Quality of Life in Asia 1

Takashi Inoguchi
Seiji Fujii

The Quality of Life in Asia

A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia

Springer

The Quality of Life in Asia

Quality of Life in Asia

Volume 1

Series Editors:

ALEX C. MICHALOS
Professor Emeritus, University of Northern British Columbia

DANIEL T.L. SHEK
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hunghom, P.R.C.

DOH CHULL SHIN
University of California, Irvine, California, USA.

This series, the first of its kind, will examine both the objective and subjective dimensions of life quality in Asia, especially East Asia. It will unravel and compare the contours, dynamics and patterns of building nations, offering innovative works that discuss basic and applied research, emphasizing inter- and multi-disciplinary approaches to the various domains of life quality. Thus, the series will appeal to a variety of fields in humanities, social sciences and other professional disciplines. Asia is the largest, most populous continent on Earth, and it is home to the world's most dynamic region, East Asia. In the past three decades, East Asia has been the most successful region in the world in expanding its economies and integrating them into the global economy, offering lessons on how poor countries, even with limited natural resources, can achieve rapid economic development. Yet while scholars and policymakers have focused on why East Asia has prospered, little has been written on how its economic expansion has affected the quality of life of its citizens. The series will publish several volumes a year, either single or multiple-authored monographs or collections of essays.

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/8416

Takashi Inoguchi • Seiji Fujii

The Quality of Life in Asia

A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia

Springer

Takashi Inoguchi
University of Niigata Prefecture
Tokyo, Japan

Seiji Fujii
University of Niigata Prefecture
Tokyo, Japan

ISSN 2211-0550 ISSN 2211-0569 (electronic)
ISBN 978-90-481-9071-3 ISBN 978-90-481-9072-0 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0
Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2012944254

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Synoptic Outline

This book studies and compares quality of life in 29 countries/societies in Asia: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Korea (South), Laos, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam. We utilize the AsiaBarometer Surveys conducted annually from 2003 through 2008. We focus on the notion of subjective quality of life and conceptualize it as two levels, global and domain. After we explain about the AsiaBarometer Survey Project, we explore current country profile, demographics, lifestyles, value priorities, specific life domain assessment, and overall quality of life. We then estimate the independent effects of demographics, lifestyles, value priorities, and life domain assessment on the overall quality of life within each society. As well as comparing the results between nations, we look for key generalized characteristics of life quality for the entire and subregions of Asia.

University of Niigata Prefecture
Tokyo, Japan

Takashi Inoguchi and Seiji Fujii

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Prof. Doh C. Shin at the University of Missouri-Columbia for a lot of encouragement and guidance in writing this manuscript. We would also like to thank session participants at the 10th Conference of the International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies (ISQOLS), held in Bangkok, Thailand, in December 2010 for helpful comments and suggestions. We also wish to thank Dr. Yuichi Kubota for his excellent research assistance. Financial support from the Murata Science Foundation is also gratefully acknowledged.

The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan provided funding for the conducting of the AsiaBarometer Survey from 2005 onward. The Ministry awarded Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research to the project director, Takashi Inoguchi, at Chuo University (project identification number 17002002) for the 2005–2008 period. The Ministry awarded Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research to Takashi Inoguchi at University of Niigata Prefecture (project identification number 21243010) for the 2009–2010 period. Business firms and foundations in 2003 and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan in 2004 funded the AsiaBarometer Survey.

Contents

Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Asia: Enormous Diversity

It is not an exaggeration to say that Asia is too diverse. Incredible contrasts exist among the 29 societies that this book examines. Demographically, China's population is 1.3 billion and India's is 1.2 billion, whereas the Maldives and Brunei each have populations of roughly 400,000 people. Adult literacy rates range from 28.1% in Afghanistan to 99.5% in Kazakhstan. Life expectancy ranges from 45 years in Afghanistan to 82 years in Japan. Gross domestic product per capita ranges from US$1,000 in Afghanistan to US$57,200 in Singapore. CO_2 emissions per capita, measured in metric tons, range from 0 in Afghanistan to 12.8 in Singapore and 12.6 in Kazakhstan. Internet users per 1,000 people range from 79 in Cambodia to 389,000 in China. The civil liberties index (Freedom House) ranges from 7 in Myanmar to 2 in Japan.

Not only in terms of these, more or less, easily measurable indicators of people's lives, but also in terms of self-assessed happiness, enormous diversity exists. Those respondents who assess themselves as very happy are highest in Brunei at 51.2%, the Maldives at 41.3%, and India at 37.4%. In contrast, those respondents who assess themselves as very unhappy are highest in Kyrgyzstan at 11.5%, Kazakhstan at10.5%, and Nepal at 8.3%.

In terms of daily life priorities, the differences are vast. For instance, in India, people prioritize daily life in the order of health, home, diet, job, and family. In China, people prioritize daily life in the order of health, home, job, medical care, and low crime rates. In Japan, people prioritize daily life in the order of health, family, job, home, and relationships with other persons. In Bangladesh, people prioritize daily life in the order of health, medical care, low crime rates, being devout, and home. In Indonesia, people prioritize daily life in the order of health, diet, home, being devout, and job. In Afghanistan, people prioritize daily life in the order of diet, health, home, being devout, and job. In the Philippines, people prioritize daily life in the order of diet, health, home, job, and family. In Myanmar, people prioritize daily life in the order of health, diet, being devout, home, and job.

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0_1,

All these findings are meant to be illustrative and to argue that diversity is very strong and that Asia needs to be examined with systematic empirical thoroughness. And this is the aim and thrust of the book. Before laying out the ample empirical findings, some major results are previewed first.

1. Asia as a whole is moving upward: East and Southeast Asia faster, Central and South Asia slower.
2. People in East Asia assess their happiness more negatively than their GDP per capita and the human development index (HDI) suggest.
3. People in Southeast Asia assess their happiness more positively than their GDP per capita and the HDI suggest.
4. People in South Asia assess their happiness more positively than their GDP per capita and the HDI suggest.
5. People in Central Asia assess their happiness more negatively than their GDP per capita and the HDI suggest.
6. People in East Asia tend to prioritize materialist or quality of life (QOL)-sustaining factors (such as housing, standard of living, household income, education, and job) in their daily lifestyle.
7. People in more traditional Southeast Asia (Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, and Myanmar) tend to prioritize materialist or QOL-sustaining factors in their daily lifestyle.
8. People in more dynamic, more competitive Southeast Asia (Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam) tend to prioritize post-materialist or QOL-enriching factors (such as friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life) in their daily lifestyle.
9. People in state-dominant Southeast Asian societies (Brunei, Singapore, and the Philippines) tend to prioritize their daily lifestyle in harmony with state-imposed constraints (such as public safety, the condition of the environment, social welfare system, and the democratic system).
10. People in traditional and competitive South Asia (India, Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka) tend to prioritize traditional or QOL-sustaining factors.
11. People in South Asia whose societies face the challenge of tropical weather systems and have dominant-state structures (Bhutan, the Maldives, and Pakistan) tend to harmonize public sphere factors.
12. People in Central Asia whose societies are more traditional (Afghanistan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan) prioritize traditional or QOL-sustaining factors.
13. People in Central Asia whose state structures are dominant (Kazakhstan) tend to harmonize their lives with public sphere factors.
14. People in Central Asia whose societies have more cleavages and are more competitive tend to prioritize QOL-enriching factors (Kyrgyzstan).
15. Standard of living and marriage or being married are important determinants for overall quality of life in Asia.

16. Seniors are less likely to feel happy but more likely to have a sense of accomplishment in Asia.
17. Income is more likely to enhance the feeling of achievement but less likely to enhance the feeling of happiness in Asia.

1.2 Asia: Why Is Quality of Life in Asia Important to Examine?

Quality of life is defined as the physical, psychological, and sociological state of being of people. It is broader than happiness because it entails factors such as enjoyment and achievement. Quality of life is also broader than satisfaction because it entails variables such as aspiration and recollection. It is also broader than well-being because quality of life is neutral. It is broader than health because it entails being in the context of one or another factors. Why is quality of life in Asia important to examine? Because, compared to quality of life in North America and Western Europe, quality of life in Asia has not been as comprehensively and systematically examined. The demographic size and diversity of Asia make a thorough empirical examination necessary: Asia is a dynamic and diverse region that is geographically, demographically, economically, politically, and militarily important. The economic development, democratic prospect, and security situation of Asia are hugely volatile and unpredictable in nature. Quality of life is basic in all these three issues. Quality of life is such a comprehensive concept that large-scale, meticulous empirical research is required. In Asia, geographical vastness and diversity have prevented many researchers from designing and implementing large-scale scientific empirical research. This study undertakes such research in a detailed and systematic manner. In the period between 2003 and 2008, one of the coauthors, Takashi Inoguchi, had the opportunity to design and carry out large-scale research with a nationwide random-sampled method in 29 societies in Asia. The thematic focus of the research was "Daily Lives of Ordinary People in Asia."

The many cultures and people of Asia are experiencing rapid economic growth. Annual GDP is growing rapidly in Singapore at 14.7%, Taiwan at 10.5%, China at 10.3%, Afghanistan at 8.9%, India at 8.3%, and Uzbekistan at 8.2%. Other macro-level data is available on the fact sheet of Appendix A.

Little is known about how the ordinary people of Asia live their lives. Asia was ignored in social sciences for a long time due to a lack of survey data, even though about two-thirds of the world's population lives in this region.

The objective of this book is to fill this void and investigate thematically and empirically the quality of life in 29 Asian countries and societies, namely, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam, using the AsiaBarometer Survey data from 2003 to 2008.

This book commemorates the tenth anniversary of the AsiaBarometer. The AsiaBarometer was launched in 2002 when the director Takashi Inoguchi wrote articles with the aim of building the AsiaBarometer Survey Project (Inoguchi 2002a, b, c).

1.3 The Notion of Quality of Life and Research Design

Researchers in the field of quality-of-life study have attempted to define the umbrella term "quality of life" in different ways since 1964 (Storrs 1975; Veenhoven 2000). One way to dichotomize the notion of life quality is from the viewpoint of either the objective or subjective (Shin and Inoguchi 2009a; Veenhoven 2000). One approach focuses on objective conditions in which people live, while the other approach considers how they feel about those conditions and other life circumstances (Shin and Inoguchi 2009a).

Following Doh Chull Shin and Inoguchi (2009a), the studies in this volume take the subjective approach of equating quality of life with subjective well-being. We assume that the word "quality" has an evaluative property that admits degrees of desirability or value. Of the various elements and conditions of life experienced and evaluated, only those to which people impute value count toward the parameter of life quality (Shin and Inoguchi 2009a).

Shin and Inoguchi (2009a), in an edited a volume, studied the quality of life in Confucian societies (China, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan) in a systematic approach by addressing both values and objective conditions of life. The places and environment where people live and the resources and activities that are available to them affect quality of life directly, but such objective conditions of life also affect quality indirectly through a set of values held by the same people (Shin and Inoguchi 2009a). Shin and Inoguchi and their colleagues begin each country/society chapter with a demographic profile of respondents, lifestyles, value priorities, overall quality-of-life assessments measured by happiness, enjoyment, and achievement, specific life domain satisfactions, and the regression analyses to estimate the effects of demographics, lifestyles, value priorities, and domain assessments on overall quality of life (Shin and Inoguchi 2009b).

Shin and Inoguchi (2009a), in their edited volume, conceptualize the quality of life as a multidimensional, multilevel phenomenon. In assessing quality of life, people consider all the things that matter to them and judge the overall quality of their lives as a whole, while at the same time, people choose particular aspects or domains of their lives and judge each of those domains separately (Shin and Inoguchi 2009a). Therefore, the AsiaBarometer asked two sets of questions. The first set of three questions taps the overall quality of life in terms of happiness, enjoyment, and accomplishment. The second set uses a variety of questions to tap levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with 16 life domains on a five-point verbal scale. These two sets of questions serve as our indicators of two levels of quality of life, global and domain specific.

Inoguchi and Seiji Fujii (2009) studied the quality of life in Japan and found that, when satisfaction levels for 16 specific life domains are grouped into three life spheres, namely, materialist, post-materialist, and public, none of the domains in the public life sphere statistically nor significantly affect the overall quality of life, while some of the domains in the post-materialist life sphere and a few of those in the materialist life sphere determine the level of overall quality of life in Japan. We intend to extend the analysis about Japan to 29 Asian countries and societies using the AsiaBarometer Survey pooled data from 2003 to 2008. We focus on the relationship between overall quality of life measured by happiness, enjoyment, and achievement and satisfaction levels for the 16 specific life domains.

To find determinants for quality of life, we test three sets of predictors, namely, objective conditions of life, lifestyles, and value priorities (Shin and Inoguchi 2009a). We hypothesize that the quality of life people experience depends on their value preferences and priorities. Under this modeling, we propose that quality of life and the objective conditions of life are separate concepts. People evaluate their life experiences based on their own judgments. Their evaluations also depend on how they compare themselves with other people. Subjective well-being cannot be inferred accurately by objective indicators of life circumstances. Subjective feelings can be measured accurately only by asking people directly to what extent they find their life conditions pleasant or unpleasant, and/or fulfilling or disappointing (Shin and Inoguchi 2009a).

We also postulate that the production of more material goods and services does not necessarily enhance the quality of citizens' lives. Although up to a certain point greater production of such material resources generally does have a favorable impact on people's lives, beyond that point, more production can actually detract from the overall quality of life by causing congestion, pollution, and dehumanization. Thus, enhancing citizen well-being depends less on investment in economic growth and more on policies that promote good governance, liberty, democracy, trust, and public safety (Shin and Inoguchi 2009a).

1.4 Organization

Chapter 2 introduces the AsiaBarometer Survey Project. We explain the details about the project including its aim, scope, rationale, principles of questionnaire formulation, future prospects, and the way the AsiaBarometer Survey contributes to scholarship and development of the region of Asia.

Chapter 3 goes over overall evaluations of well-being in Asia. It compares the extent to which people experience feelings of happiness, enjoyment, and achievement in the 29 countries/societies.

Chapter 4 focuses on how people feel about specific life domains. It compares the extent to which they are satisfied or dissatisfied with 16 specific life domains, and it identifies the particular domains and spheres of domains that they find most and least satisfying. The life domains surveyed are housing, friendships, marriage,

standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, public safety, the condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, family life, leisure, and spiritual life.

Chapter 5 focuses on lifestyles. Specifically, it highlights the various ways in which people live their lives in terms of spending time and money and interacting with other people at home and abroad. It also examines the extent to which respondents access public utilities and digital devices.

Chapter 6 analyzes how people prioritize their values. It identifies distinct value orientations through an examination of which resources and activities respondents value above all others and examines how value orientations differ significantly among the 29 Asian societies.

Chapter 7 estimates independent effects of demographics, lifestyles, value priorities, and domain assessments on the overall quality of life—happiness, enjoyment, and achievement. We run regressions for each society and for all of Asia using the pooled data.

References

Inoguchi, T. (2002a). *AsiaBarometer no setsuritsu wo mezase* (Let us do an Asian-wide opinion poll every year). *Chuo Koron* (Central Review), *117*(7), 150–155.

Inoguchi, T. (2002b). A call for regional opinion polling in Asia. *Japan Echo, 29*(5), 14–18.

Inoguchi, T. (2002c). *Ajia kenkyu nihon no shudou de kiban seibi wo* (Japan initiative to build infrastructure for studies on Asia). *Asahi Shimbun, 29*, 11.

Inoguchi, T., & Fujii, S. (2009). The quality of life in Japan. *Social Indicators Research, 92*, 227–262.

Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (2009a). Avowed happiness in Confucian Asia: Ascertaining its distribution, patterns, and sources. *Social Indicators Research, 92*, 405–427.

Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (Eds.). (2009b). *The quality of life in Confucian Asia: From physical welfare to subjective well-being* (Social indicators research series). Dordrecht: Springer [This book was originally published as a special volume in *Social Indicators Research*, *92*(2), (2009)].

Storrs, M. (1975). Quality of life. *Social Indicators Research, 2*(2), 229–248.

Veenhoven, R. (2000). The four qualities of life: Ordering concepts and measure of the good life. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 1*, 1–39.

Chapter 2
The AsiaBarometer Survey Project

2.1 Its Aim and Trust

2.1.1 Introduction

The AsiaBarometer represents the largest ever, comparative survey in Asia, covering East, Southeast, South, and Central Asia. The AsiaBarometer is not the only survey done in Asia. The Social Weather Stations (Guerrero 2003) in Manila has been conducting social surveys continuously for the last two decades. Then in the wake of the third wave of democratization (Huntington 1991) in East and Southeast Asia, a number of democracy barometers were born. The Korea Democracy Barometer (Shin 2003) and the East Asia Democracy Barometer (Chu 2003) are the most well known of the various democracy barometers (Diamond and Morelino 2004). Needless to say, the Global Democracy Barometer, led by Richard Rose, has been in existence since the end of the Cold War (Rose and Munro 2003). The two oldest, the European Values Study, led by Jan Ker Khofs and Rund Alphons de Moor (Halman et al. 2007), and the World Values Survey, led by Ronald Inglehart et al. (1998), were launched in the 1960s and continue until today.

The AsiaBarometer distinguishes itself from many others in that it focuses on daily lives of ordinary people. It is not primarily about values or democracy. It is primarily about how ordinary people live their life with all their worries, anger, desires, and dreams. It focuses secondarily on their relationship to family, neighborhood, workplace, social and political institutions, and marketplace. In short, it is a survey based on the principle of bottom up rather than that of top down: bottom up in the sense of adopting a down-to-earth perspective (Rose 1989).

Most importantly, however, the AsiaBarometer is fundamentally different from other Asia barometers, such as the Social Weather Stations barometer, the Korea Democracy Barometer, and the East Asia Democracy Barometer, which all originated from the third wave of democratization in the last quarter of the last century in countries, such as the Philippines, South Korea, and Taiwan. In a good contrast, the AsiaBarometer originates from a genuine academic interest in the daily lives,

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0_2,

views, and sentiments of ordinary people in Asia as registered in survey data. One of the coauthors, Takashi Inoguchi, was shocked to find a paucity of information in this area when he wrote about the research infrastructure for social and behavioral sciences in Asia for the *International Encyclopaedia for Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Inoguchi 2002b). The very dynamic and divergent nature of daily lives in Asia in an era of globalization needs to be registered and subjected to systemic empirical analysis. In a meeting with the founder of the Eurobarometer, Jean-Jacques Rabier, at the Institut français d'opinion publique in Paris, Inoguchi was inspired by how much regular surveys reveal about how human beings think and act; Inoguchi wanted to seize the opportunity to conduct such a survey in Asia. Also, as someone who has studied several Asian languages, including Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Indonesian (as well as English, French, German, and Russian, not to mention his native tongue of Japanese), the AsiaBarometer was the natural next step in the formulation of research projects for Inoguchi. Furthermore, the AsiaBarometer idea had been successfully tested in another form as the Asia-Europe Survey on globalization and political cultures of democracy. This project conducted an 18-country survey, nine countries in East and Southeast Asia and nine countries in Europe, in 2000 (Inoguchi 2003a). The ASES (Asia-Europe Survey) project produced such volumes as Blondel and Inoguchi (2006), Inoguchi and Blondel (Inoguchi and Blondel 2008), and Inoguchi and Marsh (2007). This survey reinforced the critical need to conduct surveys on a regular format.

The AsiaBarometer distinguishes itself from many others in that it makes the utmost efforts to be sensitive to cultures and languages. The first step is to conduct focus groups where deemed necessary. The next step is to thoroughly compare and discuss the English language questionnaire and the questionnaires in local languages, which always include those familiar with both languages. The third step is to have local academics participate in questionnaire formulation and data analysis. In short, the AsiaBarometer tries to be as culturally and linguistically fluent as possible.

The operation of the AsiaBarometer was headquartered at the Institute of Oriental Culture at University of Tokyo before 2003. It is funded by a number of sources: business firms, the University of Tokyo, the Ministry of Education and Science, and a few foundations. Coordinated by the Nippon Research Center, the Gallup International networks conduct the AsiaBarometer Surveys. The predecessor of the AsiaBarometer, the Asia-Europe Survey, focused on norms and values. The AsiaBarometer is a direct and extended successor to the Asia-Europe Survey with a shift in focus from norms and values in the Eurasian continent to daily lives of ordinary people in Asia. The AsiaBarometer was conducted on an annual basis between 2003 and 2008 in 32 countries in East, Southeast, South, and Central Asia. It was an ambitious project. It was also a project worth undertaking.

2.1.2 Rationale and Promises of the AsiaBarometer

Intra-regional interactions in Asia have been deepening and broadening much faster than anticipated (Inoguchi 2002a). Interdependence has progressed considerably in

the economic sphere, especially in manufacturing. Reciprocal market entry has become active in the service sector as well. Japanese anime now dominate the Asian animated-film market. In 2003, *Spirited Away*, an animation film, earned an Academy award. And Korean kimuchi has emerged as the top-selling type of pickled food in many Japanese supermarkets. More systematic, intra-regional trade among Japan, China, and South Korea expanded dramatically with the 1991 lifting of the Western and Japanese embargo against China for its Tiananmen massacre.

Ten years after 1991, intra-regional trade had surpassed overall trade by 50%. In comparison, Western Europe had needed more than 30 years after the Treaty of Rome in 1957 for intra-regional trade to surpass overall trade by 50%.

In the world of politics, a similar trend is detectable. Two decades ago, summit talks between Japanese and other Asian leaders occurred only once or twice a year, but by 2000, such meetings had increased 20-fold. Among Asian political leaders, the level of interaction has dramatically increased. Representatives of countries belonging to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) now gather for as many as 300 meetings a year at various levels. Although Japan, China, and South Korea are economically interdependent, politically they are intermittently at odds. Only a few years ago they never met regularly, especially in the setting of all three. It was necessary to use a room with three entrances and to have a triangular meeting table to inaugurate a formal meeting among the three states in 2005. Now it has been formally institutionalized to meet regularly without such awkward arrangements and setting.

There is no denying that this broadening and tightening of regional interdependence in Asia has benefited both individual countries and the region as a whole. This is corroborated by the region's economic development and relative stability in the 2000s. To promote further regional growth and engender greater mutual benefits, however, closer contact in the field of scholarship is a must. Unfortunately, Asia suffers from an absence of strategy to build a common academic infrastructure (Inoguchi 2002b). What sort of an intellectual framework would be useful?

A useful model is the Eurobarometer. It is time-tested large-scale surveys of public opinion within the European Union. We advocate establishing the Asian equivalent—the AsiaBarometer. It is important, however, to stress one major difference between them. The AsiaBarometer is run not by an intergovernmental organization like the European Union but by nongovernmental academics. This, we are convinced, would result not only in huge advances in scholarly research in Asia but also in making contributions to indirectly fostering economic prosperity and political stability.

2.1.2.1 Knowledge Begets Prosperity

First, let us consider how a regional survey of public opinion would benefit businesses. Opinion polls generally gather information, albeit limited, about the socioeconomic background of respondents, including such items as age, gender, occupation, education, income, and family. And it is possible to use them anonymously to collect

information about people's values and norms, along with their outlook on a variety of basic subjects, such as life and death, work, the family, society, politics, science and technology, gender, and international affairs. Knowing better under certain conditions begets trust and social capital, which in turn becomes a foundation of wealth accumulation (Fukuyama 1997; Inoguchi 2002c).

A system of regional surveys that cover topics like these would make it possible for companies to assemble basic data on income levels, consumer preferences, and lifestyles. Equipped with this knowledge, companies could then formulate strategies for product development, manufacturing, and marketing and could also identify the scale and location of target markets. Such an information infrastructure would definitely be a boon to business companies in East and Southeast Asia, many of which have been frustrated by sluggish domestic economies, yet remain stuck because they do not have a good grasp of markets elsewhere in Asia.

The results could be used for analyses that go beyond country-by-country breakdowns to consider region-wide patterns based on income level, city size, occupation, generation, age group, lifestyle, level of awareness about environmental and human-rights issues, and so forth. Eventually such surveys would enable companies to look at the entire region as a single large market.

One potential stumbling block could be the difficulty of accessing the data. Opinion polls are already conducted in many Asian countries, but the ideas, facilities, and services for sharing the results have yet to be developed more fully.

When we consider Asia's increasingly high-income levels and mostly robust economic growth, it is remarkable how little social data is available for the Asian region as a whole. Needless to say, there have been similar attempts, but more conceptually limited, including Yun-han Chu's *East Asia Barometer* and Doh Chull Shin's *Korean Barometer*, both focusing somewhat narrowly on democracy and democratization. Much the same applies to Japan where the results of costly opinion surveys are generally used just once and then discarded. There has, to be sure, been a sharp rise in the number of surveys that are administered periodically in Japan and whole results are publicly disclosed, such as the Japanese General Social Surveys (Osaka University of Commerce and University of Tokyo 2002). Of late, general social surveys have been cooperatively coordinated among Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. Yet even these are marred by the fact that the facilities and services to enable shared use of the results remain to be vigorously consolidated.

A foundation for enduring regional prosperity could be built if such shortcomings in the availability of social data could be overcome in Asia as a whole. North America and Western Europe are ahead in this regard. The strength of many Western corporate brands is testimony to the merits of having a vast storehouse of data. An accurate grasp of consumer preferences and lifestyles in Asia as a whole will enable the pinpoint targeting of potential markets. And this should turn Japanese and other Asian firms into even more dynamic, enterprising, and creative entities. The merits of having access to reliable, annually updated facts about a vast market are immeasurable. In 2010, ASEAN declared its intentions to enhance its connectivity by 2015. ASEAN has espoused from its inception the principle of noninterference in internal affairs. But rising developmental momentum and the

tide of globalization have been so strong that intra-regional connectivity needs to be enhanced to help the region acquire additional efficiency and strength.

Suppose a manufacturer wants to develop a product that integrates the functions of a mobile phone, calculator, television set, camera, voice recorder, security device, and car navigator. What sort of potential customers should it target in terms of income bracket, occupational category, and age group? And how large a market should it anticipate? These questions are difficult to answer accurately, but with the AsiaBarometer, a set of common region-wide questions could be formulated to obtain the required information.

The weather forecasts aired on NHK (Japan Broadcasting Corporation) still tend to focus entirely or largely on Japan. Will it rain in Beijing this afternoon? How hot will it be in Bangkok tomorrow? The Japanese network apparently thinks that its viewers have little interest in knowing such information. This is in sharp contrast to the weather reports on CNN, for instance, which provides forecasts for major cities all around the world. This US-based cable news network is sensitive to the changing needs of its business audience. For example, in 1996, when sources indicated that the US government was on the verge of announcing a partial lifting of its embargo on Cuba, CNN responded the next day by adding Havana to its worldwide weather forecasts.

In an age of globalization, with the pace of business activities accelerating all around the world, the merits of conducting region-wide social surveys regularly every year should not be underestimated.

2.1.2.2 Knowledge Engenders Stability

The benefits of a regular series of public opinion surveys would go beyond the promotion of economic prosperity. The knowledge obtained from such surveys would also serve as the foundation for greater regional stability. A shared regional perception of how the world is changing would facilitate adaptation to such changes, and this could minimize social upheaval and disintegration. A common perception could also gradually spawn a sense of Asian identity, promoting sentiments of belonging, of ownership, and of attachment toward the region. Furthermore, an increasingly common perception may in the long run foster minimally shared norms and values, such as democracy and human rights (Putnam 1993; Inoguchi 2002c). Such shared perception can play an important role in the context of globalization, which is sowing the seeds of instability in countries around the world. Antiterrorist monitoring and networking have been developed in the East and Southeast Asian regions after the terrorist event on September 11, 2001, and the Bali bombing in 2005.

Although globalization has the effect of raising overall income levels, it also tends to leave certain individuals, groups, communities, nations, and regions outside the circle of prosperity and push them to the brink of collapse. The concept of global governance has been created as a way of containing these negative consequences of globalization. This refers to efforts to build a global framework—in the absence of a world government—to ensure a certain degree of rule of law, transparency, and accountability so as to enable individuals to pursue their own

safety, happiness, and fulfillment (Inoguchi and Bacon 2003). Income gaps, among other kinds of gaps, between rich and poor within China are well known. Another gap is between regular and irregular workers. The latter migrated to cities without being able to transfer their residence permits, thus leaving them vulnerable as a social group that is segregated and discriminated against in China. But their predicament is not reflected in national economic statistics. Survey-aided research would assist immensely in this regard.

For global governance to function properly, there must be healthy arrangements for the disclosure of information. The AsiaBarometer would, up to a point, serve as a tool to gather and disclose information on key topics, such as the extent to which the rule of law is working to prevent crime and corruption and the objectives and policies according to which businesses, governments, and other socially significant organizations are operating. An accumulation of data gathered regularly every year on a common set of questions throughout Asia would be extremely significant.

Even governments have a difficult time accurately ascertaining what citizens think of their policies both because of, and despite, their policies. The AsiaBarometer operated by an academic third-party organization could be of great help to them. Some governments might be disinclined to accept the results of opinion polls conducted by a third-party organization. Suppose you ask a question about confidence in social institutions in countries that are characterized as military dictatorship and one such social institution is the military, then this might be problematic for the government. But, in most cases, it should be possible to overcome the government's objections by adjusting the wording of questions and other aspects of the survey methodology. The experience of the AsiaBarometer Survey in the 2000s tells us that the number of cases in which the deletion of a question deemed inappropriate by local authorities is required has decreased visibly over the years. It appears that governments have realized that academic third-party organizations may not be necessarily a "bad guy." Rather they appear to have gained an appreciation for being well informed about their citizenry's daily lives and perceptions of social relations, social institutions, and the government. Regularly gathered survey results could, moreover, help eliminate the suspicions that states tend to harbor about other countries; in other words, the AsiaBarometer could serve as a disarming instrument. This is another advantage of having the surveys conducted by an academic third-party organization.

2.1.2.3 Contribution to Scholarship

Finally, and most importantly, there are two major ways in which the AsiaBarometer would have significant consequences for academic research. The first would be to dramatically increase the use of data from Asia in the social sciences. There has been an overwhelming tendency to use data that originates in Western countries because of the wealth and ease of use of such information; the AsiaBarometer would help correct this imbalance.

The second would be to raise the standards of social scientific research in Asia to levels comparable to those in the United States and Western Europe, as opinion polls constitute a powerful tool of empirical social science. Four conditions must

be met for the results of such surveys to be of value to researchers (Inoguchi 1995, 2002d). These are (1) a reasonable level of political freedom and democracy; (2) a sizable corps of researchers espousing shared academic values; (3) adequate infrastructure to support academic research, including specialized staff and the necessary physical facilities and equipment at universities and research institutes; and (4) a widely accepted system of evaluating academic performance that affects researcher's conduct. These conditions are increasingly being met in many Asian countries.

How, specifically, does the AsiaBarometer contribute to scholarship? Two positive consequences should emerge from periodically asking the same set of questions throughout Asia and turning the results into a database of essential information widely available to empirical researchers.

The first is that a vast range of Asian social phenomena would become objects of comparative research. Such research until now has focused on Western countries because of the ready availability of a large pool of data necessary for empirical research in the social sciences—including basic statistics like those for population, occupation, and income; the results of public opinion surveys; and the findings of experiments in social psychology. These countries are dramatically ahead in the scope of their databases in these areas; furthermore, the data is accessible to researchers all around the world.

Sadly, little progress has been achieved toward creating such databases in Japan and other Asian countries, and both the idea of, and mechanisms for, disseminating data to foreign researchers have been lacking with some notable exceptions. This represents a failure to meet our responsibilities as global citizens. It shows that our gaze has been focused until recently on our own countries; we have been paying too little attention to trends in other societies, other regions, and among humankind in general. This is why we have not developed mechanisms for sharing our data with the rest of the world. An Asian polling institution would greatly broaden the region's intellectual horizons.

The second anticipated consequence is an increase in scholarly research based on a shared awareness of issues (as expressed in the shared list of questions), resulting in a fuller body of scientific knowledge. Surveys targeting Japan tend to zero in redundantly on the complexity or distinctiveness of Japan's social structure, political behavior, economic system, or whatever, diminishing the possibility of coming up with propositions that can be generalized beyond just Japan. It is comparative surveys—with such countries as China, Sri Lanka, the Philippines, Uzbekistan, Singapore, Pakistan, South Korea, India, Tajikistan, and Thailand—that are likely to produce propositions that can be generalized across the entire region. Many such findings have been generated for the United States and Western Europe. The polling organization could contribute by triggering a quest for a similar body of knowledge in Asia.

Japan's social scientists would benefit greatly by working together with their Asian colleagues rather than keeping to themselves. For one thing, they would see their works being cited with far greater frequency in the Social Sciences Citation Index. As a forerunner, the Ministry of Education in South Korea has instructed that the Social Sciences Citation Index be the most important criterion for decisions on

hiring and promotion. Observations of social phenomena in Asia could beget new hypotheses and enrich the world's body of scientific knowledge. Findings from an isolated Far Eastern island nation, however remarkable they may be, are unlikely to attract much international attention as long as they are seen as emanating from a peculiar "outlier."

The need for a common Asian polling organization is also evident if we consider the historical development of the social sciences in the United States and Europe. The first step in the process by which US social sciences achieved their current position of overwhelming dominance dates back to World War II when Samuel Stouffer et al. (1945) surveyed morale among American soldiers. The second step was the creation of the Institute of Social Research (Featherman 2003) and a consortium led by the University of Michigan to enable the sharing of survey results. With these initiatives, empirical social scientific research took root in the United States. And the third step was the establishment and development of scholarly journals (like the *American Political Science Review* and many other reputed journals) to serve as vehicles for the publication of researchers' findings, and these, based on a strict system of anonymous peer review (Farr and Seidelman 1993; Oren 2003). Developing the social sciences in Asia will require a similar three-stage process.

Europe followed a pattern like that of the United States starting in the 1970s. First, the European community launched the Eurobarometer surveys with Jacques-René Rabier's creative leadership. Second, the European Consortium for Political Research was set up under the leadership of University of Essex professor, Jean Blondel (now a professor emeritus at the European University Institute) (Blondel 2003). And third, the *British Journal of Political Science* was launched—edited by another University of Essex professor, Anthony King—and developed into a leading voice of political research in Europe. Slightly later, the European Consortium for Political Research started to publish its own journal, *European Journal of Political Research*, and more lately another journal, *European Journal of International Relations*.

2.1.3 Principles of Questionnaire Formulation

Having provided the rationale and the promise of the AsiaBarometer, we now turn to its principles of questionnaire formation. They are summarized by the following three points:

- Principle one: Opinion polls cannot penetrate people's minds by being excessively obtrusive.
- Principle two: Opinion polls cannot focus too much on the peripheral concerns of ordinary people.

- Principle three: Opinion polls can be most illuminating when they are recasted and examined with the deft use of Przeworsky and Teune's (1970) two contrasting research designs.

2.1.3.1 Minimum Unobtrusiveness

When opinion polls are so often used for marketing, journalistic, academic, and policy purposes, one tends to forget one important element: that they are intrinsically obtrusive to potential interviewees (Campbell and Stanley 1966). A number of adaptations have been observed to cope with the need to reduce obtrusiveness and to enhance sensitivity while not compromising too much on capturing with as much precision as possible what interviewees have in mind. Here clearly, the need for cultural fluency cannot be overstressed, especially in attempts like the AsiaBarometer. Five examples are mentioned briefly to illustrate this point.

1. When asked how rich or poor you are, some tend to portray themselves as poorer than they really are. If you say you are rich and if that becomes known to others, you are bound to attract jealousy or even to attract tax authorities to tax you more, or, in worst cases, to attract burglars. Hence, you tend to say that you are somewhere in the middle. Yanjie Bian's work (1994) on Chinese response proclivity seems to point to the basic correctness of this concern.
2. When asked how happy or unhappy you are, some tend to portray themselves as happier than they really are. If you say you are unhappy, you feel bad because you have been socialized to say happy in the United States. Albert Hirschmann (1970) registers the subtle yet substantial difference between different linguistic cultures. Two Jews, one American and the other German, ran into each other at New York after a long separation. The former asked the latter, "How are you?" The latter replied, "I am happy, *aber bin ich nicht so gluecklich*" (but I'm not so lucky). In the United States, people have been socialized to say happy: after all, their country is free with abundant opportunities.
3. When asked how strongly you are favorably disposed to the view that men are born unequal, you tend to hide yourself in the middle category as you do not want to let your view on this kind of proposition be known even to your interviewee. The exceedingly high percentage of Japanese respondents who choose the middle response is a case in point. In contrast, we would surmise that the majority of interviewees in the United States and Western Europe, being politically correct, respond unfavorably to this question.
4. When asked what is your primary identity, the majority point to their national identity. For instance, 96–98% of South Koreans or Thais point to their respective national identity as their primary identity (Inoguchi 2002e). But some 30% of Japanese replied that they have never thought about it, that they do not bother thinking about it, or that they do not care to answer the question. It may be that Japanese feel more reluctant to answer a context-free question like that than many other people (Inoguchi 2002c). The same thing can be said about the

question concerning trust. As Russell Hardin (2006) eloquently argues, a context-free question about trust, whether it is interpersonal or social institutional, is difficult to answer.

5. When asked how much confidence you have in the government leader, whether he/she is prime minister or president, some groups tend to reply very positively. American and British tended to reply to the question very positively until sometime in the 1960s. The standard answer was that their political culture is a truly democratic civic culture à la Gabriel Almond and Sydney Verba (1962). A less sanguine view of American and British political cultures is that they contained these cultural streaks that are best characterized as more authoritarian, more conformist, and more strongly socialized to be patriotic at least before the 1970s than Almond and Verba (1962) wanted to make us believe. This characterization may be more consistent with Samuel Huntington's characterization of American polity as an essentially Tudor polity (Huntington 1981).

2.1.3.2 Minimum Oddness

It is too easily forgotten to social scientists who play with high sounding norms and abstract concepts that the daily lives of ordinary people are central to them and that politics and economics, let alone international affairs, are peripheral. Bombarding interviewees with streams of questions in which the vocabulary tends to be odd, strange, abstract, alien, incomprehensible, eerie, or weird at least to *bumi putra*, the sons of the soil, does not help survey designers to obtain what they want to tap in issues. This type of concern is terribly important when interviewees are not necessarily exposed to social science-related questions, which is 99% the case. This concern has led the AsiaBarometer to focus more on the daily lives and concerns of ordinary people and then shift to ask more peripheral questions about democracy and government performance. No less important is the way in which interviews are conducted. In the United States, telephone-conducted surveys are common, but in the rest of the world, it is not common at all. For most of the world, face-to-face interviews are essential. In Russia, it is normal for interviewees to answer their responses at a designated place for interviews: asking someone, even an interviewer, into one's home is viewed as potentially inviting a criminal into one's home. In Malaysia, it is common to respond to questions outside the door of the house but inside the front courtyard. In these surroundings, it is simply odd to respond to questions, one after another, for more than an hour, the meaning of which is too remote to the daily lives of ordinary people. The need to be sensitive to differences in survey culture cannot be overstressed.

2.1.3.3 Most Similar and Most Dissimilar Systems Comparisons

By posing most similar and most dissimilar systems comparisons, we do not mean that the AsiaBarometer has adopted a particular based on the methodological advice of Adam Przeworsky and Henry Teune (1970). The AsiaBarometer is designed to

cover the entire region of Asia: East Asia, Southeast Asia, South Asia, and Central Asia. The region contains a huge range of diversity. It covers a vast area from Tokyo to Tashkent, from Jakarta to Islamabad, and from Beijing to Colombo. As a regional barometer, the AsiaBarometer is the largest in geographical coverage and least homogeneous in terms of key regional features such as lingua franca, colonial heritage, per capita income level, regime characteristics, and social capital. Within each of the four subregions, many subregional characteristics might be more similar, whereas diversity within one society might be extensive, such as China or India. The critical point here is to be conscious of similarities and dissimilarities at, or across, national, subregional, or regional levels, thereby allowing the researcher to tap more interesting features such as the growth of regionalism within each subregion (Acharya 2002; Ravenhill 2001; Solingen 1998) or globalization's fragmenting effects within each national unit (Held and Koenig-Archibugi 2003) in terms of per capita income level or lifestyle or some other factor.

In the AsiaBarometer Surveys, we surveyed Asia, subregion to subregion. In 2003, we selected and surveyed countries from each of the subregions. In 2004, we surveyed all the East and Southeast Asian countries, plus India, Australia, and New Zealand. In 2005, we surveyed all the South and Central Asian countries. In 2006, we surveyed all the East Asian countries, plus Vietnam and Singapore. In 2007, we surveyed all the Southeast Asian countries, minus Vietnam and Singapore. In 2008, we surveyed Japan, China, India, Indonesia, the United States, Australia, and Russia. In a sense, we surveyed countries with the most similar country comparative schemes.

When a survey chooses to do most-similar-system comparisons, the creation of a new sample design is possible. Ijaz Gilani, chairman of Gallup Islamabad, has recently proposed that instead of state-centric random sampling, global (regional) random sampling can be as cost-efficient and as scientific (without much bias) as state-centric random sampling (Gilani Research Foundation 2010).

By so doing, two merits arise: first, you can save costs by not allowing state-centric sampling carried out for Brunei (with a total population of 400,000) and for Indonesia (with a total population close to 248,000,000). Second, with global (regional) sampling, analysis can be much more extensive with demographic variables that are crossed with substantial variables, for example, Muslim people as a region and as a country.

In sum, the AsiaBarometer tries to be as interviewee-friendly and culturally sensitive as possible and to give analysts more scope and space for cross-level and cross-national examinations.

2.1.4 Four Distinctive Clusters of Questions

2.1.4.1 Daily Lives of Ordinary People

The recording of ordinary people's daily lives is placed centrally in the questionnaire (Rose 1989). The rationale is that without first trying to comprehend even a modicum of people's daily lives, it would be even less productive than just

registering the array of interest areas that social scientists have about people's norms, values, identities, relationship to society, and political action and beliefs, which ultimately tend to be treated rather superficially. Therefore, it would be much more rewarding and productive to base social scientists' interest in the daily lives of ordinary people. It is not that daily lives determine the norms, beliefs, and actions of ordinary people. To ordinary people, society, and public policy, economy and politics are issues that are normally very distant from their central concerns. True, their daily lives are overshadowed by economic conditions, social configurations, political institutions, and public policy, but they do not constitute the core of their life. Asking questions, one after another, about their peripheral concerns, that is, those affairs they are not much interested in, is not the optimal way to understand them. The daily lives of ordinary people must be understood as they are first. This point must be stressed in Asia for two reasons: first, Asia is full of diversity; second, Asia is changing fast. No other region in the world is more diverse and fast changing. By asking about the daily lives of ordinary people, another role is first served. These questions presumably would be easier for the respondents to answer than questions about matters more peripheral to them. Furthermore, queries about the daily lives of ordinary people are important to be asked and answered in comparative settings. Even where social surveys are conducted frequently in a national setting, they tend to have no comparative scope. In many Asian societies, social surveys have been conducted rather frequently for the last quarter of a century. But survey research infrastructure within and across countries has been unabashedly underdeveloped in much of Asia. Despite the mushrooming of surveys in Asia such as the Social Weather Stations headquartered in the Philippines (Guerrero 2003), the Korea Barometer headquartered in South Korea (Shin 2003), the East Asia Barometer headquartered in Taiwan (Chu 2003), and this AsiaBarometer headquartered in Japan, covering various parts of Asia, archiving and consortium building across and beyond Asia have not been well developed. By registering periodically the daily lives of ordinary people in Asia over the years, we hoped to trigger the development of social survey and more broadly, empirically oriented social science infrastructure in Asia (Featherman 2003; Inoguchi 2002b).

2.1.4.2 Perceptions and Assessments of Their Lives

How ordinary people perceive their own lives is very significant in itself and in terms of its ramifications to public policy, the role of central government, confidence in institutions, etc. How they place their standard of living on the rich-poor continuum, how happy they are with their life, how satisfied they are with their life, what is their lifestyle (Inglehart 1977, 1997), what are their daily worries, what are their desires and ambitions, what are their deprivations and frustrations—these issues are central to ordinary people as well as others. Their answers to these questions constitute the core of their lives. In building on the daily lives of ordinary people comes the perception and assessment of ordinary people's concerns and

relations to the larger social entities such as patriotism and confidence in government performance (Inoguchi 2003b, c). Since social surveys have been developed mostly in the United States and Western Europe in the latter half of the last century (Featherman 2001), these perceptions and assessments of ordinary people about their lives and their relationships to the larger social entities have tended to be examined in relation to conducting democratic politics such as voting and elections (Miller and Shanks 1996; Butler and Stokes 1976; Watanuki and Miyake 1997; Miyake 1985; Kabashima 1998). But democratic or otherwise, this cluster of questions is primordial in considering how they relate to the larger society. These questions are not just to explain the types of voting behavior and election outcomes.

2.1.4.3 From Relationships of Their Lives to Larger Social Entities

How do ordinary people relate themselves to the larger society? This is what political scientists and sociologists are most eager to ask questions about. After all, it is not sufficient to relate, for instance, individual economic satisfaction with government support. At least their confidence in the government must be placed in the equation linking individual economic satisfaction with government support (Hibbs 1993). The crux of the matter is how people relate to society at large. In a similar vein, it is not sufficient to relate individual economic deprivation to anti-Americanism. One needs to bring in how national, ethnic, and religious identity is configured in the equation linking economic deprivation and anti-Americanism. In a similar vein, it is not sufficient to relate individual religiosity to preference for nondemocracy. One needs to take into account economic deprivation and psychological apprehension, at least, in the equation linking religiosity and nondemocratic preference.

2.1.4.4 Norms, Beliefs, Value Preferences, and Actions

Norms, beliefs, value preferences, and actions are those pet items of political scientists and sociologists. Social surveys are a convenient research instrument to use to examine these items. Hence, we witness the accumulation of millions of works on these items that are examined in the context of democratic politics (Katznelson and Milner 2002). These items are easiest to ask in a democratic society, but not necessarily in a nondemocratic society. Inquiring about confidence in government is challenging at best in many societies. In Malaysia and Singapore, for instance, confidence in government is at the highest, whereas in South Korea, Taiwan, and Japan, confidence in government is at the lowest, according to the Asia-Europe Survey, conducted in 2000 (Blondel and Inoguchi 2006). In the former societies, it is difficult for interviewees to respond to a question negatively as they have been socialized not to express views and preferences on politics. They might be suspicious that their responses will be relayed to state security apparati. South Koreans, Taiwanese, and Japanese exhibit symptoms of disaffected democracies: most dissatisfied with democracy among all democracies in the world (Inoguchi 2003b, 2004a; Pharr and Putnam 1999). Even in democratic societies such as the

United States and the United Kingdom, what seems to be occasionally exceeding conformism and patriotism has been registered in surveys conducted in the 1950s and 1960s (Almond and Verba 1962). By conformism, we mean conformism to the belief that the United States is an established great democracy as contrasted to a democracy in the making (Burnham 1986). By patriotism, we mean the swift and solid rally around the flag once war looms large. In having a continuum of democracy in Asia from nondemocracies to established democracies, caution cannot be overstressed in comparing responses across societies.

2.1.5 Harvesting the AsiaBarometer Survey

The AsiaBarometer was first conducted in summer 2003 in ten countries: Uzbekistan, India, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia, China, South Korea, and Japan. The AsiaBarometer sourcebook contains a description of its aims and scope, fieldwork report, questionnaire, all the basic figures (tabulated and cross-tabulated) on all the questions surveyed, links, and references. Published in 2005, it appeared as a sister volume to the sourcebook of the World Values Surveys and European Values Surveys, combined and coedited by Ronald Inglehart, Miguel Basanez, and their associates at Siglo XXI editors (Inoguchi et al. 2005; Inglehart et al. 2004). The survey was a nationwide survey in principle. But for some countries, like China and India, only selected large cities were surveyed. For countries like Indonesia and Malaysia, only the island of Java and the peninsula of Malaysia were surveyed, excluding non-Java Indonesia and eastern Malaysia. Each sample size was 800, and the sampling method was a multistage random sampling in principle with some notable exceptions. Also, it was conducted through face-to-face interviews, except in Japan. All the expenditures were covered by business donations to the University of Tokyo for this purpose. The AsiaBarometer 2003 Survey was carried out by the Gallup International coalition, led by the Nippon Research Center.

After cleaning and integrating the assembled data from the ten countries, the AsiaBarometer 2003 data set was sent to prospective authors of the countries profiled, and comparative papers were drawn from academics of the ten countries to examine and analyze the data set for presentation and discussion at the AsiaBarometer conference. The AsiaBarometer conference was held on January 14–15, 2004, at the University of Tokyo with academics presenting their papers. Their revised papers were published subsequently as Discussion Papers of the Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, in March 2004. These papers were included in the aforementioned volume (Inoguchi et al. 2005). In conjunction with the AsiaBarometer conference, an open symposium was held also. It drew attention region wide. Not only Japanese, but also South Korean, Sri Lankan, and Malaysian newspapers and TV stations reported on the AsiaBarometer. Access to the data set is easy, just clicking asiabarometer.org to get permission. Besides, access to the data set can be done through two data consortiums: the Social Science Japan Data Archive (SSJDA) of the University of Tokyo and the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

Based on the success of the AsiaBarometer 2003 Survey, the 2004 survey focused on Southeast Asia and received its core funding from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Similar to the 2003 survey, the AsiaBarometer conference and symposium for the 2004 data set was held early in 2005 where local academics presented their papers. After the cleaning and integration of the data assembled from surveyed countries, country profile and comparative papers were drafted, presented, and discussed at the annual conference and symposium. A similar annual sourcebook was published like the preceding volume for 2003. A similar donation of the data set was done as was the case for the 2003 data set.

In 2004, the countries surveyed included the ASEAN countries, plus China, Japan, and South Korea. In 2005, we won the national scientific research competition, guaranteeing funds for the 2005–2008 surveys. We conducted the annual surveys starting with South Asia and Central Asia in 2005; East Asia, plus Vietnam and Singapore in 2006; Southeast Asia, minus Vietnam and Singapore in 2007; and Japan, China, India, the United States, the Russian Federation, and Australia in 2008.

2.1.6 Gauging Developmental, Democratic, and Regionalizing Potentials

It is appropriate to give our thoughts on the future of Asia, as the AsiaBarometer is to measure many issues close to people's minds and hearts. It is our conviction that conducting the AsiaBarometer every year in all parts of Asia would enable us to gauge Asia's potential for economic development, democratization, and regional integration. In this section, we discuss each of the three potentials for Asia over the next half of this century.

Economic development in Asia has a vast future. Only in various parts of Asia, most importantly in coastal East, Southeast, and South Asia, has economic development begot self-sustained momentum. Tangible fruits of self-sustained economic development affect merely some 10% of the total population of Asia. Two giants, China and India, have a long way to go before they can declare that they have reached their self-sustained and mature developmental stage. Vast population and vast space pose a formidable challenge to any engineer of economic development for China and India. Even what looks like more manageable continental Southeast Asia, Vietnam and Myanmar, for instance, require huge investments before discussing self-sustained and mature economic development. Some optimists, like Andre Gunder Frank (1998), sanguinely talk about the coming historic shift of global economic weight to the Orient; notwithstanding, Asia's economic developmental potential is huge and thus challenging. Where is the most visible turning point in terms of an economic developmental take off stage? In our view, one's desire to purchase a refrigerator in the near future and one's recent acquisition of a refrigerator seem to be a most accurate and convenient indicator of what is to come. Food purchases tend to be time consuming. No less tangible changes can be

detected by the steady increase in the sale of disposable diapers. Use of cloth diapers takes away too much precious time from a mother, a second and indispensable household earner.

Democratization in Asia has a long road ahead of it. The two largest and longest non-Western democracies, Japan and India aside, many democratizing countries remain to be more deeply democratized even in the democratic corridor of coastal East and Southeast Asia. Continental East and Southeast Asia and most of South and Central Asia require far more time before they are democratized. Take China as an example. One can wait patiently believing that once per capita national income goes beyond a certain threshold, democracy is bound to come. Alternatively, the Gorbachev syndrome may work. During a transition period, the failure to make its policy transparent and accountable to the public, as in the case of SARS in 2003, would make this process faster. A likely collapse of an accumulating bubble of the Chinese economy in the aftermath of the Olympic Games in Beijing in 2008 would make it much faster. In our view, one tangible indicator of democratization in the initial stage is the reverse of two contrasting options to the question, "Generally, do you think people can be trusted or do you think that you can't be too careful in dealing with people? (1) Most people can be trusted; (2) Can't be too careful in dealing with people." More operationally clear is whether a certain survey question is approved or dropped at the request of the government. Even before formal democratization takes place, de facto democratization will start creeping in once the government approves, for instance, the question on confidence in institutions.

Regionalizing potentials are more difficult to grasp with the questionnaire. Questions on identities, primary and secondary and tertiary, would enable one to be more precise on such potentials once questions about subregional identities, such as East Asian, are included. Take a look at Japan, South Korea, and China. Japan has a long way to go before they forge a regional identity. Those Japanese who think their Asianness is the next most important identity after national identity are at some 60%, whereas South Koreans on this question are at 96%. Chinese secondary identity appears to be more parochial, such as Fukienese and Siquanese, rather than going more regional such as Asian. They seem to stick to the formula of Chinese versus the rest at each level. But if free trade agreements are concluded among the three, the picture may well quickly change. South Koreans and Chinese are ardent in their support of this issue, whereas Japanese remain cautious in moving in that direction. Equally complex pictures may be drawn for Southeast Asia, South Asia, and Central Asia.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 Countries/Societies

The AsiaBarometer conducted surveys in 29 Asian countries and societies, namely, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India,

Table 2.1 Societies and years the AsiaBarometer survey was conducted with sample size

	Society	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
1	Afghanistan			874			
2	Australia						(1,000)
3	Bangladesh			1,008			
4	Bhutan			801			
5	Brunei		804				
6	Cambodia		812			1,012	
7	China	800	1,000		2,000		1,000
8	Hong Kong				1,000		
9	India	822		1,238			1,052
10	Indonesia		825			1,000	
11	Japan	857	825		1,003		1,012
12	Kazakhstan			800			
13	Kyrgyzstan			800			
14	Laos		800			1,000	
15	Malaysia	800	800			1,000	
16	Maldives			821			
17	Mongolia			800			
18	Myanmar	800	800			1,000	
19	Nepal			800			
20	Pakistan			1,086			
21	Philippines		800			1,000	
22	Russia						(1,055)
23	Singapore		800		1,038		
24	South Korea	800	819		1,023		
25	Sri Lanka	800		813			
26	Taiwan				1,006		
27	Tajikistan			800			
28	Thailand	800	800			1,000	
29	Turkmenistan			800			
30	United States						(1,002)
31	Uzbekistan	800		800			
32	Vietnam	807	800		1,000		
Total	52,215 (49,158)	8,086	10,685	12,241	8,070	7,012	6,121

Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam, plus three non-Asian countries (Australia, Russia, and the United States) during the period from 2003 to 2008. Table 2.1 shows which country/society is surveyed in which year with what sample size. The grand total number of observations is 52,215. The sample size of 29 Asian countries/societies is 49,158. This research utilizes the sample of these 29 countries and societies in Asia.

2.2.2 *Sampling Methods of the AsiaBarometer Survey*

Nationwide and stratified random sampling methods were utilized in principal. But in some cases due to such problems as public security and costs, quota sampling methods were applied. For more details about which sampling method was utilized in which country in which year, refer to the AsiaBarometer website at www.asiabarometer.org.

References

Acharya, A. (2002). *Regionalism and multilateralism*. Singapore: International Specialized Book Service.

Almond, G., & Verba, S. (1962). *The civic culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bian, Y. (1994). *Work and inequality in urban china*. Albany: State University of New York.

Blondel, J. (2003, May 6–7). *European consortium for political research*. Paper presented at the AsiaBarometer Symposium, Tokyo.

Blondel, J., & Inoguchi, T. (2006). *Political cultures in Asia and Europe: Citizens, states and societal values*. London: Routledge.

Burnham, W. D. (1986). *Democracy in the making: American government and politics*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Butler, R., & Stokes, D. (1976). *Political change in Britain: The evolution of electoral choice*. London: Palgrave-Macmilliam.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Chu, Y. (2003, May 6–7). *The East Asian democracy barometers*. Paper presented at the AsiaBarometer Symposium, Tokyo.

Diamond, L., & Morelino, L. (2004). The quality of democracy: An overview. *Journal of Democracy, 15*(4), 20–31.

Farr, J., & Seidelman, R. (Eds.). (1993). *Discipline and history: Political science in the United States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Featherman, D. (2001). Infrastructure of social and behavioral research in the United States. In N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (Vol. 11, pp. 7503–7511). Oxford: Elsevier.

Featherman, D. (2003, May 6–7). *Reflections on the evolution of a "social hubble": Survey research as a telescope on societies around the globe*. Paper presented at the AsiaBarometer Symposium, Tokyo.

Frank, A. G. (1998). *Re-orient: Global economy in the Asian age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fukuyama, F. (1997). *Trust: Social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Gilani Research Foundation. (2010). *Theory as practice of global surveys: Paradigmatic shift in methodology of global sampling: From 'state-centric' to 'global-centric'*. Islamabad: Gilani Research Foundation.

Guerrero, L. L. (2003, May 6–7). *Social weather stations: Asia's oldest barometer*. Paper presented at the AsiaBarometer Symposium, Tokyo.

Halman, L., Inglehart, R., Diez-medrano, J., Luijkx, R., Moreno, A., & Basanez, M. (2007). *Changing values and beliefs in 85 countries: Trend from the values surveys from 1981 to 2004*. Leiden: Brill.

Hardin, R. (2006). *Trust*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Held, D., & Koenig-Archibugi, M. (2003). *Taming globalization: Frontiers of governance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Hibbs, D. A. (1993). *Solidarity of egoism? The economics of sociotropic and egocentric influences on political behavior*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
Hirschmann, A. (1970). *Exit, voice and loyalty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Huntington, S. P. (1981). *American politics: The power of disharmony*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Huntington, S. P. (1991). *The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Inglehart, R. (1977). *The silent revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and post-modernization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Inglehart, R., Basanez, M., Moreno, A., et al. (1998). *Human values and beliefs: A cross-cultural sourcebook: Political, religions, sexual and economic norms in 43 countries*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Inglehart, R., Basanez, M., et al. (Eds.). (2004). *Human beliefs and values: A cross-cultural sourcebook based on the 1999–2002 values surveys*. Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
Inoguchi, T. (1995). Democracy and the development of political science in Japan. In D. Easton, J. Gunnell, & M. Stein (Eds.), *Regime and discipline* (pp. 269–293). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Inoguchi, T. (2002a). *AsiaBarometer no setsuritsu wo mezase* (Let us do an Asian-wide opinion poll every year). *Chuo Koron* (Central Review), *117*(7), 150–155.
Inoguchi, T. (2002b). Infrastructure of social and behavioral sciences: Japan and Korea. In N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (Vol. II, pp. 7489–7493). Oxford: Elsevier.
Inoguchi, T. (2002c). Broadening the basis of social capital in Japan. In R. Putnam (Ed.), *Democracies in flux: The evolution of social capital in contemporary society* (pp. 358–392, 481–489). New York: Oxford University Press.
Inoguchi, T. (2002d). Japanese political science looks toward 2006. *Participation, 26*(3), 17–20.
Inoguchi, T. (2002e, January 14–15). *Governance across borders in Northeast Asia: Shaping and sharing identities, ideas, interests and institutions*. Paper presented at the EU-UNU symposium on Governance Across Borders, United Nations University Headquarters, Tokyo.
Inoguchi, T. (2003a). The final report of project: *Minshushugino kino fuzen no rironteki-jisshoteki kenkyu* (No. 11102001, April 1999–March 2003).
Inoguchi, T. (2003b). *Gendai Nihon Seiji: Fuhen to Tokui* (Contemporary Japanese politics: The universal and the idiosyncratic). Tokyo: NTT Shuppan.
Inoguchi, T. (2004a). *Seijibunka to Globalization* [Political cultures and globalization]. Tokyo: NTT Shuppan.
Inoguchi, T., & Bacon, P. (2003). Governance, democracy consolidation and the "end of transition". *Japanese Journal of Political Science, 3*(2), 169–190.
Inoguchi, T., & Blondel, J. (2008). *Citizens and the states: Attitudes in Western Europe and East and Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.
Inoguchi, T., & Marsh, I. (2007). *Globalization, public opinion and the State: Western Europe and East and Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.
Inoguchi, T., Basanez, M., Tanaka, A., & Dadabaev, T. (Eds.). (2005). *Values and lifestyles in Asia: A cross-cultural sourcebook of the AsiaBarometer 2003 survey*. Mexico: Siglo Veintuno Editores.
Kabashima, I. (1998). *Seiken Kotai to Yukensha no Taido Henyo* (Regional change and attitudinal change of electorates). Tokyo: Bokutakusha.
Katznelson, I., & Milner, H. (Eds.). (2002). *Political science: The state of the discipline*. New York: Norton.
Miller, W. E., & Shanks, J. M. (1996). *The new American voter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Miyake, I. (1985). *Seito Shiji no Bunseki* (An analysis of party support). Tokyo: Sobunsha.

Oren, I. (2003). *Our enemies and us: America's rivalries and the making of political science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Osaka University of Commerce and University of Tokyo. (2002). *Nihonban General Social Surveys JGSS-2000 Kisoshukeihyo codebook (Japanese General Social Survey source book)*. Tokyo: Institute of Social Sciences, University of Tokyo.
Pharr, S., & Putnam, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Disaffected democracies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Przeworsky, A., & Teune, H. J. (1970). *Logic of comparative social inquiry*. New York: Krieger.
Putnam, R. (1993). *Bowling alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Ravenhill, J. (2001). *APEC and the construction of Pacific rim regionalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rose, R. (1989). *Ordinary people in public policy*. London: Macmillan.
Rose, R., & Munro, N. (2003). Elections and parties in New European democracies. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
Shin, D. C. (2003, May 6–7). *The Korea democracy barometer surveys*. Paper presented at the AsiaBarometer Symposium, Tokyo.
Solingen, E. (1998). *Regional orders at century's dawn: Global and domestic influences on grand strategy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Stouffer, S., et al. (1945). *American soldier: Adjustment during army life*. New York: Sunflower University Press.
Watanuki, J., & Miyake, I. (1997). *Kankyo Hendo to Taido Hen'yo* (Attitudinal changes under environmental change). Tokyo: Bokutakusha.

Chapter 3
Overall Quality of Life in Asia

The following three sections compare overall evaluations of well-being. It compares the extent to which people experience feelings of happiness, enjoyment, and achievement and identifies the specific components of global well-being. One way to assess their subjective quality of life is that people consider all the things that they deem significant to them and thus judge the overall quality of their lives (Shin and Inoguchi 2009).

3.1 Levels of Happiness

This section focuses on the extent to which the Asian people experience feelings of happiness in life across the 29 Asian countries/societies. The AsiaBarometer Survey asked respondents, on a five-point verbal scale in all the surveys from 2003 to 2008, if "All things considered, would you say that you are happy these days?" The response categories are "very happy," "quite happy," "neither happy nor unhappy," "not too happy," and "very unhappy" with a "don't know" category. This question was not asked only in the 2004 China Survey. In the 2003 and 2004 questionnaires, the second choice was coded as "pretty happy." Table 3.1 shows the distribution of survey responses across the five categories, ranging from "very happy" to "very unhappy" by country/society. Of the entire sample size of 47,958, "don't know" responses and missing values were excluded. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very unhappy) to a high of 5 (very happy), the mean of this variable is 3.7 with a standard deviation of 0.93.

The last row of Table 3.1 shows that one-fifth (20%) of all the respondents in Asia reported they are very happy, more than two-fifths (45%) say they are quite happy, one-fourth (25%) reported they are neither happy nor unhappy, slightly less than one-tenth (8%) say they are not too happy, and only a few (2%) reported they are very unhappy. In combining the two positive replies together, a substantive majority of the people in Asia (65%) is shown to be living happy lives. Those who

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0_3,

Table 3.1 Self-assessments of happiness (%)

	Very happy	Quite happy	Neither happy nor unhappy	Not too happy	Very unhappy	PDI
Brunei	51.2	43.5	3.9	1.4	0.0	93.3
Maldives	41.3	45.9	7.3	3.8	1.7	81.7
Malaysia	26.6	57.5	10.5	5.1	0.3	78.7
Bhutan	35.2	47.6	12.6	4.3	0.3	78.2
Sri Lanka	24.6	59.5	9.5	5.5	1.0	77.6
Singapore	27.7	51.9	14.4	4.9	1.1	73.6
Philippines	35.0	45.1	12.7	6.2	1.0	72.9
Thailand	18.7	58.2	16.9	5.5	0.8	70.6
India	37.4	36.2	20.3	5.0	1.2	67.4
Indonesia	14.1	61.1	16.4	7.8	0.5	66.9
Bangladesh	15.2	59.8	14.4	7.7	2.9	64.4
Laos	14.3	57.1	18.4	9.7	0.5	61.2
Vietnam	35.9	25.4	37.0	1.5	0.2	59.6
China	18.2	44.0	31.5	4.7	1.6	55.9
Japan	14.9	47.1	31.4	6.0	0.7	55.3
Myanmar	14.4	48.7	25.6	9.4	1.8	51.9
Mongolia	4.4	56.5	29.3	9.4	0.4	51.1
Hong Kong	6.6	44.0	46.1	2.2	1.0	47.4
Nepal	9.1	54.8	15.9	11.9	8.3	43.7
Taiwan	16.5	33.7	40.5	7.2	2.2	40.8
South Korea	9.5	44.2	32.1	12.8	1.4	39.5
Pakistan	14.2	39.2	29.8	13.3	3.6	36.5
Turkmenistan	14.7	35.7	35.5	8.0	6.2	36.2
Uzbekistan	13.0	43.7	21.2	18.6	3.6	34.5
Afghanistan	16.5	24.0	48.2	9.6	1.7	29.2
Kyrgyzstan	12.6	40.8	12.8	22.3	11.5	19.6
Cambodia	4.6	20.1	64.0	10.0	1.3	13.4
Kazakhstan	5.8	33.5	20.4	29.7	10.5	−0.9
Tajikistan	3.1	29.8	30.8	29.1	7.1	−3.3
Total	19.9	45.1	25.0	8.1	1.8	55.1

have unhappy lives, on the other hand, constitute a small minority of one-tenth (10%). In the region of Asia, over six times as many people live a happy life as live an unhappy life.

Table 3.1 also shows that the proportions of each category vary considerably from one society to another. For example, the proportions of "very happy" vary from only a few (3.1%) in Tajikistan, Mongolia (4.4%), and Cambodia (4.6) to almost a half (51%) in Brunei. To compare the levels of avowed happiness among 29 countries and societies over one variable, we rank the 29 countries and societies based on the percentage difference index (PDI), namely, the sum of the two positive categories ("very happy" and "quite happy"), minus the sum of the two negative categories ("not too happy" and "very unhappy"). The PDI variable takes on the value from negative 100 to positive 100. According to the PDI reported in the last column of Table 3.1, Brunei emerges as the greatest nation of happiness with a positive 93 points on this index. It is followed

by Maldives, Malaysia, Bhutan, and Sri Lanka. A vast majority (95%) of the Bruneian respondents rated themselves as very happy or quite happy. Overwhelming majorities (87% and 85%, respectively) of the people of the Maldives and Malaysia say they are very happy or quite happy these days.

Conversely, the people of Tajikistan are least likely to live a happy life with the lowest value on the PDI score in Asia at a negative 3 points. The people in Kazakhstan and Cambodia are the second and third least likely to express happiness. About one-third (33%) of the respondents of Tajikistan say they are very happy or quite happy these days, whereas more than one-third (36%) say they are not too happy or very unhappy. About two-fifths (40%) of respondents in Kazakhstan and one-fourth (25%) of the respondents in Cambodia reported they are very happy or quite happy these days, compared to more than two-fifths (41%) and about one-tenth (11%) who indicated that they are not too happy or very unhappy. We also note that only two countries Tajikistan and Kazakhstan have a negative value on the PDI.

Although feelings of happiness vary widely in the Asian region, generally speaking, people in Asia experience more happiness than unhappiness.

3.2 Levels of Enjoyment

This section compares the extent to which the Asian people experience feelings of enjoyment in life. The AsiaBarometer Survey asked respondents on a four-point verbal scale in the surveys from 2006 to 2008: "How often do you feel you are really enjoying life these days?" The response categories include "often," "sometimes," "rarely," and "never," along with a "don't know" category. This question was asked in 15 countries and societies (see Table 3.2). The sample size is 18,106 without the "don't know" responses and missing values.

Of the four response categories, Table 3.2 shows that over one-half (53%) of the respondents chose "sometimes." This category was followed by "often" (28%), "rarely" (17%), and "never" (2%). When we rescaled the original four-category verbal scale into a four-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (often) to a high of 4 (never), the mean of this variable is 3.1 with a standard deviation of 0.72.

When the two positive categories are considered together, an overwhelming majority of four-fifths (81%) is shown to be enjoying life. Those who do not express feelings of enjoyment, on the other hand, constitute a minority of one-fourth (19%). In the region, although we use only a subsample of 15 countries and societies, four times as many people live an enjoyable life as live an unenjoyable life.

Table 3.2 also shows that the proportions of each category vary considerably from society to society, just as Table 3.2 does on levels of happiness. For example, the proportions of "often" vary from about one-eighth (13%) in Taiwan to about one-half (51%) in Vietnam. To compare the levels of enjoyment in 15 countries and societies, we combine the two positive ratings (often and sometimes) and the two negative ratings (rarely and never) and constructed a percentage difference index (PDI) by subtracting the combined ratings of the latter from those of the former. According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 3.2, Vietnam

Table 3.2 Self-assessments of enjoyment (%)

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	PDI
Vietnam	50.7	44.5	4.1	0.7	90.4
Malaysia	45.4	44.9	8.9	0.7	80.7
Laos	27.0	62.8	9.4	0.8	79.6
Cambodia	13.1	76.2	9.6	1.1	78.6
Singapore	34.3	54.2	10.0	1.5	77.0
Thailand	40.4	47.8	11.4	0.4	76.4
Philippines	35.9	51.9	11.7	0.5	75.6
India	38.4	45.0	15.0	1.5	66.9
Indonesia	30.4	52.9	15.3	1.4	66.6
Japan	21.2	59.3	18.4	1.1	61.0
Myanmar	25.2	52.3	19.8	2.7	55.0
China	22.0	53.4	21.1	3.5	50.8
South Korea	17.0	52.0	28.0	3.0	38.0
Hong Kong	16.9	45.5	32.0	5.6	24.8
Taiwan	12.9	48.7	34.4	3.9	23.3
Total	27.6	53.2	17.2	2.0	61.6

emerges as the nation with the greatest level of enjoyment in life with a positive 90 points, then followed by Malaysia with a positive 81 points. If the two positive categories are combined together, over 90% of the people of Vietnam and Malaysia are shown to be living an enjoyable life.

Table 3.2 shows the people of Taiwan, on the other hand, are least likely to live an enjoyable life with the lowest value on the PDI score at a negative 23 points. The people in Hong Kong are shown to be the second least likely to express enjoyment. About three-fifths in both societies chose either "often" or "sometimes" of the four categories, whereas about two-fifths reported "rarely" or "never."

All in all, the PDI values are positive in all the 15 countries and societies surveyed, and on average of the sample of those countries and societies, four times as many people live an enjoyable life as live an unenjoyable life. Feelings of enjoyment are prevalent in these Asian countries and societies.

3.3 Levels of Achievement

This section compares the extent to which Asian people experience feelings of achievement in life. The AsiaBarometer Survey from 2006 to 2008 asked respondents: "How much do you feel you are accomplishing what you want out of your life?" The four response categories offered ranged from "a great deal," "some," "very little," and "none," with a "don't know" category. This question was asked in 15 countries and societies with a sample size of 18,053, excluding "don't know" responses and missing values. See Table 2.1 for in which country in which year this question was asked with its sample size. Table 3.3 reports the distribution of survey responses across these four response categories for each country and society. Of the whole sample, one-eighth (12%) of all the respondents reported a great deal of achievement, over one-half (56%) reported some achievement, one-fourth (27%) reported very little achievement,

Table 3.3 Self-assessments of achievement (%)

	A great deal	Some	Very little	None	PDI
Laos	18.8	71.4	8.2	1.6	80.4
India	31.7	53.0	12.3	3.1	69.3
Indonesia	25.4	59.0	14.0	1.6	68.8
Malaysia	23.7	58.1	16.2	2.0	63.6
Singapore	16.9	59.1	20.7	3.2	52.1
Philippines	23.6	51.4	20.6	4.4	50.0
Thailand	9.4	65.5	16.9	8.2	49.8
Vietnam	15.6	54.5	28.7	1.2	40.2
Japan	6.4	60.1	30.3	3.2	33.0
China	7.0	57.0	29.0	7.0	28.0
Hong Kong	7.3	48.4	38.7	5.5	11.5
Cambodia	5.0	50.5	40.7	3.8	11.0
Myanmar	2.9	51.0	42.3	3.8	7.8
Taiwan	4.5	48.9	39.2	7.3	6.9
South Korea	3.6	46.6	45.3	4.4	0.5
Total	12.4	56.0	27.3	4.3	36.8

and only a few (4.3%) reported no achievement. When we rescaled the original four-category verbal scale into a four-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (none) to a high of 4 (a great deal), the mean of this variable is 2.8 with a standard deviation of 0.72. In all the 15 countries and societies, "some" achievement constitutes the majority of responses.

To compare the levels of the feelings of achievement in each society, we construct the percentage difference index (PDI) again by subtracting the combined two negative ratings ("very little" and "none") from the combined two positive ratings ("a great deal" and "some"). Table 3.3 ranks 15 societies according to the PDI scores reported in the last column of the table. Table 3.3 shows the people of Laos are the most likely to feel achievement with a positive 80 points on this index, whereas the South Korean people are least likely to feel accomplishment with a positive 1 point on this index. An overwhelming majority (90%) of the respondents of Laos reported a great deal or some achievement, compared to about one-half (50%) of the South Korean respondents who reported a great deal or some achievement and about one-half (50%) of them who reported very little or no achievement.

Although the PDI values are positive in all 15 countries and societies, the values of the bottom three societies, South Korea, Taiwan, and Myanmar, are low, with positive and negative feelings being almost equally divided in their assessments of life achievements. In these societies, feelings of achievement are not dominant, but in some societies, such as Laos, India, Indonesia, and Malaysia, feelings of achievement in life are dominant.

Reference

Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (2009). Avowed happiness in Confucian Asia: Ascertaining its distribution, patterns, and sources. *Social Indicators Research, 92*, 405–427.

Chapter 4
Satisfaction Levels with Specific Life Domains

In addition to assessing quality of life from a global perspective, we assess it at the level of specific life domains. The AsiaBarometer asked respondents to "Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following aspects of your life." Respondents answered on a five-point verbal scale of "very satisfied," "somewhat satisfied," "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied," "somewhat dissatisfied," and "very dissatisfied," with a "don't know" category. The 16 specific life domains include housing, friendships, marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, public safety, the condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The 16 items are included in all the questionnaires from 2003 to 2008, with only the last item "spiritual life" being added from 2005 to 2008. The third item "marriage" was asked to only married respondents. Table 4.1 reports and compares the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories that range from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" for the 16 life domains.

In which life domains do the people in Asia feel most satisfied with? First, to identify which life domain has the highest and lowest level of satisfaction within the entire region of Asia, we combine the two positive ratings (very satisfied and somewhat satisfied) and two negative ratings (somewhat dissatisfied and very dissatisfied) and construct a percentage difference index (PDI) by subtracting the combined ratings of the latter from the former. According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.1, marriage emerges as the domain with the highest level of satisfaction within Asia with a positive 84 points on this index. The next highest levels in descending order are friendships (+77), family life (+74), and neighbors (+67). Conversely, Asian people find themselves least satisfied with the social welfare system (+17), followed by the democratic system (+27), and household income (+31).

Next, to examine how the Asian people distinguish life spheres, we performed factor analysis on the 16 life domains and estimated the closeness of their relations. Some life domains are more closely related to each other than are others, and we attempt to group the domains into wider categories of life spheres. Here, we factor analyzed the entire pooled samples. We used principal factors solution with

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0_4,

Table 4.1 Self-assesments of specific life domain (entire sample) (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Marriage	52.0	34.6	10.6	2.0	0.8	83.8
Friendships	33.6	46.8	16.5	2.4	0.7	77.3
Family life	34.8	44.1	16.6	3.6	1.0	74.3
Neighbors	26.3	45.6	23.0	4.0	1.2	66.7
Health	28.6	41.8	17.9	9.4	2.4	58.6
Spiritual life	25.5	40.4	25.9	6.1	2.1	57.7
Housing	30.1	40.4	16.0	10.0	3.4	57.1
Leisure	21.1	42.5	24.6	8.7	3.0	51.9
Standard of living	17.7	42.5	26.6	10.4	2.9	46.9
Education	20.3	39.8	25.1	11.8	3.1	45.2
Job	17.8	38.6	26.0	12.6	5.0	38.8
Public safety	18.3	38.0	25.1	14.1	4.5	37.7
Condition of the environment	14.8	38.9	26.7	15.0	4.6	34.1
Household income	13.4	38.9	26.4	16.2	5.0	31.1
Democratic system	11.5	35.9	31.8	14.2	6.6	26.6
Social welfare system	10.1	32.5	31.4	18.2	7.8	16.6

Note: Spiritual life was asked only after 2005. The samples of all the surveys from 2003 to 2008 are used. The rest of all domains were asked in all the surveys from 2003 to 2008

orthogonal varimax rotation. The pooled samples are not entirely scientific in that each country's samples are not necessarily proportional to the population of each country. Yet to grasp Asia-wide pictures of self-assessment of happiness and its principal factors, we have carried out such an analysis. Table 4.2 shows how 16 life spheres are distinguished into factors or life spheres by the Asian respondents, and Table 4.3 reports eigenvalues associated with each factor. Since the last item spiritual life was asked only in the questionnaires from 2005 to 2008, the Brunei sample, surveyed in 2004, is not included.

The first group of six domains, that is, housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job, displays primary loadings on the first factor, meaning they are most related to the first factor. The first factor has eigenvalue of 5.410, overwhelming the eigenvalues of the succeeding factors that are below 1.0. We may call the first group the materialist sphere of life, as domains in this sphere are more or less related to basic survival needs an individual requires when we apply the arguments of Ronald Inglehart (1971, 2006) and Inglehart and Paul Abramson (1994). We may also call the first factor the QOL-sustaining factor.

According to factor loadings, the second factor is most related to friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. We may call this group of six domains the post-materialist sphere of life as these domains are related to the aspects of life that people can choose more freely and are allowed to exercise more self-expression, again following the same arguments laid out by Inglehart (1971, 2006)

Table 4.2 Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments

	Factors			
	Materialist	Post-materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Housing	0.46			0.67
Standard of living	0.69			0.66
Household income	0.72			0.60
Health	0.42			0.43
Education	0.51			0.42
Job	0.58			0.68
Friendships		0.49		0.63
Marriage		0.57		0.58
Neighbors		0.46		0.69
Family life		0.59		0.52
Leisure		0.44		0.52
Spiritual life		0.49		0.45
Public safety			0.65	0.58
Condition of the environment			0.66	0.53
Social welfare system			0.69	0.57
Democratic system			0.61	0.56

Note: The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation. Loadings of greater than 0.30 were reported. The samples only after 2005 are used because Spiritual life was asked only after 2005. So, the Brunei sample is not included

Table 4.3 Entire Asia

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.410
Factor 2	0.979
Factor 3	0.527
Factor 4	0.273
Factor 5	0.172
Factor 6	0.101
Factor 7	0.046
Factor 8	−0.041
Factor 9	−0.050
Factor 10	−0.122
Factor 11	−0.138
Factor 12	−0.144
Factor 13	−0.154
Factor 14	−0.164
Factor 15	−0.182
Factor 16	−0.194
n	16,153

and Inglehart and Abramson (1994). We may also call this second factor the QOL-enriching factor.

The third group of four domains includes public safety, the condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system, all of which have larger factor loadings on the third factor. We call this group the public sphere of life as domains in this sphere are mostly connected with conditions of community and

national life (Park 2009) and are categorized differently from the materialist/post-materialist dimension. We may also call this third factor the QOL-enabling factor.

In which life sphere do the Asian people find themselves most and least satisfied? According to the information given from Table 4.1, the Asian people find themselves most satisfied with domains in the post-materialist sphere of life. All the domains in the post-materialist sphere of life are rated above +50 on the PDI values. The PDI values for six domains are friendships (+77), marriage (+84), neighbors (+67), family life (+74), leisure (+52), and spiritual life (+58) (see Table 4.1). The domains in this sphere are all ranked within the top eight: friendships (2nd), marriage (1st), neighbors (4th), family life (3rd), leisure (8th), and spiritual life (6th).

On the other hand, the people in Asia find themselves least satisfied with the domains in the public sphere of life. All the domains in the public life sphere are rated under positive 40 on the PDI scores: public safety (+38), the condition of the environment (+34), social welfare system (+17), and democratic system (+27). The domains are also ranked low: public safety (12th), the condition of the environment (13th), social welfare system (16th), and democratic system (15th).

Ranked between the post-materialist life sphere and the public life sphere is the materialist sphere of life. The people of Asia rated housing with a positive 57 points on the PDI and ranked it 7th, rated standard of living with a positive 47 points and ranked it 9th, rated household income with a positive 31 points and ranked it 14th, rated health with a positive 59 points and ranked it 5th, rated education with a positive 45 points and ranked it 10th, and rated job with a positive 39 points on the PDI and ranked it 11th.

Now that we know the Asian people find themselves most satisfied with the domains in the post-materialist sphere of life and least satisfied with the domains in the public life sphere, we can identify and compare the particular domains and spheres of domains most and least satisfied within each country and society.

4.1 Materialist Life Sphere

Table 4.2 groups into the materialist sphere of life the following six domains: housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job.

4.1.1 Housing

"Housing" is rated with a positive 57 points on the PDI values and ranked seventh in the 16 domains according to the last column of Table 4.1. This domain is grouped into the materialist sphere of life according to Table 4.2. About one-third (30%) of all the respondents of the 29 countries and societies are satisfied with their housing, two-fifths (40%) are somewhat satisfied, one-tenth (10%) are somewhat dissatisfied,

Table 4.4 Satisfaction with housing (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	64.0	30.5	3.1	2.4	0.0	92.1
Afghanistan	70.6	20.2	4.9	2.2	2.1	86.5
India	59.9	29.8	4.9	3.5	1.9	84.3
Singapore	30.2	56.6	9.3	3.3	0.6	82.9
Sri Lanka	46.8	40.6	4.3	4.5	3.8	79.1
Bhutan	39.0	45.7	8.4	5.1	1.8	77.8
Maldives	54.0	30.2	7.5	4.0	4.3	75.9
Pakistan	38.2	44.7	9.2	6.0	1.9	75.0
Indonesia	43.6	37.8	8.9	8.4	1.2	71.8
Thailand	39.7	41.4	8.3	9.7	0.9	70.5
Nepal	13.0	67.5	7.1	10.3	2.1	68.1
Malaysia	25.8	53.5	9.3	9.9	1.4	68.0
Philippines	38.7	40.7	8.9	8.1	3.6	67.7
Laos	37.9	42.0	6.2	13.1	0.9	65.9
Bangladesh	31.3	45.6	9.0	9.3	4.8	62.8
Tajikistan	27.9	48.3	7.8	10.3	5.9	60.0
Kazakhstan	26.4	48.1	9.0	12.0	4.5	58.0
Myanmar	23.5	49.5	11.4	11.3	4.2	57.5
Taiwan	13.2	45.3	33.5	7.0	1.0	50.5
Cambodia	34.2	26.6	27.7	8.9	2.5	49.4
Japan	19.2	46.2	18.2	12.9	3.4	49.1
Mongolia	29.7	33.6	20.0	10.6	6.0	46.7
Kyrgyzstan	24.0	44.3	8.4	13.8	9.4	45.1
Hong Kong	4.9	49.9	34.7	9.6	0.9	44.3
Vietnam	32.7	23.4	28.9	11.5	3.4	41.2
South Korea	8.1	44.1	34.2	11.0	2.6	38.6
Uzbekistan	19.0	42.7	13.6	17.0	7.8	36.9
China	11.6	33.6	32.3	15.6	6.9	22.7
Turkmenistan	13.0	20.8	25.0	25.6	15.6	−7.4
Total	30.1	40.4	16.0	10.0	3.4	57.1

Note: Reported in percentages

and only a few (3%) are very dissatisfied with their housing. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.8 with a standard deviation of 1.1.

Looking at the survey results by country, the percentages of those satisfied and dissatisfied vary across nations. To compare the levels of satisfaction with housing across the 29 countries and societies in Asia, Table 4.4 reports the distribution of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" within each society, and the PDIs by subtracting the two combined negative ratings (the sum of "very unsatisfied" and "somewhat unsatisfied") from the two combined positive ratings (the sum of "very satisfied and somewhat satisfied").

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.4, Brunei emerges as the country where the people are the most satisfied with their housing with a positive 92 points on the PDI. It is followed by Afghanistan with a positive 87 points on the PDI and India with a positive 84 points on the PDI.

In contrast, the people of Turkmenistan are the least likely to be satisfied with housing with a negative 7 points on the PDI, followed by China that scored a positive 23 points on the PDI and Uzbekistan that scored a positive 37 points on the PDI variable.

The PDI values vary considerably from a low of negative 7 points in Turkmenistan to a high of positive 92 points in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two positive ratings ("very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied") vary from a low of 34% in Turkmenistan to a high of 95% in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two negative ratings ("somewhat dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied") vary from a high of 41% in Turkmenistan to a low of 2% in Brunei.

4.1.2 Standard of Living

"Standard of living" is rated with a positive 47 points on the PDI values and ranked ninth in the 16th domains according to Table 4.1. The people of Asia viewed this domain as a materialist domain according to the factor analysis reported in Table 4.2. Of the five response categories, Table 4.5 shows that "somewhat satisfied" was the most popular choice with a plurality of two-fifths (43%) of the entire Asian sample. This category was followed by "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (27%), "very satisfied" (18%), "somewhat dissatisfied" (10%), and "very dissatisfied" (3%). When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.6 with a standard deviation of 1.0.

Looking at the survey results by country, the percentages of those satisfied and dissatisfied vary considerably across nations. Nepal which is ranked fifth on the PDI rated the standard of living as "very satisfied" for less than one-tenth (9%) of the respondents and "somewhat satisfied" for the great majority (73%). To compare the levels of satisfaction with the standard of living in life across the 29 countries and societies in Asia, Table 4.5 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" within each society and the PDIs. The PDI values vary considerably from a low of a positive 0.2 points in Mongolia to a high of a positive 92 points in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two positive ratings ("very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied") vary from a low of 28% in Vietnam to a high of 94% in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two negative ratings ("somewhat dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied") vary from a high of 39% in Turkmenistan to a low of 2% in Brunei.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.5, Brunei emerges as the country where the people find themselves the most satisfied with their

Table 4.5 Satisfaction with standard of living (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	56.4	37.9	3.6	2.1	0.0	92.2
Maldives	56.1	34.2	7.0	1.8	0.9	87.6
Bhutan	30.6	57.3	9.3	2.3	0.5	85.1
India	45.0	39.9	12.1	2.2	0.8	81.9
Nepal	9.2	73.4	9.5	6.9	1.0	74.7
Malaysia	21.4	58.5	13.3	6.3	0.5	73.1
Sri Lanka	23.8	54.8	12.3	5.5	3.7	69.4
Philippines	27.8	51.4	10.6	7.8	2.4	69.0
Singapore	17.5	58.3	16.9	6.3	1.0	68.5
Thailand	22.2	54.1	11.2	11.7	0.8	63.8
Bangladesh	22.2	51.1	14.3	10.0	2.3	61.0
Indonesia	16.4	51.5	18.8	12.3	0.9	54.7
Afghanistan	24.8	41.7	20.7	10.5	2.3	53.7
Laos	13.4	54.3	16.8	14.9	0.7	52.1
Myanmar	11.9	55.3	17.7	12.3	2.8	52.1
Pakistan	18.6	45.8	23.2	10.7	1.8	51.9
Taiwan	4.5	40.0	49.0	6.5	0.1	37.9
Japan	9.4	44.1	29.7	13.6	3.2	36.7
Tajikistan	15.0	42.3	18.8	18.3	5.8	33.2
Cambodia	16.2	27.2	45.3	9.3	1.9	32.2
Kazakhstan	14.6	44.6	13.1	19.1	8.5	31.6
Hong Kong	1.8	36.1	53.5	7.9	0.7	29.3
Kyrgyzstan	16.7	39.6	16.6	17.1	10.0	29.2
China	7.5	30.4	47.1	12.6	2.4	22.9
Vietnam	9.5	18.0	63.6	7.4	1.5	18.6
South Korea	2.5	30.5	50.5	13.5	3.0	16.5
Uzbekistan	9.1	34.6	24.9	20.2	11.2	12.3
Turkmenistan	41.3	8.3	11.4	7.7	31.2	10.7
Mongolia	7.3	23.7	38.3	23.4	7.4	0.2
Total	17.7	42.5	26.6	10.4	2.9	46.9

Note: Reported in percentages

standard of living with a positive 92 points on the PDI. It is followed by the Maldives with a positive 88 points on the PDI and Bhutan with a positive 85 points on the PDI.

In comparison, the people of Mongolia are the least likely to be satisfied with their standard of living in life with a positive 0.2 points on the PDI. The people of Mongolia appear to be divided in their assessment of satisfaction with their standard of living in life. One-thirteenth (7%) reported "very satisfied" and about one-quarter (24%) reported "somewhat satisfied." Similarly, about one-quarter (23%) reported "somewhat dissatisfied" and one-thirteenth reported "very dissatisfied." Those giving negative responses are as common as those giving positive responses. The people of Mongolia in terms of their satisfaction levels are followed by the people of Turkmenistan with a positive 11 points on the PDI and the people in Uzbekistan with a positive 12 points on the PDI variable. We also note that, although the people of Hong

Kong and Vietnam rated their standard of living lower in Asia on the PDI values (22nd and 25th respectively), they are less likely to have negative feelings toward their standard of living (9%) when the two negative replies are considered together. More broadly, in Asian societies, a great inequality exists in rating the level of satisfaction with the standard of living in the lives of ordinary people.

4.1.3 Household Income

Of the five response categories, Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.6 shows that for household income, "somewhat satisfied" was the most popular choice for slightly less than two-fifths (39%) of the entire Asian sample. This category was followed by "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (26%), "somewhat dissatisfied" (16%), "very satisfied" (13%), and "very dissatisfied" (5%). When the two positive replies are considered together, about one-half (52%) of the people are shown to have at least some feelings of satisfaction with their household incomes. Those who show at least some feelings of dissatisfaction with their household incomes, on the other hand, constitute one-fifth (21%). When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.4 with a standard deviation of 1.1.

To compare the levels of satisfaction with household income across the 29 countries and societies in Asia, Table 4.6 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" within each society and the PDIs.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.6, Brunei emerges as the country where the people are the most satisfied with their household incomes with a positive 89 points on the PDI. It is followed by the Maldives with a positive 87 points on the PDI and Bhutan with a positive 73 points on the PDI.

The people of Turkmenistan, in contrast, are least likely to be satisfied with family income with a negative 19 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Mongolia with a negative 14 points on the PDI and the people of Uzbekistan with a negative 6 points on the PDI variable. These three countries have the only negative PDI values among the 29 societies.

According to Table 4.1, "Household income" is rated with a positive 31 points on the PDI and ranked 14th among the 16 surveyed domains. This domain is grouped in the materialist life sphere according to the factor analyses reported in Table 4.2. The people of Asia are the least satisfied with their household incomes in the six materialist domains.

We note that the PDI values vary from a low of a negative 19 points to a high of a positive 89 points according to Table 4.6. Table 4.6 also shows that the proportions of each of five response categories also vary considerably between societies. The proportion of those who replied with "very satisfied" with household income

Table 4.6 Satisfaction with household income (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	53.4	37.7	6.3	2.6	0.0	88.5
Maldives	52.8	37.5	6.1	2.6	0.9	86.8
Bhutan	24.6	54.6	14.6	4.8	1.4	73.0
India	34.7	44.1	13.1	5.4	2.7	70.7
Malaysia	16.2	58.6	14.5	9.5	1.2	64.1
Sri Lanka	19.1	52.2	14.5	9.4	4.7	57.2
Nepal	6.6	65.1	11.8	13.3	3.3	55.1
Singapore	14.1	53.2	19.6	10.7	2.4	54.2
Philippines	18.5	49.4	15.4	11.2	5.6	51.1
Bangladesh	20.1	48.1	13.2	14.8	3.9	49.5
Afghanistan	18.1	42.7	22.6	12.4	4.2	44.2
Indonesia	13.8	47.2	20.3	16.1	2.6	42.3
Thailand	15.1	48.4	9.2	24.6	2.5	36.4
Myanmar	10.0	48.8	17.1	18.5	5.5	34.8
Pakistan	11.8	42.9	22.3	16.4	6.7	31.6
Taiwan	3.4	34.6	48.8	11.7	1.5	24.8
Hong Kong	1.3	31.6	52.4	12.9	1.8	18.2
Kazakhstan	11.5	37.4	19.4	22.0	9.7	17.2
Laos	8.7	40.4	17.9	31.1	2.0	16.0
Japan	6.9	35.2	30.8	20.8	6.4	14.9
Tajikistan	8.4	36.9	23.7	22.6	8.4	14.3
Vietnam	7.2	18.5	60.6	11.2	2.5	12.0
Kyrgyzstan	11.8	34.7	17.6	21.5	14.4	10.6
Cambodia	8.4	28.7	34.5	23.3	5.2	8.6
China	5.1	25.6	45.9	18.3	5.1	7.3
South Korea	2.5	25.4	48.0	20.0	4.0	3.9
Uzbekistan	6.7	29.4	21.8	26.7	15.4	−6.0
Mongolia	3.9	20.8	36.5	26.7	12.2	−14.2
Turkmenistan	28.6	8.2	7.7	11.3	44.2	−18.7
Total	13.4	38.9	26.4	16.2	5.0	31.1

Note: Reported in percentages

varies considerably from 1% in Hong Kong to 53% in Brunei. The percentage of the respondents who are somewhat satisfied with household income varies from less than one-tenth (8%) of the respondents in Turkmenistan to one-third (65%) in Nepal. The proportion of the "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" responses varies from 6.1% in the Maldives to 61% in Vietnam. The percentage of those who are somewhat dissatisfied with their family incomes varies from 3% in Brunei and the Maldives to 31% in Laos. The proportion of those who replied with "very dissatisfied" varies from 0% in Brunei to more than 44% in Turkmenistan.

The domain of household income is ranked the lowest among the materialist domains and ranked 14th among the 16 domains on the PDI. Also, in Asian societies, there is great inequality regarding the levels of satisfaction with household income.

4.1.4 Health

The domain of health is rated with a positive 59 points on the PDI values and ranked fifth in the 16 domains according to the last column of Table 4.1. This domain is grouped into the materialist sphere of life according to Table 4.2. Three-tenths (29%) of all the respondents of the 29 countries and societies are satisfied with their health, two-fifths (42%) are somewhat satisfied, one-tenth (9%) are somewhat dissatisfied, and only a few (2%) are very dissatisfied with their health. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.8 with a standard deviation of 1.0.

Looking at the survey results by country, the percentages of those satisfied and dissatisfied vary across nations. To compare the levels of satisfaction with health across the 29 countries and societies in Asia, Table 4.7 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" within each society and the PDIs.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.7, Brunei emerges as the country where the people are the most satisfied with their health with a positive 97 points on the PDI. It is followed by Bhutan with a positive 87 points on the PDI and Malaysia with a positive 85 points on the PDI.

The people of Turkmenistan, on the other hand, are the least likely to be satisfied with their health with a positive 5 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people in Cambodia with a positive 19 points on the PDI and the people in Mongolia with a positive 32 points on the PDI variable.

The PDI values vary from a low of a positive 5 points in Turkmenistan to a high of a positive 97 points in Brunei. Table 4.7 also shows that the proportions of each of the five response categories also vary across societies. The proportion of those who replied with "very satisfied" for their health varies from 5% in Hong Kong to 67% in Brunei. The percentage of the respondents who are somewhat satisfied with health varies from 19% in Turkmenistan to 72% in Nepal. The proportion of the "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" responses varies from 2% in the Maldives to 49% in Vietnam. The percentage of those who are somewhat dissatisfied with their health varies from 1% in Brunei to 19% in Uzbekistan. The proportion of those who replied with "very dissatisfied" varies from 0% in Brunei to 25% in Turkmenistan.

4.1.5 Education

The people of Asia rate "education" a positive 45 points on the PDI values and rank it tenth in the 16 domains (see Table 4.1). The people of Asia viewed this domain as a materialist domain according to the factor analysis reported in Table 4.2. Of the five response categories, Table 4.8 shows that one-fifth (20%) of all the respondents of the 29 countries and societies are satisfied with education, two-fifths (40%)

Table 4.7 Satisfaction with health (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	65.9	31.5	1.7	0.9	0.0	96.5
Bhutan	53.2	36.7	6.8	1.8	1.5	86.6
Malaysia	34.7	54.4	6.5	3.7	0.7	84.7
Indonesia	51.5	37.7	5.8	4.4	0.6	84.2
Philippines	40.3	48.1	6.2	4.2	1.2	83.0
Maldives	53.3	32.7	10.0	2.4	1.6	82.0
Singapore	25.8	59.3	10.2	4.3	0.4	80.4
Sri Lanka	34.5	51.8	7.6	4.5	1.7	80.1
India	52.2	32.5	9.5	4.2	1.5	79.0
Nepal	10.1	72.2	8.1	8.0	1.5	72.8
Afghanistan	42.3	36.3	12.9	6.8	1.6	70.2
Laos	36.7	40.2	8.9	13.4	0.8	62.7
Bangladesh	28.7	45.6	13.0	9.0	3.7	61.6
Thailand	32.5	42.7	6.5	17.2	1.1	56.9
Myanmar	27.4	45.2	11.7	12.7	3.1	56.8
Tajikistan	30.7	39.1	16.6	11.8	1.8	56.2
China	21.0	41.8	27.9	7.8	1.5	53.5
Hong Kong	4.9	54.6	33.6	6.3	0.6	52.6
Japan	19.3	46.3	21.0	11.3	2.2	52.1
Taiwan	12.4	47.3	31.0	8.3	0.9	50.5
South Korea	12.4	44.8	30.1	10.7	2.0	44.5
Pakistan	13.8	45.1	24.1	12.7	4.3	41.9
Kyrgyzstan	26.4	37.9	10.3	17.4	8.1	38.8
Kazakhstan	17.0	43.7	14.9	17.5	6.8	36.4
Vietnam	22.7	20.1	48.5	7.7	0.9	34.2
Uzbekistan	16.1	42.3	16.3	18.9	6.4	33.1
Mongolia	14.6	39.5	24.2	16.5	5.2	32.4
Cambodia	18.1	21.2	40.2	17.2	3.3	18.8
Turkmenistan	27.1	18.6	13.9	15.2	25.4	5.1
Total	28.6	41.8	17.9	9.4	2.4	58.6

Note: Reported in percentages

are lsomewhat satisfied, one-quarter (25%) are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, one-tenth (12%) are somewhat dissatisfied, and only a few (3%) are very dissatisfied with education. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.6 with a standard deviation of 1.0.

To compare the levels of satisfaction with education among the 29 countries and societies in Asia, Table 4.8 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" within each society and the PDIs.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.8, Brunei emerges as the country where the people are the most satisfied with education with a

Table 4.8 Satisfaction with education (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	60.3	35.5	2.5	1.8	0.0	94.0
Maldives	54.5	31.7	9.1	3.4	1.3	81.5
Sri Lanka	32.0	52.4	9.1	4.5	2.0	77.9
India	42.1	38.7	12.5	5.0	1.7	74.1
Philippines	34.3	47.3	8.2	7.5	2.7	71.4
Malaysia	24.4	54.0	13.5	7.5	0.6	70.3
Singapore	20.8	54.2	17.0	7.5	0.4	67.1
Bhutan	32.8	43.4	12.4	8.2	3.2	64.8
Afghanistan	31.5	39.3	17.2	7.9	4.1	58.8
Indonesia	27.1	42.7	15.3	12.3	2.6	54.9
Kazakhstan	22.5	43.4	21.3	9.7	3.0	53.2
Nepal	9.3	60.2	6.8	19.4	4.4	45.7
Vietnam	24.3	27.7	41.4	5.6	1.0	45.4
Thailand	18.9	45.8	15.0	18.3	2.0	44.4
Kyrgyzstan	22.5	38.9	19.4	14.1	5.1	42.2
Cambodia	24.5	29.7	31.0	11.5	3.2	39.5
Japan	8.9	40.2	41.3	8.2	1.4	39.5
Uzbekistan	17.6	42.2	19.6	14.8	5.8	39.2
Bangladesh	20.3	39.0	16.6	13.1	11.0	35.2
Laos	14.3	43.7	15.6	23.7	2.8	31.5
Taiwan	5.0	36.8	46.0	11.5	0.8	29.5
Mongolia	14.0	34.8	29.5	16.8	4.9	27.1
Pakistan	11.2	37.4	28.6	17.5	5.3	25.8
Tajikistan	15.5	34.5	24.7	17.5	7.7	24.8
Hong Kong	2.1	34.5	51.0	11.6	0.8	24.2
Myanmar	11.8	39.6	21.1	18.7	8.7	24.0
Turkmenistan	31.1	20.7	20.4	18.7	9.1	24.0
South Korea	4.2	32.3	48.7	12.0	2.7	21.8
China	7.8	32.4	40.3	16.2	3.4	20.6
Total	20.3	39.8	25.1	11.8	3.1	45.2

Note: Reported in percentages

positive 94 points on the PDI. It is followed by the Maldives with a positive 82 points on the PDI and Sri Lanka with a positive 78 points on the PDI.

The Chinese people, on the other hand, are the least likely to be satisfied with education with a positive 21 points on the PDI. They are followed by the South Korean people with a positive 22 points on the PDI and the people of Turkmenistan with a positive 24 points on the PDI variable.

The PDI values vary from a low of a positive 21 points in China to a high of a positive 94 points in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two positive ratings ("very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied") vary from a low of 37% in South Korea to a high of 94% in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two negative ratings ("somewhat dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied") vary from a high of 28% in Turkmenistan to a low of 2% in Brunei.

4.1.6 Job

The people of Asia rated "job" with a positive 39 points on the PDI values and ranked it eleventh in the 16 domains according to Table 4.1. The people of Asia grouped this domain into the materialist sphere of life according to the factor analysis reported in Table 4.2. Of the five response categories, Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.9 shows that "somewhat satisfied" was the most popular choice for a plurality of two-fifths (39%) of the entire Asian sample. This category was followed by "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (26%), "very satisfied" (18%), "somewhat dissatisfied" (13%), and "very dissatisfied" (5%). When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.5 with a standard deviation of 1.1.

To compare the levels of job satisfaction among the 29 countries and societies in Asia, Table 4.9 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" within each society and the PDIs.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.9, the people of Brunei are the most satisfied with their jobs with a positive 85 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of the Maldives with a positive 82 points on the PDI and the people of Bhutan with a positive 74 points on the PDI.

The people of Turkmenistan, in comparison, are the least likely to be satisfied with their jobs with a positive 7 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Mongolia with a positive 9 points on the PDI and the people in Kyrgyzstan with a positive 11 points on the PDI variable.

The PDI values vary from a low of a positive 7 points in Turkmenistan to a high of a positive 85 points in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two positive ratings ("very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied") vary from a low of 38% in China to a high of 88% in Brunei. The percentages of the sum of the two negative ratings ("somewhat dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied") vary from a high of 36% in Kyrgyzstan to a low of 3% in Brunei.

4.2 Post-materialist Life Sphere

Table 4.2 groups into the post-materialist sphere of life the following six domains: friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life.

4.2.1 Friendships

According to Table 4.1, "friendships" is rated with a positive 77 points on the PDI and ranked second in the 16 surveyed domains. This domain is grouped in the post-materialist life sphere, which has the highest levels of public satisfaction

Table 4.9 Satisfaction with job (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	53.2	34.6	9.5	2.5	0.1	85.2
Maldives	53.7	32.2	10.5	2.7	0.9	82.3
Bhutan	29.1	51.8	11.6	5.6	1.8	73.5
Sri Lanka	35.8	43.9	11.7	5.1	3.5	71.1
Malaysia	21.1	54.4	15.6	8.0	1.0	66.5
India	33.6	38.3	17.5	6.1	4.6	61.2
Singapore	17.6	52.6	20.5	6.7	2.5	61.0
Nepal	6.7	67.3	10.9	11.2	3.9	58.9
Thailand	22.2	48.7	13.4	14.2	1.6	55.1
Philippines	25.4	43.9	13.8	10.8	6.1	52.4
Laos	15.2	49.3	16.4	16.2	2.9	45.4
Kazakhstan	22.2	39.4	18.9	11.8	7.7	42.1
Indonesia	20.6	37.4	21.2	16.2	4.5	37.3
Myanmar	12.9	45.1	20.9	15.0	6.0	37.0
Afghanistan	23.9	33.5	20.9	13.7	8.0	35.7
Cambodia	20.6	29.7	34.4	10.7	4.6	35.0
Hong Kong	2.7	38.9	49.9	7.5	1.0	33.1
Japan	8.8	40.3	34.4	12.8	3.6	32.7
Uzbekistan	18.6	38.8	17.4	14.3	10.9	32.2
Vietnam	18.3	24.4	45.6	9.6	2.1	31.0
Taiwan	4.5	31.9	46.3	14.9	2.4	19.1
South Korea	5.1	33.4	41.8	15.7	4.2	18.6
Bangladesh	17.1	27.8	25.5	19.1	10.5	15.3
China	8.0	29.7	39.6	16.8	5.9	15.0
Pakistan	9.7	33.5	26.7	21.0	9.0	13.2
Tajikistan	12.2	31.2	24.8	22.6	9.3	11.5
Kyrgyzstan	18.8	27.7	17.9	14.8	20.7	11.0
Mongolia	17.7	26.1	21.2	15.5	19.4	8.9
Turkmenistan	17.1	24.7	23.5	18.3	16.4	7.1
Total	17.8	38.6	26.0	12.6	5.0	38.8

Note: Reported in percentages

among the three spheres. Of the five response categories, Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.10 shows that "somewhat satisfied" was the most popular choice for slightly less than one-half (47%) of the entire Asian sample. This category was followed by "very satisfied" (34%), "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (17%), "somewhat dissatisfied" (2%), and "very dissatisfied" (1%). When the two positive replies are considered together, an overwhelming majority (80%) of the people is shown to have, at least, some level of satisfaction with friendships. Those who show some level of dissatisfaction with their marriage, on the other hand, constitute only a small minority (3%). When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 4.1 with a standard deviation of 0.9.

Table 4.10 Satisfaction with friendships (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	65.4	33.3	0.9	0.4	0.0	98.3
Bhutan	57.7	36.6	5.3	0.3	0.1	93.9
Maldives	75.6	19.5	3.0	0.9	1.1	93.1
Malaysia	35.1	59.0	4.0	1.6	0.2	92.3
Indonesia	58.9	34.3	5.3	1.4	0.1	91.7
Philippines	51.1	41.6	5.3	1.7	0.3	90.7
Nepal	14.7	77.2	5.4	2.5	0.3	89.1
Singapore	31.9	58.0	8.5	1.4	0.2	88.3
Kazakhstan	48.2	41.2	8.0	2.2	0.5	86.7
Afghanistan	55.8	32.2	10.5	1.2	0.3	86.5
India	55.0	34.0	8.5	1.5	1.0	86.5
Thailand	34.6	52.1	11.4	1.7	0.2	84.8
Kyrgyzstan	47.5	41.3	6.5	3.0	1.6	84.2
Tajikistan	45.5	40.1	11.3	2.4	0.8	82.4
Sri Lanka	35.3	50.3	10.9	2.1	1.4	82.1
Mongolia	51.1	34.0	11.0	3.1	0.9	81.1
Pakistan	26.4	56.6	13.9	3.0	0.2	79.8
Laos	18.9	64.9	11.1	4.9	0.2	78.7
Myanmar	21.6	57.9	17.2	2.6	0.8	76.1
Japan	23.4	54.3	18.9	2.9	0.6	74.2
Bangladesh	31.3	47.7	16.2	3.7	1.2	74.1
Uzbekistan	33.4	46.2	12.2	6.2	1.9	71.5
Taiwan	18.8	53.7	25.6	1.8	0.1	70.6
Hong Kong	10.4	62.2	25.2	2.0	0.2	70.4
Turkmenistan	43.0	38.3	7.2	5.8	5.7	69.8
South Korea	14.3	56.5	25.3	3.3	0.6	66.9
China	21.6	47.5	28.4	2.1	0.5	66.5
Cambodia	25.2	27.1	45.0	2.5	0.3	49.5
Vietnam	26.6	25.6	44.1	2.8	0.8	48.6
Total	33.6	46.8	16.5	2.4	0.7	77.3

Note: Reported in percentages

To compare the levels of satisfaction with friendships across the 29 countries and societies in Asia, Table 4.10 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied," within each society and the percentage difference indexes (PDIs).

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.10, Brunei emerges as the country where the people are the most satisfied with their friendships with a positive 98 points on the PDI. It is followed by Bhutan with a positive 94 points on the PDI and the Maldives with a positive 93 points on the PDI.

In contrast, the Vietnamese people are the least likely to be satisfied with friendships with a positive 49 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people in Cambodia with a positive 50 points on the PDI and the Chinese people with a positive 67 points on the PDI variable.

The PDI values vary from a low of a positive 49 points to a high of a positive 98 points. The proportions of the sum of the two positive ratings ("very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied") vary from a low of 52% in Vietnam to a high of 99% in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two negative ratings ("somewhat dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied") vary from a high of 12% in Turkmenistan to a low of 0.4% in Brunei and Bhutan. The 29 societies in Asia are similar in that the majority is satisfied with their friendships and only a small minority is dissatisfied with this life domain. They are also similar in the proportions of the sum of the two positive replies that outnumber the proportions of the sum of the two negative ratings. Asia is a region where people are more satisfied with their friendships than dissatisfied.

4.2.2 Marriage

When we look at the distribution of survey responses of the entire Asian region, the domain of "marriage," which is grouped into the post-materialist life sphere, was identified as having the highest satisfaction levels of the 16 surveyed domains (see Table 4.1). Of the five response categories, Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.11 shows that "very satisfied" was the most popular choice for one-half (52%) of the entire Asian sample. This category was followed by "somewhat satisfied" (35%), "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (11%), "very dissatisfied" (2%), and "very unsatisfied" (1%). When the two positive replies are considered together, an overwhelming majority (87%) of married people is shown to have, at least, some feelings of satisfaction with their marital life. Those who express, at least, some level of dissatisfaction with their marriage, on the other hand, constitute only a small minority (3%). When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 4.4 with a standard deviation of 0.8. As this question was posed to only married respondents, the sample size without the "don't know" responses and missing values is 35,102.

To what extent are the citizens of Asian societies satisfied or dissatisfied with their marriage? To compare the levels of marital satisfaction across the 29 societies, Table 4.11 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied," within each society and the percentage difference indexes (PDIs).

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.11, the people of Brunei feel the most satisfied with their marriage with a positive 99 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Sri Lanka (+97), the people of Malaysia (+96), and the people of Nepal (+95). In these four countries, an enormous majority of married people (over 90%) is shown to be satisfied with their marital life. When the two positive replies are considered together, the percentages of those who are very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with marriage are 99% in Brunei, 98% in Sri Lanka, 97% in Malaysia, and 96% in Nepal. When the two negative ratings are considered together, the percentages of those who are somewhat dissatisfied and

Table 4.11 Satisfaction with marriage (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	79.8	19.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	99.2
Sri Lanka	76.5	21.0	1.7	0.3	0.5	96.7
Malaysia	61.3	35.6	2.6	0.5	0.1	96.3
Nepal	47.9	48.3	2.8	0.7	0.3	95.2
Bhutan	71.9	23.3	3.6	0.9	0.4	93.9
Laos	65.1	29.7	3.4	1.6	0.2	93.0
Tajikistan	70.2	24.1	4.5	1.1	0.2	93.0
Singapore	55.6	38.6	4.1	1.4	0.2	92.6
India	70.4	23.5	4.7	0.9	0.6	92.4
Indonesia	67.3	26.3	4.8	1.3	0.3	92.0
Philippines	67.7	26.6	3.4	1.8	0.5	92.0
Kyrgyzstan	67.5	26.7	3.2	0.9	1.6	91.7
Maldives	78.7	15.2	3.9	1.5	0.7	91.7
Afghanistan	70.9	22.1	4.7	2.0	0.3	90.7
Bangladesh	70.5	22.5	4.4	1.7	0.9	90.4
Mongolia	69.5	22.1	6.8	1.4	0.2	90.0
Kazakhstan	57.5	35.4	2.9	2.5	1.6	88.8
Thailand	54.0	36.0	6.9	2.5	0.5	87.0
Myanmar	42.9	44.9	9.3	2.0	0.8	85.0
Cambodia	69.0	17.2	12.7	1.0	0.2	85.0
Pakistan	27.4	56.7	12.1	3.5	0.4	80.2
Uzbekistan	48.5	37.0	8.2	3.2	3.1	79.2
Japan	26.6	52.1	16.8	3.2	1.3	74.2
China	35.6	42.0	18.9	2.8	0.7	74.1
Vietnam	57.2	16.6	24.3	1.3	0.6	71.9
Turkmenistan	61.6	22.1	4.2	4.9	7.2	71.6
Hong Kong	12.6	59.8	25.8	1.8	0.0	70.6
Taiwan	20.6	51.3	25.1	2.8	0.1	69.0
South Korea	14.0	51.0	29.2	4.8	0.9	59.3
Total	52.0	34.6	10.6	2.0	0.8	83.8

Notes: Reported in percentages. This question was asked only to married respondents

very dissatisfied with marriage are 0%(!) in Brunei, 0.8% in Sri Lanka, 0.6% in Malaysia, and 1% in Nepal.

The people of South Korea, on the other hand, tend to feel the least satisfied with their marriage with a positive 59 points on the PDI among the 29 Asian societies. They are followed by Taiwan (+69), Hong Kong (+71), and Turkmenistan (+72). When the two positive replies are considered together, the proportion is lowest in South Korea with 65%. When the two negative replies are considered together, the proportions vary from a high of 12% in Turkmenistan to a low of 0% in Brunei.

The 29 societies in Asia are similar in the percentage of people who are very satisfied and somewhat satisfied with marriage, which when combined outnumber the percentage of those who are very dissatisfied and somewhat dissatisfied with marriage. Asia as a region has more married people who are satisfied than dissatisfied with their marriage.

Table 4.12 Satisfaction with neighbors (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	58.3	38.3	2.6	0.6	0.1	95.9
Indonesia	56.5	37.1	4.3	1.7	0.4	91.5
Maldives	58.0	31.6	7.0	2.2	1.3	86.1
Malaysia	31.8	57.2	7.8	2.6	0.5	85.9
Kyrgyzstan	44.7	43.6	7.7	2.9	1.1	84.3
Kazakhstan	32.9	53.4	8.3	3.8	1.6	80.9
Tajikistan	45.8	40.7	7.7	4.9	0.9	80.7
Bangladesh	37.9	47.1	10.0	4.0	1.0	80.0
India	44.1	39.0	12.6	2.9	1.5	78.7
Nepal	6.5	77.6	10.4	4.2	1.3	78.6
Laos	16.9	65.1	14.5	3.5	0.1	78.4
Philippines	32.5	52.0	9.3	4.7	1.5	78.3
Afghanistan	47.3	36.8	9.8	5.1	0.9	78.1
Turkmenistan	57.2	29.2	4.0	3.8	5.8	76.8
Thailand	27.0	52.6	16.9	2.9	0.6	76.1
Singapore	21.1	58.8	16.2	3.3	0.7	75.9
Bhutan	30.7	47.9	17.8	2.3	1.3	75.0
Sri Lanka	25.4	54.1	16.0	3.0	1.5	75.0
Myanmar	22.6	55.9	17.2	3.7	0.6	74.2
Pakistan	20.1	56.0	13.9	7.2	2.8	66.1
Mongolia	28.9	42.6	18.3	6.9	3.3	61.3
Uzbekistan	22.6	47.0	19.0	6.8	4.6	58.2
Taiwan	11.8	46.9	37.2	3.8	0.4	54.5
South Korea	8.2	48.4	37.6	4.7	1.0	50.9
China	15.0	40.7	39.1	4.3	0.9	50.5
Cambodia	23.1	30.6	42.1	3.6	0.7	49.4
Japan	9.5	41.0	42.7	5.4	1.3	43.8
Vietnam	22.5	24.2	48.2	4.5	0.7	41.5
Hong Kong	1.1	34.0	57.2	7.1	0.5	27.5
Total	26.3	45.6	23.0	4.0	1.2	66.7

Notes: Reported in percentages. This question was not asked in Myanmar in 2003 and 2004

4.2.3 Neighbors

According to Table 4.1, "neighbors" is rated with a positive 67 points on the PDI and ranked fourth in the 16 surveyed domains. The Asian people viewed this life domain as a part of the post-materialist life sphere according to the factor analysis reported in Table 4.2. Of the five response categories, Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.12 shows that one-quarter (26%) of all the respondents of the 29 countries and societies are satisfied with their neighbors, less than one-half (46%) are somewhat satisfied, one-quarter (23%) are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4% are somewhat dissatisfied, and 1% are very dissatisfied with this life domain. When the two positive replies are considered together, a large majority (72%) of the people have, at least, a level of satisfaction with their neighbors. In contrast, those

who have, at least, some level of dissatisfaction constitute only a small minority (5%). When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of the scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.9 with a standard deviation of 0.9. This question was asked in all the countries/societies except in Myanmar in 2003 and 2004. This question was asked in Myanmar in 2007.

To what extent are the citizens of Asian societies satisfied or dissatisfied with their neighbors? To compare the levels of satisfaction with neighbors across the 29 societies, Table 4.12 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied," within each society and the percentage difference indexes (PDIs).

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.12, the people of Brunei are the most satisfied with their neighbors with a positive 97 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Indonesia with a positive 92 points on the PDI and the people of the Maldives with a positive 86 points on the PDI.

The people of Hong Kong, on the other hand, are the least likely to be satisfied with their neighbors with a positive 28 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Vietnam with a positive 42 points on the PDI and the people of Japan with a positive 44 points on the PDI variable.

The PDI values vary from a low of a positive 28 points in Hong Kong to a high of a positive 96 points in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two positive ratings ("very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied") vary from a low of 35% in Hong Kong to a high of 97% in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two negative ratings ("somewhat dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied") vary from a high of 11% in Uzbekistan to a low of 1% in Brunei. The 29 societies in Asia are similar in the proportions of the sum of the two positive replies, outnumbering the proportions of the sum of the two negative ratings. Feelings of satisfaction with neighbors are dominant among the people of Asia.

4.2.4 Family Life

"Family life" was given a positive 74 points on the PDI and ranked third in the 16 life domains by the Asian people. This domain is grouped into the post-materialist sphere of life according to the factor analysis reported in Table 4.2. Of the five response categories, Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.13 reports that more than one-third (35%) of all the respondents of the 29 countries and societies are satisfied with their family life, more than two-fifths (44%) are somewhat satisfied, one-sixth (17%) are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4% are somewhat dissatisfied, and 1% are very dissatisfied with this domain. When the two positive replies are considered together, a large majority (79%) of the people have, at least, some level of satisfaction with their family life. Those who express, at least, some level of dissatisfaction, in comparison, constitute only a small minority (5%). When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from

Table 4.13 Satisfaction with family life (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	64.0	35.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	99.0
Malaysia	36.8	56.6	5.3	1.2	0.2	92.0
Singapore	39.2	52.8	6.3	1.3	0.5	90.2
Maldives	63.8	27.9	6.7	1.4	0.3	90.0
Sri Lanka	54.9	37.5	4.9	1.9	0.8	89.7
Bhutan	59.6	30.8	8.8	0.5	0.4	89.5
Nepal	17.2	74.3	5.0	2.8	0.6	88.1
Philippines	46.1	44.6	5.6	3.2	0.5	87.0
Indonesia	51.8	37.2	7.6	3.2	0.2	85.6
Thailand	42.4	46.9	6.2	3.8	0.7	84.8
Laos	40.1	48.0	7.7	3.8	0.4	83.9
Myanmar	42.7	45.8	6.9	3.7	0.9	83.9
India	45.9	39.4	11.4	2.7	0.6	82.0
Tajikistan	39.5	46.9	8.0	3.2	2.4	80.8
Afghanistan	50.9	33.8	10.6	3.6	1.2	79.9
Bangladesh	45.8	39.1	10.1	3.1	1.9	79.9
Kyrgyzstan	42.6	42.1	7.2	5.6	2.5	76.6
Kazakhstan	43.9	39.4	9.5	4.9	2.4	76.0
Japan	19.3	54.1	22.2	3.7	0.8	68.9
Uzbekistan	32.2	46.6	10.3	7.2	3.7	67.9
Mongolia	32.0	40.3	21.6	5.2	0.9	66.2
Turkmenistan	47.7	29.2	11.7	5.1	6.4	65.4
Taiwan	11.2	55.3	30.2	3.3	0.0	63.2
Cambodia	39.6	27.5	27.5	4.1	1.3	61.7
Pakistan	17.4	52.7	18.2	8.9	2.8	58.4
Vietnam	31.6	28.3	37.1	2.8	0.2	56.9
South Korea	10.5	51.0	32.5	4.6	1.3	55.6
Hong Kong	5.0	52.8	39.5	2.4	0.3	55.1
China	17.1	41.7	34.9	5.0	1.3	52.5
Total	34.8	44.1	16.6	3.6	1.0	74.3

Note: Reported in percentages

a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of the scales of the entire Asian sample is 4.1 with a standard deviation of 0.9.

To what extent are the citizens of Asian societies satisfied or dissatisfied with their family life? To compare the levels of satisfaction with family life across the 29 societies, Table 4.13 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied," within each society and the percentage difference indexes (PDIs).

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.13, the people of Brunei feel the most satisfied with their family life with a positive 99 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Malaysia (+92), the people of Singapore (+90.2), and the people of the Maldives (+90.0).

Conversely, the people of China tend to feel the least satisfied with their family life with a positive 53 points on the PDI among the 29 Asian societies. They are followed by the people of Hong Kong (+55) and by the people of South Korea (+56).

When the two positive replies are considered together, the proportion is lowest in Hong Kong with 58% and highest in Brunei with 99%. When the two negative replies are considered together, the proportions vary from a high of 12% in Turkmenistan to a low of 0% in Brunei. The 29 societies in Asia are similar in the levels of those who are very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with family life, and these levels outnumber those who are very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied with this life domain. Feelings of satisfaction with family life are dominant in the societies of Asia.

4.2.5 Leisure

"Leisure" was rated with a positive 52 points on the PDI values, ranking it eighth in the 16 domains by the people of Asia (see Table 4.1). The people of Asia grouped this domain in the post-materialist sphere of life according to the factor analysis reported in Table 4.2. Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.14 shows that of the five response categories, one-fifth (21%) of all the respondents of the 29 countries and societies are satisfied with leisure, two-fifths (42%) are somewhat satisfied, one-quarter (25%) are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, one-tenth (9%) are somewhat dissatisfied, and only a few (3%) are very dissatisfied with this life domain. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.7 with a standard deviation of 1.0.

To compare the levels of satisfaction with their leisure activities across the 29 societies, Table 4.14 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied," within each society and the PDIs.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.14, Brunei emerges as the country with the highest levels of public satisfaction for leisure, scoring a positive 93 points on the PDI. It is followed by the Maldives (+85.3) and Malaysia (+85.2).

Tajikistan, on the other hand, has the most population who reported, at least, some dissatisfaction with this life domain with a negative 3 points on the PDI. It is followed by South Korea (+9) and China (+19). The PDI values are rated as negative only in Tajikistan.

When the two positive replies are considered together, the proportion is lowest in South Korea with 33%, which is followed by Tajikistan (34%) and China (37%). When the two negative replies are considered together, the proportions vary from a high of 37% in Tajikistan to a low of 2% in Brunei. Of the 29 Asian societies, only in Tajikistan is the percentage of the sum of the two positive replies smaller than the percentage of the sum of the two negative ratings.

Table 4.14 Satisfaction with leisure (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	56.7	38.2	3.4	1.6	0.1	93.2
Maldives	59.9	28.6	8.4	2.4	0.8	85.3
Malaysia	23.6	64.2	9.6	2.3	0.3	85.2
Indonesia	37.9	46.9	11.2	3.6	0.4	80.8
Singapore	22.6	61.4	12.2	3.4	0.3	80.3
Bhutan	39.1	44.3	11.1	4.5	1.0	77.9
India	37.0	43.3	15.2	2.9	1.6	75.8
Philippines	26.0	54.1	13.8	4.8	1.3	74.0
Sri Lanka	30.8	48.6	12.6	5.1	2.9	71.4
Thailand	28.2	50.7	11.6	8.8	0.7	69.4
Laos	19.9	56.4	13.9	8.9	0.8	66.6
Bangladesh	27.5	45.9	18.3	5.6	2.7	65.1
Myanmar	25.2	46.3	19.2	6.6	2.7	62.2
Afghanistan	23.3	44.0	24.8	6.3	1.6	59.4
Nepal	2.9	66.3	16.8	9.6	4.3	55.3
Pakistan	12.9	47.2	24.4	13.1	2.4	44.6
Kazakhstan	19.8	43.6	17.5	12.1	6.9	44.4
Taiwan	5.8	45.6	40.7	7.5	0.5	43.4
Hong Kong	6.8	42.0	44.5	6.1	0.5	42.2
Kyrgyzstan	22.1	40.6	16.7	11.9	8.8	42.0
Japan	12.5	45.2	26.4	13.0	2.9	41.8
Turkmenistan	37.2	24.3	18.0	11.5	8.9	41.1
Cambodia	19.9	28.5	41.0	7.8	2.8	37.8
Vietnam	15.8	24.9	54.0	4.7	0.6	35.4
Mongolia	15.3	34.3	30.5	14.0	6.0	29.6
Uzbekistan	14.3	36.7	17.5	18.0	13.6	19.4
China	8.1	28.9	45.2	13.7	4.1	19.2
South Korea	4.8	28.3	42.8	18.5	5.6	9.0
Tajikistan	6.9	26.9	29.3	21.9	14.9	−3.0
Total	21.1	42.5	24.6	8.7	3.0	51.9

Note: Reported in percentages

4.2.6 Spiritual Life

"Spiritual life" was given a positive 58 points on the PDI and ranked sixth among the 16 life domains (see Table 4.1). According to the factor analysis reported in Table 4.2, spiritual life was grouped into the post-materialist sphere of life. As this question was asked only after 2005, this question was not asked in the Brunei survey. The sample size without the "don't know" responses and missing values is 29,332.

Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.15 shows that of the five response categories, one-quarter (25.5%) of all the respondents of the 29 countries and societies are satisfied with spiritual life, two-fifths (40%) are somewhat satisfied, one-quarter (25.9%) are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 6% are somewhat dissatisfied, and only a few (2%) are very dissatisfied with this life domain. When we rescaled the

Table 4.15 Satisfaction with spiritual life (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Indonesia	70.7	25.1	3.9	0.1	0.2	95.5
Philippines	41.5	49.3	6.8	1.8	0.5	88.5
Malaysia	25.5	63.8	8.9	1.4	0.4	87.5
Maldives	68.6	20.9	7.7	2.3	0.6	86.6
Bhutan	51.7	36.3	10.3	1.4	0.3	86.3
Nepal	8.3	79.5	10.7	0.8	0.8	86.2
Sri Lanka	43.2	44.3	10.6	1.5	0.4	85.6
Laos	38.0	46.6	13.7	1.7	0.0	82.9
Singapore	29.3	54.4	14.4	1.6	0.3	81.8
Thailand	39.6	46.6	9.3	4.3	0.2	81.7
India	32.6	44.3	18.8	3.4	0.9	72.6
Afghanistan	38.4	36.8	18.6	4.1	2.1	69.0
Pakistan	18.9	54.1	20.5	5.5	1.1	66.4
Bangladesh	28.6	37.9	24.7	5.4	3.4	57.7
Kyrgyzstan	24.2	46.0	17.3	7.7	4.8	57.7
Japan	13.8	47.8	30.7	6.7	0.9	54.0
Turkmenistan	51.2	19.7	11.9	10.1	7.1	53.7
Kazakhstan	19.8	43.7	23.0	9.2	4.2	50.1
Vietnam	21.4	33.1	41.0	4.0	0.4	50.1
Taiwan	6.5	46.2	40.2	7.1	0.1	45.5
Mongolia	17.2	38.3	32.5	9.1	3.0	43.4
Hong Kong	4.2	38.9	50.9	5.6	0.4	37.1
Uzbekistan	13.7	41.1	25.6	11.3	8.3	35.2
China	12.2	31.5	43.6	9.8	3.0	30.9
South Korea	7.3	26.4	53.2	10.7	2.4	20.6
Cambodia	11.8	23.0	50.6	10.7	4.0	20.1
Myanmar	5.7	23.8	54.8	9.8	5.9	13.8
Tajikistan	6.6	27.4	30.4	24.0	11.6	−1.6
Total	25.5	40.4	25.9	6.1	2.1	57.7

Notes: Reported in percentages. Brunei is not included because Brunei was surveyed in 2004 and this question was asked only from 2005 to 2008

original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.8 with a standard deviation of 1.0.

To what extent are the citizens of Asian societies satisfied or dissatisfied with their spiritual life? To compare the levels of satisfaction with spiritual life across the 28 societies, Table 4.15 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied," within each society and the percentage difference indexes (PDIs).

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.15, Indonesia emerges as the country where the largest amounts of people are satisfied with their spiritual life, scoring a positive 96 points on the PDI. It is followed by the Philippines (+89) and Malaysia (+88).

Conversely, Tajikistan has the most population who reported, at least, some dissatisfaction with this life domain, scoring a negative 2 points on the PDI. It is followed by Myanmar (+14) and Cambodia (+20). Only Tajikistan registered a negative PDI value.

When the two positive replies are considered together, the proportion varies from 30% in Myanmar to 96% in Indonesia. When the two negative replies are considered together, the proportions vary from a high of 36% in Tajikistan to a low of 0.3% in Indonesia. The percentages of the sum of the two negative ratings are below 3% in the top nine societies in Table 4.15. Again, among the surveyed societies, only in Tajikistan was the percentage of the sum of the two positive replies smaller than the percentage of the sum of the two negative ratings.

4.3 Public Sphere of Life

Table 4.2 groups into the public sphere of life the following four domains: public safety, the condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

4.3.1 Public Safety

"Public safety" is rated with a positive 38 points on the PDI values and ranked twelfth in the 16 domains (see last column of Table 4.1). Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.16 reports that about one-fifth (18%) of all the respondents of the 29 surveyed countries and societies are satisfied with public safety, about two-fifths (38%) are somewhat satisfied, one-quarter (25%) are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, about one-seventh (14%) are somewhat dissatisfied, and only a few (5%) are very dissatisfied. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.5 with a standard deviation of 1.1.

To compare the levels of satisfaction with public safety across the surveyed Asian societies, Table 4.16 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied," within each society and the PDIs.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.16, the people of Brunei find themselves the most satisfied with public safety with a positive 96 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Indonesia with a positive 88 points on the PDI and the people of Singapore with a positive 84 points on the PDI.

The people of Taiwan, in comparison, find themselves the least satisfied with this domain, rating a negative 34 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Mongolia with a negative 29 points on the PDI and the people of Pakistan with a negative 3 points on the PDI variable. Of the surveyed countries, these three countries are the only ones to have negative PDI values.

Table 4.16 Satisfaction with public safety (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	59.7	37.2	2.1	1.0	0.0	95.9
Indonesia	54.1	36.3	7.4	2.0	0.3	88.1
Singapore	26.0	61.3	9.8	2.4	0.5	84.4
Myanmar	27.9	51.5	15.2	4.4	1.0	74.0
Philippines	29.0	50.5	12.2	6.1	2.2	71.2
Bhutan	24.6	51.2	17.0	5.2	1.9	68.7
Maldives	45.7	28.4	13.6	7.1	5.3	61.7
Afghanistan	29.5	39.8	19.0	9.9	1.7	57.7
Sri Lanka	21.5	47.0	20.4	8.3	2.9	57.3
Malaysia	17.4	54.1	13.7	11.4	3.4	56.7
Laos	14.5	52.5	21.7	10.4	0.9	55.7
Hong Kong	3.6	49.0	40.4	7.0	0.0	45.6
Bangladesh	18.5	41.6	21.4	13.9	4.6	41.6
Tajikistan	11.4	44.1	29.7	12.8	2.0	40.7
India	19.3	39.1	23.6	12.7	5.3	40.4
Turkmenistan	51.3	13.1	11.3	10.7	13.7	40.0
Thailand	20.4	41.0	15.9	20.1	2.6	38.7
Vietnam	24.5	25.0	38.2	9.5	2.8	37.2
Kazakhstan	14.4	40.6	24.0	14.8	6.2	34.0
Japan	10.9	37.3	30.6	17.5	3.6	27.1
China	6.4	29.2	38.5	20.3	5.7	9.6
Uzbekistan	8.7	32.4	26.5	21.7	10.7	8.7
South Korea	3.6	26.3	48.4	17.4	4.2	8.3
Nepal	1.8	39.6	21.4	29.4	7.9	4.1
Cambodia	8.5	26.1	34.7	23.0	7.7	3.9
Kyrgyzstan	7.6	30.3	26.7	21.1	14.3	2.5
Pakistan	7.0	25.2	33.0	23.7	11.1	−2.6
Mongolia	5.2	16.2	28.5	29.0	21.2	−28.8
Taiwan	1.8	15.4	31.2	39.0	12.5	−34.3
Total	18.3	38.0	25.1	14.1	4.5	37.7

Note: Reported in percentages

We note that the PDI values vary significantly from a low of a negative 34 points to a high of a positive 96 points (see Table 4.16). The percentages of the sum of the two positive ratings ("very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied") vary from a low of 17% in Taiwan to a high of 97% in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two negative ratings ("somewhat dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied") vary from a high of 52% in Taiwan to a low of 1% in Brunei. In Asian societies, the level of satisfaction with public safety for ordinary people varies greatly.

4.3.2 The Condition of the Environment

Table 4.1 shows that the people of Asia ranked the "condition of the environment" 13th in the 16 surveyed domains with a positive 34 points on the PDI scores.

Table 4.17 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 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.17 reports that 15% of all the respondents of the 29 countries and societies are satisfied with the condition of the environment, two-fifths (39%) are somewhat satisfied, 27% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 15% are somewhat dissatisfied, and only a few (5%) are very dissatisfied with public safety in their lives. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.4 with a standard deviation of 1.1.

To compare the levels of satisfaction with the condition of the environment across the 29 societies, Table 4.17 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" within each society and the PDIs.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.17, the people of Brunei are the most satisfied with the condition of the environment, scoring a positive 96 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Indonesia with a positive 82 and the people of Singapore with a positive 80 points on the PDI.

At the other end of the spectrum, the people of Nepal are the least satisfied with this domain, registering a negative 33 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Uzbekistan with a negative 30 points on the PDI, the people of Mongolia with a negative 16 points, and the people of Kazakhstan with a negative 13 points. In these four countries, the PDIs are negative, and the proportions of the sum of the two positive replies are greater than the proportions of the sum of the two negative ratings. In Pakistan, the PDI has a value of zero and those giving negative responses are as common as those giving positive responses. The PDIs vary from a positive single point for Cambodia, ranking it 24th, to a positive 19 points for Taiwan, ranking it 18th. Satisfaction with the condition of the environment is not dominant in the surveyed Asian societies.

4.3.3 Social Welfare System

Table 4.1 shows that the domain of the "social welfare system," the third domain in the public sphere of life, was identified as registering the least satisfaction in the 16 surveyed domains (see Table 4.1). Of the five response categories, Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.18 reports that one-tenth (10%) of all the respondents of the 29 countries and societies are satisfied with the social welfare system of their nation, whereas one-third (33%) are somewhat satisfied, three-tenths (31%) are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, one-fifth (18%) are somewhat dissatisfied, and 8% are very dissatisfied with the system. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.2 with a standard deviation of 1.1. This question was not asked in Myanmar when it was surveyed in 2003, 2004, and 2007.

To what extent are the citizens of Asian societies satisfied or dissatisfied with their country's welfare system? To compare the levels of satisfaction with each country's welfare system, Table 4.18 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" within each society and the PDIs.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.18, Brunei emerges as the society with the most people satisfied with their social welfare system, scoring a positive 97 points on the PDI. It is followed by Bhutan (+69), Indonesia (+96), and Malaysia (+57).

Uzbekistan, in contrast, turned out to have the most people least satisfied with this domain, scoring a negative 44 points on the PDI. Table 4.18 shows that among the surveyed Asian societies, ten societies have negative PDI values. Following the scoring of Uzbekistan is Nepal (−40), Mongolia (−35), and then Kyrgyzstan

Table 4.18 Satisfaction with social welfare system (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Brunei	57.0	40.1	2.5	0.4	0.0	96.7
Bhutan	21.0	52.9	21.4	4.2	0.5	69.2
Indonesia	24.2	44.5	20.4	9.8	1.1	57.8
Malaysia	12.8	55.7	20.2	9.1	2.1	57.3
Maldives	32.9	37.0	16.6	7.1	6.5	56.3
Singapore	11.2	52.1	27.2	6.9	2.5	53.9
Laos	9.0	52.6	25.7	10.1	2.6	48.9
Philippines	12.9	48.6	20.6	12.4	5.5	43.6
Bangladesh	10.9	45.3	28.0	12.0	3.8	40.4
India	12.4	43.8	25.8	11.7	6.3	38.2
Thailand	15.0	43.6	20.8	16.8	3.8	38.0
Sri Lanka	11.2	39.8	29.1	13.6	6.3	31.1
Vietnam	11.2	21.0	56.0	9.4	2.4	20.4
Cambodia	10.7	33.6	31.3	18.3	6.1	19.9
Hong Kong	1.6	28.7	56.8	11.7	1.2	17.4
Afghanistan	12.5	30.1	31.3	17.9	8.2	16.5
Turkmenistan	19.7	22.5	30.4	12.2	15.2	14.8
Kazakhstan	4.9	34.3	25.0	22.5	13.3	3.4
Japan	3.3	22.3	44.8	23.3	6.3	−4.0
Pakistan	4.9	24.9	32.3	28.2	9.7	−8.1
Taiwan	1.1	18.9	44.5	27.8	7.6	−15.4
China	4.0	17.2	38.4	27.5	12.9	−19.2
Tajikistan	2.5	19.4	29.9	33.0	15.2	−26.3
South Korea	0.9	13.3	43.8	31.2	10.8	−27.8
Kyrgyzstan	4.9	20.5	19.2	25.2	30.1	−29.9
Mongolia	3.6	14.8	28.8	31.3	21.6	−34.5
Nepal	1.3	18.0	21.6	44.1	15.0	−39.8
Uzbekistan	3.9	13.8	20.4	33.3	28.6	−44.2
Total	10.1	32.5	31.4	18.2	7.8	16.6

Notes: Reported in percentages. This question was not asked in the Myanmar surveys of 2003, 2004, and 2007

(−30). Until Japan, scoring a negative 4 points on the PDI and ranking 19th from the countries with the highest satisfaction levels, the PDIs have negative values. Table 4.18 also shows that "very dissatisfied" received the greatest response in Uzbekistan with 29%, in Mongolia with 22%, and in Kyrgyzstan with 30%. Those who find themselves dissatisfied with their social welfare system outnumber those who are satisfied in these societies.

4.3.4 The Democratic System

The people of Asia rated "the democratic system" with a positive 27 points on the PDI values and ranked it 15th in the 16 domains (see Table 4.1). The people of Asia

Table 4.19 Satisfaction with the democratic system (%)

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	PDI
Maldives	33.7	38.8	27.5	0.0	0.0	72.5
Turkmenistan	34.9	46.7	8.9	4.4	5.1	72.1
Malaysia	15.4	61.9	15.9	5.5	1.2	70.6
Indonesia	28.1	45.1	21.7	4.3	0.8	68.1
Bhutan	22.6	45.4	25.6	4.2	2.2	61.6
Singapore	11.1	56.5	24.4	5.9	2.0	59.7
Thailand	21.7	45.6	17.5	11.9	3.3	52.1
Bangladesh	17.8	40.8	23.3	14.0	4.1	40.5
India	16.4	41.0	25.4	11.8	5.5	40.1
Philippines	11.4	44.2	21.0	15.1	8.4	32.1
Cambodia	16.4	31.1	36.0	12.5	4.0	31.0
Afghanistan	21.0	31.9	24.9	13.9	8.3	30.7
Sri Lanka	9.1	40.4	27.8	12.9	9.8	26.8
Hong Kong	2.0	34.6	52.4	9.4	1.5	25.7
Kazakhstan	8.2	38.7	28.2	16.6	8.2	22.1
Taiwan	2.0	31.3	46.0	16.6	4.1	12.6
Japan	4.0	25.7	52.2	14.7	3.4	11.6
Mongolia	7.2	32.1	31.2	17.1	12.4	9.8
Pakistan	6.1	29.4	30.5	22.7	11.3	1.5
China	5.4	22.1	45.9	18.1	8.5	0.9
Tajikistan	4.5	32.8	26.1	24.3	12.2	0.8
Kyrgyzstan	8.1	31.1	21.8	19.0	20.0	0.2
South Korea	1.2	19.9	49.7	22.1	7.2	−8.2
Nepal	3.0	22.8	17.3	41.4	15.5	−31.1
Uzbekistan	3.6	16.7	26.7	25.6	27.4	−32.7
Total	11.5	35.9	31.8	14.2	6.6	26.6

Notes: Reported in percentages. In 2003, this question was not asked in Vietnam and Myanmar. In 2004, this question was not asked in Brunei, Laos, Myanmar, Vietnam, and China. In 2006, this question was not asked in Vietnam. In 2007, this question was not asked in Myanmar and Laos

grouped this domain into the public sphere of life according to the factor analysis reported in Table 4.2. Of the five response categories, Table 4.1 or the last row of Table 4.19 shows that "somewhat satisfied" was the most popular choice for 36% of the entire Asian sample. This category was followed by "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" (32%), "somewhat dissatisfied" (14%), "very satisfied" (12%), and "very dissatisfied" (7%). When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied), the mean of scales of the entire Asian sample is 3.3 with a standard deviation of 1.1. This question was not asked in Myanmar when it was surveyed in 2003, 2004, and 2007. It was also not asked in Vietnam in the 2003, 2004, and 2006 surveys. This question was also not part of the surveys for Laos in 2004 and 2007. The other two exceptions to this question were the 2004 surveys in Brunei and China.

To compare the levels of satisfaction with the political systems of the 25 countries and societies in Asia, Table 4.19 reports the distributions of survey

responses across the five response categories, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied," within each society and the PDIs.

According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 4.19, the people of the Maldives are the most satisfied with their democratic system, scoring a positive 73 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Turkmenistan with a positive 72 points on the PDI and the people of Malaysia with a positive 71 points on the PDI.

The people of Uzbekistan, on the other hand, are the least likely to be satisfied with this domain, scoring a negative 33 points on the PDI. They are followed by the people of Nepal with a negative 31 points on the PDI and the people of South Korea with a negative 8 points on the PDI variable. The PDI takes negative values in these three societies.

The PDI values vary from a low of a positive 7 points in Turkmenistan to a high of a positive 85 points in Brunei. The proportions of the sum of the two positive ratings ("very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied") vary from a low of 38% in China to a high of 88% in Brunei. The percentages of the sum of the two negative ratings ("somewhat dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied") vary from a high of 36% in Kyrgyzstan to a low of 3% in Brunei. Table 4.19 also shows that the PDI values are close to zero in Kyrgyzstan (+0.2), Tajikistan (+0.8), China (+0.9), and Pakistan (+0.5). In these four societies, those giving negative responses are as common as those giving positive responses.

4.4 Patterns of Life Domain Satisfactions by Society

This section identifies which life domain each country in Asia finds the most and least satisfactory. From Tables 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, 4.15, 4.16, 4.17, 4.18, 4.19, we compared the levels of satisfaction with all 16 life domains across the 29 societies by the distributions of survey responses across the five response categories within each society and by the PDI values. In Table 4.20, we first identify the most satisfying and the least satisfying domain for each society based on the highest and the lowest values on the PDI. After that, we count the number of domains each respondent rates positively and negatively and report the means for each country.

According to Table 4.20, "marriage" emerges as the domain with which the people are the most satisfied in 23 of the 29 societies in Asia. The PDIs are given the highest values by the people of Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam. Looking carefully at the societies where "marriage" is not the most satisfactory domain but ranks second, we find Indonesia, the Maldives, South Korea, and Taiwan. Respondents in Afghanistan and Turkmenistan rank in this domain third. The popularity of marriage among the 29 societies shown in Table 4.20 was also reported in Table 4.11, which shows high PDIs on the marriage

Table 4.20 Patterns of domain satisfaction by society

	Specific domains		Number of domains	
	Most satisfied	Least satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Afghanistan	Housing	Household income	11.5	1.6
Bangladesh	Marriage	Job	11.5	1.9
Bhutan	Friendships/Marriage	Democratic system	13.6	0.6
Brunei	Marriage	Job	13.5	0.1
Cambodia	Marriage	Condition of the environment	8.5	2.0
China	Marriage	Social welfare system	7.0	2.4
Hong Kong	Marriage	Social welfare system	7.5	1.2
India	Marriage	Condition of the environment	12.0	1.2
Indonesia	Spiritual life	Job	12.4	1.0
Japan	Friendships/Marriage	Social welfare system	10.1	1.7
Kazakhstan	Marriage	Condition of the environment	10.6	2.8
Kyrgyzstan	Marriage	Social welfare system	10.1	3.4
Laos	Marriage	Household income	10.1	1.7
Malaysia	Marriage	Public safety	13.4	1.1
Maldives	Friendships	Condition of the environment	13.5	0.7
Mongolia	Marriage	Social welfare system	8.3	3.6
Myanmar	Marriage	Spiritual life	9.2	1.5
Nepal	Marriage	Social welfare system	11.1	3.1
Pakistan	Marriage	Social welfare system	9.4	3.1
Philippines	Marriage	Democratic system	12.9	1.4
Singapore	Marriage	Social welfare system	13.0	0.8
South Korea	Friendships	Social welfare system	7.0	2.5
Sri Lanka	Marriage	Democratic system	12.5	1.0
Taiwan	Friendships	Public safety	7.5	2.2
Tajikistan	Marriage	Social welfare system	9.5	3.4
Thailand	Marriage	Household income	12.3	1.8
Turkmenistan	Neighbors	Household income	10.4	3.2
Uzbekistan	Marriage	Social welfare system	8.6	4.0
Vietnam	Marriage	Household income	7.3	1.3

Notes: For Brunei, "Democratic system" and "Spiritual life" are not included. For Laos, "Democratic system" is not included. For Myanmar, "Social welfare system" and "Democratic system" are not included. For Vietnam, "Democratic system" is not included

domain. Table 4.1 reported that this domain is ranked first on the PDI using the entire Asian sample reported. It then follows that Asia is a region in which people are dominantly satisfied with their married life.

"Marriage" is followed by "friendships," which respondents of five societies find the most satisfying: Bhutan, Japan, the Maldives, South Korea, and Taiwan. These two domains are tied as the most satisfying domains in Bhutan and Japan.

Three other domains also took the most satisfying domain ranking in three different countries. "Housing" is the most satisfying domain for the people of Afghanistan; "spiritual life" is the most satisfying domain in Indonesia; and "neighbors" is the most satisfying domain in Turkmenistan.

On the other side of the satisfaction continuum, the domains that ranked as the least satisfying in each society have less discernable patterns and distribute more

widely. "The social welfare system" is the least satisfying domain of the 16 domains in the following 11 societies: China, Hong Kong, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Singapore, South Korea, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. "Household income" is the least satisfying in five societies: Afghanistan, Laos, Thailand, Turkmenistan, and Vietnam. The "condition of the environment" was least satisfying in the following four societies: Cambodia, India, Kazakhstan, and Maldives. "Job" is ranked as the least satisfying in three societies: Bangladesh, Brunei, and Indonesia. "The democratic system" is given the lowest value on the PDI in three societies: Bhutan, the Philippines, and Sri Lanka. "Public safety" is the least satisfying for the people of Malaysia and Taiwan. "Spiritual life" is the least satisfying domain in Myanmar. We note that the domain of spiritual life is the most satisfying for the people of Indonesia.

How many life domains do the people of Asian countries find satisfying and dissatisfying? To address these questions, we counted the number of domains each individual respondent rated positively and negatively. When respondents replied by either "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied," it is counted as a satisfying domain, whereas either "somewhat dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" is counted as a dissatisfying domain.

The fourth and fifth columns of Table 4.20 report the means of the numbers of domains that are satisfying and dissatisfying for each country and society. As the full list of the 16 life domains is not asked in four societies, Brunei, Laos, Myanmar, and Vietnam, we compare the means among the remaining 25 societies. The average number of domains found satisfactory is the largest in Bhutan with a mean of 13.6, followed by the Maldives with a mean of 13.5, Malaysia with a mean of 13.4, and Singapore with a mean of 13.0. The average number of domains found satisfactory is the lowest in China and South Korea, both scoring a mean of 7.0. Hong Kong and Taiwan follow each with a mean of 7.5.

The average number of domains that are dissatisfying is the largest in Uzbekistan with a mean of 4.0, followed by Mongolia with a mean of 3.6, and Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, each with a mean of 3.4. The average number of domains found dissatisfactory is the lowest Bhutan with a mean of 0.6, followed by the Maldives with a mean of 0.7, Singapore with a mean of 0.8, and Indonesia and Sri Lanka both with a mean of 1.0.

When we examine only the average number of domains found satisfying by the respondents, we notice that the mean is relatively lower in the seven Confucian societies with the exception of Japan. (See Shin and Inoguchi 2009 for more details.) Excluding Japan (10.1) and Singapore (13.0), the mean values are around 7 points: China (7.0), Hong Kong (7.5), South Korea (7.0), Taiwan (7.5), and Vietnam (7.3).

In all, in Asia the most satisfying domain is clearly "marriage," whereas the least satisfying domain is unclear. More broadly, when we compare the three life spheres—materialist, post-materialist, and public—the people of Asia are the most satisfied with the domains in the post-materialist sphere of life and the least satisfied with the domains in the public sphere of life. In Confucian societies, Japan and Singapore aside, feelings of satisfaction with life domains are relatively lower than the rest of Asia.

4.5 Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Satisfactions in Each Country and Society

This section uses factor analyses to examine how the people of each country and society distinguish the 16 life domains. In Tables 4.2 and 4.3, we factor analyzed the entire pooled samples. The first factor having an eigenvalue of 5.410 is called the materialist factor or QOL-sustaining factor. The materialist factor includes the following six life domains: housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The second factor is called the post-materialist factor or QOL-enriching factor. Those domains on the second factor include friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The third factor is called public sphere factor or QOL-enabling factor. The third factor includes the following life domains: public safety, the condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

Also, in each country, some life domains are more closely related to each other than are others, and we attempt to group them into wider categories of life spheres. We perform factor analyses for each country and society and report the results in words without tables. The numerical results for each country and society are presented in tables in Appendix A.

We divide the region of Asia into East Asia (China, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan), Southeast Asia (Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam), South Asia (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka), and Central Asia (Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan).[1]

4.5.1 East Asia

4.5.1.1 China

Those items whose factor loading is high on the first factor are housing, standard of living, household income, education, and job. The first factor's eigenvalue is 5.066. We call this factor the materialist life sphere or QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second factor are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. We call the second

[1] Turkmenistan is not included in the factor analyses and regression analyses since the valid number of observations becomes small and less than 100. In the Turkmenistan survey, there are many "don't know" responses, which are treated missing values in data analyses. For example, the sample size of Turkmenistan is 800, of which 44% (450) are "don't know" responses for the question about life domain satisfaction with the democratic system. As in the previous section, the sample size is large enough when the response distribution of each single question is analyzed individually. However, when the questions are used and analyzed together as in factor analyses or regression analyses, the valid sample size is less than 100.

factor the public sphere of life or QOL-enabling factor. Its eigenvalue is 0.836. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third factor are friendships, marriage, health, neighbors, family life, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 0.565. The third factor is called the post-materialist life sphere or QOL-enriching factor.

4.5.1.2 Hong Kong

Those items whose factor loadings are high on the first factor include friendships, marriage, health, education, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The first factor is called the post-materialist life sphere or QOL-enriching factor. This list is very different from that listed for the entire Asia sample or for the China sample. Its eigenvalue is 4.696. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second factor are housing, standard of living, household income, and job. The second factor is called the materialist life sphere or QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third factor are neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The third factor is called the public life sphere or QOL-enabling factor.

4.5.1.3 Japan

Those items whose factor loadings are high on the first factor are housing, standard of living, household income, education, and job. Its eigenvalue is 5.640. The first factor is the materialist life sphere or QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second factor are friendships, marriage, health, public safety, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 1.097. The second factor is called the post-materialist life sphere or QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third factor are neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 0.645. The third factor is called the public life sphere or QOL-enabling factor.

4.5.1.4 South Korea

Those items whose factor loadings are high on the first factor are housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 5.488. The first factor is called the materialist life sphere or QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second factor are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 1.108. The second factor is called the public sphere or QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third factor are friendships, marriage, neighbors, and family life. Its eigenvalue is 0.495. The third factor is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. The order of the second and third factors is reversed from the Japanese ranking and remains the same as the Chinese ranking.

4.5.1.5 Taiwan

Those items whose factor loadings are high on the first factor are standard of living, household income, health, education, job, and leisure. Its eigenvalue is 4.974. The first factor is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high are housing, friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 1.177. The second factor is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 0.783. The third factor is called the public sphere factor or the QOL-enabling factor. It is important to note that the ranking of the second and third factors is the same, or reversed from China.

4.5.2 Southeast Asia

4.5.2.1 Brunei

Those items whose loadings are high are job, neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, family life, and leisure. Its eigenvalue is 7.182. The first factor is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor with the QOL-enriching elements added too. Those items whose factor loadings are high are standard of living, household income, health, and education. The second factor is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Its eigenvalue is 0.724. Those items whose factor loadings are high are housing, friendships, and marriage on the third factor. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Its eigenvalue is 0.401. The first factor or the QOL-enabling factor is hegemonic.

4.5.2.2 Cambodia

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are housing, friendships, marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, and family life. Its eigenvalue is 3.710. It is the materialist factor or the QOL-sustaining factor combined with the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second factor are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 1.187. It is called the public sphere factor or the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third factor are leisure and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 0.610. The third factor is called the post-materialist factor or part of the QOL-enriching factor. It is important to note that this third factor appears separate from the first QOL-sustaining factor and the QOL-enriching factor combined.

4.5.2.3 Indonesia

Those items whose factor loadings are high on the first factor are housing, standard of living, household income, education, and job. Its eigenvalue is 5.274. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second factor are friendships, marriage, health, neighbors, public safety, family life, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 1.228. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third factor are condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, and leisure. This factor is called the public life sphere. The rankings of the first through the third factor resemble those of Japanese respondents. This corresponds with the findings of the citizen-state relationship in Asia and Europe, that is, Japanese and Indonesians are similar in their relationship with the state in terms of identity, trust, and satisfaction (Inoguchi and Blondel 2008).

4.5.2.4 Laos

Those items whose factor loadings on the first dimension are housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, and family life. Its eigenvalue is 3.341. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second dimension are housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, and family life. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second dimension are neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 0.719. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor or loadings on the third dimension are friendships, marriage, and leisure. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Its eigenvalue is 0.322.

4.5.2.5 Malaysia

Those items whose factor loadings on the first dimension are high are friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 5.149. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second dimension are housing, standards of living, household income, health, education, and job. Its eigenvalue is 1.087. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third dimension are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Its eigenvalue is 0.828. It is important to note that the QOL-enriching factor looms large in Malaysia. It appears that social relationships were woven together to encompass part of public sphere conditions of happiness.

4.5.2.6 Myanmar

Those items whose factor loadings are high on the first dimension are housing, friendships, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Its eigenvalue is 3.679. Those items whose factor loadings on the second dimension are high are neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Its eigenvalue is 1.100. The item whose factor loading is high on the third dimension is marriage. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Its eigenvalue is 0.45.

4.5.2.7 The Philippines

Those items whose factor loadings on the first dimension are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Its eigenvalue is 5.481. Those items whose factor loadings on the second dimension are high are housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Its eigenvalue is 1.081. Those items whose factor loadings on the third dimension are high are friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Its eigenvalue is 0.596. Without the provisions of public sphere conditions, the public cannot be happy.

4.5.2.8 Singapore

Those items whose factor loadings are high on the first dimension are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 5.420. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second dimension are high are housing, friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 1.308. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second dimension are high are standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. Its eigenvalue is 0.673. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Again, as in the Philippines, it is worth noting that without the provision of the public sphere or the QOL-enabling factor conditions, no one can feel happiness.

4.5.2.9 Thailand

Those items whose factor loadings on the first dimension are high are housing, friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 5.001. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching

factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second dimension are standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. Its eigenvalue is 0.974. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third dimension are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 0.650. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. It is important to note that the public sphere factor carries less weight than those factors related to social relations and individual efforts.

4.5.2.10 Vietnam

Those items whose factor loadings on the first dimension are high are friendships, marriage, education, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 4.205. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second dimension are high are housing, standard of living, household income, health, and job. Its eigenvalue is 1.081. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third dimension are high are neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, and social welfare system. Its eigenvalue is 0.460. It is worth noting that the QOL-enriching factor or public sphere factor looms large despite or because of the socialist system.

4.5.3 South Asia

4.5.3.1 Bangladesh

Those items whose factor loadings are high on the first dimension are housing, friendships, standard of living, health, education, and job. Its eigenvalue is 3.480. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 1.547. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third dimension are high are marriage, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. It is the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor.

4.5.3.2 Bhutan

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 3.710. It is called the public life sphere or the

QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. Its eigenvalue is 1.187. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third dimension are high are friendships, marriage, family life, and leisure. Its eigenvalue is 0.610. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. It is noteworthy that the first factor is the QOL-enabling factor. Those geographical and public sphere conditions loom large in the lives of Bhutanese.

4.5.3.3 India

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are housing, friendships, marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, and neighbors. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Its eigenvalue is 4.804. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 1.430. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high are family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 0.422. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. It is clear that the first factor mobilizes forces that are centered on social relationships.

4.5.3.4 The Maldives

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 6.719. It is the QOL-enabling factor and QOL-sustaining factor combined. We call this factor the public life sphere. It appears that life in the Maldives, an island nation on the Indian Ocean, is primarily determined by this sheer geography. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 1.173. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third factor are housing, friendships, and marriage. Its eigenvalue is 0.714. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor, although much of what would constitute the QOL-constituting factor has been explained by the first factor.

4.5.3.5 Nepal

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 3.667. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor.

Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 1.431. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third factor are high are friendships, marriage, neighbors, and family life. Its eigenvalue is 0.511. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. The degree to which the second factor determines happiness is considerably sizable. Geography, migration, and democracy mingle with each other in a landlocked country.

4.5.3.6 Pakistan

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 4.765. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are housing, friendships, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. Its eigenvalue is 1.563. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third factor are high are marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 0.754. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. A demographically large and yet relatively poor country, it is of little surprise to find that the QOL-enabling factor looms so large.

4.5.3.7 Sri Lanka

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 4.687. It is called the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are housing, friendships, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. Its eigenvalue is 1.407. It is called the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third factor are high are marriage, neighbors, family life, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 0.717. It is called the QOL-enriching factor. Again, it is worth noting that the QOL-enabling factor comes at the top. Public sphere conditions determine so much of Sri Lankan life.

4.5.4 Central Asia

4.5.4.1 Afghanistan

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, and neighbors. Its eigenvalue is 3.728. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items

whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are housing, friendships, family life, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 0.752. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third factor are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, and leisure. Its eigenvalue is 0.544. It is called the public life sphere or QOL-enabling factor. How Afghani life is sustained is evident by looking at each item of the first factor items. Small local communities consist of marriage, meager household income, neighbors, good attention and care to health, education, and job. The public sphere conditions are thin and unreliable. (See Appendix A.)

4.5.4.2 Kazakhstan

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 5.394. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are housing, standard of living, household income, health, and job. Its eigenvalue is 1.245. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third factor are friendships, marriage, education, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 0.739. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Being a geographically large and resource-abundant country, Kazakhstan is demographically a very small country. Yet the dominance of the first factor is mildly surprising. Part of the explanation probably relates to the sizable number of Russians residing in Kazakhstan and its geographical closeness to Russia.

4.5.4.3 Kyrgyzstan

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are friendships, marriage, education, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 3.500. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are housing, standard of living, household income, health, and job. Its eigenvalue is 1.191. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third factor are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 0.541. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. It is not unexpected to find that Kyrgyzstan is constituted by complex social relationships with the thin public sphere conditions.

4.5.4.4 Mongolia

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are standard of living, household income, health, education, job, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 4.542. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 1.473. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third factor are high are neighbors, housing, friendships, and marriage. Its eigenvalue is 0.633. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor.

4.5.4.5 Tajikistan

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, democratic system, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 5.046. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. A lot is packed into this factor. As a demographically and geographically small country, Tajikistan society consists of small communities in which those items are woven together with each other with the public sphere conditions being kept thin. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the second factor are friendships, marriage, neighbors, public safety, and family life. Its eigenvalue is 1.164. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings are high on the third factor are condition of the environment and social welfare system. Its eigenvalue is 0.645. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor.

4.5.4.6 Uzbekistan

Those items whose factor loadings on the first factor are high are housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, leisure, and spiritual life. Its eigenvalue is 3.986. It is called the materialist life sphere or the QOL-sustaining factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the second factor are high are friendships, marriage, and family life. Its eigenvalue is 0.983. It is called the post-materialist life sphere or the QOL-enriching factor. Those items whose factor loadings on the third factor are high are public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. Its eigenvalue is 0.643. It is called the public life sphere or the QOL-enabling factor. Again small communities full of complexities dominate life.

4.5.5 Types of Countries (Societies) Based on Factor Analyses

Based on the above factor analyses, we attempt to group 28 countries (societies) into different types and suggest the following society types below[2]:

1. Societies whose quality of life is largely determined by materialist factors or QOL-sustaining factors. Let us call such societies type A.
2. Societies whose quality of life is largely determined by post-materialist factors or QOL-enriching factors. Let us call such societies type B.
3. Societies whose quality of life is largely determined by public sphere factors or QOL-enabling factors. Let us call such societies type C.

We use "largely" because the first factor eigenvalue is uniformly and overwhelmingly strong compared to the succeeding factors.

Societies belonging to type A have two variants. (1) The second factor is the post-materialist factor or the QOL-enriching factor. Let us call such societies type Ab. (2) The second factor is the public sphere factor or the QOL-enabling factor. Let us call such societies type Ac.

Type B societies have only one type: its second factor is the materialist factor or the QOL-sustaining factor.

Type C societies have two variants. (1) The second factor is the materialist factor or the QOL-sustaining factor. Let us call such societies type Ca. (2) The second factor is the post-materialist factor or the QOL-enriching factor. Let us call such societies type Cb.

Societies of type A have 15 societies, of which five societies are type Ab and ten societies are type Ac; societies of type B have four societies; and societies of type C have eight societies, of which six societies are type Ca and two societies are type Cb.

It is society types as viewed from the ground. Unlike most theories of the state that are almost exclusively theories seen from above (Inoguchi and Blondel 2008), this society-focused proto-theory examines the state from the bottom up. The exercise is to figure out the nature of the state from the way that quality of life is determined: materialist factor, post-materialist factor, or public sphere factor.

Table 4.21 shows how 28 countries and societies are grouped into different types.[3] Societies of type Ab include Japan, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan. In a sense, this type has deep societies. Tajikistan's first factor eigenvalue is overwhelmingly hegemonic; literally, the first factor explains almost everything. The first factor of this type is the materialist factor or QOL-sustaining factor. The state within this type appears to be weak. Japan and Indonesia appear very similar from a perspective of citizens' identity, citizens' confidence in the state, and citizens' satisfaction in the performance of the state (Inoguchi and Blondel 2008) as they point to the same feature from different angles. Afghanistan

[2] See *supra* note 1.

[3] See *supra* note 1.

Table 4.21 Types of countries (societies) based on factor analyses

Type	1st	2nd	Societies
Ab	Materialist	Post-materialist	Japan, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan
Ac	Materialist	Public	China, South Korea, Taiwan, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Mongolia
B	Post-materialist	Materialist	Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, Kyrgyzstan
Ca	Post-materialist	Public	Brunei, The Philippines, Bhutan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Kazakhstan
Cb	Public	Materialist	Singapore, The Maldives

has no state to speak of. It has strong tribal communities. Uzbekistan and Tajikistan are former Soviet Union member states, and without Moscow, these states do not exercise their authority and power very much. The states are weak. The societies are strong.

Societies of type Ac include China, South Korea, Taiwan, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Mongolia. In this group, the state exercises power and the society is no less strong. China, South Korea, and Taiwan have a strong society of individualism and clan organizations. Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar are heavily Indianized continental Southeast Asian states. They exercise power where the society keeps its hold. Bangladesh, India, and Nepal have an Indianized state structure of bureaucratic authoritarianism where the society never gives in. Mongolia is under the heavy influence of Russia and the untamable nature of a harsh landscape and climate. The state must come in order to sustain lives.

Societies of type B include Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Kyrgyzstan. Post-materialist features are salient. They are more or less new settlers' havens where competition and coexistence must be well handled among near strangers. State power recedes. A Vietnamese proverb is apt: state power is up to the bamboo gate.

Societies of type Ca include Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Kazakhstan. Here the state is domineering. It is the weak state domineering among a centrifugal society.

Societies of type Cb include Singapore and the Maldives. Here the state is dominant. The society is seemingly docile. But outside the framework of an imposed state, society is more vibrant.

Thus, the diversity of Asia is immense, and the picture provided above may not be orthodox interpretations because our picture is the picture from below. It is the QOL-based society-state typology. It is our contention that only through an examination of society and quality-of-life determinants is it possible to glimpse the nature of state power.

References

Inglehart, R. (1971). The silent revolution in Europe: Intergenerational change in post-industrial societies. *The American Political Science Review, 65*, 991–1017.

Inglehart, R. (2006). Commentary on "The silent revolution in Europe: Intergenerational change in post-industrial societies". *American Political Science Review, 100*, 685 (Thematic issue on the evolution of political science, in recognition of the centennial of the review).

Inglehart, R., & Abramson, P. R. (1994). Economic security and value change. *American Political Science Review, 88*, 336–354.

Inoguchi, T., & Blondel, J. (2008). *Citizens and the states: Attitudes in Western Europe and East and Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.

Park, C. M. (2009). The quality of life in South Korea. *Social Indicators Research, 92*, 263–294.

Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (Eds.). (2009). *The quality of life in Confucian Asia: From physical welfare to subjective well-being* (Social indicators research series). Dordrecht: Springer [This book was originally published as a special volume in *Social Indicators Research, 92*(2), (2009)].

Chapter 5
Lifestyles

In this section, we examine a way of life or lifestyles. We extend the analyses done by Chong-Min Park (2009) and examine six lifestyles: modern life, digital life, religious life, global life, political life, and family life. We also tap the relative standard of living of the respondents. We use the pooled survey data conducted from 2003 to 2008, assuming survey responses are time invariant in that pattern and nature of survey responses for a particular question do not differ across covered years. We treat the survey responses as if they are asked in the same year. For example, the AsiaBarometer conducted surveys in China in 2003, 2004, 2006, and 2008, and we analyze the responses as if they are cross-sectional data.

5.1 Modern Life

One of the most important factors that affect lifestyles in modern life is the extent to which infrastructure is constructed and necessities are available to citizens. The AsiaBarometer Surveys asked the extent to which respondents have access to public utilities. The exact wording of the question is "Which of the following public utilities does your household have the use of?" The list of public utilities in the 2003 and 2004 questionnaires includes the following three public utilities: "public water supply," "electricity," and "LPG or piped gas." From 2005 onward, the following four public utilities are added to the questionnaire: "fixed-line phone," "mobile phone," "facsimile," and "cable TV." "LPG or piped gas" was written as "piped gas" in the 2003 and 2004 questionnaires, "liquefied petroleum gas or LPG" in 2005, and "liquefied petroleum gas or LPG, piped gas" from 2006 to 2008.

To compare the extent to which the people of 29 Asian societies live a modern life with these necessities, we used the data from 2005 to 2008 and counted the number of public utilities each respondent could access at home.[1] We then calculated the

[1] Turkmenistan is included in this analysis. See *supra* note 1.

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0_5,

Table 5.1 Number of public utilities

Society	Mean	*N*
Taiwan	6.1	1,006
South Korea	5.9	1,023
Japan	5.7	2,015
Maldives	5.6	821
Hong Kong	5.4	1,000
Singapore	5.4	1,038
Bhutan	5.2	801
China	5.1	3,000
India	5.0	2,290
Malaysia	4.7	1,000
Uzbekistan	4.7	800
Nepal	4.5	800
Vietnam	4.4	1,000
Thailand	4.1	1,000
Kazakhstan	3.5	800
Sri Lanka	3.4	813
Philippines	3.1	1,000
Pakistan	3.1	1,086
Laos	3.0	1,000
Cambodia	2.9	1,012
Mongolia	2.8	800
Turkmenistan	2.7	800
Kyrgyzstan	2.5	800
Tajikistan	2.4	800
Afghanistan	2.1	874
Bangladesh	2.0	1,008
Indonesia	1.7	1,000
Myanmar	1.1	1,000
Asia	*4.1*	*30,387*

average values of the numbers for each society and for Asia as a whole. For the region of Asia, the average number of public utilities is 4.1 out of 7 utilities.

The mean values vary considerably from a low of 1.1 in Myanmar to a high of 6.1 in Taiwan (see Table 5.1). The Taiwanese people have the most access to the seven public utilities, followed by the South Korean people with a mean of 5.9 and the Japanese people with a mean of 5.7.

Myanmar, on the other hand, is the country in which the seven public utilities are least available in Asia. It is followed by Indonesia with a mean of 1.7 and Bangladesh with a mean of 2.0.

5.2 Digital Life

To examine the levels of digital lives of ordinary people in Asia, we first look at the question about how often the respondents view Internet web pages on computers. The AsiaBarometer asked this question from 2005 onward, thereby eliminating

Table 5.2 Viewing internet web pages by computers (%)

	Almost every day	Several times a week	Several times a month	Seldom	Never
South Korea	49.2	13.4	3.5	5.1	28.7
Hong Kong	39.7	11.9	5.7	11.4	31.3
Singapore	36.2	12.5	5.2	8.9	37.0
Bhutan	26.3	17.1	8.4	16.2	32.0
Japan	30.2	14.1	6.6	7.5	41.7
Taiwan	28.1	11.9	5.2	10.5	44.3
Maldives	19.2	11.0	6.8	21.7	41.2
China	18.3	9.8	5.8	12.5	53.6
Nepal	5.3	9.1	5.3	12.2	68.1
Vietnam	7.1	6.8	5.6	11.8	68.8
Uzbekistan	6.5	6.5	6.0	13.1	67.8
Malaysia	5.3	6.9	3.9	12.0	71.9
India	6.7	4.7	4.1	6.2	78.3
Philippines	5.1	6.1	4.3	14.6	69.8
Thailand	6.9	5.5	1.8	7.6	78.2
Mongolia	1.3	4.5	7.0	11.6	75.6
Sri Lanka	1.5	5.3	3.3	15.0	74.8
Laos	1.4	2.5	5.7	6.2	84.2
Pakistan	3.9	3.7	1.5	3.9	87.0
Kazakhstan	2.3	3.3	3.3	8.5	82.6
Cambodia	0.7	2.5	3.7	2.0	91.2
Kyrgyzstan	2.0	2.6	1.6	6.6	87.1
Tajikistan	2.0	1.2	2.5	10.7	83.7
Turkmenistan	0.5	1.4	3.3	4.2	90.7
Myanmar	0.1	1.5	3.0	10.9	84.5
Afghanistan	3.7	0.4	0.4	95.5	0
Bangladesh	0.7	0.8	0.5	3.4	94.6
Indonesia	0.5	0.6	0.6	4.9	93.3
Total	12.8	7.0	4.3	11.8	64.1

Brunei, surveyed in 2004, from analysis of this question. Table 5.2 shows the distribution of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "almost every day" to "never" for each society and for the entire sample.

Table 5.2 ranks 28 societies and countries based on the sum of the top three positive ratings. Table 5.2 shows that in only five countries and societies does a majority of respondents view Internet web pages at least several times a month. In the rest of the countries, negative ratings (the sum of the "seldom" and "never" responses) prevail.

We also look at the question about how frequently the respondents read and write e-mails. Since the AsiaBarometer asked this question only after 2006, the number of countries and societies in Table 5.3 was reduced to 15. Table 5.3 shows the distribution of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from "almost every day" to "never" for each of the 15 countries and societies. According to Table 5.3, a majority of the respondents say they use computer e-mails

Table 5.3 Reading or writing e-mails by computers (%)

	Almost every day	Several times a week	Several times a month	Seldom	Never
Singapore	35.8	12.6	4.4	8.6	38.6
South Korea	28.8	14.0	7.1	11.3	38.8
Hong Kong	30.3	11.6	6.2	11.7	40.2
Taiwan	21.6	11.9	6.0	11.5	49.0
Japan	23.1	10.3	5.1	12.5	49.1
China	7.2	8.2	6.6	13.8	64.2
India	9.7	6.6	5.7	5.7	72.3
Malaysia	4.6	6.0	4.3	11.5	73.7
Vietnam	3.6	6.9	4.3	8.7	76.6
Philippines	4.3	6.0	4.4	14.6	70.6
Thailand	4.4	4.1	1.8	6.5	83.2
Cambodia	0.6	1.9	3.3	1.8	92.5
Laos	0.8	1.3	3.4	5.2	89.3
Myanmar	0.0	0.5	2.3	8.7	88.5
Indonesia	0.5	0.4	0.9	3.9	94.3
Total	12.1	7.3	4.7	9.8	66.1

Table 5.4 Reading or writing messages by mobile phones (%)

	lmost every day	Several times a week	Several times a month	Seldom	Never
South Korea	52.4	15.0	5.0	7.3	20.4
Singapore	58.2	10.2	3.4	6.2	22.0
Japan	48.1	15.5	4.2	6.3	26.0
Malaysia	43.4	15.6	3.5	6.3	31.2
Philippines	42.0	12.8	3.7	15.7	25.8
China	35.7	14.0	5.7	12.6	32.0
India	28.4	16.6	8.0	9.2	37.9
Taiwan	18.0	17.6	13.6	20.9	29.8
Hong Kong	18.7	14.7	11.6	22.5	32.5
Vietnam	25.8	6.9	3.8	14.0	49.6
Cambodia	7.4	9.3	8.6	6.0	68.7
Laos	5.7	8.5	10.5	10.8	64.4
Indonesia	16.0	6.7	1.1	10.9	65.3
Thailand	6.2	7.4	5.0	16.0	65.4
Myanmar	0.1	0.7	1.4	5.5	92.3
Total	29.4	12.0	5.8	11.2	41.6

at least several times a month in only 2 of the 15 countries. A majority say they never use computer e-mails in ten of these countries and societies.

The AsiaBarometer also asked the respondents how often they text using mobile phones from 2006 onward. Table 5.4 shows the distribution of survey responses across the five response categories, ranging from “almost every day” to “never” for each of the 15 countries and societies surveyed since 2006. Over a majority of the respondents say they use mobile phone messaging at least several times a month in

7 of the 15 surveyed countries and societies. A majority of respondents in five countries report that they never use mobile phone messaging.

In all, the levels of digital life are not high in Asia.

5.3 Religious Life

The AsiaBarometer asked respondents in all 29 countries and societies whether they belong to any particular religion and how often they pray or meditate. Table 5.5 shows that a vast majority (80%) of the respondents have religious affiliation. In a majority of countries and societies, over 90% of the respondents belong to a religion. Yet some countries and societies show a quite different pattern. The proportion of those who belong to a religion is the lowest in China at 17%, followed by Hong Kong

Table 5.5 Religious affiliation (%)

	Yes	No
Afghanistan	100	0
Bangladesh	100	0
Indonesia	100	0
Maldives	100	0
Cambodia	99.9	0.1
Laos	99.9	0
Myanmar	99.9	0.1
Pakistan	99.9	0
India	99.9	0.1
Philippines	99.8	0.1
Nepal	99.8	0.3
Sri Lanka	99.7	0.1
Thailand	99.6	0
Malaysia	99.3	0.7
Brunei	99.3	0.6
Bhutan	99.0	0
Tajikistan	98.1	1.5
Turkmenistan	95.5	1.3
Kyrgyzstan	92.5	6
Uzbekistan	88.4	10.6
Singapore	87.0	12.9
Mongolia	80.6	18.6
Taiwan	75.6	24.1
Kazakhstan	75.1	22.3
Vietnam	63.1	36.7
South Korea	56.4	43.3
Japan	32.4	66.3
Hong Kong	27.0	72.8
China	17.4	81.6
Total	79.9	19.6

Table 5.6 Frequency of praying (%)

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	On special occasions	Never
Maldives	59.8	40.2	0	0	0
Afghanistan	96.9	2.2	0.6	0.3	0
Philippines	77.8	16.7	2.2	2.9	0.3
Myanmar	77.8	15.9	2.9	3.1	0.3
Indonesia	87.0	6.3	0.9	5.5	0.3
India	85.4	7.2	0.9	4.0	2.6
Bangladesh	60.5	29.6	4.0	5.6	0.4
Pakistan	53.5	32.2	5.8	5.1	3.3
Malaysia	77.7	7.5	1.8	10.9	2.2
Brunei	68.2	11.8	2.4	16.5	1.1
Nepal	57.1	9.3	2.8	27.9	3.0
Bhutan	53.6	11.9	2.4	29.2	2.9
Sri Lanka	47.5	12.8	5.7	24.3	9.7
Laos	16.2	40.5	8.3	33.7	1.4
Singapore	47.9	8.7	3.6	19.7	20.1
Cambodia	17.7	27.0	2.3	34.9	18.1
Uzbekistan	34.4	9.9	2.8	36.6	16.3
Turkmenistan	40.5	0	0	7.8	51.7
Tajikistan	35.0	4.2	2.3	38.7	19.9
Thailand	23.2	10.8	2.9	50.4	12.7
South Korea	17.6	12.3	3.6	25.5	41.0
Kyrgyzstan	24.5	5.1	1.4	27.4	41.7
Japan	21.7	4.4	3.7	33.9	36.2
Kazakhstan	10.9	2.4	2.9	49.0	34.7
Vietnam	4.5	7.1	13.4	51.5	23.5
Taiwan	7.6	3.6	9.7	38.3	40.9
Mongolia	5.7	4.9	14.9	49.7	24.8
Hong Kong	6.9	2.9	1.7	10.3	78.2
China	4.5	2.4	3.0	21.9	68.2
Total	42.0	12.1	3.6	22.2	20.2

at 27%, Japan at 32%, and South Korea at 56%. These are all North East Asian countries and societies.

Table 5.6 below shows the response results to the question about frequencies of prayer or meditation. Slightly more than one-half of the entire sample (54%) reported they pray or meditate "daily" or "weekly." In contrast, about two-fifths (42%) said they pray or meditate "on special occasions" or "never." Only 4% said they pray or meditate "monthly."

Table 5.6 ranked 29 societies on the sum of the top two categories "daily" and "weekly." According to Table 5.6, the Maldives emerges as the country with the highest percentage. All of the Maldivian respondents pray or meditate "daily" or "weekly." It is followed by Afghanistan at 99%, and then the Philippines and Myanmar, both which are over 90%.

On the other side of the spectrum, China, Hong Kong, Mongolia, Taiwan, and Vietnam in this order have the least percentage of those who pray or meditate on a

"daily" or "weekly" basis. In these countries and societies, the percentage of praying and meditating "daily" is in the single digits, whereas those who reported "on special occasions" and "never" outnumber those who reported "daily" and "weekly."

5.4 Global Life

To measure and compare the levels of global life across the 29 countries and societies, we look at two sets of questions. The first question asks respondents the extent to which they live a life internationally. The second question asks respondents to assess their own ability to speak English. The exact wording of the first set of questions is "Which, if any, of the following statements applies to you?" The six statements include "A member of my family or a relative lives in another country," "I have traveled abroad at least three times in the past three years," "I have friends from other countries who are in SURVEYED COUNTRY," "I often watch foreign-produced programs on TV," "I often communicate with people in other countries via the Internet or e-mail," and "My job involves contact with organizations or people in other countries." The AsiaBarometer posed this question to the respondents of all the 29 societies from 2003 to 2008.

We counted the number of statements for which each individual respondent said "yes." The maximum value is six and the minimum is zero. According to Table 5.7, the grand mean for the entire sample of Asia is 1.0. On average, one of the six statements applies to the surveyed respondents in Asia.

Table 5.7 also reports the average value for each society or country. Generally speaking, the mean values are low in Asian societies. One-half of the 29 societies have a mean less than 1. The number of applicable statements is the largest in Brunei with a mean of 2.8, followed by Singapore with a mean of 2.7 and the Maldives with 2.4. The number of the statements is the smallest in Turkmenistan and Indonesia, both with a mean of 0.4. They are followed by Thailand and China, both with a mean of 0.5

The second question we chose taps the extent to which people experience global life, and in this survey, this is determined by how well the respondents rate their ability to speak English. The exact wording of the questions is "How well do you speak English?" The AsiaBarometer asked respondents this question in all the surveys from 2003 to 2008 on the five verbal response categories, including "not at all," "very little," "I can speak it well enough to get by in daily life," and "I can speak English fluently" along with the "don't know" category.

To convey a balanced picture of self-assessed English proficiency in each society, we combined the two positive replies "I can speak English fluently" and "I can speak it well enough to get by in daily life" and then combined the two negative ratings "very little" and "not at all." We then constructed a percentage difference index (PDI) by subtracting the combined ratings of the latter from those of the former. Values of this index range from a low of a negative 100 points to a

Table 5.7 Levels of living internationally

	Mean	*N*
Brunei	2.8	804
Singapore	2.7	1,838
Maldives	2.4	821
Bhutan	1.9	801
Uzbekistan	1.8	1,600
Laos	1.7	1,800
Cambodia	1.5	1,824
Nepal	1.5	800
Philippines	1.3	1,800
Vietnam	1.2	2,607
Malaysia	1.2	2,600
Hong Kong	1.1	1,000
Myanmar	1.1	2,600
Sri Lanka	1.0	1,613
Tajikistan	1.0	800
Taiwan	0.9	1,006
Kyrgyzstan	0.9	800
Kazakhstan	0.9	800
Mongolia	0.8	800
Afghanistan	0.7	874
Japan	0.6	3,697
Pakistan	0.6	1,086
Bangladesh	0.6	1,008
South Korea	0.6	2,642
India	0.5	3,112
China	0.5	4,800
Thailand	0.5	2,600
Indonesia	0.4	1,825
Turkmenistan	0.4	800
Total	1.0	49,158

high of a positive 100 points. According to the PDI values reported in the last column of Table 5.8, Singapore emerges as the nation where most people evaluate their ability to speak English high with a positive 62 points. It is followed by Bhutan (+62), the Maldives (+40), and Nepal (+2). The rest of the societies other than these top four all have negative values on the PDI. Of the 29 surveyed societies, 25 societies or over three-quarters of Asian respondents rated their own ability to speak English negatively. The total mean of the PDI for the entire sample of Asia is a negative 48 points. One-half of the 29 societies have a PDI lower than a negative 70 points. We also notice that those who replied with "I can speak English fluently" constitute the majority (55%) only in Singapore. Those who replied with "I can speak it well enough to get by in daily life" constitute the majority in the other three top countries: Bhutan (45%), the Maldives (41%), and Nepal (38%). Looking at the societies ranked at the bottom of Table 5.8, more than three-quarters replied "not at all"—Kazakhstan (80%), Turkmenistan (79%), Tajikistan (77%), Kyrgyzstan

Table 5.8 Self-assessed ability to speak English (%)

	Fluently	Enough in daily life	Very little	Not at all	PDI
Singapore	55.3	25.8	14.6	4.2	62.3
Bhutan	35.6	45.1	11.5	7.8	61.5
Maldives	29.1	40.8	20.2	9.9	39.9
Nepal	13.3	37.9	24.9	24.0	2.3
Brunei	14.9	32.2	45.1	7.9	−5.9
Sri Lanka	15.7	29.5	39.9	15.0	−9.6
India	19.0	25.4	35.0	20.6	−11.1
Philippines	6.6	26.5	58.7	8.2	−33.9
Hong Kong	3.9	23.1	45.2	27.8	−45.9
Malaysia	9.0	17.6	40.9	32.4	−46.7
Bangladesh	2.4	23.2	32.1	42.3	−48.7
South Korea	0.7	21.7	53.8	23.8	−55.1
Pakistan	3.8	16.6	19.2	60.3	−59.0
Thailand	1.3	16.7	36.5	45.5	−63.9
Vietnam	2.6	14.7	38.7	44.0	−65.5
Myanmar	1.7	12.9	36.4	49.1	−70.9
Japan	1.0	11.5	53.3	34.2	−75.0
Cambodia	1.5	10.6	28.9	59.0	−75.8
Mongolia	0.9	10.2	22.8	66.1	−77.8
China	1.5	8.1	38.1	52.3	−80.8
Uzbekistan	2.4	6.4	28.4	62.8	−82.5
Taiwan	1.5	6.6	40.2	51.7	−83.8
Laos	0.9	6.4	32.9	59.8	−85.5
Afghanistan	3.0	3.5	18.4	75.1	−87.0
Kyrgyzstan	0.8	3.3	18.8	77.3	−92.0
Kazakhstan	1.1	2.5	16.5	79.9	−92.7
Indonesia	0.3	2.6	38.6	58.5	−94.2
Tajikistan	0.4	1.9	20.4	77.3	−95.5
Turkmenistan	0.4	1.6	18.9	79.1	−96.0
Total	10.5	15.3	34.4	39.8	−48.4

(77%), and Afghanistan (75%). Overwhelming majorities of people in Asia and within each society assessed their own English proficiency as low.

According to Tables 5.7 and 5.8, the people of Asia tend to have a low level of global life.

5.5 Political Life

The AsiaBarometer asked the respondents how often they vote in the national elections on a five-category verbal scale, ranging from “every time,” “most of the time,” “sometimes,” “rarely,” and “never voted,” along with two other response

Table 5.9 Voting frequency in national elections (%)

	Every time	Most of the time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never voted	Don't have the right to vote
Laos	88.1	3.7	3.5	2.1	1.4	1.2
Mongolia	81.9	11.9	3.4	1.0	1.0	0.9
Thailand	79.6	9.4	6.3	2.2	2.3	0.3
Sri Lanka	78.0	11.7	5.4	1.8	1.9	1.2
Philippines	75.1	11.6	5.2	4.0	3.5	0.6
Vietnam	74.9	14.6	5.5	1.8	3.0	0.2
Cambodia	73.6	10.1	3.7	1.0	6.8	4.8
Indonesia	72.4	18.7	4.9	2.7	1.0	0.1
India	68.9	13.7	8.1	3.3	4.4	1.6
Bangladesh	65.8	12.9	6.1	2.5	7.3	5.4
Maldives	65.0	12.8	8.4	3.1	10.7	0
South Korea	62.5	19.0	8.3	4.6	3.9	1.7
Malaysia	59.7	10.5	3.8	2.7	11.4	11.9
Kyrgyzstan	56.4	26.5	8.9	3.7	3.2	1.4
Japan	53.1	23.4	10.9	7.9	4.5	0.2
Taiwan	52.9	25.8	10.5	4.7	3.8	2.3
Uzbekistan	46.4	14.8	13.8	11.4	13.1	0.5
Pakistan	46.2	29.6	8.8	6.6	3.6	5.0
Nepal	41.4	22.3	11.9	6.9	17.5	0
Kazakhstan	40.5	24.1	13.7	10.2	11.0	0.5
Turkmenistan	38.1	29.8	12.9	10.7	8.5	0
Singapore	37.3	14.9	12.7	10.8	12.5	11.7
Tajikistan	33.2	28.8	18.8	9.4	9.8	0
Hong Kong	21.9	6.8	10.9	6.9	27.8	25.7
China	14.3	8.1	11.9	20.2	20.0	25.5
Bhutan	1.5	1.8	2.6	5.3	88.8	0
Total	57.2	14.9	8.2	6.0	8.7	5.0

categories "don't have the right to vote" and "don't know." This question was not asked in Myanmar in 2003, 2004, and 2007; it was not asked in Brunei and China in 2004; and it was not asked in Afghanistan in 2005.

The bottom line of Table 5.9 reveals that 72% of all the respondents vote in national elections either every time or most of the time. Of the respondents, 5% do not have the right to vote. Table 5.9 also shows the distribution of survey responses across six response categories with the exception of the "don't know" category. The 26 countries and societies are ranked based on the "every time" category. Generally speaking, voter turnout is high in Asia. Over 60% of the respondents in 12 of the countries and societies vote every time in national elections. When we combine the two positive responses together, over 60% of respondents in 22 countries and societies vote either every time or most of the time at their national elections.

5.6 Family Life

To examine the levels of family life of ordinary citizens living in Asia, we first examine their eating patterns. The AsiaBarometer asked respondents whether they eat a home-cooked breakfast and dinner at home. Table 5.10 shows the percentages of those who say they eat breakfast and evening meals cooked at home at home for each country/society and for the entire sample. Table 5.10 reveals that of the respondents, over 90% eat both home-cooked meals at home; 93% eat breakfast cooked at home; and 97% eat evening meals cooked at home.

We then look at the types of housing for respondents. The AsiaBarometer asked respondents in all the surveys from 2003 to 2008 to categorize their current residence according to the given choices. The five categories include "owner-occupied detached or semidetached house (duplex)," "owner-occupied terraced house or unit in an apartment or condominium complex," "rented detached or

Table 5.10 Diet (%)

	Breakfast	Dinner
Laos	99.4	100
Myanmar	99.5	99.9
Pakistan	99.5	99.1
Philippines	98.6	99.5
Kyrgyzstan	98.4	98.9
Kazakhstan	97.9	99.3
Nepal	98.6	98.5
Indonesia	97.5	99
Tajikistan	97.5	98.6
Cambodia	96.3	99.6
Mongolia	97.0	98.8
Afghanistan	97.9	97.6
Uzbekistan	97.3	97.7
Sri Lanka	96.2	98
India	99.5	94.6
Brunei	96.1	97.6
Bhutan	93.5	97
Japan	91.9	98.3
China	92.2	97.9
Taiwan	90.7	97.4
Singapore	90.8	95.3
Thailand	88.6	96.4
South Korea	90.1	94
Malaysia	88.8	95.3
Maldives	89.3	91
Vietnam	81.2	97.9
Hong Kong	78.2	97.7
Turkmenistan	75.9	99.6
Bangladesh	98.1	72.6
Total	92.9	96.7

Table 5.11 Current residence (%)

	Owner-occupied detached or semi-detached (duplex) house	Owner-occupied terraced house or unit in an apartment or condominium complex	Rented detached or semi-detached (duplex) house	Rented terraced house or unit in an apartment or condominium complex	Other (a room in a relative's home, etc.)
Uzbekistan	1.7	94.7	0.1	3.1	0.4
Tajikistan	73.8	22.0	1.3	1.3	1.6
Turkmenistan	64.1	31.6	0.9	2.0	1.4
Kazakhstan	49.4	45.0	0.5	4.8	0.4
Vietnam	89.7	4.0	4.0	1.6	0.7
Kyrgyzstan	58.9	34.5	0.9	4.6	1.1
Singapore	4.3	88.9	0.5	5.1	1.2
Laos	88.9	2.2	2.2	4.4	2.3
Taiwan	50.2	38.3	3.2	5.9	2.5
Indonesia	83.8	4.4	7.5	2.0	2.2
Pakistan	85.3	2.7	8.9	1.2	1.9
Sri Lanka	76.3	10.8	7.6	3.8	1.4
Philippines	83.4	1.8	8.3	3.6	2.9
Cambodia	53.2	31.7	6.6	5.7	2.8
Myanmar	77.3	5.1	9.5	3.0	5.1
South Korea	31.1	46.1	8.8	12.8	1.2
Japan	69.8	4.9	5.0	19.6	0.7
Afghanistan	68.7	5.3	16.5	1.7	7.8
China	17.6	52.6	1.4	19.0	9.4
Thailand	53.5	15.1	7.1	19.0	5.3
Malaysia	36.2	31.8	5.8	18.5	7.7
Maldives	48.7	17.2	13.3	17.1	3.7
India	35.2	30.1	17.6	14.1	3.0
Bangladesh	58.6	3.3	22.6	11.1	4.4
Hong Kong	0.4	56.2	0.4	43.0	0
Brunei	42.3	13.1	10.0	8.1	26.6
Mongolia	25.8	26.2	1.6	3.1	43.3
Nepal	33.3	9.3	5.1	51.7	0.6
Bhutan	9.6	9.1	38.3	16.0	26.9
Total	50.6	26.6	6.9	11.2	4.7

semidetached house (duplex)," "rented terraced house or unit in an apartment or condominium complex," and "others (a room in a relative's home, etc.)," along with a "don't know" response. The first category "owner-occupied detached or semidetached house (duplex)" was written as "owner-occupied detached house" from 2003 to 2005. The third category "rented detached or semidetached house (duplex)" was written as "rented detached house" from 2003 to 2005.

Table 5.11 shows the distribution of survey responses on the five categories for each country and society and for the entire sample of Asia. Of the respondents, 77% have their own home, compared to 18% who have rented accommodations. Table 5.11 ranks the 29 countries and societies based on the proportion of the respondents who

Table 5.12 Number of family members

Afghanistan	8.8
Maldives	8.6
Brunei	7.6
Pakistan	7.4
Tajikistan	6.9
Cambodia	5.4
Malaysia	5.3
Myanmar	5.3
Philippines	5.2
Laos	5.2
Bangladesh	5.0
Sri Lanka	4.9
Nepal	4.9
Kyrgyzstan	4.7
Indonesia	4.6
India	4.6
Uzbekistan	4.6
Bhutan	4.5
Vietnam	4.5
Mongolia	4.5
Taiwan	4.4
Thailand	4.2
Singapore	4.0
Kazakhstan	4.0
Turkmenistan	3.8
South Korea	3.7
Japan	3.6
Hong Kong	3.6
China	3.5
Average	4.7

have their own home, combining the first two categories together. More than one-half of the respondents live in their own home in 27 of the 29 countries and societies. Exceptions are Nepal with 43% and Bhutan with 19% being homeowners.

To examine family life in Asia, we also ask respondents to quantify the number of family members. According to Table 5.12, the average family size for the entire sample is 4.7 people. The number of family members varies from 3.5 people in China to 8.8 in Afghanistan. A vast majority of countries and societies have around four or five family members on average.

5.7 Self-Assessments of Relative Standard of Living

To tap subjective assessments of one's own standard of living, the AsiaBarometer asked respondents the question "How would you describe your standard of living?" This item asked respondents to assess their own standard of living in a relative

Table 5.13 Self-assessments of relative standard of living (%)

	High	Relatively high	Average	Relatively low	Low	Mean	PDI
India	13.9	22.8	57.0	5.0	1.3	3.43	30.3
Sri Lanka	8.2	27.3	59.2	4.0	1.2	3.37	30.2
Maldives	12.0	11.3	72.6	3.6	0.5	3.31	19.2
Singapore	7.9	16.3	70.7	3.2	1.9	3.25	19.2
Bhutan	2.4	19.3	73.8	3.5	1.0	3.19	17.2
Brunei	3.1	8.0	87.2	1.5	0.2	3.12	9.3
Malaysia	4.5	9.4	78.5	5.9	1.7	3.09	6.3
Hong Kong	1.0	12.3	75.4	10.3	1.0	3.02	2.0
Taiwan	0.6	8.1	83.8	6.9	0.6	3.01	1.2
Myanmar	1.5	12.5	70.8	12.1	3.1	2.97	−1.2
Vietnam	1.1	8.6	78.7	8.5	3.2	2.96	−2.1
Afghanistan	7.9	12.0	55.8	15.4	8.9	2.95	−4.4
Thailand	1.1	6.0	80.7	10.1	2.2	2.94	−5.2
Bangladesh	2.7	14.0	63.3	13.5	6.6	2.93	−3.4
Pakistan	8.4	13.7	49.3	19.2	9.4	2.92	−6.6
Japan	1.7	10.5	66.9	16.7	4.1	2.89	−8.6
Philippines	1.4	6.2	75.5	13.3	3.6	2.89	−9.3
Cambodia	0.6	6.5	77.1	11.7	4.2	2.88	−8.8
China	0.9	9.8	69.1	15.7	4.4	2.87	−9.3
Kyrgyzstan	2.4	6.4	74.3	8.8	8.2	2.86	−8.2
South Korea	0.8	10.2	66.3	19.1	3.6	2.85	−11.8
Laos	2.2	6.5	69.3	17.1	5.0	2.84	−13.4
Mongolia	1.4	5.5	71.9	16.9	4.3	2.83	−14.2
Kazakhstan	1.1	4.8	74.2	14.7	5.2	2.82	−14.0
Nepal	1.5	6.8	68.9	16.5	6.3	2.81	−14.5
Turkmenistan	6.4	11.7	43.9	27.8	10.2	2.76	−19.8
Uzbekistan	1.5	6.0	68.5	13.9	10.1	2.75	−16.5
Indonesia	0.9	4.4	69.5	17.0	8.1	2.73	−19.7
Tajikistan	0.9	8.6	59.4	22.0	9.1	2.70	−21.6
Asia	*3.5*	*11.4*	*69.0*	*12.2*	*4.0*	*2.98*	*−1.3*

perspective on a 5-point verbal response category: “high,” “relatively high,” “average,” “relatively low,” and “low,” along with “don’t know” category. This variable can measure a sense of relative well-being (Shin and Inoguchi 2009). The sample size is 52,008 without the “don’t know” responses and missing values.

To compare the self-assessed relative standard of living among the 29 countries and societies, Table 5.13 reports the distributions of survey responses across the five categories, ranging from “high” to “low,” the mean values, and the percentage difference indexes (PDIs) for the 29 countries and societies that represent the entire sample of Asia. The original five-category verbal scale is assigned a 5-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (“low”) to a high of 5 (“high”). The mean is calculated on this 5-point numeric scale. The PDIs are calculated by subtracting the two combined negative ratings (the sum of “relatively low” and “low”) from the two combined positive ratings (the sum of “high” and “relatively high”).

According to the row at the bottom of Table 5.13, the distribution of survey responses across the five categories appears to be normal. An overwhelming majority (69%) of the people of Asia assessed their own standard of living as average. Only a few (4%) assessed their standard of living as high, and more than one-tenth (11%) assessed it as relatively high. Similarly, more than one-tenth (12%) assessed their standard of living as relatively low, and only a few (4%) assessed it as low. As a result, the mean value for the entire Asian sample is close to 3 and the PDI is close to 0.

We also note that those who replied with "average" constitute a majority in all the 29 societies with the exception of Turkmenistan (44%) and Pakistan (49%). Because large proportions of the surveyed respondents in each society replied with "average," we refer to the mean value for the data on the 5-point numeric scale to compare the levels of self-assessed standard of living. According to the means reported in the second column from the right of Table 5.13, India, with a mean of 3.43, has the largest proportion of people who positively assess their own standard of living. It is followed by Sri Lanka with a mean of 3.37 and the Maldives with a mean of 3.31.

In contrast, Tajikistan, with a mean of 2.70, has the most people who negatively assess their own standard of living. It is followed by Indonesia with a mean of 2.73 and Uzbekistan with a mean of 2.75. We note that the mean values center around 3, ranging from a low of 2.70 to a high of 3.43. We also note that the rankings of the 29 societies based on the mean values are similar to those based on the PDI values. India is ranked first on the PDI with a positive 30 points, and Tajikistan is ranked 29th with a negative 22 points.

References

Park, C. M. (2009). The quality of life in South Korea. *Social Indicators Research, 92*, 263–294.
Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (2009). Avowed happiness in Confucian Asia: Ascertaining its distribution, patterns, and sources. *Social Indicators Research, 92*, 405–427.

Chapter 6
Value Priorities

This section analyzes how the people of Asia prioritize their values. The environment in which people live and the resources they use affect quality of life directly by offering benefits or posing hazards to human existence. Such objective conditions of life also affect its quality indirectly through the mediation of values. Not only do values influence which needs and desires people have but different values also cause people to evaluate the same resources differently. This section identifies distinct value orientations through an examination of resources and activities respondents of all of Asia and within each society value above all. To address these questions, the AsiaBarometer asked respondents: "Of the following lifestyle aspects or life circumstances, please select five that are important to you."

From 2003 to 2005, the list of the following 20 aspects is surveyed: "having enough to eat," "having a comfortable home," "being healthy," "having access to good medical care if required," "being able to live without fear of crime," "having a job," "having access to higher (beyond compulsory) education," "owning lots of nice things," "earning a high income," "spending time with your family," "being on good terms with others," "being successful at work," "being famous," "enjoying a pastime," "experiencing art and culture," "dressing up," "winning," "expressing your personality or using your talents," "contributing to your local community or to society," and "being devout."

The following five lifestyle aspects that were added to the questionnaires from 2006 to 2008 are not used in this analysis: "raising children," "freedom of expression and association," "living in a country with a good government," "pleasant community to live," and "safe and clean environment." Due to this decision, the responses to this question for these 3 years are not included in the analysis. Hence, Hong Kong and Taiwan, surveyed in 2006, are not part of this analysis.

Table 6.1 shows how the populations of these 27 societies are alike and how they differ in the prioritization of their values. In an overwhelming 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 a fourth priority. "Being healthy" is followed by "having enough to eat," which was the most popular choice in five

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0_6,

Table 6.1 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
Asia	*Health*	*Home*	*Diet*	*Job*	*Family*

countries and the second most popular choice in nine countries. "Having enough to eat" listed as diet in Table 6.1 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, and 1 to the fifth ranking and then added up the numeric values for each lifestyle aspect. Based on this numeric rating, "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."

According to Table 6.1, 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 the 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 selected the same 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; and 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 6.1, "being healthy" is ranked first for the entire sample from 2003 to 2005 surveys, followed by "having a comfortable home" and "having enough to eat."

Chapter 7
Determinants of Overall Quality of Life

In this section, we attempt to identify any factors that affect feelings of overall quality of life. We estimate the effects of specific life domain satisfactions, lifestyles, value priorities, and demographics on overall life quality measured by happiness, enjoyment, and achievement. First, we regress the three measures of overall quality of life on the independent variables for each individual country and society. Second, we fit multilevel regressions that use the entire sample of Asia.

Which life domains are most and least related to feelings of happiness, enjoyment, and achievement? What makes people live a higher life quality? Of the independent variables, which factor contributes, positively or negatively, to the experience of a higher level of quality of life? We address these questions both for each individual country and society and for Asia as a whole.

The AsiaBarometer used the question about happiness from to 2008, and questions about enjoyment and achievement were used from 2006 onward. For the countries and societies where the questions about all three measures of overall life quality were asked, two tables are reported separately; one table presents the results of analysis for a subsample of the married respondents, and the other table presents the results for an entire sample of the country. For the countries and societies where the question about happiness was analyzed, one table reports both the subsample of the married respondents and the sample of all the respondents in that country and society. As the dependent variables are ordered, ranging from 1 to 5 on the variable of happiness and from 1 to 4 on the variables of enjoyment and achievement, we fit ordered logit regressions.

For the multilevel regressions, one table reports the results of the sample from 2006 to 2008 in which all three measures of overall life quality, happiness, enjoyment, and achievement, are compared. The other table reports only the results of regressions of happiness using the sample from 2003 to 2008.

Because the sample of Turkmenistan contains many "don't know" responses and has only a small number of valid responses, we exclude the Turkmenistan sample

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0_7,

from analysis. Descriptive statistics of the dependent and independent variables in the regression analyses for the entire sample are given in Appendix B.

In the next section, we deal with the descriptions of dependent variables and independent variables.

7.1 Dependent Variables

7.1.1 Happiness

The first of our three dependent variables is the level of happiness, of which distributions are compared among 29 societies in Table 3.1. The exact wording of this question is "All things considered, would you say that you are happy these days?" The four verbal response categories to this question are "very happy," "quite happy," "neither happy nor unhappy," "not too happy," and "very unhappy," along with a "don't know" category. This question appeared on all the questionnaires from the 2003 to 2008 surveys. The sample size is 47,229, without "don't know" responses and missing values. We rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very unhappy) to a high of 5 (very happy). The mean of this variable is 3.7 with a standard deviation of 0.93. The only time this question was not asked was in the 2004 China survey.

7.1.2 Enjoyment

The second dependent variable is the level of enjoyment in life, of which distributions are compared among 15 societies in Table 3.2. This question appeared on the questionnaires from 2006 onward and was thus asked in 15 societies. The exact wording of this question is "How often do you feel you are really enjoying life these days?" The four verbal response categories to this question are "often," "sometimes," "rarely," and "never," along with a "don't know" category. The sample size is 18,106 without the "don't know" responses and missing values. We rescaled the original four-category verbal scale into a four-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (never) to a high of 4 (often). The mean of this variable is 3.1 with a standard deviation of 0.72.

7.1.3 Achievement

The last of our dependent variables is the level of achievement, of which distributions are compared among 15 societies in Table 3.3. This question and the

question about enjoyment appeared on the questionnaires from 2006 onward and were thus asked in 15 societies. The exact wording of this question is "How often do you feel you are accomplishing what you want out of your life?" The four verbal response categories to this question are "a great deal," "some," "very little," and "none," along with a "don't know" category. The sample size is 18,053 without "don't know" responses and missing values. We rescaled the original four-category verbal scale into a four-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (none) to a high of 4 (a great deal). The mean of this variable is 2.8 with a standard deviation of 0.72.

7.2 Independent Variables

The first set of our independent variables in the regression analyses is satisfaction levels with 16 specific life domains: 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, leisure, and spiritual life. The exact wording of the question is "Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following aspects of your life." The five verbal response categories to this question are "very satisfied," "somewhat satisfied," "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied," "somewhat dissatisfied," and "very dissatisfied," along with a "don't know" category. We rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (very dissatisfied) to a high of 5 (very satisfied). See Appendix B for the descriptive statistics.

Spiritual life was asked only after 2005. Note also that the domain of neighbors was not asked in Myanmar in 2003 and 2004 and that the domain of the social welfare system was not asked in Myanmar in 2003, 2004, and 2007. The domain of the democratic system was not asked in Vietnam in 2003, 2004, and 2007; Myanmar in 2003, 2004, and 2007; Brunei in 2004; Laos in 2004 and 2007; and China in 2004.

7.2.1 The Public Water Supply

This variable is used in the regression of happiness instead of access to the number of public utilities. This is a dummy variable equal to 1, if the respondent has this public utility. The exact wording is "Which of the following public utilities does your household have the use of?" The sample size is 48,358, and 80% of all the respondents state they have access to the public water supply.

7.2.2 Electricity

This variable is used in the regression of happiness instead of access to the number of utilities. This is a dummy variable equal to 1, if the respondent has this public utility. The exact wording is "Which of the following public utilities does your household have the use of?" The sample size is 48,358, and 95% of all the respondents state they access to electricity.

7.2.3 Piped Gas

This variable is used in the regression of happiness instead of access to the number of utilities. This is a dummy variable equal to 1, if the respondent has this public utility. The exact wording is "Which of the following public utilities does your household have the use of?" The expression has changed from "piped gas" in the 2003 and 2004 questionnaires to "liquefied petroleum gas or LPG" in the 2005 survey and to "liquefied petroleum gas or LPG, piped gas" in the surveys from 2006 to 2008. The sample size is 48,358, and 53% of all the respondents state they have access to this utility.

7.2.4 Number of Utilities

This variable measures the degree to which people live a modern life in the lifestyle section. We compared the mean values for each society among the 29 societies in Table 4.20. The sample size is 29,587 with a grand mean of 4.1 and a standard deviation of 1.8.

This variable is included only in the regressions of enjoyment and achievement because the 2003 and 2004 surveys asked about only the three public utilities: "public water supply," "electricity," and "piped gas." From 2005 onward, the following four public utilities were added to the questionnaires: "fixed-line phone," "mobile phone," "facsimile," and "cable TV." The exact wording of the question is "Which of the following public utilities does your household have the use of?"

7.2.5 Internet

This variable measures the extent to which people live a digital life in the lifestyle section. The exact wording is "How often do you view Internet web pages by computer?" The five verbal response categories are "almost every day," "several times a week," "several times a month," "seldom," and "never," with a "don't

know" category. This question was asked in the surveys from 2005 to 2008. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (never) to a high of 5 (almost every day), the mean of the scales for the entire sample is 2.0 with a standard deviation of 1.5. The sample size is 28,290 without the "don't know" responses and missing values (see Appendix B).

7.2.6 E-mail

This is also one of the variables used to measure the extent to which people live a digital life in the lifestyle section. The exact wording is "How often do you read or write e-mails by computer?" The five-point verbal response categories are "almost every day," "several times a week," "several times a month," "seldom," and "never," with a "don't know" category. This question was asked in the surveys from 2006 to 2008. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (never) to a high of 5 (almost every day), the mean of the scales for the entire sample is 1.9 with a standard deviation of 1.4. The sample size is 17,656 without the "don't know" responses and missing values.

7.2.7 Mobile Phone

This is the last variable that measures the extent to which people live a digital life in the lifestyle section. The exact wording is "How often do you read or write messages by mobile phones?" The five verbal response categories are "almost every day," "several times a week," "several times a month," "seldom," and "never," with a "don't know" category. This question was asked in the surveys from 2006 to 2008. When we rescaled the original five-category verbal scale into a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 (never) to a high of 5 (almost every day), the mean of the scales for the entire sample is 2.8 with a standard deviation of 1.7. The sample size is 17,875 without the "don't know" responses and missing values (see Appendix A).

7.2.8 Prayer

This is one of the two variables employed to measure the extent to which people live a religious life. The exact wording is "How often do you pray or meditate?" The five verbal response categories are "daily," "weekly," "monthly," "on special occasions," and "never," with a "don't know" category. This question was asked in the questionnaires from 2004 to 2008. In 2004, this question was not asked in Vietnam and China. The sample size is 38,275 without the "don't know" responses and missing values. The mean of this variable is 3.3 and a standard deviation of 1.6.

7.2.9 Religion

This is the second variable that measures the extent to which people live a religious life. The exact wording is "Do you regard yourself as belonging to any particular religion? If yes, which?" The response list of religions includes "Catholic," "other Christian," "Muslim (Sunni)," "Muslim (Shia)," "Hindu," "Buddhist (Mahayana)," "Buddhist (Theravada)," "Confucianist," "Jewish," "Sikh," "Taoist," "Shintoist," "others," and "none," with a "don't know" category.

This variable takes on the value of 1, if the respondent belongs to any religion and 0 if otherwise. This question, although the list of religions differs from survey to survey (see notes below), was asked from 2004 to 2008. The sample size is 47,170 without "don't know" responses and missing values. Of the respondents, 80% have a religious affiliation.

Many notes were attached to this question. In 2006, in order to avoid confusion among respondents, "Buddhist (Theravada)" was omitted in China, Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, and Taiwan. "Muslim (Shia)" was omitted in Singapore. In 2008, in Japan and China, "Buddhist (Mahayana)" was shown as "Buddhist" without "(Mahayana)," and "Buddhist (Theravada)" was omitted to avoid confusion among respondents. From 2003 to 2007, "other Christian" was "Christian religion other than Catholic." From 2007 to 2008, "Shintoist" was added. In 2003, in Thailand, "Muslim (Sunni)" was shown as "Muslim (Sunni/Shia)," and "Muslim (Shia)" was omitted to avoid confusion among respondents. Similarly, "Buddhist (Mahayana)" was shown as "Buddhist (Mahayana/Theravada)," and "Buddhist (Theravada)" was omitted. In 2003, 2004, and 2007 in Malaysia, "Muslim (Sunni)" was shown as "Muslim" without "(Sunni)," and "Muslim (Shia)" was omitted to avoid confusion among respondents. In the same way, "Buddhist (Mahayana)" was shown as "Buddhist" without "(Mahayana)," and "Buddhist (Theravada)" was omitted.

7.2.10 Living Internationally

This is one of the two variables measuring the extent to which people live a global life. The AsiaBarometer asked respondents the question "Which, if any, of the following statements apply to you?" The six statements include "a member of my family or a relative lives in another country," "I have traveled abroad at least three times in the past three years," "I have friends from another country who are in [SURVEYED COUNTRY]," "I have friends from other countries who are in SURVEYED COUNTRY," "I often watch foreign-produced programs on TV," "I often communicate with people in other countries via the internet or email," and "My job involves contact with organizations or people in other countries."

This variable is constructed by counting the number of statements for which each respondent reported "yes." The maximum value is 6 and the minimum is 0. This question was asked in all the surveys from 2003 to 2008, and its sample size is 48,358 with a mean of 1.1 and a standard deviation of 1.2.

7.2.11 English Ability

The second question that measures the extent to which people experience the level of global life is how well the respondents rate their ability to speak English. The exact wording of the question is "How well do you speak English?" The AsiaBarometer asked respondents this question in all the surveys from 2003 to 2008. The four verbal response categories include "not at all," "very little," "I can speak it well enough to get by in daily life," and "I can speak English fluently," along with a "don't know" category.

When we assigned the original four-category verbal scale into a four-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 ("not at all") to a high of 4 ("I can speak English fluently"), the mean of the scales for the entire sample is 1.9 with a standard deviation of 0.9. The sample size is 47,557 without the "don't know" responses and missing values.

7.2.12 Homeownership

This variable takes on the value of 1, if the respondent lives in their own house and 0 if otherwise. The exact wording of the question is "Which category does your current residence fall into?" The respondents select one of the following five choices: "owner-occupied detached or semidetached house (duplex)," "owner-occupied terraced house or unit in an apartment or condominium complex," "rented detached or semidetached house (duplex)," "rented terraced house or unit in an apartment or condominium complex," and "others (a room in a relative's home, etc.)," with the "don't know" category. We assigned a value of 1 to the first two choices and 0 to the other choices. Of the respondents, 77% have their own home.

7.2.13 Number of Family Members

The AsiaBarometer asked a question about family size in the surveys from 2003 to 2008. The sample size is 48,351. The mean of this variable is 4.7, and the standard deviation is 2.4. The minimum number of family member is 1 and the maximum is 33.

7.2.14 Relative Standard of Living

The exact wording of the question is "How would you describe your standard of living?" This item asked respondents to assess their own standard of living in relative terms with five verbal response categories: "high," "relatively high,"

"average," "relatively low," and "low," along with a "don't know" category. The original five-category verbal scale is assigned a five-point numeric scale, ranging from a low of 1 ("low") to a high of 5 ("high"). The AsiaBarometer asked this question from 2003 to 2008. The sample size is 48,225 with a mean of 3.0 and a standard deviation of 0.7.

7.2.15 Female

This variable is set as 1, if the respondent is female and 0 if male. The sample size is 48,358, and 51% of all the respondents are female.

7.2.16 Married

This variable takes on the value of 1, if the respondents are married. The AsiaBarometer asked the respondents for their marital status in all the surveys. Of the sample size, which totaled 48,358, 22% replied single, 72% reported married, 3% replied divorced or separated, 3% reported widowed, and 0.1% reported "other." This variable is not included in a regression when the specific life domain of "marriage" is used.

7.2.17 Female and Married

This is an interaction term of the two variables between female and married. This variable takes on the value of 1, if the respondent is a wife.

7.2.18 Age

This variable takes on the value of 1, if the respondents are in their twenties, 2 if the respondents are in their thirties, 3 if the respondents are in their forties, 4 if the respondents are in their fifties, and 5 if the respondents are in their sixties. In a sample size of 48,358, 29% are between the ages of 20 and 29 years, 28% are between the ages of 30 and 39 years, 23% are between the ages of 40 and 49 years, 15% are between the ages of 50 and 59 years, and 5% are between the ages of 60 and 69 years.

7.2.19 Household Income

Appendix B reports the summary statistics for the grouped income variable that takes on the values of "low," "mid," and "high." This grouped variable is used in the multilevel regression with the pooled data. The sample size is 45,833. The criterion by which we divide the samples into the three categories is based on the frequencies. We divide the samples into subsamples with frequencies of close to 33% each.

For each individual country and society regression, the variable of household income takes on different values. For example, the Japanese income variable takes on the values from 1 to 20 representing from "2 million yen or less" to "more than 20 million yen." For details on income variables of each country and society, refer to the codebook available on the website of the AsiaBarometer Survey (https://www.asiabarometer.org/).

7.2.20 Educational Attainment

The educational attainment of the respondents is divided into three levels. The variable takes on the value of 1 if the level of educational attainment of the respondents is "low," 2 if the level is "mid," and 3 if the level is "high." Of the respondents, 34% of all the respondents have a low level of educational attainment, 37% have a middle level of attainment, and 29% have a high level of educational background.

7.2.21 Region

This variable is used only in a country and society regression. Not all countries and societies have this variable. We converted into a dummy variable that represents each region where the survey was conducted. For example, in Afghanistan in 2005, the survey was conducted in "Kabul (central)," "eastern," "south central," "south-western," "western," "northern," and "Hazarajat (central)." We have six dummy variables in this case. For more details, refer to the codebook available at the website of the AsiaBarometer Survey (https://www.asiabarometer.org/).

7.2.22 City Size

This dummy variable is set as 1 for each category of size of city in which the survey was conducted. For example, in Afghanistan in 2005, the size of cities is divided into four groups: "villages," "towns," "cities," and "Kabul." As the capital of Kabul is the largest city in Afghanistan, it is classified as the fourth group. For more details, refer to the codebook available at the website of the AsiaBarometer Survey (https://www.asiabarometer.org/).

7.2.23 Year-Dummy Variables

This dummy variable is set as 1 for each year. In the regression of happiness, 5 year-dummy variables are used, whereas in the regressions of enjoyment and achievement, 2 year dummies are used.

7.3 Country-by-Country Assessment Within the Subregional Contexts

We divide the region of Asia into East Asia (China, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan), Southeast Asia (Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam), South Asia (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka), and Central Asia (Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan). Note again Turkmenistan is not used in regression analyses. Table 7.1 shows the subregional summary statistics for the PDI of happiness reported in Table 3.1 and the gross domestic product (GDP) per capita and the human development index (HDI) values reported in Appendix A.

7.3.1 Self-Assessment of Happiness: Subregional Summary

Self-assessment of happiness by country in terms of the PDI values gives fairly consistent subregional pictures. The respondents of South Asia and Southeast Asia tend to assess themselves as happy, whereas those in East Asia tend to assess themselves as somewhat happy, and those in Central Asia tend to assess themselves as not too happy. Subregionally averaged, South Asia's PDI is a positive 64.2 points, Southeast Asia's PDI is a positive 64.2 points, East Asia's PDI is a positive 47.8 points, and Central Asia's PDI is a positive 23.8 points. We compare the PDI values to HDI values and GDP per capita (PPP US$). Again, subregionally averaged, South Asia's HDI value is 0.528, Southeast Asia's HDI value is 0.630, East Asia's HDI value is 0.822, and Central Asia's HDI value is 0.593.

Table 7.1 Sub-regional comparison

	Happiness PDI	GDP	HDI
East Asia	47.8	30,640	0.822
Southeast Asia	64.2	14,730	0.630
South Asia	64.2	3,314.3	0.528
Central Asia	23.8	4,542.9	0.593

Note: Refer to Table 3.1 for Happiness PDI and Appendix A for GDP per capita and the HDI value

Again, subregionally averaged, South Asia's GDP per capita is US$3,314, Southeast Asia's GDP per capita is US$14,730, East Asia's GDP per capita is US $30,640, and Central Asia's GDP per capita is US$4,543. In terms of GDP per capita, East Asia, Southeast Asia, Central Asia, and South Asia are ranked from high to low, respectively. In terms of HDI values, East Asia, Southeast Asia, Central Asia, and South Asia are ranked from high to low, respectively.

But in terms of the self-assessment of happiness, subregional rankings are very different. In terms of the PDI values, South Asia, Southeast Asia, East Asia, and Central Asia are ranked from high to low, respectively. What are the key differences? First, East Asians and Central Asians are not as happy as other indices, such as HDI and GDP per capita, would suggest. In other words, Southeast Asians and South Asians are happier than other indices, such as HDI and GDP per capita, would suggest. With these questions in mind, we answer how happiness (and enjoyment and achievement) is self-assessed in each country through a country-by-country examination of ordered logit regression equation results. Before doing so, there are some outliers to the above observations. Cambodia is an outlier in Southeast Asia, and Myanmar may also be an outlier. As demonstrated later in the regression analyses, statistically and significantly negative for Cambodia is the estimated coefficients on the variable "pray" and the residence variables outside the coastal region. Statistically and significantly positive for Myanmar is "neighbors," and statistically negative is the regional variable Mandalay. Our interpretation is that both countries are happier than other indices suggest because many respondents have a strong spiritual world that comes through prayer. Also important to note is that both countries suffer from security concerns, especially the non-coastal regions in Cambodia and the non-Yangon regions in Myanmar. These residents tend to assess their level of happiness as less.

Kazakhstan is an outlier in Central Asia. In terms of GDP per capita, Kazakhstanis should be happier than they say. South Korea and Taiwan are also outliers in East Asia. These two countries have high security concerns for their neighborhoods, although this does not appear explicitly in the regression results. The two countries of Pakistan and Nepal are outliers in South Asia. In Pakistan, the variable for "the democratic system" is statistically and significantly positive. In Nepal "public safety" is statistically and significantly positive. These results appear to indicate that security concerns are high in Pakistan and Nepal.

7.3.2 Country-by-Country Analysis Through Regression Equations: East Asia

7.3.2.1 Summary of East Asia

East Asians register high-income levels on average. Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea, and Japan register high-income levels on par with Western Europeans and

North Americans. Chinese respondents register mid-income levels globally, yet as a whole, the country registers number two in terms of GDP by 2010. No less important in China is the very high level of income inequality. Common to all the East Asian countries are the following four. (1) Physical conditions for survival and good life are deemed very important; hence, housing, health (except Hong Kong), and standard of living are all statistically significant and positively related. (2) Social relations are no less important; hence, friendships (except South Korea and Taiwan), marriage, and family life (except Taiwan) are deemed very important; the kind of social relations essential to happiness tends to be primary groups often with direct lineages; secondary group social relations are no less important, but they are often compromised due to conditions of workplace, neighborhood, etc. (3) Public sphere conditions tend to be of tertiary importance; hence, conditions of the environment, public safety, neighbors, and democratic system are sometimes marked as statistically and significantly negative. (4) Globalization has been adapted slowly but steadily; hence, Internet, e-mail, mobile telephone, English ability, and living internationally register as weakly positive or weakly negative.

7.3.2.2 China

Tables 7.2 and 7.3 show the results from fitting ordered logit regressions based on married observations and all the Chinese observations, respectively. Among the three life spheres, the satisfaction levels with the domains in the post-materialist sphere appear to be the most powerful in determining the levels of overall life quality. In an examination of the results for married respondents, the estimated coefficients on the domains in the post-materialist life sphere tend to be positive and statistically significant. More specifically, the estimated coefficients on "friendships," "marriage," "health," and "family life" in the regression of "happiness," all the six domains in the regression of "enjoyment," and "marriage" in the regression of "achievement" are positive and statistically significant, using the sample of married respondents. It follows that the higher the satisfaction levels with these domains, the higher the probability that the respondents feel happier, are more able to enjoy life, and have more of a sense of achievement.

Conversely, the public sphere of life appears to provide the least important determinants for a higher quality of life according to the results based on the married observations. The number of estimated coefficients that are positive and statistically significant is smaller than the other two life spheres. In fact, the estimated coefficient on "condition of the environment" is *negative* and statistically significant in the regressions of "happiness" and "enjoyment." It follows that the more satisfied the respondents are with the condition of the environment, the lower the probability that they have higher levels of happiness and enjoyment.

Regionally, self-assessment of happiness tends to be higher in central regions (such as Anhui, Henan, Hebei, and Hubei) than in either high-income eastern regions (such as Zhejiang, Jiangsu, Guangdong, Fujian, and Shandong) or lower-income western regions (such as Shanxi, Gansu, Xinjiang, Qinhai, and Sichuan).

Table 7.2 Ordered logit regression – China – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.13	0.06*	0.19	0.06**	0.90	0.07**
Standard of living	0.26	0.10*	0.14	0.10	0.21	0.11*
Household income	0.06	0.09	−0.01	0.09	0.19	0.09
Education	0.04	0.07	−0.10	0.07	−0.09	0.08
Job	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.12	0.07
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.14	0.07*	0.14	0.07*	0.02	0.07
Condition of environment	−0.10	0.07	−0.22	0.08**	−0.13	0.08
Social welfare system	0.05	0.07	0.12	0.07	0.10	0.07
Democratic system	−0.004	0.07	0.13	0.07	−0.01	0.07
Leisure	−0.03	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.12	0.08
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.34	0.08**	0.26	0.08**	0.02	0.08
Marriage	0.52	0.07**	0.35	0.07**	0.25	0.08**
Health	0.23	0.07**	0.16	0.07*	−0.02	0.07
Neighbors	−0.14	0.07	0.16	0.07*	−0.01	0.08
Family life	0.55	0.08**	0.23	0.08**	0.06	0.08
Spiritual life	0.15	0.08	0.30	0.08**	0.10	0.08
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.002	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.05
Internet	0.08	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.08	0.08
Email	−0.06	0.09	−0.11	0.09	−0.10	0.10
Mobile phone	−0.04	0.05	0.003	0.05	−0.002	0.05
Pray	0.02	0.06	−0.10	0.06	0.19	0.07**
Religion	0.18	0.16	0.40	0.16*	0.12	0.17
Living internationally	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.09	−0.02	0.10
English ability	−0.11	0.12	0.17	0.13	0.05	0.13
Homeownership	−0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	−0.12	0.15
Number of family members	0.005	0.04	−0.05	0.04	0.01	0.04
Relative standard of living	0.24	0.10*	0.13	0.10	0.29	0.10**
No right to vote	0.03	0.12	−0.03	0.13	−0.08	0.13
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.27	0.11*	0.08	0.11	−0.11	0.12
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	−0.03	0.05	0.11	0.06*	0.11	0.06
Income	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.03*	0.03	0.03
Educational attainment	0.04	0.10	0.03	0.10	0.08	0.11
Region (base: western)						
Eastern	0.05	0.15	−0.05	0.16	−0.03	0.16
Central	0.34	0.15*	0.02	0.15	0.16	0.16
City size (base: population over 3 million)						
Population 1–3 million	0.41	0.21	0.43	0.22	0.15	0.23
Population 0.5–1 million	0.46	0.21*	0.49	0.22*	0.21	0.23
Population less than 0.5 million	0.47	0.29	0.30	0.29	−0.11	0.31
County	0.33	0.21	0.53	0.21*	0.13	0.23
cut1	3.75	0.61	4.90	0.60	4.86	0.61
cut2	5.39	0.58	7.45	0.60	7.34	0.63
cut3	8.61	0.60	10.5	0.64	11.5	0.68
cut4	11.1	0.63				
N	1,420		1,421		1,421	
Pseudo R2	0.1671		0.1488		0.1852	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.3 Ordered logit regression – China – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.17	0.05**	0.19	0.06**	0.89	0.06**
Standard of living	0.38	0.08**	0.23	0.08*	0.25	0.09*
Household income	0.10	0.08	−0.003	0.08	0.13	0.08
Education	−0.01	0.06	−0.05	0.06	−0.09	0.07
Job	−0.02	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.14	0.06*
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.12	0.06*	0.17	0.06**	0.07	0.06
Condition of environment	−0.14	0.06*	−0.17	0.07*	−0.11	0.07
Social welfare system	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.10	0.06
Democratic system	0.02	0.06	0.13	0.06*	−0.02	0.06
Leisure	−0.01	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.33	0.07**	0.22	0.07**	0.09	0.07
Marriage	na		na		na	
Health	0.25	0.06**	0.18	0.06*	−0.004	0.06
Neighbors	−0.03	0.06	0.20	0.06**	0.02	0.07
Family life	0.59	0.07**	0.24	0.07**	0.12	0.07
Spiritual life	0.23	0.07**	0.35	0.07**	0.12	0.07
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.004	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.05
Internet	0.02	0.06	−0.01	0.06	0.05	0.06
Email	−0.07	0.07	−0.09	0.07	−0.10	0.08
Mobile phone	−0.001	0.04	0.03	0.04	−0.03	0.04
Pray	−0.01	0.05	−0.10	0.05	0.20	0.06**
Religion	0.15	0.13	0.29	0.14*	0.05	0.14
Living internationally	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.07	−0.04	0.08
English ability	−0.01	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.11	0.11
Homeownership	−0.08	0.12	0.08	0.12	−0.21	0.13
Number of family members	0.03	0.03	−0.01	0.03	0.03	0.03
Relative standard of living	0.28	0.09**	0.13	0.09	0.24	0.09*
No right to vote	−0.07	0.11	−0.01	0.11	−0.09	0.11
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.40	0.21	0.09	0.21	0.03	0.21
Married	0.59	0.18**	0.04	0.18	0.49	0.18*
Female × married	−0.20	0.23	−0.04	0.24	−0.16	0.24
Age	−0.04	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.11	0.05*
Income	−0.005	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.02*
Educational attainment	0.04	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.10
Region (base: western)						
Eastern	0.08	0.13	−0.04	0.14	0.02	0.14
Central	0.24	0.13	−0.003	0.13	0.23	0.14
City size (base: population over 3 million)						
Population 1–3 million	0.27	0.18	0.36	0.19	−0.04	0.20
Population 0.5–1 million	0.22	0.18	0.28	0.18	0.12	0.20
Population less than 0.5 million	0.18	0.25	−0.01	0.25	−0.23	0.27
County	0.13	0.18	0.18	0.18	−0.07	0.20
cut1	3.63	0.52	3.85	0.52	4.81	0.53
cut2	5.23	0.50	6.31	0.52	7.30	0.54
cut3	8.19	0.52	9.19	0.55	11.4	0.59
cut4	10.5	0.54				
N	1,797		1,798		1,798	
Pseudo R2	0.1519		0.1322		0.1822	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

In terms of demography, all the married respondents are happier, but the happiness differential between married females and their single counterparts is especially significant, that is, in the regression using only married respondents, the estimated coefficient on "female" is positive and statistically significant. The relative standard of living is also an important determinant in Chinese respondents assessing their level of happiness.

7.3.2.3 Hong Kong

Being a small geographical spot, Hong Kong does not exhibit all the East Asian features. Marriage and family life are valued most, indicating that primary social relations are what count most. Table 7.4, which is based on married respondents, shows that the estimated coefficient on "marriage" is positive and statistically significant in all the three regressions of "happiness" "enjoyment," and "achievement." The estimated coefficient on "family life" is positive and statistically significant and has a large standardized normal variable Z, which is the coefficient divided by the standard error ($0.757/0.217 = 3.49$) in the regression of "happiness."

Among the three life spheres, the domains in the post-materialist sphere are the most critical determinants and positively related to the overall quality of life measured by levels of happiness, enjoyment, and accomplishment. The materialist life sphere comes next in importance, followed by the public life sphere.

The tide of globalization has been adapted as a destiny. Table 7.5, which is based on all the respondents, reports that "living internationally" is positive and statistically significant in all the three regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement." According to Table 7.4, in terms of demography, seniors feel more enjoyment and more achievement.

7.3.2.4 Japan

All the East Asian features are clear and statistically significant in Japan. Among the three life spheres, the domains in the post-materialist life sphere are the chief determinants and positively related to the overall quality of life. The materialist life sphere is second in importance, followed by the public life sphere. The public sphere institutions do not seem to add to levels of happiness, enjoyment, or accomplishment. Tables 7.6 and 7.7 show that only the estimated coefficient on the "social welfare system" in the public life sphere is positive and statistically significant in the regressions. The "democratic system" is negatively related to the dependent variable. Yet the number of estimated coefficients that relate positively to happiness and enjoyment is larger in the sphere of social relations than the other two spheres. Only in the regression of achievement is the number of the estimated coefficients that are positive and statistically significant is larger in the materialist life sphere than in the other two spheres.

Table 7.4 Ordered logit regression – Hong Kong – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.33	0.18	0.33	0.16*	−0.05	0.17
Marriage	0.62	0.19**	0.57	0.16**	0.34	0.17*
Health	0.004	0.16	−0.19	0.14	−0.34	0.15*
Education	−0.18	0.16	−0.34	0.14*	−0.14	0.15
Family life	0.76	0.22**	−0.10	0.18	0.36	0.19
Leisure	0.37	0.21	0.41	0.18*	0.23	0.19
Spiritual life	0.03	0.22	0.07	0.20	0.37	0.21
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.16	0.16	0.20	0.14	0.25	0.14
Standard of living	0.06	0.21	0.38	0.18*	−0.09	0.19
Household income	0.08	0.18	0.20	0.17	0.09	0.17
Job	0.13	0.17	0.35	0.15*	0.27	0.15
Public sphere						
Neighbors	0.11	0.17	−0.10	0.15	0.25	0.16
Public safety	−0.17	0.17	−0.27	0.15	0.07	0.16
Condition of environment	0.36	0.18	0.28	0.16	0.04	0.17
Social welfare system	0.003	0.16	−0.22	0.14	−0.18	0.15
Democratic system	0.05	0.15	−0.06	0.14	−0.02	0.14
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.06	0.13	0.10	0.12	−0.05	0.13
Internet	0.08	0.08	0.20	0.07*	0.11	0.08
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	−0.03	0.09	0.02	0.08	0.06	0.09
Pray	0.06	0.09	0.04	0.08	−0.12	0.09
Religion	0.01	0.23	−0.18	0.20	0.07	0.22
Living internationally	0.17	0.09	0.17	0.08*	0.12	0.09
English ability	0.35	0.18	−0.21	0.16	0.29	0.16
Homeownership	0.56	0.20*	0.02	0.17	0.40	0.18*
Number of family members	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.09	0.08
Relative standard of living	0.68	0.22**	0.45	0.20*	0.87	0.21**
No right to vote	−0.14	0.22	−0.09	0.20	−0.27	0.21
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.35	0.20	0.31	0.17	0.27	0.18
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	−0.09	0.10	0.20	0.09*	0.08	0.10
Income	−0.03	0.03	−0.03	0.03	−0.02	0.03
Educational attainment	−0.09	0.21	−0.13	0.19	0.02	0.20
cut1	6.45	1.41	4.61	1.19	5.32	1.23
cut2	7.58	1.37	7.43	1.22	8.56	1.26
cut3	12.6	1.46	10.1	1.25	12.1	1.32
cut4	16.4	1.54				
N	561		562		562	
Pseudo R2	0.2356		0.1503		0.1651	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.5 Ordered logit regression – Hong Kong – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.42	0.13**	0.39	0.12**	0.10	0.13
Marriage	na		na		na	
Health	0.11	0.12	−0.13	0.11	−0.34	0.11**
Education	−0.07	0.12	−0.14	0.11	−0.01	0.11
Family life	0.50	0.15**	−0.05	0.14	0.29	0.14*
Leisure	0.21	0.15	0.38	0.14*	0.21	0.14
Spiritual life	0.15	0.16	0.09	0.15	0.20	0.16
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.27	0.11*	0.20	0.10	0.24	0.11*
Standard of living	0.32	0.15*	0.42	0.14**	0.14	0.15
Household income	−0.03	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.18	0.14
Job	0.21	0.12	0.29	0.12*	0.35	0.12**
Public sphere						
Neighbors	0.06	0.13	−0.10	0.12	0.16	0.12
Public safety	−0.04	0.12	−0.20	0.11	−0.13	0.12
Condition of environment	0.09	0.14	0.27	0.12*	−0.03	0.13
Social welfare system	−0.01	0.12	−0.06	0.11	0.00	0.12
Democratic system	0.06	0.11	−0.01	0.11	−0.13	0.11
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.08	0.10	−0.01	0.10	−0.11	0.10
Internet	0.06	0.06	0.22	0.06**	0.10	0.06
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	−0.002	0.07	0.01	0.06	0.03	0.07
Pray	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.07	−0.13	0.07
Religion	−0.10	0.19	−0.04	0.17	0.04	0.18
Living internationally	0.19	0.06**	0.24	0.06**	0.14	0.06*
English ability	0.15	0.14	−0.26	0.12*	0.16	0.13
Homeownership	0.38	0.15*	0.05	0.14	0.35	0.14*
Number of family members	0.01	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.73	0.17**	0.51	0.15**	0.79	0.16**
No right to vote	−0.29	0.17	−0.03	0.15	−0.40	0.16*
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.06	0.24	0.02	0.22	0.46	0.23*
Married	−0.03	0.24	0.01	0.22	0.62	0.23*
Female × married	0.26	0.30	0.31	0.27	−0.21	0.28
Age	−0.10	0.08	0.19	0.07*	0.17	0.08*
Income	−0.01	0.02	−0.04	0.02	−0.04	0.02
Educational attainment	−0.05	0.16	−0.03	0.15	0.11	0.15
cut1	4.55	0.98	4.22	0.88	4.09	0.90
cut2	5.90	0.95	6.96	0.89	7.35	0.92
cut3	10.3	1.00	9.60	0.92	10.7	0.96
cut4	13.9	1.06				
N	903		903		904	
Pseudo R2	0.1919		0.1322		0.1478	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.6 Ordered logit regression – Japan – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.13	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.28	0.09**
Standard of living	0.33	0.12**	−0.01	0.13	0.30	0.13*
Household income	−0.07	0.11	0.15	0.11	−0.15	0.11
Education	0.18	0.10	0.01	0.11	0.23	0.11*
Job	0.18	0.09	0.24	0.10*	0.33	0.10**
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	−0.06	0.10	0.52	0.11**	0.18	0.11
Marriage	0.66	0.12**	0.36	0.12**	0.30	0.12*
Health	0.26	0.09**	0.24	0.09**	−0.07	0.09
Family life	0.43	0.13**	0.07	0.14	−0.27	0.15
Leisure	0.01	0.10	0.07	0.10	−0.005	0.10
Spiritual life	0.41	0.12**	0.64	0.13**	0.19	0.13
Public sphere						
Neighbors	−0.01	0.10	−0.17	0.11	0.08	0.11
Public safety	0.01	0.09	−0.13	0.10	−0.07	0.10
Condition of environment	−0.08	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.02	0.11
Social welfare system	0.20	0.10*	0.13	0.10	0.14	0.11
Democratic system	−0.33	0.11**	−0.19	0.11	−0.08	0.12
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.03	0.08	−0.02	0.08	0.05	0.08
Internet	−0.02	0.05	0.01	0.05	−0.01	0.05
Email		na		na		na
Mobile phone	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.05
Pray	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.05
Religion	−0.09	0.15	0.17	0.15	−0.12	0.16
Living internationally	0.15	0.06*	0.23	0.07**	−0.06	0.07
English ability	0.09	0.11	0.32	0.12**	0.20	0.12
Homeownership	0.02	0.18	−0.34	0.20	0.03	0.20
Number of family members	−0.03	0.05	0.12	0.05*	−0.04	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.37	0.13**	0.33	0.14*	0.70	0.14**
No right to vote		na		na		na
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.17	0.14	0.41	0.15**	0.22	0.15
Married		na		na		na
Female × married		na		na		na
Age	−0.19	0.07**	0.12	0.07	0.26	0.08**
Income	−0.04	0.02	−0.07	0.02**	−0.005	0.02
Educational attainment	−0.11	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.22	0.13
Region (Base-Kyushu)						
Hokkaido/Tohoku	−0.47	0.28	0.02	0.29	0.31	0.30
Kanto	−0.43	0.26	−0.05	0.27	−0.08	0.28
Chubu	−0.18	0.26	−0.09	0.27	−0.01	0.28
Kinki	−0.22	0.27	0.20	0.27	−0.01	0.29
Chugoku/Shikoku	−0.05	0.29	−0.13	0.30	0.03	0.31

(continued)

Table 7.6 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
City size (base: towns and rurals)						
Government designated cities	0.06	0.21	−0.05	0.22	−0.41	0.23
Population 100,000 or more	0.29	0.18	−0.01	0.19	0.27	0.20
Population less than 100,000	−0.10	0.21	−0.12	0.22	0.21	0.23
cut1	2.05	0.93	3.56	1.01	4.72	0.91
cut2	4.54	0.81	8.53	0.88	8.43	0.92
cut3	8.05	0.84	12.4	0.94	12.8	0.98
cut4	11.2	0.87				
N	1,047		1,046		1,034	
Pseudo R2	0.1973		0.2047		0.1655	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.7 Ordered logit regression – Japan – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.15	0.07*	0.11	0.08	0.25	0.08**
Standard of living	0.38	0.10**	0.09	0.11	0.17	0.11
Household income	−0.06	0.09	0.08	0.09	−0.03	0.10
Education	0.16	0.09	−0.08	0.09	0.18	0.09
Job	0.23	0.08**	0.22	0.09*	0.33	0.09**
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.13	0.09	0.46	0.09**	0.23	0.09*
Marriage	na		na		na	
Health	0.19	0.07*	0.25	0.08**	−0.02	0.08
Family life	0.50	0.10**	0.28	0.10**	−0.05	0.11
Leisure	0.01	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.09
Spiritual life	0.57	0.10**	0.66	0.11**	0.15	0.10
Public sphere						
Neighbors	−0.01	0.09	−0.17	0.09	0.11	0.09
Public safety	−0.05	0.08	−0.14	0.08	−0.10	0.08
Condition of environment	−0.01	0.09	0.14	0.09	0.07	0.09
Social welfare system	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.09
Democratic system	−0.23	0.09*	−0.15	0.10	−0.10	0.10
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.04	0.07	−0.05	0.07	0.06	0.07
Internet	−0.004	0.04	0.01	0.04	−0.01	0.04
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.05
Pray	0.09	0.04*	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.04
Religion	0.005	0.13	0.04	0.14	−0.08	0.14
Living internationally	0.14	0.05**	0.20	0.06**	−0.09	0.06

(continued)

Table 7.7 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
English ability	0.13	0.10	0.35	0.10**	0.27	0.11*
Homeownership	−0.24	0.15	−0.40	0.16*	−0.02	0.16
Number of family members	−0.01	0.04	0.10	0.05*	−0.01	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.32	0.10**	0.46	0.11**	0.61	0.11**
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.32	0.25	−0.04	0.26	0.45	0.26
Married	1.06	0.22**	0.39	0.22	0.73	0.23**
Female × married	−0.22	0.28	0.39	0.29	−0.28	0.30
Age	−0.12	0.06*	0.08	0.06	0.30	0.07**
Income	−0.05	0.02**	−0.08	0.02**	−0.02	0.02
Educational attainment	−0.10	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.24	0.11*
Region (Base-Kyushu)						
Hokkaido/Tohoku	−0.59	0.24*	0.08	0.25	0.15	0.25
Kanto	−0.51	0.22*	0.17	0.23	−0.16	0.23
Chubu	−0.20	0.22	0.04	0.23	−0.24	0.24
Kinki	−0.36	0.22	0.19	0.23	−0.22	0.24
Chugoku/Shikoku	−0.13	0.25	−0.06	0.26	−0.06	0.27
City size (base: towns and rurals)						
Government Designated Cities	−0.01	0.18	−0.06	0.19	−0.26	0.20
Population 100,000 or more	0.36	0.16*	−0.02	0.17	0.30	0.17
Population less than 100,000	−0.13	0.18	−0.19	0.19	0.26	0.19
cut1	2.31	0.73	4.41	0.70	5.59	0.69
cut2	5.12	0.64	8.21	0.70	8.98	0.72
cut3	8.51	0.67	12.0	0.75	13.3	0.78
cut4	11.4	0.70				
N	1,342		1,342		1,326	
Pseudo R2	0.2020		0.2130		0.1718	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

In terms of demography, females feel more enjoyment according to Table 7.6; seniors are less happy according to both tables, although with age comes an increased sense of achievement; high income does not necessarily lead to happiness ceteris paribus; southwestern parts of Japan as contrasted with northeastern and metropolitan regions are happier; residents in midsized cities with population sizes of 100,000 are happier.

7.3.2.5 South Korea

Based on the results reported in Tables 7.8 and 7.9, we argue that the domains in the materialist life sphere appear to be the key determinants and positively relate to the overall quality of life among the three life spheres. In terms of impact, the post-materialist life sphere is next in importance, followed by the public life sphere. Education in the materialist life sphere is statistically and negatively related to

Table 7.8 Ordered logit regression – South Korea – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.32	0.12*	0.13	0.12	0.40	0.13**
Standard of living	0.27	0.17	0.51	0.18**	0.48	0.19*
Household income	0.08	0.15	0.07	0.15	−0.01	0.16
Health	0.04	0.10	0.12	0.11	−0.30	0.11*
Education	−0.30	0.12*	−0.13	0.13	−0.08	0.14
Job	0.13	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.27	0.12*
Leisure	0.07	0.11	0.20	0.12	−0.06	0.12
Spiritual life	0.29	0.13*	0.22	0.13	0.02	0.14
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.31	0.12*	0.28	0.13*	0.11	0.13
Condition of environment	−0.37	0.13**	−0.41	0.13**	−0.22	0.14
Social welfare system	0.11	0.12	0.26	0.13*	0.20	0.13
Democratic system	−0.01	0.12	0.09	0.12	−0.06	0.13
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.03	0.13	−0.19	0.14	−0.16	0.14
Marriage	0.50	0.13**	0.62	0.14**	0.64	0.15**
Neighbors	−0.02	0.13	0.01	0.14	0.01	0.14
Family life	0.38	0.15*	0.26	0.15	0.23	0.17
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.06	0.14	0.09	0.15	0.28	0.16
Internet	0.08	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.03	0.09
Email	−0.02	0.08	0.07	0.08	−0.08	0.08
Mobile phone	0.03	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.07
Pray	0.14	0.06*	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.07
Religion	0.12	0.18	0.21	0.19	0.29	0.20
Living internationally	−0.05	0.09	0.00	0.09	0.14	0.10
English ability	0.19	0.16	0.13	0.17	0.11	0.18
Homeownership	−0.20	0.22	−0.15	0.22	−0.23	0.24
Number of family members	−0.12	0.07	−0.03	0.08	−0.06	0.08
Relative standard of living	0.45	0.14**	0.26	0.16	0.87	0.17**
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.41	0.18*	0.68	0.19**	0.07	0.20
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	−0.39	0.11**	−0.222	0.11*	−0.19	0.12
Income	−0.064	0.05	−0.049	0.05	0.02	0.06
Educational attainment	0.01	0.17	0.07	0.19	0.03	0.20
Region (base: Seoul metropolitan)						
Middle	−0.03	0.27	0.41	0.28	0.73	0.30*
South-west	0.03	0.29	0.31	0.30	−0.03	0.31
South-east	0.04	0.19	0.09	0.20	0.29	0.22
City size (base: large city)						
Small and medium	−0.04	0.17	−0.18	0.18	0.09	0.19
Eup/Myeon	0.32	0.31	−0.35	0.32	−0.54	0.33
cut1	1.30	1.27	4.02	1.30	4.50	1.35
cut2	4.52	1.22	7.52	1.31	8.79	1.39
cut3	6.76	1.24	10.94	1.36	13.37	1.46
cut4	9.84	1.27				
N	662		662		662	
Pseudo R2	0.1974		0.2280		0.2377	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.9 Ordered logit regression – South Korea – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.36	0.10**	0.19	0.10	0.42	0.11**
Standard of living	0.24	0.15	0.57	0.15**	0.46	0.16**
Household income	0.10	0.13	−0.05	0.14	0.08	0.14
Health	0.14	0.08	0.20	0.09*	−0.08	0.09
Education	−0.11	0.10	0.06	0.11	0.03	0.12
Job	0.19	0.09*	0.17	0.10	0.26	0.10*
Leisure	0.09	0.10	0.19	0.10	0.02	0.11
Spiritual life	0.43	0.11**	0.41	0.11**	0.23	0.12
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.24	0.10*	0.25	0.10*	0.13	0.11
Condition of environment	−0.32	0.11**	−0.38	0.11**	−0.22	0.12
Social welfare system	−0.01	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.11
Democratic system	0.01	0.10	0.07	0.10	−0.14	0.11
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.19	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.04	0.12
Marriage	na		na		na	
Neighbors	0.12	0.11	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.12
Family life	0.21	0.12	0.18	0.12	0.20	0.13
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.01	0.12	−0.08	0.13	0.18	0.14
Internet	0.05	0.07	−0.03	0.08	0.03	0.08
Email	0.01	0.07	0.13	0.07	−0.03	0.07
Mobile phone	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.01	0.07
Pray	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.01	0.06
Religion	0.15	0.16	0.21	0.17	0.22	0.17
Living internationally	−0.08	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.16	0.09
English ability	0.23	0.13	0.18	0.14	0.20	0.15
Homeownership	−0.14	0.18	−0.19	0.19	−0.34	0.20
Number of family members	−0.11	0.06	−0.08	0.06	−0.07	0.07
Relative standard of living	0.37	0.13**	0.19	0.14	0.64	0.14**
No right to vote	1.01	0.79	−0.50	0.76	−1.38	0.85
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.58	0.28*	−0.23	0.29	−0.09	0.31
Married	1.01	0.26**	0.28	0.27	0.45	0.28
Female × married	−0.25	0.32	0.71	0.34*	0.09	0.36
Age	−0.34	0.09**	−0.224	0.10*	−0.14	0.10
Income	−0.01	0.04	−0.051	0.04	0.01	0.04
Educational attainment	−0.07	0.15	−0.002	0.16	−0.13	0.16
Region (Base-Seoul metropolitan)						
Middle	−0.19	0.23	0.04	0.24	0.46	0.25
South-west	0.21	0.25	0.25	0.26	−0.01	0.27
South-east	−0.08	0.16	0.03	0.17	0.19	0.18
City size (base: large city)						
Small and medium	−0.05	0.15	−0.14	0.15	−0.08	0.16
Eup/Myeon	0.39	0.27	−0.15	0.28	−0.34	0.30
cut1	1.77	1.01	2.43	1.02	3.90	1.08
cut2	5.06	0.99	6.01	1.04	7.91	1.11
cut3	7.26	1.00	9.28	1.07	12.2	1.17
cut4	10.3	1.03				
N	872		871		870	
Pseudo R2	0.1853		0.2031		0.2038	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

happiness in the sample of only married respondents. But housing or standard of living in the materialist life sphere is statistically significant and positively related to the dependent variables. The condition of the environment in the public life sphere is statistically and negatively related to levels of happiness and enjoyment in both the sample of only married respondents and the general sample of all South Korean respondents, whereas public safety is statistically and positively related. Marriage in the post-materialist life sphere is strongly and positively associated with the dependent variables.

In terms of demography, females are happier than males, seniors are less happy, and high income does not guarantee happiness. The estimated coefficient on females is positive and statistically significant in the regression of happiness as reported in Tables 7.8 and 7.9 and in the regression of enjoyment as reported in Table 7.8. Age is negatively related to happiness and enjoyment and statistically significant using both samples. The relative standard of living is also an important determinant of the levels of overall life quality.

7.3.2.6 Taiwan

Tables 7.10 and 7.11 report the results from fitting ordered logit regressions using only married observations and all the Taiwanese observations. Curiously, marriage is statistically significant only in the regression of achievement, and family life is not statistically significant in all the three regressions. In other words, one of the East Asian features, primary group importance, is not featured.

Among the three life spheres, we argue that the domains in the post-materialist life sphere are the most important to overall quality of life in Taiwan based on the number of statistically significant and positively estimated coefficients The materialist life sphere is next, followed by the public life sphere.

In the regressions of happiness based on both married respondents and all the Taiwanese respondents, the estimated coefficients on "health" and "job" are positive and statistically significant. "Spiritual life" also affects the feelings of happiness positively based on both samples.

In terms of demography, females are happier than males in the regression based on only married observations. Seniors are more likely to feel a sense of accomplishment. Curiously enough, being married does not generate feelings of happiness and enjoyment, but being satisfied with one's marriage is positively related to feelings of achievement in Taiwan.

7.3.3 Country-by-Country Analysis Through Regression Equations: Southeast Asia

7.3.3.1 Summary of Southeast Asia

Southeast Asian features focus on housing, household income, and standard of living, that is, materialist life sphere except in Brunei. The solidarity of primary

Table 7.10 Ordered logit regression – Taiwan – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Standard of living	−0.05	0.18	0.17	0.18	−0.20	0.18
Household income	0.10	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.22	0.16
Health	0.24	0.11*	0.15	0.12	0.08	0.12
Education	−0.15	0.13	−0.11	0.14	0.11	0.14
Job	0.34	0.14*	0.02	0.14	−0.01	0.14
Leisure	0.10	0.15	0.53	0.16**	0.31	0.16*
Post-materialist sphere						
Housing	0.38	0.12**	0.43	0.12**	0.33	0.12*
Friendships	0.05	0.13	−0.07	0.14	0.08	0.14
Marriage	0.15	0.14	0.27	0.14	0.40	0.15*
Neighbors	−0.14	0.13	0.16	0.13	−0.05	0.14
Family life	0.20	0.16	0.01	0.17	−0.04	0.17
Spiritual life	0.41	0.16*	0.11	0.16	0.16	0.16
Public sphere						
Public safety	−0.04	0.10	0.08	0.11	−0.01	0.11
Condition of environment	0.07	0.13	0.25	0.14	0.16	0.14
Social welfare system	0.23	0.12	−0.17	0.13	0.03	0.13
Democratic system	−0.18	0.11	−0.23	0.11	−0.15	0.12
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.20	0.13	−0.02	0.14	0.01	0.14
Internet	−0.14	0.07*	−0.14	0.07*	−0.08	0.07
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.12	0.07	0.02	0.07	0.06	0.07
Pray	0.07	0.07	0.20	0.07*	0.01	0.08
Religion	−0.27	0.21	−0.13	0.22	−0.15	0.22
Living internationally	−0.04	0.09	0.13	0.09	0.12	0.09
English ability	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.16	−0.21	0.16
Homeownership	−0.06	0.26	−0.27	0.28	0.25	0.27
Number of family members	0.08	0.05	0.13	0.05*	0.11	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.12	0.20	0.59	0.20**	0.25	0.20
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.50	0.16**	0.01	0.16	−0.03	0.17
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	0.06	0.09	−0.001	0.09	0.25	0.09*
Income	0.001	0.02	−0.042	0.02	−0.02	0.02
Educational attainment	0.08	0.15	0.32	0.15*	0.20	0.16
Region (base: southern)						
Northern	0.13	0.24	−0.02	0.25	0.06	0.26
Western	0.96	0.23**	0.20	0.24	0.28	0.24
City size (Base- <9,000,000)						
Population 9,000,000 more	0.02	0.19	0.16	0.20	0.55	0.21*
Urban/rural (base: rural)						
Urban	0.28	0.20	0.33	0.21	0.54	0.21*
cut1	2.64	1.24	5.35	1.30	4.88	1.34
cut2	4.03	1.24	8.50	1.32	7.61	1.35
cut3	6.81	1.25	11.42	1.36	11.28	1.40
cut4	8.73	1.27				
N	651		646		649	
Pseudo R2	0.1087		0.1312		0.1109	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.11 Ordered logit regression – Taiwan – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Standard of living	−0.09	0.15	0.10	0.16	−0.13	0.16
Household income	0.27	0.14	0.17	0.14	0.32	0.14*
Health	0.24	0.09*	0.15	0.10	0.04	0.10
Education	−0.04	0.11	−0.10	0.11	0.06	0.12
Job	0.28	0.10*	0.07	0.11	0.15	0.11
Leisure	0.16	0.12	0.51	0.13**	0.18	0.13
Post-materialist sphere						
Housing	0.09	0.10	0.26	0.10*	0.28	0.10*
Friendships	0.20	0.11	0.13	0.11	0.09	0.12
Marriage	na		na		na	
Neighbors	−0.09	0.11	0.05	0.11	0.02	0.12
Family life	0.19	0.11	0.07	0.12	0.04	0.12
Spiritual life	0.55	0.13**	0.31	0.13*	0.24	0.13
Public sphere						
Public safety	−0.04	0.08	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.09
Condition of environment	0.05	0.11	0.13	0.11	0.23	0.11*
Social welfare system	0.01	0.10	−0.20	0.11	−0.07	0.11
Democratic system	−0.12	0.09	−0.28	0.10*	−0.17	0.10
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.34	0.11**	−0.11	0.12	0.02	0.12
Internet	−0.13	0.06*	−0.11	0.06	−0.06	0.06
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.09	0.06	−0.01	0.06	0.04	0.06
Pray	0.01	0.06	0.15	0.06*	0.05	0.07
Religion	−0.02	0.17	−0.07	0.17	−0.01	0.18
Living internationally	−0.03	0.07	0.13	0.08	0.14	0.08
English ability	0.24	0.13	0.11	0.13	−0.13	0.13
Homeownership	−0.17	0.21	−0.36	0.22	0.10	0.22
Number of family members	0.04	0.04	0.09	0.05	0.08	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.12	0.17	0.39	0.17*	0.12	0.17
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.05	0.25	−0.33	0.26	−0.37	0.26
Married	−0.49	0.22*	−0.55	0.23*	0.22	0.23
Female × married	0.46	0.29	0.32	0.31	0.29	0.31
Age	0.02	0.08	0.03	0.08	0.32	0.08**
Income	−0.003	0.02	−0.05	0.02*	−0.03	0.02
Educational attainment	0.01	0.13	0.26	0.13	0.15	0.13
Region (base: southern)						
Northern	−0.02	0.20	−0.11	0.21	0.07	0.22
Western	0.67	0.20**	−0.01	0.20	0.30	0.21
City size (base: <9,000,000)						
Population 9,000,000 more	0.10	0.16	0.01	0.17	0.49	0.18*
Urban/rural (base: rural)						
Urban	0.06	0.17	0.34	0.17	0.39	0.18*
cut1	0.37	1.01	2.53	1.04	4.17	1.07
cut2	1.92	1.00	5.62	1.05	7.08	1.09
cut3	4.58	1.01	8.39	1.07	10.7	1.13
cut4	6.55	1.02				
N	892		886		889	
Pseudo R2	0.099		0.109		0.1166	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

group relationship is not exclusively highlighted. Those countries that are heavily culturally influenced by East Asia, that is, Singapore and Vietnam, exhibit deviations from the mainstream Southeast Asian features. Most directly, Singapore and Vietnam emphasize marriage and family life along with mainstream Southeast Asian features. Those countries that are culturally influenced by South Asia, that is, Myanmar, Cambodia, and Thailand, exhibit features such as spiritual life and leisure.

7.3.3.2 Brunei

Geographically a small spot, the features of Brunei are not easily grasped through statistics. Its population size is 300,000. Because Brunei is incredibly rich and is a tightly knit community, it is no wonder that the most statistically significant variable is friendships. In terms of demographics, females are happier than males. Already rich, increased income does not add to levels of happiness.

Among the three life spheres, we argue that the post-materialist life sphere is the most important determinant for overall quality of life, which is followed by the public life sphere and the materialist life sphere in that order. Friendships in the post-materialist sphere are statistically significant and positively related to happiness, whereas education in the materialist life sphere is statistically significant but estimated as a negative. Finally, none of the life domains in the public sphere are statistically significant (Table 7.12).

7.3.3.3 Cambodia

Tables 7.13 and 7.14 report the results from fitting ordered logit regressions using only married observations and all the observations of Cambodia, respectively. Housing, friendships, standard of living, household income, public safety, and spiritual life matter for both married respondents and the general sample of all the Cambodian respondents. Housing and standard of living are statistically and positively related to happiness in both samples. Among the three life spheres, life domains in the materialist sphere are the most important determinants and positively related to overall life quality, which is followed by the post-materialist life sphere and then the public life sphere.

Salient variables are prayer and relative standard of living. The estimated coefficient on prayer is negative and statistically significant in the regressions of happiness using both samples.

In terms of demographics, income is positively related to the feelings of enjoyment and achievement. Regionally, respondents in the coastal region are happiest with access to trade. Respondents in the plain region are less happy than those in the coastal region as land property is not well protected. Respondents in the Tonle Sap region are the least happy as both land use and fishing face challenges.

Table 7.12 Ordered logit regression – Brunei

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Public sphere				
Job	0.20	0.22	0.19	0.15
Neighbors	0.04	0.29	0.09	0.23
Public safety	0.17	0.28	−0.07	0.22
Condition of environment	−0.20	0.30	0.23	0.25
Social welfare system	0.05	0.33	0.05	0.28
Democratic system	na		na	
Family life	0.54	0.34	0.24	0.29
Leisure	−0.26	0.25	−0.17	0.20
Spiritual life	na		na	
Materialist sphere				
Standard of living	−0.15	0.26	−0.19	0.21
Household income	0.33	0.22	0.30	0.19
Health	0.06	0.28	0.25	0.21
Education	−0.61	0.28*	−0.57	0.22*
Post-materialist sphere				
Housing	0.01	0.19	−0.08	0.16
Friendships	1.35	0.30**	1.19	0.24**
Marriage	−0.21	0.31	na	
Lifestyles				
The public water supply	na		na	
Electricity	0.57	1.15	−0.08	1.03
Piped gas	−0.62	0.33	−0.68	0.27*
Pray	−0.05	0.10	−0.10	0.08
Religion	na		na	
Living internationally	0.03	0.09	0.04	0.07
English ability	0.34	0.16*	0.26	0.13
Home ownership	0.29	0.21	0.21	0.18
Number of family members	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.02
Relative standard of living	0.02	0.23	0.11	0.19
No right to vote	na		na	
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.47	0.21*	0.05	0.32
Married	na		−0.16	0.28
Female × married	na		0.40	0.38
Age	0.14	0.12	0.07	0.11
Income	−0.23	0.08**	−0.15	0.07*
Educational attainment	−0.07	0.20	−0.11	0.17
City size (base – village)				
Urban	0.34	0.26	0.24	0.21
cut1	2.67	1.95	2.80	1.57
cut2	4.69	1.90	4.27	1.55
cut3	7.8	1.93	7.45	1.57
N	439		620	
Pseudo R2	0.1051		0.0965	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.13 Ordered logit regression – Cambodia – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.23	0.10*	0.0002	0.10	−0.09	0.09
Friendships	0.23	0.12*	0.20	0.13	0.30	0.11*
Marriage	−0.06	0.13	0.09	0.14	−0.15	0.12
Standard of living	0.27	0.11*	0.22	0.12	0.16	0.10
Household income	0.16	0.10	−0.07	0.12	0.17	0.10
Health	−0.04	0.09	−0.02	0.10	0.19	0.09*
Education	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.11	−0.08	0.09
Job	0.10	0.09	0.22	0.10*	0.00	0.09
Neighbors	0.09	0.11	−0.27	0.12*	−0.01	0.10
Family life	−0.02	0.11	0.08	0.12	−0.02	0.10
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.17	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.03	0.09
Condition of environment	−0.05	0.11	−0.05	0.12	−0.12	0.10
Social welfare system	−0.14	0.09	0.00	0.10	0.0002	0.08
Democratic system	0.14	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.08
Post-materialist sphere						
Leisure	0.01	0.10	0.34	0.12**	0.18	0.10
Spiritual life	0.30	0.11**	0.48	0.12**	0.15	0.10
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.05	0.09	0.14	0.10	0.11	0.08
Internet	−0.38	0.22	0.25	0.24	−0.43	0.21*
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.11	0.10	−0.09	0.11	0.21	0.10*
Pray	−0.35	0.09**	−0.12	0.10	−0.01	0.08
Religion	−0.98	2.52	−2.10	2.82	−3.08	2.21
Living internationally	0.17	0.13	−0.004	0.15	−0.0003	0.12
English ability	0.14	0.18	−0.21	0.21	−0.13	0.17
Homeownership	0.19	0.27	−0.01	0.31	0.09	0.25
Number of family members	−0.05	0.04	−0.06	0.04	−0.07	0.03
Relative standard of living	0.49	0.18**	0.33	0.19	0.63	0.16**
No right to vote	−0.78	0.70	0.02	0.83	0.47	0.67
Demographic characteristics						
Female	−0.01	0.19	−0.01	0.21	−0.15	0.17
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	0.05	0.09	−0.10	0.10	0.02	0.08
Income	−0.03	0.04	0.114	0.05*	0.14	0.04**
Educational attainment	−0.31	0.19	0.02	0.21	0.01	0.17
Region (base – coastal region)						
Plain region	−1.01	0.27**	−0.31	0.32	−0.56	0.26*
Tonle Sap region	−1.46	0.27**	−0.66	0.33*	−0.67	0.26*
cut1	−2.27	2.69	−1.89	2.99	−2.70	2.35
cut2	−0.36	2.66	0.77	2.98	0.72	2.35
cut3	4.18	2.67	5.86	2.99	4.56	2.36
cut4	7.05	2.68				
N	657		657		657	
Pseudo R2	0.1267		0.1415		0.1165	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.14 Ordered logit regression – Cambodia – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.23	0.08**	0.06	0.08	−0.02	0.07
Friendships	0.15	0.09	0.13	0.10	0.07	0.08
Marriage	na		na		na	
Standard of living	0.33	0.09**	0.25	0.10*	0.02	0.08
Household income	0.19	0.08*	0.02	0.09	0.22	0.08*
Health	0.04	0.07	0.13	0.08	0.16	0.07*
Education	−0.04	0.08	−0.04	0.08	−0.06	0.07
Job	−0.01	0.07	0.23	0.08*	0.03	0.07
Neighbors	0.09	0.09	−0.09	0.10	0.06	0.08
Family life	0.003	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.02	0.08
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.16	0.08*	0.08	0.08	0.01	0.07
Condition of environment	0.02	0.09	−0.04	0.10	−0.02	0.08
Social welfare system	−0.13	0.07	−0.06	0.08	−0.12	0.07
Democratic system	0.03	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.07
Post-materialist sphere						
Leisure	0.04	0.08	0.25	0.09*	0.09	0.08
Spiritual life	0.30	0.09**	0.41	0.10**	0.13	0.08
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.01	0.07	0.18	0.08*	0.08	0.06
Internet	0.10	0.12	0.07	0.14	−0.17	0.12
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.06	0.07	−0.11	0.08	0.15	0.07*
Pray	−0.20	0.07*	−0.06	0.07	0.03	0.06
Religion	−1.01	2.36	−1.82	2.70	−3.33	2.08
Living internationally	0.09	0.09	0.16	0.11	0.10	0.09
English ability	0.10	0.14	−0.01	0.16	0.08	0.13
Homeownership	0.27	0.21	0.07	0.25	0.28	0.20
Number of family members	−0.06	0.03*	−0.03	0.03	−0.06	0.03*
Relative standard of living	0.45	0.15**	0.13	0.15	0.69	0.14**
No right to vote	0.03	0.28	−0.26	0.31	−0.32	0.26
Demographic characteristics						
Female	−0.08	0.25	0.40	0.28	−0.23	0.24
Married	0.08	0.24	0.16	0.26	−0.05	0.23
Female × married	0.13	0.31	−0.34	0.34	0.16	0.29
Age	0.14	0.07	−0.11	0.08	0.001	0.07
Income	−0.02	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.03*
Educational attainment	−0.05	0.15	0.003	0.17	0.04	0.14
Region (base – coastal region)						
Plain region	−0.79	0.21**	−0.22	0.25	−0.33	0.21
Tonle Sap region	−1.22	0.22**	−0.57	0.26*	−0.45	0.21*
cut1	−0.84	2.45	−1.07	2.79	−2.20	2.16
cut2	1.01	2.44	1.49	2.78	1.20	2.16
cut3	5.27	2.44	6.42	2.79	4.79	2.17
cut4	8.10	2.45				
N	983		983		983	
Pseudo R2	0.1179		0.1374		0.0997	

Notes: ** 1% significance level; * 5% significance level

7.3.3.4 Indonesia

Housing, household income, and public safety are the key features of mainstream Southeast Asian features. According to Tables 7.15 and 7.16, the estimated coefficients on housing are positive and statistically significant in all the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement." The importance of spiritual life and prayer is underlined also. The estimated coefficient on spiritual life is positive and statistically significant in the regressions of happiness that use both married respondents and all the respondents of Indonesia. Public safety and neighbors in the post-materialist life sphere are statistically significant but negatively estimated. Among the three life spheres, the domains in the materialist life sphere are the most critical and positively related to the dependent variables, followed by the public life sphere and the post-materialist life sphere in that order. Negative coefficients on the domains in the post-materialist sphere rank the sphere as the lowest.

Prayer is negatively associated with "happiness" using only married respondents. "English ability" is negatively associated with "happiness" and "achievement" using both the married and the general samples of respondents. In terms of demographics, seniors are less like to feel levels of enjoyment and achievement. Regionally, Sumatra is the happiest as it is demographically moderate in density, land space is sufficient, and resources are abundant. Java is less happy as it is demographically dense and the pace of life is more hectic. Other regions are the least happy as the areas are either undeveloped or underdeveloped and isolated by sea.

7.3.3.5 Laos

Household income, standard of living, and public safety are key features of mainstream Southeast Asian features. In using the general sample of all the respondents of Laos, "standard of living" and "household income" are positively associated with "happiness," but "public safety" is negatively associated. In using only the sample of married respondents in Laos, "household income" is positively related to "happiness." Because of the negative relationship between public safety and happiness when using the sample of all the respondents, we argue that the materialist life sphere is the most important and positively related to overall quality of life. The post-materialist life sphere comes next, followed by the public life sphere.

In terms of demographics, seniors, high-income groups, and highly educated respondents are rewarded with a sense of achievement. Regionally, respondents in Luang Prabang do not express as much enjoyment as those in Vientiane (Tables 7.17 and 7.18).

7.3.3.6 Malaysia

Housing, household income, standard of living, and public safety are key features of mainstream Southeast Asian features. The estimated coefficients on "housing" are

Table 7.15 Ordered logit regression – Indonesia – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.28	0.11**	0.24	0.11*	0.30	0.12*
Standard of living	0.07	0.14	0.19	0.14	0.13	0.15
Household income	0.31	0.13*	0.13	0.14	0.16	0.14
Education	0.20	0.10	0.22	0.11*	0.29	0.11*
Job	0.09	0.11	−0.07	0.11	−0.12	0.12
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.24	0.13	0.54	0.14**	0.20	0.14
Marriage	0.01	0.15	0.01	0.15	−0.14	0.15
Health	0.11	0.12	0.07	0.12	0.04	0.13
Neighbors	−0.29	0.15	−0.09	0.16	−0.52	0.17**
Public safety	−0.45	0.15**	−0.36	0.15*	−0.12	0.15
Family life	0.16	0.15	0.11	0.15	0.48	0.16**
Spiritual life	0.56	0.18**	0.29	0.19	−0.13	0.19
Public sphere						
Condition of environment	0.25	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.14
Social welfare system	−0.05	0.12	−0.07	0.12	0.30	0.13*
Democratic system	−0.01	0.11	0.17	0.12	−0.05	0.12
Leisure	0.20	0.12	0.32	0.13*	0.07	0.13
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.22	0.11*	0.19	0.11	−0.001	0.11
Internet	0.15	0.23	0.08	0.26	−0.0004	0.25
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.16	0.07*	0.04	0.07	0.28	0.08**
Pray	−0.23	0.11*	−0.17	0.11	−0.08	0.11
Religion	na		na		na	
Living internationally	0.28	0.16	0.03	0.16	0.08	0.16
English ability	−0.43	0.21*	−0.31	0.21	−0.48	0.22*
Homeownership	−0.01	0.28	−0.08	0.29	0.32	0.30
Number of family members	0.01	0.05	−0.04	0.05	0.004	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.60	0.14**	0.33	0.14*	0.55	0.15**
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	−0.20	0.18	0.08	0.18	−0.34	0.19
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	−0.10	0.08	−0.28	0.09**	−0.22	0.09*
Income	−0.08	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05
Educational attainment	0.20	0.18	0.13	0.18	0.13	0.19
Region (base – Sumatra)						
Java	−0.40	0.24	−0.39	0.24	−1.31	0.26**
Others	−0.65	0.31*	−1.13	0.33**	−1.90	0.34**
Urban/rural (base – rural)						
Urban	−0.08	0.18	−0.19	0.19	−0.59	0.20**
cut1	−1.09	1.48	1.88	1.17	−1.85	1.21
cut2	3.05	1.10	4.73	1.15	1.22	1.17
cut3	5.47	1.12	7.97	1.19	4.95	1.19
cut4	8.68	1.15				
N	638		637		636	
Pseudo R2	0.1479		0.1518		0.1723	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.16 Ordered logit regression – Indonesia – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.32	0.09**	0.34	0.09**	0.31	0.10**
Standard of living	0.15	0.12	0.13	0.12	−0.01	0.13
Household income	0.24	0.11*	0.18	0.12	0.18	0.12
Education	0.24	0.09**	0.18	0.09*	0.18	0.10
Job	0.19	0.09*	0.04	0.09	0.09	0.09
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.24	0.11*	0.47	0.12**	0.19	0.12
Marriage	na		na		na	
Health	0.10	0.10	0.04	0.10	−0.02	0.11
Neighbors	−0.17	0.13	−0.07	0.14	−0.48	0.14**
Public safety	−0.38	0.13**	−0.26	0.13	−0.13	0.13
Family life	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.13	0.31	0.13*
Spiritual life	0.51	0.15**	0.31	0.15	0.01	0.16
Public sphere						
Condition of environment	0.25	0.11*	0.20	0.11	0.11	0.12
Social welfare system	−0.12	0.10	−0.04	0.10	0.26	0.11*
Democratic system	−0.10	0.10	0.004	0.11	−0.01	0.11
Leisure	0.27	0.11*	0.38	0.11**	0.07	0.12
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.19	0.09*	0.18	0.10	0.10	0.10
Internet	0.31	0.17	0.26	0.19	0.08	0.18
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.13	0.06*	0.07	0.06	0.27	0.07**
Pray	−0.17	0.09	−0.16	0.09	−0.06	0.09
Religion	na		na		na	
Living internationally	0.21	0.13	−0.003	0.14	0.09	0.14
English ability	−0.47	0.18**	−0.32	0.18	−0.45	0.19*
Homeownership	−0.03	0.24	−0.06	0.25	0.02	0.26
Number of family members	−0.003	0.04	−0.04	0.04	0.06	0.04
Relative standard of living	0.47	0.12**	0.25	0.12*	0.57	0.13**
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.09	0.29	0.25	0.30	0.31	0.31
Married	0.42	0.25	0.06	0.25	0.60	0.27*
Female × married	−0.30	0.34	−0.13	0.35	−0.63	0.36
Age	−0.10	0.07	−0.23	0.07**	−0.16	0.08*
Income	−0.07	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.05
Educational attainment	0.21	0.15	0.12	0.16	0.03	0.17
Region (base – Sumatra)						
Java	−0.53	0.20*	−0.34	0.21	−1.32	0.22**
Others	−0.77	0.27**	−1.20	0.28**	−1.88	0.30**
Urban/rural (base – rural)						
Urban	0.05	0.16	−0.11	0.16	−0.43	0.17*
cut1	0.85	1.04	2.61	1.00	−0.32	1.02
cut2	4.10	0.94	5.63	0.98	2.47	1.00
cut3	6.40	0.95	8.89	1.02	6.19	1.03
cut4	9.65	0.98				
N	839		838		837	
Pseudo R2	0.1551		0.1697		0.1827	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.17 Ordered logit regression – Laos – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.18	0.11	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.13
Standard of living	0.19	0.14	0.18	0.15	0.44	0.16**
Household income	0.42	0.11**	−0.03	0.13	0.09	0.13
Health	0.15	0.10	0.22	0.11	−0.18	0.11
Education	0.04	0.10	0.06	0.11	0.12	0.11
Job	0.01	0.12	0.17	0.13	0.23	0.13
Family life	0.33	0.15*	0.03	0.17	0.10	0.17
Public sphere						
Neighbors	0.18	0.16	0.20	0.18	−0.12	0.18
Public safety	−0.19	0.12	−0.25	0.13	−0.17	0.13
Condition of environment	0.13	0.13	0.17	0.15	−0.19	0.15
Social welfare system	0.17	0.12	−0.14	0.13	0.14	0.13
Democratic system	na		na		na	
Spiritual life	−0.04	0.15	−0.18	0.17	−0.08	0.17
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	−0.16	0.15	0.04	0.16	−0.01	0.16
Marriage	−0.05	0.17	0.26	0.19	0.07	0.19
Leisure	0.14	0.12	0.16	0.14	0.23	0.14
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.05	0.10	0.07	0.11	−0.08	0.11
Internet	−0.12	0.15	0.23	0.18	−0.05	0.17
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.14	0.11	−0.06	0.12	0.07	0.12
Pray	0.05	0.09	0.14	0.10	−0.01	0.10
Religion	na		na		na	
Living internationally	−0.01	0.13	0.27	0.14	0.30	0.14*
English ability	0.25	0.20	0.52	0.23*	−0.14	0.23
Homeownership	−0.15	0.34	−0.32	0.39	0.01	0.39
Number of family members	−0.004	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.06
Relative standard of living	0.16	0.17	0.19	0.19	0.45	0.19*
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.41	0.21	0.01	0.24	0.02	0.24
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	0.01	0.10	−0.22	0.11*	0.24	0.11*
Income	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.06	0.02**
Educational attainment	0.19	0.13	0.18	0.15	0.46	0.15**
Region (base – Vientiane)						
Savannakhet	0.10	0.27	0.48	0.30	0.37	0.30
Luang Prabang	−0.09	0.25	−0.71	0.28*	−0.35	0.28
cut1	2.32	1.27	1.43	1.48	0.42	1.56
cut2	4.76	1.23	4.00	1.41	3.68	1.42
cut3	6.04	1.24	8.43	1.47	8.34	1.49
cut4	9.39	1.29				
N	490		490		490	
Pseudo R2	0.1203		0.1521		0.1611	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.18 Ordered logit regression – Laos – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.14	0.09	0.06	0.10	0.11	0.11
Standard of living	0.26	0.11*	0.18	0.12	0.52	0.13**
Household income	0.27	0.09**	−0.02	0.10	0.03	0.11
Health	0.21	0.08*	0.09	0.09	−0.13	0.10
Education	0.03	0.08	0.04	0.10	0.15	0.10
Job	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.10	0.21	0.11
Family life	0.20	0.12	0.04	0.13	−0.01	0.14
Public sphere						
Neighbors	0.20	0.13	0.16	0.14	−0.01	0.14
Public safety	−0.30	0.10**	−0.19	0.11	−0.13	0.11
Condition of environment	0.06	0.11	0.02	0.12	−0.24	0.12
Social welfare system	0.16	0.10	0.00	0.11	0.12	0.11
Democratic system	na		na		na	
Spiritual life	0.04	0.13	−0.04	0.14	−0.01	0.15
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	−0.12	0.12	0.14	0.13	−0.08	0.14
Marriage	na		na		na	
Leisure	0.08	0.10	0.20	0.11	0.19	0.12
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.03	0.08	−0.03	0.09	−0.10	0.09
Internet	−0.16	0.12	0.23	0.13	−0.09	0.14
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.15	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.04	0.09
Pray	0.09	0.07	0.15	0.08	0.02	0.08
Religion	na		na		na	
Living internationally	0.02	0.10	0.46	0.12**	0.36	0.12**
English ability	0.14	0.17	0.31	0.18	−0.03	0.19
Homeownership	−0.03	0.27	−0.27	0.30	0.27	0.32
Number of family members	−0.03	0.04	−0.04	0.04	−0.06	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.15	0.35	0.16*
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.44	0.33	0.45	0.36	0.08	0.38
Married	0.38	0.31	0.11	0.35	0.31	0.36
Female × married	−0.11	0.38	−0.37	0.42	−0.10	0.44
Age	−0.06	0.08	−0.13	0.09	0.21	0.09*
Income	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.02*	0.06	0.02**
Educational attainment	0.16	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.30	0.13*
Region (base – Vientiane)						
Savannakhet	0.09	0.21	0.11	0.24	0.11	0.25
Luang Prabang	−0.15	0.21	−0.74	0.24**	−0.49	0.25
cut1	1.57	0.95	0.23	1.05	−0.04	1.13
cut2	4.48	0.88	2.66	0.99	2.78	1.04
cut3	5.58	0.89	6.79	1.03	7.47	1.09
cut4	8.77	0.93				
N	671		671		670	
Pseudo R2	0.1071		0.1422		0.1443	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

positive and statistically significant in all the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" using both married observations and the general sample of all the Malay observations. "Household income" is positively associated with "happiness" and "achievement" when using the married observations. Satisfaction with public safety tends to be positively related to the overall quality of life. It is essential to note that family life adds immensely to happiness. The estimated coefficient on "family life" is positive and statistically significant in the regressions of "happiness" when using the married observations and the general sample of all the Malay observations.

The materialist life sphere is the most vital and positively related to overall quality of life in the three spheres, followed by the post-materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order.

In terms of demographics, females are happy based on the general sample of all the Malay respondents. Seniors are more likely to have a sense of accomplishment.

Regionally, respondents in the northern border area with southern Thailand express less happiness, whereas respondents in the southern and central regions are the happiest as this includes Kuala Lumpur. The respondents in eastern Malaysia, an area that borders Indonesia's Kalimantan, fare slightly worse in terms of enjoyment levels (Tables 7.19 and 7.20).

7.3.3.7 Myanmar

Housing, household income, and standard of living are key features of mainstream Southeast Asian features. The estimated coefficients on "housing" are positive and statistically significant in all the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" when using both married observations and the general sample of all the observations of Myanmar. "Standard of living" is positively associated with "happiness" and "enjoyment." The "relative standard of living" also tends to affect positively the overall quality of life. The estimated coefficient on "household income" is positive and statistically significant in the regression of "happiness." Satisfaction with leisure is positively related to feelings of happiness and enjoyment. That neighbors are deemed negative is no less important in that it also means having "unneighborly" residents as neighbors.

We argue that the domains in the materialist life sphere are the most important determinants and are positively related to the overall quality of life, followed by the post-materialist life sphere and then the public life sphere.

In terms of demographics, seniors do not experience heightened feelings of enjoyment. Regionally, respondents in Lashio, a medium-sized city, express higher levels of enjoyment and achievement. Yangon, a major urban center, has big-city problems. Pathein, another source of respondents for the survey, is a medium-sized city. The city of Mandalay adds least quality of life. The estimated coefficients on the dummy variable "Mandalay" are all negative and statistically significant in the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" when using the general sample of all the Myanmar observations, and the estimated coefficients

Table 7.19 Ordered logit regression – Malaysia – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.15	0.22	0.24	0.23	−0.08	0.22
Marriage	0.19	0.21	−0.05	0.23	−0.13	0.21
Neighbors	0.18	0.20	0.21	0.20	−0.18	0.20
Family life	0.63	0.23**	0.51	0.24*	0.42	0.23
Leisure	0.73	0.21**	0.12	0.21	0.33	0.20
Spiritual life	−0.50	0.24*	0.45	0.24	0.16	0.23
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.29	0.14*	0.35	0.14*	0.42	0.13**
Standard of living	0.28	0.19	0.28	0.20	0.0003	0.19
Household income	0.55	0.18**	0.31	0.18	0.40	0.17*
Health	−0.08	0.17	0.14	0.17	0.13	0.17
Education	−0.01	0.16	−0.12	0.16	−0.09	0.15
Job	−0.07	0.16	−0.06	0.16	0.11	0.16
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.40	0.14**	0.43	0.14**	0.28	0.13*
Condition of environment	−0.37	0.16*	−0.26	0.17	−0.33	0.16*
Social welfare system	0.13	0.17	−0.04	0.17	0.08	0.16
Democratic system	0.01	0.16	−0.07	0.17	−0.08	0.17
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.33	0.13*	0.23	0.13	0.17	0.13
Internet	0.002	0.12	−0.01	0.12	0.14	0.11
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.001	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.25	0.07**
Pray	−0.01	0.12	0.08	0.12	0.04	0.12
Religion	1.10	1.87	0.72	2.17	−1.71	1.55
Living internationally	0.18	0.12	−0.01	0.13	0.02	0.13
English ability	−0.29	0.15	−0.11	0.16	−0.28	0.15
Homeownership	−0.16	0.26	0.22	0.27	−0.42	0.26
Number of family members	−0.01	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.29	0.20	0.29	0.21	−0.07	0.19
No right to vote	0.25	0.78	−0.03	0.76	1.29	0.76
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.40	0.20*	0.26	0.21	0.21	0.20
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	−0.07	0.11	−0.10	0.12	0.28	0.11*
Income	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.13	0.07
Educational attainment	0.20	0.21	0.13	0.22	0.06	0.21
Region (base – Northern)						
Southern	1.46	0.37**	0.89	0.38*	0.37	0.37
Eastern	1.00	0.36**	0.02	0.35	0.29	0.34
Central	1.39	0.32**	1.14	0.33**	0.93	0.31**
East Malaysia (KK Kuching)	0.35	0.33	−0.81	0.35*	−0.33	0.33
Urban/rural (base – rural)						
Urban	−0.04	0.24	−0.26	0.25	−0.67	0.24**
cut1	10.2	2.27	6.42	2.72	0.97	1.98
cut2	11.5	2.28	10.3	2.56	4.21	1.93
cut3	15.3	2.34	14.0	2.60	7.90	1.96
N	489		488		486	
Pseudo R2	0.2099		0.2091		0.1579	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.20 Ordered logit regression – Malaysia – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.25	0.18	0.25	0.18	−0.19	0.18
Marriage	na		na		na	
Neighbors	0.28	0.15	0.07	0.15	0.01	0.15
Family life	0.51	0.18**	0.32	0.18	0.30	0.18
Leisure	0.58	0.17**	0.22	0.17	0.33	0.17*
Spiritual life	−0.34	0.17	0.26	0.18	0.13	0.17
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.24	0.11*	0.36	0.11**	0.24	0.11*
Standard of living	0.56	0.16**	0.53	0.16**	0.28	0.15
Household income	0.20	0.13	0.10	0.14	0.25	0.13
Health	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.13	0.02	0.13
Education	−0.04	0.12	−0.03	0.13	0.01	0.12
Job	0.06	0.12	0.05	0.13	0.02	0.12
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.23	0.11*	0.30	0.11**	0.20	0.11
Condition of environment	−0.18	0.12	−0.11	0.13	−0.07	0.12
Social welfare system	0.05	0.13	−0.09	0.13	0.01	0.12
Democratic system	−0.09	0.13	−0.08	0.14	−0.16	0.13
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.21	0.10*	0.13	0.10	0.18	0.10
Internet	−0.07	0.08	−0.05	0.09	0.07	0.08
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.02	0.06	0.11	0.06	0.23	0.06**
Pray	0.01	0.08	0.29	0.08**	0.14	0.08
Religion	0.62	1.05	−1.02	1.47	−2.85	1.14*
Living internationally	0.13	0.10	0.04	0.10	0.09	0.10
English ability	−0.16	0.12	−0.12	0.12	−0.27	0.12*
Homeownership	0.08	0.21	0.34	0.21	−0.18	0.21
Number of family members	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.04
Relative standard of living	0.21	0.15	0.29	0.16	0.08	0.15
No right to vote	0.30	0.31	−0.02	0.31	0.41	0.30
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.40	0.30	−0.27	0.31	−0.08	0.29
Married	0.24	0.26	−0.18	0.27	0.24	0.25
Female × married	−0.08	0.35	0.50	0.37	0.22	0.35
Age	−0.17	0.09	−0.07	0.09	0.25	0.09**
Income	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.05
Educational attainment	−0.03	0.17	0.30	0.18	0.23	0.17
Region (base – Northern)						
Southern	1.00	0.30**	0.70	0.30*	0.28	0.29
Eastern	0.55	0.29	−0.08	0.29	0.05	0.28
Central	1.05	0.26**	0.99	0.26**	0.99	0.26**
East Malaysia (KK Kuching)	0.19	0.26	−0.55	0.27*	−0.05	0.26
Urban/rural						
Urban	−0.07	0.20	−0.19	0.20	−0.63	0.19**
cut1	8.15	1.44	5.58	1.89	0.93	1.51
cut2	9.61	1.44	8.73	1.84	4.02	1.48
cut3	13.1	1.49	12.2	1.88	7.59	1.51
N	710		708		707	
Pseudo R2	0.1817		0.2057		0.1466	

Notes: ** 1% significance level; * 5% significance level

on "Mandalay" are statistically and significantly negative in the regressions of "enjoyment" and "achievement" when using married respondents' observations (Tables 7.21 and 7.22).

7.3.3.8 The Philippines

Housing and household income are key features of mainstream Southeast Asian features. The estimated coefficients on "housing" are positive and statistically significant in all the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" when using both married observations and all the observations of the Philippines. The estimated coefficients on "household income" are positive and statistically significant in the regressions of "happiness" and "enjoyment."

Perhaps due to the influence of American and Spanish colonialism, marriage, health, and friendships also matter immensely. The estimated coefficients on "marriage" are positive and statistically significant in all the three regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement." The estimated coefficients on "friendships" are positive and statistically significant in all the regressions except for the regression of enjoyment when using married observations. "Health" is positively associated with feelings of enjoyment.

Among the three life spheres, the domains in the materialist life sphere are the most important and positively related to overall quality of life in the Philippines, followed by the post-materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order.

In terms of demographics, the qualities of being female and highly educated add to feelings of happiness. Regionally, respondents in Mindanao have more of a sense of achievement, perhaps because of the large Muslim population. Respondents in Visayas express higher levels of achievement but not enjoyment (Tables 7.23 and 7.24).

7.3.3.9 Singapore

Standard of living, health, family life, and spiritual life are key features of Singapore, which has an ethnic population base of Chinese, Indian, and Malay. In an island republic, surrounded by massive Muslim populations and inhabited by huge temporary and permanent new immigrants from countries, such as China and Indonesia, Singapore has much to worry about when they assess their quality of life.

Satisfaction with the standard of living is positively related to feelings of happiness, enjoyment, and achievement when using the sample of married respondents. When using the sample of only married respondents, the satisfaction level with the standard of living is positively related to feelings of happiness and enjoyment. The estimated coefficients on "spiritual life" are positive and statistically significant in the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" based on the married sample. "Health" and "family life" are positively associated with "happiness."

Table 7.21 Ordered logit regression – Myanmar – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.28	0.12*	0.28	0.13*	0.32	0.13*
Friendships	0.13	0.17	−0.13	0.17	0.05	0.19
Standard of living	0.27	0.15	0.27	0.16	0.34	0.17*
Household income	0.17	0.13	−0.12	0.14	0.14	0.15
Health	0.08	0.12	0.10	0.12	−0.09	0.13
Education	−0.05	0.11	0.04	0.12	−0.05	0.13
Job	0.18	0.13	0.21	0.13	0.35	0.14*
Public sphere						
Neighbors	−0.37	0.19*	−0.23	0.18	−0.42	0.20*
Public safety	0.20	0.19	0.08	0.19	−0.08	0.21
Condition of environment	−0.24	0.19	−0.03	0.18	0.29	0.20
Social welfare system		na		na		na
Democratic system		na		na		na
Family life	−0.16	0.17	−0.02	0.17	0.03	0.19
Leisure	0.54	0.13**	0.48	0.13**	0.01	0.15
Spiritual life	0.16	0.11	0.001	0.12	0.22	0.12
Post-materialist sphere						
Marriage	0.27	0.15	0.48	0.16**	0.16	0.17
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.09	0.17	0.04	0.17	0.11	0.19
Internet	−0.17	0.28	0.17	0.29	−0.72	0.30*
Email		na		na		na
Mobile phone	0.22	0.34	0.85	0.40*	0.45	0.41
Pray	−0.01	0.17	−0.23	0.17	−0.11	0.18
Religion		na		na		na
Living internationally	0.14	0.16	0.02	0.17	0.63	0.18**
English ability	−0.10	0.19	0.32	0.19	−0.06	0.21
Homeownership	0.04	0.28	0.56	0.30	0.04	0.31
Number of family members	−0.01	0.05	0.004	0.05	−0.10	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.65	0.20**	0.36	0.20	0.45	0.23*
No right to vote		na		na		na
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.19	0.21	0.19	0.21	0.27	0.23
Married		na		na		na
Female × married		na		na		na
Age	−0.06	0.09	−0.32	0.09**	0.24	0.10*
Income	−0.01	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.08	0.06
Educational attainment	0.27	0.19	0.04	0.20	0.46	0.21*
Region (base – Yangon)						
Mandalay	−0.19	0.34	−0.97	0.35**	−0.81	0.38*
Lashio	0.19	0.32	0.39	0.32	0.31	0.35
Pathein	0.02	0.31	0.01	0.32	0.20	0.35
cut1	2.72	1.25	2.92	1.31	3.15	1.40
cut2	5.01	1.23	5.49	1.32	7.03	1.44
cut3	7.01	1.25	8.83	1.36	12.13	1.55
cut4	10.3	1.30				
N	442		442		442	
Pseudo R2	0.1350		0.1597		0.2022	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.22 Ordered logit regression – Myanmar – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.20	0.10*	0.21	0.10*	0.27	0.10**
Friendships	0.26	0.13*	−0.04	0.13	0.13	0.14
Standard of living	0.31	0.12**	0.33	0.12**	0.17	0.12
Household income	0.27	0.11*	−0.07	0.11	0.07	0.11
Health	0.11	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.04	0.10
Education	0.01	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.00	0.10
Job	0.13	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.27	0.11*
Public sphere						
Neighbors	−0.31	0.15*	−0.20	0.14	−0.37	0.16*
Public safety	−0.19	0.16	−0.02	0.15	−0.35	0.16*
Condition of environment	−0.07	0.14	−0.08	0.13	0.35	0.14*
Social welfare system		na		na		na
Democratic system		na		na		na
Family life	0.03	0.11	0.25	0.12*	0.15	0.12
Leisure	0.33	0.11**	0.42	0.11**	0.10	0.11
Spiritual life	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.09	0.10	0.10
Post-materialist sphere						
Marriage		na		na		na
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.30	0.14*	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.15
Internet	0.14	0.18	0.35	0.17*	−0.27	0.18
Email		na		na		na
Mobile phone	0.01	0.24	0.29	0.25	0.45	0.27
Pray	−0.05	0.12	−0.13	0.12	0.05	0.12
Religion		na		na		na
Living internationally	0.08	0.13	0.03	0.13	0.29	0.14*
English ability	−0.08	0.14	0.27	0.14*	0.17	0.15
Homeownership	0.02	0.24	0.51	0.25*	−0.03	0.25
Number of family members	−0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	−0.03	0.04
Relative standard of living	0.66	0.15**	0.47	0.15**	0.77	0.16**
No right to vote		na		na		na
Demographic characteristics						
Female	−0.44	0.28	−0.22	0.28	0.02	0.30
Married	0.03	0.27	0.11	0.28	0.17	0.29
Female×Married	0.61	0.34	0.33	0.35	0.25	0.36
Age	−0.06	0.07	−0.23	0.07**	0.12	0.07
Income	−0.02	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.08	0.05
Educational attainment	0.23	0.14	0.06	0.14	0.26	0.15
Region (base: Yangon)						
Mandalay	−0.67	0.27*	−1.19	0.27**	−0.81	0.28**
Lashio	0.19	0.26	0.53	0.26	0.57	0.28*
Pathein	−0.05	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.36	0.26
cut1	1.39	0.92	1.92	0.95	4.27	1.00
cut2	3.91	0.90	4.57	0.94	7.90	1.03
cut3	5.81	0.91	7.79	0.97	12.5	1.12
cut4	9.20	0.95				
N	693		693		693	
Pseudo R2	0.1382		0.1362		0.1677	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.23 Ordered logit regression – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Public sphere						
Public safety	−0.01	0.14	0.09	0.14	−0.06	0.13
Condition of environment	−0.11	0.15	−0.17	0.15	0.10	0.14
Social welfare system	0.13	0.14	0.10	0.15	−0.06	0.14
Democratic system	−0.20	0.11	−0.05	0.12	0.08	0.11
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.27	0.10**	0.31	0.10**	0.32	0.10**
Standard of living	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.12	0.23	0.11*
Household income	0.28	0.10**	0.26	0.11*	0.10	0.10
Health	0.36	0.13**	0.15	0.13	0.11	0.12
Education	0.20	0.11	0.19	0.12	0.13	0.11
Job	−0.07	0.10	0.04	0.10	−0.04	0.10
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.29	0.14*	0.17	0.14	0.30	0.14*
Marriage	0.31	0.14*	0.47	0.15**	0.41	0.14**
Neighbors	0.18	0.12	0.17	0.13	0.25	0.12*
Family life	−0.08	0.14	−0.17	0.15	−0.07	0.14
Leisure	−0.13	0.14	−0.12	0.14	−0.04	0.14
Spiritual life	0.19	0.15	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.15
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.00	0.09	−0.08	0.09	0.13	0.09
Internet	−0.07	0.10	0.001	0.11	0.06	0.10
Email		na		na		na
Mobile phone	−0.11	0.07	−0.07	0.07	−0.15	0.07*
Pray	−0.05	0.15	0.08	0.15	0.004	0.14
Religion		na		na		na
Living internationally	0.17	0.11	0.17	0.11	0.20	0.11
English ability	0.21	0.16	0.40	0.16*	0.07	0.16
Homeownership	−0.18	0.25	−0.15	0.26	0.31	0.24
Number of family members	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	−0.09	0.04*
Relative standard of living	0.00	0.15	0.42	0.16*	0.28	0.15
No right to vote	−0.74	1.04	−1.05	1.15	−1.17	1.16
Demographic characteristics						
Female	−0.44	0.17*	−0.05	0.18	0.12	0.17
Married		na		na		na
Female × married		na		na		na
Age	0.10	0.08	−0.05	0.08	−0.12	0.08
Income	0.01	0.02	0.003	0.02	0.03	0.02
Educational attainment	0.34	0.15*	0.18	0.15	0.08	0.15
Region (base: metro Manila)						
Balance Luzon	0.15	0.29	−0.41	0.30	−0.05	0.29
Visayas	−0.56	0.31	−1.19	0.33**	0.43	0.31
Mindanao	0.32	0.30	−0.23	0.30	0.58	0.29

(continued)

Table 7.23 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Urban/rural (base: rural)						
Urban	−0.31	0.20	−0.14	0.21	−0.36	0.20
cut1	1.80	1.33	2.28	1.36	5.50	1.13
cut2	4.32	1.16	6.66	1.21	8.06	1.15
cut3	6.04	1.16	9.86	1.25	11.0	1.19
cut4	8.84	1.19				
N	626		626		626	
Pseudo R2	0.1145		0.1538		0.1409	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.24 Ordered logit regression – Philippines – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Public sphere						
Public safety	−0.08	0.12	0.10	0.12	−0.10	0.12
Condition of environment	0.07	0.12	−0.06	0.13	0.09	0.12
Social welfare system	0.05	0.12	0.06	0.12	−0.08	0.12
Democratic system	−0.09	0.10	−0.02	0.10	0.11	0.10
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.25	0.09**	0.24	0.09**	0.29	0.09**
Standard of living	0.04	0.10	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.10
Household income	0.31	0.09**	0.19	0.09*	0.13	0.09
Health	0.21	0.11	0.05	0.11	0.10	0.11
Education	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.07	0.10
Job	0.02	0.08	0.12	0.09	0.08	0.08
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.33	0.12*	0.32	0.13*	0.30	0.12*
Marriage	na		na		na	
Neighbors	0.18	0.10	0.04	0.11	0.19	0.11
Family life	−0.05	0.12	−0.003	0.12	−0.01	0.12
Leisure	−0.16	0.12	−0.13	0.13	0.02	0.12
Spiritual life	0.19	0.13	0.16	0.13	0.13	0.13
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.06	0.07	0.001	0.08	0.12	0.08
Internet	0.02	0.08	0.003	0.08	0.07	0.08
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	−0.09	0.06	−0.02	0.06	−0.11	0.06
Pray	−0.08	0.12	0.16	0.13	0.18	0.12
Religion	na		na		na	
Living internationally	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.17	0.09
English ability	0.16	0.13	0.30	0.13*	0.16	0.13
Homeownership	0.09	0.22	−0.03	0.22	0.26	0.21
Number of family members	−0.01	0.03	0.004	0.03	−0.08	0.03*
Relative standard of living	0.09	0.13	0.38	0.14**	0.24	0.13
No right to vote	−0.27	0.81	0.02	0.90	−0.62	0.88

(continued)

Table 7.24 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Demographic characteristics						
Female	−0.07	0.33	−0.09	0.33	−0.03	0.32
Married	−0.17	0.25	0.13	0.25	0.38	0.24
Female×Married	0.45	0.36	0.03	0.37	0.11	0.36
Age	0.11	0.07	0.01	0.07	−0.04	0.07
Income	−0.005	0.02	−0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Educational attainment	0.24	0.13	0.22	0.13	0.10	0.13
Region (base: metro Manila)						
Balance Luzon	0.05	0.25	−0.39	0.26	0.09	0.25
Visayas	−0.41	0.27	−0.95	0.28**	0.66	0.27*
Mindanao	0.29	0.25	−0.36	0.26	0.68	0.25**
Urban/rural (base: rural)						
Urban	−0.30	0.18	−0.16	0.18	−0.35	0.18*
cut1	0.52	1.11	1.04	1.15	5.16	0.97
cut2	3.02	0.97	4.95	1.02	7.52	0.98
cut3	4.50	0.97	8.07	1.05	10.5	1.02
cut4	7.16	0.99				
N	797		797		797	
Pseudo R2	0.0906		0.1214		0.1218	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Based on the regression analyses, we argue that the domains in the post-materialist life sphere are the most important and are positively related to overall quality of life in Singapore, followed by the materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order.

"Relative standard of living" is also associated with the dependent variables except in the regression of "enjoyment" for married respondents. In terms of demographics, females and seniors are more likely to have a sense of achievement (Tables 7.25 and 7.26).

7.3.3.10 Thailand

Standard of living, marriage, and spiritual life are the key features of Thailand in terms of happiness. Emphasis on marriage appears to come from East Asia, whereas emphasis on spiritual life appears to come from South Asia. This may be called Thai syncretism.

The estimated coefficient on "standard of living" is positive and statistically significant in all the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" when using both married observations and the general sample of all the observations of Thailand. The estimated coefficients on "marriage" are positive and statistically significant in all the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" when using married observations. The estimated coefficients on

Table 7.25 Ordered logit regression – Singapore – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Public sphere						
Public safety	−0.21	0.18	−0.25	0.18	−0.19	0.19
Condition of environment	0.05	0.19	0.07	0.19	0.09	0.19
Social welfare system	0.16	0.15	−0.10	0.15	−0.01	0.16
Democratic system	0.27	0.16	0.25	0.16	0.28	0.16
Post-materialist sphere						
Housing	−0.05	0.15	0.07	0.15	0.18	0.16
Friendships	0.23	0.18	0.29	0.18	−0.23	0.18
Marriage	0.16	0.20	0.34	0.20	0.39	0.20*
Neighbors	−0.01	0.14	−0.08	0.14	−0.34	0.14*
Family life	0.48	0.22*	0.13	0.22	0.16	0.21
Leisure	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.26	0.18
Spiritual life	0.23	0.17	0.22	0.17	0.14	0.18
Materialist sphere						
Standard of living	0.73	0.15**	0.63	0.15**	0.24	0.15
Household income	−0.04	0.14	−0.07	0.14	0.05	0.15
Health	0.13	0.15	0.02	0.15	−0.20	0.16
Education	0.07	0.14	0.07	0.14	0.28	0.14
Job	0.21	0.13	−0.06	0.14	0.08	0.14
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.25	0.11*	0.22	0.12	0.01	0.12
Internet	−0.11	0.08	0.01	0.08	−0.07	0.08
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.13	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.15	0.08
Pray	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.06	−0.05	0.07
Religion	0.14	0.32	0.26	0.32	0.14	0.33
Living internationally	0.03	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.07
English ability	−0.04	0.14	0.09	0.15	0.31	0.15*
Homeownership	−0.01	0.52	−0.61	0.56	−0.44	0.52
Number of family members	−0.01	0.06	0.03	0.07	−0.05	0.07
Relative standard of living	0.31	0.14*	0.26	0.14	0.42	0.14**
No right to vote	0.65	0.37	1.01	0.38**	0.51	0.35
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.28	0.19	0.05	0.19	0.47	0.19*
Married	na		na		na	
Female×Married	na		na		na	
Age	0.07	0.11	0.18	0.11	0.37	0.11**
Income	−0.02	0.05	−0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Educational attainment	−0.04	0.17	−0.04	0.17	0.03	0.17
cut1	3.94	1.48	4.51	1.41	4.59	1.35
cut2	7.05	1.34	7.49	1.36	7.02	1.36
cut3	8.75	1.35	10.8	1.41	10.5	1.41
cut4	12.0	1.40				
N	551		549		546	
Pseudo R2	0.1797		0.1247		0.1069	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.26 Ordered logit regression – Singapore – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Public sphere						
Public safety	−0.11	0.15	0.001	0.15	0.05	0.15
Condition of environment	−0.03	0.15	−0.12	0.16	−0.19	0.16
Social welfare system	0.14	0.12	−0.06	0.12	0.05	0.13
Democratic system	0.24	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.18	0.13
Post-materialist sphere						
Housing	0.01	0.11	0.15	0.12	0.18	0.12
Friendships	0.20	0.13	0.32	0.14*	−0.03	0.14
Marriage	na		na		na	
Neighbors	0.01	0.11	−0.05	0.11	−0.01	0.11
Family life	0.43	0.15**	0.22	0.15	0.25	0.15
Leisure	0.20	0.14	0.32	0.14*	0.09	0.14
Spiritual life	0.50	0.13**	0.33	0.14*	0.27	0.14*
Materialist sphere						
Standard of living	0.60	0.12**	0.59	0.12**	0.29	0.12*
Household income	−0.11	0.11	0.05	0.12	0.08	0.12
Health	0.37	0.12**	0.16	0.13	−0.07	0.13
Education	−0.06	0.11	−0.11	0.12	0.06	0.12
Job	0.09	0.10	−0.03	0.11	0.09	0.11
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.15	0.09	0.21	0.10*	0.02	0.10
Internet	−0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	−0.02	0.06
Email	na		na		Na	
Mobile phone	0.11	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.14	0.07*
Pray	0.01	0.05	−0.06	0.05	−0.09	0.05
Religion	0.10	0.25	0.20	0.25	0.20	0.25
Living internationally	0.003	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.05
English ability	−0.03	0.12	0.16	0.13	0.22	0.13
Homeownership	−0.54	0.43	−0.83	0.46	−0.44	0.44
Number of family members	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	−0.01	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.37	0.12**	0.29	0.12*	0.47	0.12**
No right to vote	0.38	0.28	0.62	0.29*	0.21	0.28
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.36	0.26	0.19	0.27	−0.08	0.27
Married	0.28	0.24	0.26	0.25	−0.57	0.25*
Female × married	−0.11	0.32	−0.18	0.33	0.48	0.33
Age	0.04	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.27	0.09**
Income	−0.01	0.04	−0.06	0.04	0.03	0.04
Educational attainment	0.04	0.13	0.08	0.14	0.11	0.14
cut1	4.30	1.12	5.25	1.08	4.38	1.06
cut2	7.13	1.03	7.88	1.07	6.80	1.07
cut3	8.93	1.05	11.3	1.11	10.2	1.11
cut4	12.0	1.09				
N	792		789		786	
Pseudo R2	0.1722		0.1465		0.1012	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

"spiritual life" are positive and statistically significant in the regressions of "happiness" and "enjoyment" when using the married and general samples of respondents.

Among the three life spheres, the domains in the materialist life sphere are the most important and are positively related to overall quality of life in Thailand, followed by the post-materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order.

The "relative standard of living" is positively and statistically significant in all the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" when using both married observations and the general sample of all the observations of Thailand. In terms of demographics, seniors are not more likely to feel happier but are more likely to feel achievement instead. Income adds to feelings of achievement. Regionally, respondents in the central area that surrounds Bangkok have more happiness but do not have a greater sense of achievement; Bangkok itself does not positively impact feelings of achievement (Tables 7.27 and 7.28).

7.3.3.11 Vietnam

Standard of living, marriage, family life, friendships, and the number of utilities are key features of Vietnamese happiness. It may be called Vietnamese syncretism. "Standard of living" is significantly positively and related to "happiness" for married respondents in Vietnam. For the general sample of Vietnamese respondents, "standard of living" is positively associated with "happiness" and "enjoyment." The "relative standard of living" is positively related to "achievement" for both samples of married and general respondents. "Marriage" is statistically and positively associated with "happiness" and "enjoyment." The estimated coefficients on "family life" are positive and statistically significant in the regressions of "happiness" and "enjoyment" for only married respondents. For the Vietnamese sample, "family life" is positively associated with "happiness." "Friendships" is an important determinant for "happiness" and "enjoyment" when using the general sample of all the observations of Vietnam. "Number of utilities" also affects positively the feelings of happiness based on both married observations and all the Vietnamese observations.

Among the three life spheres we factor analyzed from the 16 domains of satisfaction levels, the post-materialist life sphere is the most important and is positively related to overall quality of life in Vietnam, followed by the materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order.

In terms of demographics, married respondents are more likely to have feelings of happiness. Seniors and those who have higher family income tend to have a sense of achievement. Regionally, Da Nang in central Vietnam contributes to the happiness of respondents. The Vietnamese living in Hue in central Vietnam and Ho Chi Minh City and Hanoi in northern Vietnam are less likely to have feelings of enjoyment and add little to the public's happiness. People from Thai Nguyen in northern Vietnam, Da Nang in central Vietnam, and Can Tho in southern Vietnam are more likely to have feelings of achievement (Tables 7.29 and 7.30).

Table 7.27 Ordered logit regression – Thailand – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Post-materialist sphere						
Housing	0.15	0.11	0.09	0.11	−0.02	0.12
Friendships	0.12	0.14	0.22	0.14	0.26	0.14
Marriage	0.36	0.14*	0.26	0.13*	0.32	0.14*
Neighbors	−0.01	0.14	0.15	0.14	−0.16	0.15
Family life	0.09	0.16	0.11	0.16	0.05	0.16
Leisure	−0.17	0.13	−0.14	0.13	0.08	0.14
Spiritual life	0.57	0.15**	0.54	0.15**	0.28	0.15
Materialist sphere						
Standard of living	0.46	0.13**	0.25	0.12*	0.31	0.13*
Household income	0.15	0.10	0.24	0.10*	0.21	0.10*
Health	0.002	0.09	−0.03	0.09	−0.08	0.09
Education	0.05	0.10	0.01	0.10	0.11	0.10
Job	−0.01	0.11	0.22	0.10*	−0.08	0.11
Public sphere						
Public safety	−0.04	0.10	−0.02	0.10	−0.13	0.11
Condition of environment	0.03	0.11	−0.09	0.11	0.12	0.12
Social welfare system	0.12	0.09	−0.03	0.09	−0.01	0.10
Democratic system	0.12	0.09	−0.02	0.09	−0.10	0.09
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.11	0.09	−0.01	0.09	0.15	0.10
Internet	−0.001	0.10	0.03	0.10	0.08	0.11
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	−0.12	0.09	0.03	0.09	0.14	0.10
Pray	−0.02	0.06	−0.05	0.06	−0.07	0.06
Religion	na		na		na	
Living internationally	0.22	0.12	0.04	0.13	0.29	0.13*
English ability	−0.02	0.13	0.25	0.13	0.29	0.15*
Homeownership	0.27	0.21	0.36	0.21	0.32	0.22
Number of family members	−0.01	0.05	−0.04	0.05	0.07	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.49	0.18**	0.68	0.20**	0.85	0.19**
No right to vote	0.31	2.07	0.90	1.94	3.13	2.48
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.190	0.17	0.21	0.17	0.15	0.18
Married						
Female×Married						
Age	−0.19	0.08*	−0.09	0.08	0.37	0.09**
Income	0.00	0.03	0.008	0.03	0.08	0.03**
Educational attainment	0.25	0.14	−0.14	0.14	0.02	0.15
Region (Base-South)						
Bangkok	0.18	0.36	0.41	0.36	−1.41	0.39**
Central	0.63	0.30*	0.10	0.30	−0.84	0.33*
North	0.22	0.32	0.29	0.32	−0.11	0.35
North-east	0.08	0.30	−0.12	0.30	−0.60	0.32

(continued)

Table 7.27 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
City size						
Urban	0.06	0.25	0.39	0.25	−0.37	0.27
cut1	2.51	1.21	7.27	1.05	6.90	1.09
cut2	5.10	1.01	10.38	1.09	8.54	1.11
cut3	7.38	1.02			13.05	1.19
cut4	10.92	1.07				
N	701		701		701	
Pseudo R2	0.1646		0.1664		0.1812	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.28 Ordered logit regression – Thailand – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Post-materialist sphere						
Housing	0.21	0.09*	0.06	0.09	0.16	0.10
Friendships	0.07	0.11	0.24	0.11*	0.07	0.12
Marriage	na		na		na	
Neighbors	−0.004	0.11	0.12	0.11	−0.04	0.12
Family life	0.06	0.11	0.16	0.11	0.03	0.11
Leisure	−0.10	0.11	0.00	0.11	0.16	0.12
Spiritual life	0.63	0.12**	0.43	0.12*	0.12	0.12
Materialist sphere						
Standard of living	0.49	0.11**	0.29	0.11**	0.41	0.11**
Household income	0.16	0.08	0.21	0.08*	0.08	0.09
Health	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.07	−0.04	0.08
Education	0.09	0.08	−0.05	0.08	0.01	0.09
Job	−0.01	0.09	0.24	0.08**	0.07	0.09
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.01	0.09	0.02	0.09	−0.07	0.09
Condition of environment	0.02	0.09	−0.06	0.09	0.14	0.10
Social welfare system	0.10	0.08	−0.02	0.08	0.09	0.08
Democratic system	0.15	0.07*	0.06	0.07	−0.12	0.08
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.11	0.07	−0.02	0.07	0.05	0.08
Internet	−0.003	0.07	0.14	0.08	0.05	0.08
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	−0.07	0.07	−0.005	0.07	0.06	0.07
Pray	0.02	0.05	−0.03	0.05	0.02	0.05
Religion	na		na		na	
Living internationally	0.04	0.09	0.02	0.10	0.16	0.10
English ability	0.01	0.11	0.17	0.11	0.33	0.12**
Homeownership	0.14	0.17	0.14	0.17	0.20	0.18
Number of family members	−0.02	0.04	−0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04

(continued)

Table 7.28 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Relative standard of living	0.45	0.15**	0.59	0.16**	0.97	0.16**
No right to vote	0.72	2.04	0.94	1.90	3.01	2.39
Female	0.05	0.26	0.42	0.26	0.40	0.27
Married	0.31	0.23	0.30	0.23	0.63	0.24**
Female × married	0.09	0.31	−0.23	0.31	−0.38	0.32
Age	−0.16	0.07*	−0.12	0.07	0.32	0.07**
Income	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.02*
Educational attainment	0.15	0.12	−0.08	0.11	0.10	0.13
Region (base: south)						
Bangkok	−0.22	0.30	0.43	0.30	−1.08	0.33**
Central	0.37	0.25	0.09	0.25	−0.86	0.27**
North	0.09	0.27	0.41	0.28	−0.10	0.30
North-east	−0.10	0.25	0.04	0.24	−0.50	0.26
City size						
Urban	0.01	0.21	0.45	0.21*	−0.02	0.22
cut1	1.95	0.96	3.13	0.94	6.98	0.86
cut2	4.64	0.79	6.88	0.82	8.67	0.87
cut3	6.83	0.80	9.94	0.86	13.04	0.94
cut4	10.35	0.85				
N	971		971		971	
Pseudo R2	0.1633		0.1568		0.1687	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.29 Ordered logit regression – Vietnam – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	−0.06	0.12	0.03	0.12	0.14	0.11
Marriage	0.83	0.12**	0.38	0.12**	0.05	0.12
Education	0.07	0.12	0.29	0.13*	0.05	0.12
Family life	0.24	0.13	0.36	0.14*	−0.01	0.13
Leisure	0.17	0.14	0.26	0.15	−0.02	0.13
Spiritual life	0.04	0.13	0.07	0.15	0.05	0.12
Materialist sphere						
Housing	−0.005	0.08	0.02	0.09	0.04	0.08
Standard of living	0.36	0.15*	0.37	0.16*	0.09	0.14
Household income	0.10	0.15	−0.18	0.16	0.13	0.14
Health	0.19	0.10	−0.02	0.11	−0.12	0.10
Job	0.02	0.11	0.01	0.12	0.26	0.10

(continued)

Table 7.29 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Public sphere						
Neighbors	−0.01	0.12	−0.11	0.13	−0.09	0.12
Public safety	−0.08	0.11	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.10
Condition of environment	−0.09	0.11	−0.21	0.12	−0.09	0.10
Social welfare system	0.05	0.13	0.16	0.14	−0.08	0.13
Democratic system	na		na		na	
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.26	0.10**	0.18	0.10	−0.01	0.09
Internet	−0.18	0.16	−0.23	0.17	0.10	0.15
Email	0.19	0.20	0.15	0.21	−0.17	0.18
Mobile phone	0.02	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.18	0.06**
Pray	−0.03	0.10	−0.18	0.11	−0.05	0.10
Religion	0.07	0.22	−0.31	0.24	0.43	0.22
Living internationally	−0.11	0.12	0.28	0.13*	−0.01	0.11
English ability	0.02	0.15	0.10	0.16	−0.09	0.15
Homeownership	−0.31	0.40	−0.92	0.44*	−0.23	0.40
Number of family members	−0.07	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.11	0.05
Relative standard of living	−0.06	0.17	0.00	0.18	0.58	0.17**
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	−0.09	0.19	0.13	0.21	0.04	0.19
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	−0.10	0.08	−0.08	0.09	0.06	0.08
Income	−0.01	0.04	−0.005	0.04	0.02	0.04
Educational attainment	−0.09	0.14	0.07	0.15	0.0002	0.14
City (Base-My Tho)						
Ha Noi	0.03	0.34	−1.14	0.39**	0.76	0.35
Thai Nguyen	−0.66	0.35	−0.68	0.38	1.18	0.35**
Da Nang	0.83	0.36*	−0.32	0.39	1.21	0.35**
Hue	0.45	0.37	−0.91	0.41*	0.49	0.37
HCMC	0.52	0.38	−1.12	0.42**	0.45	0.39
Vung Tau	0.81	0.36*	−0.36	0.40	−0.03	0.35
Can Tho	0.55	0.36	−0.27	0.41	0.87	0.36*
cut1	1.50	1.07	−0.52	1.16	0.24	1.00
cut2	6.12	1.00	1.69	1.05	3.80	0.96
cut3	7.67	1.02	5.33	1.06	6.74	0.99
N	571		570		570	
Pseudo R2	0.1531		0.1535		0.0938	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.30 Ordered logit regression – Vietnam – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.17	0.08*	0.24	0.09*	0.13	0.09
Marriage	na		na		na	
Education	0.14	0.09	0.25	0.10*	−0.03	0.09
Family life	0.46	0.10*	0.36	0.11**	−0.09	0.10
Leisure	0.03	0.10	0.13	0.12	0.15	0.11
Spiritual life	0.04	0.10	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.10
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.09	0.07	0.12	0.07	0.06	0.07
Standard of living	0.33	0.11**	0.25	0.12	0.15	0.12
Household income	0.09	0.11	0.01	0.13	0.17	0.12
Health	0.15	0.08	−0.02	0.09	−0.09	0.08
Job	0.01	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.22	0.09*
Public sphere						
Neighbors	0.02	0.09	−0.10	0.10	−0.05	0.10
Public safety	−0.08	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.02	0.09
Condition of environment	−0.03	0.09	−0.18	0.09	−0.08	0.09
Social welfare system	−0.10	0.10	0.07	0.11	0.01	0.10
Democratic system	na		na		na	
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.22	0.08**	0.09	0.09	−0.06	0.08
Internet	−0.18	0.11	−0.09	0.11	−0.11	0.11
Email	0.16	0.12	0.004	0.13	0.07	0.12
Mobile phone	0.01	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.19	0.05**
Pray	0.03	0.08	−0.25	0.09**	0.01	0.08
Religion	0.13	0.17	−0.07	0.18	0.18	0.17
Living internationally	0.00	0.09	0.24	0.10*	−0.03	0.09
English ability	0.04	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.04	0.12
Homeownership	−0.17	0.33	−1.00	0.37*	−0.13	0.34
Number of family members	−0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.12	0.04**
Relative standard of living	0.08	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.47	0.13**
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	−0.19	0.23	0.20	0.25	0.08	0.24
Married	0.73	0.22**	0.25	0.24	0.52	0.22
Female × married	0.13	0.29	−0.003	0.32	−0.05	0.30
Age	−0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.07*
Income	0.04	0.03	0.005	0.03	0.03	0.03*
Educational attainment	−0.06	0.11	−0.11	0.12	−0.06	0.12
City (Base-My Tho)						
Ha Noi	−0.16	0.27	−0.97	0.30**	0.56	0.28*
Thai Nguyen	−0.57	0.28*	−0.46	0.30	0.79	0.29**
Da Nang	0.62	0.28*	0.11	0.30	0.87	0.28**
Hue	0.19	0.28	−1.10	0.30**	0.05	0.28

(continued)

Table 7.30 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
HCMC	0.11	0.29	−0.66	0.31	0.34	0.30
Vung Tau	0.50	0.29	−0.19	0.32	−0.28	0.29
Can Tho	0.01	0.28	−0.13	0.31	0.86	0.29**
cut1	1.65	0.79	−0.81	0.92	0.33	0.83
cut2	5.59	0.77	1.42	0.83	4.34	0.78
cut3	7.04	0.79	4.95	0.84	7.37	0.81
N	875		875		875	
Pseudo R2	0.1176		0.1376		0.0969	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

7.3.4 Country-by-Country Analysis Through Regression Equations: South Asia

7.3.4.1 Summary of South Asia

Housing and standard of living are key features of South Asians. Friendships and family life are important in some countries. Physical conditions are closely connected to social relationships at home, in the neighborhood, and in the workplace. Social relationships used to be determined strictly by caste and language, but starting in big urban centers, caste and language have ceased to be the sole dominant determinants.

7.3.4.2 Bangladesh

Standard of living, marriage, family life, and friendships stand out as contributing to happiness. The estimated coefficients on "standard of living," "marriage," and "friendships" are positive and statistically significant when using the sample of married observations. The estimated coefficients on "family life" are positive and statistically significant when using both married observations and the general sample of all the observations of Bangladesh. The estimated coefficient on "housing" is positive and statistically significant when using all the observations of Bangladesh. It follows that the more satisfied people are with these life domains, the higher the probability that they feel more happiness. The salience of primary and secondary group relationships and the relative non-salience of physical conditions appear to point to the combination of a stagnant economy and the crucial importance of family, neighborhood, and workplace support and grassroots level organizations like people-based banks. Among the three life spheres, the domains grouped into the post-materialist life sphere are the most important and positively related to overall quality of life in Bangladesh, followed by the materialist life sphere and the public life sphere.

In terms of demographics, married females are more likely to have feelings of happiness, compared to single females who do not. The estimated coefficient on "female × married" is positive and statistically significant based on the sample of all the respondents of Bangladesh, whereas the estimated coefficient on "female" is negative and statistically significant in regression. Seniors are not rewarded. The estimated coefficients on "age" in the two regressions are both negative and statistically significant.

Regionally, Dhaka contributes more to the happiness of its residents. Medium-sized cities, like Barisal, also add to levels of happiness. Some local remote cities, like Rajshahi and Khulna, negatively impact happiness. The size of the cities also matters. Metropolitan areas enhance levels of happiness compared to other municipal centers and rural areas (Table 7.31).

7.3.4.3 Bhutan

Housing, education, spiritual life, and prayer stand out in featuring Bhutan's happiness. Table 7.32 shows that the estimated coefficients on these variables are positive and statistically significant in both regressions of happiness when using only married respondents and all the Bhutanese respondents. The more satisfied people are with the life domains of housing, education, and spiritual life, the more often people pray, the higher the probability that people feel happiness. Befitting a country whose king has invented the notion of gross national happiness, Bhutanese add happiness in praying, educating oneself, and immersing oneself in spiritual life. In terms of demographics, education may not add happiness, though.

Among the three life spheres, the materialist life sphere is the most important determinant for overall quality of life in Bhutan, followed by the post-materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order.

7.3.4.4 India

Housing, friendships, household income, family life, and public safety are hallmarks of South Asian features of happiness. India is South Asia's representative par excellence. The estimated coefficients on "housing" are positive and statistically significant for both married observations and all the observations of India. "Friendships" is positively related to "happiness" and "achievement" when people are married. The estimated coefficients on "household income" are positive and statistically significant in all the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" when using both married observations and the general sample of all the observations of India.

Among the three life spheres, the materialist life sphere is the most important and positively related to overall quality of life, followed by the post-materialist life sphere and then the public life sphere. The estimated coefficients on "family life" are positive and statistically significant in all the regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and

Table 7.31 Ordered logit regression – Bangladesh

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Materialist sphere				
Housing	0.24	0.15	0.34	0.15*
Friendships	0.34	0.17*	0.29	0.16
Standard of living	0.45	0.19*	0.31	0.17
Household income	0.06	0.18	0.21	0.17
Health	0.07	0.16	0.07	0.15
Education	0.04	0.17	−0.02	0.15
Job	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.12
Public sphere				
Neighbors	−0.04	0.20	−0.21	0.17
Public safety	−0.10	0.16	0.01	0.14
Condition of environment	0.19	0.18	0.14	0.16
Social welfare system	−0.04	0.19	0.00	0.17
Democratic system	−0.07	0.15	0.00	0.14
Post-materialist sphere				
Marriage	0.59	0.26*	na	
Family life	0.69	0.23**	0.76	0.20**
Leisure	−0.12	0.19	−0.04	0.16
Spiritual life	−0.18	0.16	−0.25	0.15
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.20	0.12	0.14	0.11
Internet	−0.08	0.31	0.04	0.25
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	0.44	0.19*	0.52	0.17**
Religion	na		na	
Living internationally	−0.26	0.19	−0.17	0.17
English ability	0.20	0.22	0.20	0.19
Homeownership	0.17	0.31	0.02	0.27
Number of family members	−0.01	0.07	−0.05	0.06
Relative standard of living	0.35	0.23	0.44	0.20*
No right to vote	0.61	0.85	0.37	0.60
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.68	0.34*	−1.75	0.65*
Married	na		0.19	0.44
Female × married	na		2.37	0.72**
Age	−0.34	0.16*	−0.33	0.15*
Income	−0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04
Educational attainment	0.12	0.23	0.13	0.21
Region (Base-Dhaka)				
Chittagong	0.12	0.45	−0.09	0.39
Rajshahi	−0.74	0.48	−0.99	0.44*
Barisal	1.04	0.50*	0.84	0.46
Khulna	−0.88	0.48	−0.91	0.42*
Sylhet	0.38	0.70	0.35	0.60

(continued)

Table 7.31 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
City size (Base-Metro)				
Other Municipal Centers	−0.80	0.38*	−0.82	0.34*
Non-Municipal Centers	−0.47	0.40	−0.41	0.37
Rural	−1.26	0.59*	−1.09	0.51*
cut1	6.79	1.72	5.02	1.41
cut2	8.66	1.72	6.82	1.39
cut3	10.1	1.75	8.41	1.41
cut4	14.4	1.86	12.8	1.51
N	312		374	
Pseudo R2	0.2024		0.2112	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.32 Ordered logit regression – Bhutan

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Public sphere				
Neighbors	−0.27	0.19	−0.17	0.17
Public safety	0.004	0.19	0.08	0.16
Condition of environment	−0.12	0.19	0.02	0.16
Social welfare system	0.46	0.24	0.24	0.21
Democratic system	−0.01	0.17	0.07	0.15
Spiritual life	0.43	0.20*	0.54	0.16**
Materialist sphere				
Housing	0.49	0.16**	0.38	0.14*
Standard of living	−0.23	0.26	0.07	0.21
Household income	0.22	0.22	0.16	0.19
Health	0.15	0.20	0.21	0.16
Education	0.48	0.17**	0.36	0.14*
Job	0.21	0.19	0.24	0.16
Post-materialist sphere				
Friendships	0.30	0.23	0.29	0.20
Marriage	0.41	0.24	na	
Family life	0.14	0.23	0.17	0.19
Leisure	−0.29	0.19	−0.32	0.17
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.04	0.15	0.11	0.13
Internet	0.14	0.10	0.13	0.09
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	0.20	0.09*	0.16	0.08*
Religion	na		na	
Living internationally	−0.04	0.10	−0.01	0.09

(continued)

Table 7.32 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
English ability	−0.28	0.19	−0.20	0.17
Homeownership	−0.41	0.31	−0.34	0.28
Number of family members	−0.02	0.06	−0.03	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.26	0.21	0.15	0.19
No right to vote	na		na	
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.01	0.26	−0.51	0.49
Married	na		−0.27	0.39
Female × married	na		0.50	0.55
Age	0.01	0.13	−0.003	0.11
Income	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.05
Educational attainment	−0.50	0.21*	−0.56	0.19**
cut1	6.32	1.88	2.98	1.79
cut2	7.95	1.89	5.93	1.55
cut3	11.1	1.96	7.53	1.56
cut4			10.5	1.61
N	315		397	
Pseudo R2	0.1617		0.1424	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

"achievement" for all the observations of India. "Public safety" is positively related to "happiness" for all the respondents, and the "condition of the environment" is positively related to "enjoyment" and "achievement." But the "democratic system" is statistically significant and negatively related to "achievement."

In terms of demographics, female are happy once married. Seniors are not rewarded. Household income and educational attainment matter in terms of enjoyment levels. Regionally, Delhi and Kolkata when compared to Mumbai add the least to the quality of life measured by feelings of happiness, enjoyment, and accomplishment. Local and yet large cities, like Bangalore, add less to feelings of enjoyment and achievement (Tables 7.33 and 7.34).

7.3.4.5 The Maldives

A small island nation of Indian, Sri Lankan, and Arab migrants, the Maldives has to sustain itself through education, thus attaining a good standard of living. The satisfaction with the life domain of education is statistically significant and relates positively to feelings of happiness among married respondents, whereas standard of living is positively related among all the Maldivian respondents. In terms of demographics, females are happy once married. Seniors are rewarded. Educational attainment leads to happiness.

Among the three life spheres, the public life sphere appears the most important and positively related to overall quality of life, followed by the materialist life sphere and the post-materialist life sphere in that order (Table 7.35).

Table 7.33 Ordered logit regression – India – only married

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.53	0.15**	0.03	0.15	0.17	0.16
Friendships	0.30	0.15*	−0.04	0.14	0.38	0.15*
Marriage	−0.10	0.18	−0.19	0.18	−0.34	0.19
Standard of living	0.09	0.17	0.11	0.17	0.06	0.17
Household income	0.31	0.14*	0.40	0.13**	0.34	0.14*
Health	−0.19	0.15	−0.10	0.15	−0.16	0.15
Education	0.11	0.14	0.01	0.14	−0.05	0.14
Job	0.22	0.13	0.21	0.13	0.19	0.13
Neighbors	−0.31	0.15*	−0.15	0.15	−0.01	0.15
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.22	0.13	0.16	0.12	−0.01	0.12
Condition of environment	−0.05	0.11	0.21	0.11	0.10	0.11
Social welfare system	−0.08	0.13	−0.27	0.13	0.06	0.13
Democratic system	0.15	0.12	0.05	0.12	−0.18	0.12
Post-materialist sphere						
Family life	0.18	0.15	0.25	0.15	0.21	0.15
Leisure	0.21	0.15	0.20	0.15	0.15	0.15
Spiritual life	0.10	0.14	0.004	0.14	0.005	0.14
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.05	0.13	−0.04	0.13	0.30	0.13*
Internet	0.01	0.11	−0.04	0.10	0.02	0.10
Email		na		na		na
Mobile phone	0.08	0.07	−0.001	0.07	0.004	0.07
Pray	0.08	0.12	0.11	0.13	0.10	0.13
Religion		na		na		na
Living internationally	0.11	0.13	0.09	0.12	0.11	0.12
English ability	0.03	0.14	−0.38	0.14*	−0.33	0.14*
Homeownership	0.08	0.22	0.32	0.22	0.27	0.22
Number of family members	0.06	0.06	−0.04	0.06	−0.05	0.06
Relative standard of living	0.40	0.14**	0.35	0.13*	0.30	0.13*
No right to vote		na		na		na
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.54	0.21*	0.002	0.21	0.25	0.21
Married		na		na		na
Female×Married		na		na		na
Age	−0.19	0.09*	−0.21	0.09*	−0.14	0.09
Income	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.08	0.07	0.07
Educational attainment	0.09	0.20	0.57	0.19**	0.37	0.19
City (Base-Mumbai)						
Delhi	−1.46	0.35**	−0.86	0.33*	−0.84	0.34*
Chennai	−0.17	0.61	0.89	0.60	−0.11	0.53
Kolkata	−1.26	0.42**	−1.61	0.42**	−1.46	0.44**
Bangalore	−0.38	0.37	−2.67	0.39**	−1.19	0.36**

(continued)

Table 7.33 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Hyderabad	−0.49	0.38	−0.43	0.38	−0.41	0.39
Ahmedabad	0.20	0.40	−0.40	0.38	−0.42	0.40
cut1	1.80	1.49	−0.35	1.35	2.24	1.35
cut2	4.04	1.36	2.47	1.32	4.18	1.34
cut3	6.67	1.37	5.41	1.34	7.49	1.37
cut4	8.96	1.39				
N	497		497		495	
Pseudo R2	0.2076		0.1883		0.1461	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.34 Ordered logit regression – India – all

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.39	0.12**	0.05	0.12	0.20	0.13
Friendships	0.21	0.12	−0.16	0.13	0.23	0.12
Marriage	na		na		na	
Standard of living	0.17	0.14	0.05	0.14	−0.04	0.14
Household income	0.32	0.12**	0.32	0.12*	0.37	0.12**
Health	−0.14	0.13	−0.11	0.13	−0.17	0.13
Education	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.12	−0.13	0.12
Job	0.14	0.11	0.13	0.11	0.21	0.11
Neighbors	−0.11	0.12	−0.01	0.12	0.04	0.12
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.24	0.10*	0.04	0.10	−0.10	0.10
Condition of environment	−0.04	0.10	0.22	0.09*	0.23	0.09*
Social welfare system	−0.16	0.11	−0.20	0.11	0.10	0.11
Democratic system	0.03	0.10	0.03	0.10	−0.27	0.11*
Post-materialist sphere						
Family life	0.31	0.12*	0.28	0.13*	0.29	0.13*
Leisure	0.13	0.13	0.23	0.13	0.19	0.13
Spiritual life	0.14	0.12	0.03	0.12	0.02	0.13
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	0.04	0.11	0.15	0.11	0.41	0.11**
Internet	−0.01	0.08	0.02	0.08	−0.03	0.08
Email	na		na		na	
Mobile phone	0.12	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.06
Pray	0.08	0.10	0.14	0.11	0.11	0.11
Religion	na		na		na	
Living internationally	0.15	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.10
English ability	0.02	0.12	−0.34	0.12**	−0.28	0.12*
Homeownership	0.25	0.19	0.27	0.18	0.37	0.18*

(continued)

Table 7.34 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Number of family members	−0.01	0.05	−0.06	0.05	−0.10	0.05*
Relative standard of living	0.30	0.11**	0.49	0.11**	0.43	0.11**
No right to vote	na		na		na	
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.11	0.39	−0.47	0.38	−0.05	0.38
Married	0.14	0.28	−0.20	0.28	0.01	0.28
Female × married	0.36	0.43	0.51	0.42	0.28	0.43
Age	−0.17	0.08*	−0.21	0.08*	−0.13	0.08
Income	0.04	0.06	0.15	0.06*	0.07	0.06
Educational attainment	0.08	0.17	0.39	0.17*	0.26	0.17
City (Base-Mumbai)						
Delhi	−1.46	0.30**	−0.70	0.29*	−0.95	0.29**
Chennai	−0.22	0.49	0.29	0.48	−0.36	0.44
Kolkata	−1.32	0.36**	−1.32	0.36**	−1.63	0.39**
Bangalore	−0.38	0.31	−2.48	0.32**	−1.40	0.31**
Hyderabad	−0.43	0.33	−0.60	0.33	−0.40	0.33
Ahmedabad	0.08	0.35	−0.22	0.34	−0.74	0.36*
cut1	2.06	1.20	1.20	1.10	3.91	1.08
cut2	4.19	1.09	4.09	1.08	6.01	1.09
cut3	6.90	1.09	6.93	1.10	9.31	1.13
cut4	9.07	1.12				
N	652		651		650	
Pseudo R2	0.1976		0.1814		0.1680	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.35 Ordered logit regression – Maldives

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Public sphere				
Standard of living	0.41	0.24	0.43	0.19*
Household income	−0.09	0.25	−0.17	0.21
Health	0.12	0.22	0.28	0.18
Education	0.53	0.22*	0.32	0.18
Job	−0.02	0.22	−0.10	0.18
Neighbors	−0.001	0.22	−0.09	0.18
Public safety	0.07	0.15	0.06	0.13
Condition of environment	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.12
Social welfare system	0.08	0.15	0.14	0.11
Democratic system	0.27	0.16	0.11	0.13
Post-materialist sphere				
Family life	−0.11	0.27	−0.14	0.22
Leisure	0.26	0.22	0.24	0.19
Spiritual life	−0.40	0.22	−0.32	0.19

(continued)

Table 7.35 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Materialist sphere				
Housing	−0.22	0.16	−0.15	0.13
Friendships	−0.02	0.27	0.52	0.18**
Marriage	0.38	0.24	na	
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.17	0.15	0.03	0.11
Internet	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.07
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	0.09	0.25	0.08	0.20
Religion	na		na	
Living internationally	−0.09	0.08	0.01	0.07
English ability	−0.07	0.17	−0.11	0.14
Homeownership	0.14	0.25	0.03	0.21
Number of family members	0.03	0.03	0.004	0.02
Relative standard of living	0.96	0.20*	0.84	0.16**
No right to vote	na		na	
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.60	0.27*	−0.18	0.40
Married	na		−0.23	0.30
Female×Married	na		0.67	0.45
Age	0.31	0.11**	0.17	0.09
Income	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.05
Educational attainment	0.28	0.17	0.30	0.14*
cut1	8.11	2.13	5.56	1.61
cut2	9.11	2.11	6.62	1.60
cut3	9.99	2.12	7.60	1.61
cut4	12.9	2.18	10.4	1.65
N	322		460	
Pseudo R2	0.1443		0.1225	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

7.3.4.6 Nepal

A landlocked nation of sizable migrants from the south, Nepalese achieve happiness when minimum conditions are satisfied: housing and public safety. The estimated coefficient on "housing" is positive and statistically significant among married respondents, and the estimated coefficients on "public safety" are positive and statistically significant among both married respondents and all the respondents of Nepal.

The satisfaction with family life and the number of family members affects negatively the feelings of happiness. The estimated coefficients on "family life" and "number of family members" are negative and statistically significant among married respondents. The estimated coefficient on the "number of family members" is negative and statistically significant among all the Nepalese respondents.

In terms of demographics, the estimated coefficients on "female" are positive and statistically significant in the both regressions. It would follow that, when the respondents are female, they are more likely to feel happier. Moreover, educational attainment adds immense happiness.

Finally, we note that, among the three life spheres, the public life sphere is the most important and is positively related to overall quality of life in Nepal, followed by the materialist life sphere and the post-materialist life sphere in that order (Table 7.36).

7.3.4.7 Pakistan

Housing, standard of living, and leisure are features that enhance happiness along with health and prayer. The estimated coefficients on "housing," "standard of living," and "leisure" are positive and statistically significant in all the regressions for both married and general samples of respondents. "Health," "pray," and "relative standard of living" are also positively related to feelings of happiness. Where nutrition and hygiene are not well provided nationwide, prayer is an important way of adding happiness along with efforts to stay healthy. Negatively related to feelings of happiness are "education" and "homeownership."

Among the three life spheres, we argue that the materialist life sphere is the most important and positively related to overall quality of life, followed by the public life sphere and the post-materialist life sphere in that order. The "democratic system" in the public life sphere is more strongly related to the dependent variable than "leisure" in the post-materialist life sphere (Table 7.37).

7.3.4.8 Sri Lanka

An island country with sizable immigrants from nearby areas, Sri Lanka adds happiness when the satisfaction with housing, household income, job, and family life improves. The estimated coefficients on these life domains are positive and statistically significant in either or both of the regressions on happiness. In terms of demographics, seniors are not rewarded. Regionally, respondents in southern and north central areas express higher levels of happiness compared to the western area, where Colombo is located and which has problems of big urban centers and yet was secure from the civil war against the Tamils in the north (civil war ended May 2009).

Among the three life spheres, the materialist life sphere is the most important determinant for overall quality of life in Sri Lanka, followed by the post-materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order (Table 7.38).

Table 7.36 Ordered logit regression – Nepal

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Materialist sphere				
Housing	0.44	0.19*	0.28	0.15
Standard of living	0.03	0.22	0.06	0.18
Household income	0.24	0.19	0.25	0.15
Health	0.17	0.17	0.23	0.14
Education	0.04	0.15	0.02	0.12
Job	0.14	0.18	0.12	0.13
Leisure	0.10	0.14	0.13	0.11
Spiritual life	−0.36	0.25	−0.29	0.20
Public sphere				
Public safety	0.37	0.15*	0.38	0.12**
Condition of environment	0.27	0.15	0.28	0.11*
Social welfare system	−0.05	0.17	−0.13	0.13
Democratic system	0.08	0.15	0.10	0.11
Post-materialist sphere				
Friendships	0.02	0.25	0.04	0.19
Marriage	−0.24	0.25	na	
Neighbors	0.24	0.24	0.00	0.18
Family life	−0.48	0.23*	−0.09	0.18
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.25	0.13	0.25	0.11*
Internet	0.0004	0.17	0.16	0.13
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	−0.19	0.10	−0.04	0.09
Religion	na		2.66	2.02
Living internationally	−0.16	0.14	−0.17	0.11
English ability	−0.41	0.19*	−0.27	0.16
Homeownership	0.47	0.29	0.46	0.23*
Number of family members	−0.17	0.05**	−0.12	0.04**
Relative standard of living	0.38	0.19*	0.24	0.17
No right to vote	na		na	
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.86	0.28**	1.45	0.46**
Married	na		0.17	0.36
Female×Married	na		−0.71	0.52
Age	−0.08	0.13	−0.17	0.11
Income	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04
Educational attainment	0.55	0.19**	0.43	0.17*
cut1	0.61	1.58	5.65	2.38
cut2	1.99	1.57	7.06	2.39
cut3	3.04	1.58	8.16	2.40
cut4	7.14	1.62	11.96	2.44
N	330		433	
Pseudo R2	0.1878		0.1662	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.37 Ordered logit regression – Pakistan

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Public sphere				
Public safety	0.21	0.13	0.15	0.10
Condition of environment	0.08	0.14	−0.07	0.11
Social welfare system	−0.27	0.14	−0.19	0.12
Democratic system	0.30	0.12*	0.37	0.10**
Materialist sphere				
Housing	0.25	0.13*	0.30	0.11**
Friendships	0.16	0.16	0.23	0.13
Standard of living	0.44	0.14**	0.27	0.12*
Household income	−0.11	0.13	−0.02	0.11
Health	0.37	0.13**	0.25	0.11*
Education	−0.27	0.12*	−0.21	0.10*
Job	−0.10	0.12	−0.08	0.10
Post-materialist sphere				
Marriage	0.16	0.16		na
Neighbors	−0.18	0.12	−0.03	0.10
Family life	0.07	0.13	0.07	0.11
Leisure	0.28	0.13*	0.29	0.11**
Spiritual life	−0.15	0.13	−0.12	0.12
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.16	0.09	0.12	0.08
Internet	0.003	0.10	−0.02	0.09
Email		na		na
Mobile phone		na		na
Pray	0.34	0.11**	0.32	0.09**
Religion		na		na
Living internationally	−0.11	0.10	−0.11	0.09
English ability	−0.11	0.16	−0.02	0.13
Homeownership	−0.75	0.28**	−0.87	0.25**
Number of family members	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.02*
Relative standard of living	0.46	0.12**	0.62	0.10**
No right to vote	1.20	0.54*	0.69	0.38
Demographic characteristics				
Female	−0.13	0.22	0.37	0.38
Married		na	−0.10	0.25
Female × married		na	−0.34	0.41
Age	−0.05	0.09	−0.05	0.08
Income	−0.06	0.07	−0.06	0.06
Educational attainment	0.24	0.22	0.19	0.19
Region (Base-Punjab)				
Sindh	0.08	0.29	0.27	0.25
NWFP	−0.49	0.28	−0.21	0.24
Balochistan	−0.06	0.32	−0.09	0.27

(continued)

Table 7.37 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Urban/Rural (Base-Result)				
Urban	0.26	0.25	0.19	0.22
cut1	3.79	0.99	3.97	0.83
Cut2	5.60	1.00	5.73	0.83
Cut3	7.55	1.02	7.58	0.86
Cut4	10.2	1.07	10.2	0.89
N	481		630	
Pseudo R2	0.1394		0.1404	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.38 Ordered logit regression – Sri Lanka

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Public sphere				
Public safety	−0.06	0.18	−0.01	0.16
Condition of environment	−0.05	0.19	0.10	0.18
Social welfare system	0.08	0.20	−0.07	0.17
Democratic system	0.19	0.15	0.27	0.14
Leisure	0.19	0.16	0.17	0.14
Materialist sphere				
Housing	0.56	0.19**	0.62	0.17**
Friendships	0.21	0.20	0.30	0.18
Standard of living	−0.15	0.20	−0.06	0.19
Household income	0.60	0.22*	0.28	0.19
Health	0.22	0.20	0.29	0.18
Education	−0.17	0.22	−0.14	0.19
Job	0.39	0.18*	0.38	0.16*
Post-materialist sphere				
Marriage	0.34	0.30		na
Neighbors	−0.20	0.20	−0.28	0.18
Family life	0.50	0.23	0.37	0.18*
Spiritual life	−0.12	0.21	−0.01	0.18
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.31	0.14*	0.30	0.12*
Internet	0.43	0.19*	0.46	0.15**
Email		na		na
Mobile phone		na		na
Pray	0.06	0.09	0.11	0.08
Religion		na		na
Living internationally	0.22	0.16	0.14	0.14
English ability	−0.05	0.18	−0.10	0.16
Homeownership	−0.55	0.38	−0.67	0.33*
Number of family members	−0.21	0.07**	−0.18	0.06**

(continued)

Table 7.38 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Relative standard of living	0.61	0.18**	0.58	0.16**
No right to vote	na		−0.95	1.54
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.18	0.25	0.76	0.49
Married		na	0.40	0.38
Female × Married		na	−0.70	0.55
Age	−0.16	0.10	−0.21	0.10*
Income	−0.06	0.06	0.01	0.05
Educational attainment	−0.31	0.27	−0.21	0.24
Region (Base-Western)				
Central	0.18	0.47	−0.05	0.42
Southern	1.02	0.47*	0.68	0.39
Northern	0.12	0.53	0.37	0.47
Eastern	0.65	0.59	0.67	0.52
North Western	0.76	0.64	0.91	0.59
North Central	2.80	1.19*	1.79	0.96
Uva	0.03	0.99	−0.48	0.81
Sabaragamuwa	−1.69	0.91	−1.08	0.76
cut1	6.06	1.70	4.89	1.36
Cut2	8.09	1.64	7.18	1.27
Cut3	9.66	1.64	8.73	1.27
Cut4	13.78	1.75	12.78	1.37
N	380		480	
Pseudo R2	0.2127		0.208	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

7.3.5 Country-by-Country Analysis Through Regression Equations: Central Asia

7.3.5.1 Summary of Central Asia

Central Asia is not one region. It consists of different countries. Kazakhstan and Mongolia are close to Russia, not only geographically but also in terms of social system. Afghanistan is an outlier. Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan are narrowly Central Asian. Key feature in Central Asia is (relative) standard of living. Housing matters in some countries. Physical conditions and social relationships are closely tied to each other and that the public sphere conditions come next. In Tajikistan, happiness is determined more by public sphere conditions, such as condition of the environment and the democratic system. Mongolia follows suit with Tajikistan, although the importance of public sphere conditions is second only to primordial primary group conditions, such as standard of living, housing, and health.

7.3.5.2 Afghanistan

Happiness does not easily come in Afghanistan. The salient condition to increasing happiness is household income. Satisfaction with household income is positively related to feelings of happiness in both regressions of married respondents and the general group of respondents. The estimated coefficients on "relative standard of living" are also positive and statistically significant for both samples. Satisfaction with the social welfare system is negatively related to happiness as is satisfaction with neighbors, when using the general sample of all the respondents of Afghanistan. Because two domains in the materialist life sphere are positively related and one life domain is negatively related to the dependent variable, none of the life domains in the post-materialist sphere are statistically significant. Moreover, one life domain in the public sphere is negatively related to the dependent variable, and hence, we argue that the materialist life sphere is the most important and positively related to overall quality of life, followed by the post-materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order.

Regionally, south central, southwestern, and northern areas are far from central government. In those regions, residents feel a modicum of happiness. Central/Hazarajat and Central/Kabul are so close to central government and war executing efforts that happiness is not something to feel tangibly (Table 7.39).

7.3.5.3 Kazakhstan

Public sphere conditions matter in Kazakhstan. The most salient are conditions of the environment and number of utilities along with standard of living. The estimated coefficients on "conditions of the environment," "number of utilities," and "relative standard of living" are positive and statistically significant in both regressions of happiness. "Standard of living" is positively related to feelings of happiness among married respondents. Former Soviet legacies abound and economic interdependence with Russia is closely intertwined. It is striking to find that the public life sphere is the most important determinant of happiness, followed by the materialist life sphere and the post-materialist life sphere in that order. Regionally, areas in the south and east (geographically far from Russia but close to China), including Almaty and Druzhba, contribute to respondents' happiness. Areas in the center and north have Russian residents, especially in Astana, the new capital city (Table 7.40).

7.3.5.4 Kyrgyzstan

Housing and standard of living along with spiritual life do matter in determining happiness in Kyrgyzstan. The estimated coefficients on "housing" and "standard of living" are positive and statistically significant in the two regressions on happiness. It follows that the more satisfied the people of Kyrgyzstan are with these life

Table 7.39 Ordered logit regression – Afghanistan

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Materialist sphere				
Marriage	−0.14	0.18	na	
Standard of living	−0.07	0.12	0.14	0.10
Household income	0.27	0.11*	0.23	0.10*
Health	0.21	0.12	0.24	0.11*
Education	−0.01	0.10	−0.001	0.09
Job	−0.06	0.10	−0.06	0.08
Neighbors	−0.16	0.12	−0.23	0.11*
Post-materialist sphere				
Housing	0.17	0.14	−0.01	0.12
Friendships	0.13	0.16	0.11	0.13
Spiritual life	0.10	0.12	0.09	0.10
Public sphere				
Public safety	0.15	0.13	0.16	0.11
Condition of environment	−0.09	0.12	−0.08	0.11
Social welfare system	−0.13	0.11	−0.20	0.09*
Democratic system	0.17	0.10	0.13	0.08
Leisure	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.10
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.09
Internet	−0.07	0.17	0.01	0.15
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	0.23	0.33	−0.04	0.28
Religion	na		na	
Living internationally	−0.04	0.13	−0.12	0.12
English ability	−0.01	0.19	−0.03	0.16
Homeownership	0.19	0.24	0.40	0.21
Number of family members	−0.02	0.03	−0.01	0.03
Relative standard of living	0.24	0.11*	0.25	0.10*
No right to vote	na		na	
Demographic characteristics				
Female	−0.55	0.20**	−0.16	0.36
Married	na		0.04	0.28
Female × Married	na		−0.28	0.40
Age	−0.01	0.08	0.02	0.07
Income	−0.05	0.13	0.02	0.11
Educational attainment	0.08	0.19	0.03	0.17
Region (Base-Central/Kabul)				
Eastern	0.09	0.51	0.30	0.42
South Central	0.87	0.41*	1.06	0.37**
South Western	2.03	0.53**	1.99	0.46**
Western	−0.35	0.44	−0.32	0.38
Northern	1.60	0.40**	1.66	0.35**
Central/Hazarjat	−1.66	0.68*	−1.39	0.57*

(continued)

Table 7.39 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
City size (Base-Kabul)				
Villages	−0.46	0.39	−0.46	0.34
Towns	−1.98	0.74**	−1.74	0.64*
City	−0.48	0.62	−0.38	0.55
cut1	−1.06	2.07	−1.68	1.71
Cut2	1.81	2.03	1.02	1.67
Cut3	4.61	2.04	3.84	1.68
Cut4	6.12	2.05	5.39	1.69
N	474		607	
Pseudo R2	0.1112		0.105	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.40 Ordered logit regression – Kazakhstan

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Public sphere				
Public safety	0.05	0.14	−0.01	0.10
Condition of environment	0.73	0.13**	0.73	0.11**
Social welfare system	−0.08	0.14	0.01	0.11
Democratic system	0.00	0.15	−0.04	0.12
Materialist sphere				
Housing	0.11	0.12	0.17	0.10
Standard of living	0.34	0.15*	0.22	0.12
Household income	−0.11	0.16	−0.05	0.13
Health	−0.17	0.12	−0.09	0.10
Job	−0.23	0.12	−0.15	0.09
Post-materialist sphere				
Friendships	0.21	0.18	0.20	0.14
Marriage	0.07	0.20	na	
Education	0.01	0.14	−0.04	0.11
Neighbors	−0.02	0.17	−0.09	0.13
Family life	−0.17	0.18	−0.09	0.11
Leisure	0.21	0.15	0.19	0.12
Spiritual life	−0.06	0.15	−0.11	0.12
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.38	0.12**	0.27	0.10**
Internet	−0.09	0.15	0.04	0.12
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.08
Religion	−0.12	0.31	−0.21	0.25

(continued)

Table 7.40 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Living internationally	−0.15	0.13	−0.16	0.11
English ability	0.00	0.23	0.30	0.18
Homeownership	−0.04	0.48	0.02	0.38
Number of family members	−0.06	0.07	−0.02	0.06
Relative standard of living	0.53	0.20**	0.43	0.17**
No right to vote	na		na	
Demographic characteristics				
Female	−0.05	0.21	0.37	0.35
Married	na		0.34	0.31
Female × married	na		−0.38	0.40
Age	0.00	0.10	0.02	0.08
Income	0.00	0.03	−0.01	0.02
Educational attainment	0.08	0.18	0.02	0.15
Region (Base-West)				
Almaty	0.96	0.60	1.01	0.49*
North	0.88	0.50	0.77	0.41
Centre	0.48	0.52	0.43	0.43
East	1.29	0.49**	1.36	0.41**
South	1.43	0.48**	1.29	0.40**
Urban/rural (base: urban)				
Urban village/small town	1.05	0.31**	1.13	0.26**
Rural	1.11	0.34**	1.14	0.29**
cut1	4.14	1.34	4.04	1.10
Cut2	6.30	1.36	6.35	1.11
Cut3	7.37	1.37	7.50	1.12
Cut4	11.0	1.45	11.1	1.19
N	481		630	
Pseudo R2	0.1394		0.1404	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

domains, the higher the probability that they feel happiness. "Spiritual life" in the post-materialist life sphere is statistically significant but negatively related to the dependent variable when using only the group of married respondents. "Job" is statistically significant and positively related to the dependent variable when using the general sample of all Kyrgyzstani respondents. Hence, we argue that the materialist life sphere is the most important determinant of overall quality of life among the three life spheres, followed by the public life sphere and the post-materialist life sphere in that order.

Regionally, Naryn, Osh, and Jalalabad *oblasts* (provinces) add happiness compared to Bishkek, the capital city. However, ethnic competition between the Kyrgyz people and Uzbeks along with democratizing forces makes Kyrgyzstani happiness more complicated (Table 7.41).

Table 7.41 Ordered logit regression – Kyrgyzstan

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Post-materialist sphere				
Friendships	0.13	0.15	0.16	0.13
Marriage	0.25	0.19	na	
Education	0.02	0.13	−0.06	0.10
Neighbors	−0.07	0.16	−0.12	0.13
Family life	−0.31	0.19	−0.21	0.12
Leisure	−0.12	0.12	−0.06	0.10
Spiritual life	−0.28	0.14*	−0.16	0.11
Materialist sphere				
Housing	0.44	0.11**	0.48	0.09**
Standard of living	0.75	0.13**	0.68	0.11**
Household income	−0.02	0.12	0.06	0.11
Health	0.07	0.11	0.10	0.09
Job	0.14	0.09	0.17	0.08*
Post sphere				
Public safety	−0.18	0.12	−0.09	0.10
Condition of environment	0.18	0.11	0.12	0.09
Social welfare system	−0.08	0.11	−0.05	0.09
Democratic system	0.18	0.11	0.09	0.09
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.07	0.11	−0.01	0.10
Internet	−0.25	0.17	−0.12	0.13
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	−0.03	0.07	−0.02	0.06
Religion	0.65	0.53	0.89	0.39*
Living internationally	−0.08	0.13	−0.12	0.11
English ability	−0.01	0.23	−0.18	0.18
Homeownership	−0.01	0.58	−0.02	0.45
Number of family members	−0.04	0.06	0.01	0.05
Relative standard of living	0.54	0.19**	0.61	0.16**
No right to vote	1.98	1.08	1.57	0.85
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.28	0.23	−0.55	0.38
Married	na		−0.66	0.36
Female × married	na		−0.79	0.45
Age	−0.14	0.11	−0.15	0.09
Income	−0.01	0.03	−0.04	0.02
Educational attainment	−0.06	0.20	−0.05	0.16
Region (Base-Bishkek)				
Isyk-Kul oblast	−0.28	0.54	−0.56	0.45
Naryn oblast	1.91	0.56**	1.71	0.49**
Chui oblast	−0.11	0.47	−0.13	0.39
Talass oblast	0.85	0.76	0.93	0.58

(continued)

Table 7.41 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Batken oblast	0.35	0.62	0.06	0.51
Jalalabad Oblast	1.39	0.48**	0.64	0.39
Osh Oblast	1.57	0.45**	0.99	0.37**
Urban/Rural (Urban)				
Urban village/small town	−0.07	0.33	−0.26	0.28
Rural	na		na	
cut1	2.57	1.50	1.09	1.13
Cut2	4.89	1.51	3.52	1.14
Cut3	5.64	1.52	4.25	1.15
Cut4	8.89	1.56	7.43	1.18
N	356		496	
Pseudo R2	0.2169		0.2296	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

7.3.5.5 Mongolia

Housing, health, and family life along with Internet access and prayer strongly determine happiness in Mongolia. The estimated coefficients on housing, Internet, and prayer are positive and statistically significant in the regressions of "happiness" for both married respondents and the general sample of all Mongolian respondents. The satisfaction with health and family life is positively associated with feelings of happiness among all the respondents of Mongolia. Huge geographic space and a sparse population mean that physical conditions are predeterminants and that people can network with others through mostly Internet and prayer.

Among the three life spheres, we argue that the post-materialist life sphere is the most important determinant and is positively related to overall life quality, followed by the materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order. Housing in the post-materialist life sphere is more strongly related to the dependent variable in both regressions. *Z*-score is 3.19 and 3.69, respectively, while *z*-score of health and family life in the regression using only married respondents is 2.94 and 2.69, respectively.

In terms of demographics, females are more likely to have higher feelings of happiness when married (Table 7.42).

7.3.5.6 Tajikistan

Housing, standard of living, health, and condition of the environment are central to happiness in Tajikistan. The estimated coefficients on housing, health, and condition of the environment are positive and statistically significant in the two regressions of "happiness." Standard of living and the relative standard of living are positively related to "happiness" in both regressions. Physical conditions and public sphere conditions determine so much that what remains to be done to add to happiness is to keep the body and mind healthy and ready.

Table 7.42 Ordered logit regression – Mongolia

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Materialist sphere				
Standard of living	0.33	0.17	0.65	0.15**
Household income	0.31	0.19	−0.02	0.16
Health	0.24	0.13	0.32	0.11**
Education	−0.06	0.14	−0.02	0.11
Job	0.13	0.10	0.13	0.09
Family life	0.21	0.16	0.35	0.13**
Leisure	−0.06	0.13	−0.07	0.12
Spiritual life	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.14
Public sphere				
Public safety	0.01	0.13	−0.05	0.11
Condition of environment	0.08	0.14	0.04	0.12
Social welfare system	−0.07	0.13	−0.02	0.12
Democratic system	−0.04	0.12	−0.06	0.11
Post-materialist sphere				
Neighbors	0.18	0.13	0.18	0.11
Housing	0.38	0.12**	0.36	0.10**
Friendships	0.10	0.16	−0.02	0.13
Marriage	0.16	0.18	na	
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.15	0.13	0.16	0.11
Internet	0.51	0.21*	0.47	0.17**
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	0.31	0.12**	0.23	0.10*
Religion	0.11	0.33	−0.03	0.27
Living internationally	0.08	0.17	0.11	0.14
English ability	−0.15	0.21	−0.20	0.18
Homeownership	−0.13	0.26	−0.10	0.22
Number of family members	0.04	0.08	0.13	0.06*
Relative standard of living	−0.05	0.20	0.08	0.17
No right to vote	na		−0.63	1.28
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.46	0.23*	0.05	0.40
Married	na		−0.06	0.34
Female × married	na		0.29	0.45
Age	0.15	0.11	0.12	0.09
Income	−0.02	0.11	0.06	0.09
Educational attainment	−0.01	0.20	0.14	0.17
Region (Base-Ulaanbaatar)				
Sukhbaatar	−0.28	0.50	−0.09	0.43
Khuvsgul	−0.45	0.37	0.12	0.32
Khovd	−0.32	0.41	−0.19	0.34
Dundgobi	−0.40	0.42	0.28	0.36

(continued)

Table 7.42 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Urban/rural (base: rural)				
Urban	−0.45	0.31	−0.23	0.2
cut1	5.64	1.22	2.37	1.15
cut2	8.30	1.26	6.20	1.00
cut3	12.8	1.37	8.69	1.04
cut4			13.3	1.15
N	407		536	
Pseudo R2	0.1920		0.1932	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Among the three life spheres, the domains in the materialist life sphere is the most important determinants of overall quality of life in Tajikistan, followed by the public life sphere and the post-materialist life sphere in that order.

In terms of demographics, females and married respondents are less likely to be happy than their counterparts. Regionally, living in urban areas adds to the happiness of respondents (Table 7.43).

7.3.5.7 Uzbekistan

Friendships, marriage, and standard of living are key determinants of happiness in Uzbekistan. The estimated coefficients on friendships and standard of living are positive and statistically significant in both regressions. Marriage is estimated positive and strongly related to the feelings of happiness in the regression using only married respondents. Closely woven communities (mahala) make physical conditions and conditions of social relationships function reasonably well given the constraints given by public space conditions.

Among the three life spheres, the post-materialist life sphere is the most important determinant of overall quality of life in Uzbekistan, followed by the materialist life sphere and the public life sphere in that order.

In terms of demographics, income adds to happiness (Table 7.44).

7.3.6 Statistically Significant Coefficients in Each Country and Society in Asia

Table 7.45 reports regression results from fitting ordered logit regressions of happiness on a set of independent variables for each individual country and society based on the feedback of married respondents. The table also shows the number of statistically significant cases for each variable in the two far-right columns. Table 7.45 indicates with a plus sign if the estimated coefficient on the independent

Table 7.43 Ordered logit regression – Tajikistan

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Materialist sphere				
Housing	0.49	0.14**	0.44	0.11**
Standard of living	0.65	0.18**	0.67	0.14
Household income	−0.10	0.18	−0.10	0.14
Health	0.42	0.13**	0.47	0.11**
Education	−0.32	0.12*	−0.20	0.10
Job	0.24	0.14	0.05	0.12
Democratic system	0.23	0.13	0.23	0.11*
Leisure	−0.27	0.16	−0.29	0.14*
Spiritual life	0.28	0.17	0.26	0.14
Post-materialist sphere				
Friendships	0.23	0.18	0.28	0.14
Marriage	−0.08	0.22	na	
Neighbors	−0.10	0.16	−0.04	0.13
Public safety	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.11
Family life	−0.15	0.21	−0.18	0.14
Public sphere				
Condition of environment	0.51	0.14**	0.51	0.12**
Social welfare system	−0.18	0.14	−0.20	0.12
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	−0.004	0.15	0.04	0.13
Internet	0.13	0.16	−0.06	0.14
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.07
Religion	1.39	0.99	1.32	0.72
Living internationally	−0.14	0.14	−0.01	0.12
English ability	0.09	0.25	−0.08	0.12
Homeownership	1.08	0.70	0.17	0.51
Number of family members	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.04
Relative standard of living	0.34	0.17	0.48	0.15*
No right to vote	na		na	
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.08	0.26	−0.92	0.41*
Married	na		−0.89	0.38*
Female × married	na		1.11	0.47*
Age	−0.12	0.11	−0.11	0.09
Income	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.04
Educational attainment	0.00	0.19	0.03	0.16
Region (base: rupublican subordination)				
Dushanbe	−0.70	0.59	−0.31	0.47
Mountain-Badakhshan Autonomic	0.01	0.78	−0.09	0.59
Sogd Region	0.50	0.40	0.59	0.36
Khatlon Region	−0.02	0.35	0.15	0.30

(continued)

Table 7.43 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Urban/rural (base: rural)				
Urban	1.32	0.45**	0.96	0.35*
cut1	7.66	1.73	6.68	1.33
cut2	10.77	1.77	9.56	1.36
cut3	12.52	1.80	11.22	1.38
cut4	16.00	1.88	14.91	1.46
N	351		466	
Pseudo R2	0.2393		0.231	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.44 Ordered logit regression – Uzbekistan

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Specific life domains				
Materialist sphere				
Housing	−0.07	0.13	0.01	0.10
Standard of living	0.57	0.16**	0.58	0.13**
Household income	−0.14	0.17	−0.04	0.13
Health	0.18	0.13	0.28	0.10
Education	0.15	0.13	0.10	0.11
Job	0.01	0.13	−0.01	0.10
Neighbors	−0.01	0.13	−0.16	0.10
Leisure	0.28	0.13*	0.13	0.10
Spiritual life	0.07	0.13	0.10	0.11
Post-materialist sphere				
Friendships	0.32	0.16*	0.36	0.12**
Marriage	0.86	0.18**	na	
Family life	−0.01	0.19	0.53	0.11**
Public sphere				
Public safety	−0.10	0.14	−0.09	0.10
Condition of environment	−0.23	0.13	−0.07	0.11
Social welfare system	−0.17	0.14	−0.16	0.11
Democratic system	0.14	0.13	0.11	0.10
Lifestyles				
Number of utilities	0.06	0.16	0.03	0.12
Internet	0.06	0.13	−0.07	0.10
Email	na		na	
Mobile phone	na		na	
Pray	−0.03	0.08	0.00	0.07
Religion	−0.08	0.44	0.03	0.34
Living internationally	−0.09	0.13	0.03	0.10
English ability	0.20	0.20	0.09	0.15
Homeownership	−1.13	0.69	−0.21	0.46
Number of family members	0.00	0.07	−0.03	0.05

(continued)

Table 7.44 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness – only married		Happiness – all	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Relative standard of living	0.39	0.20	0.15	0.16
No right to vote	−1.49	2.29	−0.68	2.11
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.41	0.26	0.15	0.35
Married	na		0.34	0.32
Female × married	na		0.03	0.42
Age	−0.10	0.11	−0.05	0.09
Income	0.08	0.06	0.10	0.04*
Educational attainment	0.06	0.26	0.07	0.18
City (Base-Namangan)				
Tashkent	−0.35	0.42	−0.45	0.34
Samarkand	−0.14	0.52	−0.45	0.42
Bukhara	0.01	0.50	−0.36	0.41
Urgench	0.57	0.51	0.45	0.43
Fergana	0.12	0.45	−0.35	0.36
Andijan	−0.21	0.47	−0.20	0.39
cut1	2.57	1.60	1.61	1.23
cut2	6.17	1.54	5.68	1.13
cut3	7.79	1.57	7.17	1.15
cut4	11.7	1.64	10.7	1.21
N	350		502	
Pseudo R2	0.2117		0.1761	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

variable is positive and statistically significant and with a minus sign if the estimated coefficient on the independent variable is negative and statistically significant. The two far-right columns of Table 7.45 count the number of plus and minus signs. The variable "relative standard of living" in lifestyles appears significantly positively related to happiness in 17 countries/societies, which is the largest number. Since "standard of living" in the specific life domains is statistically significantly positive in 13 countries/societies, standard of living matters in Asia. The higher the (relative) standard of living that the citizens perceive, the higher the probability that they feel happy. Relative standard of living is followed by specific life domain "housing" on which the slope coefficient is estimated to be positive in 16 regressions. Marriage matters in 13 countries/societies. Family life and spiritual life are important in eight countries/societies. Friendships and household income in life domains are important in seven countries/societies. On the other hand, the number of estimated coefficients that are negative and statistically significant is the largest at 4 on the variable "education" in life domains and "age" in demographic characteristics.

In terms of demographics, the number of estimated coefficients on "female" that are positive and statistically significant is 13, and the number of estimated coefficients on "female" that are negative and statistically significant is 1. The

Table 7.45 Ordered logit regression (dependent variables = happiness; only married)

Independent variables	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Bhutan	Brunei	Cambodia	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Laos	Malaysia	Maldives
Specific life domains															
Housing			+		+	+		+	+			+		+	
Friendships		+		+	+	+		+							
Marriage		+				+	+			+					
Standard of living		+			+	+				+	+	+			
Household income	+							+	+				+	+	
Health						+				+					
Education			+	−											+
Job															
Neighbors								−							
Public safety						+			−					+	
Condition of environment											+			−	
Social welfare system										+					
Democratic system				na						−			na		
Family life		+				+	+			+			+	+	
Leisure														+	
Spiritual life			+	na	+				+	+		+		−	
Lifestyles															
Number of utilities				na					−		+			+	
Internet				na											
Email	Na	na	na	na	na		na	Na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Mobile phone	Na	na	na	na					+		na	na			na
Pray		+	+		−				−						
Religion	Na	na	na	na				na	na				na		Na

(continued)

Table 7.45 (continued)

Independent variables	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Bhutan	Brunei	Cambodia	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Laos	Malaysia	Maldives
Living internationally										+					
English ability				+					–						
Homeownership							+								
Number of family members															
Relative standard of living	+				+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+
No right to vote	na		na	na				na	na	na	na		na		na
Demographic characteristics															
Female	–	+		+		+		+						+	+
Married	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	Na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Female × Married	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	Na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Age		–						–		+					+
Income				–											
Educational attainment			+												
Region (city)	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
City size	Yes	Yes		No		Yes				No					
Urban/rural									No		Yes			No	

Independent variables	Mongolia	Myanmar	Nepal	Pakistan	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Sri Lanka	Taiwan	Tajikistan	Thailand	Uzbekistan	Vietnam	+	–
Specific life domains															
Housing	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+				16	
Friendships					+							+		7	
Marriage					+		+				+	+	+	10	
Standard of living				+		+				+	+	+	+	13	
Household income					+			+						7	

Health				+	+				+	+					6	
Education				−			−			−					2	4
Job								+	+						2	
Neighbors		−														2
Public safety			+				+								4	1
Condition of environment							−			+					2	2
Social welfare system		na													1	
Democratic system		na		+										na	1	1
Family life			−			+	+								8	1
Leisure		+		+									+		4	
Spiritual life							+		+		+				8	1
Lifestyles																
Number of utilities								+						+	4	2
Internet	+							+	−						2	1
Email	na	na	na	na	na	na		na	na	na	na	na				
Mobile phone	na		na	na				na		na		na			1	
Pray	+			+			+								5	2
Religion		na	na	na	na			na			na					
Living internationally															1	
English ability			−												1	2
Homeownership				−											1	1
Number of family members			−					−								2
Relative standard of living		+	+	+		+	+	+			+				17	
No right to vote	na	na	na	+			na	na	na	na				na	1	
Demographic characteristics																
Female	+		+		+		+		+						12	1
Married	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na			

(continued)

Table 7.45 (continued)

Independent variables	Mongolia	Myanmar	Nepal	Pakistan	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Sri Lanka	Taiwan	Tajikistan	Thailand	Uzbekistan	Vietnam	+	–
Female × Married	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		
Age							–							2	4
Income															1
Educational attainment			+		+									3	
Region (city)	No	No		No	No		No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	13	
City size							No		No		No			3	
Urban/rural	No			No	No				No	Yes				2	

number of the coefficients on "age" that is estimated positive is smaller than the number of the negative coefficients. "Region" matters in 13 countries/societies out of 22 countries/societies.

Table 7.46 reports the results from fitting ordered logit regressions of happiness on a set of independent variables for each country and society using all the observations of that country and society. Similar to Table 7.45, Table 7.46 counts the number of estimated coefficients that are positive and statistically significant and those that are negative and statistically significant. A plus sign indicates the coefficient on that variable is estimated to be positive and statistically significant, and a minus sign indicates the coefficient is negative and statistically significant. The number of estimated coefficients that are positive and statistically significant is largest for the variables "housing" and "relative standard of living" at 18. They are followed by "standard of living" at 14. The estimated coefficients on "family life" are positive and statistically significant in 11 regressions of happiness. Friendships, health, and spiritual life are important in nine countries/societies.

"Age" has the most estimated coefficients that are negative and statistically significant. The estimated coefficients on "age" are negative and statistically significant in six countries/societies and positively related to happiness in none of the countries/societies. "Region" matters in 12 countries/societies out of 22 countries/societies.

Table 7.47 shows the regression results from fitting an ordered logit regression of "enjoyment" on a set of independent variables, life domain satisfactions, lifestyles, and demographic variables using only married observations. Table 7.47 counts the number of estimated coefficients that are positive and statistically significant and those that are negative and statistically significant. The number of coefficients that are estimated positive is the largest for "marriage" at 8. It is followed by "relative standard of living" at 7. Housing is important in six countries/societies. Standard of living and leisure matter in five countries/societies. On the other hand, the number of estimated coefficients that are negative and statistically significant is the largest for "age" at 5 when age is positively related to enjoyment in two countries/societies. "Region" matters in eight countries/societies out of 13 countries/societies.

Table 7.48 shows the results from fitting ordered logit regressions of "enjoyment" on a set of independent variables using all the observations of each country and society. Table 7.48 counts the numbers of estimated coefficients that are positive and statistically significant and those that are negative and statistically significant. The variable "relative standard of living" has the largest number of estimated coefficients that are positive and statistically significant at 9. It is followed by "friendships" and "standard of living" at 8. Standard of living as either a life domain or an objective condition is important here again. The number of estimated coefficients on "spiritual life" that are positive and statistically significant is 7. Leisure and housing are important in six countries/societies. Family life matters in five countries/societies.

On the other hand, the number of estimated coefficients on "age" is 4, the largest in the set of independent variables that are statistically significant and negatively

Table 7.46 Ordered logit regression (dependent variables = happiness; all)

Independent variables	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Bhutan	Brunei	Cambodia	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Laos	Malaysia	Maldives
Specific life domains															
Housing		+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	
Friendships				+		+	+		+						+
Marriage	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Standard of living					+	+	+			+		+	+	+	+
Household income	+				+			+	+				+		
Health	+					+				+			+		
Education			+	−					+						
Job									+	+		+			
Neighbors	−														
Public safety					+	+		+	−				−	−	
Condition of environment						−			+		+				
Social welfare system	−														
Democratic system				na						−			na		
Family life		+				+	+	+		+				+	
Leisure									+					+	
Spiritual life			+	na	+	+			+	+					
Lifestyles															
Number of utilities				(-)					−		+			+	
Internet				na											
Email	na	na	na	na	na		na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Mobile phone	na	na	na	na					+		na	na			na
Pray		+	+		−					+					
Religion	na	na	na	na				na	na			+	na		na
Living internationally							+			+					
English ability									−						

Homeownership							+												
Number of family members					–														
Relative standard of living	+	+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+				
No right to vote	na		na	na				na	na	na	na		na		na				
Demographic characteristics																			
Female		–								+									
Married						+													
Female × married		+						–		–									
Age		–								–									
Income				–															
Educational attainment			–												+				
Region (city)	Yes	Yes			Yes	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes					
City size	Yes	Yes		No		No				Yes									
Urban/rural									No		Yes	No		No					

Independent variables	Mongolia	Myanmar	Nepal	Pakistan	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Sri Lanka	Taiwan	Tajikistan	Thailand	Uzbekistan	Vietnam	+	–
Specific life domains															
Housing	+	+		+	+		+	+		+	+			18	
Friendships		+			+							+	+	9	
Marriage	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		
Standard of living		+		+		+					+	+	+	14	
Household income		+			+									7	
Health				+		+			+	+				9	

(continued)

Table 7.46 (continued)

Independent variables	Mongolia	Myanmar	Nepal	Pakistan	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Sri Lanka	Taiwan	Tajikistan	Thailand	Uzbekistan	Vietnam	+	–
Education				–										2	2
Job							+	+	+					6	
Neighbors		–													2
Public safety			+				+							6	2
Condition of environment			+				–			+				6	2
Social welfare system		na													1
Democratic system		na		+						+	+		na	3	1
Family life	+					+		+				+	+	11	
Leisure		+		+						–				4	1
Spiritual life						+	+		+		+			9	
Lifestyles															
Number of utilities		+	+					+	–				+	6	3
Internet	+							+	–					2	1
Email	na	na	na	na	na	na		na	na	na	na	na			
Mobile phone	na		na	na				na		na		Na		1	
Pray	+			+										5	1
Religion		na		na	na			na			na			1	
Living internationally														2	
English ability															1
Homeownership			+	–				–						2	2
Number of family members	+		–	+				–						2	3
Relative standard of living		+		+		+	+	+		+	+			18	
No right to vote		na	na						na	na			na		
Demographic characteristics															
Female			+				+		–					2	2
Married							+	–	–				+	4	2

Female × married							+					2	
Age					–	–		–					6
Income									+			1	2
Educational attainment			+									2	1
Region (city)	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	12	
City size			No		No		No		No			3	
Urban/rural	No			No			No	Yes				2	

Note: "Number of utilities" for Brunei is "Piped gas"

Table 7.47 Ordered logit regression (dependent variable = enjoyment; only married)

Independent variables	Cambodia	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Laos	Malaysia	Myanmar	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Taiwan	Thailand	Vietnam	+	−
Specific life domains																	
Housing		+			+			+	+	+			+			6	
Friendships		+	+		+	+										4	
Marriage		+	+			+			+	+		+		+	+	8	
Standard of living			+								+	+		+	+	5	
Household income				+						+				+		3	
Health		+				+										2	
Education			−		+										+	2	1
Job	+		+			+								+		4	
Neighbors	−	+														1	1
Public safety		+			−			+								2	1
Condition of environment		−															1
Social welfare system									na			+				1	
Democratic system							na		na			−			na		1
Family life		+						+				+			+	4	
Leisure	+		+		+				+				+			5	
Spiritual life	+	+				+								+		4	
Lifestyles																	
Number of utilities																	
Internet			+										−			1	1
Email	na		na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		na	na			
Mobile phone									+								
Pray													+			1	
Religion		+		na	na		na		na	Na				na		1	

Living internationally			+			+									+	3		
English ability				−		+	+			+						3	1	
Home ownership															−		1	
Number of family members						+							+			2		
Relative standard of living			+	+	+	+				+			+	+		7		
No right to vote				na	na	na	na		na		+	na	na		na	1		
Demographic characteristics																		
Female												+				2		
Married	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	Na	na	na	na	na	na			
Female × married	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	Na	na	na	na	na	na			
Age		+	+	−	−		−		−			−				2	5	
Income	+	+				−										2	1	
Educational attainment				+									+			2		
Region (city)	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	No	No	Yes	8		
City size		Yes				No						No	No	No		1		
Urban/Rural					No			No		No								

Table 7.48 Ordered logit regression (dependent variable = enjoyment; all)

Independent variables	Cambodia	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Laos	Malaysia	Myanmar	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Taiwan	Thailand	Vietnam	+	-
Specific life domains																	
Housing		+			+			+	+	+			+			6	
Friendships		+	+		+	+				+	+			+	+	8	
Marriage	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		
Standard of living	+	+	+				+	+		+	+		+			8	
Household income				+						+				+		3	
Health		+				+						+				3	
Education					+										+	2	
Job	+		+			+								+		4	
Neighbors		+														1	
Public safety		+						+				+				3	
Condition of environment		−	+	+								−				2	2
Social welfare system									na								
Democratic system		+					na		na						na	1	1
Family life		+		+		+			+						+	5	
Leisure	+		+		+				+		+		+			6	
Spiritual life	+	+				+					+	+	+	+		7	
Life styles																	
Number of utilities	+										+					2	
Internet			+						+							2	
Email	na		na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		na	na			
Mobile phone																	
Pray								+					+		−	2	1

Religion		+		na	na		na		na	na				na		1	
Living internationally			+			+	+								+	4	
English ability			−	−		+			+	+						3	2
Home ownership						−			+						−		
Number of family members						+										1	
Relative standard of living			+	+	+	+			+	+	+		+	+		9	
No right to vote				na	na	na	na		na		+		na		na	1	
Demographic characteristics																	
Female																	
Married													−				1
Female × married												+				1	
Age			+	−	−				−			−				1	4
Income				+		−	+						−			2	2
Educational attainment				+												1	
Region(City)	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	No	No	Yes	7	
City size		No				No						No	No	Yes		1	
Urban/rural					No			No		No			No				

related to the dependent variable. Income as an objective condition is positively and statistically significantly related to enjoyment in two countries/societies, while it is negatively related in two countries/societies.

The region where the respondent lives matters in seven countries/societies out of 13 countries/societies where the variable is available.

Table 7.49 reports the results from fitting ordered logit regressions of "achievement" on the set of independent variables, life domain satisfactions, lifestyles, and demographic variables using only married observations and counts the number of estimated coefficients that are either positive or negative and statistically significant. "Relative standard of living" appears as the most important variable since the estimated coefficients are positive and statistically significant in 12 countries/societies. It is followed by "housing" and "marriage," which are statistically significant in eight countries/societies. Standard of living and age matter in seven countries/societies. The variable "region" affects "achievement" in eight countries/societies out of 13 countries/societies.

Income is related negatively in three countries/societies and related positively in one country.

Table 7.50 reports the results from fitting ordered logit regressions of "achievement" that use all the observations of each country and society and counts the number of estimated coefficients that are positive and negative and statistically significant. The number of estimated coefficients that are positive and statistically significant is largest for "relative standard of living" at 12, followed by "housing" and "age" at 9. Job matters in six countries/societies. "Standard of living" as a life domain, "mobile phone," and "married" and "income" from demographic characteristics are important in five countries/societies. "Region" matters in eight countries/societies out of 13 countries/societies. "English ability" and "number of family members" are negatively and statistically significantly associated with "achievement" in three countries/societies.

7.4 Multilevel Regression Analysis

Tables 7.51 and 7.52 report the results from fitting multilevel ordered logit regressions of "happiness," "enjoyment," and "achievement" on a set of independent variables of individual level, life domain satisfactions, lifestyles, and demographic variables and society-level variables, such as GDP and literacy rates. Because the questions about enjoyment and achievement were asked from 2006 onward only, we examined survey results about enjoyment and achievement from 2006 to 2008 in Tables 7.51 and 7.52. The results in Table 7.51 are based on only married respondents, whereas the results in Table 7.52 are based on all the respondents. The 16 life domains are grouped into three life spheres according to the factor analysis reported in Table 4.2.

Here we can notice several fascinating characteristics about citizens' perceptions of quality of life in Asia. First, Tables 7.51 and 7.52 clearly show that life domains in the public sphere are less important determinants for overall life quality,

Table 7.49 Ordered logit regression (dependent variable = achievement; only married)

Independent variables	Cambodia	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Laos	Malaysia	Myanmar	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Taiwan	Thailand	Vietnam	+	−
Specific life domains																	
Housing		+			+	+		+	+	+		+	+			8	
Friendships	+			+						+						3	
Marriage		+	+			+				+	+	+	+	+		8	
Standard of living		+				+	+		+	+		+		+		7	
Household income				+				+						+		3	
Health	+		−									−				1	2
Education					+	+										2	
Job						+			+			+			+	4	
Neighbors					−				−	+	−					1	3
Public safety								+								1	
Condition of environment								−									1
Social welfare system					+				na							1	
Democratic system							na		na						na		
Family life					+											1	
Leisure													+			1	
Spiritual life																	
Life styles																	
Number of utilities				+												1	
Internet	−								−								2
Email	na		na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		na	na			
Mobile phone	+				+			+		−					+	4	1
Pray		+														1	

(continued)

Table 7.49 (continued)

Independent variables	Cambodia	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Laos	Malaysia	Myanmar	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Taiwan	Thailand	Vietnam	+	−
Religion				na	na		na		na	na				na			
Living internationally							+		+					+		3	
English ability				−	−						+			+		2	2
Home ownership			+													1	
Number of family members										−							1
Relative standard of living	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+		+	+	12	
No right to vote				na	na	na	na		na			na	na		na		
Demographic characteristics																	
Female											+					1	
Married	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		
Female × married	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		
Age					−	+	+	+	+		+		+	+		7	1
Income	+						+							+		3	
Educational attainment							+		+							2	
Region(City)	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	8	
City size		No				No						No	Yes	No		1	
Urban/Rural					Yes			Yes		No			Yes			3	

Table 7.50 Ordered logit regression (dependent variable = achievement; all)

Independent variables	Cambodia	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Laos	Malaysia	Myanmar	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Taiwan	Thailand	Vietnam	+	−
Specific life domains																	
Housing		+	+		+	+		+	+	+		+	+			9	
Friendships						+				+						2	
Marriage	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		
Standard of living		+					+				+	+		+		5	
Household income	+			+									+			3	
Health	+		−													1	1
Education																	
Job		+	+			+			+			+			+	6	
Neighbors					−				−								2
Public safety									−								1
Condition of environment				+					+				+			3	
Social welfare system					+				na							1	
Democratic system				−			na		na						na		1
Family life			+	+	+											3	
Leisure								+								1	
Spiritual life											+					1	
Life styles																	
Number of utilities				+												1	
Internet																	
Email	na		na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na		na	na			
Mobile phone	+				+			+			+				+	5	
Pray		+														1	

(continued)

Table 7.50 (continued)

Independent variables	Cambodia	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Laos	Malaysia	Myanmar	Philippines	Singapore	South Korea	Taiwan	Thailand	Vietnam	+	−
Religion				na	na		na	−	na	na				na			1
Living internationally			+				+		+							3	
English ability				−	−	+		−						+		2	3
Home ownership			+	+												2	
Number of family members	−			−						−					+	1	3
Relative standard of living	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+		+	+	12	
No right to vote			−	na	na	na	na		na				na		na		1
Demographic characteristics																	
Female			+													1	
Married		+	+		+	+					−			+		5	1
Female × married																	
Age		+	+		−	+	+	+			+		+	+	+	9	1
Income	+	+					+							+	+	5	
Educational attainment						+	+									2	
Region(City)	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	No	Yes	Yes	8	
City size		No				No						No	Yes	No		1	
Urban/Rural					Yes			Yes		Yes			Yes			4	

Table 7.51 Multi-level ordered logit regression – only married (2006–2008)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Individual level						
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.16	0.03**	0.12	0.03**	0.30	0.03**
Standard of Living	0.22	0.04**	0.18	0.04**	0.1	0.04**
Household income	0.16	0.03**	0.15	0.03**	0.16	0.03**
Health	0.14	0.03**	0.06	0.03*	−0.002	0.03
Education	0.05	0.03	−0.01	0.03	0.06	0.03*
Job	0.09	0.03**	0.10	0.03**	0.08	0.03**
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.23	0.03**	0.20	0.03**	0.11	0.04**
Marriage	0.37	0.03**	0.31	0.03**	0.18	0.04**
Neighbors	−0.06	0.03	−0.01	0.03	−0.03	0.03
Family life	0.24	0.04**	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.04
Leisure	0.03	0.03	0.1	0.03**	0.12	0.03**
Spiritual life	0.26	0.04**	0.27	0.03**	0.15	0.04**
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.05	0.03	0.01	0.03	−0.03	0.03
Condition of environment	−0.05	0.03	−0.02	0.03	0.003	0.03
Social welfare system	0.03	0.03	0.00001	0.03	0.05	0.03
Democratic system	−0.005	0.03	−0.004	0.03	−0.04	0.03
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.02	0.02	0.07	0.02**	0.04	0.02
Internet	−0.03	0.02*	0.01	0.02	−0.03	0.02
Mobile phone	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.02**
Pray	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.02
Religion	0.01	0.07	0.12	0.07	−0.01	0.07
Living internationally	0.07	0.02**	0.11	0.02**	0.07	0.03**
English ability	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.04
Homeownership	0.006	0.06	0.003	0.05	0.19	0.06**
Number of family members	0.002	0.01	−0.01	0.01	−0.02	0.01
Relative standard of living	0.31	0.04**	0.32	0.04**	0.38	0.04**
No right to vote	−0.02	0.08	−0.01	0.08	−0.04	0.08
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.21	0.04**	0.17	0.04**	0.08	0.05
Married	na		na		na	
Female × married	na		na		na	
Age	−0.05	0.02*	0.01	0.02	0.09	0.02**
Income	−0.06	0.03	−0.01	0.03	0.16	0.03**
Educational attainment	0.04	0.04	0.09	0.04*	0.05	0.04
Society level						
GDP	−0.00002	0.00002	−0.00001	0.000006*	−0.00001	0.00001
Unemployment rate	0.01	0.09	−0.02	0.05	0.15	0.04**
Literacy rate	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.009**
Political right (Freedom House)	0.03	0.10	−0.08	0.03*	−0.04	0.04

(continued)

Table 7.51 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
cut1	4.39	1.65**	4.01	1.27**	6.37	0.84**
cut2	6.36	1.64**	6.89	1.27**	8.88	0.84**
cut3	9.30	1.64**	9.98	1.27**	12.42	0.85**
cut4	12.00	1.64**				
N	8,563		9,215		8,536	
Rho	0.083		0.045		0.037	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

Table 7.52 Multi-level ordered logit regression – all (2006–2008)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Individual level						
Specific life domains						
Materialist sphere						
Housing	0.17	0.02**	0.13	0.02**	0.30	0.02**
Standard of Living	0.29	0.03**	0.21	0.03**	0.17	0.03**
Household income	0.14	0.03**	0.14	0.03**	0.16	0.03**
Health	0.16	0.02**	0.08	0.02**	−0.01	0.02
Education	0.04	0.02	−0.01	0.03	0.04	0.03
Job	0.08	0.02**	0.12	0.02**	0.14	0.02**
Post-materialist sphere						
Friendships	0.25	0.03**	0.25	0.03**	0.10	0.03**
Marriage	na		na		na	
Neighbors	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03
Family life	0.27	0.03**	0.13	0.03**	0.06	0.03*
Leisure	0.06	0.03*	0.17	0.03**	0.10	0.03**
Spiritual life	0.32	0.03**	0.29	0.03**	0.14	0.03**
Public sphere						
Public safety	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.03	−0.02	0.03
Condition of environment	−0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.03
Social welfare system	−0.007	0.02	−0.02	0.03	0.05	0.03*
Democratic system	0.007	0.02	−0.001	0.02	−0.05	0.02*
Lifestyles						
Number of utilities	−0.03	0.02	0.06	0.02**	0.04	0.02*
Internet	−0.02	0.02	0.003	0.02	−0.05	0.02**
Mobile phone	0.04	0.02*	0.03	0.02*	0.05	0.02**
Pray	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.02**
Religion	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.06	−0.02	0.06
Living internationally	0.07	0.02**	0.12	0.02**	0.07	0.02**
English ability	0.07	0.03*	0.06	0.03*	0.09	0.03**
Homeownership	0.02	0.05	−0.008	0.05	0.15	0.05**

(continued)

Table 7.52 (continued)

Dependent variables	Happiness		Enjoyment		Achievement	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Number of family members	−0.0004	0.01	−0.01	0.01	−0.02	0.01
Relative standard of living	0.32	0.03**	0.33	0.03**	0.41	0.03**
No right to vote	−0.04	0.06	0.01	0.06	−0.04	0.06
Demographic characteristics						
Female	0.14	0.07*	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.07
Married	0.23	0.06**	0.10	0.06	0.30	0.06**
Female × married	0.03	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.01	0.09
Age	−0.04	0.02*	0.02	0.02	0.11	0.02**
Income	−0.06	0.03*	−0.02	0.03	0.12	0.03**
Educational attainment	0.03	0.03	0.09	0.03**	0.07	0.03*
Society level						
GDP	−0.00003	0.000008**	−0.00001	0.000005*	−0.00001	0.00001
Unemployment rate	−0.01	0.05	−0.02	0.04	0.15	0.04**
Literacy rate	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.007*
Political right (Freedom House)	0.003	0.07	−0.08	0.03*	−0.07	0.03*
cut1	3.74	1.21**	2.96	1.12**	6.05	0.72**
cut2	5.71	1.20**	5.73	1.12**	8.62	0.72**
cut3	8.52	1.21**	8.77	1.12**	12.09	0.73**
cut4	11.16	1.21**				
N	11,578		11,564		11,545	
Rho	0.076		0.050		0.039	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

happiness, enjoyment, or achievement. According to Table 7.51, none of the estimated coefficients on domains in the public life sphere are statistically significant, and Table 7.52 shows that only two coefficients are estimated significant in the regression of achievement. This finding is consistent with the numbers of statistically significant coefficients that we have analyzed in the previous section.

Second, although "housing," "standard of living," "household income," "job," "friendships," and "spiritual life" are statistically significant and positively related with the dependent variables both in Tables 7.51 and 7.52, "health," "family life," and "leisure" reveal a different picture. "Health" is statistically significant and positively related to happiness and enjoyment but is not statistically significantly related to achievement in both Tables 7.51 and 7.52. Health is important to the feelings of happiness and enjoyment but does not quite matter to the feeling of achievement. According to Table 7.51, the estimated coefficient on "family life" is positive and statistically significant in the regression of happiness but is not in the regressions of enjoyment and achievement. "Leisure" is statistically significant and related positively to enjoyment and achievement instead. Family life is important to the feeling of happiness for married people, while leisure is important to the feelings of enjoyment and achievement for them.

Third, the estimated coefficients on "living internationally" and "relative standard of living" among lifestyles are positive and statistically significant in the three regressions according to Tables 7.51 and 7.52. According to Table 7.52, the estimated coefficients on "mobile phone" and "English ability" are also positive and statistically significant in all the three regressions. However, according to Table 7.51, "number of utilities" is statistically significant and positively related only to enjoyment, and "mobile phone" is statistically significant and positively related only to achievement. The number of utilities is important to the feeling of enjoyment for Asian people. And most interestingly, "homeownership" is statistically significant and positively related only to achievement in both Tables 7.51 and 7.52. Owning home especially enhances the feeling of achievement for the Asian people.

Among the demographic variables, "female" is statistically significant and positively related to happiness according to Table 7.52. According to Table 7.51, "female" is statistically significant and positively related to happiness and enjoyment. Females are more likely to feel happy than their male counterparts. In addition, once married, the feeling of enjoyment is added and the quality of life of females improves. According to Table 7.52, "married" is statistically significant and positively related to happiness and achievement. Since we have already found that marriage as a life domain is also an important determinant for the life quality in Asia, marriage and being married is very important for the quality of life in Asia. Another interesting characteristic is seen about the variable "age." According to both Tables 7.51 and 7.52, "age" is statistically significant and negatively related to happiness and positively related to achievement. Seniors are less likely to feel happy but more likely to have a sense of accomplishment instead. Similar trend is seen about income as an objective condition. Although "income" is not statistically significantly related to happiness according to Table 7.51, "income" is statistically significant and negatively related to happiness according to Table 7.52 and statistically significant and positively related to achievement in both Tables 7.51 and 7.52. Income is likely to enhance the feeling of achievement instead of the feeling of happiness for Asian people.

Among the society-level variables, GDP per capita and the Freedom House political right score are statistically significant and negatively related to feeling of enjoyment according to Tables 7.51 and 7.52. Unemployment rate and literacy rate are statistically significant and positively related to feeling of achievement according to the both tables.

Table 7.53 shows the results from fitting multilevel ordered logit regressions of "happiness" on a set of individual-level and society-level variables. As the Asia-Barometer asked about happiness from 2003 to 2008, we use all the observations in this regression analysis.

Table 7.53 shows a similar picture about the quality of life that we have found from previous tables. What is different is that "condition of environment" and "democratic system" are statistically significant and positively related to happiness, but the values of the estimated coefficients on "condition of environment" and "democratic system" are smaller than those of the estimated coefficients on other

Table 7.53 Multi-level ordered logit regression – Happiness (2003–2008)

Dependent variables	Only married		All	
Independent variables	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Individual level				
Specific life domains				
Materialist sphere				
Housing	0.21	0.02**	0.23	0.01**
Standard of Living	0.26	0.02**	0.30	0.02**
Household income	0.13	0.02**	0.12	0.02**
Health	0.14	0.02**	0.16	0.01*
Education	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Job	0.09	0.02**	0.9	0.01*
Post-materialist sphere				
Friendships	0.12	0.02**	0.18	0.02**
Marriage	0.35	0.02**	na	
Neighbors	−0.04	0.02	−0.01	0.02
Family life	0.16	0.02**	0.24	0.02**
Leisure	0.09	0.02**	0.10	0.01**
Public sphere				
Public safety	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01
Condition of environment	0.06	0.02**	0.05	0.01*
Social welfare system	0.03	0.02	0.0002	0.01
Democratic system	0.03	0.02*	0.05	0.01**
Lifestyles				
Public water supply	0.03	0.04	−0.01	0.04
Electricity	0.09	0.11	0.04	0.09
Piped gas	0.09	0.04*	0.09	0.03**
Religion	0.06	0.05	0.08	0.04*
Living internationally	0.03	0.01*	0.03	0.01*
English ability	0.004	0.02	0.02	0.02
Homeownership	−0.06	0.03	−0.05	0.03
Number of family members	0.002	0.01	0.01	0.01
Relative standard of living	0.40	0.02**	0.40	0.02**
No right to vote	0.001	0.07	0.01	0.05
Demographic characteristics				
Female	0.16	0.03**	0.09	0.05
Married	na			0.04**
Female × married	na		0.04	0.05
Age	−0.07	0.01**	−0.07	0.01**
Income	−0.04	0.02*	−0.04	0.02*
Educational attainment	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.02*
Society level				
GDP	−0.00001	0.00001	−0.000003	0.00001
Unemployment rate	−0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01
Literacy rate	0.01	0.003	0.005	0.003
Political right (Freedom House)	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03
cut1	3.21	0.36**	2.64	0.32**
cut2	5.29	0.36**	4.76	0.32**
cut3	7.37	0.36**	6.79	0.32**
cut4	10.17	0.36**	9.54	0.32**
N	21,756		29,215	
Rho	0.151		0.125	

Notes: **1% significance level; *5% significance level

variables in the materialist and post-materialist spheres of life. In addition, two variables out of four are statistically significant and positively related to happiness in public life sphere, while five out of six in the materialist life sphere and four out of five in the post-materialist life sphere are statistically significant and positively related. So, the results reported in Table 7.53 do not contradict the results we have discussed so far in the earlier sections.

Among lifestyles variables, "piped gas," "living internationally," and "relative standard of living" are estimated as positive and statistically significant in the two regressions for only married observations and the general sample of all the observations.

Among demographic characteristics, female or married respondents are more likely to feel happy, whereas seniors and those who have a higher income are not. None of the society-level variables are statistically significant.

In sum, life domains in the public sphere are less important determinants for overall life quality measured by happiness, enjoyment, or achievement. Counting the number of countries/societies in which the estimated coefficient is either positive or negative and statistically significant, "relative standard of living" as an objective condition appears as the most important variable. Since "standard of living" as a life domain is also a strong determinant for the life quality, (relative) standard of living is important for levels of overall quality of life in Asia. Among specific life domains, health is important to the feelings of happiness and enjoyment but does not quite matter to the feeling of achievement. Family life is important to the feeling of happiness for married people, while leisure is important to the feelings of enjoyment and achievement for them. Owning home especially enhances the feeling of achievement for the Asian people. "Living internationally" and "relative standard of living" are positive and statistically significant in the three regressions of happiness, enjoyment, and achievement. Among demographic characteristics, seniors are less likely to feel happy but more likely to have a sense of accomplishment instead. Similar trend is seen about income as an objective condition. Income is likely to enhance the feeling of achievement instead of the feeling of happiness for Asian people. "Region" matters more than half of the countries and societies where the variable region is used. Finally, marriage and being married is very important for the quality of life in Asia.

When we examine by subregion, namely, East, Southeast, South, and Central Asia, East Asian countries have the following common characteristics: physical conditions for survival and good life are deemed very important, social relations are no less important, public sphere conditions tend to be of tertiary importance, and globalization has been adapted slowly but steadily. In Southeast Asia, housing, household income, and standard of living, that is, materialist life sphere, are important except in Brunei. Housing and standard of living are key features of South Asia, and friendships and family life are important in some countries in South Asia. Key feature in Central Asia is (relative) standard of living and housing matters in some countries in Central Asia.

Chapter 8
Conclusion

This book examines the subjective and multileveled quality of life in 29 Asian societies using the AsiaBarometer Survey data from 2003 to 2008. We attempt to measure diversities and contrasts among 29 countries and societies in Asia in terms of value priorities, lifestyles, specific life domain satisfactions, and overall quality of life—happiness, enjoyment, and achievement. Following Shin and Inoguchi (2009), we take the subjective approach of equating quality of life with subjective well-being and conceptualize it as multidimensional.

We analyze overall quality of life in Asia by self-assessed happiness, enjoyment, and achievement. 65% of the people of 29 Asian countries and societies reported they are happy, while 10% reported they are not happy. In 29 Asian countries and societies, Brunei emerges as the greatest nation of happiness. On the other hand, the people of Tajikistan are least likely to live a happy life. 81% of the people of 15 Asian counties and societies reported they are enjoying their life, while those who do not express feelings of enjoyment constitute 19%. In 15 countries/societies, Vietnam emerges as the nation with the greatest level of enjoyment in life. The people of Taiwan, on the other hand, are least likely to live an enjoyable life. 12% of the people of 15 Asian countries and societies reported a great deal of achievement, 56% reported some achievement, 27% reported very little achievement, and 4.3% reported no achievement. The people of Laos are the most likely to feel achievement, whereas the South Korean people are least likely to feel accomplishment.

In addition to overall quality of life, we examine satisfaction levels with 16 specific life domains and group 29 Asian countries and societies according to the patterns of satisfaction levels with the 16 life domains. Our findings include that people in East Asia tend to prioritize materialist or quality of life (QOL)-sustaining factors (such as housing, standard of living, household income, education, and job) in their daily lifestyle. People in more traditional Southeast Asia (Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, and Myanmar) tend to prioritize materialist or QOL-sustaining factors in their daily lifestyle. People in more dynamic, more competitive Southeast Asia (Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam) tend to prioritize post-materialist or QOL-enriching factors (such as friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life) in their daily lifestyle. People in state-dominant Southeast Asian

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0_8,

societies (Brunei, Singapore, and the Philippines) tend to prioritize their daily lifestyle in harmony with state-imposed constraints (such as public safety, the condition of the environment, social welfare system, and the democratic system). People in traditional and competitive South Asia (India, Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka) tend to prioritize traditional or QOL-sustaining factors. People in Southeast Asia whose societies face the challenge of tropical weather systems and have dominant-state structures (Bhutan, the Maldives, and Pakistan) tend to harmonize public sphere factors. People in Central Asia whose societies are more traditional (Afghanistan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan) prioritize traditional or QOL-sustaining factors. People in Central Asia whose state structures are dominant (Kazakhstan) tend to harmonize their lives with public sphere factors. People in Central Asia whose societies have more cleavages and are more competitive tend to prioritize QOL-enriching factors (Kyrgyzstan).

We also examined lifestyles of the Asian people in terms of modern, digital, religious, global, political, and family lives. For the modern life, South Koreans have the highest access to public utilities, whereas Myanmar people have the lowest. Almost all the people in the Maldives pray or meditate daily or weekly, which is the highest rate among the 29 societies examined regarding religious life. We also found that Asian people tend to have low levels of global life. In terms of political life, voter turnout is high in Asia. Over 60% vote in national elections either every time or most of the time in 22 of the 26 countries and societies. Three aspects of family life are examined: diet, the number of family members, and types of residence. A great majority has home-cooked meals at home on a daily basis in Asia. More than one-half of the respondents live in their own home in 27 of the 29 countries and societies. A vast majority of countries and societies have over around four or five family members on average. Finally, we compare relative standard of living, which is one of the most important determinants for overall life quality in the regression analyses. Asian people tend to assess their own standard of living as average.

In the chapter on value priorities (Chap. 6) upheld by Asian people, we found that good health is prioritized the most out of 20 aspects in Asia. Having a comfortable home is also highly prioritized in Asia.

We then attempt to find the factors that affect overall quality of life by fitting regressions for individual country/society data and fitting multilevel regressions for pooled data. Our findings include that, firstly, life domains in the public sphere are less important determinants than materialist and post-materialist sphere for overall life quality measured by happiness, enjoyment, or achievement. “Relative standard of living” is statistically significant and positively related with overall quality of life in the largest number of countries/societies. Since “standard of living” as a life domain is also statistically significant and positively related to life quality, (relative) standard of living is an important determinant for levels of overall quality of life in Asia. Among specific life domains, health is important to the feelings of happiness and enjoyment but does not quite matter to the feeling of achievement. Family life is important to the feeling of happiness for married people, while leisure is important to the feelings of enjoyment and achievement for them. In the rest of

specific life domains, housing, household income, and job in materialist life sphere and friendships and marriage in post-materialist life sphere are important. Owning home especially enhances the feeling of achievement for the Asian people. Among demographic characteristics, seniors are less likely to feel happy but more likely to have a sense of accomplishment instead. Similar trend is seen about income as an objective condition. Income is likely to enhance the feeling of achievement instead of the feeling of happiness for Asian people. Finally, marriage and being married is very important for the quality of life in Asia.

When we examine subregion by subregion, we found that East Asian countries have the following common characteristics: physical conditions for survival and good life are deemed very important, social relations are no less important, public sphere conditions tend to be of tertiary importance, and globalization has been adapted slowly but steadily. In Southeast Asia, housing, household income, and standard of living, that is, materialist life sphere, are important except in Brunei. Housing and standard of living are key features of South Asia, and friendships and family life are important in some countries in South Asia. Key feature in Central Asia is (relative) standard of living and housing matters in some countries in Central Asia.

In addition, we propose a unique picture and grouping of 28 societies (countries) based on factor analyses applied to satisfaction levels with 16 specific life domains. The group of countries and societies that has the materialist life sphere and the post-materialist life sphere as the first and second factors includes Japan, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan. The group of countries and societies that has the materialist life sphere and public life sphere as the first and second factors includes China, South Korea, Taiwan, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Mongolia. The group of countries and societies that has the post-materialist life sphere and the public life sphere as the first and second factors includes Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Kyrgyzstan. The group of countries and societies that has the post-materialist life sphere and the public life sphere as the first and the second factors includes Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Kazakhstan. Finally, the group that has the public life sphere and the materialist life sphere as the first and second factors includes Singapore and the Maldives. This is the picture seen from below and the QOL-based society-state typology. We argue that only through examination of the society and quality of life determinants can one glimpse the nature of state power. When we examine the characteristics of quality of life in subregions of Asia, we group into East, Southeast, South, and Central Asia. The analysis based on the aforementioned grouping according to life spheres is left to future research.

Reference

Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (2009). Avowed happiness in Confucian Asia: Ascertaining its distribution, patterns, and sources. *Social Indicators Research, 92*, 405–427.

Appendices

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0,

Appendix A: Fact Sheet

Selected indicators			Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Bhutan	Brunei	Cambodia	China
Total population (millions)			29.84	158.57	0.71	0.4	14.7	1336.72
Population growth (annual %)			2.38	1.57	1.20	1.71	1.70	0.49
Surface area (sq. km)			652,230	143,998	38,394	5,765	181,035	9,596,961
Urban population (% of total)			23	28	35	76	20	47
Combined gross enrollment ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary education (%)			45.33	48.30	59.13	73.13	54.43	69.40
Adult literacy rate (% of ages 15 and above)			28.1(2000)	47.9(2001)	47(2003)	92.7(2001)	73.6(2004)	91.6(2007)
Life expectancy at birth, total (years)			45.02	69.75	67.3	76.17	62.67	74.68
Mortality rate, under -5 (per 1,000)			257	54	81	7	90	21
GDP per capita (PPP US$)			1,000	1,700	5,000	50,300	2,000	7,400
GDP growth (annual %)			8.9	6	6.8	1	5	10.3
Inflation, GDP deflator (annual %)			13.30(2009)	8.10(2010)	4.30(2008)	2.70(2008)	4.10(2010)	5.00(2010)
Unemployment rate, Total (% of labor force)			35.0(2008)	4.8(2010)	4.0(2009)	3.7(2008)	3.5(2007)	4.3(2009)
Employment (%)	Agriculture	Women	78.6(2008–2009)	45(2008)	4.37(2004)	4.2(2008)	57.6(2009)	38.1(2008)
		Men						
	Industry	Women	5.7(2008–2009)	30(2008)	3.91(2004)	62.8(2008)	15.9(2009)	27.8(2008)
		Men						
	Services	Women	15.7(2008–2009)	25(2008)	17.2(2004)	33(2008)	26.5(2009)	34.1(2008)
		Men						
Imports of goods and services (% of GDP)			48(2008)	27(2009)	48(2009)	28(2007)	63(2009)	22(2009)
Exports of goods and services (% of GDP)			16(2008)	19(2009)	58(2009)	68(2007)	60(2009)	27(2009)
Electric power consumption (kWh per capita)			8*	154	229	8,842	10	1,684
CO_2 emission (tons per capita)			0	0.3	0.6	15.5	0.3	4.6
R&D investment (% of GDP)								1.44(2007)
Patent applications by country of origin (1995–2009)			5	535	1	73	2	1,123,277
Sanitation coverage (%)			37	53	65	100	29	55
Gini index				31			44.2	41.5
Cellular subscribers (per 1,000 people)			12,000	50,400	327	425	5,593	747,000
Internet users (per 1,000 people)			1,000	617	50	315	79	389,000
Malnutrition prevalence, weight for age (% of children under 5)				41.3(2007)	12.0(2008)		28.8(2008)	
Freedom House Score (Political Rights)			6	3	4	6	6	7
Freedom House Score (Civil Liberties)			6	4	5	5	5	6
Human development index (HDI) value			0.349	0.469		0.805	0.494	0.663
HDI rank (from 1 to 169)			155	129		37	124	89

Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Japan	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Laos	Malaysia	Maldives
7.12	1189.17	245.61	126.48	15.52	5.59	6.48	28.73	0.39
0.45	1.34	1.07	−0.28	0.40	1.43	1.68	1.58	−0.15
1,104	3,287,263	1,904,569	377,915	2,724,900	199,951	236,800	329,847	298
100	30	44	67	59	35	33	72	40
72.73	61.20	71.57	86.93	81.57	77.27	56.37	65.57	
93.5(2002)	61(2001)	90.4(2004)	99(2002)	99.5(1999)	98.7(1999)	73(2005)	88.7(2000)	93.8(2006)
82.04	66.8	71.33	82.25	68.51	70.04	62.39	73.79	74.45
2.9	69	41	4	30	38	61	6	28
45,600	3,400	4,300	34,200	12,800	2,200	2,400	14,700	4,600
6.8	8.3	6	3	7	−3.5	7.8	7.2	4
4.50(2010)	11.70(2010)	5.10(2010)	−0.70(2010)	7.80(2010)	4.80(2010)	6.00(2010)	1.70(2010)	6.00(2010)
4.3(2010)	10.8(2010)	7.1(2010)	5.1(2010)	5.5(2010)	18.0(2004)	2.9(2009)	3.5(2010)	14.5(2010)
0(2007)	52(2009)	41(2007)	4(2007)	28.2(2010)	35(2006)	75.1(2010)	10(2007)	7(2006)
0(2007)		41(2007)	4(2007)		37(2006)		18(2007)	14(2006)
6(2007)	14(2009)	15(2007)	17(2007)	18.2(2010)	11(2006)		23(2007)	32(2006)
21(2007)		21(2007)	35(2007)		26(2006)		32(2007)	20(2006)
91(2007)	34(2009)	44(2007)	77(2007)	53.6(2010)	54(2006)		67(2007)	56(2006)
78(2007)		38(2007)	59(2007)		37(2006)		51(2007)	62(2006)
187(2007)	24(2009)	21(2009)	12(2009)	34(2010)	81(2009)	44(2008)	75(2009)	94(2009)
194(2007)	20(2009)	24(2009)	13(2009)	42(2009)	50(2009)	33(2008)	96(2009)	67(2009)
6,401	618	476	8,459	4,320	2,320	126	3,196	539
5.5	1.3	1.5	10.1	12.6	1.1	0.2	7.2	2.9
0.81(2006)	0.80(2007)		3.44(2007)	0.22(2008)	0.23(2007)		0.64(2006)	
9,805	62,767	2,200	7,075,146	13,850	1,370	2	7,929	
	31	52	100	97	93	53	96	98
43.4	36.8	37.6	24.9	30.9	33.5	32.6	37.9	37.4
12,207	670,000	159,248	114,917	14,995	4,487	3,235	30,379	461
4,873	61,338	20,000	99,182	5,299	2,195	300	15,355	86
	43.5(2006)	17.5(2010)		4.9(2006)	2.7(2006)	31.6(2006)		
5	2	2	1	6	5	7	4	3
2	3	3	2	5	5	6	4	4
0.862	0.519	0.6	0.884	0.174	0.598	0.497	0.744	0.602
21	119	108	11	66	109	122	57	107

Selected Indicators			Mongolia	Myanmar	Nepal	Pakistan	Philippines
Total population (millions)			3.13	50.5*	29.39	187.34	101.83
Population growth (annual %)			1.49	1.08	1.60	1.57	1.90
Surface area (sq. km)			1,564,116	676,578	147,181	796,095	300,000
Urban population (% of total)			62	34	19	36	49
Combined gross enrollment ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary education (%)			82.13	58.33	57.70	40.97	72.47
Adult literacy rate (% of ages 15 and above)			97.8(2000)	89.9(2006)	48.6(2001)	49.9(2005)	92.6(2000)
Life expectancy at birth, total (years)			68.31	64.88	66.16	65.99	71.66
Mortality rate, under -5 (per 1,000)			41	98	51	89	32
GDP per capita (PPP US$)			3,300	1,100	1,200	2,400	3,500
GDP growth (annual %)			6.1	3.1	3.5	2.7	7.3
Inflation, GDP deflator (annual %)			13.00(20010)	9.60(2010)	8.60(2010)	13.40(2010)	3.80(2010)
Unemployment rate, Total (% of labor force)			11.5(2009)	5.7(2010)	46.0(2008)	15.0(2010)	7.3(2010)
Employment (%)	Agriculture	Women	35(2007)	70(2001)	75(2010)	72(2007)	23(2009)
		Men	41(2007)			36(2007)	42(2009)
	Industry	Women	15(2007)	7(2001)	7(2010)	13(2007)	10(2009)
		Men	21(2007)			23(2007)	18(2009)
	Services	Women	50(2007)	23(2001)	18(2010)	15(2007)	68(2009)
		Men	39(2007)			41(2007)	41(2009)
Imports of goods and services (% of GDP)			63(2009)	8*	37(2009)	20(2009)	31(2009)
Exports of goods and services (% of GDP)			56(2009)	13*	16(2009)	13(2009)	32(2009)
Electric power consumption (kWh per capita)			1.260	129	86	564	677
CO_2 emission (tons per capita)			3.6	0.2	0.1	0.9	0.8
R&D investment (% of GDP)			0.23(2007)			0.67(2007)	
Patent applications by country of origin (1995–2009)			1,320	3	8	1,036	2,947
Sanitation coverage (%)			50	81	31	45	76
Gini index			36.6		47.3	31.2	44
Cellular subscribers (per 1,000 people)			2,249	502	7,618	103,000	92227
Internet users (per 1,000 people)			330	110	578	20,431	8,278
Malnutrition prevalence, weight for age (% of children under 5)					38.8(2006)		
Freedom House Score (Political Rights)			2	7	4	4	3
Freedom House Score (Civil Liberties)			2	7	4	5	3
Human development index (HDI) value			0.622	0.451	0.428	0.49	0.638
HDI rank (from 1 to 169)			100	132	138	125	97

Singapore	South Korea	Sri Lanka	Taiwan	Tajikistan	Thailand	Turkmenistan	Uzbekistan	Vietnam
4.74	48.75	21.28	23.07	7.63	66.72	5	28.13	90.55
0.82	0.23	0.93	0.19	1.85	0.57	1.14	0.94	1.08
697	99,720	65,610	35,980	143,100	513,120	488,100	447,400	331,210
100	83	14		26	34	50	36	30
	99.10			68.93			68.90	60.23
92.5(2000)	97.9(2002)	90.7(2001)	96.1(2003)	99.5(2000)	92.6(2000)	98.8(1999)	99.3(2003)	90.3(2002)
82.14	79.05	75.73	78.32	66.03	73.6	68.52	72.51	72.18
3	5	15	5.18*	64	14	48	38	14
57,200	30,200	4,900	35,800	2,000	8,700	7,400	3,100	3,100
14.7	6.1	6.9	10.5	5.5	7.6	11	8.2	6.8
2.80(2010)	3.00(2010)	5.60(2010)	1.00(2010)	5.80(2010)	3.30(2010)	12.00(2010)	15.00(2010)	11.80(2010)
2.1(2010)	3.3(2010)	5.4(2010)	5.2(2010)	2.2(2009)	1.2(2010)	60.0(2004)	1.1(2010)	2.9(2010)
1(2007)	8(2007)	37(2007)	5.2(2010)	49.8(2009)	40(2007)	48.2(2004)	44(1995)	53.9(2009)
2(2007)	7(2007)	28(2007)			43(2007)			
18(2007)	16(2007)	27(2007)	35.9(2010)	12.8(2009)	19(2007)	14(2004)	20(1995)	20.3(2009)
26(2007)	33(2007)	26(2007)			22(2007)			
82(2007)	76(2007)	34(2007)	55.8(2010)	37.4(2009)	41(2007)	37.8(2004)	36(1995)	25.8(2009)
72(2007)	60(2007)	41(2007)			35(2007)			
203(2008)	46(2009)	28(2009)	31*	56(2009)	58(2009)	46(2009)	36(2009)	79(2009)
221(2008)	50(2009)	21(2009)	33*	13(2009)	68(2009)	76	36(2009)	68(2009)
8,685	7,710	420	9,571*	2,638	2,020	2,060	1,944	560
12.8	9.9	0.6		1	4.3	9	2.2	1.2
2.52(2007)	3.21(2007)	0.17(2007)		0.06(2007)	0.25(2006)			
21,524	1,719,615	1,632		467	9,804	207	9,195	721
100	100	91		94	96	98	100	75
42.5	31.6	41.1	32.6*	33.6	42.5	40.8	36.7	37.8
6,652	47,944	15868(2010)	26,959	4,900	83,057	1,500	16,418	98,224
3,235	39,400	1,777	16,147	700	17,483	80	4,689	23,382
		21.6(2009)			7.0(2006)		4.4(2006)	20.2(2008)
5	1	5	1	6	5	7	7	7
4	2	4	2	5	4	7	7	5
0.846	0.877	0.658		0.58	0.654	0.669	0.617	0.572
27	12	91		112	92	87	102	113

Sources: Rows 1, 2, 7 from CIA, *The 2011 World Factbook* (The numbers are estimates for 2011). Rows 9, 10, 19, 20 from CIA, *The 2011 World Factbook* (The numbers are estimates for 2010). Rows 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 29 from CIA, *The 2011 World Factbook*. Row 4 from CIA, *The 2011 World Factbook* (The numbers are data for 2010). Rows 30, 31 from CIA, *The 2011 World Factbook* (The numbers are data for 2009). Rows 1, 35, 36 from UNDP, *Human Development Report 2010*. Row 5 from UNDP, *Human Development Report 2010* (The numbers are data from 2001 to 2009). Row 29 from UNDP, *Human Development Report 2010* (The numbers are data from 2000 to 2010). Rows 8, 28 from UNDP, *Human Development Report 2010* (The numbers are estimates for 2008). Row 21 from UNDP, *Human Development Report 2010* (The numbers are estimates for 2004). Row 22 from UNDP, *Human Development Report 2010* (The numbers are estimates for 2006). Rows 13–20, 26, 32 from World Bank, *World Development Indicators*. Row 27 from World Intellectual Property Organization. Rows 33, 34 from Freedom House, *Freedom in the World 2011*.

Appendix B: Descriptive Statistics of Regression Analysis (Entire Sample)

Dependent variables	*N*	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Happiness	47,229	3.74	0.93	1	5
Enjoyment	18,106	3.06	0.72	1	4
Achievement	18,053	2.77	0.72	1	4
Independent variables					
Housing	48,288	3.85	1.06	1	5
Friendships	48,097	4.10	0.80	1	5
Marriage	34,508	4.35	0.80	1	5
Standard of living	48,103	3.62	0.97	1	5
Household income	48,134	3.40	1.05	1	5
Health	48,254	3.86	1.00	1	5
Education	47,889	3.63	1.02	1	5
Job	44,772	3.52	1.07	1	5
Neighbors	47,957	3.91	0.86	1	5
Public safety	47,660	3.51	1.07	1	5
Condition of environment	47,866	3.44	1.06	1	5
Social welfare system	43,801	3.19	1.09	1	5
Democratic system	37,698	3.31	1.06	1	5
Family life	47,904	4.08	0.86	1	5
Leisure	47,921	3.70	0.99	1	5
Spiritual life	28,611	3.81	0.95	1	5
Lifestyles					
Public water supply	48,358	0.81	0.39	0	1
Electricity	48,358	0.95	0.22	0	1
Piped gas	48,358	0.53	0.50	0	1
Number of utilities	29,587	4.12	1.80	0	7
Internet	28,290	1.95	1.46	1	5
Email	17,656	1.89	1.44	1	5
Mobile phone	17,875	2.77	1.74	1	5
Pray	38,275	3.34	1.64	1	5
Religion	47,170	0.80	0.40	0	1
Living internationally	48,358	1.05	1.18	0	6
English ability	47,557	1.90	0.92	1	4
Homeownership	48,166	0.77	0.42	0	1
Number of family members	48,351	4.75	2.45	1	33
Relative standard of living	48,225	2.98	0.72	1	5
No right to vote	42,660	0.05	0.22	0	1
Demographic characteristics					
Female	48,358	0.51	0.50	0	1
Married	48,326	0.72	0.45	0	1
Female × married	48,326	0.38	0.48	0	1
Age	48,358	2.39	1.19	1	5
Income	45,833	1.98	0.81	1	3
Educational attainment	48,187	1.95	0.80	1	3

(continued)

(continued)

Dependent variables	*N*	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Society level					
GDP	48,358	7162.7	11220.7	194.6	38215.6
Unemployment rate	45,716	6.48	7.30	0.3	46.0
Literacy rate	48,358	85.4	16.6	28	100
Political right (Freedom House)	48,358	3.56	2.19	1	7

Appendix C: Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Afghanistan

	Factors			
	Materialist	Post-materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Marriage	0.38			0.74
Standard of living	0.41			0.61
Household income	0.45			0.67
Health	0.53			0.68
Education	0.41			0.77
Job	0.42			0.72
Neighbors	0.49			0.71
Housing		0.54		0.68
Friendships		0.31		0.77
Family life		0.39		0.74
Spiritual life		0.39		0.74
Public safety			0.58	0.59
Condition of the environment			0.63	0.56
Social welfare system			0.62	0.59
Democratic system			0.56	0.65
Leisure			0.38	0.73

Notes: The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation. Loadings of greater than 0.30 were reported

Afghanistan

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	3.728
Factor 2	0.752
Factor 3	0.544
Factor 4	0.488
Factor 5	0.397
Factor 6	0.192
Factor 7	0.117
Factor 8	−0.014
Factor 9	−0.038
Factor 10	−0.081
Factor 11	−0.117
Factor 12	−0.149
Factor 13	−0.190
Factor 14	−0.232
Factor 15	−0.262
Factor 16	−0.293
n	534

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Bangladesh

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Housing	0.46			0.73
Friendships	0.30			0.86
Standard of living	0.59			0.60
Household income	0.66			0.55
Health	0.42			0.79
Education	0.67			0.54
Job	0.64			0.59
Neighbors		0.29		0.78
Public safety		0.72		0.47
Condition of the environment		0.66		0.52
Social welfare system		0.69		0.51
Democratic system		0.60		0.63
Marriage			0.28	0.86
Family life			0.57	0.56
Leisure			0.54	0.64
Spiritual life			0.42	0.78

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

Bangladesh

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	3.480
Factor 2	1.547
Factor 3	0.563
Factor 4	0.278
Factor 5	0.202
Factor 6	0.182
Factor 7	0.056
Factor 8	0.021
Factor 9	−0.054
Factor 10	−0.073
Factor 11	−0.102
Factor 12	−0.144
Factor 13	−0.186
Factor 14	−0.207
Factor 15	−0.240
Factor 16	−0.275
n	525

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Bhutan

	Factors			
	Public	Materialist	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Neighbors	0.37			0.77
Public safety	0.71			0.46
Condition of the environment	0.57			0.65
Social welfare system	0.75			0.43
Democratic system	0.56			0.68
Spiritual life	0.32			0.76
Housing		0.37		0.76
Standard of living		0.70		0.48
Household income		0.67		0.48
Health		0.33		0.80
Education		0.46		0.74
Job		0.42		0.78
Friendships			0.43	0.74
Marriage			0.55	0.66
Family life			0.62	0.57
Leisure			0.43	0.72

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

Bhutan

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	3.710
Factor 2	1.187
Factor 3	0.610
Factor 4	0.550
Factor 5	0.307
Factor 6	0.195
Factor 7	0.095
Factor 8	0.035
Factor 9	−0.006
Factor 10	−0.069
Factor 11	−0.130
Factor 12	−0.167
Factor 13	−0.194
Factor 14	−0.203
Factor 15	−0.240
Factor 16	−0.305
n	424

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Brunei

	Factors			
	Public	Materialist	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Job	0.66			0.40
Neighbors	0.59			0.39
Public safety	0.65			0.42
Condition of the environment	0.72			0.33
Social welfare system	0.72			0.33
Family life	0.72			0.34
Leisure	0.71			0.41
Standard of living		0.55		0.38
Household income		0.65		0.38
Health		0.61		0.46
Education		0.66		0.38
Housing			0.48	0.55
Friendships			0.56	0.39
Marriage			0.57	0.53

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

Brunei

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	7.182
Factor 2	0.724
Factor 3	0.401
Factor 4	0.272
Factor 5	0.147
Factor 6	0.029
Factor 7	−0.015
Factor 8	−0.039
Factor 9	−0.068
Factor 10	−0.085
Factor 11	−0.110
Factor 12	−0.140
Factor 13	−0.161
Factor 14	−0.176
n	498

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Cambodia

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Housing	0.40			0.78
Friendships	0.41			0.82
Marriage	0.35			0.85
Standard of living	0.53			0.70
Household income	0.44			0.72
Health	0.27			0.88
Education	0.28			0.87
Job	0.44			0.77
Neighbors	0.33			0.85
Family life	0.38			0.75
Public safety		0.52		0.72
Condition of the environment		0.57		0.65
Social welfare system		0.43		0.80
Democratic system		0.39		0.84
Leisure			0.54	0.68
Spiritual life			0.52	0.71

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

Cambodia

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	3.710
Factor 2	1.187
Factor 3	0.610
Factor 4	0.550
Factor 5	0.307
Factor 6	0.195
Factor 7	0.095
Factor 8	0.035
Factor 9	−0.006
Factor 10	−0.069
Factor 11	−0.130
Factor 12	−0.167
Factor 13	−0.194
Factor 14	−0.203
Factor 15	−0.240
Factor 16	−0.305
n	660

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-China

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Housing	0.44			0.75
Standard of living	0.71			0.41
Household income	0.74			0.39
Education	0.40			0.66
Job	0.49			0.61
Public safety		0.64		0.56
Condition of the environment		0.61		0.53
Social welfare system		0.63		0.47
Democratic system		0.62		0.58
Leisure		0.40		0.59
Friendships			0.46	0.70
Marriage			0.53	0.67
Health			0.43	0.74
Neighbors			0.41	0.75
Family life			0.54	0.57
Spiritual life			0.50	0.56

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

China

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.066
Factor 2	0.836
Factor 3	0.565
Factor 4	0.293
Factor 5	0.204
Factor 6	0.061
Factor 7	0.043
Factor 8	−0.020
Factor 9	−0.063
Factor 10	−0.089
Factor 11	−0.121
Factor 12	−0.148
Factor 13	−0.163
Factor 14	−0.177
Factor 15	−0.178
Factor 16	−0.222
n	2,233

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Hong Kong

	Factors			
	Post-materialist	Materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Friendships	0.41			0.70
Marriage	0.45			0.66
Health	0.30			0.79
Education	0.35			0.73
Family life	0.64			0.51
Leisure	0.73			0.40
Spiritual life	0.73			0.39
Housing		0.44		0.69
Standard of living		0.67		0.45
Household income		0.63		0.52
Job		0.40		0.64
Neighbors			0.28	0.87
Public safety			0.52	0.66
Condition of the environment			0.47	0.65
Social welfare system			0.41	0.72
Democratic system			0.33	0.81

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

Hong Kong

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	4.696
Factor 2	0.647
Factor 3	0.480
Factor 4	0.365
Factor 5	0.240
Factor 6	0.190
Factor 7	0.102
Factor 8	0.032
Factor 9	0.017
Factor 10	−0.035
Factor 11	−0.073
Factor 12	−0.159
Factor 13	−0.192
Factor 14	−0.214
Factor 15	−0.247
Factor 16	−0.266
n	604

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-India

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
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

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

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Indonesia

	Factors			
	Materialist	Post-materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Housing	0.58			0.59
Standard of living	0.71			0.45
Household income	0.79			0.37
Education	0.49			0.67
Job	0.67			0.48
Friendships		0.34		0.72
Marriage		0.60		0.54
Health		0.45		0.65
Neighbors		0.64		0.49
Public safety		0.48		0.57
Family life		0.48		0.53
Spiritual life		0.53		0.64
Condition of the environment			0.50	0.56
Social welfare system			0.61	0.49
Democratic system			0.55	0.60
Leisure			0.39	0.66

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

Indonesia

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.274
Factor 2	1.228
Factor 3	0.500
Factor 4	0.274
Factor 5	0.182
Factor 6	0.165
Factor 7	0.068
Factor 8	−0.013
Factor 9	−0.061
Factor 10	−0.079
Factor 11	−0.108
Factor 12	−0.149
Factor 13	−0.167
Factor 14	−0.184
Factor 15	−0.204
Factor 16	−0.223
n	704

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

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
Factor 16	−0.209
n	1,352

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Kazakhstan

	Factors			
	Public	Materialist	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Public safety	0.64			0.49
Condition of the environment	0.59			0.57
Social welfare system	0.76			0.37
Democratic system	0.72			0.40
Housing		0.41		0.77
Standard of living		0.78		0.32
Household income		0.74		0.34
Health		0.47		0.65
Job		0.45		0.66
Friendships			0.56	0.63
Marriage			0.70	0.49
Education			0.36	0.70
Neighbors			0.37	0.76
Family life			0.66	0.54
Leisure			0.49	0.50
Spiritual life			0.57	0.44

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

Kazakhstan

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.394
Factor 2	1.245
Factor 3	0.739
Factor 4	0.490
Factor 5	0.356
Factor 6	0.163
Factor 7	0.116
Factor 8	−0.019
Factor 9	−0.054
Factor 10	−0.067
Factor 11	−0.115
Factor 12	−0.120
Factor 13	−0.166
Factor 14	−0.180
Factor 15	−0.188
Factor 16	−0.251
n	447

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Kyrgystan

	Factors			
	Post-materialist	Materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Friendships	0.38			0.81
Marriage	0.46			0.75
Education	0.38			0.71
Neighbors	0.29			0.91
Family life	0.56			0.65
Leisure	0.57			0.57
Spiritual life	0.61			0.56
Housing		0.31		0.81
Standard of living		0.62		0.51
Household income		0.63		0.52
Health		0.41		0.77
Job		0.46		0.73
Public safety			0.61	0.58
Condition of the environment			0.48	0.72
Social welfare system			0.63	0.56
Democratic system			0.62	0.59

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

Kyrgystan

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	3.500
Factor 2	1.191
Factor 3	0.541
Factor 4	0.357
Factor 5	0.275
Factor 6	0.215
Factor 7	0.087
Factor 8	−0.009
Factor 9	−0.019
Factor 10	−0.047
Factor 11	−0.149
Factor 12	−0.192
Factor 13	−0.208
Factor 14	−0.216
Factor 15	−0.231
Factor 16	−0.267
n	412

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Laos

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Housing	0.47			0.75
Standard of living	0.66			0.52
Household income	0.60			0.62
Health	0.33			0.85
Education	0.34			0.84
Job	0.50			0.68
Family life	0.42			0.62
Neighbors		0.38		0.68
Public safety		0.54		0.70
Condition of the environment		0.59		0.63
Social welfare system		0.47		0.71
Spiritual life		0.41		0.66
Friendships			0.35	0.81
Marriage			0.37	0.81
Leisure			0.39	0.74

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

Laos

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	3.341
Factor 2	0.719
Factor 3	0.322
Factor 4	0.274
Factor 5	0.209
Factor 6	0.058
Factor 7	0.018
Factor 8	−0.043
Factor 9	−0.066
Factor 10	−0.099
Factor 11	−0.133
Factor 12	−0.168
Factor 13	−0.203
Factor 14	−0.231
Factor 15	−0.249
n	580

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Malaysia

	Factors			
	Post-materialist	Materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Friendships	0.60			0.57
Marriage	0.55			0.65
Neighbors	0.57			0.62
Family life	0.67			0.48
Leisure	0.56			0.56
Spiritual life	0.67			0.44
Housing		0.46		0.67
Standard of living		0.68		0.42
Household income		0.76		0.38
Health		0.39		0.72
Education		0.47		0.62
Job		0.65		0.53
Public safety			0.63	0.56
Condition of the environment			0.67	0.52
Social welfare system			0.69	0.47
Democratic system			0.45	0.73

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

Malaysia

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.149
Factor 2	1.087
Factor 3	0.828
Factor 4	0.302
Factor 5	0.199
Factor 6	0.142
Factor 7	0.018
Factor 8	−0.006
Factor 9	−0.023
Factor 10	−0.063
Factor 11	−0.100
Factor 12	−0.143
Factor 13	−0.169
Factor 14	−0.192
Factor 15	−0.221
Factor 16	−0.231
n	560

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Maldives

	Factors			
	Public	Materialist	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Standard of living	0.61			0.54
Household income	0.71			0.40
Health	0.65			0.46
Education	0.64			0.39
Job	0.59			0.43
Neighbors	0.48			0.48
Public safety	0.64			0.55
Condition of the environment	0.61			0.53
Social welfare system	0.55			0.64
Democratic system	0.11			0.98
Family life		0.75		0.31
Leisure		0.76		0.34
Spiritual life		0.78		0.35
Housing			0.40	0.68
Friendships			0.71	0.35
Marriage			0.57	0.50

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

Maldives

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	6.179
Factor 2	1.173
Factor 3	0.714
Factor 4	0.607
Factor 5	0.278
Factor 6	0.179
Factor 7	0.124
Factor 8	0.045
Factor 9	0.024
Factor 10	−0.041
Factor 11	−0.074
Factor 12	−0.116
Factor 13	−0.136
Factor 14	−0.180
Factor 15	−0.215
Factor 16	−0.246
n	361

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Mongolia

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Standard of living	0.72			0.43
Household income	0.79			0.36
Health	0.46			0.64
Education	0.57			0.65
Job	0.58			0.65
Family life	0.39			0.68
Leisure	0.47			0.74
Spiritual life	0.53			0.59
Public safety		0.70		0.50
Condition of the environment		0.76		0.38
Social welfare system		0.68		0.50
Democratic system		0.60		0.61
Neighbors			0.40	0.70
Housing			0.43	0.72
Friendships			0.54	0.59
Marriage			0.57	0.63

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

Mongolia

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	4.542
Factor 2	1.473
Factor 3	0.633
Factor 4	0.498
Factor 5	0.239
Factor 6	0.116
Factor 7	0.015
Factor 8	−0.017
Factor 9	−0.041
Factor 10	−0.067
Factor 11	−0.113
Factor 12	−0.147
Factor 13	−0.149
Factor 14	−0.198
Factor 15	−0.223
Factor 16	−0.237
n	443

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Myanmar

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Housing	0.55			0.61
Friendships	0.38			0.71
Standard of living	0.62			0.52
Household income	0.67			0.52
Health	0.38			0.79
Education	0.51			0.71
Job	0.59			0.60
Neighbors		0.70		0.47
Public safety		0.78		0.38
Condition of the environment		0.70		0.49
Family life		0.46		0.57
Leisure		0.33		0.80
Spiritual life		0.17		0.97
Marriage			0.45	0.71

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

Myanmar

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	3.679
Factor 2	1.100
Factor 3	0.382
Factor 4	0.182
Factor 5	0.093
Factor 6	0.071
Factor 7	0.048
Factor 8	−0.054
Factor 9	−0.089
Factor 10	−0.129
Factor 11	−0.154
Factor 12	−0.174
Factor 13	−0.213
Factor 14	−0.242
n	471

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Nepal

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Housing	0.51			0.65
Standard of living	0.70			0.47
Household income	0.72			0.47
Health	0.42			0.79
Education	0.65			0.55
Job	0.59			0.63
Leisure	0.26			0.91
Spiritual life	0.19			0.93
Public safety		0.56		0.62
Condition of the environment		0.59		0.62
Social welfare system		0.70		0.50
Democratic system		0.62		0.61
Friendships			0.48	0.64
Marriage			0.40	0.70
Neighbors			0.42	0.70
Family life			0.47	0.69

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

Nepal

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	3.667
Factor 2	1.341
Factor 3	0.511
Factor 4	0.303
Factor 5	0.190
Factor 6	0.173
Factor 7	0.060
Factor 8	0.015
Factor 9	−0.002
Factor 10	−0.068
Factor 11	−0.117
Factor 12	−0.129
Factor 13	−0.161
Factor 14	−0.197
Factor 15	−0.231
Factor 16	−0.317
n	380

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

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

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Philippines

	Factors			
	Public	Materialist	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Public safety	0.68			0.48
Condition of the environment	0.78			0.33
Social welfare system	0.74			0.40
Democratic system	0.67			0.49
Housing		0.52		0.63
Standard of living		0.62		0.48
Household income		0.65		0.50
Health		0.44		0.66
Education		0.62		0.53
Job		0.63		0.51
Friendships			0.41	0.77
Marriage			0.48	0.73
Neighbors			0.42	0.65
Family life			0.53	0.54
Leisure			0.47	0.53
Spiritual life			0.54	0.63

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

The Philippines

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.481
Factor 2	1.081
Factor 3	0.596
Factor 4	0.339
Factor 5	0.246
Factor 6	0.142
Factor 7	0.026
Factor 8	−0.015
Factor 9	−0.050
Factor 10	−0.098
Factor 11	−0.125
Factor 12	−0.138
Factor 13	−0.155
Factor 14	−0.181
Factor 15	−0.187
Factor 16	−0.217
n	764

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

Singapore

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

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-South Korea

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Housing	0.50			0.61
Standard of living	0.73			0.34
Household income	0.77			0.37
Health	0.49			0.72
Education	0.59			0.63
Job	0.62			0.57
Leisure	0.48			0.60
Spiritual life	0.44			0.61
Public safety		0.65		0.54
Condition of the environment		0.66		0.48
Social welfare system		0.63		0.51
Democratic system		0.60		0.59
Friendships			0.48	0.65
Marriage			0.53	0.49
Neighbors			0.42	0.70
Family life			0.49	0.49

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

South Korea

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.488
Factor 2	1.108
Factor 3	0.495
Factor 4	0.276
Factor 5	0.236
Factor 6	0.142
Factor 7	0.017
Factor 8	−0.021
Factor 9	−0.053
Factor 10	−0.068
Factor 11	−0.122
Factor 12	−0.127
Factor 13	−0.146
Factor 14	−0.183
Factor 15	−0.199
Factor 16	−0.215
n	689

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Sri Lanka

	Factors			
	Public	Post-materialist	Materialist	Uniqueness
Public safety	0.69			0.50
Condition of the environment	0.76			0.39
Social welfare system	0.81			0.31
Democratic system	0.66			0.55
Leisure	0.39			0.64
Housing		0.47		0.74
Friendships		0.35		0.71
Standard of living		0.71		0.45
Household income		0.75		0.40
Health		0.43		0.66
Education		0.44		0.63
Job		0.54		0.61
Marriage			0.57	0.64
Neighbors			0.46	0.65
Family life			0.57	0.63
Spiritual life			0.49	0.68

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

Sri Lanka

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	4.687
Factor 2	1.407
Factor 3	0.717
Factor 4	0.367
Factor 5	0.321
Factor 6	0.189
Factor 7	0.030
Factor 8	0.008
Factor 9	−0.062
Factor 10	−0.093
Factor 11	−0.114
Factor 12	−0.148
Factor 13	−0.175
Factor 14	−0.194
Factor 15	−0.228
Factor 16	−0.232
n	462

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Taiwan

	Factors			
	Materialist	Post-materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Standard of living	0.65			0.45
Household income	0.70			0.41
Health	0.50			0.69
Education	0.59			0.61
Job	0.69			0.48
Leisure	0.45			0.57
Housing		0.49		0.66
Friendships		0.52		0.67
Marriage		0.64		0.52
Neighbors		0.48		0.73
Family life		0.67		0.47
Spiritual life		0.53		0.50
Public safety			0.60	0.61
Condition of the environment			0.54	0.56
Social welfare system			0.72	0.43
Democratic system			0.53	0.71

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

Taiwan

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	4.974
Factor 2	1.177
Factor 3	0.783
Factor 4	0.339
Factor 5	0.293
Factor 6	0.237
Factor 7	0.077
Factor 8	0.025
Factor 9	−0.069
Factor 10	−0.071
Factor 11	−0.108
Factor 12	−0.161
Factor 13	−0.176
Factor 14	−0.196
Factor 15	−0.209
Factor 16	−0.255
n	678

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Tajikistan

	Factors			
	Materialist	Post-materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Housing	0.68			0.51
Standard of living	0.79			0.33
Household income	0.81			0.32
Health	0.41			0.72
Education	0.44			0.64
Job	0.65			0.45
Democratic system	0.47			0.60
Leisure	0.70			0.41
Spiritual life	0.65			0.42
Friendships		0.52		0.58
Marriage		0.69		0.49
Neighbors		0.45		0.77
Public safety		0.35		0.84
Family life		0.55		0.63
Condition of the environment			0.40	0.82
Social welfare system			0.51	0.60

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

Tajikistan

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.046
Factor 2	1.164
Factor 3	0.645
Factor 4	0.432
Factor 5	0.294
Factor 6	0.188
Factor 7	0.091
Factor 8	0.065
Factor 9	0.018
Factor 10	−0.055
Factor 11	−0.109
Factor 12	−0.123
Factor 13	−0.174
Factor 14	−0.204
Factor 15	−0.233
Factor 16	−0.265
n	390

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Thailand

	Factors			
	Post-materialist	Materialist	Public	Uniqueness
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

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
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

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Uzbekistan

	Factors			
	Materialist	Post-materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Housing	0.36			0.77
Standard of living	0.70			0.44
Household income	0.72			0.44
Health	0.38			0.72
Education	0.27			0.87
Job	0.46			0.74
Neighbors	0.28			0.84
Leisure	0.50			0.69
Spiritual life	0.44			0.73
Friendships		0.36		0.81
Marriage		0.75		0.41
Family life		0.78		0.37
Public safety			0.56	0.65
Condition of the environment			0.55	0.67
Social welfare system			0.58	0.57
Democratic system			0.50	0.68

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

Uzbekistan

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	3.986
Factor 2	0.983
Factor 3	0.643
Factor 4	0.407
Factor 5	0.292
Factor 6	0.215
Factor 7	0.127
Factor 8	0.046
Factor 9	−0.020
Factor 10	−0.076
Factor 11	−0.121
Factor 12	−0.168
Factor 13	−0.198
Factor 14	−0.209
Factor 15	−0.229
Factor 16	−0.282
n	376

Distinguishing Life Sphere of Domain Assessments-Vietnam

	Factors			
	Post-materialist	Materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Friendships	0.35			0.73
Marriage	0.48			0.71
Education	0.39			0.70
Family life	0.61			0.51
Leisure	0.49			0.64
Spiritual life	0.58			0.57
Housing		0.43		0.76
Standard of living		0.69		0.49
Household income		0.74		0.42
Health		0.37		0.73
Job		0.37		0.72
Neighbors			0.49	0.62
Public safety			0.67	0.54
Condition of the environment			0.64	0.57
Social welfare system			0.61	0.55

Vietnam

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	4.205
Factor 2	1.081
Factor 3	0.460
Factor 4	0.224
Factor 5	0.171
Factor 6	0.050
Factor 7	0.048
Factor 8	−0.035
Factor 9	−0.049
Factor 10	−0.086
Factor 11	−0.132
Factor 12	−0.158
Factor 13	−0.196
Factor 14	−0.227
Factor 15	−0.248
Factor 16	−0.246
n	638

Index

T. Inoguchi and S. Fujii, *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Quality of Life in Asia 1, DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9072-0,

T