

International Handbooks of Quality-of-Life

Wolfgang Glatzer  
and  
Laura Camfield  
Valerie Møller  
Mariano Rojas *Editors*

# Global Handbook of Quality of Life

Exploration of Well-Being of Nations and  
Continents

 Springer

Takashi Inoguchi

---

## Introduction

The definition of wellbeing depends primarily on subjective assessment about how you feel about yourself in society. Especially the adjective, well, is bound to be highly subjective. Thus when we discuss wellbeing, multiple modes of wellbeing is a natural phrasing. Hence, wellbeing is defined by how positively or negatively an individual feels about her/his existence in society, whether it is about happiness, health, prosperity, accomplishment, or whatever other area is under consideration. This definition is quite appropriate when I examine wellbeing in Asia. Asia is not only demographically dense but also economically dynamic. But most important here is the diversity of wellbeing in Asia. And this is why I titled my essay multiple modes of wellbeing.

Multiple wellbeings might remind one of multiple modernities. Multiple modernities contain the dimension of time and evolution. The idea is that modernity is not a singular evolution of society that commences with the liberation of art from Christianity (e.g., Rafael), science (e.g., Gallileo), politics (e.g., Reformation) through the industrial revolution and democratization as experienced in Western

Europe. There must be many distinctive paths observed in reaching modernity. Also, modernity is defined in so many ways. Hence, the ascendance of the concept of multiple modernities has gained a general acceptance (Eisenstadt 2002, 2006). In a similar vein, multiple wellbeings should be examined. One of the most important features of multiple wellbeings is that it can be specified not only at the national level but also at the individual level. This feature distinguishes itself from multiple modernities. That multiple wellbeings can be specified at the individual level enables this concept to be amenable to scientific empirical testing of the strictest kind. The concept of multiple modernities is also amenable to scientific empirical testing (Bates et al. 1998). But it is not of a strict kind. It is more by the case study or systematic comparative method. In this respect multiple wellbeings allow one to be used as a pluri-potent concept: Pluri-potent is most frequently used in relation to a stem cell that has multiple potentials in its growth. This stream of analysis includes individual wellbeing, group wellbeing, national wellbeing, supra-national wellbeing (regional wellbeing, wellbeing by religion, wellbeing by beliefs, wellbeing by gender, wellbeing by race, wellbeing by class, wellbeing by income level, wellbeing by educational level, wellbeing by language, etc.).

---

T. Inoguchi (✉)

Emeritus Professor, President and Chairman of the Board,  
University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

Emeritus Professor, President and Chairman of the Board,  
University of Niigata Prefecture, Niigata, Japan  
e-mail: [inoguchi@ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp](mailto:inoguchi@ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp)

## Multiple Wellbeings as Prioritized Life Aspects

In the AsiaBarometer Survey (Inoguchi 2012; Inoguchi and Fujii 2012) that we executed annually between 2003 and 2008, we posed five questions in areas that impact the respondents' perception on quality-of-life and lifestyle. Life aspects include such items as health, home, job, family, income, being devout, and medical care, and workplace success. We have 52,215 observations in the AsiaBarometer Survey.

We simply count the number of chosen priorities in all of Asia and by country.

**Question:** Of the following lifestyle aspects or life circumstances, please select the five that are most important (Table 27.1). (Twenty lifestyle aspects or life circumstances are listed in the surveys in 2003, 2004, and 2005. Twenty-five lifestyle aspects or life circumstances are listed in the surveys in 2006, 2007, and 2008. The selection of “none of the above” and “don't know” responses are listed.)

**Table 27.1** Lifestyle aspects each respondent asked to choose five from among those listed below

Lifestyle aspects	Important	Not mentioned
1. Appreciating art and culture	1	0
2. Being able to live without fear of crime	1	0
3. Being devout	1	0
4. Being famous	1	0
5. Being healthy	1	0
6. Being on good terms with others	1	0
7. Being successful at work	1	0
8. Contributing to your local community or to society	1	0
9. Don't know	1	0
10. Dressing up	1	0
11. Earning a high income	1	0
12. Enjoying leisure	1	0
13. Expressing your personality or using your talents	1	0
14. Freedom of expression and association <sup>a</sup>	1	0
15. Having a comfortable home	1	0
16. Having a job	1	0
17. Having access to good medical care if required	1	0
18. Having access to higher education (beyond compulsory schooling)	1	0
19. Having enough to eat	1	0
20. Having pleasant community to live <sup>a</sup>	1	0
21. Having safe and clean environment <sup>a</sup>	1	0
22. Living in a country with a good government <sup>a</sup>	1	0
23. None of the above	1	0
24. Owning lots of nice things	1	0
25. Raising children <sup>a</sup>	1	0
26. Spending time with your family	1	0
27. Winning over others	1	0

<sup>a</sup>Aspects numbered 21 through 25 were added to surveys in 2006, 2007, and 2008

Asia-wide refers to the regions of East, South-east, South, and Central Asia. For the countries within these regions, the most highly prioritized life aspects or domains are in the following order: health, home, diet, job, and family.

National diversity is our focus. To better and more parsimoniously handle national diversities, we have factor-analyzed country by country, with a varimax rotation, prioritized life aspects or domains (for details, see Inoguchi and Fujii 2012). Three factors have emerged: the materialist factor, the post-materialist factor, and the public sector dominance factor. The materialist factor is determined by such priorities as housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The post-materialist factor is characterized by such priorities as friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, spiritual life, and public safety. The public sector dominance factor is composed of such priorities as condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The materialist factor is also called the QOL-sustaining factor, whereas the post-materialist factor is called the QOL-enriching factor and the public sector dominant factor is called the QOL-enabling factor. It is worth remembering that, when the factor analysis was applied Asia-wide to all the 29 countries, the first factor’s eigenvalue is 5.4, compared to the second factor’s value of 1.0 and the third factor’s eigenvalues of 0.5. Thus, from an Asia-wide perspective, the materialist factor is dominant. The post-materialist and public sector dominance factors are auxiliary. Here, it is important to note that: (1) the materialist factor is not always the most important in life; (2) the post-materialist factor is not always the second most important factor, which develops after the materialist factor is met in life; and (3) the public sector dominance factor is not always the least important of the three factors. National diversity is pronounced. That is determined by the configuration of life prioritizing of individuals and many other factors that are above individual preference and also beyond individual control.

To view national diversity, we factor-analyzed life aspects or domain priorities country by country. Here, it is very important to note at the outset that not all countries exhibit an overwhelming dominance of the materialist

**Table 27.2** Generating society typology through life aspect prioritizing from bottom (factor dimensions after varimax rotation)

	1	2
Ab	Materialism	Post-materialism
Ac	Materialism	Public sector dominance
B	Post-materialism	Materialism
Ca	Post-materialism	Public sector dominance
Cb	Public sector dominance	Materialism

factor. If we look at the first two factors only and categorize country types on how the three factors are deemed important in terms of the size of eigenvalues country by country, the following life priority types can be listed: Ab, Ac, Ba, Bc, Ca, Cb (Table 27.2).

Because there is empirically no Bc type, the distinction between Ba and Bc is not necessary. Therefore, we use B, and not Ba or Bc. Hence, there are five life priority types empirically: Ab, Ac, B, Ca and Cb. Which countries fit one of these types?

Ab five societies: Japan, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan.

Ac ten societies: China, South Korea, Taiwan, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Mongolia.

B five societies: Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Kyrgyzstan.

Ca six societies: Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Kazakhstan.

Cb two societies: Singapore and the Maldives.

Ab refers to the materialist factor dominance, followed by the auxiliary post-materialist factor. The following five countries belong to the Ab type: Japan, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan. Ac refers to the materialist factor dominance, followed by the auxiliary public sector dominance factor. The following ten countries/societies are of the Ac type: China, South Korea, Taiwan, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Mongolia. B refers to the post-materialist factor dominance, followed by the auxiliary materialist factor. The following countries/societies belong to the B type: Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Kyrgyzstan. Ca refers to the post-materialist factor dominance, followed by the auxiliary public sector dominance factor. The following six countries/societies are of

Ca type: Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Kazakhstan. Cb refers to the public sector dominance factor, followed by the auxiliary materialist factor. The following countries/societies are of the Cb type: Singapore and the Maldives.

The above life priorities based typology and its “membership” may not be familiar to some readers. To other readers, materialism and post-materialism are familiar from the immensely influential writings of Ronald Inglehart (1977, 1990, 1997, 1989; Inglehart and Welzel 2005). However, his meaning of these two concepts is very different from our meaning of the terms. Here, materialism refers to QOL-sustaining and post-materialism refers to QOL-enriching. In addition to materialism and post-materialism, prioritized life aspects also reflect those public sector dominant societies. This is called the public sector dominance factor or the QOL-enabling factor, because without public sector infrastructure and public policy management, people’s lives are sometimes unsustainable. The use of these two terms are very clearly differentiated from Inglehart’s use of materialism and post-materialism. Due to the lack of better concepts, we use materialism and post-materialism in a very different sense. Our use is justified because our concepts are based on prioritized life aspects in Asia, much closer and broader concepts of life preference patterns. It is very critical to note at this point that these types are rooted in a comprehensive, systematic, and empirical analysis of the daily life priorities as reported by 52,215 respondents throughout Asia (Inoguchi and Fujii 2012; cf. Kato 2012). The picture that emerges of these countries/societies represents, in a sense, a snapshot from below. In other words, the result is an evidence-based typology of societies.

---

## Profiles of Countries/Societies as Seen from Below

### Ab Type: Weak State-Strong Society

The Ab type social system includes Afghanistan, Indonesia, Japan, Taiwan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. Let me examine each country one

by one. Lifestyle priorities in Afghanistan are: diet, health, home, being devout, and job in this order. It is significant to note the high priority given to diet and being devout. The life domains that weigh heavily on the materialist factor are: marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, and neighbors. The valuable point in this data is the high priority given to marriage, capped by the materialist factor. The life domains that are prominent on the post-materialist factor are: housing, friendships, family life, and spiritual life. The life domains that figure heavily on the public sector dominance factor are: condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, and leisure.

Let me turn to Indonesia. Lifestyle priorities in Indonesia are: health, diet, home, being devout, and job in this order. In this country study, the significance of the data is the high ranking given to being devout. The life domains that emphasize heavily on the materialist factor are: housing, standard of living, household income, education, and job. The life domains that rise to prominence for the post-materialist factor are: friendships, marriage, health, neighbors, public safety, family life, and spiritual life. The life domains that are significant in the public sector dominance factor are: condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, and leisure.

In Japan, lifestyle priorities in are: health, family, job, home, others in this order. It is worth noting that others receive a high priority in Japanese society. Attention to others is very much a matter of social survival (Inoguchi 2011; Nakane 1970). The life domains heavily featured on the materialist factor are: housing, standard of living, household income, education, and job. The life domains highly valued in the post-materialist factor are: friendships, marriage, health, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains that played prominently in the public sector dominance factor are: neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The prioritized life aspects in Japanese society appear to be roughly harmonious with Inglehart’s materialism and post-materialism.

This convergence is natural as Inglehart deals primarily with advanced industrial democracies, and Japan is one of them in Asia.

In Taiwan, lifestyle priorities are not available as life priorities were not measured there. The life domains expressed heavily in the materialist factor of Taiwan are: standard of living, household income, health, job, leisure, and housing. The value placed on leisure on the materialist factor for Taiwan is significant. The life domains highly appreciated in the post-materialist factor are: friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, and spiritual life. The life domains valued heavily in the public sector dominance factor in Taiwan are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

In Tajikistan, lifestyle priorities are: health, diet, home, job, and income in this order. The valued life domains that emerge from the materialist factor are: housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, democratic system, leisure, and spiritual life. It is important to note that such life spheres as democratic system, leisure, and spiritual life play heavily on the materialist factor. The life domains that rise to prominence in the post-materialist factor are: friendships, marriage, neighbors, public safety, and family life. It is significant that public safety is part of the leading life aspects in the post-materialist factor. The life domains that are particularly valued in the public sector dominance factor are: condition of the environment and social welfare system.

In Uzbekistan, lifestyle priorities are: health, home, income, job, diet in this order. The life domains that stood out in the materialist factor are: housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, leisure, and spiritual life. It is important to note that neighbors, leisure, and spiritual life are included in this category. They are associated closely with survival (Dadabaev 2006). The life domains that determined the post-materialist factor are: friendships, marriage, and family life. The life domains heavily loaded on the public sector dominance factor are: public safety,

condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

It is not too odd to characterize Afghanistan, Indonesia, Japan, Taiwan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan as a weak state, but strong society. A strong society is exemplified by the heavy emphasis given to certain life priorities on the materialist factor, such as neighbors, others, spiritual life, family life, and public safety. Chie Nakane's (1970) account of Japanese society, Takeshi Matsui's (2011) account of Pushtun tribal communities, and Timor Dadabaev's account of Uzbekistan neighborhood communities roughly corroborate this feature of the Ab type social system. The societal picture that emerges in the next section reveals similarities with societies not conventionally associated with the picture that emerged in the above section, most notably by regime type (Dahl 1971; Linz 2000; Gunther et al. 2002; Blondel 2012).

Of the five countries/societies, Japan and Indonesia are noted for their weak state-strong society pattern. In another survey-based study (Blondel and Inoguchi 2006), which focused on Asia and Europe, citizens' identities, citizens' confidence in the state, and citizens' satisfaction in the performance of the state in 18 countries/societies are examined. Canonical correlation analysis of those responses has yielded the countries/societies types on a diagram in which Japan and Indonesia are spatially similar in their location. Both countries/societies are noted for weak identity, weak confidence in the state, and weak satisfaction in the state's performance.

Afghanistan arguably has no state of which to speak. It has strong tribal communities (Matsui 2011). Tribal groups have a very strong sense of self-identity. They reside and move as their herds search for new grass growing on the plains. Their group solidarity and fierce spirit to fight tenaciously against what they consider to be intruders are well known. The Pushtuns and Baluchis are two such groups that anthropologist Matsui (2011) portrays vividly. The capital city of Kabul is dependent on foreign assistance and resources.

Uzbekistan and Tajikistan are states of the former Soviet Union. Now separate from their

twentieth-century legacy, these states do not exercise very much authoritarian power vis-à-vis society. Rather ethnic groups are strong in community development and protection (Dadabaev 2010).

Let us turn to the Ac type social system. It amounts to ten societies with four subtypes. Let us examine Ac1, Ac2, Ac3, Ac4 one by one.

### **Ac Type: Strong Society – Strong State**

*Ac1 includes China and South Korea* Lifestyle priorities in China are: health, home, job, medical care, and low crime rates. The life domains greatly appreciated by the materialist factor in China are: housing, standard of living, household income, education, and job. The life domains in the public sector dominance factor in China are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, and leisure. The life domains readily apparent in the post-materialist factor in China are: friendships, marriage, health, neighbors, family life, and spiritual life.

Lifestyle priorities in South Korea are: health, home, family, job, and income. The life domains heavily favored in the public sector dominance factor in South Korea are: housing, standard of living, household income, health, job, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains that stand out in the public sector dominance factor in South Korea are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains strongly appreciated in the post-materialist factor in South Korea are: friendships, marriage, neighbors, and family life.

The common dominant features of China and South Korea are strong society and strong state. A strong society is defined by individualism and clan organization. Individualism sometimes verges on anarchism in pursuit of wealth and the clan's defense. In contrast, the state recruits and develops privileged elite corps by a sort of meritocracy, within which a strong state apparatus is forged. Hence, a strong society and a strong state (Wright 2010; Henderson 1968).

*Ac2 includes Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar* Lifestyle priorities in Cambodia are: diet, health, home, job, and income. The life domains strongly valued in the materialist factor in Cambodia are: housing, friendships, marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, and family life. The life domains appreciated in the public sector dominance factor in Cambodia are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

Lifestyle priorities in Laos are: health, diet, home, job, and family. The life domains valued in the post-materialist factor in Cambodia are: leisure and spiritual life. The life domains emphasized in the materialist factor in Laos are: housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, and family life. The life domains heavily supported in the public sector dominance factor in Laos are: neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and spiritual life.

Lifestyle priorities in Myanmar are: health, diet, being devout, home, and job. It is important to note that being devout is highly ranked as a life priority. Myanmar is a strongly Buddhist society. The life domains rated prominently in the post-materialist factor in Laos are: friendships, marriage, and leisure. The life domains heavily preferred in the materialist factor in Myanmar are: housing, friendships, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The life domains greatly supported in the public sector dominance factor in Myanmar are: neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains valued in the post-materialist factor in Myanmar is: marriage (Fave and Knoop 2012).

Common to Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar is a strong presence of continental Indian civilization in Southeast Asian states. Common to all three systems is the blurred distinction of what is normally regarded as the public and the private. Both co-mingle, serving the daily life of people. Hills, floods, and contesting tribal groups prevent the state from being too heavily intrusive on

society. In other words, the state exercises power where the society maintains its hold. An extreme example is the dominant Burman ethnic group of Myanmar who controls the federal state and must cope with armed ethnic minorities (Steinberg 2009; Taylor and Hlaing 2005).

### **The Ac3 Type Social System Includes Bangladesh, India, and Nepal**

Lifestyle priorities in Bangladesh are: health, medical care, low crime rates, being devout, and home. The life domains that are heavily favored in the materialist factor in Bangladesh are: housing, friendships, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The life domains strongly preferred in the public sector dominance factor in Bangladesh are: neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains robustly chosen in the post-materialist factor in Bangladesh are: marriage, family life, leisure, and spiritual life.

Lifestyle priorities in India are: health, home, diet, job, and family. The life domains valued in the materialist factor in India are: housing, friendships, marriage, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, and neighbors. The life domains that emerged in the public sector dominance factor in India are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains that are valued in the post-materialist factor in India are: family life, leisure, and spiritual life.

Lifestyle priorities in Nepal are: health, diet, job, work, and low crime rate. The life domains that ranked highly in the materialist factor in Nepal are: housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, job, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains strongly favored in the public sector dominance factor in Nepal are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains strongly endorsed in the post-materialist factor in Nepal are: friendship, marriage, neighbors, and family life.

Bangladesh, India, and Nepal have an Indianized state structure of British colonial bureaucratic authoritarianism in which society never yields. In other words, the penetration of the state is shallow. Takashi Inoguchi (2004) reveals, by factor analysis applied to the perception of trust in ten Asian countries, that British colonial legacy looms large, second to the perception of human nature (good vs. evil), and followed by communist systemic influence (cf. Inoguchi et al. 2007).

*The Ac4 type system includes Mongolia* - Lifestyle priorities in Mongolia are: health, home, diet, job, and medical care. The life domains heavily selected in the materialist factor in Mongolia are: standard of living, household income, health, education, job, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains strongly supported in the public sector dominance factor in Mongolia are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains that receive high ratings in the post-materialist factor in Mongolia are: neighbors, housing, friendships, and marriage. A pronounced feature of the Mongolian system is the absolute importance of family, geography, geology, and climate along with its neighbors, Russia and China. The state comes in to sustain lives (Humphrey and Sneath 1999).

*The B type system has five societies: Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Kyrgyzstan* Lifestyle priorities in Hong Kong are: not available as they have not been measured.

The life domains heavily favored in the post-materialist factor in Hong Kong are: friendships, marriage, health, education, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains in the materialist factor in Hong Kong are: housing, standard of living, household income, and job. The life domains that emerged in the public sector dominant factor in Hong Kong are: neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

Lifestyle priorities in Malaysia are: health, home, diet, family, and job. The life domains highly endorsed in the post-materialist factor in



Malaysia are: friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains that are greatly valued in the materialist factor in Malaysia are: housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The life domains heavily favored in the public sector dominant factor in Malaysia are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

Lifestyle priorities in Thailand are: health, diet, home, job, and family. The life domains highly endorsed in the post-materialist factor in Thailand are: housing, friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains valued in the public sector dominance factor in Thailand are: standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The life domains strongly rated in the public sector dominant factor in Thailand are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

Lifestyle priorities in Vietnam are: health, job, diet, home, and work. The life domains frequently selected in the post-materialist factor in Vietnam are: friendships, marriage, education, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains widely supported in the materialist factor in Vietnam are: housing, standard of living, household income, health, and job. The life domains valued in the public sector dominance factor in Vietnam are: neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, and social welfare system.

A common quality among Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam is that all four places are more or less havens for new settlers where competition and coexistence must be well handled among near-strangers. Post-materialist features are salient and materialist features are just as strong. However, state power is receding. A Vietnamese proverb aptly depicts the situation: state power is up to the bamboo gate (Woodside 2006). The proverb is especially suitable for northern Vietnam, but is not necessarily applicable to central and southern Vietnam, where state power has limited penetration of the markets of settlers and strangers.

Lifestyle priorities in Kyrgyzstan are friendships, house, and living standard along with spiritual life. The life domains frequently selected in the post-materialist factor in Kyrgyzstan are friendships, marriage, education, neighbors, family, leisure and spiritual life. The life domains salient in the materialist sector are living standard, household income, health, and job. The life domains pronounced in the public sector dominance are public safety, conditions of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system.

***Ca type: Societies where post-materialist features are dominant; include Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Kazakhstan*** Lifestyle priorities in Brunei are: health, home, diet, family, and job. Lifestyle priorities in Bhutan are: health, home, diet, job, and workplace success. The life domains emphasized in the public sector dominant factor in Brunei are: job, neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, family life, and leisure. The valued life domains in the materialist factor in Brunei are: standard of living, household income, health, and education. The important life domains in the post-materialist factor in Brunei are: education, friendships, and marriage.

Lifestyle priorities in the Philippines are: diet, health, home, job, and family. The life domains appreciated in the public sector dominant factor in the Philippines are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains heavily esteemed in the materialist factor in the Philippines are: housing, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The life domains valued in the post-materialist factor in the Philippines are: friendships, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life.

Lifestyle priorities in Bhutan are housing, education, spiritual life, and pray. The life domains salient in the public sector dominance factor are neighbors, public safety, conditions of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, and spiritual life. The life domains

pronounced in the materialist factor are housing, living standard, household income, health, education, and job. The life domains frequently selected in the post-materialist factor are friendships, marriage, family, and leisure.

Lifestyle priorities in Pakistan are: health, diet, home, being devout, and income. The leading life domains in the public sector dominant factor in Pakistan are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains prominent in the materialist factor in Pakistan are: housing, friendships, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The life domains valued in the post-materialist factor in Pakistan are: marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life.

Lifestyle priorities in Sri Lanka are: health, diet, home, family, and job. The life domains most cherished in the public sector dominant factor in Sri Lanka are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains deemed important in the post-materialist factor in Sri Lanka are: housing, friendships, standard of living, household income, health, education, and job. The life domains valued most in the materialist factor in Sri Lanka are: marriage, neighbors, family life, and spiritual life.

Lifestyle priorities in Kazakhstan are: health, job, home, medical care, and income. The life domains most appreciated in the public sector dominant factor in Kazakhstan are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains most important in the materialist factor in Kazakhstan are: housing, standard of living, household income, health, and job. The life domains strongly valued in the post-materialist factor in Kazakhstan are: friendship, marriage, education neighbors, family life leisure, and spiritual life.

A common feature of Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Kazakhstan is the domineering behavior of state. However, in each country it is a weak state domineering among a centrifugal society, with each component of society asserting itself sporadically. Pakistan represents a dominating state and a

strong society, which has prompted one of the authors about Pakistan to title his book, *Pakistan: A hard country* (Lieven 2012).

### The Cb Type System Includes Singapore and the Maldives

Lifestyle priorities in Singapore are: health, home, job, family, and diet. The valued life domains in the public sector dominant factor in Singapore are: public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domains heavily favored in the post-materialist factor in Singapore are: housing, marriage, neighbors, family life, leisure, and spiritual life. The life domains strongly appreciated in the materialist factor in Singapore are: standard of living, household income, health, education, and job.

Lifestyle priorities in the Maldives are: diet, medical care, low crime rates, health, and job. The life domains most selected in the public sector dominant factor in the Maldives are: standard of living, household income, health, education, job, neighbors, public safety, condition of the environment, social welfare system, and democratic system. The life domain valued in the materialist factor in the Maldives is: family life. The life domains most appreciated in the

**Table 27.3** Society typology through life aspect priorities from bottom (factor dimensions after varimax rotation)

<i>Ab type materialism followed by post-materialism</i>
Weak state/strong society
Japan, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan
<i>Ac type materialism followed by public sector dominance</i>
Strong society/strong state
Ac1 China, South Korea (East Asia)
Ac2 Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar (Southeast Asia)
Ac3 Bangladesh, India, Nepal (South Asia)
Ac4 Mongolia (Central Asia)
<i>B type post-materialism followed by materialism</i>
Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, Kyrgyzstan
Ca type Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Kazakhstan
Post-materialism followed by public sector dominance
Cb type public sector dominance followed by materialism
Singapore, the Maldives

post-materialist factor in the Maldives are: housing, friendships, and marriage.

A common feature to Singapore and the Maldives is that the state is really dominant. The society is seemingly compliant and docile. However, outside the framework of regulation and imposition by the state, society is more vibrant in Singapore (Koh and Ling 2000).

---

## Conclusion

Guided by the notion of multiple modes of wellbeing, I have constructed a typology of societies based on life priorities. The strength of this method is that it is evidence-based in that each respondent's responses to life priorities are nationally aggregated by factor analysis with varimax rotation and that the combination of two of the three large factors, materialism, post-materialism and public sector dominance, enables me to have eight society types in Asia as summarized in Table 27.3.

The definitions of materialism, post-materialism, and public sector dominance are in other words, quality-of-life-sustaining, quality-of-life-enriching, and quality-of-life-enabling factors. They are somewhat different from those used by Inglehart. However, our use of these concepts are more encompassing of various life priorities and thus more widely and universally applicable. Our deliberations of these concepts are more systematically evidence-based. I have also examined a large body of literature concerning typology of societies, especially in relation to the state. Although my examination was not done systematically and thoroughly for all 27 societies in Asia in this article, it is safe to say that basic validity of my proposed typology is justified.

---

## References

Bates, R. H., Levi, M., et al. (1998). *Analytic narratives*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Blondel, J. (2012, November 7). Telephone discussion on the distinction between presidential and parliamentary systems.

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

Dadabaev, T. (2006). *Mahalla no Jitsuzo: Chuo-Asia Shakai no Dento to Henyo* (Realities of Mahalla: Changing cultures and societies of central Asia). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Dadabaev, T. (2010). *Kioku no naka no Soren* (The Soviet Union as Living in the Memory of Central Asians). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation & opposition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2002). *Multiple modernities*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2006). *The great revolutions and the civilizations of modernity*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.

Fave, A. D., & Knoop, H. H. (Eds.). (2012). *Wellbeing and cultures: Perspectives from positive psychology (Cross-cultural advancements in positive psychology)*. New York: Springer.

Gunther, R., Montero, J. R., & Linz, J. (2002). *Political parties: Old concepts and new challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henderson, G. (1968). *Korea: The politics of vortex*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Humphrey, C., & Sneath, D. A. (1999). *The end of Nomadism?: Society, state, and the environment in Inner Asia*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.

Inglehart, R. (1977). *Silent revolution: Changing values and political styles among western publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1989). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1990). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization cultural change and democracy: The human development sequence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Inoguchi, T. (2004). Social capital in ten Asian societies. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 5(1), 197–211.

Inoguchi, T., Mikami, S., & Fuji, S. (2007). Social capital in east Asia: Comparative political culture in Confucian societies. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 8(3), 409–426.

Inoguchi, T. (2011, December). Keynote address and panel discussion at Center for Social Capital Studies Institute for the Development of Social Intelligence. Sensyu University, Tokyo.

Inoguchi, T. (2012). AsiaBarometer's achievements, Underutilized areas of the survey materials, and future prospects. *American Political Science Association Comparative Democratization Newsletter*, 10(3), 2, 13–15.

Inoguchi, T., & Fujii, S. (2012). *The quality of life in Asia: A comparison of quality of life in Asia*. New York: Springer.

- Kato, T. (2012). *Buki to shiteno Shakai Ruikeiron* (Typology of societies as a looking glass). Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Koh, G., & Ling, O. G. (Eds.). (2000). *State-society relations in Singapore*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Lieven, A. (2012). *Pakistan: A hard country*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Linz, J. (2000). *Totalitarian and authoritarian regimes*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Matsui, T. (2011). *Seinan-Asia no Sabaku Bunka* (Desert culture in southwest Asia). Kyoto: Jimbun Shoin.
- Nakane, C. (1970). *Japanese Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Steinberg, D. (2009). *Burma/Myanmar: what everyone needs to know*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, R. H., & Hlaing, K. Y. (Eds.). (2005). *Myanmar: Beyond politics to societal imperatives*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Woodside, A. (2006). *Lost modernities: China, Vietnam, Korea, and the hazards of world history*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wright, T. (2010). *Accepting authoritarianism: State-society relations in China's reform era*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.