

## Cross-national Social Survey in East Asia:

World Values Survey, ISSP, AsiaBarometer, Asian Barometer, East Asia Value Survey and EASS

Kunio MINATO

Osaka University School of Foreign Studies

東アジアにおける国際比較社会調査とその課題  
- 世界価値観調査、ISSP、アジア・バロメーター、アジアン・バロメーター、  
東アジア価値観国際比較調査から EASS へ -

湊 邦生

大阪大学外国語学部

In East Asia (Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, China and Hong Kong) in recent years, cross-national social surveys have started such as the AsiaBarometer, the Asian Barometer (East Asia Barometer) and the East Asia Value Survey. These surveys, in contrast with surveys conducted worldwide like the World Values Survey and the ISSP (International Social Survey Programme), focus their attention on East Asia, and aim at clarifying issues and features which are inherent in the region. This article is a review of surveys with East Asian focus, and cross-national studies based on the result of such surveys, within the range of availability in Japan. The purposes of the article are: 1) to gain understanding and knowledge of the current situation and problems of cross-national social surveys in East Asia; 2) to discuss the issues which the EASS (East Asian Social Surveys) project, implemented jointly by the Japanese General Social Surveys (JGSS) project team and South Korean, Taiwanese, Chinese and Hong Kong teams, has to work on.

Key Words: JGSS, EASS, Cross-national Social Survey

東アジア（日本・韓国・台湾・中国・香港）では、近年「アジア・バロメーター」（AsiaBarometer）や「アジアン・バロメーター（東アジアバロメーター）」（Asian Barometer; East Asia Barometer）、「東アジア価値観国際比較調査」（East Asia Value Survey）などの国際比較調査が開始されている。これらは世界規模で実施されている国際比較調査である「世界価値観調査」（World Values Survey）や ISSP（International Social Survey Programme）とは異なり、東アジアに焦点を絞り、東アジアに特有の問題や特徴の解明を目指したものである。本稿では、それらの調査や、調査結果に基づく各国・地域の比較分析の結果について検討し、東アジアにおける国際比較調査の現状と課題について述べる。その上で、JGSS プロジェクトが韓国・台湾・中国・香港のチームとともに実施している EASS（East Asian Social Surveys）プロジェクトが取り組むべき課題について考察する。

キーワード：JGSS，EASS，国際比較社会調査

## 1. Introduction

Cross-national social surveys, targeting on people living in plural countries/regions with common question batteries or questionnaires, have been developed in Europe. In East Asia, on the other hand, such survey had been said to fall behind for a long time (Ikeda, 2004; Inoguchi, 2002). Although there are countries/regions participating well-known worldwide surveys, the “World Values Survey” and the ISSP (International Social Survey Programme), those surveys are not always suitable for cross-cultural comparison within East Asia for the various reasons which will be mentioned below.

Recently, however, cross-national social surveys focusing on East Asia have appeared, such as “AsiaBarometer”, “Asian Barometer (East Asia Barometer)” and “East Asia Value Survey”, and several studies based on those results have come to be seen. Summary of those surveys are compiled in table 1 and table 2. Table 1 shows the name of the survey, countries and regions surveyed, target population, actual sample size in the survey in Japan, and the method of the surveys. Table 2 contains the Headquarter or organizer of the survey, principal investigator in Japan, and Organizations conducting the survey in Japan. Out of 5 surveys, the AsiaBarometer and the East Asia Value Survey are headquartered in Japan, while the East Asia Barometer is organized by Taiwanese researchers.

In addition to those surveys, the EASS (East Asian Social Survey) project was launched jointly by Japanese, South Korean, and Taiwanese teams which conduct nationwide social survey in each country/region. Japanese team is the JGSS (Japanese General Social Survey) team, conducting survey with the cooperation of Institute of Social Science, the University of Tokyo; South Korean team is the Sungkyunkwan University Survey Research Center; And Taiwanese team is the Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica. In February 2005, Hong Kong team (the Survey Research Center at Hong Kong University of Science and Technology) and Chinese team (the School of Sociology and Population Studies, Renmin University of China) joined the project. The EASS conducted its first survey in 2006, with the topic of “Family in East Asia”. The second survey, “Globalization and Culture in East Asia”, will be conducted in 2008, and the third survey “Health” is planned in 2010<sup>(1)</sup>.

**Table1 Cross-national social surveys in East Asia (1)**

Name	Countries and regions surveyed	Target people (age) <sup>2)</sup>	Respondents (Response rate) <sup>2)</sup>	Survey method <sup>2)</sup>
AsiaBarometer 2003	<u>Japan</u> <sup>1)</sup> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>China</u> , Thailand, Malaysia, Vietnam, Myammer, India, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan	800 (20-59)	857 -58.80%	Interview
Asian Barometer (East Asia Barometer), 1st wave	<u>Japan</u> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>Taiwan</u> , <u>China</u> , <u>Hong Kong</u> , Philippines, Thailand, Mongolia	1,200 (20 or over)	- ( - )	Interview
East Asia Value Survey	<u>Japan</u> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>Taiwan</u> , <u>China</u> (Beijing, Shanghai, Hong Kong), Singapore	1,200 (20 or over)	787 -65.60%	Interview
ISSP2003	34 countries/regions including <u>Japan</u> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>Taiwan</u>	1,800 (16 or over)	1,102 -61.20%	Interview
World Values Survey, 4th wave	96 countries/regions including <u>Japan</u> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>China</u>	1,000 (17 or over)	1,362 ( - )	Mailing

Note: 1) Countries and regions with underline are participating in the EASS 2006.

2) The number of respondents and survey method are those in Japan, and some difference, which will be mentioned below, can be seen in other countries/regions.

Source: Websites of the AsiaBarometer, the Asian Barometer, the East Asia Barometer, the East Asia Value Survey, the ISSP, the World Values Survey.

**Table2 Cross-national social surveys in East Asia (2)**

Survey	Headquarter or organizer of surveys in Japan	Principal investigator in Japan	Organizations conducting surveys in Japan
AsiaBarometer	Inoguchi office, Chuo University	Inoguchi, Takashi (Professor, Chuo University)	Nippon Research Center*
Asian Barometer (East Asia Barometer), 1st wave	Asian Barometer Core Partners	Ikeda Ken'ichi (Professor, the University of Tokyo)	Central Research Service
East Asia Value Survey	The Institute of Statistical Mathematics(ISM), Japan	Yoshino Ryoza (Professor, ISM)	Shin Joho Center
ISSP2003	The ISSP secretariat	Aramaki, Hiroshi (NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Institute)	Central Research Service
World Value Survey, 4th wave	World Values Survey Executive Committee	Yamazaki, Seiko (Dentsu Institute for Human Studies)	Nippon Research Center

Note: \*2004 and 2005 surveys were conducted by Shin Joho Center.

Source: Websites of the AsiaBarometer, the Asian Barometer, the East Asia Barometer, the East Asia Value Survey, the ISSP, the World Values Survey.

This article aims at clarifying current situation and challenges of cross-national social survey in East Asia. For that purpose, we will first examine worldwide social surveys mentioned above, *i.e.* the World Values Survey and the ISSP, and discuss necessity of cross-national survey focusing on East Asia. Then we will review such surveys, the AsiaBarometer, the Asian Barometer and the East Asia Value Survey, and cross-national comparative studies based on the result of those surveys, within the range of availability in Japan.

## 2. The World Values Survey

The World Values Survey (WVS), headed by Michigan University Professor Ronald Inglehart, is a cross-national comparative research project which aims at grasping change of political culture and society of various countries in courtiers and regions all over the world. Up to now five waves (surveys) have been carried out since 1981, and out of these, the summary and data of 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th waves are published. Table 3 shows outline of those surveys, and table 4 shows methodology of the World Values Survey in East Asia. The survey data are deposited in ICPSR (Inter-university Consortium of Political and Social Research), and in the World Values Survey website, the data of each wave (from 1st wave to 4th) and cumulative data set can be also downloaded in SPSS form.

**Table 3 Summary of World Values Survey<sup>1)</sup>**

Wave	Survey years	No. of participant countries and regions	Participant countries and regions in East Asia
1st	1981	12	Japan, South Korea, China
2nd	1989-1992	37	Japan, South Korea, China
3rd	1995-1998	91	Japan, South Korea, Taiwan
4th	1999-2002	96	Japan, South Korea, China, Taiwan <sup>2)</sup>

Note: 1) Survey years and counting and name of surveys are not unified between literatures. In this table they are based on Yamazaki (2004) and are different from World Values Survey website or some of other literatures.

2) In Yamazaki (2004), Taiwan is listed as a participant, but in World Values Survey website it is said to have participated only in "WVS-1995" (3rd wave)

Source: The World Values Survey website.

**Table 4 Methodology of the World Values Survey**

	Japan (2000)	South Korea (2000)	Taiwan (1995)	China (2000) <sup>1)</sup>
Respondents	1362 (Response rate: 68.0%)	1,200	780	1,000
Age	18 or over	18 or over	18 or over	18-65
Sampling	Multi-stage stratified sampling	Probability proportionate sampling	Three-stage stratified sampling <sup>2)</sup>	Probability proportionate sampling
Survey Methodology	Mailing	Face to face interview	Face to face interview	Face to face interview

Note: 1) In China, six remote provinces with very low population density were excluded from the sampling process: Hainan, Tibet, Gansu, Qinghai, Ningxia, and Xinjiang. These provinces consists 5.1% of the total population and 4.6% of total households of the country. (The World Values Survey website)

2) Confirmed by Dr. Su-Hao Tu, Assistant Research Fellow of the Office of Survey Research, Academia Sinica.

Source: The World Values Survey website.

The main feature of the WVS lies in its scale, which enables us to clarify various aspects of values of diverse people living in various countries and regions. As shown in table 3, the number countries and regions participating in WVS increased time to time, with various backgrounds of economic standard, political system and religions. Especially, the WVS carries out survey and offers valuable social data in Asia, Africa, the former Soviet Union and Latin America, where survey data had long been hardly available. Besides, there are various questions asking respondents' values on various topics including family, health, environment, job, politics, economy and religion in a questionnaire and 4th wave question items reach almost 250.

Acknowledging the merits mentioned above, we have to be aware of problems in the WVS. First, the sample of the WVS in each country or region is supposed to be at least 1,000, consisting of men and women aged 18 or over. Yet actually it is uneven between countries and regions. In 4th wave, for example, the sample size was the smallest in Puerto Rico with 720 respondents, while the largest size was 3,401 in Turkey<sup>(2)</sup>, which is about 4.7 times larger than that of Puerto Rico<sup>(3)</sup>.

Another problem is in methodology. In the WVS conduct and data collection is left to a participant of each country or region, and there are not unified survey schedule, sampling specifications of data collection. In addition, until 4th wave every country and region was to use the same questionnaire<sup>(4)</sup>, but actually not all the questions were asked in each country. So we cannot obtain all the data in the original questionnaire in all countries and regions questions.

As for analysis of East Asia, other problems should be point out. As seen in table 3, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and China have not conducted survey in the same wave. Moreover, translation from English questionnaire is another issue to be examined. Manabe et. al. (1996) pointed out two discrepancies between the questionnaire used in the USA and that used in China. There is an item saying "Trade unions" in the former, English version of the questionnaire, but in the latter the item was translated as "Organizations of trade". Also, "lying in your own interest" in the US questionnaire was changed into "relying on interest" in the Chinese version.

Judging from above, although data of the WVS enables us comparative analysis of various countries and regions in the world, it is dangerous to use the data unless we examine the data carefully<sup>(5)</sup>.

### 3. The ISSP

The ISSP is the cross-national comparative survey which was started in 1984 by West Germany, USA, UK and Australia. Since then countries and regions participating in the ISSP had increased, and number of those reached 39 countries in 2003. From East Asia Japan was first accepted to the

ISSP 1992 and started survey in 1993, followed by Taiwan (accepted in 2001 and started survey in 2002) and South Korea (accepted in 2002 and started survey in 2003).

The main characteristics of the ISSP are seen in existence of a certain topic in each survey, such as “National Identity” (1995 and 2003) or “Role of Government” (1985, 1990 and 1996), and repetition of the topics after a certain period of time. This enables researchers to make time-series comparison between surveys, as well as cross-national analysis at the same survey. Survey topics and the countries and regions conducting survey until 2009 are shown in table 5 and table 6.

Another feature of the ISSP is its detailed rules on conduct of survey (*ISSP working principles*). The standard questionnaire is decided at the General Meeting held a year before the survey, and it is bound to be written in British English. The questionnaire is translated into each national questionnaire by non-literal, culturally equivalent translation, but no transformation of the questionnaire or addition of new question is permitted. The working principles of the ISSP establishes that questionnaires should be 15 minutes-long with 60 questions, and At this chance the insertion of a new question and a change of a turn are not accepted. Sample has to consist of at least 1,000 person aged 18 years old or over (16 years old or over in Japan and Russia), which represents each country or region and is chosen by random sampling. It is determined that each participating nation should conduct a survey and send the archive the result of the survey by definite deadline, and it is required to report precisely the outline of the survey and sampling method when sending the data. Besides, it is necessary to answer the questionnaire called Study Monitoring Questionnaires which regards the method of the survey. These points shows clear contrast to the WVS, which allows variations in data collection, survey schedule and specification the data (Yamazaki, 2004:93). Survey data of the ISSP is released by German data archive ZA (Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung) and the ICPSR.

**Table 5 Survey topics of the ISSP**

Year	Topic	Countries and Regions Surveyed	No.
1985	Role of Government I	Australia, Austria, Great Britain, Italy, USA, West Germany	6
1986	Social Networks I	Australia, Austria, Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, USA, West Germany	8
1987	Social Inequality I	Australia, Austria, Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, USA, West Germany, Switzerland, Poland	10
1988	Family and Changing Gender Roles I	Austria, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, USA, West Germany	8
1989	Work Orientations I	Austria, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Netherlands, USA, West Germany	11
1990	Role of Government II	Australia, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Northern Ireland, Norway, USA, East Germany, West Germany	11
1991	Religion I	Australia, Austria, Germany (East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, USA	17
1992	Social Inequality II	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Germany (East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, Sweden, USA	17
1993	Environment I	Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Germany (East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, <u>Japan</u> , Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, USA	21

Year	Topic	Countries and Regions Surveyed	No.
1994	Family and Changing Gender Roles II	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Germany (East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, <u>Japan</u> , Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, USA	23
1995	National Identity I	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Germany (East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, USA	23
1996	Role of Government III	Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Germany(East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel (Jews and Arabs), Italy, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, USA	24
1997	Work Orientations I	Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany(East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Israel (Jews and Arabs), Italy, <u>Japan</u> , Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, USA	25
1998	Religion II	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany (East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, USA	31
1999	Social Inequality III	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany (East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Israel, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, USA	27
2000	Environment II	Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Israel, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, USA	26
2001	Social Networks II	Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Israel, Italy, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, USA	28
2002	Family and Changing Gender Roles III	Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Flanders (Belgium), France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, <u>Taiwan</u> , USA	34
2003	National Identity II	Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, <u>South Korea</u> , Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, <u>Taiwan</u> , Uruguay, USA, Venezuela	34
2004	Citizenship	Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Flanders (Belgium), France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, <u>South Korea</u> , Spain, Switzerland, <u>Taiwan</u> , Uruguay, USA, Venezuela	38
2005	Work Orientations III	Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Flanders, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland (Republic), Israel, <u>Japan</u> , Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, South Africa, <u>South Korea</u> , Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, <u>Taiwan</u> , USA	31

Note: Countries and regions with underline are participating in the EASS 2006.

**Table 6 Survey topics of the ISSP (countries and regions have not been announced)**

Year	Topic
2006	Role of Government IV
2007	Leisure Time and Sports
2008	Religion III
2009	Social Inequality IV
2010	Environment III

Note: Survey topics in 2009 and 2010 are under contemplation.

Source: the ISSP website.

The ISSP, with above-mentioned characteristics, has also some problems in methodology. Survey method differs between countries/regions such as interview, mailing, and distribution collection method. Difference is also seen in a sampling method and the degree of usage of provisional sample. Some countries and regions do not use any of it, while the Philippines is said to approach people 10 times more than the target sample before conducting a survey. And in France in the 1999 survey, there were 11,015 persons who are targeted on the survey, but the number of respondent was only 1,889 (Aramaki and Onodera, 2004; Onodera, 2003b). On account of these differences, careful examination is required when we are to use data of these countries.

There are also problems as to comparative analysis within East Asia. As mentioned earlier, it is 2003 when Japan, South Korea and Taiwan conducted the ISSP survey altogether, and survey has not been carried out in China so far<sup>(6)</sup>. This imposes strict limitation on the possibility of comparative analysis using the ISSP data. In addition to this, as Onodera (2003b) pointed out, questionnaires are not free from Western sense of values because most of the participating countries and regions are Western nations. For example, in countries and regions participating in the 2003 survey, there are only 4 non-Christian countries and regions: Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and Israel. Non-European countries beside those 4 were Chile, the Philippines, South Africa and Venezuela, but they are still minority in the 34 participants. Onodera also recollected her own experience as a representative Japanese team in the 1998 survey “Religion”; at that time all countries and regions but Israel were those holding Christianity, so she took some trouble explaining Japanese values toward religion and religious activities in Japan, which were far different from those in Western culture. (*ibid.*)

Judging from above, as far as the current ISSP data is concerned, it is difficult to use the data on comparative analysis between East Asian countries and regions. Although cross-national comparative studies using the ISSP data do exist in Japan, they focus on comparison with Japan and Western countries (Onodera, 2000; 2001; 2003a), or comparison with Japan and other countries and regions all over the world (Manabe, 1999).

Onodera, who has been engaged in the ISSP project in the NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Institute, argues that the ISSP in the future should “be premised that there are countries whose structure of values differs with each other, incorporate variety of values, and be oriented to the survey which examines the difference of the structure of value between areas” (Onodera, 2003b:27). And she expects the researcher using the ISSP data to make an analysis on such difference. Her argument is based on the anticipation that many countries and regions with various backgrounds will participate in the ISSP in future. This may apply to the WVS as well, which already includes great variety of countries and regions. In other words, when we are going to make a comparative analysis within East Asia, where some common feature might be observed in values, cross-national survey is necessary which can capture characteristics of the area. The following chapters are review of such survey and studies based on them.

#### 4. The AsiaBarometer

The AsiaBarometer has been conducting survey since 2003 in various parts in Asia, based on a common framework with a common standard questionnaire. The countries and regions surveyed vary every year, which are shown in table 7<sup>(7)</sup>. Table 8 shows the method of the AsiaBarometer in East Asia, taking 2003 survey for example.

**Table 7 Countries and regions surveyed, and target population in the AsiaBarometer**

Year	Countries and regions (Number)	Target population
2003	<u>Japan</u> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>China</u> , Thailand, India, Malaysia, Myanmar (Burma), Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan, Vietnam (10)	800 (aged 20-59)
2004	<u>Japan</u> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>China</u> , Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam (13)	800 (aged 20-59)
2005	Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan (14)	800 (aged 20-59)
2006	<u>Japan</u> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>Taiwan</u> , <u>China</u> , Hong Kong, Singapore, Vietnam (7)	1,000 (aged 20-59)

Note: Countries and regions with underline are participating in the EASS 2006.  
Source: The AsiaBarometer website.

**Table 8 Methodology of sampling and survey of the AsiaBarometer 2003**

	Japan	South Korea	China
Sample size	857 (Response rate: 58.8%)	800	800
Sampling	Two-stage stratified random sampling	Two-stage stratified random sampling	Choosing 10 individuals from randomly-chosen 10 survey points in 8 cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Chongqing, Xi'an, Nanjing, Dalian and Tsingtao)
Survey Method	Placement	Face to face interview	Face to face interview

Source: The AsiaBarometer website.

Takashi Inoguchi, the leader of the AsiaBarometer, describes the main subject of the AsiaBarometer as “daily of ordinary people in Asia” (Inoguchi, 2005a:17). Unlike the WVS or the ISSP, questionnaires of the AsiaBarometer contain questions regarding life of respondent, which can be categorized into the following nine clusters: 1) social infrastructure, 2) patterns of economic life, 3) patterns of daily life, 4) values and norms in daily life, 5) values and norms associated with social behavior, 6) identities, 7) views on social and political issues and institutions, 8) health conditions, and 9) sociological attributes of respondents (Inoguchi, 2006b; Inoguchi and Fujii, 2007:7).

Basically, the survey of the AsiaBarometer is conducted thorough face-to-face interview to respondents chosen by random sampling. However, telephone is used in area where interviews are difficult, and in Japan 2003 survey was conducted by placement method (Inoguchi et. al., 2005a). In addition, in 2003 survey people in urban area were focused on, except Japan and South Korea which conducted a nationwide survey.

The data of the AsiaBarometer is now being released. In the AsiaBarometer website 2003 and 2004 data can be downloaded upon request. 2003 data is also deposited in ICPSR and SSJ (Social Science Japan) Data Archive and is open to public. Also, a CD-ROM containing data and all the questionnaires used in each country is attached to the codebook of 2003 survey (Inoguchi, et. al., 2005b), which will be mentioned below.

There are already several cross-national studies covering East Asia with the survey result of the AsiaBarometer. Manabe (2004) made three exploratory analyses with 2003 survey data. First, he investigated the condition and process of spread of public utilities such as waterworks, electricity and



city gas (Q1; see «Appendix A» for questions of the AsiaBarometer). Then, he made two correlation analyses, among well-being (Q4, Q5a-o and Q6), trust in people (Q9, Q10 and Q11) and institution (Q21a-r) and among frequency of voting (Q24a and b), sense of obligation to vote (Q25a), political cynicism (Q25b-g) and national pride (Q15-2). With his analyses, he revealed that countries could be divided into two categories according to the correlation between political behavior and national pride; the one consisted of countries where national pride correlated positively to frequency of voting and sense of obligation to vote, as well as negatively to political cynicism (Q25b-g), the other was countries where such correlations do not exist. Japan, South Korea and China were included in the former category. In addition, in the article he indicated two advantages of the AsiaBarometer. The one is related on Asian focus of the AsiaBarometer, although cross-national surveys have mainly focused on North America and Europe. With its Asian focus, he explains, it becomes possible to produce hypotheses and scientific knowledge based on Asian reality, and thus to understand diversified consciousness of Asian people. The other advantage is that the AsiaBarometer encourages reinvestigating and clarifying stereotypes and concepts which tend to be regarded as self-evident<sup>(8)</sup>.

In Manabe (2006a), concepts of “happiness and satisfaction” were examined by using questions on happiness (Q4) and satisfaction (Q5) out of 2003 and 2004 data. The results could be summarized as the following four things: first, happiness cannot be fully determined by economic development; second, correlation between happiness and satisfaction is weak; third is on the relationship between income and satisfaction. Income increases as the age of respondents get older, but satisfaction with income decreases at the same time. And correspondence of income with satisfaction with income is not necessarily strong; fourth, in Japan, South Korea and China, “public safety”, “environment”, “social welfare”, “democracy” are loaded in one factor.

Inoguchi (2005b, 2005c) summarized arguments about “the East Asian Community” which was frequently put on a topic in recent years and produced five theories about driving forces of the East Asian Community, *i.e.* functional unification which is based on economic ties, regional identity, middle class impellers, reorganization of national and regional security, and democracy. He argued that the AsiaBarometer could offer proof and/or disproof to the five theories by presenting data which showed consciousness of East Asian citizens. However, he did not make analysis in the article, and left concrete image of East Asian Community to be described in future.

Inoguchi (2006a) discussed whether the Japanese lost their law-abiding spirit through a cross-national comparison. From the data of AsiaBarometer 2003 and 2004 on how to deal with bureaucracy (Q26) and sense of justice and solidarity (Q11), he argued that in Japan more people tend to ignore the authority, and to refuse to be taken in on people in trouble. Based on his argument, he alerted Japanese society seemed at stake.

In the series of his analyses, Tanaka (2005, 2006, 2007) argued current situation of Asian international politics and Japanese foreign diplomacy with the question asking whether a country has a good influence or a bad influence on respondent’s own country/region (Q20). The result regarding East Asia, which is our concern, showed that Japan was seen to have good influence in most countries, except countries including South Korea and China. China also showed good performance in many countries, which was not the case in Japan and Taiwan. South Korea was a country which scarcely thought to have a good influence from other countries. From these results, he argued that mutual distrust was prevailing in East Asia and it was the most important challenge Japanese diplomacy was facing.

Kawato (2005) discussed on whether “East Asian Civilization” can be formed or not with the data

of AsiaBarometer 2003. He argued that there were both encouraging and discouraging factors found from the result of the AsiaBarometer; the former included high level of trust in others (Q9), middle-class consciousness and satisfaction with life (Q6), indifference to religion (Q17-1), and fine image of East Asia seen by other Asian countries (Q20); the latter contained relatively low sense of identification to Asia (Q16-1), adherence to social group in countries other than Japan (Q16-2), authoritarianism (Q21) and mutual distrust among East Asian countries (Q20).

Fukushima (2005) made a cross-national comparison on trust in the UN, WTO and IMF among Japan, South Korea and ASEAN countries (Q21). The result showed that the UN, although very few respondents chose the answer of “trust a lot”, garnered trust more than other organizations. Fukushima attributed it to the lack of an organization dealing with security in Asia. When it comes to economic organization, WTO gained almost as much trust as the UN in those countries, while the IMF, criticized its treatment of Asian currency crisis, turned out to be less trusted than WTO.

Sonoda (2005b) discussed whether newly-emerging “urban middle class”<sup>(9)</sup> could support the forthcoming “East Asian Community”, by examining their own educational background, ethnic consciousness (Q15-2), importance of religion (Q21), sense of belonging to a social group within a country, identification as an Asian person (Q16-1) and trust in central government (Q21). On the basis of these, he argued that there was a similarity between new middle class and working class within a country, so middle class in Asia did not share common value across countries. Although usage of the Internet (Q2, Q38) might well show as if cultural exchange and mutual understanding were prevailing in East Asia, it was not clear whether this was the truth. On the contrary, exchange of information only within the borders might raise radical nationalism, as seen in Chinese anti-Japan demonstrations in 2005.

Sonoda (2006a) extended his discussion above to a comparative analyses between new middle class<sup>(10)</sup> and working class in Asia on the following ten items: 1) age, 2) sex, 3) percentage of university graduate, 4) exposure to globalization (Q2), 5) fluency of English, 6) anti-nepotism (Q13), 7) religiosity, 8) support of gender-equal policy (Q23j), 9) support of environmental policy (Q23a) and 10) pro-democratic attitude (Q27). He first analyzed difference between new middle class and working class, both of which consisted of the total number in Asia. The difference was significant in most variables, but in some socio-political variables (4, 7, 8, 9) it was smaller than in socio-cultural variables (1, 2, 3, 5), and not significant in others (6, 10). He also analyzed the difference in each country, and found that two clusters of middle classes in countries surveyed. The one was former Anglo-American colonies, (Malaysia, Philippines, and Singapore), and the other non-English speaking countries. Compared with the latter, new middle class of the former consisted of more women. They are equipped with higher educational background and more fluency in English. In the former cluster income was influenced positively by the fluency in English, while such influence was not found in some of the countries in the latter (Japan and China), or if any, very weak effect was seen (Indonesia).

Hosono (2005) argued the relationship between economic and social development and sense of happiness in ASEAN+3 countries. His analysis showed that no correlation could be found between life expectancy, which was used as a proxy variable of development, and other variables including happiness (Q4), satisfaction with aspects of life (Q5) and trust in central government (Q21). Focusing his attention on Japan and South Korea, both of which had developed far more than other countries surveyed but showed low sense of happiness, he argued that sense of happiness could not be determined so much by development as by one’s own status compared with others surrounding him/her. Such comparison created relative dissatisfaction, and it was a background lying in a society with high

standard of living and low sense of happiness. Based on this argument, he suggested to reduce the disparity in society and thus to restore social integration.

Other than the above-mentioned studies, source books were edited about investigation in 2003 survey, written in Japanese and English (Inoguchi et. al., 2005a; English version, Inoguchi, et. al., 2005b). In the source book case studies of 10 countries were performed based on 2003 survey, which was appreciated by a book review by Chen (2006) as “largely succeeded in putting together ... a wealth of information from a timely source on a diverse group of Asian countries” (Chen, 2006:400).

The AsiaBarometer is a cross-national research specialized in Asia, which offers wide variety of data about everyday life and consciousness of citizens living in Asia. It also made it possible to make comparative research within Asian countries and regions. At the same time, however, we cannot put aside some problems, as Kawato (2006) pointed out in his book review of the source book.

First, some questions about politics are ambiguous so that they may not provoke caution of the authorities in some countries. Q20, for example, asks whether respondents think countries mentioned in the questionnaire “have a good influence or a bad influence on your country” (AsiaBarometer 2003 questionnaire). But as ‘influence’ has many aspects such as politics, economy or culture, so answers might differ depending on which aspect respondent see. Moreover, as Sonoda (2005a) argues, when consciousness of citizens is surveyed in a socialist country or a country under dictatorship, it would be necessary to add a question to ask whether the respondent is a member of the party in power. Besides, in countries where citizens are strictly monitored by the authorities, respondents might answer to the questions taking the authorities’ intention into account.

Sonoda (2006b) also pointed out challenges the AsiaBarometer is facing. As seen before, East Asia is an area which has short history of cross-national survey. This makes it difficult to explain the survey results logically, for in such area framework for logical explanation on survey result does not exist. Besides, drafting a questionnaire is likely to be led by the member of the project. Sonoda regards calling for a question battery, which JGSS project adopts, as one of the solutions for this.

## **5. The Asian Barometer (East Asia Barometer)**

The Asian Barometer (ABS) is a comparative survey of public opinion on political values, democracy, and governance around the region. The headquarter of the ABS is at National Taiwan University (NTU), with the cooperation of the Department of Political Science at the NTU and the Institute of Political Science of Academia Sinica. Originally, the ABS was launched as the East Asia Barometer (EABS) in 2000, a survey focusing on democracy and value change in the region. The EABS merged with the South Asia Barometer in 2003 and became the ABS. Meanwhile, in 2001 the EABS built a partnership with three survey project in other area: Latinobarometro, Afrobarometer and the Arab Barometer, and together they inaugurated the Global Barometer Survey (GBS).

Table 9 shows countries and regions surveyed in either wave of the ABS. In regards of methodology, although it has not been open to public in most countries and regions, we can see Japanese country report of the 2nd survey of the ABS in Japan. According to the report, the 2nd wave survey in Japan was conducted in face-to-face interview by Central Research Services. Target population was 2,500 people aged 20 or over, chosen in two-stage stratified random sampling method. Out of the samples 1,067 valid responses were obtained, and the response rate was 42.7% (Ikeda et. al., 2007)<sup>(11)</sup>.

Out of two waves of the ABS, dataset of the 1st wave has already been released and can be obtained in the Asian Barometer website. Online analysis is also possible on the website. There is preliminary dataset of the 2nd wave with the exclusion of countries where data processing are not

completed, but the two dataset has already provided number of cross-national studies concerning democracy in East Asia, which will be reviewed below.

Albritton et. al. (2003) analyzed determinants of support for democracy (100, 101, 103, 104, 118 and 119 in «Appendix B»); numbers refer to questions in the 1st wave unless otherwise indicated). The analysis showed that support for democracy is not determined by nationality except Thailand, but by location of the respondents (urban or rural area), modern attitudes (64-72), trust to other people (24) and economic prospect (6). In this analysis, based on studies of Thailand, it was assumed people in urban area and with modern orientations tend to give less support for democracy than those in rural area and with more traditional backgrounds, and the analysis did support their assumption.

**Table 9 Countries and regions surveyed in the ABS**

Wave	Survey year	Countries and regions surveyed
1st	2001-2002	<u>Japan</u> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>Taiwan</u> , <u>China</u> , <u>Hong Kong</u> , Mongolia Philippines, Thailand
2nd	2006-2007	<u>Japan</u> , <u>South Korea</u> , <u>Taiwan</u> , <u>China</u> , <u>Hong Kong</u> , Cambodia, Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mongolia, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam

Note: Countries and regions with underline are participating in the EASS 2006.

Source: The East Asia Barometer website.

Chang et. al. (2003) made an analysis on how corruption affected trust in political institution (7-10, 12-14) in East Asia. From the result of their analysis, corruption, both perceived (114, 115) and witnessed (116), eroded trust in political institution, even when they controlled economic condition in past (2), present (1) and future (3), satisfaction with democracy (104), perceived fairness of government (106), perceived influence of people on government (107), perceived freedom (105), gender and age.

Chu et. al. (2003) explored what would lead people in East Asia to detach from authoritarian regime, which is still considered to be a potential alternative to democracy in the area. Pointing out exceptional generosity to non-democratic regime in East Asia (121-124), they analyzed the impact of factors which previous studies regarded as a source of detachment from authoritarianism: i) socio-economical background such as education, age and income; ii) institutional influences measured by electoral (27, 29, 30) and non-electoral (73, 75, 76, 78) participation, membership in civic organizations (19) and psychological involvement in politics (56-58); iii) performance of democratic regime indicated by satisfaction with it (98), trust in democratic institutions (8-10, 14, 16), level of political corruption (114, 115) and perceived responsibility of political leaders (128, 129); iv) economic condition of respondents themselves (4, 5) as well as their country/region (1, 2); v) regime comparison consisting of perceived democratic progress (99, 100), increase in political rights (105-113); and vi) social and political value revealed in detachment from traditionalism (64-71), values toward democracy and authoritarianism (132-139) and belief in procedural norm in democracy (145-148). Their cross-national analyses showed that the social and political value, more specifically, detachment from traditionalism and democratic orientation was the most critical force of detachment from authoritarianism. Comparison on regime performance came next, while economic condition did not hold significant effect on democracy.

Another study on the source to orient people toward democracy is Chu and Huang (2007). In this study not only determinants of detachment from authoritarian regime (121-124) but also support for democracy (101, 103, 117, 118) was analyzed, but here they used the data of the 2nd wave, while the previous study used the 1st. Also, variables included in the analysis were somewhat different

from Chu et. al. (2003). The most striking is that quality of democracy evaluated by the respondents, consisting of rule of law (43, 104, 112-116, 120 in the 2nd wave), equality (108, 109 in the 2nd wave), freedom (110, 111 in the 2nd wave), and accountability (103 in the 2nd wave), replaced performance of democratic regime. From their analyses they concluded that culture of detachment from traditionalism and democratic orientation was the main source of detachment from authoritarianism, which confirmed the argument of Chu et. al. (2003). Meanwhile, support for democracy, they argued, was determined by perceived democratic progress and satisfactory with democracy, rather than cultural factors.

Ikeda et. al. (2003) investigated the patterns of social capital in promoting democracy under different cultural contexts. For that purpose, they analyzed how political participation was related with social capital and cultural factors. Political participation was divided into two categories, i.e. election participation (27, 29, 30) and active political participation (73-80). Social capital includes participation in community-level associations (19s2-s16), social (24) and institutional trust (7-18), and others related to trust such as perceived corruption (114, 115) and social connections (25). Cultural factors is represented by collective value (68, 69), which is regarded as a main feature in East Asia, and ideas about political leadership (121, 122, 131, 133-135, 138, 139). Based on the analysis, they argued that social trust and entry in community-level associations had significant effect on political participation, especially behavior regarding election. Cultural factors influenced political participation indirectly; effect of social trust becomes on political participation becomes larger when people are less collectivistic or more embedded in Asian “tradition” of supporting morally upright political leaders.

Varying operations of social capital on democracy was also analyzed in Ikeda and Kobayashi (2007). They made the analysis out of the same variables used in Ikeda et. al. (2003), but here tested was whether cultural factors have effect on political participation on aggregate level, that is, cultural character in country/regional level, as well as personal level. The result verified the findings of the aforementioned study that the less collectivistic, or the more supportive for politically upright leaders, the more effective social trust becomes on participation in political activities.

Park and Shin (2005) discussed how democracy was perceived in Asian new democracies: Korea, Mongolia, the Philippines, Taiwan and Thailand. They first sorted out respondents by their perception of democracy, *i.e.* whether or not they were satisfied with it (98) and how they evaluate it (105-113). The result clarified that the largest number of respondents showed satisfaction and high evaluation to democracy. They also made analyses on relationship between the perception and attachment to democracy (101, 117), detachment form authoritarian regime (121-124), and commitment to democracy which was made up by combination of the two variables. According to their analyses, the largest number of respondents both showed satisfaction with their democracies and gave better assessment on current regime than previous non-democratic regime. Moreover, citizens in these countries support democracy and reject authoritarianism when they are not only satisfied with current democratic system, but also see the system is performing better than previous regime.

Shin (2007a) again argued the perception of democracy in the five emerging democracies. In his argument he made another index of perception of democracy (98-100), and the analysis assured the findings of the above-mentioned study. Those who were satisfied with their democracies and gave better assessment on current regime than previous non-democratic regime dominated the largest share in the respondents, and satisfaction and perceived better performance of current democratic system increases their support for democracy and rejection of authoritarianism.

Albritton and Bureekul (2005) focused on impacts of cultural socialization and interaction with

government in regards to support for democracy (98, 101, 103, 117-119), pluralist values (135-137, 145,146), regime legitimacy (130, 131, 133, 134) economic situation in country/region (1-3) and personal (4-6) level, perceived (114, 115) and witnessed (116) corruption and institutional trust. The result showed that cultural socialization had contradicting impact; modernization (64-71) influence negatively on interaction with government, while trust to others (24) did positively. An Interaction with government also produced differences in other interactions.

Tan and Wang (2007) examined whether or not younger generation in Asia was more proactive to democracy. First they made intergenerational comparison on pro-democratic variables such as democratic values (132-139), support for democracy (101, 103, 117-119), and traditional values (64-71), which showed that democratic values increased from older generation to younger generation as a whole. Then they analyzed effect of age on democratic values and support for democracy, finding that although age did have effect on pro-democratic variables, the effect reduced when other variables were included. They also observed that in East Asia, Support for Democracy in democratic societies is overall stronger than that in the non-democratic societies.

In Park and Lee (2007), the effect of association in democracy was tested. They made cross-national correlation analyses between the following items: membership in organization or group (19), civic virtue such as social trust (24), reciprocity (30 of the 2nd wave) and citizenship (152, 153 in the 2nd wave); democratic values and norms reflected in attachment to democracy (117, 118), detachment from authoritarianism (123, 124) support for political institutional pluralism (136, 137) and for rule of law (125, 145); and political activism such as political efficacy (127), political interest (50 in the 2nd wave), activities of voting (27), campaign (29, 30), contact with officials or organizations (73, 75-77) and protest (86-88 in the 2nd wave). From the analyses they found that most respondents in each country were not engaged in any of associations, regardless of the country and region. Moreover, association had little or did not have effect on civic virtue, nor did it promote democratic values or norms. It only turned out to have correlation with political activism in every country.

Chang and Chu (2007) focused on two conceptions of democracy (92 in the 2nd wave), *i.e.* liberal democracy which regards electoral procedure or freedom of expression as essential to a democracy, and substantivist notion which places small income gap or satisfying basic necessities as an essence of it. They elucidated the significant effect on the conceptions of gender, education, political involvement (56) and detachment from traditionalism (64, 66, 69 in the 1st wave; 64 in the 2nd wave). Age and detachment from authoritarianism (121-123) proved insignificant, while effect of media exposure (57), they argued, might be absorbed in education. They also showed that the two conceptions made differences in support for democracy (101, 103, 117-119), but did not in evaluation of it (103, 104, 108, 115, 116 in the 2nd wave).

Huang et. al. (2007) assessed quality of democracy and explored its relationship with popular support for democracy and belief in liberal democratic values. They argued that quality of democracy had the following nine dimensions: i) Rule of Law (104, 113 in the 2nd wave); ii) Controlling Corruption (115 in the 1st wave, 120 in the 2nd wave); iii) Competition (43, 105, 114 in the 2nd wave); iv) Participation (27, 29, 30); v) Vertical Accountability (103, 106, 112 in the 2nd wave); vi) Horizontal Accountability (107, 115 in the 2nd wave); vii) Freedom (110, 111 in the 2nd wave); viii) Equality (108, 109 in the 2nd wave); and ix) Responsiveness (116 in the 2nd wave). Their assessment revealed that most of respondents gave low evaluations on their democracy, especially on rule of law, controlling corruption and horizontal accountability. Lower quality of democracy led to less satisfaction with democracy (98), less popular support for democracy (103,

117-119) and less belief in liberal democratic values (125, 133-139, 145), according to their correlation analyses. They also regressed support for democracy (101, 103, 117, 118) on quality of democracy which were categorized into four dimensions, that is, rule of law (43, 104, 107, 112- 116, 120 in the 2nd wave), freedom, and equality and accountability (103 in the 2nd wave), as well as on political participation (27, 29, 30), economic condition in both country (2 in the 2nd wave) and personal (5 in the 2nd wave), democratic orientation (125, 133-139, 145), priority of democracy (119) and interest in politics (56). According to the result, quality of democracy, especially rule of law hold crucial effect on support for democracy.

Wu and Chu (2007) examined whether uneven income distribution affected satisfaction with democracy. They analyzed the effect on satisfaction with actual condition of democracy (98) and support for democracy (101, 103, 117-119) caused by income and subjective social status (SE9, SE9a, SE19 in the 2nd wave), Gini coefficient in each country/region, satisfaction with basic necessities (109 in the 2nd wave), assessment of present government (104), demand for liberal democracy (125, 133-137, 139, 145) and current economic condition (1, 4). From the analyses both higher lower income holder were found to be less satisfied with democratic performance than income holders, which means that income disparity accumulates dissatisfaction with democracy.

Nathan (2007) discussed how political and cultural values affected support for current regime in East Asia, where there are various types of regimes. In his discussion democratic values (132-139) and traditionalism (64-72 in the 1st wave, 61-65 in the 2nd wave) were used in order to operationalize the two values. Nathan made analyses of effect of those variable, as well as perceived regime performance in democracy (105-107, 112, 113) and policy execution (108-111), on detentions of support for current government (98, 101, 103, 117-119, 121-124, 130). He argued from his analyses that political and cultural values have effect more on respondents' support for existing regime than performance variables, and of the two values democratic values was the more effective. Yet the effect was so complicated that Nathan left future task to solve the complexity.

In Shin (2007b) people's reaction to democratization was focused on. In the study reaction to democratic change was classified into four categories, according to attachment to democracy (101, 103, 117) and detachment from authoritarian alternative (121-123): that is, hybrids; anti-authoritarians; proto-democrats; and authentic democrats. Then the source of the different types of the reaction was analyzed, from the result of which they pointed out strong effect of attachment to Confucianism and experience of democratic regime.

The ABS, as stated above, has been providing data and studies on democracy in Asia. Since democratic change is still a critical issue in Asia where diverse types of regime exist, the data and the finding of the ABS will produce various guidelines for the future of the area.

However, we should be aware of the danger in the interpretation of "traditionalism". The ABS covers variety of East and Southeast Asian countries and regions, which are different from each other in regime. And so are they in terms of tradition. The ABS covers the area where variety of religions is believed (Buddhism, Islam, Catholic, etc.) and where there are diverse way of living from farming to nomadic pastoralism. This means that there is no unified "tradition" in the area where the ABS is conducted, and careful examination is required when we are to deal with "traditionalism" or cultural factors in the ABS.

## 6. The East Asia Value Survey<sup>(12)</sup>

The Institute of Statistical Mathematics has been performing various cross-national comparative researches whose subject is mainly national character and culture, since it started the survey of

Hawaiian *Nikkei* (Japanese-American) people in 1971. The East Asia Value Survey, which is going to be discussed here, is one of such surveys, conducted in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, China (Beijing, Shanghai and Hong Kong) and Singapore. The survey is based on the criticism to the WVS and the idea that “Survey in Asia should be done from Asian viewpoint” (Yoshino, 2005a:143). The focus of the East Asia Value Survey is on the structure of consciousness and sense of values, especially “sense of trust”. Table 8 shows the period of survey, the age of targeted people, sample size and the number of the actual respondents.

There have already been analyses using the result of the East Asia Value Survey, mainly done by researchers of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics.

**Table 10 Outline of the East Asia Value Survey**

Countries and regions	Target population	Sampling method	Sample size	Respondents (response rate)
Japan	Japanese aged 20 or over	Two-stage stratified random sampling	1,200	787(65.6%)
South Korea	South Korean aged 20 or over	Quota	—	1,006
Taiwan	Taiwanese aged 20 or over	Three-stage stratified random sampling <sup>1)</sup>	1,800	734
China (Beijing)	Adults aged 18 or over	Multi-stage stratified random sampling	3,633 <sup>2)</sup>	1,062 (29.2%)
China (Shanghai)	Adults aged 18 or over	Multi-stage stratified random sampling	1,915	1,052 (54.9%)
Hong Kong	Residents in Hong Kong Aged 18 or over, living in China including Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan more than 5 years	Multi-stage stratified random sampling	3,000	1,057
Singapore	Singaporean aged 20 or over	Two-stage stratified random sampling	—	1037 (about 20%)

Note: 1) Confirmed by Dr. Su-Hao Tu, Assistant Research Fellow of the Office of Survey Research, Academia Sinica.

2) Including supplementary sample.

Source: East Asia Value Survey website, Yoshino (2006).

The analysis of “the sense of trust” by Yoshino (2005b) made a cross-national comparison of trust to person (Q.26-28. see «Appendix C» for questions), trust to institution and society (Q.41a-j), consciousness on law (Q.35 and 36) and values on society (Q.23 and 50). In addition to this, the comparative analysis between Western countries and East Asia was also carried out, with the data of “Cross-National Survey of Seven Countries”<sup>(13)</sup>. According to the study, the existing “sense of trust” is falling down on account of the breakdown of conventional system of society and is changing into a new system of trust. And from the result of the analysis, Yoshino asserted that the universal value of human relationship, such as family relations, exists in not only the East but also the West. He proposed that international mutual understanding be based on it, and that national wealth and sense of trust develop complementarily with each other under the new system of society.

Zheng (2005) analyzed the transition of traditional values. In his study, values on family and marriage (Q.3, 13, 19 and 20), preference of gender (Q.42a and b) and Confucian thought (Q.50) were analyzed, in order to examine whether traditional values was changing, and whether there were differences between Chinese including Taiwanese, South Korean and Japanese. The result showed the difference of current situation of traditional values; in China traditional values was declined; in Japan it co-existed with Western values; in South Korea, among traditional values, emphasis on superiority of man (e.g. wife should go along with her husband) was found.

Miyoshi and Yoshino (2005) made an analysis of values toward occupation with open-answered questions asking respondents what occupation they consider most respected (Q.39a) and what occupation they actually would like to have (Q39b). The most frequent answers were “a teacher”



and “a doctor” in all the countries and regions, except for Japan in which “a civil servant” held the first place of the occupation Japanese respondents actually would like to have, and for South Korea where “an independent enterpreneur” ranked the second occupation to have actually. With these results, Miyoshi and Yoshino argued that it was important to analyze such tendency when comparing the values toward occupation in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and China.

Kakuda and Suzuki (2006) discussed what are regarded as important thing in East Asia. First, they paid their attention to the question (Q.38) which asked “the most important thing” of the respondents in an open-answer form. They categorized the answers into “life, health, myself”, “family”, “love and spirit”, “others” and “Don’t know, no answer”, and the most frequent answer turned out to be “family and children” in Japan and South Korea, while in Taiwan, Beijing, Shanghai and Hong Kong it was “life, health, myself”. Then, they examined questions on importance of matters in life with 7-point scale for each (Q.12). The category with the most frequent answers was “your immediate family members such as spouse and children”, followed by “Parents, brothers, sisters, and other relatives”, “Career and Job”. On the other hand, in some categories frequency varied among countries and regions; in Singapore 40.1% of the respondents scored 7 points for “Religion”, while in Japan the number of respondents was 8%; the ratio of South Korean who gave 7 points to “Politics” was 21%, in Hong Kong the ratio was only 3%.

Hayashi (2006) made a research on the meaning of religious faith and religious mind for the Japanese, in comparison with other East Asian people. In the study, she first analyzed the result of questions asking whether respondents had a religious faith (Q.31a) and religious mind (Q.32). Then, she classified patterns of answers to the questions on respect for ancestors of the respondents (Q.1), belief of existence of soul (Q.11b) and life after death (Q.11c), health condition (Q.5), satisfaction with family (Q.13) and life in general (Q.14), values toward science (Q.29b-d), religious mind (Q.32), and attitude toward parents (Q.49a and b). From the result of the analysis, she found that many of the Japanese did not have religious faith but “a religious mind”<sup>(14)</sup>. Similar tendency was found in Hong Kong, while in Beijing most people did not have religious faith, nor they thought it necessary to have religious mind. She also noted that in Japan correlation was high between existence of religious faith and respect for ancestors, as well as between interest to religion and satisfaction with life in general.

Hoshino (2006) focused on the questions which asked values of the respondents on law (Q.34), norm (Q.35 and 36) and contract (Q.24a-b, and Q.55), and the questions on sense of trust in people (Q.26-28). He analyzed those questions and sought what determined those items in each country, and how they related each other within a person. The analysis showed that sense of trust correlated with different senses in each country. In China it correlated with sense of norm and sense of law<sup>(15)</sup>. In Taiwan it correlated with sense of norm and sense of contract. In Japan it correlated with sense of contract and sense of law. Also, it was shown that sense of trust correlated with educational background in Beijing and Shanghai, while such correlation was not found in other countries and regions.

Matsumoto (2006) made a research on the sense of trust in organizations. In the research, he made factor analysis on the sense of trust in organization (Q.41), both in the whole East Asian level and in each country/region. Then he analyzed relation with sense of trust to other people (Q.26-28). Based on the results of the research, he pointed out that two common factors were likely to exist behind the trust in organization; one was “establishment trust” to the media, the administration, the legislation and the judiciary, and the other was “civil trust” to a religious group, NGO/NPO, a social welfare facilities and the United Nations, although the two types of trust might not be completely the same in the whole East Asia. And as the model to explain trust in people couldn’t be applied to trust

in organizations, he argued that some parts of trust in organization were constructed apart from trust in people, and such part demands further investigation.

Yamaoka (2004, 2005) analyzed relation between “sense of health” in East Asia and factors on society and culture, by examining respondents’ attributes including self-rated health (Q.4)<sup>(16)</sup>, health condition (Q.5), satisfaction with life (Q.13 and 14), sense of trust (Q.26 and 28), uneasiness (Q.10a-c) attitude toward science (Q.25a) and social classification (Q.6). The result clarified that self-rated health had strong relation with uneasiness and satisfaction with life, and that women in general tended to appeal dissatisfaction with their own health more than men do (the average number of subjective symptoms was higher in women than in men).

Zheng et. al. (2006) analyzed environmental consciousness of people in East Asia. First, they made a comparison between attitudes toward nature (Q.21) and environment (Q.37). Then they categorized the pattern of the answers in each country on health condition (Q.5), satisfaction with life (Q.14), sense of trust (Q.26 and 28), religious faith (Q.31a) and mind (Q.32) and technology (Q.41j.), by sex, age and educational background, and analyzed factors of environmental consciousness in each countries and regions. From the analysis, they pointed out that China had strong tendency to choose “conquer nature” rather than “follow nature”, and in the whole East Asia, young people, people with lower educational background and people who received lower incomes tended to prefer “conquer nature” to “follow nature”. They also found out that factors which influence environmental consciousness were different between countries and regions.

Yamaoka and Li (2006) examined the stability of international comparative survey data, by comparing the result of a common question (Q.3, 4, 6, 10, 11a-g, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, 29a-c, 41a, c, j and 50a-g) of the East Asia Value Survey and “Health and Culture Survey”, which was conducted in South Korea and Taiwan in 2003 with the same method as the East Asia Value Survey. The result verified the confidence of the data, because the ratio and pattern of answers fairly coincided between both surveys.

As seen in the researches above, data of the East Asia Value Survey is used in various analyses and offers precious knowledge to the study of Japanese national characters and consciousness of people in East Asia. However, it is a pity that the data of is not open to public. And we saw in table 8, the survey was in China is conducted only in a few large city. The Institute of Mathematic Science implemented survey in Guangzhou and Kunming in 2002 and 2003 too, and the studies presented above contain the result of that survey. Nevertheless, we cannot say that the data, with a supplement of the survey result of the two cities, is representative of the whole China.

## 7. Discussion toward EASS 2008

In this article cross-national surveys focusing on East Asia and analyses based on their results were reviewed. We first examined the World Values Survey and the ISSP, conducting surveys worldwide including East Asia. These surveys tend to put together the countries and regions of East Asia in terms of culture. In the World Values Survey website, for example, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and China are collected into “Confucian” culture.<sup>(17)</sup> Our interest, however, lies in similarities and differences within East Asia. When we are to make cross-national comparison between East Asian countries and regions, which are supposed to hold some common features like values, it is essential to conduct cross-national surveys incorporating questions which can grasp such features. So in this article we examined the surveys with East Asian focus, *i.e.* the AsiaBarometer, the Asian Barometer and the East Asia Value Survey, and cross-national studies based on the surveys.

On concluding this article, let us consider the role and the significance of the EASS. As

mentioned above, the EASS is preparing its second survey “Globalization and Culture in East Asia” Culture is a topic which cross-national surveys in East Asia have not taken up. The AsiaBarometer is centered on daily life of people; The ABS focus on political matter like democracy; and the East Asia Value Survey holds “Sense of trust” as its main topic. None of them tackles straight on culture in East Asia, or effect of globalization on culture. The ISSP covered globalization in the survey of “National Identity” conducted in 1995 and 2003, but relation between globalization and culture of East Asia is out of their sight. Therefore, in EASS 2008, it is required to investigate to cultural features which are thought to be common to East Asia, cultural practice and diffusion of cultural products derived from each of East Asian country/region. And based on such investigation, it is necessary to clarify points in common and points in differences in East Asia which we have been apt to see as self-evident.

### [Footnotes]

- (1) Information released in the website of each survey project was confirmed in January 2008, and are subject to future change or revision. The author would like to ask readers to see the sites to check the latest information.
- (2) In Turkey the 4th wave was carried out twice, and the total number of respondents amounts 4,607. Morocco and Spain are countries which also conducted survey twice in the period of the 4th wave.
- (3) According to Yamazaki (2004), the number of respondents of the 2nd wave varied from 304 in Northern Ireland to 2,736 in South Africa.
- (4) In 5th wave three different questionnaires are used: non OECD questionnaire, OECD questionnaire A-ballot and OECD questionnaire B-ballot, all of which derived from the same root version.
- (5) In order to solve the problem mentioned above and use the data of the WVS, the series of studies by Manabe et. al. are useful. About data of East Asia, see Manabe et. al. (1996; 1997)
- (6) Aramaki and Onodera (2004) and Onodera (2003b) reported that China once made an application for entry to ISSP every year, but the vote at a general meeting did not approve it for some reason.
- (7) According to Inoguchi (2006c), The AsiaBarometer is planning its 2007 survey in Southeast Asia, *i.e.* Indonesia, Malaysia, Brunei, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Singapore and Thailand). 2008 survey is planned in Japan, China, India, Indonesia and Kazakhstan, with extended number of samples.
- (8) Manabe (2006b) extended his analyses to India, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan.
- (9) Sonoda defined “Urban middle class” as those who answered 2 (business owner in mining or manufacturing industry of an organization with up to 30 employees), 3 (business owner of a retail organization with up to 30 employees), 4 (vendor or street trader), 6 (self-employed professional), 7 (senior manager), 8 (employed professional or specialist), 9 (clerical worker) and 10 (those engaged in sales) in Question F6. Out of the “Urban middle class”, he classified respondents who answered 2, 3 and 6 as “Old middle class”, 7 and 8 as “New middle class”, and 4, 9, and 10 as “Marginal middle class”. He also defined those who answered 11, 12 and 13 as “Working class”.
- (10) “New middle class” here was defined as the aggregation of those who answered 7, 8, 9 and 10 in Question F6. Definition of “working class” was the same as previous discussion of Sonoda (2005b).
- (11) Due to difficulties in the implementation of the survey, Japanese team of the ABS conducting additional sampling. 709 cases were collected, out of which 611 cases were used as substitute sample. The response rate including additional sample was 34.3% (Ikeda, et. al., 2007)
- (12) In regards to the background of East Asia Value Survey, see Yoshino (2004, 2005a) and Zheng and Yoshino (2003).
- (13) The Institute of Statistical Mathematics conducted “Cross-National Survey of Seven Countries” in Japan, the UK, France, West Germany, the U.S., the Netherlands and Italy from 1985 to 1994 (<http://www.ism.ac.jp/~yoshino/arito/>).
- (14) However, in the data of “the Survey on the Japanese National Character” conducted by the Institute of Statistical Mathematics, the number of the twenties who do not have “religious faith” but “religious mind” was decreasing from

1980's to 1990's. (Hayashi, 2006)

- (15) Hoshino (2006) only argued that correlation existed in mainland China, but table 4 in Hoshino(2006) showed the correlation was positive in Beijing and negative in Shanghai.
- (16) “Self-rated health” was measured by the average number to subjective symptoms (such as headache and back pain) complained by respondents (Yamaoka, 2005).
- (17) Inglehart-Welzel Cultural Map of the World in the World Values Survey website.

## [References]

- Albritton, Robert B., Thawilwadee Bureekul and Gang Guo, 2003, “Impacts of Urban-Rural Cleavages and Cultural Orientations on Attitudes toward Elements of Democracy: A Cross-National, Within-Nation Analysis”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 6.
- Albritton, Robert B. and Thawilwadee Bureekul, 2005, “Social and Cultural Supports for Plural Democracy in Eight Asian Nations: A Cross-National, Within-Nation Analysis”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 31.
- Aramaki, Hiroshi and Noriko Onodera, 2004, “ISSP kokusai hikaku chosa no gaiyo to data ni tsuite” (Outline and data of ISSP International Comparative Survey), in Manabe (ed.), *Kokusaihikaku chosa no frontier - bunkateki tayosei no shizakara (Frontier of Cross-national Comparative Study - from the Viewpoint of Cultural Diversity)*, Kwansai Gakuin University Graduate School of Sociology and Social Work: 81-90.
- Chang, Eric, Yun-han Chu and Fu Hu, 2003, Regime Performance and Support for Democratization, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 7.
- Chang, Eric and Yun-han Chu, 2007, “Traditionalism, Political Learning and Conceptions of Democracy in East Asia”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 39.
- Chen, Xiangming, 2006, “Book Review: Values and Life Styles in Urban Asia: A Cross-Cultural Analysis and Sourcebook Based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2003”, *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 65(2):398-400.
- Chu, Yun-han, Yu-tzung Chang and Fu Hu, 2003, “Regime Performance, Value Change and Authoritarian Detachment in East Asia”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 8.
- Chu, Yun-han and Min-hua Huang, 2007, “A Synthetic Analysis of Sources of Democratic Legitimacy”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 41.
- Fukushima, Akiko, 2005, “Higashi Asia ni okeru kinoteki kyoryoku no kanosei -2004 nendo AsiaBarometer tyosa kekka kara-” (Possibility of Functional Cooperation in East Asia - from the Result of the AsiaBarometer 2004 Survey), *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 1:21-25.
- Hayashi, Fumi, 2006, “Shukyo to soboku na shukyoteki kanjo” (A Study of Religious Faith and Religious Feelings), *Behaviormetrics*, 33 (1): 13-24.
- Hoshino Takahiro, 2006, “Ninchiteki social capital toshiteno hoishiki, kihan'ishiki, keiyakukan to taijinshinraikan no kanren -Higashiajia kachikan kokusai hikaku chosa data kara-”(The Relationships between Cognitive Social Capitals - Law-Abiding Spirit, Normative Consciousness, Attitude Toward Contract and Trust in the East Asia -), *Behaviormetrics*, 33(1): 41-53.
- Hosono, Sukehiro, 2006, “Kofuku ni totte keizai shakai hatten toha nanika? -AsiaBarometer no data kaiseki kara no shiken-” (What is Economic and Social Development for Happiness? - Personal Opinion out of Data Analysis of the AsiaBarometer) *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 2:6-23.
- Huang, Min-hua, Yun-han Chu and Yu-tzung Chang, 2007, “Quality of Democracy and Regime Legitimacy in East Asia”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 40.
- Ikeda, Ken'ichi, 2004, “Kokusai hikaku data riyo no igi” (Significance of Cross-national Comparative

- Data) in Manabe (ed.), *Kokusaihikaku chosa no frontier -bunkateki tayosei no shizakara (Frontier of Cross-national Comparative Study - from the Viewpoint of Cultural Diversity)*, Kwansai Gakuin University Graduate School of Sociology and Social Work: 61-64.
- Ikeda, Ken'ichi, Yasuo Yamada and Masaru Kohno, 2003, "Influence of Social Capital on Political Participation in Asian Cultural Context", *ABS Working Paper Series*, 10.
- Ikeda, Ken'ichi, Masashiro Yamada, Naoko Taniguchi, Satoko Yasuno, Yoshitaka Nishizawa, and Gill Steel, 2007, "Japan Country Report - Second Wave of Asian Barometer Survey", *ABS Working Paper Series*, 32.
- Ikeda, Ken'ichi and Tetsuro Kobayashi, 2007, "The Influence of Social Capital on Political Participation in the Cultural Context of Asia", *ABS Working Paper Series*, 37.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, 2002, "AsiaBarometer no setsuritsu wo mezase -chiiki seron chosa ga hiraku gakujutsu, bijinesu no kanosei" (Head for Establishment of the AsiaBarometer -Regional Opinion Poll Develops Possibility of Science and Business) *Central Review*, July 2002: 150-155.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, 2005a, "The AsiaBarometer: Its Origins, Its Principles and Its Prospects" *Participation*, 29(2): 16-18.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, 2005b, "AsiaBarometer ni mirareru kyodotaiishiki" (Consciousness toward East Asian Community Seen in AsiaBarometer), *Gaiko Forum*, October 2005: 56-61.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, 2005c, "AsiaBarometer ni mirareru kyodotaiishiki" (Consciousness toward East Asian Community Seen in AsiaBarometer), *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 1: 6-12. (Reprint of Inoguchi, 2005b)
- Inoguchi, Takashi, 2006a, "Nihon shakai ha jumbo shakai deha nakunatta noka?" (Is Japanese Society No Longer Law-abiding?) *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 2:1-5.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, 2006b, "The AsiaBarometer Question and Answers" Paper prepared for presentation at the World Congress of the International Political Science Association, Fukuoka, Japan, 9-13 July 2006.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, 2006c, "AsiaBarometer" *Yoron*, 98: 35-39.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, Miguel Basáñez, Akihiko Tanaka and Timur Dadabaev (eds.), 2005a, "AsiaBarometer Toshiba no kachikan to seikatu style -AsiaBarometer [2003] no bunseki to shiryō" (*Values and Life Styles in Urban Asia: A Cross-Cultural Analysis and Sourcebook Based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2003*), Akashi shoten.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, Miguel Basáñez, Akihiko Tanaka and Timur Dadabaev (eds.), 2005b, *Values and Life Styles in Urban Asia: A Cross-Cultural Analysis and Sourcebook Based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2003*, Mexico City: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, and Seiji Fujii, 2007, *The AsiaBarometer: Its Aim, Its Scope and Its Development*, paper presented in the AsiaBarometer website.
- ISSP Working Principle*, downloaded from the ISSP website.
- Kawato, Akio, 2005, "'Higashi Asia bunmei' ha kano nanoka?" (Is It Possible to Form 'East Asian Civilization'?), *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 1:17-20.
- Kawato, Akio, 2006, "[Book review] Inoguchi, Takashi, Miguel Basáñez, Akihiko Tanaka and Timur Dadabaev (eds.) [2005] 'AsiaBarometer Toshiba no kachikan to seikatu style -AsiaBarometer [2003] no bunseki to shiryō' (Inoguchi, Takashi, Miguel Basáñez, Akihiko Tanaka and Timur Dadabaev (eds.), 2005b, *Values and Life Styles in Urban Asia: A Cross-Cultural Analysis and Sourcebook Based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2003*), *Ajia Kenkyu*, 52(1): 102-106.
- Manabe, Kazufumi, 1999, "National Identity no kozo - ISSP kokusai hikakuchosa no data kaiseki -" (The Structure of National Identity -Data Analysis of the ISSP Cross-national Survey-), *Research*

- Association Administration Committee School of Sociology, Kwansai Gakuin University School of Sociology Journal*, 82:145-156.
- Manabe, Kazufumi, 2004, “AsiaBarometer no data kaiseki - hohoronteki kentou to tansakuteki data kaiseki -” (Data Analysis of the AsiaBarometer Survey - Methodological Discussions and Exploratory Data Analysis -), *Kwansai Gakuin University School of Sociology Journal*, .97: 1-24.
- Manabe, Kazufumi (ed.), 2004, *Kokusaihikaku chosa no frontier -bunkateki tayosei no shizakara (Frontier of Cross-national Comparative Study- from the Viewpoint of Cultural Diversity)*, Kwansai Gakuin University Graduate School of Sociology and Social Work.
- Manabe, Kazufumi, 2006a, “Ajia ni okeru kofuku to manzoku no bunka -AsiaBarometer chosa no data kaiseki-” (The Culture of Happiness and Satisfaction in Asia: Data Analysis of the AsiaBarometer Surveys), *Kwansai Gakuin University School of Sociology Journal*, 100: 55-70.
- Manabe, Kazufumi, 2006b, Data Analysis of the AsiaBarometer Survey -Methodological Discussions and Exploratory Data Analysis-), *Kwansai Gakuin University School of Sociology Journal*, 101: 25-40.
- Manabe, Kazufumi, Maki Kurita, Liu Zhiming, Hiroko Kato, Jong-Hwan Lee, 1996, “R. Inglehart no 'Sekai kachikan chōsa' (World Values Survey) data no nijiteki bunseki no tameno junbi sagyō” (Toward a Secondary Analysis of the World Values Survey Data), *Kwansai Gakuin University School of Sociology Journal* .75: 67-82.
- Manabe, Kazufumi, Maki Kurita, Hiroko Kato, 1997, “R. Inglehart no 'Sekai kachikan chōsa' (World Values Survey) data no nijibunseki no tameno junbi sagyō (2)” (Toward a Secondary Analysis of the World Values Survey Data (II)), *Kwansai Gakuin University School of Sociology Journal*, 76: 157-204.
- Matsumoto, Wataru, 2006, “Higashiajia ni okeru soshiki ni taisuru shinraikan -kokusai hikaku no tameno shinraikan no bunseki-” (Sense of Trust on Organizations in East Asia -Analysis for a Cross-National Comparative Survey-), *Behaviormetrics*, 33(1): .25-40.
- Miyoshi, Yoshihiro and Ryoza Yoshino, 2005, “Higashiajia no syokugyokan -Nihon, Chugoku, Taiwan, Kankoku no hikaku-” (A Comparative Study of Work Value of the East Asian People -Japan, China, Taiwan, and South Korea-), *Behaviormetrics*, 32(2): 173-189.
- Nathan, Andrew J., 2007, “Political Culture and Diffuse Regime Support in Asia”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 43.
- Onodera, Noriko, 2000, “Hitobito wa seifu ni nani wo kitaishite iruka -ISSP kokusai hikaku chosa kara-” (What Do People Expect of their Government?: the ISSP International Comparative Survey), *The NHK Monthly Report on Broadcast Research*, 50(4): 14-29.
- Onodera, Noriko, 2001, “Nihonjin ha 'kaishaningen' ka -ISSP kokusai hikaku chosa 'shokugyo ishiki' kara-” (Are the Japanese Loyal to their Companies?: From ISSP International Comparative Survey in Attitudes towards Work) *The NHK Monthly Report on Broadcast Research*, 51(8) 90-105.
- Onodera, Noriko, 2003a, “Byodo shakai no imeji to jikkan no zure -ISSP kokusai hikaku chosa 'shakaiteki hubyodo' ni miru nihonjin no ishiki-” (Images and Realities of the Egalitarian Society: Japanese Views on Social Inequality as Reflected in the ISSP's International Comparative Survey), *The NHK Monthly Report on Broadcast Research*, 53(1): 56-71.
- Onodera, Noriko, 2003b, “ISSP no kokusai chosa” (International Survey of ISSP), *Yoron*, 92: 18-27.
- Park, Chong-Min and Doh Chull Shin, 2005, “Do East Asians View Democracy as a Lesser Evil? Testing the Churchill's Notion of Democracy in East Asia”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 30.
- Park, Chong-min and Jaechul Lee, 2007, “Are Associations the Schools of Democracy across Asia?”

- ABS Working Paper Series*, 38.
- Shin, Doh Chull, 2007a, “Is Not So Bad Good Enough: Retesting Churchill’s Lesser-Evil Notion of Democracy in East Asia”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 44.
- Shin, Doh Chull, 2007b, “Why East Asians React Differently to democratic Regime Change: Discerning Their Routes to Becoming Authentic Democrats”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, No. 45.
- Sonoda, Sigeto, 2005a, “Vietnam: Social Life under Development and Globalization”, in Inoguchi et. al. (eds.), 2005b, *Values and Life Styles in Urban Asia: A Cross-Cultural Analysis and Sourcebook Based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2003*, Mexico City: Siglo XXI Editores: 121-133.
- Sonoda, Sigeto, 2005b, “Toshi chukanso no taito to ‘Higashi Asia kyodotai’” (Emerging Urban Middle Class and ‘East Asian Community’), *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 1:27-32.
- Sonoda, Sigeto, 2006a, “Urban New Middle Classes in East Asia: Their Socio-cultural Background and Socio-political Orientations in Comparative Perspective”, *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 3:23-38.
- Sonoda, Sigeto, 2006b, “Chugoku kenkyu kara hikaku kenkyu he -‘toi’ wo toinaosu tameno seido kochiku to AsiaBarometer no yakuwari”, *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 4:14-18.
- Tan, Ern Ser and Wang Zhengxu, 2007, “Are Younger People in Asia More Pro-democratic: Lifecycle Effects or Generational Changes?”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 36.
- Tanaka, Akihiko, 2005, “Higashi Asia shokoku ni okeru shuyokoku no eikyoryoku ninshiki” (Recognition of Influence of Major Countries in East Asia), *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 1:13-16.
- Tanaka, Akihiko, 2006, “Higashi Asia shokoku ni okeru shuyokoku no eikyoryoku ninshiki” (Recognition of Influence of Major Countries in East Asia), *AsiaBarometer Project Series*, 3:1-22.
- Tanaka, Akihiko, 2007, “Nihon gaiko no shori to kadai -serontyosa ‘AsiaBarometer’ kara akiraka to natta Asia kakkoku no shisen” (Triumphs and Challenges of Japanese Diplomacy- Visual Lines of Asian Countries Revealed by ‘the AsiaBarometer’ Survey) *Ronza*, Mar. 2007:98-103.
- Tsunoda, Hiroko and Tatsuzo Suzuki, 2006, “‘Ichiban taisetsu na mono’ -Higashiajia kachikan kokusai hikaku chosa data kara ikutsuka no wadai-” (The Most Important Thing -Several Topics from Analysis of the East Asia Value Survey-), *Behaviormetrics*, 33(1): 1-12.
- Wu, Chin-en and Yun-han Chu, 2007, “Income Inequality and Satisfaction with Democracy: Evidence from East Asia”, *ABS Working Paper Series*, 42.
- Yamaoka, Kazue, 2004, “Kenko to kokuminsei” (Health and National Character), *Gakusai*, 12: 39-45.
- Yamaoka, Kazue, 2005, “Higashi ajia no hitobito no ‘kenko’ to kanrensuru shakai, bunka yoin: - ‘Higashiajia kachikan kokusai hikaku chosa Higashiajia kachikan kokusai chôsa’ to ‘Iryo to bunka chosa’ kekka no bunseki” (Health and Social and Cultural Factors in East Asia- Analysis of the East Asia Value Survey and the Health and Culture Survey-), *Behaviormetrics*, 32(2): 191-199.
- Yamaoka, Kasue and Sangyoon Lee, 2006, “Kokusai hikaku chosa no anteisei ni tuite no kensyô -2003 nendo Kankoku to Taiwan ni okeru ‘Kenko to bunka chosa’ oyobi ‘Higashiajia kachikan kokusai chosa’ data no hikaku-” (A Note on the Stability of International Comparative Survey Data: Comparison of Survey Data of “Health and Culture Survey” and “East Asian Value Survey” in Korea and Taiwan), *Behaviormetrics*, 31(2): 125-135.
- Yamazaki, Seiko, 2004, “Sekai kachikan chosa no gaiyo to data riyô no tebiki” (Outline of the World Values Survey and Guide of Data Utilization) in Manabe (ed.), *Kokusaihikaku chosa no frontier -*

- bunkateki tayosei no shizakara (Frontier of Cross-national Comparative Study- from the Viewpoint of Cultural Diversity)*, Kwansai Gakuin University Graduate School of Sociology and Social Work: 93-150.
- Yonemura, Keiko, 1998, “‘Sekai kachikan chosa’ ni miru seikatsu kachikan no kokusai hikaku” (Cross-national Comparison of Values toward Daily Life Seen in ‘the World Values Survey’), *Tokei*, 49(1): 13-18.
- Yoshino, Ryozo, 2004, “‘Kokuminsei’ no chosa - keiryoteki bummeiron kakuritsu ni mukete” (Survey of National Character -toward establishment of Behaviormetric Study of Civilization), *Gakusai*, 12: 6-12.
- Yoshino, Ryozo, 2005a, “Higashiajia kachikan kokusai hikaku chosa -Bunkateki tayotai bunseki [CULMAN] ni motodoku keiryoteki bummeiron kochiku ni mukete-” (East Asia Value Survey -For the Development of Behaviormetric Study of Civilization on the Cultural Manifold Analysis [CULMAN] -), *Behaviormetrics*, 32(2): 133-146.
- Yoshino, Ryozo, 2005b, “Hukoku shinrai no jidai e -Higashiajia kachikan kokusai hikaku chosa ni okeru shinraikan no tokei kagakuteki bunseki-” (A time to Trust in the East Asia -A Behaviormetric Study on the Sense of Trust in East Asia Value Survey-), *Behaviormetrics*, 32(2): 147-160.
- Yoshino, Ryozo, 2006, “Higashiajia kachikan kokusai chosa -Shinraikan no tokei kagakuteki bunseki” (The East Asia Value Survey -Statistical Analysis of ‘the Sense of Trust’-) *Report of Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A) 2002-2005*.
- Zheng, Yuejin, 2005, “Higashi ajia no dentoteki kachikan no hensen ni kansuru keiryō bunseki” (Cross-National Comparison of Transitions of Traditional Values in Eastern Asian Countries), *Behaviormetrics*, 32(2): 161-172.
- Zheng, Yuejin and Ryozo Yoshino, 2003, “Higashiajia kachikan kokusai chosa ni mukete -Chugoku ni okeru ishikityosa no tameno hyohonchushutsu no jissennteki kento”, *Yoron*, 91: 16-21.
- Zheng, Yuejin, Ryozo Yoshino and Masakatsu Murakami, 2006, “Higashiajia shokoku no hitobito no shizenkan, kankyokan no kaiseki – kankyōishiki keiei ni eikyo wo ataeru yoin no chushutsu” (An Analysis on Attitudes toward Nature and Environment in East Asia -Main Factors in Formation of Environmental Consciousness –), *Behaviormetrics*, 33(1): 55-68.

## URL

The AsiaBarometer (English and Japanese)	<a href="https://www.asiabarometer.org/">https://www.asiabarometer.org/</a>
The Asian Barometer (English)	<a href="http://www.asianbarometer.org/">http://www.asianbarometer.org/</a>
The East Asia Barometer (Chinese and English)	<a href="http://eacsurvey.law.ntu.edu.tw/">http://eacsurvey.law.ntu.edu.tw/</a>
The East Asia Values Survey (English and Japanese)	<a href="http://www.ism.ac.jp/~yoshino/ea/index.html">http://www.ism.ac.jp/~yoshino/ea/index.html</a>
International Comparative Surveys Data Archive, The Institute of Statistical Mathematics (English and Japanese)	<a href="http://www.ism.ac.jp/~yoshino/">http://www.ism.ac.jp/~yoshino/</a>
The ISSP (English)	<a href="http://issp.org">http://issp.org</a>
The World Values Survey (English)	<a href="http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/">http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/</a>



**Appendix A: Questions of AsiaBarometer 2003 used in the studies mentioned in this article**  
 Source: the AsiaBarometer website.

Q1 Which of the following public utilities does your household have the use of? (MA)  
 1 The public water supply 2 Electricity 3 Piped gas 4 None of the above 5 Don't know

Q2 Which, if any, of the following statements apply to you. (MA)  
 1 A member of my family or a relative lives in another country 5 I often communicate with people in other countries via the Internet or email.  
 2 I have traveled abroad at least three times in the past three years, on holiday or for business purposes. 6 My job involves contact with organizations or people in other countries.  
 3 I have friends who are from other countries. 7 None of the above  
 4 I often watch foreign-produced programs on TV. 8 Don't know

Q4 All things considered, would you say that you are happy these days? (SA)  
 1 Very happy 2 Pretty happy 3 Neither happy nor unhappy 4 Not too happy 5 Very unhappy 6 Don't know

Q5 Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following aspects of your life. (SA for each)  
 (1 Very satisfied 2 Somewhat satisfied 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
 4 Somewhat dissatisfied 5 Very dissatisfied 6 Don't know)

a Housing → 1 2 3 4 5 6  
 b Friendships →  
 c Marriage (if married) →  
 d Standard of living →  
 e Household income →  
 f Health →  
 g Education →  
 h Job →  
 i Neighbors →  
 j Public safety →  
 k The condition of the environment →  
 l Social welfare system →  
 m The democratic system →  
 n Family life →  
 o Leisure →

Q6 How would you describe your standard of living? (SA)  
 1 High 2 Relatively high 3 Average 4 Relatively low 5 Low 6 Don't know

Q9 Generally, do you think people can be trusted or do you think that you can't be too careful in dealing with people (that it pays to be wary of people)? (SA)  
 1 Most people can be trusted 2 Can't be too careful in dealing with people 3 Don't know

Q10 Do you think that people generally try to be helpful or do you think that they mostly look out for themselves? (SA)  
 1 People generally try to be helpful 2 People mostly look out for themselves 3 Don't know

Q11 If you saw somebody on the street looking lost, would you stop to help? (SA)  
 1 I would always stop to help. 2 I would help if nobody else did.  
 3 It is highly likely that I wouldn't stop to help. 4 Don't know.

Q13 Suppose that you are the president of a company. In the company's employment examination, a relative of yours got the second highest grade, scoring only marginally less than the candidate with the highest grade. In such a case, which person would you employ? (SA)  
 1 The person with the highest grade  
 2 Your relative  
 3 Don't know

Q15-2 How proud are you of being [JAPANESE]? (SA)  
 1 Very proud 2 Somewhat proud 3 Not really proud 4 Not proud at all 5 Don't know

Q16-1 Throughout the world, some people also see themselves as belonging to a transnational group (such as Asian, people of Chinese ethnicity, people who speak the same language or practice the same religion). Do you identify with any transnational group? (SA)  
 1 Asian  
 2 Other transnational identity (please specify: )  
 3 No, I don't identify particularly with any transnational group 9 Don't know

Q16-2 Also, within [Japan], some people identify themselves with a region or other local group and feel that the region or group has given them characteristics that distinguish them from other people in the country. Do you identify with any region/group within [Japan]? (SA) [Different for each country]  
 1 Kansaijin 2 Kantojin 3 Other group (specify: )  
 4 No, I don't identify particularly with any region/group.

Q17-1 Which of the following social circles or groups are important to you? (MA)  
 1 Family 2 Relatives 3 Place of work 4 Club, hobby circle etc. 5 The school / university you attended  
 6 The area where you grew up 7 People who speak the same language or dialect as you 8 Neighborhood  
 9 Agricultural cooperative, commercial cooperative or industry group 10 Labor union 11 Political party  
 12 Religion 13 Other (please specify: )

Q20 Do you think the following countries have a good influence or a bad influence on your country? Please select the response closest to your opinion for each country listed. (SA for each country)  
 (1 Good influence 2 Rather good influence 3 Neither good nor bad influence 4 Rather bad influence 5 Bad influence 9 Don't know)

a China → 1 2 3 4 5 9  
 b Japan →  
 c India →  
 d USA →  
 e UK →  
 f Russia →  
 g Pakistan →  
 h South Korea →  
 i North Korea →

Q25 I am going to read out some statements about society and politics. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. (SA for each statement)

(1 Strongly agree 2 Agree 3 Neither agree nor disagree 4 Disagree 5 Strongly disagree 6 Don't know)

1 2 3 4 5 6

a Citizens have a duty to vote in elections. →

b There is widespread corruption among those who govern the country. →

c Generally speaking, people like me don't have the power to influence government policy or actions. →

d Politics and government are so complicated that sometimes I don't understand what's happening. →

e Since so many people vote in elections, it really doesn't matter whether I vote or not. →

f Generally speaking, the people who are elected to the [NATIONAL PARLIAMENT] stop thinking about the public once they're elected. →

g Government officials pay little attention to what citizens like me think. →

Q26 What should a person who needs a government permit do if the response of the officer handling the application is: "just be patient and wait?" (SA)

1 Use connections to obtain the permit 2 Nothing can be done 3 Wait and hope that things will work out

4 Write a letter 5 Act without a permit 6 Bribe an officer 7 Don't know

Q27 I'm going to describe various types of political systems. Please indicate for each system whether you think it would be very good, fairly good or bad for this country. (SA for each political system)

(1 Very good 2 Fairly good 3 Bad 4 Don't know)

1 2 3 4

a Governance by a powerful leader without the restriction of parliament or elections. →

b A system whereby decisions affecting the country are made by experts (such as bureaucrats with expertise in a particular field) according to what they think is best for the country. →

c Military government →

d A democratic political system →

Q28 From which kind of media do you get information about the following subjects? Please select all media that apply for each subject. (MA)

(1 TV programs 2 TV advertisements 3 Radio 4 Newspaper articles 5 Newspaper advertisements  
6 Magazine articles 7 Magazine advertisements 8 The Internet 9 Other 10 Don't know)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

a General household provisions (food, toiletries, cosmetics etc.) →

b Home electrical appliances →

c Automobiles →

d Politics and the economy →

e New trends →

Q21 Please indicate to what extent you trust the following institutions to operate in the best interests of society. If you don't know what to reply or have no particular opinion, please say so. (SA for each institution)

(1 Trust a lot 2 Trust to a degree 3 Don't really trust 4 Don't trust at all 5 Don't know)

1 2 3 4 5

a The central government →

b Your local government →

c The army →

d The legal system →

e The police →

f Parliament →

g The public education system →

h The public health system →

i Large domestic companies →

j Multinational companies operating in [Japan] →

k Trade unions/labor unions →

l The media →

m Non-governmental organizations (e.g. environmental, social advocacy groups or other non-profit organizations) →

n Religious organizations →

o The United Nations →

p The World Trade Organization →

q The World Bank →

r The International Monetary Fund →

Q23 Listed below are various areas of government spending. Please indicate whether you would like to see more or less government spending in each area. Please bear in mind that more spending may require a tax increase. (SA for each area of spending)

(1 Spend much more 2 Spend more 3 Spend the same as now 4 Spend less 5 Spend much less 6 Can't choose/Don't know)

1 2 3 4 5 6

a The environment →

b Health →

c Policing and law enforcement →

d Education →

e The military and defense →

f Old-age pensions →

g Unemployment benefits →

h Public transport, telecommunications infrastructure →

i Culture and the arts →

j Improvement of the social status of women →

Q24 How often do you vote in each of the following elections? Please answer for each type of election. (SA for each election type)

(1 Every time 2 Most of the time 3 Sometimes 4 Rarely 5 Never voted (even though I have the right to vote) 6 Don't have the right to vote 7 Don't know)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

a National elections →

b Local elections →

**Appendix B: Questions of the ABS used in the studies mentioned in this article**  
 Source: the Asian Barometer website, Wu and Chu (2007, SEI19 in the 2nd wave)

**B-1. The 1st wave**

1. How would you rate the overall economic condition of our country today? Is it ...?	Very good Good So so (not good nor bad) Bad Very bad	1 2 3 4 5
2. How would you describe the change in the economic condition of our country over the past five years? Is it ...?	Much better A little better About the same A little worse Much worse	1 2 3 4 5
3. What do you think will be the state of our country's economic condition five years from now? Will it be ...?	Much better A little better About the same A little worse Much worse	1 2 3 4 5
4. As for your own family, how do you rate your economic situation today? Is it ...?	Very good Good So so (not good nor bad) Bad Very bad	1 2 3 4 5
6. What do you think the economic situation of your family will be five years from now? Will it be ...?	Much better A little better About the same A little worse Much worse	1 2 3 4 5

I'M GOING TO NAME A NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS. FOR EACH ONE, PLEASE TELL ME HOW MUCH TRUST YOU HAVE IN THEM. IS IT A GREAT DEAL OF TRUST, QUITE A LOT OF TRUST, NOT VERY MUCH TRUST, OR NONE AT ALL?

	A Great Deal of Trust	Quite a Lot of Trust	Not Very Much Trust	None at All
7. The Courts	1	2	3	4
8. The national government [in capital city]	1	2	3	4
9. Political parties [not any specific party]	1	2	3	4
10. Parliament	1	2	3	4
12. The military	1	2	3	4
13. The police	1	2	3	4
14. Local government	1	2	3	4
15. Newspapers	1	2	3	4
16. Television	1	2	3	4
17. The election commission [specify institution by name]	1	2	3	4
18. Non-governmental organizations or NGOs	1	2	3	4

19. Are you a member of any organization or formal groups? IF YES: Please tell me the three (3) most important organizations or formal groups you belong to. (OPEN-ENDED AND THEN USE CODES BELOW)

VERBATIM:

Member of any organization or group	01
Residential association	02
Parent-Teacher Association or PTA	03
Trade association	04
Agricultural association	05
Labor union	06
Producer cooperative	07
Consumer cooperative	08
Volunteer group	09
Citizen movement organization	10
Religious group	11
Alumni association	12
Candidate support organization	13
Political party	14
Sports or leisure club	15
Others, please specify _____	( )
Not a member of any organization or group	99

64.	As you know, there are some people in our country who would like to change the way in which our country is governed. We would like to know what you think of their views. For each statement, would you say you STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, SOMEWHAT DISAGREE, or STRONGLY DISAGREE?	SA	SWA	SWD	SD
72.	Even if parents' demands are unreasonable, children still should do what they ask.	1	2	3	4
65.	When hiring someone, even if a stranger is more qualified, the opportunity should still be given to relatives and friends.	1	2	3	4
66.	When one has a conflict with a neighbor, the best way to deal with it is to accommodate the other person.	1	2	3	4
67.	Wealth and poverty, success and failure are all determined by fate.	1	2	3	4
68.	A person should not insist on his own opinion if his co-workers disagree with him.	1	2	3	4
69.	For the sake of the family, the individual should put his personal interests second.	1	2	3	4
70.	A man will lose face if he works under a female supervisor.	1	2	3	4
71.	If there is a quarrel, we should ask an elder to resolve the dispute.	1	2	3	4
72.	When a mother-in-law and a daughter-in-law come into conflict, even if the mother-in-law is in the wrong, the husband should still persuade his wife to obey his mother.	1	2	3	4
	In the past three (3) years, have you NEVER, ONCE, or MORE THAN ONCE done the following because of personal, family, or neighborhood problems, or problems with government officials and policies? <i>Neiz to Izenizuzuzi:</i>				
	For each question: If the answer is ONCE or MORE THAN ONCE, immediately ask the following questions; otherwise go to the next item.				
	● [Qs. 81-88]: did you do this alone or with others? <Optional>				
	● [Qs. 89-96]: did you ever give gifts or bring them out for dinner? ☞ do not ask this question for Q79. <Optional>				
		Qs. 81-88	Qs. 89-96		
		FREQUENCY	WITH OTHERS?	GIFTOR DINNER?	NEVER
		Once	More than once	Yes	No
				Yes	No
				Yes	Done
73.	Contacted government official.	1	2	1	2
75.	Contacted elected legislative representatives at any level.	1	2	1	2
76.	Contacted political parties or other organizations.	1	2	1	2
77.	Contacted non-government/civil organizations (farmers' unions, religious groups, interests groups).	1	2	1	2
78.	Contacted media (letter to newspapers, call-in to radio, TV, etc.)	1	2	1	2
98.	On the whole, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way democracy works in our country. Are you...?				
				Very Satisfied	1
				Fairly Satisfied	2
				Not Very Satisfied	3
				Not At All Satisfied	4

24.	General speaking, would you say that "Most people can be trusted" or "you can't be too careful in dealing with them"?	Most people can be trusted	1
		One can't be too careful in dealing with them	2
	HOW WELL WOULD YOU SAY THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS APPLY TO YOU?		
		Applies very well	1
		Applies pretty well	2
		Doesn't apply much	3
		Doesn't apply at all	4
25.	I have enough friends and connections so that I can get help if I need it.		
27.	In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they were away from home, they were sick or they just didn't have time. How about you? Did you vote in the election [the most recent national election, parliamentary or presidential] held in [year]?		
	Yes	1	
	No	2	
	[Do not read] Not applicable	7	
	[Do not read] Don't remember	8	
29-30.	Thinking about the national election in [year], did you...?		
29.	attend a campaign meeting or rally?	Yes	1
		No	2
		[Do not read] Not applicable	7
		[Do not read] No answer	9
30.	try to persuade others to vote for a certain candidate or party?	Yes	1
		No	2
		[Do not read] Not applicable	7
		[Do not read] No answer	9
56.	How interested would you say you are in politics?	Very interested	1
		Somewhat interested	2
		Not very interested	3
		Not at all interested	4
		Don't know	9
57.	How often do you follow news about politics	Everyday	2
		Several times a week	3
		Once or twice a week	4
		Not even once a week	5
		Practically never	6
58.	How often do you follow news about politics in the daily newspaper?	Everyday	2
		Several times a week	3
		Once or twice a week	4
		Not even once a week	5
		Practically never	6

114. How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in your local/municipal government? Would you say ...?	Hardly anyone is involved Not a lot of officials are corrupt Most officials are corrupt Almost everyone is corrupt	1 2 3 4
115. How widespread do you think corruption and bribe-taking are in the national government [in capital city]? Would you say ...?	Hardly anyone is involved Not a lot of officials are corrupt Most officials are corrupt Almost everyone is corrupt	1 2 3 4
116. Have you or anyone you know personally witnessed an act of corruption or bribe-taking by a politician or government official in the past year? IF WITNESSED: Did you personally witness it or were you told about it by a family member or friend who personally witnessed it?	WITNESSED (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSE) Personally witnessed Told about it by a family member who personally witnessed Told about it by a friend who personally witnessed PERSONALLY NEVER WITNESSED NO ONE I KNOW HAS PERSONALLY WITNESSED	1 2 3 4 5 6
117. Which of the following statements comes closest to your own opinion?	Democracy is always preferable to any other kind of government Under some circumstances, an authoritarian government can be preferable to a democratic one For people like me, it does not matter whether we have a democratic or a nondemocratic regime	1 2 3
118. Which of the following statements comes closer to your own view?	Democracy is capable of solving the problems of our society Democracy can not solve our society's problems	1 2
119. If you had to choose between democracy and economic development, which would you say is more important?	Economic development is definitely more important Economic development is somewhat more important Democracy is somewhat more important Democracy is definitely more important They are both equally important (DO NOT READ OUT)	1 2 3 4 5
121-124. As you know, there are some people in our country who would like to change the way in which our country is governed. We would like to know what you think of their views. For each statement, would you say you STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, SOMEWHAT DISAGREE, or STRONGLY DISAGREE?	DEMOCRATIC LEGITIMACY AND PREFERENCE FOR DEMOCRACY 121. We should get rid of parliament and elections and have a strong leader decide things. 122. No opposition party should be allowed to compete for power 123. The military should come in to govern the country. 124. We should get rid of parliament and elections and have the experts decide everything.	SA SWA SWD SD 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4

100. Where would you place our country under the present government?	Complete Dictatorship 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 DK = 99	
101. To what extent would you want our country to be democratic now?	Complete Dictatorship 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 DK = 99	
103. Here is a similar scale of 1 to 10 measuring the extent to which people think democracy is suitable for our country. If "1" means that democracy is completely unsuitable for [name of country] today and "10" means that it is completely suitable, where would you place our country today?	Democracy is completely unsuitable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 DK = 99	
104. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the [name of president, etc. ruling current] government? Are you ...?	Very Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	1 2 3 4
105-113. We would like you now to compare the present system of government with the one our country had under [name of president, etc. having most recent authoritarian rule]. In each of the following areas, would you say that today things are MUCH BETTER THAN BEFORE, SOMEWHAT BETTER, MUCH THE SAME, SOMEWHAT WORSE, or MUCH WORSE?		
<i>CHINA'S INTRODUCTION</i> {For China: "We would like you to compare the system of government we have today in China with the one we had before 'reform and opening' in 1978..."} Much better than Before Somewhat Better Same Somewhat Worse Much Worse		
105. Everyone is free to say what they think.	1 2 3 4 5	
106. Everyone is treated equally by the government.	1 2 3 4 5	
107. People like me can have an influence on government.	1 2 3 4 5	
108. Corruption in politics and government is under control.	1 2 3 4 5	
109. The gap between the rich and the poor have narrowed.	1 2 3 4 5	
110. Preventing crime and maintaining order.	1 2 3 4 5	
111. Economic development.	1 2 3 4 5	
112. Judges and courts are free from political interference.	1 2 3 4 5	
113. You can join any organization you like.	1 2 3 4 5	

5. How would you compare the current economic condition of your family with what it was a few years ago? Is it ...	Much better A little better About the same A little worse Much worse Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
30. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "By helping people in trouble today, someone else will help me when I am in trouble someday."	Agree Somewhat agree Somewhat disagree Disagree Do not understand the question Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 7 8 9
43. On the whole, how would you rate the freeness and fairness of the last national election, held in [year]. Was it: (NEW)	Completely free and fair Free and fair, but with minor problems Free and fair, with major problems Not free or fair Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 8 9
50. How often do you follow news about politics and government?	Everyday Several times a week Once or twice a week Not even once a week Practically never Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
61-65. Please tell me how you feel about the following statements. Would you say you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree? (Do not read: Do not understand the question, Can't choose & Decline to answer)		
61. Sometimes one has to follow one's own beliefs regardless of what other people think.	SA SVA SWD SD DU CC DA 1 2 3 4 7 8 9	
62. When dealing with others, securing one's immediate interests should be more important than developing a long-term relationship.	1 2 3 4 7 8 9	
63. Open quarrels (criticisms) among politicians are harmful to society.	1 2 3 4 7 8 9	
64. The relationship between the government and the people should be like that between parents and children.	1 2 3 4 7 8 9	
65. People should always support the decisions of their government even if they disagree with them.	1 2 3 4 7 8 9	

I have here other statements. For each statement, would you say you STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, SOMEWHAT DISAGREE, or STRONGLY DISAGREE?			
CITIZEN EMPowerMENT, SYSTEM RESPONSIVENESS AND POLITICAL SUPPORT	SA SVA SWD SD		
128. The nation is run by a powerful few and ordinary citizens cannot do much about it.	1 2 3 4		
129. People like me don't have any influence over what the government does.	1 2 3 4		
131. You can generally trust the people who run our government to do what is right.	1 2 3 4		
AUTHORITARIAN/DEMOCRATIC VALUES	SA SVA SWD SD		
132. People with little or no education should have as much say in politics as highly-educated people.	1 2 3 4		
133. Government leaders are like the head of a family; we should all follow their decisions.	1 2 3 4		
134. The government should decide whether certain ideas should be allowed to be discussed in society.	1 2 3 4		
135. Harmony of the community will be disrupted if people organize lots of groups.	1 2 3 4		
136. When judges decide important cases, they should accept the view of the executive branch.	1 2 3 4		
137. If the government is constantly checked [i.e. monitored and supervised] by the legislature, it cannot possibly accomplish great things.	1 2 3 4		
138. If we have political leaders who are morally upright, we can let them decide everything.	1 2 3 4		
139. If people have too many different ways of thinking, society will be chaotic.	1 2 3 4		
145-148. We oftentimes talk about the character and style of political leaders. Please tell me how you feel about the following statements. Do you STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, SOMEWHAT DISAGREE, or STRONGLY DISAGREE?	SA SVA SWD SD		
145. The most important thing for a political leader is to accomplish his goals even if he has to ignore the established procedure.	1 2 3 4		
146. If a political leader really believes in his position, he should refuse to compromise regardless of how many people disagree.	1 2 3 4		
147. A political leader should tolerate the views of those who challenge his political ideals.	1 2 3 4		
148. As long as a political leader enjoys majority support, he should implement his own agenda and disregard the view of the minority.	1 2 3 4		
<b>2. The 2nd wave</b>			
2. How would you describe the change in the economic condition of our country over the last few years? Is it ...	Much better A little better About the same A little worse Much worse Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 5 8 9	

112. How often do government officials withhold important information from the public view?	Always Most of the time Sometimes Rarely Don't understand the question Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 7 8 9
113. How often do national government officials abide by the law?	Always Most of the time Sometimes Rarely Don't understand the question Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 7 8 9
114. How often do you think our elections offer the voters a real choice between different parties/candidates.	Always Most of the time Sometimes Rarely Don't understand the question Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 7 8 9
115. To what extent is the legislature capable of keeping the government in check?	Very capable Capable Not capable Not at all capable Don't understand the question Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 7 8 9
116. How well do you think the government responds to what people want?	Very capable Capable Not capable Not at all capable Don't understand the question Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 7 8 9
120. In your opinion, is the government working to crackdown corruption and root out bribes? (NEW)	It is doing its best It is doing something It is not doing much Doing nothing Don't understand the question Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 7 8 9

67. How closely do you follow major events in foreign countries / the world?	Very closely Somewhat closely Not too closely Very little Not at all Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
Here is a list of actions that people sometimes take as citizens. For each of these, please tell me whether you, personally, have never, once, or more than once done any of these things during the past three years. (New) (Do not read: Can't choose & Decline to answer)	<u>Once</u> <u>More than once</u> <u>Never</u> <u>Decline to answer</u> <u>DA</u>	
86. Refused to pay taxes or fees to the government	1   2   3   8   9	
87. Got together with others to raise an issue or sign a petition	1   2   3   8   9	
88. Attended a demonstration or protest march	1   2   3   8   9	
92. People often differ in their views on the characteristic that is essential to democracy. If you have to choose only one of the things that I am going to read, which one would you choose as the most essential to a democracy?	Opportunity to change the government through elections Freedom to criticize those in power A small income gap between rich and poor Basic necessities like food, clothes and shelter etc. for everyone Don't understand question Can't choose Decline to answer	1 2 3 4 7 8 9
103-111. Now I am going to read to you a list of statements that describe how people often feel about the state of affairs in [country name]. Please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of these statements. (Do not read: Do not understand the question, Can't choose & Decline to answer)	<u>SA</u> <u>SWA</u> <u>SWD</u> <u>SD</u> <u>DU</u> <u>CC</u> <u>DA</u>	
103. People have the power to change a government they don't like.	1   2   3   4   7   8   9	
104. Our current courts always punish the guilty even if they are high-ranking officials.	1   2   3   4   7   8   9	
105. Political parties or candidates in our country have equal access to the mass media during the election period.	1   2   3   4   7   8   9	
106. Between elections, the people have no way of holding the government responsible for its actions.	1   2   3   4   7   8   9	
107. When the government breaks the laws, there is nothing the legal system can do.	1   2   3   4   7   8   9	
108. Everyone is treated equally by the government.	1   2   3   4   7   8   9	
109. People have basic necessities like food, clothes, and shelter.	1   2   3   4   7   8   9	
110. People are free to speak what they think without fear.	1   2   3   4   7   8   9	
111. People can join any organization they like without fear.	1   2   3   4   7   8   9	

**Appendix C: Questions of East Asia Value Survey used in the studies mentioned in this article**  
 Note: Questions are excerpted from Draft translation of the Japanese questionnaire, which is NOT a standardized English version for cross-national comparative survey.  
 Source: Yoshino, 2006.

Q.1 Would you say that you respect your ancestors more than average or less than the average?  
 1 More than the average Japanese  
 2 Less than the average Japanese  
 3 Average  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

Q.2 If you did not have children, would you or would you not adopt a child who is not related to you in order to continue your family line?  
 1 Would adopt 2 Would not adopt 3 Depends on situation  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_ 9 DK

Q.3 In general, what would you say is an ideal number of children for a family?  
 ( ) ( ) 9 DK

Q.4 Have you suffered from any of the following in the past month?  

	Yes	No
a. Headache/migraines(head left heavy)	1	2
b. Backache (stiff back)	1	2
c. dizziness	1	2
d. Depression (feeling down)	1	2
e. Insomnia (sleeplessness)	1	2
8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____		9 DK

Q.5 In relation to others of your age, how satisfied are you with your health?  
 1 Very satisfied 2 Satisfied 3 Not very satisfied 4 Not satisfied  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_ 9 DK

Q.6 Suppose one categorizes classes in your society as in Card 3, which one of the categories would you say your family belongs to?  
 1 High 2 High middle 3 Middle 4 Low middle 5 Low  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_ 9 DK

Q.10 People feel uneasy about themselves or their family members from time to time. How do you personally feel about the following?  

	A lot	Some	A bit	Not at all	DK
a. Serious illness	1	2	3	4	9
b. Car accident	1	2	3	4	9
c. War	1	2	3	4	9

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? For each statement, would you say you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree? (Do not read: Do not understand the question, Can't choose & Decline to answer)

SA SWA SWD SD DU CC DA  
 1 2 3 4 7 8 9

152. A citizen who does not actively participate in the affairs of his local and national community is not performing his duties.  
 153. Citizens should always obey laws and regulations, even if they disagree with them.

SE9 Here is a scale of household [fill in "annual" or "monthly"] incomes. We would like to know in what group your household on average is, counting all wages, salaries, pensions, dividends and other incomes that come in before taxes and other deduction.  
 Just give the letter of the group your household falls into. (SHOWCARD)  
 5 Highest quintile  
 1 Lowest quintile  
 9 Decline to answer

SE9a Does the total income of your household allow you to satisfactorily cover your needs? I will read out few statements about your income. Please tell me, which of the following statement is closest to your situation?  
 1 "Our income covers the needs well, we can save."  
 2 "Our income covers the needs all right, without much difficulty."  
 3 "Our income does not cover the needs, there are difficulties."  
 4 "Our income does not cover the needs, there are great difficulties."  
 0 Not applicable  
 7 Do not understand the question  
 9 Decline to answer

SE 17 People sometimes think of the social status of their families in terms of being high or low. Imagine a ladder with 10 steps. At step one stand the lowest status and step 10 stand the highest. Where would you place your family on the following scale?  
 10 Highest status  
 1 Lowest status  
 98 Can't choose  
 99 Decline to answer



Q.23 If you were asked to select the two important items listed on the card, which would they be? Selected

a. Love and respect for parents \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
 b. Return favors when needed from whom you received favor in the past \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
 c. Respect for individual rights \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
 d. Respect for individual freedom \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.24a. Suppose that you are a company president. The company conducts a test among applicants to select one employee. The section chief asks you to decide between the two applicants with the highest score and your relative who received the second highest score. Which one of them would you hire?  
 1 One with the highest grade \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 Your relative \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

b. In this question, let us suppose the applicant who came in second was a daughter or son to whom you are indebted. Now, which one of them would you hire?  
 1 One with the highest grade \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 Daughter son of person whom you are indebted \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.26 Would you say that most people are helpful to others or are looking after only their interest?  
 1 Trying to be helpful to others \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 Looking out for themselves \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.27 Do you suppose most people would try to take advantage of you if there is an opportunity to do so?  
 1 Yes, they are \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 No, they are not \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.28 Would you say we can trust most people or better to be always on look out?  
 1 Most people are trustworthy \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 Better to be on look out \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.11 Do you think each of the following exists?

	Exists	May exist	Does not exist	DK
a. God, gods and Buddha	1	2	3	9
b. Life after death	1	2	3	9
c. soul	1	2	3	9
d. Evil	1	2	3	9
e. Hell	1	2	3	9
f. Heaven and Paradise	1	2	3	9
g. sin	1	2	3	9

Q.12 By using the scale of 1 to 7, 1 being the least important and 7 being the most important, how important do you feel each of the following is?

	Not important at all	Very important	Other	DK/NA					
a. your immediate family members such as spouse and children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
b. Career and Job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
c. Free time and relaxation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
d. Friends and people you know	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
e. Parents, brothers, sisters, and other relatives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
f. Religion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
g. Politics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Q.13 How satisfied are you with your family life?  
 1 Very satisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 Somewhat satisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 4 Somewhat dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 5 Dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.14 Now I would like to ask how satisfied you feel about your life in general. Would you say you are?  
 1 Very satisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 Somewhat satisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 4 Somewhat dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 5 Dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.19 Some people say that home is the only place where you can totally relax and feel comfortable. Do you feel that way or not?  
 1 Yes, home is the only place \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 No \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.20 Of the three views on the card, which do you feel represent your view the most?  
 1 One should never, ever divorce \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 Divorce is OK when it is unbearable \_\_\_\_\_  
 3 Divorce is OK when husband and wife mutually agree to divorce \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.21 There are three views on man and nature on the card. Which one of them do you feel is closest to the truth?  
 1 To be happy, we must follow the nature. \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 To be happy, we must make use of nature \_\_\_\_\_  
 3 To be happy, we must conquer nature \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK \_\_\_\_\_

Q.34 There are two different views on law: 1) We must abide by the law, no matter what, 2) If we think the purpose of breaking the law is right, we could not help but break the law.

1 We must always abide by law  
 2 No, we don't have to abide by under certain circumstances  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

Q.35 As you understand a contract, which one of the following comes closest to your opinion?  
 A "To have a contract constitutes evidence that there is no trust between parties. There is no need to have a contract if parties trust each other."  
 B "No matter how much parties trust each other, it is better to have contract."  
 1 Closer to A's opinion  
 2 Closer to B's opinion  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

Q.36 Which comes closer to your opinion?  
 A "If you were to have contract, it is better to keep the contract simple allowing for its flexibility since it is just formality."  
 B "Contracts should be written clearly in detail to avoid the possibility of conflicting interpretations."  
 1 Closer to A's opinion  
 2 Closer to B's opinion  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

Q.37 There are often two different views on environmental protection and economic development. Which one of them would you say represents your view?  
 1 Protecting the environment comes first, even if economic growth slows  
 2 Economic growth comes first, even if it harms the environment  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

Q.38 What is most important for you? (Write down all answers if the respondent gives more than one.)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

Q.39 a) What occupation do you consider most respected? (Write down all answers if the respondent gives more than one.)  
 b) What is the occupation you yourself would like to have? (Write down all answers if the respondent gives more than one.)

Q.29 Using the answers on this card, would you tell me how much you agree or disagree with each one of the following statements:  
 a. We have illnesses we can better treat with methods other than modern medicine  
 1 Strongly agree  
 2 Agree  
 3 Disagree  
 4 Strongly disagree  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

b. If and when science and technology develop further, someday we should be able to understand the human mind  
 1 Strongly agree  
 2 Agree  
 3 Disagree  
 4 Strongly disagree  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

c. We can someday solve economic and social problems we face today with the development of science and technology  
 1 Strongly agree  
 2 Agree  
 3 Disagree  
 4 Strongly disagree  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

d. At some point in the future, we can expect to live on Mars as we live on earth today  
 1 Strongly agree  
 2 Agree  
 3 Disagree  
 4 Strongly disagree  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

Q.31a. Next, I would like to ask you about religion. Do you profess to have religious faith?  
 1 Yes → Q.31b  
 2 No → Q.32

Q.32 Without reference in any of the established religions, do you think it important to be of a religious mind?  
 1 Important  
 2 Not important  
 8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 DK

Q.41 How much trust would you give to each one of the following organizations and systems? Please select one answer from the following response categories: 1) very much 2) somewhat 3) not very much 4) not at all

	1	2	3	4	DK
a. Religious organization	1	2	3	4	9
b. Law and legal system	1	2	3	4	9
c. Newspaper, television	1	2	3	4	9
d. Police	1	2	3	4	9
e. National government bureaucracy	1	2	3	4	9
f. National Assembly (Diet)	1	2	3	4	9
g. NPO+NGO (Non Profit Organization, Non Government Organization)	1	2	3	4	9
h. Social welfare facilities	1	2	3	4	9
i. The United Nations	1	2	3	4	9
j. Science and Technology	1	2	3	4	9

Q.42a. Looking back the past, if you could have been born again, would you rather have been a boy or a girl?

- 1) Wish to have been born a boy
- 2) Wish to have been born a girl
- 8) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_
- 9) DK

b. Now, looking ahead into the future and could be born again, would you rather to be male or female?

- 1) Male
- 2) Female
- 3) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) DK

Q.49a. Imagine the following situation. Your parents died when you were young and your neighbor Hiraki brought you up. Because of Hiraki's help, you graduated from college and live comfortable today. Now, you hear that Hiraki is suffering from a terminal illness. Although unaware, Hiraki has only three months to live, according to his doctors. You also learned that Hiraki might live if a special surgery is performed that would also eliminate his pain. However, it will take all the assets you have to save Hiraki's life. What do you think you will do?

- 1) I will use all I have to save Hiraki's life through surgery
- 2) I couldn't help but giving up the surgery
- 8) Others (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

b. The last question dealt with a benefactor, what would you do if it was one of your parents who need the surgery?

- 1) I will have the surgery done, even if it means spending everything I have
- 2) I couldn't help but giving up the surgery
- 8) Others (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

Q.50 How do you feel about each of the following traditional values?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Other	Don't know
a. We should respect ancestor.	1	2	3	4	8	9
b. The eldest son should look after his aging parents	1	2	3	4	8	9
c. Wife should go along with her husband	1	2	3	4	8	9
d. Not to marry someone whom your parents do not approve	1	2	3	4	8	9
e. We should go along with older people	1	2	3	4	8	9
f. We need a son to keep our family line going	1	2	3	4	8	9
g. Man should work outside and woman should tend to household chores	1	2	3	4	8	9

Q.53 As a result of advanced medical science technology, we are able to transplant organs such as heart and liver from people who die in car accident and illness to people who are suffering from serious illness. How do you feel about this type of medical treatment now available? Which one of the views best represents yours?

- 1) It's a good thing since it will help people who can recover from serious illness to lead normal life again
- 2) Even it helps to save lives, it is not a good idea to extract an organ from dead people
- 8) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_
- 9) DK

Q.55 Imagine the following situation. You are working for a firm. After discovering the wrongdoings of a coworker benefiting himself/herself by breaking the rules, you decide to report it to his superiors. Then, one day, an armed robber broke into the office and threatened you and others present with weapons. But thanks to the coworker whose wrongdoings you wanted to report, your life was saved. Would you still report the wrong doings of the coworker or not?

- 1) While I appreciate his/her help in saving me, I still have to report the wrongdoings.
- 2) I think him/her for saving my life, and forget about the wrongdoings.
- 8) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_
- 9) DK