

Political Indicators: An Attempt at the Quantification of Political Information*

ELSA P. JURADO

I

To quantify political information and provide a more precise way of understanding political phenomena, two measurements are attempted, namely: 1) voter's registration ratios and voting turn-out ratios where time series data are available, and 2) experimental political indicators based on people's attitudes. For the latter the following indices of several political experimental variables are constructed: a) political mobility index, b) political participation index, c) political dissent index, d) political awareness index, and e) political efficacy index.

II

Electoral participation is one form of political involvement. When people register in an election, they indicate their interest in the political process. When voters choose their representatives in government by casting their votes, they directly participate in political decision-making. High electoral participation is one essential element of representative democracy.

This section presents in quantified forms trends in electoral participation in the Philippines from 1907 to 1971. More specifically,

*This paper is based on Elsa P. Jurado, "Indicators of Political Opportunity and Political Welfare," and Elsa P. Jurado and Barbara Jo Lava "Philippine Elections and Political Participations from 1907-1971" in Mahar Mangahas, ed., *Measuring Philippine Development: Report of the Social Indicators Project*, the Development Academy of the Philippines, 1976, pp. 357-378.

The author is Assistant Professor of Political Science, Department of Political Science, University of the Philippines.

it examines general voting participation, qualified citizens' voting participation, registration ratios and voting turn-outs.

In symbols, it looks into:

$$V/P, R/P, V/Pq/ V/R,$$

where V means citizens who actually voted;

P, total population;

R, citizens who registered; and

Pq, total qualified (21 years old and over) population.

The foregoing ratio is used as indicator of political participation. It can be said that the higher they are, the more politically conscious, active and directly participatory the population is in the making of political decisions. The opposite is also true, the lower the ratios are, the less participation the citizenry has in the society's political life.

1.

Data on elections were obtained from the Commission on Elections (COMELEC), and those on population from the Bureau of the Census and Statistics (BCS). The population for each election year which we used to compute for participation ratios was obtained from projections (Table 1):

These data are not without limitations. One problem is the lack of uniformity in the reporting of information. The COMELEC started disaggregating election reports by age and sex in 1946. Before 1946, only national totals were available. For the adult population, the BCS reported 20 years old and over for certain years but later, changed the base to 21 years old and over. For purposes of uniformity, ages were adjusted to 21 years and over for the adult population.

A more serious problem is the incompleteness and even total unavailability of data for certain years. This was partly remedied by secondary sources, mainly newspapers, which we used to complete or supplement the data. Where data could not be completed, the inadequacy is properly indicated.

2.

Filipino citizens began their political participation in the election of national leaders in 1907 when they chose their representatives to the Philippine Assembly. In 1916, their political participation was expanded to include voting for the country's President and Vice-President. Their political participation was interrupted by the war but immediately resumed in 1946. Since then, qualified citizens have

Table 1. Total Population, Population 21 Years Old and Over and Number of Registered Voters and Voters Philippines: 1909 – 1971

Years	Total Population ¹ (Thousands)	Total Population 21 Years & Over (Thousands)	Registered Voters	Voters
1909	8,657	3,973	208,845	192,975
1912	9,187	4,216	248,154	235,786
1935	14,817	6,629	1,629,000 ²	1,022,547
1946	17,990	7,826	2,898,604	2,596,880
1947	18,531	8,061	4,233,528	3,264,423
1949	19,664	8,514	5,135,814	3,579,917
1951	20,866	8,972	4,754,307	4,391,109
1953	22,141	9,454	5,603,231	4,326,706
1955	23,493	9,937	6,487,061	5,046,488
1957	24,928	10,469	9,763,897	5,108,112
1959	26,451	11,003	7,822,472	6,393,724
1961	28,233	11,716	8,483,568	6,738,805
1963	29,958	12,432	9,692,161	7,711,019
1965	31,789	13,192	9,962,345	7,610,051
1967	33,732	13,999	9,744,604	7,957,019
1969	35,793	14,854	10,300,898	8,203,072
1971	37,067	15,384	11,661,909	9,419,568

¹Population figures were projected by Vic Paquero.

²Figures for registered voters' turn-out are incomplete.

participated in the election process regularly every two years. The years 1946, 1949, 1953, 1957, 1961, 1965, and 1969 were presidential election years, while the years 1947, 1951, 1955, 1959, 1963, 1967, and 1971 were election years for members of the Senate and local officials.

3.

General Voting Participation: The general voting participation (V/P) increased over time. Table 2 shows that starting from 2.23% in 1909, it went up to 18.20% in 1949. After 1949, participation became stable at 23.0%. Registration participation (R/P) also increased from 1907 to 1949 the number of registered voters growing from 1.0% of

Table 2. Registration Participation (R/P) and General Voting Participation (V/P) Rates, Philippines: 1907-1971

Years	Registered Voters/ Total Population R/P (%)	Voters/Total Population V/P (%)
1907	1.0%	
1909	2.41	2.23%
1912	2.70	2.56
1935	10.99	6.90
1946	16.11	14.43
1947	22.84	17.61
1949	26.11	18.20
1951	22.78	21.04
1953	25.30	19.54
1955	27.61	21.48
1957	27.15	20.49
1959	29.57	24.17
1961	30.04	23.86
1963	32.35	25.73
1965	31.33	23.93
1967	28.88	23.58
1969	28.77	22.91
1971	30.11	25.41

the total population to 16.11%. After 1946, the ratio steadily went up to 29.57% in 1959, then levelled off at about 30.0%.

Citizens' Voting Participation, Registration and Voting Turn-Out: Table 3 shows trends in citizen's voting participation (V/Pq), registration ratio (R/Pq), and voting turn-out (V/R).

Citizens' voting participation and registration ratios increased over time. However, the increase was most pronounced up to 1946. It became gradual after that until 1959, after which both ratios stabilized. Voting turn-out, on the other hand, has remained stable over time, except in two election years (1946 and 1951) when it was abnormally high.

A closer look at the data indicates that the registration ratios grew from 5.26% in 1909 to 37.04% in 1946, and from 52.52% in 1947 to 71.09% in 1959, until it stabilized at about 73.0% from 1961 to 1971. Citizens' voting participation followed the same trend. It increased from 4.86% in 1909 to 33.1% in 1946, and from 40.50% in

1947 to 58.11% in 1959, until it stabilized from 1961 to 1971 at about 58.10%. Voting turn-out remained stable over the years at about 80.0% except in 1946 and 1951 when it went up to more than 90%.

The increase in registration ratios and citizens' voting participation from 1907 to 1946 can be explained by the various electoral reforms adopted between 1907 and 1935, particularly in suffrage. Among the changes adopted were (1) the abolition of the prior holding of public office requirement (1916); (2) lowering of the age requirement from 23 to 21 (1935); (3) the extension of the right

Table 3: Trends in Registration Rate (R/Pq) Citizen's Voting Participation Rate (V/Pq) and Voters' Turn-out Rate (V/R), Philippines: 1909-1971

Years	Registered Voters/ Population 21 Years old & over R/Pq (%)	Voters/Popula- tion 21 years Old & over V/Pq (%)	Voters/ Registered V/R (%)
1907			93.6 %
1909	5.26%	4.86%	92.4 %
1912	5.89%	5.59	95.02
1935	24.57	15.43	62.85/
1946	37.04	33.18	89.59
1947	52.52	40.50	75.57
1949	60.32	42.05	70.74
1951	52.99	48.94	92.36
1953	59.27	45.77	77.22
1955	65.28	50.78	77.79
1957	64.61	48.79	75.52
1959	71.09	58.11	81.74
1961	72.41	57.52	79.43
1963	77.96	62.03	79.57
1965	75.52	57.69	76.39
1967	69.61	56.84	81.66
1969	69.35	55.22	79.63
1971	75.81	61.23	80.77

of suffrage to women (1935); (4) the removal of property qualification (1935); and (5) the inclusion of the ability to read and write in any dialect as the literacy requirement (1935). They were all incorporated into the Philippine Constitution of 1935 along with specific provisions spreading the right of suffrage to as many Filipinos as possible. The 1935 Constitution extended suffrage to (1) all citizens of the Philippines, (2) who were 21 years of age and over, (3) able to read and write, (4) residents of the Philippines for one year and, in the municipality where they were going to vote, residents for six months prior to election, and (5) not disqualified by law (i.e., not convicted of any crime involving moral turpitude, nor disloyal citizens, nor insane, feeble-minded, or illiterate). Their effects were not to be felt until 1946 when the first election after the war was held.

The gradual increase of registration ratios and citizens' voting participation rates from 1947 to 1959 can be viewed as an effect of the liberalization of the suffrage requirements started in 1935 which enfranchised many citizens who were 21 years of age and over. It can also be seen as a consequence of the public education system which opened schools to the Filipino masses in the 1930's, thus increasing the literacy rates and making Filipinos more politically conscious. Nor can the effect of mass media, particularly newspapers and radios, on the minds of the Filipino masses be completely discounted.

After 1959, the combined effects of the electoral reforms, progress in education and literacy, and the mass media had apparently reached their highest point. Thus, in the 1960's, registration ratios and citizens' voting participation rates began to stabilize.

The high voting turn-outs in the elections of 1909 and 1912 can be attributed to the fact that those who registered were highly selected. The literacy requirement (the ability to read and write in Spanish or English), the property requirement, and the prior holding of public office as voting requirement practically limited voting participation to the ilustrados who were already politicized and interested in politics to begin with. Moreover, this was a period when such vital political issues as political independence or political annexation were being discussed. The high voting turn-out in the first postwar election in 1946, similarly, can be seen as a release of political feeling after four years of suppression by the conquering Japanese. Undoubtedly, also, the turn-out was stimulated by such

issues as collaboration, communism, and the "old" versus the "new" leadership.

The election of 1951 was preceded by years of political turmoil. From 1949 to 1950, civil unrest marked by the resurgence of the Huk problem, demoralization in the army, and the people's loss of confidence in the government characterized the political scene. In 1950, Magsaysay was appointed Secretary of National Defense; his socio-economic programs scattered and weakened the Huks, and his leadership strengthened the army and helped restore the confidence of the rural folks in the government. Magsaysay vowed to make the 1951 election honest and clean, and mobilized the army ROTC, and the various civic and private organizations to realize that end. Under his influence, the 1951 off-year election attracted much attention, with the citizens casting their votes in response to a dynamic personality and strong leadership.

III

The study also developed several experimental political indicators based on people's attitudes. The *political mobility index* generates a score which depends on the respondent's political leadership status and on the chances he thinks he or his child has to become a political leader if he were interested. The *political participation index* yields a score which depends on whether the respondent is a non-member, member, or leader in a political organization, and on the of his participation in it. The *freedom of political dissent index* provides a measure which depends on whether the respondent has a source of political information and on the form and frequency with which he registers political disagreement. The *political awareness index* measures the number of government programs, out of a list of fourteen, of which the respondent is aware. The *political efficacy index* scores the respondents' replies to statements about the ability of common citizens to affect political decisions.

I.

The data for trial construction of the indices were obtained from a part of the Batangas multi-purpose Social Indicators survey. A total of 1,000 randomly chosen citizen-respondents aged 15 years and over, and a total of 114 leader-respondents, partly chosen at random and partly purposively chosen, were interviewed. A questionnaire measuring political mobility, political information, political awareness, political participation, and political efficacy was administered to the respondents. The questions on political mobility

were administered to both citizen-respondents and leader-respondents. The rest were given only to the citizen-respondents.

2.

The survey data were gathered and indexed using the sets of formulae which follow:

A. Political mobility:

- (a) Political position(s) of respondents
- (b) Other members of the family/ relatives in politics
- (c) Political position(s) of (b)
- (d) Perception of Political mobility
 - (i) self
 - (ii) children

The foregoing data were used for the measurement of political mobility. Data (a) to (c) were used as descriptive measures to compare the backgrounds of political leaders and citizens. Data on (d) were scored to constitute the Index of Perception of Political Mobility. The Index is computed as follows:

For the respondents' own political mobility:

$$(1) \text{PPM}_{si} = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{j=1}^6 X_{ij}$$

where

PPM_{si}: average perception of political mobility of self of respondent i.

X_{ij}: score for political position j that respondent i has a chance of getting. Number of Positions: 6. Range of X_{ij}; 1 - 5.

$$(2) \text{PPMS} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{PPM}_{si}$$

where

PPMs: overall perception of political mobility of self of respondents.

n: number of respondents.

For the respondents' perception of the mobility of their children:

$$(3) \text{PPMci} = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{j=1}^6 X_{cij}$$

where

PPMci: respondent *i*'s average perception of the political mobility of his children.

X_{cij}: score for each political position *j* that respondent *i*'s child has a chance of attaining. Number of positions: 6. Range of X_{cij}: 1 - 5.

$$(4) \text{PPMc} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{PPMci}$$

where

PPMc: overall perception of political mobility for children.

n: number of respondents.

B. Political information:

(a) Sources of political information

(b) Frequency of getting information from sources

Responses were scored and indexed as follows:

$$(5) \text{INFOi} = \frac{1}{9} \sum_{j=1}^9 X_{ij}$$

where

INFOi: respondents *i*'s average score on frequency of information from all sources.

X_{ij}: respondent *i*'s score on frequency of *j*th source of political information. Number of sources: 9. Range of X_{ij}: 1 - 6.

$$(6) \text{INFO} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{INFOi}$$

where

INFO: average score on frequency of information from all sources of all respondents.
number of respondents

C. Political awareness:

The respondents were presented with 14 programs and major policies of the government, and asked to indicate their awareness or non-awareness of these programs and policies.

Their responses were scored and indexed as follows:

$$(7) PA_i = \frac{1}{14} \sum_{j=1}^{14} D_{ij}$$

where

D_{ij} : score of respondents i on item j on political awareness. Number of items:

14 Range of D_{ij} : 0–1.

PA_i : respondents i 's score on political awareness of all relevant programs and policies.

$$(8) PA = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n PA_i$$

where

PA : average score on political awareness by all respondents.

n : number of respondents.

D. Political participation:

On political participation in community activities, the respondents were given five areas of community activities, and asked to identify what form of community participation they would undertake if confronted with those activities. The respondents were given eight forms of community participation to choose from. The respondents were scored and indexed as follows:

$$(9) PP_i = \frac{1}{5} \sum_{j=1}^5 W_{ij}$$

W_{ij} : score of respondents i on area j ;

where number of j : 5; range of W_{ij} : 1–8.

$$(10) PP = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n PP_i$$

where

PP : average score for the questions on political participation of all respondents.

n : number of respondents.

On political dissent, the respondents were presented with seven political activities, and asked to react to each of the activities. Reactions range from strong agreement to strong disagreement with those political activities. Their reactions were scored and indexed as follows:

$$(11) PD_i = \frac{1}{7} \sum_{j=1}^7 Z_{ij}$$

where

PD_j: average score of respondent *i*
for all items on political dissent.

Z_{ij}: score of respondents *i* on item *j*
on political dissent; number of items:
7; range of Z_{ij}: 1—5.

$$(12) PD = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n PD_i$$

where

PD: average score of all respondents
for all items on political dissent.

n: number of respondents.

E. Political Efficacy:

The respondents were asked to indicate their reactions to four statements indicative of political efficacy. Their answers ranged from strong agreement to strong disagreement. The responses were scored and indexed using the formulae below:

$$(13) PE_i = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^4 W_{ij}$$

where

PE_i: average score of respondent *i* on all
items on political efficacy.

W_{ij}: score of respondent *i* on item *j* on
political efficacy; number of items: 4;
range of W_{ij}: 1 - 5.

$$(14) PE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ij}$$

where

PE: average score of all respondents on all
items on political efficacy.

n: number of respondents.

The following analysis pertains only to the pilot survey data from Batangas. Our purpose is simply to demonstrate, with Batangas as a case in point, the procedure suggested for measuring the indices.

Political Mobility: The respondents' profiles and perception of political chances indicate low political mobility in Batangas. Their backgrounds differed, with a predominance of leader-respondents and only a sprinkling of citizen-respondents coming from families that were traditionally involved in politics. Within each set of respondents, those who had no political background perceived their political chances as not too bright. This seems to be confirmed by the respondents' Indices of Perception of Political Mobility for both the self and the children. These indices are uniformly low.

Perception of Political Mobility: On an Index of Political Mobility that ranges from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating "no chance" for all positions and 5 meaning "very good" chance for all political positions, the respondents showed low perception both for themselves and for their children. For the citizen-respondents (Table 4), the Index for the self [formula (2)] is only 1.69, and for their children [formula (4)], 2.01. For the leader respondents, it is also 1.69 for the self, but 1.89 for the children. The indices stand somewhere between "no chance" and "poor chance" for all positions for both the self and the children. These are indications of very low perception of political mobility.

Table 4. Perception of Political Mobility Index: Batangas, June, 1974

Overall	Self	Children
Citizens	1.69	2.01
Leaders	1.69	1.85

The picture is not all bleak, however. An examination of the responses shows that both sets of respondents see a better political future for their children. This is perhaps an indication of a belief on the part of the respondents that things will be politically better in the future, at least when their children's generation comes of age. More generally, this may mean that they read an improvement of the political chances of citizens from all walks of life to attain political office.

Political Information: The respondents have a low over-all information index. On an index scale which ranges from 0 to 6, where 0 indicates that the respondents never had any of the 9 listed information sources, and 6 means that the respondents had all the 9 sources and obtained information from them everyday, the respondents yielded an overall index [formula (6)] of 0.96, which suggests that they hardly had any source of information and that they were extremely poorly informed.

Table 5: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Sources of Political Information: Batangas, June 1974

SOURCE	NUMBER OF RESPONDENT	PERCENTAGE
Friends/Neighbors	400	30.0
Radio	380	28.5
Newspapers	258	19.3
TV	104	7.8
Government Sources	94	7.0
Magazines	62	4.6
Comics	20	1.5
Private Organizations	16	1.2
	1,934*	100.0

*The number exceeds 1000 because some respondents used more than one source.

An examination of the information sources in Table 5 partly provides the answer. Friends and neighbors are free and readily available, and hence, they are the most popular sources. Government sources and private organizations, even if they are free, are not readily available, and hence, are less popular sources. In contrast, money is needed to find other sources of information. Radios, television sets, newspapers, magazines, and comics have either to be bought or rented. Quite a sum of money is needed to buy a television or radio set. The reason the radio is a popular source is that inexpensive transistorized radios are widely available. Television is available mostly with wealthier neighbors or in public places. Newspapers, magazines, and comics have to be bought from the newstands. Newspapers are cheaper than comics and magazines, and hence, more popular than the latter.

From the Political Information Index, we can conclude that the respondents have very low political information both as to quality and quantity of information sources.

Political Awareness: The respondents have low political awareness. The respondent's average Political Awareness Index [formula (8)] is only 0.28 on a 0 to 1 scale, where 0 means no awareness of any of the 14 listed government programs and 1 means awareness of all such programs. This means that, on the average, the respondents indicated awareness of only 4 of the programs and activities of the government.

On the basis of individual programs, the respondents showed varying awareness indices (Table 6). Except for Martial Law, the respondents showed less than 50% awareness of the different programs and activities of the government. As regards the barangay or citizens' assembly, a body actively organized by the government at the grassroots level, they showed an even lesser degree of awareness. As to community-based programs like the Samahang Nayan, Balik-bayan, and Masagana '99, they also displayed little awareness. They had low awareness, too, of the government's

Table 6. Political Awareness Index by Programs and Activities of the Government: Batangas, June, 1974

Programs/ Activities	Index
Martial Law	0.67
Citizens' Assembly (Barangay)	0.49
Green Revolution	0.38
Samahang Nayan	0.37
Balik-Bayan	0.37
Masagana '99	0.36
Family Planning Program	0.32
Bagong Lipunan	0.30
Land Reform Program	0.16
YCAP	0.14
1972 Constitution	0.08
NCEE	0.07
NMYC	0.06
Citizens' Army Training	0.04

family planning and land reform programs and the "green revolution." Most surprising of all, they were hardly aware of the 1972 Constitution. It may be noted that the ratification of the 1972 Constitution by the Barangays took place in January, 1973. Of national programs like the YCAP, NCEE, and NMYC, the respondents were least aware.

Essentially the same factors affecting political information affect political awareness. The respondents are low in both. All government programs and activities in the interview questionnaires could not be missed by those exposed to information sources like the mass media. Since the respondents had low information exposure, it is not surprising that they also scored low on awareness.

The better educated higher-income respondents who had better political information also had better political awareness. This should not be surprising since both higher education and more income provide one with easier access to information sources, and thus generate higher awareness of political issues.

Political Participation. Participation in Community Activity: The respondents show general willingness to participate in community activities. The over-all participation index [formula (10)] is 4.46 on a 1 to 8 scale, with 1 indicating non-participation in any of the 5 community activities enumerated, 2 to 3 passive participation, 4 to 6 more than passive participation (i.e., taking part in discussions and voting on what to do), and 6 to 8 meaning actual participation (i.e., contributing labor/money, helping, and leading) in the implementation/administration of community activities.

Table 7: Participation in Community Activity Index: Batangas, June, 1974

Over-All Activities	Index
Cleanliness in surroundings	4.10
Vocational training	4.40
Lack of employment	4.50
Lack of education	4.60
Alleviating hunger	4.70
Age Bracket: 15-17	

Table 7 shows that respondents are willing to take part in community activities through more than passive forms of participation. The indices by community activity ranges from 4.10 for community cleanliness and sanitation to 4.70 for alleviating hunger.

From the Index, it seems reasonable to infer that the respondents believe in group participation and action as solutions to community problems. Many even indicated willingness to mobilize personal resources and get directly involved in the implementation of programs and activities decided by the group to solve community problems. They indicated more than passive participation in community activities.

Political Dissent: The respondents scored moderately in freedom of political dissent. The over-all Index [formula (12)] is 3.20 on a 1 to 5 index scale, with 1 meaning weak freedom to dissent and 5 meaning strong freedom to dissent. Table 8 shows the indices by type of dissent activities.

Table 8: Political Dissent Index: Batangas, June 1974

Dissent Activities	Index
Always on the lookout for political news	3.67
Keep political views to oneself	2.46
Verbalize political dissent	2.55
Put political disagreement in writing	2.97
Believe in and join organized dissent	3.87
Encourage friends to join organized dissent	3.73
Lead and organize political dissent	3.17

The respondents indicate a mild belief in organized forms of dissent (Index: 3.87), and show willingness to join organized forms of dissent, if there is any. They also like their friends to join in organized dissent (Index: 3.73), but they are not certain if they are willing to lead and organize one themselves (Index: 3.17).

The indices indicate that the respondents are likely to be reading or listening to news with political content. When they politically disagree, they are not likely to keep the disagreement to themselves. But they are not prone to publicly announcing it, much less to putting it down on paper for the public to read. They seem ambivalent since they are not quite willing to get openly involved in

such forms of political dissent; open political disagreement got an index of 2.46, verbal disagreement 2.55, and written political dissent 2.97. Such indices border on disagreement and uncertainty responses.

Political Efficacy: The Political Efficacy Index for Batangas is moderate (Table 9). The over-all index [formula (14)] is 3.15 on a 1 to 5 scale where 1 means low efficacy and 5 means strong efficacy. The respondents indicate a mild belief in their ability to influence the political system. With enough efforts, they believe—at an index of 3.76—that the problem of graft and corruption can be solved. They also believe—at an index of 3.24—that, by taking part in social and political affairs, people can control national events. However, on their ability to control what the President and technocrats, do the index is 2.63. And on the statement that this nation is being run by a few persons in power and that ordinary citizens cannot do much about it, the index is 2.87.

From the indices, we can conclude that, while the respondents share the general feeling that they can influence the political system, they display some degree of ambivalence on their ability to influence or control the President and the technocrats and national events, or do anything about the "fact" that the country is being run by a few who are in power.

Table 9: Political Efficacy Index. Batangas, June 1974

Activities	Indices
With enough effort, graft and corruption can be solved	3.76
It is difficult to control what the President and technocrats do	2.63
People can control national events	3.24
The country is being run by a few	2.87

IV.

The paper has shown that political information is capable of quantification. Also, the two measurements have provided more precise ways of understanding political phenomena.

From the election data, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The general voting participation, citizens' voting participation, and registration ratios have increased over time. Voting turn outs are consistently higher and more stable in recent than in earlier years.
2. The general voting participation, citizens' voting participation, and registration ratios follow a time pattern. Increasing occurred between 1907 and 1946; the change became gradual from 1947 to 1949, and from 1949 to 1971, the ratios stabilized.
3. The above patterns can be explained by a number of political factors, namely, a) electoral reforms that took place on or before 1935, b) the introduction of mass education system in the 1930's leading to the great improvement in literacy rates and development of civic and political consciousness among Filipinos, and c) the occurrence of political crises which politicized the electorate.

From the Batangas data, the following can be drawn:

1. The respondents have low political mobility. This is confirmed by the data on the political backgrounds of respondents as well as by the Index of Perception of Political Mobility for both the self and the children. On the perception of political mobility, both the leader-respondents and the citizen-respondents perceive a better political future for their children than for themselves and better political opportunities for attaining various political positions.
2. They have a low Index of Political Information. The respondents hardly have any source of information and thus are extremely poorly informed.
3. Political information seems to be related to political awareness. Like the Index of Political Information, the Index of Political Awareness is low. Had the citizens more exposure to sources of information, political awareness would have been higher.
4. The respondents' Participation in Community Activity Index is relatively high. This indicates their willingness to undertake community activities through more than a passive form of participation.

The respondents score moderately in freedom of political dissent. This indicates a mild belief in organized forms of political activities and general willingness to join one or even campaign among friends to join the same. The respondents also show general political

awareness by being on a constant lookout for political news. However, they indicate a reluctance to express their political views in public.

5. Finally, the respondents score moderately in political efficacy. This indicates a mild belief that they can constructively relate to and influence the political system. Citizen who is young and affluent is most likely to have high estimate of his ability to influence the political community. While the respondents share the general feeling that they can influence the political system, they manifest some degree of ambivalence of their ability to influence or control the President and the technocrats and national events, or do anything about the "fact" that they country is being run by a few who are in power.

The findings suggest the existence of the "political man." The crucial consideration in political participation is the willingness to register. Once the decision to register is made, the decision to vote almost certainly follows. On political activities, over which the citizens have more or less personal control, the experimental indices are moderate. But on political activities which are more or less dependent on external factors, beyond personal control, the experimental indices are low.

It is important to stress the fact the the computed values for the indices are not what really count in this study. Rather, what counts are the approach is used. The study has demonstrated that it is feasible to gather political data using through existing records as well as surveys. The study has shown that it is possible to quantify and index qualitative systematically and quickly, especially in this age of the high-powered computer. Finally, the study has shown that political information can be subjected to quantification.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelman, Irma and Cynthia Morris, *Society, Politics and Economic Development*, Baltimore John Hopkins Press, 1967.
- Bank, Arthur S. and Robert Texter, *A Cross Polity Survey*, Cambridge MIT Press, 1963.
- Bulatao, Rodolfo A., *Personal Contentment and Political Attitude in Greater Manila*, Quezon City: UP Social Science and Humanities Research Council, 1973, Unpublished.
- Holt, Robert T. and John Turner, *The Political Basis of Economic Development*, New York: D. Von. Nostrand, Co., Inc., 1966.
- Lipset, S.M., "Some Social Prerequisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy," *American Political Science Review*, (March 1959).
- Neubauer, Deane, "Some Conditions of Democracy," *American Political Science Review*, (December 1967).
- Taylor, Charles and Michael Hudson, *World Handbook of Social and Political Indicators*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Verba, Sidney, "Democratic Participation," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, (September, 1967).