

Chapter 4

Satisfaction Levels with Specific Life Domains

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 4.2 Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments

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

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

Table 4.3 Entire Asia

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.1 Materialist Life Sphere

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

4.1.1 Housing

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

Table 4.4 Satisfaction with housing (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

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

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

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

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

4.1.2 *Standard of Living*

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

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

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

Table 4.5 Satisfaction with standard of living (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

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

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

4.1.3 *Household Income*

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 4.6 Satisfaction with household income (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

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

4.1.4 Health

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

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

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

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

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

4.1.5 Education

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

Table 4.7 Satisfaction with health (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

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

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

Table 4.8 Satisfaction with education (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

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

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

4.1.6 *Job*

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

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

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

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

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

4.2 Post-materialist Life Sphere

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

4.2.1 *Friendships*

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

Table 4.9 Satisfaction with job (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

Table 4.10 Satisfaction with friendships (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

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

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

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

4.2.2 *Marriage*

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

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

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

Table 4.11 Satisfaction with marriage (%)

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

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

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

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

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

Table 4.12 Satisfaction with neighbors (%)

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

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

4.2.3 Neighbors

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.4 Family Life

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

Table 4.13 Satisfaction with family life (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.5 Leisure

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

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

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

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

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

Table 4.14 Satisfaction with leisure (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

4.2.6 *Spiritual Life*

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

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

Table 4.15 Satisfaction with spiritual life (%)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3 Public Sphere of Life

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

4.3.1 Public Safety

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

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

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

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

Table 4.16 Satisfaction with public safety (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

4.3.2 The Condition of the Environment

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

Table 4.17 Satisfaction with the condition of the environment (%)

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

Note: Reported in percentages

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

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

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

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

4.3.3 *Social Welfare System*

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

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

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

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

Table 4.18 Satisfaction with social welfare system (%)

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

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

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

4.3.4 The Democratic System

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

Table 4.19 Satisfaction with the democratic system (%)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.4 Patterns of Life Domain Satisfaction by Society

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

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

Table 4.20 Patterns of domain satisfaction by society

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.5.1 East Asia

4.5.1.1 China

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

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

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

4.5.1.2 Hong Kong

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

4.5.1.3 Japan

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

4.5.1.4 South Korea

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

4.5.1.5 Taiwan

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

4.5.2 Southeast Asia

4.5.2.1 Brunei

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

4.5.2.2 Cambodia

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

4.5.2.3 Indonesia

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

4.5.2.4 Laos

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

4.5.2.5 Malaysia

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

4.5.2.6 Myanmar

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

4.5.2.7 The Philippines

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

4.5.2.8 Singapore

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

4.5.2.9 Thailand

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

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

4.5.2.10 Vietnam

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

4.5.3 South Asia

4.5.3.1 Bangladesh

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

4.5.3.2 Bhutan

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

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

4.5.3.3 India

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

4.5.3.4 The Maldives

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

4.5.3.5 Nepal

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

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

4.5.3.6 Pakistan

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

4.5.3.7 Sri Lanka

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

4.5.4 *Central Asia*

4.5.4.1 Afghanistan

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

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

4.5.4.2 Kazakhstan

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

4.5.4.3 Kyrgyzstan

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

4.5.4.4 Mongolia

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

4.5.4.5 Tajikistan

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

4.5.4.6 Uzbekistan

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

4.5.5 *Types of Countries (Societies) Based on Factor Analyses*

Based on the above factor analyses, we attempt to group 28 countries (societies) into different types and suggest the following society types below²:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

² See *supra* note 1.

³ See *supra* note 1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

References

- Inglehart, R. (1971). The silent revolution in Europe: Intergenerational change in post-industrial societies. *The American Political Science Review*, 65, 991–1017.
- Inglehart, R. (2006). Commentary on “The silent revolution in Europe: Intergenerational change in post-industrial societies”. *American Political Science Review*, 100, 685 (Thematic issue on the evolution of political science, in recognition of the centennial of the review).
- Inglehart, R., & Abramson, P. R. (1994). Economic security and value change. *American Political Science Review*, 88, 336–354.
- Inoguchi, T., & Blondel, J. (2008). *Citizens and the states: Attitudes in Western Europe and East and Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Park, C. M. (2009). The quality of life in South Korea. *Social Indicators Research*, 92, 263–294.
- Shin, D. C., & Inoguchi, T. (Eds.). (2009). *The quality of life in Confucian Asia: From physical welfare to subjective well-being* (Social indicators research series). Dordrecht: Springer [This book was originally published as a special volume in *Social Indicators Research*, 92(2), (2009)].