



– Codebook –

What Holds Asian Societies Together?

Insights from the Social Cohesion Radar

What Holds Asian Societies Together?

Insights from the Social Cohesion Radar

Codebook

Authors

Georgi Dragolov¹

Mandi Larsen¹

Michael Koch²

¹ Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences, Jacobs University Bremen, Germany

² Institute for Sociology, Otto-von-Guericke Universität Magdeburg, Germany

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank (Mark) Zhiqi Kang for his valuable and intense efforts to help us put this codebook together.

Contact

Dr. Peter Walkenhorst

Senior Project Manager

Germany and Asia Program

Bertelsmann Stiftung

Phone +49 5241 81-81172

Fax +49 5241 81-681131

peter.walkenhorst@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de

www.social-cohesion.net

Cover picture: estherpoon / Fotolia.com

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Information on the Data Set.....	5
3	How to Use the Codebook	6
3.1	Input Variables in Chapter I	6
3.2	Output Variables in Chapter II	7
4	Chapter I: Input	8
4.1	Dimension 1.1 – Social Networks	8
4.2	Dimension 1.2 – Trust in People.....	12
4.3	Dimension 1.3 – Acceptance of Diversity.....	18
4.4	Dimension 2.1 – Identification.....	22
4.5	Dimension 2.2 – Trust in Institutions.....	26
4.6	Dimension 2.3 – Perception of Fairness	34
4.7	Dimension 3.1 – Solidarity and Helpfulness.....	38
4.8	Dimension 3.2 – Respect for Social Rules.....	43
4.9	Dimension 3.3 – Civic Participation	48
5	Chapter II: Output	53
5.1	Dimension Scores	53
5.2	Domain Scores.....	54
5.3	Social Cohesion Scores	54
6	Sources of Cited Data Documentation	55

1 Introduction

The present codebook accompanies the dataset that we compiled to measure the level and trend of social cohesion in 22 Asian societies as presented in the edited volume, titled *What Holds Asian Societies Together – Insights from the Social Cohesion Radar* (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2017).

The volume offers an assessment of the degree of social cohesion in the following societies of South, Southeast, and East Asia: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam. The degree of social cohesion has been measured in two time periods: Wave 1 (2004-2008) and Wave 2 (2009-2015).

Carried out by a team of researchers from Jacobs University Bremen in Germany, the study belongs to a social reporting initiative of the Bertelsmann Foundation that aims to provide the general public with a conceptually and methodologically sound overview of the levels and trends of cohesion as well as an in-depth understanding of its determinants and outcomes. Due to the theoretical and methodological rigor of the study, researchers of the topic can also benefit from this project.

We publish the codebook, the dataset, and the related methods report to assist our readers and potential students of social cohesion in finding all information needed to understand the construction of its dimensions and indices, as published in the actual report. We attempt to our best to deliver this information in a transparent, useful, and easily accessible way.

2 Information on the Data Set

1. The dataset is available as an Excel-Workbook in an .xlsx format. The dataset can be downloaded from www.social-cohesion.net.
2. It contains two spreadsheets, thereby mimicking the style of SPSS (IBM 2016) with which, we hope, most researchers are familiar.
3. Sheet 1 “Data”
 - The first row provides the variable names.
 - Rows 2 to 23 uniquely represent a country, i.e. a case.
 - Each country has a unique identification number along the ISO 3166-1 classification system. It is given by the variable `cntryiso3n`.
 - Each country has two further unique identifiers – `cntryiso2c` and `cntryname` – in an alpha-numeric format.
 - Columns contain indicators, dimension scores, domain scores, and cohesion scores per wave:
 - Variables of the type `d[XX]_[original name]_[source]_w[Y]` store input data: the indicators that construct the dimensions of social cohesion.
 - Variables of the type `d[XX]w[Y]`, `d[X]w[Y]`, and `cohesion_w[Y]` store output data which are computed from the input data: dimension scores per wave, domain scores per wave, and cohesion scores per wave, respectively.
 - Blanks on any variable designate missing data.
4. Sheet 2 “Variable View”
 - This sheet associates variable names with informative variable labels.
 - The first row provides the header for the columns:
 - `variable.name` shows a variable’s name
 - `variable.label` shows a variable’s labels

3 How to Use the Codebook

This codebook has been organised in two chapters. Chapter I documents the **input variables**. The chapter has nine sections for each set of indicators that construct the dimensions. Chapter II documents the **output variables**. The chapter has three sections for the country scores: dimension scores, domain scores and scores on the overall index of cohesion in each wave. Every section begins with a list documenting the variable names.

3.1 Input Variables in Chapter I

1. Relevant information on coding and recoding as well as the source of the indicators is presented in the following template:

variable.name	variable.label			
	Source (Year coverage)			
	Survey Round i [Item j] (XXXX)	Item wording		
		<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
		4	1	Option 1
		3	2	Option 2
		2	3	Option 3
		1	4	Option 4
		missing	9	Don't know, refusal, etc.

2. If an indicator repeats over time, its operationalization is presented as follows:

variable.name	variable.label			
	Source (Year coverage)			
	Survey Round i [Item k] (XXXX)	Item wording		
		<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
		4	1	Option 1
		3	2	Option 2
		2	3	Option 3
		1	4	Option 4
		missing	9	Don't know, refusal, etc.
	Survey Round j [Item k] (YYYY)		See Survey Round i for exact wording	

3. Data aggregation from the individual level to the country level has been performed using the arithmetic mean of the respective item as described in the accompanying Methods Report.
4. The template further shows which years that a pertinent indicator covers enter a given wave of the study. This is presented as follows:

```
Aggregation XXXX      -> _w1
Year -> Wave  YYYY-ZZZZ -> _w2
```

The aggregation from Year -> Wave averages the relevant occurrences by taking their arithmetic mean as described in the accompanying Methods Report.

5. The names of the input variables from Chapter I follow the format:

d[XX]_[item name]_[source]_w[Y]

where:

- [XX] indicates the dimension: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3;
- [item name] is most often an abbreviation of the variable label;
- [source] indicates the data source: ab, anb, bti, ffp, gwp, pew, sb, unodc, van, vdem, wvs. They are documented in the accompanying Methods Report;
- [Y] indicates the wave: 1, 2.

3.2 Output Variables in Chapter II

1. The output variables are computed from the input variables as described in the Methods Report. Chapter II lists all of these output variables. It further documents from which variables an output variable is constructed. A reference is given to the section of the Methods Report where the computation is explained.
2. The names of the output variables from Chapter II follow the format:

d[XX]w[Y] or d[X]w[Y] or cohesion_w[Y]

where:

- [XX] indicates the dimension: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3;
- [X] indicates the domain: 1, 2, 3;
- [Y] indicates the wave: 1, 2.

4 Chapter I: Input

4.1 Dimension 1.1 – Social Networks

Construct	Variable Names
Social Networks	d11_cntct_anb_w1 d11_cntct_anb_w2 d11_counthelp_gwp_w1 d11_counthelp_gwp_w2 d11_oppmkfr_gwp_w2

d11_cntct_anb

Number of people in contact

Source
(Year coverage)

Asian Barometer II [27] On average, about how many people do you have contact with in a typical week day?
(2005-2008) We are interested in contact on a one-on-one basis, including everyone with whom you chat, talk, or discuss matters. This can be face to face, by telephone, by mail, or on the internet. Please include only people you know.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
2	1	0-4 people
7	2	5-9 people
14.5	3	10-19 people
34.5	4	20-49 people
50	5	50 or more people
missing	0, 8, 9	Not applicable, Can't choose, Decline to Answer

Asian Barometer III [28] See Asian Barometer II for exact wording
(2010-2012)

Aggregation 2005-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2010-2012 -> _w2

d11_counthelp_gwp **Have relatives or friends you count on to help**

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll If you were in trouble, do you have relatives or friends you can count on to help you
(2006-2015) whenever you need them, or not?

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
1	Yes	Yes
0	No	No
missing	DK/RF	Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d11_oppmkfr_gwp

Satisfied with opportunities in city/area to meet people/make friends

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll In the city or area where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with...? The oppor-
(2010-2015) tunities to meet people and make friends

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Satisfied

Satisfied

0

Dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation
Year -> Wave 2010-2015 -> _w2

4.2 Dimension 1.2 – Trust in People

Construct	Variable Names
Trust in People	d12_pplhlp_ab_w1 d12_trstothr_anb_w1 d12_trstothr_anb_w2 d12_trstppl_ab_w1 d12_trstppl_gwp_w2 d12_trstprs_wvs_w1 d12_trstprs_wvs_w2

d12_pplhlp_ab

People try to be helpful

Source
(Year coverage)

Asia Barometer 2004 [Q10] Do you think that people generally try to be helpful or do you think that they mostly look out for themselves?
(2004)

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

1

People generally try to be helpful

0

2

People mostly look out for themselves

missing

9

Don't know

Asia Barometer 2005 [Q11] See Asia Barometer 2004 for exact wording
(2005)

Asia Barometer 2006 [Q12] See Asia Barometer 2004 for exact wording
(2006)

Asia Barometer 2007 [Q13] See Asia Barometer 2004 for exact wording
(2007)

Aggregation 2004-2007 -> _w1
Year -> Wave

d12_trstothr_anb

Trust in other people you interact with

Source
(Year coverage)

Asian Barometer II [26] How much trust do you have in each of the following types of people? Other people
(2005-2008) you interact with

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
4	4	A great deal of trust
3	3	Quite a lot of trust
2	2	Not very much trust
1	1	None at all
missing	7,8,9	Do not understand the question, Can't choose, Decline to answer

Asian Barometer III [27]
(2010-2012)

See Asian Barometer II for exact wording

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
4	1	A great deal of trust
3	2	Quite a lot of trust
2	3	Not very much trust
1	4	None at all
missing	7,8,9	Do not understand the question, Can't choose, Decline to answer

Aggregation 2005-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2010-2012 -> _w2

d12_trstppl_ab_w1

Most people can be trusted

Source
(Year coverage)

Asia Barometer 2004 [Q9] Generally, do you think people can be trusted or do you think that you can't be too careful in dealing with people (that it pays to be wary of people)?
(2004)

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

1

Most people can be trusted

0

2

Can't be too careful in dealing with people

missing

9

Don't know

Asia Barometer 2005 [Q10] See Asia Barometer 2004 for exact wording
(2005)

Asia Barometer 2006 [Q11] See Asia Barometer 2004 for exact wording
(2006)

Asia Barometer 2007 [Q12] See Asia Barometer 2004 for exact wording
(2007)

Aggregation 2004-2007 -> _w1
Year -> Wave

d12_trstppl_gwp_w2 **Most people can be trusted**

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll (2009-2010) Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you have to be careful in dealing with people?

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
1	Most people can be trusted	Most people can be trusted
0	You have to be careful in dealing with people	You have to be careful in dealing with people
missing	DK/RF	Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation
Year -> Wave 2009-2010 -> _w2

d12_trstprs_wvs

Trust people you know personally

Source
(Year coverage)

World Values Survey 5 [V127] I'd like to ask you how much you trust people from various groups. Could you tell me
(2005-2007) for each whether you trust people from this group completely, somewhat, not very much or not at all? People you know personally

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
4	1	Trust completely
3	2	Trust somewhat
2	3	Do not trust very much
1	4	Do not trust at all
missing	-1,-2,-3,-4,-5	Don't know, No answer, Not applicable, Not asked in survey, Missing; Unknown

World Values Survey 6 [V104] See World Values Survey 5 for exact wording
(2010-2014)

Aggregation 2005-2007 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2010-2014 -> _w2

4.3 Dimension 1.3 – Acceptance of Diversity

Construct	Variable Names
Acceptance of Diversity	d13_gri_pew_w1 d13_gri_pew_w2 d13_grogri_ffp_w1 d13_grogri_ffp_w2 d13_shi_pew_w1 d13_shi_pew_w2

d13_gri_pew

Government restrictions on religion

Source
(Year coverage)

Pew Research Center (2007, 2012, 2013) The Government Restrictions Index (Pew Research Center 2015) regarding religion takes into account 20 indicators of ways that national and local governments impose restrictions on religion, including legislation, intimidation, and force. The index is a fine-grained measure on a 0-to-10 scale, with 0 indicating very low levels and 10 indicating very high levels of government restrictions on religion.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
0	0	Very low
...
10	10	Very high
missing	missing	

Aggregation 2007 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2012, 2013 -> _w2

d13_grogri_ffp

Group grievance

Source
(Year coverage)

Fund for Peace (2006-2014) Part of the Fragile States Index (Fund for Peace 2016), group grievance examines tensions and violence between groups using measures of discrimination and powerlessness, as well as ethnic, communal, sectarian, and religious violence. Scores can range from 0, indicating no group grievance, to 10, indicating an extremely deep form of group grievance.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
0	0	None
...
10	10	Extremely high
missing	missing	

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2014 -> _w2

d13_shi_pew

Social hostilities involving religion

Source
(Year coverage)

Pew Research Center (2007, 2012, 2013) The Social Hostilities Index regarding religion (Pew Research Center 2015) makes use of 13 indicators of the infringement upon religious beliefs and practices by private individuals (e.g., religious hate crimes, mob violence). Similarly to the Government Restrictions Index, the Social Hostilities Index ranges from 0, which stands for very low impediments to religious beliefs and practices, to 10, which indicates very high impediments.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
0	0	Very low
...
10	10	Very high
missing	missing	

Aggregation 2007 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2012, 2013 -> _w2

4.4 Dimension 2.1 – Identification

Construct	Variable Names
Identification	d21_ctzcom_wvs_w1 d21_ctzcom_wvs_w2 d21_prdctzn_anb_w1 d21_prdctzn_anb_w2 d21_rcmndct_gwp_w1 d21_rcmndct_gwp_w2

d21_ctzcom_wvs

See yourself as part of local community

Source
(Year coverage)

World Values Survey 5 [V211] (2005-2007) People have different views about themselves and how they relate to the world. Using this card, would you tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how you see yourself?
I see myself as part of my local community.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
4	1	Strongly agree
3	2	Agree
2	3	Disagree
1	4	Strongly disagree
missing	-1,-2,-3,-4,-5	Don't know, No answer, Not applicable, Not asked in survey, Missing; Unknown

World Values Survey 6 [V213] (2010-2014) See World Values Survey 5 for exact wording

Aggregation 2005-2007 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2010-2014 -> _w2

d21_prdctzn_anb Proud to be citizen of country

Source
(Year coverage)

Asian Barometer II [155] How proud are you to be a citizen of (COUNTRY)? Are you?
(2005-2008)

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
4	1	Very proud
3	2	Somewhat proud
2	3	Not very proud
1	4	Not proud at all
missing	7,8,9	Don't understand the question, Can't choose, Decline to answer

Asian Barometer III [154] See Asian Barometer II for exact wording
(2010-2012)

Note: Data in Wave 1 for Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, India, Lao's, Nepal, and Pakistan taken from Asia Barometer as follows:

Asia Barometer 2004 [Q16] How proud are you of being (YOUR COUNTRY'S PEOPLE)?
(2004)

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
4	1	Very proud
3	2	Somewhat proud
2	3	Not really proud
1	4	Not proud at all
missing	9	Don't know

Asia Barometer 2005 [Q17] See Asia Barometer 2004 for exact wording
(2005)

Asia Barometer 2006 [Q18] See Asia Barometer 2004 for exact wording
(2006)

Asia Barometer 2007 [Q19] See Asia Barometer 2004 for exact wording
(2007)

Aggregation 2005-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2010-2012 -> _w2

d21_rcmndct_gwp

Recommend city/area as place to live

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll (2006-2015) Would you recommend the city or area where you live to a friend or associate as a place to live, or not?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes, would recommend

Yes, would recommend

0

No, would not recommend

No, would not recommend

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

4.5 Dimension 2.2 – Trust in Institutions

Construct	Variable Names
Trust in Institutions	d22_cnfcrct_gwp_w1 d22_cnfcrct_gwp_w2 d22_cnffin_gwp_w1 d22_cnffin_gwp_w2 d22_cnfplc_gwp_w1 d22_cnfplc_gwp_w2 d22_hnstel_gwp_w1 d22_hnstel_gwp_w2 d22_trstcvlsrvc_anb_w1 d22_trstcvlsrvc_anb_w2 d22_trstnws_anb_w1 d22_trstnws_anb_w2 d22_trstprlmnt_anb_w1 d22_trstprlmnt_anb_w2

d22_cnfct_gwp

Confidence in judicial system

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll In this country, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about
(2006-2015) judicial system and courts?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d22_cnffin_gwp

Confidence in financial institutions

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll In this country, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about
(2006-2015) financial institutions or banks?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d22_cnfplc_gwp

Confidence in local police

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll In the city or area where you live, do you have confidence in the local police force, or
(2006-2015) not?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d22_hnstel_gwp

Confidence in honesty of elections

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll In this country, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about
(2006-2015) honesty of elections?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d22_trstcvlsrvc_anb **Trust in civil service**

Source
(Year coverage)

Asian Barometer II [12] I'm going to name a number of institutions. For each one, please tell me how much
(2005-2008) trust do you have in them? Is It a great deal of trust, quite a lot of trust, not very much trust not very much trust, or none at all? Civil service.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
4	1	A great deal of trust
3	2	Quite a lot of trust
2	3	Not very much trust
1	4	None at all
missing	7,8,9	Do not understand the question, Can't choose, decline to answer

Asian Barometer III [12] See Asian Barometer II for exact wording
(2010-2012)

Aggregation 2005-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2010-2012 -> _w2

d22_trstnws_anb

Trust in newspapers

Source
(Year coverage)

Asian Barometer II [16] I'm going to name a number of institutions. For each one, please tell me how much
(2005-2008) trust do you have in them? Is It a great deal of trust, quite a lot of trust, not very much
trust not very much trust, or none at all? Newspapers

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

4	1	A great deal of trust
3	2	Quite a lot of trust
2	3	Not very much trust
1	4	None at all
missing	7,8,9	Do not understand the question, Can't choose, decline to answer

Asian Barometer III [16] See Asian Barometer II for exact wording
(2010-2012)

Aggregation 2005-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2010-2012 -> _w2

d22_trstprlmnt_anb **Trust in parliament**

Source
(Year coverage)

Asian Barometer II [11] I'm going to name a number of institutions. For each one, please tell me how much
(2005-2008) trust do you have in them? Is It a great deal of trust, quite a lot of trust, not very much trust not very much trust, or none at all? Parliament.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
4	1	A great deal of trust
3	2	Quite a lot of trust
2	3	Not very much trust
1	4	None at all
missing	7,8,9	Do not understand the question, Can't choose, decline to answer

Asian Barometer III [11] See Asian Barometer II for exact wording
(2010-2012)

Aggregation 2005-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2010-2012 -> _w2

4.6 Dimension 2.3 – Perception of Fairness

Construct	Variable Names
Perception of Fairness	d23_crptgov_gwp_w1 d23_crptgov_gwp_w2 d23_eqopp_bti_w1 d23_eqopp_bti_w2 d23_pvrty_anb_w1 d23_pvrty_anb_w2

d23_crptgov_gwp

Corruption throughout government widespread

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll Is corruption widespread throughout the government in this country, or not?
(2006-2015)

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d23_eqopp_bti

Equality of opportunity

Source
(Year coverage)

Bertelsmann Transformation Index (2006-2014) Equality of Opportunity is an indicator used in the Bertelsmann Transformation Index (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2016), which examines the state of political and economic transformation in developing and transition countries. The equality of opportunity indicator draws on expert assessments of equal access to social participation (e.g., education, public office, employment) regardless of social background, particularly for women, but also for ethnic and religious groups. Scores range from 1 to 10, where 1 indicates that equality of opportunity is denied, and 10 indicates that equality of opportunity is achieved.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
1	1	Denied
...
10	10	Achieved
missing	missing	

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2014 -> _w2

d23_pvrty_anb

Most important problem: poverty/destitution

Source
(Year coverage)

Asian Barometer II [100-102] In your opinion, what are the most important problems facing this country that government should address?
(2005-2008)

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
1	4	Poverty/destitution
0	...	All other options
missing	0, 996, 998	Nothing/no problems, No further reply, Can't choose

Asian Barometer III [96] See Asian Barometer II for exact wording
(2010-2012)

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
1	4	Poverty/destitution
0	...	All other options
missing	0, 998	Nothing/no problems, Can't choose

Aggregation 2005-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2010-2012 -> _w2

4.7 Dimension 3.1 – Solidarity and Helpfulness

Construct	Variable Names
Solidarity and Helpfulness	d31_blddon_who_w1 d31_dntmny_gwp_w1 d31_dntmny_gwp_w2 d31_hlpstr_gwp_w1 d31_hlpstr_gwp_w2 d31_sndmny_gwp_w2

d31_blddon_who

Voluntary unpaid blood donation

Source
(Year coverage)

World Health Organization Percentage of blood donations that are voluntary and unpaid.
(2004, 2007, 2008)

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
1	0-24.9	%
2	25-49.9	%
3	50-89.9	%
4	90-100	%
missing	missing	

Aggregation 2004, 2007, 2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave -> _w2

d31_dntmny_gwp

Donated money to charity

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll Have you done any of the following in the past month? How about donated money to
(2006-2015) a charity?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d31_hlpstr_gwp

Helped a stranger

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll Have you done any of the following in the past month? How about helped a stranger
(2006-2015) or someone you didn't know who needed help?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d31_sndmny_gwp **Sent money or goods**

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll In the past 12 months, did this household SEND help in the form of money or goods to
(2011-2015) another individual...?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1	Living inside this country	Living inside this country
1	Living in another country	Living in another country
1	Both	Both
0	Neither	Neither
missing	DK/RF	Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2011-2015 -> _w2

4.8 Dimension 3.2 – Respect for Social Rules

Construct	Variable Names
Respect for Social Rules	d32_homicide_unodc_w1 d32_homicide_unodc_w2 d32_mnystln_gwp_w1 d32_mnystln_gwp_w2 d32_sfwlk_gwp_w1 d32_sfwlk_gwp_w2 d32_shaeco_sb_w1

d32_homicide_unodc

Homicide rate

Source
(Year coverage)

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2004-2013) Homicide rates per 100,000 population. A homicide is defined as an unlawful death intentionally inflicted by another person.

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

...

...

...

Aggregation 2004-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2013 -> _w2

d32_mnystln_gwp

Money/property stolen

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll (2006-2015) Within the last 12 months, have you had money or property stolen from you or another household member?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d32_sfwlk_gwp

Feel safe walking alone at night

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll Do you feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where you live?
(2006-2015)

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d32_shaeco_sb

Shadow economy

Source
(Year coverage)

Schneider, Buehn & Montenegro (2010) define the shadow economy as including all market-based legal production of goods and services that are deliberately concealed from public authorities for various reasons. The author use several measures related tax and social security contribution burdens, intensity of regulations, public sector services, state of the official economy, as well as monetary and labor market indicators. The size of the shadow economy is expressed as a percentage of the official gross domestic product.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
0	0	%
...
100	100	%
missing	missing	

Aggregation 2004-2007 -> _w1
Year -> Wave -> _w2

4.9 Dimension 3.3 – Civic Participation

Construct	Variable Names
Civic Participation	d33_ccsi_vdem_w1 d33_ccsi_vdem_w2 d33_polpart_van_w1 d33_polpart_van_w2 d33_vcopnoff_gwp_w1 d33_vcopnoff_gwp_w2 d33_vlnttm_gwp_w1 d33_vlnttm_gwp_w2

d33_ccsi_vdem

Core Civil Society Index

Source
(Year coverage)

Varieties of Democracy Project (2004-2012) The Core Civil Society Index is a measure of the robustness of a civil society. It is part of the Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) project, which draws on internal and external expert ratings (Coppedge et al. 2015). Civil society organizations are understood to span the space between the private sphere and the state, for instance, labor unions, social movements, or non-governmental organizations. Thus, the index measures how autonomous civil society is from the state and the degree to which citizens can freely strive for political and civic goals. A higher score on the index reflects a more robust civil society.

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

...

...

...

Aggregation 2004-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2012 -> _w2

d33_polpart_van

Political participation

Source
(Year coverage)

Vanhanen (2004-2012) Political Participation from Vanhanen's (2014) Measures of Democracy is used to examine voting turnout, calculated as the percentage share of the adult population that voted in elections. This measure also takes referenda into account: National referenda raise the variable value by 5% and state (regional) referenda by 1% for the year they are held.

<i>Recoded Values</i>	<i>Original Values</i>	<i>Answer Labels</i>
0	0	%
...
100	100	%
missing	missing	

Aggregation 2004-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2012 -> _w2

d33_vcopnoff_gwp

Voiced opinion to public official

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll Have you done any of the following in the past month? How about voiced your opinion
(2006-2015) to a public official?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

d33_vlnttm_gwp

Volunteered time to organization

Source
(Year coverage)

Gallup World Poll Have you done any of the following in the past month? How about volunteered your
(2006-2015) time to an organization?

Recoded Values

Original Values

Answer Labels

1

Yes

Yes

0

No

No

missing

DK/RF

Don't know, Refusal

Aggregation 2006-2008 -> _w1
Year -> Wave 2009-2015 -> _w2

5 Chapter II: Output

5.1 Dimension Scores

Construct	Variable Names
Dimension 1.1 – Social Networks	d11w1
	d11w2
Dimension 1.2 – Trust in People	d12w1
	d12w2
Dimension 1.3 – Acceptance of Diversity	d13w1
	d13w2
Dimension 2.1 – Identification	d21w1
	d21w2
Dimension 2.2 – Trust in Institutions	d22w1
	d22w2
Dimension 2.3 – Perception of Fairness	d23w1
	d23w2
Dimension 3.1 – Solidarity and Helpfulness	d31w1
	d31w2
Dimension 3.2 – Respect for Social Rules	d32w1
	d32w2
Dimension 3.3 – Civic Participation	d33w1
	d33w2

Generic documentation for variable d[XX]w[Y]:

The values of the variable are computed from the input variables which fit the scheme d[XX][...]w[Y] as documented in the Methods Report.

Example XX=11, Y=2: d11w2 is computed from d11_cntct_anb_w2, d11_counthelp_gwp_w2, d11_oppmkfr_gwp_w2.

5.2 Domain Scores

Construct	Variable Names
Domain 1 – Social Relations	d1w1 d1w2
Domain 2 – Connectedness	d2w1 d2w2
Domain 3 – Focus on the Common Good	d3w1 d3w2

Generic documentation for variable d[X]w[Y]:

The values of the variable are computed from the variables which fit the scheme d[X][1-3]w[Y] as documented in the Methods Report.

Example X=1, Y=2: d1w2 is computed from d11w2, d12w2, d13w2.

5.3 Social Cohesion Scores

Construct	Variable Names
Overall Index of Social Cohesion	cohesion_w1 cohesion_w2

Generic documentation for variable cohesion_w[Y]:

The values of the variable are computed from the variables which fit the scheme d[11-33]w[Y] as documented in the Methods Report.

Example Y=2: cohesion_w2 is constructed from d11w2, d12w2, d13w2, d21w2, d22w2, d23w2, d31w2, d32w2, d33w2.

6 Sources of Cited Data Documentation

- Bertelsmann Stiftung. (2016). *Transformation Index BTI 2016. Political management in international comparison*. Gütersloh, Germany: Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Lindberg, S. I., Skaaning, S., & Teorell, J. (2015). *V-Dem Codebook v5*. Gothenburg/Notre Dame: Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project.
- FFP. (2016). *Fragile States Index* [Data file]. Washington, DC: Author.
- GWP. (2015). *Gallup World Poll* [Data file]. Washington, DC: The Gallup Organization.
- Inoguchi, T. (2003). *AsiaBarometer Survey Data 2003* [Data file]. Retrieved from www.asiabarometer.org/data/abdl.php.
- Inoguchi, T. (2004). *AsiaBarometer Survey Data 2004* [Data file]. Retrieved from www.asiabarometer.org/data/abdl.php.
- Inoguchi, T. (2005). *AsiaBarometer Survey Data 2005* [Data file]. Retrieved from www.asiabarometer.org/data/abdl.php.
- Inoguchi, T. (2006). *AsiaBarometer Survey Data 2006* [Data file]. Retrieved from www.asiabarometer.org/data/abdl.php.
- Inoguchi, T. (2007). *AsiaBarometer Survey Data 2007* [Data file]. Retrieved from www.asiabarometer.org/data/abdl.php.
- National Taiwan University. (2003). *Asian Barometer Survey (ABS) Wave 1* [Data file]. Retrieved from www.asianbarometer.org.
- National Taiwan University. (2008). *Asian Barometer Survey (ABS) Wave 2* [Data file]. Retrieved from www.asianbarometer.org.
- National Taiwan University. (2012). *Asian Barometer Survey (ABS) Wave 3* [Data file]. Retrieved from www.asianbarometer.org.
- Pew Research Center. (2015). *Latest trends in religious restrictions and hostilities*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Schneider, F., Buehn, A., & Montenegro, C.E. (2010). New estimates for the shadow economies all over the world. *International Economic Journal*, 24(4), 443–461.
- UNODC. (2013). *Global Study on Homicide 2013*. Vienna, Austria: Author.
- Vanhanen, T. (2014). *Measures of Democracy 1810–2012* [Data file]. FSD1289, version 6.0 (2014-01-31). Retrieved from urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:fsd:T-FSD1289.
- WHO. (2008). *Global Database on Blood Safety: Summary report 2008*. Retrieved from www.who.int/blood-safety/global_database/GDBS_Summary_Report_2008.pdf?ua=1.
- WHO. (2009). *Global Database on Blood Safety: Summary report 2009*. Retrieved from www.who.int/blood-safety/global_database/GDBS_Summary_Report_2009.pdf?ua=1.
- WHO. (2011). *Global Database on Blood Safety: Summary report 2011*. Retrieved from www.who.int/blood-safety/global_database/GDBS_Summary_Report_2011.pdf?ua=1.
- WVS. (2015). *World Value Survey 1981–2014 Official Aggregate v.20150418* [Data file]. World Values Survey Association. Retrieved from www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSContents.jsp.

Address | Contact

Bertelsmann Stiftung
Carl-Bertelsmann-Straße 256
33311 Gütersloh
Germany
Phone +49 5241 81-0

Dr. Peter Walkenhorst
Senior Project Manager
Germany and Asia Program
Phone +49 5241 81-81172
peter.walkenhorst@bertelsmann.de

www.social-cohesion.net

www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de