

Typology and Correlates of Political Participation Among Filipinos

EVANGELINE P. SUCGANG
Ateneo de Manila University

This study sought to establish the types of political participation among Filipino citizens including some of its attitudinal and social structural-demographic correlates. Using data from the 2001 National Survey on Filipino Citizenship, 17 political participation items were subjected to an exploratory factor analysis. Two types of political involvement surfaced namely, political participation as proactive engagement in the public arena and political participation as public problem solving. Multiple regression analyses to determine possible correlates revealed the presence of two-way interaction effects for both types of political engagement. Data gathered from interviews with 20 respondents yielded 11 other forms of participation that are reflective of the evolving nature of political engagement as it is influenced by the Philippine socio-cultural and political history. A research agenda for future work on this area is also proposed.

Greater citizen participation in the political life of a society is a goal governments, civil society groups, non-government organizations, and international development organizations around the world share. The 2002 Human Development Report (HDR) published by the United Nations Human Development Programme (UNDP), asserted that "Countries can promote human development for all only when they have governance systems that are fully accountable to all people and when all people can participate in the debates and decisions that shape their lives" (p. 3). Cross cultural comparisons illustrate that when people enjoy political freedom and are able to effectively take part in

decision-making that affect their lives, they tend to have higher levels of over-all human development.

Current thinking in governance advocates increased political engagement as evidenced by the growing number of mechanisms being enacted for citizen involvement as well as the allocation by national and international organizations of an increasing amount of resources for this purpose. Investigating the phenomena of political participation is essential to understanding the complex relationship between citizens and their leaders. The changing social-cultural-political environment drives the evolution of political engagement as citizens find that the usual ways of making their needs felt may not have been as effective as before; or that new avenues for expression and influencing their leaders are becoming available.

In the Philippines, studies in political participation have predominantly focused on the experience of political involvement through organized groups, electoral behavior including voting, and women's political participation—specifically their attempts to organize as a political force at the local level and to run for public office (Cunanan-Angsioco, 2000; Francisco, 1998; Kerkvliet, 1990; Montiel & Macapagal, 2000; Rüländ, 1990; Santos, 1998; Tapales, 1994). Although the country boasts of a multitude of organized community as well as civic/political groups through which people participate, it is indisputable that a significant portion of its citizenry does not engage politically through such avenues and that almost everyone will, at one point or another, still participate politically as an individual.

Research dealing with the various forms of individual political engagement by Filipinos has been rather scarce. This research is exploratory in the sense that it attempts to systematically study the political participation of Filipinos as individuals by establishing a baseline typology of current forms of Filipino political participation. The second goal of this research is to explore the attitudinal as well as social-structural and demographic correlates to citizens' political participation.

Nature of Political Participation

Political participation had been defined as behavior that seeks to influence the policies, decisions, and actions of government, including its allocation of resources (Barner-Barry & Rosenwein, 1985; Milbrath, 1965; Verba, Nie & Kim, 1980; Washburn, 1982). It usually includes an aspect directed towards the achievement of a shared goal among those who engaged in it—particularly for those carrying out such behavior as part of a group (Zimmerman & Rappaport as cited in Duffy & Wong, 2000). Research in this area had primarily been driven by the need to understand the ways people take part in political life, their motivations for becoming involved or choosing to stay in the sidelines, and more importantly, to find ways of increasing the quality and quantity of their political engagement.

Identified forms of political engagement had been diverse and changing as revealed by comparing earlier studies such as Almond and Verba's cross-cultural study completed in the late 1950s with more contemporary studies (Leighley, 1991; Seligson, 1980). The notion of an evolving nature of political participation was hypothesized in reaction to studies citing a noticeable decline in the reported performance of traditionally defined manifestations of political participation (Dalton 2000; Haney, Borgida & Farr, 2002). Behaviors customarily studied as forms of political participation included voting, convincing others to vote for a particular candidate, joining a political party, donating money for a campaign, and contacting government officials. The hypothesis that newer forms of behavior had supplanted these traditionally measured actions received support as recent studies found citizens increasingly engaging in behaviors such as joining public interest or issue-based groups, participating in protest rallies, and refusing to obey unjust laws (Dalton, 2000; Haney, Borgida & Farr, 2002).

These emerging forms of political engagement were considered to have developed as a result of changes in the socio-cultural-

political environment including people's evolving expectations from government and their fellow citizens. For instance, Zalcita and his colleagues (1995) documented how the political engagement of citizens through organized groups was encouraged by the implementation of 1991 Local Government Code (LGC). The effect of LGC's implementation on the evolution of political participation could be glimpsed as well in the experience of Bicolanos in the creation of their People's Councils that sought to address their needs and facilitate access to government services (Santos, 1998).

Changes in conceptualization likewise affected what was regarded as the domain of political participation. For instance, some researchers included government service as well as membership in government-organized national and local special bodies as forms of political engagement (Tapales 1994). Faulks (2002), emphasizing the active dimension of political involvement, cited behaviors expressing opposition to governmental policies, decisions, and actions as manifestations of political engagement. Commonly, such behaviors had been labeled as political protest—characterized by Chong (2001) as “a multitude of methods used by individuals and groups within a political system to express their dissatisfaction with the status quo” (p. 11693). Political protest had also been referred to as alternative or non-routine political activities (Washburn, 1982), which included participation in strikes or boycotts, civil disobedience, and rebellion (Chong, 2001; Washburn, 1982).

Modes of Political Participation

Types or modes of behavior could be compared to what Tilly (as cited in Kinder, 1998) referred to as a *repertoire* or well-defined and established forms of participation. An action or political repertoire represented the forms of political behavior citizens had been socialized to engage in and as such also evolved with the changing economic-political and social circumstances.

In 1965, Lester Milbrath proposed a unidimensional typology of political behavior patterned after the hierarchy of a Roman gladiatorial contest and reflecting the escalation of time, resources, and effort citizens were willing to devote for political involvement. He suggested that an individual's position in the hierarchy implied his/her engagement or at least willingness to perform behaviors found in the lower levels. This typology was later criticized for emphasizing a somewhat rigid progression of political engagement that was not supported by subsequent research (Miller, Wilford, & Donoghue, 1999).

Verba et al. (1980) were among the first to propose a multidimensional typology of political involvement. Their seven-nation study established common modes of political participation that confirmed their hypothesis regarding the underlying similarity in structure of political engagement across countries. They hoped that this resulting typology could serve as basis for constructing comparable scales of political behavior in the future. Their typology of engagement included: (a) voting in national and local elections; (b) taking part in campaign activities including giving money for a campaign and membership in political organizations; (c) communal activities such as active membership in organizations engaged in solving community problems, organizing, or working through groups to address this type of issues and contacting government officials for this purpose; and (d) particularized contacts—specifically getting in touch with local or national officials regarding personal concerns. In addition, they also turned up country specific modes that confirmed the susceptibility of political engagement to the effects of unique socio-cultural-political environments.

Other researchers were also able to establish particular modes of political participation including Theiss-Morse (1993) who came up with five types of engagement, which bore similarities with Verba et al.'s (1980) earlier findings. Her typology included: (a) voting and being informed; (b) conventional participation—campaign-related actions, engaging in political

discussions and joining/being involved in interest groups or political organizations; (c) contacting activities—getting in touch with local or national officials about problems that affected the person and writing letters to newspaper editors; (d) unconventional participation—i.e., joining demonstrations or protest march, refusing to obey unjust laws, engaging in civil disobedience; and (e) a factor described as passive activities that included attending parades and having love and loyalty for one's country.

Leighley's (1991) research, that utilized data from the 1976 American National Election Study, also produced modes of engagement closely resembling those derived by the two earlier mentioned studies as well as an expressive mode which incorporated behaviors primarily intended to express political opinions rather than accomplishing specific goals.

The susceptibility of political behavior and subsequently the modes of engagement to the social-political-economic environment can be observed in the results of various participation studies (Barner-Barry & Rosenwein, 1985; Erdođan, 2003; Hirano, 2001; Petterson & Rose, 1996; Zhong, Chen, & Scheb, 1998). Inclusion of a wider range of activities such as political protest or alternative forms of behavior has likewise affected resulting typologies as demonstrated by Seligson (1980) as well as Bahry and Silver (1990) with their establishment of an unconventional political participation mode as distinct from other types of engagement. Comparing the results of these studies highlight the fact that differences in the derived types of political engagement are attributable to variations in the clustering of behaviors rather than performance of unique political acts.

Influences to Political Participation

Research on the influences to political engagement could be classified into two kinds of variables—social structural-demographic and attitudinal. Age, civil status, education, socio-economic status, sex, race, locale or type of community, and

membership in organizations or political parties were examples of social structural-demographic variables investigated. Attitudinal variables commonly studied were political efficacy, political interest, and political trust. Studies have thus far been unable to establish a consistent pattern for any variable's effect on specific types of political involvement across countries or groups of people (Bahry & Silver, 1990; Finkel, 1985; Hirano, 2001; Leighley, 1991; Milbrath, 1965; Pettersen & Rose, 1996; Seligson, 1980; Theiss-Morse, 1993; Verba et al., 1980).

For instance, cross-cultural research confirmed a general positive relationship between political participation and education but the degree of its relationship varied across countries and types of engagement, i.e., activities requiring access or use of resources and skills developed through education were more likely to have a significant relationship with education (Verba et al., 1980). Although others found similar positive relationships between these two (Bahry & Silver, 1990; Pettersen & Rose, 1996; Theiss-Morse, 1993), there were those who failed to find any relationship (Finkel, 1985; Leighley, 1991).

Like education, socio-economic status (SES) had been positively linked to certain modes of political participation (Theiss-Morse, 1993; Verba et al., 1980). Pettersen and Rose (1996) found income to be positively related for organizational involvement and political discussion modes of engagement. Similarly, Theiss-Morse obtained a positive correlation between income and two types of involvement, specifically voting and being informed, and active conventional participation.

Significant sex differences in political behavior detected in earlier studies showed men as generally being more likely to participate than women, however, recent findings produced mixed results depending on the type of involvement (Bahry & Silver, 1990; Milbrath, 1965; Pettersen & Rose, 1996; The Electoral Commission, 2004; Verba et al., 1980).

In terms of age, earlier studies showed general participation levels increasing with age but gradually declining when people reached 60 years (Milbrath, 1965). More recent studies meanwhile found age to have dissimilar effects on political involvement. For instance, while it was found to be positively related to voting behavior and keeping informed about political issues, age had negative relationship for such modes as campaign activities, local and national problem-solving activities, willingness to hold public office, joining demonstrations or protest marches, and signing petitions (Leighley, 1991; Pettersen & Rose, 1996; Theiss-Morse, 1993).

Single people, as Pettersen and Rose (1996) found out, were more likely to engage in a public opinion formation mode of behavior such as joining demonstrations and signing petitions. Married people, on the other hand, were more likely to be influencing political decision-making (i.e., contacting local government officials and advocating an issue within organizations). Barner-Barry and Rosenwein (1985) had earlier hypothesized that different life-stages affected the type of political involvement people engaged in.

The relationship of an urban-rural setting on political participation has likewise been found to be dependent on the kind of behavior engaged in (Milbrath, 1965; Pettersen & Rose, 1996; Verba et al., 1980). In their cross-cultural study, Verba et al. (1980) found some support for the hypothesis of greater participation in rural areas particularly for communal activities however their data also revealed country differences for this relationship but again depending on the specific mode of engagement. Pettersen and Rose (1996) found that place of residence was significant for rural residents influencing political decision-making by contacting their local government representative, voting and expressing their opinion by writing to newspapers while for urban residents it was influencing public opinion by joining demonstrations and signing petitions.

Among attitudinal variables studied, political efficacy was regarded as an important factor for political involvement because it has been hypothesized that unless people think their behavior will have some effect, they are unlikely to engage in political action (Barner-Barry & Rosenwein, 1985; Manheim, 1975). This proposition had been borne out by general findings linking higher degrees of political efficacy with greater involvement (Haney et al., 2002; Pettersen & Rose, 1996).

As with the socio-structural variables discussed earlier, the effect of political efficacy was observed to be dependent on the type of political behavior. It was, for instance, positively related to engagement that can be considered conventional such as voting, being informed, taking part in political discussions, campaigning for a candidate or party, participating in interest groups as well as community and/or local government activities, contacting media and government officials, and even willingness to hold public office (Finkel, 1985; Milbrath, 1965; Pettersen & Rose, 1996; Seligson, 1980; Theiss-Morse, 1993). However, it had little or insignificant effects for unconventional political behavior such as participating in public demonstrations and protests, engaging in civil disobedience to correct perceived unfair government action, and refusing to obey unjust laws (Seligson, 1980; Theiss-Morse, 1993).

Traditionally, political efficacy was defined as "the feeling that individual political action does have, or can have, an impact upon the political process, i.e., that it is worth while to perform one's civic duties. It is the feeling that political and social change is possible, and that the individual citizen can play a part in bringing about this change." (Campbell, Gurin & Miller, 1956, p.170). Recent studies confirmed theoretical speculation regarding its multidimensional nature (Craig, Niemi, & Silver, 1990; Finkel, 1985; Gilens, Glaser & Mendelberg, 2001; Madsen, 1987) with at least two primary dimensions i.e., internal and external efficacy. Internal political efficacy had been defined as "beliefs about one's own competence to understand and to participate effectively in

politics,” while external political efficacy referred to “beliefs about the responsiveness of governmental authorities and institutions to citizen demands,” (Craig et al., 1990 p. 290). Local studies, such as the Social Weather Stations’ (SWS) Social Weather Reports employed questions asking respondents to rate their degree of influence on national, provincial, municipal or city, and barangay issues as a measure of efficacy for their public opinion surveys. However, no local scales measuring efficacy has been established with researchers preferring to use their own expert knowledge in constructing items to be used primarily for public opinion surveys.

For the Philippines, emerging from a history of dictatorship, people power revolutions, and grappling its way to an established and flourishing democracy, this exploratory research attempts to provide a baseline knowledge about the political repertoire of ordinary citizens and variables that influence their political participation. This research specifically seeks to investigate the following research questions: (a) what are the current types of political participation among Filipino adults? and (b) how do the social structural-demographic variables of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, group membership, locale, and socio-economic status as well as the attitudinal variable of political efficacy affect the Filipino’s willingness to engage in particular types of political engagement?

METHOD

DENIZEN Survey Data

This study used a portion of an existing dataset collected for the 2001 National Survey on Filipino Citizenship: National Identity, Political Culture and Behavior, Governance and Democracy (DENIZEN) to establish a typology of Filipino political participation. DENIZEN was designed and directed by Dr. Jose V. Abueva for the Center for Leadership, Citizenship and Democracy

of the National College of Public Administration and Governance (NCPAG), University of the Philippines. This research drew on one of the seven modules of the DENIZEN survey namely, the module on Citizen's Political Participation and Efficacy.

DENIZEN employed multistage probability sampling to identify 1,200 adult respondents (i.e., 18 years old and above) nationwide. An equal number of female and male respondents were selected with almost half (46.5%) under the age of 35 years. Majority of the sample were married (68.8%) and belonging to lower income classes (i.e., Class D with 63% and 25.1% from Class E). Slightly more than half (51%) came from urban areas and majority of the respondents did not go beyond high school (37% had some or completed high school education while 25.3% completed, had some elementary education or did not have any formal schooling). Trained field interviewers conducted the face-to-face interviews using one of the six versions of the questionnaire (i.e., Filipino, English, Bicolano, Cebuano, Ilocano, or Ilonggo) and the results produced a +/-3% error margin at the 95% confidence level.

Political participation was measured using the following questions:

1. Using this rating board, please tell me the likelihood that you will participate in the following activities. Would you say that it is (a) Very Likely, (b) Likely, (c) Unlikely, (d) Very Unlikely that you will...?
 - 1.1. Join in public street demonstrations.
 - 1.2. Attend protest meetings.
 - 1.3. Refuse to obey unjust laws.
 - 1.4. Form a group to work on community problems.
 - 1.5. Contact local officials on problems.
 - 1.6. Contact national officials on particular problems.

- 1.7. Join and actively support a political party.
 - 1.8. Run for public office.
 - 1.9. Attend political fora/symposia.
 - 1.10. Write letters to newspaper editors.
 - 1.11. Send support or protest messages to political leaders.
 - 1.12. Keep myself informed about politics.
 - 1.13. Take an active part in political campaigns.
 - 1.14. Teach my children to participate in politics beyond voting.
 - 1.15. Teach my children to love our country.
 - 1.16. Actively support community organizations.
2. Did you vote during the 1998 Presidential elections or not?
(Response choices: (a) Voted in 1998, (b) Did not vote in 1998)

Responses to these political participation questions were factor analyzed to establish a typology of political participation.

Meanwhile, the attitudinal and social structural-demographic variables were measured as follows—the respondents' political efficacy were gauged by these two sets of questions:

1. Using this rating board, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. Would you say that you (a) Strongly Agree, (b) Agree, (c) Maybe Agree/Maybe Disagree, (d) Disagree or (e) Strongly Disagree with the statement...?
 - 1.1. Together with the votes of other citizens, my vote has a big influence in determining what kind of government Filipinos will have.
 - 1.2. Elections are a good way of making government pay attention to what people think.

- 1.3. The nation is run by a powerful few and ordinary citizens cannot do much about this.
 - 1.4. Filipinos are used to being commanded by high officials and so they just follow without question.
 - 1.5. At present, ordinary citizens belong to organizations, through which they can effectively participate in governing the country.
 - 1.6. The citizens are ready to employ "people power" to save the country from an abusive regime.
 - 1.7. People can control national events.
 - 1.8. With enough effort, graft and corruption can be solved.
 - 1.9. In my family, the males are more politically inclined than the females.
 - 1.10. If more citizens will participate in the affairs of government, the country will be better off.
2. In your opinion, how much influence would you say people like you have on the following. Would you say this is a (a) Great Deal, (b) A Little, (c) Almost None, or (d) None?
- 2.1. National issues
 - 2.2. Provincial issues
 - 2.3. Municipal/City issues
 - 2.4. Barangay issues

Seven social structural-demographic variables were selected from the DENIZEN items:

1. Age of respondent
2. Civil status—(a) Married [control variable], (b) Widowed, (c) Separated/married but separated/not living with legal spouse, (d) Single/never married, (e) Living-in

3. Sex
4. Educational attainment—(a) Elementary—includes completed, had some or no formal elementary education [control variable], (b) High school—had some or completed high school, (c) Vocational—had some or completed vocational, (d) College—includes had some or completed college or had post college education
5. Socio economic status—(a) Class AB, (b) Class C, (c) Class D, (d) Class E [control variable]
6. Organizational membership was measured by the question, “Are you currently a member of any organization or not?” Response choices: (a) Yes, (b) No [control variable]
7. Locale—(a) Urban, (b) Rural [control variable]

Four social structural-demographic variables were chosen to be paired with the other variables and test for two-way interaction effects. Age, gender, locale, and group membership were selected based on the researcher’s personal interest. The resulting combinations produced 58 additional predictor variables for the regression analyses.

The types of participation produced by the factor analysis together with the attitudinal and social structural-demographic variables were then subjected to multiple regression analyses to determine correlates for each type of political engagement. Control variables were set for the nominal variables to make them amenable to regression analyses.

Individual Interviews

Qualitative data were also collected through individual interviews of 20 respondents obtained through convenience sampling. Interviewers were specifically instructed to choose commonplace people—i.e., those not holding leadership positions within the community or known to be actively involved in political activities. This was done to approximate the responses that

average Filipinos in an urban setting would make. The interviews were undertaken during the period of 19-30 July 2004. There were an equal number of female and males with 11 of the 20 being single. The respondents lived within Metro Manila and most were between the ages of 25 and 34 years. Half were professionals and the rest were micro-entrepreneurs (i.e., *sari-sari* or *carinderia* store owners) and blue-collar workers. Some respondents expressed hesitation about the topic (i.e., they did not know anything about it) and were reassured by the interviewers that they could contribute useful information. Each interview lasted approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

For the individual interviews, a six-item questionnaire with English and Filipino versions was formulated to probe forms of political participation respondents have engaged in or have observed others to engage in. The first four questions were open-ended to allow additional forms of political participation to surface.

1. In general, how do Filipinos participate in the affairs of government?
2. In what ways do Filipinos express their opinion about our country and how the government is being run?
3. How do Filipinos express their needs and complaints to government officials and politicians in the various levels of government?
 - 3.1. Let's start with the barangay...
 - 3.2. How about with the city or municipal government...
 - 3.3. And now, how about with the national government?
4. How do Filipinos show their approval or disapproval of the actions of government officials and politicians?

The remaining two were dichotomous or "yes/no" questions based on the political participation list used in the DENIZEN survey. Interviewees were asked which of the 17 actions they

have engaged in, and whether they participated as part of a group. These two questions sought to investigate if individuals made a distinction regarding their political engagement, i.e., if they behaved as an individual acting alone or as part of a group (collective political participation). It was assumed that if respondents answered positively to the second question about participating as part of a group, it would imply that their political engagement was collectivist in nature. Frequency count was used to describe the results of the interviews.

RESULTS

Types of Filipino Political Participation

Principal components analysis (PCA) using a varimax method of rotation produced three components that accounted for 54.55% of the total variance. The first component could be described as a proactive type of political engagement in the public arena. Behaviors comprising this mode appeared to underscore the importance of people exercising their voice or power as citizens to express their opinions and even influence others of their own beliefs and aspirations. The second component could be characterized as a category of participation that is instrumental in nature (i.e., politically oriented action designed to address a specific need or goal that is important to the individual and one's community). A third component depicted a kind of participation that affirms one's perceived core duties as a Filipino citizen. However, since this last component only accounted for about 7% of the variance, it was dropped in the subsequent statistical analysis.

In summary, the two modes of Filipino political involvement that emerged from the exploratory factor analysis were:

1. Political participation as proactive engagement in the public arena (PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT)

2. Political participation as public problem solving (PUBLIC PROBLEM SOLVING)

Table 1. Rotated Component Matrix for Political Participation

	Component		
	1	2	3
Run for public office	.749	.090	.118
Take an active part in political campaigns	.721	.250	.085
Join and actively support political party	.693	.303	-.061
Attend political fora/symposia	.677	.333	.012
Send support or protest message to political leaders	.672	.367	-.001
Write letters to newspaper editors	.670	.255	-.074
Teach my children to participate in politics beyond voting	.621	-.091	.304
Attend protest meetings	.601	.310	-.419
Join in public street demonstrations	.585	.139	-.482
Contact local officials on problems	.243	.790	.005
Contact national officials on particular problems	.304	.739	-.033
Actively support community organizations	.198	.722	.199
Form a group to work on community problems	.341	.655	-.189
Refuse to obey unjust laws	.095	.614	-.129
Keep myself informed about politics	.348	.445	.322
Teach my children to love our country	-.088	.509	.542
Vote during 1998 presidential elections	.023	-.034	.493
Percentage of variance	26.208	20.895	7.443
<i>Cumulative percentage of variance = 54.546</i>			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Correlates to Filipino Political Participation

Prior to running the multiple regressions, factor analysis was also carried out for the variable of political efficacy to determine whether it was uni- or multi-dimensional as indicated by related literature and generate individual political efficacy scores for use in the regressions. PCA revealed three underlying components for political efficacy and these were labeled as:

1. Political efficacy as the latent power of citizens (LATENT POWER)

2. Political efficacy as citizens' influence on government other than voting (OTHER THAN VOTING)
3. Political efficacy as citizens' influence on government through voting (THROUGH VOTING)

Regression results for the first type of participation, proactive engagement in the public arena, produced 11 significant interaction effects. Age was found to interact with three variables namely, (a) socio-economic status, (b) membership in groups, and (c) political efficacy. Those belonging to Class AB were less willing to engage in proactive political behavior as they got older. Similar results were also obtained for those from Class D. Age together with membership in groups was positively related to the willingness to engage in this mode of political involvement. In terms of political efficacy, age was found to positively interact with the perception of influence on government based on voting. However, age together with efficacy based on their belief on the latent power of citizens was negatively related to willingness to participate via this type of political action.

Those with a political efficacy based on their perception of people's influence on government other than voting who were members of groups were found to be less open to engaging in proactive political participation than those not belonging to organizations. A similar trend was found for widows who were members of groups as compared to married non-members. In contrast, single members of groups were more likely to engage in this type of political involvement.

Urban dwellers belonging to Class D were less likely than members of Class E from rural areas to engage in proactive political behavior while female urban dwellers indicated more willingness for this mode of participation. Females belonging to Class C however were significantly less likely than their male counterparts to be involved in proactive political action in the public arena.

Two social structural-demographic variables, socio-economic status and education, were also found to have significant effects on the willingness to engage in behavior falling under this type of involvement. Specifically, those from Class D were more likely than those belonging to Class E to engage in this mode of behavior. College graduates, on the other hand, were less likely than those with elementary or no formal education to be willing to participate politically in this manner. Political efficacy was similarly found to be significant for this type of political involvement. In particular, those with an efficacy based on their perception of influence on government through voting were less likely to engage in proactive political behavior in the public arena.

Four interaction effects emerged significant for political engagement as public problem solving. Urban college or post college educated individuals were less inclined to engage in political behavior of this kind. However, urban dwellers possessing a political efficacy based on one's perception of influence on government through voting were more willing to undertake this type of political action than those from rural areas. Older separated people as well as female members of organizations were also more inclined to participate politically through this type of behavior. In addition, individuals with a political efficacy anchored on their perception of influence on government through voting were willing to engage in this mode of involvement.

The adjusted R-squared for both regressions were quite low with the model for proactive political engagement obtaining only 0.082 and 0.119 for political participation as public problem solving. This could be attributed to the predominance of nominal variables in the regression equations and non-normality of the data sets as revealed by the Stata 7.0—Skewness/Kurtosis test for Normality (however, the Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity revealed both to be homoscedastic). The low adjusted R-squared for both equations indicated their weak explanatory power thus suggesting that other variables should be considered to better understand citizens' willingness to engage in political

participation. Nevertheless, the regressions confirmed that social structural-demographic and attitudinal variables - particularly in interaction with one another, had distinctive effects on both types of political engagement.

Other Forms of Filipino Political Participation

Responses to the open-ended interview questions were prelisted, clustered according to themes and compared with the items from the DENIZEN survey to determine the other forms of political participation Filipinos engaged in. Additional manifestations identified included:

1. **Join violent protests**—although similar to the items *attending protest meetings* and *joining public street demonstrations*, this form of behavior was characterized by the use of violence in expressing their objection. Responses grouped to form this category included “*paninira sa mga gawain at patakaran ng pamahalaan, nakikipag-away, nag aaklas, nagre-rebelde.*”
2. **Deface government or public property**—described the response—vandalism (in the street or highway) as a means to air disagreement with governmental policy or action. It could take the form of painting slogans or putting up posters along streets.
3. **Express criticism towards the government and politics**—was distinguished from the existing item, *sending support or protest messages to political leaders*, by the recipient of their criticisms. Remarks were directed not towards the object of their criticism but to a third party such as their own acquaintances and friends as well as opponents of the targets of their criticism. These unfavorable comments were disseminated through email and mobile phone text messages
4. **Join interest or advocacy groups**—differed from the DENIZEN item, *actively supporting community organizations*, in that

respondents deliberately choose the groups sharing their concerns or agenda and whose scope of concern is bigger than that of the community.

5. **Volunteer during elections (in non-partisan activities)**—diverged with the DENIZEN item, *vote during elections*, to behavior that encompassed facilitating the casting of other people's votes and ensuring the integrity of the voting process through poll watching.
6. **Express opinion thru broadcast media (i.e., radio and television shows)**—while related to the item, *write letters to newspaper editors*, it underscored the technological advances (particularly the popularity of mobile phone text messaging or SMS) that allow faster and more convenient ways to utilize the media in conveying their sentiments to the government and other sectors of society.
7. **Discuss and inject humor into political issues**—although similar to the DENIZEN item, *keep myself informed about politics*, it emphasized interaction among neighbors and friends particularly through jokes as a means to manifest their awareness of political matters.
8. **Actively support or boycott government initiated projects and/or organizations**—included items that pertain to joining or volunteering their efforts for government projects at the local or national level as well as refusing to participate in such projects if they disagree with the local or national government officials initiating these.
9. **Offer prayers with political intentions**—referred to prayer vigils as a means to show their approval or disapproval of the actions of government officials and politicians. It could also include other religious forms of behavior such as offering novenas and attending Eucharistic celebrations for political issues like the conduct of peaceful elections.
10. **Obey laws**

11. **Inaction**—characterized an expressed apathy to government and political affairs as well as refusal to take action despite one's apparent need for government services or attention.

Tabulation of responses to the second portion of the interview, which behaviors the respondents have engaged in, revealed that they had a limited political repertoire with voting being the only action everyone had engaged in at one time. Only two other items received a clear majority of responses: (a) keeping one's self informed about politics (17 responses) and (b) teaching one's children to love our country (16 responses).

On the follow-up question, did they engage in these political behaviors because they were part of a group, the tabulation showed that the interviewees engaged in majority of these actions not because they were a part of a group. Running for public office was the only item that got more responses as having been carried out because the respondent was part of a group (i.e., two out of three).

Overall, the individual interviews confirmed that new forms of political participation arise, sometimes as a variation or adaptation of existing manifestations of political engagement as well as in direct response to the specific social-cultural-political circumstances.

DISCUSSION

Typology of Filipino Political Participation

Comparing the two types of Filipino political engagement with previous research shows that local modes bring together behaviors from separate categories in these other typologies. For instance, political participation as proactive engagement in the public arena includes behaviors from three of Theiss-Morse's (1993) categories, namely: conventional participation, contacting activities, and unconventional participation; as well as forms of political

involvement that belong to the expressive and campaign modes of Leighley's typology (1991). Behavioral forms clustering under the second type of Filipino political participation, on the other hand, can be located in the contacting activities, unconventional participation and, voting, and being informed modes of Theiss-Morse. Actions comprising Leighley's modes of local- and national-problem solving activities as well as Verba et al.'s (1980) communal activities, and particularized contacts also have items that fall under the political participation as a public problem-solving mode.

Political participation as proactive engagement in the public arena is characterized by behaviors that emphasize the importance of having the voice of citizens heard in the public sphere particularly by those in government. This factor underscores the power of citizens be it through active involvement in selection or even assumption of public office as well as joining in a variety of occasions for open expression of support or protest over issues and political personalities. An underlying theme in these behaviors is recognition of the importance of active political engagement of citizens, perhaps beyond personal gain. It conveys the idea that politics—including interactions between government, political leaders, political parties, media, civil society groups, and other stakeholders—is valuable in itself. This type of participation goes outside what is commonly perceived as the traditional political duty of citizens.

Behaviors belonging to the mode of political participation as public problem solving, on the other hand, appear to be motivated by the fulfillment of a need or attainment of a particular goal. The behaviors can be described as taking action in order to be in a position to address personal or community problems and/or issues. For instance, refusal to obey unjust laws can be considered as a manifestation of people's opposition to what they perceive to be biased treatment or discrimination, and their noncompliance is a means to get government to repeal or amend it. Keeping oneself informed about politics is a way to keep abreast of how

these issues affect the person and to guide one's subsequent decision-making and action. This mode of political participation is distinguishable from other problem-solving kinds of behavior as it focuses on goals involving the public sphere specifically, community, government, and the larger society.

Results of the factor analysis clarify the underlying nature of Filipino citizens' political participation. First, the clustering of factors support the traditional definition of political engagement as a means to achieve an end (i.e., to influence the allocation of resources or services by government as well as affect its legislation, policies, and decisions). In addition, it indicates that political participation is considered as an end in itself (i.e., the performance of these behaviors have an intrinsic value—particularly for the type of actions falling under proactive engagement in the public arena). A person's conceptualization of political participation could be influenced by the salience of politics in everyday life. It is possible that the more salient politics is, the greater the likelihood of considering political engagement as valuable in itself and to possess a more diverse political repertoire. The groupings appear to support this assumption with a greater variety of behavioral forms coming together for participation as proactive engagement in the public arena rather than the instrumental mode of political involvement.

It should be kept in mind, however, that this typology is based on respondents' willingness to undertake these behaviors and therefore does not provide an indication of the actual level of political participation among Filipinos. While its scope is constrained by the items formulated for the DENIZEN survey, the measures used are nevertheless comparable to those in participation studies elsewhere.

Evolving Typology of Filipino Political Participation

As noted in the literature review, manifestations of political engagement are sensitive to the social-cultural-economic-political

influences. Results of the open-ended questions bear this out as it revealed 11 other forms of participation. Some of these can be considered as alternative or nonroutine forms of behavior (Chong, 2001; Washburn, 1982) as it does not conform to commonly held Western ways of influencing government such as offering prayers with political intentions and radical forms that border on prosecutable actions like joining violent protests and defacing or destroying government/public property.

The items generated from the interviews likewise reflect the Filipino's socio-political history, particularly from the Marcos regime to the present administration. For instance, inaction (which has not been cited in previous literature) can be interpreted as a form of passive resistance to a suppressive or unresponsive government. Offering prayers with political intentions, on the other hand, has been a predominant form of expressing either criticism or support of government action or personalities since the latter days of the Marcos dictatorship. Prayer vigils, in particular, reached their peak as a form of political participation in the EDSA revolution of 1986 wherein thousands of people gathered to pray as an expression of their true sentiment for political change and peace. The importance of asserting one's voice in the electoral process is demonstrated not just by voting but also through volunteering for nonpartisan activities such as safeguarding the voting and vote counting process. Also, while majority of Filipinos may not write letters to newspapers or directly contact political leaders regarding their opinion and problems— as citizens from other countries do, popularity of mobile phones here have made them more receptive to sending mobile text messages as well as to phone in comments to radio or television news and talk shows. The nature of text messages allows Filipinos, who are not necessarily well educated and fluent, to be able to express themselves candidly and with immediacy.

Exploring Collective and Individual Political Participation

To investigate the phenomena of the individualist-collectivist aspect of political participation, interview respondents were asked to indicate what political behaviors they had performed and whether they did this because they were part of a group. Previous studies did not inquire as to whether citizens' political engagement was largely due to the influence of a specific group they belonged to or something they did on their own. This issue is of interest as it has been cited that the Filipino culture is predominantly collectivist in nature (Montiel & Macapagal 2000). Thus, it stands to reason that this would influence the political participation of Filipinos.

Majority of the interviewees who admitted to performing particular behaviors from the list also indicated they did not do these because they were part of a group. Unfortunately, there was no opportunity to further probe their responses. The superficial nature of the responses together with the small sample size constrain the drawing of a firm conclusion regarding the individual/collective nature of political participation.

Correlates to the Filipino's Willingness to Engage in Political Behavior

A combination rather than any one particular variable appears more likely to influence the Filipino's willingness to engage in specific types of political behavior. While previous studies have dealt with individual variables, results obtained here support the general finding that the effects of variables (in this case the interaction of) differ depending on the kind of political behavior in question. Political participation as proactive engagement in the public arena, for instance, had a greater number and variety of interaction effects as compared to the participation as public problem solving. With the lack of previous work to anchor the interpretation of these results on, tentative explanations are put forward here subject to later confirmation and revision.

Political efficacy. Older individuals whose political efficacy is rooted in their perception of citizens' influence on government through voting are more willing to engage in a proactive type of participation in the public arena perhaps because having had more experience in electoral participation makes them open to taking on more proactive action that express the power of the voice of the people—the utmost expression of which is casting one's ballot during elections. On the other hand, younger people whose political efficacy is based on their belief in the latent power of citizens are less willing to engage in this same type of behavior possibly because they expect others can take on the active role in political sphere and there is still plenty of time to be involved when they decide to do so or if the need arises in the future. Group members with an efficacy rooted in their belief of citizens' influence on government being achieved through means other than voting are also less likely to engage in this type of participation presumably because they already consider their organizations as a venue through which they can impact government's actions and legislation.

Urban residents whose political efficacy is based on their view that citizens influence government through voting are more ready to perform behaviors falling under the public problem solving mode of political action than rural residents perhaps due to their greater personal and vicarious experience in elections, whether in their community associations or other venues, as a means to attain a solution to issues confronting them.

By itself, political efficacy specifically related to citizen's influence on government through voting is associated with less willingness to undertake a proactive type of political behavior but it has an opposite effect with regard to participation as a public problem-solving mode. The former relationship could be due to what individuals, with a high level of confidence in the power of the vote to express their sentiments, feel is an unnecessary kind of action to take. Whereas the latter may regard voting as a means to resolve issues or problems such as when individuals

vote to choose a course of action or elect government officials to address issues important to them.

Age. Apart from the earlier discussed interaction with political efficacy, age also has interactive effects with other variables for both types of political participation. Specifically, older individuals who are members of organizations are more willing to be politically engaged in a proactive manner perhaps because their experience within these groups gives them confidence to initiate or take part in a more diverse range of political activities as compared to those who have little exposure to such acts. In addition, their level of expectations of leaders and followers may have matured through their experience that they are more willing to be involved in campaigning and running for public office as well as publicly voicing their opposition to government.

Younger individuals from Class AB are less likely than those from Class E to engage in proactive political behavior possibly because they do not regard this type of political involvement as relevant to them—particularly as they can influence government through more interpersonal means. Members of Class D are similarly less inclined to engage in this mode of participation probably due to their preoccupation with earning a livelihood as compared with those from Class E who have less or even no access to similar employment/business opportunities, thus providing them more motivation and time to engage in such proactive political behavior.

The willingness of older individuals who are separated to politically participate using a public problem-solving type of behavior may be due to their need for greater local or national government support and resources being single parents who need to address their families' needs.

Organizational membership. Single people who are members of groups are more willing to engage in political behavior falling under the proactive type of engagement probably because of lesser personal responsibilities as compared to married people which

gives them greater opportunity to focus on political issues and to engage in more time- as well as resource-intensive political activities. On the other hand, widowed members of groups are less likely to participate in this manner perhaps because compared to married couples, they are left with the burden of taking care of their families financially as well as emotionally and physically—making political participation less of a priority

Females belonging to organizations are more willing to participate politically using a public problem solving type of behavior perhaps owing to their experience within organizations - a significant portion of which are community-based groups established to address local community issues.

Gender. Females from urban areas are more willing to engage in proactive political participation in the public arena possibly because their proximity to centers of political power expose them to this kind of activities and present them opportunities to be involved in this manner. However, females belonging to Class C are less likely than those from Class E to undertake this same type of behavior perhaps because they are less concerned with political affairs. Their relatively secure financial position does not make them dependent on government services as compared to those from Class E and may even reduce the importance of political action for its own sake in favor of ensuring their current economic and social standard of living.

Locale. Aside from the previously discussed interactions with political efficacy and gender, locale also has interaction effects with socio-economic status and education. Urban residents belonging to Class D are less willing than those from Class E to engage in proactive political behavior in the public arena probably due to their perception that unlike the very poor, they have more to lose if they antagonize political leaders and the government by voicing their complaints; and since they have greater opportunities for regular employment than those from Class E, they have less time to engage in this type of political behavior.

Urban residents who have had college or even post-graduate education are less willing than those with elementary or no formal education to engage in behaviors that fall under political participation as public problem solving perhaps because the former are more likely to be employed in a formal work setting which hinder their participation in community groups—particularly those meet regularly, or in contacting officials since their free time would be on weekends which is usually devoted to family and other personal concerns.

Socio-economic status and education. These two variables are also significantly related to the proactive type of political participation although of different directions. First, members of class D are more willing to engage in this mode of political action than members of class E. This main effect seems to contradict earlier interaction results found between locale (i.e., urban) and socio-economic status (i.e., class D). However, the overall significance of SES for this mode could indicate that those from class D feel more confident in their ability to express their needs and complaints than those from class E.

Those with college as well as post-graduate education are less willing to undertake proactive political behavior probably because having more opportunities of economic as well as social advancement (which are commonly what individuals aspire for) places the pursuit of proactive political action as a lesser priority.

Results of the regression analyses offer some insight into the profile of citizens' political engagement. It reveals that a combination of different social structural-demographic and attitudinal variables gives greater depth in explaining the willingness of people to engage in specific types of participation than focusing on individual effects of these variables. So far, research on political participation has tended to concentrate on the latter. The presence of interaction effects underscores the complicated nature of human behavior and a more accurate comprehension of it needs to include these kinds of relationships.

The poor fit of regression models however highlights the need to consider a wider range of factors—particularly of other attitudinal variables.

Research Agenda for Citizens' Political Participation

In conclusion, the following research agenda is being proposed for future inquiry into the political participation of Filipinos. First on the list is a more comprehensive qualitative study to check the existing forms of political participation. Given its propensity to evolve with the changing social-cultural-political and even economic milieu, current forms of local political engagement are likely to be more diverse than what has been uncovered here. Particular attention should be given to rural data as most research, this one included, has been biased towards obtaining respondents from urban areas as well as to differentiate involvement in the barangay, municipal/city, and national levels of government. This qualitative study can also include a follow through on the inquiry with regard to the individualist-collectivist aspect of citizens' political participation. Probe questions that tease out perceptions about how people participate and their expectations on the outcome of their action will be useful in generating a better understanding of this aspect of political engagement.

A second option will be to investigate the Filipino's conceptualizations of citizenship and social responsibility, as political participation is an integral part of these. Theiss-Morse's (1993) study in the US showed that differences in cognitions about how good citizens should participate politically influence one's own type of engagement. It will be interesting to see if the same relationship holds true here as well as to discover how good citizenship is conceptualized by Filipinos. The scope of this proposed research could be extended to include citizens' cognitions of government as well as expectations of their fellow citizens and how this is related to their mode of participation.

A third possible research theme is the investigation of the relationship of political participation with other attitudinal variables such as locus of control, political and social trust, and social capital. These variables have been cited by Western literature as having varying effects on political engagement. A local study can improve on these previous researches by looking at how these different attitudinal variables (including political efficacy) interact to influence willingness and even actual political behavior. Developing an improved method of measurement for these attitudinal as well as other social structural-demographic variables will also help facilitate the statistical analysis and interpretation of the results. A long-range proposal is to generate panel data to better appreciate how citizens' political engagement vis-à-vis these variables behave over time.

As mentioned in the introduction, this research is exploratory in the sense that it has tried to lay the foundation for future studies on political participation among Filipinos. Its results though have barely scratched the surface of the rich topic of citizens' political engagement. Hopefully, the research agenda offered above would fuel the interest of others who share in the belief that, it is the concerned citizens who will make this country great.

REFERENCES

- Bahry, D., & Silver, B. D. (1990). Soviet citizen participation on the eve of democratization. *American Political Science Review*, 84 (3), 821-847.
- Barner-Barry, C., & Rosenwein, R. (1985). *Psychological perspectives on politics*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Campbell, A., Gurin, G., & Miller, W. E. (1956). Sense of political efficacy and political participation. In H. Eulau, S. J. Eldersveld, & M. Janowitz (Eds.), *Political behavior: A reader in theory and research* (pp. 170-173). Illinois: The Free Press.

- Chong, D. (2001). Political protest and civil disobedience. In N. Smelser, & P. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences*, Vol. 17 (pp. 11693-11696). Oxford: Elsevier Science, Ltd.
- Craig, S. C., Niemi, R. G., & Silver, G. E. (1990). Political efficacy and trust: A report on the NES pilot study items. *Political Behavior*, 12 (3), 289-314.
- Cunanan-Angsioco, E. (2000). *Constituency-building and electoral advocacy with grassroots women in the Philippines*. Washington, D.C.: The Asia Foundation. Retrieved August 12, 2003 from http://www.asiafoundation.org/pdf/philippines_gwip.pdf .
- Dalton, R. J. (2000). Citizen attitudes and political behavior. *Comparative Political Studies*, 33 (6/7), 912-940.
- Duffy, K., & Wong, F. (2000). *Community psychology* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Erdođan, E. (2003). *The Turkish youth and political participation: 1999-2003*. Retrieved September 11, 2003 from http://www.urbanhobbit.net/PDF/typp_english.pdf.
- Faulks, K. (2002). *Political sociology: A critical introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Finkel, S. E. (1985). Reciprocal effects of participation and political efficacy: A panel analysis. *American Journal of Political Science*, 29(4), 891-913.
- Francisco, J. (1998). *Women's participation and advocacy in the party-list election*. Quezon City: The Center for Legislative Development.
- Gilens, M., Glaser, J., & Mendelberg, T. (2001). *Having a say: Political efficacy in the context of direct democracy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco. Retrieved December 5, 2002 from <http://www.princeton.edu/~talim/EfficacyPaperApsa2001.pdf>

- Haney, B., Borgida, E., & Farr, J. (2002). Citizenship and civic engagement in public problem-solving. In M.X. Delli-Carpini, L. Huddy, & R.Y. Shapiro (Eds.), *Research in micropolitics: New directions in political psychology*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. Retrieved October 1, 2002 from <http://www.psych.umn.edu/faculty/Borgida/haneyetal.pdf>
- Hirano, H. (2001). *Political participation and forms of social capital*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco. Retrieved November 30, 2002 from <http://pro.harvard.edu/abstracts/096/096003HiranoHiro.htm>
- Kerkvliet, B. (1990). *Everyday politics in the Philippines: Class and status relations in a Central Luzon village*. California: University of California Press.
- Kinder, D. (1998). Opinion and action in the realm of politics. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 2* (pp. 778-867). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Leighley, J. (1991). Participation as a stimulus of political conceptualization. *Journal of Politics, 53* (1), 198-211.
- Madsen, D. (1987). Political self-efficacy tested. *American Political Science Review, 81*(2), 571-581.
- Manheim, J. B. (1975). *The politics within*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Milbrath, L. W. (1965). *Political participation*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Miller, R. L., Wilford, R. & Donoghue, F. (1999). Personal dynamics as political participation. *Political Research Quarterly, 52*(2), 269-291.
- Montiel, C. J., & Macapagal, M. E. J. (2000). Political psychology in the Philippines: An update. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 33* (2), 1-32.

- Pettersen, P. A., & Rose, L. E. (1996). Participation in local politics in Norway: Some do, some don't; some will, some won't. *Political Behavior*, 8 (1), 51-97.
- Rüland, J. (1990). Continuity and change in Southeast Asia: Political participation in three intermediate cities. *Asian Survey*, 30 (5), 461-480.
- Santos, S. M. (1998). *People's councils*. Quezon City: Institute of Politics and Governance.
- Seligson, M. A. (1980). Trust, efficacy and modes of political participation: A study of Costa Rican peasants. *British Journal of Political Science*, 10 (1), 75-98.
- Tapales, P. (1994). Politics for non-widows: Increasing women's political participation in the Philippines. *Solidarity*, 143, 55-60.
- The Electoral Commission. (2004). *Gender and political participation*. London: The Electoral Commission.
- Theiss-Morse, E. (1993). Conceptualizations of good citizenship and political participation. *Political Behavior*, 15 (4), 355-380.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2002). *Human development report 2002*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Verba, S., Nie, N. H., & Kim, J. (1980). *Participation and political equality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Washburn, P. (1982). *Political sociology: Approaches, concepts, hypothesis*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Zhong, Y., Chen, J., & Scheb, J. (1998). Mass political culture in Beijing. *Asian Survey*, 38(8), 763-783.