



A Comparative Survey of

DEMOCRACY, GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

Working Paper Series: No. 32

Jointly Published by

GLOBALBAROMETER™

Japan Country Report

Second Wave of Asian Barometer Survey

Ken'ichi Ikeda, The University of Tokyo

Masashiro Yamada, Kwansai Gakuin University

Naoko Taniguchi, Teikyo University

Satoko Yasuno, Chuo University

Yoshitaka Nishizawa, Doshisha University

Gill Steel, The University of Tokyo

Issued by

Asian Barometer Project Office

National Taiwan University and Academia Sinica

2007 Taipei

Asian Barometer
A Comparative Survey of Democracy, Governance and Development

Working Paper Series

Jointly Published by
Globalbarometer

The Asian Barometer (ABS) is an applied research program on public opinion on political values, democracy, and governance around the region. The regional network encompasses research teams from twelve East Asian political systems (Japan, Mongolia, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, China, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Singapore, and Indonesia), and five South Asian countries (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal). Together, this regional survey network covers virtually all major political systems in the region, systems that have experienced different trajectories of regime evolution and are currently at different stages of political transition.

The ABS Working Paper Series is intended to make research result within the ABS network available to the academic community and other interested readers in preliminary form to encourage discussion and suggestions for revision before final publication. Scholars in the ABS network also devote their work to the Series with the hope that a timely dissemination of the findings of their surveys to the general public as well as the policy makers would help illuminate the public discourse on democratic reform and good governance. The topics covered in the Series range from country-specific assessment of values change and democratic development, region-wide comparative analysis of citizen participation, popular orientation toward democracy and evaluation of quality of governance, and discussion of survey methodology and data analysis strategies.

The ABS Working Paper Series supercedes the existing East Asia Barometer Working Paper Series as the network is expanding to cover more countries in East and South Asia. Maintaining the same high standard of research methodology, the new series both incorporates the existing papers in the old series and offers newly written papers with a broader scope and more penetrating analyses.

The ABS Working Paper Series is issued by the Asian Barometer Project Office, which is jointly sponsored by the Department of Political Science of National Taiwan University and the Institute of Political Science of Academia Sinica. At present, papers are issued only in electronic version.

Contact Information

Asian Barometer Project Office

Department of Political Science

National Taiwan University

21 Hsu-Chow Road, Taipei, Taiwan 100

Tel: 886 2-2357 0427

Fax: 886-2-2357 0420

E-mail: asianbarometer@ntu.edu.tw

Website: www.asianbarometer.org

Country Report: Japan (Preliminary Draft)

(Please do not quote without the authors' permission)

This paper is a draft of the country report on the survey conducted in Japan in February-March 2007. It consists of four parts. Part I is a brief description of the field work and the macro-political and economic context. In Parts:II to IV, we describe the findings. Part II examines Japanese attitudes and values toward democracy. Part III focuses upon trust in Japan. And Part IV analyzes national attachment in Japan.

Part C Field Work in Japan 2007 and the Macro-Political Context

I. 1. The Survey Design and Fieldwork

The Japan survey was conducted between February and March 2007 and yielded 1,067 valid cases from a sample of 2,500 cases yielding a response rate of 42.7% (for the reasons we discuss below, we did additional sub-sampling which will be used for the valid cases. Including the additional cases, the sample size was 3,111 and the response rate was 34.3%). A layered two-stage random sample was taken from the adult population 20 years and older nationwide (in all 47 prefectures, 203 districts (50 major metropolitan cities, 151 other cities, and 22 town/villages). The detailed information is as follows;

Survey Period: 2007, February 23 –March 12

Data Collection: number of effective responses 1,067

(response rate 42.7% for the original sample and 34.3% including additional sample)

Reasons for non-response (including additional sample):

| | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Change of address | 125 (6.1%) | Refusal | 1144 (56.0%) |
| Long-term absence | 84 (4.1%) | Refusal before the interview | 59 (2.9%) |
| Temporary absence | 507 (24.8%) | Absence notice before the interview | 6 (.3%) |
| Address unknown | 70 (3.4%) | Other | 49 (2.4%) |
| Total | 2044 (100.0%) | | |

The response rate was lower than the EAB 2003 Japanese survey (the response rate was 71% then). First, the survey environment worsened in the fall of 2006 following changes in the law regulating survey research that banned commercial surveys from using the voters' lists or resident registries. This was widely known and

many people misunderstood and thought that the restriction to be applied to academic surveys. Second, many hoax “surveys” were widely reported, these purported to be surveys, but were actually tools to sell consumer goods. Third, the questionnaire for the Asian Barometer 2nd round was quite long, the average time the respondents needed to finish was 50 minutes (as shown below) which is 10 minutes longer than the 2003 survey. Reflecting this situation, even the successful interviewees often seemed irritated (22%) and 9% refused to answer at least part of the questionnaire. In order to deal with these difficulties, we relied on the additional sub-sampling (5 each for metropolitan city districts and 3 for other districts, yielding a total of 709) and used 611 of these as a substitute sample, if the original target was inaccessible due to a change of address, death, or long-term absence.

In sampling, the basic district units established in the 2005 national census were used as the first sampling unit. The number of survey districts was calculated so that sample size of each layer was about 13. Municipalities in each layer were ordered according to a code determined by Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs, Posts and Telecommunications at the time of selection. Respondents were selected from voters’ lists (complete resident registries in some districts) of designated town, block, and street number within the survey district, using an equal interval selection method.

The interviews were conducted by Central Research Services interviewers. Though the interviewers were skilled at this kind of fieldwork, they were still required to participate in an orientation training session for these particular interviews.

Interviews were conducted in Japanese. The mean length of the interviews was 50.3 minutes, with a range from 19 to 178 minutes (the SD was 16.2). The survey was

exclusively for the Asian Barometer 2nd round survey. However, we plan to extend this sample to create a panel survey in the summer of 2007 after the House of Councilors Election. This 2nd wave of the panel will include a CSES3 (Comparative Studies of Electoral Systems 3rd round) module, as well as other election and political participation related questions.

In order to test whether the survey was successfully conducted, we sent 30% of the total sample a confirmatory letter by mail. The result was basically sound.

I.2. The Macro-Political Context and Evaluations of Economic Conditions

Our survey was conducted from February 23 to March 12, 2007. During this time, the approval rate of the Abe cabinet was declining (Figure 1)¹. Various reasons caused the decline, including the statement, “Females are reproductive machines” by Hakuo Yanagisawa, then Minister for Health, Labour, and Welfare. Female politicians and voters in particular resented this statement, although Prime Minister Abe did not ask for his resignation, he conceded that his statement was inappropriate. Before this incident, the minister for deregulation policy, Gen’ichiro Sada resigned on December 28, 2006, because his staff turned in a false report of his political finances to the government.

Shinzo Abe is heir to the structural reform policies of the Koizumi administration. The policy package encourages decentralization and ‘small government’. According to table 1, compared to 2003, citizens felt that the economy was better in 2007 than in 2003, but expectations that the economy would be better in the future had not (responses to the question “What do you think the state of our

¹ The data come from Jiji Press, which conducts monthly surveys of the approval rate for the cabinet (<http://www.jiji.com/service/yoron/result/index.html>).

country's economy will be in a few years from now?").

Many Japanese feel that a rapid growth of inequality among Japanese households or regional gaps in the standard of living have occurred. The media popularized the term 'kakusa shakai', meaning a society with income disparities. In addition, citizens know that the country is aging rapidly, and feel insecure about their own lives in the future.

Part C ~~C~~ Japanese Attitudes and Values toward Democracy

II. 1. Overview

How do Japanese people regard democracy? Ikeda and Kohno (forthcoming), based on the previous Asian Barometer survey (2003), summarize Japanese attitudes toward democracy in the following way: first and foremost, "the overwhelming majority of Japanese perceive a fundamental regime change to have taken place at the end of World War II, and consider the new regime vastly more democratic than the military dictatorship of the pre-war era" (Ikeda and Kohno forthcoming, p.193). In other words, the Japanese consider that postwar democratization led to a shift from a dictatorial or authoritarian regime to a democratic regime. In terms of awareness, people in, or over their forties, that is, those who received, and have been strongly affected, by a postwar education centered on democracy are strongly aware of democracy; on the other hand, the younger generation generally perceive democracy as a background condition of life, and so tend to be less interested in democracy or public issues.

A second point to note is that "while the democratic performance of the current regime is evaluated highly, many Japanese have reservations about its performance" (Ikeda and Kohno, forthcoming, p.193), as they do about the performance of politics, administration, and institutions. When asked whether they regarded democracy or

democratic regimes as trustworthy, the Japanese scored the lowest among the countries in the survey.

Moreover, the Japanese “tend to conceptualize democracy statically, rather than dynamically as a regime to be attained through the assertion of citizenship rights” (Ikeda and Kohno, forthcoming). The authors suggest that such static views are connected with the historical character of Japanese democracy, namely that it was something that was imposed by the United States.

Currently, Japanese politics and the economy are comparatively stable and Japan is without doubt a democratic nation. Surprisingly, however, the citizens of such a country view the performance of their democracy negatively, and that they tend not to actively participate, Japanese democracy should consider both of these points in future.

In this report, based on Ikeda and Kohno’s summary, we shall discuss the main characteristics of Japanese attitudes and values toward democracy. For comparison, we use survey results that were available as of July 2007 (Taiwan, Mongolia, Philippines, Thailand, Korea, Singapore, and Indonesia). At the same time, we consider the differences in political and social attitudes between generations. Based on this, we identify the context that shaped Japanese attitudes toward democracy.

II. 2. Attitudes toward Democracy

How do the Japanese understand the word “Democracy”? In the survey, the largest group understood democracy in terms of “freedom and liberty” (jq41), which was in line with the previous survey. When asked “the characteristic that is most essential to a democracy”(jq42) as we can see in Table 2, the greatest number of respondents chose the “Opportunity to change the government through elections” (34.7%), followed by

“Basic necessities like food, clothes and shelter etc. for everyone”(27.3%). Similar results are also evident in Taiwan, the Philippines, Singapore, and Indonesia, and so cannot be regarded as a feature peculiar to Japan. Rather, a salient feature is the very low number who chose “Freedom to criticize those in power” (11.9%). The responses show that the Japanese strongly support democracy (jq58 • 59 • 60), as can be seen in the high proportion of people who felt that “Democracy is always preferable to any other kind of government” (63.4%), and “Democracy is capable of solving the problems of our society”(66.8%). Also noteworthy is the high rate of agreement with “Democracy is more important than economic development”, which was higher than in any of the other countries surveyed, with those who responded that it was “somewhat important” and “definitely important” accounting for 40%. This figure may be revealing post-materialism among Japanese citizens.

Authoritarian detachment is also a prominent feature in Japan (jq64_1-9). Those who felt “People with little or no education should have as much say in politics as highly-educated people” were the most numerous among all countries, with those who strongly agreed and somewhat agreed totaling 88.7%. A high proportion of people are against any kind of political authoritarianism: scores were very high for those who did not agree with such statements as “Government leaders are like the head of a family; we should all follow their decisions,” “The government should decide whether certain ideas should be allowed to be discussed in society,” “If we have political leaders who are morally upright, we can let them decide everything,” and “When the country is facing a difficult situation, it is ok for the government to disregard the law in order to deal with the situation.”

The survey shows that the Japanese do not position the executive above

judicial and legislative powers. This was observed in the strong opposition to “When judges decide important cases, they should accept the view of the executive branch,” and “If the government is constantly checked [i.e. monitored and supervised] by the legislature, it cannot possibly accomplish great things.”

On the other hand, the Japanese apparently do not value the clash of different opinions and interests: compared with South Korea, for example, quite a high number of Japanese people agreed that “Harmony of the community will be disrupted if people organize lots of groups,” and “If people have too many different ways of thinking, society will be chaotic.”

To conclude, the findings suggest that the Japanese place a high value on democracy which is based on the separation of powers and on equality in society; at the same time, however, they apparently believe that opposition and competition between various groups do not generate vitality in democracy.

II. 3. How highly is Democracy Evaluated in Japan?

How highly do the Japanese evaluate or trust democracy? When asked “In your opinion, how much of a democracy is Japan?” (jq44), only 6.5% responded “A full democracy”; more than 80% responded either “A democracy, but with minor problems” or “A democracy, with major problems”. This is a considerably lower rate compared to the other 7 countries. Moreover, Japan was rated second lowest (following the Philippines) regarding satisfaction with democracy, as seen from the scores for the question “How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way democracy works in your country?” (jq43).

Dissatisfaction towards Japan’s political situation was also evident in the

responses to the question “How would you describe the present political situation in our country?” (jq25): only 7.6% responded “Very good” or “Good”, which was third lowest after South Korea and Taiwan.

With regard to feelings of trust in various institutions (jq7), Japanese respondents scored relatively highly on trust in “Newspapers”, “The police”, and “The military (or armed forces)”, with over 50% expressing “A great deal of trust” or “Quite a lot of trust.” However, scores were low for political institutions, including the “Prime Minister”, “The national government”, “Political parties”, “Parliament”. All in all, the Japanese do not have high levels of trust, of all the countries, they were second lowest after South Korea. Findings based on other surveys (i.e. Pharr and Putnam 2000) corroborate the low levels of trust in politics among the Japanese. Such low figures are evidence that the Japanese have very high standards for democracy, and that they expect their democracy to rise to these standards, and so they tend to regard the current situation as problematic.

II. 4. Political Participation

So far we have seen that the Japanese regard the current democratic regime as problematic. If so, are they committed to change the situation? In this section, we take a look at commitment to politics.

Japanese respondents scored relatively highly on the question “How interested would you say you are in politics?”(jq26), with “Very interested” and “Somewhat interested” amounting to 68.7%. This may suggest that they are committed to politics in terms of political awareness. However, only 19% agree somewhat or strongly with the statement “I think I have the ability to participate in politics” (jq62_1), this was lowest

rate among all countries. 60% agreed with the statement “Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what is going on” (jq62_2), which suggests that political efficacy is low among the Japanese. This observation is further enhanced by the fact that nearly a majority agreed with the statement “If possible, I don’t want to get involved in political matters” (jq37_1), (although Japan was average among the countries surveyed).

As regards political commitment in terms of political participation, a total of 80% responded that they “Voted in every election” or “Voted in most elections” (jq40); however, it should be noted here that the rates for “Voted in every election” were the lowest of all countries (37.6%). Japan was average among the countries (21.3%) for those who chose “Yes” to the question “Thinking about the national election in [year], did you attend a campaign meeting or rally?” However, rates were among the lowest for the question “(did you) try to persuade others to vote for a certain candidate or party?” following Singapore (7%).

Asked whether they contacted political figures, a relatively large number of Japanese responded that they contacted “elected officials or legislative representatives at any level” (7.9%). Few responded that they contacted “government officials.” Rates were average for contacting other political figures.

Asked about their direct participation in politics, 26% responded that they “Got together with others to raise an issue or sign a petition”, which was high compared to other countries. Very few responded that they “Attended a demonstration or protest march” or “Used force or violence for a political cause”.

Based on the above, Japanese commitment to politics may be summarized as follows: first, Japanese have low levels of self-efficacy, which may be a matter of

concern. However, Japanese people are quite interested in politics compared to people in other countries; moreover, quite a lot of people have had contact with political figures. Many people attend campaign meetings, but not many have persuaded other people to vote for a particular party. Participating in protest marches is rare, but political participation such as signing petitions is quite common. In spite of a moderately high level of participation in some political activities, note that few people responded that they voted in every election. This leads to the observation that there is a large gap among the Japanese people who actively participate in politics and those who do not.

II. 5. Political/Social Attitudes: The Generation Gap

We hypothesized that such a gap in political participation is associated with generational differences. In order to confirm this assumption, let us now turn to Figure 2, which is a principal component analysis of political/social attitude variable (jq32, 37, 49, 62, 64). The analysis was classified into eight components: 1) justification of government legitimacy, 2) satisfaction with democracy, 3) authoritarianism, 4) values political autonomy, 5) collectivism, 6) trust in the government, 7) political independence and activeness, and 8) pessimism.

Figure 2 and Table 3 present the average for each of the eight components divided by cohort (20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, 60s, 70s+). Analyses of variance show significant linearity between age and “satisfaction with democracy”, “authoritarianism”, “values political autonomy”, “trust in the government”, “collectivism” and “pessimism”. To put it more specifically, older cohorts consider that Japan fulfills democracy’s requirements (such as freedom of speech). They also place higher value on a nation’s or a local authority’s political autonomy.

In contrast, those in their thirties to sixties, or core workers to those who are close to retirement (the “*dankai*” generation, that is, Japanese baby boomers), value “political independence and activeness” highly, while at the same time they are highly pessimistic.

Trust in the government was highest among those in their thirties and forties. Justification of government legitimacy, or a tendency to prefer a stronger government, was highest among the youngest and oldest generations.

The above results spring from the following context: those who are in, and over, their seventies value authoritarianism and collectivism, and at the same time appreciate contemporary Japanese democracy. The *dankai* generation, who experienced the student movement in their youth, have the most active and autonomous views toward politics. Those in their thirties are pessimistic about politics. Those in their twenties tend to value the government’s exercise of power; except for this, they seem to have negative attitudes. The younger generation does not appear to have a clear awareness of democracy.

II. 6. Conclusion

In sum,

- 1) The Japanese, as compared to the other countries in the survey, have relatively high democratic values, and show a moderate level of political commitment.
- 2) However, as regards the performance of Japanese democracy, the Japanese have low levels of trust and satisfaction.
- 3) Overall, Japanese people do not participate much in politics, but awareness

and participation vary widely between generations.

Indifference to politics among the young generation is common in older democracies. However, if supportive attitudes continue to decline sharply, then the future of Japanese democracy may become a matter of concern.

Part III. Trust in Japan

This section focuses on continuity and change in the levels of various kinds of trust in Japan. If the levels of trust in a society are high, people feel safer. If people trust politicians or the government, then they are more satisfied with politics. Social trust and political trust, are therefore indicative of the degree of success at which society or government functions and can function as social capital to produce smooth social interaction (Putnam, 1994).

III. 1. Japan as a ‘High Trust Society’

Francis Fukuyama (1995) described Japan as one of the ‘high-trust societies’. The data from 2007 basically support his claim. For example, our questionnaire includes a question about general trust (trust in most people). The actual wording is ‘Generally speaking, would you say “Most people can be trusted” or “that you must be very careful”?’ Table 4 presents the results of a cross-national comparison. Japanese people are the most trusting, and the majority of Japanese think that “most people can be trusted”. No other countries look like that.

We also have other questions which ask about specific people (relatives, neighbors, and other people with whom they interact) to measure social trust. Table 5 presents the cross-national comparisons. Japanese citizens have high levels of trust,

with more than 75% trusting their relatives, neighbors, and people they interact with, although the difference between Japan and other countries is not as great as it is in terms of general trust.

III. 2. Change and Continuity in Political Trust in Japan

The Asian Barometer survey includes questions about political trust. In Japan, surveys were conducted in 2003 and 2007, so we can compare the levels of political trust at these two points in time (see Table 6). The 2003 survey - the Asian Barometer Round I - did not include a question about trust in the prime minister, but the 2007 survey - the Asian Barometer Round II - did. The prime minister was Shinzo Abe. At the time of survey, February 2007, the approval rate for his cabinet was about 35% and the disapproval rate was 39%, according to the Jiji Press monthly public opinion surveys (see Figure 1). In our 2007 dataset, less than 30% answered that they trust the prime minister. As we discussed section II.3 and we can see in table 3, this evaluation of the prime minister is relatively low compared with other countries.

The levels of trust in some institutions changed considerably over the course of time. In 2007, people on average, had less trust in the courts, the civil service, newspapers, television, the electoral commission, and NGOs in 2007 than they had in 2003. In contrast, people had slightly higher levels of trust in political parties, parliament, and the military in 2007 than they had in 2003.

Japanese people support democracy, but they are very dissatisfied with the performance of the system. The attitudinal situation as a whole can not be regarded as more positive.

Part IV. National Attachment among Japanese

IV. 1. The structure of national attachments

Nationalism is one of the hot topics in the contemporary world. After the end of the cold war, nationalism or ethnocentrism, are major causes of international conflict.

The term 'nationalism', however, is confusing. First, though the term is basically inseparable from modern "nation states", the concept of "nationalism" sometimes implies other group identities, such as religious, ethnic, or local identities. Second, nationalism is multi-dimensional. Some researchers have found that an emotional attachment to one's country or homeland (patriotism) can be distinguished from a sense of superiority over other countries, which is so referred to as nationalism (e.g., Doob,1964; Huddy & Khatib,2007; Karasawa, 2002; Sidanius, Feshbach, Levin, & Pratto,1997). While nationalism "can be regarded as a 'right-wing' form of a national attachment and concerns the desire for the dominance of one's own nation over others" (Sidanius et al.,1997, p.106), patriotism is associated with positive feelings to one's own national symbols, such as national flags or anthems (Kosterman & Feshbach,1989; Sidanius et al.,1997). In addition, there are two types of patriotism: uncritical patriotism and constructive patriotism (e.g., Rothi, Lyons, & Chrysochoou, 2005; Schats, Staub, Levine,1999). Uncritical patriotism is a kind of unconditional loyalty, whereas constructive patriotism is a willingness to improve one's nation and accept criticism.

It should be noted here that national attachments might include other dimensions. For example, based on US responses, Sidanius et al. (1997) found four dimensions of national attachment. They are (1) patriotism (e.g., "I find the sight of the American flag very moving." "I have great love for my country.") (2) nationalism (e.g., "To maintain our country's superiority, war is sometimes necessary" or "The USA should not

dominate other countries(inverse)”) (3) national attachment (e.g., “I feel no differently about the place I grew up than any other place.”, “ I would really not want to move to another country.”) and (4) concern for co-nationals (e.g., “I feel very warmly towards my countrymen.”).

On the other hand, Huddy & Khatib (2007) found four national attachment factors (National identity, Symbolic patriotism, Constructive patriotism, Uncritical patriotism) among American students, whereas three factors (National identity, National [pride, Nationalism) were extracted from 1996 GSS data (Huddy & Khatib, 2007).

In Japan, Karasawa (2002) reported the following four dimensions of Japanese national attachment: (1) commitment to national heritage (i.e., religion, history, tradition and also national symbols such as the flag and the anthem. e.g. “Every time I hear Kimigayo, I feel strongly moved”) (2) patriotism (e.g., “Living in foreign countries may cost less, but I would prefer living in Japan and paying more”) (3) nationalism (e.g., In view of Japanese economic superiority, it is only right that we should have a bigger say in the UN and other international organizations”) (4) Internationalism (e.g., “Japan has many things to learn from other countries”).

Thus, the structure of national attachment varies in accordance with the exact survey items, the respondents or situation. To summarize, however, an exclusive dimension (i.e., nationalism) should be distinguished from an emotional attachment to one's nation (i.e., patriotism). Furthermore, uncritical loyalty seems to be different from the simple positive group identity of nationality.

What are the determinants of national attachment? Some researchers have pointed out that nationalism and uncritical patriotism are related to conservative ideology authoritarianism (e.g., Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Schatz, Staub, & Levine, 1999).

In regard to the construction of Japanese national attachment, Karasawa (2002) examined the effects of information. He found that “commitment to national heritage” and “nationalism” are negatively correlated with knowledge of international affairs, whereas the factor “internationalism” is positively correlated with news exposure and knowledge of international affairs.

IV. 2. National attachments among Japanese

Some previous research finds that Japanese pride in their nationality is low. For example, the World Value Survey (WVS) shows that Japanese national pride is lower than that of most of other countries (Inglehart, Basanez & Moreno, 1998, see also Note 1). What accounts for the low levels of pride in their nationality among Japanese? The possible reasons are as follows: First, the notion that the Japanese standard of living is inferior to other developed countries, especially to western countries, has long been widespread (the Japanese standard of living has improved, so this may not be true now.) Second, the term “nationalism” is associated with WW II militarism and defeat. Considering this, national attachment should be assessed without using the term “nationalism”. Indeed, Evans & Kelly (2002) reported that Japanese national pride in particular fields (e.g., technology and economy) were relatively high among 24 nations.

Items for national attachment in the Asian Barometer

Unfortunately, detailed questions on national attachment were not included in the Asian Barometer, so we used four items to investigate national attachment. “Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “A citizen should always remain loyal

only to his country, no matter how imperfect (qII154)”, “How proud are you to be a citizen of Japan (qII155)” “Given the chance, how willing would you be to go and live in another country? (qII156) [what is your] “impression of Japan” (qII167).

The frequencies are shown in Table 7 (qII154, qII155, qII156) and Figure 3 (qII167). As for the national pride item (qII155), the distribution is more positive than is the WVS distribution. Impressions of Japan, unsurprisingly, are more positive than are impressions of other countries (Figure 4, 5, 6).

Table 8 shows the correlations between qII154, qII155, qII156, and qII167. (the coding of qII154, qII155, and qII156 were reversed). Whereas qII154, qII155, qII156 represent a kind of loyalty to Japanese nationality, the impressions of Japan (qII167) are simple positive affect. Thus, to distinguish between the two types of national attachment, loyalty to Japanese nationality and the impressions of Japan were examined separately (see note 2). Principal component analysis was conducted using items qII154, qII155, and qII156 (Table 9; observations with missing values were excluded). Table 10 shows the correlation matrix between the PCA score and the impression scores (a high PCA score indicates a stronger commitment to Japanese nationality). Interestingly, positive affect for Japan is not associated with negative affect toward other countries.

IV. 3. Results: The Determinants of National Attachment

To investigate the determinants of national attachment, two OLS regression analyses were estimated. The dependent variables were (1) the PCA score on loyalty toward Japanese nationality, and (2) the impression of Japan score (qII167). Observations with missing values were excluded from the analysis.

Independent Variables

Based on previous research, the following variables were used as independent variables in the regression analyses. (1) authoritarianism (the 1st PCA score in Table 11; lower values indicate higher levels of authoritarianism) (2) news exposure (qII51_1: TV, qII51_2: newspapers, and qII51_4: the internet) (3) orientations toward foreign countries (qII67, qII69).

The effect of the following variables was also examined: (4) social capital: membership in organization/s (number) (the sum of q8_1, Q8_2, Q8_3, range: 0-3) (5) general trust (q024 “most people can be trusted”, 1=“yes”, 0= the other) (6) trust in personal relationships (the principal component score for Table 12; higher scores indicate higher trust in personal relationships) (7) distrust in the administration (the 1st principal component score for Table 12; lower scores indicate higher levels of distrust) (8) political self-efficacy (the 2nd component score for Table 13; higher scores indicate higher efficacy) and (9) satisfaction with the present political situation (qII48; lower scores indicate higher satisfaction). The demographic variables age, gender, years of education, the size of the residential area (1=capital/megacity, 2=major city, and 3=other areas), and subjective social status were also included.

Results: Loyalty towards Japanese nationality

Table 14 presents the results of the OLS regression on loyalty toward Japanese nationality. Lower scores of the dependent variable indicate higher loyalty toward Japanese nationality, the findings are: (1) loyalty toward their nationality is higher among older people (2) those who trust in their personal relationships tend to be more

loyal toward their nationality, while general trust is not correlated with loyalty toward their nationality (3) authoritarianism and (4) political self-efficacy are positively correlated to loyalty towards nationality (5) those who are more satisfied with the present political situation are more loyal to their nationality, though the size of this effect is relatively small. (6) People with fewer years of education (7) those with lower subjective social status (8) those who participate in fewer organizations (9) who don't trust the administration and (10) who have less personal contact with foreigners are more loyal to their nationality.

Impressions of Japan

The determinants of impressions of Japan are presented in Table 15. The results are quite different from those presented in Table 14, and the findings are as follows: (1) age, years of education, and subjective social status are positively correlated with favorable impressions of Japan (2) authoritarianism and trust in the administration are also positively related to favorable impressions of Japan (note that lower scores mean higher authoritarianism and higher trust) and (3) the frequency of personal contact with foreigners is negatively related to positive impressions of Japan. Other variables had no effect.

IV. 4. Conclusion

Authoritarianism is positively correlated with two different types of favorable affect for one's nation. National attachment is dependent on authority. However, while loyalty towards one's nationality is a kind of "withdrawal into a close relationship", favorable impressions of Japan don't have such characteristics. Finally, personal

contacts with foreigners suppresses affect for Japan. This finding is consistent with the so-called “contact hypothesis” (Allport, 1954) and might provide a solution to international conflict.

Note

Note1: The frequencies for the national pride item (“How proud are you to be Japanese?”) in the World Value Survey (2000) in Japan are as follows; “Very proud”(n=287 21.1%), “quite proud” (n=287,21.1%), “ not very proud” (n=472, 34.7%), “ Not at all proud” (n=48, 3.5%), DK/NA)n=104, 7.6%). Total N=1362. (cf., <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/>)

Note 2: However, it should be noted that the principal component analysis with the four items extracted only one component. To investigate the determinants of the two different types of national attachment, the further analysis with more items is needed.

References

- Allport, G. W. 1954. *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Evans, M. D. R. & Kelley, J. 2002 National pride in the developed world: Survey data from 24 nations. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, Vol.14, No.3, pp.303-338.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. Hamish Hamilton: London.
- Huddy, L. & Khatib, N. 2007. “American patriotism, national identity, and political involvement. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51: 63-77.
- Ikeda, Ken'ichi, & Kohno, Masaru (forthcoming) Japanese Attitudes and Values toward

- Democracy. (In) Yun-han Chu, Andrew Nathan, Larry Diamond and Doh Chull Shin(Eds.) Democratization and Value Change. (Volume 1: How East Asians View Democracy: Attitudes and Values in Eight Political Systems).
- Inglehart, R. 1997. Modernization and postmaterialism: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies. Princeton University Press.
- Karasawa, M. 2002. "Patriotism, nationalism, and inter-nationalism among Japanese citizens: An etic-emic approach." *Political Psychology*, 23: 645-66.
- Kosterman, R., and Feshbach, S. 1989. "Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes." *Political Psychology*, 10, 257-274.
- Pharr, Susan J., and Robert D. Putnam. 2000. Disaffected Democracies: What's Troubling the Trilateral Countries? Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1994. Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy. Princeton University Press.
- Rothi, D. M., Lyons, E. & Chryssochoou, X. 2005. "National attachment and patriotism in a European nation: A British study." *Political Psychology*, 26: 135-155.
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. 1999. "On the varieties of national attachment: blind versus constructive patriotism", *Political Psychology*, 20, 151-174.

Asian Barometer
A Comparative Survey of Democracy, Governance and Development

Working Paper Series

01. Yu-tzung Chang and Yun-han Chu. 2002. Confucianism and Democracy: Empirical Study of Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong.
02. Yu-tzung Chang, Alfred Hu, and Yun-han Chu. 2002. The Political Significance of Insignificant Class Voting: Taiwan and Hong Kong Comparison.
03. Albritton, Robert B. and Thawilwadee Bureekul. 2002. Support for Democracy in Thailand.
04. Robert Albritton, and Thawilwadee Bureekul. 2002. The Role of Civil Society in Thai Electoral Politics.
05. Jose Abueva and Linda Luz Guerrero. 2003. What Democracy Means to Filipinos.
06. Robert Albritton, Thawilwadee Bureekul and Gang Guo. 2003. Impacts of Rural-Urban Cleavages and Cultural Orientations on Attitudes toward Elements of Democracy: A Cross-National, Within-Nation Analysis.
07. Eric C.C. Chang, Yun-han Chu, and Fu Hu. 2003. Regime Performance and Support for Democratization.
08. Yun-han Chu, Yu-tzung Chang and Fu Hu. 2003. Regime Performance, Value Change and Authoritarian Detachment in East Asia.
09. Alfred Ko-wei Hu. 2003. Attitudes toward Democracy between Mass Publics and Elites in Taiwan and Hong Kong.
10. Ken'ichi Ikeda, Yasuo Yamada and Masaru Kohno. 2003. Influence of Social Capital on Political Participation in Asian Cultural Context.
11. Wai-man Lam and Hsin-Chi Kuan. 2003. Noises and Interruptions – the Road to Democracy.
12. Chong-Min Park and Doh Chull Shin. 2003. Social Capital and Democratic Citizenship: The Case of South Korea.
13. Tianjian Shi. 2003. Does it Matter or Not? Cultural Impacts on the Political Process.
14. Chih-yu Shih. 2003. Back from the Future: Ambivalence in Taiwan's Democratic Conditions.
15. Doh Chull Shin, and Chong-min Park. 2003. The Mass Public and Democratic Politics in South Korea: Exploring the Subjective World of Democratization in Flux.

16. Yun-han Chu. 2003. Lessons from East Asia's Struggling Democracies.
17. Robert Albritton, and Thawilwadee Bureekul. 2004. Development Electoral Democracy in a Developing Nation: Thailand.
18. Yu-tzung Chang, Yun-han Chu, Fu Hu, and Huo-yan Shyu. 2004. How Citizens Evaluate Taiwan's New Democracy.
19. Roger Henke, and Sokhom Hean. 2004. The State of democracy in Cambodia, the Added Value of Opinion Polls.
20. Chong-min Park. 2004. Support for Democracy in Korea: Its Trends and Determinants.
21. Chih-jou Jay Chen. 2004. Getting Ahead in Rural China.
22. Yun-han Chu, Yu-tzung Chang, and Ming-hua Huang. 2004. Modernization, Institutionalism, Traditionalism, and the Development of Democratic Orientation in Rural China.
23. Andrew Nathan, and Tse-hsin Chen. 2004. Traditional Social Values, Democratic Values, and Political Participation.
24. Tianjian Shi. 2004. Economic Development and Political Participation: Comparison of Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong.
25. Yun-han Chu, and Doh Chull Shin. 2004. The Quality of Democracy in South Korea and Taiwan: Subjective Assessment from the Perspectives of Ordinary Citizens.
26. Chong-min Park, and Doh Chull Shin. 2004. Do Asian Values Deter Popular Support for Democracy? The Case of South Korea.
27. Ken'ichi Ikeda, Yasuo Yamada and Masaru Kohno. 2004. Japanese Attitudes and Values toward Democracy.
28. Robert Albritton, and Thawilwadee Bureekul. 2004. Developing Democracy under a New Constitution in Thailand.
29. Damba Ganbat. 2004. The Mass Public and Democratic Politics in Mongolia.
30. Chong-min Park, and Doh Chull Shin. 2005. Do East Asians View Democracy as a Lesser Evil? Testing the Churchill's Notion of Democracy in East Asia.
31. Robert Albritton, and Thawilwadee Bureekul. 2005. Social and Cultural Supports for Plural Democracy in Eight Asian Nations: A Cross-National, Within-Nation Analysis.
32. Ken'ichi Ikeda et al. 2007. Japan Country Report. Second Wave of Asian Barometer Survey.
33. Damba Ganbat. 2007. Mongolia Country Report. Second Wave of Asian Barometer

Survey.

34. Robert B. Albritton, and Thawilwadee Bureekul. 2007. Thailand Country Report: Public Opinion and Political Power in Thailand. (Second Wave of Asian Barometer Survey).
35. Tan Ern Ser, and Wang Zhengxu. 2007. Singapore Country Report. Second Wave of Asian Barometer Survey.
36. Wang Zhengxu, and Tan Ern Ser. 2007. Are Younger People in Asia more Pro-democratic: Lifecycle Effects or Generational Changes?
37. Ken'ichi Ikeda, and Tetsuro Kobayashi. 2007. The Influence of Social Capital on Political Participation in the Cultural Context of Asia.
38. Chong-min Park, and Jaechul Lee. 2007. Are Associations the Schools of Democracy across Asia?
39. Yu-tzung Chang, and Yun-han Chu. 2007. Traditionalism, Political Learning and Conceptions of Democracy in East Asia.
40. Min-hua Huang, Yun-han Chu, and Yu-tzung Chang. 2007. Quality of Democracy and Regime Legitimacy in East Asia.
41. Yun-han Chu, and Min-hua Huang. 2007. A Synthetic Analysis of Sources of Democratic Legitimacy.
42. Chin-en Wu, and Yun-han Chu. 2007. Income Inequality and Satisfaction with Democracy: Evidence from East Asia.
43. Andrew J. Nathan. 2007. Political Culture and Diffuse Regime Support in Asia.
44. Doh Chull Shin. 2007. Is Not So Bad Good Enough: Retesting Churchill's Lesser-Evil Notion of Democracy in East Asia.
45. Doh Chull Shin. 2007. Why East Asians React Differently to democratic Regime Change: Discerning Their Routes to Becoming Authentic Democrats.

Asian Barometer

A Comparative Survey of Democracy, Governance and Development

The Asian Barometer Survey (ABS) grows out of the Comparative Survey of Democratization and Value Change in East Asia Project (also known as East Asia Barometer), which was launched in mid-2000 and funded by the Ministry of Education of Taiwan under the MOE-NSC Program for Promoting Academic Excellence of University. The headquarters of ABS is based in Taipei, and is jointly sponsored by the Department of Political Science at NTU and the Institute of Political Science of Academia Sinica. The East Asian component of the project is coordinated by Prof. Yun-han Chu, who also serves as the overall coordinator of the Asian Barometer. In organizing its first-wave survey (2001-2003), the East Asia Barometer (EABS) brought together eight country teams and more than thirty leading scholars from across the region and the United States. Since its founding, the EABS Project has been increasingly recognized as the region's first systematic and most careful comparative survey of attitudes and orientations toward political regime, democracy, governance, and economic reform.

In July 2001, the EABS joined with three partner projects -- New Europe Barometer, Latinobarometro and Afrobarometer -- in a path-breathing effort to launch Global Barometer Survey (GBS), a global consortium of comparative surveys across emerging democracies and transitional societies.

The EABS is now becoming a true pan-Asian survey research initiative. New collaborative teams from Indonesia, Singapore, Cambodia, and Vietnam are joining the EABS as the project enters its second phase (2004-2008). Also, the State of Democracy in South Asia Project, based at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (in New Delhi) and directed by Yogendra Yadav, is collaborating with the EABS for the creation of a more inclusive regional survey network under the new identity of the Asian Barometer Survey. This path-breaking regional initiative builds upon a substantial base of completed scholarly work in a number of Asian countries. Most of the participating national teams were established more than a decade ago, have acquired abundant experience and methodological know-how in administering nationwide surveys on citizen's political attitudes and behaviors, and have published a substantial number of works both in their native languages and in English.

For more information, please visit our website: www.asianbarometer.org