

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX AS AN INDICATOR OF STANDARD OF LIVING IN SOUTHEAST ASIAN COUNTRIES*

*Thirunaukarasu Subramaniam
Mohammad Raduan Mohd. Ariff*

INTRODUCTION

In the past, a single measure that was widely used to compare standard of living between countries is a country's per capita GDP (Gross Domestic Product). Due to many limitations of this particular measure as a measure of standard living, a new measure namely Human Development Index (HDI) which was devised by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) can be used to measure standard of living between countries.

HDI which was coined by UNDP in 1990 has become a standard measure of development in this world. UNDP in its Human Development Report 1990 defined human development as 'a process of enlarging people's choices with the most critical ones are to lead a long and healthy life, to be educated and to enjoy a decent standard of living' (Human Development Report, 1990). The HDI is a composite index of four variables: life expectancy at birth; adult literacy rate; an aggregate primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio; and a transformation of per capita GDP in US dollar purchasing power parity (PPP) terms (Cahill, 2002). Longevity and knowledge refer to the formation of human capabilities, and income is a proxy measure for the choices people have in putting their capabilities to use (Human Development Report, 1990).

The HDI attempts to rank all countries on a scale of 0 (lowest human development) to 1 (highest human development) based on three goals or end products of development: longevity as measured by life expectancy at birth, knowledge as measured by a weighted average of adult literacy (two-thirds) and mean years of schooling (one-third), and standard of living as measured by real per capita income adjusted for the differing purchasing power parity) of each country's currency to reflect cost of living and for the assumption of diminishing marginal utility of income (Todaro and Smith, 2002). Using these three measures of development and applying a formula to data for 175 countries, the HDI ranks all countries into three groups: low human development (0.0 to 0.499), medium human development (0.50 to 0.799), and high human development (0.80 to 1.0) (Todaro and Smith, 2002).

The objective of this paper is twofold. Firstly, it intends to analyse the trend in human development indices in Southeast Asian countries namely Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Singapore, Myanmar, Brunei, Cambodia, Laos PDR

and Viet Nam. Secondly, it intends to analyse if recent economic crisis has brought any adverse impact on the standard of living in Southeast Asian countries.

MEASUREMENT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX

Three distinct aspects of human development which is covered in HDI namely life expectancy index, income index and education index can be constructed as a composite index. The three indices (Philipson and Soares, 2001) are constructed for each country i , according to the following formulas:

$$\text{Life expectancy index}_i = (\text{Life exp}_i - \text{Life exp}_{\min}) / (\text{Life exp}_{\max} - \text{Life exp}_{\min})$$

$$\text{Income index}_i = [\ln(\text{income}_i) - \ln(\text{income}_{\min})] / \{\ln(\text{income}_{\max}) - \ln(\text{income}_{\min})\}$$

$$\text{Education index}_i = (2/3) * (\text{Adult lit}_i - \text{Adult lit}_{\min}) / (\text{Adult lit}_{\max} - \text{Adult lit}_{\min}) +$$

$$(1/3) * (\text{Enrollment}_i - \text{Enrollment}_{\min}) / (\text{Enrollment}_{\max} - \text{Enrollment}_{\min})$$

$$\text{HDI}_i = (\text{Life expectancy index}_i + \text{Income index}_i + \text{Education index}_i) / 3$$

To combine the variables together to form one index, the first three variables are transformed to index values between zero and one, where zero represents the theoretical maximum value possible (Cahill, 2002). The GDP statistic is transformed by taking the natural logarithm in order to force diminishing returns to GDP, and then scaled to the zero-one range (Cahill, 2002). Life expectancy index is obtained through life expectancy at birth which is a measure for longevity. Income index is obtained through adjusted per capita income in PPP\$ which measures decent standard of living. Education index uses adult literacy rate and combined enrolment ratio which measure the knowledge aspect of human development.

The following example shows how HDI is measured. Assume in year 2001, the data for Malaysia are as follows:

If,

Life expectancy at birth(years)= 72.8

Adult literacy rate(% age 15 and above)= 87.9

Combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio(%)= 72

GDP per capita (PPP US\$) = 8750

So,

Income index = $[\log(8750) - \log(100)] / [\log(40000) - \log(100)] = 0.75$

Life expectancy index = $[72.8 - 25] / [85 - 25] = 0.80$

Adult literacy index = $[87.9 - 0] / [100 - 0] = 0.879$

Gross enrolment index = $[72 - 0] / [100 - 0] = 0.72$

Education index = $2/3(\text{Adult literacy index}) + 1/3(\text{gross enrolment index})$

$$= 2/3(0.879) + 1/3(0.72)$$

$$= 0.83$$

Thus,

$$\text{HDI} = 1/3(\text{income index}) + 1/3(\text{life expectancy index}) + 1/3(\text{education index})$$

$$= 1/3(0.75) + 1/3(0.80) + 1/3(0.83)$$

$$= 0.790$$

LIFE EXPECTANCY INDEX

Table 1 shows the life expectancy index for Southeast Asian countries from 1997 to 2002. It is evident from table 1 that all Southeast Asian countries displayed an increase in the life expectancy except Myanmar which showed a decline in life expectancy in 1999. Singapore has the highest life expectancy index in Southeast Asia which was 0.88 in 2002 and life expectancy at birth was 77.8 years in 2002. Lao PDR has the lowest life expectancy index which is only 0.49 (2002). The life expectancy at birth for Lao PDR is only 54.3 years in 2002. Based on the data we can say that the life expectancy for Southeast Asian countries is improving because of the availability of better health care facilities and better access to health care.

Table 1: Life expectancy index for Southeast Asian countries, 1997-2002

| Country | Year | | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| Singapore | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Brunei DS | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |
| Malaysia | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| Thailand | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.73 | 0.74 |
| Philippines | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.75 |
| Indonesia | 0.67 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 |
| Viet Nam | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Myanmar | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 0.54 |
| Cambodia | 0.47 | 0.48 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.54 |
| Lao PDR | 0.47 | 0.48 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.48 | 0.49 |

Source: Human Development Report, various years

Improvement in life expectancy indicates that the standard of living is improving in Southeast Asian countries. Better access to health represents an investment in human capital as this will enable one to increase productivity and thus generating a higher income. A higher income received generally will reflect an improvement in the standard of living.

GDP INDEX

GDP Index comprise of per capita GDP. Table 2 shows the GDP index for Southeast Asian countries. Almost all of the Southeast Asian countries displayed an increase in GDP index. Singapore recorded a decline in GDP index in 1998 (0.92) and in 1999 (0.89) from 0.94 (1997). This decline is attributable to the economic

downturn which has effected Singapore badly. Myanmar also recorded a decline in GDP index from 0.41 in 1997 and 1998 to 0.39 in 1999, 2000 and 2001. Despite the economic downturn which badly hit many SEA countries, Malaysia was somewhat able to improve its GDP index from 0.73 in 1997 and 1998 to 0.75 in 2000 and 2001. Indonesia also recorded a decline in GDP index from 0.59 (1997) to 0.55 (1998). GDP per capita for Indonesia declined from US\$3490 (1997) to US\$2651 (1998). Even though, Indonesia had a higher GDP per capita compared to Viet Nam in 2001, Viet Nam had done much more in translating that income into human development. This is evident from higher HDI for Viet Nam compared to Indonesia in 2001.

Table 2: GDP Index for Southeast Asian countries, 1997-2002

| Country | Year | | | | | |
|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| Singapore | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.89 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.92 |
| Brunei DS | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Malaysia | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Thailand | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.71 |
| Philippines | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.62 |
| Indonesia | 0.59 | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.57 | 0.56 | 0.58 |
| Viet Nam | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 0.52 |
| Myanmar | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Cambodia | 0.43 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.50 |
| Lao PDR | 0.43 | 0.48 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.47 |

Source: Human Development Report, various years

Higher income no doubt is the major indicator of improvement in standard of living. Even though the GDP index is increasing for many Southeast Asian countries, there is a vast difference in their standard of living. Countries such as Singapore, Brunei and Malaysia has a higher standard of living which is indicated by their GDP index which is 0.75 and above. The transitional economies such as Viet Nam, Myanmar, Cambodia and Lao PDR has a GDP index of 0.52 and lesser which shows that the standard of living in these countries are much lower.

EDUCATION INDEX

Table 3 shows the education index for Southeast Asian countries. This index comprises two aspects of education namely adult literacy rate (% age 15 and above) and also combined primary, secondary, tertiary gross enrolment ratio (%). Almost all of the Southeast Asian countries displayed an increase in education index. In 2001, Philippines had the highest education index in Southeast Asia. This has since 1997 been fluctuating between 0.90 and 0.91. In 2001, there is a slight decline in education index for Thailand, Philippines and Viet Nam. Education index is the lowest for Lao PDR which was only 0.50 (1998) and later improved to 0.64 in 2002.

Table 3: Education Index for Southeast Asian countries, 1997-2002

| Country | Year | | | | | |
|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| Singapore | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.91 |
| Brunei DS | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.87 |
| Malaysia | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Thailand | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.86 |
| Philippines | 0.90 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.89 |
| Indonesia | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| Viet Nam | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.83 | 0.82 |
| Myanmar | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.72 | 0.73 |
| Cambodia | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.66 |
| Lao PDR | 0.57 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.63 | 0.64 |

Source: Human Development Report, various years

Most of the Southeast Asian countries give great importance to investment in human capital which is being translated into an increasing education index especially in countries such as Singapore, Brunei, Malaysia, Thailand, Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam which hit the 0.80 mark. The Human Development Report(1996) stated that:

“The human capital models show how education allows the whole education process to benefit from “positive externalities”. Educated people use capital more efficiently, so it becomes more productive. They are also more likely to innovate - to devise new and better forms of production. Moreover, they spread the benefits to their co-workers, who learn from them and also become more productive. Thus, the rising level of education causes a rise in the efficiency of all factors of production”.

Increasing education index in Southeast Asian countries also proves that there is an improvement in standard of living in these countries. Human Capital Theory suggests that higher educational attainment is associated with higher income. Thus, this will enable one to have a better standard of living.

HDI FOR SOUTHEAST ASIAN COUNTRIES DURING THE 1997-ASIAN ECONOMIC CRISIS

Table 4 below shows the HDI for Southeast Asian countries in 1995 and 1997 to 2001. In 1995 and 1997, Singapore and Brunei were the only two Southeast Asian countries that fell under the high human development category. Lao PDR was the only Southeast Asian country that fell under the low level of human development category in 1995 and 1997. Other Southeast Asian countries fell under the medium level of human development category during this period. In 1998, a similar pattern can be observed. Only Singapore and Brunei Darussalam are classified as high

human development countries. Lao PDR still falls under the low human development countries category. All the Southeast Asian countries saw a decline in their HDI as one of the components in the HDI, that is the GDP declined during this period due to the economic recession which badly affected many Southeast Asian countries. This trend continued up to 2000. In 2001, Lao PDR managed to pull itself into the medium human development category.

Table 4: HDI for Southeast Asian Countries from 1997-2001

| Countries | Year | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1995 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| Singapore | 0.856 | 0.888 | 0.881 | 0.876 | 0.885 | 0.884 | 0.902 |
| Brunei DS | na | 0.878 | 0.848 | 0.857 | 0.856 | 0.872 | 0.867 |
| Malaysia | 0.759 | 0.768 | 0.772 | 0.774 | 0.782 | 0.790 | 0.793 |
| Thailand | 0.739 | 0.753 | 0.745 | 0.757 | 0.762 | 0.768 | 0.768 |
| Philippines | 0.731 | 0.740 | 0.744 | 0.749 | 0.754 | 0.751 | 0.753 |
| Viet Nam | 0.646 | 0.664 | 0.671 | 0.682 | 0.688 | 0.688 | 0.691 |
| Indonesia | 0.659 | 0.681 | 0.670 | 0.677 | 0.684 | 0.682 | 0.692 |
| Myanmar | na | 0.580 | 0.585 | 0.551 | 0.552 | 0.549 | 0.551 |
| Cambodia | 0.543 | 0.514 | 0.512 | 0.541 | 0.543 | 0.556 | 0.568 |
| Lao PDR | 0.485 | 0.491 | 0.484 | 0.476 | 0.485 | 0.525 | 0.534 |

na = not available

Source: Human Development Report, various years

Singapore has experienced a decline in its HDI from a record high of 0.888 in 1997 to 0.884 in 2001. Before the economic crisis, HDI for Singapore was 0.857 (1995). This shows that the economic crisis had a negative effect on Singapore. Generally speaking, the economic crisis has reduced the standard of living in Singapore. The same goes for Brunei Darussalam where in 1997 the HDI was 0.878. In 1998, the HDI for Brunei Darussalam dropped tremendously to 0.847. Thailand also experienced a decline in its HDI from 0.753 in 1997 to 0.745 in 1998. Malaysia is the only country in Southeast Asian that has been having a steady growth in her HDI from 0.76 (in 1995) to 0.790 (in 2001). Indonesia also experienced a decline in her HDI from 0.681(1997) to 0.670(1998). HDI for Indonesia declined again from 0.684(2000) to 0.682(2001).

Singapore and Brunei Darussalam are the only two countries in Southeast Asia that have been in the high human development category for the past 6 years. In the near future, Malaysia will be able to push itself into the high human development category. This is evident from the value of HDI in Malaysia which is approaching the high human development category. In 2002, the HDI for Malaysia was 0.793. This is attributable to the many efforts of the Malaysian government to improve the three key aspects of human development. It is not impossible for Malaysia to move into the high human development category in a few years time.

From 1995 to 2001, Myanmar has been displaying a decline in its human development when the HDI fell from 0.585 (1998) to 0.551 (1999). Lao PDR which has always been in the low human development category managed to pull itself into the medium human development category in 2001 with a HDI value of 0.525. With the movement of Lao PDR into medium human development category, all the Southeast Asian countries now falls under the category of high and medium human development category.

CHANGE IN HDI FOR SOUTHEAST ASIAN COUNTRIES FROM 1975-2000

Table 5 shows the development of HDI for Southeast Asian countries from 1975-2000. From the table it is obvious that Singapore has made a significant progress in HDI when it moved from medium human development to high human development in 1990 (0.818). Malaysia had also made a tremendous progress during this period. The HDI for Malaysia had increased from 0.616 (1975) to 0.782 (2000). Viet Nam had also made significant progress from a HDI of 0.583 (1985) to 0.688 (2000). This is attributable to the Doi Moi policy of Viet Nam. Indonesia was also able to move from low human development in 1975 (0.469) to medium human development in 1980 (0.530). Only Lao PDR remained in the low human development category in 2000 compared to other Southeast Asian countries. But in 2001, Lao PDR also managed to pull itself up into the medium human development category.

Table 5 : HDI for Southeast Asian Countries from 1975-2000

| Countries | Year | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 |
| Singapore | 0.722 | 0.755 | 0.782 | 0.818 | 0.857 | 0.885 |
| Brunei DS | na | na | na | na | na | 0.856 |
| Malaysia | 0.616 | 0.659 | 0.693 | 0.722 | 0.760 | 0.782 |
| Thailand | 0.604 | 0.645 | 0.676 | 0.713 | 0.749 | 0.762 |
| Philippines | 0.652 | 0.684 | 0.688 | 0.716 | 0.733 | 0.754 |
| Viet Nam | na | na | 0.583 | 0.605 | 0.649 | 0.688 |
| Indonesia | 0.469 | 0.530 | 0.582 | 0.623 | 0.664 | 0.684 |
| Myanmar | na | na | na | na | na | 0.552 |
| Cambodia | na | na | na | 0.501 | 0.531 | 0.543 |
| Lao PDR | na | na | 0.374 | 0.404 | 0.445 | 0.485 |

na = not available

Source: Human Development Report, various years

CONCLUSION

The recent economic crisis has actually reduced the standard of living in most of the Southeast Asian countries. Singapore has experienced a decline in its HDI from a record high of 0.888 in 1997 to 0.884 in 2001. Before the economic crisis HDI for Singapore was 0.857 (1995). This shows that the economic crisis has brought nega-

tive effect on Singapore. Generally speaking, the economic crisis has reduced the standard of living in Singapore. The same goes for Brunei Darussalam where in 1997 the HDI was 0.878. In 1998, the HDI for Brunei Darussalam dropped tremendously to 0.847. Thailand experienced a decline in its HDI from 0.753 in 1997 to 0.745 in 1998. Indonesia also experienced a decline in its HDI from 0.681(1997) to 0.670(1998). Thailand and Indonesia especially saw a decline in their standard of living as unemployment and inflation increased after the economic crisis. As HDI measures only the average national achievement and not how well it is distributed in a country, disaggregating a country's HDI by region and population group can spotlight stark disparities between rural and urban areas and among regions and ethnic and income groups (Human Development Report, 2001). Disaggregating a country's HDI by region and population group can better reflect the standard of living in Southeast Asian countries.

ENDNOTE

* This paper was presented in Seminar Kebangsaan Sains, Teknologi dan Sosial held at Vistana Hotel, Kuantan, Pahang Darul Makmur from 31st of May to 1st of June 2004

REFERENCES

Anand, S., and Martin, Ravillion (1993), "Human Development on poor countries: on the role of private income and public services", *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 7 (1, Winter), pp. 133-150.

Cahill, M.B. (2002), "Diminishing Returns to GDP and the Human Development Index", *Applied Economics Letters*, 9, pp. 885-887

Chakravarty, S.R. (2003), "A Generalized Human Development Index", *Review of Development Economics*, 7(1), pp. 99-114.

Dowrick, S., Dunlop, Y and John Quiggin (2003), "Social indicators and comparisons of Living Standard", *Journal of Development Economics*, 70, pp. 501-529.

Gibson, John (2001), "Literacy and Intrahousehold Externalities". *World Development*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 155-166

Hicks, D. A. (1997), "The Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index: a Constructive Proposal", *World Development*, Vol. 25, No. 8, pp. 1283-1298.

Human Development Report, UNDP, various years.

Islam, Sadequl (1995), "The human development index and per capita GDP", *Applied Economics Letters*, 2, pp. 166-167

Foster, J.E., Lopez-Calva, L.F and Miguel Szekely (2003), "Measuring the Distribution of

Human Development: Methodology and an Application to Mexico”, unpublished paper.

Kleczkowski, Jacek (2001), “Disaggregated Human Development Index for New York Counties: Direct Comparison of Development Among Whites and African Americans”, unpublished paper.

Luchters, G and Lukas Menkhoff (1996), “Human Development as Statistical Artifact”, *World Development*, Vol. 24, No.8, pp. 1385-1392.

Majumder, A, and Satya R. Chakravarty (1996), “Achievement and improvement in living standards”, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 50, pp. 189-195.

Mazumdar, K. (2002), “A note on cross-country divergence in standard of living”, *Applied Economics Letters*, 9, pp. 87-90.

Noorbakhsh, F. (1998), “A Modified Human Development Index”, *World Development*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 517-528

Paul, S. (1996), “A modified human development index and international comparison”, *Applied Economic Letters*, 3, pp. 677-682.

Philipson, T and Rodrigo, Soares (2001), “Human Capital, Longevity and Economic Growth: A Quantitative Assessment of Full Income Measures”. Unpublished paper.

Ravallion, M. (1997), “Good and Bad Growth: The Human Development Reports”, *World Development*, Vol. 25, No.5, pp. 631-638.

Sen, Amartya (1998), “Mortality as an Indicator of Economic Success and Failure”, *The Economic Journal*, 108(January), pp. 1-25.

Sen, Amartya (2000), “A Decade of Human Development”, *Journal of Human Development*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 17-23.

Srinivasan, T.N. (1994) “Human development: a New Paradigm or Reinvention of the Wheel?”, *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings* Vol. 84, No.2, May, pp. 238-243.

Streeten Paul (1994), “Human development: Means and Ends”, *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings* Vol. 84, No. 2, May, pp. 232-237.

Todaro, M.P and Stephen C. Smith (2002), *Economic Development*, 8th. Ed. Singapore: Pearson- Addison Wesley.

_____, “Years of plenty?”, *Economist*, 00130613, 7/12/2003, Vol. 368, Issue 8332.

_____, “Nation Consolidates Position on Human Development Index”, *The Vietnam Investment Review*, July 29, 2002.

_____, "Malaysia up a notch in UN Human Development Report", *New Straits Times*, August 01, 2003.

_____, "Malaysia fares well in UN Report", *New Straits Times*, August 02, 2002.