

Takashi Inoguchi

# Typology of Asian Societies

Bottom-Up Perspective and  
Evidence-Based Approach

 Springer

# Typology of Asian Societies

Takashi Inoguchi

# Typology of Asian Societies

Bottom-Up Perspective and Evidence-Based  
Approach

 Springer

Takashi Inoguchi  
Institute of Asian Cultures  
J.F. Oberlin University  
Shibuya, Tokyo, Japan

ISBN 978-981-19-5465-8                      ISBN 978-981-19-5466-5 (eBook)  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5466-5>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2022

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.  
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

# Preface

What are the key features of Asian societies? Some adjectives come up immediately: different, diverse, and difficult to characterize in one phrase. Indeed, specialists in geography, anthropology, demography, geology, climatology, agronomy, religious studies, gender studies, sociology, economics, and political science have had so many things to say on this seemingly simple question.

My interest in typologies of Asian societies comes from two sources: Quality of Life (QOL) studies and political science. QOL studies in Asia are relatively new (Inoguchi and Estes, 2017; Shrotryia and Mazumdar, 2017; Mangahas and De Jesus, 2017). They began in Hong Kong and Singapore, gradually diffusing to Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, and more recently to China and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) societies. The research field into QOL is characterized by an evidence-based approach largely from medical science and psychology. It is noteworthy that QOL studies tend to focus on one Asian society at a time, rather than on a number of societies in Asia. They are interested in the physical and mental aspects of life quality, like weight, height, pulse, blood pressure, heartbeat, with those areas that normally fall under the purview of internal medicine as well as in more mental and neuroscientific aspects of human life. Medical data have tended to be assembled on a country basis with QOL data treated as one or many items in such lists.

It is no less noteworthy that QOL studies have tended to be interested in one composite item of data, like high or medium or low in terms of well-being, health, and happiness. It is largely because QOL studies have tended to follow, curiously enough, the famous opening sentence of Leo Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*: "Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way." The search for happiness has led QOL studies to choose one answer by asking a direct question—such as "Overall, how happy are you?"—and then providing six options: very happy, somewhat happy, neither happy nor unhappy, somewhat unhappy, very unhappy, and don't know. It seems that QOL study specialists take the first part of Tolstoy's observation as a primary line of academic enquiry.

If QOL studies have a tendency to search for one composite data, then political science has a tendency to search for an often normatively tinged research strategy of

identifying an ideal type, *à la* Max Weber's Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism or Aristotelian typology of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy or American social science-coined bifurcated typology of dictatorship versus democracy, with varieties of factors causing such diversification.

To make a long story short, as a political scientist, dealing with QOL in Asian societies east of the Middle East, this book is a presentation of my research and findings on this topic.

Shibuya, Japan

Takashi Inoguchi

## References

- Inoguchi, Takashi and Richard J. Estes (2017) "The History of Well-Being in East Asia: From Global Conflict to Global Leadership," in Richard J. Estes and M. Joseph Sirgy, eds., *The Pursuit of Human Well-Being: The Untold Global History*, Switzerland: Springer, 301-348.
- Mangahas, Mahar and Edilberto C. De Jesus (2017) "The History of Well-Being in Southeast Asia," in Richard J. Estes and M. Joseph Sirgy, eds., *The Pursuit of Human Well-Being: The Untold Global History*, Switzerland: Springer, 381-408.
- Shrotryia, Vijay Kumar and Krishna Mazumdar (2017) "The History of Well-Being in South Asia," in Richard J. Estes and M. Joseph Sirgy, eds., *The Pursuit of Human Well-Being: The Untold Global History*, Switzerland: Springer, 349-380.
- Tolstoy, Leo (2014) *Anna Karenina* (translated by R. Bartlett), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

# Acknowledgements

Ever since I vaguely envisaged a research project surrounding what I later called the Asia Barometer Survey in the mid-1970s, it had never occurred to me that the project would take so many years. My modest ambition was that given the already apparent success of the Eurobarometer in the 1970s, an Asia Barometer survey project should stand forth as well. It was in spring 1979 that I asked a bundle of questions to Dr. Jacques-René Rabier at *L'Institut français d'opinion publique* in Paris. He was one of the founders of the European Community's (which later became the European Union's) Eurobarometer. His advice on questionnaire formulation and institutional building was most inspiring and helpful. I am profoundly grateful to him. But hope was hope. My hope was almost shattered thereafter because securing funds for such a project has been very difficult. The Japanese Ministry of Education's Scientific Research Grant scheme does not have much scope for an Asia-wide empirical survey and analysis project in social science. Its priorities are placed on natural science, medical science, and engineering. It was a bit like being in Samuel Beckett's play *Waiting for Godot* for two decades.

It was Emiko Tomiye of the Nihon Research Center, a business and market opinion research company, who helped me identify and collect corporate donations. Together, in 2002, we approached some 20-odd business corporations for funding, returning a second time with a request for additional funds. This first group of corporate donations allowed me to carry out the first Asia-wide survey in 2003 in 10 Asian countries. My heartfelt gratitude goes to Ms Tomiye. In the following year, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs asked me to conduct a similar survey in Asian countries in the way I best felt possible. I followed through with this survey. Again, I express my heartfelt gratitude to Ambassador Makio Miyakawa. Then, at long last, in the following year, I was successful in securing a Scientific Research Grant that allowed the project to continue for the next four years. I am genuinely grateful to the Scientific Research Grant committee. The implementation of the project was from 2005 till 2008 in terms of the grant money. The six rounds of the Asia-wide survey were based on a similar questionnaire, although between 5% and 10% of the questions were tailored according to each of the four Asian sub-regions: East,

Southeast, South, and Central Asia. The surveys were very large, registering approximately 60,000 respondents in 32 societies (29 Asian and 3 Asian neighbors, i.e., the United States, Australia, and Russia), with nationwide random sampling, in principle, conducted in face-to-face interviews. The sample sizes ranged from 800 for small societies like Brunei and Bhutan to 2,000 respondents in places like India, China, and Japan. I register my profound gratitude to colleagues and friends all over Asia. In total, four volumes were published, one after each of the four surveys, and they are as follows:

Takashi Inoguchi, Miguel Basanez, Akihiko Tanaka, and Timur Dadabaev, eds., *Values and Life Styles in Urban Asia: A Cross-Cultural Analysis and Sourcebook Based on the Asia Barometer Survey of 2003*, Mexico City, Siglo XXI Editores for the Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, 2005.

Takashi Inoguchi, Akihiko Tanaka, Shigeto Sonoda, and Timur Dadabaev, eds., *Human Beliefs and Values in Striding Asia: East Asia in Focus: Country Profiles, Thematic Analyses, and Sourcebook Based on the Asia Barometer Survey of 2004*, Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2006.

Takashi Inoguchi, ed., *Human Beliefs and Values in Incredible Asia: South and Central Asia in Focus: Country Profiles and Thematic Analyses Based on the Asia Barometer Survey of 2005*, Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2008.

Takashi Inoguchi, ed., *Human Beliefs and Values in East and Southeast Asia in Transition: 13 Country Profiles on the Basis of the Asia Barometer Surveys of 2006 and 2007*, Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2009.

For the publication of these four volumes in book form, I express my heartfelt gratitude to Professor-Ambassador Miguel Basanez for his indispensable advice and help on editing and publishing. I am no less grateful to Ronald Inglehart of the University of Michigan, who not only gave advice about the vital importance of publication of the Asia Barometer Survey project but also for providing a Foreword to Volume One. Also, I express my profound gratitude to Peter J. Katzenstein of Cornell University for writing a Foreword to Volume Two. In acknowledging praise received for these four volumes, I am most grateful to Lucian W. Pye of M. I. T., Jean Blondel of the European University Institute, Russell Dalton of the University of California, Irvine, Hans-Dieter Klingemann of the Social Science Research Center Berlin, Marshall Bouton of the Chicago Council for Global Affairs, Ashis Nandy of the Center for the Study of Developing Societies, New Delhi, Akio Kawato, Ambassador to Uzbekistan, and Wolfgang Jagodzinski of the University of Cologne.

My utmost gratitude goes naturally to those who contributed excellent chapters to each of these four volumes, published respectively in 2005, 2006, 2008, and 2009, and who worked under the pressures of analyzing tons of survey data and meeting deadlines for chapter manuscripts: Timur Dadabaev, Akihiko Tanaka, Guo Dingping, Myungsoon Shin, Chaiwat Khamchoo, Aaron Stern, Johan Saravanamuttu, Shigeto Sonoda, Myat Thein, Sanjay Kumar, Sirimal Abeyratne, Daesong Hyun, Do Manh Hong, Bounlouane Douangneune, Kheang Un, Pratikno, I Keut Putra Erawan, Lydia N. Yu-Jose, Hj Hanzah Sulaiman, Zen-U Lucian Hotta, Kazufumi Manabe, Kensuke Okada, Matthew Carlson, Akiko Fukushima, Misa Okabe, Imtiaz Ahmed, Dorji Penjore, Faisal Bari, Adeel Faheem, Purnendra Jain, Krishna Hachhethu, Muhammad



Jamshed Khan, Nargis Kassenova, Termirlan Moldogaziev, Turtogtoh Janar, Muzafardjon R. Khudoikulov, Steven R. Reed, Le Hong Giang, Ming Shu, Chua Beng Huat, Ming Sing, David W.F. Huang, Seiji Fujii, Jennifer Santiago Oreta, Azeem Fazwan Ahmad Farouk.

In carrying out a big project like this, diligence and perseverance are indispensable in each phase of securing funding (20 years of “Waiting for Godot”), implementing the surveys within 6 years, publishing four conference proceedings within 6 years, and publishing five monographs (taking 14 years). I was fortunate in reaching this stage of monograph publication thanks to extraordinary colleagues and friends providing me with encouragement, advice and help. Four volumes have already come out with another volume in this AsiaBarometer project awaiting publication in 2022.

These five monographs are as follows:

Shin, Doh Chull and Takashi Inoguchi, eds., *The Quality of Life in Confucian Asia: From Physical Happiness to Subjective Well-Being*, Dordrecht: Springer, 2008.

Inoguchi, Takashi and Seiji Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Dordrecht: Springer, 2013.

Inoguchi, Takashi and Yasuharu Tokuda, eds., *Trust with Asian Characteristics: Interpersonal and Institutional*, Dordrecht: Springer, 2017.

Inoguchi, Takashi, *Exit, Voice and Loyalty in Asia: Individual Choice under 32 Societal Umbrellas*, Dordrecht: Springer, 2017.

Inoguchi, Takashi, *Typology of Asian Societies: Bottom-Up Perspective and Evidence-Based Approach*, Springer, forthcoming in 2021 or 2022.

A brief note on each of the five monographs is in order. Doh Chull Shin of the University of California, Irvine, introduced me in the 2010s to The International Society for Quality of Life Studies and co-edited the above monograph on how East Asians conceive happiness. I am grateful to him for opening the door to monograph publication thereafter.

Seiji Fujii of the University of Niigata Prefecture (Ph.D. in economics at the University of California, Irvine) carried out virtually all data analysis in the AsiaBarometer Survey project. My second book with Seiji Fujii is the most comprehensive in scope on quality of life in Asia. Until today this represents the only solid evidence-based quality of life analysis covering all of Asia, east of the Middle East, in 32 societies, including the United States, Australia, and Russia, Asia’s neighbors. I extend my heartfelt gratitude to him.

Yasuharu Tokuda, MD, MPH, Ph.D., president of Muribushi Okinawa Medical Clinic and Training Center, Okinawa, co-edited the third book on interpersonal and institutional trust. Working with him has enriched my understanding of both types of trust. This book has exposed the weakness of posing abstract questions without providing some concrete examples or situations to frame such questions. Richard Nisbett, a psychologist at the University of Michigan, and Joseph Henrich, an evolutionary biologist at Harvard University, raise such warnings regarding questionnaire formulations.

The fourth book, *Exit, Voice and Loyalty in Asia*, examines empirically how Asians face deteriorating societal and organizational situations, that is, exit, voice and loyalty. Suppose you ask an agency in the bureaucracy for permission to do something. Their

response is to “wait for a while.” What would you do? Choose from one of seven options: (1) bribe an official; (2) write a letter; (3) use connections; (4) nothing can be done; (5) wait and hope patiently; (6) act without permission; (7) or don’t know. After analyzing 32 societal responses, sharp comparisons are made focusing on respondents from India, China, Japan, the United States, Russia, and Australia.

The fifth book, *Typology of Asian Societies*, argues for both a bottom-up perspective and evidence-based approach. I believe that much of the typologies of Asian societies tend to adopt a top-down perspective and ideal-type approach. By so doing, systematic empirical comparisons and bottom-up perspectives are not appreciated and given due consideration.

In addition to these listed academics, I owe an enormous debt to those who have worked for the project across the four universities I have had affiliations with: the University of Tokyo, Chuo University, the University of Niigata Prefecture, and J. F. Oberlin University, Tokyo. The timing of the Scientific Research Grant came 1 month before my retirement from the University of Tokyo, where I had spent 20 years of waiting. Over the course of the project, I changed university affiliation twice, transitions that posed great challenges to the running of the project. My gratitude is profound to those who helped my project run seamlessly across these changes. The hard work and commitment of others to my project made me more diligent and perseverant in executing the project through its many publications of which this book may be the last.

Scientific Research Grants (#17002002, 2005–2008; #21243010, 2009–2012; 19H00583, 2019–2023) were received at the University of Tokyo, Chuo University, the University of Niigata Prefecture, and J. F. Oberlin University, Tokyo, and were implemented at the last three universities.

I gratefully acknowledge the following publishers and journals for graciously granting permission:

Asia Barometer English Master Questionnaire 2006.

Inoguchi, T., Tanaka, A., Sonoda, S., & Dadabaev, T. (Eds.). (2009). *Human Beliefs and Values in East and Southeast Asia in Transition: 13 Country Profiles on the Basis of the AsiaBarometer Surveys of 2006 and 2007*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, pp. 265–284.

Table 2.1 List of multilateral treaties covered in the dataset.

Inoguchi, Takashi and Lien Thi Quynh Le (2021) *Digitized Statecraft in Multilateral Treaty Participation: Global Quasi-Legislative Behavior of 193 Sovereign States*, Singapore: Springer Nature, p. 16.

## Praise for “*Typology of Asian Societies*”

“I enjoyed reading this book profoundly. He shows it is the outcome as long as a long and slow process of maturing deep ideas and thinking, a least for the last three decades. I fully share the aim announced in the title: Bottom-Up Perspective an Evidence-Based Approach to a Typology of Asian Societies.

Challenging the classical top-down approach taken by Hegel, Marx, Weber et al to define Asia, was a must. But now Inoguchi does it brilliantly, showing the richness and diversity, with no redundancy, on this five confirmed types (Octopus-Cave Society, God-of-Small Things, Society Colonized from Within, Seeming Fractured and Fragmented Divisions of Society, Micro-Monitoring Society, illustrated by 29 nations, while a sixth (Fractured and Fragmented Society) will be waiting to real case testing.”

—Miguel E. Basáñez, *Director, Tufts University, The Fletcher School*

“Written by a highly regarded productive Asian quality-of-life scholar, this book presents an innovative approach to the systematic categorization of Asian societies based on the author’s pioneering AsianBarometer Surveys. It is a major contribution to our research field.”

—Alex C. Michalos, C.M., Ph.D., D. Lett., F.R.S.C. *Professor Emeritus, Political Science University of Northern British Columbia* (Residence: 1506 Kilborn Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1H 6M2, Tel 613 218 1384)

“*Typology of Asian Societies: Bottom-Up Perspective and Evidence-Based Approach*, provides a wealth of information on human beliefs, values and lifestyles in 32 Asian societies, and fulfills the promise of the book’s title. Prof. Takashi Inoguchi, an innovative award-winning political scientist, founded the AsiaBarometer in the 1970s, which was the basis for several of his books co-authored with teams of international leaders in survey research. In the 2010s, he worked with colleagues in The International Society for Quality of Life Studies to publish several more books, including this one. Drawing on face-to-face surveys with nationwide random samples, Takashi Inoguchi takes a bottom-up perspective with an evidence-based approach to compare

what publics in these diverse societies value most. He offers a new and comprehensive typology of Asian societies that will guide future research for years to come.”

—Holli A. Semetko, *Asa Griggs Candler Professor of Media & International Affairs, Professor of Political Science, Emory University*

“From one of the leading forerunners of cross-country survey projects on East Asia, this is a great book that sheds important light on the life of Asian people, in a meticulous fashion, with bountiful data.”

—Zhengxu Wang, Ph.D. *Distinguished Professor, Department of Political Science, Fudan University*

“The new book of Prof. Takashi Inoguchi is a methodological theoretical proposal that seeks to identify the similarities and differences between Asian societies. It is organized in ten chapters and presents two Appendix.

This book seeks to reveal the similarities and differences of Asian societies in terms of key dimensions, examining the power to explain the variation of each dimension and thus typifying each society. Its objective is to generate a typology of Asian societies, based on two original ideas: the type of indicators that are selected to cover the domains, aspects and styles of daily human life (Inoguchi and Fujii, 2013; Shin and Inoguchi, 2008), regardless of social differences in terms of political regimes, economic systems, and historical and cultural background; and the factorial analysis carried out separately for each social sample as well as the rotation that is carried out in a uniform way between societies.

The author explains that to examine the quality of life in Asian societies, it is necessary to adopt a bottom-up approach, however traditional studies that have used such an approach have portrayed individuals and societies in detail and have not necessarily connected the two in a systematic way. Other studies have taken an evidence-based approach, with two weaknesses: responses from local sample populations were used without specifying population size, and massive data was collected.

The AsiaBarometer Survey deploys a framework that ensures both an evidence-based approach and a bottom-up perspective. Evidence-based means that the target population is randomly selected at the national level and response data is collected from face-to-face interviews in the first step. The AsiaBarometer Survey prioritizes discovering the types of Asian societies based on three dimensions: survival, social relations, and dominance of the public sector, differentiating six types of societies. The survival dimension is made up of elements such as housing, standard of living, family income, health, education, and work. The dimension of social relations is composed of elements such as friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Finally, the public policy dimension is made up of elements such as public security, environmental condition, social welfare system, and democratic system (Inoguchi and Fujii, 2013, pp. 33–36).

Given that human beings are satisfied or dissatisfied with what they define as their daily activities or what the author calls satisfaction with aspects, domains, and styles of daily life, 16 items were used in this study: housing, friendships, marriage, level

of life, family income, health, education, work, neighbors, public security, environmental condition, social welfare system, democratic system, family life, spiritual life, and leisure. This classification arises from quite comprehensive elements in the activities of daily life of ordinary people and are mostly universally observed, regardless of the geographical, historical, and cultural aspects of societies.

The author points out that two methodological problems have concerned him throughout his work, one is the question of the survey as conversation, or questions formulated with clear and concise words and questions formulated in a familiar context and using familiar words; and the second is the level of analysis, of adding individual responses to social responses.

Some of the question designers have tended to forget an important aspect of surveys and polls, that is, they are conversations between the question designers and the respondents. Unless the questions are well understood by potential respondents, many of them do not respond or fail to respond. The problem becomes more complex when some simple words are included in the question, such as happiness or quality of life, which are at the same time words of common use and abstract concepts. In this case the author has chosen the use of concrete words instead of abstract words, and instead of decontextualizing words, he used minimally contextualized words.

The author proposed the factorial analysis of each one of the matrices of the 29 Asian societies. The level of analysis problem occurs in relation to the level of sampling and the level of aggregation or synthesis. First, when addressing the problem of choosing respondents, that is, national sampling or global or regional sampling, he chooses national sampling, since he was interested in knowing the similarities and differences between 29 Asian societies. Second, deal with the level of aggregation or synthesis.

Likewise, instead of placing each of the responses of the 29 Asian societies together as one, the author proposes a strategy of factorially analyzing each of the responses of the 29 Asian societies separately, observing that the relationships between the 16 items of satisfaction with daily life varies from one society to another. Holistic and comprehensive understanding rather than analytical and differential understanding is likely to highlight the similarities and differences between the 29 Asian societies more effectively.

In the AsiaBarometer survey, 37 languages were used in 32 types of questionnaires to generate the response data on quality of life. It was carried out in 32 societies: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Malaysia, Nepal, Korea Korea (DPRK), Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, South Korea (ROK), Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, USA, Uzbekistan and Vietnam.

The author concludes that satisfaction with the dimensions, aspects and lifestyles is the key to understanding the aggregate configuration of social satisfaction that emerges as a result of factor analysis and its results are called types of society. Likewise, it is observed that in the variables on individual satisfaction with aspects, domains, and styles of daily life there are great differences between the 29 Asian societies, which indicates immense diversities.

Finally, the author also alerts us that there are two key issues facing the citizens of the world, and these are globalization and democratization, since both are difficult forces to manage, they are two of the most important forces that can damage and/or benefit 21st century societies.

To conclude the book presents two appendices. Appendix one includes the AsiaBarometer questionnaire and appendix 2, the list of multilateral treaties included in the dataset.

Once again Prof. Inoguchi delights us with a book of excellent conceptual and methodological precision, offering us the possibility of a new look at Asian societies, which will be of great use not only for the academy and the scientific field, but also for people interested in understanding the different diversities of Asian societies.”

I highly recommend the publication of the book.

—Graciela Tonon, *Director of the Master’s Program of Social Sciences and the Social Sciences Research Centre (CICS-UP), Faculty of Social Sciences, Universidad de Palermo, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>How I Was Inspired by the Eurobarometer and Grappled with the AsiaBarometer Survey</b> .....	1
	References .....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>How My Encounters with Cultural Psychology and Evolutionary Biology Helped to Justify My Choice of Perspective and Approach Adopted in This Book</b> .....	5
	References .....	8
<b>3</b>	<b>The Need for a Bottom-Up Perspective About Asian Societies</b> .....	11
	References .....	12
<b>4</b>	<b>The Need for an Evidence-Based Approach to Asian Societies</b> .....	13
	References .....	14
<b>5</b>	<b>Two Methodological Issues</b> .....	17
	5.1 The “Survey as Conversation” Problem .....	17
	5.2 The Level of Analysis Problem: Aggregating Individual Response Patterns to Societal Response Patterns .....	21
	References .....	23
<b>6</b>	<b>Attending Holistically and Analytically</b> .....	25
	References .....	36
<b>7</b>	<b>Are Asian Societies One Type?</b> .....	39
	7.1 Typology of Asian Societies .....	39
	References .....	41
<b>8</b>	<b>Choosing Indicators and Typologizing of Societies</b> .....	43
	8.1 Choosing Indicators: Form and Substance .....	43
	8.2 Typologizing Societies .....	44
	8.3 Methodological Issues Related to Factor-Analyzing Human Daily Life Satisfaction of Each of 29 Asian Societies ...	45
	References .....	46

- 9 Factor Analysis Results** ..... 47
- Reference ..... 49
- 10 Twenty-Nine Types of Asian Societies** ..... 51
- 10.1 Abc Society: Octopus-cave Society ..... 52
  - 10.1.1 Japan ..... 52
  - 10.1.2 Indonesia ..... 53
  - 10.1.3 Taiwan ..... 54
  - 10.1.4 Afghanistan ..... 55
  - 10.1.5 Uzbekistan ..... 56
  - 10.1.6 Tajikistan ..... 57
- 10.2 Acb Society: God-of-Small-Things ..... 57
  - 10.2.1 India ..... 57
  - 10.2.2 Bangladesh ..... 59
  - 10.2.3 Nepal ..... 59
  - 10.2.4 Myanmar ..... 60
  - 10.2.5 Cambodia ..... 61
  - 10.2.6 Laos ..... 62
  - 10.2.7 Mongolia ..... 62
  - 10.2.8 China ..... 63
  - 10.2.9 South Korea ..... 63
- 10.3 Bac Society: Society Colonized from Within ..... 64
  - 10.3.1 Hong Kong ..... 64
  - 10.3.2 Malaysia ..... 64
  - 10.3.3 Thailand ..... 65
  - 10.3.4 Vietnam ..... 66
  - 10.3.5 Kyrgyzstan ..... 66
- 10.4 Bca Society: Fragmented and Fractured Society ..... 67
- 10.5 Cab Society: Seeming Fractured and Fractured Divisions  
of a Society ..... 67
  - 10.5.1 Pakistan ..... 67
  - 10.5.2 Brunei ..... 68
  - 10.5.3 The Philippines ..... 68
  - 10.5.4 Bhutan ..... 69
  - 10.5.5 Kazakhstan ..... 69
- 10.6 Cba Society: Micro-monitoring Society ..... 70
  - 10.6.1 Singapore ..... 70
  - 10.6.2 Sri Lanka ..... 70
- References ..... 71
- 11 Strength and Weakness of the Proposed Typology** ..... 73
- 11.1 Measurement and Comparison ..... 73
- 11.2 Interpretation of Typologized Results ..... 75
- 11.3 How to Cope with Globalization and Democratization? ..... 76
- 11.4 Managing Globalization and Democratization ..... 77
- References ..... 78



<b>12 Corroborative Analysis and Empirical Validation</b> .....	81
References .....	86
<b>13 Conclusion</b> .....	87
References .....	89
<b>Appendix A: Asia Barometer English Master Questionnaire 2006</b> .....	91
<b>Appendix B List of Multilateral Treaties Covered in the Dataset</b> .....	115
<b>Appendix C Multilateral Treaty Participation (Accumulated     Number)</b> .....	117

# Chapter 1

## How I Was Inspired by the Eurobarometer and Grappled with the AsiaBarometer Survey



*The Economist* magazine on 2 October 2020 carried an article on China under the tag “The 1.4 bn-people question” with the main title being “Apparatchiks and academics alike struggle to take China’s pulse.” The article reminded me of the feeling I had when I wanted to design and carry out an Asia-wide opinion poll project in the late 1970s. Inspired by the Eurobarometer project, I visited Jacques-René Rabier for his advice at *L’Institut français d’opinion publique* in Paris in 1979. This was the year when I was teaching at *L’Institut universitaire haut études de relations internationale* in Geneva. As the founder of the Eurobarometer, he was delighted to give me both moral support and concrete advice. He was especially emphatic about questionnaire formulation and institutional building: (1) Questions to be asked should first of all be clear and concise, and secondly should be placed in a familiar context and use familiar words; and (2) Having regional scope, my project should have an ambitious institutional design. He reminded me of his being Cartesian in the use of words and being Gallic in institutional building.

More than two decades would pass before I decided to design and implement what would be named the AsiaBarometer Survey at the dawn of the new millennium. The time was ripe and my strategy ready, I thought. The economic sanctions of the West and Japan against the Chinese suppression of the Tiananmen protestors were lifted from 1991 onward. The Deng Xiaoping strategy of “hide your strength, bide your time” resumed again. China sought foreign direct investment and joined multilateral treaties to hasten its economic momentum. The World Trade Organization (WTO) and the World Intellectual Property Organization were such treaties. In Beijing, Jiang Zemin legislated the inclusive basis of rule by the Chinese Communist Party to be enlarged to admit capitalists. My strategy retrospectively was to ride the current wave of the time in what Milanovic (2019) calls “political capitalism” from the disembargo by the West to China’s entry into the WTO through the blossoming of the Deng’s “hide your strength, bide your time” policy. My design covers all 32 states in East, Southeast, South and Central Asia, plus three neighbors to Asia: the Russian Federation, Australia and the US. The tide of globalization permeated the developing South and the developed North and the steady increase in the democratizing push

from below increasingly led many Asian governments to become more authoritarian or autocratic (Chu & Wong, 2010) at the dawn of the new millennium.

My strategy worked well. The time was ripe for implementation. But writing books and articles did not proceed quickly. The years 2003–2008 were spent on implementation in carrying out surveys in each of these five years in six to 12 societies, out of 29 Asian societies, as well as the adjacent societies, i.e., the Russian Federation, Australia and the US, almost each year. Also, for almost each year after the survey, the tabulation and cross-tabulation analysis came out, after which country experts and survey analysts gathered to write papers for review and discussion in Tokyo. The revised manuscripts each year were published (Inoguchi et al., 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009). Monographs were published on the subjects of happiness (Shin & Inoguchi, 2008); quality of life (Inoguchi & Fujii, 2013); trust (Inoguchi & Tokuda, 2017); exit, voice and loyalty (Inoguchi, 2017), and typology of Asian societies (Inoguchi, 2019), the last of which was a chapter in the handbook on Asian foreign policy (Inoguchi, 2019). A full decade passed between the publication of the first book and that of the seventh book. While I was embarking on a full-length book publication in the original design in 2003, I read those articles authored by Richard Nisbett and Joseph Henrich, which came out in book format, Nisbett (2004) and Henrich (2016, 2020), in relation to cross-cultural research in psychology and evolutionary biology, and the research of Fog (2020) and Welzel (2013) on factor analyzing data on cross-cultural research.

## References

- Chu, Y., & Wong, S. (Eds.). (2010). *East Asian new democracies: Deeper*. Routledge.
- Fog, A. (2020). A test of the reproducibility of the clustering of cultural variables. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 55(1), 29–57.
- Henrich, J. (2016). *The secret of our success: How culture is driving human evolution. Domesticating our species, and making us smarter*. Princeton University Press.
- Henrich, J. (2020). *The weirdest people in the world: How the west became psychologically peculiar and particularly prosperous*. Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Inoguchi, T. (2017). *Exit, voice and loyalty in Asia: Individual choice under 32 societal umbrellas*. Springer.
- Inoguchi, T. (2019). An evidence-based typology of Asian societies: What do Asian societies look like from the bottom up instead of top down? In T. Inoguchi (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of Asian foreign policy*, 2 vols. (Vol. 1, pp. 443–461).
- Inoguchi, T., & Fujii, S. (2013). *The quality of life in Asia: A comparison of quality of life in Asia*. Springer.
- Inoguchi, T., & Tokuda, Y. (Eds.). (2017). *Trust with Asian characteristics: Interpersonal and institutional*. Springer.
- Inoguchi, T., et al. (Eds.). (2005). *Values and life styles in urban Asia: A cross-cultural analysis and sourcebook based on the AsiaBarometer survey of 2003*. Siglo XXI Editores for the Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo.
- Inoguchi, T., et al. (Eds.). (2006). *Human beliefs and values in strident Asia: East Asia in focus: Country profiled and thematic analyses based on the AsiaBarometer survey of 2004*. Akashi Shoten.

- Inoguchi, T., et al. (Eds.). (2008). *Human beliefs and values in incredible Asia: South and central Asia in focus: Country profiles and thematic analyses based on the AsiaBarometer survey of 2005*. Akashi Shoten.
- Inoguchi, T., et al. (Eds.). (2009). *Human beliefs and values in east and southeast Asia in transition: 13 countries profiles on the basis of the AsiaBarometer surveys of 2006 and 2007*. Akashi Shoten.
- Milanovic, B. (2019). *Capitalism, alone: The future of the system that rules the world*. Harvard University Press.
- Nisbett, R. (2004). *The geography of thought: How Asians and westerns think differently ... and why*. Free Press.
- Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (Eds.). (2008). *The quality of life in Asia: From physical welfare to subjective well-being*. Springer.
- The Economist*. (2020, October 22). China: The 1.4 bn-people question: Apparatchiks and academics alike struggle to take China's pulse.
- Welzel, C. (2013). *Freedom rising: Human empowerment and the quest for emancipation*. Cambridge University Press.

## Chapter 2

# How My Encounters with Cultural Psychology and Evolutionary Biology Helped to Justify My Choice of Perspective and Approach Adopted in This Book



While shifting from focusing on values and norms in the Asia-Europe democracy survey to focusing on quality of life in the AsiaBarometer Survey, the question of how to tackle an Asia-wide quality of life survey that would allow both systematic comparisons and efficiently highlight societal peculiarities gradually stood in my way.

When embarking on what I then prematurely thought would be the last book on the AsiaBarometer Survey, I serendipitously read works by Richard Nisbett and Joseph Henrich in relation to cross-cultural research in cultural psychology and evolutionary biology, respectively. I was struck by the cultural diversities and analytic versus holistic orientation between Americans and Asians (Nisbett, 2004) and between WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich and Democratic) and other groups in terms of perceptual and cognitive abilities and biases, especially analytic over holistic thinking, attention to the foreground and central actors, isolating objects from the background and those in between (Henrich, 2016, 2020). Although I was vaguely cognizant of some difficulties often encountered in factor-analyzing and explaining cross-cultural survey analysis results, both Nisbett and Henrich directly pointed out the challenges and eliminated my hesitancy to embrace diversities related to perceptual and cognitive abilities and biases. In this chapter, I attempt to present my line of thinking about how and what strategy I would pursue in asking questions and interpreting results, thus justifying the methodological part of the *raison d'être* of this book.

When I was reading works on trust by Yamagishi (1990), I was struck by how differently Americans and Japanese respond to psychological experiments. The key difference is the quality of being risk averse versus risk taking, such as in an iterative prisoner's dilemma game where one Japanese plays a game with one American incommunicado. While the American chooses a cooperative move first, the Japanese chooses a non-cooperative move, i.e., a risk-averse move without knowing about the predisposition of the American (Putnam, 1997). A Japanese idiom, "Do not cross a bridge before you check twice about safety," captures the mindset.

When Maruyama (1961), a political scientist, characterizes Japanese society as an octopus-cave society, he is referring to the behavior of the octopus that seeks an empty cave in competition to other octopuses or other non-octopus competitors. Furthermore, like-minded people join a small space, constructing a small community under a boss-octopus, within which conversations inside a cave are frequent and in-depth whereas conversations with those outside are rare and superficial (Tett, 2016).

Robert Putnam and Toshio Yamagishi argue that Japanese trust is particularistic trust whereas American trust is general trust. According to them, Japanese tend to trust people with similar attributes, backgrounds (the same school, the same company, and the same geographical birthplace, etc.) and those who occupy similar space for work and social relations. In general, Americans tend to show impersonal prosociality (Henrich, 2020) when meeting people for the first time. Thus Americans tend to be more predisposed to offering friendly smiles in first encounters. In contrast, Japanese tend to be apprehensive about people in their first encounter. They quickly gaze at the name card to find the name, position and affiliation of the other person rather than look in their eyes, and in bowing to that person they are able to view from head to toe that person's hairstyle, clothes and shoes. In the second encounter and beyond, Americans tend to find out relatively quickly whether a person they have encountered is trustworthy or not, by first engaging them in their highly multi-cultural and mobile society. Japanese tend to determine trustworthiness by engaging new acquaintances in the same small space for a longer time with a high degree of attention to social relations in a less multi-cultural and less mobile society.

When I analyzed trust levels in individuals and institutions with the AsiaBarometer Survey data (Inoguchi & Tokuda, 2017), my interest was in Asians and the differences and similarities among them (Inoguchi, 2017). The distinction between Americans and East Asians (Nisbet) or between the WIERD and others (Henrich, 2020) never occurred to me as useful when formulating questionnaires for the AsiaBarometer Survey. My approach was to draw up a list, as large as possible, of questions on trust that other analysts have used and factor-analyze cross-national survey data. The key three dimensions that have emerged are (1) human nature as good and evil, (2) merit-based and utilitarian, and (3) harmonious relationship with a larger society. In other words, the first dimension discriminates those who see humankind as good-natured versus evil-natured. Myanmar and India are located at polar opposites on this dimension. The second dimension of trust is utilitarian, or whether individuals are worthy of trust in terms of benefit. Those former British colonies stand out on this dimension. The third dimension differentiates between those who are in basic harmony with a larger society and those who are not. On this dimension, those in communist societies stand out (Inoguchi, 2017).

Only when I encountered Inglehart (2017), Welzel (2013) and Fog (2020) in conjunction with Nisbett and Henrich (2020) did the idea occur to me to justify my perspective and approach in survey research design as scientifically valid. These three dimensions of trust analysis (Inoguchi, 2017) can be categorized as attributes, abilities and aspirations (human nature) and as social-relational (beneficial to individual), and social-relational (harmonious with a larger society). Whereas the attributive

dimension and the social-relational dimensions coexist in Asian societies, the Asian conceptions of trust have turned out to be much more diverse and “balanced” in the sense of Henrich (2020) who means the WEIRD are “essentially extreme” outliers on many cultural tendencies of individualism, overconfidence, being analytic over holistic, isolating objects over backgrounds, single minded pursuit of consistency generating deep stress, etc.

Take Henrich’s (2020) individualism scale list: The Netherlands is in the most extreme position, followed by most Northwestern Europeans whom Henrich calls WEIRD, while the furthest apart from the Dutch on that individualism scale are the Mapuche, a hunter-gatherer tribe in the Andean mountain range in Chile who are the least WEIRD and individualistic in the Henrich sense. The Asians in East, Southeast, South and Central Asia are somewhere in between the Dutch and Mapuche. The psychological experiment to measure the individualism scale highlights the quality of being analytic versus holistic in perceptual and cognitive abilities and biases. In the first chapter of Henrich (2020, p. 54) immediately strikes me.

The list in Inoguchi and Le (2019) of multilateral treaty participation of 193 sovereign states incredibly resembles Henrich’s list of individualism. Inoguchi and Le (2021) list those states in terms of the number of participation in multilateral treaties between 1945 and 2019. Inoguchi and Le’s list of the sovereign states is as follows:

1. The Netherlands
2. Belgium
3. Finland
4. Slovakia
5. Czech Republic
6. Luxembourg
7. Norway
8. Germany
9. France
10. Sweden.

They are all West European, industrialized, rich, and democratic. Even those ranked from 11th and 21st are very Westernized and fit into Henrich’s grouping of WEIRD. They are: Turkey, Egypt, Nigeria, Armenia, Malaysia, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Brazil, South Africa, and Mexico.

In Asia, Malaysia and Japan are the signatories to the largest number of multilateral treaties since 1945, ranking 15th and 16th worldwide. This means that of the 29 sovereign states surveyed in the AsiaBarometer Survey, Asian states fall between 15 and 193th among all state participants. If my observation that Asians are located in the “broadly balanced” spectrum on the analytic and holistic dimension is accurate and if the degree of multilateral treaty participation can be taken possibly as a surrogate scale of analytic versus holistic scale, then Asians are indeed broadly balanced on the analytic versus holistic dimension. The surprising resemblance between Henrich (2020) on individualism and Inoguchi and Le (2021) on multilateral treaty participation has encouraged me to avoid using abstract words without suggesting clues to

a contextual setting. Unlike most psychology scale measurements, respondents are not overwhelmingly WEIRD-like. If Asian reality was not overwhelmingly WEIRD-like, it would not be pertinent to have those survey questions that are unintentionally tailored to those states that fall into the WEIRD category. The consequence of the distribution of responses would most likely be skewed to extreme non-WEIRD locations. That would not be a very wise strategy to properly capture the differences of non-WEIRD propensity and proclivity to be analytic or holistic. This is exactly what happened to Inoguchi and Le (2019) in terms of the distribution of those states on those dimensions of agile versus cautious, global commons versus individual interests, and aspirational bonding versus mutual binding. Those states that are grouped as Sub-Saharan Africa, Islamic East (which includes Middle Eastern and Northern African states), Latin America (which includes Caribbean states), and New West (which includes Southern Pacific states) tend to be crowded in the corner of non-WEIRD state locations whether it is cautious, individual interests, or aspirational bonding. Those states that are categorized as Indic East (which includes South and Southeast Asian states), Sinic East (East Asian states), Old West (which includes those states founded during the Roman Empire), Returned West (those states which used to belong to the communist bloc but have returned to the capitalist bloc), and Orthodox East (which includes those states under Russian and Byzantine empires) tend to be located in between on most dimensions. Reformed West (which includes those states that emerged around the Reformation) tends to accommodate what Henrich (2020) calls the WEIRD states. The scope of the AsiaBarometer Survey covers Sinic East, Indic East, and Orthodox East, all of which include in-between states between WEIRDers and non-WEIRDers in other works by Henrich.

## References

- Fog, A. (2020). A test of the reproducibility of the clustering of cultural variables. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 55(1), 29–57.
- Henrich, J. (2016). *The secret of our success: How culture is driving human evolution, domesticating our species, and make us smarter*. Princeton University Press.
- Henrich, J. (2020). *The WEIRDest people in the world: How the west psychologically peculiar and particularly prosperous*. Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Inglehart, R. (2017). *Cultural evolution: People's motivations are changing, and reshaping the world*. Princeton University Press.
- Inoguchi, T. (2017). *Exit, voice and loyalty in Asia: Individual choice under 32 societal umbrellas*. Springer.
- Inoguchi, T., & Tokuda, Y. (Eds.). (2017). *Trust with Asian characteristics: Interpersonal and institutional*. Springer.
- Inoguchi, T., & Le, L. T. Q. (2019). *The development of global legislative politics: Rousseau and Locke Writ Global*. Springer Nature.
- Inoguchi, T., & Le, L. T. Q. (2021). *Digitized statecraft in multilateral treaty participation: Global quasi-legislative behavior of 193 sovereign states*. Springer Nature.
- Maruyama, M. (1961). *Nihon no Shiso* [Japanese thought]. Iwanami Shoten.
- Nisbett, R. (2004). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently ... and why*. Free Press.



- Putnam, R. (1997). Democracy in America and century's end. In A. Hadelnius (Ed.), *Democracy's victory and crisis* (pp. 27–70). Cambridge University Press.
- Tett, G. (2016). *The silo effect: The peril of expertise and the promise of breaking down barriers*. Simon and Schuster.
- Welzel, C. (2013). *Freedom rising: Human empowerment and the quest for emancipation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yamagishi, T. (1990). *Shakaiteki jiremima no kenkyu* [A study of social dilemma]. Science Sha.

# Chapter 3

## The Need for a Bottom-Up Perspective About Asian Societies



Classical authors of Asian societies have tended to adopt a top-down approach. Georg Friedrich Hegel's key concept of Asian societies was "freedom for one person" (Avineri, 1974). It means freedom is for one person, an autocrat. Karl Marx's key concept was Asiatic mode of production (Marx, 1992). It means that in Asia the mode of production is tied to coercion and connectivity. Max Weber's key word to explain the prosperity of Europe was the Protestant ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism (Weber, 2002). Hence, according to Weber, production outside of Europe was not that vigorous, except for those Protestant settler-originated societies. Karl Wittfogel's key concept was state-directed infrastructure building (Wittfogel, 1957). This means that large-scale infrastructure construction of rivers, roads, gates and castles, dams, and ports requires an autocratic leader to mobilize resources and labor effectively.

To examine QOL in Asian societies, one needs to adopt a bottom-up approach. Because QOL differs from one person to another, rounding all the individual differences with "national characteristics" is not my approach either. Needless to say, the classical picture of Asian society does not represent the immensely vast and intricately diverse Asian societies. To make up for this classical author weakness, geographers, geologists, anthropologists, linguists, biologists, psychologists, sociologists, and medical doctors deploy the bottom-up approach to portray and reveal individuals and societies with immense detail and often with picturesque vividness. Many of them, however, do not necessarily try to connect individuals and societies systematically. Many of them adopt an evidence-based approach. However, there are two major weaknesses: (1) local sample populations' responses are used without specification of the population size (for example, medical doctors assemble data often based on local medical hospitals, and evolutionary biologists assemble data often focusing on voluntary participants and patients in local villages); (2) these medical doctors energetically assemble massive data on patients, especially those affected by the Covid-19 virus, in particular from China. On cross-national research, however, psychologists vigorously assemble data, focusing on Western (Europe, North America or Australia)

university undergraduate students. About 70% of the subjects are American university undergraduate students. Many of them are statistically biased (Henrich et al. 2010).

## References

- Avineri, S. (1974). *Hegel's theory of the modern state*. Cambridge University Press.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*, 466, 29.
- Marx, K. (1992). *Capital vol.1: A critique of political economy*. Penguin Classics.
- Weber, M. (2002). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism: And other writings*. Penguin Classics.
- Wittfogel, K. (1957). *Oriental despotism: A comparative study of total power*. Yale University Press.

## Chapter 4

# The Need for an Evidence-Based Approach to Asian Societies



In Chap. 3, I point out the weakness of a top-down perspective in dealing with QOL in Asia. However, QOL research on Asia has the one weakness of there not being much cross-national research conducted (Inoguchi & Fujii, 2008). Hong Kong and Singapore spearheaded QOL research in Asia, then Taiwan, South Korea, Japan, Thailand, and the Philippines followed in the 1990s, with China picking up this research trend in the new millennium. QOL research has focused on one society, not comparison with other societies, let alone with cross-national research. Hence, those cross-nationally derived data have not been assembled in, and on, Asia until the new millennium (Estes & Sirgy, 2017; Glatzer et al., 2015; Moller et al., 2008). The AsiaBarometer Survey (Inoguchi, 2002, 2013, 2015) has been the first of its kind in the world. Also, the East Asian General Social Survey's (EAGSS) quadrilateral survey in the new millennium has given new vigor to QOL research on Asia. Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and China participate in the EAGSS. The Asian Barometer Survey, which focuses on democracy and used to be called the East Asian Barometer Survey, has also energized QOL research on Asia. This survey was re-named the Asian Barometer Survey after the creation, funding, and implementation of the AsiaBarometer Survey and its focus on QOL research. The AsiaBarometer Survey covers 32 Asian societies, three of which deal with Russia, Australia and the US. The Asian Barometer Survey and its focus on democracy covers about 20 Asian societies.

The AsiaBarometer Survey's "typologizing of Asian societies" project deploys a scheme that ensures both an evidence-based approach and bottom-up perspective. Evidence-based means that the target population is nationally, randomly sampled and face-to-face interviewed response data is collected in the first step. In the second step of data analysis, I do not deploy the scheme of, say, the World Value Survey focusing on values and norms the world over (Inglehart, 2020; Welzel, 2013). Instead, I deploy my scheme of factor-analyzing each of 29 societal data separately and factor-analyzing each of 29 societal responses separately, coming up with the scheme of each of the 29 societal responses collected Asia-wide, factor-analyzed and the associated dimensions and society scores plotted on three dimensional spaces. The key difference is that whereas the World Value Survey gives priority to detecting the changing

value trends over the entire world, the AsiaBarometer Survey prioritizes discovering the types of Asian societies. In other words, whereas the World Value Survey is interested in the global human value change taking place along the materialist (survival or modern) and post-materialist (social relations or post-modern) dimensions, the AsiaBarometer Survey is interested in Asian societies shaping themselves with the three dimensions of survival, social relations and public sector dominance differentiating six types of Asian societies.

It was Hendrich (2016) who coined WEIRD to denote those holders of extremely strange and peculiar angle to look at other persons and its institutional outcomes. Because of the medieval Catholic Church-tigered transformation of many traditional clans and groups, Western European conception of human beings as composed of families with God shining under Catholic Church influence.

Jacques René Rabier's advice in 1979 emphasized the importance of concise and clear wording and of questionnaire formulation with familiar words and context. I am also further encouraged by Henrich (2016, 2020) who has shown populations and their societies differ tremendously with experimental psychological responses, registering vast empirical evidence the world over. My project of typologizing Asian societies on the basis of daily life satisfaction has followed a similar line as far as Henrich's epistemological understanding is concerned. Factor analyzing of individuals' responses to questions about daily life satisfaction with 16 items of daily life domains, aspects and styles country by country—not the entire sampled Asian populations—probably plays the most important role in the results of my project. It reveals and illuminates the vast diversities in clear contrast to the pictures that representative WEIRD academics, like Hegel, Marx, Weber, and Wittfogel, have painted in their respectively WEIRD fashion.

## References

- Estes, R., & Sirgy, J. (Eds.). (2017). *The pursuit of human well-being: The untold global history*. Springer.
- Glatzer, W., et al. (Eds.). (2015). *Global handbook of quality of life: Exploration of well-being of nations and continents*. Springer.
- Henrich, J. (2016). *The secret of our success: How culture is driving human evolution, domesticating our species, and make us smarter*. Princeton University Press.
- Henrich, J. (2020). *The WEIRDest people in the world: How the west became psychologically peculiar and particularly prosperous*. Farrer, Strauss and Giroux.
- Inglehart, R. (2020). *Cultural evolution: People's motivations are changing, and reshaping the world*. Cambridge University Press.
- Inoguchi, T. (2002). A call for regional opinion polling in Asia. *Japan Echo*, 29(5), 14–17.
- Inoguchi, T., & Fujii, S. (2008). The AsiaBarometer: Its aim, its scope and its development. In V. Moller, D. Huschka & A. Michalos (Eds.), *Barometers of quality of life around the globe: How are we doing?* (pp 187–232). SpringerScience + Business Media B.V.
- Inoguchi, T. (2013). A pioneer in Asian quality of life research. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 273–274.
- Inoguchi, T. (2015). Quality of life research in Asia. In A. C. Michalos & F. Maggino (Eds.), *A life devoted to quality of life*. Festschrift in Honor. Springer.

- Moller, V., Huschka, D., & Michalos, A. C. (Eds.). (2008). *Barometers of quality of life around the globe: How are we doing?* Springer.
- Welzel, C. (2013). *Freedom rising: Human empowerment and the quest for emancipation.* Cambridge University Press.

# Chapter 5

## Two Methodological Issues



Having sketched my design, survey implementation, and publications, I now come to the two methodological issues that have been haunting me without full resolution. They are:

- (1) The “survey as conversation” problem, or questions being formulated with clear and concise words and questions being asked in a familiar context and using familiar words.
- (2) The level of analysis problem of aggregating individual responses to societal responses.

### 5.1 The “Survey as Conversation” Problem

This problem has become serious as survey research has become immensely specialized in tandem with many innovations in surveying technology. Some of the question-designers have tended to forget an important aspect of the surveys and polls, that is, they are conversations between the question-designers and respondents thereto. Unless questions are well understood by potential respondents, many of them fail to answer, or stop answering. Philosophers and engineers, for instance, often formulate questions so abstract or so esoteric or with such unknown words that they create many unexpected problems. This is not to be taken lightly, especially as the English master questionnaire must be translated into 35 local languages in 32 societies, as is the case with the AsiaBarometer Survey. For instance, Hong Kong, Singapore, China, Taiwan, and Malaysia in the AsiaBarometer Survey have their respective Mandarin (Chinese) versions. Although the meanings of all versions remain the same as the English master questionnaire, the exact sentences and words used in the respective places (i.e., Hong Kong, Singapore, Beijing, Taipei, Kuala Lumpur) are not always the same. In survey implementation, the difficulty of executing face-to-face interviewing has become so extreme that the number of respondents who respond becomes less than 30% and easily drops to 10%. Costs to carry out one survey have become so high

in tandem with the per capita national income levels that it gets prohibitively costly. Alternatively, randomly sampled respondents by a telephone survey obfuscate the statistical problem of the entire national population and the sampled persons; thus the problem of representation of respondents becomes serious.

The problem becomes more complex when some simple words come into the question. Take “happiness,” “trust,” and “quality of life,” for example. These words are commonly used words and at the same time incredibly abstract words. Without being more specific and concrete in setting up the context in which happiness, trust or satisfaction are asked of respondents, their answers can be shaped by their own respective understanding of the situation. As previously noted, Tolstoy (2014) begins *Anna Karenina* with the sentence: “Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.” Tolstoy is not necessarily logical here. We need to remind ourselves that such an abstract word as happiness is difficult to use, especially in survey research, unless one or two tacks are deployed.

Following the advice of Jacques-René Rabier to the AsiaBarometer survey project, I give nine specific valued priorities, listed in the question for respondents to choose from (Shin & Inoguchi, 2008):

1. Being healthy
2. Having a comfortable home
3. Having enough to eat
4. Having access to good medical care
5. Raising children
6. Spending time with your family
7. Earning a high income
8. Being able to live without fear of crime
9. Being on good terms with others.

And following up with counting the accumulated positive experience with the above nine priorities, three kinds of happiness—narrow happiness, happiness derived from enjoyment, and happiness derived from accomplishment—are distinguishable. On the basis of this operation the similarity and dissimilarity among Confucian societies in East Asia is examined (Shin & Inoguchi, 2008).

Trust is another common and at the same time abstract word. Inoguchi and Tokuda (2017) use two approaches to this problem. In part one of this book, Inoguchi (2017) lists some eight daily life situations for gauging trust, asking respondents to give their respective answer by choosing one pertinent response. Questions 1 through 8 deal with:

- (1) High trust and low (Q1, Q2, Q3)
- (2) Broad trust and narrow (Q4, Q5)
- (3) Collective trust (Q6)
- (4) Gender-related trust (Q7)
- (5) Power and non-confidence (Q8).

The eight questions listed are:



Q1: Generally, do you think people can be trusted or do you think that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people (that it pays to be wary of people)?

1. Most people can be trusted
2. Can't be too careful in dealing with people
3. Don't know.

Q2: Do you think that people generally try to be helpful or do you think that they mostly look out for themselves?

1. People generally try to be helpful
2. People mostly look out for themselves
3. Don't know.

Q3: If you saw somebody on the street looking lost, would you stop to help?

1. Would always stop to help
2. Would help if nobody else did
3. Highly likely that I wouldn't stop to help
4. Don't know.

Q4: If you had no descendants, would you think it desirable to adopt somebody in order to continue the family line, even if there were no blood relationship? Or do you think this would be unnecessary?

1. Would adopt in order to continue the family line
2. Would not adopt in order to continue the family line. I think it would be pointless
3. Would depend on the circumstances
4. Don't know.

Q5: Suppose that you are the president of a company. In the company's employment examination, a relative of yours got the second-highest grade, scoring only marginally less than the candidate with the highest grade. In such a case, which person would you employ?

1. The person with the highest grade
2. Your relative
3. Don't know.

Q6: If the main breadwinner of your household should die or become unable to work due to illness, how would your household maintain the household budget? Select up to two of the following measures.

1. Another adult member of the family would become the main breadwinner
2. Would send one or more of the children out to work
3. Would get support from relatives
4. Would get support from neighbors and the community
5. Would get social welfare payments
6. Retirement allowance
7. Have an insurance policy to cover such a situation

8. Other
9. Don't know.

Q7: Do you think that on the whole men and women are treated equally in your country? Please indicate which of the following is closest to your opinion:

1. Men are treated much more favorably than women
2. Men are treated somewhat more favorably than women
3. Men and women are treated equally
4. Women are treated somewhat more favorably than men
5. Women are treated much more favorably than men
6. Don't know.

Q8: What should a person who needs a government permit do, if the response of the official handling the application is: "just be patient and wait?"

1. Use connections to obtain a permit
2. Nothing can be done
3. Wait and hope that things will work out
4. Write a letter
5. Act without a permit
6. Bribe an official
7. Don't know.

These eight questions have been adopted from works on trust using various definitions. On question 6, I focus only on the answer 4 (Q6-4). These eight questions tap very wide-ranging meanings of trust, thus enabling me to come up with a wide mix of variety and balance.

The 10 societies examined are: China, Vietnam, South Korea, Japan, Myanmar, India, Uzbekistan, Thailand, Malaysia, and Sri Lanka. Given the configuration of the 10 countries pooled and analyzed, the whole picture represents Asian diversity in religions, such as Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Christianity, but also in the developed North and the developing South, in Maritime versus Continental Asia, and in experiences with colonialism and its legacy.

The respondents of the 10 countries are pooled together to be analyzed by principal component analysis with Kaiser varimax rotation. The first dimension is that of general trust. It taps the dimension of how one perceives one's fellow humans and whether they initiate dealings with other persons, (1) from the point that views humankind essentially as good in nature or (2) from the point that views humankind essentially as bad in nature. The second dimension is that of trust in merit-based utility. It taps one's contributions to the rest on utility or merit. The third dimension is like confidence in the institutions and systems in which the respondents are embedded. It taps whether one engages in community affairs or not. In other words, it taps the difference between broad and narrow trust in terms of blood and gender.

QOL is another common and at the same time abstract concept. By asking the following question, I try to induce respondents to answer with relative ease by specifying aspects of life with familiar words and settings—"Please tell me how satisfied

or dissatisfied you are with the following aspects of life.” Respondents are requested to answer on a five-point verbal scale of “very satisfied,” “somewhat satisfied,” “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied,” “somewhat dissatisfied,” or “very dissatisfied,” with a “don’t know” category also included. The 16 life aspects are:

1. Housing
2. Friendships
3. Marriage
4. Standard of living
5. Household income
6. Health
7. Education
8. Job
9. Neighbors
10. Public safety
11. Condition of the environment
12. Social welfare system
13. Democratic system
14. Family life
15. Spiritual life
16. Leisure.

Factor-analyzing each one of the matrices of 29 Asian societies, i.e., 16 columns by those respondents of each one of 29 Asian societies, yields 29 factor-analysis results. This is what this book seeks to produce—revealing and illuminating the similarities and dissimilarities of Asian societies in terms of key dimensions, examining the power to explain the variance of each dimension, and thus typologizing each society.

An alternative way of factor-analyzing is not by each of the matrices of Asian societies, but by the matrices of 29 Asian societies, i.e., 16 columns of the entire 29 societies’ responses pooled together. This alternative way of analyzing is the same as our case of factor-analyzing trust shown above. It is also the case of the World Values Survey in which all respondents from the entire surveyed societies are pooled for analysis. It comes from the different priorities of factor analysis. Factor-analyzing QOL in each society aims to generate the typology of Asian societies, as is the case with this book, whereas factor-analyzing values and norms the world over aims to generate law-like generalizations, as is the case with the World Values Survey products.

## **5.2 The Level of Analysis Problem: Aggregating Individual Response Patterns to Societal Response Patterns**

The level of analysis problem occurs twice in relation to (1) the level of sampling and (2) the level of aggregation or synthesis. Before discussing the problem, it is

important to restate that the aim of this book is to reveal the similarities and dissimilarities of Asian societies. First, in dealing with the problem of choosing respondents, i.e., national sampling or global (or regional) sampling, we naturally chose national sampling, as we are interested in knowing the similarities and differences among 29 Asian societies. Global or regional sampling means the entire population of the world or the entire population of the Asian region (in our case, East, Southeast, South and Central Asia) should be sampled to economize the costs of surveys while satisfying representation (Gilani & Gilani, 2013). One method of achieving a quasi-representative sampling of the world or Asia is using Global Earth: many big dots on a map where two to five million people reside are selected randomly from the entire world or the whole of Asia. Another way of conducting global or regional sampling is to ask users of registered mobile phones globally or regionally. The major reason why we have not chosen the global or regional sampling method is that it has not been well developed, theoretically or operationally.

Second, we have to deal with the level of aggregation or synthesis. As we have chosen the national sampling method, the next problem is another level of analysis problem—how to aggregate individual response patterns to societal response patterns. Many multivariate analysis methods are available for this purpose. Our problem is which is better for our goal of elucidating societal differences in Asia. One way is factor-analyzing each of the national data sets of 29 Asian societies. The other way is factor-analyzing the pooled data of 29 Asian societies in one stroke. What are their differences? On this issue, Agner Fog (2020) shows the statistical examination of many cross-cultural data sets reproduced with factor analysis to cluster cultural variables to see whether something redundant or unproductive in analysis has been conducted. Fog's answer is yes: "the results are showing remarkably strong similarities between different studies carried out at different times using different variables and different methods" (p. 12). To see redundancies the correlations were calculated with and without control for the Human Development Index (HDI) because development is a likely confounding factor. Apart from findings of factor-analyzing cross-cultural variables, Fog cites, among many others, Ronald Inglehart (2018) on modernization. His finding is that "a single factor combining *survival versus self-expression values, individualism versus collectivism, and autonomy versus embeddedness* accounts for 81% of cross-national variation in these variables, Inglehart's modernization dimensions is similar to the super factor identified in the present study, with opposite sign" (cf. Beugelsdijk & Maseland, 2010). Fog and some other studies he cites like Inglehart (2018) and Beugelsdijk and Welzel (2018) inform us of the strategy of factor-analyzing each of the national data sets, not the whole national data sets of 29 Asian societies in our case in one stroke. That is in sync with our aim of elucidating those similarities and dissimilarities among 29 Asian societies with the dimensional size of eigenvalues and varying loads on satisfaction with aspects of daily life.

I must emphasize that apart from two problems of the level of analysis, our variables on individual satisfaction with daily life aspects, domains, and styles have large differences among the 29 societies in Asia, which indicates immense diversities.

## References

- Beugelsdijk, S., & Maseland, R. (2010). *Culture in economics: History*. Cambridge University Press.
- Beugelsdijk, S., & Welzel, C. (2018). Dimensions and dynamics of national culture: Synthesizing Hofstede With Inglehart. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 49(10), 1469–1505.
- Fog, A. (2020). A test of the reproducibility of the clustering of cultural variables. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 55(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397120956948>
- Gilani, I., & Gilani, B. (2013). *New method to do world poll*. Paper presented at WAPOR annual conference at Boston, Massachusetts, USA, 14–16 May, 2013.
- Inglehart, R. (2018). *Cultural evolution: People's motivations are changing, and reshaping the world*. Cambridge University Press.
- Inoguchi, T. (2017). Ch. 2: Social capital in ten Asian societies. In T. Inoguchi & Y. Tokuda (Eds.), (2017) *Trust with Asian characteristics: Interpersonal and institutional* (pp. 13–28). Springer.
- Inoguchi, T., & Tokuda, Y. (Eds.). (2017). *Trust with Asian characteristics: Interpersonal and institutional*. Springer.
- Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (Eds.). (2008). *The quality of life in Confucian Asia: From physical strength to subjective well-being*. Springer.
- Tolstoy, L. (2014). *Anna Karenina* (R. Bartlett, Trans.). Oxford University Press.

## Chapter 6

# Attending Holistically and Analytically



One of the challenges that the AsiaBarometer Survey faced was how to transform individual response patterns to societal response patterns. It was resolved by the adoption of facto-analyzing the matrix of 16 life aspects, domains, and styles for each of the 29 Asian societies instead of factor-analyzing the matrix of 16 life aspects, domains, and styles for columns and the rows amounting to the entire pooled number of respondents for the 29 Asian societies. This adoption may look simple. But the above two ways tend to produce differences that should never be underestimated.

When culture is to be analyzed on a cross-national basis, more caution is advisable. In the field of cultural psychology, Richard Nisbett and his colleagues show how different epistemology can be between the West and the East (Nisbett, 2004; Peng & Nisbett, 1999; Masuda & Nisbett, 2001; Nisbett et al., 2001). The authors of these works argue on the basis of many experimental studies of Asians and Americans that “reasoning about contradiction is guided by tacit ontologies and epistemologies” (Nisbet, pp. 36–37) and that “Asians believe that the world is in a constant flux and that the part cannot be understood except in relation to the whole” (Nisbet, pp. 80–86). In contrast, “Westerners believe in constancy of the world and believe it is possible to decontextualize propositions, understanding them just in relation to one another rather than attending also to a larger field of facts and theories in which the propositions are embedded” (Nisbet, pp. 111–135). Causal attribution differs across cultures, with Asians being inclined to attribute to contexts the sorts of actions that Westerners attribute to dispositions of the object—whether the object is human or physical (Peng & Nisbett, 1999). In other words, Asians attend holistically while Westerners attend analytically (Masuda & Nisbett, 2001). In a different context of the need to have more conversations between political philosophy and empirical theory, Inoguchi (2016) uses the Dharmic versus the Abrahamic to distinguish between dialectic (or middle-way) reasoning versus reasoning by formal logic respectively. Although Nisbett’s (2004) vocabulary may be taken as exaggeration or over-extension, what I have done with regard to the choice of factor-analyzing 29 times in total each of the 29 Asian societies’ responses instead of factor-analyzing

all the responses from 29 Asian societies in one stroke has a lot to do with Nisbett's Asian epistemology.

First, instead of abstract words like being happy about life, I have chosen the use of concrete words like being satisfied with your job. Second, instead of decontextualizing words, I have chosen minimally contextualized words such as being dissatisfied about your family. Third, instead of placing each of the 29 Asian societies' responses together as one, I have chosen the strategy of factor-analyzing each of the 29 Asian societies' responses separately.

It is for this very reason that relations between the 16 items of daily life satisfaction vary from one society to another. Holistic and integral understanding rather than analytic and differential understanding is likely to highlight the similarities and differences among the 29 Asian societies more effectively. If I had chosen the strategy of factor-analyzing the entire 29 Asian societies' responses in one shot, the labels of key dimensions were likely to be altered. Whatever singularities or key features of each of the 29 Asian societies are embedded with respect to daily life satisfaction would be diluted significantly. What Fog calls the "superfactor" is bound to emerge and cast a shadow over smaller dimensions other than the superfactor. In other words, if the superfactor dimension becomes too big and other smaller dimensions are overshadowed, then the original aim of revealing features of Asian societies is likely to be underachieved.

Fourth, more concretely, let me compare the factor-analysis results in terms of eigenvalues, dimension labels, and the dimensions loaded with daily life satisfaction items among Japan, India, Thailand, Pakistan, and Singapore (Tables 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5).

## Japan

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.640
Factor 2	1.097
Factor 3	0.645
Factor 4	0.291
Factor 5	0.239
Factor 6	0.173
Factor 7	0.083
Factor 8	-0.001
Factor 9	-0.056
Factor 10	-0.101
Factor 11	-0.124
Factor 12	-0.140
Factor 13	-0.163
Factor 14	-0.172
Factor 15	-0.181

(continued)

(continued)

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 16	-0.209
n	1.352

**India**

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	4.804
Factor 2	1.430
Factor 3	0.422
Factor 4	0.257
Factor 5	0.076
Factor 6	0.062
Factor 7	0.001
Factor 8	-0.012
Factor 9	-0.034
Factor 10	-0.091
Factor 11	-0.120
Factor 12	-0.127
Factor 13	-0.139
Factor 14	-0.157
Factor 15	-0.200
Factor 16	-0.246
n	1.202

**Thailand**

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.001
Factor 2	0.974
Factor 3	0.659
Factor 4	0.451
Factor 5	0.303
Factor 6	0.204
Factor 7	0.141
Factor 8	0.029
Factor 9	-0.038
Factor 10	-0.104

(continued)



(continued)

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 11	-0.135
Factor 12	-0.162
Factor 13	-0.169
Factor 14	-0.205
Factor 15	-0.234
Factor 16	-0.248
n	701

**Pakistan**

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	4.745
Factor 2	1.563
Factor 3	0.754
Factor 4	0.415
Factor 5	0.186
Factor 6	0.096
Factor 7	-0.027
Factor 8	-0.046
Factor 9	-0.055
Factor 10	-0.093
Factor 11	-0.119
Factor 12	-0.129
Factor 13	-0.149
Factor 14	-0.194
Factor 15	-0.203
Factor 16	-0.214
n	579

**Singapore**

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.420
Factor 2	1.308
Factor 3	0.673
Factor 4	0.523
Factor 5	0.351

(continued)

(continued)

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 6	0.152
Factor 7	0.121
Factor 8	0.061
Factor 9	-0.053
Factor 10	-0.082
Factor 11	-0.104
Factor 12	-0.145
Factor 13	-0.151
Factor 14	-0.196
Factor 15	-0.208
Factor 16	-0.246
n	578

Before the above five tables are to be compared, my scheme of 16 original items of daily aspects of life, domains and styles needs to be established.

Three key dimensions are labeled survival, social relations, and public policy dominance. Survival and social relations are materialist, post-materialist in the early Inglehartian labels. Public policy dominance is my contribution: i.e., Inoguchi-revised dimension on satisfaction with daily life aspects, domains, and styles.

Japan's survival dimension covers the following five items: housing, standard of living, household income, education, and job. Japan's social relations dimension covers the following six items: friendships, marriage, health, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Japan's public policy dimension covers the following five items: neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

India's survival dimension covers the following nine items: housing, friendships, marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, and neighbors. India's social relations dimension covers the following three items: family life, leisure, and spiritual life. India's public policy dimension covers the following four items: condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system and family life.

Thailand's survival dimension covers the following five items: standard of income, household income, health, education, and job. Thailand's social relations dimension covers the following seven items: housing, friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Thailand's public policy dimension covers the following four items: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

Pakistan's survival dimension covers the following seven items: housing, friendships, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. Pakistan's social relations dimension covers the following five items: marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Pakistan's public policy dimension covers the

**Table 6.1** Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments-Japan

	Factors		
	Materialist Post-materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Housing	0.41		0.70
Standard of living	0.77		0.31
Household income	0.77		0.34
Education	0.44		0.64
Job	0.49		0.60
Friendships	0.47		0.69
Marriage	0.59		0.55
Health	0.36		0.69
Family life	0.67		0.47
Leisure	0.53		0.58
Spiritual life	0.63		0.44
Neighbors		0.38	0.66
Public safety		0.64	0.52
Condition of the environment		0.60	0.51
Social welfare system		0.71	0.44
Democratic system		0.70	0.46

*Notes* The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

following four items: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

Singapore’s survival dimension covers the following five items: standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. Singapore’s social relations dimension covers the following seven items: housing, friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Singapore’s public policy dimension covers the following four items: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

Examining which items are covered by which dimensions is to find out which dimensions or features are striking. Those items with high correlations create dimensions or clusters of items. Here, what is most important to note is that one may think that the item “neighbors” is highly correlated within the social relations dimension, but in some other societies “neighbors” is highly correlated within the survival dimension or with the public policy dimension. Also, it is important to note the size of the eigenvalue of dimensions. The larger the eigenvalue is, the greater the influence the dimension exerts. Eigenvalues in terms of size and order determine types of societies.

**Table 6.2** Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments-India

	Factors			Uniqueness
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	
Housing	0.62			0.56
Friendships	0.53			0.63
Marriage	0.52			0.62
Standard of living	0.66			0.51
Household income	0.62			0.57
Health	0.55			0.61
Education	0.58			0.62
Job	0.56			0.62
Neighbors	0.43			0.64
Public safety		0.62		0.57
Condition of the environment		0.65		0.58
Social welfare system		0.66		0.54
Democratic system		0.63		0.57
Family life			0.57	0.52
Leisure			0.51	0.62
Spiritual life			0.57	0.56

*Notes* The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

Eigenvalues of the dimensions for these five societies are:

Japan: 5.7 (survival), 1.1 (social relations), and 0.65 (public policy) in this order.

India: 4.6 (survival), 1.4 (public policy), and 0.4 (social relations) in this order.

Thailand: 5.0 (social relations), 0.9 (survival), 0.7 (public policy) in this order.

Pakistan: 4.7 (social relations), 1.6 (public policy) and 0.76 (survival) in this order.

Singapore: 5.4 (public policy), 1.3 (social relations), and 0.7 (survival) in this order.

My typology of Asian societies focuses on 16 items of daily life satisfaction and their manifestations in relation to each other, especially in relation to the order of eigenvalue’s size. My formulation can be re-stated as follows:

Human beings are satisfied or dissatisfied with what they define as their daily activities or what I call satisfaction with daily life aspects, domains, and styles. I list 16 items: housing, friendships, marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, family life, spiritual life, and leisure.

If I factor-analyze the *entire* responses about daily life satisfaction with life aspects, domains, and styles in 29 Asian societies, three dimensions emerge: survival, social relations and public policy. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The

**Table 6.3** Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments-Thailand

	Factors			Uniqueness
	Post-materialist	Materialist	Public	
Housing	0.41			0.70
Friendships	0.42			0.75
Marriage	0.55			0.63
Neighbors	0.56			0.59
Family life	0.65			0.49
Leisure	0.57			0.57
Spiritual life	0.60			0.51
Standard of living		0.53		0.51
Household income		0.65		0.54
Health		0.38		0.72
Education		0.55		0.65
Job		0.65		0.52
Public safety			0.61	0.53
Condition of the environment			0.60	0.53
Social welfare system			0.66	0.51
Democratic system			0.59	0.62

*Notes* The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

social relations dimension is loaded with such items as friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The public policy dimension is loaded with such items as public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system (Inoguchi & Fujii, 2013, pp. 33–36). As compared with the picture of factor-analyzing 16 items of daily life aspects, domain, and styles in *each* of the 29 Asian societies, the picture of factor-analyzing 16 items of daily life aspects, domain, and styles manifests what Fog points out as the domination of the super-factor. Portions of the 16 items have something to do with Inglehart’s modernization and the size of the eigenvalue of the first dimension tends to be more inflated in the whole Asia data set than in each of the 29 Asian societies.

Bearing this in mind, my aim is to elucidate the main features or singularity of each of the 29 Asian societies. Thus, I factor-analyze each of the 29 Asian societies and see which of the 16 items of daily life satisfaction is loaded mainly on which dimension and how each of the three dimensions is ranked in terms of the size of eigenvalues.

There are three tasks to perform: (1) determining the order of ranking in terms of dimensional eigenvalues; (2) determining the deviations from the revised Inglehart scheme, i.e., survival, social relations, and public policy dominance in this order; and (3) determining which society places the dimension of public policy higher than third, which is the order of ranking in the revised Inglehart scheme; and determining

**Table 6.4** Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments-Pakistan

	Factors			
	Public	Materialist	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Public safety	0.67			0.47
Condition of the environment	0.73			0.43
Social welfare system	0.77			0.39
Democratic system	0.71			0.48
Housing		0.50		0.66
Friendships		0.43		0.66
Standard of living		0.55		0.50
Household income		0.74		0.41
Health		0.59		0.58
Education		0.51		0.66
Job		0.60		0.49
Marriage			0.50	0.62
Neighbors			0.40	0.75
Family life			0.56	0.60
Leisure			0.45	0.60
Spiritual life			0.58	0.64

*Notes* The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

which society places the dimension of social relations higher than second, which is the order of ranking in the revised Inglehart scheme.

Tables 6.6 and 6.7 summarizes the types of Asian societies in this book: Abc, Acb, Bac, Bca, Cab, Cba.

One finds that out of the 28 Asian societies, nine societies show the order of eigenvalue size of the public policy dominance dimension higher than the third: India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar, Cambodia, Laos, Mongolia, China, and South Korea. These are Acb societies that lean to authoritarian proclivity or predisposition. But some societies also rank the dimension of public policy predominance first, and these are categorized as Cab and Cba societies. Five are Cab societies—Pakistan, Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, and Kazakhstan—in which the sub-national elite sectors maintain private trust of sorts in the military or imperial house (king or sultan) or transnational investors, while two are Cba societies—Singapore and Sri Lanka—which view government as meritocratic or at least having discriminating powers in running the public sector. Also, one finds that of the 28 Asian societies, there are five that show the order of eigenvalue size of the social relations dimension to be higher than the second: Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Kyrgyzstan. These societies are Bac societies that are new settler societies with private trust among elite sectors. New settler societies mean those societies where migrants from outside constitute a large number of residents. Bca is not found in the 28 Asian societies. It is

**Table 6.5** Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments-Singapore

	Factors			
	Public	Post-materialist	Materialist	Uniqueness
Public safety	0.70			0.46
Condition of the environment	0.71			0.45
Social welfare system	0.73			0.42
Democratic system	0.71			0.45
Housing		0.44		0.71
Friendships		0.56		0.61
Marriage		0.58		0.51
Neighbors		0.34		0.72
Family life		0.65		0.45
Leisure		0.62		0.48
Spiritual life		0.56		0.56
Standard of living			0.44	0.64
Household income			0.67	0.48
Health			0.54	0.54
Education			0.62	0.55
Job			0.57	0.57

*Notes* The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

**Table 6.6** Conceptual basis of societal types

Label	First dimension	Second dimension	Third dimension
Abc	Materialism	Post-materialism	Public sector dominance
Acb	Materialism	Public sector dominance	Post-materialism
Bac	Post-materialism	Materialism	Public sector dominance
Bca	Post-materialism	Public sector dominance	Materialism
Cab	Public sector dominance	Materialism	Post-materialism
Cba	Public sector dominance	Post-materialism	Materialism

sometimes said that the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (North Korea) might be classified as this type of society, but there was no possibility that the authorities there would permit a QOL survey such as ours to be conducted in the 2000s. The rest are Abc society types that are fragmented societies either ethnically, geoclimatically, institutionally or otherwise.

**Table 6.7** Six types of Asian societies

Societal types			Asian societies
Abc	A	Materialism	Japan, Indonesia, Taiwan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan
	b	Post-materialism	
	c	Public sector dominance	
Acb	A	Materialism	India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar, Cambodia, Laos, Mongolia, China, South Korea
	c	Public sector dominance	
	b	Post-materialism	
Bac	B	Post-materialism	Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, Kyrgyzstan
	a	Materialism	
	c	Public sector dominance	
Bca	B	Post-materialism	Not found in 28 Asian societies
	c	Public sector dominance	
	a	Materialism	
Cab	C	Public sector dominance	Pakistan, Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Kazakhstan
	a	Post-materialism	
	b	Materialism	
Cba	C	Public sector dominance	Singapore, Sri Lanka
	b	Post-materialism	
	a	Materialism	

On Henrich’s scale (2020, p. 54) of the analytic versus holistic, the 10 WEIRD countries—the Netherlands, Finland, Sweden, Ireland, New Zealand, Germany, the US, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia—are concentrated as the 10 most analytic countries. Of the 30 countries in terms of analytic versus holistic thinking listed by Henrich, only six Asian countries are on this scale—Singapore (16th), India (18th), Malaysia (20th), Indonesia (22nd), Thailand (25th), and the Philippines (28th).

Inoguchi and Le (2019) list 193 states in terms of multilateral treaty participation. The 10 most participatory states in multilateral treaties are all European. Welzel (2013) categorizes European states into three groupings: five Reformed West states (the Netherlands, Finland, Norway, Germany, and Sweden), three Old West (Belgium, Luxembourg, and France), and two Returned West (Slovakia and Czech Republic). Adding these 10 to the following two Reform West’s states, the UK (17th) and Switzerland (18th), the variance of Reformed West is very large and concentrated.

What is striking in the Asian list of multilateral treaty participation is that the countries range in the participation rate from Malaysia (40th) to Bhutan (185th): Malaysia (40th), Japan (42nd), India (55th), South Korea (58th), the Philippines (61st), China (68th), Sri Lanka (84th), Kazakhstan (88th), Mongolia (94th), Pakistan (96th), Thailand (98th), Kyrgyzstan (107th), Indonesia (111th), Cambodia (120th), Tajikistan (124th), Vietnam (125th), Afghanistan (128th), Laos (131st), Bangladesh (135th),



Uzbekistan (136th), Turkmenistan (157th), Myanmar (170th), Brunei (173rd), North Korea (179th), and Bhutan (185th). In other words, the variance of participation among Asian countries in terms of multilateral treaties signed is very scattered.

Comparing the WEIRD ranking on the analytic versus holistic scale and the multilateral treaty participation rankings enable us to say that the former and the latter rankings register the same proclivity of European states concentrated in the top 20 positions, whereas Asian states are thinly spread out from 40 to 185th. The question arises: why have multilateral treaties flourished during 1945–2019.

Is the following hypothesis validated? Whether sovereign states do or do not participate, a multilateral treaty requires decision makers to think more analytically rather than more holistically. After all, multilateral treaties were born in Europe and have been nurtured in Europe and beyond (Alexandrowicz, 2017; Koskenniemi, 2001). Of the 21 Asian sovereign states, only two, Japan and Thailand, have not had colonial experiences, compared to 19 sovereign Asian states that have been colonized in the past. Thinking about the colonial experiences of most Asian states, colonization means emulation and learning. Thinking about many years of national independence, the process of decolonization may include the steady return of more holistic thinking, a more background and relations-focused approach. The sheer number of developing South UN members *vis-à-vis* the developed North UN members has been changing favorably toward the developing South: 149 versus 44. In tandem with the above two trends and in tandem with the increase in the numbers of the developing South, a gradual increase in the emerging prevalence of multilateral treaties seems to be detected. That is, thinking along aspirational bonding lines versus mutual binding. Mutual binding means that multilateral treaties are growing “international standards” with punishment clauses attached and entry barriers imposed without such achievements shown as per capita income levels and the percentage levels of infant death rates, whereas aspirational bonding means waving flags with the competition of “yes” votes and “abstain” votes without punishment clauses. In the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, the developed North kept the thinking of mutual binding about terms of multilateral treaties dominant. In the 1990s, 2000s, and beyond, the tide has reversed with the thinking of aspirational bonding overwhelming that of mutual binding, judging from the enormous increase in the European developed North states changing from mutual binding to aspirational bonding, thereby enhancing the latter spirit bearers in the UN members dramatically, say, 177 versus 28. Sharma (2020) calls it “the rise of the rest.”

## References

- Alexandrowicz, C. H. (2017). *The law of nations in global history*. Oxford University Press.
- Fog, A. (2020). A test of the reproducibility of the clustering of cultural variables. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 55(1), 29–57.
- Henrich, J. (2020). *The WEIRDest people in the world: How the west psychologically peculiar and particularly prosperous*. Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.

- Inoguchi, T. (2016). Toward modelling a global social contract: Jean-Jacques Rousseau and John Locke. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 17(3), 489–522.
- Inoguchi, T., & Fujii, S. (2013). *The quality of life in Asia: A comparison of quality of life in Asia*. Springer.
- Inoguchi, T., & Le, L.T.Q. (2019). *The development of global legislative politics: Rousseau and Locke Writ Global*. Springer Nature.
- Koskenniemi, M. (2001). *The gentle civilizer of nations: The rise and fall of international law 1870–1960*. Cambridge University Press.
- Masuda, T., & Nisbett, R. (2001). Attending holistically versus analytically: Comparing the context sensitivity of Japanese and Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(5), 922–934.
- Nisbett, R. (2004). *The geography of thought: How Asians and westerners think differently*. Free Press.
- Nisbett, R., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Noenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought: Holistic versus analytic cognition. *American Psychologist*, 109(2), 129.
- Peng, K., & Nisbett, R. (1999). Culture, dialectics and reasoning about contradiction. *American Psychologist*, 54(9), 741.
- Sharma, R. (2020). *Will nations rise because of the crisis?* New York Times International Edition, 1 and 11.
- Welzel, C. (2013). *Freedom rising: Human empowerment and the quest for emancipation*. Cambridge University Press.

# Chapter 7

## Are Asian Societies One Type?



### 7.1 Typology of Asian Societies

Asia makes up a large area of the earth. Demographically, over 60% of human beings reside in Asia. In terms of economic production, the East reached a point of rebalancing the West around the turn of the new millennium (Maddison, 2003; Milanovic, 2019). In terms of the accumulation of weapons, East Asia now surpasses the Atlantic West (even though NATO exists) or the Middle East (International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2019). In terms of political regimes, authoritarian or autocratic regimes outnumber by far democracies or semi-democracies in Asia (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2020). The picture of Asia that emerges from the above set of basic macro data is one of immense vastness, increasing activeness, and structural closeness. This may be an oversimplified picture. Yet it sounds like an old-fashioned and anachronistic picture of the old East held by the old West. For example, Hegel's type of Asian societies is clear and simple: a regime is characterized by whether "freedom is only for one person or all." As if in support of Hegel's picture of Asian regimes, The Economist Intelligence Unit's annual democracy rankings for 2019 listed no "full democracy" in Asia, with Japan, India, Indonesia, South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines categorized as faulty democracies.

Marx's (McFarlane et al., 2005) type of "Asiatic mode of production" for Asia was also clear and simple: whether the mode of economic production is heavily curtailed by the autocratic state with its own possession of land and people and with its control of money and commerce. The US government's practice of demanding liberalization with the threat of retaliatory measures or imposing economic sanctions on certain countries in Asia, like Japan in the 1980s and China since the 2010s, sounds a bit as if Marx's idea of good capitalism has permeated the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), WTO and multilateral practices.

Weber's type of "Confucian mode of disciplining people and the state" is also clear and simple: whether statecraft is handled with a Confucian spirit of compassion (*ren*) on the basis of bureaucratic authoritarianism. Wittfogel's type of "amassing autocratic power to build massive infrastructure of city walls, roads, rivers, dams,

ports, channels” is clear and simple too: China’s “Belt and Road Initiative” with the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank assisting to finance infrastructure projects abroad, using surplus state money and surplus manpower.

In these examples, the focus of the organizing principle is on reproducing China. They cover neither all of East Asia nor the whole of Asia. When the West tries to capture the essence of the East, the authors mentioned above exercise great influence on the conception of the East, East Asia and Asia. Perhaps the immense fascination with the East as seen from the West led them to choose China and exaggerate its Eastern characteristics.

In contrast to the above approach to highlight the extreme case and to use it as an ideal type, another approach is to compare many cases using the organizing principles of religion and family. To illustrate this point, let me cite the work of Kato (2012) for religion and Todd (2011) for family. Kato singles out religion as the moulder of society, whereas Todd chooses family to illuminate the singularity of society. The first step for Kato is to distinguish those religions in which only one god is allowed to exist and be revered and those religions in which many gods are allowed to exist and are respected. They are sometimes called monotheism and polytheism, respectively, and sometimes they are called Abrahamic and Dharmic, respectively (Inoguchi, 2016; Nisbett, 2004). Kato presents five types of society on the basis of the religious order prevailing in Christianity and Judaism, and in the religious order prevailing in China, Japan, and India. Types I and II distinguish between the elite and masses whereas Types III, IV, and V refuse to distinguish between the elite and others. Type I distinguishes the elite with freedom and individualism and the masses with labor. The elite govern the rest. Type II distinguishes the elite and the masses, with the former recruited from the latter through meritocratic criteria. The elite rule the whole and do not have much freedom while the rest are guided by individualism. Type III is called a holistic community where consensus is formed on the basis of occupied shared space by community members. The elite therein take care of the whole community. Type IV is a craft-focused community where as long as its members abide by their craft-focused community, they are relatively free. Type V is an identity-focused community whose members abide by behaving according to identity-focused rules like caste practices. Two of Kato’s societal types are drawn from ancient Judaism and ancient Christianity and their evolution and the remaining three types are drawn from China, Japan and India (Fei, 1939; Nakane, 1970; Roy, 1997). The first step for Todd is to distinguish matriarchy and patriarchy among more complex hybrid principles.

These approaches are often found to be quite revealing in societal manifestations of singular traits. Take Islamic religion’s distinction between Sunni (tradition-following) and Shia (movement-mobilizing). In the former, no one is allowed to transmit god’s will and preference to believers whereas in the latter Shia leaders (imams) are there to help believers communicate and understand god’s will and preference. This difference is manifested in how a society functions. Comparison between Shia Iranian and Sunni Saudi societies shows the importance of mediator-imams.

Let's take another example of family dynamics, not human this time, but gorilla, Ethiopian mountain monkey, and Japanese monkey (Yamagiwa, 2008). Gorilla families center on a mother who forms a mini-society with her children including those children with a different father. The paternal gorilla protects his family and plays an active role in child caring if the maternal gorilla agrees such roles for the paternal gorilla to play within a wider gorilla community. Ethiopian mountain monkeys perennially suffer from food shortages in their mountain habitat, although they are relatively safe from the threat of stronger animals. Ethiopian mountain monkeys live in large groups of many families, and endure food shortages and threats from stronger animals together. Japanese monkeys live in groups of many families, with the strongest male chosen as the group's leader and whose strength other competing males test daily. These societal manifestations are excellent in highlighting the singularity of groups. Societal manifestations are the result of very complex sets of organizing principles and backgrounds. The difficulties encountered in applying societal typologies have led us to use an evidence-based approach.

## References

- Fei, H.-T. (1939). *Peasant life in China: A field study of country life in the Yangtze Valley*. Routledge.
- Inoguchi, T. (2016). AsiaBarometer. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of sociology*. Blackwell Publishing.
- International Institute for Strategic Studies. (2019). *Strategic survey 2019*. Routledge.
- Kato, T. (2012). *Buki toshiteno shakai ruikeiron (Typology of societies as weapons)*. Kodansha.
- Maddison, A. (2003). *Growth and interaction in the world economy: The roots of modernity*. The AEI Press for the American Enterprise Institute.
- McFarlane, B., Cooper, S., & Jaksic, M. (2005). The Asiatic mode of production: A new phoenix? (Part 1 and Part 2). *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 35(3), 283–231 and 35(4):499–536.
- Milanovic, B. (2019). *Capitalism, alone: The future of the system that rules the world*. Harvard University Press.
- Nakane, C. (1970). *Japanese society*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Nisbett, R. (2004). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently*. Free Press.
- Roy, A. (1997). *The god of small things*. Flamingo.
- The Economist Intelligence Unit. (2020). *Annual democracy rankings 2019*. EIU.
- Todd, E. (2011). *L'origine des systèmes familiaux, tome I: L'Eurasie*. Gallimard.
- Yamagiwa, J. (2008). *Jinrui Shinkaron: Reichorui karano Tenkai (Evolution from the Primates)*. Shokabo.

# Chapter 8

## Choosing Indicators and Typologizing of Societies



### 8.1 Choosing Indicators: Form and Substance

When choosing indicators in terms of form and substance and typologizing societies, three approaches exist:

- (1) Sociology of form: Georg Simmel (Goodstein, 2017), as a founder of this school of sociology, says that the number of individuals and the relationship between them make differences (Levine, 1972). The change between two individuals and three makes a great difference in the societies that are formed. The latter is more complicated and at least two of the three individuals will become closer. When the number is many, say 10,000, then the society that ensues tends toward anarchy, unless some other criteria are introduced.
- (2) Sociology of substance: Aristotle is a founder of this school of sociology, which says that when a strong person governs a society, it is called a monarchy. When a group of elites of similar rank, heritage, power, or wealth governs a society, it is called an oligarchy, or in Aristotle typology, aristocracy. When many individuals of similar rank or rights govern a society, it is called democracy. One notices immediately that Aristotle combines form and substance in creating a typology of regimes. One problem when combining form and substance in forming societal typologies is that the number of indicators in terms of substance tends to increase as the characterization of a society is bound to be more complex in modern times.
- (3) When happiness is gauged, a number of indicators that have a lot to do with one's happiness emerge in forming a synthesized or aggregated figure. One of the problems in gauging happiness is that the meaning of happiness differs from one person to another. Thus, the number of happiness indicators tends to increase immensely. Cross-cultural studies are fond of gauging the degree of happiness across cultures by factor scores of cultures along key dimensions. Thus, the problem is resolved to a certain extent by factor-analyzing such numerous indicators. Furthermore, the number of key dimensions is sometimes suggested by

rotating or not rotating. Fog has discovered that labels accorded to key dimensions often differ. However, the truth is that rotating the labels of dimensions incurs change but the configurations of factor dimensions and scores remain identical.

## 8.2 Typologizing Societies

Our interest has been to generate the typology of Asian societies. For this purpose, two original ideas were introduced. (1) The kind of indicators that are selected to cover the domains, aspects, and styles of human daily life (Inoguchi & Fujii, 2013; Shin & Inoguchi, 2008), irrespective of the societal differences in terms of political regimes, economic systems, and historical and cultural backgrounds; (2) Factor analysis is carried out separately for each societal sample and rotation is carried out uniformly across societies. Factor-analyzing all the world responses together is often the case with many cross-cultural studies (Fog, 2020; Hofstede & Minkoff, 2010) and world value-and-norms surveys (Inglehart, 2018; Inglehart & Welzel, 2019; Welzel, 2013).

These two ideas are explained in more detail in relation to the aim of such a project. Unlike universal cross-cultural studies or World Value Surveys, our primary aim is not generating key dimensions of human life but differentiating key dimensions of human life and its synthesized societal characteristics. Also differentiating us from endeavors of identifying universally applicable dimensions is our primary interest of generating differentiated pictures of societies, especially Asian societies. We have chosen 16 daily life items:

- (1) Housing
- (2) Friendships
- (3) Marriage
- (4) Standard of living
- (5) Household income
- (6) Health
- (7) Education
- (8) Job
- (9) Neighbors
- (10) Public safety
- (11) Condition of the environment
- (12) Social welfare system
- (13) Democratic system
- (14) Family life
- (15) Spiritual life
- (16) Leisure.

Note that these items are fairly concrete specified domains, aspects, and styles of human daily life. It is our belief that the *sine qua non* of asking survey questions is making questions easier for respondents to answer. Survey questions are best without

abstract or vague or ambiguous expressions. Questions are best related to daily life situations that everyone experiences. Important in cross-societal or cross-cultural or cross-national surveys is the degree of difficulties one encounters when language is immensely different. In the AsiaBarometer Survey, we have used 37 languages in 32 kinds of questionnaires to generate the response data on quality of life. Most of the 37 languages used in the questionnaires are not European languages, except English (in which the Master Questionnaires are written) or Russian (which is the common language in the former Soviet Union republics). When 32 AsiaBarometer questionnaires are written, the normal practice of back translation and focus group would not be of much help if abstract, vague, or ambiguous words, which can be enormously dangerous and are often used in European languages, are employed. To make this point stronger, even those questions in Mandarin that were translated from the Master Questionnaires in English in Beijing, Taipei, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Kuala Lumpur often differ subtly among them, if not for the key meaning of each of those questions in the Master Questionnaires in English. If the questions are used without reference to daily life situations familiar to most respondents, such survey questions are called precarious questions, if not failed questions. The AsiaBarometer Survey on quality of life was carried out in the following 32 societies: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan, Laos, the Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Malaysia, Nepal, North Korea (DPRK), Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, South Korea (ROK), Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, the US, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam.

### **8.3 Methodological Issues Related to Factor-Analyzing Human Daily Life Satisfaction of Each of 29 Asian Societies**

Before the results of factor analysis of 29 Asian societies, I reiterate that the matrix to be factor-analyzed is composed of 16 human daily life areas of satisfaction and of each group of respondents of the 29 Asian societies. The degree of human daily life satisfaction is measured by choosing one of the five responses: very satisfied, somehow satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somehow dissatisfied, very dissatisfied. Five responses are of ordinary scale, i.e., 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1. It is important to note that each of the 29 Asian societies is factor-analyzed separately. What many cross-cultural studies and world-value studies are ultimately interested in is universally derived key dimensions of variables. Their factor scores carry secondary interest to them. What makes my typology-formulating operation different from those cross-cultural studies and world-value studies is that what interests me most is those factor dimensions of 16 human daily life areas of satisfaction in each society and the similarity and dissimilarity of the 29 Asian society factor analysis results. In other words, I am interested in the size of eigenvalues of the key dimensions and the order for each



key dimension to explain the variances. Some might well ask: why bother factor-analyzing the whole universally derived respondents or their proxy of aggregating nationally sampled respondents of 29 Asian societies? It must be noted that each of the 29 societal respondents cannot be aggregated because the size and sampling mode are often very different. Even when the issues of population size and sample size are resolved or at best placated, the most serious problem arises—the problem that Warren Weaver pointed out as early as in 1948. That is how statistical methods are amenable to the subjects to be observed. Weaver (1948) explained that there are three kinds of the complexity: (1) complexity (or better called simplicity) which can be explained by Newtonian dynamics and associated statistical methods; (2) disorganized complexity which can be explained by quantum physics and associated statistical methods; and (3) organized complexity which often defies statistical analysis like the biology of living animal functions. Although Weaver (1948) has in mind various scientific objects, many cross-cultural or cross-national analysts have faced a similar problem. That is, factor-analyzing all the sampled respondents from 29 Asian societies in one stroke results in the kind of analysis difficult to explain, whereas factor-analyzing each of the 29 sampled respondents, society by society, separately yields results clear in their explanation of dimensions. In the former, each culturally differentiated configuration tends to be overwhelmed by more strongly universal or global dimensions or what Fog calls the superfactor, whereas in the latter such societally idiosyncratically organized complexities are retained through factor-analyzing each societal respondent of the 29 societies.

## References

- Fog, A. (2020). A test of the reproducibility of the clustering of cultural variables. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 55(1), 29–57.
- Goodstein, E. (2017). *Georg simmel and the disciplinary imaginary*. Stanford University Press.
- Hofstede, G., & Minkoff, M. (2010). *Cultures and organization: Software of the mind, inter-cultural cooperation and its imperative for survival* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Gill.
- Inglehart, R. (2018). *Cultural evolution: People's motivations are changing, and reshaping the world*. University of Michigan Press.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2019). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Inoguchi, T., & Fujii, S. (2013). *The quality of life in Asia: A comparison of quality of life in Asia*. Springer.
- Levine, D. (Ed.). (1972). *Georg Simmel on individuality and social forms*. Chicago University Press.
- Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (2008). *The quality of life in Confucian Asia: From physical strength to subjective well-being*. Springer.
- Weaver, W. (1948). Science and complexity. *American Scientist*, 36, 536–544.
- Welzel, C. (2013). *Freedom rising: Human empowerment and the quest for emancipation*. Cambridge University Press.

## Chapter 9

# Factor Analysis Results



The results of typologizing Asian societies through factor-analyzing human daily life satisfactions in 28 Asian societies are shown in alphabetical order, one by one: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Malaysia, the Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam. Turkmenistan was not included in this analysis because the “don’t know” responses numbered too many on the key question of “Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following aspects of your life.”

Table 9.1 summarizes the four analysis results in terms of labels of three key dimensions of 18 factor analysis of human daily life satisfaction, in each of the 18 Asian societies (Inoguchi, 2019) (Table 9.2).

A glance at the labels of the three key dimensions of daily life satisfaction in the 28 Asian societies reminds one of the similarity with the results of the World Value Survey, although with one immensely important difference: the first appearance of public sector dominance in daily life satisfaction. My list of 16 life domains, aspects, and styles is born of fairly comprehensive items in ordinary people’s daily life activities. Those items are mostly universally observed, irrespective of the geographical, historical, and cultural backgrounds of the societies. The first two labels are also called survival for materialism and social relations for post-materialism. Public sector dominance does not appear in the World Value Survey because it is interested in values and norms, not in real life activities and satisfaction therewith, as is the case with the AsiaBarometer Survey. The difference comes because the World Value Survey has been interested in value-related normative principles whereas the AsiaBarometer Survey has been interested in QOL-related human activities and the organizing principles thereof. Another no less important difference is that the World Value Survey has been interested in the relatively high-level universal value-related dimensions as yielded by factor-analyzing survey respondents, whereas the AsiaBarometer Survey has been interested in QOL-related basic human activity-dimensions as yielded by

**Table 9.1** Conceptual basis of societal types

Label	First dimension	Second dimension	Third dimension
Abc	Materialism	Post-materialism	Public sector dominance
Acb	Materialism	Public sector dominance	Post-materialism
Bac	Post-materialism	Materialism	Public sector dominance
Bca	Post-materialism	Public sector dominance	Materialism
Cab	Public sector dominance	Materialism	Post-materialism
Cba	Public sector dominance	Post-materialism	Materialism

**Table 9.2** Six types of Asian societies

Societal types			Asian societies
Abc	A	Materialism	Japan, Indonesia, Taiwan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan
	b	Post-materialism	
	c	Public sector dominance	
Acb	A	Materialism	India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar, Cambodia, Laos, Mongolia, China, South Korea
	c	Public sector dominance	
	b	Post-materialism	
Bac	B	Post-materialism	Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, Kyrgyzstan
	a	Materialism	
	c	Public sector dominance	
Bca	B	Post-materialism	Not found in the 28 Asian societies
	c	Public sector dominance	
	a	Materialism	
Cab	C	Public sector dominance	Pakistan, Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Kazakhstan
	a	Post-materialism	
	b	Materialism	
Cba	C	Public sector dominance	Singapore, Sri Lanka
	b	Post-materialism	
	a	Materialism	

factor-analyzing survey respondents, living in a society with more local and regional flavors.

Now, I return to the subject of the three QOL-related human activity dimensions—survival, social relations, and public sector dominance—in the 28 Asian societies.

To reiterate the above tables: *Abc* means that the first dimension is that of materialism, the second dimension is that of post-materialism, the third dimension is that of public sector dominance. The order of *abc* is determined by those eigenvalues of each dimension. The first appearing letter means that it is the largest explanatory power and capitalized.

## Reference

Inoguchi, T. (2019). An evidence-based typology of Asian societies: What do Asian societies look like from the bottom up instead of top down? In T. Inoguchi (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of Asian foreign policy*, 2 vols. (Vol. 1, pp. 443–461). Sage Publications.

# Chapter 10

## Twenty-Nine Types of Asian Societies



### **10.1. Abc Society: Octopus-cave Society** (named by Maruyama, 1961).

Abc Type (Japan, Indonesia, Taiwan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan).

### **10.2. Acb Society: God-of-Small-Things** (named by Roy, 1997).

Acb Type (China, South Korea, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Mongolia).

### **10.3. Bac Society: Society Colonized from Within** (named by O'Donnell, 1973).

Bac Type (Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam).

### **10.4. Bca Society: Fragmented and Fractured Society** (named by Fanon, 2005).

Bca Type (not found among the 29 Asian societies).

### **10.5. Cab Society: Seeming Fractured and Fragmented Divisions of a Society**

(These are covered by the sheer force of public sector dominance, whether it is materialized and consolidated by Islam, Buddhism, monarchy, elite coalition, mining-foreign capital coalition, or ethnic competition.)

Cab Type (Pakistan, Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, and Kazakhstan).

### **10.6. Cba Society: Micro-monitoring Society** (named by Keane, 2009)—a society

small enough with sufficiently capable regime apparatus that keeps its test of residents focused on pursuing comfort and compliance. Keane's concept of monitoring democracy is translated into Chinese as *jiandu minzhu zhuyi*.

Cba Type (Singapore and Sri Lanka).

## 10.1 **Abc Society: Octopus-cave Society**

Abc is represented in Asia by Japan, Indonesia, Taiwan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan. It is named an octopus-cave society because it is a society composed of a myriad octopus-occupying caves, each keeping a distance from the other, within each of which different rules and norms prevail. It is a society fractured, fragmented, and decentralized. But when somewhat isolated actors with their own rules and values in the hyper-globalization environment appear, vulnerability of an awful kind sometimes occurs. Gillian Tett titles one of her books *The Silo Effect: The Peril of Expertise and the Promise of Breaking Down Barriers* (2016). The glaring example that prompted Tett to give her book this title was the “silo-nization” of the department of securitization of US housing loans in UBS (an investment banking company) during the process leading to the 2008 Lehman Brothers shock. The silo-nization of the department produced megatons of debt. The combination of managing risks was shouldered by each department and the results-oriented scheme of personnel management was emphasized within each department. A silo stores agricultural products and Tett characterizes business corporations as cultured silos sticking to strange rules that have been built on past experience of narrow-focused experts in a tiny space of finance specialists. Japan and Indonesia (Java) are places where feudalism ended, meaning that decentralized land ownership persisted. Japan, Indonesia and Taiwan are all islands countries; Afghanistan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan are landlocked and endure ethnic strife with similar effects toward fragmentation.

### 10.1.1 *Japan*

Of the three key dimensions, the survival (materialism) dimension dominates with its eigenvalue 5.640. Social relations (post-materialism) come next with its weight being less than one-fifth of the survival dimension. Public sector dominance comes last with its weight less than one-tenth of the survival dimension. Survival dominates both social relations and the public sector.

So what are the daily life domains, aspects, and styles that are salient to the survival dimension? They are standard of living, household income, job, education, and housing, in this order. These represent an orthodox item of survival. What are the daily life domains, aspects, and styles salient to the social relations (post-materialist) dimension? They are friendships, marriage, health, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Again, these items represent a fairly standard set of daily life domains, aspects, and styles that have good bearings on social relations. Its eigenvalue is less than one-fifth of the survival dimension. Lastly, what are the daily life domains, aspects, and styles salient to public sector dominance? They are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Again, these items represent a fairly standard set of public sector dominance. Its eigenvalue is very small

at less than one-tenth of the survival dimension's eigenvalue. What societal profile emerges from this?

Japanese society is characterized as an octopus-cave society. In other words, it is a decentralized society with octopus-cave-like organizations, each of which is headed by a small boss occupying an octopus cave, very limited communication with other cave bosses but still competing with each other. As seen from the bottom of society, social relations do not occupy a large realm of one's daily life activities, as is the case with Bac or Bca societies. Rather constant social insecurity pressures are strong. This has been most strongly manifested in the spread of the Covid-19 virus in Japan. Japan registered one of the lowest death tolls in 2021 (14,605 deaths as of 24 June) among developed industrialized societies, compared with the US registered death rate of more than 40,000 (Inoguchi, 2020). The most outstanding psychological trait of the Japanese is fear and overall pessimism (Dadabaev, 2005; Inoguchi, 2015). That profile prompted them to use masks and wash hands assiduously without the government ordering them. Amitai Etzioni calls Japan the exemplar of liberal communitarianist societies among the Covid-19 affected societies (Etzioni, 2020). Most important is that the public sector occupies a small space in one's daily life. Take a closer look at each of the four items in terms of central government budget. Annual traffic accidents and homicides, for instance, occur a great deal less often than in many countries of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Japan has not been involved in wars as a combatant country for almost 75 years. A glance at the national defense budget of the Japanese central government *vis-à-vis* the US federal government is shocking. Japan spends some 40% of its budget on social welfare expenditures, 15% on government bonds, and barely 1% on national defense. In sharp contrast, the US federal government spends some 50% of its budget on military expenditure and some 10% on social welfare (Wertheim, 2020). Japanese citizens abhor tax hikes. Tokyo introduced a consumption tax in early 1989 set at 3%. Loud public protests have prevented the consumption tax from exceeding 10% as of 2020. The consequence has been an astronomical increase in government bonds, the size of which is 223% of gross national product in 2019.

### **10.1.2 Indonesia**

Indonesia has some 17,000-plus islands as its national territory and some 300 million people. Moreover, some 7,000 languages are used in these islands. American anthropologist Elizabeth Pisani visited and stayed on a number of these islands. Because of her proficiency in Indonesian (standard Indonesian), the first question for her was "Which island are you from?" Indonesia stretches across the Indo-Pacific Ocean, covering a region wider than that of Russian Siberia, say from Novosibirsk to Vladivostok. Immediately after its independence and at the height of nationalism under President Sukarno, the school textbook map showed Indonesia broadly stretching between Galapagos Island in the eastern Pacific to the island of Madagascar in the western Indian ocean (they called the Indian Ocean, the Indonesian ocean)

because those residents have the Indonesian kind of blood (or more broadly Malayo-Polynesian blood ancestry). All of this is to say that Indonesia is a very decentralized society. To further strengthen this argument is the historical fact that of the two societies in Asia in the pre-modern period to have a feudal system, one of them is Java and the other Japan (Reischauer et al., 1973). Feudalism is a decentralized system of producing grains on the basis of decentralized land ownership.

A glance at the daily life domain satisfaction enables one to see how this Abc society functions. Like Japan, the standard survival-focused daily lifestyle makes the following daily life domains most salient: household income, standard of living, job, housing, and education, in the order of weight on the survival dimension. These standard social relations items are heavily loaded on the social relations dimension: neighbors, marriage, spiritual life, family life, public safety, health, and friendships. Of importance to note is the public safety item. In Indonesia, public safety often relies on local units. Spiritual life is often carried out locally, like visiting Islamic prayer sites. Very early in the morning, local broadcasting stations provide the Islamic wake-up call to prayer: Allahu Akbar! Allahu Akbar! Pray for Islam! The 1965–1967 massive nationwide massacres of alleged communists through military-led operations were mostly carried out locally (Kurasawa, 2020; McGregor et al., 2018). Remember that in Japanese society, the items of neighbors and public safety are saliently loaded on the public sector dimension. In Indonesia, both are heavily loaded on the social relations dimension. On the public sector dimension, the salient items are condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, and leisure. It is not quite clear why leisure is loaded on the public sector dimension. Leisure could mean locally sponsored festivals like the anniversary of national independence festival or teaching English language as a good Muslim by teaching the less privileged.

### 10.1.3 Taiwan

Taiwan is an Abc society. It is a new settler society. Japan colonized Taiwan from 1895 till 1945. Before that the Qing (Manchu-Han dynasty) succeeded the Ming dynasty (the Han dynasty). During the Qing Dynasty, many new settlers came to Taiwan from the nearest province, Fujian. In 1949, Chinese communists defeated the Republic of China and drove the massive Kuomintang elite families to Taiwan and Hong Kong (a British colony). They were called *waishengren* whereas those born in Taiwan have been called *neishengren* since 1945. The Kuomintang's authoritarian politics alienated *neishengren*. Ethnic-provincial-linguistic divisions deepened during its authoritarian and transition years (1945–1995). Li Donghui, a *neishengren* of Hakka origin, was the first president, democratically elected in 1995. Since then, Taiwanese identity has shifted from an overwhelming Chinese identity to a transitional cultural Chinese identity, and further to the majority Taiwanese identity. The two political parties often change positions. Furthermore, the traditional distinction



by ethnic-linguistic-provincial origins has been considerably blurred. The distinction between *neishengren* and *waishengren* has been slowly weakened. Yet as to what equilibrium is best between a friendly and yet interventionist China and a less friendly and yet economically less interdependent China, Taiwanese citizens wonder.

Turning to daily life satisfaction for Taiwan, the survival dimension is loaded by household income, job, standard of living, education, health, and leisure in this order. Household income is heaviest on the survival dimension. This is explained among East Asian societies by Iwai (2009). In Taiwan, couples tend to each hold a full-time job, especially if they are at the same workplace. Leisure is loaded on the survival dimension in Taiwan whereas in Indonesia, another Abc society, leisure is loaded on the public sector dimension and in Japan leisure is loaded on social relations dimension. In Taiwan, leisure may take place as part of extended-family-related festive occasions like marriage ceremonies and lunar New Year vacations. The social relations dimension are loaded by family life, spiritual life, friendships, housing, and neighbors in this order. Housing is loaded in Japan on the survival dimension whereas in Taiwan it is loaded on the social relations dimension. Housing takes care of mostly nuclear families in Japan whereas in Taiwan housing may mean housing for extended family, and thus related to part of the social relations dimension. The public sector dimension is loaded by public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

#### ***10.1.4 Afghanistan***

Afghanistan is an Abc society, that is, a decentralized society (Malejacq, 2019). Afghanistan is inhabited by a majority of Pashtuns, sizable minorities of Uzbeks and Tajiks in the north, many small minorities south of Kabul and in Kabul itself, and Hazars (Monsutti, 2005), who are predominantly Shia Muslims and have a Mongoloid appearance among the majority Turkic-Persians in the rugged highlands of central Afghanistan, are one of the largest ethnic minorities. Afghanistan has been a center of civilization and empire with the Timur and the Mughal empires prospering in the pre-modern ages. Afghanistan has been a noted place into which foreign powers intervened and invaded, competing with each other. Britain invaded Afghanistan to deter Russia from dominating the country; the Soviet Union invaded to deter US intervention; and the US invaded to replace and suppress the Taliban, the Islamic extremists who took power from the Marxist government that had toppled monarchs in the mid-twentieth century. Afghanistan may be the only country that has experienced foreign interference and military invasions by three major powers—Britain, Russia, and the US—over three centuries, from the fourth-quarter of the nineteenth century through the first-quarter of the twenty-first century.

Turning to the daily life satisfaction items and dimensions, the survival dimension is loaded by health, neighbors, household income, standard of living, job, education, and marriage in this order. Most noteworthy of the survival dimension are the highest loaded items, health and neighbors. Afghans often live in isolation with

family clans. To be reliable your health is most important. To be sick means your whole clan is weakened. If neighbors are weak, it means your weakness in survival. Also, marriage is loaded on the social relations dimension in the other Abc societies, Indonesia, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan. Only in Afghanistan is marriage loaded on the survival dimension. Perhaps, marriage means more males born who are able to fight enemies. Matsui (2001) observes in his social anthropological study of Pashtuns in Balochistan, the southwestern part of Pakistan, that during his stay and interviews of locals, he was warmly welcomed through shared meals, wine, and endless conversations. At the same time, at the end of evening events, he observed fully armed, muscular young men outside the meeting places of tents, remaining there overnight. The social relations dimension is loaded by housing, family life, spiritual life and friendships in this order. Housing loaded on this dimension is no less interesting. Housing in Japan is a survival asset as well. Housing in Afghanistan means social relations or diplomacy and negotiation, meaning they are conducted inside tents in the desert. The public sector dimension is loaded by condition of the environment, social welfare system, public safety, democratic system, and leisure in this order. Leisure on the public sector dimension may mean, I suspect, that only on those festive days like national independence day and Islamic holy days can one relax a bit *vis-á-vis* adversaries and the enemies of your clans.

### **10.1.5 Uzbekistan**

Uzbekistan is an Abc society, a decentralized society, also a doubly landlocked society. In the former Soviet Union, Uzbekistan's division of labor was monoculture, using vast plains with water coming from the Aral Sea and focusing on cotton and natural gas on the other side of Turkmenistan and Azerbaijan, major suppliers of oil and natural gas to Europe. Uzbekistan is one of the former Soviet Union states with the majority nationality dominant and having fewer minorities. Uzbekistan is focusing on the apparel sector due to its massive domestic cotton production. It has been increasingly trying to build its industrial base and infrastructure without relying too much on attracting foreign direct investment and without eagerly participating in multilateral agreements, which may be utilized to give bias to one or other domineering powers.

Turning to daily life satisfaction, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan have a similar structure of daily life satisfaction items. Their similarity is that the survival dimension is loaded with many items of daily life satisfaction. In Uzbekistan and in Tajikistan, nine items out of 16 are loaded on the survival dimension. In Uzbekistan, the survival dimension is loaded with household income, standard of living, leisure, job, spiritual life, health, housing, neighbors, and education, in that order. The social relations dimension is loaded with family life, marriage, and friendships. The public sector is loaded with social welfare systems, public safety, condition of the environment, and democratic system. The survival dimension is loaded to a maximum whereas the social relations dimension and the public sector dimension are loaded to a minimum. This suggests

that Uzbekistani society is a minimalist society neither very active in social relations nor mobilizing the public sector. That many daily life domains, aspects, and styles are loaded on the survival dimension means that to survive fairly independently, families must be active in an isolated environment with their immediate neighbor potentially being miles away.

### ***10.1.6 Tajikistan***

Tajikistan is an Acb society. It is a decentralized society. It is a small country with many small ethnic groups that reside in the hills with a poor income. The survival dimension is loaded with nine out of 16 items: household income, standard of living, leisure, housing, job, spiritual life, democratic life, education, and health. So many daily life items are loaded on the survival dimension. Poverty and isolation force them to focus on survival. The social relations dimension is loaded with marriage, family life, friendships, spiritual life, and public safety in this order. It looks as if married couples must take care of most things related to social relations, including spiritual life and public safety. The public policy dimension is loaded with only two items: condition of the environment and social welfare system. The meagerness of public policy is suggested by the fact that the rights of use of the capital city airport shifted from Russia to the United States, and to China after 1989 and now to Russia since Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan have agreed not to host foreign militaries bases in their countries most recently.

## **10.2 Acb Society: God-of-Small-Things**

Acb is represented by India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar, Cambodia, Laos, Mongolia, China, and South Korea. It is a “God-of-Small-Things” society, often co-existing side by side with a domineering state.

### ***10.2.1 India***

India is an Acb society. An Acb society is characterized by the public sector dimension being placed with the second dimension after the survival dimension instead of the social relations dimension unlike an Abc society. Yet the public sector dimension does not overwhelm the survival and social relations dimensions unlike a Cab or a Cba society. India is a vast sub-continent sandwiched by the Himalayas and the Indian Ocean. India is proud of its old civilization, its Sanskrit language, and Hindu religion. Before independence in 1946, India was a British colony. Already in the 1930s, British India allowed limited political participation by Indians in response

to a series of enlightening and protest movements like Mahatma Gandhi's Satyagraha (non-violent protest, meaning that knowing is power), cotton weaving, and salt production. On the eve of national independence, four political forces competed to shape a new independent India: the Indian National Congress, the Indian Communists, the Indian nationalists, and the Islamists. The Indian National Congress shaped the new India most in non-violent protest and cooperative petition with Britain. Jawaharlal Nehru led it and stood tall on the principles of self-reliance at home and non-alignment abroad. Indian communists preferred to go along with the Soviet Union. Some Indian nationalists were impatient toward carrying out armed independence against Britain by fighting jointly with Japan. When the British court punished the Indian National Army after the defeat of Japan, massive nationwide protests occurred in India. In response, Britain decided not only that they were innocent but also that India be given independence in 1945. All these four political forces each contributed in their own way to shaping a new independent India in 1945.

Now turning to the daily life satisfaction, India is an Acb society. Roy characterizes Indian society as a society where everyone can feel that she or he is a god of small things. Asked about important social circles, Indians responded with very high figures about their informal social circles, and no such attachment to formal circles: family, 100%; relatives, 81%; place of work, 71%; and the area where one grew up, 61%. In contrast, the figures for formal circles are: political party, 8%; agricultural or commercial cooperatives or industry group, 10%; trade union, 10%; club or hobby circle, 15%; and people who speak the same language, 40% (Kumar, 2005). The immense diversity of language, caste, race, wealth, religion, ideology and their associated groups and movements afforded them opportunities to feel bonds and belongingness. So it was not surprising to see Narendra Modi, India's prime minister, giving a speech in 13 languages—Hindi, English, Gujarati, Marathi, Tamil, Kannada, Urdu, Malayalam, Telugu, Bengali, Assamese, Punjabi, and Odia—with each sentence followed by tens of thousands in the audiences replying in their respective language “jaya” (right on!) in Madison Square Garden, New York, on September 28, 2014, where massive Indians gathered to welcome Prime Minister Narendra Modi in 2014. The survival dimension is loaded with standard of living, household income, housing, education, health, job, friendships, marriage, and neighbors in this order. Noteworthy is the varieties of items which give daily life satisfaction on the survival dimension. Not only income but also housing and health are necessary. Furthermore, what is normally loaded on the social relations dimension are indispensable parts of survival: friendships, marriage, and neighbors! The public sector dimension is loaded with social welfare system, democratic system, condition of the environment, and public safety. These and other systems in the public sector help alleviate disgruntlements, pains, and wounds to a considerable extent. The social relations dimension is loaded with family life, spiritual life, and leisure, in this order.

### ***10.2.2 Bangladesh***

Bangladesh is an Acb society. Bangladesh was “born” in 1971 when it gained independence after fighting the Pakistan Army that had come to suppress eastern Bengal, a Pakistani province. Bangladesh is a Muslim society. Under British India, Bengal was proud of hosting the capital with the East India Company headquartered in Calcutta. In 1857, the Sepoy Mutiny took place among the British Indian Army, involving a large number of Bengal employees. In response, Britain decided to take direct control of British India with the capital relocated to Delhi, replacing the East India Company that had once carried out colonial governance in Calcutta. In constructing the British Indian Army, Britain recruited officers largely from among Punjabi rather than Bengalese populations. Britons observed that Bengalese are good at literature and debates, and most importantly rebellious in light of the Sepoy Mutiny whereas Punjabi are good in farming, mechanics, and hard work. Their biased observation seems to have been evidenced twice later: first, during World War II, Subhas Chandra Bose led the Indian National Army’s fight against the British Indian Army; second, the 1971 independence war of eastern Bengal province was led by officers who were almost exclusively Bengalese against the Pakistan Army whose officers are almost exclusively Punjabi.

Turning to the daily life satisfaction, the survival dimension is loaded with such items as education, household income, job, standard of living, housing, health, and friendships. The survival dimension is crowded with many items as survival is always hard in Bangladesh. Most noteworthy is that the highest value is loaded on education. Education is regarded very highly in Bangladesh. Many rivers flow from the Himalayas through Hariyana Pradesh, Uttal Pradesh, West Bengal, and Bangladesh. Where the Ganges and Brahmaputra rivers meet (sangham), the large Ganges-Brahmaputra Delta forms, which is frequently flooded. Thus, in Bangladesh, young men and women from the Khulna and Barisal, located deep in the delta, are the most eager to move upward in terms of jobs, rather than young people in Dhaka, the capital city, located in the middle lower stream of the delta (Inoguchi & Fujii, 2013). The survival dimension is loaded much higher for jobs. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as public safety, social welfare system, condition of the environment, democratic system, and neighbors. The inventor of a micro-financing scheme for entrepreneurs and Nobel Prize winner Muhammad Yunus gives proof of the importance of tackling life in disaster-prone lands. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as family life, leisure, spiritual life, and marriage.

### ***10.2.3 Nepal***

Nepal and Britain fought a war against each other in the early nineteenth century when Britain was expanding its territory to the north. The war ended in a peace accord, whereby Nepal kept peaceful relations and its national independence by offering

contingents of the courageous Gurkha forces to the British Army for deployment around the world. Nepal had a monarchy till the late twentieth century. Its monarchy was replaced by the tide of democratization. Sandwiched between two giants, India and China, Nepali politics wavers between the pull of each.

Turning to daily satisfaction, the survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, standard of living, education, job, housing, health, leisure, and spiritual life. As is often the case in South Asia, the survival dimension of Nepal society is crowded with many items. Loaded on the survival dimension of note is health, leisure, and spiritual life. Also, the survival dimension is loaded with such standard items as household income, standard of living, education, job, housing, health, leisure, and spiritual life. Of special note is the importance of education. Landlocked, Nepal has been one of the most eager states to learn from abroad, and uses one of the most dangerous airports located in the mountains near Kathmandu. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as social welfare system, democratic system, condition of the environment, and public safety. The steady immigration of Indians from the south has been a source of annoyance. It is bound to increase the fear of Nepalese, especially within the poorer castes, although the per capita income may increase overall (Pyakurel, 2021). The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as friendships, family life, neighbors, and marriage.

#### **10.2.4 Myanmar**

Myanmar is a new settler society. Myanmar is officially called The Republic of the Union of Myanmar. It is a decentralized society. Myanmar or Burma was a British colony. Well before it became a British colony, Burma was a strong empire, invading what was then called Siam and accommodating immigrants from Bengal. Burmese, a major ethnic group, subjugated neighboring ethnic groups and built a Buddhist kingdom on the basis of rice agriculture and the advanced weapons of the time. However, many of those ethnic-religious groups did not quite comply with the Rangoon-based Burmese kingdom. Once Britain colonized Burma, the semi-autonomous system of non-Burmese provinces was born with more or less equal status *vis-à-vis* Rangoon. Gaining independence after World War II, the Rangoon-based Burmese dominated other ethnic-religious groups through the military's grip of coercive power. However, other groups have not complied. Many groups rejected being under Rangoon's rule. Thus, even now, such groups as Shans (Christians), Karens, Rakhine (Muslim), Han-Chinese, Mons, Kachins, and Chins (Christians) are more or less defiant against Naypyitaw, the capital city. Military rule continued till the National League of Democracy, the alliance of democracy headed by Aung San Suu Kyi, succeeded in attaining an absolute majority of seats in both houses in the military-dominated parliament, albeit able to exercise only extremely limited power. Suu Kyi is State Counsellor, a role akin to a prime minister, but with the military's dominance in power she has been barred from constitutionally taking the presidency (Myint-U, 2019). The NLD, the majority party in the parliament, recognizes in its

party manifesto a highly centralized state. In 2020 the military conducted a *coup d'état*, fearing that the NLD under Suu Kyi might not protect its privileged powers and that China's threats would not be well handled by the NLD under Suu Kyi.

Turning to daily life satisfaction, the survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, standard of living, job, housing, education, health, and friendships in this order. The public sector is loaded with such items as public safety, condition of the environment, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Most noteworthy is what would normally be loaded on the social relations dimension like neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life are loaded instead on the public sector dimension in Myanmar under Buddhist socialism and under the military's grip on power. The social relations dimension is loaded by marriage, and marriage only. To sum up, the five most important things in life are being healthy (74.3%), having enough to eat (58.4%), being devout (52.4%), having a comfortable home (46.5%), and having a job (42.0%).

### 10.2.5 Cambodia

Cambodia built a kingdom, one of the symbolic legacies of which was Angkor Wat. Cambodia at its height included what are now good portions of northeast Thailand and southern Vietnam along large rivers that flow from Tibet and the Himalayas. From the southern edge of Bangkok and the northern edge of Hue, respectively, Thai and Vietnamese both steadily advanced into Cambodian territories. France colonized Cambodia along with Laos and Vietnam as French Indochina. After Japan's defeat, Cambodia's monarchy returned. After North Vietnam's peace treaty with the US in 1973, Cambodia and Vietnam relations deteriorated, with Vietnam occupying Cambodia. Then China militarily intervened in Vietnam. After Vietnam withdrew from Cambodia, Cambodia went through a period of brutal repression and genocide under the Khmer Rouge that massacred millions of people before United Nations Peacekeeping Operations set the stage for free elections. Prime Minister Hun Sen has been in power since 1985, exercising authoritarian rule. Global warming has impacted Cambodia's biggest lake, Tong Le Sap, shrinking it steadily, and China's construction of upstream dams has further aggravated Cambodia's water supply and fishing industry. Partly in return, China has been assisting Cambodia to construct roads and ports.

Turning to daily life satisfaction, the survival dimension is loaded with such items as standard of living, job, friendships, housing, marriage, family life, neighbors, and health in this order. The survival dimension correlates with a few items very heavily, which would be otherwise correlated with the social relations dimension. They are marriage, family life, neighbors, and health. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as condition of the environment, public safety, social welfare system, and democratic system in this order. Noteworthy is the heavily loaded item, condition of the environment. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as leisure and spiritual life.

### ***10.2.6 Laos***

Laos is an Acb society. Mountains and rivers are dominant in Lao geography. Hill tribes and boat people tend to defy the central power of the capital city, i.e., tax, deployment of soldiers, and legal compliance (Scott, 2009). As arable land is scant, but occupied by big rice paddies, subsistence is not easy. This leads to drug production and trafficking, and out-migration to neighboring Thailand and Vietnam and to the US. Laos has always been subject to vicissitudes with its neighbors, Thailand, Vietnam, and also the US. Politics is authoritarian.

Let me turn to daily life satisfaction and to those items that are loaded on the three dimensions. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as standard of living, household income, job, housing, family life, education, and health in this order. The survival dimension is heavily loaded with many items. Family life, education, and health stand out as those items ordinary people find some modest degree of satisfaction with their poverty-stricken lives. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as condition of the environment, public safety, social welfare system, spiritual life, and neighbors. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as leisure, marriage, and friendships.

### ***10.2.7 Mongolia***

Mongolia is an Acb society. It is a decentralized society with its territory spreading widely from East to West. A nationwide postal system does exist and drones are used in seasonal nomadic animal husbandry. Instead of street numbers and a postal code, the latitude and longitude of a place in precise detail is critical. Genghis Khan built a worldwide empire that lasted more than one century. The Republic of Mongolia constitutes less than one-half of the Mongol-residing space: the Inner Mongolian Autonomous province of China and a few semi-autonomous states where broadly Mongolian people reside is part of the Russian Federation. After the end of the Cold War, Mongolia became the Republic of Mongolia, dropping the adjective, Socialist. The pastoral population has dropped as the urban population has become dominant. Economic inequality has increased since the end of the Cold War.

In daily life satisfaction, the survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, standard of living, job, education, spiritual life, leisure, health, and family life in this order. The survival dimension is heavily crowded. Noteworthy are spiritual life (Lamaism), leisure, health, and family life. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as condition of the environment, public safety, social welfare system, and democratic system in this order.



### **10.2.8 *China***

China is an Acb society. To say that China is a decentralized society may cause one to pause. As a matter of fact, provincial and other subnational units dominate spending on social welfare and pensions by 87%, not the central government (Zheng, 2007). China is a vast country with a large population. The regime is what Milanovic (2019) calls “political capitalism.” The state can run business firms flexibly with its own resources and judgement at the top level. But given the diversity of local preferences and of implementation and the occasional misjudgment at the authoritarian top, large mishaps and mistakes cannot be avoided. That is why Chinese society is a decentralized society (Hayton, 2020; Zhao, 2014).

Let me turn to daily life satisfaction on the three dimensions. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, standard of living, job, housing, and education in this order. The survival dimension is compact in terms of items. Those South and Southeast Asian societies of an Acb type tend to have greater variety in the social relations dimension than Chinese society. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as public safety, social welfare system, democratic system, condition of the environment, and leisure. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as family life, marriage, spiritual life, friendships, health, and neighbors, in that order.

### **10.2.9 *South Korea***

South Korea is an Acb society. It is a divided society. Japan colonized Korea from 1911 to 1945. The last phase of World War II coincided with the advances of the US and the Soviet Union into East Asia, the Kurils, Sakhalin, Manchuria, North and South Korea, and Okinawa. Korea was divided into two by the US and the Soviet Union. South Korea is a divided society in three senses: economic disparity, localism, and ideological antagonism. These divisions are manifested in small numbered Chaebol-based big business firms versus myriads of miniscule self-owned firms, Dominant Kyunsando versus Oppressed Chollado local antagonism, and pro-American versus pro-unification sentiments (or pro-China, pro-North Korea).

In daily life satisfaction, the survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, standard of living, job, education, housing, health, leisure, and spiritual life in this order. Noteworthy are leisure and spiritual life. Leisure seems an indispensable item of survival: golfing together with like-minded people and enjoying BBQ parties in the mountains on festive occasions. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as condition of the environment, public safety, social welfare system, and democratic system in this order. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as marriage, family life, friendships, and neighbors.

### 10.3 Bac Society: Society Colonized from Within

Bac is represented by Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Kyrgyzstan. These societies are colonized from within, as labeled by O'Donnell (1973), where a leading sector and its coalitions colonize the regime. There is no level playing field, and the rest of society is not in any position for significant participation and recruitment.

#### 10.3.1 *Hong Kong*

Hong Kong is a Bac society. It is a social relations-focused society. Until 1997 this characteristic was most pronounced. After 1997, Chinese sovereignty was reaffirmed under the “one-country, two-systems” policy. In 2020, China legislated a new security law for the whole of China, including Hong Kong, tightening the limits on freedom substantially. But it is still a Bac society. A public opinion poll research center at the University of Hong Kong has been carrying out regular public opinion surveys in Hong Kong, albeit with difficulties, including the house investigation by Hong Kong Police on 10 June 2020 (Asahi Shimbun, 2020; cf. Peterson, 2000). It has been a new settler society. In the Opium War with Britain (1842), the Qing government (Han-Manchu dynasty) conceded Hong Kong to Britain till 1997 as a rented colony. People massively migrated to Hong Kong from mainland China due to the Kuomintang-Communist civil war (1945–1949), the Great Leap Forward (1958–1959), and the Cultural Revolution (1965–1976).

Turning to daily life satisfaction, the items on the social relations dimension are most salient. They include leisure, spiritual life, family life, marriage, friendships, education, and health. Since 1842 people have focused on survival and social relations. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as standard of living, household income, housing, and job. A number of items that might be loaded on the survival dimension in some other societies are loaded on the social relations dimension. It is because people in Hong Kong live their lives focused on survival and social relations with other Hong Kongers, and not politically engaged with either Britain or China. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, and neighbors.

#### 10.3.2 *Malaysia*

Malaysia is a Bac society. It is a new settler society. Malaysia was a British colony before it became independent in 1964. Britain, which surrendered to Japan in 1942, came back to British Malaya in 1945. Of the three major groups, Malays, Chinese

and Indians, the latter two are new settlers, whom Britain recruited for labor service, especially for the agricultural and mining sectors. The Malays are on the whole poorer and less educated, whereas the latter group of new settlers are highly motivated to get a higher education and to move upward.

In daily life satisfaction, the social relations dimension is loaded with such items as spiritual life, family life, friendships, neighbors, leisure, and marriage in this order. Spiritual life means Islam for the Malays, Taoism-Confucianism for the Chinese, and Hindu for the Tamils. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, standard of living, job, education, housing, and health. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as social welfare system, condition of the environment, public safety, and democratic system. Most noteworthy is the importance of the social welfare system whereby the Malays are privileged compared to Chinese and Indians in terms of income compensation and institutionalized career promotion in government service. In sum, “A strong developmentalist (materialist) orientation and continuing propensity to support the status quo” (Saravanamuttu, 2005).

### 10.3.3 Thailand

Thailand is a Bac society. It is a new settler society. With business, big and small, thriving in the capital city, and with many large rivers supplying water to rice paddies, Thailand has attracted migrants from Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar, and China. In early modern times, Thailand, then called Siam, competed with Burma (which invaded Siam and wreaked havoc on Bangkok), with Cambodia, from which it won concessionary territories during World War II, and with Vietnam, which steadily expanded from central Vietnam and the Mekong Delta, absorbing Mons (hill tribes), Champa (Chams), Khmers (Cambodians), and migrating Chinese. Thailand was the only country in Asia, besides Japan, which was not colonized by Westerners.

In daily life satisfaction, the social relations dimension is loaded with such items as family life, spiritual life, leisure, neighbors, marriage, friendships, and housing. The whole range and weight of the social relations dimension extend to what would be often characterized as belonging to other dimensions. Thai politics is often characterized by a dense social mixture of religious (a lot of Buddhist temples), bureaucratic (police renowned for being tough on criminal offenders), military (many successful *coup d'états*), business billionaires, political, royal, and non-governmental groups. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, education, standard of living, and health in this order. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as social welfare system, public safety, condition of the environment, and democratic system. What happens in Thai society is “Economic prosperity tends to trump concerns about political freedoms and rights” (Khamchoo & Stein, 2005).

### 10.3.4 Vietnam

Vietnam is a Bac society. It is a new settler society. Vietnam was a Chinese colony till the eleventh century, and since the nineteenth century onward Vietnam has been expanding its territory and population steadily. Those ethnic groups originally residing in southern China kept moving south. They came down to northern Vietnam and settled there. During the nineteenth century, France colonized Vietnam. The French Indochinese colony treated Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos as one. Vietnamese were advancing further south into the Mekong Delta where Mons, Chams, and Khmers (Cambodians) resided as well as along the mountains that border Laos.

In daily life satisfaction, the social relations dimension is loaded with such items as family life, spiritual life, leisure, marriage, education, and friendships. The survival satisfaction is loaded with health, household income, standard of living, health, and job in this order. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and neighbors.

Vietnam is different from other East Asian societies in that it has had dense interactions with continental Southeast Asians in the hills and in the Mekong Delta. Continental Southeast Asians' life is more competitive and combative. Also, Vietnamese society in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam after 1975 had two distinctive parts. In 1975, the two societies, North Vietnam and South Vietnam, were integrated: Northern society has basically been built on socialist central planning and infrastructure construction in the Red River Delta and in ports and in the hills bordering Laos where many ethnic minorities reside, whereas Southern Vietnam has been built on a capitalist market economy in a new settler society with multi-ethnic varieties, especially Khmers and Chinese. Integration has been accelerated since 1986 with the *doimoi* (reform) policy, started by the Communist Party that dominated the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

### 10.3.5 Kyrgyzstan

Kyrgyzstan is a new settler society. It was one of the former republics of the Soviet Union. At the same time Kyrgyzstan is a multi-ethnic society with a thriving commercial marketplace at its center. Ethnically, the Kyrgyzstan people are rich in the north, while the ethnically Uzbek and Tajik people of the south are poor, and do not get along well. Kyrgyzstan was the first in trying to democratize the regime after the end of the Cold War. The North–South ethnic and economic antagonisms make the country inherently unstable.

In daily life satisfaction, the social relations dimension comes top of the three dimensions. Ethnic and economic diversities lead to a society in which social relations loom large. Furthermore, the transition from communism to capitalism has its trials and errors with authoritarian and autocratic inclinations easily emerging, especially when confronted with the difficult forces of globalization and liberalization that

permeate the world. Thus, the social relations dimension is crowded: spiritual life, leisure, family life, marriage, friendships, education, and neighbors. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, standard of living, job, health, and housing. The public sector dimension is loaded with such items as social welfare system, democratic system, public safety, and condition of the environment.

## **10.4 Bca Society: Fragmented and Fractured Society**

Bca is not represented by any society in Asia. Possibly, North Korea might belong to this type. Without being able to carry out a survey inside North Korea, one cannot say that this is the case (cf. Baik, 2016).

## **10.5 Cab Society: Seeming Fractured and Fragmented Divisions of a Society**

Cab is represented by Pakistan, Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, and Kazakhstan. A society composed of those who are disconnected and dispossessed is a fragmented and fractured society. Unlike a society colonized from within, a fragmented and fractured society does not enjoy a high level of compliance. Because of affluence and poverty, coercion and defiance, and oppressive environments, the equilibrium of fragmentation and fluctuation is maintained robustly. A Cab society is seemingly fractured and fragmented. Its divisions within society are covered by the sheer force of public sector dominance, whether it is materialized and consolidated by Islam, Buddhism, a monarchy, quasi-feudal estate possessing an elite coalition, a mining-foreign capital coalition, or ethnic competition.

### ***10.5.1 Pakistan***

Pakistan is a Cab society. Pakistan consists of very dissimilar sectors, one of which takes power through assorted coalitions of Punjabi military, Punjabi farmers, Punjabi bureaucrats, and educated middle class, Sindhi business millionaires, Balochistani Pashtuns, and Northwest frontier hill tribes. Once power has been taken, Pakistani society is strong, however seemingly fragmented and poor (Lieven, 2012; Walsh, 2020). The powerful military and bureaucracy network has been one of the key underlying factors of Pakistani strength despite all the institutional underdevelopment and underperformance. For two reasons private trust networks have tended to provide answers (Bari & Faheem, 2008). Take the spread of Covid-19 in 2020 in Pakistan and India. The accumulated death tolls in Pakistan between January and September

2020 totaled some 6,500, whereas those in India are far larger than 6,500 even in a month (*The Economist*, 3 October 2020, pp. 19–20).

In daily life satisfaction, the public sector dimension is loaded with such items as social welfare system, condition of the environment, democratic system, and public safety. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, education, health, standard of living, education, housing, and friendships in this order. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as spiritual life, family life, marriage, leisure, and neighbors in this order.

### **10.5.2 Brunei**

Brunei is a Cab society. Brunei is immensely rich due to oil and natural gas. The population is extremely tiny, some 30,000 with the monarch at the societal apex. The monarch is all-powerful since no taxation is necessary.

In daily life satisfaction, the public sector dimension is loaded with social welfare system, condition of the environment, democratic system, family life, leisure, job, and neighbors. Family life, leisure, and neighbors are loaded on the public sector dimension, which may suggest that close neighborhood communities share activities in institutions built with public expenditure. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as education, household income, health, and standard of living. The fact that health and education are loaded on the survival dimension may suggest that one's own health and children's education is emphasized in life. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as marriage, friendships, and housing.

### **10.5.3 The Philippines**

The Philippines is a Cab society. The Philippines is a fractured and fragmented society. Well-established families who have gained their wealth through extensive land holdings and business ownership occupy high and influential positions in the central and provincial governments. Of the 23 senators in the Philippine Senate, many come from such families. Also, of the many presidents the country has had since independence, most are from these families. The current and outgoing president, Rodrigo Duterte, is from Davao, Mindanao and is a rare exception to this political pattern.

In daily life satisfaction, the public sector dimension is loaded with such items as democratic system, condition of the environment, democratic system, and public safety. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, job, education, standard of income, and health. The social relation dimension is loaded with such items as spiritual life, family life, marriage, leisure, neighbors, and friendships. The social relations dimension is literally crowded. Worshipping and dancing weekly at their Catholic church with family, neighbors, and friends belong to spiritual

life and social life. Most Filipinos are Christian and a small percentage are Muslims on the island of Mindanao, the southernmost province.

#### ***10.5.4 Bhutan***

Bhutan is a Cab society. It is a Buddhist society with a monarch. Geographically, it is sandwiched between two giants: China and India. Bhutan is best known for its monarch preaching happiness. Bhutan's concept of happiness is derived from Buddhism. Naturally, its meaning differs from Western-derived happiness.

Looking at the satisfaction level in Bhutan with daily life domains, aspects, and styles, the public sector dimension is loaded with such items as social welfare system, public safety, condition of the environment, democratic system, neighbors, and spiritual life in this order. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as standard of living, household income, education, job, housing, and health. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as family life, marriage, friendships, and leisure. As mentioned, the public sector dimension contains spiritual life, which may suggest that the monarch encourages worshipping at Buddhist temples as public institutions. As far as one can see, the degree of satisfaction with concrete daily life domains, aspects, and styles in Bhutan does not differ much from the Western kind of definition of happiness. As long as survey data are collected using mostly abstract questions, without asking questions that encourage and remind respondents to envisage concrete daily life situations, the effort will be basically futile.

#### ***10.5.5 Kazakhstan***

Kazakhstan is a Cab society. Kazakhstan is a vast, fragmented society, spanning a large geographical region that starts at the Russian border to the north, then extends to Mongolia and China in the east, and continues to Turkmenistan in the south. Fragmentation of society is revealed through Kazakhstan's distinctive multiethnic society that has Kazakhs as a majority, a sizable Russian population, and many non-Kazakh Mongol-Turkic minorities. It is a resource-rich society with a strong mining sector and well-connected sources of foreign capital. Other notable qualities of the country include a fairly strong Soviet-style socialist bureaucracy and, based on its shift from the Cyrillic to Latin alphabet, a yearning to join the Euro-Atlantic organization called the Eurasian Economic Community.

In daily life satisfaction, the public sector dimension is loaded with such items as social welfare system, democratic system, public safety, and condition of the environment. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as standard of living, household income, health, job, and housing. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as marriage, family life, spiritual life, friendships, leisure, neighbors, and education.

## 10.6 Cba Society: Micro-monitoring Society

Cba is represented by Singapore and Sri Lanka. Its traits feature a society small enough but with sufficiently capable regime apparatus to keep residents focused on pursuing comfort and compliance.

### 10.6.1 *Singapore*

Singapore is a Cba society. Singapore gained independence in 1965 by splitting itself from the Malaysian Federation that had been born in 1964. British Malaya remained for another 20 years after World War II. Largely Chinese communist dissidents in British Malaya resisted Britain's suppression for approximately a dozen years (1948–1960). A newly independent Singapore was built under Lee Kuan Yew's leadership. It is an economic miracle that Singapore grew from a third world to a modern state in less than half a century (Lee, 2012). The People's Action Party constructed a disciplined meritocratic society with microscopic management.

In daily life satisfaction, the public sector dimension is loaded with such items as social welfare system, democratic system, condition of the environment, and public safety in this order. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as family life, leisure, marriage, friendships, spiritual life, housing, and neighbors in this order. The survival dimension is loaded with such items as household income, education, job, health, and standard of living.

### 10.6.2 *Sri Lanka*

Sri Lanka is a Cab society. It is a fractured society with a majority Sinhalese population who have an antagonistic relationship with the minority Tamils. Prior to independence, the British Ministry of Colonies was in charge of the Sinhalese and the Ministry of British India was in charge of the Tamils. The problem started when the Ministry of British India sent Tamils from the Tamil Nadu state as tea plantation workers on the hillsides of eastern Ceylon. The Ministry of British Colonies focused on the Sinhalese who have been Buddhist since ancient times in western Ceylon. Sinhalese have resided in Ceylon since ancient times whereas Tamils are new settlers from India. Religious composition is 70% Buddhism for Sinhalese, 20% Hindu for Tamils, and 10% Muslim for the remaining population. Ceylon, or Sri Lanka, gained independence in 1948. But the steady increase of Tamil tea plantation migrants in Sri Lanka caused structural frictions and civil war between the two main ethnicities. The civil war ended in 2009 but the structural problems remain unresolved. Tamil migrants work harder compared to Sinhalese who tend to be more moderate. Singapore's Tamils also work hard but the new Chinese settlers work just



as hard in the same society. Singapore's Cab society runs more smoothly with a meritocratic promotion and microscopic monitory system. In contrast, Sri Lanka's Tamils face slow-moving Sinhalese, and the Tamils can get aggressive in attempts to alleviate their sufferings.

In daily life satisfaction, the public sector dimension is loaded with such items as social welfare system, condition of the environment, public safety, democratic system, and leisure. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as household income, standard of living, job, housing, education, health, and friendships in this order. The social relations dimension is loaded with such items as marriage, family life, spiritual life, and neighbors.

## References

- Asahi Shimbun. (2020). *Hong Kong no yoronchosakikan ni kataku sosaku, minshuha yobisen garamika* (A Hong Kong public opinion organization received a domiciliary visit by prosecutors, probably related to the Democratic party's primary election), 11 July 2020.
- Baik, J. (2016). *North Korea's Hidden Revolution: How the information underground its transforming a closed society*. Yale University Press.
- Bari, F., & Faheem, A. (2008). Pakistan: Institutional underdevelopment/underperformance and reliance on private trust networks: Pakistan through the AsiaBarometer Survey. In T. Inoguchi, et al. (Eds.), *Human beliefs and values in incredible Asia. South and Central Asia in focus: Country profiles and thematic analyses based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2005*. Akashi Shoten.
- Dadabaev, T. (2005). Uzbekistan: How does transition work in Central Asia? Coping with ideological, economic and value system changes in Uzbekistan. In T. Inoguchi, et al. (Eds.), *Human beliefs and values in South and Central Asia: 13 country profiles and thematic analysis on the basis of the AsiaBarometer Survey*. Akashi Shoten.
- Etzioni, A. (2020). Covid-19 tests nation's communitarian values. *The Japan Times*, 19 July 2020.
- Fanon, F. (2005). *The wretched of the earth*. Penguin.
- Hayton, B. (2020). *The invention of China*. Yale University Press.
- Inoguchi, T. (2015). War occurrence: Hyper-insecurity and multilateral institutions. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 16(3), 388–398.
- Inoguchi, T. (2020). *The need for evidence-based approaches and justice*. Springer Nature Special blog for International Day of Peace. <https://www.springernature.com/gp/researchers/sdg-programme/sdg16/international-day-of-peace/takash-iinoguchi-blog>
- Inoguchi, T., & Fujii, S. (2013). *The quality of life in Asia: A comparison of quality of life in Asia*. Springer.
- Iwai, N. (2009). *Data de miru Higashi Asia no Kazokukan: Higashi Asia shakai chosa ni yoru Nichi-Kan-Chu-Tai no hikaku* (East Asia view of families: Japan-South Korea-China-Taiwan comparisons in East Asian general social surveys). Nakanishya Shu.
- Keane, J. (2009). *The life and death of democracy*. Simon and Shuster.
- Khamchoo, C., & Stein, A. (2005). Thailand: The primacy of prosperity in democracy. In T. Inoguchi, et al. (Eds.), *Values and life styles in urban Asia: A cross-cultural analyses and sourcebook based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2003*. Siglo XXI Editores for the Institute of Oriental Culture University of Tokyo.
- Kumar, S. (2005). India's urban middle class. In T. Inoguchi, et al. (Eds.), *Values and life styles in urban Asia: A cross-cultural analyses and sourcebook based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2003*. Siglo XXI Editores for the Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo.

- Kurasawa, A. (2020). *Indonesia no daigyakusatu: Futatsu no coup d'état to shijo saidaikyū no Sangeki* (Indonesia's massive scale Massacre: Two Coups d'états to historic largest Massacres). Chuo koron shin sha.
- Lee, K. Y. (2012). *From third world to first: The Singapore story: 1965–2000*. Marshall Cavendish.
- Lieven, A. (2012). *Pakistan: A hard country*. Penguin.
- Malejacq, R. (2019). *Warlord survival: The decline of state building in Afghanistan*. Cornell University Press.
- Maruyama, M. (1961). *Nihon no Shiso* (Japanese thought). Iwanami shoten.
- Matsui, T. (2001). *Yuboku toiu bunka: idonu no seikatsu senryaku* (Cultural properties of South-western Asian Pastoral Nomads: Migration and strategies of politico-economic adaptation). Yoshikawa Kobunkan.
- McGregor, K., Melvin, J., & Pohlman, A. (2018). *The Indonesian genocide of 1965: Causes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Milanovic, B. (2019). *Capitalism, alone: The future of the system that rules the world*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Monsutti, A. (2005). *War and migration: Social networks and economic strategies of the Hazaras of Afghanistan*. Routledge.
- Myint-U, T. (2019). *The hidden history of Burma: Race, capitalism, and the crisis of democracy in the 21st century*. W.W. Norton.
- O'Donnell, G. (1973). *Modernization and bureaucratic authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics*. Institute of International Studies, University of California.
- Pisani, E. (2014). *Indonesia Etc: Exploring the improbable nation*. Granta.
- Peterson, C. J. (2000). Preserving academic freedom in Hong Kong: Lessons from the “Robert Chung affair.” *Hong Kong Law Journal*, 30(2), 165–176.
- Pyakurel, U. (2021). *Reproduction of inequality and social exclusion: A study of Dalits in a caste society, Nepal*. Springer Nature.
- Reischauer, E., Fairbank, J., & Albert, C. (1973). *East Asia: Tradition and transformation*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Roy, A. (1997). *The god of small things*. Fourth Estate.
- Saravanamuttu, J. (2005). Malaysia: Middle class affectations of a democratizing multicultural society. In T. Inoguchi, et al. (Eds.), *Values and life styles in urban Asia: A cross-cultural analyses and sourcebook based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2003* (pp. 103–119). Siglo XXI Editores for the Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo.
- Scott, J. C. (2009). *The art of not being governed: An anarchist history of Upland Southeast Asia*. Yale University Press.
- Tett, G. (2016). *The silo effect: The peril of expertise and the promise of breaking down barriers*. Simon and Schuster.
- The Economist*. (2020). Is Pakistan really handling the pandemic better than India? 3 October 2020.
- Walsh, D. (2020). *The nine lives of Pakistan: Dispatches for a divided nation*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wertheim, S. (2020). *Tomorrow, the world: The birth of U.S. global supremacy*. Harvard University Press.
- Zhao, S. (2014). *A nation state by construction: Dynamics of modern Chinese nationalism*. Stamford University Press.
- Zheng, Y. (2007). Federalism in China. In B. He, B. Galligan, & T. Inoguchi (Eds.), *Federalism in Asia* (pp. 213–241). Edward Edgar.

# Chapter 11

## Strength and Weakness of the Proposed Typology



The typology proposed in this book come from a bottom-up perspective and evidence-based approach. In this chapter, I discuss the strength and weakness of the proposed typology.

### 11.1 Measurement and Comparison

To reveal the features of this thoughtfully crafted new typology, it is best to compare it with dominant typologies prevailing in economics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and political science. For example, the typology of democracy-dictatorship uses an ideal-type methodology to envisage what may be viewed as a pure or perfect democracy or dictatorship. The NPO Freedom House's flagship publication and The Economist Intelligence Unit's flagship publication, the *Democracy Index*, both adopt this methodology. Another example, the typology of a united or divided society adopts per capita income distribution or ethnic group distribution or religious belief distribution or kinship principle or holistic versus analytic orientation from observation. In economics, the OECD uses the Gini index as a summary measure of income inequality. In anthropology, ethnic group distribution determines much of a society's configuration. This is especially the case in tandem with globalization and digitization, when migration becomes massive and plays the role of triggering social change. In religious studies, religiosity matters. The era of Max Weber's *Entzauberung* has been replaced by a new era of the rebirth and rise of religion (Inglehart, 2021). In family studies, the principles of kinship in inheritance and in inter-cousin marriage matter and have been changing fast together with nuclear-family dominance. From a psychological perspective, backgrounds, attributes, and relationships matter versus foreground, actors, and intentions mattering (Henrich, 2020). These examples of elevating an ideal-type to a typologizing scheme reveal the strength of this approach. At the same time, this ideal-type approach has the weakness of exaggerating one analytic observation. This is in part what Henrich

calls the WEIRDest psychological propensity of looking at trees rather than forests, at actors and intentions rather than relations and attributes and backgrounds.

Attending to both holistic and analytic observation has foretold the discussion of this section. When evidenced-based measurement is called for, one has tended to focus on one or two dimensional qualities. This proposed typology calls for multi-dimensional features of assessment. Tolstoy's approach to family happiness in *Anna Karenina* tells a half-truth. Not only unhappy families have all sorts of different reasons for being unhappy but also happy families have all sorts of different reasons for being happy. Furthermore, the kind and degree of happiness are specified in my new typology according to 16 items of life domains, aspects, and styles: housing, friendships, marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, family life, spiritual life, and leisure. Such an abstract word as happiness needs to be made specific in usage in order to be identifiable in relation to some concrete life situations. By so doing, one can avoid reporting unusually high figures from Americans or from Chinese about their happiness. Americans are so accustomed to affirming happiness that when asked about their happiness they respond positively, almost without thinking. Hirschmann (1970) in his work on exit, voice, and loyalty has a passage about different meanings of being happy in English and of being *gluecklich* in German. An American Jew asked a German Jew, how are you? The German Jew answered, "Yes, I am very happy." Then in German he added, "*Aber bin ich nicht so gluecklich*" (But I'm not so lucky). Chinese also usually express their trust toward others in very positive terms. This is a good Confucian response to trust in the abstract. Yet when asked what they would do if someone looked lost on the street, whether they would help him or her, or wait for someone else to help and only then offer their own assistance, Chinese respondents appear to be more negative if the person needing help does not belong to their family or kinship group. My point is simply that a mere abstract word is often misleading for analysts to use in survey questions.

Another point to consider is the use of domestic "pundits and experts" who are called on by media outlets to discuss responses to survey questions, such as the degree of friendship or hostility in a bilateral relationship, say in US-Japan relations. The same holds true in discussions about survey question responses on freedom and human rights. In US-Japan bilateral relations, some mild suspicion has been raised about the unusually high-level and more or less flat response of pundits and experts as compared to the general public whose answers usually show more volatility. It is about the tendency toward cartelization of pundits and experts on the US-Japan alliance, or the "US-Japan alliance first" school. Among the general public, mass media lines differ according to the policy and ideological lines of major mass media sponsored surveys. The differences are not to be exaggerated but they remain fixed, from the Sankei, Yomiuri, NHK (Japan Broadcasting Corporation), and Nikkei on the right, to the Asahi, Mainichi, and Tokyo (Chunichi) on the left, regarding Japanese policy and ideological issues. Why do I touch on this subject? Because once "pundits and experts" are included as a reliable source for the measurement of a certain scale of psychological propensity, just as American freshmen and sophomores are very

often deployed as a reliable resource for measurement of a certain scale of psychological propensity by authors of articles in *American Psychological Review*, *Nature*, and *Science*, some start to think about the reliability of data. This worry increases, especially with the prevailing use of RDD (random-digit-dialing) interviews as a major method of contacting respondents who are otherwise difficult to contact. That is why this book is based on the classical survey method of face-to-face interviewing with nationwide random sampling in 32 Asian societies.

## 11.2 Interpretation of Typologized Results

Satisfaction with life domains, aspects, and styles is the key to understanding the aggregate configuration of societal satisfaction that emerges as a result of factor analysis. The results are called types of society. The three dimensions are named survival, social relations, and public policy dominance. The World Value Survey focuses on values and norms held by world citizens. The AsiaBarometer Survey focuses on satisfaction as revealed in relation to 16 life items (domains, aspects, and styles). The three dimensions that are yielded by factor analysis of 16 life items are survival, social relations and public policy dominance. What needs utmost attention is that these three dimensions are more or less fixed but the order of eigenvalues attached to each of the three dimensions differs. It is not always the case that survival, social relations, and public policy dominance appear in this order as in the original theory of Maslow (1943). For instance, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam belong to the Bac societal type. i.e., the eigenvalues of social relations, survival, and public policy dominance dimensions are in descending order. In other words, the dimension of social relations as cartelized by many diverse life items is strongest. Those life items that correlate among them center on life items of social relations like housing, friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. For another example, Pakistan, the Philippines, Kazakhstan, and Brunei belong to the Cab type, meaning that public policy dominance comes first. Once power is captured by one of the oligarchical groups that are of major power importance, then public policy is shaped sharply by that oligarchical group as long as its policy line does not go beyond the red line of the state. Those life items that correlate among themselves include such life items as spiritual life, leisure, and neighbors. The construction of the typology of societies needs to be not only attentive to both holistic and analytic, but also sensitive to changes not only in trees but also in forests and even in the whole planet of jungles.

### 11.3 How to Cope with Globalization and Democratization?

The two key issues facing global citizens in the last quarter of the twentieth century and beyond are globalization and democratization. From a regime's point of view, both forces are difficult to manage, with the traditional institutional setups and the weakness of siphoning citizens' voices and carrying out necessary measures to accommodate new grievances and discontent with what comes out of globalization and democratization. For example, massive movements of people across borders trigger cultural nationalism disguised as populism. As another example, massive and swift movements of currencies caused by large-scale speculation destabilize business forecasts. Hence, governments tend to use extraordinary and unusual measures to handle difficulties. Oftentimes governments inadvertently or half-consciously backslide on democratic principles and liberal trading principles.

#### a. *Globalization*

Of the 193 sovereign state members of the United Nations, the developing South represents 149 members and the developed North represents 44 members. In Asia—East, Southeast, South, and Central Asia—the developed South amounts to 28 states while the developed North amounts to one, Japan. Those high-income states in Asia include Singapore, Brunei, Turkmenistan, Hong Kong, South Korea, and China and are defined as belonging to the developing South by the United Nations. Hong Kong is a special administrative region of China and it is not a member of the United Nations. Neither is Taiwan. Singapore has the highest per capita income in Asia with those institutions and skills approved de facto of the developed North (or the First World or the OECD club). The government of Singapore has shown that it is a de facto member of the developed North as Lee Kuan Yew's autobiography is entitled (Lee, 2013). China is about to become the world's number one power in the near future, but its government is not ready to be defined as part of the developed North. Given its population size and its national per capita income, China does not want to shoulder what might be expected of a member of the developed North in terms of climate change, pandemic prevention, conflict prevention roles, global monetary movement rules and regulations, intellectual property rights, human dignity and rights, developmental financial assistance, and foreign direct investment. South Korea, ranking 10th in terms of GNP, does not want to shoulder the expenditure and regulations that are almost semi-automatically committed to by the developed North.

Membership of the developed North has not grown very much since 1945 when the United Nations was founded: membership is 30–40 states, mostly North American and West European countries. They follow the rules and regulations set up by multilateral treaties, of which only those states that promulgate and ratify them can become members. Why did multilateral treaty participation (meaning promulgation and ratification combined) start to decrease around the turn of the new millennium? The end of the Cold War triggered the stagnating trend of the liberal international order due to: (1) the overloaded tasks of multilateral treaties when globalization and

digitalization were accelerated without the Cold War separation and with the outburst of massive and supersonic movement of purchasing and selling currencies; (2) the increasingly malfunctioning international organizations like GATT and its replacement, the WTO; (3) the free-riding mood of an increasing number of developing South states that overwhelm the developed North in number in the United Nations; (4) US laxity laid bare in the Iraq War, the Afghan War, and the September 11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, D.C., in the 1990s and 2000s, bringing about the Lehmann Brothers-triggered 2008 great recession and the subsequent rise of “America First” in the 2016 US presidential election; and (5) the re-invention of China (Hayton, 2020) through political capitalism (Milanovic, 2019) by deploying manufacturing and communication service sector products with an abundant surplus supply of state-owned capital and surplus labor. China joined the WTO in 2001 and resurrected Deng’s policy of “Hiding your strength and biding your time” under Jiang Zemin, whose own slogan was “Three Presents”—meaning that capitalists were no less important Communist Party members after the Western and Japanese economic embargoes laid on China for its massive suppression of Tiananmen protestors in 1989. While emphasizing the spirit of globalization and international cooperation abroad, President Xi Jinping has effectively consolidated the “new authoritarianism” (proposed as an ideological slogan by Hu Weining, a new central committee executive member from Fudan University) with the deft use of communication and technological surveillance.

#### b. *Democratization*

The tide of democratization reached a height of 120 member states in the United Nations in the early 1990s. Of the 193 sovereign states, 120 adopted democracy as a governing principle. Thereafter the backsliding of democratization has become the most often-cited word related to democracy. What does it mean?

## 11.4 Managing Globalization and Democratization

Both globalization and democratization are two of the most important forces that can damage and/or benefit societies in the twenty-first century. Gelfand (2018) explains their impacts on cultural change along a spectrum of loose and tight cultural norms, which are the glue that binds groups together. Singapore has many rules and strict punishments, and thus is called a tight culture. New Zealand has lax rules and greater permissiveness, and is called a loose culture. In Gelfand’s (2018, p. 25), countries around the world are given scores of tightness or looseness according to a spectrum on cultural norms: Pakistan, Malaysia, India, Singapore, South Korea, and Norway are on the tight end of the spectrum; and Ukraine, Estonia, Hungary, Israel, the Netherlands, Brazil, Greece, and New Zealand are on the loose end of the spectrum. Located somewhere in the middle are China, Japan, Belgium, Poland, France, Hong Kong, Iceland, Germany, Austria, Italy, the UK, the US, Mexico, and Portugal. Gelfand argues tight and loose culture is not easy to change in the short run. But both types

of culture must cope with globalization and democratization with structured looseness and flexible tightness respectively to a certain extent. Disruptive and disturbing impacts of globalization and democratization are related to the curvilinear relationship between tightness-looseness and well-being. Put simply, Gelfand's argument is that as long as well-being is relatively high, the room for adaptation to those disrupting and disturbing changes related to globalization and democratization is large regardless of where a society is located in the tightness-looseness spectrum. Among Asian societies, Singapore with its tight culture presents good adaptation with its ambidexterity on globalization. Japan with its tight-middle culture adapts to globalization by shifting from mercantile state-led bilateralism to state-led liberalism focusing on standards and rules (Katada, 2020) and seamless supply chains across East and Southeast Asia through three decades of fledgling regionalism and the incipient US-China tariff-tech war in the region. Among emerging economies and societies in Asia, Thailand has gone through two military *coups d'état* in 2014 and 2016 reversing from democratization that started as early as 1991 (Mikami & Inoguchi, 2010). Societal well-being has been hampered by an income divide between Bangkok and the rest of the country, especially in the Northeast. China has practiced for three decades Deng's policy of "hiding your strength and biding your time" with state-own enterprises, surplus labor, surplus capital, and infrastructure construction in communication service and manufacturing. The US-China tariff-tech war since 2017 has put enormous constraints on the continuation of the Dengist policy line, replaced by the Xi Jinping policy line of autocratic rule at home, combined with promotion of globalization and international cooperation abroad. This transformation has caused a further intensification of the US-China tariff-cum-technology war resulting, for one, in the all-out suppression of Hong Kong democratic protesters in 2020. Most glaring has been the US with its income inequality reaching an extreme and its policy of isolationism and protectionism captured in its "America First" policy, culminating in the failed quasi *coup d'état*, on 6 January 2021, by supporters of Donald Trump bursting into the Capitol Building before Congress had formalized Joe Biden's presidential win.

This chapter has had three objectives. First, the typology of Asian societies has been constructed on the basis of satisfaction with daily life domains, aspects, and styles. Second, measurement and comparison have been discussed with reference to works by human evolutionary biologist Henrich (2020) and cognitive psychologist Nisbett (2004). Third, using the concept of tight and loose cultures by psychologist Gelfand (2018), an explanation of major events related to globalization and democratization has been attempted.

## References

- Gelfand, M. (2018). *Rule makers, rule breakers: How tight and loose cultures wire our world*. Scribner.
- Hayton, B. (2020). *The invention of China*. Yale University Press.



- Henrich, J. (2020). *The WEIRDest people in the world: How the west became psychologically peculiar and particularly prosperous*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Hirschman, A. (1970). *Exit, voice and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Harvard University Press.
- Inglehart, R. (2021). *Religion's sudden decline: What's causing it, and what comes next?* Oxford University Press.
- Katada, S. (2020). *Japan's new regional reality: Geoeconomic strategy in the Asia-Pacific*. Columbia University Press.
- Lee, K. Y. (2013). *One man's view of the world*. Straits Times Press.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396.
- Mikami, S., & Inoguchi, T. (2010). Diagnosing the micro foundation of democracy in Asia: Evidence from the AsiaBarometer survey, 2003–2008. In Y.-W. Chu & S.-L. Wong (Eds.), *East Asia's new democracies: Deepening* (pp. 246–292). Routledge.
- Milanovic, B. (2019). *Capitalism alone: The future of the system that governs the world*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Nisbett, R. (2004). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently ... and why*. Free Press.

# Chapter 12

## Corroborative Analysis and Empirical Validation



The standard practice of empirical validation requires at least one more piece of corroborative or reinforcing empirical evidence (*International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, edited by Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, 2001). To meet this request, the AsiaBarometer Survey asks the question about five top lifestyle priorities, country by country: “Of the following lifestyle aspects of life circumstances, please select five that are important to you.” From 2003 to 2005, the following list of 20 aspects was included in the survey:

1. Having enough to eat
2. Having a comfortable home
3. Being healthy
4. Having access to good medical care if required
5. Being able to live without fear of crime
6. Having a job
7. Having access to higher (beyond compulsory) education
8. Owning lots of nice things
9. Earning a high income
10. Spending time with your family
11. Being on good terms with others
12. Being successful at work
13. Being famous
14. Enjoying a pastime
15. Experiencing art and culture
16. Dressing up
17. Winning
18. Expressing your personality or using your talents
19. Contributing to your local community or to society
20. Being devout.

The following five style aspects that were added to the questionnaire from 2006 to 2008 are not used in this analysis:

1. Raising children
2. Freedom of expression and association
3. Living in a country with a good government
4. Pleasant community to live in
5. Safe and clean environment.

Due to this decision, the responses to this question from 2006 to 2008 are not used in this analysis. Hence, Hong Kong and Taiwan, surveyed in 2006, are not part of this analysis. I believe that this omission does not change the empirical validity of the test result.

Table 12.1 shows how the populations of these 27 societies are alike and how they differ in the prioritization of their values (Inoguchi & Fujii, 2013, p. 98). The overwhelming result is that in 22 of 27 societies, good health is the most valued lifestyle aspect and the second most valued aspect in four countries (Afghanistan, Cambodia, the Philippines, and Turkmenistan). The Maldives ranked “being healthy” as the fourth priority. “Being healthy” is followed by “having enough to eat,” which was the most popular choice in five countries and the second most popular in nine countries. “Having enough to eat” listed as diet in Table 12.2 is ranked within the top five aspects in 22 of 27 surveyed societies. “Having a comfortable home” is ranked within the top five aspects in 25 societies. To determine whether “having enough to eat” or “having a comfortable home” is more popular, we assigned the numeric value of 5 to the first ranking, 4 to the second ranking, 3 to the third ranking, 2 to the fourth ranking, 1 to the fifth ranking and then added up to the numeric values for each lifestyle aspect. Based on this numeric rating, “being healthy” obtains 132 points, “having enough to eat” obtains 81 points, and “having a comfortable home” obtains 76 points. It follows that of the 20 lifestyle aspects, “being healthy” is the most valued and prioritized aspect by Asian people, followed by “having enough to eat,” and “having a comfortable home.” We also notice the following patterns in value priorities among the 27 surveyed countries. “Being healthy” and “having a comfortable home” are in the top five choices in all societies. Respondents in Brunei and Malaysia made the same choices in the same order (health, home, diet, family, and job). Respondents in Laos and Thailand selected the same items in the same order (health, diet, home, job, and family). Other groupings of countries that shared the same selection of items include Brunei, India, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, and Thailand; Afghanistan, Indonesia, and Myanmar; Bhutan and Vietnam; Cambodia, Kyrgyzstan, South Korea, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan; China, the Maldives, and Mongolia. The above analysis is based on the rankings of life aspects within each country. According to the row at the bottom of Table 12.1, “being healthy” ranks first for the entire sample from 2003 to 2005 surveys, followed by “having a comfortable home” and “having enough to eat.” (Inoguchi & Fujii, 2013, pp. 95–97).

By comparing how the 27 countries prioritized lifestyle aspects with how they ranked satisfaction of the 16 items of daily life domains, aspects, and lifestyles, this enables one to see how (a) those prioritized lifestyle aspects and (b) those items in

**Table 12.1** Satisfaction with the condition of the environment (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	55.6	41.4	2.4	0.6	0.0	96.4
Indonesia	49.6	36.6	9.1	4.2	0.4	81.6
Singapore	20.4	63.1	12.9	2.9	0.7	79.9
Myanmar	23.9	55.1	15.5	4.4	1.0	73.6
Bhutan	27.2	51.4	14.9	5.2	1.3	72.1
Malaysia	16.0	57.8	14.3	10.1	1.7	62.0
Philippines	21.3	50.4	16.0	9.2	3.1	59.4
Laos	12.3	55.5	20.7	10.5	1.0	56.3
Bangladesh	19.2	45.7	20.6	11.2	3.3	50.4
Maldives	32.9	34.2	15.9	11.8	5.3	50.0
Sri Lanka	17.5	44.6	22.8	10.6	4.5	47.0
Thailand	22.1	43.2	15.8	16.7	2.2	46.4
Japan	12.8	44.4	28.0	12.7	2.1	42.4
Afghanistan	16.3	40.0	26.9	13.3	3.6	39.4
Turkmenistan	14.7	35.4	36.0	8.6	5.4	36.1
Hong Kong	2.0	39.6	51.2	7.0	0.2	34.4
India	12.5	36.3	24.1	16.7	10.4	21.7
Taiwan	3.2	33.1	46.5	15.9	1.3	19.1
Kyrgyzstan	8.9	39.7	19.0	19.7	12.7	16.2
Tajikistan	5.7	35.5	33.5	22.8	2.6	15.8
China	6.7	28.7	42.4	18.5	3.7	13.2
Vietnam	12.4	22.1	43.2	18.2	4.1	12.2
South Korea	3.3	29.8	43.8	19.7	3.4	10.0
Cambodia	4.7	24.9	42.2	22.6	5.6	1.4
Pakistan	6.1	27.5	32.6	26.1	7.8	-0.3
Kazakhstan	7.4	26.5	19.7	28.9	17.5	-12.5
Mongolia	7.0	21.8	26.9	27.3	17.0	-15.5
Uzbekistan	3.5	18.8	25.4	33.7	18.6	-30.0
Nepal	1.0	24.8	15.3	44.4	14.5	-33.1
Total	14.8	38.9	26.7	15.0	4.6	34.1

*Note* Reported in percentages

**Table 12.2** Top five lifestyle aspects

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Afghanistan	Diet	Health	Home	Being devout	Job
Bangladesh	Health	Medical care	No crime	Being devout	Home
Bhutan	Health	Home	Diet	Job	Work
Brunei	Health	Home	Diet	Family	Job
Cambodia	Diet	Health	Home	Job	Income
China	Health	Home	Job	Medical care	No crime
India	Health	Home	Diet	Job	Family
Indonesia	Health	Diet	Home	Being devout	Job
Japan	Health	Family	Job	Home	Others
Kazakhstan	Health	Job	Home	Medical care	Income
Kyrgyzstan	Health	Diet	Job	Home	Income
Laos	Health	Diet	Home	Job	Family
Malaysia	Health	Home	Diet	Family	Job
Maldives	Diet	Medical care	No crime	Health	Job
Mongolia	Health	Home	Diet	Job	Medical care
Myanmar	Health	Diet	Being devout	Home	Job
Nepal	Health	Diet	Job	Work	No crime
Pakistan	Health	Diet	Home	Being devout	Income
Philippines	Diet	Health	Home	Job	Family
Singapore	Health	Home	Job	Family	Diet
South Korea	Health	Home	Family	Job	Income
Sri Lanka	Health	Diet	Home	Family	Job
Tajikistan	Health	Diet	Home	Job	Income
Thailand	Health	Diet	Home	Job	Family
Turkmenistan	Diet	Health	Income	No crime	Home
Uzbekistan	Health	Home	Income	Job	Diet
Vietnam	Health	Job	Diet	Home	Work
<i>Asia</i>	<i>Health</i>	<i>Home</i>	<i>Diet</i>	<i>Job</i>	<i>Family</i>

sync with the key dimension that emerged by factor analysis via varimax rotation empirically overlap, country by country.

Those societies with type Abc register naturally many materialist-oriented (or survival or QOL sustaining) lifestyle priorities, followed by many post-materialist oriented (or social relations or QOL enriching) lifestyle priorities, further followed by public sector-related lifestyle priorities (prioritized lifestyles are italicized).

Afghanistan: diet, *health*, home, being devout, and *job*

Indonesia: *health*, diet, home, being devout, and *job*

Japan: *health*, family, *job*, and home

Taiwan: *standard of living, income, health, job, leisure, and housing*

Tajikistan: *health, diet, home, job, and income*

Uzbekistan: *health, home, income, job, and diet.*

Those societies with type Acb materialism (prioritized lifestyles are italicized) are followed by public sector dominance. Again, both materialist (survival or QOL sustaining) and public sector dominance (or QOL enabling) lifestyle priorities are most frequently registered.

China: *health, home, job, medical care, and low crime rates*

South Korea: *health, home, family life, job, and income*

Cambodia: *diet, health, home, job, and income*

Laos: *health, diet, home, job, and family*

Myanmar: *health, diet, being devout, home, and job*

Bangladesh: *health, medical care, low crime rates, being devout, and home*

India: *health, home, diet, job, and family life*

Nepal: *health, diet, job, and low crime rates*

Mongolia: *health, home, diet, job, and medical care.*

Those societies with type Bac post-materialism (lifestyle priorities in sync with post-materialism are italicized), followed by materialism, and further followed by public sector dominance.

Hong Kong: *friendships, marriage, health, education, family life, leisure, and spiritual life*

Malaysia: *health, home, diet, family life, and job*

Thailand: *health, diet, home, job, and family life*

Vietnam: *health, job, diet, home, and success at work*

Kyrgyzstan: *friendships, home, living standard, and spiritual life.*

These post-materialist lifestyle priorities are often registered as well as materialist lifestyle priorities.

Type Bca cannot be found among the 29 Asian societies.

Type Cab societies of public sector dominance (lifestyle priorities in sync with public sector dominance are italicized), followed by survival, and further followed by social relations.

Brunei: *health, home, diet, family, and job*

Philippines: *diet, health, home, job, and family*

Bhutan: *housing, education, spiritual life, and prayer*

Pakistan: *health, diet, home, being devout, and income*

Sri Lanka: *health, diet, home, family, and job*

Kazakhstan: *health, job, home, medical care, and income.*

Under public sector dominance, lifestyle priorities are often registered with materialism and post-materialism dominance.

Type Cba societies of public sector dominance, followed by materialism and further followed by post-materialism. Those lifestyle priority in sync with public sector dominance are italicized.

Singapore: health, home, job, family, and diet

Sri Lanka: health, diet, home, family, and job.

Public sector dominance lifestyle priorities are often registered together with materialist lifestyle priorities and post-materialist dominance.

Looked at from lifestyle priorities as well, the six types of Asian societies, on the basis of everyday life satisfaction registered by people, are *grosso modo* validated empirically (Inoguchi, 2019, pp. 456–458).

## References

- Inoguchi, T. (Ed.). (2019). *The SAGE handbook of Asian foreign policy* (2 Vols., pp. 458–480). Sage Publications.
- Inoguchi, T., & Fujii, S. (2013). *The quality of life in Asia: A comparison of quality of life in Asia*. Springer.
- Smelser, N. J., & Baltes, P. B. (Eds.). (2001). *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences*. Reed Elsevier.

# Chapter 13

## Conclusion



Having been heavily influenced by classical authors on Asia, such as Hegel, Marx, Weber, and Wittfogel, studies of Asian societies have tended to be viewed from the top down, not from the bottom up. However, more recently, the remarkable growth in solid empirical data collected about various aspects of Asian societies has enabled analysis of Asian societies and individuals, broadly bereft of such classical Western biases. Two major reasons should be noted. First, the burgeoning and permeation of what is called behavioral science from medical and biological sciences into social sciences, starting in the third-quarter of the last century. The methodological armory of humanities and social sciences has been enriched tremendously by the addition of this scientific school to the traditional school of meticulous text analysis and the imaginative and logical argumentation schools (Smelser & Baltes, 2001). Economics, social psychology, and sociology have been influenced by this factor. It has then come to influence political science as well. It is not uncommon to see articles in political science journals that are full of methodologies like public opinion surveys, computer text analysis, experimental analysis with and without human actors, all of which are accelerated by megatons of data generated and processed by information technology and communication. Second, considered from the longer-term perspective of modern history, say, from the Renaissance to the Reformation, and from the Reformation to the New Millennium, it is not difficult to discern the difference between Niccolò Machiavelli, a realist in the world of power and blood but a hidden republican, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a philosopher of hyper-imaginary standards, envisaging a social contract based on *volonté générale*. Leonardo da Vinci is a Renaissance man while Isaac Newton is a scientist in the broad Reformation period. Third, no less difficult is the shift from the Reformation to the New Millennium. It is distinguished by the paradigmatic shift from self-expression by the Abrahamic orientation to the Dharmic orientation. By Abrahamic is meant the orientation to logical clarity and argumentative consistency, solidified by the determination to discover law-like generalization. By Dharmic is meant the awareness of known and unknown complexity and the proclivity to tolerate and adapt even to the unknown unknowns. Manifestations of these two orientations are not one or zero but some mix of the two orientations. Into



the New Millennium, the former seems to decline whereas the latter seems to rise. It is in tandem with the increasingly accelerated planetary, climatic, and demographic changes affecting human actions and especially emotions. It may be related to the astounding reversal of the West (Europe, Latin America, North America, Oceania) and the non-West (Asia and Africa) around the first-quarter of the twenty-first century in terms of their demographic size, that is, 1.81 billion in the West versus 5.98 billion in the non-West in 2022 and 1.87 billion versus 9.0 billion in 2100 (Otsuka, 2020).

Since the 1970s when I was first exposed to the Eurobarometer and its larger variant, the World Value Survey, one nagging question on conceptualization has whirled in my mind. It is the uneasy coexistence between universalism and parochialism. Both the Eurobarometer and the World Value Survey reflect the combination of universalism and parochialism, not uncommon among what Henrich (2020) calls the WEIRDers, in less rigorous terms, Westerners. While the language of the questionnaire is an exemplar of universalism, those results of analysis have inadvertently tended to lean toward the law-like generalization, the instinctive flavor of parochialism. Many of those survey questionnaires generated annually by Western pollsters and academics have been very similar to those psychological experimental questions, underneath which lay various aspects of the WEIRDer mindset like individualism rather than social relations; attributes and abilities rather than intentions; foreground rather than background; and consistency rather than contradictions. In contrast, many of those analysis results seem to emphasize universalistic characteristics and alleviate parochial aspects.

In parallel with universalism versus parochialism, I was exposed to the multiple modernity argument of Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt (2002). He argues that a society has experienced many different paths to what each has today. Take the Industrial Revolution in England. Marx argued that English society first achieved the Industrial Revolution on the basis of a defeudalized society through enclosure, enabling the supply of workers, as well as through manufactured products like cotton, cloth, and steel, enabling the supply of capital. The first achiever was followed by other Western states. Walt W. Rostow of contrasting persuasion argued similarly, except with a different goal, i.e., a non-communist manifesto. Eisenstadt argued that human society has evolved with different paths for many millenniums and that it would be ridiculous to think that from the Industrial Revolution onward the human path would be similar. You might as well argue that the most recent “aberration” of the single path modernity argument is China in the dawn of the third millennium. Instead of the half-colonial experience of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, China went through a communist path for half a century. At the dawn of the third millennium, China metamorphosed into what Branko Milanovic (2019) calls “political capitalism.” China has been successful with state-owned and non-state-owned firms, flourishing under state-guided allocation of surplus capital and labor, focusing on operations of a global scale. The benefit of getting the most out of producing and exporting service goods with their abundant capital and labor has been furthered by borrowing advanced foreign technologies and taking advantage of loosened rules and regulations under the newly reconstructed but soon virtually defunct WTO and other specialized UN organizations like the World Intellectual Property Organization.

My initial nagging question has been cleared for the implementation of the AsiaBarometer Survey with the long nagging question on measurement and analysis resolved. (1) On measurement, abstractly worded questions should be skirted; a question should be simple and use familiar words and with a clue to context. (2) On analysis, each national data should be factor-analyzed, so that national peculiarities are more salient than a worldwide or region-wide pooled data factor-analysis would allow. The reasons are as follows: (1) The AsiaBarometer Survey is not going to be deployed for the WEIRDers, so that the varied and diverse Asian responses will be allowed and properly reflected in terms of factor analysis results; and (2) On analysis, national diversity and peculiarity skirt being watered down and alleviated by the still remaining concatenation of WEIRD-like questions.

## References

- Eisenstadt, S. N. (2002). *Multiple modernities*. Routledge.
- Henrich, J. (2020). *The WEIRDest people in the world: How the west psychologically peculiar and particularly prosperous*. Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Milanovic, B. (2019). *Capitalism, alone: The future of the system that rules the world*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Otsuka, R. (2020). *Sekai jinkogen tookunai mirai* (Global demographic decline not far in the future), *Yomiuri Shinbun* (p. 6).
- Smelser, N. J., & Baltes, P. B. (Eds.). (2001). *International Encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences*. Reed Elsevier.

# **Appendix A**

## **Asia Barometer English Master Questionnaire 2006**

**I would like to ask you some questions about your living environment.**

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q1** Which of the following public utilities does your household have the use of? (MA)

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The public water supply</li> <li>2. Electricity</li> <li>3. Liquefied petroleum gas or LPG</li> <li>4. Fixed-line phone</li> <li>5. Mobile phone</li> <li>6. Facsimile</li> <li>7. Cable TV</li> <li>8. None of the above</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|---|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q2** Please indicate how frequent you use the Internet and mobile phones.

**Q2-1** How often do you view Internet web pages by computers? (SA)

**Q2-2** How often do you read or write e-mails by computers? (SA)

**Q2-3** How often do you read or write messages by mobile phones? (SA)

	Almost everyday	Several times a week	Several times a month	Seldom	Never	Don't know
1. View Internet web pages by computers →	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. Read or write emails by computers →	1	2	3	4	5	9
3. Read or write messages by mobile phones →	1	2	3	4	5	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q3** Which, if any, of the following statements apply to you? (MA)

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A member of my family or a relative lives in another country</li> <li>2. I have traveled abroad at least three times in the past three years, on holiday or for business purposes.</li> <li>3. I have friends from other country who are in YOUR COUNTRY.</li> <li>4. I often watch foreign-produced programs on TV.</li> <li>5. I often communicate with people in other countries via the Internet or email.</li> <li>6. My job involves contact with organizations or people in other countries.</li> <li>7. None of the above</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|---|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q4** All things considered, would you say that you are happy these days? (SA)

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Very happy</li> <li>2. Quite happy</li> <li>3. Neither happy nor unhappy</li> <li>4. Not too happy</li> <li>5. Very unhappy</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|---|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q5** How often do you feel you are really enjoying life these days? (SA)

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Often</li> <li>2. Sometimes</li> <li>3. Rarely</li> <li>4. Never</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|--|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q6** How much do you feel you are accomplishing what you want out of your life? (SA)

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A great deal</li> <li>2. Some</li> <li>3. Very little</li> <li>4. None</li> <li>5. Don't know</li> <li>6.</li> </ol> |
|--|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q7** Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following aspects of your life. (SA for each)

		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Some what dissatisfied	Very dis-satisfied	Don't know
a. Housing	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. Friendships	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
c. Marriage <b>【if married】</b>	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
d. Standard of living	→	1	2	3	4	5	9

		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Some what dissatisfied	Very dis-satisfied	Don't know
e. Household income	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
f. Health	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
g. Education	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
h. Job	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
i. Neighbors	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
j. Public safety	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
k. The condition of the environment	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
l. Social welfare system	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
m. The democratic system	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
n. Family life	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
o. Leisure	→	1	2	3	4	5	9
p. Spiritual life	→	1	2	3	4	5	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q8** How would you describe your standard of living? (SA)

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High</li> <li>2. Relatively high</li> <li>3. Average</li> <li>4. Relatively low</li> <li>5. Low</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|---|

**I would like to ask you some general questions.**

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q9** Of the following lifestyle aspects or life circumstances, please select five that are important to you. (5MA)

- |   |
|---|
| 1. Having enough to eat                           |
| 2. Having a comfortable home                      |
| 3. Being healthy                                  |
| 4. Having access to good medical care if required |
| 5. Being able to live without fear of crime       |
| 6. Having a job                                   |

8. Owning lots of nice things
9. Earning a high income
10. Spending time with your family
11. Being on good terms with others
12. Being successful at work
13. Being famous
14. Enjoying a pastime
15. Appreciating art and culture
16. Dressing up
17. Winning over others
18. Expressing your personality or using your talents
19. Contributing to your local community or to society
20. Being devout
21. Raising children
22. Freedom of expression and association
23. Living in a country with a good government
24. Pleasant community to live
25. Safe and clean environment
26. None of the above
27. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q10** How would you like to see your son(s) and your daughter(s) grow up? Of the following accomplishments, please select two that you would wish for a daughter, and two that you would wish for a son. If you don't have a son/daughter please imagine what you would feel if you had. (Select up to two items only for each gender.)

	(a) For a son (2MA)	(b) For a daughter (2MA)
Become a great scholar	1	1
Become a powerful political leader	2	2
Become very wealthy	3	3
Become a loving and charitable person	4	4
Become a person respected by the masses	5	5
Become more proficient in profession than I am	6	6
Follow in my footsteps	7	7
Become a person who cares about family	8	8
Find a good marriage partner	9	9
Become fulfilled spiritually	10	10
None of the above	11	11
Don't know	12	12

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q11** Generally, do you think people can be trusted or do you think that you can't be too careful in dealing with people (that it pays to be wary of people)? (SA)

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Most people can be trusted</li> <li>2. Can't be too careful in dealing with people</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|--|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q12** Do you think that people generally try to be helpful or do you think that they mostly look out for themselves? (SA)

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. People generally try to be helpful</li> <li>2. People mostly look out for themselves</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|--|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q13** If you saw somebody on the street looking lost, would you stop to help? (SA)

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I would always stop to help.</li> <li>2. I would help if nobody else did.</li> <li>3. It is highly likely that I wouldn't stop to help.</li> <li>9. Don't know.</li> </ol> |
|--|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q14** If you had no descendants, would you think it desirable to adopt somebody in order to continue the family line, even if there were no blood relationship? Or do you think this would be unnecessary? (SA)

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would adopt in order to continue the family line</li> <li>2. Would not adopt in order to continue the family line. I think it would be pointless.</li> <li>3. It would depend on the circumstances.</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|---|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q15** Suppose that you are the president of a company. In the company's employment examination, a relative of yours got the second highest grade, scoring only marginally less than the candidate with the highest grade. In such a case, which person would you employ? (SA)

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The person with the highest grade</li> <li>2. Your relative</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|---|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q16** If the main breadwinner of your household should die or become unable to work due to illness, how would your household maintain the household budget? Select up to two of the following measures. (2MA)



1. Another adult member of the family would become the main breadwinner	5. Would get support from members of my religious group
2. Would send one or more of the children out to work	6. Would get social welfare payments
3. Would get support from relatives	7. Depend on retirement allowance
4. Would get support from neighbors	8. Have an insurance policy to cover such a situation
	9. Other
	10. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q17** Throughout the world many people identify themselves by their nationality. For example, Korean, Indian, etc. Do you think of yourself as being [*YOUR COUNTRY'S PEOPLE*\*], or do you not think of yourself in this way? (SA)

1. [Japanese]
2. Korean
3. Chinese
4. Other (specify: _____)
5. I don't identify myself with my nationality
9. Don't know

\*[The categories are different for each country]

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q18** How proud are you of being [*YOUR COUNTRY'S PEOPLE*]? (SA)

1. Very proud
2. Somewhat proud
3. Not really proud
4. Not proud at all
9. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q19** Throughout the world, some people also see themselves as belonging to a transnational group (such as Asian, people of Chinese ethnicity, people who speak the same language or practice the same religion). Do you identify with any transnational group? (SA)

1. Asian
2. Ethnic group that has common genealogy or ancestry
3. Language group that I am speaking
4. Religious group that I am believing in and practicing
5. Other transnational identity (please specify: _____)
6. No, I don't identify particularly with any transnational group
9. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q20** Can you recite the national anthem by heart? (SA)

1. Yes
2. No
9. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q21-1** Which of the following social circles or groups are important to you? (MA)

**Q21-2** Of those, which one is the most important to you? (SA)

	<b>Q21-1</b> Important social circle/group (MA)	<b>Q21-2</b> Most important social circle/group (SA)
Family	1	1
Relatives	2	2
Place of work	3	3
Club, hobby circle, etc.	4	4
The school / university you attended	5	5
The area where you grew up	6	6
People who speak the same language or dialect as you	7	7
Agricultural cooperative, commercial cooperative or industry group	8	8
Neighborhood	9	9
Labour union	10	10
Political party	11	11
Religion	12	12
Other (specify:            )	13	13
Don't know	99	99

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q22** Do you think that on the whole men and women are treated equally in your country? Please indicate which of the following is closest to your opinion. (SA)

1. Men are treated much more favorably than women.
2. Men are treated somewhat more favorably than women.
3. Men and women are treated equally.
4. Women are treated somewhat more favorably than men.
5. Women are treated much more favorably than men.
9. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q23** How often do you pray or meditate? (SA)

1. Daily
2. Weekly
3. Monthly
4. On special occasions
5. Never
9. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q24** For each of the following events, please rate the importance of having a religious institution (such as mosque, church, temple, and shrine) or a religious professional (such as imam, priest, and monk) involved. (SA for each event)

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not really important	Not at all important	Don't know
1. Births	1	2	3	4	9
2. Weddings	1	2	3	4	9
3. Festivals or Holidays	1	2	3	4	9
4. Funerals	1	2	3	4	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q25** Which, if any, of the following issues cause you great worry? Please choose all issues that cause you serious worry. (ROTATE card) (MA)

1. Poverty
2. Economic inequality in your society
3. Fair world trade
4. Terrorism
5. Environmental destruction/pollution/problems relating to natural resources
6. Wars and conflicts
7. Natural disasters
8. Nuclear disasters
9. Globalization of human economic activities
10. Health issues
11. Economic problems in your country
12. Global recession
13. Crime
14. Human rights
15. Corruption
16. Lack of democracy
17. Illegal drugs and drug addiction
18. Refugee and asylum problems
19. Unemployment
20. Education

- 21. The social-welfare system in your country
- 22. Ethics of scientists (ethics in science)
- 23. The aging of society (growing relative weight of senior citizens)
- 24. The decline in birthrate
- 25. The fast pace of change/technology is advancing too quickly
- 26. The threat of corporate power dominates human activities
- 27. Religious fundamentalism
- 28. Overpopulation
- 29. Moral decline/spiritual decadence
- 30. Other (specify:            )
- 31. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q26** Do you think the following countries have a good influence or a bad influence on your country? Please select the response closest to your opinion for each country listed. (SA for each country)

Note to research agencies: Omit your country from the list (e.g. Respondents in China should not be asked to evaluate the influence of China).

		Good influence	Rather good influence	Neither good nor bad influence	Rather bad influence	Bad influence	Don't know
a.	China →	1	2	3	4	5	9
b.	Japan →	1	2	3	4	5	9
c.	India →	1	2	3	4	5	9
d.	USA →	1	2	3	4	5	9
e.	UK →	1	2	3	4	5	9
f.	Russia →	1	2	3	4	5	9
g.	Pakistan →	1	2	3	4	5	9
h.	South Korea →	1	2	3	4	5	9
i.	North Korea →	1	2	3	4	5	9
j.	Iran →	1	2	3	4	5	9
k.	Turkey →	1	2	3	4	5	9
l.	Kazakhstan →	1	2	3	4	5	9
m.	Indonesia →	1	2	3	4	5	9
n.	Australia →	1	2	3	4	5	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q27** Any society has some kinds of inequality. In which of the following areas do you think equality should be most eagerly promoted in your society? Please indicate three that are most important to you. (3MA)

1. Gender
2. Age
3. Education
4. Occupation
5. Income/Wealth
6. Religion
7. Descent
8. Ethnicity
9. Other (specify: _____)
10. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q28** In your opinion, what are benefits of education? Please choose the three most important benefits from the following. (3MA)

1. Develops your humanity
2. Enables you to obtain a job of your choice
3. Enables you to earn more money
4. Enable you to live in another country
5. Enables you to gain higher social status
6. Contributes to the development and prosperity of your country
7. Enables you to contribute to your society
8. Enables you to work internationally
9. Other (Specify: _____)
10. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q29** Please indicate to what extent you trust the following institutions to operate in the best interests of society. If you don't know what to reply or have no particular opinion, please say so. (SA for each institution)

	Trust a lot	Trust to a degree	Don't really trust	Don't trust at all	Haven't thought about it	Don't know
a. The central government →	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. Your local government →	1	2	3	4	5	9
c. The army →	1	2	3	4	5	9
d. The legal system →	1	2	3	4	5	9
e. The police →	1	2	3	4	5	9
f. Parliament, Congress →	1	2	3	4	5	9
g. The political party →	1	2	3	4	5	9
h. The public education system →	1	2	3	4	5	9

		Trust a lot	Trust to a degree	Don't really trust	Don't trust at all	Haven't thought about it	Don't know
i.	The public health system →	1	2	3	4	5	9
j.	Large domestic companies →	1	2	3	4	5	9
k.	Multinational companies operating in [YOUR COUNTRY] →	1	2	3	4	5	9
l.	Trade unions/labor unions →	1	2	3	4	5	9
m.	The media →	1	2	3	4	5	9
n.	Non-governmental organizations (e.g environmental, social advocacy groups or other non-profit organizations) →	1	2	3	4	5	9
o.	Religious organizations →	1	2	3	4	5	9
p.	The United Nations →	1	2	3	4	5	9
q.	The World Trade Organization →	1	2	3	4	5	9
r.	The World Bank →	1	2	3	4	5	9
s.	The International Monetary Fund →	1	2	3	4	5	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q30** I'm going to mention some issues. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations (such as ASEAN [Association of South East Asian Nations] and APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation]), or by the United Nations? (SA for each issue)

	National governments	Regional organizations	United Nations	Don't know	
a.	Peace keeping	1	2	3	9
b.	Protection of the environment	1	2	3	9
c.	Aid to developing countries	1	2	3	9
d.	Refugees	1	2	3	9
e.	Human rights	1	2	3	9

**I would like to ask you some questions about the central government.**

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q31** How well do you think the [YOUR COUNTRY'S] government is dealing with the following issues? (SA for each statement)

	Very well	Fairly well	Not so well	Not well at all	Don't know
a. The economy →	1	2	3	4	9
b. Political corruption →	1	2	3	4	9
c. Human rights →	1	2	3	4	9
d. Unemployment →	1	2	3	4	9
e. Crime →	1	2	3	4	9
f. The quality of public services →	1	2	3	4	9
g. Increase of immigration →	1	2	3	4	9
h. Ethnic conflict →	1	2	3	4	9
i. Religious conflict →	1	2	3	4	9
j. Environmental problems →	1	2	3	4	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q32** Listed below are various areas of government spending. Please indicate whether you would like to see more or less government spending in each area. Please bear in mind that more spending may require a tax increase. (SA for each area of spending)

	Spend much more	Spend more	Spend the same as now	Spend less	Spend much less	Can't choose/ Don't know
a. The environment →	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. Health →	1	2	3	4	5	9
c. Policing and law enforcement →	1	2	3	4	5	9
d. Education →	1	2	3	4	5	9
e. The military and defense →	1	2	3	4	5	9
f. Old-age pensions →	1	2	3	4	5	9
g. Unemployment benefits →	1	2	3	4	5	9
h. Public transport, telecommunications infrastructure →	1	2	3	4	5	9

		Spend much more	Spend more	Spend the same as now	Spend less	Spend much less	Can't choose/ Don't know
i.	Culture and the arts →	1	2	3	4	5	9
j.	Improvement of the social status of women →	1	2	3	4	5	9

**I would like to ask you some questions about elections and politics.**

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q33** How often do you vote in each of the following elections? Please answer for each type of election. (SA for each election type.)

		Every time	Most of the time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never voted (even though I have the right to vote)	Don't have the right to vote	Don't know
a.	National elections →	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
b.	Local elections →	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q34** I am going to read out some statements about society and politics. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. (SA for each statement)

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
a.	Citizens have a duty to vote in elections. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
b.	There is widespread corruption among those who govern the country. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
c.	Generally speaking, people like me don't have the power to influence government policy or actions. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
d.	Politics and government are so complicated that sometimes I don't understand what's happening. →	1	2	3	4	5	9



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
e. Since so many people vote in elections, it really doesn't matter whether I vote or not. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
f. Generally speaking, the people who are elected to the [NATIONAL PARLIAMENT] stop thinking about the public once they're elected. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
g. Government officials pay little attention to what citizens like me think. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
h. [YOUR COUNTRY'S] traditional culture is superior to that of other country. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
i. [YOUR COUNTRY'S] government should emphasize patriotic education to breed patriotism. →	1	2	3	4	5	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q35** When you shape your opinions about social and political issues, which of the following media influence your opinions most? Please choose up to five that are influential on you. (5MA)

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TV programs</li> <li>2. TV advertisements</li> <li>3. Radio programs</li> <li>4. Radio advertisements</li> <li>5. Newspaper articles</li> <li>6. Newspaper advertisements</li> <li>7. Magazine articles</li> <li>8. Magazine advertisements</li> <li>9. Books</li> <li>10. Internet news</li> <li>11. Internet bulletin boards / Mailing lists</li> <li>12. Internet advertisements</li> <li>13. Leaflets / Brochures</li> <li>14. Conversation with friends and neighbors</li> <li>15. Conversation with campaigners</li> <li>16. Meetings / Conferences</li> <li>17. Other (Specify:                    )</li> <li>18. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|--|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q36** I am going to read out some statements about economy. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. (SA for each statement)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
1. Central government should restrict the inflow of foreign workforce to protect domestic people's interests. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. Women's employment should be promoted to attain gender equality. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
3. It is desirable that the people are equal, even if the economy is stagnant, rather than unequal but developing. →	1	2	3	4	5	9
4. It is natural that those work harder get more money. →	1	2	3	4	5	9

(Ask all respondents) (Show card)

**Q37** What should a person who needs a government permit do if the response of the official handling the application is: "just be patient and wait?" (SA)

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use connections to obtain the permit</li> <li>2. Nothing can be done</li> <li>3. Wait and hope that things will work out</li> <li>4. Write a letter</li> <li>5. Act without a permit</li> <li>6. Bribe an official</li> <li>7. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|--|

(Ask all respondents) (Show card)

**Q38** I'm going to describe various types of political systems. Please indicate for each system whether you think it would be very good, fairly good or bad for this country. (SA for each political system)

	Very good	Fairly good	Bad	Don't know
a. Governance by a powerful leader without the restriction of parliament or elections. →	1	2	3	9
b. A system whereby decisions affecting the country are made by experts (such as bureaucrats with expertise in a particular field) according to what they think is best for the country. →	1	2	3	9
c. Military government →	1	2	3	9
d. A democratic political system →	1	2	3	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q39** How satisfied are you with the current scope of the following rights in [YOUR COUNTRY]?  
(SA for each right)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
a. The right to vote →	1	2	3	4	9
b. The right to participate in any kind of organization →	1	2	3	4	9
c. The right to gather and demonstrate →	1	2	3	4	9
d. The right to be informed about the work and functions of government →	1	2	3	4	9
e. Freedom of speech →	1	2	3	4	9
f. The right to criticize the government →	1	2	3	4	9

**I would like to ask you some questions about your daily life.**

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q40** Please indicate your usual eating patterns for breakfast and the evening meal by selecting up to two of the following eating styles. (2MA for each meal type)

	(a) Breakfast (2MA)	(b) Evening meal (2MA)
a. I eat food cooked at home at home	1	1
b. I buy ready meals in a shop, or food cooked in a restaurant or at an outdoor stall.	2	2
c. I eat instant* food at home	3	3
d. I eat out in restaurants	4	4
e. I eat out at food stalls and such like	5	5
f. Other	6	6
g. Usually do not eat this meal	7	7
h. Don't know	8	8

\*Food that only needs to be heated or have boiling water added

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q41** Which of the following foods do you like to eat? Please choose all that apply. (MA)

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Beijing Duck</li> <li>2. Kimchi</li> <li>3. Sushi</li> <li>4. Hamburger</li> <li>5. Curry</li> </ol> |
|--|

- |                    |
|--------------------|
| 6. Pizza           |
| 7. Tom-Yum-Goong   |
| 8. Dim Sum         |
| 9. Pho             |
| 10. Sandwich       |
| 11. Instant Noodle |
| 12. None of above  |
| 13. Don't know     |

(Ask all respondents) (Show card)

**Q42** Which category does your current residence fall into? (SA)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Owner-occupied detached or semi-detached (duplex) house                      | 4. Rented terraced house or unit in an apartment or condominium complex |
| 2. Owner-occupied terraced house or unit in an apartment or condominium complex | 5. Other (a room in a relative's home, etc.)                            |
| 3. Rented detached or semi-detached (duplex) house                              | 9. Don't know   |

**I would like to ask you some questions about your family.**

(Ask all respondents)

**Q43-1** How many members of your family, including yourself, live in your household? (OA)

<div style="border-left: 1px dashed black; border-right: 1px dashed black; width: 80%;"></div>	person(s)
--	-----------

[Interviewers: "Members of your family living in your household" mean the family members who 1. live with you for more than 4 days in a week, and/or who 2. share the household budget with you. Thus, respondents should include their family members who are seasonal migrate workers who send money home, but exclude living-in helpers.]

(Ask all respondents) (Show card)

**Q43-2** Which of the following describe your family structure? (SA)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Single-person household   | 4. A parent(s) and child(ren) who is/are married (two generation household) (Select this item even if only one child is married and the other unmarried children also live in the household.) |
| 2. Married couple only   | 5. Grandparent(s), parent(s) and child(ren) (three-generation household)  |
| 3. A parent(s) and child(ren) who are not married (two generation household) | 6. Other  |
|  | 9. Don't know   |

(Ask all respondents)

**Q43-3** How many, if any, members of your family who live with you are in need of special care due to illness, old age or handicap? Fill in '0' on the frame, if you don't live with such persons. (OA)

--	--

person(s)

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q44** Here is a list of qualities that children can be encouraged to learn at home. Please select two you consider to be most important (2MA)

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Independence</li> <li>2. Diligence</li> <li>3. Honesty</li> <li>4. Sincerity</li> <li>5. Mindfulness</li> <li>6. Humbleness</li> <li>7. Religiosity</li> <li>8. Patience</li> <li>9. Competitiveness</li> <li>10. Respect for senior persons</li> <li>11. Deference for teachers</li> <li>12. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|---|

**I would like to ask you some questions about your family.**

**(Ask all respondents)**

**Q43-1** How many members of your family, including yourself, live in your household? (OA)

--	--

person(s)

[Interviewers: “Members of your family living in your household” mean the family members who 1. live with you for more than 4 days in a week, and/or who 2. share the household budget with you. Thus, respondents should include their family members who are seasonal migrate workers who send money home, but exclude living-in helpers.]

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q43-2** Which of the following describe your family structure? (SA)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Single-person household</li> <li>2. Married couple only</li> <li>3. A parent(s) and child(ren) who are not married (two generation household)</li> <li>4. A parent(s) and child(ren) who is/are married (two generation household) (Select this item even if only one child is married and the other unmarried children also live in the household.)</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Grandparent(s), parent(s) and child(ren) (three-generation household)</li> <li>6. Other</li> <li>9. Don't know</li> </ol> |
|---|---|

**(Ask all respondents)**

**Q43-3** How many, if any, members of your family who live with you are in need of special care due to illness, old age or handicap? Fill in '0' on the frame, if you don't live with such persons. (OA)

--	--

person(s)

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q44** Here is a list of qualities that children can be encouraged to learn at home. Please select two you consider to be most important (2MA)

- 1 Independence
- 2 Diligence
- 3 Honesty
- 4 Sincerity
- 5 Mindfulness
- 6 Humbleness
- 7 Religiosity
- 8 Patience
- 9 Competitiveness
- 10 Respect for senior persons
- 11 Deference for teachers
- 12 Don't know

**I would like to ask you some questions about your values.**

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q45-1** If you have to choose, which one of the things on this card would you say is most important?  
CODE ONE ANSWER ONLY. (SA)

**Q45-2** And which would be the second most important? CODE ONE ANSWER ONLY. (SA)

	First Choice	Second Choice
Maintaining order in nation	1	1
Giving People more say in important government decisions	2	2

Fighting rising prices	3	3
Protecting freedom of speech	4	4
Don't know	9	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q46** I'm going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don't you mind? (SA for each change)

	Good	Bad	Don't mind	Don't know
a. More emphasis on the development of technology	1	2	3	9
b. Greater respect for traditional authority	1	2	3	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q47** Now I'd like you to look at this card. I'm going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I'd like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you might do or would never, under any circumstances, do it. (SA for each action)

	Have done	Might do	Would never do	Don't know
a. Signing a petition to improve conditions	1	2	3	9
b. Joining in boycotts	1	2	3	9
c. Attending lawful demonstrations	1	2	3	9

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q48** There are two opinions about the role of chance in the world. In your opinion, which of the following two positions is more correct? (SA)

A: Many things happen for no particular reason at all. It is just a matter of chance.
B: Everything happens for a reason. Even events that look like accidents have a hidden purpose.

1. Closer to A
2. Closer to B
3. Neither
9. Don't know

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q49** Do you believe in an unseen spiritual world that can influence events in the world we see around us? (SA)

- |   |
|---|
| 1. Definitely I believe<br>2. Somewhat I believe<br>3. I do not really believe<br>4. I do not believe at all<br>9. Don't know |
|---|

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**Q50** Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. **READ OUT STATEMENTS.** (SA for each statement)

a. Someone accepting a bribe in the course of their duties.											
Never					Always						Don't
Justifiable					justifiable						Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	

b. Homosexuality											
Never					Always						Don't
Justifiable					justifiable						Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	

c. Abortion											
Never					Always						Don't
Justifiable					justifiable						Know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99	

**Lastly, I would like to ask some questions about yourself.**

**(Ask all respondents)**

**F1** Please indicate your gender. (SA)

1	2
Male	Female

**(Ask all respondents)**

**F2** What is your age? (OA)

--	--

 years old

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**F3** What is the highest level of education you have completed? (SA)



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. No formal education                                | 4. Professional school/technical school |
| 2. Elementary school/junior high school/middle school | 5. University/graduate school           |
| 3. High school  | 9. Don't know                           |

\*[The categories are different for each country]

(Ask all respondents) (Show card)

F4 How well do you speak English? (SA)

- |   |
|---|
| 1. Not at all   |
| 2. Very little  |
| 3. I can speak it well enough to get by in daily life |
| 4. I can speak English fluently                       |
| 9. Don't know   |

(Ask all respondents) (Show card)

F5 What is your marital status? (SA)

- |                       |
|-----------------------|
| 1. Single             |
| 2. Married            |
| 3. Divorced/separated |
| 4. Widowed            |
| 5. Other              |
| 9. Don't know         |

(Ask all respondents) (Show card)

F6 What is your occupation? Please select one of the following responses. (SA)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Self-employed in agriculture, forestry or fisheries   | 8. Employed professional or specialist (hospital doctors, employed lawyers, engineers, etc.) |
| 2. Business owner in mining or manufacturing industry of an organization with up to 30 employees   | 9. Clerical worker   |
| 3. Business owner of a retail organization with up to 30 employees   | 10. Sales  |
| 4. Vendor or street trader   | 11. Manual worker (including skilled and semi-skilled)                                       |
| 5. Business owner or manager of an organization with over 30 employees   | 12. Driver   |
| 6. Self-employed professional (self-employed doctors, lawyers, writers, etc.)  | 13. Other worker   |
| 7. Senior manager (company director, no lower in rank than a manager of a company section in a company with 300 or more employees, or a manager of a department in a company with less than 300 employees) | 14. Homemaker  |
|  | 15. Student  |
|  | 16. Retired  |
|  | 17. Unemployed   |
|  | 18. Unemployed other   |
|  | 99. Don't know   |

(Ask all respondents)

F7 How many people in your household work and earn an income? (OA)

		person(s)
--	--	-----------

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**F8** What was the total gross annual income of your household last year? (SA)

[Japan] (Japanese yen)

1. 2 million or less	6. 6 to 7 million	11. 11 to 12 million	16. 16 to 17 million
2. 2 to 3 million	7. 7 to 8 million	12. 12 to 13 million	17. 17 to 18 million
3. 3 to 4 million	8. 8 to 9 million	13. 13 to 14 million	18. 18 to 19 million
4. 4 to 5 million	9. 9 to 10 million	14. 14 to 15 million	19. 19 to 20 million
5. 5 to 6 million	10. 10 to 11 million	15. 15 to 16 million	20. more than 20 million
			99. Don't know

**\*[The categories are different for each country]**

**(Ask all respondents) (Show card)**

**F9** Do you regard yourself as belonging to any particular religion? If yes, which? (SA)

- |   |
|---|
| 1. Catholic                               |
| 2. Christian religion other than Catholic |
| 3. Muslim (Sunnah)                        |
| 4. Muslim (Shiah)                         |
| 5. Hindu                                  |
| 6. Buddhist (Mahayana)                    |
| 7. Buddhist (Theravada)                   |
| 8. Confucian                              |
| 9. Jewish                                 |
| 10. Sikh                                  |
| 11. Taoism                                |
| 12. Shintoism                             |
| 13. Other (specify:            )          |
| 14. None                                  |
| 99. Don't know                            |

## Appendix B

### List of Multilateral Treaties Covered in the Dataset

Domain	Sub-domain	Number of treaties	Source of data
Environment (52 treaties)	Environment	52	United Nations Treaty Collection (UNTC)
Human Rights (53 treaties)	Freedom of Information	1	UNTC
	Human Rights	27	
	Slavery	3	
	Obscene Publications	5	
	Refugees and Stateless Persons	4	
	Status of Women	3	
	Traffic in Persons	10	
Intellectual Property (36 treaties)	Other IP-Related	10	WIPO
	WIPO—Administered	26	WIPO
Labor and Health (110 treaties)	Health	13	UNTC
	ILO-Administered	78	ILO
	Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances	19	UNTC
Peace and Disarmament (84 treaties)	Disarmament	13	UNTC
	Law of the Sea	10	
	Outer Space	2	
	Pacific Settlement of International Disputes	1	
	Penal Matters	21	
	Privileges and Immunities, Diplomatic and Consular Relations	37	

(continued)

(continued)

Domain	Sub-domain	Number of treaties	Source of data
Trade, Commerce and Communication (265 treaties)	Commercial Arbitration	3	UNTC
	Commodities	13	
	Economic Statistics	2	
	Educational and Cultural Matters	5	
	International Trade and Development	24	
	Navigation	13	
	Telecommunications	8	
	Transport and Communications	197	
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>600</b>	

*Source* Inoguchi, Takashi and Lien Thi Quynh Le (2021) *Digitized Statecraft in Multilateral Treaty Participation: Global Quasi-Legislative Behavior of 193 Sovereign States*, Singapore: Springer Nature, p. 16

## Appendix C

# Multilateral Treaty Participation (Accumulated Number)

Rank	Country code	Country name	Region	Multilateral treaty participation (Accumulated number)
1	NLD	Netherlands	Reformed West Members	436
2	BEL	Belgium	Old West Members	430
3	FIN	Finland	Reformed West Members	429
4	SVK	Slovakia	Returned West Members	428
5	CZE	Czech Republic	Returned West Members	410
6	LUX	Luxembourg	Old West Members	410
7	NOR	Norway	Reformed West Members	407
8	DEU	Germany	Reformed West Members	403
9	FRA	France	Old West Members	401
10	SWE	Sweden	Reformed West Members	401
11	HUN	Hungary	Returned West Members	397
12	ITA	Italy	Old West Members	394
13	SRB	Serbia	Orthodox East Members	383
14	ROM	Romania	Orthodox East Members	380
15	ESP	Spain	Old West Members	379

(continued)

(continued)

Rank	Country code	Country name	Region	Multilateral treaty participation (Accumulated number)
16	RUS	Russian Federation	Orthodox East Members	370
17	GBR	United Kingdom	Reformed West Members	370
18	POL	Poland	Returned West Members	362
19	CHE	Switzerland	Reformed West Members	361
20	MNE	Montenegro	Orthodox East Members	357
21	SVN	Slovenia	Returned West Members	356
22	DNK	Denmark	Reformed West Members	353
23	HRV	Croatia	Returned West Members	346
24	LTU	Lithuania	Returned West Members	344
25	MDA	Republic of Moldova	Orthodox East Members	335
26	AUT	Austria	Old West Members	329
27	UKR	Ukraine	Orthodox East Members	329
28	MKD	North Macedonia	Orthodox East Members	320
29	TUR	Turkey	Islamic East Members	320
30	EGY	Egypt	Islamic East Members	315
31	LVA	Latvia	Returned West Members	314
32	BLR	Belarus	Orthodox East Members	313
33	BIH	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Orthodox East Members	313
34	GRC	Greece	Old West Members	301
35	EST	Estonia	Returned West Members	297
36	BGR	Bulgaria	Orthodox East Members	292

(continued)

(continued)

Rank	Country code	Country name	Region	Multilateral treaty participation (Accumulated number)
37	PRT	Portugal	Old West Members	287
38	NGA	Nigeria	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	274
39	ARM	Armenia	Orthodox East Members	271
40	MYS	<i>Malaysia</i>	Indic East Members	265
41	SMR	San Marino	Old West Members	246
42	JPN	<i>Japan</i>	Sinic East Members	243
43	ALB	Albania	Orthodox East Members	242
44	AUS	Australia	New West Members	236
45	CYP	Cyprus	Old West Members	226
46	NZL	New Zealand	New West Members	225
47	BRA	Brazil	Latin America Members	214
48	ZAF	South Africa	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	210
49	IRL	Ireland	Reformed West Members	208
50	MEX	Mexico	Latin America Members	208
51	CUB	Cuba	Latin America Members	204
52	URY	Uruguay	Latin America Members	202
53	TUN	Tunisia	Islamic East Members	196
54	ECU	Ecuador	Latin America Members	194
55	IND	<i>India</i>	Indic East Members	194
56	ARG	Argentina	Latin America Members	193
57	AZE	Azerbaijan	Orthodox East Members	192
58	KOR	<i>Republic of Korea</i>	Sinic East Members	189
59	MAR	Morocco	Islamic East Members	186
60	MLT	Malta	Old West Members	183
61	PHL	<i>Philippines</i>	Indic East Members	181

(continued)

(continued)

Rank	Country code	Country name	Region	Multilateral treaty participation (Accumulated number)
62	CHL	Chile	Latin America Members	178
63	CAN	Canada	New West Members	177
64	GTM	Guatemala	Latin America Members	176
65	NER	Niger	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	170
66	BFA	Burkina Faso	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	169
67	GHA	Ghana	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	167
68	CHN	<i>China</i>	Sinic East Members	166
69	GIN	Guinea	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	166
70	NIC	Nicaragua	Latin America Members	166
71	SEN	Senegal	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	165
72	LBR	Liberia	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	163
73	PAN	Panama	Latin America Members	163
74	PER	Peru	Latin America Members	163
75	TTO	Trinidad and Tobago	Latin America Members	163
76	CRI	Costa Rica	Latin America Members	162
77	SLV	El Salvador	Latin America Members	160
78	PRY	Paraguay	Latin America Members	160
79	DZA	Algeria	Islamic East Members	159
80	GEO	Georgia	Orthodox East Members	159
81	IRQ	Iraq	Islamic East Members	159
82	JAM	Jamaica	Latin America Members	159

(continued)



(continued)

Rank	Country code	Country name	Region	Multilateral treaty participation (Accumulated number)
83	MUS	Mauritius	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	159
84	LKA	<i>Sri Lanka</i>	Indic East Members	159
85	ISL	Iceland	Reformed West Members	157
86	MLI	Mali	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	157
87	FJI	Fiji	New West Members	156
88	KAZ	<i>Kazakhstan</i>	Orthodox East Members	155
89	CIV	Côte d'Ivoire	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	154
90	MDG	Madagascar	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	153
91	CMR	Cameroon	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	152
92	JOR	Jordan	Islamic East Members	152
93	GAB	Gabon	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	151
94	MNG	<i>Mongolia</i>	Sinic East Members	150
95	MWI	Malawi	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	149
96	PAK	<i>Pakistan</i>	Indic East Members	148
97	DOM	Dominican Republic	Latin America Members	147
98	THA	<i>Thailand</i>	Indic East Members	145
99	HND	Honduras	Latin America Members	144
100	UGA	Uganda	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	144
101	BEN	Benin	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	143
102	ZMB	Zambia	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	143
103	IRN	Iran	Islamic East Members	141
104	KEN	Kenya	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	141

(continued)

(continued)

Rank	Country code	Country name	Region	Multilateral treaty participation (Accumulated number)
105	LSO	Lesotho	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	141
106	VEN	Venezuela	Latin America Members	141
107	KGZ	<i>Kyrgyzstan</i>	Orthodox East Members	140
108	TGO	Togo	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	140
109	COL	Colombia	Latin America Members	139
110	SYR	Syrian Arab Republic	Islamic East Members	137
111	IDN	<i>Indonesia</i>	Indic East Members	136
112	BOL	Bolivia	Latin America Members	135
113	RWA	Rwanda	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	135
114	SYC	Seychelles	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	135
115	TZA	United Republic of Tanzania	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	135
116	KWT	Kuwait	Islamic East Members	134
117	SLE	Sierra Leone	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	133
118	USA	United States of America	New West Members	133
119	LBN	Lebanon	Islamic East Members	132
120	KHM	<i>Cambodia</i>	Indic East Members	130
121	GUY	Guyana	Latin America Members	130
122	BRB	Barbados	Latin America Members	129
123	ISR	Israel	Old West Members	129
124	TJK	<i>Tajikistan</i>	Orthodox East Members	129
125	VNM	<i>Viet Nam</i>	Sinic East Members	129
126	AFG	<i>Afghanistan</i>	Islamic East Members	128

(continued)

(continued)

Rank	Country code	Country name	Region	Multilateral treaty participation (Accumulated number)
127	ZWE	Zimbabwe	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	126
128	CAF	Central African Republic	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	125
129	ZAR	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	125
130	ATG	Antigua and Barbuda	Latin America Members	124
131	LAO	<i>Lao People's Democratic Republic</i>	Indic East Members	124
132	BHS	Bahamas	Latin America Members	122
133	LIE	Liechtenstein	Old West Members	122
134	SGP	<i>Singapore</i>	Indic East Members	122
135	BGD	<i>Bangladesh</i>	Indic East Members	120
136	UZB	<i>Uzbekistan</i>	Orthodox East Members	120
137	MOZ	Mozambique	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	119
138	SAU	Saudi Arabia	Islamic East Members	118
139	COG	Congo	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	117
140	NPL	<i>Nepal</i>	Indic East Members	117
141	LBY	Libya	Islamic East Members	116
142	HTI	Haiti	Latin America Members	115
143	BWA	Botswana	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	114
144	VCT	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	Latin America Members	114
145	MCO	Monaco	Old West Members	111
146	BLZ	Belize	Latin America Members	110
147	QAT	Qatar	Islamic East Members	110
148	BHR	Bahrain	Islamic East Members	109

(continued)

(continued)

Rank	Country code	Country name	Region	Multilateral treaty participation (Accumulated number)
149	ARE	United Arab Emirates	Islamic East Members	109
150	DMA	Dominica	Latin America Members	108
151	ETH	Ethiopia	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	107
152	DJI	Djibouti	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	104
153	GMB	Gambia	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	104
154	MDV	<i>Maldives</i>	Indic East Members	100
155	MRT	Mauritania	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	100
156	LCA	St. Lucia	Latin America Members	100
157	TKM	<i>Turkmenistan</i>	Orthodox East Members	100
158	NAM	Namibia	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	99
159	YEM	Yemen	Islamic East Members	98
160	CPV	Cabo Verde	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	97
161	OMN	Oman	Islamic East Members	97
162	AGO	Angola	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	95
163	SDN	Sudan	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	95
164	SWZ	Eswatini	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	94
165	GNB	Guinea-Bissau	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	94
166	WSM	Samoa	New West Members	94
167	SUR	Suriname	Latin America Members	93
168	TCD	Chad	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	90
169	BDI	Burundi	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	89

(continued)

(continued)

Rank	Country code	Country name	Region	Multilateral treaty participation (Accumulated number)
170	MMR	<i>Myanmar</i>	Indic East Members	89
171	PNG	<i>Papua New Guinea</i>	New West Members	86
172	STP	<i>Sao Tome and Principe</i>	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	85
173	BRN	<i>Brunei Darussalam</i>	Indic East Members	83
174	GRD	Grenada	Latin America Members	82
175	COM	Comoros	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	79
176	TON	Tonga	New West Members	79
177	VUT	Vanuatu	New West Members	79
178	SLB	Solomon Islands	New West Members	75
179	PRK	<i>DPR Korea</i>	Sinic East Members	74
180	KNA	St. Kitts and Nevis	Latin America Members	74
181	KIR	Kiribati	New West Members	68
182	MHL	Marshall Islands	New West Members	67
183	ADO	Andorra	Old West Members	64
184	GNQ	Equatorial Guinea	Latin America Members	64
185	BTN	<i>Bhutan</i>	Indic East Members	60
186	NRU	Nauru	New West Members	60
187	PLW	Palau	New West Members	56
188	FSM	Micronesia (Federated States of)	New West Members	55
189	SOM	Somalia	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	55
190	ERI	Eritrea	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	53
191	TMP	<i>Timor-Leste</i>	Indic East Members	52
192	TUV	Tuvalu	New West Members	42
193	SSD	South Sudan	Sub-Saharan Africa Members	32

Source Lien Thi Quynh Le