

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. CONTROL NUMBER

2. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION (695)

PN-AAK-449

PA00-0000-0000

3. TITLE AND SUBTITLE (240)

Political and economic participation: a study of political participation and income distribution

4. PERSONAL AUTHORS (100)

Lyman, P. N.

5. CORPORATE AUTHORS (101)

AID/PPC

6. DOCUMENT DATE (110)

1971

7. NUMBER OF PAGES (120)

14p.

8. ARC NUMBER (170)

9. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION (130)

PPC

10. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (500)

(Summarizes results of a research study by Northwestern Univ. under contract AID/csa-2236)

11. ABSTRACT (950)

social organization

12. DESCRIPTORS (920)

income distribution
political aspects
participation
economic conditions

13. PROJECT NUMBER (150)

14. CONTRACT NO. (140)

PPC

15. CONTRACT TYPE (140)

16. TYPE OF DOCUMENT (160)



POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION: A STUDY OF
POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AND INCOME DISTRIBUTION

The attached paper is a summary of the results of a research study by Northwestern University, Contract AID/csd-2236.

Princeton N. Lyman
Bureau for Program and
Policy Coordination
A.I.D./Washington
July 1971

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION
A STUDY OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION
AND INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Under A.I.D. contract AID/csd-2236, Professor Irma Adelman of Northwestern University in collaboration with Cynthia Morris of American University, has completed the main portion of a research project on economic and political participation in the LDCs. The project constructed a broad definition of "political participation" by which it measured countries in two time periods (1957-62; 1963-68). The project defined and measured "economic participation" by income distribution. The project then correlated these two types of participation and measured them in relation to over 30 other characteristics of development to determine what factors of change might contribute most to a greater degree of economic and political participation in the development process. The project studied income distribution in 44 countries, mostly LDCs, but including some advanced countries like Japan, South Africa, Greece and Israel, and political participation in 74 countries, mostly LDCs.

I. Interpretation of the Results

The researchers state that it is important to recognize the limitations of the analysis. The conclusions and recommendations are based on their interpretation of the analysis and other related research cited in the report, bearing in mind the limitations of the data and methodology. It should be noted particularly that the sample, though unusually large, is still a limited one, that it covers only a limited period of time, that the analysis is based on cross-sectional data rather than on time series data, and that the effects of the transitional character of the many newly independent countries of Black Africa on the validity of the results for the least developed group of countries is not clear. Furthermore, the techniques employed to show the relationship between independent and dependent variables does not establish causation but only association. This does not exclude the possibility of a causal nexus; but empirical work in specified situations would be required to establish it, e.g., analysis of individual country experiences over time.

II. Summary and Conclusions

The principal conclusions are summarized below under Political Participation, Economic Participation, and Policy Conclusions.

A. Political Participation

1. Political participation is positively associated with the extent of social mobility, strength of specialized political organizations such as the labor movement, and an earlier period of social tension. The "extent of social mobility" emerges as the most important variable both as contemporarily associated with higher levels of participation and as predictive of higher levels of political participation in the future.

2. The factors of greatest importance vary however at different stages of socio-economic development:

a. At lower levels (among LDCs) of socio-economic development specialized political or quasi-political institutions appear to be most important -- labor unions, parliament, press -- plus the level of industrialization and the modernization of outlook.

b. At intermediate and higher levels of socio-economic development, other factors become of prime importance: freedom of political opposition and press, importance of the indigenous middle class, declining political strength of the traditional elite, and the basis of the party system.

3. As predictive of higher political participation, the basis of social organization emerges as the critical variable among countries at the intermediate stage. This variable includes changes in the social system brought about by education, increased access to middle class status, land reform, and military intervention in politics against a traditional elite (the military often being a prime vehicle of early middle or lower middle class participation).

4. There is relatively little association between the rate of economic growth and the extent of political participation. Industrialization, agricultural productivity, physical overhead capital, financial and tax institutions, investment, and the rate of growth of per capita GNP virtually never appear as primary variables in the analysis of inter-country differences in political participation.

B. Economic Participation (Income Distribution)

1. Overall. Income distribution tends toward more equality in countries which:

a. Are not sharply dualistic (i.e., where there is a less sharp division between the modernized and traditional sectors).

b. Are resource poor and which emphasize the development of human more than natural resources.

c. Have a greater degree of direct government involvement in the economic sector, i.e., greater government investment as a percentage of total investment (the author suggests but does not demonstrate that government ownership of enterprise may be an important factor in this variable).

2. Lower Income Groups. Economic development appears to work to the relative disadvantage of the lowest income groups, encompassing the majority of the population, especially during the early and intermediate stages of development.

a. Lowest 20% of the population. Most LDCs accord only 4-5% of the Net National Product (NNP) to the lowest 20% of the population. Countries which accord significantly more (7-9%) are either largely underdeveloped (Chad, Dahomey, Malagasy, Niger) or very highly developed (Argentina, Greece, Israel and Japan).

b. Lowest 60% of the population. LDCs accord, on the average, only 25% of NNP to the lowest 60% of the population. Those countries which accord significantly higher than the average, between 30% and 40% of NNP, are as in the preceding paragraph, either pervasively underdeveloped or very substantially developed. Those countries which accord significantly less than 25% of NNP to the lowest 60% of the population, i.e., around 17% of NNP, are resource rich countries with a sharply dualistic development pattern and where traditional elites or expatriates are prominent economically (Gabon, Iraq, Peru, Senegal and South Africa).

3. Middle Income Groups. The portion of income allocated to the middle income groups (the two deciles clustered around the median income) is the only share which appears to vary systematically with the level of development. Social and economic development are uniformly to the advantage of the middle income groups. Given the level of socio-economic development, middle income groups do less well (vis-a-vis upper income groups) where there is a natural resource abundance. By contrast, greater political participation is associated with higher than average shares for middle-income households, even when the middle class accounts for less than 10% of the population.

4. Upper Income Groups. The share of income going to the upper income groups is associated positively (i.e., higher share) with a relative abundance of natural resources and negatively (lower share) with direct government participation in the economy, popular participation in the political process and policies to develop human resources.

a. Upper 5%. This group receives on the average, 30% of NNP. The range was from 11% in Israel to 60% in Rhodesia. Those at the lower end of the range (lower share to the upper 5%) were featured by relatively poor natural resources and/or a significant level of direct government investment in the economy and nationalized enterprises. Those with higher than average shares going to the upper 5% were rich in natural resources (especially minerals), had less direct government economic activity, less middle class, and -- at the extreme end -- severe racial problems or large poor ethnic minorities.

b. Upper 20%. The average accorded this group was 56%. As with the upper 5% of the population, countries which accorded less (no more than 50%) to this group had socialist-oriented governments and not too abundant natural resources. Those according more (above 60% of NNP) were featured by sharply dualistic economies, lack of

strongly socialist governments, and lack of generalized access to education.

C. Policy Conclusions

1. General. The optimistic view -- that if we take care of economic development, economic and political participation will take care of themselves -- is contradicted by the empirical evidence.

a. In the absence of specific policy action for the promotion of political participation there is no discernible correlation between faster rates of economic growth and increases in political participation.

b. In the absence of specific policy measures aimed at improving the distribution of income there is, for the most part, a negative association between the rate of economic development and the share of income accruing to the poorest segment of the population.

2. Political Participation. Based on associations in the data, policy instruments which can be used most to promote increases in political participation would appear to vary with the country's level of socio-economic development.

a. In the least developed countries, possible instruments are related to the establishment of independent political structures and those associated with expanding political awareness and political involvement.

b. In the next most developed group, possible instruments for increasing political participation are those basic to the expansion of the middle class. Because the military cadre constitute the key organized element of the middle class in many of these countries, appropriate training courses for the military may be useful.

c. For the most developed LDCs, possible instruments are the promotion of greater social mobility, land reform, and the strengthening of a multi-party political structure.

3. Economic Participation. Policy instruments to promote increases in economic participation (greater distribution of income to the poorer segments of the population) are:

a. Development strategies based on more intensive human resource development and use.

b. More direct government participation in the economy.

- c. Reductions in socio-economic dualism.
- d. Promotion of greater political participation.

4. Economic-Political Interaction.

a. Human-resource-oriented development programs are associated with both greater economic participation (more equal distribution of income) and, through increasing social mobility with greater political participation.

b. Policies associated with increasing political or economic participation may, especially in highly dualistic countries, not be those associated with the highest achievable rate of growth of per capita GNP in the short run.

c. Measures implemented to increase political participation in the longer run are likely to be associated in the short-run with an increase in social tension and political instability. In the long run, the success of these measures are associated with reduced social tension and increased political stability.

III. Methodology

A. Selection of Data and Definitions

The research is based on a pioneering and in some quarters controversial method of quantitative analysis of social, political and economic factors in 74 countries. The basic data on socio-economic development levels was first compiled and developed into composite scores for each country in an earlier work by the researchers, Irma Adelman and Cynthia Morris, Society, Politics and Economic Development (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1968).

For the current project, the researchers constructed a measure of political participation which they felt was applicable to the characteristics of the LDCs and was not tied to Western institutional norms, per se. The classification scheme adopted, after review of literature and discussions with regional and country experts, was in terms of the following broad criteria.

1. The extent to which, through participant associations and institutions, the major socio-economic and cultural-ethnic groups have their interests represented in, and are able to influence, the making of national political decisions affecting them.

2. The extent to which those individuals belonging to nationally represented cultural-ethnic and/or socio-economic groups can

choose between different political channels in seeking national representation of their interests.

3. The extent of actual participation by individuals in the national political process through participation in political parties, special interest groups and/or other institutions or associations carrying out political functions, or through voluntary voting between genuine political alternatives.

The researchers then examined available empirical data on these factors, made an initial evaluation of composite country rankings, checked these with over 100 country or regional experts, and then developed the final categorization. The precise make-up of the composite for each country is determined by a priori judgments regarding the relative importance of the different aspects of political participation represented.

Three types of sources were employed in order to construct the income distribution analysis used in the study. Budget, income-expenditure, studies which sample different strata of the population; income information compiled from national censuses; and tax returns. In some cases, the basic information was exceedingly coarse; a finer breakdown into class intervals was achieved by fitting the distributions to similar empirical or theoretical distributions. There were various other sources of incompatibility in the data which, together with the means used to overcome them, are discussed in the full report.

B. Technique of Analysis

The classification of countries according to the extent of political participation was used to perform discriminant analyses for the full sample of 74 countries and for three sub-samples representing successive levels of socio-economic development during two subperiods (1957-62 and 1963-68). The purpose of the discriminant analyses was to find for each sample that linear combination of country attributes which best differentiated between the groupings according to political participation. The variables in the discriminant functions were chosen from over twenty indicators of social, political and economic characteristics of the countries over the period 1957-62, which had been analyzed and measured in the authors' earlier work, Society, Politics and Economic Development.

In seeking the best discriminant function for each sample a stepwise procedure was used: that variable was selected at each step in the analysis for which the F ratio was the highest, given the prior inclusions. Those variables not selected which were the next-best alternatives were examined at each step to gain more insight into the forces represented by the included variables.

Also, to obtain insight into the forces represented by the included variables, simple correlations between included and omitted variables were studied. The net correlations between the omitted variables and political participation at successive steps in the analysis were studied for the same purpose. Finally, the authors made a detailed examination of those countries classified in each category by successive variables and of the individual country scores on the variables included at each step and on political participation. The discussion of results draws on all these sources of information.

The statistical technique used for analysis of income distribution is based on an analysis of variance. It was deemed especially appropriate because it does not require a priori stratification of the original sample. It employs an assymetrical branching process to subdivide the original sample into a series of subgroups constructed so as to facilitate prediction of the value of the dependent variable with the least error. The particular technique used, akin to a highly non-linear type of stepwise multiple regression analysis, is described fully in the report.

The authors applied this technique to income distribution comparison using as independent variables over 30 factors of economic, social, political and historical significance. The technique was felt to be ideally suited to the study of changes in income distribution because the authors felt that such changes are brought about by highly complex processes which impinge in a different manner on various strata of the population, and differently in countries with varying sets of characteristics.

C. Country Listings

Attached are tables showing the composite country classifications for political participation and the country information on income distribution.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF INCOME DISTRIBUTIONS

COUNTRY	LOWEST 20%		21 - 40%		41 - 60%		61 - 80%		81 - 95%		96 - 100%	
	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income
Argentina ¹	7.00	7.00	10.30	17.30	13.10	30.40	17.60	48.00	22.60	70.60	29.40	100.00
Bolivia ²	4.00	4.00	13.70	17.70	8.90	26.60	14.30	40.90	23.40	64.30	35.70	100.00
Brazil ³	3.50	3.50	9.00	12.50	10.20	22.70	15.30	38.50	23.10	61.60	38.40	100.00
Burma ⁴	10.00	10.00	13.00	23.00	13.00	36.00	15.50	51.50	20.29	71.79	28.21	100.00
Ceylon ⁵	4.45	4.45	9.21	13.66	13.81	27.47	20.22	47.69	33.93	81.62	18.38	100.00
Chad ⁶	12.00	12.00	11.00	23.00	12.00	35.00	22.00	57.00	20.00	77.00	23.00	100.00
Chile ⁷	5.40	5.40	9.50	15.00	12.00	27.00	20.70	47.70	29.70	77.40	22.60	100.00
Taiwan ⁸	4.50	4.50	9.70	14.20	14.30	29.00	19.00	48.00	27.90	75.90	24.10	100.00
Colombia ⁹	2.21	2.21	4.70	6.91	8.97	15.33	16.06	31.94	27.70	59.64	40.36	100.00
Costa Rica ¹⁰	6.00	6.00	7.30	13.30	12.10	25.40	14.00	40.00	25.00	65.00	35.00	100.00
Cuba ¹¹	8.00	8.00	10.00	18.00	12.00	30.00	20.00	50.00	18.00	68.00	32.00	100.00
Ecuador ¹²	6.30	6.30	10.60	16.50	25.10	42.60	15.60	58.20	20.30	78.50	21.50	100.00
El Salvador ¹³	5.50	5.50	6.70	12.20	11.30	23.50	15.10	38.60	23.40	67.00	33.00	100.00
Gabon ¹⁴	2.00	2.00	6.00	8.00	7.00	15.00	14.00	29.00	24.00	53.00	47.00	100.00
Greece ¹⁵	9.00	9.00	12.30	21.80	12.30	34.10	16.40	50.50	26.50	77.00	23.00	100.00
India ¹⁶	8.00	8.00	12.00	20.00	16.00	36.00	22.00	58.00	34.00	92.00	8.00	100.00
Iraq ¹⁷	2.00	2.00	6.00	8.00	8.00	16.00	16.00	32.00	34.00	66.00	34.00	100.00
Israel ¹⁸	8.30	8.30	13.40	20.20	18.60	31.80	21.00	52.80	28.20	83.80	16.20	100.00

COUNTRY	LOWEST 20%		21 - 40%		41 - 60%		61 - 80%		81 - 95%		96 - 100%	
	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income
Ivory Coast ¹⁹	8.00	8.00	10.00	18.00	12.00	30.00	15.00	45.00	26.00	71.00	29.00	100.00
Jamaica ²⁰	2.20	2.20	6.00	8.20	10.80	19.00	19.50	38.50	30.30	68.30	31.20	100.00
Japan ²¹	4.70	4.70	10.60	15.30	15.80	31.10	22.90	54.00	31.20	85.20	14.80	100.00
Kenya ²²	7.00	7.00	7.00	14.00	7.00	21.00	15.00	36.00	41.80	77.80	22.20	100.00
Lebanon ²³	3.00	3.00	4.20	7.20	15.80	23.00	16.00	39.00	27.00	66.00	34.00	100.00
Lybia ²⁴	0.11	0.11	0.39	0.50	1.28	1.78	8.72	10.50	43.10	53.60	46.40	100.00
Madagascar ²⁵	7.00	7.00	7.00	14.00	9.00	23.00	18.00	41.00	22.00	63.00	37.00	100.00
Mexico ²⁶	3.66	3.66	6.84	10.50	11.25	21.75	20.21	41.96	29.52	71.48	28.52	100.00
Morocco ²⁷	7.10	7.10	7.40	14.50	7.70	22.20	12.40	34.60	44.50	79.10	20.90	100.00
Niger ²⁸	12.00	12.00	11.00	23.00	12.00	35.00	23.00	58.00	19.00	77.00	23.00	100.00
Nigeria ²⁹	7.00	7.00	7.00	14.00	9.00	23.00	16.10	39.10	22.50	61.62	38.38	100.00
Pakistan ³⁰	6.50	6.50	11.00	17.50	15.50	33.00	22.00	55.00	25.00	80.00	20.00	100.00
Panama ³¹	4.90	4.90	9.40	14.30	13.80	28.10	15.20	43.30	22.20	65.50	34.50	100.00
Peru ³²	4.04	4.04	4.86	8.90	8.30	17.20	15.20	32.40	19.30	51.70	48.30	100.00
Philippines ³³	4.30	4.30	8.40	12.70	12.00	24.70	19.50	44.20	28.30	72.50	27.50	100.00
N. Rhodesia ³⁴ (Zambia)	6.27	6.27	9.55	15.82	11.10	26.95	15.95	42.90	19.60	62.50	37.50	100.00
Rhodesia ³⁵	4.00	4.00	8.00	12.00	8.00	20.00	15.00	35.00	5.00	40.00	60.00	100.00
Senegal ³⁶	3.00	3.00	7.00	10.00	10.00	20.00	16.00	36.00	28.00	64.00	36.00	100.00

COUNTRY	LOWEST 20%		21 - 40%		41 - 60%		61 - 80%		81 - 95%		96 - 100%	
	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income	% income	% cum. income
Sierra Leone ³⁷	3.80	3.80	6.30	10.10	9.10	19.20	16.70	35.90	30.30	66.20	33.80	100.00
South Africa ³⁸	1.94	1.94	4.17	6.11	10.16	16.27	26.37	42.64	17.98	60.62	39.33	100.00
Sudan ³⁹	5.60	5.60	9.40	15.00	14.30	29.30	22.60	51.90	31.00	82.90	17.10	100.00
Surinam ⁴⁰	10.70	10.70	11.56	22.26	14.74	37.00	20.60	57.60	27.00	84.60	15.40	100.00
Tanzania ⁴¹	9.75	9.75	9.75	19.50	9.85	29.25	9.75	39.00	18.10	57.10	42.90	100.00
Trinidad and Tobago ⁴²	3.60	3.60	5.76	9.36	9.16	18.52	24.42	43.00	30.40	73.40	26.60	100.00
Tunisia ⁴³	4.97	4.97	5.65	10.62	9.95	20.57	14.43	35.00	42.56	77.56	22.44	100.00
Venezuela ⁴⁴	4.40	4.40	9.00	13.40	16.60	30.00	22.90	52.90	23.90	76.80	23.20	100.00

TABLE A-1

Country classifications with respect to the three components
of the Composite Index of Popular Political Participation
(1957-1962)

Country	C a t e g o r y	Country Classification with respect to			Country	C a t e g o r y	Country Classification with respect to		
		Nat'l Repre- sentation 1/	Choice of Channel 2/	Actual Partici- pation 3/			Nat'l Repre- sentation 1/	Choice of Channel 2/	Actual Partici- pation 3/
Afghanistan	J-	5	3a	2	Laos	J-	5	3a	2
Algeria	I	4	3a	2	Lebanon	D	1	2a	1
Argentina	A	1	1	1	Liberia	J-	5	3b	2
Bolivia	D	1	2b	1	Libya	J-	5	3a	2
Brazil	A-	1	1	1	Malagasy	H	3	2a	2
Burma	C	3	1	1	Malawi	H	3	2a	2
Cambodia	I	4	3b	2	Mexico	A-	1	1	1
Cameroun	H	4	2a	2	Morocco	H	4	2b	2
Ceylon	B	2a	1	1	Nepal	J-	5	3a	2
Chad	J-	5	3b	2	Niger	J-	5	3b	2
Chile	A	1	1	1	Nigeria	E	2a	2a	1
China (Taiwan)	E	2a	2b	1	Nicaragua	H	4	2a	2
Colombia	B	2a	1	1	Pakistan	J-	5	3a	2
Costa Rica	A	1	1	1	Panama	F	4	1	1
Cyprus	E	2a	2a	1	Paraguay	G	3	1	2
Dahomey	G	3	1	2	Peru	F	4	1	1
Dominican Republic	J-	5	3b	2	Phillipines	A	1	1	1
Ecuador	F	4	1	1	Rhodesia	J	5	1	2
El Salvador	F	4	1	1	Senegal	G	1	2b	2
Ethiopia	J-	5	3a	2	Sierra Leone	H	3	2a	2
Gabon	I	4	3a	2	Somali Republic	D	1	2a	1
Ghana	E	2	2a	1	South Africa	J-	5	1	2
Greece	A	1	1	1	Sudan	J	5	3a	2
Guatemala	F	4	1	1	Surinam	A	1	1	1
Guinea	E	2b	2	1	Syria	E	2b	2b	2
Honduras	C	3	1	1	Tanganyika	D	1	2b	1
India	B	2a	1	1	Thailand	J-	5	3a	2
Indonesia	E	3	2a	1	Trinidad	D	1	2a	1
Iran	I	4	3	2	Tunisia	G	2	2b	2
Iraq	J-	5	3a	2	Turkey	B-	2a	1	1
Israel	A	1	1	1	Uganda	H	3	2a	2
Ivory Coast	E	2b	2b	1	United Arab Republic	H	3	2b	2
Jamaica	A	1	1	1	Uruguay	A	1	1	1
Japan	A	1	1	1	Venezuela	A	1	1	1
Jordan	J-	5	3a	2	Vietnam (South)	J-	5	3b	2
Kenya	H	3	2a	2	Yemen	J-	5	3a	2
Korea (South)	F	3	1-	1	Zambia	D	1	2a	1

1/See above for the definitional scheme for the Effectiveness of National Political Representation.

2/See above for the definitional scheme for the Extent of Choice of Channel for National Political Representation.

3/See above for the definitional scheme for the Extent of Actual Participation by the Adult Population in the National Political Process.

TABLE A-2

Country classifications with respect to the three components
of the Composite Index of Popular Political Participation

(1963-68)

Country	C a t e g o r y	Country Classification with respect to			Country	C a t e g o r y	Country Classification with respect to		
		Nat'l Repre- sentation	Choice of Channel	Actual Participa- tion			Nat'l Repre- sentation	Choice of Channel	Actual Participa- tion
		<u>1/</u>	<u>2/</u>	<u>3/</u>			<u>1/</u>	<u>2/</u>	<u>3/</u>
Afghanistan	H-	4	3+	2	Laos	F-	3	3a	1
Algeria	E	2a	2b	1	Lebanon	D	1	2a	1
Argentina	C	2a(5)	2(3a)	1(1)	Liberia	J-	5	3b	2
Bolivia	D	1	2b+	1	Libya	J-	5	3a	2
Brazil	H	4	2	2	Malagasy	ll	3	2a	2
Burma	J	5	3a	2	Malawi	E	2b	2b	1
Cambodia	I	4	3b	2	Mexico	A-	1	1-	1
Cameroun	G	2b	2b	2	Morocco	H	3	2b	2
Ceylon	B	2a	1	1	Nepal	H-	4	3b	2
Chad	J-	5	3b	2	Niger	J-	5	3b	2
Chile	A	1	1	1	Nigeria	E	2a	2a	1
China(Taiwan)	E	2a	2b+	1	Nicaragua	H	4	2b+	2
Colombia	B	2a	1	1	Pakistan	E	2b	2a	1
Costa Rica	A	1	1	1	Panama	F	4	1	1
Cyprus	E	2a	2a	1	Paraguay	E-	2b	3b	1
Dahomey	G	2b(1)	2b+	2	Phillipines	A	1	1	1
Dominican Republic	C	2b-	1-	1-	Rhodesia	J	5	1	2
Ecuador	F	4	1	1	Senegal	G	1	2b	2
El Salvador	F	4	1	1	Sierra Leone	C	3	1-	1
Ethiopia	J-	5	3a+	2	Somali Republic	D	1	2a	1
Gabon	G-	2b-	3b	2	South Africa	J	5	1	2
Ghana	F	3	2b-	1	Sudan	J-	5	3a	2
Greece	A	1	1	1	Surinam	A	1	1	1
Guatemala	F	4	1	1	Syria	E	2b	2b	2
Guinea	E	2b	2b-	1	Tanzania	D	1	2b	1
Honduras	C	3	1	1	Thailand	J-	5	3a	2
India	B+	2a+	1	1	Trinidad	D+	1	2a+	1
Indonesia	E	2b	2a+	1	Tunisia	H-	3	3b+	2+
Iran	G	2b	2c-	2	Turkey	A-	1-	1	1
Iraq	J-	5	3a	2	Uganda	G	2b	2a	2
Israel	A	1	1	1	United Arab Republic	G	2b	2b	2
Ivory Coast	F	3b+	2b-	1	Uruguay	A	1	1	1
Jamaica	A-	1	1-	1	Venezuela	A	1	1	1
Japan	A	1	1	1	Vietnam (South)	H-	3	3b	2
Jordan	J-	5	3a	2	Yemen	J-	5	3a	2
Kenya	D	1	2b	1	Zambia	D	1	2a+	1
Korea (South)	C	3	1-	1					

1/See above for the definitional scheme for the Effectiveness of National Political Representation.

2/See above for the definitional scheme for the Extent of Choice of Channel for National Political Representation.

3/See above for the definitional scheme for the Extent of Actual Participation by the Adult Population in the National Political Process.

Table 1

Definition of Indicator of Popular Political Participation
in Terms of I's Three Component Elements

<u>Categories of Popular Political Participation (composite)</u>	<u>National Political Representation</u>	<u>Choice of Channel for Representation</u>	<u>Actual Participation</u>
A	1	1	1
B	2	1	1
C	3	1	1
D	1	2	1
E	2	2	1
E-	2	3	1
F	3	2	1
F	4	1	1
F-	3	3	1
G	1 or 2	2	2
G-	1 or 2	3	2
H+	3 or 4	1	2
H	3 or 4	2	2
H-	3 or 4	3	2
I	4	3	2
J	5	1 or 2	2
J	5	3	1
J-	5	3	2

Note: See the pages following for an explanation of the symbols in this table.