonding* social capital. Studies show that during disasters, bridging and linking capital increase only temporarily (Porio, Yulo-Loyzaga and See 2016). Institutions need to invest in transformative and long-term strategies and interventions such as investments in infrastructure and livelihood resilience (Porio, 2017).

SOCIAL COHESION, INTEGRATION WITH COMMUNITY AND GROUP ACTIVITIES

A sizeable portion (36-40%) of the respondents admitted that they have not engaged in social activities with the community at all or even once this year. Only about 19% have engaged a few times a year (including once a month/week) in communities activities such as sports, hobbies and leisure, community development (21%), elderly and childcare support (17%), disaster and crime prevention activities (15%, 17% respectively). It seems that those from Visayas and Mindanao (i.e., less urbanized) have just a bit higher records (About 25%) of community involvement.

It seems that Filipinos have a pitiful record of community service. This is quite an irony or at the very least, puzzling, because from the survey results, the foundational base of their happiness and life satisfaction is having good relationships with their family, relatives, friends and neighbors. So, it is surprising that they do not engage with community activities with them and the larger community (i.e., beyond face-to-face interaction or beyond their primary group or comfort zones).

During events/times of disasters, however, the same primary group serve as the main/primary layer of support (Porio 2011; Porio, See and Yulo-Loyzaga 2016). However, over the last few years of the "new normal climate regime where extreme events seem to be happening more often, their reliance over their immediate reference group has been incrementally supplemented with support from institutions like church, religious organizations, humanitarian groups and local government units. Evacuation, emergency rescue services and perhaps relocation for displaced flood victims needed higher capacities and resources that only institutions or organized groups can provide it to them. Thus, the shift in trust levels is necessary for community resilience (Porio 2017).

Interestingly, when we computed how socio-demographic characteristics were correlated with social well-being dimensions (i.e., satisfaction with life, family finances, employment, job, family life and relationships with friends) among Filipinos, only socio-economic class and education were significant. Age was negatively

correlated with satisfaction with family and married life.

SUMMARY, PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

As shown in the preliminary analysis, the feeling of well-being among Filipinos is quite high and associated with their individual, family, community and societal locations and primary or face-to-face relationships. The results also show that those in highly urbanized areas like Metro Manila have less satisfaction and happiness compared to their provincial/regional counterparts.

Except in the areas of family finances, employment and job security, most of the respondents expressed high levels of happiness and satisfaction with their life circumstances. Moreover, their overall satisfaction with life is highly associated the socio-economic status and occupation. Similarly, their satisfaction with family finances, employment, current job, security, friendships, area of residence and leisure (spare time and quality) is associated with higher socio-economic status and education. Interestingly, satisfaction with their married life is not associated with any socio-demographic characteristic while satisfaction with personal health is associated with age (i.e., as one gets older, perhaps the higher one get painfully aware of pain and life frustrations and the inefficiencies of the existing health system).

Where they live is also important in determining their level of happiness and satisfaction with various aspects of their lives like job security, employment, finances and so on. More importantly, the quality of their life is highly associated with the quality of their relationships with their family, relatives, friends, neighbors and other members of the community and their workplace. Being connected to family and neighborhood networks (relatives and friends living nearby) in the community seems to contribute largely to Filipinos' satisfaction and happiness with their lives.

In terms of fair treatment to certain social categories of people (i.e., different religion, region/area, gender, ethnicity, class, family, occupation, income, education, and age), respondents from Visayas and Mindanao claim that they were treated more fairly compared to those from Luzon and Metro Manila who perceived less fair treatment. Again, this seem to be consistent where people in less urbanized areas to claim more experience of equitable treatment than those in more economically advanced areas.

While Filipinos in general seemed neutral (no change) of their lives five years ago/from now and upon reaching age, their hope for improvement incrementally increased as they progressed into their future. They feel very positive that their lives would change for the better in five years from and when they reach old age.

The survey results also showed that Filipinos have very "thick" bonding capital with their family, relatives, and friends. This also is reinforced when the survey asked for their trusted networks and engagement in social activities. Interestingly their "social connectedness" with their friends and neighbors do not seem to translate to building cohesion or integration with their communities through sharing (e.g., recreational/sports activities) and supporting activities (e.g., childcare/elderly support or volunteer services for vulnerable groups, etc.). As Abad (2006) commented the paucity of associational ties compare starkly with the rich bonding social capital among Filipinos. Perhaps, the Filipinos' ability to live with this dissonance is a survival strategy giving the weakness of societal institutions that seem to fail to deliver support during disasters and critical moments of survival.

But survey results also showed that their having experienced a series of flooding disasters over the years have incrementally increased their trust in organizations (e.g., church and humanitarian groups) and institutions (local government units, village security and other disaster risk reduction related groups) is highlighted over their friends and neighbors. In the earlier periods

(before extreme events of typhoons, earthquakes, heavy rainfall and flooding, etc.), they just relied on their relatives, friends and neighbors for help (food, medicine, watch over their house or children, etc.) but with the "new normal" (i.e., frequency/intensity of climate events), they found that now they realized they had to rely or trust institutional actors (i.e., humanitarian organizations, local government, hospitals, etc.) for emergency rescue, medical assistance, evacuation and relocation. Given that the Philippines is highly at risk to climate-related hazards (typhoons, sea level rise, storm surge) and earthquakes, the need to build incrementally Filipinos' trust in state institutions is very crucial.

APPENDIX

Appendix Table 1: Sample Regions, Provinces, and Towns
Appendix Table 2: Socio-Demographic Characteristics and Other Variables
Appendix Table 3: Correlations of Social Well-Being Indicators with Social Factors

Appendix Table 1. Sample Regions, Provinces, and Towns

Table 1.1. Number and List of Sample Provinces and Municipalities

ISLAND GROUP/REGION	Number of Sample Provinces	Name of Sample Province/s	Number of Sample Municipalities	Name of Sample Municipalities
LUZON	**10**		**15**	
Region 1 - Ilocos Region	1	Pangasinan	2	Alaminos, Bolinaw
Region 2 - Cagayan Valley and Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR)	1	Isabela	2	Cauayan, Cordon
Region 3 - Central Luzon	3	Bulacan	4	Santa Maria, Malolos
		Nueva Ecija		Munoz
		Zambales		Iba
Region IV-A& B - CALABARZON and MIMAROPA	4	Cavite	5	Bacoor, Carmona
		Laguna		Santa Rosa
		Quezon Province		Candelaria
		Oriental Mindoro		Calapan
Region 5 – Bicol	1	Camarines Sur	2	Naga, Calabanga
VISAYAS	**5**		**15**	
Region VI - Western Visayas	1	Iloilo	4	Iloilo City, Dumangas, Dingle, Lambunao
Region VII - Central Visayas	2	Cebu	5	Mandawe, Danao, Bantayan
		Bohol		Tubigon, Jagna
Negros Island Region*	1	Negros Occidental	3	Bacolod, Talisay, Bago
Region VIII - Eastern Visayas	1	Leyte	3	Ormoc, Baybay, Palo
MINDANAO	**6**		**15**	
Region IX - Zamboanga Peninsula	1	Zamboanga del Sur	2	Pagadian, Aurora
Region X - Northern Mindanao	1	Misamis Oriental	3	Opol, Gingoog, Cagayan de Oro
Region XI – Davao	1	Davao del Sur	3	Digos, Santa Cruz, Davao City
Region XII – SOCCSKSARGEN	1	South Cotabato	3	General Santos, Polomolok, Lake Sebu
Region XIII –CARAGA	1	Agusan del Norte	2	Butuan, Cabadbaran
Administrative Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM)	1	Lanao del Sur	2	Marawi City, Malabang

Source: Population - 2015 Census of Population and Housing
*Created into a region on May 29, 2015.

Table 1.2. List of Sample Barangays in the National Capital Region

Cities / Municipality	Population	Number of sample barangays	Sample barangays
Total	11,855,975	60	
Quezon City	2,761,720	14	1. Bahay Toro 2. Commonwealth 3. Fairview 4. Krus na Ligas 5. Manresa 6. Matandang Balara 7. Pasong Tamo 8. San Bartolome 9. Sauyo 10. Tatalon 11. Batasan Hills 12. Greater Lagro 13. Payatas 14. Nagka-isang Nayon
Manila City	1,652,171	8	1. Bgy. 292, Binondo 2. Bgy. 667, Ermita 3. Bgy. 655, Intramuros 4. Bgy. 387, Quiapo 5. Bgy. 719, Malate 6. Bgy. 20, Tondo 7. Bgy. 843, Pandacan 8. Bgy. 464, Sampaloc
Caloocan City	1,489,040	7	1. Bgy. 28 2. Bgy. 120 3. Bgy. 165 4. Bgy. 171 5. Bgy. 176 6. Bgy. 178 7. Bgy. 185
Pasig City	669,773	3	1. Pinagbuhatan 2. Rosario 3. Santolan
Taguig City	644,473	3	1. Lower Bicutan 2. Bagumbayan
Parañaque City	588,126	3	1. San Dionesio 2. San Isidro
Valenzuela City	575,356	3	1. Hen T. de Leon 2. Malinta 3. Marulas
Las Piñas City	552,573	3	1. Almanza Dos 2. Pulang Lupa Uno 3. Talon Dos
Makati City	529,039	3	1. West Rembo 2. Rizal 3. Post Proper Southside
Muntinlupa City	459,941	2	1. Putatan 2. Tunasan
Marikina City	424,150	2	1. Parang 2. Santa Elena
Pasay City	392,869	2	1. Bgy. 14 2. Bgy. 46
Malabon City	353,337	2	1. Potrero 2. Longos
Mandaluyong City	328,699	2	1. Addition Hills 2. Mauway
Navotas City	249,131	1	North Bay Blvd. South
San Juan City	121,430	1	Corazon de Jesus
Pateros	64,147	1	Santa Ana

Appendix Table 2. Socio-Demographic Characteristics and Other Variables

Table 2.1. Social Demographics of the Respondents

(Unit: %)

Demographics	Categories	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Sex	Male	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Female	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Socio-economic Class	AB	2.4	2.7	3.3	2.0	1.7
	C	23.4	23.3	19.3	21.7	29.3
	D	61.0	61.7	65.7	65.3	51.3
	E	13.2	12.3	11.7	11.0	17.7
Civil Status	Single	17.7	20.7	22.3	15.7	12.0
	Married	57.5	48.3	55.3	66.7	59.7
	Separated	3.0	5.0	1.0	2.7	3.3
	Widowed / Widower	7.3	8.3	7.0	5.0	9.0
	Live-in	14.5	17.7	14.3	10.0	16.0
Education	Some Elementary – HS Graduate	67.8	66.7	71.3	65.0	68.3
	Vocational	3.7	4.7	3.0	4.3	2.7
	Some College – College Graduate	28.3	28.7	25.7	30.7	28.3
Occupational Status	Regular Employee	12.7	15.7	14.3	11.0	9.7
	Contractual Employee	18.0	12.3	14.0	16.3	29.3
	Self-Employed	32.9	29.0	29.3	38.7	34.7
	Not working but currently looking for jobs	9.7	9.3	12.0	10.0	7.3
	Not working and not looking for jobs	26.8	33.7	30.3	24.0	19.0
Area Classification	Urban	70.0	100.0	80.0	43.3	56.7
	Rural	30.0	0.0	20.0	56.7	43.3
Age	Below 18 years old	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	18 to 59 years old	85.3	87.7	87.0	81.7	85.0
	60 years old and above	14.7	12.3	13.0	18.3	15.0
Household Type	Extended with non-relatives	2.8	3.0	1.7	1.7	4.7
	Extended	38.0	51.3	36.3	32.3	32.0
	Nuclear	59.3	45.7	62.0	66.0	63.3

Table 2.2. Region of the Respondents

Region	%
NCR	25.0
Region 1 (Ilocos)	2.9
Region 2 (CAR)	2.9
Region 3 (Central Luzon)	6.3
Region 4A (CALABARZON)	7.9
Region 4B (MIMAROPA)	1.7
Region 5	3.3
Region 6	5.8
Negros Island Region	5.8
Region 7	7.5
Region 8	5.8
Region 9	3.8
Region 10	5.0
Region 11	5.0
Region 12	4.6
Region 13	2.9
ARMM	3.8

Table 2.3-A. Level of Happiness

(Unit: %)

	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Reported Level of Happiness	72.3	67.6	68.7	77.0	75.7

Table 2.3-B. Social Well-being per Region

(Unit: %)

Somewhat Satisfied & Very Satisfied	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Current Life Overall	70.8	62.0	71.0	72.6	77.3
Employment & Job Stability	57.8	53.2	64.1	61.3	53.4
Current Job	62.8	60.7	70.0	63.7	58.0
Family Life	81.7	78.0	83.7	84.4	80.7
Family Finances	50.3	48.0	55.6	50.3	47.3
Marital Life	84.9	75.1	86.0	86.7	91.9
Relationships with Friends & Acquaintances	82.9	77.3	83.7	83.6	87.0
Area of Residence	78.1	73.0	81.3	79.4	78.7
Amount of Spare time	64.7	57.7	64.3	74.0	62.7
Quality of Spare time	66.4	58.3	62.7	77.0	67.3
Hobbies, social contribution	60.5	48.7	52.4	73.0	67.6
Current Personal Health	79.0	74.3	78.7	84.7	78.0

Table 2.4. Components of Social Well-Being: PCA Results for Metro Manila

Component	Name	% Variation Explained	Significant Variable	Component Loading
1	Satisfaction with Job & Finances	41.5	Satisfaction with Job	+0.896
			Satisfaction with Employment and Job Stability	+0.844
			Satisfaction with Family Finances	+0.756
2	Satisfaction with Spare Time and Hobbies	14.4	Quality of Spare Time	+0.892
			Amount of Spare Time	+0.892
			Satisfaction with Hobbies and Social Contributions	+0.607
3	Satisfaction with Family Life	10.8	Satisfaction with Family Life	+0.808
			Satisfaction with Married Life	+0.739

Table 2.5. Components of Social Well-Being: PCA Results for Luzon

Component	Name	% Variation Explained	Significant Variable	Component Loading
1	Satisfaction with Job & Finances	47.5	Satisfaction with Job	+0.879
			Satisfaction with Employment and Job Stability	+0.860
			Satisfaction with Family Finances	+0.761
2	Satisfaction with Spare Time and Hobbies	13.8	Quality of Spare Time	+0.916
			Amount of Spare Time	+0.883
			Satisfaction with Hobbies and Social Contributions	+0.768
3	Satisfaction with Relationships &Family Life	10.3	Satisfaction with Friends & Acquaintances	+0.799
			Satisfaction with Married Life	+0.770
			Satisfaction with Family Life	+0.693

Table 2.6. Components of Social Well-Being: PCA Results for Visayas

Component	Name	% Variation Explained	Significant Variable	Component Loading
1	Satisfaction with Job and Finances	41.4	Satisfaction with Job	+0.852
			Satisfaction with Employment & Job Stability	+0.835
			Satisfaction with Family Finances	+0.700
2	Satisfaction with Spare Time & Hobbies	11.8	Satisfaction with Quality of Spare Time	+0.863
			Satisfaction with Amount of Spare Time	+0.855
			Satisfaction with Hobbies	+0.621
3	Satisfaction with Relationships and Area	10.3	Satisfaction with Friends and Acquaintances	+0.763
			Satisfaction with Area of Residence	+0.763
4	Satisfaction with Family Life	9.3	Satisfaction with Married Life	+0.858
			Satisfaction with Family Life	+0.749

Table 2.7. Components of Social Well-Being: PCA Results for Mindanao

Component	Name	% Variation Explained	Significant Variable	Component Loading
1	Satisfaction with Family and Relationships	44.1	Satisfaction with Married Life	+0.723
			Satisfaction with Friends & Acquaintances	+0.701
			Satisfaction with Family Life	+0.698
2	Satisfaction with Employment & Finances	11.5	Satisfaction with Employment & Job Stability	+0.851
			Satisfaction with Job	+0.850
			Satisfaction with Family Finances	+0.791
3	Satisfaction with Spare Time & Hobbies	10.1	Satisfaction with Quality of Spare Time	+0.842
			Satisfaction with Amount of Spare Time	+0.793
			Satisfaction with Hobbies	+0.646

Table 2.8. Components of Social Well-Being: PCA Results for Philippines

Component	Name	% Variation Explained	Significant Variable	Component Loading
1	Satisfaction with Job & Finances	42.8	Satisfaction with Job	+0.881
			Satisfaction with Employment & Job Stability	+0.864
			Satisfaction with Family Finances	+0.746
2	Satisfaction with Family Life & Relationships	12.0	Satisfaction with Married Life	+0.740
			Satisfaction with Family Life	+0.717
			Satisfaction with Friends & Acquaintances	+0.698
3	Satisfaction with Spare Time& Hobbies	10.5	Satisfaction with Quality of Spare Time	+0.872
			Satisfaction with Amount of Spare Time	+0.857
			Satisfaction with Hobbies	+0.690

Table 2.9. Cantril's Ladder: Quality of Life   (Unit: %)

	Philippines	Metro Manila	Visayas	Mindanao
Thriving	52.5	44.0	48.7	53.0
Struggling	40.2	44.5	42.3	38.5
Suffering	7.1	11.5	6.0	7.5

Table 2.10. Life Circumstances over Time

A. 5 Years Ago   (Unit: %)

	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Worsen	14.7	11.6	12.4	17.7	17.0
No Change	24.4	23.0	35.0	17.0	22.7
Improved	61.0	65.4	52.7	65.3	60.3
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

B. 5 Years from Now   (Unit: %)

	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Worsen	4.5	2.9	3.0	5.7	6.0
No Change	13.7	12.3	13.3	9.0	20.0
Improved	74.0	77.1	73.3	82.6	63.0
Don't Know	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

C. Upon Reaching Old Age   (Unit: %)

	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Worsen	5.8	2.9	2.7	7.0	10.3
No Change	11.7	9.7	13.0	8.3	15.7
Improved	65.8	66.0	62.3	75.7	59.1
Don't Know	16.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 2.11. In Philippine Society, people are treated Extremely/ Somewhat Fair Based on…   (Unit: %)

Extremely and Somewhat Fair	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Gender	51.3	36.0	46.6	50.4	72.0
Age	51.4	31.0	45.6	56.0	72.7
Educational Attainment	47.4	25.9	39.9	56.1	67.4
Occupation	46.7	27.0	40.9	53.3	65.5
Income	45.3	25.3	42.4	52.0	61.4
Assets	44.1	20.0	41.0	52.4	63.1
Family	52.2	29.6	46.0	63.0	69.6
Ethnicity	54.8	29.3	49.0	68.9	71.6
Area	55.4	35.7	52.7	61.7	71.4
Region	59.7	37.7	53.7	69.7	77.9
Religion	61.2	41.4	53.4	71.0	79.0

Table 2.12. Whether Respondent has Experienced the Following…   (Unit: %)

	Philippines		Metro Manila		Luzon		Visayas		Mindanao	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Typhoons, Floods	**89.2**	**10.8**	**84.7**	**15.3**	**89.3**	**10.7**	**99.3**	**0.7**	**83.3**	**16.7**
Earthquakes, Volcanic Eruptions	57.6	42.4	48.3	51.7	50.3	49.7	73.3	26.7	58.3	41.7
Epidemic Disease	13.4	86.6	11.3	88.7	19.0	81.0	13.3	86.7	10.0	90.0
Air/ Water Pollution	23.7	76.3	22.7	77.3	20.3	79.7	31.3	68.7	20.3	79.7
Injury / Accident at work	4.8	95.2	2.7	97.3	4.0	96.0	8.7	91.3	4.0	96.0
Accident in Bus, Train, Plane	5.8	94.2	2.3	97.7	4.7	95.3	5.7	94.3	10.7	89.3
War	4.4	95.6	0.7	99.3	0.7	99.3	2.0	98.0	14.3	85.7

Table 2.13. Level of Trust   (Unit: %)

	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Most People	27.1	30.0	28.0	22.3	28.0
Family & Relatives	76.0	80.7	75.7	77.6	70.0
Friends & Acquaintances	42.0	47.7	55.3	37.0	43.3
Co-workers	42.0	46.7	58.3	39.2	39.3
Local Government & Police	28.7	22.7	26.7	30.3	35.0
Neighbors	37.6	36.3	38.3	35.0	40.7
Strangers	6.3	4.3	5.7	9.0	6.0

Table 2.14. Feelings towards Social Activities   (Unit: %)

	Philippines		Metro Manila		Luzon		Visayas		Mindanao	
Wedding Of…	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Close Family	85.6	14.4	71.0	29.0	77.0	23.0	96.7	3.3	97.7	2.3
Relatives	85.8	14.2	86.7	13.3	87.7	12.3	77.3	22.7	91.7	8.3
Friends & Acquaintances	66.1	33.9	70.7	29.3	74.0	26.0	50.3	49.7	69.3	30.7
Neighbors	41.6	58.4	38.3	61.7	52.0	48.0	33.7	66.7	42.3	57.7
Co-workers & Superiors	15.2	84.8	13.0	87.0	21.0	79.0	11.7	88.3	15.0	85.0

	Philippines		Metro Manila		Luzon		Visayas		Mindanao	
Burial Of…	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Close Family	88.3	11.7	74.0	26.0	83.7	16.3	98.0	2.0	97.3	2.3
Relatives	94.1	5.9	93.3	6.7	95.3	4.7	91.0	9.0	96.7	3.3
Friends & Acquaintances	79.2	20.8	84.7	15.3	88.7	11.3	66.3	33.7	77.0	23.0
Neighbors	62.2	37.8	56.7	43.3	76.0	24.0	58.7	41.3	57.3	42.7
Co-workers & Superiors	20.9	79.1	19.7	80.3	24.3	75.7	19.3	80.7	20.3	79.7

Table 2.15. Level of Trust with Daily Problems

(Unit: %)

Type of People	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Local Government	33.6	29.4	39.0	27.0	39.4
School, Hospital, and other Facilities	53.1	49.7	52.0	51.6	59.0
Police	43.9	38.7	40.3	51.0	45.6
Firefighting Organization	61.9	64.7	61.0	71.4	50.7
Armed Forces	50.1	45.3	45.0	55.3	54.6
Political Parties & Politicians	28.4	27.0	32.3	19.7	34.7
Neighborhood Associations	39.6	41.6	46.4	27.3	43.0
Volunteers & Civic Groups	44.1	47.7	49.3	34.3	45.0
Church & Religious Groups	67.6	68.6	66.0	58.0	77.7
Neighbors	44.1	42.3	52.4	35.4	46.4
Close Family	82.5	80.3	79.3	87.0	83.3
Relatives	81.0	83.0	81.7	78.4	81.0
Friends & Acquaintances	48.7	52.3	62.0	32.7	47.7

Table 2.16. Level of Trust during Disasters

(Unit: %)

Type of People	Philippines	Metro Manila	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao
Local Government	53.2	52.0	59.0	44.7	57.0
School, Hospital, and other Facilities	66.6	68.3	66.3	62.7	69.0
Police	51.0	46.6	48.0	55.7	53.7
Firefighting Organization	65.5	69.3	69.3	73.0	50.1
Armed Forces	54.5	48.4	49.3	59.3	60.6
Political Parties & Politicians	32.7	37.7	40.7	18.0	34.7
Neighborhood Associations	47.5	52.3	53.7	34.0	49.6
Volunteers & Civic Groups	57.4	62.0	58.3	45.0	64.0
Church & Religious Groups	72.5	77.3	71.7	57.7	83.3
Neighbors	49.1	51.4	54.7	35.4	54.7
Close Family	85.6	85.0	82.7	89.7	85.0
Relatives	84.2	87.0	83.3	80.6	85.6
Friends & Acquaintances	53.9	54.3	64.4	36.6	60.3

Table 2.17. Social Activities

A. Philippines   (Unit: %)

	Have Never Done	Have Not Done This Year	Few Times this Year	Once a Month	Once a Week
Community, Sports, Hobbies, Leisure	38.0	15.4	21.9	11.6	8.8
Community Development	37.0	14.0	23.6	13.8	7.0
Elderly Support	41.8	13.4	19.8	12.3	6.8
Childcare Support	40.9	14.8	19.3	8.1	10.9
Crime Prevention	45.0	14.1	17.7	8.3	8.0
Disaster Prevention	40.5	15.3	20.3	9.8	7.6
Neighbor Associations	39.3	14.6	21.1	12.7	6.1

B. Metro Manila   (Unit: %)

	Have Never Done	Have Not Done This Year	Few Times this Year	Once a Month	Once a Week
Community, Sports, Hobbies, Leisure	39.7	13.0	15.7	9.7	14.7
Community Development	40.7	13.0	14.0	14.0	10.0
Elderly Support	46.3	11.7	15.7	10.3	8.0
Childcare Support	40.7	13.0	12.7	9.0	10.7
Crime Prevention	45.7	14.3	7.3	8.0	9.7
Disaster Prevention	45.7	12.0	10.7	9.7	8.3
Neighbor Associations	36.7	13.3	15.3	12.7	9.3

C. Luzon   (Unit: %)

	Have Never Done	Have Not Done This Year	Few Times this Year	Once a Month	Once a Week
Community, Sports, Hobbies, Leisure	58.3	10.7	11.7	8.0	9.0
Community Development	54.7	13.3	10.7	12.0	5.7
Elderly Support	61.3	12.7	7.0	7.3	5.3
Childcare Support	62.7	12.7	9.3	4.7	5.3
Crime Prevention	64.0	13.7	6.7	5.0	3.7
Disaster Prevention	60.3	17.0	8.7	5.7	2.7
Neighbor Associations	59.3	16.0	8.3	6.7	4.7

D. Visayas   (Unit: %)

	Have Never Done	Have Not Done This Year	Few Times this Year	Once a Month	Once a Week
Community, Sports, Hobbies, Leisure	22.0	21.0	35.0	10.7	5.7
Community Development	20.0	14.7	41.3	11.3	6.7
Elderly Support	28.3	14.0	35.3	12.7	4.3
Childcare Support	27.3	20.7	32.7	7.7	9.3
Crime Prevention	29.3	13.7	35.0	10.3	6.0
Disaster Prevention	23.3	17.3	39.0	9.0	4.7
Neighbor Associations	25.7	15.7	36.7	12.3	3.7

E. Mindanao   (Unit: %)

	Have Never Done	Have Not Done This Year	Few Times this Year	Once a Month	Once a Week
Community, Sports, Hobbies, Leisure	32.0	17.0	25.3	18.0	6.0
Community Development	32.7	15.0	28.3	17.7	5.7
Elderly Support	31.3	15.3	21.0	18.7	9.7
Childcare Support	33.0	12.7	22.3	11.0	18.3
Crime Prevention	41.0	14.7	21.7	9.7	12.7
Disaster Prevention	32.7	14.7	23.0	14.7	14.7
Neighbor Associations	35.7	13.3	24.0	19.0	6.7

Appendix Table 3. Correlations of Social Well-Being Indicators with Social Factors

Table 3.1. Correlations between Social Well-Being Indicators and Social Demographics (Philippines)

	Sex	Socio-economic Class	Age	Education	Occupation	Locale
Satisfaction with Overall Life	*N.S.*	G = -0.21**	*N.S.*	G = 0.23**	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Family Finances	*N.S.*	G = -0.27**	*N.S.*	G = 0.28**	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Employment	*N.S.*	G = -0.34**	*N.S.*	G = 0.36**	G = -0.16*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Current Job	*N.S.*	G = 0.31**	*N.S.*	G = 0.35**	G = -0.19**	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Family Life	*N.S.*	G = -.23**	G = -0.21*	G = 0.26**	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Married Life	*N.S.*	G = -0.23**	G = -0.21*	G = 0.21**	*N.S.*	G = 0.18*
Satisfaction with Relationships with Friends	*N.S.*	G = -0.18**	*N.S.*	G = 0.28**	*N.S.*	G = 0.11*
Satisfaction with Area of Residence	*N.S.*	G = -0.25**	G= -0.17*	G = 0.25**	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Amount of Spare Time	*N.S.*	G = -0.17**	*N.S.*	G = 0.14*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Quality of Spare time	*N.S.*	G = -0.17**	*N.S.*	G = 0.20**	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Hobbies	*N.S.*	G = -0.19**	*N.S.*	G = 0.23**	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Personal Health	*N.S.*	G = -0.13*	G = -0.38**	G = 0.16*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*

N.S. = Not Significant; ** p < 0.001; * p < 0.01

Table 3.2. Correlations between Social Well-Being Indicators and Social Demographics (Metro Manila)

	Sex	Socio-economic Class	Age	Education	Occupation	Locale
Satisfaction with Overall Life	*N.S.*	G = -0.24*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Family Finances	*N.S.*	G = -0.26*	*N.S.*	G = 0.23*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Employment	*N.S.*	G = -0.32*	*N.S.*	G = 0.35*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Current Job	*N.S.*	G = -0.32*	*N.S.*	G = 0.32*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Family Life	*N.S.*	G = -0.24*	*N.S.*	G = 0.24*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Married Life	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Relationships with Friends	*N.S.*	G = -0.22*	*N.S.*	G = 0.44**	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Area of Residence	*N.S.*	G = -0.23*	*N.S.*	G = 0.30*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Amount of Spare Time	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Quality of Spare time	*N.S.*	G = -0.29**	*N.S.*	G = 0.26*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Hobbies	*N.S.*	G = -0.21*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*
Satisfaction with Personal Health	*N.S.*	*N.S*	G = -0.46*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*

N.S. = Not Significant; ** p < 0.001; * p < 0.01

Table 3.3. Correlations between Social Well-Being Indicators and Social Demographics (<u>Luzon</u>)

	Sex	Socio-economic Class	Age	Education	Occupation	Locale
Satisfaction with Overall Life	N.S.	G = -0.25*	N.S.	G = 0.32*	N.S.	N.S.
Satisfaction with Family Finances	N.S.	G = -0.26*	N.S.	G = 0.30*	G = -0.20*	N.S.
Satisfaction with Employment	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	G = -0.27*	N.S.
Satisfaction with Current Job	N.S.	G = -0.36*	N.S.	G = 0.50**	G =- 0.39**	N.S.
Satisfaction with Family Life	N.S.	G = -0.35*	N.S.	G = 0.38**	N.S.	N.S.
Satisfaction with Married Life	N.S.	G = -0.30*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Satisfaction with Relationships with Friends	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	G = 0.37**	N.S.	N.S.
Satisfaction with Area of Residence	N.S.	G = -0.28*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Satisfaction with Amount of Spare Time	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Satisfaction with Quality of Spare time	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Satisfaction with Hobbies	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Satisfaction with Personal Health	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	G = 0.27*	G = -0.20*	N.S.

N.S. = Not Significant; ** p < 0.001; * p < 0.01

Table 3.4. Correlations between Social Well-Being Indicators and Social Demographics [<u>Visayas</u>]

	Sex	Socio-economic Class	Age	Education	Occupation	Locale
Satisfaction with Overall Life	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S	N.S
Satisfaction with Family Finances	N.S.	G = -0.30**	N.S.	G = 0.33**	N.S	N.S
Satisfaction with Employment	N.S.	G = -0.37**	N.S.	G = 0.43**	G = -0.25*	N.S
Satisfaction with Current Job	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	G = 0.30*	N.S.	N.S
Satisfaction with Family Life	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S	N.S
Satisfaction with Married Life	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S	N.S
Satisfaction with Relationships with Friends	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S	N.S.	N.S
Satisfaction with Area of Residence	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S
Satisfaction with Amount of Spare Time	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S	N.S
Satisfaction with Quality of Spare time	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S
Satisfaction with Hobbies	N.S.	G = -0.33**	N.S.	G = 0.27*	N.S.	N.S
Satisfaction with Personal Health	N.S.	N.S.	G= -0.34*	N.S.	N.S	N.S

N.S. = Not Significant; ** p < 0.001; * p < 0.01

Table 3.5. Correlations between Social Well-Being Indicators and Social Demographics (<u>Mindanao</u>)

	Sex	Socio-economic Class	Age	Education	Occupation	Locale
Satisfaction with Overall Life	*N.S.*	G = -0.28**	*N.S.*	G = 0.29*	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Family Finances	*N.S.*	G = -0.28**	*N.S.*	G = 0.28*	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Employment	*N.S.*	G = -0.36**	*N.S.*	G = 0.40**	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Current Job	*N.S.*	G = -0.35**	*N.S.*	G = 0.37**	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Family Life	*N.S.*	G = -0.23*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Married Life	*N.S.*	G = -0.38**	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Relationships with Friends	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S*	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Area of Residence	*N.S.*	G = -0.34**	*N.S.*	G = 0.30*	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Amount of Spare Time	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Quality of Spare time	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Hobbies	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	*N.S*	*N.S*
Satisfaction with Personal Health	*N.S.*	*N.S.*	G = -0.48**	*N.S.*	*N.S*	*N.S*

N.S. = Not Significant; ** p < 0.001; * p < 0.01

Notes
1. This survey followed the ABCD income class stratification being used by Social Weather Station (SWS). This scheme has been validated by the National Census and Statistics Office (NSO).For elaboration, please see Appendix Table 1.

References
Cutter, Susan L., Alik Ismail-Zadeh, Irasema Alcántara-Ayala, Orhan Altan, Daniel N. Baker, Salvano Briceño, Harsh Gupta, Ailsa Holloway, David Johnston, Gordon A. McBean, Yujiro Ogawa, Douglas Paton, Emma Porio, Rainer K. Silbereisen, Kuniyoshi Takeuchi, Giovanni B. Valsecchi, Coleen Vogel, and Guoxiong Wu. 2015. "Global Risks: Pool knowledge to Stem Losses from Disasters." *Nature* 522 (7556): 277-279.

Cutter, Susan L., Irasema Alcántara-Ayala, Orhan Altan, Daniel Baker, Sálvano Briceño, Harsh Gupta, Ailsa Holloway, Alik Ismail-Zadeh, Virginia Jiménez Díaz, David Johnston, Gordon McBean, Yujiro Ogawa, Douglas Paton, Emma Porio, Rainer Silbereisen, Kuniyoshi Takeuchi, Giovanni Valsecchi, Coleen Vogel, Guoxiong Wu, and Panmao Zhai. 2015. *Disaster Risks Research to Promote Disaster Risk Reduction and Management*. Paris: International Science Council (ICSU) and International Social Science Council (ISSC).

Dator-Bercilla, Jessica, Emma Porio, and Antonia Yulo-Loyzaga. 2017. "The Journey towards Integrated Risk Assessment: The Case of the Philippines. *UNISDR Newsletter, pp1-2.*

Harada, Hiroo. 2016. "Happiness in Japan: From the Point of View of Age, Sex and Relative Wealthiness." *The Senshu Social Well Being Review* 3:37-58.

Holden, William, Kathleen M. Nadeau, and Emma Porio. 2017. *Ecological liberation theology: Faith-based approaches to poverty and climate change in the Philippines*. New York: Springer.

Kanai, Masayuki. 2016. "Perception of Inequality and Social Well-being." Paper Presented in the 24th World Congress of Political Science, July 23-28, Poznan, Poland.

Koo,Hearan, Jaeyeol Yee, Eun Young Nam, and Ee Sun Kim. 2016. "Dimensions of Social Well-Being and Determinants of in Korea." *The Senshu Social Well Being Review* 3:37-58.

Lin, Nan. 2001. *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and*

Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Porio, Emma. 2009. "Policy Driven Knowledge Production, Audit Culture and Power: Transforming Sociological Practices." *ISA-e bulletin* 13:82-97.

Porio, Emma. 2011. "Vulnerability, Adaptation and Resilience to Climate-Related Effects Among Marginal, Riverine Communities in Metro Manila." *Asian Journal of Social Science* 39: 425–45.

Porio, Emma. 2014a. "Climate Change Vulnerability and Adaptation in Metro Manila: Challenging Governance and Human Security Needs of Urban Poor Communities." *Asian Journal of Social Science* 42:75-102.

Porio, Emma. 2014b. "Climate Change Adaptation in Metro Manila: Community Risk Assessment and Power in Community Interventions." Pp.149-166 in *Community Interventions*, edited by J. Fritz and J. Rheume. Netherland: Springer Publications.

Porio, Emma. 2015. "Sustainable Development Goals and Quality of Life targets: Insights from Metro Manila." *Current Sociology* 63(2):244-60.

Porio, Emma, Justin C. See, and Antonia Yulo-Loyzaga. 2016. *Survey of social Capital and Trust Networks in Post-Yolanda Eastern Samar*. Manila Observatory and Zuellig Foundation.

Porio, Emma. 2016a. Asian Prosperity and Social Inequality: Reflections on Social-Ecological Transitions and Governance of Cities. Pp. 177-97 in *Global-Regional Systems: Alternative Futures for Democracy and Cities in Asia*, edited by Chantana Banpasirichote Wungaeo, Boike Reihben, Surichai Wungaeo. Berlin: Palgrave Publications.

Porio, Emma. 2016b. Citizen Participation and Decentralization in the Philippines Pp. 31-50 in *Citizenship, Democracy and Governance in Southeast Asia*, edited by Ward Berenschot H.G.C.(Henk) Schulte Nordholt and Laurens Bakker. Leiden: Brill.

Porio, Emma. 2017. "Risk Governance in Metro Manila: Resilience for Whom? " Paper presented in the Conference on "Resilient Cities and Human Flourishing: Governing the Asia-Pacific Transition in the Anthropocene", March 2-3, Asian Research Institute, National University of Singapore.

See, Justin C., and Emma Porio. 2015. "Assessing social vulnerability to flooding in Metro Manila using Principal Component Analysis." *Philippine Sociological Review* 63: 53-80.

Yee, Jaeyeol, Hyun-Chin Lim, Eun Young Nam, Do-Kyun Kim, and Ee Sun Kim. 2016. "Survey Design and Descriptive Outcomes of Korean Survey." *The Senshu Social Well Being Review* 3:59-74.

Dr. Emma Porio, Professor of Sociology at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila University and Climate Science Research Fellow at the Manila Observatory.

Justin See, Lecturer at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila and currently pursuing his Ph. D. (Sociology) at La Trobe University (Melbourne,Australia)