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Democracy and the Emergence of Urban New Middle Classes in the Philippines

Masatoshi IKEDA

Introduction

In early 1990's, with the upswing of Asian economy, the making of the new rich is said to be a social phenomenon in Asia. According to a Japanese cultural anthropologist, although their income, and educational attainment varies from region to region, there are things that they have in common, particularly, in terms of hobby, life style, and the international development of their business activities. For example, their lifestyle and social consciousness are different from their parent's. Their monthly income exceeds US$2,500 a month.

The Philippines (once dubbed as the “sick man in Asia”) may not be an exception. Since the latter part of the 1980's particularly during the Ramos administration, the progress of the knowledge-intensive industrial structure, coupled with the growth of the educational attainment among the people brought about the existence of a mass of formerly unknown people which are now known as the new rich middle class.

This paper has three main foci: first, to clarify the social characteristics of the urban new middle classes; second, to analyze their basic political attitude; and third, to examine the relevance of this strata to the democratization process in the Philippines.

Research Outline

This research was conducted at Don Bosco Institute Makati, the largest financial center in the Philippines. Don Bosco Institute Makati is well known as an expensive private school where most students are from the upper middle class family. questionaires were distributed to the parents of the first grade pupil to the sixth grade pupil through class room teachers. From 500 questionaires, originally distributed, 455 of them were retrieved from the teacher. The targetted parson was the household
head. Actually 94.7% of respondents were household head.

**Table 1  Age Distribution by Sex in % (n)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1.3 (4)</td>
<td>41.1 (122)</td>
<td>48.8 (145)</td>
<td>8.1 (24)</td>
<td>0.7 (2)</td>
<td>100.0 (297)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5.9 (9)</td>
<td>56.6 (86)</td>
<td>36.8 (56)</td>
<td>0.7 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.9 (13)</td>
<td>46.3 (208)</td>
<td>44.8 (201)</td>
<td>5.6 (25)</td>
<td>0.4 (2)</td>
<td>100.0 (449)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 1, 297 out of 449 respondents are men. In short, the ratio of men to women is 2:1. The median age for both sexes is 40, to be specific 40.2 for men and 40 for women. The reason why respondents are relatively young is that they are parents of elementary school pupil.

**Analitical point of view**

As societies are stratified along the line of occupation, in this study occupation is adopted as a key variable for the analysis of above mentioned undertaking.

**Table 2  Occupational Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/ Managerial</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business operator</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/ Technical</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management workers</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales related workers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production process workers</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the distribution of the occupation of our respondents. Administrative/managerial worker, business operators, professional/technical workers, clerical workers, sales-related workers and people who work for the middle management are the core occupational groups of middle classes. The combined share of these employed white collar groups accounts for 61.0%. By combining administrative, managerial worker, professional technical worker, people who work for the middle management, we can obtain a category of the upper middle class. On the other hand, we can obtain
a category of the lower middle class by combining categories clerical workers, sales related workers, production process workers and other workers. This lower middle class accounts for 39%. Thus, in our sample the upper middle class out-numbers the lower middle class in number.

In the following analysis, these two categories are used as pivotal ones in analyzing the social- political characteristics of middle classes.

I. The Demographic Characteristics of the Urban New Middle Class

1. Gender

According to table 3 while men account for 74.6% in the upper middle class, they account for 55.0% in the lower middle class. This difference is statistically significant at the 5% level. As our respondents were household head, this table indicates that the upper middle class is more male dominated stratum than the lower middle class.

2. Age

Table 4 shows the age distribution of our respondents

The median age of the middle class is 40.3 for both strata. To be specific it is 41 for the upper middle class and 31 for the lower middle class. This suggests that in order to attain higher social status, it is necessary for people to have a long business
experience/career.

3. Ethnic characteristics of the middle class

| Table 5  Do you have Chinese Ancestors on Your Side or Spouse’s Side? |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                  | Yes             | None            | Total           |
| Upper middle     | 79.9 (219)      | 20.1 (55)       | 100.0 (274)     |
| Lower middle     | 82.6 (133)      | 17.4 (28)       | 100.0 (161)     |
| Total            | 80.9 (352)      | 19.1 (83)       | 100.0 (435)     |

According to table 5, 80.9% of the middle class people is ethnic Chinese. To be specific, it is 79.9% among the upper middle class and 82.6% among the lower middle class. This figure is very high when compared to the national average. This means that being ethnic Chinese is very advantageous for one to belong to the middle class. But, as small Cramer’s contingency coefficient suggests, being ethnic Chinese or not doesn’t matter in determining his/her status in the middle class.

4. Place of birth

Why are middle class called urban middle class?

| Table 6   The Place of Birth of the Present Generation in % (n) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|               | Myself           | Spouse           |               |               |
|               | Upper middle     | Lower middle     | Upper middle   | Lower middle   |
| Metro-Manila   | 60.4 (162)       | 54.7 (88)        | 52.4 (133)     | 46.7 (70)      |
| Rural Luzon    | 27.2 (73)        | 35.4 (57)        | 37.8 (96)      | 36.7 (55)      |
| Urban Visayas  | 4.9 (13)         | 5.0 (8)          | 5.5 (14)       | 8.7 (13)       |
| Rural Visayas  | 3.0 (8)          | 3.7 (6)          | 2.0 (5)        | 2.7 (4)        |
| Urban Mindanao | 1.9 (5)          | 1.2 (2)          | 1.2 (3)        | 2.7 (4)        |
| Rural Mindanao | 2.6 (7)          | 1.2 (3)          | 2.7 (4)        |               |
| Total          | 100.0 (268)      | 100.0 (161)      | 100.0 (254)    | 100.0 (150)    |

Table 6 shows the place of birth of household heads and his/her spouse by social strata. Indication is that the upper middle class is more coming from urban area Metro-Manila in particular than the lower middle class. This can be said of household heads themselves and their spouses. This findings lead to the following conclusion to the effect that Being the urbanites is advantageous for one to belong to the upper
middle class. This suggests that chances are given more in cities than in rural areas. More men than women move to cities Metro-Manila in particular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro-Manila</td>
<td>29.8 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Luzon</td>
<td>53.3 (136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Visayas</td>
<td>9.4 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Visayas</td>
<td>3.5 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mindanao</td>
<td>2.4 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Mindanao</td>
<td>1.6 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 (256)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 7 the percentage of fathers who are born in Metro Manila is higher in the upper middle class than in the lower middle class. The same thing can be said of mother. In parents generation as well, the upper middle class is more urban in terms of socio demographic aspects than the lower middle class.

Comparison of table 6 and table 7 indicates that the percentage of the people who are born in Metro-Manila is 60.4% among the present upper middle class household heads. On the other hand, the percentage of father who are born in Metro-Manila is only 29.8% among the upper middle class, the former is higher than the latter by a margin of 30.5%. Indication is that during the period of one generation, a lot of people transferd to Metro-Manila and the second generation grew up there. The same trend can be also observed among the lower middle class to a smaller degree though.

Above findings indicate that the children’s generation is more urban than the parent’s generation, and this tendency is much strongly observed in the upper middle class than in the lower middle class. It is the reason why the middle class is considered as the urban middle class.

5. Birth order

In Confucianism dominated society like China, Korea and Japan in prewar days, elder child, elder boy in particular were a bearer of parent’s expectation. Parents invest more on elder children than younger children. In such societies birth order was also a determinant of social status of children.

Then, how is the case in the Philippines? Table 8 shows the birth order of the household head by social strata.
Table 8  Birth order of middle class household head  in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>After Third</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>29.2 (76)</td>
<td>17.7 (46)</td>
<td>17.7 (46)</td>
<td>35.4 (92)</td>
<td>100.0 (260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>24.8 (37)</td>
<td>24.2 (36)</td>
<td>13.4 (20)</td>
<td>37.6 (56)</td>
<td>100.0 (149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.6 (113)</td>
<td>20.0 (82)</td>
<td>16.1 (66)</td>
<td>36.2 (148)</td>
<td>100.0 (409)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 0.2656\)  \(v=0.02548\)  n.s.

According to this table, the percentage of the first born child is 29.2% in the upper middle class. On the other hand it is 24.8% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 4.4%. However, this difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level. In the Philippines, the society of bilineal kinship structure and Christianity dominated society, no marked difference was observed with regard to the birth order by social strata.

6. Family Structure

In general, nuclear family is said to be more adaptable to industrialization. The upper middle class is considered as a more economically successful class than the lower middle class in the industrialized society. Then, Can more nuclear families be found in the upper middle class than in the lower middle class?

Table 9 shows the responses of our respondents to the following question. Who live with you other than helper/live-in maid?

Table 9  The Family Structure by Social Strata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper middle</th>
<th>Lower middle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My spouse and myself</td>
<td>12.6 (33)</td>
<td>16.3 (25)</td>
<td>14.0 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse &amp; unmarried children</td>
<td>83.6 (219)</td>
<td>72.6 (111)</td>
<td>79.5 (330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse &amp; my parents</td>
<td>3.4 (9)</td>
<td>9.8 (15)</td>
<td>5.8 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents &amp; married children</td>
<td>0.4 (1)</td>
<td>1.3 (2)</td>
<td>0.7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 (262)</td>
<td>100.0 (153)</td>
<td>100.0 (415)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 9 the percentage of the family composed of the household head, spouse and unmarried children is 83.6% in the upper middle class. It is 72.6% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 11.0%. We aggregate the category of myself & spouse and My spouse & unmarried children so as to make a category of nuclear family. Again, we aggregate the category of My spouse & my parents and My parents & married children so as to make the category of
extended family. By this operation we obtain table 10 which indicates the percentage of the nuclear family and that of extended family by social strata.

Table 10: Family Structure by Social Strata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nuclear family</th>
<th>Extended family</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>96.2 (252)</td>
<td>3.8 (10)</td>
<td>100.0 (262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>88.9 (136)</td>
<td>11.1 (17)</td>
<td>100.0 (153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.5 (388)</td>
<td>6.5 (27)</td>
<td>100.0 (415)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 8.325 \quad v = 0.1416 \quad p < 0.05 \)

Table 10 indicates that the percentage of nuclear family is 96.2% in the upper middle class. On the other hand it is 88.9% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 7.3%. This difference is statistically significant at the 5% level.

From this observation we can conclude that more nuclear family is found in the upper middle class than in the lower middle class, the nuclear family is more adaptable to the industrializing process in the Philippines as well.

The emergence of the middle class in the Philippines is partly related to the generalizing trend of nuclear family. But, we should be careful to conclude that way. The relation of family structure and the class status may be the other way around. We can not say that being extended family make them stay at the lower middle class but can say that relatively less advantage economic situation have them form extended family.

II. The Emerging Process of the Middle Class

1. Intergenerational Occupational mobility

According to table 11 the percentage of fathers who were engaged on well paid occupation like administrative, business operators, professional/technical, middle management related occupation is 31.3% in the upper middle class. On the other hand, the percentage of these occupation is only 16.8% in the lower middle class. The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a wide margin of 15.1%. Indication is that the upper middle class is more inclined to be reproduced in the upper middle class.
### Table 11  Father’s Occupation During the High School Days  in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper middle</th>
<th>Lower middle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0.7 (2)</td>
<td>1.9 (3)</td>
<td>1.1 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operator</td>
<td>12.0 (33)</td>
<td>6.2 (10)</td>
<td>9.9 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/technical</td>
<td>13.1 (36)</td>
<td>5.6 (9)</td>
<td>10.3 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>5.5 (15)</td>
<td>3.1 (5)</td>
<td>4.6 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>13.1 (36)</td>
<td>11.8 (19)</td>
<td>12.6 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales related workers</td>
<td>3.3 (9)</td>
<td>6.8 (11)</td>
<td>4.6 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue collar workers</td>
<td>15.0 (41)</td>
<td>24.2 (39)</td>
<td>18.4 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>33.3 (91)</td>
<td>31.1 (50)</td>
<td>32.5 (141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.0 (11)</td>
<td>9.3 (15)</td>
<td>6.0 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 (274)</td>
<td>100.0 (161)</td>
<td>100.0 (435)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Intragenerational occupational mobility

### Table 12  First Occupation After Graduating From School  in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper middle</th>
<th>Lower middle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0.4 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operator</td>
<td>3.6 (10)</td>
<td>3.1 (5)</td>
<td>3.4 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/technical</td>
<td>21.2 (58)</td>
<td>4.3 (7)</td>
<td>14.9 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>3.3 (9)</td>
<td>1.9 (3)</td>
<td>2.8 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>29.1 (80)</td>
<td>37.9 (61)</td>
<td>32.4 (141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales related workers</td>
<td>13.9 (38)</td>
<td>11.2 (18)</td>
<td>12.9 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue collar workers</td>
<td>9.1 (25)</td>
<td>17.4 (28)</td>
<td>12.2 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>17.9 (49)</td>
<td>23.0 (37)</td>
<td>19.8 (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.5 (4)</td>
<td>1.2 (2)</td>
<td>1.4 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 (274)</td>
<td>100.0 (161)</td>
<td>100.0 (435)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 12, the percentage of those who were engaged on well-paid occupation like administrative, business related work, professional/technical, middle management related work after finishing school is 28.5% in the upper middle class. On the other hand, the percentage of the well-paid occupation is only 9.3% in the lower middle class. The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a wide margin of 19.2%. This reveals that the first occupation after finishing school determines one’s later career strongly.

3. The Emergence of the Middle Class and Education

Table 13 shows the upper middle class is more educated than the lower middle class. The percentage of the graduate school school enrollees is 25.2% among the upper middle class. On the other hand, it is 24.9% among the lower middle class. Although
this difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level. One in every four is the graduate school enrollees among them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>Educational Attainment by Social Strata</th>
<th>in % (n)</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>Grad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>8.6 (22)</td>
<td>74.5 (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>14.4 (22)</td>
<td>69.9 (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.8 (44)</td>
<td>72.8 (297)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 3.0105  v = 0.0859  n. s.

What was said of the household heads can be said of their spouse. In the case of spouse, one in every six are the graduate school enrollees. Among the Philippine middle class people, not only household heads but also their spouses are highly educated. In addition, the upper middle class is more highly educated than the lower middle class as well. Although the difference is not statistically significant, we can point out that Philippine middle class is endogamous in terms of educational attainment as well. In this sense, following Ehrenreich, we can conclude that the middle class is a group of the people whose social status is based not only on economic resources, but also on education. As such, they have been trying hard to convey this resource from generation to generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
<th>Father's Educational Attainment by Social Strata. in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 12.7539  v = 0.1768  p < 0.005
What was said of the educational attainment of the present household head holds true for his/her father. According to table15 one in eight is graduate school enrollees in the father’s generation of the present middle class people. Irregularity to the effect that the percentage of the graduate school enrollees is higher in the lower middle class than in the upper middle class. This seems to be brought about by the high percentage of the university graduates in the upper middle class. The fact to the effect that the percentage of high school graduates is higher in the lower middle class than the upper middle class indicates that father of the upper middle class people are well educated than the lower middle class people. In this respect more note worthy, however is the fact to the effect that high educational attainment seems to be handed down from father’s generation to children’s generation Table16 compares educational attainment of father’s and those of present generation.

Table16  Comparison of Educational Attainment Between Father and Present Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Generation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11.7 (19)</td>
<td>76.0 (123)</td>
<td>12.3 (20)</td>
<td>100.0 (162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>3.3 (5)</td>
<td>84.5 (125)</td>
<td>12.2 (18)</td>
<td>100.0 (148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>68.2 (30)</td>
<td>29.5 (13)</td>
<td>100.0 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.1 (25)</td>
<td>78.5 (275)</td>
<td>14.4 (51)</td>
<td>100.0 (354)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 43.509 \quad v= 0.350581 \quad p< 0.05$

According to table16 if father is a graduate school enrollees, 29.5% of their children are also graduate school enrollees. On the other hand, if father is high school graduates, only 12.3% of their children were enrolled in graduate schools. This result indicates educational attainment was handed down from father’s generation to children’s generation. On top of that, highly educated people has been encouraging their children to study hard. Table17 shows the relationship between parent’s educational attainment and their attitude toward children’s education. The latter is measured by the response to the following question. Does(do) your schooling child (children) presently engage in curricular lessons from private teachers or attend private institutes for the purpose of upgrading marks of the school?

From table17 following findings become clear. While the percentage of children who are studying curricular lessons from private teachers or attend private institutions is 14.3% among the high school graduates, it reaches high at 20.3% among the graduate school enrollees. Thus, The philippine middle class has been trying to carry over this
social resources to the next generation.

Table 17  Educational Attainment and Educational Investment Does (do) your child (children) presently engage in curricular lessons from private teachers or attend private institutes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High.</td>
<td>14.3 ( 4)</td>
<td>85.7 ( 24)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>12.3 ( 38)</td>
<td>87.7 ( 272)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>20.3 ( 22)</td>
<td>79.6 ( 86)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.3 ( 64)</td>
<td>85.7 ( 382)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 446)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 11.22533 \quad v = 0.15865 \quad n.s. \]

III. Socio-economic characteristics of the middle class

1. Employment status

Table 18 shows the distribution of social strata by employment status.

Table 18  Social Strata by Employment Status  n % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper middle</th>
<th>Lower middle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>55.4 (158)</td>
<td>44.6 (127)</td>
<td>100.0 (285)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>77.3 (116)</td>
<td>22.7 (34)</td>
<td>100.0 (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.0 (274)</td>
<td>37.0 (161)</td>
<td>100.0 (435)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 20.1772 \quad v = 0.2154 \quad p < 0.050 \]

According to this table, more upper middle class people are found in the self-employed than in the employee. The analysis of occupational mobility reveals that administrative managerial worker turned business operator and professional technical worker turned business operator are found among self-employed. Therefore, it is natural that more upper middle class people are found in the self-employed than in the employee. Accordingly, we should not regard these self-employed as the old middle class.

2. Internationalization and the middle class

As mentioned in a foreward the emergence of the middle class is an international social phenomena. As such, its emergence seems to be closely related to the international development of economic activities. Table 19 shows the nature of
companies where the middle class people are working for.

**Table 19** Is Your Company Transnational Company? in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transnational</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>59.3 (67)</td>
<td>52.6 (72)</td>
<td>55.6 (139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>41.7 (46)</td>
<td>47.4 (65)</td>
<td>44.4 (111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 (113)</td>
<td>100.0 (137)</td>
<td>100.0 (250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.15392$  $p = 0.0679$  n. s.

According to this table, more upper class is found in transnational companies (59.3%) than in the local companies (52.6%). The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a margin of 6.7%. But, this difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level. Income of some blue collar workers is higher than that of some white collar workers. Those well paid blue collar workers are working in factories of transnational companies along the South Super High Way.

### 3. Double Earning Structure

Another occupational characteristics of the middle class is of the fact that they are double income earners. **Table 20** shows the kind of occupation spouse are engaged on.

**Table 20** Occupation of Spouse By Social Trata. in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper middle</th>
<th>Lower middle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1.1 (3)</td>
<td>0.6 (1)</td>
<td>0.9 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>16.1 (44)</td>
<td>11.2 (18)</td>
<td>14.3 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/technical</td>
<td>13.1 (36)</td>
<td>11.2 (18)</td>
<td>12.4 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>7.7 (21)</td>
<td>5.0 (8)</td>
<td>6.7 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>23.0 (63)</td>
<td>31.7 (51)</td>
<td>26.1 (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales related workers</td>
<td>2.9 (8)</td>
<td>3.1 (5)</td>
<td>3.0 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue collar workers</td>
<td>3.6 (10)</td>
<td>12.4 (20)</td>
<td>6.9 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21.2 (58)</td>
<td>13.0 (21)</td>
<td>18.2 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11.3 (31)</td>
<td>11.8 (19)</td>
<td>11.5 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 (274)</td>
<td>100.0 (161)</td>
<td>100.0 (435)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 20 the percentage of spouses who are engaged on well paid occupation is higher in the upper middle class than in the lower middle class. The combined percentage of workers accounted by administrative workers, business operators, professional/technical workers, the people who are working for the middle management is 38% in the upper middle class. On the other hand, it is 28% in the
lower middle class. The tendency is of the fact that well paid people are more inclined to get married to well paid people. This endogamous tendency can be said to be a base of the emerging process of the middle class.

4. Income Characteristics

The foregoing shows that the middle class people are highly educated and engaged on well paid occupation. As a result, their income level is high when compared to that of the general public. Table 21 shows the income distribution of annual family income of those who live in Makati city where this research was conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>No of Families</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000- 19,999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000- 29,999</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000- 39,999</td>
<td>4,123</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000- 59,999</td>
<td>11,519</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000- 99,999</td>
<td>24,737</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000- 249,999</td>
<td>40,055</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 and Over</td>
<td>18,676</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100,026</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Computed median annual family income is 116,075 pesos. It is tantamount to 9,673 pesos a month. On the other hand, table 22 is income distribution of our middle class respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>21.3 (57)</td>
<td>27.4 (73)</td>
<td>23.9 (64)</td>
<td>27.4 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>44.9 (70)</td>
<td>28.2 (44)</td>
<td>9.4 (24)</td>
<td>11.5 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.0 (127)</td>
<td>27.7 (117)</td>
<td>20.8 (88)</td>
<td>21.5 (91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 28.71351 \quad v = 0.2605 \quad p < 0.05 \]

Note:
Low income group: less than 25,000 pesos a month
Middle income group: 25,000- 45,000 pesos a month
High income group: 45,000- 75,000 pesos a month
Highest income group: 75,000 pesos and over
Median income for both classes is P39,440
Median income for the upper middle class is P46,875
Median income for the lower middle class is P28,617

The comparison of the income level of Makati citizen in general and that of our respondents shows that the income of the our middle class people is more than four times as high as the income level of general public. Table22 further shows that there is a big income difference between the upper middle class and the lower middle class in terms of median monthly income, That is, while the median income of the upper middle class is 46,875pesos, that of the lower middle class is 28,617pesos. The former is more than 60% higher than the latter.

IV. The Life Style of The New Rich

1. Consumerism

Consumption style which characterizes the new rich in Asia is conspicuous consumption. “The use-value of an object of consumption is secondarily to the object’s signifying effects” (2). In the Philippines as well, many middle class people have a lot of items which symbolize their social status. Table23 reveals the diffusion rate of personal computer.

| Table23 The Diffusion Rate of Personal Computer in % (n) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Haves | Have nots | Total |
| Upper middle | 71.5 (196) | 28.5 (78) | 100.0 (274) |
| Lower middle | 43.5 (70) | 56.5 (91) | 100.0 (161) |
| Total | 61.1 (266) | 38.9 (169) | 100.0 (435) |

$\chi^2 = 33.7182 \quad v= 0.2784 \quad p<0.05$

Personal computers whose average diffusion rate is around 60% seems to have a good discriminative power between the upper middle class and the lower middle class. The percentage of those who have personal computer is very high at 71.5% in the upper middle class. On the other hand, it is only 43.5% in the lower middle class. This difference is statistically significant at the 5% level. The Cramer’s contingency coefficient is also high at 0.2784. As double income earners, the personal computer is
necessary not only as a tool showing their social status, but also as a business tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table24</th>
<th>the diffusion rate of fax in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>29.9 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>11.2 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.0 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 19.10912 \quad v = 0.2096 \quad p < 0.05 \]

Table24 shows the diffusion rate of fax. Its overall diffusion rate is only 23%. As in the case with table23, there is a wide difference in terms of the diffusion rate between the upper middle class and the lower middle class. The diffusion rate of fax in the upper middle class is 29.9%. On the other hand, it is only 11.2% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 18.7%. This difference is statistically significant at the 5% level. But the Cramer’s contingency coefficient is 0.2096. This is smaller than the coefficient obtained from the contingency table of personal computer and the social strata. In terms of life style, having cars is important for them to lead the life suitable for the middle class. Table25 shows the relationship between car ownership and social strata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table25</th>
<th>Car Ownership by Social Strata. in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>65.0 (178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>50.9 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59.8 (260)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 10.2036 \quad v = 0.1532 \quad p < 0.05 \]

While the percentage of those who have a car is 65.0% in the upper middle class, it is 50.9% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 14.1%. This difference is statistically significant at the 5% level. This signifies the importance to the life style of the middle class. But the Cramer’s contingency coefficient is smaller than the one obtained from the contingency table between social strata and fax. This means what matters is to have a car or not, but what type of car or model of car they have. Another important index which has discriminative power is air conditioner. In such a hot and humid country like the Philippines, having air conditioner installed or not is of vital importance to leading the life style suitable for
the middle class.

Table 26 indicates the relationship between air conditioner ownership and social strata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Have</th>
<th>Have nots</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>78.8 (216)</td>
<td>21.2 (58)</td>
<td>100.0 (274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>68.3 (110)</td>
<td>31.7 (51)</td>
<td>100.0 (161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74.9 (326)</td>
<td>25.1 (109)</td>
<td>100.0 (435)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.96485 \quad \nu = 0.1171 \quad p < 0.05 \]

According to Table 26, the average percentage of those who have air conditioner is 74.9%. However, to be specific, it is 78.8% in the upper middle class and 68.3% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 10.5%. But, this difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level. The Cramer's contingency coefficient is smaller than that obtained from the contingency table between car ownership and social strata. This indicates that air conditioner becomes necessities of life, as such it loses discriminative power for social strata. In terms of propensity to consume, habit of using credit cards seems to be an important index which tells one's social status. Table 27 shows the credit card ownership by social strata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Have</th>
<th>Have nots</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>79.9 (219)</td>
<td>20.1 (55)</td>
<td>100.0 (274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>65.2 (105)</td>
<td>34.8 (56)</td>
<td>100.0 (161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74.5 (324)</td>
<td>25.5 (111)</td>
<td>100.0 (435)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 23.2454 \quad \nu = 0.2312 \quad p < 0.05 \]

As expected, credit card ownership has stronger discriminative power for social strata than car ownership and air conditioner ownership. The percentage of those who hold credit cards is 79.9% in the upper middle class and 65.2% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 14.7%. This difference is statistically significant at the 5% level. The upper middle class appears to be more inclined than the lower middle class to use credit card. Another aspect of life which shows people’s conspicuous consumption lies in the leisure time activities. In what follows the relationship between social strata and golf club membership is examined.
Table 28: Golf Club Membership by Social Strata in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Strata</th>
<th>Haves</th>
<th>Have Nots</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>9.5 (26)</td>
<td>90.5 (248)</td>
<td>100.0 (274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>5.0 (8)</td>
<td>95.0 (153)</td>
<td>100.0 (161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.8 (34)</td>
<td>92.2 (401)</td>
<td>100.0 (435)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 2.8946 \quad v = 0.0816 \quad n. s.$

The diffusion rate of golf club membership is too low at 7.8% to wield discriminative power for social strata. It stands at only 9.5% even in the upper middle class. Playing golf is an extravagant sport even for the upper middle class. Probably it is an sport for the upper class.

2. Living Environment

Living environment is an important index which symbolizes the social status of family. Table 29 shows the living environment of two social strata.

Table 29: Living Environment by Social Strata in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Strata</th>
<th>HQRA</th>
<th>GRA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>32.5 (89)</td>
<td>67.5 (185)</td>
<td>100.0 (274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>24.2 (39)</td>
<td>75.8 (122)</td>
<td>100.0 (161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.4 (128)</td>
<td>70.6 (307)</td>
<td>100.0 (435)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations
- HQRA: High Quality Residential Area
- GRA: General Residential Area

$\chi^2 = 3.31748 \quad v = 0.08733 \quad n. s.$

The percentage of those who live in the high quality residential area is higher in the upper middle class than in the lower middle class by a margin of 8.3%. The former is more inclined than the latter to live in the higher residential area. On top of that, the upper class lives in a walled subdivision like Forbes Park. Recently, after Ramos administration in particular, vast housing complex has been developed in and around Makati. High rise condominiums have been built up. Their targeted customer is the urban middle class. Thus, we can tell the people's social status by the living environment.
V. Relevance of The Middle Class to Democracy

1. Basic Political Attitude
   Attitude is preparatory psychological state for action.

(1) Components of Political Attitude
   In this section political attitude is hypothesized to be composed of political concern, the sense of political accessibility, the sense of political effectiveness, the sense of obligation to vote, affiliation with political party, and confidence in their ability as the vanguard of democracy.

(2) The sense of Political concern
   Political concern is an aspect of political attitude which makes people commit to political affairs. This attitude can be measured by the response to the following test statement. “Politics should be left to the people who like it.” Those who agree with this statement can be considered to be politically indifferent, and those who disagree with this statement can be considered to be interested in politics.

   | Table30 Political Concern by Social Strata Politics Should be Left to The People Who Like it in % (n) |
   |---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
   | Agree (Indifferent) | Disagree (Interested) | Total |
   | Upper middle | 53.9 (130) | 46.1 (111) | 100.0 (241) |
   | Lower middle | 68.4 (93) | 31.6 (43) | 100.0 (136) |
   | Total | 59.2 (223) | 40.8 (154) | 100.0 (377) |

χ² = 7.5567  v= 0.1416  n. s.

As shown in Table 30, on average, 40.8% of the middle class people are interested in politics. By social strata, the percentage of those who are interested in politics is 46.1% in the upper middle class. On the other hand, it is 31.6% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 14.5%. Indication is that the upper middle class appears to be more inclined than the lower middle class to show interest in politics. Explaining it at length, the emergence of rich middle class is conducive to the progress of democracy.
2. Political accessibility

Political accessibility is a sense that reflects one's intimacy with politics. This component of political attitude can be measured by the response to the following test statement "Politics is too difficult to understand". If one's response to this statement is agree, he/she is considered to distances himself/herself from politics. Table31 reveals the relationship between political accessibility and social strata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree (Unaccessible)</th>
<th>Disagree (Accessible)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>69.1 (170)</td>
<td>30.9 (76)</td>
<td>100.0 (246)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>81.8 (112)</td>
<td>18.2 (25)</td>
<td>100.0 (137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.6 (282)</td>
<td>26.4 (101)</td>
<td>100.0 (383)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.21294 \quad v = 0.1372 \quad n.s. \]

According to this table, the percentage of those who consider that they are accessible to politics is 26.4% on average. By social strata, those who disagree with this statement is 30.9% in the upper middle class. It means 30.9% of the upper middle class people think they are accessible to politics. On the other hand, the percentage of those who think they are accessible to politics is only 18.2% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 12.7%. This finding shows that the higher stratum he/she belongs to, the closer one's distance to politics becomes. Thus, it seems to be that high socio economic status helps people take part in politics. In this regard, economic well being and transparency of political process so as for people to understand it are important factors for participatory democracy to be realized.

3. The Sense of Political Effectiveness

In mass society as we live in these days, we likely lose confidence in our ability to influence on politics. This confidence in our ability to influence on politics can be called the sense of political effectiveness. In this research the sense of political effectiveness was measured by the response to the following test statement "However hard we may work for politics nothing would happen to it". Table32 shows the relationship between the sense of political effectiveness and social strata.

As shown in table32 75.5% of the middle class people are caught up by the sense of political ineffectiveness. By social strata, the percentage of those who think they are politically effective is 25.7% in the upper middle class. On the other hand, it is 22.0%
in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 3.7%. This difference is not statistically significant. However, the tendency seems to be that the higher stratum one belongs to, the stronger one feels oneself politically effective. The sense of political effectiveness must have close relationship with confidence in the ability as a vanguard of democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table32</th>
<th>However Hard we Way Work for Politics Nothing Would Happen to it. in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (Ineffective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>74.3 (179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>78.0 (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.5 (278)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 0.06252 \)  \( v= 0.0412 \)  n. s.

4. Confidence in the ability as a vanguard of democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table33</th>
<th>The Middle Class is the Vanguard of Democracy in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>87.6 (198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>88.4 (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87.9 (305)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 0.04422 \)  \( v= 0.01129 \)  n. s.

As shown in table33 overwhelming majority (87.9%) agree with the test statement to the effect that the middle class is the vanguard of democracy. As Small Cramer’s contingency coefficient shows, This percentage is so high as to negate the difference by social stratum. Contrary to our expectation, the lower middle class is more confident in their ability as a vanguard of democracy, but this difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level. A case in point is that here is the fact that overwhelming majority (87.9%) of the middle class are confident in their ability as a vanguard of democracy. Herein lies the relevance of the middle class to democracy. Under the parliamentary democratic system, voting is the minimum requirement to sustain the system. Then, how strong do they stick to the minimum duties as a citizen? In order to measure people’s involvement in this democratic principle, the following test statement was addressed. Table34 shows the response to the question to the effect that “abstaining from voting is renunciation of sacred public duties”.
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5. The Sense of Obligation to vote

All in all, 85.4% of middle class people think abstaining from voting is inexcusable, leaving the question whether they actually go to the polls or not aside, when compared to the low Japanese voting rate which stands somewhere around 50%, this finding is of great encouragement to the development of the democratic system in the Philippines. The difference in this attitude is not found by social strata. Irrespective of social strata, middle class people have strong confidence in the parliamentary democratic system. In view of foregoing, it can be said that the advent of social environment which brings about the middle classes is conducive to the development of democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 34</th>
<th>Abstaining From Voting is in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inexcusable</td>
<td>Excusable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>85.4 (204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>85.6 (113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85.4 (317)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 0.00415 \quad \text{v}= 0.0033 \quad \text{n. s.} \)

6. The Political Party Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 35</th>
<th>Do You Have a Political Party by Which You Stand? in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haves</td>
<td>Have nots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>9.3 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>7.8 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.7 (37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 0.32289 \quad \text{v}= 0.0276 \quad \text{n. s.} \)

However, the prospect of democracy in the Philippines doesn't seem to be bright as suggested by foregoing analysis. Table 35 shows the political party affiliation of the middle class people. According to the table, the percentage of those who have a political party by which they stand is only 8.7% on average. To be specific it is 9.3% in the upper middle class and 7.8% in the lower middle class. The figure of 8.7% is extremely low even compared to the low political party support rate which stands somewhere around 60%. This may be the reason why there have been so many movie star turned politicians and sports player turned politicians in the Philippines. Non existence of political parties which have clear cut policy goals. will prevent Philippine democracy from developing to a higher stage. It holds true even if people are confident
in their ability as a vanguard of democracy and seldom abstain from voting.

VI. Inner Structure of Political Consciousness

In what follows, the inner relationship of aspects of political attitude is examined

1. Political Concern and The Sense of Political Accessibility

As shown in table36 38.8% of those who are interested in politics feel that they are accessible to politics. On the other hand, only 17.6% of those who are indifferent to politics feel they are accessible to politics. The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a margin of 21.2%. As the large Cramer's contingency coefficient indicates the relationship between the two variables is very strong. Those who are interested in politics are more inclined than those who are indifferent to regard politics as accessible and vice versa. From this we can say transparancy of politics is a requisite for one to become politically concerned. In this sense, transparancy of political process seems to be an important base of democracy.

2. Political Concern and The Sense of Political Effectiveness

If one is concerned with politics, and has confidence in one's abilities as a political actor, he/she will actively take part in politics. Table37 examines the relationship between political concern and the sense of political effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>39.3 (57)</td>
<td>60.7 (88)</td>
<td>100.0 (145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>12.9 (27)</td>
<td>87.1 (182)</td>
<td>100.0 (209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.7 (84)</td>
<td>76.3 (270)</td>
<td>100.0 (354)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 38.99569 \quad v = 0.3318956 \quad p < 0.05 \]
As shown in table 37 those who are interested in politics are more inclined than those who are politically indifferent to have confidence in their abilities as a political actor. To be specific, 39.3% of those who are interested in politics have confidence in their abilities as a political actor. On the other hand, only 12.9% of those who are indifferent to politics have confidence in their abilities as a political actor. As a result, as the large Cramer’s contingency coefficient indicates, the relationship between the two variables is very strong. Table 37 also shows that those who have confidence in their abilities as a political actor are more inclined than those who don’t have confidence in their abilities as a political actor to be interested in politics.

3. The Sense of Political Effectiveness and the Sense of Political Accessibility

Table 38 showed that the sense of political effectiveness seems to be the base of political concern. How is the case in its relation to the sense of political accessibility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accessible</th>
<th>Unaccessible</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>58.0 (47)</td>
<td>42.0 (34)</td>
<td>100.0 (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>16.8 (46)</td>
<td>83.2 (227)</td>
<td>100.0 (273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.3 (93)</td>
<td>73.7 (261)</td>
<td>100.0 (354)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 54.8101 \quad v = 0.3941 \quad p < 0.050$

As shown in table 38, 58.0% of those who feel they are effective as a political actor think politics is accessible. On the other hand, among those who think they are ineffective as a political actor, only 16.8% of them feel they are accessible to politics. The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a wide margin of 41.2%. As shown by the large Cramer’s contingency coefficient, the relationship between the sense of political effectiveness and the sense of political accessibility is very strong. When compared to the previous table 36 and table 37. The Cramer’s contingency coefficient is largest in this table. The Sense of political effectiveness brings about the sense of political Accessibility. On its part, the sense of political accessibility brings about political concern. If the political system is not transparent, it is hard for people to feel the sense of political concern. and to feel the sense of political accessibility. These negative political attitude will discourage people to take part in political affairs. From this, we can say that the transparency of the political system which is the base of political accessibility and political concern is the requisite of participatory democracy.
VII. Election Democracy and Political Consciousness

Under the system of election democracy, voting plays a key role to sustain the system. Although irregularities such as vote buying, flying vote, ballot box snatching are rampant, the Philippines is a country of free election. How people are prepared to the principle of democracy? In what follows their daily expression of political concern, whether they have a political party by which they stand or not, their actual voting behavior are to be examined.

1. The Sense of Political Concern and The Sense of Obligation to Vote

As noted above, more than 80% of our upper middle class respondents have strong sense of obligation to vote. This tendency is preserved among those who are interested in politics and who are not. Accordingly, in terms of the sense of obligation to vote, no marked difference is found between these two groups. The small Cramer's contingency coefficient(0.0252) obtained from the analysis of the Sense of Political Concern and The Sense of Obligation to Vote supports this tendency.

2. The Sense of Political Effectiveness and the Sense of Obligation to vote

Underlying hypothesis regarding this relation is that those who feel they are effective as a political actor are more inclined than those who are not to feel abstaining from voting is not excusable. However, as shown by the small Cramer's contingency coefficient(0.0903). Marked difference is not found between these two groups. The sense of political effectiveness is not a strong conscious factor which encourages people to have the sense of obligation to vote.

3. The Sense of Political Accessibility and the Sense of Obligation to vote

So far the sense of political accessibility turned out to be an important conscious factor in the structure of political consciousness. Then how this consciousness affects the sense of obligation to vote?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 39 Abstaining From Voting is in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Un accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.8206 \quad v = 0.0899 \quad n.s. \]
Table 39 shows 82.6% of those who feel politics is unaccessible think abstaining from voting is inexcusable. On the other hand, 90% of those who feel politics is accessible think abstaining from voting is inexcusable. The percentage of the latter is higher than that of the latter by a margin of 7.4%. But as the small Cramer's contingency coefficient shows, this difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level. Any way this result indicates that if the political system is not transparent, it is hard for people to feel political accessibility. These negative political attitude will discourage them to have the sense of obligation to vote. This attitude on its turn discourage people to take part in political affairs. From this, we can say that the transparency of the political system which is the base of political accessibility, political concern is the requisite of participatory democracy.

VIII. Voting Behavior

1. Factors influencing on Voting behavior

Table 40 sheds light on the voting behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 40</th>
<th>How Often Have You Abstained From Voting</th>
<th>in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>4.9 (13)</td>
<td>21.1 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>5.3 (8)</td>
<td>13.2 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.0 (21)</td>
<td>18.3 (76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.0222 \quad v = 0.09833 \quad n.s. \]

According to this table, more than 3 in 4 go to the polls. This percentage seems to be higher than that of Japan where sometimes more than half people abstain from voting. On the other hand in the Philippines, people appear to be eager to go to the polls, although as examined later, they don't have a political party by which they stand. Nevertheless, they seldom abstain from voting. voting appears to have more than political significance in this country. It is a high time for people in the different social positions, between “big people and small people” in Frank Lynch’s term. to tighten social relations among them. Viewed this way it is understandable that the lower middle class appears to be more inclined than the upper middle class to go to the polls. In that occasion the small people repay their utangnalooob to big people.
Actually, the percentage of those who seldom abstain from voting is 81.5% in the lower middle class. On the other hand, it is 74.0% in the upper middle class. Relationship between voting behavior and demographic factors like gender and age are examined in that order.

2. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table41</th>
<th>How Often Have You Abstained From Voting by Gender</th>
<th>in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>4.5 (13)</td>
<td>18.1 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5.6 (8)</td>
<td>17.4 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.9 (21)</td>
<td>17.8 (77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 0.87176$  v= 0.04492  n. s.

Table41 shows the relationship between gender and voting behavior. focusing on the percentage of those who seldom abstain from voting, it is almost the same in both genders. As small Cramer's contingency coefficient shows, gender doesn't influence voting behavior. Then, what about next important demographic factor, age? In table42 age group was divided by median age 40.

3. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table42</th>
<th>How Often Have You Abstained From Voting by Age Group</th>
<th>n % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>4.7 (10)</td>
<td>17.4 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and above</td>
<td>5.0 (11)</td>
<td>18.5 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.8 (21)</td>
<td>17.9 (78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 0.22361$  v= 0.0227  n. s.

According to this table, regarding the percentage of those who seldom abstain from voting, marked difference can't be found between two age groups. Conclusion from above two table is that demographic factors don't influence voting behavior. Then, do socio economic factors influence voting behavior?

4. Occupation

Table43 examined the relationship between occupation and the degree of
abstention from voting. According to this table, the percentage of those who seldom abstain from voting is highest in clerical workers (82.7%) and lowest in professional/technical workers (67.5%). It appears that it is too troublesome for professional/technical workers, to go to the polls. On the other hand for clerical workers politics appears to be too problematical to be ignored. Following clerical workers, blue collar workers have seldom abstained from voting. They are well informed of political events through trade union. They are the ones who are mobilized in important political occasions like EDSA I and EDSA II. However, as small Cramer’s contingency coefficient shows, the relationship between occupation and voting behavior is weak.

Table 43 How Often Have You Abstained From Voting by Occupation in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>5.2 ( 6)</td>
<td>20.0 (23)</td>
<td>74.8 (86)</td>
<td>100.0 (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6.3 ( 5)</td>
<td>17.7 (14)</td>
<td>76.0 (60)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof/tech</td>
<td>6.8 ( 5)</td>
<td>25.7 (19)</td>
<td>67.5 (50)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>6.2 ( 5)</td>
<td>11.1 ( 9)</td>
<td>82.7 (67)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>7.7 ( 5)</td>
<td>13.8 ( 9)</td>
<td>78.5 (51)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.3 (26)</td>
<td>17.9 (74)</td>
<td>75.8 (314)</td>
<td>100.0 (414)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 11.05945 \quad v = 0.11833 \quad n. s.\)

5. Income

Table 44 How Often Have You Abstained From Voting by Income Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.9 ( 5)</td>
<td>18.1 (23)</td>
<td>78.0 (99)</td>
<td>100.0 (127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7.1 ( 8)</td>
<td>14.1 (16)</td>
<td>78.8 (89)</td>
<td>100.0 (113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.6 ( 5)</td>
<td>18.9 (17)</td>
<td>75.5 (68)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>5.5 ( 5)</td>
<td>20.9 (19)</td>
<td>73.6 (67)</td>
<td>100.0 ( 91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.5 (23)</td>
<td>17.8 (75)</td>
<td>76.7 (323)</td>
<td>100.0 (421)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 2.689371 \quad v = 0.056516 \quad n. s.\)

Table 44 shows that the percentage of those who have seldom abstained from voting is lowest in the highest income bracket (73.6%). On the other hand, it is highest in the middle income bracket (78.8%). This coincides with the finding in table 43 to the effect that the white collar workers are most inclined to go to the polls. The fact that the white collar has been increasing in number is encouraging to the future development of democracy in the Philippines.
6. Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 45</th>
<th>How Often Have You Abstained From Voting in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.1 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Graduate</td>
<td>4.8 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.6 (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.39662 \quad v = 0.0926 \quad n.s. \]

Table 45 shows that the percentage of those who have seldom abstained from voting is highest among university graduates. From above three tables we can outline an approximate socio economic feature of those who go to the polls regularly. They are university graduated middle income white collar workers.

7. The Self Confidence as a Vanguard of Democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 46</th>
<th>The Middle Class is a Vanguard of Democracy in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>87.6 (198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>88.4 (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87.9 (305)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.04422 \quad v = 0.01129 \quad n.s. \]

As shown in table 46 overwhelming majority (87.9%) agree with the test statement to the effect that the middle class is a vanguard of democracy. As Small Cramer’s contingency coefficient shows, this percentage is so high as to negate the difference by social stratum. Contrary to our expectation, the lower middle class is more confident of their ability as a vanguard of democracy, but this difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level. A case in point is that there is the fact that overwhelming majority (87.9%) of the middle class are confident of their ability as a vanguard of democracy. Herein lies the relevance of the middle class to democracy. Does the sense to the effect that the middle class is a vanguard of democracy influence people’s voting behavior?
Table 47  How Often Have You Abstained From Voting  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often (n)</th>
<th>Sometimes (n)</th>
<th>Seldom (n)</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanguard</td>
<td>3.5 (11)</td>
<td>16.5 (51)</td>
<td>80.0 (248)</td>
<td>100.0 (310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not vanguard</td>
<td>11.4 (5)</td>
<td>25.0 (11)</td>
<td>63.6 (28)</td>
<td>100.0 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.5 (16)</td>
<td>17.5 (62)</td>
<td>78.0 (276)</td>
<td>100.0 (354)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 8.08101  v= 0.151  p< 0.05

According to table 47 those who are confident that they are a vanguard of democracy are more likely than those who are not to go to the polls. The percentage of those who seldom abstain from voting is 80.0% in those who think they are vanguard of democracy. On the other hand, the percentage of those who seldom abstain from voting is 63.6% in those who think they are not vanguard of democracy.

8. The Sense of Political Concern

Political concern is an aspect of political attitude which makes people commit to political affairs. This attitude can be measured by the response to the following test statement. “Politics should be left to the people who like it.” Those who agree with this statement can be considered to be indifferent to politics. And those who disagree with this statement can be considered to be interested in politics. As was shown in table 30, on average, 40.8% of the middle class people are interested in politics. By social strata, the percentage of those who are interested in politics is 46.1% in the upper middle class. On the other hand, it is 31.6% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by the margin of 9.3%. Indication is that the upper middle class appears to be more inclined than the lower middle class to show interest in politics. Explaining it at length, the emergence of the rich middle class is conducive to the progress of democracy. Does this sense of political concern actually influence voting behavior of the people?

Table 48  The Sense of Political Concern and Voting Behavior  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often have you abstained from voting</th>
<th>Often (n)</th>
<th>Sometimes (n)</th>
<th>Seldom (n)</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>6.2 (13)</td>
<td>12.9 (27)</td>
<td>80.9 (170)</td>
<td>100.0 (210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>8.1 (5)</td>
<td>43.5 (27)</td>
<td>48.4 (30)</td>
<td>100.0 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.6 (18)</td>
<td>19.9 (54)</td>
<td>73.5 (200)</td>
<td>100.0 (272)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 29.91916  v= 0.33166  n.p.< 0.05
Table 48 reveals that those who have seldom abstained from voting is 80.9% among those who feel they are indifferent to politics. On the other hand, it is much lower at 48.4% among those who are interested in politics. Why is it so contradictory? Possibility is that there are many people who are so critical to politics as to prevent them from going to the polls among those who are interested in politics. Voting behavior may be influenced by the sense of political effectiveness. If one feel oneself politically ineffective, one is unlikely to go to the polls.

9. The Sense of Political Effectiveness

The Sense of Political Effectiveness was measured by responses to the test statement to the effect that “however hard we may work for politics, nothing would happen to it”. Those who agree with this statement can be the ones who are caught up by the sense of political ineffectiveness. As was shown in Table 32, 75.5% of the middle class people are caught up by the sense of political ineffectiveness. By social strata, the percentage of those who think they are politically effective is 25.7% in the upper middle class. On the other hand, it is 22.0% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 3.7%. This difference is not statistically significant. However, the tendency seems to be that the higher stratum one belongs to, the stronger one feels oneself politically effective. The sense of political effectiveness must have close relationship with voting behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 49</th>
<th>How Often Have You Abstained From Voting in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>4.9 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>5.3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.0 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.15368 \quad v = 0.0202 \quad n.s. \]

According to Table 49 focusing on those who have seldom abstained from voting, the following findings come up. Those who feel they are politically effective is more inclined than those who are not to less abstain from voting. However, as the small Cramer’s contingency coefficient shows, the relationship between these two variables is weak. Then what about the influence of the sense of political accessibility?

10. The Sense of Political Accessibility

Political accessibility is a sense that reflects one’s intimacy with politics. This
component of political attitude can be measured by the response to the following test statement "Politics is too difficult to understand". If one's response to this statement is agree, he/she is considered to distances himself/herself from politics. Table 31 reveals the relationship between political accessibility and social strata. As was shown in table 30, the percentage of those who consider that they are accessible to politics is 26.4% on average. By social strata, those who disagree with this statement is 30.9% in the upper middle class. It means 30.9% of the upper middle class people think they are accessible to politics. On the other hand, the percentage of those who think they are accessible to politics is 18.2% in the lower middle class. The former is higher than the latter by a margin of 11.9%. Table 50 examines the relationship between the Sense of Political Accessibility and voting behavior,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 50</th>
<th>How Often Have You Abstained From Voting</th>
<th>in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccessible</td>
<td>5.6 (16)</td>
<td>18.3 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>5.4 (5)</td>
<td>12.0 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.5 (21)</td>
<td>16.8 (63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 2.05461 \quad v = 0.0739 \quad n.s.$

Although the relationship between the Sense of Political Accessibility and voting behavior is weak as shown in table 50, this table indicates the more one gains the sense of political accessibility the more often one goes to the polls. In this sense, transparency of politics is a requisite to promote election democracy.

11. The Sense of Obligation to Vote

Table 51 shows the relationship between the sense of obligation to vote and voting behavior. The categories in the row of the table is responses to the test statement to the effect that "to abstain from voting is renunciation of sacred public duties", therefore, inexcusable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 51</th>
<th>How Often Have You Abstained From Voting</th>
<th>in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexcusable</td>
<td>62.4 (204)</td>
<td>19.3 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excusable</td>
<td>58.8 (30)</td>
<td>11.8 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.9 (234)</td>
<td>18.3 (69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 5.3696 \quad v= 0.11919 \quad n.s.$
The result of table 51 is also contradictly. Those who consider abstention as inexcusable are more inclined than those who consider abstention as excusable to abstain more often. Attitude to the abstention seems to be an expression of superficial principle about election. From above examinations we can say that factors relating political consciousness don't seem to influence voting behavior. The sense of political concern, The sense of self confidence in the ability of political actor of democracy, the sense of obligation to vote are only superficial expression of democratic principles.

12. The Daily Expression of Political Concern

If people are interested in politics, they may usually discuss political topics with friends, family members. Table 52 shows the degree of their participatin into such aspect of political life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 52</th>
<th>Daily Expression of Political Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How Often Do You Discuss Politics With Your Friends or Family Members?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>26.2 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>22.9 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.0 (107)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 52 the percentage of those who often discuss politics with friends or family members is 26.2% in the upper middle class. On the other hand, it is 22.9% in the lower middle class. Although this difference is not statistically significant, the upper middle class appears to be more inclined than the lower middle class to discuss political topics with friends or family members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 53</th>
<th>How Often Have You Abstained From Voting in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4.7 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4.4 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>4.9 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.6 (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53 indicates that although the relationship between the degree of political concern and voting behavior is weak, tendency seems to be that the more one
discusses political topics with one's friends or family members, the less one comes to abstain from voting. Voting behavior is unlikely to realize without the existence of political party. In the following, this problem is to be examined.

13. Political Party Affiliation

Table 54 shows to what extent do people have political parties by which they stand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Strata</th>
<th>Haves</th>
<th>Have nots</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>9.3 (25)</td>
<td>90.7 (245)</td>
<td>100.0 (270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>7.8 (12)</td>
<td>92.2 (142)</td>
<td>100.0 (154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.7 (37)</td>
<td>91.3 (387)</td>
<td>100.0 (424)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.25149 \text{ v= 0.0244 n. s.} \]

According to table 54 only 8.7% of the people have a political party by which they stand. This percentage is extremely low when compared to a Japanese research result which shows about 60% of the electorate have a political party by which they stand in one way or other. (3)

Table 54 further shows that although the difference is not significant, the upper middle class appears to be more inclined than the lower middle class to have a political party by which they stand. Then, does the existence of political party affect voting behavior of the people? Table 55 shows the relationship between political party affiliation and voting behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Often Have You Abstained From Voting</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haves</td>
<td>2.7 (1)</td>
<td>8.1 (3)</td>
<td>89.2 (33)</td>
<td>100.0 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have nots</td>
<td>5.1 (20)</td>
<td>18.9 (74)</td>
<td>76.0 (298)</td>
<td>100.0 (392)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.9 (21)</td>
<td>17.9 (77)</td>
<td>77.2 (331)</td>
<td>100.0 (429)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.477832 \text{ v= 0.09004 n. s.} \]

Table 55 shows 89.2% of those who have a political party by which they stand have seldom abstained from voting. On the other hand, 76.0% of those who don’t have a political party by which they stand have seldom abstained from voting. The former (89.2%) appear to be more inclined than the latter (76.0%) to go to the polls. From table 54 and table 55 we can say that the socio economic environment which brings
about the upper middle class is conducive to the progress of election democracy. In view of foregoing, the following conclusion can be drawn. The non existence of political parties which have mutually discernible political goals prevents people from developing sound political consciousness which is conducive to the development of election democracy. Under these circumstances People are liable to be influenced by human connections or popularity of candidates in deciding the candidate to be elected during the campaign period. This may be the reason why so many sports players, movie stars have been elected in the Philippines. In the following section, direct participatory political activities is to be examined.

IX. Aspects of Direct Participatory Political Activities

1. Rally Attendance

Table56 shows their experience of attending rallies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.5346, \nu = 0.0631, \text{n.s.} \]

According to table56 42.3% of the middle class people have attended rallies. This percentage seems to be higher than that of Japan. By social strata, the upper middle class appears to be more inclined than the lower middle class to attend rallies. This finding is corresponds to the fact shown in table31 that the upper middle class is more politically concerned than the lower middle class. But the difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level.

2. Canvassing votes

In a society like the Philippines where they put emphasis on the personal relation, vote canvassing may be an effective tactics to gain votes. Table57 shows a responce to the test statement to the effect that I have asked some one to vote for a candidate.
Table 57  I Have Asked Some One to Vote for a Candidate  in % (n)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>57.5 (149)</td>
<td>42.5 (110)</td>
<td>100.0 (259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>47.2 (67)</td>
<td>52.8 (75)</td>
<td>100.0 (142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53.9 (216)</td>
<td>46.1 (185)</td>
<td>100.0 (401)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.9598 \quad v = 0.09994 \quad n. s. \]

As shown in table 57 more than half of the people (53.9\%) have ever asked some one to vote for a candidate. By social strata, the upper middle class is more inclined than the lower middle class to ask some one to vote for a candidate. It is because the upper middle class people are more influential than the lower class people. At the same time, as was shown in table 57 they are more confident in their ability as a political actor.

3. Election Fund Donation

As is the case in Japan, Election in the Philippines is very expensive also. Candidates have to pay meals for campaigners, poll watchers, motorcade, hand bills, posters, t-shirts, and cap But, soliciting money for election is prohibited. Accordingly, some people donate money to an intimate candidate. Table 58 is a response to the test statement to the effect that I have donated money to a candidate.

Table 58  I Have Donated Money to a Candidate  in % (n)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>11.5 (28)</td>
<td>88.5 (215)</td>
<td>100.0 (243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>4.9 (6)</td>
<td>95.1 (116)</td>
<td>100.0 (122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.3 (34)</td>
<td>90.7 (331)</td>
<td>100.0 (365)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.43179 \quad v = 0.09696 \quad n. s. \]

Donation of money to a candidate is not as popular as rally attendance, vote canvassing, distributing election materials. On average only 9.3\% of the middle class people have donated money to a candidate. Herein also the upper middle class appears to be more inclined than the lower middle class to donate money to a candidate. Because they can afford to donate money than the lower middle class.

4. Working as a election staff member

Table 59 shows only less than one fifth have ever worked as a member of election
campaign staff. By social stratum, the percentage of those who have ever worked as a member of election campaign staff is 18.1% in the upper middle class and 16.1% in the lower middle class. Although the difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level, the upper middle class appears to be more inclined than the lower middle class to work as a member of Campaign staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table59</th>
<th>I Have Worked as a Member of Campaign Staff in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>18.1 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>16.1 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.4 (64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.2246 \quad v = 0.0247 \quad n.s. \]

X. Factors affecting Direct Participatory Political Activities

In the following, among the above mentioned direct participatory political activities, the activity like distributing such election related materials as hand bills, posters, t-shirts, calling cards will be taken up. Distributing election related materials In the Philippines, during the election time many people are mobilized for distributing hand bills. How are the middle class people involved in the activity of this kind? Table60 is a response to the test statement to the effect that I have distributed election materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table60</th>
<th>I Have Distributed Election Materials. in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>36.2 (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>29.1 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.8 (126)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.8575 \quad v = 0.070568 \quad n.s. \]

According to table60 about one third of the middle class people have ever distributed election materials such as hand bills. When compared to the middle class in Japan where most people are cynical to politics. This percentage can be said to be very high. In this aspect of political behavior also, the upper middle class is more
active than the lower middle class. It may be because, they are more closely related to the candidate because of their esteemed position.

1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 61</th>
<th>Have You Ever Distributed Election Related Materials?</th>
<th>in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>35.4 (93)</td>
<td>64.6 (170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>29.4 (37)</td>
<td>70.6 (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.4 (130)</td>
<td>66.6 (259)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.3722 \quad v = 0.0594 \quad n. s. \]

According to table 61 man appears to be more inclined than woman to distributed election related materials. This may be because of the fact man seems to be more than woman involved in the public affairs.

2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 62</th>
<th>Have You Ever Distributed Election Related Materials?</th>
<th>in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>30.3 (59)</td>
<td>69.7 (136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and above</td>
<td>37.0 (71)</td>
<td>63.0 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.6 (130)</td>
<td>66.4 (257)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.95762 \quad v = 0.0711 \quad n. s. \]

According to table 62 Among those who are under 40, 30.3% of them have distributed election related materials. On the other hand, among those who are 40 and above 37.0% of them have ever distributed election related materials. With respect to distributing election related materials, It appears the older one becomes the more actively one takes part in the political activities of this kind.

3. Occupation

As shown in table 63 the percentage of those who have distributed election related materials is 33.9%. distributing election related materials is time consuming activity. Therefore, it seems to be difficult for those who are forced to work in accordance with routine time schedule to take part in activity of this kind. Such being the case,
percentage of those who have distributed election related materials is lowest among blue collar workers. Among them its percentage is only 21.4%. On the other hand, Business operators seem to actively take part in the work of distributing election related materials. Among them the percentage of those who have taken part in the activity of this kind is 43.7%. However, the difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level. Nevertherless, we can’t deny the fact that the percentage of the latter is more than two times as high as that of the former. From this we can say that time factor is an important determinant of participatory political activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table63</th>
<th>Have You Ever Distributed Election Related Materials?</th>
<th>in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>33.6 (36)</td>
<td>66.4 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>43.7 (31)</td>
<td>56.3 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof/tech</td>
<td>32.4 (22)</td>
<td>67.6 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>35.8 (24)</td>
<td>64.2 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>21.4 (12)</td>
<td>78.6 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.9 (125)</td>
<td>66.1 (244)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 7.07941$  v= 0.1385  n. s.

4. Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table64</th>
<th>Have You Ever Distributed Election Related Materials?</th>
<th>in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26.7 (31)</td>
<td>73.3 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>38.0 (35)</td>
<td>65.0 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>40.0 (32)</td>
<td>60.0 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>36.6 (30)</td>
<td>63.4 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.9 (128)</td>
<td>66.1 (250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 3.3329$  v= 0.0939  n. s.

According to table64 those who fall in the high income group are most actively taking part in the campaign activities. On the other hand, those who fall in the low income group are least actively taking part in distributing election related materials. Although Cramer’s contingency coefficient is small, the general tendency is that the richer one becomes the more actively one takes part in the campaign activities of this kind.
5. Educational Attainment

Table 65: Have You Ever Distributed Election Related Materials? in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>30.8 (8)</td>
<td>69.2 (18)</td>
<td>100.0 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>32.4 (86)</td>
<td>67.5 (179)</td>
<td>100.0 (265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>38.9 (37)</td>
<td>61.1 (58)</td>
<td>100.0 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.9 (131)</td>
<td>66.1 (255)</td>
<td>100.0 (386)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.57528 \quad v= 0.06388 \quad n. s. \]

Table 65 indicates there is a positive relationship between educational attainment and the activity like distributing election related materials. The more highly one is educated the more actively one takes part in such campaign activity as distributing election related materials.

6. The Self Confidence as a Vanguard of Democracy

Table 66: Have Distributed Election Related Materials in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanguard</td>
<td>35.2 (99)</td>
<td>64.8 (182)</td>
<td>100.0 (281)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not vanguard</td>
<td>43.2 (16)</td>
<td>56.8 (21)</td>
<td>100.0 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.2 (115)</td>
<td>63.8 (203)</td>
<td>100.0 (318)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.86139 \quad v= 0.0520 \quad n. s. \]

Table 66 shows the middle class people’s participation in campaign activities. The row categories in the table are responses to a test statement to the effect that “the middle class is a vanguard of democracy”. Underlying hypothesis of this table is that those who are confident of their ability as a vanguard of democracy is more inclined than those who are not to distribute election related materials. but, the result betrayed our hypothesis. Why is it so? The reason is that this belief is too superficially principle to discern people’s political activity. More important factors which influence direct participatory political activities will be political consciousness. In what follows the effect of political consciousness on direct participatry political activity will be taken up.
7. The Sense of Political Concern

Table 67: I Have Distributed Election Related Materials in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>31.4 (64)</td>
<td>68.6 (140)</td>
<td>100.0 (204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>40.0 (56)</td>
<td>60.0 (84)</td>
<td>100.0 (140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.9 (120)</td>
<td>65.1 (224)</td>
<td>100.0 (344)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 2.715  v = 0.08884  n. s.

Table 67 shows the relationship between the sense of political concern and activity like distributing election related materials. According to this table those who are interested in politics is more inclined than those who are not to take part in the political activity of this kind. However, as the small Cramer's contingency coefficient shows, the relationship between these variables is not strong. The next to be examined is the relationship between the sense of political effectiveness and direct participatory political activity.

8. The Sense of Political Effectiveness

Table 68: I Have Distributed Election Related Materials in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>30.2 (32)</td>
<td>69.8 (74)</td>
<td>100.0 (106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>31.5 (46)</td>
<td>68.5 (100)</td>
<td>100.0 (146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.0 (78)</td>
<td>69.0 (174)</td>
<td>100.0 (252)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 0.04746  v = 0.0138  n. s.

According to table 68 those who feel they are politically effective seem to be more inclined than those who are not to take part in the political activity of this kind. However, as the small Cramer's contingency coefficient shows the relationship between these variables is not strong. Then, How is the case with the Sense of Political Accessibility?

9. The Sense of Political Accessibility

According to table 69 those who feel they are accessible to politics are more inclined than those who can't feel they are accessible to politics to actively take part in election campaign activities. As elsewhere described, If politics becomes too much complicated
and beyond understanding of the people, they are unlikely to get involved in politics. In the Philippines, politics is under the control of a handful of rich people. Under these circumstances, it is hard for general public to feel they can access to politics. On top of that, political parties haven’t developped well as has been shown by rampant party change of politicians and non-existance of policy goal oriented political parties. Stimulated political concern based on the sense of political accessibility will lead people to verbal discussion on political affairs. This daily verbal expression of political concern make the people more politically active.

Table 9.1 Have Distributed Election Related Materials in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unaccessible</td>
<td>29.4 (75)</td>
<td>70.6 (180)</td>
<td>100.0 (255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>48.5 (47)</td>
<td>51.5 (50)</td>
<td>100.0 (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.7 (122)</td>
<td>65.3 (230)</td>
<td>100.0 (352)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 11.286934 \quad v = 0.1791 \quad p < 0.05$

10. The Daily Expression of Political Concern

Table 10. Discussing Political Topics and Distributing Election Related Materials in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>46.2 (43)</td>
<td>53.8 (50)</td>
<td>100.0 (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>38.5 (70)</td>
<td>61.5 (112)</td>
<td>100.0 (182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>14.0 (13)</td>
<td>86.0 (80)</td>
<td>100.0 (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.2 (126)</td>
<td>65.8 (242)</td>
<td>100.0 (368)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 23.88605 \quad v = 0.2548 \quad p < 0.005$

Table 10 reveals that 46.2% of those who often discuss political topics have distributed election related materials and on the other hand, only 14.0% of those who seldom discuss political topics have distributed electionrelated materials. The percentage of the former is higher than the percentage of the latter by a big margin of 32.2%. As large Cramer’s contingency coefficient shows, these two variables are strongly related. Indication is that those who often discuss political topics appears to be more inclined than those who seldom discuss political topics to take part in the participatory activities of this kind.
11. The Political Party Affiliation

As was shown in table 54, on average only 8.7% of the middle class people have a political party by which they stand. Table 71 shows the relationship between party affiliation and such political behavior as distributing election related materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haves</td>
<td>80.6(25)</td>
<td>19.4(6)</td>
<td>100.0(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have nots</td>
<td>29.5(104)</td>
<td>70.5(249)</td>
<td>100.0(353)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.6(129)</td>
<td>66.4(255)</td>
<td>100.0(384)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 18.00957 \quad v=0.21656 \quad p<0.05 \]

Table 71 supports the conclusions above. 80.6% of those who have a political party by which the stand have distributed election related materials. On the other hand, only 29.5% of those who don’t have a political party by which the stand have distributed election related materials. The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a wide margin of 51.1%. Herein lies also the significance of political parties in promoting participatory democracy was confirmed. Then is indirect participatory political action related with direct political action like distributing election related materials?

12. Status Consciousness

Experience of distributing election related materials by status consciousness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>18.1(21)</td>
<td>81.9(95)</td>
<td>100.0(116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>12.7(28)</td>
<td>87.3(192)</td>
<td>100.0(220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16.4(9)</td>
<td>83.6(46)</td>
<td>100.0(55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.8(58)</td>
<td>85.2(333)</td>
<td>100.0(391)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.76084 \quad v=0.0671 \quad n. s. \]

According to table 72 the upper class seems to be more inclined than other class to take part in such activity as distributing election related materials. And the middle class seems to be least inclined than other class to take part in such activity. Then how can class consciousness affect direct participatory political action?
13. Class Consciousness

Table 73  Have You Ever Distributed Election Related Materials?  in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitalist</td>
<td>54.3 (19)</td>
<td>45.7 (16)</td>
<td>100.0 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>32.0 (93)</td>
<td>68.0 (198)</td>
<td>100.0 (291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.4 (112)</td>
<td>65.6 (214)</td>
<td>100.0 (326)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 6.96027$  $v = 0.1461$  n. s.

Table 73 shows those who identify themselves with capitalist class are more inclined than those who identify themselves with working class to have distributed election related materials. This finding corresponds to the finding that the upper middle class is more inclined than the lower middle class to take part in direct participatory political action. As will be later stated, in the people power 2 movement which deposed Estrada from presidency, the upper middle class in Makati played important roles. Table 72 and table 73 underline this point.

XI. Democracy and Clear Cut Policy Goal Oriented Political Party.

Regarding political consciousness, it is the sense of political accessibility which strongly influences the direct participatory political behavior. Then what factors affect this political consciousness? Factors affecting the sense of political accessibility will be examined.

1. Gender

Table 74  Politics is Too Difficult to Understand  in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (Unaccessible)</th>
<th>No (Accessible)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>69.0 (180)</td>
<td>31.0 (81)</td>
<td>100.0 (261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>83.0 (112)</td>
<td>17.0 (23)</td>
<td>100.0 (135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.7 (292)</td>
<td>26.3 (104)</td>
<td>100.0 (396)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 9.0645$  $v = 0.1513$  $p<0.05$

Table 74 shows how man and woman differ regarding the sense of political accessibility. 31% of man feel they are accessible to politics. On the other hand only
17% of women think they are accessible to politics. The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a margin of 14%. This difference is statistically significant, though. This gender difference may be brought about by the fact that men are more inclined than women to get involved in the public affairs. Through this process they may get more information about politics than women.

2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 75</th>
<th>The Sense of Political Accessibility by Age Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politics is Too Difficult to Understand</td>
<td>in % (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (Unaccessible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>78.6 (162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and above</td>
<td>66.7 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.4 (178)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the analysis of age effect on the sense of political accessibility, people are divided by median age (40). The result shows 33.3% of the people 40 and above feel they are accessible to politics. On the other hand, only 21.4% of the people under 40 think they are accessible to politics. The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a margin of 11.9%. Although this difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level, this age effect seems to be brought about by the fact that the older man becomes more inclined than the younger man to get involved in the public affairs. Through this process the older man get more information about politics than the youth. This made them feel accessible to politics. Another important socio economic factor to be analysed is occupation. How can occupation influence the sense of accessibility to politics?

3. Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 76</th>
<th>Politics is Too Difficult to Understand in % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (Unaccessible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>63.9 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>82.9 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof/ tech</td>
<td>63.2 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>84.0 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>77.2 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.3 (277)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 16.3583$  v= 0.20803  p< 0.05
Table76 shows there is strong relationship between occupation and the sense of accessibility to politics. Among occupational groups, professional/technical workers appear to consider themselves as most accessible to politics. Among them, 36.8% of the people think they are accessible to politics. On the other hand, among clerical workers only 16.0% of them think they are accessible to politics. As was shown in table44, professional/technical workers appear to abstain from voting more often than the clerical workers.

4. Income

Income factor also has strong relevancy to the sense of political accessibility.

Table77  Politics is Too Difficult to Understand  in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (Unaccessible)</th>
<th>No (Accessible)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>86.4 (102)</td>
<td>13.6 (16)</td>
<td>100.0 (118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>76.6 (82)</td>
<td>23.4 (25)</td>
<td>100.0 (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>70.5 (55)</td>
<td>29.5 (23)</td>
<td>100.0 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>55.4 (46)</td>
<td>44.6 (37)</td>
<td>100.0 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.8 (285)</td>
<td>26.2 (101)</td>
<td>100.0 (386)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\chi^2 = 25.18152 \quad v = 0.2554 \quad p < 0.05\]

Table77 shows those who are in the highest income group appears to strongly feel they are accessible to politics. In this group 44.6% of them think that way. On the other hand, in the low income group, only 13.6% of the people feel they are accessible to politics. Those who are in the higher income bracket appears to be more inclined than those who are not to have acquaintances in the political world. This makes these people in higher income bracket feel accessible to politics. The sense of political accessibility may come into existence by one’s intelectual ability. Then, next to be analyzed is the relationship between educational attainment and the sense of political accessibility.

5. Educational attainment

Table78  Politics is Too Difficult to Understand  in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (Unaccessible)</th>
<th>No (Accessible)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>79.2 (19)</td>
<td>20.8 (5)</td>
<td>100.0 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>77.6 (215)</td>
<td>22.4 (62)</td>
<td>100.0 (277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>60.0 (57)</td>
<td>40.0 (38)</td>
<td>100.0 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.5 (291)</td>
<td>26.5 (105)</td>
<td>100.0 (396)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\chi^2 = 11.662812 \quad v = 0.172 \quad p < 0.05\]
Table 78 shows there is a strong relationship between these two variables. 40.0% of graduate school enrollees feel they are accessible to politics. On the other hand, only 20.8% of high school graduates think that way. The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a wide margin of 19.2%. The sense of political accessibility seems to depend on educational attainment. In this sense the advancement of educational level is of great encouragement to the progress of democracy in the Philippines. Comparison of three Cramer’s contingency coefficients tells us among three socio economic factors, income influences most strongly the sense of political accessibility.

6. Political Party

As has been shown by the above discussion, one of the factors which strongly affects the sense of political accessibility is the existence of political party by which they stand. Table 79 shows the relationship between the existence of a political party by which they stand and the sense of political accessibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (Accessible)</th>
<th>No (Unaccessible)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haves</td>
<td>41.1 (14)</td>
<td>58.9 (20)</td>
<td>100.0 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have nots</td>
<td>24.5 (88)</td>
<td>75.5 (271)</td>
<td>100.0 (359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.0 (102)</td>
<td>74.0 (291)</td>
<td>100.0 (393)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown by table 79, the percentage of those who have the sense of political accessibility is 41.1% among those who have a political party by which they stand. On the other hand, the percentage of those who don’t have the sense of political accessibility is 24.5% among those who don’t have a political party by which they stand. The percentage of the former is higher than that of the latter by a margin of 16.6%. This difference is statistically significant at the 5% level. Indication is that the existence of political party by which they stand strongly affects the sense of political accessibility. This finding also confirms the importance of the existence of policy goal oriented a political party. Noteworthy, Further more, as shown in table 80 the sense of political accessibility influences people’s daily interest in politics. That is, those who think they are accessible to politics seem to be more inclined than those who don’t think that way to discuss political topics more often.
Table 80: The Sense of Political Accessibility and Discussion About Political Topics in % (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>No (Accessible)</th>
<th>Yes (Unaccessible)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>37.5 (39)</td>
<td>21.1 (62)</td>
<td>25.4 (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50.0 (52)</td>
<td>46.1 (135)</td>
<td>47.1 (187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>12.5 (13)</td>
<td>32.8 (96)</td>
<td>27.5 (109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 (104)</td>
<td>100.0 (293)</td>
<td>100.0 (397)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 19.7424 \quad v = 0.22230 \quad p < 0.05 \]

XII. The Prospect Of Filipino Democracy

1. The Filipino Middle Class and People Power 2

The social forces that propeled People Power 1 in February 1986 are unmistakably middle classes. As Bautista argues, “important developments after 1986 opened possibilities for greater middle class involvement in substantiating the democratization process.” (41) They also show greater appreciation for the rule of law and higher ethical standard for public servise. As such they are natural constituency for democratic politics.” (5) “The period saw, for instance, the remarkable growth of development NGO communities committid to grass roots organizing and advocacy for economic and human development.” As of 1998 The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) estimates that there are about 58,000 NGOs in the Philippines. (6) “Thease organizations are middle class in orientation with high standards of public consciousness and morality. Because of their higher level of education, the middle classes are less dependent on system of patronage. Together with social instutions like Catholic and Protestant Churches, other business chambers and the Makati Business Club (MBC), the development communities and voluntary associations provided the organizational infrastructure for the mobilization against the Estrada government.” (7) “The dramatic four- day People power 2 uprising and the transfer of government leadership to Vice President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo on January 20 2001 was the unexpected culmination of protest against the Estrada administration. The more technologycally oriented segments of the middle classes set up electronic discussion groups and signature campaigns. They linked unorganized individuals, including Filipinos working abroad to one another via the Internet. More important than acces to cellular phones, however, is the Filipino middle class’ obsession with text messaging. Proof of its high utilization in the final days of Estrada’s presidency was
the five-fold increase in the volume of text message.

2. The Middle class and 2001 Election

The ascendancy of GMA to presidency was not an easy way. Estrada resorted to a tactical rhetoric. He asserted that the personal attacks on him were the attacks of the rich on the masses. In short, Estrada and his defenders projected People Power 2 as the revenge of the elite on the poor." (8) After People power 2 and ensuing arrest of out going President Estrada on April 25, the number of pro- Estrada protesters swelled in the streets outside Malacanang Palace. May 14 mid term elections will be an important touch stone for Arroyo to consolidate her political support she needs to finish her term in 2004. According to a exit poll conducted by the Social Weather Station- one of famous public opinion research institutes, the voter turn out is 89%.

"The exit poll predicted that 13 winners of the 2001 election will be 8 From the People power Coalition and 5 from the Puwersa ng Masa, based on its random sample of 5,446 voters who were interviewed nationwide as of May 28. The ABS-CBN/ SWS 2001 Day of Election Survey of 5,446 voters shows that senatorial voters are related to public trust in President Gloria Macapagal- Arroyo and former Pres. "Erap" Estrada. Among those with much trust in Pres. GMA, representing 45 % of voters, the composition of the top 13 candidates are 11 from the People Power Coalition (PPC) and 2 from the Puwersa ng Mesa (PnM) coalition including guest candidates. However, among the 22% with little trust in her, the PPC- PnM score is 2-11.

Socio economic characteristics of Voters for PPC candidates upper classes and the highly educated voted more for senatorial candidates from the People Power Coalition than those from the Puwersa ng Masa (PnM) coalition. According to the ABS- CBN/ SWS 2001 Day of Election Survey of 5,446 voters, Among middle- to upper Class ABC which comprises 8% of voters, the top 13 candidates are 11 from PPC and 2 from PnM including guest candidates. The score among the class D or the masa, comprising 73% of voters, is the same as the national score (8-5). However, among the very poor class E which represents 19% of voters, the PPC- PnM score is 6-7. By educational attainment, The PPC- PnM score is11-2 among college graduates, comprising 15% of voters. Among those with partial/full high school (34%), the top 13 include Enrile (PnM) instead of Magsaysay (PPC) for a PPC- PnM score of 7-6. Among those with at most elementary education comprising 36% of voters. The top 13 include PnM's Enrile and Santiago, instead of PPC's Flavier and Recto, thus a score of 7-6. Above data shows the support base of PPC is highly educated rich urban people. Accordingly,
economic development which is conducive to the emergence of middle classes brings about democracy through the political roles peculiar to this class.” (9)

APPENDIX

2001 ELECTION RELATED DATA (EXIT POLL) (9)
Updated: may 22 2001

SENATORIAL VOTES BY CLASS

- Total RP, PPC vs. PnM: 8- 5
- Class ABC: PPC vs. PnM: 11- 2
- Class D: PPC vs. PnM: 8- 5
- Class E: PPC vs. PnM: 6- 7

SENATORIAL VOTES BY EDUCATION

- College Grad., PPC vs. PnM: 11- 2
- Some Coll./Voc., PPC vs. PnM: 8- 5
- Up to HS Grad., PPC vs. PnM: 7- 6
- Up to Elem. Grad., PPC vs. PnM: 6- 7

BELIEF THAT FORMER PRES. ESTRADA ENRICHED HIMSELF WHILE IN POWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATE</th>
<th>BELIEVE</th>
<th>DO NOT BELIEVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL CLASS</th>
<th>BELIEVE</th>
<th>DO NOT BELIEVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class ABC</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class D</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class E</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>BELIEVE</th>
<th>DO NOT BELIEVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>BELIEVE</th>
<th>DO NOT BELIEVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGION</th>
<th>BELIEVE</th>
<th>DO NOT BELIEVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iglesia ni Cristo</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic group</td>
<td>Couples for Chr</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Shadai</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jesus is Lord</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesus Miracle</th>
<th>53%</th>
<th>47%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Charismatic</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First language

- Tagalog 45% 53%
- Cebuano 43% 55%
- Ilocano 39% 59%
- Ilongo 47% 52%
- Bicolano 56% 44%
- Waray 32% 67%
- Kapampangan 62% 38%
- Pangasinense 57% 43%
- Chavacano 28% 72%
- Others 55% 44%

references cited

(1) Tamotsu Aoki: Asian dilemma Tyoukouron sya 2000
(2) Chua Beng-Huat ed.: Consumption in Asia p5 Routledge 2000
(3) Toshio ARAKI: Politics of voting behavior p80 Hokkaido Univ. press 1994
(4) Maria Cynthia Bautista: Draft for ABS-CBN April 2001
(5) Maria Cynthia Bautista: Draft for ABS-CBN April 2001
(6) G. Sidney Silliman and Garner Nobleed.: Organizing for Democracy Ateneo de Manila University 1998
(7) Maria Cynthia Bautista: Draft for ABS-CBN April 2001
(8) Bautista op. cit.
(9) Conducted by Social weather Station on may 14 2001 ABS-CBN/SWS

30/11/2001

Lastly

I have to mention to Jenifer Javier who didn’t spare no effort in checking errors of my English. Without her help, this paper would not come out as it is now. However, only I am responsible for all the errors.

Acknowledgement

This project has been funded by special research program of Toyo University from 1999-2001.
【要　約】

フィリピンにおける民主主義と都市新中間層の形成

池田 正敏

フィリピンにおける都市新中間層の形成は、否定しがたい社会現象である。この現象は知識集約型産業の発展と人々の高度な教育的展開によって可能となった。彼らは高い社会的・経済的地位を誇っているが、中でも彼らの高い所得と高い学歴達成度は顕著である。彼らはこの社会的に有利な条件を保持するために、子どもの教育に投資することに躍起となっている。現在の新中間層の親の出身地の多くは実際にはメトロ・マニラである。二代目のメトロ・マニラっ子としての彼らは、これまたメトロ・マニラ出身の、高学歴で高収入の仕事の従事する配偶者と核家族を作る。このように彼らは教育や職業の点でも内婚的傾向を示している。

彼らの旺盛な消費活動を最も良く表わす消費品目はクレジットカードである。この点で上流中間層は下流中間層に較べて、顕著にクレジットカードを使う傾向が見られる。

また、上流中間層は下流中間層に較べて政治的には、より活動的である。即ち、彼らは下流中間層より政治に関心を寄せており、その結果、前者は後者より直接的参加民主制にも積極的な関心を示している。しかし、フィリピンにおける民主主義の発展という点からは、政策志向型の政党の確立が必要であるように思われる。新中間層のわずか10％の人が支持政党を持っている。その結果として、新中間層の人々ですら政治というのは彼らにとって理解をこえたものという存在となっている。この感覚は他の政治意識の例えば、政治的関心・政治的有効性感覚にも影響を与えている。

その結果、彼らは政治的有効性感覚を失い、さらには投票義務感を失ってゆく。こうしたことからフィリピンでは国政選挙は人気取り投票となり、元スポーツ選手の政治家やまた映画スター出身の政治家が多くなる傾向がある。