

The Impacts of Social Capital and Some Demographic Variables on Life Satisfaction: Antalya Case

Faik Ardahan

*Akdeniz University, School of Physical Education and Sport Recreation Department,
07058 Antalya, Turkey
Telephone: +90 505 4562112, Fax: +90 242 2271116
E-mail: ardahan@akdeniz.edu.tr*

KEYWORDS Social Interaction. Well Being. Happiness. Life Satisfaction. Ancova Models

ABSTRACT The purpose of the present study is to examine the impacts of Social Capital (SC) and some demographic indicators on Life Satisfaction (LS) by using two different linear regression models. The sampling group consists of 410 persons. In the questionnaire form, SC, Achievement Perception, LS Scales and demographics variables were used to gather data. As a result of the study, there are strong positive relation between SC and LS. Especially, the sub factors "Neighbor", "Being the property of somewhere", "Trust to other" and "The safety level of residence" have positive effect on LS in both regression models. It was found that when individuals get older or if they are unemployed, or single, or live with their families LS level of them decreases. In contrast, being female, having satisfied neighbor relations, higher safety level of residence, higher income, possessing any property of somewhere, and trusting to others increase LS level.

INTRODUCTION

The meaning and constitutes of "good life" for individuals and for society are the main concept for researchers since the last decades. The idea of well-being (WB) and life satisfaction (LS) comes from Aristotle and beyond. The WB concept is used to refer to being happy, healthy, prosperous, enough income, having satisfied relation (Amanda et al. 2011). On the other hand, LS, is an important measure which gives how an individual has good life, happiness or subjective WB, and which involve fulfillment level of goals, needs and aspiration to adequate living standard (Sirgy and Cornwell 2002). In addition to this, LS defined as, (a) "global judgment (which is individualistic and based on individual's self imposed standards) of an individual's life" (Diener 1984; Diener et al. 1985; Pavot and Diener 1993), (b) "individual's emotional acts or general attitude towards life" (Sung-Mook and Gianakopoulos 1994), (c) "pleasure which is generally taken/seen" Telman and Unsal (2004) and

(d) "judgments related quality of life or/and subjective prosperity of an individual" Dikmen (1995).

White (2009) listed the factors which has affect on individual's subjective well-being in three categories like a pyramid. First; "the material dimension" that reflects welfare and standards' living of an individual like income, assets, wealth, livelihood activities, having home and etc., second; "the social dimension" refers to the social relations and access level of public good, and third; "the human dimension" refers to capabilities, relationships with others, and attitude to life. Some researchers divide WB in two main parts. First is economic WB which was related the things bought by money and which has economic value such as house, flat, car, holiday, hospital, insurance and so on. The second is psychological (or subjective) WB which cannot be bought or created by money (Gundelach and Kreiner 2004). The second group factors can be thought as social relations. These two groups of factors effects WB and LS together; not only one, but the psychological factors usually have major affect on well-being. As Campbell et al. (1976) pointed out, Americans believed that economic growth did not bring them psychological WB and many social problems come out in spite of the improved welfare. Many other researchers as Lane (2000), Frey and Stutzer (2002) concluded that WB and economic valued factors were to be vulnerably related. In addition to this, many researchers studied the terms happiness

Address for Correspondence:
Dr. Faik Ardahan
Akdeniz University
School of Physical Education and Sport
Recreation Department
07058 Antalya, Turkey
Telephone: +90 505 4562112
Fax: +90 242 2271116
E-mail: ardahan@akdeniz.edu.tr

and satisfaction and they accept these two concepts have different identity but have strong correlations. They believed that satisfaction is a cognitive and/or judgmental results or happiness, experience is feeling derived from experienced things (Campbell et al. 1976; Mastekaasa and Moum 1984; Veenhoven 1991; Inglehart and Klingemann 2000; Lane 2000). Satisfaction includes both state and trial time, but happiness is usually state time. Furthermore; Ventegodt et al. (2003) defines satisfaction as a main component of happiness. In addition to White's list, many other researchers accept LS and subjective WB as a dependent variable which affected by internal and external many factors which the sequence and impacts can change from person to person, time to time.

LS is the main subject of many researchers. It can be accepted as a result and it affects many things in individuals/societies/organizations life. Each of them tries to explain major factors which affect LS and factors affected by LS. Some researchers who studied LS intensively can be ordered as given below:

Amanda et al. (2011), Ang et al. (2014), Diener (1984), Diener et al. (1985), Fugl-Meyer et al. (2002) Hou (2014), Pavot and Diener (1993), Rodriguez-Pose and Berlepsch (2014), Schmitter et al. (2003), Telman and Unsal (2004) studied the factors affecting LS like getting pleasure from daily life, harmony in reaching goals, finding life meaningful, economic security, having a child and close friends, having a flat/house and car, quality of life, having satisfying job and/or being employed, adequate income level, being harmony with age, and having occupation. They concluded the relation between LS and demographics variables. In addition these factors, Ardahan (2012, 2013), Ardahan and Mert (2012), Helliwell and Putnam (2004), Newman et al. (2014), Oh et al. (2014), and Ngai (2005) reported that having positive social relations, confidence in physical health, having mental and physical wellness, having hobbies and participating in recreational activities, being representative of social context, helping others, being volunteer, experienced achievement in school/work/social relation, participation in the local community, feelings of trust and safety, and being the property of somewhere increase LS. Further, Augusto et al. (2006), Palmer et al. (2002) studied relation between emotional intelligence and LS. They concluded that high emotional intelligence level has positive effect on LS. Faillant et al. (2011), Sung-Mook and Giannakopoulos (1994) con-

cluded that personality has positive impact on LS. Bruce et al. (1976), Poulsen et al. (2011) suggested that having satisfied marriage or a partnership and relation with friends, neighbor, family and relatives increase LS. Ateca-Amestoy et al. (2014) studied relation between social interaction and LS and found that satisfied social interaction increases LS increases, too.

While many researchers support measuring the WB/LS of person, some economists were eschewed that direct measuring of LS or WB will bring problems which have some objectiveness of subjective evaluations of WB/LS. They concluded that measuring subjective objects increases subjectivity affected by many factors which are uncontrolled or difficult to control like personalities, experienced life (Helliwell 2003; Kahneman et al. 2004). For example, when a boss asked to a worker "How do you do?" the answer can be "I feel well", "I'm ok", or "I'm happy", but when a close friend asked to the same person the same question, the answer could be different. Besides, the economists conclude that this kind of measurements do not reflect reality all-time. Xing (2008) concluded this by using "utility" of experience which is output of person's behaviors and the impact on her/his feelings. He defined this as "experienced utility" or "remembered utility" by using backward-looking evaluations and forward-looking decisions.

Like WB, Social Capital (SC) does not have universal definition, either. While Coleman (1988) accepted SC as a resource of everyone social relation depends on shared and trusted values, Putnam (1993) defined SC as a feature of social life of communities which includes networks, trust and norms affected by the efficiency of social relations and coordinated actions as basis of WB and social integration. Onyx and Bullen (2000) defined SC as "basic row material of society", many other researchers have common consensus on the networks and civic norms which explain reciprocity, sociability, trust, social support, and social networks and community and civic engagement (Chiu Llorente 2010). Jack and Jordan (1999) accepted SC as public good, but some others like, Halpern (2005), they consider SC as personal assets not as public good. Helliwell and Putnam (2004) concluded that "virtual communities" in social media can be accepted as a part of individual's SC. Many researchers tried to explain SC from different point of view, from individual, a household, or a community perspective. While Bourdieu's analysis focused on individual and/or small groups

as micro level, Coleman's analysis included community level and Portes focus on macro level (Portes 2000; Halpern 2005). An individual is usually born as the baby of a family with intensive social relation, then grow up with his/her own environment (society), and create his/her life with the quality of this relations. These relations can be thought as the engine of a motor which carries the baby to younger age and following years. After adolescent period, this young person shoulders his/her own responsibility and creates a new world for him/her. All these continue to be an adult. Many researchers in their LS analysis focus on the individual's window rather than society. They concluded that the link and the relation between individual and his/her society are important (Ackerman et al. 1997). The amount and the quality of this reciprocal relationship effect persons WB and LS. Urbanizing or/and globalization brings and carries many bridge opportunities to individuals and the society. Sometimes this bridge has intensifier effect on this relation as leisure opportunities, sometimes weak as family togetherness and sometimes opposite effect as the fear of unfamiliar and weak tolerance for diversity (Vemuri et al. 2011).

In previous research in cross-country and cross-level comparison, there are many studies which interrogated the relation between LS and demographic factors as age, gender, education level, marital status, occupation and socio-economic factors (SE) as income, workplace, residence, living with whom (Diener 1984; Chiu Llorente 2010; Ang et al. 2014; Hou 2014). Many researchers recognized that the variables and dimensions of SE and SC not only cope with the framework of LS, but also have been proven to be effective in empirical means (Xing 2008) and in many of these studies, SC was studied for conceptualizing and operationalizing in structural and cognitive dimensions which are selected associated with LS (Knack and Keefer 1997). Helliwell (2003) reported that there was a link between LS and SC. After this report, Helliwell and Putnam (2004) concluded that SC strongly affect LS and individuals subjective WB and happiness in individual level of SC by the indicators as religious, trust and safety, membership, governance, community involvement, neighborhood, being the property of somewhere, the strength of family, and communities. Helliwell (2004) concluded that SC has affect on individual's, families', organization's and society's LS. SC has an effect on individual's LS to increase wellness and decrease suicide, on fam-

ily's LS level to decrease divorce rate, organization's LS to increase job satisfaction and society's LS to create trusted society. Helliwell et al. (2009) found that big percentage of subjective WB can be affected by social context. Ram (2010) reported a fragile connection between SC and happiness. Chiu Llorente (2010) examined children dimension of SC and LS relation. She found that children have high SC level, when they have high LS and happiness. Vemuri et al. (2011) studied SC and LS relation in neighborhood level and they declared that trusted neighborhood affect SC and LS positively. Elgar et al. (2011) examined SC and LS relation in healthy level in 50 countries and they found that there is strong effect of SC on LS both in individual and country level. Rodri' guez-Pose and Berlepsch (2014) studied SC and individual happiness in Europe. Han (2014) concluded how SC affects subjective happiness.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study is to examine the impacts of SC's nine sub factors and some demographic indicators as achievement perception, age, income, gender, marital status, residence, education level, occupation, and living with whom on LS of individuals living in Antalya by using two different linear regression models.

In current study LS was considered as a dependent variable and the independent variables were as SC's nine sub factors and some demographic indicators as achievement perception, age, income, gender, marital status, residence, education level, occupation, and living with whom. This study is a descriptive and definitive research which uses ANCOVA regression model for LS.

Sampling and Data Collection Tools

The sampling group of the present study consists of 197 males ($X_{\text{years}} = 37.56 \pm 11.82$), 213 females ($X_{\text{years}} = 34.92 \pm 11.17$) and in total 410 persons ($X_{\text{years}} = 36.19 \pm 11.55$). In this study, stratified sampling has been applied and questionnaire form was filled by face to face methods with the volunteer participants living in Antalya between the dates 01st February-30th April 2012. In Turkey, union rate was about 400\$ in 2012. From these rates, Antalya divided into 164

neighborhoods and these neighborhoods grouped four prosperity levels and those were represented in the income variables (low, medium, upper medium, high). From these, samples were selected randomly, and questionnaire forms delivered and collected back.

The questionnaire form developed to gather suitable data for the purpose of this study contained SC Scale developed by Onyx and Bullen (2000) and adapted version into Turkish by Arda-han (2013), Achievement Perception Scale developed by Bilgin and Kaynak (2008) and Life Satisfaction Scale developed by Diener et al. (1985). Social Capital Scale was measured by 4 point (1-definitely no, 2- Usually no, 3- Usually yes, 4-definitely yes), Achievement Perception Scale and LS Scale were measured by 5 point Likert Scale (1-definitely disagree... 5-definitely agree). In the process of assessing data, AN-COVA regression model, descriptive statistic methods and Kruskal Wallis Test were performed. The results have been assessed according to significant level 0.01 and 0.05.

The variables used in this study listed in Table 1.

As it was found by Arda-han (2013); SC scale were grouped in nine sub-factors for Turkish population. These are; (a) "Participation in the Local Community" which explains to solve the local community problems for the problems in local community, (b) "Neighbor Connections" explaining the neighbor relation to do something together or to share some feelings, (c) "Being the property of somewhere" which explains the work/school relation and property, (d) "Tolerance of Diversity" explained the acceptable level of diversity which in work, school, neighbor, (e) "Being a member of nongovernmental organizations" explained the active participation of legal local and social community, (f) "Feelings of Trust" which explains the trust to other, (h) "Feelings of Safety level of residence" which felt by the people living around settlements, (i) "Community initiative" explained the responsibility of others, and (j) "Being representative of social context" explained helping others.

First, natural logarithm of dependent variable and covariates were taken and then regression model was constructed which was containing an admixture of quantitative and qualitative variables, was called Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) models (Gujarati 2003). The equation of the ANCOVA model was given below:

Model-1

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LnLS} = & c_0 + \beta_1 \text{Lnage} + \beta_2 \text{LnAP} + \beta_3 \text{Ln}f1 + \\ & \beta_4 \text{Ln}f2 + \beta_5 \text{Ln}f3 + \beta_6 \text{Ln}f4 + \beta_7 \text{Ln}f5 + \beta_8 \text{Ln}f6 + \\ & \beta_9 \text{Ln}f7 + \beta_{10} \text{Ln}f8 + \beta_{11} \text{Ln}f9 + c_1 \text{gender} + c_2 \text{ms} + \\ & c_3 \text{residence} + c_4 \text{income}2 + c_5 \text{income}3 + \\ & c_6 \text{income}4 + c_7 \text{education}2 + c_8 \text{education}3 + \\ & c_9 \text{withwhom}2 + c_{10} \text{withwhom}3 + \\ & c_{11} \text{occupation}2 + c_{12} \text{occupation}3 + \\ & c_{13} \text{occupation}4 + c_{14} \text{occupation}5 + \\ & c_{15} \text{occupation}6 + c_{16} \text{occupation}7 + \\ & c_{17} \text{occupation}8 + u \end{aligned}$$

Table 1: The variables list of study

Dependent Variable	
LS	Life satisfaction level
Age	Age
AP	Achievement Perception (AP)
f1	Participation in the Local Community
f2	Neighbor
f3	Being the property of somewhere
f4	Tolerance of Diversity
f5	Member of nongovernmental organizations
f6	Trust to others
f7	The safety level of residence
f8	Community initiative
f9	Being representative of social context
Dummy Variables	400 • and below (omitted)
income1	401 – 800 • (Takes value 1 or 0)
income2	801 – 1200 • (Takes value 1 or 0)
income3	1201 • and above (Takes value 1 or 0)
income4	
gender	Gender (0-male, 1-female)
ms	Marital status (0-married, 1-single)
residence	Residence (0-urban, 1 rural)
education1	High school or below (omitted)
education2	University (Takes value 1 or 0)
education3	Graduate school (Takes value 1 or 0)
withwhom1	Alone (omitted)
withwhom2	With my family (Takes value 1 or 0)
withwhom3	With my friend (Takes value 1 or 0)
occupation1	Private sector (omitted)
occupation2	Public sector (Takes value 1 or 0)
occupation3	Self-employment (Takes value 1 or 0)
Own work	(Takes value 1 or 0)
occupation5	Student (Takes value 1 or 0)
occupation6	Retired (Takes value 1 or 0)
occupation7	House wife (Takes value 1 or 0)
occupation8	Unemployment (Takes value 1 or 0)

Model-2

$$\text{LnLS} = c_0 + \beta_1 \text{Ln}f1 + \beta_2 \text{Ln}f2 + \beta_3 \text{Ln}f3 + \beta_4 \text{Ln}f4 + \beta_5 \text{Ln}f5 + \beta_6 \text{Ln}f6 + \beta_7 \text{Ln}f7 + \beta_8 \text{Ln}f8 + \beta_9 \text{Ln}f9 + u$$

In these equations, c_0 represents a constant term, $c_{i(i=1...17)}$ represents the coefficients of dummy variables, $\beta_{j(j=1...11)}$ represents the coefficients of the covariates and u is a disturbance term in the models. Ordinary least square (OLS) estimator was used to estimate the coefficient of Model-1 and Model-2. Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test were performed to check out the presence of heteroskedasticity, and result was “ $\chi^2 = 29.10$ and $P > \chi^2 = 0.000$ ” for Model-1 and “ $\chi^2 = 23.85$ and $P > \chi^2 = 0.000$ ” for Model-1. With this result, the null hypothesis of constant variance was rejected. So, robust standard errors were computed to correct the coefficients for the presence of heteroskedasticity for both models. In addition to this, if there was a multicollinearity problem in the models or not, the variance inflation factors (VIF) were calculated for each covariates and maximum value of VIF found as “1.30” in Model-1 and “1.31” in Model-2 which were in the limits (not greater than 10) (Gujarati 2003). Because of large sample size ($n=410$), disturbances was assumed as normally distributed (Baltagi 2008).

RESULTS

In this part, the descriptive results and the results of regression models were given. Descriptive statistics of dependent variables and covariates are given in Table 2. As it is seen in Table 2, majority of the participants were female

(52.0%), single (65.4%), living in urban (90.0%), well educated (69.5%), have monthly income 800 • and below (66.1%), living with their family (69.8%) and employed in private (31.5%) and public sector (22.0%). The mean age of participants was 36.19 years old and they have medium LS ($M_{LS} = 3.19 \pm 11.55$), medium achievement perception ($M_{AP} = 3.19 \pm 0.72$), poor “Participation in the Local Community” ($M = 2.19 \pm 0.98$), high “Neighbor” ($M = 3.12 \pm 0.84$), high “Being the property of somewhere” ($M = 3.50 \pm 0.80$), high “Tolerance of Diversity” ($M = 3.61 \pm 0.90$), poor “Member of nongovernmental organizations” ($M = 2.24 \pm 1.26$), poor “Trust to others” ($M = 2.30 \pm 1.00$), high “The safety level of residence” ($M = 3.25 \pm 1.07$), high “Community initiative” ($M = 3.75 \pm 0.54$), medium “Being representative of social context” ($M = 3.38 \pm 0.94$) and high Total Social Capital ($M = 3.04 \pm 0.42$). It can be said that while some sub dimensions of SC has lower score the SC of participants is high. People living in Antalya are not willing to participate in Local community, to be member of nongovernmental organizations and do not trust others, but they have satisfied neighbor relations, they feel themselves as a property of somewhere, their tolerance for diversity are high.

The regression Model-1 results were given in Table 3a. As seen in Table 3a, the regression Model-1 is significant ($F = 5.56$ and $P = 0.000$). The variables which have negative significant effect on LS are age (coef. = -0.150945 , $P = 0.008$), the participants who are living with their families (coef. = -0.0709544 , $P = 0.039$), the participants who are unemployed (coef. = -0.1479412 , $P = 0.011$) and marital status (coef. = -0.0850426 , $P =$

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of dependent variables and covariates

Var.	Mean±SD	Variables	n	%	Variables	n	%
Age	36.19 ±11.55	Male	197	48.0	Alone	78	19.0
LS	3.19 ± 0.72	Female	213	52.0	With my family	286	69.8
AP	3.73 ± 0.72	Married	142	34.6	With my friend	46	11.2
f1	2.19 ± 0.98	Single	268	65.4	Private sector	129	31.5
f2	3.12 ± 0.84	Urban	369	90.0	Public sector	90	22.0
f3	3.50 ± 0.80	Rural	41	10.0	Self-employment	16	3.9
f4	3.61 ± 0.90	High school or below	83	20.2	Own work	39	9.5
f5	2.24 ± 1.26	University	285	69.5	Student	54	13.2
f6	2.30 ± 1.00	Graduate school	42	10.2	Retired	45	11.0
f7	3.25 ± 1.07	Income 400 • and <	129	31.5	House wife	14	3.4
f8	3.75 ± 0.54	Income 401–800 •	142	34.6	Unemployment	23	5.6
f9	3.38 ± 0.94	Income 801–1200 •	86	21.0	Total	410	100.0
TSC	3.04 ± 0.42	Income 1201 • and >	53	12.9			

Scale ranking for f1, f2, ..., f9: 1-definitely no... 4-definitely yes,
 Scale ranking for LS and for AP: 1-definitely no... 5-definitely yes

Table 3a: Regression model result for Model-1

<i>Robust</i>				
<i>lnls</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Err.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>P>t</i>
_cons	1.223525 *	0.2349711	5.21	0.000
lnage	-0.150945 *	0.0566249	-2.67	0.008
lnAP	-0.0032969	0.030623	-0.11	0.914
lnf1	0.0285696	0.0259468	1.10	0.272
lnf2	0.097049 **	0.0443462	2.19	0.029
lnf3	0.285694*	0.0454849	6.28	0.000
lnf4	-0.014372	0.0332863	-0.43	0.666
lnf5	0.0175649	0.0199014	0.88	0.378
lnf6	0.045176 ***	0.0258242	1.75	0.081
lnf7	0.0446826***	0.0237916	1.88	0.061
lnf8	-0.0004401	0.0549317	-0.01	0.994
lnf9	-0.0386333	0.0317359	-1.22	0.224
gender	0.0453498 ***	0.023412	1.94	0.053
ms	-0.0850426*	0.031631	-2.69	0.007
residence	0.0256111	0.0369453	0.69	0.489
income2	-0.0168609	0.0343514	-0.49	0.624
income3	0.0500745	0.0376299	1.33	0.184
income4	0.1126014**	0.0463189	2.43	0.016
education2	0.0184058	0.0311029	0.59	0.554
education3	0.0311021	0.0476123	0.65	0.514
withwhom2	-0.0709544**	0.0343345	-2.07	0.039
withwhom3	-0.068903	0.0488981	-1.41	0.160
occupation2	0.0289607	0.0323714	0.89	0.372
occupation3	-0.0397532	0.0626761	-0.63	0.526
occupation4	-0.0065359	0.0381281	-0.17	0.864
occupation5	-0.019356	0.042324	-0.46	0.648
occupation6	0.0354796	0.049106	0.72	0.470
occupation7	-0.038786	0.0631544	-0.61	0.539
occupation8	-0.1479412**	0.0577484	-2.56	0.011
Number of obs	410			
F(28. 381)	5.56			
Prob> F	0.0000			
R-squared	0.3174			
Root MSE	.21089			

*Significant at 0.01 level, ** Significant at 0.05 level, ***Significant at 0.10 level

Table 3b: Regression model result for Model-2

<i>Robust</i>				
<i>lnls</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Err.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>P>t</i>
_cons	0.5534095*	0.0995254	5.56	0.000
lnf1	0.0360306	0.026198	1.38	0.170
lnf2	0.0886006 **	0.0421371	2.10	0.036
lnf3	0.2973572 *	0.0418659	7.10	0.000
lnf4	-0.0011512	0.0341546	-0.03	0.973
lnf5	0.007899	0.0207305	0.38	0.703
lnf6	0.042005 ***	0.0242679	1.73	0.084
lnf7	0.041481 ***	0.0228239	1.82	0.070
lnf8	0.0190343	0.0558645	0.34	0.733
lnf9	-0.0068998	0.0296659	-0.23	0.816
Number of obs	410			
F(9. 400)	8.91			
Prob> F	0.0000			
R-squared	0.2318			
Root MSE	.21836			

* Significant at 0.01 level, ** Significant at 0.05 level, *** Significant at 0.10 level

Table 4: Correlation between social capital sub factors and age

<i>Pearson correlations values</i>	<i>Age</i>
Participation in the Local Community	0.092
Neighbor	0.242**
Being the property of somewhere	0.090
Tolerance of Diversity	-0.028
Member of nongovernmental organizations	0.205**
Trust to others	0.308**
The safety level of residence	0.249**
Community initiative	0.110*
Being representative of social context	0.027
Total Social Capital	0.335**

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

0.007). This means that getting older, or being unemployed, or being single or living with families has negative effect on LS. When one of these variable's value increases LS level decreases. According to the results, being married/couple has positive effect on LS.

The variables which have positive significant effect on LS in Model-1 are "Neighbor" (coef. = 0.097049, $P = 0.029$), "Being the property of somewhere" (coef. = 0.285694, $P = 0.000$), "Trust to others" (coef. = 0.045176, $P = 0.081$), "The safety level of residence" (coef. = 0.0446826, $P = 0.061$), gender (coef. = 0.0453498, $P = 0.053$) and having income over 1201 • (coef. = 0.1126014, $P = 0.016$). This means that being female, having satisfied neighbor relations, living in higher safety level of residence, having higher income, having property and having someone to trust on have positive effect on LS. When one of these variable's value increases LS level increases, too. Among these variables "being the property of somewhere" has the highest effect on LS and it can be accepted as strategic variable. In addition to these, being male has negative effect on LS. In addition, to these, having high income has positive effect on LS. Income level affects many parameters of individual life. For example, if a person wants to live in high safety residence, he/she must have high income to buy or to finance its expenditure because of family rules, while living alone does not have statistically significant effect on LS; "living with family" brings some borders to the individual's life and has negative effect on individual's LS.

The regression Model-2 results were given in Table 3b. As seen in Table 3b, the regression Model-2 is significant ($F = 8.91$ and $P = 0.000$).

The variables which have positive significant effect on LS in Model-2 are "Neighbor" (coef. = 0.0886006, $P = 0.036$), "Being the property of somewhere" (coef. = 0.2973572, $P = 0.000$), "Trust to others" (coef. = 0.042005, $P = 0.084$), "The safety level of residence" (coef. = 0.041481, $P = 0.061$). This means that having satisfied neighbor relations, living in higher safety level of residence, being property of somewhere and having someone to trust on have positive effect on LS. When one of these variable's value increases LS level increases, too. In Model-2, while the others effect was under 10% "being the property of somewhere" has highest nearly 30% effect on LS as in Model-1.

Correlation between Social Capital's sub factors and age were given in Table 4. As seen in Table 4, there is positive and statistically meaningful correlation between the variables "Neighbor", "Being member of non-governmental organizations", "Trust to others", "The safety level of residence", "Total Social Capital" and age. This means when age increases, the demand for satisfactory neighboring, having opportunity and necessity of being member of nongovernmental organization, need for trusting to others, need for safety residence, need for community initiative, and total SC level increases. When age increases, education level, income level will increase and people want to be married or to live together with their partner. In onward age, many people will demand for themselves and for their families (especially for their children) safety residence, they will have chance to finance this demand, because of their increased income. On the other hand, being employed, having private life and being a part of a team will increase the need for trusting to others.

Model-1's R-squared value is higher than Model-2 because of the demographic variables in Model-1.

DISCUSSION

ANCOVA linear regression model was used to explain and to estimate the independent variables as SC's nine sub factors, achievement perception, age, income, gender, marital status, residence, education level, occupation, and living with whom on LS as dependent variable. The results of this study are restricted to the participants living in Antalya in Turkey.

It is found that there is a positive correlation between Total SC score and age. In other words, if age increases, SC level of individuals increases, too. The reasons for this correlation can be thought that individuals will demand nonvolatile relations both in their career and in their social life including neighbor, family, occupational, marriage, love and other relations.

There is a positive correlation between LS and SC's sub factors "Neighbor", "Being the property of somewhere", "Trust to others" and "The safety level of residence". When age increases, expectation and demand for satisfied neighbor relation, participating in local community, being member of non-governmental organizations, trust to others, the safety of residence and being representative of social context increase, too. It can be thought that life is an iceberg and when individuals get older they define hidden side of this iceberg or/and they understand the real face of life. While family was an umbrella for youngest, usually after university graduation individuals take his/her responsibility with their own umbrella. Age cannot be the determiner of effecting LS negatively itself, but when age increases, responsibility of the time stress of, and the energy needed for achieving career steps, taking role in whether professional or social, politics nongovernmental organization, being representative of society, having partner (wife or husband), being parents, marriage, social and family roles, having things like car, home, holiday, etc. will increase and all these factors affect LS negatively. The conclusions of Karakurt (2008), Ozdemir et al. (2009), Yildirim et al. (2011) and Rodriguez-Pose and Berlepsch (2014) support the result of current study.

The relation between gender and LS has been studied by many researchers. The results were contradictory. Some; like Klonoff et al. (2000), Schmitt et al. (2002), Zhang and Leung (2002) found that males have advantages and have higher level of LS than females. Shaw and Henderson (2005) explained that women have disadvantages, are more constrained, have more time stress and lack of time in their life than men. Women carry social and family roles on their shoulder so they spend much of their time and energy for their family and expected social roles. But men spend more energy and concentration on their career. Further, some researcher found no differences between men and women's LS like Fugl-Meyer et al. (2002). On the other hand,

Ardahan and Mert (2012) concluded that when they get rid of from their constraints and expected roles, women would have higher LS than men, because women has higher emotional intelligence level than men and it increases and affects LS level positively. Kalkan and Ardahan (2013) found out that female outdoor sport participants have higher LS than men because of their paradigm. Some researchers like Ang and Mansor (2012), Ang et al. (2014) concluded that men have greater loneliness than women and being/feeling loneliness has negative effect on LS. Rodríguez-Pose and Berlepsch (2014) concluded that being female increases LS. In addition to these, there is a statistically meaningful and positive correlation between neighbor relation and LS. In recent decades, urbanizing has started to affect negatively neighbor relation, but in spite of this, whether housewife, unemployed or employed, women's emotional potential and current neighbor relation remains higher than men and this affect LS positively and can be the reason of higher LS (Helliwell and Putnam 2004; Bilgin and Kaynak 2008; Akdogan 2009; Koyuncu 2009; Leeves and Herbert 2014; Vemuri et al. 2011).

In the current study, positive relation was observed between LS and income as concluded in introduction. Many individuals demand safety, good neighboring and safety neighborhood or residence for themselves and for their children, to increase their quality of life. Many studies concluded that the quality, the qualified quantity of relation and satisfactory relation between person and community and neighbors, trusting others and safety of residence and/or neighborhood can be the one of the main indicator objective and a subjective dimension of LS level (Reisig et al. 2000; Prezza et al. 2001; Sirgy and Cornwell 2002; Brown et al. 2004; Ardahan 2013; Rodríguez-Pose and Berlepsch 2014). There is a Turkish proverb which has a close meaning to explain this relation, like "Neighbors are more important than the value of home you want to buy". Funk et al. (2007), Koyuncu (2009) and Vemuri et al. (2011) declared that parents demand safety for their children, their family and themselves around their homes in any hours in day or night. If people have enough income, they would be willing to pay more money for renting or buying a home in a safety neighborhood. Especially, all these factors effect rental value and price of the flat/home. When safety increases the prices go up. When people be-

lieve and experience, perceived safety, this increases individuals' LS. Thus, the individuals who have higher income level have higher LS. Brown et al. (2004) and Funk et al. (2007) concluded that individuals have higher income demand more safety and willing to pay more to ensure safety. Ardahan (2012) examined the relation between SC, LS and achievement perception of Sport Faculty students. He found that the students who have satisfied neighboring have higher academic achievement and LS.

Many researchers concluded that being the property of somewhere has positive effect on LS. Being the property of somewhere can be workplace, family, neighborhood, non-governmental organization, social club, friendship, participating social and leisure activities or somewhere else. Being the property of somewhere is an important need of individuals listed in Maslow Need Hierarchy. It motivates and gives satisfaction to human being (Ibrahim and Cordes 2002; Helliwell and Putnam 2004; Rodriguez-Pose and Berlepsch 2014). People usually participate in and follow some leisure activities to satisfy this need (Kalkan and Ardahan 2013). In the present study "being the property of somewhere" found to have a positive effect on LS.

In literature, it was concluded that there is a positive correlation between marital status and LS as measured by morale, depression, happiness and so on. Many of them concluded that happy marriage or being coupled increases satisfaction and motivates couples and mates positively (Bruce et al. 1976; Chipperfield and Havens 2001; Rodríguez-Pose and Berlepsch 2014) and many activities when taken together or taken as a couple with other couples create positive implication on LS (Dykstra 1995). Furthermore, Brown et al. (2004) found out that home owner wants married or coupled new neighbors to have satisfied neighborhood relation and to have permanent relations. Ang and Mansor (2012), Ang et al. (2014) concluded that while being loneliness affect LS negatively, being coupled or married has positive effect on LS. Ardahan (2012) concluded that for singles whether student or not also it is a great problem for accommodation both in urbanized cities and countryside in Turkey. This creates social pressure on singles daily life and when they find empty accommodation, they pay more for rent. This can be the results from living style, higher mobility of singles or lower tolerance for diversity.

This affects individuals' LS negatively and this conclusion supports the result of current study. According to the results of this study, being single has negative effect on LS.

Davis (1940) and Chang et al. (2003) declared that being in the property of family usually makes objectively and/or subjectively stronger and protects individuals from many things individuals, but it carries some softer or harder rules. The domain of social interaction was higher at adolescence and the following ages. The youngster usually left family relation and have social and friendship centered life, when they believe and accept themselves as individual. Van Gaalen and Dykstra (2006) investigated that the nature and structure of social relations also change age to age during teen age period and late youth. Many parents have generation clash with their youngsters. Living with family has a positive effect in the childhood period, but after adolescence and following ages, it has negative effect on LS depending on quality and solidarity of relation. In the Turkish family, based to prescriptive law has some strict rule and the structure is patriarchal. Thus, it has negative effect on the younger's and the other part of families' LS as explored in the present study.

Diener (1984), Diener et al. (1985), Krause (2010) and Sage (2014) pointed out that there is a strong relation between having income, being employed and LS. This was called Easterlin-paradox which developed by Richard A. Easterlin in 1974 (Clark et al. 2008). This paradox explains that being full or part time employed and being economic welfare increases individuals' personal confidence and LS level. Being involuntarily unemployed or being employed with dissatisfying wage affects LS negatively and the result of current study overlaps with the LS literature.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the study, there is a strong positive relation between SC and LS. Especially, the sub factors "Neighbor", "Being the property of somewhere", "Trust to other" and "The safety level of residence" have positive effect on LS in both regression models. When these variables' values are affected positively by using any stimulant, this will cause positive reflection on LS. In addition to this result, it was found that when individuals get older or if they are unemployed, or single, or live with their families

LS level of them decreases. In contrast, if an individual is female, or have satisfied neighbor relations, or have higher safety level of residence, or have higher income, or possess any property of somewhere and trusting to others increases LS level.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is true that the neighbors' relation can be strengthened by using some leisure activities to create close friendships among individuals. For safety neighborhood and residence there must be a strong relation, cooperation and communication between individuals, self-governing, local government, municipality, police, nongovernmental organization and informal neighborhood managers. In addition to these, the new neighbors must be introduced to the others in a socialization program. The main purpose of city authorities must create and keep going living and safety cities, parks and centers for both gender, all citizens whether poor or rich, children or old, married or singles. Additionally, accommodation for single individuals shouldn't be a problem anymore. For this purpose, owners of flats and representative of real estate agencies must be more tolerated, and municipalities, local governments, youth centers, and universities must take more responsibility about this problem.

In addition to these, being property of somewhere (school, work, organization, neighborhood, city and so on) has positive effect on LS and, private sectors, public sectors and nongovernmental organizations must focus on the idea of creating organizational citizenship. When someone feels him/herself as a citizen of somewhere, he/she can feel as a part of society, school, organizations etc.

According to the results of the study, it is recommended to the new researchers on this subject, an experimental research which involves recreational activities to create or strength the SC sub factors should be designed.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman F, Kiron D, Goodwin NR, Harris JM, Gallagher K 1997. *Human Well-Being and Economic Goals*. Washington DC: Island Press.
- Akdogan A 2009. Neighbor relation and Islam in urbanizing. *The Journal of Devoutness Science*, 53: 1-16.
- Amanda WV, Morgani GJ, Matthew AW, William RB Jr 2011. A Tale of Two Scales: Evaluating the Relationship among Life Satisfaction, Social Capital, Income, And the Natural Environment at Individual and Neighborhood Levels in Metropolitan Baltimore. *Environment and Behavior*, 43(1): 3-25, DOI: 10.1177/0013916509338551.
- Ang CS, Mansor AT 2012. An empirical study of selected demographic variables on loneliness among youths in Malaysian university. *Asia Life Sciences*, 21: 107-121.
- Ang CS, Mansor AT, Tan KA 2014. Pangs of loneliness breed material lifestyle but don't power up life satisfaction of young people: The moderating effect of gender. *Soc Indic Res*, 117: 353-365
- Ardahan F 2012. Examining the Relation Between Social Capital, Life Satisfaction and Academic Achievement: Akdeniz University, School of Physical Education and Sport Case. *12th International Sport Science Congress*. 12-14th December 2012, Denizli-Türkiye.
- Ardahan F 2013. The relation between neighboring, Tolerance of diversity and life satisfaction, the importance of recreative activities for establishing and strengthening these relations. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 10(1): 1078-1090.
- Ardahan F, Mert M 2012. Impacts of Outdoor Activities, Demographic Variables and Emotional Intelligence on Life Satisfaction: An Econometric Application of a Case in Turkey, Social Indicators Research, An International and Interdisciplinary. *Journal for Quality-of-Life Measurement*, DOI 10.1007/s11205-012-0118-5.
- Ateca-Amestoy V, Aguilar AC, Moro-Egido AI 2014. Social Interactions and Life Satisfaction: Evidence from Latin America. *J Happiness Stud*, 15: 527-554. DOI 10.1007/s10902-013-9434-y.
- Augusto JM, López-Zafra LE, Antoñana RM, Pulido M 2006. Perceived emotional intelligence and life satisfaction among university teachers, *Psicothema*, 18: 152-157.
- Baltagi BH 2008. *Econometrics*. 4th Edition. Berlin: Springer.
- Bilgin N, Kaynak R 2008. Effects of social capital factors on work success: An empirical research of university staff. *University of Cumhuriyet, Journal of Social Sciences*, 32(1): 29-38.
- Brown G, Brown BB, Perkins DD 2004. New Housing as Neighborhood Revitalization: Place Attachment and Confidence among Residents. *Environment and Behavior*, 36: 749-775 DOI: 10.1177/0013916 503254823.
- Bruce AC, Stan LA, Phillip RK 1976. Marital and family role satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 38(3): 431-440.
- Campbell A, Converse PE, Rodgers WL 1976. *The Quality of American Life*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Chang L, McBride-Chang C, Stewart SM, Au E 2003. Life Satisfaction, Self-concept, and Family Relations in Chinese Adolescents and Children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27: 182-189. DOI: 10.1080/01650250244000182.
- Chipperfield JG, Havens B 2001. Gender differences in the relationship between marital status transitions and life satisfaction in later life. *Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences*, 56B(3): 176-186.
- Chiu Llorente NA 2010. Social Capital and Well-being, a Study of Child- Headed Households in Kigali, Rwan-

- da. From <<http://www.chabha.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Llorente-Social-Capital-and-Well-being-A-Study-of-CHHs-in-Kigali-Rwanda.pdf>> (Retrieved on 17 February 2014).
- Clark AE, Frijters P, Shields MA 2008. Relative income, happiness, and utility: An explanation for the Easterlin Paradox and other puzzles. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 46(1): 95-144.
- Coleman JS 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology Supplement*, 94: 95-120.
- Davis K 1940. The sociology of parent-youth conflict. *American Sociological Review*, 5(4): 523-535.
- Diener E 1984. Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3): 542-575.
- Diener E, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, Griffin S 1985. The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49: 71-75.
- Dikmen AA 1995. Relation between life satisfaction and job satisfaction. *Journal of Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences*, 50: 3-4.
- Dykstra PA 1995. Loneliness among the never and formerly married: The importance of supportive friendships and a desire for independence. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, SOB,(5): 321-329.
- Elgar FJ, Davis CG, Wohl MJ, Trites SJ, Zelenski JM, Martin MS 2011. Social capital, health and life satisfaction in 50 countries. *Health & Place*, 17: 1044-1053.
- Faullant R, Matzler K, Mooradian TA 2011. Personality, basic emotions, and satisfaction: Primary emotions in the mountaineering experience. *Tourism Management*, XXX: 1-8.
- Frey BS, Stutzer A 2002. *Happiness and Economics: How the Economy and Institutions Affect Well-being*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fugl-Meyer AR, Melin R, Fugl-Meyer KS 2002. Life satisfaction in 18- to 64-year-old swedes: In relation to gender, age, partner and immigrant status. *J Rehabil Med*, 34: 239-246.
- Funk LM, Allan DE, Chappell NL 2007. Testing the Relationship Between Involvement and Perceived Neighborhood Safety: A Multinomial Logit Approach. *Environment and Behavior*, 39: 332-351. DOI: 10.1177/0013916506290959.
- Gujarati DN 2003. *Basic Econometrics*. 4th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gundelach P, Kreiner S 2004. Happiness and Life Satisfaction in Advanced European Countries. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 38(4): 359-386, DOI: n10.1177/10.69397104267483.
- Halpern D 2005. *Social Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Han S 2014. Social Capital and Subjective Happiness: Which Contexts Matter? *J Happiness Stud*, DOI 10.1007/s10902-014-9506-7
- Helliwell JF 2003. How's life? Combining individual and national variables to explain subjective well-being. *Economic Modelling*, 20: 331-360.
- Helliwell JF 2004. Well-Being and Social Capital: Does Suicide Pose a Puzzle? *Working Paper 10896*, Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Helliwell JF, Putnam RD 2004. The Social Context of Well-Being, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society (London)*, Series B, 359: 1435-1446, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2004.1522.
- Helliwell J, Barrington-Leigh C, Harris A, Huang H 2009. International evidence on the social context of well-being, NBER Working Papers, Working Paper N_ 14720, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hou F 2014. Life Satisfaction and Income in Canadian Urban Neighbourhoods. Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper Series. Catalogue no. 11F0019M - No. 357: 1-33.
- Ibrahim H, Cordes KA 2002. *Outdoor Recreation, Enrichment for A Lifetime*. 2nd Edition. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing.
- Inglehart R, Klingemann HD 2000. Genes, culture, democracy, and happiness. In: E Diener, EH Sun (Eds.): *Subjective Well-Being Across Cultures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 165-183.
- Jack G, Jordan B 1999. Social capital and child welfare. *Children & Society*, 13(4): 242-256.
- Kahneman D, Krueger AB, Schkade D, Schwarz N, Stone A 2004. Toward national well-being accounts. *American Economic Review*, 94: 429-434.
- Kalkan A, Ardahan F 2013. The profile of the outdoor sports participants and the reason and the benefits of participating in outdoor sports: Antalya case. *Giresun University, Institute of Social Science, The Black Sea Journal of Social Science*, 5(8): 93-114.
- Karakurt E 2008. The importance of social capital in terms of sustainable city life. *The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources*, 10(2): 76-100.
- Klonoff EA, Landrine H, Campbell R 2000. Sexist discrimination may account for well-known gender differences in psychiatric symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24: 93-99.
- Knack S, Keefer P 1997. Does social capital have an economic payoff? A cross country investigation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(4): 1251-1288.
- Koyuncu A 2009. Neighboring in global city. *Selcuk University, Journal of Faculty of Letter*, 22: 23-42.
- Krause A 2010. The Effect of Unemployment on Life and Satisfaction An Analysis for Switzerland in its Cultural Diversity. From <http://www.iza.org/conference_files/ReDisWeBe2010/krause_a5647.pdf> (Retrieved on 21 February 2014).
- Lane RE 2000. *The Loss of Happiness in Market Democracies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Leeves GD, Herbert R 2014. Gender differences in social capital investment: Theory and evidence. *Economic Modelling*, 37: 377-385.
- Mastekaasa A, Moum T 1984. The perceived quality of life in Norway: Regional variations and contextual effects. *Social Indicators Research*, 14(4): 385-420.
- Newman DB, Tay L, Diener E 2014. Leisure and Subjective Well-Being: A Model of Psychological Mechanisms as Mediating Factors. *Happiness Stud*, 15:555-578. DOI 10.1007/s10902-013-9435-x
- Ngai VT 2005. Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in Macao, China. *Leisure Studies*, 24(2): 195-207.
- Oh HJ, Ozkaya E, LaRose R 2014. How does online social networking enhance life satisfaction? The relationships among online supportive interaction, affect, perceived social support, sense of community, and life satisfaction. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 30: 69-78
- Onyx J Bullen P 2000. Measuring Social Capital in Five Communities. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36(1): 23-42.

- Ozdemir S, Basel H, Senocak H 2009. A dissertation on the growing importance of the NGOs and some NGOs operating in Üsküdar. *The Journal of Social and Politics*, 56: 152- 233.
- Palmer B, Donaldson C, Stough C 2002. Emotional intelligence and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33: 1091–1100
- Pavot W, Diener E 1993. Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(2): 164–172.
- Portes A 2000. The two meanings of social capital. *Sociological Forum*, 15(1): 1-12.
- Poulsen AA, Ziviani JM, Johnson H, Cuskelly M 2008. Loneliness and life satisfaction of boys with developmental coordination disorder: The impact of leisure participation and perceived freedom in leisure. *Human Movement Science*, 27: 325–343.
- Prezza M, Amici M, Roberti T, Tedeschi G 2001. Sense of community referred to the whole town: its relations with neighboring, loneliness, life satisfaction, and area of residence. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 29(1): 29–52.
- Putnam RD 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ram R 2010. Social capital and happiness: Additional cross-country evidence. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 11: 409–418.
- Reisig MD, Parks RB 2000. Experience, quality of life, and neighborhood context: A hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with police. *Justice Quarterly*, 17(3): 607-630.
- Rodriguez-Pose A, Berlepsch VV 2014. Social Capital and Individual Happiness in Europe. *J Happiness Stud*, 15: 357–386. DOI 10.1007/s10902-013-9426-y.
- Sage D 2014. Do Active Labour Market Policies Promote the Well-Being, Health and Social Capital of the Unemployed? Evidence from the UK. *Soc Indic Res*, DOI 10.1007/s11205-014-0788-2.
- Schmitt MT, Branscombe NR, Kobrynowicz D, Owen S 2002. Perceiving Discrimination Against One's Gender Group has Different Implications for Well-Being in Women and Men. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull.*, 28: 197- 210. DOI: 10.1177/0146167202282006
- Schmitter C, Zisselman M, Woldow A 2003. Life satisfaction in centenarians residing in long-term care. *Annals of Long Term Care*, 7(2): 437-442.
- Shaw SM, Henderson KA 2005. Gender analysis and leisure constraints: An uneasy alliance. In: EL Jackson (Ed.): *Constraints to Leisure*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, pp. 23–34.
- Sirgy J, Cornwell T 2002. How neighborhood features affect quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*. 59: 79-114.
- Sung-Mook H, Giannakopoulos E 1994. The relationship of satisfaction with life to personality characteristics. *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary & Applied*, 128(5): 547.
- Telman N, Unsal P 2004. *Employee Satisfaction*. Istanbul: Epsilon Press.
- Van Gaalen RI, Dykstra PA 2006. Solidarity and conflict between adult children and parents: A latent class analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68: 947–960.
- Veenhoven R 1991. Questions on happiness: Classical topic, modern answers, blind spots. In: F Argyle, M Schwarz, N Strack (Eds.): *Subjective Well-Being: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon, pp. 7-26.
- Vemur AW, Grove JM, Burch Jr WR 2011. A tale of two scales: Evaluating the relationship among life satisfaction, social capital, income, and the natural environment at individual and neighborhood levels in Metropolitan Baltimore. *Environment and Behavior*, 43(1) 3–25.
- Ventegodt S, Andersen, NJ, Merrick J 2003. Quality of Life Philosophy I. Quality of Life, Happiness, and Meaning in Life. *The Scientific World Journal*, 3: 1164–1175, DOI 10.1100/tsw.2003.102.
- White S 2009. Analyzing Wellbeing: A Framework for Development Practice. Wed Working Paper 09/44, ESRC Research Group on Wellbeing in Developing Countries. From <<http://www.welldev.org.uk/>> (Retrieved on 7 August 2010).
- Xing W 2008. *Life Satisfaction and Social Capital A Synthetic Panel Approach*. Master Thesis on Public Policy, KDI School of Public Policy and Management, Hoegiro Dongdaemun Seoul.
- Yildirim U, Oner, S, Aksu H, Tatli SM 2011. Municipal councils in terms of local representation and participation: The K. Mara^o and Sivas Municipal Councils. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 8(15): 507- 530.
- Zhang L, Leung JP 2002. Moderating Effects of Gender and Age on the Relationship between Self-Esteem and Life Satisfaction in Mainland Chinese. *International Journal of Psychology*, 37:2, 83-91, DOI: 10.1080/00207560143000252.