The Nonprofit Sector: Toward an International Scope

By Leigh Hersey

We are becoming a more globalized citizenry. With technological advancements, we are more aware of the events around the world. Internet capabilities allow donors to make donations to nonprofit organizations in developing countries. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation directs grants to global development and global health (www.gatesfoundation.org). With all this international nonprofit development, can it be predicted which countries are more likely to have more nonprofit organizations? This study outlines some of the research on the factors that are present in countries with a strong nonprofit sector. It follows with a brief regression analysis suggesting that, while this factors may be present, they are not a predictor to how many nonprofit organizations will develop.

Around the world, there has been astonishing growth in the nonprofit sector since the latter part of the twentieth century. Salamon (1994) identifies this growth as the "association revolution," suggesting it to have an impact similar to the rise of the nation-state a century earlier. Yet, inconsistencies in the definition of nonprofit organizations around the globe have made it difficult to provide empirical comparative analysis of this growth. The United States has developed a very formal system of registering and recognizing the nonprofit sector. However, many other countries lack this systematic approach, limiting the ability to determine the exact nature of the nonprofit sector in each country. This study uses multivariate regression analysis to build on the comparative descriptive analysis of Anheier and Salamon to investigate if the similar values they identify in their research can lead to a predictive analysis of how the third sector may develop within a country outside of the United States.

Defining the Nonprofit Sector

Just what is the nonprofit sector? In the United States, the term tends to refer to tax-exempt organizations that are not part of the private market or the governmental realm. However, even in the United States, where the nonprofit sector is often considered the strongest, various terms are used to describe the sector and the organizations within it, each with a slightly different meaning — nonprofit organization, charitable organization, or voluntary sector just to name a few. Much has been written in attempt to define the nonprofit sector in a global perspective. When comparing different countries, differences in terminology and scope are even greater, from the nongovernmental organizations in the developing countries to the *économie sociale* used in France and Belgium (Salamon and Anheier, 1997). Each country's definition of the nonprofit sector varies by what types of organizations it does and does not include. This scope of definitions can make it difficult to provide a comparative analysis that includes the same types of associations in each country.

McCarthy, Hodgkinson, Sumariwalla, and Associates (1992) recognize common features of nonprofit organizations that transcend national boundaries, despite the wide scope and variety between different countries. "They are organizations formed to serve the public good, and income (or profits) from these organizations are not distributed to members or owners" (p. 3). Salamon (1994) addresses the global third sector as "a massive array of self-governing private organizations, not dedicated to distributing profits to shareholders or directors, pursuing public purposes outside the formal apparatus of the state" (p. 109).

In attempt to define the nonprofit sector for cross-national analysis, Salamon and Anheier (1997) describe four different types of definitions:

1. *Legal* — establishes the requirements each country requires for an organization to be considered a nonprofit organization;
2. *Economic/financial* — focuses on the source of income that the nonprofit receives;
3. *Functional* — examines the purpose of the organization such as public interest or public purpose;
4. *Structural/operational* — emphasizes the basic structure and operation of the nonprofit organization. Based on this definition, to be part of the nonprofit sector, the organization must be a) organized; b) private; c) nonprofit-distributing; d) self-governing; and e) voluntary. This definition is supported by Salamon and Anheier in their studies on the nonprofit sector in different countries.

It should be noted that the nonprofit sector is broader than the more limited term of nongovernmental organizations (NGO). The United Nations (2006) describes an NGO as "a not-for-profit, voluntary citizens' group, which is organized on a local, national or international level to address issues in support of the public good." While the definition seems very

broad, the United Nations only identifies those that are recognized nationally or internationally and promote the principles of the United Nations charter. It excludes organizations that may have a more local focus, or that are based on a mission that is not aligned with the United Nations charter. For example, well-known nonprofits in the United States such as the American Heart Association and the Boys and Girls Clubs of America are not listed in the directory.

Factors Key to the Nonprofit Sector

Salamon and Anheier (1997) studied a number of countries, finding variety of characteristics that lead to a vibrant nonprofit sector. In developing countries, they found these characteristics to impact the status of the nonprofit sector:

1. *Religion* — those countries with a predominant Christian religion are more likely to have a strong nonprofit sector;
2. *Colonialism* — this characteristic had two different effects. Colonialism often stifled the local social class system, thereby reducing the number of nonprofit organizations. However, in those countries where England was the colonizer, laws and political systems were left in place that benefited the nonprofit sector;
3. *Authoritarian politics* — countries with authoritarian governments are less open to the development of a nonprofit sector;
4. *Development ideology* — whether countries were friendly toward the development of the nonprofit sector, or whether the strength and power of the government makes a nonprofit sector irrelevant;
5. *Urban middle class* — countries that had a stronger urban middle class had more nonprofit organizations; and,
6. *Legal treatment* — whether the country had restrictive laws in place hampering the development of the sector.

When studying more developed countries, Anheier and Salamon (1998) find these additional factors present when looking at the nonprofit sector:

1. *Legal system* — countries with a common law foundation are more open to nonprofit organizations than those recognizing civil law;
2. *Level of development* — this includes such identifiers as the existence of urban commercial and industrial elites and middle-class professionals as well as a strong communications system which links people together;
3. *Degree of centralization* — including both political and institutional centralization, such that the more centralized the structure, the less likely the development of nonprofit organizations; and
4. *Government policy* — whether it supported the sector or not.

Further research has suggested other factors that lead to a strong nonprofit sector, including social capital, as described by Robert Putnam in *Bowling Alone* (Dollery and Wallis, 2003); the existence of surplus cash and time (McCarthy et al., 1992); and a heterogeneous population, which is supported by public good theory (McCarthy et al., 1992).

Methodology

This study builds on the characteristics identified by Anheier and Salamon by applying them to a multivariate regression analysis to help determine if there is a predictive nature to these values. The independent variables (Table 1), selected for this model include religion, governmental rule, population, heterogeneity, per capita gross national income, literacy rates, and the legal system. These variables are measured using data from the Central Intelligence Agency, the World Bank, and Freedom House. The data sources chosen provide comprehensive data for multinational comparisons, using the same measurement tools within each set. The dependent variable is based on the number of associations listed in the electronic database Associations Unlimited, which lists information on associations and professional organizations around the world. Unfortunately, this database does not include all nonprofit organizations in a country, but it is one of the more comprehensive databases available and it provides an indicator of the nonprofit climate for each country. Appendix A provides a table of the final dataset.

Table 1. Independent Variables

Variable	Definition	Notation	Data Source
Religion	% of population that practices Christianity	REL	Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook
Governmental Rule	Scale rating of how much freedom a country has	GOV	Freedom House
Population	Population of each country	POP	Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook
Heterogeneity	% of the predominant ethnic group in each country	HET	Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook
Per Capita Gross National Income	The average income per country	GNI	World Bank
Poverty	The percentage of the population that falls below the poverty line	POV	Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook
Literacy Rates	The percentage of the population that is considered literate	LIT	Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook
Legal System	Dichotomous variable where 1 is used when a country uses common law; 0 is used when a county uses any other legal system	LEG	Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook

The following is an explanation of the expected direction of each independent variable in the regression analysis:

- *Religion* — Anheier and Salamon (1998) found a positive correlation between countries with prominent Christian religions and increased nonprofit development, suggesting a positive sign in the regression equation. The Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook provides a listing of the various religions in each country by percentage of adherents represented in the total population. The percentage of the population that practices a Christian religion is used in this research model. Christian religions included Anglican, Protestant, Roman Catholic, Methodist, the Orthodox religions, and the label "other Christian." Some populations mix the Christian religion with aspects of the indigenous religious practice. In this research, this is still counted as practicing Christianity.
- *Governmental Rule* — This research model uses the *Freedom in the World* Country Ratings, an annual survey conducted by Freedom House (2006), as an indicator of which countries have less authoritarian governments. Freedom House bases its analysis of political freedom on civil liberties and political rights. Freedom House creates a scale from these characteristics, with 1 being "free", and 7 being "not free." The organization describes freedom as the "opportunity to act spontaneously in a variety of fields outside the control of the government and other centers of potential domination" (Freedom House, n.d.). The position of the country on the scale is represented in this model. Salamon and Anheier (1997) found that countries with less authoritarian governments provided more fertile ground for the establishment of a nonprofit sector, suggesting a positive sign in the regression equation.
- *Population* — Countries with larger populations will have more human resources to meet the needs of the nonprofit sector. A positive sign is predicted for this variable. Data for this variable is based on the July 2006 population estimate provided by the Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook.
- *Heterogeneity* — According to Kingma (2003), "the mixture of religious, political, ethnic, and racial backgrounds contribute to a large diverse nonprofit sector. This diversity is important when estimating the supply of public goods by nonprofit organizations and local governments" (p. 58). The heterogeneity Kingma describes is the basis of heterogeneity hypothesis and associated with public good theory. A positive sign is predicted for this independent variable. To determine the heterogeneity of a country this research model uses the ethnic makeup of each country as indicated by the Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook. The percentage of people that are represented in the predominant ethnic group is used to measure the variable. While ethnicity is an imperfect indicator of heterogeneity, it is one of the indicators that Salamon and Anheier (1998) and Kingma (2003) consider when determining heterogeneity, along with religion (which is already an independent variable).
- *Per Capita Gross National Income (GNI)* — McCarthy et al. (1992) note that having a surplus of money helps to maintain a nonprofit sector, particularly those organizations that depend heavily on private donations for funding. Each country's per capita gross national income, as noted by the World Bank, is used to help determine the level of such surplus of money present in the economy. The method used by the World Bank to convert the GNI to U.S. dollars attempts to reduce exchange rate fluctuations by using a five year average for the exchange rate.
- *Poverty* — While nonprofits do address issues other than poverty (examples include the arts and the environment), poverty and related issues, such as improved healthcare, are among the main issues facing nonprofit organizations. Salamon (1994) considers one of the causes for the rise of the third sector is the "perceived

crisis of the modern welfare state" (p. 115). During the second half of the 20th century, governments were no longer able to continue providing the welfare services that had developed in the earlier part of the century, due to ineffective systems, an overburdened bureaucratic structure, and reduced global economic growth. Nonprofit agencies stepped in to accommodate some of these needs. Poverty rates provided by the Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook are used in the research presented here to help determine the impact of need on the development on nonprofit organizations. As the source notes, definitions of poverty vary by country, with wealthier nations applying a more generous definition. It is predicted that countries with higher poverty rates have more need. More need leads to the development of more nonprofit organizations, resulting in a positive sign in the regression equation. This variable could also be a suppressor variable, offsetting the impact of GNI. Unfortunately, the year in which the poverty rates were updated by the CIA varies widely from country to country. Some countries' statistics are as recent as 2005 (Egypt) while others are from 1993 (Niger).

- *Literacy Rates* — Salamon (1994) also contributes much of the recent growth in nonprofit organizations to increased literacy rates, again suggesting a positive sign. The data used here, as noted by the Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook, show the literacy rates of adults in each country that are 15 years of age or older.
- *Legal System* — Another of Salamon and Anheier's (1997) findings is that common law systems are more open to nonprofit organizations than other kinds of legal systems, including those based on civil law. Using analysis of the legal system from the Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook, countries that incorporated common law or patterned themselves after English or US law were given a value of "1" for this variable, even if they mixed other kinds of legal systems with the common law. All other legal systems (civil, communist legal theory, Islamic, French, Spanish) were assigned the value of "0." Based on this analysis, a positive sign is expected, supporting the hypothesis that countries with common law are more likely to demonstrate an active nonprofit sector. When defining each country's legal system, the Central Intelligence Agency provides an historical contest to the system. In reviewing this data, the kind of legal system adopted by each country is closely related to colonialism, another factor Salamon and Anheier (1997) found to be important in establishing and maintaining a nonprofit sector, particularly in developing countries. The Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook often described countries as having adopted English, French, Spanish, or Dutch-Roman legal systems, countries that were prominent in the age of colonialism.

"If the ability of the country to financially create and support a nonprofit sector is the main factor in determining the growth of the sector in the country, consideration should be given to finding ways to better facilitate this growth, such as through the investment of international dollars to start-up nonprofits in less developed countries."

Data Collection

Data collection started with approximately 200 countries recognized by the World Bank. Once countries with incomplete data collection were removed from the dataset, the final n equaled 109. After removing the countries with incomplete datasets, the only inhabitable continent not represented is Australia. The countries remaining spanned different development levels from countries that are considered by the World Bank (2007) to have high income (i.e., United States, United Kingdom, Belgium), middle income (i.e., Brazil, Hungary, Cape Verde), and low income (Afghanistan, Chad, Cambodia). This wide variety of countries suggests that the diversity of all the countries is represented in the data sample.

Results Analysis

Pearson correlation scores were run for each pair of independent variables (see Table 2). There is concern about the number of variables that are highly correlated. Most notable is LIT which is significantly correlated with all the other IV except for POP and LEG. GOV also shows strong correlations with all the other IVs except for POP and HET. To omit one or both of these variables, however, would provide an incomplete predictability of these factors on the growth and sustainability of the nonprofit sector. Therefore, both LIT and GOV remain in the regression equation. POV is significantly correlated with GNI, which is somewhat expected as they both measure level of income. However, in this model, they are used to measure different indicators — one (GNI) the ability to financially support a nonprofit sector; and the other (POV) the presence of need in the community that could be served by the nonprofit sector. Therefore, both of these indicators remain in the model. A word of caution should be injected as leaving these variables with high collinearity in the regression equation could result in high standard deviations.

Table 2. Pearson Correlations of Independent Variables

	GNI	REL	GOV	POV	POP	HET	LIT	LEG
GNI		0.151	-0.454**	-0.449**	0.009	0.041	0.345**	0.126
REL	0.151		-0.490**	0.088	-0.193*	0.068	0.369**	-0.033
GOV	-0.454**	-0.490**		0.289**	0.084	-0.070	-0.282**	0.206*
POV	-0.449**	0.088	0.289**		-0.180	-0.145	-0.413**	-0.049
POP	0.009	-0.193*	0.084	-0.180		0.019	-0.012	0.083
HET	0.041	0.068	-0.070	-0.145	0.019		0.222*	-0.054
LIT	0.345**	0.369**	-0.282**	-0.413**	-0.012	0.222*		0.019
LEG	0.126	-0.033	0.206*	-0.049	0.083	-0.054	0.019	

GNI = Gross National Income; REL = Religion; GOV = Government; POV = Poverty; POP = Population; HET = Heterogeneity; LIT = Literacy; LEG = Legal System
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Results

Table 3 outlines the coefficients established by the regression analysis. Most interestingly, only GNI has a statistically significant impact on the number of nonprofit organizations within a country. This finding suggests that nonprofit organizations are more likely to be more numerous in countries with a higher per capita gross national income, all else held constant. This result supports McCarthy et al. (1992), finding that the presence of surplus cash leads to a strong nonprofit sector. The relatively low adjusted R2 of .20 suggests that the variables used in this study only provide part of the picture of what factors predict the growth and sustainability of the nonprofit sector.

Table 3. Estimates of Cultural, Political, and Economic Characteristics on NGOs

Independent Variable	Coefficient (t-statistic)
Religion	3720.18 (1.015)
Governmental Rule	835.87 (1.107)
Population	.0000110 (1.761)
Heterogeneity	21.73 (.487)
Per Capita Gross National Income	.79 (5.105) *
Poverty	4055.10 (.611)
Literacy	-48.229 (-0.755)
Legal System	2574.30 (1.151)
Constant	.790 (-1.021)
Adjusted R2 = .20	* p < .05 of 1.67

Conclusion

Although the findings of this paper do not qualify as robust, they do provide an overview of how different factors may impact the nonprofit sector internationally. They also suggest that the nonprofit sector varies between countries, and it can be challenging to quantify the sector using one set of characteristics. Therefore, while suggesting some important factors that come into play for developing a nonprofit sector, these variables to not lend themselves to predicting how many organizations a country will have.

In addition, thoughts of how to use these findings should also come into play. If the ability of the country to financially create and support a nonprofit sector is the main factor in determining the growth of the sector in the country, consideration should be given to finding ways to better facilitate this growth, such as through the investment of international dollars to start-up nonprofits in less developed countries.

Further research on each individual country can also be taken into account. New variables to replace those that represented high collinearity should be considered, while still maintaining the cultural, political, and economic characteristics that Salamon and Anheier developed and on which this research expanded. If historical data could be found it could help identify variables that led to the dramatic growth described by Salamon (1994). Additionally, other independent variables could be added, that may help strengthen the equation, including social capital and measurements of government spending on social welfare.

References

Anheier, H., & Salamon, L. M. (Eds.). (1998). *The nonprofit sector in the developing world*. New York: Manchester University Press.

Associations Unlimited. (n.d.). Electronic Database via Gale Group retrieved November 2, 2007.

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (n.d.). http://www.gatesfoundation.org. Home Page retrieved April 5, 2008.

Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook (n.d.) https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/fields/2122.html retrieved November 24, 2006.

Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook (n.d.) https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/fields/2100.html retrieved November 24, 2006.

Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook (n.d.) https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/fields/2075.html retrieved November 24, 2006.

Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook (n.d.) https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/fields/2046.html retrieved November 24, 2006.

Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook (n.d.) https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2103.html retrieved November 3, 2007.

Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook (n.d.) https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/fields/2119.html retrieved November 24, 2006.

Dollery, B. E., & Wallis, J. L. (2003). *The political economy of the voluntary sector: A reappraisal of the comparative institutional advantage of voluntary organizations*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.

Freedom House (n.d.). http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=366&year=2007 retrieved November 3, 2007.

Freedom House (n.d.). http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=351&ana_page=333&year=2007 retrieved November 3, 2007.

Kingma, P. R. (2003). Public good theories of the nonprofit sector: Weisbrod revisited. In H. Anheier, & A. Ben-Ner (Eds.), *The study of the nonprofit enterprise: Theories and approaches* (pp. 53-66). New York: Kluwar Academic/Plenum Publishers.

McCarty, K. D., Hodgkinson, V. A., Sumariwalla, R. D., & Associates (Eds.). (1992). *The nonprofit sector in the global community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Salamon, L. M. (1994). The rise of the nonprofit sector. *Foreign Affairs, 73*, 109-122.

Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. (Eds.). (1997). *Defining the nonprofit sector: A cross-national analysis*. New York: Manchester University Press.

United Nations (n.d.). http://unstats.un.org/unsd/snaama/dnllist.asp retrieved November 24, 2006.

United Nations (2006). *What is an NGO?* http://www.un.org/dpi/ngosection/criteria.asp retrieved November 24, 2006.

World Bank. (2007). *World Bank List of Economies*. http://go.worldbank.org/K2CKM78CC0 retrieved November 11, 2007.

Appendix A: Data

Country	GNI	REL	GOV	POV	POP	HET	LIT	LEG	DV
Afghanistan	187.70	0	5	0.53	31889923	42	28.1	0	20
Albania	2627.42	0.3	3	0.25	3600523	95	98.7	0	35
Algeria	2401.68	0.01	5.5	0.25	33333216	99	69.9	0	19
Angola	1015.56	0.53	5.5	0.7	12263596	37	67.4	0	18
Argentina	3749.78	0.94	2	0.385	40301927	97	97.2	1	233
Armenia	1189.00	0.987	4.5	0.43	2971650	97.9	99.4	0	43
Austria	35253.12	0.783	1	0.059	8199783	91.1	98.0	0	269
Azerbaijan	930.00	0.048	5.5	0.49	8120247	90.6	98.8	0	32
Bahamas	14669.88	0.037	1	0.093	305655	85	95.6	1	25
Bangladesh	462.64	0.01	4	0.45	150448339	98	43.1	1	78
Belarus	2337.07	0.8	6.5	0.271	9724723	81.2	99.6	0	50
Belgium	34356.71	1	1	0.04	10392226	58	99.0	0	942
Belize	3416.74	0.766	1.5	0.33	294385	58.7	76.9	1	18
Benin	496.02	0.3	2	0.33	8078314	99	34.7	0	23
Bolivia	910.51	1	3	0.64	9119152	30	86.7	0	50
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2113.00	0.46	3	0.25	4552198	48	96.7	0	24
Botswana	4581.93	0.716	2	0.303	1815508	79	81.2	0	32
Brazil	3110.57	0.89	2	0.33	190010647	53.7	88.6	0	221
Bulgaria	3058.21	0.838	1.5	0.134	7322858	83.9	98.2	0	117
Burkina Faso	346.95	0.1	4	0.45	14326203	40	21.8	0	26
Burundi	91.30	0.67	4.5	0.68	8390505	85	59.3	0	17
Cambodia	276.00	0	5.5	0.4	13995904	90	73.6	0	23
Cameroon	955.64	0.4	6	0.48	18060382	31	67.9	0	47
Canada	30436.88	0.297	1	0.159	33390141	28	99.0	1	3124
Cape Verde	3192.67	1	1	0.3	423613	71	76.6	0	5
Chad	437.14	0.35	6	0.8	9885661	27.7	47.5	0	10
Chile	5334.94	1	1	0.182	16284741	95	95.7	0	122
China	1276.23	0.04	6.5	0.1	1321851888	91.9	90.9	0	526
Colombia	2007.14	0.9	3	0.492	44379598	58	92.8	0	110
Costa Rica	4141.26	0.92	1	0.18	4133884	94	96	0	67
Cote d'Ivoire	856.73	0.2	6.5	0.37	18013409	42.1	50.9	0	33
Croatia	7216.94	0.074	2	0.11	4493312	89.6	98.1	0	97
Djibouti	821.48	0.06	5	0.5	496374	60	67.9	0	9
Dominica	3341.98	0.92	1	0.3	72386	86.8	94.0	1	10
Dominican Republic	2680.05	0.95	2	0.25	9365818	73	87.0	0	42
Ecuador	2180.46	0.95	3	0.41	13755680	65	91	0	76
Egypt	1141.12	0.1	5.5	0.2	80335036	98	71.4	1	88
El Salvador	2238.35	0.83	2.5	0.361	6948073	90	80.2	1	40
Ethiopia	115.11	0.35	5	0.5	76511887	40	42.7	0	45
Fiji	3094.68	0.52	5	0.255	918675	51	93.7	1	42
Georgia	1149.73	0.886	3	0.54	4646003	83.8	100.0	0	41
Ghana	395.00	0.63	1.5	0.314	22931299	98.5	57.9	1	77
Grenada	3726.56	1	1.5	0.32	89971	82	96.0	1	12
Guinea	414.33	0.08	5.5	0.4	9947814	40	29.5	0	52
Haiti	470.09	0.96	4.5	0.8	8706497	95	52.9	0	17
Honduras	998.88	1	3	0.53	7483763	90	80	0	33

Country	GNI	REL	GOV	POV	POP	HET	LIT	LEG	DV
Hungary	9408.42	0.745	1	0.086	9956108	92.3	99.4	0	166
India	621.26	0.023	2.5	0.25	1129866154	72	61	1	515
Indonesia	976.79	0.08	2.5	0.167	234693997	45	90.4	0	94
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	2403.95	0.02	6	0.4	65397521	51	77	0	41
Israel	17946.44	0.021	1.5	0.21	6352117	76.4	97.1	1	199
Jamaica	3042.07	0.653	2.5	0.191	2758124	90.9	87.9	1	48
Jordan	1964.37	0.06	4.5	0.3	6053193	98	89.9	0	48
Kazakhstan	2630.66	0.46	5.5	0.19	15284929	53.4	99.5	0	30
Kenya	440.73	0.78	3	0.5	36913721	22	85.1	1	148
Kyrgyzstan	396.04	0.2	4.5	0.4	5284149	64.9	98.7	0	0
Lao People's Democratic Republic	399.13	0.015	6.5	0.34	6521998	68	68.7	0	11
Lebanon	5981.65	0.39	4.5	0.28	3925502	95	87.4	0	56
Lesotho	949.23	0.8	2.5	0.49	2125262	99.7	84.8	1	20
Liberia	121.27	0.4	3.5	0.8	3195931	95	57.5	1	15
Mali	372.24	0.01	2	0.64	11995402	50	46.4	0	25
Mauritania	410.12	0	4.5	0.4	3270065	40	51.2	0	13
Mauritius	5098.86	0.326	2	0.1	1250882	68	84.4	1	34
Mexico	6273.18	0.03	2.5	0.4	108700891	60	91	1	173
Micronesia (Federated States of)	2286.41	0.97	1	0.267	107862	48.8	89.0	1	4
Mongolia	498.39	0.06	2	0.361	2951786	94.9	97.8	1	32
Morocco	1596.31	0.011	4.5	0.19	33757175	99.1	52.3	0	38
Mozambique	310.53	0.413	3.5	0.7	20905585	99.66	47.8	0	24
Namibia	2895.00	0.8	2	0.558	2055080	87.5	85	0	30
Nepal	254.48	0.009	4.5	0.31	28901790	15.5	48.6	1	94
Netherlands	35203.18	0.51	1	0.105	16570613	83	99.0	0	582
Nicaragua	784.11	0.896	3	0.5	5675356	69	67.5	0	26
Niger	196.51	0.2	3	0.63	12894865	56	28.7	0	18
Nigeria	521.81	0.4	4	0.6	135031164	29	68.0	1	101
Panama	3921.74	1	1.5	0.37	3242173	70	91.9	0	33
Paraguay	1190.02	1	3	0.32	6669086	95	94.0	0	34
Peru	2631.56	0.831	2.5	0.54	28674757	45	87.7	0	77
Philippines	1136.01	0.923	3	0.4	91077287	28.1	92.6	1	169
Poland	6156.94	0.914	1	0.17	38518241	96.7	99.8	0	154
Republic of Moldova	721.41	0.985	3.5	0.8	4320490	78.2	98.4	0	30
Romania	3326.52	0.99	2	0.25	22276056	89.5	97.3	0	85
Russian Federation	3950.16	0.22	5.5	0.178	141377752	79.8	99.4	0	155
Rwanda	208.32	0.956	5.5	0.6	9907509	84	70.4	0	15
Senegal	657.08	0.05	2.5	0.54	12521851	43.3	39.3	0	37
Sierra Leone	180.41	0.1	3.5	0.68	6144562	90	35.1	1	21
Slovakia	7531.80	0.838	1	0.21	5447502	85.8	99.6	0	83
South Africa	4415.31	0.797	2	0.5	43997828	79	86.4	1	392
Sri Lanka	920.55	0.062	4	0.22	20926315	73.8	90.7	1	64
Sudan	538.67	0.05	7	0.4	39379358	52	61.1	1	19
Suriname	2344.87	0.48	2	0.7	470784	37	89.6	0	14
Swaziland	2314.15	0.6	6	0.69	1133066	97	81.6	0	24
Syrian Arab Republic	1157.49	0.1	6.5	0.2	19314747	90.3	79.6	0	20
Tajikistan	276.91	0	5.5	0.64	7076598	79.9	99.5	0	13
Thailand	2468.99	0.007	5.5	0.1	65068149	75	92.6	1	181

Country	GNI	REL	GOV	POV	POP	HET	LIT	LEG	DV
The FYR of Macedonia	2574.68	0.6507	3	0.296	2055915	64.2	96.1	0	31
Togo	346.60	0.29	5.5	0.32	5701579	99	60.9	0	23
Trinidad and Tobago	8402.90	0.576	2	0.21	1056608	40	98.6	1	56
Tunisia	2690.81	0.01	5.5	0.074	10276158	98	74.3	0	30
Turkey	4166.33	0.002	3	0.2	71158647	80	87.4	0	126
Turkmenistan	2558.32	0.09	7	0.58	5097028	85	98.8	0	7
Uganda	274.79	0.66	4.5	0.35	30262610	17	66.8	1	69
Ukraine	1364.31	0.62	2.5	0.29	46299862	77.8	99.4	0	72
United Kingdom	36424.48	0.716	1	0.17	60776238	83.6	99.0	1	4950
United Republic Of Tanzania	292.69	0.3	3.5	0.36	39384223	99	69.4	1	65
United States	39602.82	0.78	1	0.12	301139947	81.7	99.0	1	122821
Uruguay	3681.05	0.68	1	0.22	3460607	88	98.0	0	66
Uzbekistan	444.56	0.09	7	0.28	27780059	80	99.3	0	20
Vietnam	542.60	0.072	6	0.195	85262356	86.2	90.3	0	54
Zambia	441.97	0.5	3.5	0.86	11477447	98.7	80.6	1	47
Zimbabwe	350.93	0.75	6.5	0.8	12311143	98	90.7	1	97