<<Article>>

Emergence of Cross-National Social Surveys in Mongolia: What Have They Revealed?

MINATO Kunio

Introduction

The 2000s witnessed a blossoming of cross-national social surveys in Asia. These surveys, initially developed in Western countries, broadened their coverage to Asia. There are also surveys focusing on Asian societies from an Asian viewpoint such as "AsiaBarometer," "Asian Barometer (East Asia Barometer)," "East Asia Value Survey," and "East Asian Social Survey" (Minato, 2008).

The trend of cross-national social surveys has reached Mongolia. Although the country's sparse population and underdeveloped transportation and telecommunications infrastructure might raise doubt about the possibility of quantitative surveys nationwide, there have already been projects conducting such surveys in Mongolia. These projects are developing a new and scientifically-valid approach of Mongol study, as well as cross-national comparisons that include Mongolia.

This study examines the cross-national social surveys conducted in Mongolia and their results. Considering the short history of cross-national social surveys in the country, I begin by detailing the advantages of the surveys, especially in the context of Mongol study. Next, I introduce the survey projects covering Mongolia, namely the AsiaBarometer, the Asian Barometer, the Life in Transition Survey, and the studies using data from these surveys, depending upon their availability. Lastly, I discuss the challenges and the perspectives for cross-national social surveys in Mongolia.

I Advantages of Cross-National Social Surveys in Mongolia

Studies that explore the reality of the Mongolian people and society have been gathered for a century. Some of these studies are bibliographic surveys, while others apply field research[1)], a method based on observation and interaction with people, family, or an organization in focus.

This paper focuses on cross-national social surveys. Since these surveys adopt unconventional methods in Mongol study, it is necessary to explain their advantages, which are summarized as follows: (i) attitudes and behaviors of Mongolians can be grasped quantitatively; (ii) the surveys enable cross-national comparison; and (iii) survey data is open to researchers.

The first advantage derives from the quantitative method of the survey. Field researches focus on specific people or areas and describe their detailed images; therefore, it is regarded as qualitative research. Cross-national social surveys, on the other hand, target people living in plural societies and aim to measure such information as their attitudes toward a certain topic, their values,

and their behavior in quantitative terms, thereby classifying this method as a quantitative survey.

Quantitative surveys and qualitative researches have distinct characteristics, which are outlined in Table 1. It should be noted that, although some argue that one method is superior to the other, these two approaches can be complementary[2)]: the life history of a herdsman transitioning to a market economy might be best depicted through the qualitative research, whereas the quantitative survey might be appropriate in verifying factors determining herdsmen's attitudes toward transition in the country.

Table 1　Quantitative Survey and Qualitative Research

Quantitative Survey	Qualitative Research
Measure objective facts	Construct social reality, cultural meaning
Focus on Variables	Focus on interactive processes, events
Reliability is key	Authenticity is key
Value free	Values are present and explicit
Independent of context	Situationally constrained
Many cases, subjects	Few cases, subjects
Statistical analysis	Thematic analysis
Researcher is detached	Researcher is involved
Measure attitudes and orientation in a large population	Describe events taking place in limited area and time

Source: Babbie (2004), Neuman (2003).

As for the second advantage, I would like to address the following two aspects by applying Manabe (2004). First, social and human behavioral phenomena in Mongolia have become a subject of scientific research for researchers all over the world. This promotes the development of not only Mongol study but also the study of other cultures. Second, comparative studies lead us to reexamine conventional assumptions and concepts. There are plenty of arguments that attribute the distinctive characteristics of Mongolians to their “peculiar” nomadic pastoralism. However, the problem lies in verifying whether or not they are correct. Cross-national social surveys with established and scientifically-valid methodology offer a way to test such descriptions.

The third advantage is in the drastically easier and more certain access to the realities of the Mongolian people and society. A cross-national survey requires huge amounts of resources and time, and cannot be conducted by an individual researcher. Releasing survey data enables researchers to explore the realities of Mongolia, even if they cannot conduct a survey by themselves. An analysis utilizing survey data collected by other researchers or organizations is called a “secondary analysis,” and has already become an established research method in social science.

There is another significance in opening survey data: it enables researchers to verify the

arguments of previous studies. Qualitative researches provide detailed descriptions of subjects studied, but it is difficult to assure whether or not such descriptions can be generalized. It is also difficult to verify studies based on quantitative surveys unless open data is available. Studies using open data can be replicated and tested by another study, as with experiments in natural science. This makes it possible to detect unsuitable studies, thereby eliminating a biased image of Mongolia.

As a recent addition to the history of Mongol study, cross-national social surveys are crucial to the exploration of people and society in Mongolia. Studies based on these surveys are expected to offer scientific findings from the country, and to contribute to the understanding of not only Mongolia but also other cultures. The following sections are an examination of such examples.

II The AsiaBarometer

The AsiaBarometer has been conducting surveys since 2003 in various parts of Asia. The countries and regions surveyed vary each year, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Countries and Regions Surveyed, and Target Population in the AsiaBarometer

Year	Countries and Regions Surveyed (Number)	Target Population
2003	Japan, South Korea, China, Thailand, India, Malaysia, Myanmar (Burma), Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan, Vietnam (10)	800 (aged 20-59)
2004	Japan, South Korea, China, Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam (13)	800 (aged 20-59)
2005	Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan (14)	800-1200 (aged 20-59)*
2006	Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, China, Hong Kong, Singapore, Vietnam (7)	1,000 except China with 2,000**
2007	Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, The Philippines, Thailand (7)	1,000**
2008	Australia, China, India, Japan, Russia, The United States (6)	1,000**

Note: *- In Mongolia adults aged 20-69 were surveyed.

**- Age group is not specified.

Source: The AsiaBarometer website (https://www.asiabarometer.org/).

Takashi Inoguchi, the leader of the AsiaBarometer, describes the main subject of the survey as “daily of ordinary people in Asia” (Inoguchi, 2005:17). Questionnaires of the AsiaBarometer contain questions regarding the lives of respondents, such as their social infrastructure, patterns of economic life, patterns of daily life, values and norms in daily life, values and norms associated with social behavior, identities, views on social and political issues and institutions, health conditions, and sociological attributes (Inoguchi, 2006; Inoguchi and Fujii, 2007:7).

Mongolia was included in the AsiaBarometer 2005 survey targeting the regions of Central and

South Asia. The survey in Mongolia was conducted in the capital city of Ulaanbaatar and the four aimags of each region: Dundgobi (Central), Sukhbaatar (Eastern), Khovd (Western) and Khövsgöl (Khangai). The 800 respondents were chosen through multi-stage stratified random sampling and participated in face-to-face interviews (January, 2008). The survey data has been released on the AsiaBarometer and the ICPSR of the University of Michigan websites, and is available upon request. The AsiaBarometer website released questionnaires in Mongolian and English.

The AsiaBarometer 2005 data, along with the data collected in other years, has already produced several cross-national analyses that include Mongolia. Carlson (2008) used 2004 and 2005 data and examined whether religious affiliation affected one's preference of regime. The analysis found differences in the preferences of regimes among and within religious groups. Afghan Muslims, for instance, preferred government led by experts. Within Buddhist groups, the Mongolians were most supportive of democracy. Support for nondemocratic governments was significantly higher in Hindus, Muslims, and Buddhists than Christians, while support for democracy was significantly lower only in Hindus. There was no significant difference in other religious and non-religious groups.

Inoguchi and Hotta (2006, 2008) explored social capital in Central and South Asia. They extracted three components from questions on social capital: the first component "general trust" is related to interpersonal trust; the second, "merit-based utilitarianism," is witnessed as trust in lucrative human relationships; the third, "institutional engagement," comprises trust in institutions (in this case, religious groups and social welfare) and the use of social networks. They determined the scores for each component and sorted countries into six groups. Mongolia and Nepal were classified into group 5, where interpersonal trust is low but utilitarianism and institutional engagement is high. They explained the results as owing to their geopolitical proximity to China.

Manabe (2006, 2008) analyzed the correlation among public utilities, well-being (sense of happiness, life satisfaction and standard of living), as well as trust and political attitudes and behavior in Central (Kazakhstan, Mongolia, and Uzbekistan) and South (India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka) Asian countries. The results were as follows: first, generalized order could be observed in relation to public utilities: first electricity, then water, and then gas. This order was seen in the countries in AsiaBarometer 2005 and six countries (China, Japan, Malaysia, South Korea, Thailand, and Vietnam) in AsiaBarometer 2003 (Manabe, 2004). Second, sense of happiness was closely related to satisfaction with institutions in Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Uzbekistan but not in India and Mongolia. Third, the components of personal trust were related with each other in all countries, but they were less related to the components of institutional trust. No general tendency was found among the components of institutional trust. Fourth, there were patterns of correlation between cynicism in politics and voting behavior: V-shape (Kazakhstan and Sri Lanka), U-shape (India, Mongolia, and Uzbekistan) and the inverted U-shape (Pakistan).

Reed (2007) analyzed the role of religion in "secular" East Asia and "religious" South Asia. In South Asia, there was almost no respondent without a religious identification, and the majority of the respondents answered that they prayed or meditated daily. In East Asia, on the other hand, the percentage of those without a religious identification was higher, although it varied from 18.6% in Mongolia to 79.5% in China. On the other hand, there was a common feature of daily prayer between the two areas: daily prayer had a significantly positive linkage with age and gender. Besides, the effect of the standard of living and education level on daily prayer varied, regardless of the areas. The standard of living had a significantly positive effect in Mongolia whereas it was negative in China, India, and South Korea. The education level had a significantly positive effect in Hong Kong and negative effects in China, Japan, and Pakistan.

In Reed (2008), religiosity in "secular" Central Asia and "religious" South Asia was analyzed. In South Asia, except Sri Lanka, the majority of respondents performed daily prayers and thought that ceremonies such as funerals, weddings, births, and festivals should include religion. On the other hand, Central Asians tended to accept non-religious ceremonies and the absence of daily prayer. The least religious country was Mongolia, where non-religious ceremonies were most accepted and only about 5% of respondents performed daily prayer. In both areas, those who performed daily prayers were tolerant about moral decline, bribery, abortion, and homosexuality and were passive in elections, whreas those who preferred religious ceremonies exhibited a converse behavior pattern.

Sonoda (2007) examined the image of Japan in East Asian countries and the region. In a question posed to the respondents on whether Japan had a positive or a negative influence in their country, it was determined that Japan was seen favorably in all the countries and regions analyzed except South Korea and China. The AsiaBarometer also questioned the influence of other countries such as China, India, Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom. As for Mongolia, the most favored country in Mongolia was Russia, followed by the United States, South Korea, the United Kingdom, and Japan. China was the country least favored in Mongolia.

In Sonoda (2008), Asian identity was analyzed by using data from the AsiaBarometer 2004, 2005, and 2006. The percentage of respondents who identified themselves as "Asian" was highest in Cambodia (99.3%) and lowest in Afghanistan (less than 10%). In Mongolia the percentage was around 75%, or eighth place among the 28 countries and regions analyzed. There was a significantly positive and strong relation between national pride and Asian identity. Although national pride was considered as a discouraging element in the promotion of the Asian identity, the result was in fact quite opposite. The respondents with an Asian identity were found to perceive the influences of other countries more positively than those without this identity.

AsiaBarometer 2005 provides data on the lives, attitudes, and behavior of people in Central and South Asia, where quantitative survey data is extremely scarce. This data is of great help,

depicting the true image of the area and contributing to the development of social sciences.

At the same time, however, some problems should be pointed out. First, considering the political conditions or underdeveloped infrastructures, it is questionable if a nationwide survey in its true sense was possible in the countries of the 2005 survey[3]. In fact, the survey in Mongolia was limited to certain areas. Second, Kawato (2006) argued that some questions contained ambiguity— such as the question about the influence of countries analyzed in Sonoda (2007). The word "influence" can be used as a political, economic or cultural reference, and answers may differ depending on the respondent's interpretation. Third, in countries where citizens are strictly monitored, answers may be biased so as to avoid the attention of the authorities. Fourth, it would be necessary to ask whether a respondent is a member of the ruling party in a country under a socialist regime or a dictatorship (Sonoda, 2005).

III The Asian Barometer (ABS)

The Asian Barometer (ABS), headquartered at National Taiwan University, is a survey focusing on public opinion on political values, democracy, and governance in Asia. It was originally launched as the East Asia Barometer in 2000, and became the ABS in 2003 when it merged with the South Asia Barometer.

The ABS has conducted two waves of surveys. The countries and regions surveyed are shown in Table 3. The dataset of the first wave has already been released on the Asian Barometer website. An online analysis is also possible on the website.

Table 3　Countries and Regions Surveyed in the ABS

Wave	Survey year	Countries and regions surveyed (Number)
1st	2001-2002	Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, China, Hong Kong, Mongolia, Philippines, Thailand (8)
2nd	2006-2007	Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, China, Hong Kong, Cambodia, Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mongolia, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam (13)

Source: The East Asia Barometer website (http://eacsurvey.law.ntu.edu.tw/index.html).

In Mongolia both waves of the ABS were conducted. Nathan (2003) reported that the first wave of surveys in Mongolia was conducted in October and November 2002 and collected 1,144 valid responses. An outline of the second wave of surveys in Mongolia is reported in the country report (Ganbat, 2007). According to the report, the survey was conducted by the Academy of Political Education on a nationwide scale in May and June 2006. Respondents were Mongolians of voting age (18 or older), chosen by a four-stage random sampling method consisting of i) Primary Sampling Units, ii) Secondary Sampling Units (soums and districts), iii) households, and iv) respondents. One thousand two hundred and eleven interviews were conducted face-to-face.

There have already been a number of cross-national studies based on ABS data on Asia, including Mongolia. Albritton and Bureekul (2005) focused on the impacts of cultural socialization and the interaction with government in regard to support for democracy, pluralist values, regime legitimacy, economic situation at both national and personal level, perceived and witnessed corruption, and institutional trust. The results determined that cultural socialization had a contradicting impact; modernization had a negative influence on interaction with government, while the trust of others was positive. Moreover, interaction with government affected other interactions.

Chang and Chu (2007) examined the two concepts of democracy: liberal democracy with an emphasis on the electoral procedure or freedom of expression; and the substantivist notion with a stress on income equality or basic needs. In East Asia, the former had not taken root compared to the latter. These concepts were associated with sex, education, political involvement, a detachment from traditionalism but not with age, a detachment from authoritarianism and media exposure.

Chang et al. (2008) tackled the difference in values on economic development and democracy between the East and the West. Economic development took precedence over democracy in Asia. They explained that the superiority of economic development was a product of traditionalism, to be specific, Confucianism, and economic growth did not necessarily lead to a democratic transition, as Western modernization theory expected. Based on this, they argued that focusing on democratic values in Confucianism was essential in order to enroot democracy in Asia.

Chu et al. (2003) and Chu and Huang (2007) explored what would lead people in East Asia to detach themselves from authoritarian regimes. The former study, using first wave data of the ABS, demonstrated that social and political values and regime comparison (perceived democratic progress, increase in political rights, and improvement of policy performance) played a critical role in the detachment from authoritarianism. On the other hand, economic conditions, which were considered to have a correlation with regime preference, did not impose a significant effect on democracy. The latter study used the second wave dataset and explored the support for democracy as well as the detachment from authoritarianism. It also confirmed the effects of detachment from traditionalism and democratic orientation on rejecting authoritarianism, though the effects of those values were weaker for the support of democracy. Rather, the support of democracy was related to perceived democratic progress and satisfaction with democracy.

The quality of democracy was investigated in Chu et. al. (2008) and Huang et. al. (2007). The former study demonstrated that respondents required responsiveness to their needs and concerns, competitive electoral systems, and the delivery of clean politics from their governments. As corruption was still persisting even in democratic regimes, this analysis suggested that the East Asian democracies make further efforts to establish transparency and a legal system. The latter study revealed that most respondents gave low evaluations on democracy in their respective

countries, especially on rule of law, controlling corruption, and horizontal accountability (ability of the legal system and legislature to check government). Therefore, the lower the quality of democracy proved to be, the lesser the satisfaction with democracy itself, popular support for democracy, and the belief in liberal democratic values.

Ikeda et al. (2003) and Ikeda and Kobayashi (2007) analyzed how political participation was related to social capital and cultural factors. The first study demonstrated that social trust and entry in community-level associations had a significant effect on political participation, especially electoral behavior. Cultural factors influenced political participation indirectly: the effect of social trust on political participation becomes larger when people are less collectivistic or more embedded in the Asian "tradition" of supporting morally upright political leaders. The second study also found that, the less collectivistic, or the more supportive of morally upright political leaders, the more an individual is supportive of morally upright political participation.

Nathan (2003) provided exploratory study patterns of traditionalism in East Asian countries/regions. This study considered "tradition" as a set of attitudes predominant prior to modernization, and focused on the commonality of tradition among societies. It was found that Mongolia was the most traditional country of all those surveyed. Also, two factors were extracted from the questions on traditional values; the former related to hierarchy in family and gender relations, and the latter was on avoidance of conflict and refraining from self-assertion.

Nathan (2007) analyzed the effects of political values represented by democracy and cultural values represented by traditionalism on the support of current regimes in East Asia. Nathan compared the effects of those values to the perceived performance of the current regime, and argued that political and cultural values had more effect on respondents' support to existing regimes than regime performance did. Democratic values were more effective than cultural values, although the mechanism of the effect was too complicated to be grasped.

Park and Shin (2005) and Shin (2007a) investigated satisfaction and evaluation of democracy in Asian new democracies: South Korea, Mongolia, the Philippines, Taiwan, and Thailand. The majority of respondents in these countries demonstrated satisfaction and better evaluated democratic regimes than the previous nondemocratic regimes. They supported democracy and rejected authoritarianism not only when they were satisfied with the current democracy, but also when they felt the system was performing better than in previous regimes. These findings were also confirmed in Shin (2007a). The study revealed that most of the respondents were satisfied and better evaluated their current regimes than for prior nondemocratic ones. Satisfaction and better evaluation on current regimes increased support for democracy and the rejection of authoritarianism.

Park and Lee (2007) tested the effect of association on democracy. Their analyses clarified that most respondents were not engaged in any associations, regardless of the country and

region. Moreover, associations had little or no effect on civic virtue (social trust, reciprocity, and citizenship), nor did it promote the democratic values or norms reflected in the attachment to democracy, detachment from authoritarianism, and support for political institutional pluralism and rule of law. Associations were only found to have a correlation with political activism: political efficacy, political interest, voting activities, campaigns, contact with officials or organizations, and protests.

Rose et al. (2003) examined the factors of political trust, specifically, the generic factors that vary across countries such as socioeconomic attributes, or the particularistic factors specific to a certain country or area. When particularistic factors are added into the analysis along with generic factors, they have little, if any, significant effect on political trust. However, being Chinese or Russian had a relatively strong effect: the former was positive, and the latter, negative.

Shi (2003) discussed the effect of values and norms on the political process. Among various values and norms, authoritarian orientation and refusal to self-sacrifice toward collective interests had a crucial impact on institutional trust and political action such as demonstrations or strikes.

Shin (2007b) categorized people's reactions to democracy into four types: hybrids (not attached to democracy / not detached from authoritarianism), anti-authoritarians (detached from authoritarianism / not attached to democracy), proto-democrats (attached to democracy / not detached from authoritarianism), and authentic democrats (detached from authoritarianism / attached to democracy). Confucian values increased the number of hybrids and proto-democrats and reduced anti-authoritarians and authentic democrats; the experience of democracy increased the number of proto-democrats and authentic democrats and reduced hybrids and anti-authoritarians.

The process of democratization in Asia was examined by Shin (2008a). He revealed that "authentic democrats" as defined by Shin (2007b) were a minority in East Asian democracies where the support for liberal democratic regimes was low. Such a tendency was attributed to the persistence of a nonliberal culture, leading to very slow and unsteady transition toward democracy.

Shin (2008b) conducted a comparative analysis on the understanding of democracy between East Asia and other regions, using data from the Global Barometer Survey[4]. His analysis demonstrated that most citizens in new democracies had the cognitive capabilities [5] for defining democracy in their own words. However, against prior hypothesis, such citizens were likely to connect democracy with socioeconomic benefits rather than freedom, or liberty.

Shyu (2003) explored the similarities and differences in the attitudes of people toward political leaders. He revealed that a strong leader mindless of established procedure or opposition was most welcomed in Mongolia. He also found the difference and similarity in factors related to attitudes within East Asia. The effect of sociodemographic factors varied among countries: for instance, effect of age was negative in China but positive in Mongolia. On the other hand, political factors such as democratic values and trust in government had a positive effect in almost all the countries.

Shyu (2007) focused on the relation between economic performance and support for democracy. The evaluation of macroeconomic conditions proved to have a significantly positive effect on the support for democracy. Meanwhile, the evaluation of a respondent's own economic condition had a significantly negative effect, which indicated that people in disadvantageous financial situations were more supportive of democracy, perhaps with a view to changing their situation.

Tan and Wang (2007) examined whether or not younger generations in Asia were supportive of democracy. The results showed that younger generations were likely to have democratic values, more so than older generations. Asia's youth were also found to be more supportive of democracy and less traditional. However, the effect of age reduced when other variables were controlled.

Wu and Chu (2007) investigated whether uneven income distribution affected satisfaction with and support for democracy. Their analyses showed that both lower and higher income holders tended to be less satisfied with democratic performance than middle income holders. It also showed that the assessment of democracy worsened as income disparity expanded.

It should be noted that there have already been studies on Mongolia using ABS data. Ganbat (2004) analyzed how Mongolians perceived democratization, current democratic conditions, and the future of democracy. He demonstrated that the majority of Mongolians were satisfied with the current conditions and optimistic about democracy in near future. At the same time, he warned that the lack of a profound notion of democracy, weak detachment from authoritarianism, and an ambiguous regime preference for a democracy would impede the democratic transition in Mongolia.

Landman et al. (2005) discussed the condition of democracy in Mongolia. They assessed the various aspects of Mongolian democracy, and in their assessment the ABS data is quoted to denote that most Mongolian citizens agreed that democracy is both desirable and suitable to their own country, though they were unsatisfied with the democratic process.

Data collected in Mongolia by the ABS is used in not only cross-national or Mongolian researches, but also contributes to researches of other political systems: It was used in the analyses of Japan by Yamada et al. (2008), Taiwan by Huang et al. (2008), the Philippines by Romero et al. (2008), Indonesia by Mujani (2008), Malaysia by Welsh et al. (2008), Hong Kong by Lam and Kuan (2003) and Ma and Chan (2008), Cambodia by Meerkerk (2008), and Vietnam by Pham (2008).

The ABS, as stated above, has been providing data and studies on democracy in Asia. Since democratic transition is still a critical issue in Asia, the findings from the ABS will produce various guidelines for the latter in the future. Moreover, analyses of the ABS data can increase the possibility that Mongolian democratization could contribute to democratic transitions worldwide.

However, we should be aware of the danger when interpreting the word "tradition." The ABS covers the area with a variety of political and economic conditions, religions — Buddhism, Islam,

Catholic —, and ways of living from farming to nomadic pastoralism. Assuming the existence of a unified "tradition" in this diversified area might cause a misunderstanding, unless "tradition" is strictly defined as in Nathan (2003). Besides, "tradition" tends to be associated with Confucianism in the aforementioned researches, but a Mongolian would never label himself or herself as a Confucian. "Tradition" or cultural factors should be interpreted with caution.

IV Life in Transition Survey (LiTS)

Life in Transition Survey (LiTS) was conducted in 2006 by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), an international financial institution to support the transition of ex-socialist countries toward a market economy, with a focus on the lives of people during this transition. The survey covered transition countries in so-called the former Soviet bloc[6]; however, Turkmenistan was excluded because of its political and social conditions. Turkey was included in its place — although it is not considered to be ex-socialist but rather one of the World Bank's European and Central Asian countries — as well as other countries in LiTS (except Mongolia). The data and questionnaire are available on the EBRD website.

The methodology of LiTS is detailed in its survey reports (Synovate, 2006; EBRD, 2007a). In each country, 1,000 interviews of adults (aged 18 or older) were collected from a nationally representative sample chosen through the probability proportionate to size (PPS) method[7]. Countries were first divided into primary sampling units (PSUs) based on census enumeration areas. From these PSUs 50 units were randomly chosen, and 20 respondents were also randomly selected from each of the 50 units. In Mongolia, however, a different method was used due to its sparse population and nomadic pastoralists. Mongolia was first split into the capital Ulaanbaatar and other areas. Nineteen PSUs out of 50 were allotted to the former Ulaanbaatar stratum, and the rest (31 PSUs) were allotted to the latter. Then PPS selection was used in each stratum[8].

There have already been researches using the LiTS data. Denisova et al. (2007) examined how transitions changed labor market structure. Transitions generated self-employment and a shift in the labor force from the state to the private sector. However, non-employment rose during the transitionary period, and it was not until 2001 when employment started to recover. The impact of transition on employment was different among countries as well as within job categories; the impact was stronger in the South Caucasus and Bosnia-Herzegovina, and high-skill labor was more impact-resistant than low or medium skill labor. Mongolia was one of the countries where, against the trend mentioned above, there was a shift in its labor force from non-employment to state sector.

Grosjean and Senik (2007a, 2007b) analyzed the relation between economic liberalization and preference toward democracy. In the analysis, the effects of distance in relation to the border was controlled, based on the assumption that a person living near the border and another person living in another region faced different degrees of market development even in the same country.

The finding was that democracy increased support for market liberalization, whereas market liberalization did not generate support for democracy.

Guriel and Zhuravskaya (2007) and Sanfey and Teksoz (2008) focused on life satisfaction. The former study used data from the World Values Survey (WVS)[9] and LiTS and revealed a stagnation in life satisfaction despite economic recovery, which contradicted the empirical fact that life satisfaction improves as the economy expands. One of the major factors affecting this result was sample bias in transition countries: non-response rates were higher in individuals with high incomes than those with low incomes. Other factors related to lower life satisfaction were deteriorated human capital and lack of stability. The latter study showed the difference in the effect of countries on life satisfaction; this effect was positive in Central Asian countries, Belarus, and most of the EU member states and negative in Southern European countries and Hungary; there was no significant effect in the Kyrgyz Republic, Mongolia, Poland, and Russia.

In addition to these researches, EBRD (2007b) offers a broad and detailed report of the survey results. It contains the analyses of living standards and measures of life, changes in the labor market, public services and attitudes toward environment. It provides information on the frequencies of questions by country, and therefore can be used as a source book of LiTS.

LiTS offers data revealing the attitudes of people toward transition in countries where nationwide surveys have rarely or never been conducted. However, it is a pity that LiTS seems relatively unknown compared with the AsiaBarometer and the ABS. It is necessary for experts on transition economies to utilize LiTS data before it becomes too outdated to be relevant.

V　Future Challenges and Perspectives

This study examined cross-national social surveys conducted in Mongolia: the AsiaBarometer, the ABS, and LiTS, and researches based on these surveys. Due to time constraints and information gathering capacity, this paper may not provide a complete list of references. Nevertheless, it determines, to a certain degree, a new form of Mongol study and its achievements.

The challenges posed by these surveys are twofold. The first is that these surveys must be conducted continuously. While the ABS conducted two surveys in Mongolia, LiTS is not a continuous survey, and it is not clear whether the AsiaBarometer repeats a survey in Mongolia. However, findings in the 2000s might not hold true after a certain period of time. It is necessary to repeat surveys so as to verify whether these findings still hold true.

The second challenge is to assure the validity in the interpretation of the survey results. As was discussed in Section 3, it is difficult to interpret the results logically in countries like Mongolia, where cross-national surveys were only recently introduced. Inaccurate interpretations, such as labeling Mongolia's tradition as Confucian, might raise doubts in researches based on these surveys.

Then, what should be done? A solution to the first challenge is to have Mongolia participate in worldwide social surveys such as the WVS or the ISSP[10]. Participants of such surveys can learn the skills and techniques as well as gain the experience necessary to implement nationwide quantitative surveys. Mongolian researchers have conducted field surveys of the AsiaBarometer and the ABS, and it is possible to organize research teams in Mongolia.

As for the second challenge, it is desirable for Mongolists to test the "findings" of existing studies. There is no guarantee that the experts in data analysis are familiar with the society and culture of Mongolia. Any interpretations of the social and cultural aspects of Mongolia should be reexamined by those who have mastered knowledge of the country. However, such reexamination requires the knowledge and skill of data analysis. It is necessary to nurture such researchers and to promote the collaboration of among data scientists and Mongolists.

Despite these challenges, cross-national social surveys are useful tools to enrich social science in Mongolia. By accumulating researches based on the data provided by these surveys, we can elucidate the reality of Mongolian people and society more accurately and precisely.

References

Albritton, Robert B. and Thawilwadee Bureekul (2005), 'Social and cultural supports for plural democracy in eight Asian nations: A cross-national, within-nation analysis' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.31.

Babbie, Earl (2004), "The Practice of Social Research (10th Edition)" Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, Belmont, CA.

Carlson, Matthew (2008), 'The Leadership, democracy and the impact of religion: An analysis of the AsiaBarometer and World Values Surveys' in Inoguchi (ed.), 367-382.

Chang, Eric and Yun-han Chu (2007), 'Traditionalism, political learning and conceptions of democracy in East Asia' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.39.

Chang, Alex, Yun-han Chu, and Yu-tzung Chang (2008), 'Analyzing the foundation for the economic priority in East Asia' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Chu, Yun-han, Yu-tzung Chang and Fu Hu (2003), 'Regime performance, value change and authoritarian detachment in East Asia' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.8.

Chu, Yun-han and Min-hua Huang (2007), 'A synthetic analysis of sources of democratic legitimacy' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.41.

Chu, Yun-han, Min-hua Huang and Yu-tzung Chang (2008), 'Quality of democracy and regime legitimacy in East Asia.' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Denisova, Irina, Markus Eller and Ekaterina Zhuravskaya (2007), 'Labor market flows in transition' "CEFIR Policy Paper Series".

EBRD (2007a), “Life in Transition: A Survey of People’s Experiences and Attitudes”.

EBRD (2007b), “Transition Report 2007: People in Transition”.

Flick, Uwe (2002), “An Introduction to Qualitative Research (2nd Edition)” Sage. (Translated into Japanese by Oda, Hiroshi, Noriko Yamamoto, Tsune Kasuga and Naoko Miyaji as “Shitsu teki kenkyu nyumon: ‘Ningen no kagaku’ no tameno hohoron”, 2002.)

Ganbat, Danba (2004), ‘The mass public and democratic politics in Mongolia’ “ABS Working Paper Series” No.29.

Ganbat, Danba (2007), ‘Mongolia country report Second wave of Asian Barometer Survey’ “ABS Working Paper Series” No.33.

Grosjean, Pauline and Claudia Senik (2007a), ‘Should market liberalisation precede democracy? causal relations between political preferences and development’ “EBRD Working Paper Series” No. 103.

Grosjean, Pauline and Claudia Senik (2007b), ‘Should market liberalisation precede democracy? causal relations between political preferences and development’ “IZA Discussion Paper” No. 2889.

Guriev, Sergei and Ekaterina Zhuravskaya (2007) ‘(Un)Happiness in transition’ “CEFIR/NES Working Paper Series” No. 111.

Huang, Min-hua, Yun-han Chu and Yu-tzung Chang (2007), ‘Quality of democracy and regime legitimacy in East Asia’ “ABS Working Paper Series” No.40.

Huang, Min-hua, Chang-yen Tsai and Yu-tzung Chang (2008), ‘The state of democratic governance in Taiwan: partisan-driven perceptions in political turbulence’ Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on “The State of Democratic Governance in Asia”, Taipei.

Ikeda, Ken’ichi, Yasuo Yamada and Masaru Kohno (2003), ‘Influence of social capital on political participation in Asian cultural context’ “ABS Working Paper Series” No.10.

Ikeda, Ken’ichi and Tetsuro Kobayashi (2007), ‘The influence of social capital on political participation in the cultural context of Asia’ “ABS Working Paper Series” No.37.

Iarosshi, Giuseppe (2006), “The Power of Survey Design” The World Bank, Washington.

Inoguchi, Takashi (2005), ‘The AsiaBarometer: Its origins, its principles and its prospects’ “Participation” 29(2): 16-18.

Inoguchi, Takashi (2006), ‘The AsiaBarometer question and answers’ Paper prepared for presentation at the World Congress of the International Political Science Association, Fukuoka, Japan.

Inoguchi, Takashi, ed. (2008), “Human beliefs and values in incredible Asia: South and Central Asia in focus country profiles and thematic analysis based on the AsiaBarometer 2005” Akashi shoten.

Inoguchi, Takashi and Zen-U Lucian Hotta (2006), ‘Quantifying social capital in Central and South Asia: Are there democratic, developmental, and regionalizing potentials?’ “Japanese Journal of Political Science” 7(2): 195-220.

Inoguchi, Takashi, and Seiji Fujii (2007), ‘The AsiaBarometer: Its Aim, its scope and its development’ downloaded from the AsiaBarometer website.

Inoguchi, Takashi and Zen-U Lucian Hotta (2008), ‘Quantifying social capital in Central and South

Asia: Are there democratic, developmental, and regionalizing potentials?' in Inoguchi (ed.), 327-349.

Janar, Turtogtoh (2008), 'Daily lifestyle and political attitudes of ordinary Mongolians' in Inoguchi (ed.)., 221-248.

Kawato, Akio (2006), '[Book review] Inoguchi, Takashi, Miguel Basáñez, Akihiko Tanaka and Timur Dadabaev (eds.) [2005] "AsiaBarometer: toshibu no kachikan to seikatu style -AsiaBarometer [2003] no bunseki to shiryo" (Inoguchi, Takashi, Miguel Basáñez, Akihiko Tanaka and Timur Dadabaev (eds.), 2005, Values and life styles in urban Asia: A Cross-cultural analysis and sourcebook based on the AsiaBarometer survey of 2003)' "Asia kenkyu" 52(1): 102-106.

Lam, Wai-man and Hsin-Chi Kuan (2003), 'Noises and interruptions ? The road to democracy', "ABS Working Paper Series" No.11.

Landman, Todd, Marco Larizza and Claire McEvoy (2005), 'State of democracy in Mongolia ? A desk study', Paper prepared for "Democracy Development in Mongolia: Challenges and Opportunities" national conference, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia.

Ma, Ngok and Kin-man Chan (2008), 'The state of democratic governance in Hong Kong' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Manabe, Kazufumi (2004), 'AsiaBarometer no data kaiseki - hohoronteki kentou to tansakuteki data kaiseki ?' (Data analysis of the AsiaBarometer survey - methodological discussions and exploratory data analysis -) "Kwansei Gakuin University School of Sociology Journal" 97: 1-24.

Manabe, Kazufumi (2006), 'Data analysis of the AsiaBarometer survey -Methodological discussions and exploratory data analysis-' "Kwansei Gakuin University School of Sociology Journal" 101: 25-40.

Manabe, Kazufumi (2008), 'Data analysis of the AsiaBarometer survey -Methodological discussions and exploratory data analysis-' in Inoguchi (ed.), 351-366.

Meerkerk, Dorie (2008), 'The state of democratic governance in Cambodia.' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Minato, Kunio (2008), 'Cross-national social survey in East Asia: World Values Survey, ISSP, AsiaBarometer, Asian Barometer, East Asia Value Survey and EASS', Institute of Regional Studies, Osaka University of Commerce and Institute of Social Science, University of Tokyo (eds.), "JGSS Monographs" 7:159-193.

Mujani, Saiful (2008), 'The state of Indonesia democratic governance: A popular assessment' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Nathan, Andrew (2003), 'Patterns of traditionalism in East Asia.' Presented at East Asia Barometer Conference on "How East Asians View Democracy: The Region in Global Perspective", Taipei.

Nathan, Andrew J (2007), 'Political culture and diffuse regime support in Asia' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.43.

Neuman, W. Laurence (2003), "Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches (5th Edition)" Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Park, Chong-Min and Doh Chull Shin (2005), 'Do East Asians view democracy as a lesser evil? Testing the Churchill's notion of democracy in East Asia' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.30.

Park, Chong-min and Jaechul Lee (2007), 'Are associations the schools of democracy across Asia?' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.38.

Pham, Thanh Nghi (2008), 'The state of democratic governance in Vietnam.' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Reed, Steven R. (2007), 'Analyzing secularization and religiosity in Asia,' "Japanese Journal of Political Science" 8(3): 327-339.

Reed, Steven R. (2008), 'Religiosity in Asia: preliminary analysis of the 2005 AsiaBarometer' in Inoguchi (ed.), 383-394.

Romero, Segundo, Eclar and Linda Luz Guerrero (2008), 'Philippine democracy and governance 2005: Insights from the Asian Barometer Surveys.' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Rose, Richard, William Mishler, Yun-han Chu and Neil Munro (2003), 'Asian values, post-communist legacies and generic influences on political trust: A substantive and methodological analysis' Presented at East Asia Barometer Conference on "How East Asians View Democracy: The Region in Global Perspective", Taipei.

Sanfey, Peter and Utku Teksoz (2008), 'Life in transition: are people happier after a decade and a half?' Paper Prepared for the 30th General Conference of The International Association for Research in Income and Wealth.

Shi, Tianjian (2003), 'Does it matter or not? Cultural impacts on the political process' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.13.

Shin, Doh Chull (2007a), 'Is not so bad good enough: Retesting Churchill's lesser-evil notion of democracy in East Asia' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.44.

Shin, Doh Chull (2007b), "Why East Asians react differently to democratic regime change: Discerning their routes to becoming authentic democrats" "ABS Working Paper Series" No. 45.

Shin, Doh Chull (2008a), 'The third wave in East Asia: Comparative and dynamic perspectives.' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia" Taipei.

Shin, Doh Chull (2008b), 'How East Asians understand democracy: From a comparative perspective.' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Shyu, Huoyan (2003), 'Political style in eight East Asian countries: A preliminary analysis' Presented at East Asia Barometer Conference on "How East Asians View Democracy: The Region in Global Perspective", Taipei.

Shyu, Huoyan (2007), 'Does economic performance matter? Economic evaluation and support for democracy in seven Asian Counties' Paper presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "Why Asians Support Democracy and Why Not?", Taipei.

Sonoda, Sigeto (2005), 'Vietnam: Social life under development and globalization', in Inoguchi et.

al. (eds.), "Values and Life Styles in Urban Asia: A Cross-Cultural Analysis and Sourcebook Based on the AsiaBarometer Survey of 2003" Mexico City: Siglo XXI Editores: 121-133.

Sonoda, Sigeto (2006), 'Chugoku kenkyu kara hikaku kenkyu he -'toi' wo toinaosu tameno seido kochiku to AsiaBarometer no yakuwari (From Chinese research to comparative research ? Role of the AsiaBarometer in establishing system to reexamine "questions"' "AsiaBarometer Project Series" 4:14-18.

Sonoda, Shigeto (2007), '"AsiaBarometer" ni miru Asia no katachi' (Form of Asia seen in the AsiaBarometer) "Waseda Asia Review" 1:30-33.

Sonoda, Shigeto (2008), 'Asia no nakano Asia jin ishiki' (Asian identity in Asia) "Waseda Asia Review" 3:28-31.

Synovate (2006), "Life in Transition Survey (LITS) 2006 a Brief Report on Observations, Experiences and Methodology from the Survey" retrieved on 17th February, 2009 from the EBRD website.

Tan, Ern Ser and Wang Zhengxu (2007), 'Are younger people in Asia more pro-democratic: Lifecycle effects or generational changes?' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.36.

Welsh, Bridget, Ibrahim Suffian and Andrew Aeria (2008), 'The state of democracy in Malaysia: public perceptions' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Wu, Chin-en and Yun-han Chu (2007), 'Income inequality and satisfaction with democracy: evidence from East Asia' "ABS Working Paper Series" No.42.

Yamada, Masahiro, Gill Steel, Kazunori Inamasu, Ken'ichi Ikeda and Naoko Taniguchi (2008), 'Country assessment report on the state of democratic governance Japan: pessimism in mature democracy' Presented at the Asian Barometer Conference on "The State of Democratic Governance in Asia", Taipei.

Notes

1) Researches called "field research" in this article are generally called "fieldwork". However, "fieldwork" also indicates implementation of quantitative survey in the field (interviews, distribution of questionnaires etc.), and using the term might cause confusion. Because of this, I use "field research" to refer to qualitative method.

2) See Babbie (2004), Neuman (2003) and Flick (2002) for issues in the controversy.

3) As for other countries, detailed methodology of survey has not been open to public at the end of February 2009.

4) The Global Barometer Survey was inaugurated in 2001 based on a partnership among the ABS (then East Asia Barometer), Latinobarometro, Afrobarometer and the Arab Barometer.

5) "Cognitive capability" refers to ability how many concepts a person can think of in regards to "democracy".

6) The countries surveyed in LiTS were Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, FYR Macedonia, Georgia, Hungary,

Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

7) See Iarossi (2006) for practical procedure.

8) Another exception is Serbia and Montenegro. Because Montenegro declared independence from Serbia in 2006, survey was conducted separately and 1,000 interviews were collected for each.

9) The WVS has conducted five waves of survey with a focus on value change and modernization since 1981. See the WVS website (http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/) and Minato (2008) for further information.

10) The ISSP (International Social Survey Programme) has been conducting annual surveys in variety of countries and regions all over the world. See the ISSP website (http://issp.org) and Minato (2008) for detail.

（みなと　くにお）