

Summaries by chapter and tables with detailed statistics

Note for readers

These online appendices contain an overview of each of the chapters of the book as well as more descriptive statistics that were not included in the book manuscript. The references cited here are to be found in the back of the book. References to Korea always mean South Korea. The online appendices are in particular focusing on allowing access to further data that adds to and complements the findings. Chapter 3 is covered with a more detailed discussion, while Chapters 4, 5 and 6 set out additional tables to support the book's discussion and findings and present tables not included in the book.

List of tables

- Table 3.1.1 Q7a Government responsibility: provide job for everyone, 2016
- Table 3.1.2 Q7a Government responsibility: provide job for everyone, 2006
- Table 3.1.3 Q7g Government responsibility: reduce income differences rich/poor, 2016
- Table 3.1.4 Q7g Government responsibility: reduce income differences rich/poor, 2006
- Table 3.1.5 Q8a Who should provide: healthcare, 2016
- Table 3.1.6 Q8b Who should provide: care for older people, 2016
- Table 3.1.7 Q8c Who should provide: school education, 2016
- Table 3.1.8 Q7c Government responsibility: provide healthcare for sick, 2016
- Table 3.1.9 Q7c Government responsibility: provide healthcare for sick, 2006
- Table 3.1.10 Q7d Government responsibility: provide living standard for old people, 2016
- Table 3.1.11 Q7d Government responsibility: provide living standard for old people, 2006
- Table 3.2.1 Q6b Government should spend money: healthcare, 2016
- Table 3.2.2 Q6b Government should spend money: healthcare, 2006
- Table 3.2.3 Q6d Government should spend money: education, 2016
- Table 3.2.4 Q6d Government should spend money: education, 2006
- Table 3.2.5 Q6f Government should spend money: old-age pensions, 2016
- Table 3.2.6 Government should spend money: old-age pensions, 2006
- Table 3.2.7 Q6g Government should spend money: unemployment benefits, 2016

- Table 3.2.8 Q6g Government should spend money: unemployment benefits, 2006
- Table 3.2.9 The government should spend less on benefits for poor people
- Table 3.3.1 The government should provide a decent standard of living for unemployed people: China
- Table 3.3.2 Q7f Government responsibility: provide living standard for unemployed people, 2016
- Table 3.3.3 The government should provide a decent standard of living for unemployed people, 2006
- Table 3.3.4 Q7d Government responsibility: provide living standard for old people, 2016
- Table 3.3.5 Q7d Government responsibility: provide living standard for old people, 2006
- Table 3.4.1 Q23b Government successful: providing living standard for old people, 2016
- Table 3.4.2 Q8b Government successful: providing living standard for old people, 2006
- Table 3.4.3 Government success in fighting unemployment, 2006
- Table 3.4.4 Q23a Government successful: providing healthcare for sick people, 2016
- Table 3.4.5 Q8a Government successful: providing healthcare for sick people, 2006
- Table 3.4.6 Government and economy: cuts in governments spending
- Table 3.4.7 World Value Survey: people who don't work turn lazy
- Table 3.5.1 Income inequality attitudes
- Table 3.5.2 Differences in income are too large
- Table 3.5.3 It is responsibility of government to reduce differences in income between people
- Table 3.5.4 Taxes for high incomes
- Table 3.5.5 View of taxes for high incomes
- Table 3.5.6 Tax: do you think people with high income should pay larger share of their income in taxes?
- Table 3.5.7 Conflicts: between poor people and rich people
- Table 3.5.8 Level of status job compared to the job of father
- Table 4.2.1 Getting ahead: how important is having a good education yourself?
- Table 4.2.2 Getting ahead: how important is having ambition?
- Table 4.2.3 Getting ahead: how important is hard work?
- Table 4.2.4 Getting ahead: how important is coming from a wealthy family?
- Table 4.2.5 Getting ahead: how important is knowing the right people?
- Table 4.3.1 Democraticness in own country
- Table 4.4.1 Important in life: family
- Table 4.4.2 Important in life: politics
- Table 4.4.3 How much freedom of choice and control?

- Table 4.5.1 Average, standard deviation and sample size: political attitudes
Table 4.5.2 People who don't work turn lazy
Table 4.6.1 Trust and confidence
Table 4.6.2 Income inequality and evaluation
Table 4.6.3 Democracy attitudes
Table 4.6.4 Cultural values
Table 4.6.5 Occupational status
Table 5.5.1 Government responsibility: promote equality between men and women
Table 5.5.2 When you were 14, 15, 16 years old, did your mother work outside the household?
Table 5.5.3 Q28 Mother ever working for pay before respondent 14?
Table 5.5.4 Spouse worked outside: child under school age
Table 5.6.1 Q1a Working mother: warm relationship with children as a not-working mother
Table 5.6.2 Q1b Working mother: preschool child is likely to suffer
Table 5.6.3 Q1c Working woman: family life suffers when woman has full-time job
Table 5.6.4 Q1e Working woman: being housewife is as fulfilling as working for pay
Table 5.6.5 Q2 Both should contribute to household income
Table 5.6.6 Q2b Men's job is to earn money, women's job is to look after the house

About the book

This book provides an overview of welfare attitudes in East Asian societies using data from a range of cross-national surveys and a qualitative study. This allows us to acquire a broad understanding of main trends in welfare attitudes in these societies, and to include analysis of multiple dimensions of welfare attitudes. This allows the inclusion of a more comprehensive set of measurements of welfare attitudes and to explore what welfare attitudes matter in East Asia. The book has also included explanatory dimensions not always present in studies thus far. By looking at the multidimensional aspects of welfare attitudes and including a wider range of explanations in terms of what explains citizens' welfare attitudes, the book aims to decentre approaches built around what matters when it comes to welfare attitudes in Europe and North America, and to instead map out what matters in the region studied, East Asia. This brings us to emphasise the importance of the political and cultural trajectories of the societies in East Asia in understanding welfare attitudes. This also means that the book, rather than subscribing to a cultural or a political (and democratisation) approach, argues that both of these dimensions are crucial to take into account when studying welfare attitudes in the area.

The findings show that there is no one East Asian model of attitudes: societies group together differently depending on the area we look at. When it comes to cultural trajectories, cultural values and the family have a unique importance in the East Asian context, which calls for these dimensions to be included more in welfare attitude studies in the future. When comparing welfare attitudes in East Asia, Japan – the most mature welfare system – is seen to have welfare attitudes more like European conservative welfare state regimes. We also see that welfare state institutional patterns can be argued to matter for welfare attitude, when we look at the support for non-profit and private organisations providing, for example, healthcare in Taiwan (which is in line with the current system). Furthermore, we see that political trajectories matter, as findings suggest that political attitudes seem to be shaped by regimes and the narratives presented in political campaigns.

The book emphasises the importance of cultural value systems and has endeavoured to assess the importance of these in East Asian societies. Confucianism has been argued to be crucial in these societies, and we have explored to what extent this value system matters when it comes to welfare attitudes. Findings indicate that Confucian value systems are not always present, nor do they present in the same way in all societies. However, cultural value systems, and in particular familial value systems matter in ways that can be interpreted as Confucian, but further research is needed into whether this is accurate. Lastly, the societies studied have relatively high levels of inequality, and some authors have argued that this might cause social unrest. In our analysis we found some support for this tension to be eased by the existence of social mobility in line with Larsen (2016). Overall, the book makes a series of contributions to knowledge. First and foremost, the book shows how we need to adapt and change our approaches to how we study welfare attitudes through decentring the European experience as the benchmark against which we compare others. This means including new concepts, measurements and dimensions in our analysis, such as political and cultural hegemonic narratives, as we have done in this book (see Chapter 2 for an introduction). The book argues in favour of decolonising and queering our approaches to researching welfare attitudes, here meaning questioning the categories, explanations and assumptions we make in our research design. Throughout the book we have shown that we need to include political and cultural narratives as well as cultural value systems to be able to capture new elements of welfare attitudes in East Asia.

Chapter 2

Chapter 2 presented a multidimensional approach to how we operationalise and understand welfare attitudes drawing on work by Roosma et al (2013) where welfare attitudes are divided into different dimensions that captures

different dimensions and nuances of attitudes. These include the role and goals welfare systems have and should have, attitudes about and assessment of the performance of social policies and welfare systems and attitudes towards and judgement of the outcomes. As the book aims to provide a comprehensive overview of attitudes, this approach was used and we added to it by including questions related to concerns for the living conditions of different groups in need, and their deservingness, as well as views of income inequalities. In terms of theoretical explanations, the book has sought to show that we need to expand our theoretical explanations to include cultural and political factors both at societal level but also at individual levels to better explain welfare attitudes in places like the East Asian societies.

Chapter 3

Chapter 3 gave an overview of what existing cross-national surveys can tell us about trends in East Asian welfare attitudes. Overall, the findings suggested that there is no one East Asian model of welfare attitudes but, rather, different welfare systems with varied histories leading to different patterns of welfare attitudes. However, we do find some similarities when it comes to the role of family in taking care of elderly and young people. This confirms what one would expect from Confucian and productivist welfare state regimes. We also find less support for income inequality and higher support for taxes than what one would expect from studies such as Whyte (2010). Furthermore, we found that Japan has slightly different patterns of welfare attitudes than the other societies, pointing to the influence of an older and more advanced welfare state regime.

When it came to attitudes towards the role and goals of welfare systems, we find that there is strong support for governments to provide jobs and address large income differences and they are also seen as crucial in providing healthcare, social care and unemployment as well as pensions and redistribution. Families are seen to have a key role in providing support for elderly and young people to a higher degree than other societies. There are also other entities that are seen as important, for example, in Japan 25 per cent see healthcare as a role for private companies and in Taiwan and Korea, 5–7 per cent see it as a role of non-profit organisations. The latter can also be seen as a regime effect as these views are more in line with the current welfare systems.

In terms of attitudes towards spending, respondents in mainland China are more in favour of spending less on low-income people than respondents in Japan and Taiwan. When looking at particular areas, healthcare and education are seen as important to spend on, across societies. However, Japanese respondents report lower support for spending on education and old people than the other societies, and the same goes for spending on unemployed people.

We also looked at providing a standard of living for old people, which has high support across East Asian societies. However, we found lower support for unemployed citizens, which is lowest in Japan – in line with European and more mature welfare systems. We also analysed attitudes towards the performance of welfare systems. When looking at questions around how well the government does in terms of providing a reasonable living standard for old people, there were split answers, with a large neutral category. When it comes to healthcare, respondents in the different societies are more neutral overall while when it comes to unemployment more of the respondents see governments as unsuccessful. In terms of support for cuts, Japanese respondents are more in favour of cuts to government spending while Koreans are against cuts, with Taiwan in between.

On inequality we do not find support for theories arguing that these societies are ‘social volcanoes’. Many see income inequality as too large and consider it the government’s responsibility to reduce differences. However, when it comes to attitudes towards income inequality, it is seen more positively, as giving incentive, in Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan by and large. However, there is no clear direction when one looks at the full distribution of answers. Looking at a different approach to income inequality, we find, slightly contradictory to this, that there is a majority in all societies in favour of people with higher income paying a larger share of income in tax.

In the studies on income inequality, Larsen (2016) argues in favour of the importance of the belief that one will be socially mobile compared to one’s parents as the explanation for why we do not see unrest in highly unequal societies. However, in political attitudes studies some have argued that Confucian values matter in this regard. To explore this, we looked at views of what is needed to get ahead and find that people in mainland China appear to be more aligned to value systems (Japan less so, with Korea and Taiwan in between) when asked about the importance of hard work, ambition and so on to get ahead. On this we also find that among mainland Chinese people, the modernity narrative can apply, as 65 per cent have higher status than their father, which is not the case in Taiwan and Japan (20–30 per cent). When it comes to the views on those who do not work, people in mainland China, Hong Kong and Taiwan give very high support to claiming that people who do not work are lazy, while Singapore, Korea and Japan are less harsh. This underlines the importance of hard work in these societies.

Role, goals and responsibilities

Overall responsibilities

Traditionally, European welfare states have been related to sentiments of supporting workers and industrialisation, meaning that government’s role and citizens’ demands for support when out of work has been studied closely

(see Esping-Andersen, 1990, 1999). A common line of questioning within welfare attitudes has therefore been questions related to redistribution on the one hand and level of government interventions in labour markets and competition on the other.

In Table 3.1.1 it is clear that Taiwan has the higher support for the government having the responsibility to provide a job for everyone compared to Japan and Korea; citizens there have the highest levels of support compared to all other societies apart from the Philippines. Comparing citizens' views in 2016 (Table 3.1.1) with 2006 (Table 3.1.2) we see that despite being high in 2016, the percentage of those saying the government definitely should provide jobs for all was lower in Taiwan and Japan in 2016; however, the general trend is high support for government intervention in this area.

Moving on to look at the welfare system and the government's role when it comes to redistributing wealth in the form of income, we see that there is overall high support across societies for governments to reduce income differences. This is an important role: neoliberal societies, and societies where we have seen retrenchment of welfare systems and increasing inequalities, may need to worry about this as citizens' attitudes may translate into electoral behaviour. However, these views may not always translate into demands (see for example Whyte, 2010). We also see that there are quite big variations between societies when it comes to these attitudes, with a much higher proportion of Spain's citizens answering 'definitely should' in 2016, perhaps due to the effects of the financial crisis and increasing in inequality and unemployment.

Who should provide welfare?

There are overall high levels of support for government redistribution of wealth in the form of welfare income, see Tables 3.1.3 and 3.1.4. Many arguments regarding the organisation and view of welfare systems in East Asia have centred around Confucianism as an organising value principle. To start exploring this we here use questions asked in the International Social Survey Programme's (ISSP) Role of Government round V, which included three questions about who should provide benefits within healthcare, eldercare and education. These questions are discussed here as they are a direct measurement of who should have the role to provide welfare, a question that has been raised by Wood and Gough (2006) as central to discussions of variations of who provides and is expected to provide welfare, when comparing systems across the world.

In Tables 3.1.5, 3.1.6 and 3.1.7 we see that there is a quite large degree of variation between the different East Asian societies included here, with Taiwan standing out as different from others through being more divided when it comes to who should provide what. Healthcare, seen as

Table 3.1.1: Q7a Government responsibility: provide job for everyone, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	38.3%	14.1%	25.4%	14.3%	16.8%	68.2%	45.7%	18.3%	11.9%
Probably should be	40.2%	38.5%	39.4%	30.7%	42.9%	24.5%	36.7%	30.7%	24.4%
Probably should not be	17.6%	33.2%	27.3%	35.0%	32.2%	5.6%	10.9%	34.6%	35.1%
Definitely should not be	4.0%	14.2%	7.8%	20.0%	8.1%	1.7%	6.7%	16.4%	28.6%
N	1,908	1,067	1,595	1,373	1,043	1,198	1,779	1,091	1,364

Note: Q7a refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.1.2: Q7a Government responsibility: provide job for everyone, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	47.8%	21.6%	35.2%	16.3%	20.8%	64.3%	42.8%	28.6%	15.9%
Probably should be	40.4%	37.2%	33.1%	35.4%	49.3%	28.0%	39.3%	30.3%	23.7%
Probably should not be	10.2%	28.9%	24.7%	30.6%	25.0%	6.1%	11.9%	28.3%	34.6%
Definitely should not be	1.6%	12.3%	7.0%	17.6%	4.8%	1.6%	6.0%	12.9%	25.8%
N	1,925	1,289	1,564	1,089	1,569	1,179	2,455	1,136	1,504

Note: Q7a refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

Table 3.1.3: Q7g Government responsibility: reduce income differences rich/poor, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	50.1%	29.2%	34.8%	29.5%	38.6%	36.7%	60.7%	35.3%	27.4%
Probably should be	35.7%	27.4%	46.1%	35.8%	40.5%	29.5%	28.6%	31.4%	28.6%
Probably should not be	11.4%	24.1%	16.6%	20.7%	16.1%	19.2%	6.9%	23.6%	25.3%
Definitely should not be	2.8%	19.3%	2.5%	14.0%	4.8%	14.5%	3.8%	9.6%	18.8%
N	1,895	1,071	1,622	1,394	1,043	1,176	1,763	1,092	1,338

Note: Q7g refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.1.4: Q7g Government responsibility: reduce income differences rich/poor, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	55.4%	30.0%	33.7%	34.3%	40.5%	36.2%	50.3%	37.2%	28.6%
Probably should be	33.5%	25.3%	38.4%	31.7%	40.1%	37.0%	36.0%	30.5%	23.6%
Probably should not be	8.9%	26.6%	21.1%	21.7%	16.1%	20.4%	8.7%	22.5%	26.7%
Definitely should not be	2.2%	18.1%	6.7%	12.4%	3.3%	6.4%	4.9%	9.8%	21.1%
N	1,889	1,288	1,532	1,085	1,562	1,134	2,409	1,125	1,477

Note: Q7g refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

Table 3.1.5: Q8a Who should provide: healthcare, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Government	25.9%	92.9%	81.8%	67.3%	72.3%	78.5%	96.9%	93.0%	57.3%
Private companies/for-profit organisations	10.5%	5.3%	5.6%	13.8%	11.0%	2.3%	1.6%	6.4%	22.2%
Non-profit organisations/charities/cooperatives	20.0%	1.3%	9.5%	4.2%	4.1%	1.5%	0.0%	0.5%	12.2%
Religious organisations	0.8%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	1.1%
Family, relatives or friends	42.9%	0.5%	2.8%	14.6%	12.2%	16.7%	1.3%	0.0%	7.2%
N	1,897	1,080	1,563	1,393	1,038	1,192	1,802	1,103	1,325

Note: Q8a refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.1.6: Q8b Who should provide: care for older people, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Government	37.2%	84.0%	59.3%	48.3%	51.9%	52.3%	80.1%	87.7%	50.8%
Private companies/for-profit organisations	5.2%	11.7%	6.4%	23.8%	5.8%	3.1%	4.6%	9.6%	10.9%
Non-profit organisations/charities/cooperatives	15.3%	2.3%	22.8%	6.7%	17.1%	3.3%	0.0%	2.0%	11.1%
Religious organisations	0.4%	0.2%	1.5%	0.1%	1.2%	1.8%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%
Family, relatives or friends	42.0%	1.8%	9.9%	21.2%	24.0%	39.5%	14.4%	0.5%	26.6%
N	1,916	1,081	1,589	1,384	1,036	1,198	1,773	1,096	1,348

Note: Q8b refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.1.7: Q8c Who should provide: school education, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Government	87.2%	94.3%	95.9%	89.9%	82.9%	65.6%	94.6%	93.7%	79.4%
Private companies/for-profit organisations	3.0%	4.6%	0.5%	1.6%	3.3%	2.2%	1.3%	5.1%	5.6%
Non-profit organisations/charities/cooperatives	3.6%	0.6%	0.8%	0.9%	3.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	4.7%
Religious organisations	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.6%
Family, relatives or friends	5.8%	0.3%	2.6%	7.3%	10.0%	31.1%	3.7%	0.3%	9.7%
N	1,921	1,089	1,651	1,472	1,042	1,194	1,796	1,099	1,349

Note: Q8c refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

a governmental responsibility by the majority in most societies only has 25.9 per cent of Taiwanese respondents' support as being the provider of healthcare. Japan also has a lower level of support than other societies when it comes to government provision of healthcare. Japan, Korea and the Philippines have similar levels of support for family being the provider of healthcare, while Korea and Japan are also similar in their views of support for welfare provision by both for- and non-profit organisations. Overall, this does point to the East Asian societies being different from their European counterparts, and we also see that value- and attitude-wise, citizens are displaying views that spread roles of what in the European social model is government's responsibility across different types of providers.

We will explore further why this may be so, but for now we can hypothesise that this may stem from institutional, political or socio-economic contextual factors.

Many scholars have argued for the role of Confucian values in East Asian welfare systems. Table 3.1.6 is a chance to start analysing just this, and it is remarkable how different the East Asian societies and the Philippines are to the societies here – even to Spain, which has been argued as being characterised by familial values. We also see that the Philippines has a similar level to Taiwan when it comes to this, and thus there may be something beyond or in addition to Confucianism that explains this. When it comes to this area, we also see that respondents in Japan and Korea support private/for-profit organisations to provide these services, keeping the responsibility on individuals or families.

For education we see that the East Asian societies are more similar to their European and North American counterparts, with the majority seeing the government as a main provider of school education. There does seem to be some who view family and relatives as providers, but at quite low levels.

Overall, we are starting to see that there may be a role for Confucian explanations when it comes to attitudes towards who should provide welfare. This is linked to the fact that healthcare and education have higher levels of support as being the responsibility of the government than the caring for older people. Going further into questioning around provision of welfare, we will continue by looking at support for government provision of specific types of welfare benefits and services. Again, we use data from two different rounds of ISSP's Role of Government, and in Table 3.1.8, we see that similar to the previous question around health, a majority of respondents in across societies see a role for government in providing this type of care.

Looking at differences in time, while there has been a reduction in the number of people saying that it definitely should be the government's role to provide healthcare in Japan, Korea and Taiwan, there is a more stable, high, number when we combine the 'probably should be' and 'definitely should be'. This may indicate general support for government provision in the healthcare area, but that there may also be some discontent. It may also

Table 3.1.8: Q7c Government responsibility: provide healthcare for sick, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	47.6%	78.8%	56.8%	31.1%	31.6%	77.3%	72.7%	68.8%	49.7%
Probably should be	43.4%	19.3%	41.1%	46.9%	53.1%	20.1%	21.8%	27.0%	36.1%
Probably should not be	7.3%	1.6%	1.8%	17.0%	14.0%	2.0%	4.0%	3.2%	10.7%
Definitely should not be	1.7%	0.3%	0.3%	4.9%	1.3%	0.6%	1.5%	0.9%	3.6%
N	1,914	1,101	1,646	1,438	1,042	1,200	1,808	1,117	1,367

Note: Q7c refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.1.9: Q7c Government responsibility: provide healthcare for sick, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	51.6%	86.5%	54.5%	41.3%	35.9%	66.0%	75.9%	62.5%	56.4%
Probably should be	43.7%	12.6%	41.6%	45.5%	54.7%	28.8%	21.8%	31.1%	33.3%
Probably should not be	4.1%	0.5%	3.5%	9.7%	8.8%	4.5%	1.6%	5.0%	7.7%
Definitely should not be	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	3.4%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	1.4%	2.5%
N	1,925	1,341	1,606	1,133	1,562	1,182	2,486	1,147	1,506

Note: Q7c refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

Table 3.1.10: Q7d Government responsibility: provide living standard for old people, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	45.3%	61.0%	53.1%	33.0%	33.1%	70.9%	80.8%	68.6%	49.2%
Probably should be	46.3%	34.5%	43.0%	43.3%	50.9%	24.1%	18.5%	28.7%	39.1%
Probably should not be	7.7%	3.5%	3.6%	18.4%	13.9%	4.1%	0.7%	2.3%	9.4%
Definitely should not be	0.8%	1.0%	0.3%	5.3%	2.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%	2.3%
N	1,917	1,098	1,647	1,446	1,042	1,194	1,820	1,119	1,367

Note: Q7d refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.1.11: Q7d Government responsibility: provide living standard for old people, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	48.5%	73.6%	47.9%	44.3%	35.7%	56.8%	78.8%	66.8%	57.1%
Probably should be	45.1%	23.9%	46.4%	44.2%	54.3%	33.9%	20.7%	30.2%	32.9%
Probably should not be	5.7%	2.2%	5.0%	8.6%	9.4%	7.8%	0.4%	2.5%	8.2%
Definitely should not be	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	2.9%	0.6%	1.5%	0.1%	0.5%	1.8%
N	1,923	1,335	1,589	1,149	1,571	1,178	2,495	1,157	1,512

Note: Q7d refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

reflect that there are changes in thinking of who should provide healthcare, given there is some spread when asked about different welfare providers.

Earlier we saw some starting support for theories suggesting the importance of Confucian value sets, and we now move on to look at a variation of the question. Who should provide a reasonable living standard for old people? Again, we see that there are lower levels of support for this in the East Asian societies than in the others, further adding support to families having a different role in these societies.

The lower levels of respondents saying ‘definitely should be’ in East Asian societies is consistent between the two rounds of questioning, suggesting these may be stable levels. We do also have to note that, combined, there is a high majority saying that it ‘should definitely’ and ‘probably’ be the government’s responsibility.

Moving on to look at a different attitude that often is used to measure support we look at support for spending in specific policy areas and on specific groups. In Chapter 2 we saw that deservingness theory is interested in how different groups are ranked according to their deservingness for governmental welfare support. Here, we have so far seen that respondents deem there to be different roles for governments’ provision of welfare when it comes to healthcare, education and older people. We will now look at who respondents think governments should spend money on, and concern for their standard of living. Again, starting off with healthcare, we see that there is general support for spending on healthcare across the East Asian societies too. However, Japan has a little less support for spending more, which can be linked to the higher support for cutting spending found there and worries of a persistent declining economy.

In the two rounds we see that just over 50 per cent of respondents would like governments to spend more on healthcare in the East Asian societies included as seen in Table 3.2.1. This is lower than in the European and North American societies included, apart from Germany. Korea had a higher proportion in support of more spending in 2006 than in 2016. Again, we then see that there is a variation between societies in the region, but with similar trends.

Across societies we also see a high level of support for spending more on education across the societies, see Table 3.2.2, which means there is support for governments to invest in skills as well as showing potential support for policies addressing knowledge and skills shortages related to changing in economies. In the East Asian societies we see that there is a variation with the Taiwanese respondents giving greater support for spending more than the Japanese respondents, followed by the Korean respondents. In other words, there is a difference between the East Asian societies included here, and we see their levels being on par with societies such as Denmark and Sweden.

Looking at the difference between the two rounds, comparing Tables 3.2.3 and 3.2.4, we see that there are variations between the East Asian societies

Table 3.2.1: Q6b Government should spend money: healthcare, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Spend much more	17.1%	25.3%	29.7%	22.9%	18.9%	43.8%	39.7%	33.9%	17.5%
Spend more	44.8%	48.3%	45.6%	32.1%	48.0%	50.0%	49.4%	50.9%	49.8%
Spend the same as now	25.9%	23.8%	22.8%	35.7%	29.9%	4.4%	9.6%	14.5%	22.6%
Spend less	10.3%	2.0%	1.5%	6.3%	2.5%	1.7%	0.9%	0.4%	8.2%
Spend much less	1.9%	0.5%	0.4%	3.1%	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	1.9%
N	1,888	1,103	1,652	1,457	1,042	1,199	1,804	1,117	1,368

Note: Q6b refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.2.2: Q6b Government should spend money: healthcare, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Spend much more	17.30%	36.30%	19.50%	31.40%	26.70%	44.60%	33.90%	25.30%	36.50%
Spend more	39.80%	44.70%	46.20%	33.30%	54.50%	43.50%	53.20%	54.60%	43.70%
Spend the same as now	31.70%	17.90%	28.40%	25.90%	16.80%	9.00%	12.00%	18.60%	13.80%
Spend less	9.40%	0.90%	5.10%	6.40%	1.90%	2.30%	0.70%	1.40%	4.90%
Spend much less	1.90%	0.30%	0.80%	3.00%	0.10%	0.60%	0.20%	0.20%	1.10%
N	1,891	1,332	1,596	1,137	1,561	1,185	2,470	1,169	1,505

Note: Q6b refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

included with a general majority for spending more money on education. This is in line with findings up until now, and with the focus on education found in East Asian welfare systems (see for example Hudson et al, 2014). We also continue seeing variations between societies.

We have already seen that Confucian value sets may be driving attitudes towards preferences of the government's role in relation to elderly people. In Tables 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 we see that the societies vary less from the European and North American societies when it comes to spending preferences, which may point to the fact that attitudes to spending and what roles governments should have are capturing slightly different aspects of welfare attitudes. It might also reflect a perceived need for more investment in an area that has not been spent on in these societies. Again, there is also variation between the three East Asian societies. There were also notable changes in support for spending in Korea with a lower percentage of Korean respondents supporting increases in spending in 2016 than in 2006, coinciding with increased coverage/use of policies and attention to the cost of these types of policies.

Turning to what has been found to be the least deserving of welfare claimants in Europe (van Oorschot, 2006), we look at attitudes towards spending on unemployed people.

In Tables 3.2.7 and 3.2.8 we again see discrepancy rather than similarity between the East Asian societies included, with Japan, the older welfare system, having lower levels of support for spending more on unemployed people. We then ask whether or not maturity of a welfare system should also be taken into account when assessing welfare attitudes. Looking at the two tables it is also clear that the variations and trends are consistent across the two time points.

Moving on to what may be perceived as a more abstract group to respondents, we look at the support for spending on low-income people. Table 3.2.9 shows us that there is a high level of support for spending less on benefits for poor people in mainland China, which goes contrary to findings in Japan and Taiwan. This supports findings in Kongshøj (2015, 2017) finding Chinese people among the harshest in their views of those with low incomes. Again, then, we see variations across different East Asian societies.

Overall, we find relatively high level of support for government spending in healthcare and education, which is to be expected based on institutional and cultural explanatory approaches as these are key areas of focus in productivist welfare systems. It also fits well with Confucian values where education is a key area that is valued. When looking at specific groups we see that there is variation across the societies, with mainland China being less supportive for spending on poor people than Japan and Taiwan. Despite this there is a general support for helping unemployed people. The variation between societies in East Asia found in other studies is confirmed here, and there is a need to better understand what drives this variation.

Table 3.2.3: Q6d Government should spend money: education, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Spend much more	22.9%	16.6%	46.4%	24.6%	17.8%	50.4%	42.5%	18.1%	31.1%
Spend more	44.9%	37.7%	41.4%	33.7%	39.1%	43.6%	47.0%	48.5%	47.3%
Spend the same as now	22.7%	41.5%	11.2%	37.7%	35.7%	4.8%	9.4%	31.8%	17.7%
Spend less	7.9%	3.8%	0.6%	2.8%	6.3%	1.3%	0.7%	1.2%	2.8%
Spend much less	1.6%	0.4%	0.4%	1.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.5%	1.0%
N	1,877	1,100	1,646	1,445	1,038	1,198	1,793	1,105	1,373

Note: Q6d refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.2.4: Q6d Government should spend money: education, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Spend much more	25.6%	21.5%	41.3%	21.2%	26.9%	52.4%	33.2%	13.3%	40.8%
Spend more	40.2%	40.8%	41.1%	31.6%	44.2%	37.4%	53.6%	39.6%	41.8%
Spend the same as now	29.4%	36.3%	15.6%	40.6%	21.7%	6.6%	12.4%	43.6%	13.4%
Spend less	4.3%	1.3%	1.9%	3.5%	6.6%	2.7%	0.7%	3.2%	3.3%
Spend much less	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	3.1%	0.6%	0.8%	0.2%	0.3%	0.7%
N	1,877	1,324	1,599	1,112	1,562	1,181	2,440	1,154	1,511

Note: Q6d refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

Table 3.2.5: Q6f Government should spend money: old-age pensions, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Spend much more	16.9%	10.0%	25.8%	18.9%	15.2%	48.6%	25.6%	27.7%	17.5%
Spend more	41.9%	31.2%	43.3%	27.2%	39.9%	47.3%	53.1%	43.6%	44.2%
Spend the same as now	31.9%	53.8%	27.8%	42.2%	36.2%	3.7%	19.4%	26.9%	32.3%
Spend less	7.7%	3.7%	2.5%	7.4%	7.3%	0.3%	1.6%	1.2%	4.8%
Spend much less	1.7%	1.3%	0.6%	4.4%	1.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.6%	1.2%
N	1,890	1,092	1,637	1,421	1,042	1,198	1,791	1,097	1,363

Note: Q6f refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.2.6: Government should spend money: old-age pensions, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Spend much more	13.9%	18.4%	15.4%	25.3%	25.1%	43.0%	27.6%	16.9%	24.9%
Spend more	39.1%	34.5%	36.1%	31.1%	52.4%	41.5%	54.9%	44.0%	39.6%
Spend the same as now	40.7%	43.3%	42.3%	36.9%	18.0%	11.9%	16.3%	35.8%	28.4%
Spend less	4.6%	3.1%	5.0%	3.8%	3.5%	2.7%	1.1%	2.8%	5.8%
Spend much less	1.7%	0.7%	1.1%	3.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.1%	0.4%	1.3%
N	1,897	1,314	1,590	1,114	1,553	1,176	2,444	1,145	1,488

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

Table 3.2.7: Q6g Government should spend money: unemployment benefits, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Spain	Sweden	United States
Spend much more	11.3%	5.0%	8.5%	7.6%	9.7%	17.7%	6.0%	7.1%
Spend more	41.4%	20.8%	25.9%	14.0%	34.4%	49.9%	18.1%	23.9%
Spend the same as now	32.4%	52.6%	51.7%	57.5%	43.2%	27.8%	55.4%	47.0%
Spend less	12.5%	17.2%	12.2%	13.6%	9.0%	3.6%	16.1%	18.9%
Spend much less	2.4%	4.4%	1.7%	7.3%	3.8%	1.0%	4.4%	3.0%
N	1,853	1,090	1,636	1,342	1,039	1,759	1,091	1,359

Note: Q6g refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.2.8: Q6g Government should spend money: unemployment benefits, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Spain	Sweden	United States
Spend much more	10.5%	4.7%	9.2%	10.3%	13.5%	12.4%	6.3%	11.4%
Spend more	41.6%	15.2%	23.7%	17.9%	38.3%	47.0%	19.1%	25.5%
Spend the same as now	40.9%	60.5%	49.1%	52.2%	35.2%	33.4%	51.3%	49.1%
Spend less	4.9%	14.2%	15.3%	11.4%	9.5%	6.1%	18.8%	12.2%
Spend much less	2.1%	5.5%	2.7%	8.1%	3.5%	1.1%	4.5%	1.8%
N	1,864	1,306	1,571	1,032	1,544	2,351	1,151	1,489

Note: Q6g refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

Table 3.2.9: The government should spend less on benefits for poor people

	China	Germany	Denmark	Spain	Japan	Philippines	Sweden	Taiwan	USA
Strongly agree	15.40%	2.20%	2.90%	2.50%	2.90%	31.80%	4.20%	1.30%	3.90%
Agree	36.90%	5.40%	5.80%	13.30%	4.40%	29.50%	5.80%	8.60%	14.10%
Neither agree nor disagree	13.20%	17.10%	13.50%	9.10%	27.80%	9.60%	19.60%	9.30%	16.70%
Disagree	24.70%	48.00%	24.60%	45.60%	22.10%	15.90%	39.70%	59.00%	50.80%
Strongly disagree	9.80%	27.30%	53.20%	29.50%	42.80%	13.20%	30.70%	21.80%	14.60%
N	2,956	1,350	1,457	1,193	1,195	1,192	1,068	2,002	1,531

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities (nd)

Concern for specific groups standard of living

In European literature, unemployment is often found to be a condition associated with lower concern and support for spending (van Oorschot, 2006). We see, in Tables 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3, that a majority agree with the government being responsible for providing the unemployed with a decent standard living. Table 3.3.1 is taken from the Social Inequalities round of ISSP to include views in mainland China. In2 we see that, compared to the liberal welfare states, US, Japan and Korea have higher levels of support for government to aid unemployed people, yet compared to Sweden we see they are lower – placing them in between and perhaps more in line with more conservative system. Mainland China, on the other hand, has much higher support for spending on those who are unemployed. This points to the importance of appreciating the different and unique trends across the societies in the region, where welfare, economic and political institutions and systems vary greatly, meaning that it is difficult from this overview to say which dimensions may explain the variation. A key takeaway is the overall high support for a group that often is deemed less deserving when looking at rankings of deservingness (van Oorschot, 2006).

Based on findings thus far we would expect that respondents would have a higher level of concern for the living standards of old people. This is confirmed by the findings from both waves of the Role of Government. There are some variations between the societies, but overall they have similar levels of support across the two waves and across societies, this time with a decrease of ‘definitely should be’ in Japan in 2016 compared to 2006 as seen in Tables 3.3.3, 3.3.4 and 3.3.5.

Overall, we see high support for elderly people, and for government spending on healthcare and surprisingly high levels of support for unemployed people in most societies. Again, we see variations across and

Table 3.3.1: The government should provide a decent standard of living for unemployed people: China

Strongly agree	28.50%
Agree	58.90%
Neither agree nor disagree	9.80%
Disagree	2.70%
Strongly disagree	0.10%
N	2,977

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities (nd)

Table 3.3.2: Q7f Government responsibility: provide living standard for unemployed people, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	19.90%	26.70%	15.80%	15.40%	16.40%	52.80%	60.50%	19.80%	16.20%
Probably should be	46.60%	48.90%	56.20%	38.00%	49.20%	31.80%	35.70%	56.50%	40.40%
Probably should not be	26.70%	18.30%	22.60%	32.10%	26.70%	10.00%	3.20%	19.10%	33.00%
Definitely should not be	6.70%	6.20%	5.40%	14.50%	7.60%	5.40%	0.60%	4.50%	10.40%
N	1,876	1,084	1,599	1,372	1,034	1,196	1,802	1,100	1,339

Note: Q7f refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.3.3: The government should provide a decent standard of living for unemployed people, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	25.00%	30.30%	18.50%	18.30%	18.40%	48.60%	49.70%	27.00%	16.00%
Probably should be	47.20%	50.50%	52.40%	38.20%	51.80%	30.70%	43.00%	56.50%	35.90%
Probably should not be	23.90%	15.00%	22.20%	30.60%	23.90%	14.80%	5.80%	13.00%	34.60%
Definitely should not be	3.90%	4.30%	6.90%	12.90%	5.80%	5.90%	1.50%	3.60%	13.40%
N	1,881	1,310	1,532	1,077	1,559	1,173	2,428	1,135	1,480

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

Table 3.3.4: Q7d Government responsibility: provide living standard for old people, 2016

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	45.30%	61.00%	53.10%	33.00%	33.10%	70.90%	80.80%	68.60%	49.20%
Probably should be	46.30%	34.50%	43.00%	43.30%	50.90%	24.10%	18.50%	28.70%	39.10%
Probably should not be	7.70%	3.50%	3.60%	18.40%	13.90%	4.10%	0.70%	2.30%	9.40%
Definitely should not be	0.80%	1.00%	0.30%	5.30%	2.10%	0.80%	0.00%	0.40%	2.30%
N	1,917	1,098	1,647	1,446	1,042	1,194	1,820	1,119	1,367

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.3.5: Q7d Government responsibility: provide living standard for old people, 2006

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Japan	Korea	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Definitely should be	48.50%	73.60%	47.90%	44.30%	35.70%	56.80%	78.80%	66.80%	57.10%
Probably should be	45.10%	23.90%	46.40%	44.20%	54.30%	33.90%	20.70%	30.20%	32.90%
Probably should not be	5.70%	2.20%	5.00%	8.60%	9.40%	7.80%	0.40%	2.50%	8.20%
Definitely should not be	0.70%	0.40%	0.70%	2.90%	0.60%	1.50%	0.10%	0.50%	1.80%
N	1,923	1,335	1,589	1,149	1,571	1,178	2,495	1,157	1,512

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

between the East Asian societies and support for Confucian value system explanations due to the higher support for and concern for elderly people.

Performance

Having looked at trends related to the support for welfare systems and attitudes towards particular social policy areas and groups in need we move on to attitudes towards the performance and outcomes of welfare systems. This addresses the evaluative dimension of welfare attitudes. We will look at assessments of how successful governments are deemed to be as well as demands for cuts in spending and changes in policies found present in citizens' attitudes. ISSP allows us to look at the extent to which citizens think governments are successful in providing acceptable living standards for the three focuses: elderly people, unemployed people and healthcare provision. These questions were repeated in 2006 and 2016 allowing us to compare changes over time. When looking at evaluations we focus in on the three East Asian societies in ISSP's Role of Government survey in particular.

Between the two points in time Tables 3.4.1 and 3.4.2, we see little change in Japan, and a reduction in those seeing policies as unsuccessful in Korea. The latter may be linked to new policies in the area in that time period. There are also quite large changes in Taiwan, with an increase in those saying it is neither successful nor unsuccessful, a middle point that would be interesting to pursue in future research. Overall, we see a difference between societies, linked to policies and levels of issues related to elderly people in the societies. There is also quite a wide spread in the evaluations, deeming lower degrees of agreement across the population than in some of the other dimensions of welfare attitudes.

Moving on to unemployment, Table 3.4.3, a question only included in Role of Government IV 2006 and without Japan, we see that the majority

Table 3.4.1: Q23b Government successful: providing living standard for old people, 2016

	Japan	Korea	Taiwan
Very successful	2.2%	4.6%	2.8%
Quite successful	23.1%	29.0%	42.7%
Neither successful nor unsuccessful	37.6%	32.7%	11.0%
Quite unsuccessful	28.7%	27.2%	36.5%
Very unsuccessful	8.5%	6.5%	7.0%
N	1,431	1,046	1,872

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.4.2: Q8b Government successful: providing living standard for old people, 2006

	Taiwan	Japan	Korea
Very successful	2.4%	2.1%	1.5%
Quite successful	30.6%	20.9%	18.0%
Neither successful nor unsuccessful	32.6%	35.8%	37.5%
Quite unsuccessful	28.5%	29.8%	35.5%
Very unsuccessful	5.9%	11.4%	7.5%
N	1,890	1,131	1,559

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

Table 3.4.3: Government success in fighting unemployment, 2006

	Taiwan	Korea
Very successful	0.004	0.004
Quite successful	11.10%	5.20%
Neither successful nor unsuccessful	25.70%	20.30%
Quite unsuccessful	42.80%	51.10%
Very unsuccessful	20.00%	23.00%

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

of respondents give a negative judgement of their government's success in the two societies.

When it comes to providing healthcare for the sick, Table 3.4.4, the 2016 round did not include Taiwan on that question. We see a more positive overall judgement in the two societies. There is again a rather large middle-point answer, indicating that there is a large group without a strong leaning. Here, however, we see a higher percentage of respondents deeming their government quite successful.

Compared to 2016, seen in Table 3.4.5, the 2006 round showed similar levels of mid-point answers in Japan and Korea, and a lower level of respondents finding the government as being successful. Taiwanese respondents are more positive to their government's healthcare system than the two other societies' citizens.

Overall, we see a variation in how satisfied citizens are with government interventions, varying between the different societies. We move on to look at the type of demands and preferences citizens have when it comes to cuts and consequences of welfare.

Table 3.4.4: Q23a Government successful: providing healthcare for sick people, 2016

	Japan	Korea
Very successful	3.30%	6.00%
Quite successful	34.80%	40.70%
Neither successful nor unsuccessful	41.20%	35.10%
Quite unsuccessful	16.40%	15.40%
Very unsuccessful	4.30%	2.70%
N	1,417	1,043

Note: Q23a refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.4.5: Q8a Government successful: providing healthcare for sick people, 2006

	Taiwan	Japan	Korea
Very successful	5.10%	2.90%	2.00%
Quite successful	41.80%	24.80%	32.20%
Neither successful nor unsuccessful	27.50%	35.50%	40.00%
Quite unsuccessful	20.30%	27.70%	22.10%
Very unsuccessful	5.40%	9.10%	3.60%
N	1,896	1,137	1,549

Note: Q8a refers to the question number in the questionnaire for ease of location of the resource.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) IV

In Figure 3.1 in the book a higher score means that the public is more strongly against cuts in government spending. We see in the figure that in terms of government spending, Korean citizens are, on average, more against cuts than those in Taiwan and Japan. Again, this underlines a variation across the East Asian societies that some of the more general conceptualisations of the societies as one welfare regime fail to capture. We also see Taiwanese respondents on average being more against cuts. When we look into the distribution of these numbers (Table 3.4.6), we see that Japan has the highest percentage of respondents answering that they are strongly in favour of government cuts. This may be linked to years of austerity and pressures on a stagnating economy that see Japanese views being shaped by perceptions of and beliefs in a need for austerity. Furthermore, regarding the variations between the different East Asian societies, we also find changes over time where the larger changes happen

Table 3.4.6: Government and economy: cuts in governments spending

	TW 2016	TW 2006	JP 2016	JP 2006	KR 2016	KR 2006
Strongly in favour of	19.80%	23.20%	48.80%	57.30%	12.50%	17.60%
In favour of	54.10%	45.60%	25.30%	22.50%	38.70%	37.70%
Neither in favour of nor against	5.80%	18.10%	20.30%	13.60%	30.40%	26.70%
Against	18.20%	11.70%	3.80%	3.70%	14.50%	14.60%
Strongly against	2.10%	1.40%	1.70%	3.00%	3.90%	3.50%
N	1,837	1,845	1,431	1,091	1,038	1,544

Note: TW = Taiwan, JP = Japan, KR = Korea.

Source: ISSP Role of Government (nd) V

Table 3.4.7: World Value Survey: people who don't work turn lazy

	CN	HK	JP	KR	PH	SG	TW
Strongly agree	35.00%	24.00%	18.50%	20.40%	17.80%	19.90%	32.20%
Agree	48.30%	48.80%	51.60%	53.50%	32.60%	50.00%	54.00%
Neither agree nor disagree	2.80%	15.00%	21.70%	20.50%	12.30%	14.20%	3.70%
Disagree	11.80%	10.80%	6.40%	5.50%	31.40%	13.70%	8.80%
Strongly disagree	2.10%	1.50%	1.80%	0.20%	5.80%	2.20%	1.40%
N	3,030	2,072	1,245	1,245	1,200	2,011	1,222

Note: CN = China, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

within the options on being in favour of cuts – here we find a similar trends across societies where people are less favourable to cuts in 2016. This may be related to financial crises.

Perceptions of welfare consequences have been shown to be related to views of groups in need by deservingness theorists among others (van Oorschot, 2000, 2006). The World Value Survey (WVS) includes more of our East Asian societies and asks a question around the effects of non-work, which relates to the attitude criteria deservingness theory use in deeming if someone is deserving of support. Here we see that, in particular, people in mainland Chinese and Hong Kong are of the belief that people who do not work are lazy, which may help us understand the harsh judgement we found of those who are poor in mainland China. However, we do find a high level of agreement with this statement across the East Asian societies, pointing to potential harsh judgement of those out of work and deemed able to work.

Social inequality – progressive tales

We now turn to attitudes and views of inequalities, which can be defined and seen as sets of cognitive and affective normative beliefs. In the literature views, social inequality has been deemed a crucial area to look at within welfare attitude studies, as scholars assume that dissatisfaction with current inequality levels could lead to larger social unrest (see, for example, Whyte, 2011). This is particularly important in the societies covered in this book as we they have experienced increasing levels of inequality.

We will start by looking at descriptive data on attitudes towards redistribution, taxes and inequality. Contrary to expectations set by Larsen (2016) we see the majority of respondents in the East Asian societies agree that differences in income in their country are too large. This means that we could expect demands for reducing social inequality and the support for higher taxation shown earlier may be another sign of this. In other words, respondents see it as part of a government's job to do so, pointing to a high level of legitimacy for governments acting in such ways. Interestingly Taiwan stands out as the country where more people are against this, which may point towards a higher scepticism to more expansive government interventions generally. Again, we find different patterns of welfare attitudes in the different societies – and no one East Asian welfare attitude model.

To start us off we look at WVS data on attitudes towards income inequality, the question whether or not incomes should be made more equal or not. From Figure 3.2 in the book and Table 3.5.1 here we see that Taiwan has the higher median tolerance and acceptance of income inequality. Hong Kong, Korea and Singapore also have high median scores, surprisingly at the same level as Sweden, while mainland China is scoring a somewhat lower. Table 3.5.1 shows that this is not translated to a clear direction of opinions across the respondents, as they are spread across the answer options, and we need further analysis to understand who is accepting of income inequality.

Table 3.5.2 focuses on more macro-level income questions and asks whether income differences in society are too large. This question is trying to capture both perceptions of income differences and a sense of whether or not governments should expect demands in this area from dissatisfied citizens.

Again, we find a difference across the difference East Asian societies. A majority in Taiwan and Korea see it as the government's responsibility to reduce income differences. As in the previous dimensions of attitudes, Japan is different from the two other societies, and has lower levels of support for this. Overall, across the East Asian societies most people see income differences as being too large. As to whether this translates into a demand for government to reduce these differences, Table 3.5.3 shows that a majority

Table 3.5.1: Income inequality attitudes

	CN	DE	DK	ES	HK	JP	KR	PH	SE	SG	TW	US
Incomes should be made more equal	9.40%	7.40%	6.00%	12.40%	2.50%	6.20%	0.50%	10.60%	4.20%	2.80%	3.40%	20.10%
2	7.50%	4.90%	4.80%	9.50%	2.00%	2.10%	0.70%	5.30%	3.30%	1.40%	1.60%	4.50%
3	10.30%	9.60%	9.60%	12.60%	5.70%	9.80%	4.30%	4.20%	5.80%	3.00%	2.90%	8.60%
4	6.90%	8.10%	8.50%	9.40%	6.20%	9.40%	6.90%	5.30%	8.10%	3.70%	2.00%	8.80%
5	14.80%	17.10%	21.10%	8.80%	14.60%	27.60%	8.60%	16.20%	13.40%	15.70%	11.90%	17.20%
6	11.40%	10.40%	10.90%	10.90%	18.40%	15.70%	14.30%	8.30%	10.00%	12.40%	7.60%	10.60%
7	11.20%	15.30%	14.60%	8.30%	20.90%	15.90%	32.80%	8.30%	17.40%	16.70%	16.50%	11.10%
8	15.00%	15.70%	13.10%	10.40%	19.80%	8.30%	23.50%	15.30%	20.40%	19.70%	27.40%	6.80%
9	5.70%	4.00%	5.00%	8.40%	4.10%	2.10%	6.70%	7.80%	6.80%	7.00%	9.30%	2.80%
We need larger income differences as incentives	7.80%	7.50%	6.30%	9.30%	5.70%	3.00%	1.80%	18.80%	10.50%	17.40%	17.50%	9.60%
N	3,026	3,609	3,299	1,178	2,070	1,277	1,245	1,200	1,185	2,001	1,223	2,574

Note: This is a scale from 1 to 10 where 10 = We need large income differences as incentives and 1 = incomes should be made more equal.

CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Table 3.5.2: Differences in income are too large

	CN	DE	DK	ES	JP	PH	SE	TW	US
Strongly agree	38.50%	52.40%	28.10%	32.10%	43.10%	21.00%	32.20%	44.90%	29.40%
Agree	52.90%	37.20%	34.30%	59.10%	34.70%	30.40%	40.90%	46.20%	37.10%
Neither agree nor disagree	5.40%	5.50%	15.10%	4.80%	14.90%	15.30%	17.20%	2.60%	17.00%
Disagree	2.90%	4.20%	14.20%	3.80%	4.50%	21.50%	7.50%	5.30%	12.80%
Strongly disagree	0.30%	0.70%	8.30%	0.20%	2.70%	11.70%	2.30%	1.00%	3.70%
N	2,989	1,360	1,464	1,195	1,226	1,188	1,106	2,016	1,512

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 3.5.3: It is responsibility of government to reduce differences in income between people

	CN	DE	DK	ES	JP	PH	SE	TW	US
Strongly agree	27.20%	28.40%	24.50%	26.50%	25.40%	18.80%	21.00%	18.20%	7.90%
Agree	54.20%	37.10%	29.30%	53.10%	29.00%	33.00%	37.00%	48.20%	24.70%
Neither agree nor disagree	13.00%	14.20%	13.90%	11.80%	28.90%	21.60%	23.60%	11.50%	16.10%
Disagree	5.50%	14.90%	16.10%	7.40%	8.20%	18.30%	12.40%	20.20%	31.40%
Strongly disagree	0.20%	5.50%	16.20%	1.30%	8.50%	8.30%	6.00%	2.00%	19.80%
N	2,963	1,349	1,439	1,189	1,203	1,191	1,078	2,000	1,508

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

of respondents in these societies agree with the statement that this is the government's responsibility. The percentages vary, however, with mainland Chinese people having the greatest number seeing this as a government responsibility and Japan being on the lower end.

We next look at attitudes towards taxation of different levels of income. This is seen as a measure of demand for redistribution, and perceptions related to income inequality. Overall, in the next tables we do see that respondents in our East Asian societies would like there to be higher taxes, see Tables 3.5.4,

3.5.5 and 3.5.6 for descriptive statistics on attitudes towards taxation. Thus, there is a proven link between perceptions of too high differences in income, and views of taxation. This shows that governments in these societies do have some scope and potential to do so as many respondents have the view that that taxes are too low or much too low. Taiwanese respondents stand out here, with a higher percentage answering that taxes are much too low than in other societies.

As we have the data that enables us to look at the changes in time on this question, Table 3.5.5 gives an overview of the previous round's answer. Looking back at Role of Government's previous round we see that the findings show a consistent trend over time in Korea and Taiwan when looking at the changes from round IV to round V. Overall, we see that there is nothing to suggest that respondents believe there is too high taxation on high incomes, rather the opposite, which would support government intervention in the area.

In line with the views on taxation we find a majority of respondents answering that those with higher income should pay larger shares of their income in taxes (see Table 3.5.6). Here we see a potential demand for government intervention as income differences grow and it is combined with low taxes for those with higher incomes.

Since social inequality scholars often argue that there is a danger of social conflicts and unrest in societies with high levels of inequality, we are also interested in the potential for social unrest. When it comes to perceptions of conflicts between rich and poor people, we see Korea and mainland China having higher response rates stating that there are strong or very strong conflicts, while Taiwan and Japan are more in line with the European societies in the table. In other words, there is a perception of high tension that we do not yet see translating into larger demonstrations in mainland China. However, we do see smaller-scale symptoms of discontent in demonstrations and activism across these societies. Theoretically, then, the question and challenge to scholars becomes: when and will this translate into larger riots and social unrest.

To further understand the reasons for the apparent lack of larger-scale social unrest in societies with high levels of inequality and public attitudes in support of attitudes, Larsen (2016) has used a theoretical approach he names 'tales of progress'. In his work Larsen argued that the belief in the progress tale – that it is possible to progress from your parental social status in your own lifetime – is crucial in understanding why social inequality does not always lead to social unrest. In 8 we see how, particularly in mainland China, more respondents have a higher status job than their father, showing that narratives of progress will have a relationship with proven social mobility among many respondents. In this way it is very different from the three other East Asian welfare states included here, which are more in line with

Table 3.5.4: Taxes for high incomes

	DE	DK	ES	IN	IS	KR	PH	SE	TH	US
Much too high	2.10%	7.40%	2.40%	26.80%	6.70%	2.20%	22.40%	5.60%	2.20%	7.80%
Too high	7.90%	17.90%	7.20%	34.00%	13.00%	5.30%	28.50%	11.50%	15.80%	15.70%
About right	24.70%	38.30%	20.80%	26.50%	29.80%	17.60%	43.00%	32.70%	51.00%	24.40%
Too low	48.70%	27.90%	47.30%	11.00%	42.20%	44.70%	4.60%	36.50%	13.50%	36.10%
Much too low	16.60%	8.60%	22.30%	1.70%	8.30%	30.20%	1.40%	13.70%	17.50%	15.90%
N	1,580	1,040	1,616	1,326	1,174	1,023	1,188	1,083	1,082	1,334

Note: DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, IN = India, IS = Israel, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TH = Thailand, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 3.5.5: View of taxes for high incomes

	Taiwan	Denmark	Germany	Israel	Japan	Philippines	Spain	Sweden	United States
Much too high	2.80%	11.80%	2.90%	8.30%	8.40%	20.40%	4.80%	9.00%	4.90%
Too high	5.60%	22.10%	9.10%	20.40%	10.10%	34.70%	15.30%	18.90%	11.30%
About right	23.10%	38.30%	25.10%	34.00%	20.20%	35.50%	33.10%	32.60%	27.00%
Too low	29.10%	22.50%	46.70%	27.80%	30.30%	7.50%	37.30%	28.40%	36.70%
Much too low	39.40%	5.40%	16.20%	9.40%	31.10%	1.90%	9.50%	11.10%	20.10%
N	1,666	1,287	1,459	1,196	1,014	1,135	2,122	1,113	1,416

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 3.5.6: Tax: do you think people with high income should pay larger share of their income in taxes?

	CN	DE	DK	ES	JP	PH	SE	TW	US
Much larger share	21.90%	29.70%	11.10%	21.10%	34.90%	33.90%	19.50%	25.80%	18.90%
Larger	51.60%	54.50%	56.10%	65.40%	53.10%	26.50%	52.80%	59.80%	44.40%
The same share	23.40%	14.00%	30.30%	12.10%	10.40%	28.20%	26.10%	13.00%	34.40%
Smaller	2.50%	1.60%	2.30%	0.80%	0.90%	8.80%	1.20%	1.10%	2.10%
Much smaller share	0.60%	0.20%	0.30%	0.60%	0.70%	2.50%	0.40%	0.40%	0.10%
N	2,830	1,348	1,463	1,186	1,226	1,179	1,102	1,966	1,522

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 3.5.7: Conflicts: between poor people and rich people

	CN	DE	DK	ES	JP	PH	SE	TW	US
Very strong conflicts	23.00%	12.30%	1.90%	16.40%	5.00%	24.10%	6.30%	4.40%	14.90%
Strong conflicts	42.50%	48.20%	11.90%	35.40%	30.60%	26.90%	29.20%	24.80%	44.20%
Not very strong conflicts	26.00%	36.00%	64.50%	23.50%	50.70%	34.40%	60.80%	43.10%	36.70%
There are no conflicts	8.50%	3.60%	21.70%	24.60%	13.70%	14.60%	3.70%	27.80%	4.10%
N	2,936	1,346	1,403	1,177	1,062	1,184	1,031	1,990	1,474

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 3.5.8: Level of status job compared to the job of father

	CN	DE	DK	ES	JP	PH	SE	TW	US
Much higher than your fathers	20.20%	9.90%	13.50%	5.70%	2.40%	12.40%	10.00%	7.10%	17.90%
Higher	45.20%	26.30%	31.70%	39.10%	15.90%	20.70%	32.20%	24.80%	25.30%
About equal	18.40%	33.60%	33.90%	34.30%	20.50%	24.00%	31.70%	36.30%	25.10%
Lower	6.40%	17.50%	12.40%	13.50%	27.50%	20.40%	16.20%	14.10%	17.20%
Much lower than your fathers	1.40%	3.40%	5.00%	2.40%	16.10%	9.70%	5.10%	10.50%	8.90%
I never had a job	5.00%	5.40%	1.00%	4.00%	11.20%	6.30%	1.80%	3.00%	0.30%
I don't know what my father did, father never had a job	3.40%	4.00%	2.50%	1.00%	6.50%	6.40%	3.10%	4.30%	5.40%
N	3,010	1,363	1,491	1,188	1,276	1,198	1,125	2,011	1,524

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

the social mobility found in the other societies included. We can therefore expect a higher acceptance of social inequality in mainland China if we are to believe in Larsen's (2016) argument.

Chapter 4

Chapter 4 focuses on exploring the importance of the political, but at contextual and individual levels. Again, findings suggest that there is no one model across these societies and that political attitudes matter differently depending on society and political system. This is particularly so in the unique political system of mainland China. In the chapter we look at the importance of what has been called Asian values by some, and by testing this in a regression analysis we find that, of those values, the importance of obeying a ruler is an key attitude that is related to higher support for redistribution in the societies included. There are also traces of cultural patterns because we find that attitudes towards work being a duty and people who do not work being lazy are quite harsh in all societies but harsher in mainland China, Hong Kong and Taiwan followed by Singapore, with Japan being different from the others. However, work being a duty, which has high support across societies, also could be seen as a further support of Asian value theories. The importance in life of one's family is very important, with over 86 per cent in agreement across societies. In terms of the role of the government Korean respondents are more in favour of the government financing jobs, and when asked whether the state should equalise society, mainland China is higher followed by Korea, and Japan is less in agreement.

An important element in understanding support for policies is trust, both in the state apparatus and politicians as well as between citizens. Here we find that mainland China, somehow contradictorily reports lower interpersonal trust but highest confidence in parliament and government, while Korea and Japan demonstrate less confidence in parliament and government. To understand the importance of the political attitudes and differences between the different societies with different political systems we carried out regression analysis to see what factors matters while controlling for the typical factors we consider in attitudes research.

In the first regression we looked at redistribution measured as whether it is *the responsibility of government to reduce differences income between people with high and low income*. This was chosen to test the 'social volcano' thesis. We were also interested in testing the 'tale of progress' hypothesis promoted by Larsen (2016). What we find is that there again are different patterns in the different societies; we can see that in the different constants. Overall, we can see two groups of societies: mainland China and Korea have lower constants and are more in favour of redistribution than Japan

and Taiwan. When it comes to other factors we see that age and gender matter. Older respondents are more in favour of redistribution, and gender is only significant in Korea where women are more in favour of redistribution.

In the second regression we were interested in what explains attitudes to where or not the statement the *state makes income equal* is essential. Here we saw that Japan was different from other societies, as it had less of the attitudes towards 'state makes income equal' explained than for other societies. At the same time, it had a higher constant than other societies, meaning there is high support for it when all variables are zero. In terms of the importance of political regime we saw that there is variation as Singapore and mainland China, two societies with distinct political systems, saw the variables *importance of democracy*, *surveillance and monitoring* as well as *importance of strong leader* as important, but not in the same direction. Furthermore, mainland China is a little different from other societies as age and gender were statistically significant there, but not in other societies, meaning women and elderly people see addressing income inequality as more important. What we found across societies was that all societies see income equality as important, all constants quite high. The importance of *obey rules* is found statistically significant across societies and can be seen as an Asian value, those who are in favour are more positive to income equality. Overall, the regression analyses showed that political attitudes matter in explaining welfare attitudes, and that they matter differently in the different societies and in different political system.

Below are tables that support and further the descriptive analysis found in the book along the dimensions included in Chapter 4. For detailed discussion of the topics covered in the tables, see Chapter 4 in the book.

Table 4.2.1: Getting ahead: how important is having a good education yourself?

	CN	DK	ES	KR	PH	SE	US
Essential	44.70%	11.90%	19.70%	16.40%	44.30%	10.40%	30.40%
Very important	43.70%	47.00%	49.80%	41.30%	45.60%	53.80%	57.60%
Fairly important	9.80%	35.90%	24.70%	31.00%	7.80%	31.70%	10.70%
Not very important	1.70%	4.50%	4.90%	9.90%	1.80%	3.10%	0.90%
Not important at all	0.10%	0.70%	0.90%	1.40%	0.60%	1.00%	0.40%
N	2,998	1,499	1,195	1,595	1,200	1,119	1,568

Note: CN = China, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 4.2.2: Getting ahead: how important is having ambition?

	CN	DE	DK	ES	JP	KR	PH	SE	TW	US
Essential	30.60%	20.30%	22.40%	15.80%	14.90%	27.60%	38.90%	24.80%	34.70%	40.20%
Very important	47.50%	58.70%	42.40%	41.80%	26.80%	43.20%	45.20%	59.20%	49.80%	51.20%
Fairly important	17.80%	17.10%	31.00%	30.80%	43.30%	23.30%	14.00%	14.70%	9.80%	7.20%
Not very important	3.90%	3.60%	3.60%	8.20%	10.50%	5.40%	1.30%	1.00%	4.60%	1.20%
Not important at all	0.20%	0.30%	0.60%	3.40%	4.40%	0.60%	0.70%	0.30%	1.10%	0.20%
N	2,971	1,376	1,494	1,191	1,218	1,595	1,200	1,109	2,013	1,560

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 4.2.3: Getting ahead: how important is hard work?

	CN	DE	DK	ES	JP	KR	PH	SE	TW	US
Essential	37.30%	15.80%	12.10%	26.10%	25.50%	44.60%	47.50%	20.50%	40.50%	43.60%
Very important	47.90%	55.30%	31.80%	42.30%	39.50%	41.70%	44.40%	55.10%	53.00%	51.90%
Fairly important	11.70%	24.90%	42.00%	24.50%	29.90%	11.70%	5.80%	20.50%	5.00%	3.90%
Not very important	2.80%	3.70%	12.30%	5.70%	3.80%	1.90%	1.50%	3.30%	1.30%	0.40%
Not important at all	0.20%	0.30%	1.70%	1.50%	1.30%	0.10%	0.80%	0.50%	0.20%	0.20%
N	2,996	1,369	1,490	1,202	1,260	1,597	1,200	1,105	2,024	1,575

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 4.2.4: Getting ahead: how important is coming from a wealthy family?

	CN	DE	DK	ES	JP	KR	PH	SE	TW
Essential	27.50%	7.90%	1.20%	7.80%	2.70%	14.50%	11.80%	2.70%	10.20%
Very important	43.30%	20.90%	7.40%	24.60%	9.60%	31.30%	22.40%	10.80%	23.30%
Fairly important	16.00%	34.50%	31.20%	29.30%	40.10%	34.90%	26.90%	33.80%	25.00%
Not very important	11.30%	29.00%	46.40%	24.10%	35.20%	16.20%	27.40%	37.00%	28.90%
Not important at all	1.80%	7.80%	13.70%	14.10%	12.40%	2.90%	11.60%	15.70%	12.50%
N	2,982	1,354	1,477	1,197	1,238	1,595	1,199	1,091	2,013

Note: CN = China, DE = Denmark, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 4.2.5: Getting ahead: how important is knowing the right people?

	CN	DE	DK	ES	JP	KR	PH	SE	TW	US
Essential	34.40%	17.40%	7.80%	13.20%	3.90%	31.90%	11.20%	9.50%	27.60%	9.90%
Very important	44.70%	47.30%	26.80%	39.20%	10.70%	46.10%	31.80%	30.50%	51.30%	36.50%
Fairly important	16.10%	28.40%	43.40%	35.40%	39.70%	18.90%	30.40%	42.70%	14.80%	41.30%
Not very important	4.40%	6.30%	19.80%	10.80%	31.40%	2.70%	20.20%	15.20%	5.10%	10.80%
Not important at all	0.40%	0.60%	2.30%	1.40%	14.40%	0.40%	6.40%	2.10%	1.30%	1.50%
N	2,986	1,365	1,483	1,198	1,182	1,595	1,196	1,101	2,021	1,568

Note: CN = China, DE = Denmark, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP Social Inequalities IV (nd)

Table 4.3.1: Democraticness in own country

Scale	CN	DE	DK	ES	HK	JP	KR	PH	SE	SG	TH	TW	US
Not at all democratic	N 65 2.2%	51 1.4%	5 0.1%	47 4.0%	75 3.6%	9 0.8%	2 0.2%	45 3.8%	18 1.5%	25 1.3%	72 4.9%	22 1.8%	119 4.7%
2	N 42 1.4%	46 1.3%	10 0.3%	34 2.9%	66 3.2%	6 0.5%	2 0.2%	28 2.3%	4 0.3%	24 1.2%	44 3.0%	12 1.0%	72 2.8%
3	N 86 2.9%	101 2.8%	24 0.7%	63 5.3%	162 7.9%	51 4.3%	8 0.6%	36 3.0%	20 1.7%	51 2.6%	107 7.2%	41 3.4%	153 6.0%
4	N 92 3.1%	136 3.8%	22 0.7%	68 5.8%	186 9.0%	38 3.2%	24 1.9%	45 3.8%	15 1.3%	69 3.5%	104 7.0%	39 3.2%	202 7.9%
5	N 313 10.4%	354 9.8%	107 3.2%	127 10.8%	348 16.9%	117 9.8%	99 8.0%	192 16.0%	41 3.5%	300 15.3%	363 24.6%	130 10.6%	467 18.4%
6	N 383 12.7%	310 8.6%	104 3.1%	129 10.9%	429 20.8%	126 10.6%	273 21.9%	143 11.9%	78 6.6%	297 15.1%	206 13.9%	113 9.2%	334 13.1%
7	N 535 17.8%	660 18.2%	362 10.8%	213 18.1%	420 20.4%	257 21.5%	466 37.4%	169 14.1%	185 15.7%	495 25.2%	193 13.1%	192 15.7%	489 19.2%
8	N 696 23.2%	944 26.1%	790 23.6%	231 19.6%	249 12.1%	344 28.8%	298 23.9%	190 15.8%	362 30.7%	450 22.9%	191 12.9%	276 22.6%	403 15.9%
9	N 329 10.9%	486 13.4%	832 24.9%	102 8.7%	62 3.0%	156 13.1%	65 5.2%	122 10.2%	254 21.6%	125 6.4%	92 6.2%	153 12.5%	158 6.2%

(continued)

Table 4.3.1: Democraticness in own country (continued)

Scale	CN	DE	DK	ES	HK	JP	KR	PH	SE	SG	TH	TW	US
Completely democratic	N 464	532	1,087	165	61	89	8	230	201	126	106	245	144
	% 15.4%	14.7%	32.5%	14.0%	3.0%	7.5%	0.6%	19.2%	17.1%	6.4%	7.2%	20.0%	5.7%
Totals	N 3,005	3,620	3,343	1,179	2,058	1,193	1,245	1,200	1,178	1,962	1,478	1,223	2,541
	% 100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TH = Thailand, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Table 4.4.1: Important in life: family

Scale	CN	DE	DK	HK	JP	KR	PH	SE	SG	TH	TW	US
Very important	N 2,612	3,253	2,950	1,617	1,245	1,107	1,179	1,076	1,846	1,357	1,108	2,316
	% 86.3%	88.5%	87.9%	77.9%	92.8%	88.9%	98.3%	90.6%	91.8%	90.8%	90.6%	89.3%
Rather important	N 394	370	362	426	84	134	19	98	144	103	103	221
	% 13.0%	10.1%	10.8%	20.5%	6.3%	10.8%	1.6%	8.3%	7.2%	6.9%	8.4%	8.5%
Not very important	N 20	49	38	30	9	4	2	10	18	14	12	48
	% 0.7%	1.3%	1.1%	1.4%	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%	1.9%
Not at all important	N 2	4	5	2	3	0	0	3	2	21	0	8
	% 0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.3%
Totals	N 3,028	3,676	3,355	2,075	1,341	1,245	1,200	1,187	2,010	1,495	1,223	2,593
	% 100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TH = Thailand, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Table 4.4.2: Important in life: politics

Scale	CN	DE	DK	ES	HK	JP	KR	PH	SE	SG	TW	US
Very important	N 471 % 15.7%	549 15.1%	339 10.2%	164 13.6%	169 8.2%	203 15.7%	99 8.0%	452 37.7%	284 23.8%	172 8.6%	137 11.2%	362 14.1%
Rather important	N 1,193 % 39.6%	1,946 53.5%	1,371 41.2%	307 25.4%	741 35.9%	667 51.7%	649 52.1%	445 37.1%	635 53.3%	737 36.9%	347 28.4%	1,072 41.6%
Not very important	N 1,126 % 37.4%	947 26.0%	1,411 42.4%	436 36.1%	962 46.6%	366 28.4%	454 36.5%	198 16.5%	215 18.1%	851 42.6%	562 46.0%	955 37.1%
Not at all important	N 219 % 7.3%	194 5.3%	207 6.2%	300 24.9%	192 9.3%	55 4.3%	43 3.5%	103 8.6%	57 4.8%	236 11.8%	177 14.5%	185 7.2%
Totals	N 3,009 % 100.0%	3,636 100.0%	3,328 100.0%	1,207 100.0%	2,064 100.0%	1,291 100.0%	1,245 100.0%	1,198 100.0%	1,191 100.0%	1,996 100.0%	1,223 100.0%	2,574 100.0%

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Table 4.4.3: How much freedom of choice and control?

Scale	CN	DE	DK	ES	HK	JP	KR	PH	SE	SG	TW	US
None at all	N 66 % 2.2%	21 0.6%	22 0.7%	14 1.2%	28 1.4%	22 1.7%	2 0.2%	71 5.9%	14 1.2%	30 1.5%	19 1.6%	30 1.2%
2	N 41 % 1.4%	22 0.6%	21 0.6%	6 0.5%	22 1.1%	29 2.2%	4 0.3%	33 2.8%	6 0.5%	30 1.5%	8 0.7%	13 0.5%

Table 4.4.3: How much freedom of choice and control? (continued)

Scale	CN	DE	DK	ES	HK	JP	KR	PH	SE	SG	TW	US
3	N 87	79	43	12	68	94	20	31	13	42	27	58
	% 2.9%	2.2%	1.3%	1.0%	3.3%	7.2%	1.6%	2.6%	1.1%	2.1%	2.2%	2.2%
4	N 100	128	54	35	120	109	50	47	23	83	33	74
	% 3.3%	3.5%	1.6%	2.9%	5.8%	8.3%	4.0%	3.9%	1.9%	4.1%	2.7%	2.9%
5	N 364	509	243	131	293	262	96	203	82	313	141	185
	% 12.0%	14.0%	7.3%	10.9%	14.1%	20.1%	7.7%	16.9%	6.9%	15.6%	11.5%	7.2%
6	N 411	362	222	158	344	190	154	156	78	261	129	202
	% 13.6%	9.9%	6.7%	13.2%	16.6%	14.5%	12.4%	13.0%	6.5%	13.0%	10.5%	7.8%
7	N 507	762	550	240	492	280	468	128	249	459	220	448
	% 16.8%	20.9%	16.5%	20.1%	23.7%	21.4%	37.6%	10.7%	20.9%	22.9%	18.0%	17.4%
8	N 703	939	1,084	242	428	238	338	175	382	469	315	609
	% 23.3%	25.8%	32.6%	20.2%	20.6%	18.2%	27.1%	14.6%	32.0%	23.4%	25.8%	23.6%
9	N 249	339	635	174	135	36	88	103	175	115	121	380
	% 8.2%	9.3%	19.1%	14.5%	6.5%	2.8%	7.1%	8.6%	14.7%	5.7%	9.9%	14.7%
A great deal	N 494	478	450	185	143	46	25	253	172	201	210	581
	% 16.3%	13.1%	13.5%	15.5%	6.9%	3.5%	2.0%	21.1%	14.4%	10.0%	17.2%	22.5%
Totals	N 3,022	3,639	3,324	1,197	2,073	1,306	1,245	1,200	1,194	2,003	1,223	2,580
	% 100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Table 4.5.1: Average, standard deviation and sample size: political attitudes

	Japan			Korea			Singapore		
	Mean	Std dev	N	Mean	Std dev	N	Mean	Std dev	N
Importance of democracy (0–10 higher more important)	8.70	1.632	1,220	7.90	1.489	1,245	7.98	1.786	1,975
Democraticness in own country (0–10 higher completely democratic)	7.13	1.826	1,193	6.88	1.185	1,245	6.75	1.805	1,962
Political system: Having a democratic political system (1–6 higher democracy is very bad)	1.60	0.683	1,172	2.16	0.778	1,245	1.67	0.693	1,885
Political system: Having a strong leader (1–6 higher very bad)	2.97	0.954	1,141	2.24	0.791	1,245	2.90	0.900	1,801
Satisfaction with the political system (1–10 higher very satisfied)	5.61	2.110	1,220	6.78	1.109	1,245	6.72	1.915	1,992
Duty towards society to have children (1–5 higher disagree strongly)	3.05	1.006	1,284	2.54	0.833	1,245	2.70	0.983	2,005
It is child's duty to take care of ill parent (1–5 higher disagree strongly)	2.99	0.882	1,255	2.42	0.804	1,245	2.00	0.838	2,011
One of main goals in life has been to make my parents proud (1–4 higher disagree strongly)	2.24	0.619	1,070	2.01	0.615	1,245	1.86	0.665	2,001
Most people can be trusted (1 most people can be trusted; 2 can't be too careful)	1.64	0.479	1,281	1.67	0.470	1,245	1.66	0.474	1,998
Confidence: Parliament (1–4 higher none at all)	2.76	0.698	1,211	3.04	0.737	1,245	2.16	0.700	1,925
Confidence: The government (1–4 higher none at all)	2.64	0.720	1,243	2.52	0.699	1,245	1.99	0.685	1,989
Democracy: People receive state aid for unemployment (1–10 higher seeing it as essential part of democracy)	7.20	2.276	1,175	6.74	1.719	1,245	6.32	2.488	1,944
Democracy: The state makes people's incomes equal (1–10 higher seeing it as essential part of democracy)	4.16	2.626	1,151	6.01	1.967	1,245	5.08	2.721	1,921
Income equality (1–10 higher means we need larger income inequality to create incentives)	5.36	2.041	1,277	6.66	1.644	1,245	6.95	2.233	2,001
People who don't work turn lazy (1–5, 5 is strongly disagree)	2.21	0.879	1,245	2.11	0.793	1,245	2.28	1.004	2,011

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Summaries by chapter and tables with detailed statistics

Macao			Hong Kong			Taiwan			China		
Mean	Std dev	N	Mean	Std dev	N	Mean	Std dev	N	Mean	Std dev	N
7.48	1.968	1,014	7.83	1.852	2,064	8.95	1.507	1,223	8.77	1.666	3,013
5.76	1.841	1,015	5.76	2.010	2,058	7.39	2.149	1,223	7.17	2.106	3,005
2.07	0.709	1,016	1.97	0.741	2,037	1.70	0.602	1,201	1.75	0.617	2,980
2.70	0.753	1,019	2.87	0.843	2,038	2.13	0.931	1,188	2.61	0.805	2,975
5.54	1.882	1,016	5.10	2.147	2,060	5.11	2.208	1,222	7.55	1.957	3,001
2.87	0.959	1,018	2.98	1.002	2,071	2.70	1.112	1,219	2.25	1.027	3,028
2.17	0.778	1,017	2.19	0.826	2,071	2.17	0.920	1,222	1.40	0.559	3,029
2.28	0.704	1,021	2.24	0.706	2,066	1.89	0.661	1,220	2.04	0.730	3,029
1.56	0.496	968	1.61	0.489	2,066	1.69	0.463	1,223	1.35	0.476	3,009
2.33	0.762	1,015	2.80	0.721	2,049	2.91	0.767	1,194	1.69	0.631	3,022
2.22	0.809	1,016	2.50	0.836	2,069	2.55	0.799	1,200	1.56	0.603	3,027
6.67	2.469	1,016	6.24	2.176	2,050	7.13	2.160	1,222	8.08	2.241	2,990
5.71	2.834	1,009	5.12	2.536	2,041	5.88	2.782	1,223	7.66	2.552	2,988
5.86	2.226	1,021	6.31	2.014	2,070	7.22	2.234	1,223	5.52	2.674	3,026
2.28	0.881	1,016	2.17	0.962	2,072	1.93	0.911	1,222	1.98	1.018	3,030

Mapping Welfare Attitudes in East Asia

Table 4.5.2: People who don't work turn lazy

	CN	DE	DK	ES	HK	JP	KR	PH	SE	SG	TW	US
Strongly agree	N 1,062	662	880	233	497	230	254	214	96	401	393	347
	% 35.0%	18.5%	26.5%	19.5%	24.0%	18.5%	20.4%	17.8%	8.1%	19.9%	32.2%	13.5%
Agree	N 1,463	1,408	1,011	421	1,011	643	666	391	254	1,005	660	828
	% 48.3%	39.3%	30.5%	35.3%	48.8%	51.6%	53.5%	32.6%	21.6%	50.0%	54.0%	32.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	N 85	593	710	235	310	270	255	148	319	285	45	747
	% 2.8%	16.5%	21.4%	19.7%	15.0%	21.7%	20.5%	12.3%	27.1%	14.2%	3.7%	29.0%
Disagree	N 357	758	491	254	223	80	68	377	353	276	107	504
	% 11.8%	21.1%	14.8%	21.3%	10.8%	6.4%	5.5%	31.4%	30.0%	13.7%	8.8%	19.6%
Strongly disagree	N 63	166	224	51	31	22	2	70	156	44	17	146
	% 2.1%	4.6%	6.8%	4.3%	1.5%	1.8%	0.2%	5.8%	13.2%	2.2%	1.4%	5.7%
Totals	N 3,030	3,587	3,316	1,194	2,072	1,245	1,245	1,200	1,178	2,011	1,222	2,572
	% 100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Table 4.6.1: Trust and confidence

Country		Most people can be trusted	Confidence: parliament	Confidence: the government
CN	Mean	1.35	1.69	1.56
	N	3,009	3,022	3,027
	Std deviation	0.476	0.631	0.603
DE	Mean	1.55	2.67	2.70
	N	3,547	3,528	3,551
	Std deviation	0.498	0.755	0.754
DK	Mean	1.23	2.51	2.69
	N	3,344	3,328	3,312
	Std deviation	0.418	0.747	0.757
ES	Mean	1.59	2.84	3.12
	N	1,194	1,173	1,190
	Std deviation	0.492	0.863	0.859
HK	Mean	1.61	2.80	2.50
	N	2,066	2,049	2,069
	Std deviation	0.489	0.721	0.836
JP	Mean	1.64	2.76	2.64
	N	1,281	1,211	1,243
	Std deviation	0.479	0.698	0.720
KR	Mean	1.67	3.04	2.52
	N	1,245	1,245	1,245
	Std deviation	0.470	0.737	0.699
MO	Mean	1.56	2.33	2.22
	N	968	1,015	1,016
	Std deviation	0.496	0.762	0.809
SE	Mean	1.33	2.29	2.50
	N	1,174	1,169	1,163
	Std deviation	0.469	0.686	0.730
SG	Mean	1.66	2.16	1.99
	N	1,998	1,925	1,989
	Std deviation	0.474	0.700	0.685
TW	Mean	1.69	2.91	2.55
	N	1,223	1,194	1,200
	Std deviation	0.463	0.767	0.799
US	Mean	1.60	3.09	2.92
	N	2,587	2,569	2,579
	Std deviation	0.489	0.657	0.913

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, MO = Macao, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Table 4.6.2: Income inequality and evaluation

Country		Democracy: people receive state aid for unemployment	Democracy: the state makes people's incomes equal	Income equality	People who don't work turn lazy
CN	Mean	8.08	7.66	5.52	1.98
	N	2,990	2,988	3,026	3,030
	Std deviation	2.241	2.552	2.674	1.018
DE	Mean	8.19	5.27	5.70	2.54
	N	3,619	3,560	3,609	3,587
	Std deviation	2.179	3.109	2.498	1.148
DK	Mean	7.42	5.61	5.64	2.45
	N	1,678	1,673	3,299	3,316
	Std deviation	2.503	2.767	2.387	1.217
ES	Mean	8.06	6.58	5.26	2.56
	N	1,170	1,151	1,178	1,194
	Std deviation	2.353	2.974	2.903	1.149
HK	Mean	6.24	5.12	6.31	2.17
	N	2,050	2,041	2,070	2,072
	Std deviation	2.176	2.536	2.014	0.962
JP	Mean	7.20	4.16	5.36	2.21
	N	1,175	1,151	1,277	1,245
	Std deviation	2.276	2.626	2.041	0.879
KR	Mean	6.74	6.01	6.66	2.11
	N	1,245	1,245	1,245	1,245
	Std deviation	1.719	1.967	1.644	0.793
MO	Mean	6.67	5.71	5.86	2.28
	N	1,016	1,009	1,021	1,016
	Std deviation	2.469	2.834	2.226	0.881
SE	Mean	7.32	3.24	6.39	3.19
	N	1,174	1,170	1,185	1,178
	Std deviation	2.465	2.550	2.386	1.157
SG	Mean	6.32	5.08	6.95	2.28
	N	1,944	1,921	2,001	2,011
	Std deviation	2.488	2.721	2.233	1.004
TW	Mean	7.13	5.88	7.22	1.93
	N	1,222	1,223	1,223	1,222
	Std deviation	2.160	2.782	2.234	0.911
US	Mean	5.67	4.03	4.93	2.72
	N	2,541	2,536	2,574	2,572
	Std deviation	2.608	2.725	2.838	1.098

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, MO = Macao, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Table 4.6.3: Democracy attitudes

Country		Importance of democracy	Democraticness in own country	Political system: Having a democratic political system	Political system: Having a strong leader	Satisfaction with the political system
CN	Mean	8.77	7.17	1.75	2.61	7.55
	N	3,013	3,005	2,980	2,975	3,001
	Std deviation	1.666	2.106	0.617	0.805	1.957
DE	Mean	9.43	7.32	1.26	3.28	5.88
	N	3,659	3,620	3,582	3,451	3,630
	Std deviation	1.323	2.027	0.495	0.901	2.403
DK	Mean	9.60	8.54	1.24	3.36	7.30
	N	3,350	3,343	3,323	3,300	3,353
	Std deviation	1.105	1.498	0.508	0.877	2.106
ES	Mean	8.94	6.69	1.39	3.15	4.98
	N	1,195	1,179	1,176	1,101	1,186
	Std deviation	1.563	2.405	0.642	0.933	2.527
HK	Mean	7.83	5.76	1.97	2.87	5.10
	N	2,064	2,058	2,037	2,038	2,060
	Std deviation	1.852	2.010	0.741	0.843	2.147
JP	Mean	8.70	7.13	1.60	2.97	5.61
	N	1,220	1,193	1,172	1,141	1,220
	Std deviation	1.632	1.826	0.683	0.954	2.110
KR	Mean	7.90	6.88	2.16	2.24	6.78
	N	1,245	1,245	1,245	1,245	1,045
	Std deviation	1.489	1.185	0.778	0.791	1.109
MO	Mean	7.48	5.76	2.07	2.70	5.54
	N	1,014	1,015	1,016	1,019	1,016
	Std deviation	1.968	1.841	0.709	0.753	1.882
SE	Mean	9.30	7.90	1.18	3.38	6.43
	N	1,185	1,178	1,177	1,167	1,172
	Std deviation	1.856	1.768	0.480	0.857	2.116
SG	Mean	7.98	6.75	1.67	2.90	6.72
	N	1,975	1,962	1,885	1,801	1,992
	Std deviation	1.786	1.805	0.693	0.900	1.915
TW	Mean	8.95	7.39	1.70	2.13	5.11
	N	1,223	1,223	1,201	1,188	1,222
	Std deviation	1.507	2.149	0.602	0.931	2.208
US	Mean	8.32	6.05	1.71	2.92	4.40
	N	2,552	2,541	2,509	2,541	2,554
	Std deviation	2.155	2.227	0.806	1.026	2.430

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, MO = Macao, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Mapping Welfare Attitudes in East Asia

Table 4.6.4: Cultural values

Country		Duty towards society to have children	It is child's duty to take care of ill parent	One of main goals in life has been to make my parents proud
CN	Mean	2.25	1.40	2.04
	N	3,028	3,029	3,029
	Std deviation	1.027	0.559	0.730
DE	Mean	3.48	2.90	2.17
	N	3,620	3,640	3,523
	Std deviation	1.156	1.156	0.840
DK	Mean	3.68	3.42	2.76
	N	3,343	3,338	3,302
	Std deviation	1.099	1.058	0.842
ES	Mean	3.29	2.64	2.43
	N	1,197	1,193	1,194
	Std deviation	1.169	1.149	1.037
HK	Mean	2.98	2.19	2.24
	N	2,071	2,071	2,066
	Std deviation	1.002	0.826	0.706
JP	Mean	3.05	2.99	2.24
	N	1,284	1,255	1,070
	Std deviation	1.006	0.882	0.619
KR	Mean	2.54	2.42	2.01
	N	1,245	1,245	1,245
	Std deviation	0.833	0.804	0.615
MO	Mean	2.87	2.17	2.28
	N	1,018	1,017	1,021
	Std deviation	0.959	0.778	0.704
SE	Mean	4.11	3.36	2.44
	N	1,184	1,187	1,174
	Std deviation	0.958	1.123	0.836
SG	Mean	2.70	2.00	1.86
	N	2,005	2,011	2,001
	Std deviation	0.983	0.838	0.665
TW	Mean	2.70	2.17	1.89
	N	1,219	1,222	1,220
	Std deviation	1.112	0.920	0.661
US	Mean	3.66	2.75	1.93
	N	2,575	2,581	2,586
	Std deviation	1.016	0.988	0.761

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, MO = Macao, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Table 4.6.5: Occupational status

Country		Occupational group – respondent (WVS7)	Occupational group – respondent's father (EVSS-main earner) (respondent 14 years old)
CN	Mean	5.16	6.91
	N	2,320	2,386
	Std deviation	2.633	2.759
DE	Mean	4.15	5.08
	N	1,422	3,227
	Std deviation	2.111	2.413
DK	Mean	–	5.27
	N	3,261	–
	Std deviation	2.813	–
ES	Mean	6.33	–
	N	1,166	–
	Std deviation	2.225	–
HK	Mean	3.70	5.42
	N	1,948	1,836
	Std deviation	2.076	2.329
JP	Mean	4.11	4.83
	N	1,111	1,228
	Std deviation	2.582	2.862
KR	Mean	4.25	6.26
	N	857	1,218
	Std deviation	1.693	2.553
MO	Mean	4.93	7.41
	N	968	1,000
	Std deviation	3.170	3.228
SE	Mean	–	4.58
	N	–	1,145
	Std deviation	–	2.607
SG	Mean	3.49	4.98
	N	1,852	1,751
	Std deviation	2.210	2.265
TW	Mean	4.28	6.11
	N	962	1,176
	Std deviation	2.614	2.682
US	Mean	3.59	4.74
	N	1,556	2,205
	Std deviation	2.697	2.571

Note: CN = China, DE = Germany, DK = Denmark, ES = Spain, HK = Hong Kong, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, MO = Macao, SE = Sweden, SG = Singapore, TW = Taiwan, US = United States of America, – = the value is not available.

Source: World Value Survey (nd)

Chapter 5

In Chapter 5 we explore the importance of culture, and findings suggest that in addition to the political, cultural values also seem to matter when it comes to welfare and welfare attitudes in East Asia. A key finding is that it is crucial that we do not default to a catch-all explanation as there is great variation in the different societies. We see how attitudes to gender roles are crucial and important to consider when analysing welfare attitudes in East Asia as these attitudes shape views of who should do what and why – key elements in welfare attitudes and deservingness (see, for example, van Oorschot, 2006). Korea has particularly traditional views of how gender roles should be organised in society and in homes, while mainland China is different among other in how it is perceived by most that a working mother can have as warm a relationship with children as a non-working mother (see Table 5.6.1) in another direction. We also see this in that much larger percentages of respondents than in European and North American societies see it as the family's role to care for elderly people and children under school age in particular. Furthermore, the role of family in supporting education is important. Elderly people are seen as a provider of domestic help. When testing the importance of cultural value in the regression where we explored what explains support for the family to carry out childcare in one regression and eldercare in another, we found that cultural factors matter. This means cultural attitudes can explain parts of variation in welfare attitudes in the societies studied when we want to understand what explains who should provide care eldercare and childcare. This is more evidence that there is no one model of attitudes and there is variation depending on whether we look at eldercare or childcare. Importantly, we see that culture and what can be characterised as Confucian values are important, but more so in Taiwan, Korea and mainland China than in Japan. When it comes to childcare, we see culture being more important in mainland China, where more attitudes are explained by the variables than in the other societies. In other words, Confucianism, and cultural values associated with it, matter more in China on this particular question. Taiwan and mainland China also have opposite views here, maybe pointing to a political regime effect.

Overall, family and cultural factors matter, and there are some similarities in the descriptive statistics across societies in that family matters (but in different ways) and family has a large role, particularly in eldercare and childcare. There are also suggestions that there is a role played by shame and loss of social position if one fails to fulfil cultural obligations, something that is seen as crucial to explore further. This is linked to the importance given to obligations and duties.

Below are tables that support and further the descriptive analysis found in the book along the dimensions included in Chapter 5. For detailed discussion of the topics covered in the tables, see Chapter 5 in the book.

Table 5.5.1: Government responsibility: promote equality between men and women

	DE	ES	JP	KR	PH	SE	TH	TW	US
Definitely should be	46.10%	71.30%	31.70%	20.10%	55.70%	54.30%	41.60%	51.20%	51.70%
Probably should be	41.10%	25.70%	38.00%	36.80%	30.70%	32.30%	44.10%	37.40%	33.00%
Probably should not be	11.30%	2.00%	21.00%	33.30%	9.60%	10.40%	12.00%	8.70%	10.20%
Definitely should not be	1.60%	0.90%	9.30%	9.80%	4.10%	3.00%	2.30%	2.70%	5.00%

Note: DE = Germany, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TH = Thailand, TW = Taiwan, US = United states of America.

Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Table 5.5.2: When you were 14, 15, 16 years old, did your mother work outside the household?

	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	ES	SE	US
Yes, my mother did have a job when I was 14, 15, 16 years old	64.80%	64.90%	60.00%	71.10%	49.60%	42.80%	33.00%	70.80%	67.60%
No, my mother never had a job outside the household	29.00%	21.60%	18.40%	15.90%	45.00%	52.40%	57.60%	15.20%	22.60%
No, my mother stopped working before she got married	0.80%	2.90%	3.40%	8.60%	3.10%	1.90%	3.10%	2.60%	2.20%
No, my mother stopped working after she got married, but before having children	3.00%	4.40%	7.80%	2.00%	0.90%	1.30%	2.60%	4.30%	4.20%
No, my mother stopped working after her first child	2.40%	6.10%	10.40%	2.30%	1.30%	1.60%	3.70%	7.20%	3.40%
Totals	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Note: DE = Germany, ES = Spain, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, TW = Taiwan, US = United states of America.

Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Table 5.5.3: Q28 Mother ever working for pay before respondent 14?

	CN	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	ES	SE	US
Yes, she worked for pay	27.70%	61.40%	71.80%	60.80%	63.80%	56.50%	40.10%	37.60%	62.10%	68.20%
No	72.30%	38.60%	28.20%	39.20%	36.20%	43.50%	59.90%	62.40%	37.90%	31.80%
Totals	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Note: CN = mainland China, TW = Taiwan, DK = Denmark, DE = Germany, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, ES = Spain, SE = Sweden, US = United States of America.
 Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Table 5.5.4: Spouse worked outside: child under school age

Respondent	Answers	CN	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	ES	SE	US
Male	Worked full-time	46.10%	45.40%	51.40%	33.30%	17.40%	35.40%	18.90%	32.40%	30.30%	43.10%
	Worked part-time	11.30%	7.90%	35.50%	23.10%	22.10%	14.10%	19.90%	19.40%	47.30%	17.50%
	Stayed at home	42.70%	33.60%	13.10%	43.60%	60.50%	50.50%	61.10%	48.20%	22.50%	39.40%
	TW: Worked at home	-	13.10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	Worked full-time	84.10%	88.10%	91.20%	93.80%	91.30%	85.70%	70.40%	96.00%	93.60%	86.50%
	Worked part-time	7.80%	4.00%	6.50%	2.80%	2.30%	6.60%	20.70%	2.40%	5.60%	6.00%
	Stayed at home	8.10%	2.30%	2.40%	3.40%	6.40%	7.70%	8.90%	1.60%	0.80%	7.50%
	TW: Worked at home	-	5.70%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 5.5.4: Spouse worked outside: child under school age (continued)

Respondent	Answers	CN	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	ES	SE	US
Total (both male and female)	Worked full-time	64.60%	67.80%	72.70%	65.60%	59.60%	65.70%	46.60%	67.70%	63.80%	67.50%
	Worked part-time	9.60%	5.90%	20.00%	12.30%	10.80%	9.60%	20.30%	10.00%	25.20%	11.00%
	Stayed at home	25.80%	17.20%	7.40%	22.20%	29.60%	24.70%	33.10%	22.30%	11.00%	21.50%
	TW: Worked at home	-	9.20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes: CN = China, TW = Taiwan, DK = Denmark, DE = Germany, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, ES = Spain, SE = Sweden, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Table 5.6.1: Q1a Working mother: warm relationship with children as a not-working mother

	CN	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	SE	US
Strongly agree	9.80%	16.10%	60.90%	59.70%	44.20%	28.80%	37.90%	37.50%	26.50%
Agree	53.60%	68.00%	26.70%	27.60%	27.00%	36.40%	34.30%	40.70%	45.90%
Neither agree nor disagree	11.60%	2.70%	3.40%	2.60%	17.00%	11.50%	12.90%	11.80%	22.50%
Disagree	23.10%	12.80%	5.80%	8.10%	7.90%	19.50%	12.40%	7.80%	5.10%
Strongly disagree	2.00%	0.40%	3.20%	2.10%	3.90%	3.70%	2.40%	2.10%	0.00%

Notes: CN = China, TW = Taiwan, DK = Denmark, DE = Germany, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, US = United States of America.

Question Q1a denoted the question number in the questionnaire.

Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Table 5.6.2: Q1b Working mother: preschool child is likely to suffer

	CN	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	SE	US
Strongly agree	7.30%	3.20%	5.00%	9.60%	4.20%	22.90%	29.70%	2.90%	6.70%
Agree	49.30%	45.00%	17.10%	21.90%	16.70%	46.40%	35.50%	12.40%	27.30%
Neither agree nor disagree	12.30%	9.10%	11.00%	11.60%	29.90%	14.60%	13.30%	21.90%	50.80%
Disagree	28.60%	40.90%	16.70%	31.30%	14.30%	11.80%	18.40%	27.50%	15.30%
Strongly disagree	2.50%	1.80%	50.10%	25.70%	34.90%	4.30%	3.20%	35.30%	0.00%

Notes: CN = China, TW = Taiwan, DK = Denmark, DE = Germany, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, US = United States of America.
Question Q1b denoted the question number in the questionnaire.

Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Table 5.6.3: Q1c Working woman: family life suffers when woman has full-time job

	CN	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	SE	US
Strongly agree	4.50%	1.40%	5.50%	10.60%	7.00%	19.80%	21.20%	3.00%	5.70%
Agree	40.90%	20.60%	12.60%	21.20%	19.10%	43.30%	27.50%	13.80%	22.50%
Neither agree nor disagree	14.50%	7.40%	8.50%	12.50%	29.20%	16.20%	18.50%	17.40%	11.90%
Disagree	36.40%	64.30%	14.80%	28.70%	14.80%	15.60%	26.70%	28.40%	40.20%
Strongly disagree	3.70%	6.40%	58.50%	26.90%	29.90%	5.20%	6.00%	37.50%	19.70%

Note: CN = China, TW = Taiwan, DK = Denmark, DE = Germany, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, US = United States of America.

Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Table 5.6.4: Q1e Working woman: being housewife is as fulfilling as working for pay

	CN	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	SE	US
Strongly agree	6.30%	12.30%	13.00%	11.90%	39.10%	44.70%	27.30%	6.80%	15.00%
Agree	47.10%	70.20%	18.90%	21.00%	30.20%	33.30%	45.10%	18.30%	43.40%
Neither agree nor disagree	20.90%	7.40%	21.80%	14.60%	20.20%	14.40%	16.00%	39.30%	17.50%
Disagree	23.20%	9.60%	21.60%	30.40%	6.60%	6.00%	8.90%	22.20%	19.40%
Strongly disagree	2.50%	0.50%	24.70%	22.10%	3.90%	1.60%	2.60%	13.40%	4.70%

Notes: CN = China, TW = Taiwan, DK = Denmark, DE = Germany, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, US = United States of America.

Question Q1c and Q1e denote the question number in the questionnaire.

Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Table 5.6.5: Q2 Both should contribute to household income

	CN	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	SE	US
Strongly agree	22.20%	19.60%	59.30%	37.10%	20.80%	27.80%	62.20%	47.50%	19.70%
Agree	62.60%	62.20%	20.90%	42.80%	24.80%	41.70%	29.70%	39.20%	45.10%
Neither agree nor disagree	9.80%	7.90%	14.00%	10.40%	31.90%	19.40%	4.90%	10.80%	24.20%
Disagree	5.30%	9.70%	2.40%	7.90%	10.10%	9.10%	2.40%	2.00%	9.60%
Strongly disagree	0.20%	0.50%	3.40%	1.80%	12.40%	2.10%	0.80%	0.50%	1.40%
Totals	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Notes: CN = China, TW = Taiwan, DK = Denmark, DE = Germany, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, US = United States of America.

Question Q2 denotes the question number in the questionnaire.

Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Mapping Welfare Attitudes in East Asia

Table 5.6.6: Q2b Men's job is to earn money, women's job is to look after the house

	CN	TW	DK	DE	JP	KR	PH	SE	US
Strongly agree	7.90%	6.70%	2.40%	7.10%	7.90%	14.10%	48.80%	1.70%	4.90%
Agree	37.40%	34.40%	4.50%	9.70%	16.50%	24.40%	31.50%	4.10%	17.60%
Neither agree nor disagree	21.10%	9.90%	8.90%	11.20%	25.40%	18.80%	7.60%	11.90%	17.50%
Disagree	30.90%	41.90%	11.60%	35.40%	13.30%	27.80%	10.10%	26.30%	42.10%
Strongly disagree	2.70%	7.10%	72.70%	36.60%	36.90%	14.90%	2.00%	55.90%	17.90%
Totals	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Notes: CN = China, TW = Taiwan, DK = Denmark, DE = Germany, JP = Japan, KR = Korea, PH = Philippines, SE = Sweden, US = United States of America.

Question Q2b denotes the question number in the questionnaire.

Source: ISSP: Family and Changing Gender Roles (nd)

Chapter 6

In Chapter 6 we discuss the findings from the qualitative study. The chapter builds on and expands on Xu et al's (2021) work by expanding and suggesting adaptations to how we study welfare attitudes and what explanations we focus on. We make use of qualitative findings to capture welfare attitudes and deservingness attitudes in mainland China and in Singapore. In line with Xu et al (2021), the findings suggest that assumptions made when carrying out cross-national surveys on welfare attitudes needs adjustment. They showed the need to include further answer options in surveys, to better capture attitudes in the societies they included in their study. Here, we particularly find a need to include questions around family, in terms of values, roles and the need to use a family lens when studying individuals' attitudes. This means that surveys may need to include questions that allow us to use the family as a unit to understand the impact and role of this more fully. The chapter also explored political campaigns and narratives in the societies as they are seen to represent values and influence and shape attitudes, roles and values. We see traces of political campaigns in answers which suggest that what Xu et al (2021) call ideological socialisation may have explanatory power. The chapter argues in favour of what is called cultural deservingness, pointing to a need for deservingness criteria to be adapted and made sensitive to the cultural context studied. Here this is found to matter in the attitudes expressed in the interviews in the following ways:

- Family and value systems guide the role of different people within families; how they should or should not behave influences who is seen as deserving as well as whose role it is to provide welfare.
- This is particularly clear when it comes to who should care for old people and children, and the concept of filial piety is crucial in the two societies studied. Filial piety is seen as a sought-after virtue.
- When analysing the attitudes with the deservingness criteria lens we found that two criteria mattered: contribution and identity given, first, the emphasis on hard work and need to carry out hard work to be seen as deserving and, second, identity being crucial in that one's deservingness is judged on the basis of whether your family is deserving and whether or not you are complying with your familial duties.
- Singapore and mainland China differ in who has what attitudes when it comes to filial piety and the importance given to family. Respondents in mainland China see filial piety as crucial across ages, genders and social class, whereas Singaporean respondents differ by age and younger respondents highlight that they are doing this because they are 'good' and virtuous or to show gratitude to their families. Overall the focus on the individual is stronger among younger Singaporeans.

- The importance of family is also reflected in policies, and answers among respondents reflect and mirror slogans from political campaigns, in particular in mainland China.
- In Singapore we see the regime effect of the absence of immigrants when speaking of deservingness.
- In mainland China we see the burden internal migrants experience with having to travel back to care for elderly relatives, and the guilt related to not doing that well enough, and therefore failing in their filial piety duties.