Social Capital in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos

Shunsuke MURAKAMI

(Professor of Social Thought, Senshu University)

Social Capital in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos

Shunsuke MURAKAMI†

Introduction

In 2009, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) launched a project entitled "Exploring Social Capital towards Sustainable Development in East Asia," as part of a support project for strategic basic research infrastructure at private universities. As part of research into social capital in Southeast Asia meanwhile, that same year the project's Civil Culture Group organized a questionnaire-based survey into social capital in three Southeast Asian countries (Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos). Whereas surveys and research into social capital in East Asia would ordinarily focus on China, South Korea and Japan, the decision was taken to conduct a preliminary small-scale questionnaire, in an effort to include experts from Southeast Asian countries as members of the group, within the context of the project as a whole. We intended to conduct social capital research in the three countries, in the hope that preparing, implementing and analyzing our research would assist with surveys and research throughout the project.

With that in mind, in fiscal 2009 we held a number of group research meetings and produced a questionnaire form designed to examine public consciousness in the three Southeast Asian societies in question, which have continued to evolve rapidly in recent years due to their transition to market economies. We focused on three key points, namely social trust, livelihood risks, and social rituals. With regard to social trust in particular, we tailored the questions to produce comparable results, alongside a survey into social capital commissioned by the Cabinet Office in fiscal 2002.

In fiscal 2010, we commenced full-scale negotiations with the research agencies commissioned to conduct the survey in the three chosen countries, Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The survey got underway in Vietnam in October that same year. We also began to visit the three countries, in order to negotiate directly with the commissioned research agencies, see the survey areas for ourselves and conduct interviews with local people.

In fiscal 2011, we continued to visit the survey areas and conduct interviews with local

---

† Professor of Social Thought, Senshu University

people, as the commissioned research agencies continued with the survey. We also received reports compiled by the commissioned research agencies in each of the three countries.

In fiscal 2012, we carefully read through the survey reports and entered into discussions with each of the commissioned research agencies, to clear up any uncertainties regarding the contents of their reports and any other queries relating to their data.

As the questionnaire-based survey was always intended to be a small-scale survey, it was subject to a number of limitations. Of these, the issue that particularly needs to be mentioned is the small sample size. This met with internal opposition and criticism right from the start, and was strongly criticized by the commissioned research agencies too. We responded to the relevant criticisms as follows. It is simply not possible to identify generalized characteristics of an entire population through a questionnaire-based survey like this. In Vietnam for instance, the areas around Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City are completely different from an historical, geographical and social standpoint. Even if we were to conduct a large-scale survey, the results would not provide an accurate picture of "social capital in Vietnam." By restricting surveys to specific areas, we knew from the beginning that the results would be limited. In spite of the small sample size, we would be able to survey and compare urban and rural areas, and learn about rapid development and changes in modern society. With that in mind, we intended to compensate for the survey's small scale by adopting a more qualitative approach, including interviews. When the survey was actually conducted however, we were forced to acknowledge that there were issues with the small sample size and the questionnaire form itself. Based on our experiences in the Civil Culture Group, efforts are currently being made to remove limitations such as these from a similar survey being carried out in China as part of the larger project.

In addition to issues such as these, conducting a survey targeting specific areas also brought a number of other problems to light. In Laos for instance, it turned out that a large number of public officials live in the survey area in Vientiane, which effectively skewed the results for that area, as discussed later in this report. In Vietnam meanwhile, the urban survey area in Nam Dinh is yet to be affected by the drastic changes occurring in areas such as Hanoi. If anything, the inhabitants of the rural survey area have been affected by Vietnam's modern economic development to a greater extent because many are migrant workers who go to work in Hanoi.

There were more specific limitations too. The survey involved visiting people's homes to conduct interviews in person. Due to the limited area however, the percentage of men and women in the sample varied significantly. As interviews were conducted with people who were at home when visits took place, they also tended to be from older age groups. The fiscal 2002 survey commissioned by the Cabinet Office meanwhile produced results based on separate postal and online surveys. This produced varying results, because people from younger age groups completed the online survey, whereas the postal survey was completed by various age groups. If a survey has an uneven percentage of men and women, or is skewed in favor of certain age groups, the results tend to exhibit associated tendencies. In spite of limitations such as these however, we proceeded to compare survey results between the three countries and between

urban and rural areas. Rather than generalized characteristics, these should be regarded as comparisons of the characteristics of specific areas in different societies.

After trying to consider theoretical differences concerning the concept of social capital at the first part of this report, the second part outlines the survey process and the chosen urban and rural survey areas in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The third part provides an overview of the individual reports submitted by the commissioned research agencies. Each of the agencies compiled their own survey report upon completion, in accordance with their respective contracts. The reports from both Vietnam and Cambodia were compiled by enthusiastic young researchers and each is available to read in full as a research paper. The survey report from Laos merely commented on the data, rather than drawing any conclusions, and therefore cannot be covered in any detail in this report. The fourth section compares characteristics in the three countries, based on their respective survey results, against those in Japan (Cabinet Office commissioned survey, fiscal 2002), focusing particularly on responses relating to "social trust."

In addition to technical issues such as those outlined above, a meeting between members of the Civil Culture Group in 2009 also revealed differing perceptions regarding the concept of "social capital." As a result, another issue we had to address in order to work together as a group was how to get everyone on the same page from a theoretical standpoint. Broadly speaking, we think that social capital contributes to democratization in the investigated countries. But we have not yet reached an agreement, among the members of our research project, over how we should evaluate the conventional character of the community that we have found. This may be a problem not just for us but also for those who are concerned with the social capital debate in general. Such differences among the members, however, have not affected this joint field investigation, as we maintain the common aim to explore what communities are really like in different countries and regions.

1 . A viewpoint to the concept of social capital

Despite being the focus of much attention since the 1990s, the concept of "social capital" is still maturing. This is compounded by entirely different methods of formulating hypotheses, conducting surveys and carrying out analysis depending on the approach taken.

Certainly, theoretical studies have been conducted into various different types of social capital (bonding and bridging, formal and informal, inward- and outward-looking, horizontal and vertical, etc.), along with numerous empirical studies. Before we start defining all these different types however, there is a crucial difference between approaches to social capital that we need to consider. Approaches are either based on "individual goods" or "collective goods." Mitsunori Ishida, who translated parts of Nan Lin's "Social Capital, A Theory of Social Structure and Action" into Japanese, explains in the bibliographical introduction to the book that the two schools of social capital research are divided into "research focusing on the effects of social capital as an individual good" and "research focusing on the effects of social capital as a collective good." He cites Nan Lin as an example of the former, and Robert Putnam as an example of the latter (Ishida, 2001).

The individual-good approach is characterized as follows. "Whether the subject is a person or a group, the focus is on the subject as an 'individual' and its relationship with the social ties and networks that surround it, so as to examine how the latter benefits the former" (Ishida, 2001, p.319). The collective-good approach on the other hand is defined as "the perception of social capital as a resource that is shared by members belonging to a certain group, area or country. Collective studies take the viewpoint that networks, norms, trust and other bonds formed within a group contribute to the healthy growth of group members and help increase group efficiency" (Ishida, 2001, p.320).

As Ishida points out, there are theorists who strongly advocate the first of these approaches, such as Nan Lin, and those who support the second approach, such as Robert Putnam. Elinor Ostrom meanwhile is interested in analyzing social capital within smaller "communities," and is therefore positioned somewhere between these two approaches (Murakami, Shunsuke, 2011).

Robert Putnam was instrumental in focusing broader attention on the concept of social capital during the latter part of the 1990s, although there were pioneers in the field before him. Following the publication of "Making Democracy Work" in 1993 and "Bowling Alone" in 2000, Putnam was invited to a symposium organized by a German federal government research commission, "The Future of Civic Engagement," on "Citizen Participation and Social Capital" in 2001. At the symposium, he gave a speech entitled "Social Capital in Germany and the USA" (Putnam, 2002, pp. 257-271). Under the leadership of the Social Democrat Chancellor Gerhard Schroder, who was interested in the concept of social capital as a means of revitalizing civil society, Putnam attracted a great deal of attention within Germany.

Around the same time, the World Bank was exploring and actively promoting research into social capital from the standpoint of development aid, which also helped to focus the world's attention on the concept (Sato, Hiroshi, 2001, pp.16-18). Elinor Ostrom took part in various symposiums and events sponsored by the World Bank, and was particularly interested in social relationships within smaller local communities and the effective role they play in development aid (e.g. Irrigation system management in villages in Nepal, Ostrom, 2009). Co-authored with Toh-Kyeong Ahn, Ostrom contributed a research paper entitled "A Social Science Perspective on Social Capital: Social Capital and Collective Action" to the 11 volumes of a "Library" published by the aforementioned German federal government's "The Future of Civic Engagement" commission. She referred to the individual-good approach and the collective-good approach as "minimalist" and "expansionist" respectively, and broadly allied herself with the latter by adopting an expansionist stance (Ostrum/Ahn, 2003).

The "Library" by the German federal government's "The Future of Civic Engagement" commission had an immediate impact as soon as it was published (2002-2003). It became one of the main focuses for criticism in "Civil Society and Social Capital," which was published the following year in 2004 (Klein, Ansgar/Kristine Kern/Brigitte Geißel/Maria Berger (Hrsg.) 2004). Despite accepting the underlying need to revitalize civil society and democratize people as members of society, rather than dismissing the arguments put forward by the research

commission entirely, the main criticisms revolved around rejecting the idealistic normalization of civil society and highlighting the problems inherent in our modern society (Ref: Murakami, 2010).

As a result, one of the book's key arguments inevitably involved criticizing Putnam. The authors argued that, in reality, there was no fortuitous causal relationship between creating a good civil society underpinned by active civil associations on the one hand, and creating social and political trust (integration) on the other.

Another argument that emerged with a clear focus on Ostrom was Sandra Seubert's "Theoretical Analysis of Democracy and the Concept of Social Capital" in 2009 (Seubert, 2009). Seubert once again referenced "The Future of Civic Engagement" research commission and Putnam, and argued that the purpose of social capital research is to determine the extent to which the autonomous collaboration and self-organization envisioned in a civil society can change and improve existing national and social systems. In that respect, she was undoubtedly adopting the collective-good approach. Seubert put the ways in which social trust is formed at the heart of the problem and set out her own theory, in contrast to the argument put forward by Ostrom. In her literature in the research commission's "Library," Ostrom explained the creation of social trust and reciprocity in terms of the exchange of goods. A pays B, which then provides A with goods in return, thereby establishing an exchange relationship and creating trust. If we extend that to third-party transactions with C, D, and so on, then the trusting relationship grows, as those other parties are also trading with A. "It is possible that even an extremely selfish individual would not cheat someone who trusts them under these circumstances," explains Ostrom. "In fact, a selfish individual who is embedded in unfailingly repeated interaction is likely to respond to trust. And he does so because he is selfish, quite simply, and because he expects profits from future transactions with someone who trusts him." (Ostrom/Ahn, 2003, pp.55-59). She also states that people can trust total strangers in some cases, based on observable characteristics such as their appearance, clothing, gender, age and language.

Seubert picks up on Ostrom's point about trust based on "observable characteristics" and initially appears to agree. In reality however, she is criticizing Ostrom's assertion that trust originates from the exchange of goods. "The traditional model of collective action […] is based on the action understanding and rational understanding originating from individual people's calculations of utility," explains Seubert, including Putnam in her argument. "In response to this, social capital is also being conceptualized using the logic of investment and profits. However, this approach comes up against the question of whether rationality, a concept borrowed from economics, can capture the distinctive logic of society or not, and whether we can appropriately judge the meaning of social moral resources for the sake of democracy" (Seubert, 2009, p.93).

Rather than basing social capital on this "rational preference approach," Seubert looks for an alternative starting point and finds it in the "theoretical basis of social communication, essentially revolving around Habermas' theory" (Seubert, 2009, p.98). She argues that reciprocal trust, which is at the heart of social capital, and the resulting formation of social norms,

represents "an agreement expressed in words." This in turn relies on "the power of an individual promise." "The expression of an individual promise turns the reneging of that promise into a question of individual identity. If someone does not keep their word, he is no longer the person he declared himself to be beforehand. As human beings, we envision cooperative solutions to problems by understanding norms that we consider to be worthwhile and fair, within the context of communicative interaction" (Seubert, 2009, pp.96-97).

Verbal communication creates a sense of self-obligation to keep promises that have been made. Seubert regards this as the basis of social trust. "Normative potential depends on the moral cohesive strength that arises out of interaction, and the shared sense of obligation that creates" (Seubert, 2009, p.115) (Ref: Murakami, 2011).

For members of a civil society however, this means that social trust, which forms the basis of social capital, depends on non-utilitarian communication within their sphere of everyday life, or on a certain "something" emotional and human, underpinned by a sense moral self-awareness. As such, going beyond a "rational preference approach," as Seubert does, inevitably creates problems because it can involve dealing with attributes such as self-awareness and humanity, and focusing particularly on values, even with the best of intentions. As well as underlining the strong influence on Jurgen Habermas' theories on modern civil society, Seubert's argument also raises common issues affecting "modern" civil society theory as a whole, not just in Germany.

Nan Lin's individual-good approach makes an effort to avoid issues such as these relating to norms and values. Lin defines social capital as "the resources embedded in social networks accessed and used by actors for actions," the aim of which is the "minimization of loss and the maximization of gain." His consistent argument that these resources contribute to the rational (utilitarian) maximization of gain on an individual level is an attempt to discuss social capital anomically, without recourse to norms or values, in contrast to the collective-good approach. As a result, "the difficulty arises when social capital is discussed as a collective or even public good, along with trust, norms and other 'collective' or public goods. What has resulted in the literature is that the terms have become alternative or substitutable terms or measurements. Divorced from its roots in individual interactions and networking, social capital becomes merely another trendy term to employ or deploy in the broad context of improving or building social integration and solidarity. I intend to argue that social capital should be regarded as a relational asset and kept separate from collective assets and goods such as culture, norms and trust" (Lin, 2008, pp.9-10).

However, attempting an anomic approach means that, as soon as an individual gains something, it becomes impossible to exclude social relationships from social capital. For instance, a common discussion amongst German theorists is how to handle close relationships within groups such as the mafia or neo-Nazis. Even without going to such extremes, the question of how to differentiate between solidarity in a traditional society and solidarity in a modern society, or how social capital has changed structurally and altered society as a result, would never come up under the individual-good approach. As a result, Lin inevitably bases his

argument on existing social relationships and systems, rather than perceiving them as issues.

If Lin uses the collective-good approach at all, then it is when he discusses "social exchange," as opposed to "economic exchange." Even in a "social exchange," free from the rational confines of an economic exchange (transactional rationality), individual exchanges are based on "relational rationality," irrespective of any superficial losses. Lin uses the term "prestige" to refer to individual gains resulting from such exchanges. Defined as "the aggregation of episodes of recognition accrued to an actor in a social group or community," the concept of "prestige" presupposes that social value is fixed (Lin, 2001, pp.149-154). When dealing with social relationships involving different values however, "prestige" also varies. As well as attempting to remain anomic, Lin's individual-good approach is effectively trying to fix existing social systems.

Lin's comprehensive theory on social relationships based on utilitarian rationality however does not distinguish between communal social relationships in traditional societies and civil social relationships in modern societies. In fact one argument has emerged that actually supports his definition of social relationships as a form of "capital" offering individual gains, in the form of "Social Capital Theory: Towards a Methodological Foundation" by the young Czech researcher Julia Häuberer (Häuberer, 2011). "Putnam's scope of associations building networks of civic engagement is very limited," she comments, providing the following explanation. "He overlooks the fact that his research took place in countries where membership in associations is a key component of social capital (USA and Italy), which is not valid for other countries (e.g. post-communist nations like the Czech Republic, Poland, etc. where informal networks play the most significant role" (Häuberer, 2011, p.60). She concludes by saying, "we need to include all kinds of relationships into the social capital concept not only relations in traditional associations" (Häuberer, 2011, p.61).

She explains that this is based on her own awareness of the situation in the Czech Republic. "The formation of social networks in the Czech Republic is based heavily on past experiences of communism and the transition to capitalism. Whereas communism was characterized by political control and enforced membership, capitalism brought with it consumerism and individualism. Both systems brought about a generalized decline in trust and the rejection of civic engagement by the majority of the Czech people. As a result, people resorted to informal networks as their main source of access to social capital" (Häuberer, Julia 2011, p.252). With that in mind, Häuberer is full of praise for Lin's definition of social capital, on the basis that it can be used without distinction between traditional and modern societies.

In terms of the depth of tradition within associations, social capital in the context of an active civil society, and increasing social efficiency, there is undoubtedly an awareness of social reform inherent in Putnam's collective-good approach. Despite taking into account social reform and being based on the collective-good approach however, Putnam's theories have been heavily criticized on the grounds that there isn't necessarily a fortuitous causal relationship between (civil) social capital and democratic efficiency.

If using the collective-good approach, it becomes necessary to discuss social structure

and social awareness. Seubert for instance argues that social trust and the formation of norms are based on mutual promises and self-obligation, or self-awareness, underpinned by communicative actions that go beyond economic rationalism. Arguments such as this are actually very common in theories on modern civil society. They state that citizens are people with moral self-awareness, and that those citizens make up civil society. In the face of theories based on self-awareness like that, even Nan Lin starts to falter.

That is why Ostrom's explanation envisions two parties exchanging goods as the origin of social relationships, trust and norms, despite being based on the collective-good approach. From the author's point of view, it is sufficient to refer back to Adam Smith, who has already set out arguments such as these.

Nan Lin was reluctant to extend the collective-good approach into the realm of "values" such as social trust and norms. He consistently defined social capital from a utilitarian perspective, based on actions aimed at maximizing gain and minimizing loss for the individual. That means however that social capital is never regarded as problematic as long as it produces gains for the individual, regardless of whether social relationships are traditional or even "negative." This is reflected in arguments put forward by the likes of James Coleman. Changes to existing social relationships are regarded as even less problematic, which is completely at odds with the notion of analyzing social capital with a view to taking on the challenge of forming and revitalizing civil society. At the same time however, there is support for Lin's approach amongst theorists from post-communist nations who understand the powerful presence of traditional social relationships, such as Häuberer. Despite dealing with the same subject of social capital, there are evidently fundamental differences in perspective between the collective-good approach and the individual-good approach. A substantial gulf is likely to open up between these two approaches with regard to social capital theory and field surveys too, depending on what values are attached to traditional social relationships and social awareness, especially in developing areas that are dominated by traditional social relationships.

Determining how to attach values to traditional social relationships in a traditional society is a key issue for social capital surveys in Southeast Asia. As the same differences of opinion were shared by group members working on the project, they could potentially have impacted on the survey in terms of formulating hypotheses, compiling questionnaire forms and interpreting the results. That did not mean however that we needed to completely eliminate those differences in order to proceed with joint research. The first step was to examine the differences between social relationships in different societies. This was not only feasible, but also essential if we wanted to identify the characteristics of social capital in our society. There were a number of issues meanwhile that everyone agreed on, including whether the rapid economic development of countries in Southeast Asia could actually change social relationships and social awareness, whether it was already possible to detect signs of such changes, and whether policies and systems would be able to adapt to any such changes in the future, as new forms of social capital. With that in mind, we decided as a group that we would go ahead with the questionnaire-based survey, as an initial attempt to ascertain social relationships and levels

of social awareness in different societies. The following section outlines the survey process, opinions expressed by the commissioned research agencies, and our own comments on comparisons between the three countries.

2．Outline of survey in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos

Following the launch of the project in 2009, the Civil Culture Group prepared and implemented a survey into social capital in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia based on the following process.

2009 (2nd half)		Formulated plans, compiled questionnaire forms
2010 (1st half)		Negotiated and exchanged contracts with commissioned research agencies in each country
		Vietnam: Institute of Sociology, Vietnamese Academy of Social Studies
		Laos: Research & Academic Service Office, National University of Laos
		Cambodia: Cambodia Development Resource Institute (CDRI)
	Sept.	Visited Vietnam and Laos (negotiations with commissioned research agencies)
		Visited urban area in Vietnam (survey area: Vi Xuyen ward, Nam Dinh city)
	Oct.	Conducted survey in urban area in Vietnam (Vi Xuyen ward, Nam Dinh city)
2011	Jan.	Conducted survey in urban area in Laos (three villages in Chanthaboury district, Vientiane Municipality)
		Visited Cambodia (negotiations with commissioned research agency)
	May.	Conducted survey in rural area in Vietnam (Giao Tan commune, Giao Thuy district, Nam Dinh province)
	Aug.	Visited Cambodia (discussions with commissioned research agency) and Vietnam (rural survey area: Giao Tan commune)
	Oct.	Conducted survey in rural area in Laos (two villages in Meuang Feuang district, Vientiane province)
		Conducted survey in urban area (Siem Reap city) and rural area (Baban village, Prey Veng province) in Cambodia
2012	Feb.	Visited urban and rural survey areas in Laos (interviews conducted by Takeko Iinuma)
	Aug.	Visited Laos (two villages in Meuang Feuang district, Vientiane province)

We conducted interviews with local residents as part of our visits to the survey areas, with the commissioned research agencies acting as intermediaries (see attachment). In addition to the above visits, discussions and contract negotiations with the commissioned research agencies

continued all the way through to the start of the survey in each country, with roles divided between group members. The following section provides an outline of the survey areas.

List of survey areas

Urban Vietnam	Rural Vietnam	Urban Cambodia	Rural Cambodia	Urban Laos	Rural Laos
October, 2010	May, 2011	October, 2011	October, 2011	January, 2011	October, 2011
Nam Dinh province	Nam Dinh province	Siem Reap province	Prey Veng province	Vientiane Municipality	Vientiane province
Nam Dinh city	Giao Thuy district	Siem Reap district	Peam Ro district	Chanthaboury district	Meuang Feuang district
Vi Xuyen ward	Giao Tan commune	Sala Kamreauk commune	Babaong commune	Nongping village	Nakang village
			Babaong village	Phonesavang village	Done village
				Nongthatai village	
100 Samples	100 Samples	200 Samples	200 Samples	116 Samples	116 Samples
30:70	30:70	26:74	35:65	45：55	60：40
Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences Institute of Sociology		Cambodia Development Resource Institute (CDRI)		National University of Laos Research and Academic Service Office	

Vietnam: Urban area

Survey area: Vi Xuyen ward, Nam Dinh city, Nam Dinh province

(2,500 households, 10,500 people)

Nam Dinh province has an area of 1,669km² and a population of over 2 million (ethnicity: 90% Kinh, 10% Tay, Muong, Hoa). 17.1% of people live in urban areas and 82.9% in rural areas.

Industries in Vi Xuyen ward include family-run small-scale industries, service and commerce. The ward has access to electricity and water.

Vietnam: Rural area

Survey area: Giao Tan commune, Giao Thuy district, Nam Dinh province

(2,600 households, 8,200 people)

Located 50km east from Nam Dinh city, Giao Tan commune is surrounded by paddy fields in the alluvial area of the Red River, with paddy fields accounting for 304 hectares out of 504 hectares. Annual rice production per hectare is 11,454 tons. 70% of people work in agriculture. The average annual income is 5 million dong (slightly higher than the state-designated poverty line of 4.8 million dong), rising to 10 million dong in households where one member is a migrant worker. Many residents do migrant work in cities such as Hanoi. There is an emphasis on education.

Cambodia: Urban area

Survey area: Voat Damnak village, Sala Kamreauk commune, Siem Reap city, Siem Reap province

Sala Kamreauk is one of the 13 communes that make up Siem Reap city. Siem Reap province has a population of 896,443, Siem Reap district 230,714 and Sala Kamreauk

commune 26,252. Voat Damnak village consists of 749 households and is home to 4,415 people. As well as a thriving tourist industry, catering to the rapidly increasing number of tourists visiting Angkor Wat, fishing on Tonle Sap Lake is another growth industry.

Cambodia: Rural area

Survey area: Baban village, Peam Ro district, Prey Veng province

(579 households, 2,656 people)

Prey Veng province is in Cambodia's southern grain belt, located 90km south from Phnom Penh. It has a population of 1,103,703, with 80.5% working in agriculture and 13.7% in fishing. The province has an area of 4,883km² and is made up of 12 districts. Baban village (579 households, 2,656 people) is located in Babang commune, in Peam Ro district.

Laos: Urban area

Survey area: Three villages, Chanthaboury district, Vientiane Municipality

Nongping village (475 households, approx. 2,000 people) Phonesavang village (628 households, 4,000 people) and Nongthatai village (443 households, 2,081 people) are currently home to large numbers of public officials and workers, with very few residents employed in agriculture (as of 2011). Public officials account for 80% of the working population in Phonesavang village in particular, and 40% in Nongthatai village.

Laos: Rural area

Survey area: Nakang village (395 households, 2,338 people) and Done village (97 households, 464 people), Meuang Feuang district, Vientiane province

Both villages have long histories, having been established in the 17th or 18th centuries. The main industries are agriculture (rice) and livestock. Paddy fields are surrounded by preserved forestland and forests for everyday use.

3．Outline of survey reports from each country

From 2011 onwards, once the survey was completed, the commissioned research agencies sent us their respective survey reports. The research agency in Vietnam compiled separate reports based on survey results for the urban area and the rural area, including conclusions drawn by research staff. The research agency in Cambodia conducted surveys in both urban and rural areas in no time at all and compiled the survey results for both areas into a single survey report. The research agency in Laos produced separate survey reports for the urban area and the rural area, but they merely commented on the data rather than including conclusions drawn by research staff. The following section outlines the survey reports from each country. The section on Laos outlines data and facts only, as there were no opinions or conclusions included in the report.

Outline of Vietnam survey report

The Vietnamese Academy of Social Studies Institute of Sociology, the commissioned research agency in Vietnam, submitted the following two survey reports.

February 2011: "Exploring Social Capital towards Sustainable Development in East Asia," 52 pages (survey results for urban area)

August 2011: "Exploring Social Capital towards Sustainable Development in East Asia: The Case of Giao Tan Commune," 41 pages (survey results for rural area)

Vietnam: Urban area

The February 2011 survey report on the urban area in Vietnam consisted of the following.

INTRODUCTION

1. Vietnam's socio-economic context in brief
2. Socio-economic context of survey site
    2.1. Socio-economic characteristics of Nam-Dinh province
    2.2. Socio-economic characteristics of Vi-Xuyen ward
3. Social demographic characteristics of the sample
    3.1. Social demographic characteristics of the respondents
    3.1.1. Demographic characteristics:
    3.1.2. Social characteristics:
    3.2. Social demographic characteristics of the households
    3.2.1. Households' size and structure
    3.2.2. Households' living conditions
    3.2.3. Households' economic conditions
4. Social capital: Findings from the field
    4.1. Social capital and social life
    4.1.1. Social capital and social trust
    4.1.2. Social capital and social participation
    4.1.3. Social capital and living maintenance
    4.2. Social capital and social safety net
    4.2.1. Social capital and social risks
    4.2.2. Social capital and healthcare provision
    4.2.3. Social capital and unemployment
    4.2.4. Social capital and social support
    4.3. Social capital and social rituals, customs, and norms
    4.3.1. Self-management and gender's roles:
    4.3.2. Social capital and social network in wedding ceremonies
    4.3.3. Social capital and social network in funeral ceremonies
    4.3.4. Social capital and social network in local ritual ceremonies

CONCLUSION

The "Introduction" section of the report starts by explaining sampling, research and data analysis methods, before providing an overview of the current socio-economic situation in Vietnam. The report focuses on positive developments such as the country's changing industrial

structure, declining poverty rate (falling agricultural employment coupled with the growth of industry and the service sector) and improving unemployment figures, driven primarily by an average year-on-year GDP growth rate of 8.2% from 2006 to 2008 and rapid economic growth of 6.78% in 2010. At the same time however, it also highlights a number of serious issues that have started to emerge, including inequality, unemployment, underemployment, migrant labor and social security.

The report goes on to examine rapid economic growth in Nam Dinh province, pointing out that industrial production grew by an average of 28.1% during the three-year period from 2006 to 2008. With increased industrial production and growth in the retail and service sectors in particular, the private economic sector accounted for roughly 80% of GDP in 2008. In spite of the continuing process of urbanization, 17.1% of the population lived in urban areas and 82.9% in rural areas as of 2008.

Moving on to the socio-economic characteristics of Vi Xuyen ward, the report states that nearly 500 of the 2,500 households (10,500 people) living in the downtown area run their own retail businesses. 46.5% of the area's working population is in employment, while a further 15.2% are retired. Individual income per capita is 900,000 VND (Vietnamese dong). 100% of homes are supplied with electricity, have running water and own a television.

Looking at the survey results for the ward, one of the most distinctive findings concerns levels of social trust, indicating that "the respondents have high confidence in others" (p.13). As discussed in the overview of survey results in Section 3 of this report however, the distribution of responses varied between the urban area and rural area in Vietnam, with people in the rural area expressing higher levels of trust. Trust varied between Vietnam and the other two countries too.

The report has the following to say with regard to participation in social activities. "Although the percentage of local participants in the social activities is quite high (75%), but these participatory activities usually tend to the spiritual benefits. The most popular activities which they participate in include sports, hobbies, recreation (89.3%). The medium level includes other activities (visit, encourage) and lending loans for production (34.7% and 30.6%). Other activities such as Disaster or crime prevention; irrigation and water sources management, environmental protection and activities at work (labor union...) attract less participants with the percentage is 10.7%; 1.3% and 13.3% respectively" (p.23).

It is important to note however that the majority of these "social activities" are publically organized activities. Community organizations are formed on a wide scale in Vietnam, through "mass organizations." According to the report, "The mass organizations include Women's Union, Veterans' Organization, Youth Union, Peasant Association, etc. The voluntary social organizations include coeval association, school-fellow association, colleague association, association of bonsai, etc." (p.20). The survey report on the rural area lists specific names of some of these organizations. Social activities such as these cannot be equated with spontaneous association.

There were two questions relating to social trust in the questionnaire, so it is worth looking

at how the report analyzes the results based on the relevant responses. The first of these two questions was Q21, which asked, "For help with the problems and worries of daily life (unemployment, little income, illness, food shortage, access to water, etc.), what kind of person or organization do you feel you can rely on?" Respondents were asked to choose between "very reliable," "somewhat reliable," "not very reliable" and "cannot rely at all" for the following people or organizations; (1) city hall, town or village hall, etc., (2) public institutions such as schools or hospitals, (3) police or firefighting organization, (4) military, (5) political party, politicians, (6) organization in nearby community (neighborhood association, etc.), (7) volunteer, NPO or civic group, etc. (8) religious organization such as a temple or church, (9) employer, (10) coworkers, (11), people in neighborhood, (12) family, (13) relatives, and (14) friends, acquaintances.

The second question was Q25, which asked, "In the community where you live, if a major natural disaster or incident happened, what kind of person or organization could you rely on?" Respondents were asked to choose the same options for the same people and organizations as Q21.

These questions were compiled to correspond with questions in the fiscal 2002 survey commissioned by the Cabinet Office. One key difference however was the addition of people and organizations not included in the Japanese survey, including military, political parties and politicians, and religious organizations such as temples and churches. The categories "workplace" and "police" in the 2002 Cabinet Office survey were also changed to "employer" and "police or firefighting organization" respectively.

In the urban area of Vietnam, respondents were split roughly 50-50 between those who trusted public organizations with regard to "problems and worries of daily life" and those who didn't. A higher percentage (60-70%) said that they could rely on public organizations in the event of a "major natural disaster or incident" however, with around 80% of people placing their trust in their "city hall, town or village hall, etc." in particular. In spite of these varying trends, respondents overwhelmingly said that they could rely on their family and relatives, whether dealing with "problems and worries of daily life" or a "major natural disaster or incident."

The report added the following comments.

"The survey result shows that the social capital keeps the important role in the activities including risk prevention, health care, supporting the unemployed/no job people […] among which the most remarkableness if the binding social capital which is associated with the relationships of family members, friends, close neighbors" (p.51).

The report goes on to describe these trends in the following manner. It may be restrained, but the authors' views are nonetheless apparent. "The positive significance of the relation associated with the reliability in such range, the less reliability on the people who is out of the relationship groups probably causes the "anti- function" nature of social capital when the high reliability is mainly on the "close relationship" group." This may promote the activities which benefit the people of the group and lack the equitable behavior with the people who are not

under the group. The standards (especially the unofficial standards) will be generated stably in the group with a same implicit understanding way as to bring the benefits for people who is belong to the group and eliminate the benefits of people who is not belong to the group. Therefore, this un-expanded social network is probably a factor which holds back the development" (p.50).

This moderate view seems to suggest the limitation of the trust relationship confined in families and relatives, and the necessity for its extension widely beyond the family ties.

Vietnam: Rural area

The August 2011 survey report on the rural area in Vietnam consisted of the following.

INTRODUCTION

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

RESEARCH METHODS AND APPROACH

RESEARCH FINDINGS

1. Introduction of Giao Tan commune

2. Social-demographic and socio-economic characteristics about respondents

3. Social capital: Initial findings

   3.1 Social trust

   3.2. Norms and values

   3.3. Social networks and benefits

CONCLUSION

As well as outlining the research methods used in the "Introduction," the "Research methods and approach" section explains that the survey report on the Giao Tan commune includes a qualitative (interview-based) survey to make up for the relatively small sample size. As a result, the authors' opinions are more clearly apparent in this report than in the survey report on the urban area.

The report states that Giao Tan commune is a rural community located in the rice belt area 50km east of Nam Dinh city, with 304 hectares of the commune's 504.5 hectares given over to rice cultivation. Giao Tan has a population of 8,200 (2,600 households) and consists of 84 "kinships." The majority are Buddhist followers, but there is also a small percentage of Christians. There are numerous grand churches visible from Giao Tan in other nearby rice-growing communes, some of which are home to large numbers of Christian followers.

As the commune is located in a rice belt area, 95% of its residents work in agriculture. Despite the commune's proximity to coastal tourist destinations, there is no tourist service industry. With no access to tap water, the residents of Giao Tan use wells and rain water instead, and essentially lead self-sufficient lives. This is partially due to the fact that there is no market, with the exception of a small-scale temporary market set up in 2009.

One of the key characteristics of the commune is its high percentage of migrant laborers. According to local authority statistics, "about 2,000 laborers (24 percent of total work force) at

the age of 24-50 have left for cities or other provinces nationwide to find jobs" (p.10). The report states that the actual number is higher than that, estimating it to be around one third of the working population. This effectively distorted the gender composition and age range of the survey sample. 70% of respondents were female, with only 20% aged under 40.

On the subject of migrant labor, the report states that the average annual income per capita is 10 million VND, higher than the new poverty line of 4.8 million VND set out in 2010. This is due to income being sent back home by migrant laborers. The daily wage for a migrant laborer demolishing houses in Hanoi, as part of the redevelopment of the city, ranges from 150,000 to 200,000 VND (p.12). The report points out however that this is extremely low, especially compared to new criteria that put the average annual income per capita in rural areas at 16 million VND (p.11). The first thing we noticed upon visiting the commune however was that each of the kinship groups has its own elaborate shrine. The commune was also surrounded by lush green paddy fields, so there was no obvious sense of poverty. As there is an emphasis on education within the area however, school fees put pressure on household finances.

In terms of actual findings, the report draws the conclusion from the survey results and qualitative survey that Giao Tan commune is an intimate, closed society underpinned by the traditional nature of social relationships within the commune.

The survey results for Giao Tan commune indicate that levels of social trust are higher than in the urban area. Whereas the distribution of responses in the urban area was 9.0% "most people can be trusted," 54.0% "a lot of people can be trusted" and 33.0% "some people can be trusted," the equivalent percentages for the rural area were 25.0%, 40.0% and 24.0%.

In terms of social characteristics, the report states that Giao Tan is a " 'half-closed, half-open' community" (p.15). The specific reason for this is the commune's high percentage of migrant laborers. As urban renewal continues on the back of rapid economic development, migrant laborers are said to have " 'left to destroy Ha Noi', a joke about their work for demolishing old houses to build new ones. […] Many people (here) left for Ha Noi, some went for gold-mining, some went to Central Vietnam to work as coffee growers or coffee-bean pickers" (p.12). As a result, "it is considered "open" as one third of its labor force are working far away and only return home in lunar New Year Tet or on special occasions. It is "closed" as among those stayed, social link and interaction within the community is stronger than outside" (p.15).

According to the report, one example of how social relationships are characterized in Giao Tan is the commune's "gold guild," which is explained as follows. "A group of people contribute certain amount of gold (normally 1 chi of gold per season) and members in turn use aggregated amount. The guild is similar to bank loans and bank deposits, but interest rate is determined by members. It is not based on mortgage but credibility of members known to one another" (p.13). Based on mutual trust, the guild assists with special needs as part of people's everyday lives, such as education (See Yoshida, Hidemi, 2001, for more information on guilds).

We have already looked at the extent to which people in the urban area of Vietnam said that they relied on public organizations and other people, with regard to "problems and worries

of daily life" or in the event of a "major natural disaster or incident" (Q21 and Q25). The report on the rural area assigned scores based on the responses given to these two questions, with one point assigned to "not very reliable," two points to "somewhat reliable" and three points to "very reliable." With regard to trusting public organizations, "Expectation seems to grow more in the event of natural disasters than in daily life difficulties. For the latter, their expectation of local authority is 1 mark higher than the former. It is obvious to observe significance of family, clan, friends and neighbors in both type of circumstance" (p.18). People undoubtedly rely on and have expectations of people and organizations such as the local authorities, public organizations, military, the police and firefighting organizations, political parties and politicians, community organizations and volunteer groups to a greater extent in the event of a natural disaster than they do with regard to "problems and worries of daily life." For the most part however, "no respondent say they have much expectation of all social organizations and social groups" (p.18).

Figure 5. Expectation of assistance in the event of natural disasters or difficulties in daily life

(Rural area survey report, p.18)

Based on this, the report draws the following conclusion. "It is obvious to recognize mutual trust within this community, but that does not enable members to expect assistance from social organizations or social groups. Should we require better qualities of social capital as being more modern, being more adjustable, we would acknowledge that social capital of this community remains inadequate and limited" (p.18).

On the subject of closed social relationships, the report mentions that residents of the commune are keenly interested in local elections. Survey results from the questionnaire however

indicate that people in Giao Tan commune are actually less interested in politics than those in the urban area of Vietnam. When asked if they were interested in politics, a combined total of 34% of people in the urban area said "not much" or "not at all." The same total for the rural area was 57%. Nonetheless, every one of the respondents still participated in local elections. The report asks, "Why such an eager political attitude? It is because of individual role in deciding political status of the clan. It is said that voters would vote for candidates of their respective clan. Observation of local residents' discussion brought us interesting experience about how they used their ballots. One official said: 'In some cases voters crossed all candidates except one from their clan.' Certainly that ballot is legitimate but it reduces chance of those crossed out. The 40-year-old male official concluded: 'That is typical of small farmer and partiality.' Such behaviors reflect life in agricultural society and political attitude of farmers. They tend to judge candidates by his origin (whether he is from the same clan) rather than his morale and capability. For long-term interest of the clan, it is impossible for residents in the village to not vote, for election is a chance to elect representative of their clan to grassroots authority. Some thoughtful persons say that is not reasonable in some context, for it will deprive talented ones of chances to lead local authority and to represent farmers" (p.20). We saw for ourselves that clans in Giao Tan commune built elaborate shrines, as if they were competing with one another. We had the chance to visit one family that was the headquarters of a clan and housed the clan's shrine, and were able to learn about the significance of clans and how people relate to them in practice.

At the same time, the report states that social capital within the commune is "open," based on the formation of new social relationships by young people who have left the commune. "Those who have left Giao Tan join a far broader network in cities where economic, working and social exchange activities take place. The networks in cities are more diversified. While the cohesion among those who come from Giao Tan in the cities may not be as strong as that in the community in their native villages, it give them more mobility. The networks themselves are also more flexible (bridging contact). Migrant laborers seek to maintain their contact with people from their villages, for it forms a small community bearing common features which helps foster social credibility and makes individuals feel secure. However, the whole group as well as each individual must never stop finding new contacts" (p.26).

Having said that, the report firmly states that traditional social relationships within the intimate but closed society of Giao Tan commune are not "the key to open the door to development" (p.34). It goes on to infer that young people who have left the community and been incorporated into different types of human networks could potentially bring external factors back into the community and initiate internal reform. The idea of migrant laborers being incorporated into urban networks and triggering internal reform when they return to the Giao Tan community however is still just a possibility or inference at this stage. Although it extends beyond the confines of this survey, it would nonetheless be a worthwhile inference to explore in the future, as part of further research into social capital in Vietnam.

Outline of Cambodia survey report

The January 2012 survey report on Cambodia consisted of the following.

Chapter I: Introduction
    A. Overview of social capital
    B. Objectives of the survey
Chapter II: Methodology
    A. Sampling
    B. Questionnaire and pre-test
    C. Enumerator training and field data collection
    D. Data entry and analysis
Chapter III: Social Capital in an Urban and a Rural Community in Cambodia – A Summary
Chapter IV: Social Capital in a Rural Community in Cambodia
    Part I: Characteristics of the study province (Prey Veng)
        A. Geography
        B. Population
        C. Economy
        D. Society
    Part II: Findings
        A. Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of respondents
            1. General profile
            2. Profession
            3. Education
            4. Duration of residence
            5. Size and structure of households
            6. Access to clean water and waste management
            7. Household assets
            8. Means of transportation
            9. Major income-earner
          10. Household annual income
        B. Social trust
            1. Trust and social life
            2. Trust and civic engagement
        C. Maintaining and improving livelihood
            1. Social capital and livelihood maintenance
            2. Social network and sources of information
        D. Risk and social safety net
        E. Social rituals
            1. Management of common pool resources
            2. Gender roles
            3. Participation in local traditional ceremonies
    Part III: Summary of the findings
Chapter V: Social Capital in an Urban Community in Cambodia
    (The remainder of the Chapter constitutions are the same as the chapter IV)

Cambodia: Urban and rural areas

Before looking at the survey report submitted by the commissioned research agency in Cambodia, it is first of all necessary to mention the conflict and civil war that ravaged the country from 1970 onwards. Both Vietnam and Laos underwent major structural changes from 1975 onwards, in the wake of the Vietnam War, and have continued to change since the mid 1980s as they have transitioned to market economies. Cambodia meanwhile experienced more intense civil conflict than Vietnam and Laos, so much so that it should be regarded as something of a special case.

In 1970, General Lon Nol staged a coup and overthrew the regime of Prince Sihanouk. Five years later, in 1975, the Khmer Rouge, under the leadership of Pol Pot amongst others, took Phnom Penh by force and overthrew the Lon Nol regime. From 1975 to 1979, Cambodia became known as Democratic Kampuchea and was ruled by the Khmer Rouge, under a primitive communist system of forced group production. According to one theory, between 1.5 and 3 million Cambodians lost their lives during that period for the system. In 1979, forces loyal to Heng Samrin entered Phnom Penh with the assistance of the Vietnamese army. Although Pol Pot and his supporters were forced to retreat, they still retained power. In 1982, three anti-Heng Samrin factions (loyal to Sihanouk, Pol Pot and Son Sann) formed the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea. This led to a prolonged civil war against the People's Republic of Kampuchea, headed by Heng Samrin. The country's complex international relations with other countries, which supported different factions, were partly to blame for the civil war lasting so long. The civil war officially came to an end in 1992, when the two sides signed a peace treaty. Once the treaty had been signed, Pol Pot's faction disappeared. Since then, Cambodia has received full international support, right through to the present day.

Unlike the other two countries, the field surveys in the urban and rural areas of Cambodia were carried out at the same time and the results compiled into a single report. By way of a general theory, the report claims that Cambodia exhibits unique trends with regard to social trust, based on the country's modern history, as outlined above. This is covered by the following lengthy quote.

"These norms of solidarity and reciprocity were transformed when the country was plunged into a prolonged civil armed conflict, especially the Khmer Rouge genocide, and its consequences were even worse. The chronic conflict has caused an irreparable dent in the traditional culture of Cambodia. Although some scholars believe that social capital in Cambodia was only damaged but not destroyed by the civil war and the Khmer Rouge regime, the nature of social capital and social interactions in Cambodian society today is a clear reflection of the impact of the war. 'Mistrust, fear and the breakdown of social relationships' are evident in Cambodia today (O'Leary & Meas, 2001, p.64). In post-war Cambodia, trust has been identified as a missing element in society (UNICEF, 1996). The traditional social values such as sense of family and religion have been systematically undermined (Pellini, 2005, p.9). Today's Cambodian society is characterized as an aggregate of individuals who believe that 'no one can be fully trusted; taking care of oneself is important for survival' (UNICEF, 1996: 41). There is

a lack of trust in others. One of the factors for this severe lack of social trust in Cambodian society is the 'substantial disruption and destruction of old-style communities based primarily on kinship networks' (Pearson, 2011, p.38). The findings of this social capital survey resonate with the above observations. The survey results indicate that people in both rural and urban areas show a low level of trust in others" (p.4).

* Publications quoted in the report are as follows.

O'Leary, M. & Meas, N. (2001). *Learning for transformation: A study of the relationship between culture, values, experience and development practice in Cambodia*. Phnom Penh: Krom Akphiwat Phum (KAP).

UNICEF. (1996). *Towards a better future: An analysis of the situation of children and women in Cambodia*. Phnom Pehn: UNICEF.

Pearson, J. (2011). *Creative capacity development: Learning to adapt in development practice*. VA: Kumarian Press.

This claim is clearly evidenced by the survey results for Cambodia, with distinct trends apparent with regard to levels of social trust in both the urban and rural areas, compared to the other two countries. Continuing with the theme of comparing survey results between the three countries, the subsequent chapter offers a prime example. Results show that, when asked if people can be trusted, 6.0% of people in the urban area and 6.0% of people in the rural said "most people can be trusted." The percentages saying "a lot of people can be trusted" were 9.5% and 18.0% respectively, with 29.5% and 41.5% saying "some people can be trusted," and 53.3% and 30.5% saying "a few people can be trusted" (1.5% and 4.0% said "no one can be trusted"). Although levels of trust appear to be slightly higher in the rural area, the key point to note here is that high percentages of people in both the urban and rural areas said "a few people can be trusted." Although more people gave that response in the urban area, the distribution of responses showed the same pattern in both areas. In contrast, a higher percentage of people in all areas in Vietnam and Laos said "a lot of people can be trusted." This indicates a clear trend that sets the results for Cambodia apart from those for Vietnam and Laos.

With such low levels of social trust, there is inevitably a greater tendency for people to rely entirely on themselves, their family and their relatives. The survey report draws the following conclusions based on responses to the questions asking "For help with the problems and worries of daily life, what kind of person or organization do you feel you can rely on?" (Q21) and "If a major natural disaster or incident happened, what kind of person or organization could you rely on?" (Q25). The following chapter will examine the distribution of responses in greater detail.

"The findings from the survey indicate that the social support system in Cambodia is still very informal in nature. When faced with daily problems or worries, the people mainly turn to their circles of bonding networks for support, especially their family members and relatives. In addition, there is an increasing role played by the informal local money-lenders as well as the micro-finance institutions. In the rural area, however, the local money-lenders seem to play a

more active role in providing loans to the local people when they encounter difficulties in their daily life. Because of the nature of this informal lender, however, this has turned to be a burden to the local people. There is no formal social support system to assist the people when they face with hardships in their life. Due to the lack of an institutionalized social support system and an understanding that their close networks face similar hardships, the majority of the people in both rural and urban areas believe that they need to depend on themselves in securing their livelihood. This perception is shared by virtually all of the respondents in rural and urban areas" (p.5).

Trends such as these reflect a lack of interest in society and the community, an unwillingness to participate in cooperative activities, and a tendency of individuals to rely entirely on themselves and direct family members. The report comments "this is a worrisome trend given the current situation in the country" (p.6).

The report adds a specific explanation in relation to small-scale loans in Cambodia, as mentioned above. Concerned that the high interest rates associated with microfinance services could place too much strain on the poor people who use such services, the government has continued to impose limits on high interest rates and restrictions on finance services. In addition to dampening enthusiasm for investing in microfinance services, restrictions on such services have also resulted in poor people reverting to traditional "local money-lending." In reality however, interest rates tend to be considerably higher with "local money-lending" than microfinance services ("The annual percentage rate charged by the local moneylenders is around 120-180 percent, compared to only 18 percent charged by commercial banks and about 45 percent by MFIs" (p.19)). The report points out that "this kind of informal sources of credits is very useful for the urgent needs of the poor who have no access to formal sources of credits; however, it strips the borrowers of any potential savings or business growth due to the high interest rates" (p.19).

We visited both the urban area and the rural area, and conducted interviews with the leaders and deputy leaders of the local communities. The urban survey area was a residential district located a short distance south from the center of Siem Reap city. The 764 households within the commune included a handful of lavish newly built houses, interspersed with older houses. This is probably a change that has come about in the last few years. There were 100 households that met the commune's definition of poverty, namely that their "only form of transport is an old bicycle." Many homes had electricity and fitted toilets, but 60% of the commune's drinking water still came from wells (water pumped up from the well and stored temporarily in a tank in a high up location, enabling it to be used in the same way as running water). 20% of households had actual running water. According to the questionnaire results, 79% of households owned a motorcycle, while 93% had mobile phones and 91% televisions. The percentage of households with their own car was 13%. Buildings housing the Cambodian People's Party and the police sat alongside the commune's own office, on the same site.

The rural survey area consisted of 579 households, some of which lived in large houses made from concrete blocks or bricks rendered with mortar, along an unpaved road built as part

of a road planning scheme in 2006. The majority however lived in small wooden raftered houses on stilts, with most keeping their own cows. Houses had no electricity or running water, and had large pots lined up outside to catch rainwater. Given the proximity of the Mekong River however, residents essentially got 90% of their water from wells. According to the questionnaire results, 87% of households owned motorcycles, which is a higher percentage than the urban area. With 69% owning mobile phones, 72% televisions and 3% cars however, the other percentages were lower than in the urban area. According to the deputy leader of the village, whose brother was killed under the Pol Pot regime, 30% of households had fitted toilets, while there were no toilets in any other houses. Compared to the urban area of Cambodia, or even rural areas in Vietnam and Laos, we got the impression that the village was physically poor. We were nonetheless struck by the fact that none of the residents seemed to be unhappy about this superficial poverty. They seemed quite relaxed on the whole.

Laos: Urban and rural areas
The survey report on Laos consisted of the following.

The March 2011 survey report on Investigation of the actual situations of Social Capital and related issues in Laos (Urban area)
  1. Backgrounds of the investigation
  2. The range of commissioned work
  3. The methods of investigation
  4. Basic Result of the survey
     4.1. Basic information
     4.2. Social Trust
     4.3. Risk and Social Safety Net
     4.4. Social Rituals
The March 2012 survey report on Investigation of the actual situations of Social Capital and related issues in Laos (Rural area)
  1. Backgrounds of the investigation
  2. Report of investigation results
     2.1. Overview of the Survey Villages
        2.1.1. Basic Information of Nakang Village, Feuang District, Vientiane Province
        2.1.1.1. History of Nakang Village
        2.1.1.2. Overview of Nakang Village
        2.1.1.3. Characteristics and Village Resources
        2.1.1.4. Economic, Social, and Cultural Condition
        2.1.2. Basic Information of Done Village, Feuang District, Vientiane Province
        2.1.2.1. History of Done Village
        2.1.2.2. Overview of Done Village
        2.1.2.3. Economic, Social, and Cultural Tradition

The sample composition for the urban area was roughly even in terms of gender (61 men, 59 women), but was more biased in terms of age groups, with just 21% aged under 40 and the remaining 79% aged 40 or older. Despite the high number of public officials living in the area, that was not reflected in the survey sample. Many of the respondents were married (87.5%) or had four- or five-person families (43.3%). A considerable number of households meanwhile had two children (25.0%) or three (24.2%). The report states that running water is common within the area, with 99.2% of households owning a television, 97.5% a motorcycle, 98.3% a mobile phone, and 36.7% a computer. 30% of households also owned a car, and 40% a landline telephone.

In the rural area meanwhile, Nakang village (395 households, 2,338 people) was established in 1761 and depends on agriculture, from the surrounding paddy fields, pineapple plantations, rubber plantations and fishponds. Done village (97 households, 464 people) is another village with a long history, having been established in 1600. Much like Nakang, it too depends on agriculture and is surrounded by paddy fields, commercial timber plantations, pineapple plantations and fishponds. Both villages consist of communities that are determined to uphold traditions.

According to the report, 95.3% of respondents owned a television, 88.2% a motorcycle, 96.9% a mobile phone, 10.2% a computer, 16.5% a car, and 25.2% a landline telephone. Whereas television, motorcycle and mobile phone ownership was similar to the urban area, ownership of computers, cars and landline telephones was lower.

The survey reports from Vietnam and Cambodia provided insights based on an overall bird's-eye view of the survey results and additional supplementary information, with the aim of explaining the results. On the other hand, neither of the survey reports from Laos included insights based on the survey results or any additional information, on either the urban or the rural area. As a result, there is no real scope to comment on the contents of the relevant reports. The following chapter provides an outline comparison of the three countries based on data obtained from the survey results.

４．Outline comparison of survey results from the three countries

Having conducted the survey with the assistance of the commissioned research agencies, received reports from the research agencies, inspected the survey areas first-hand and carried out interviews with local people, the questionnaire-based survey in Vietnam, Cambodia and

Laos was completed in August 2012.

The following section examines data based on the survey results, focusing particularly on trends relating to social trust. Analysis of the survey results in relation to areas such as standards of living and social formalities will be left to other members of the Civil Culture Group. This section is intended as a straight comparison between the three countries based on survey results relating to social trust, and does not extend to the relationship between sets of data. Even if we were to use cross tabulation, it would be ineffective due to the small sample size. At best, it would only be possible to make observations based on gender. The relationship between sets of data will be dealt with separately by other members of the Civil Culture Group, using techniques such as regression analysis.

Table 1 shows results in response to the fundamental question, "Do you think that, in general, people can be trusted?" (Q1). In Vietnam, levels of social trust were high on the whole. Results were distributed differently however between the urban area and the rural area. In the urban area, relatively few people replied "most people can be trusted" (9.0%). The majority said "a lot of people can be trusted" (54.0%) or "some people can be trusted" (33.0%), accounting for almost 90% in total. The number of people who replied "most people can be trusted" in the rural area meanwhile was significantly higher (35.0%). Alongside those who said "a lot of people can be trusted" (40.0%) and "some people can be trusted" (24.0%), this reflects a shift towards a higher level of trust in the rural area compared to the urban area.

Table 1: Social trust

Q 1 Do you think that, in general, people can be trusted?

Degree of Trust	Urban Vietnam 2010 (100 Samples)	Rural Vietnam 2011 (100 Samples)	Urban Cambodia 2011 (200 Samples)	Rural Cambodia 2011 (200 Samples)	Urban Laos 2010 (116 Samples)	Rural Laos 2011 (116 Samples)
Most people can be trusted	9.0	35.0	6.0	6.0	26.7	15.5
A lot of people can be trusted	54.0	40.0	9.5	18.0	37.1	40.9
Some people can be trusted	33.0	24.0	29.5	41.5	34.5	37.3
A few people can be trusted	4.0	1.0	53.5	30.5	1.7	4.5
No one can be trusted	0.0	0.0	1.5	4.0	0.0	1.8

Survey by Cabinet Office, 2002

Q. 1-(1) Do you think that, in general, people can be trusted?

		Mail survey	Web survey
Most people can be trusted	1	6.2	3.2
	2	4.9	4.3
	3	13.7	15.1
	4	9.5	11.5
	5	32.2	27.1
	6	6.4	8.8
	7	5.5	8.3
	8	2.4	2.8
It's good to be careful	9	15.6	18.0
I don't know	10	1.4	1.1

Cabinet Office, *Social Capital: Toward A Virtuous Circle of Rich Human Relationships and Civic Activities*, 2003
Division for Volunteering Support Policy, Division for Volunteering Support Policy, Cabinet Office, 2004
http://www.npo-homepage.go.jp/data/report9.html

As discussed in Chapter 3, Cambodia exhibited noticeably different trends from the other two countries with regard to social trust. Specifically, responses in both the urban and the rural area were concentrated around "some people can be trusted" (urban: 29.5%, rural: 41.5%) and "a few people can be trusted" (53.5%, 30.5%). The difference between areas was that an exceptionally high percentage said "a few people can be trusted" in the urban area, while a high percentage said "some people can be trusted" in the rural area. A higher percentage also replied "a lot of people can be trusted" in the rural area (18.0%), compared to the urban area (9.5%). Levels of social trust in Cambodia were lower than either Vietnam or Laos in this respect, in both urban and rural areas. People in the rural area were more trusting that their urban counterparts to some extent however, echoing a similar trend in Vietnam.

The unique characteristics of social trust in Cambodia are also apparent in responses given to questions concerning the closeness of social relationships within the community. Refer to Table 2. Based on responses to the questions "How often do you meet with your relations?" (Q2), "How often do you meet with your friends and acquaintances outside of school and work?" (Q3), "What kind of social relations do you have with people in your neighborhood?" (Q4-A), and "What proportion of people do you have relations with in your neighborhood?" (Q4-B), people in the rural areas in all three countries seem to have closer relationships than people in the urban areas. The distribution of responses to Q4-A and Q4-B however indicates a lower degree of closeness in Cambodia compared to the other two countries, in terms of the extent of relations, acquaintanceship and exchange with people from the same neighborhood.

Cambodia is in a unique position historically, as outlined in the preceding chapter. Indeed, the questionnaire reflected the scars of war to a greater extent in Cambodia than Laos or Vietnam. When asked "Has someone in your family died in a war?" (Q22-3), 21.0% in the urban area of Vietnam said "yes", along with 41.0% in the rural area. In Laos, 12.1% said "yes" in the urban area and 13.8% in the rural area. In contrast, the percentages in Cambodia were significantly higher, with 71.5% saying "yes" in the urban area and 75.0% in the rural area. Similarly, when asked about their experiences of disasters or accidents, a substantially higher number of people said that they had experienced war (Q23-5) in Cambodia (urban: 85.5%, rural: 75.0%) than in Vietnam (13.0%, 8.8%) or Laos (14.7%, 20.9%).

Levels of social trust were just as high in Laos as in Vietnam. In response to Q1 about general levels of trust however, there was no noticeable tendency for higher levels of trust amongst people in the rural area than those in the urban area, as was the case in Vietnam and Cambodia. Whereas 26.7% in the urban area said "most people can be trusted", 37.1% said "a lot of people can be trusted", and 34.5% said "some people can be trusted" in the urban area, the equivalent percentages in the rural area were 15.5%, 40.9% and 37.3% in the rural area. Evidently levels of trust weren't necessarily lower in the urban area. This is likely to stem from the specialized nature of the urban survey area. Of the 120 samples in the urban area, a significant number of respondents listed their profession as "self-owned business" (27) or "stay-at-home" (34). As mentioned in the profile of the relevant survey area in Chapter 1 however, of the three villages surveyed in Laos, public officials accounted for 80% of the

residents of Phonesavang and 40% of the residents of Nongthatai. All of these officials would live in local government housing. It is fair to assume that the specialized nature of the area could have affected levels of public trust, putting them on a par with levels in rural villages. The nature of these high levels of trust however was not the same. Whereas there were high levels of trust in public institutions in the urban area, those levels weren't as high in the rural area. This is discussed in more detail below.

Nonetheless, in response to questions regarding closeness within the community, including Q2 (frequency of meeting relations), Q3 (frequency of meeting friends and acquaintances), Q4-A (frequency of meeting people from neighborhood) and Q4-B (extent of relations with people from neighborhood), there was a higher degree of closeness between people in the rural area of Laos than in the urban area, a trend that was also observed in Vietnam.

Table 2: Strength of the friendship in community

Q2 How often do you meet with your relations?

		Urban Vietnam	Rural Vietnam	Urban Cambodia	Rural Cambodia	Urban Laos	Rural Laos	Surevy by Cabinet office, 2002		
		2010	2011	2011	2011	2010	2011		Mail Survey	Web Surbey
		(100 Samples)	(100 Samples)	(200 Samples)	(200 Samples)	(116 Samples)	(116 Samples)			
Relations	Regularly	24.0	79.0	30.5	45.5	30.2	37.4		10.7	4.4
	Relatively often	26.0	16.0	30.0	29.0	38.8	32.2		26.4	15.2
	Sometimes	37.0	4.0	16.5	11.0	23.3	25.2		47.3	44.2
	Rarely	12.0	1.0	21.5	14.0	6.9	5.2		14.2	33.2
	Never	1.0	0.0	1.5	0.5	0.9	0.0		0.6	3.0

Q3 How often do you meet with your friends and acquaintances outside of school and work?

		Urban Vietnam	Rural Vietnam	Urban Cambodia	Rural Cambodia	Urban Laos	Rural Laos		Mail Survey	Web Surbey
Friends and Acquaintances	Regularly	38.0	49.0	37.0	50.5	37.4	42.1		22.4	14.0
	Relatively often	26.0	22.0	32.5	26.0	33.9	27.2		35.3	32.0
	Sometimes	27.0	20.0	10.5	12.0	22.6	24.6		33.5	36.2
	Rarely	8.0	9.0	14.5	10.0	5.2	6.1		7.4	15.5
	Never	1.0	0.0	5.5	1.5	0.9	0.0		0.5	2.4

Q4-1 Depth relations with your neighborhood

								Surevy by Cabinet office, 2002		
									Mail Survey	Web Surbey
Depth relations	There are many people with whom I have almost the same kind	42.0	47.0	7.5	13.0	32.2	50.9	There are many people with whom I have almost the same kind	23.0	10.7
	I have relations with some people in which we help each other	55.0	49.0	49.0	53.5	39.1	36.6	I chat with them regularly on the street	47.1	33.5
	I chat with them regularly on the street	3.0	4.0	23.0	15.0	21.7	8.9	I say hello to them, but that is basically the only interact	27.6	50.0
	I say hello to them, but that is basically the only interact	0.0	0.0	20.5	18.5	6.1	3.6	I have no social relations at all with them	1.7	5.9
	I have no social relations at all with them	0.0	0.0	*	*	0.9	0.0			

Q4-2 Proportion of people you have relations with in your neighborhood

									Mail Survey	Web Surbey
Proportion	I know and interact with most of them	50.0	78.0	7.0	14.5	34.8	42.6	I know and interact with most of them	18.1	9.9
	I know and interact with a lot of them	40.0	21.0	26.0	39.0	39.1	39.8	I know and interact with a lot of them	49.6	38.9
	The number of people that I know and I interact with is about the same as those I don't	6.0	1.0	26.5	26.5	15.7	8.3	I only know and interact with people in my immediate neighbor	29.3	41.9
	I only know and interact with people in my immediate neighbor	4.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	9.6	9.3	I don't know the name of my next-door neighbour	2.0	9.4
	I don't know the name of my next-door neighbour	0.0	0.0	0.5	*	0.9	0.0			

In Japan, respondents were asked to choose between nine different levels, ranging from "most people can be trusted" to "you can never be too careful". Compared to trends in social trust in the other three countries, a sizeable percentage chose level five, ("somewhere in between") (postal survey: 32.2%, online survey: 27.1%). Roughly one third chose a higher level from one to four ("most people can be trusted") (34.3%, 34.1%), and around 30% a lower level from six to nine ("you can never be too careful") (29.9%, 37.9%)*.

In the fiscal 2002 survey commissioned by the Cabinet Office, results were provided for both a postal version and an online version of the survey. Although the sample sizes were similar for both surveys, at 1,878 for the postal version and 2,000 for the online version, the age ranges differed considerably. Whereas respondents' ages were evenly distributed from 20s to 70s for the postal survey (29 or younger: 19.1%, 30s: 16.3%, 40s: 16.2%, 50s: 18.4%, 60s: 18.5%, 70 or older: 11.3%), three quarters were aged in their 30s or 40s for the online survey, or almost 90% including those in their 20s (29 or younger: 14.8%, 30s: 43.4%, 40s: 31.1%). This difference in age ranges was apparent in the results, in terms of social factors such as relations with relatives and neighbors. Roughly speaking, a level of closeness appeared in a postal version is higher than in an online version of survey. About "a level of relations with neighborhood" in a postal version, 23.0% of respondents "corporate with neighbors in daily life" (in online version 10.7%), 47.5% "chat with them regularly on the street" (online 33.5%), and 27.6% "keep minimum contact with them" (online 50.0%). About "frequency of meeting relations" in a postal version, 10.7% of respondents "meet them regularly" (online 4.4%), 26.4% "meet them relatively often" (online 15.2%), and 47.3% "meet them sometimes" (online 44.2%). (2002 survey commissioned by the Cabinet Office, p.140-141)

As the formats used for the questions and answers were different in Japan, it is only possible to compare broad trends. Even so, we can tell that levels of social trust in Japan are not as high as in Vietnam or Laos. If anything, trends in Japan are closer to those in Cambodia. In contrast to the high percentage of people in Japan who said "you can never be too carful" (15.6%, 18.0%), very few people in Vietnam or Laos replied "a few people can be trusted". In Cambodia on the other hand, an exceptionally high percentage said "a few people can be trusted" (urban: 53.5%, rural: 30.5%).

Needless to say however, this does not mean that we can draw any direct correlation between the high levels of social trust in Vietnam and Laos on the one hand, and the comparative lack of trust in Japan and Cambodia on the other. Even without drawing attention to the limited nature of this survey, we cannot draw hasty conclusions for the simple reason that Japan is fundamentally different from the survey countries, in terms of historical social changes and, more specifically, the process of modernization. Hypothetically however, if social relationships are underpinned by close family ties and norms, then the process of modernization is inevitably going to reduce levels of trust as those social relationships expand. That is one sense in which Japan stands apart from Vietnam and Laos. The low levels of social trust in Cambodia are due to specific historical factors, as discussed in the survey report, so it would be unfair to compare it to Japan. In fact, people in Cambodia expressed trust solely in their families and exhibited

low levels of trust in society. In that respect at least, it is different from Japan.

Based on relationships with members of the community, relatives, friends and acquaintances, it would be fair to say that there is a lower level of closeness in Japan than in the three survey countries. This trend is particularly noticeable in the results for the online survey, which had a comparatively lower age range than the postal survey.

Table 3 compares responses to questions regarding social activities and political interest, which help nurture social trust, in each of the three countries. When asked about participating in volunteer activities first of all, roughly 75% of people in Vietnam said that they had experience of taking part in such activities, in both the urban and rural areas. The majority listed volunteer activities as "sports, hobbies, recreational activities". Percentages were similarly high in Laos, with 81.4% of people in the urban area and 71.1% in the rural area saying that they had participated in volunteer activities. Although respondents in Laos said that they had participated in a wide range of activities across different areas, unlike the other two countries, that calls into question the reliability of the data more than anything else. There was a sizeable difference in levels of participation in Cambodia, between the urban area (54.5%) and the rural area (97.0%). This is due to conspicuously high levels of participation in "funeral associations" in the rural area of Cambodia (85.6%), which is thought to be more characteristic of rural communities. Levels of participation in disaster and crime prevention activities were particularly high in the urban area (87.2%). Apart from that however, participation in all other activities was low.

Table 3: Social activities

Q5-1 Do you participate in volunteer activities

		Urban Vietnam	Rural Vietnam	Urban Cambodia	Rural Cambodia	Urban Laos	Rural Laos
		2010	2011	2011	2011	2010	2011
		(100 Samples)	(100 Samples)	(200 Samples)	(200 Samples)	(116 Samples)	(116 Samples)
Participate in volunteer activities	Yes(often or Sometimes)	75.0	77.0	54.5	97.0	81.4	71.1
	No	25.0	23.0	45.5	3.0	18.6	28.8

Q5-2 What kind of activities are you currently involved in?

Parameters are number of participates(Q5-1)	Sport, hobbies, recreational activities	89.3	80.5	*	*	66.7	42.2
	Disaster or crime prevention activities	10.7	6.5	87.2	21.6	37.8	28.9
	Irrigation, water resource management, environmental conservation, etc.	1.3	6.5	*	11.9	28.6	77.8
	Agricultural improvement, vegetable cultivation, fruit cultivation, livestock management etc.	*	35.1	*	0.5	5.6	44.4
	Handicraft production	*	2.6	*	*	13.3	33.3
	Activities at work (labor union)	13.3	1.3	*	*	8.9	21.1
	Seniority activities, Food processing ...	34.7	35.1	10.1	5.7	34.4	5.6
	Mutual support group (funeral,Only Cambodia)			5.5	85.6		

Q6 In the community where you live, do you feel that communities by groups such as community associations, neighbourhood associations and fire cops are active?

	I think they are very active	43.0	48.0	30.0	56.0	50.0	57.3
	I think there is some degree of activity	29.0	33.0	29.5	31.5	33.9	29.1
	I don't think there is much activity	9.0	7.0	12.5	12.5	8.9	10.0
	I don't think those kinds of community-based groups exist	17.0	12.0	28.0	*	7.1	3.6

Q7 Are you interested in politics

	Very much	31.0	20.0	6.0	8.5	36.2	23.3
	Some	23.0	10.0	24.5	32.0	25.0	30.2
	So, so	12.0	13.0	38.5	35.0	32.8	30.2
	Not much	22.0	29.0	24.0	17.5	5.2	14.7
	Not at all	12.0	28.0	7.0	7.0	0.9	1.7

We went to Sala Kamreauk commune, the survey area in Siem Reap city, on August 20, 2011. When we interviewed the commune leader Van Sey, he told us the following. On the subject of recent events, he said that, through meetings held two or three times a month, residents had formed a voluntary neighborhood watch group in order to improve security in the commune. The group consisted of ten members and had been formed one year previously. Every household made a monthly contribution of 5,000 KHR (Cambodian riel), which was then used to build and maintain neighborhood watch stations. Poor families were exempted from contributions. Whereas crime had increased over the previous five to ten years, it was now on the decline.

Activities via community and neighborhood associations were effective in both the urban and rural areas of each country, with over 80% of respondents stating that associations were "very active" or that there was "some degree of activity."

A key point that needs to be underlined here is that drawing simple connections between social trust and participation in volunteer activities is extremely difficult in practice. In this survey, most of the social groups mentioned by the respondents when asked about volunteer activities were organized from above. The May 2011 report from Vietnam (rural area) listed 32 groups. Of these, there were only really two that were not organized from above, namely the commune's rice and gold guilds (18). In Laos, award schemes for achievements such as "drug-free villages" and "crime-free villages" are well established. Villages proudly display such awards in their community halls. To receive one of these awards however, the village has to organize a number of different groups. Microfinance services meanwhile are essentially run by the Lao Women's Union, but that too is under the supervision of the government. In Cambodia, crime prevention and neighborhood watch groups seem to be run as effective voluntary organizations at first glance, but once again, participants are not exactly spontaneous volunteers.

Levels of political interest vary considerably depending on the country. When asked if they were interested in politics, responses in Vietnam ranged from "very much" to "not at all." In Cambodia, the most common responses were "some" "so, so" and "not much." In Laos meanwhile, very few people replied "not much" or "not at all."

As mentioned briefly in Chapter 3, respondents were asked what kind of people or organizations they could rely on for help with "problems and worries of daily life" or in the event of a "major natural disaster, war, or accident, etc." If we compare the results for those questions between urban and rural areas, and between countries, different characteristics start to become apparent for each.

Table 4: For help with the problems and worries of daily life

Q21 For help with the problems and worries of daily life, what kind of person or organization do you feel you can rely on

	Vi Xuyen ward, Nam Dinh City, Vietnam					Giao Thuy district, Vietnam				
	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all	I don't know	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all	I don't know
1)City Hall, town or village hall etc.	18.0	26.0	24.0	31.0	1.0	25.0	28.0	28.0	17.0	2.0
2)Public institutions such as school or hospitals	18.0	33.0	19.0	28.0	2.0	30.0	20.0	22.0	24.0	4.0
3)Police or firefighting organisation	10.0	22.0	20.0	39.0	9.0	19.0	22.0	20.0	35.0	4.0
4)Military	12.0	24.0	13.0	34.0	17.0	23.0	19.0	17.0	35.0	6.0
5)Political party, politician	18.0	28.0	7.0	31.0	16.0	33.0	21.0	16.0	27.0	3.0
6)Organisation in nearby community	22.0	43.0	9.0	11.0	15.0	30.0	32.0	20.0	15.0	3.0
7)Volunteer, NPO, or civic group etc	4.0	23.0	9.0	36.0	28.0	21.0	30.0	17.0	20.0	12.0
8)Religious organisation such as a temple or church	4.0	18.0	19.0	45.0	14.0	22.0	19.0	18.0	35.0	6.0
9)Employer	8.0	30.0	16.0	22.0	24.0	6.0	8.0	6.0	11.0	69.0
10)Coworkers	18.0	38.0	9.0	16.0	19.0	7.0	12.0	3.0	7.0	71.0
11)People in neighbourhood	21.0	67.0	7.0	4.0	1.0	40.0	45.0	13.0	2.0	0.0
12)Family	92.0	6.0	0.0	2.0	*	91.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	0.0
13)Relatives	65.0	26.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	72.0	21.0	6.0	1.0	0.0
14)Friends, acquainces	35.0	59.0	5.0	0.0	1.0	47.0	46.0	3.0	4.0	0.0

	Siem Reap district, Cambodia					Babaong village, Cambodia				
1)City Hall, town or village hall etc.	3.5	29.5	23.0	41.5	2.5	7.5	47.0	28.5	17.0	0.0
2)Public institutions such as school or hospitals	8.0	48.0	23.0	21.0	0.0	17.5	57.0	19.0	6.5	0.0
3-1)Firefighting organisation	0.5	37.0	22.0	18.0	22.5					
3-2)Police	9.0	58.0	21.0	12.0	0.0	11.5	49.0	26.5	10.5	2.5
4)Military	0.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	96.5	1.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	90.5
5)Political party, politician	0.5	3.5	10.0	54.5	31.5	2.5	11.0	15.5	44.5	26.5
6)Organisation in nearby community	0.5	11.5	26.0	29.5	32.5	8.0	29.5	27.5	24.5	10.5
7)Volunteer, NPO, or civic group etc	2.0	11.0	19.5	33.0	34.5	3.5	14.5	25.5	27.0	29.5
8)Religious organisation such as a temple or church	1.5	39.0	23.5	14.5	21.5	14.0	47.0	19.0	12.5	7.5
9)Employer	2.0	8.0	6.5	5.0	78.5	0.0	2.0	1.5	1.0	95.5
10)Coworkers	4.0	18.0	5.5	5.0	67.5	0.0	5.5	2.5	2.0	90.0
11)People in neighbourhood	6.0	61.5	27.5	3.5	1.5	11.0	70.0	18.5	0.5	0.0
12)Family	92.5	7.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	96.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
13)Relatives	55.0	35.5	7.0	1.5	1.0	62.0	33.5	4.5	0.0	0.0
14)Friends, acquainces	6.5	62.0	20.0	9.0	2.5	7.5	68.0	20.5	4.0	0.0

	Vientiane Municipality, Laos					Nakang village and Done village, Laos				
	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all	I don't know	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all	I don't know
1)City Hall, town or village hall etc.	64.7	27.6	4.3	3.4	*	67.0	26.1	5.2	1.7	*
2)Public institutions such as school or hospitals	38.6	51.5	6.9	3.0	*	34.5	47.6	11.9	6.0	*
3)Police or firefighting organisation	20.2	54.4	21.1	4.1	*	20.2	45.6	27.2	7.0	*
4)Military	24.6	49.1	15.8	10.5	*	26.5	42.7	24.5	7.3	*
5)Political party, politician	27.0	39.1	18.3	15.7	*	14.0	46.5	18.4	21.1	*
6)Organisation in nearby community	27.8	46.1	16.5	9.6	*	15.5	50.0	13.8	20.7	*
7)Volunteer, NPO, or civic group etc	18.8	47.3	19.6	14.3	*	6.9	54.3	18.1	20.7	*
8)Religious organisation such as a temple or church	21.4	45.5	23.2	9.8	*	20.9	38.3	25.2	15.7	*
9)Employer	15.1	35.8	30.2	18.9	*	1.8	31.2	33.0	33.9	*
10)Coworkers	21.3	57.4	12.0	9.3	*	11.8	57.3	23.6	7.3	*
11)People in neighbourhood	31.6	53.5	10.5	4.4	*	36.0	50.0	11.4	2.6	*
12)Family	79.8	16.7	1.8	1.8	*	67.2	29.3	1.7	1.7	*
13)Relatives	68.7	27.8	1.7	1.7	*	69.8	27.6	1.7	0.9	*
14)Friends, acquainces	43.4	46.9	5.3	4.4	*	31.0	48.3	16.4	4.3	*

Q) For help with the problems and worries of daily life, what kind of person or organization do you feel you can rely on?

	Mail Survey (N=1,589)					WEB Survey (N = 2,000)				
	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Undecided	Cannot rely at all	I don't know	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Undecided	Cannot rely at all	I don't know
1)City Hall, town or village hall etc.	3.4	31.0	34.5	15.2	16.0	0.6	16.4	37.5	29.6	16.0
2)Public institutions such as school or hospitals	8.2	49.1	23.3	8.0	11.4	2.8	33.9	32.0	17.8	13.6
3)Police or firefighting organisation	3.8	34.4	31.1	15.4	15.4	1.4	27.6	32.5	23.5	15.2
4)Organisation in nearby community	2.3	21.9	33.8	17.4	24.6	0.8	13.5	34.0	31.0	20.8
5)Volunteer, NPO, or civic group etc	1.6	19.8	30.4	16.0	32.2	1.1	11.1	20.6	30.2	28.1
6)Employer	5.7	30.0	30.4	14.7	19.2	2.2	21.8	29.7	25.0	21.5
7)Coworkers	7.8	35.1	26.3	11.7	19.2	3.8	25.4	25.8	20.2	24.0
8)People in neighbourhood	6.2	36.9	28.4	13.3	15.2	2.6	23.3	32.4	25.1	16.8
9)Family	52.3	37.8	6.5	1.2	2.1	39.4	41.2	11.1	4.0	4.5
10)Relatives	20.1	43.7	22.9	6.3	7.0	10.4	39.1	25.4	15.3	9.8
11)Friends, acquainces	20.6	53.1	15.3	3.8	7.2	15.4	50.4	18.8	6.2	9.2

Table 5: For help with the major natural disaster or incident happened

Q25 In the community where you live, if a major natural disaster or incident happened, what kind of person or organization could you rely on?

	Vi Xuyen ward, Nam Dinh City, Vietnam					Giao Thuy district, Vietnam				
	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all	I don't know	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all	I don't know
1)City Hall, town or village hall etc.	48.0	30.0	17.0	5.0	0.0	60.0	22.0	12.0	5.0	1.0
2)Public institutions such as school or hospitals	23.0	39.0	15.0	23.0	0.0	43.0	27.0	15.0	12.0	3.0
3)Police or firefighting organisation	33.0	32.0	19.0	13.0	3.0	43.0	22.0	17.0	15.0	3.0
4)Military	37.0	32.0	10.0	16.0	5.0	46.0	26.0	12.0	13.0	3.0
5)Political party, politician	34.0	36.0	10.0	13.0	7.0	53.0	25.0	15.0	6.0	1.0
6)Organisation in nearby community	29.0	44.0	10.0	5.0	12.0	45.0	32.0	16.0	5.0	2.0
7)Volunteer, NPO, or civic group etc	5.0	35.0	12.0	26.0	22.0	35.0	28.0	16.0	9.0	12.0
8)Religious organisation such as a temple or church	4.0	18.0	23.0	39.0	16.0	28.0	26.0	10.0	31.0	5.0
9)Employer	6.0	30.0	18.0	16.0	30.0	8.0	7.0	5.0	13.0	67.0
10)Coworkers	16.0	35.0	11.0	12.0	26.0	11.0	4.0	7.0	10.0	68.0
11)People in neighbourhood	32.0	62.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	49.0	39.0	7.0	5.0	0.0
12)Family	93.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	88.0	10.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
13)Relatives	71.0	25.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	73.0	21.0	4.0	2.0	0.0
14)Friends, acquainces	44.0	50.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	52.0	39.0	5.0	4.0	0.0

	Siem Reap district, Cambodia					Babaong village, Cambodia				
1)City Hall, town or village hall etc.	3.0	28.0	30.5	38.0	0.5	4.5	47.0	29.5	19.0	0.0
2)Public institutions such as school or hospitals	6.5	46.0	31.5	16.0	0.0	9.0	58.5	27.0	5.0	0.5
3-1)Firefighting organisation	4.5	28.5	21.5	23.5	22.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	99.0
3-2)Police	5.5	45.5	25.5	21.5	2.0	2.5	44.5	28.5	17.5	7.0
4)Military	0.5	2.0	1.5	2.0	94.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	93.0
5)Political party, politician	0.5	4.5	9.0	55.5	30.5	0.5	15.5	20.5	40.5	23.0
6)Organisation in nearby community	0.0	12.0	25.0	32.5	30.5	5.5	33.0	31.0	20.5	10.0
7)Volunteer, NPO, or civic group etc	25.0	14.0	24.0	33.0	26.5	2.0	21.5	29.0	23.0	24.5
8)Religious organisation such as a temple or church	1.5	57.0	19.0	5.5	17.0	17.0	54.5	18.0	4.5	6.0
9)Employer	2.5	6.5	7.0	3.5	80.5	0.0	1.0	2.5	3.5	93.0
10)Coworkers	3.5	14.0	7.5	4.0	71.0	0.5	2.5	5.0	2.5	89.5
11)People in neighbourhood	4.5	67.0	21.5	6.0	1.0	9.5	72.0	18.0	0.0	0.5
12)Family	91.5	7.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	90.0	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
13)Relatives	55.0	35.0	7.0	2.0	1.0	60.5	36.0	3.5	0.0	0.0
14)Friends, acquaines	7.0	61.0	20.0	9.0	3.0	8.0	67.5	22.5	1.0	0.0

	Vientiane Municipality, Laos					Nakang village and Done village, Laos				
	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all	I don't know	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all	I don't know
1)City Hall, town or village hall etc.	73.9	16.5	5.2	4.3	*	73.9	21.7	4.3	0.0	*
2)Public institutions such as school or hospitals	39.1	49.6	6.1	5.2	*	37.9	44.0	12.1	6.0	*
3)Police or firefighting organisation	36.5	40.9	17.4	5.2	*	37.4	33.0	27.0	2.6	*
4)Military	31.3	46.1	10.4	12.2	*	33.6	33.6	26.4	4.3	*
5)Political party, politician	23.4	40.2	17.8	18.7	*	22.8	38.6	23.8	14.9	*
6)Organisation in nearby community	35.7	42.6	12.2	9.6	*	20.7	49.1	18.1	12.1	*
7)Volunteer, NPO, or civic group etc	20.7	51.7	17.2	10.3	*	15.0	50.4	18.6	15.9	*
8)Religious organisation such as a temple or church	33.0	37.4	13.9	15.7	*	25.9	30.2	30.2	13.8	*
9)Employer	11.0	37.0	23.1	28.7	*	3.7	31.5	38.9	25.9	*
10)Coworkers	23.0	51.3	13.3	12.4	*	16.8	43.4	26.5	13.3	*
11)People in neighbourhood	37.1	45.7	12.1	5.2	*	43.5	40.0	14.8	1.7	*
12)Family	77.4	17.4	2.6	2.6	*	73.3	21.6	5.2	0.0	*
13)Relatives	71.6	25.0	1.7	1.7	*	71.6	25.0	3.4	0.0	*
14)Friends, acquaines	48.3	39.7	6.0	6.0	*	33.3	44.7	16.7	5.3	*

There are three characteristics that the three countries have in common. Firstly, an overwhelming percentage of respondents included "family" as one of the people or organizations they could rely on for help with "problems and worries of daily life" or in the event of a "major natural disaster, war, or accident, etc." There were similar trends for "relatives" and "friends, acquaintances" too. Secondly, relatively few people across the board said that they could rely on public institutions. Whereas then number of people who felt they could rely on public institutions for help with everyday problems was extremely low however, levels of trust increased in the event of a major disaster or accident. This was particularly noticeable in Vietnam. Thirdly, despite the fact that fewer people said that they could rely on public institutions

than those who said they could rely on family, relatives, friends and acquaintances, comparisons between urban and rural areas indicate that, on the whole, more people in rural areas trust public institutions than in urban areas.

Moving on to differences between the three countries, the first involves levels of trust in public institutions in Cambodia, which are exceptionally low compared to the other two countries, in both the urban and the rural area, and for both everyday problems and in the event of a major disaster or accident. As mentioned in Chapter 3, levels of social trust are generally low in Cambodia, with people placing their trust in those closest to them, namely family, relatives, friends and acquaintances. There is a clear trend towards low levels of trust in other people and organizations. Secondly, Laos exhibits different trends from the other two countries with regard to levels of trust in family, relatives, friends and acquaintances. Essentially, levels of trust in public institutions are fairly high, for both everyday problems and in the event of a major disaster or accident. The number of people who said they could rely on "city hall, town or village hall, etc." was particularly high. In Laos, the urban survey area was home to large numbers of public officials, which presumably translated into an increased tendency to trust public institutions. As there were similarly high levels of trust in public institutions in the rural area however, it is fair to say that this is more than just a regional characteristic.

We compiled the questions in our questionnaire with reference to the options listed under "people and organizations you can rely on for help with problems and worries of daily life" in the fiscal 2002 survey commissioned by the Cabinet Office, with the aim of producing comparable survey results. We also added a question on "people and organizations you can rely on if a major natural disaster or incident happened." At the same time, we added options that were not included in the 2002 Cabinet Office survey, namely "military," "political party, politicians" and "religious organization such as a temple or church." We added these options based on the theory that the relevant institutions are all significant presences in Southeast Asia, particularly in the three survey countries. The results however show that levels of trust in these institutions weren't noticeably higher than those expressed in other public institutions. In fact, relatively few people expressed trust in "religious organization such as a temple or church," whether for help with everyday problems or in the event of a major disaster or accident.

In comparisons with Japan, the 2002 Cabinet Office survey only asked respondents the extent to which they could rely on people and organizations for help with "problems and worries of daily life." They were not asked the same question in the event of a major disaster or accident. Compared to the three survey countries, the percentage of people in Japan who said that they could trust "family," "relatives" and "friends and acquaintances" with regard to "problems and worries of daily life" was significantly higher than other people and organizations. Although this was the same in the three survey countries, the percentage of people who said that their family would be "very reliable" was considerably lower in Japan (postal survey: 52.3%, online survey: 39.4%) than in the other three countries (Vietnam urban: 92.0%, rural: 91%; Cambodia: 92.5%, 96.0%; Laos: 79.8%. 67.2%). With regard to trust in public institutions on the other hand, a lower overall percentage of people said "not very reliable" or "cannot rely at all" in

Japan than in the three survey countries. Whereas relatively few people in Japan rated public institutions as "very reliable," the percentage of people replying "somewhat reliable" was high across the board. The percentage of people replying "neither" was also extremely high for all options. Taking all of this into account, people in Japan can be characterized as considering family, relatives, friends and acquaintances as "very reliable" with regard to "problems and worries of daily life," whilst at the same time placing a degree of trust in public institutions. In contrast, people in the three survey countries feel that they can rely on family, relatives, friends and acquaintances, but have a stronger tendency to mistrust public institutions.

That concludes this overview of our questionnaire-based survey into social capital in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, conducted from 2010 to 2012, and key points of note regarding selected results that relate particularly to social trust. In spite of the various limitations of this small-scale survey, as mentioned previously, we believe that we have made a solid contribution to the project, in terms of paving the way for future surveys as part of social capital projects in general and enabling surveys to be improved, based on the limitations we have faced.

This report provides an overview of the survey results and compares levels of social trust in the three countries. For more information on other subjects, including maintaining livelihood, risk and social safety net, and social rituals, and comparative data analysis, please see papers by other members of the Civil Culture Group.

References

・Häuberer, Julia（2011）, *Social Capital Theory, Towards a Methodological Foundation*, VS Verlag, Wiesbaden.

・Ishida, Mitsunori（2008）, "Aafterword and notes by translator," in *Social Capital: A Theory of Structure and Action*, Mineruva-Shobo,Tokyo, Japan,translation version, in Japanese.

・Klein, Ansgar/Kristine Kern/Brigitte Geißel/Maria Berger（Hrsg.）（2004）, *Zivilgesellschaft und Sozialkapital, Herausforderungen politischer und sozialer Integration*, VS Verlag, Wiesbaden.

・Seubert, Sandra（2009）, *Das Konzept des Sozialkapitals, Eine demokratietheoretische Analyse*, Cumpus Verlag, Frankfurt/Main.

・Lin, Nan（2001）, *Social Capital, A Theory of Social Structure and Action*, Cambridge University Press, UK.

・－(2008), "Building a Network Theory of Social Capital", in *Social Capital, Theory and Research* (ed. by Nan Lin/Karen Cook/Ronald S. Burt), New Brunswick and London.

・Murakami, Shunsuke（2010）"Civil Society, Social Capital, and Civil Culture: A Modern Project?," *Senshu Social Capital Review*, Senshu University, No.1(July).

・－(2011)"The Logic of Norm Formation in Civil Society: Comparing the Collective-good and the Individual-good Approaches in Social Capital Studies"in *Senshu Social Capital Review*, Senshu University, No.2 (August).

・Ostrom, Elinor/Toh-Kyeong Ahn（2003）, "Soziales Kapital und kollektives Handeln: Eine sozialwissenschaftliche Perspektive auf soziales Kapital", "Bürgerschaftliches Engagement und Zivilgesellschaft", hrsg. v. "Enquete-Kommission "Zukunft des Bürgerschaftlichen Engagements" Deutscher Bundestag, Schriftenreihe Bd.2.

・－2009, "What is social capital? ", (Ed. by Bartkus, Via Ona/James H. Davis, *Social Capital, Reaching Out, Reaching In*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham), UK/Northampton, USA.

・Puttnam, Robert D. 2002. "Sozial Kapital in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und in den USA", "Bürgerschaftliches Engagement und Zivilgesellschaft", hrsg. v. "Enquete-Kommission "Zukunft des Bürgerschaftlichen Engagements" Deutscher Bundestag, Schriftenreihe Bd.1.

・Sakata, Shozo (2001)"The genealogical study on Social Capital and Development Aid"in *Development Aid and Social Capital* (ed.by Sato,Hiroshi), Tokyo, Japan, IDE-JETRO, in Japanese.

・Yoshida, Hidemi (2001)"Social Capital and Microfinace: A case study of Vietnam" in *Development Aid and Social Capital* (ed.by Sato,Hiroshi), Tokyo, Japan, IDE-JETRO, in Japanese.

・Cabinet Office（2003）, *Social Capital: Toward A Virtuous Circle of Rich Human Relationships and Civic Activities*.

2010 Laos and Vietnam Social Capital Study Questionnaire (Draft)

Senshu University Social Capital Project Civil Society Group

As of 05. October, 2010

Social Trust

Q1. Do you think that, in general, people can be trusted? Please choose the one answer that most closely describes your opinion.

1) Most people can be trusted

2) A lot of people can be trusted

3) Some people can be trusted

4) A few people can be trusted

5) No one can be trusted

Q2. How often do you meet with your relations?

1) Regularly (several times a week)

2) Relatively often (once a week to a few times a month)

3) Sometimes (once a month to a few times a year)

4) Rarely (once a year to once every few years)

5) Never (or I have no relatives)

Q3. How often do you meet with your friends and acquaintances outside of school and work?

1) Regularly (several times a week)

2) Relatively often (once a week to a few times a month)

3) Sometimes (once a month to a few times a year)

4) Rarely (once a year to once every few years)

5) Never (or I have no relatives)

Q4. What kind of social relations do you have with people in your neighborhood? Please choose one answer each for A and B, and circle the numbers beside those answers.

A. Depth of relations

1) There are many people with whom I have almost the same kind of relations as I do with my family

2) I have relations with some people in which we help each other out, such as exchanging advice or borrowing and lending daily necessities, etc.

3) I chat with them regularly on the street

4) I say hello to them, but that is basically the only interaction we have

5) I have no social relations at all with them

1

B. Proportion of people you have relations with in your neighborhood

1) I know and interact with most of them

2) I know and interact with a lot of them

3) The number of people that I know and interact with is about the same as those I don't

4) I only know and interact with people in my immediate neighborhood

5) I don't know the name of my next-door neighbor

Q5-1. Do you participate in volunteer activities? Please tell us the names of the organizations you have participated with.

1) Often   2) Sometimes   3) No →Q5-5

(Name of organization(s):   )

Q5-2. What kind of activities are you currently involved in? Choose all that apply (multiple answers possible).

1) Sports, hobbies, recreational activities

2) Disaster or crime prevention activities

3) Irrigation, water resource management, environmental conservation, etc.

4) Agricultural improvement, vegetable cultivation, fruit cultivation, livestock management, etc.

5) Handicraft production

6) Activities at work (labor union)

7) Other (Please explain:)

Q5-3. How often do you participate?

	A few times a week	About once a week	2-3 times a month	About once a month	A few times a year
1) Sports, hobbies, recreational activities					
2) Disaster or crime prevention activities					
3) Irrigation, water resource management, environmental conservation, etc.					
4) Agricultural improvement, vegetable cultivation, fruit cultivation, livestock management, etc.					
5) Handicraft production					
6) Activities at work (labor union)					
7) Other					

2

Maintaining and Improving Livelihood

Q9. To you, what does improving your livelihood mean, specifically? (multiple answers possible)

1) To have enough food

2) To have enough cash earnings

3) To be able to buy consumer goods

4) Other

Q10. What hardships have you faced in the past in terms of maintaining your livelihood? (multiple answers possible)

1) Insufficient harvest

2) Insufficient money to live on

3) Unemployment

4) Death of income earner

5) Illness, injury to yourself or a family member

6) Other

Q11. About what year did you experience those hardships that affected your livelihood?

Q12. How did you overcome those hardships that affected your livelihood?

1) I got a loan from the bank

2) I borrowed food from someone

3) I borrowed money from someone

4) I received food from someone

5) I received money from someone

6) I received supplies from someone

7) Other

Q13. When you had hardships that affected your livelihood, who helped you? (multiple answers possible).

1) My father   2) My mother   3) Uncle   4) Aunt   5) Grandfather

6) Grandmother   7) My father in-law   8) My mother in-law   9) Male cousin

10) Female cousin   11) Other relative   12) Neighbor   13) Friend

14) Coworker or boss   15) Other unrelated person

4

Q5-4. How do/have you benefited by participating in the activity mentioned above? Choose all that apply.

1) I think that the activity has been productive

2) I've learned how the local community or society works

3) I've been able to contribute to the local community or society

4) I've grown more attached to the local community

5) I've made connections with people in the local community

6) I've made friends who share the same values

7) I didn't really want to participate

8) Other (Please explain:)

Q5-5. How do you feel about participating in the future?

1) I want to start participating

2) I still won't participate

3) Don't know

Q6. In the community where you live, do you feel that community activities by groups such as community associations, neighborhood associations and fire corps are active? Choose the answer that applies best.

1) I think they are very active

2) I think there is some degree of activity

3) I don't think there is much activity

4) I don't think those kinds of community-based groups exist

Q7. Are you interested in politics?

1) Very much   2) Some   3) So,so   4) Not much   5) Not at all

Q8-1. Has the community where you live ever received aid from an overseas aid agency or NGO, etc.?

1) Yes   2) No →Q9

Q8-2. What kind of aid was it?   (multiple answers possible)

1) financial   2) clothing   3) educational   4) food   5) medical   6) recovering disaster

7) woman's right   8) Other

3

Q14. When you faced hardships that affected your livelihood, who were you most hoping for support from in order to resolve those hardships? (but you did not receive it)

1) A village committee or organization (name of organization: _____)

2) The prefectural or county government

3) The central government

4) An international aid agency

5) The bank

6) A relative

7) A friend

8) Other _____

Q15. How do you think you can improve your livelihood?

1) Wait for help of government

2) Wait for help of NGO

3) Wait for help of an influential person in the village

4) Form a mutual assistance group

5) Rely on overseas remittances from a relative

6) I don't think that my livelihood can be improved.

7) Other _____

Q16. What do you want specially to improve the most your livelihood? (multiple answers possible)

1	Getting water for household use
2	Getting fuel for household use
3	Getting food
4	Increasing income
5	Child rearing
6	Methods of preparing food
7	Sanitation
8	Transportation access
9	Communication (telephones)
10	Other (Please explain)

Q17-1. Do you participate in a local community activity group that could improve your livelihood?

1)Yes   2) No →Q18-1

Q17-2. What kind of activity does it involve?

1) Agricultural improvement   2) Irrigation   3) Vegetable cultivation   4) Fruit cultivation

5) Forest management   6) Water resource management   7) Livestock management

8) Handicraft production   9) Other _____

Q18-1. Have you ever received micro-financing (micro-credit, micro-finance, revolving loan fund, etc.)?

1) Yes   2) No →Q19-1

Q18-2. What kind of activity did you use it for? (multiple answers possible)

1) Agricultural improvement   2) Irrigation   3) Vegetable cultivation   4)Fruit cultivation

5) Forest management   6) Water resource management   7)Livestock management

8) Handicraft production   9) Other _____

Q18-3. Whose name was on the loan? (multiple answers possible)

1) My father   2) My mother   3) Husband   4) Wife   5) Son   6) Daughter

7) Grandfather   8) Grandmother   9)My father-in-law   10)My mother-in-law

11) Other _____

Q18-4. What did you use as collateral?

1) Joint group liability   2) My home   3) My land   4) Other _____

Q19-1. Have you ever received information that could improve your livelihood?

1) Yes   2) No →Q20

Q19-2. Whom did you get the information from? Place a circle in the boxes that apply.

		Job search	Training/ learning opportunity	Provision of public service	Technical guidance (agriculture, handicrafts)	Health guidance
1	City hall, town or village hall					
2	Organization in nearby community					
3	Volunteer, NPO or civic group, etc.					
4	Religious organization such as a temple or church					
5	Employer					
6	Coworkers					
7	People in neighborhood					
8	Family					
9	Relatives					
10	Friends, acquaintances					
11	Overseas aid agency					
12	Other					

Risk & Social Safety Net

Q20. How important do you think the following items are as threats to your life? Please mark the level of importance in the following chart for each by placing a circle in the box that applies.

		Very important (5)	Important(4)	Somewhat important (3)	Not very important (2)	Cannot answer (1)
1	Unemployment, little income					
2	Illness, injury, etc.					
3	Food shortage					
4	Not having access to water					
5	Poor means of transportation or road conditions, traffic accidents					
6	Natural disasters (Wind and flood damage, earthquake, etc.)					
7	War					

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

Q21. For help with the problems and worries of daily life (unemployment, little income, illness, food shortage, access to water, etc.), what kind of person or organization do you feel you can rely on? For each of the following items, please place a circle in the box that applies.

	Very reliable	Somewhat Reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all
1.City hall, town or village hall, etc.				
2.Public institutions such as schools or hospitals				
3.Police or firefighting organization				
4.Military				
5.Political party, politicians				
6.Organization in nearby community (neighborhood association, etc.)				
7.Volunteer, NPO or civic group, etc.				
8.Religious organization such as a temple or church				
9.Employer				
10.Coworkers				
11.People in neighborhood				
12.Family				
13.Relatives				
14.Friends, acquaintances				

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

9

Q22. Please answer the following questions about illness, unemployment and retirement. Please mark "Yes," "No" for each by placing a circle in the box that applies.

		Yes	No
1	Is there a hospital or doctor in your village?		
2	If you get sick, can you be seen by a doctor or get medicine?		
3	Has someone in your family died in a war?		
4	Do/Would your neighbors help you in some way with regard to illness?		
5	Do you have medical insurance (health insurance) ?		
6	Does/Would your government (city hall, town hall, village hall, etc.) help you in some way with regard to illness?		
7	Is someone (an adult) in your family other than you currently unemployed?		
8	Do you or enyone in your family have unemployment insurance?		
9	Do/Would your neighbors help you in some way with regard to unemployment?		
10	Does/Would your government (city hall, town hall, village hall, etc.) help you with regard to unemployment?		
11	Does any relative of yours take care of his or her parent(s)?		
12	Do you or anyone in your family have a pension plan?		
13	Do/Would your neighbors help you in some way with regard to retirement life?		
14	Does/Would your government (city hall, town hall, village hall, etc.) help you with regard to retirement life?		

Q23. Have you ever experienced a major natural disaster, war, or accident, etc.? Please mark "Yes," "No" or "Don't know" for the following items.

		Yes	No
1	Wind and flood damage (cyclone, flood, etc.)		
2	Natural disaster other than (1) (earthquake, wildfire, etc.)		
3	Drought		
4	Traffic accident		
5	War		

10

104

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

Q24. Has the community (city, town or village) where you live experienced a major natural disaster or war, etc. in the past that is still talked about today? Please mark "Yes," "No" or "Don't know" for the following items.

		Yes	No
1	Wind and flood damage (cyclone, flood, etc.)		
2	Natural disaster other than (1) (earthquake, wildfire, etc.)		
3	Drought		
4	War		

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

Q25. In the community where you live, if a major natural disaster or incident happened, what kind of person or organization could you rely on? For the following items, please place a circle in the box that applies.

	Very reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not very reliable	Cannot rely at all
City hall, town or village hall, etc.				
Public institutions such as schools or hospitals				
Police or firefighting organization				
Military				
Political party, politicians				
Organization in nearby community (neighborhood association, etc.)				
Volunteer, NPO or civic group, etc.				
Religious organization such as a temple or church				
Employer				
Coworkers				
People in neighborhood				
Family				
Relatives				
Friends, acquaintances				

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

11

12

105

Q26. In the community where you live, what organization has the primary responsibility for disaster management? Please choose the answer that applies best, and circle the number beside it.

1) Volunteer disaster prevention organization, fire corps
2) Police or fire department (public organization)
3) Local government (city hall, town hall)
4) Central government
5) Military sector

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

[   ]

Q27. If there is a dispute over land, where do you offer to mediate it? (multiple answers possible).

1) Public institution such as city hall, town or village hall, etc.
2) Police
3) Court
4) Political party, politician(s), mayor (village chief)
5) Organization in nearby community (neighborhood association, etc.)
6) Religious organization such as a temple or church
7) NPO, civic group, etc.
8) Neighbors

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

[   ]

Q28. If a dispute happens between people in your community, do you think that people in the community could resolve the problem themselves? Please choose the one answer that most closely describes your opinion, and circle the number beside it.

1) Yes
2) Probably
3) So, so
4) Probably not
5) Definitely not

13

Social Rituals

Q29-1. In the community where you live, are there any assets or resources that are managed not by the authorities but jointly by members of the local society?

1) Yes →Q30   2) No →Q31

Q30. What kinds of assets or resources are managed jointly? (Only respondents who answered "1. Yes" for Q31 need to answer.) (multiple answers possible)

1) Water sources, reservoirs
2) Waterways, rivers
3) Forests, wilderness
4) Roads
5) Bridges
6) Ceremonial facilities
7) Cemeteries

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

[   ]

Q31. In your community, what are works, tasks and role that mainly man schould take up? Please explain konkretly.

[   ]

Q32. In your community, what are works, tasks and role that mainly woman schould take up? Please explain konkretly.

[   ]

14

Q33. Of the following people, who do you feel has to attend someone's wedding?

1) Family
2) Relatives
3) Friends, acquaintances
4) People in neighborhood
5) Friends from work / coworkers
6) Employer
7) People from a religious organization such as a temple or church
8) Volunteers or people from NPOs or civic groups
9) Politicians

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

Q34. Of the following people, who do you feel has to attend someone's funeral? (multiple answers possible)

1) Family
2) Relatives
3) Friends, acquaintances
4) People in neighborhood
5) Friends from work
6) Employer
7) People from a religious organization such as a temple or church
8) Volunteers or people from NPOs or civic groups
9) Politicians

If you have any other answers besides those listed above, please list them in the space below.

Q35. Do you participate in ceremonies that are held in your community?

1) Always
2) As much as possible
3) Occasionally
4) Not much
5) Not at all

15

Q36. Do you consult with a holy man, fortune teller, or someone associated with a temple or church with regard to the problems that come up in everyday life (minor illness, family problems, choosing a marriage partner or wedding date, naming of children, etc.)?

1) Often
2) Sometimes
3) Rarely
4) Never

16

Face Sheet (Basic Attributes)

Q1. Please choose your gender.
1) Male   2) Female

Q2. Please choose your age (years completed).
1) 10-19   2) 20-29   3) 30-39   4) 40-49   5) 50-59
6) 60-69   7) 70-79   8) 80 or older

Q3. Please choose your profession that takes most of your working time.
1) Agriculture, forestry, fishing (including family workers)
2) Factory workers
3) Self-owned business (including family workers)
4) Business manager, executive officer
5) Specialist personnel (doctor, teacher, accountant, nurse, etc. or other work that requires a license)
6) Management-level position of section chief or higher (in a public office, organization, or private corporation)
7) Worker employed full-time by a private company (other than "2.")
8) Worker employed full-time by a public office or organization
9) Temporary employee, contingent employee, part-time worker
10) Student
11) Stay-at-home
12) Unemployed
13) Other (Please explain:)

Q4. Please choose which of the following describes your home.
1) Privately owned house (mine)
2) Privately owned house (relative's)
3) Private rental home
4) Publicly owned rental home
5) Company housing, public officials' housing
6) Apartment for singles
7) Dormitory, boarding house
8) Other (specify :   )

17

Q5. How do you get drinking water at your home?
1) Use household running water
2) Use household well water
3) Use shared running water
4) Use shared well water
5) Go to a far-away location to pump water
6) Buy drinking water
7) Other (Please explain:)

Q6. How is the treatment and collection of sewage water, waste water, waste material and garbage, etc. handled at your home?
1) The local government treats and collects it
2) We treat and collect it at home

Q7. How long have you lived in your current community (city, town, or village)? For those who lived elsewhere for a while and then returned to this community, please answer for the number of years you have lived here overall.
1) Less than 1 year   2) 1-3 years
3) 4-5 years   4) 6-9 years
5) 10-19 years   6) 20-29 years
7) 30 years or more

Q8. Please choose your religious affiliation from among the following.
(For the Vietnam study) Source: Ministry of Foreign Affairs website "Regional Affairs"
1) Buddhism
2) Christianity
3) Đạo Cao Đài
4) Other (Please explain:)

(For the Laos study)
1) Buddhism
2) Other (Please explain:)

18

Q9. Your marital situation is

1) Married (have spouse)
2) Diverced
3) Separeted or widowed
4) Unmarried

Q10. How many family members live in your home (including yourself)?

[ ] people

Q11. Please describe the family composition of the people that live in your home.

1) Only myself
2) Husband and wife
3) 2 generations
4) 3 generations
5) Other(Please xplain:)

Q12. Please tell us about your educational background. For current students, please write the level of school you are now attending (such as high school or college) in "10. Other."

1) I have never attended school
2) Dropped out of elementary school
3) Completed elementary school
4) Dropped out of middle school
5) Completed middle school
6) Dropped out of high school
7) Completed high school
8) Dropped out of college
9)Completedcollege
10) Other (Please explain:)

Q13. Do you have children?

1) Yes   2) No

19

Q14. To be asked of respondents who have children. Please write the number of children you have.

[ ] children

Q15. Does your household have the goods and services listed in the following chart?

	Yes	No
Television		
Radio		
Computer		
Internet access		
Fixed-line phone		
Mobile phone		
Bicycle		
Motorbike		
Automobile		

Q16. What do you often use as a means of transportation?

1) Train   2) Bus
3) Taxi   4) Motorized tricycle
5) Private automobile   6) Motorbike
7) Bicycle   8) Boat, canoe
9) Other (Please explain:)

Q17. Who in your family is the primary income earner?

1) Me
2) My spouse
3) My son
4) My daughter
5) My father
6) My mother
7) My grandparents
8) Other (Please explain:)

20

Q18. If you don't mind, please tell us the annual income earned by the entire family that lives with you (including taxes).

(For the Vietnam study) 1 dollar ＝ about 18,500 dong

1) Less than 4,000,000 dong
2) 4,000,000～6,000,000 dong
3) 6,000,001～10,000,000 dong
4) 10,000,001～12,000,000 dong
5) 12,000,001～14,000,000 dong
6) 14,000,001～20,000,000 dong
7) 20,000,001～30,000,000 dong
8) 30,000,001～40,000,000 dong
9) 40,000,001～60,000,000 dong
10) 60,000,001～80,000,000 dong
11) More than 80,000,000 dong

(For the Laos study) 1 dollar ＝ about 8,500 kip

1) Less than 2,000,000 kip
2) 2,000,000～4,000,000 kip
3) 4,000,001～6,000,000 kip
4) 6,000,001～8,000,000 kip
5) 8,000,001～10,000,000 kip
6) 10,000,001～15,000,000 kip
7) 15,000,001～20,000,000 kip
8) 20,000,001～30,000,000 kip
9) 30,000,001～50,000,000 kip
10) More than 50,000,000 kip

(For the Cambodia study) Dollars are generally accepted (1 dollar ＝ about 2,500 riel; no conversion needed)

1) Less than 200 dollars
2) 200～350 dollars
3) 351～600 dollars
4) 601～850 dollars
5) 851～1,200 dollars
6) 1,201～1,800 dollars
7) 1,801～2,400 dollars
8) 2,401～3,600 dollars
9) 3,601～6,000 dollars
10) More than 6,000 dollars

21