

STATISTICS NETHERLANDS
Department of National Accounts
P.O. Box 959
2270 AZ Voorburg
The Netherlands

SESAME FOR THE EVALUATION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL CHANGE;
THE CASE OF INDONESIA, 1975-'80*)

Steven J. Keuning

*) This paper was presented at the Twenty third General Conference of the International Association for Research on Income and Wealth in St. Andrew's, New Brunswick, Canada, August 21-27, 1994.

Nr. NA-070
1994

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of Statistics Netherlands.

Summary

This paper elaborates on the concept of a System of Economic and Social Accounting Matrices and Extensions, or SESAME for short. The SESAME-concept serves to meet the criticism that conventional national accounts, despite their wealth of information, take a too limited view at social, environmental and economic development. For that reason, SESAME details the monetary accounts, particularly those for labour income, and, more importantly, couples non-monetary information. In doing this, an integral system approach is maintained. This means that inter-relationships between monetary and non-monetary data are incorporated at a meso-level, including an additional plausibility check on the results. It also implies that non-monetary macro-indicators are based on meso-data that are consistent with the rest of the system. To put it simply, SESAME is meant as a synthesis of national accounts and the social indicators approach.

It is important to note that SESAME is a statistical framework. It is not the (implicit) result of a model simulation. Contrary to many other attempts to combine economic, social and environmental data, SESAME does not impute a money value to 'goods' or 'bads' that in reality were free of charge. Instead, the connection is made through the 'volumes' that underlie the money flows in the national accounts. In addition, SESAME provides a framework for model simulations in which external effects are priced and the behavioural reactions are made explicit.

Our case-study for Indonesia demonstrates the feasibility of capturing much of the essence of social and economic development in less than twenty summary indicators. All these measures are connected through the underlying accounting system. The paper discusses both the summary measures and the underlying accounting system for two different years and uses these SESAMEs to analyze some of the determinants behind the main trends.

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Role and Content of the SESAME	1
1. Introduction	1
2. The selection of summary indicators	3
2. Indonesian Socio-economic Development, 1975-'80	10
1. Overall trends	10
2. Changes in economic structure	12
3. Shifts in Inequality in Indonesia, 1975-'80	16
1. Demographic developments	16
2. Trends in generated income	21
3. Changes in the distribution of income and expenditure	24
4. Shifts in the consumption by product groups	29
4. Analysis and Conclusions	33
List of References	39
Statistical Annex	42

1. Role and Content of the SESAMEs

1.1 Introduction

The 1993 System of National Accounts [United Nations, etc.: Chapter XX] sketches the concept of a System of Economic and Social Accounting Matrices and Extensions, or SESAME for short. This paper elaborates on that idea and presents a first application of this information system to the case of Indonesia; refer also to Keuning [1994a].

The essence of a SESAME is the following: a core set of monetary and non-monetary macro-indicators of social, economic and environmental change is derived from a single, meso-level accounting system for two years. As a consequence, the system is driven, to a large extent, by the kind of information required for monitoring and policy-making at the macro-level. Although it is impossible to capture socio-economic development in a single or even a few indicators, it is equally clear that a prime task of national statistical offices is to comprise the countless amount of numbers they collect to a manageable, 'executive' summary. This obviously entails a loss of information; hence, one is in the best of both worlds if the macro-indicators are embedded into a consistent, much more detailed data framework such as a SESAME.

SESAME's macro-indicators should be seen as the tips of a big iceberg. The general public, the media and busy policy-makers will be satisfied with a picture in which only these tips emerge, some higher, others lower, as ups and downs in socio-economic development. Most of these users are not equally interested in all apices, let alone that they want to be bothered with the underlying relationships. However, investors, scientists and policy-advisers must know what is going on below the surface. At present, these users must then bridge all kinds of unconnected little icebergs, meticulously erected by various statistical departments. With a SESAME, they receive a single underlying meso-level information system, which does not even require much space when in electronic form.

It is important to note that a SESAME is a *statistical* framework. It is not the (implicit) result of a model simulation. Since it does not impute a money value to 'goods' or 'bads' that in reality were free of charge.¹ This is in line with Van Bochove and Van Tuinen [1986: 150]. SESAME follows their ideas in its monetary part, but meets the criticism that their 'core' system portrays a too limited view. SESAME extends the core by incorporating non-monetary accounts and non-monetary summary indicators. For example, environmental effects are not deducted from national income, nor are housekeeping services added.² Instead, separate environmental accounts leading to one or a few summary environmental indicators are an integral part of the full-fledged SESAME [Keuning, 1993a] and the same applies to time use accounts.

The Indonesian SESAMEs comprise all tables presented in this paper and in Keuning [1991, 1994a, 1994b]. The underlying SAMs are revised versions of the ones that have been published by the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics [Biro Pusat Statistik, 1982b; 1986]. Especially for 1975 much more information is available, including detailed statistics on demography, education, housing conditions, durable goods possession, access to public facilities, and land ownership and use [Downey, 1984]. For the empirical integration of environmental accounts, leading to five summary indicators for environmental pressure that are consistent with the economic aggregates, it is referred to a study for the Netherlands by De Haan et al. [1993]. Another study for the Netherlands incorporates time use figures [Kazemier and Exel, 1992]. De Haan [1992] adds resource accounts to the Indonesian SAM for 1985.

The two pillars of a SESAME are: 1. a SAM and 2. a table with macro-

1. This should even apply to owner-occupied housing services and own-account production. Regarding the former, a measurement on the basis of expenses, including depreciation and actual financing costs, is feasible and preferable. Analogously, production for own consumption is best valued on the basis of actual expenses for inputs, or not valued at all ('hobbies').
2. Beyond any doubt, national income should not be seen as the one and only beacon of welfare or progress in a country [Anderson, 1991]. However, "... the replacement of GDP by a figure which is an erratic combination of a statistic and the outcome of an (implicit) model amounts to throwing out the baby with the bath-water" [Keuning, 1993a: 291]. Dunavölgyi and Sándor [1992: 21] also argue that "If the country, through market decisions or political decisions does not validate the accounting of some costs, the statisticians could mislead the public by doing so."

indicators. The SAM has already been set out in Keuning [1994a]. The selection of summary measures is discussed next.

1.2 The selection of summary indicators

Table 1 lists the summary indicators selected in our case-study. All these measures have been derived from a single, fully consistent SESAME for 1975 and 1980; refer to the sources mentioned at the bottom of the table. The indicators fall into two categories: 1. main indicators, which are meant to capture the most important facets of social and economic change, and 2. supplementary indicators, throwing additional light on these issues. The former set should monitor major socio-economic policy objectives, such as promoting longevity, raising living standards, eradicating poverty, ensuring a sustainable use of the environment, improving human capabilities, increasing employment opportunities, maintaining external equilibrium, keeping down inflation and reducing socio-economic inequalities.³ Since not every indicator is equally relevant to all countries, the exact list should be tailored to national circumstances and needs. A standard subset should then be defined for the sake of international comparisons. Such a core set is not yet available. The indicators discussed below should therefore be seen as a preliminary selection and certainly not as an ultimate list.

A suitable indicator for the change in the average living standard may be a comparison of Net National Disposable Income (NNDI) per capita in successive periods, expressed in prices of the most recent year.⁴ This is anyhow preferable to the commonly used Gross Domestic Product (GDP) at constant prices of the base year, for four reasons. First, from

3. In the Indonesian case, the data needed for the computation of e.g. average life expectancy, aggregate productive time use and summary environmental measures must still be integrated. In addition, various monetary indicators (e.g. a key interest rate) can be included as soon as the underlying SAM contains full-fledged financial accounts; refer to Thorbecke [1992].

4. A further refinement would take into account household composition, realizing that economic growth is exaggerated in per capita measures if at the same time average household size decreases [Ringen, 1991; Chapron, 1992]. On the other hand, the equivalence scales may need to be adjusted if income rises [Conniffe, 1992].

TABLE 1: INTEGRATED SUMMARY INDICATORS of economic and social change in Indonesia, 1975-1980, derived from both SESAMES

Summary indicator	Value 1975	Value 1980	Average annual rate of change (%)
I. Main indicators:			
1. Per capita Net National Disposable Income, at 1980 market prices (* 1000 Rp.)	197	297	8.2%
2. Per capita Daily Calorie Intake in the poorest of ten household groups	1757	2262	5.0%
3. Average Number of years of Schooling of the potential labour force	3.47	3.57	0.6%
4. Potential Labour Force Participation rate (%)	51.3%	54.8%	1.3%
5. Balance on current account of the Balance of Payments / Net National Income (%)	-4.2%	7.8%	+
6. Consumer Price Index (1980=100)	45.9	100	15.6% *)
7. Income inequality (Gini-coefficient, based on average per capita net adjusted disposable income, at 1980 market prices, in ten household groups)	0.246	0.286	3.0% *)

II. Supplementary indicators:			
8. Gross Domestic Product, at 1980 market prices (trillions of Rupiah)	33.5	49.4	7.7%
9. Population (millions)	131	147	2.3% *)
10. Employment (millions of full-time equivalents)	46.3	57.1	4.2%
11. Net Domestic Product per worker equivalent, at 1980 factor cost (* 1000 Rp.)	672	807	3.7%
12. Index of Total Factor Productivity (1980=100)	99.6	100	0.1%
13. Exchange rate (Rupiah per U.S.\$)	415	627	8.3% *)
14. Fixed capital stock, at 1980 market prices (trillions of Rupiah)	67	102	8.5%
15. Share of female potential labour force with > =3 years of education in poorest of 10 subgroups (%)	52.4%	53.7%	0.5%
16. Budget share of rice in the poorest of ten household groups (%)	31.1%	24.7%	-4.6% *)
17. Labour Income Share: (imputed) Labour Income / Net Domestic Product (%)	42%	38%	-2.0%
18. Government Net Borrowing / Net National Income (%)	5.8%	-0.6%	- *
19. Net National Saving / Net National Disposable Income (%)	16.3%	28.3%	11.0%

*) The optimal rate of change of this indicator is small, zero or negative.

Sources: 1. Tables 6-7 & 94a.1, 94b.4; 2. Tables 42-44; 3. Table 51-52; 4. Tables 6-8; 5. Tables 2 & 94a.1; 6. Table 94b.A.8; 7. Tables 54-55;

8. Tables 94a.1, 94b.4; 9. Tables 6-8; 10. Tables 12-14; 11. Tables 13 & 94a.4-5, 94b.A.5; 12. Table 93b.3; 13. World Bank [1983];

14. Keuning [1991: Table 2]; 15. Tables 48-49; 16. Tables 39-40; 17. Tables A.10-11; 18. Tables 2-4 & 94a.1,3; 19. Tables 2 and 94a.2.

Note: 94a stands for Keuning [1994a], 94b for Keuning [1994b] and 93b for Keuning [1993b].

a macro-economic point of view there hardly exists a difference between consumption of fixed capital and intermediate consumption. Besides, including both depreciation and all investment in the same balancing item amounts to double-counting (cf. Bos [1992]). Therefore, the aggregate measure should be Net instead of Gross.

Secondly, living standards are influenced by wages, property incomes, taxes and transfers received from and paid to abroad, so that National Disposable Income is a more accurate yardstick than Domestic Product. Thirdly, this superiority is reinforced if the indicators for different years are converted into a common price level. Contrary to the volume growth of GDP, real NNDI growth incorporates gains or losses from changes in the terms-of-trade faced by the nation; see Keuning [1994b]. This should evidently be taken into account when assessing the change in the purchasing power of national income. Fourthly, once volume measures are computed as chain indices and not as constant price indices of a fixed base year, the indicators for both periods are better expressed in prices of the most recent year than in prices of the base year. For, the expenditure pattern of the most recent year is always more relevant.

As poverty indicator, the daily calorie intake per capita in the poorest household group has been chosen. A more sophisticated indicator is the poverty gap ratio [Ravallion et al., 1991], which in turn belongs to a class of measures with varying poverty aversion parameters [Foster et al., 1984]. A desirable property of such measures is that they take into account how many people are poor. On the other hand, the indicator selected here has the advantage of simplicity. More importantly, as income source instead of income size is our main criterion for classifying households, less people in the poorest subgroup does not always imply a reduction in poverty; people may have moved to a different subgroup without an improvement in their situation.

Apart from this, caloric intake may not be the optimal poverty indicator for all countries, if only because above a certain threshold level a further rise has a negative connotation. In industrialized

countries, an acceptable alternative may be found in the poorest subgroup's tertiary income, that is, disposable income plus social benefits in kind (education, health, etc.) received from the government. In any case, we favour an indicator of absolute poverty, as inequality is better monitored by means of a separate measure (see below).

The third indicator on our list gives the educational attainment of the potential labour force. Apart from its function as a yardstick for the stock of human capital, this figure tells us something about the access to knowledge or human capabilities in general [United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 1990; Desai, 1991].

The fourth indicator, potential labour force participation rate, is a slightly ambiguous one. On the one hand, a broader economic participation provides utility in its own right, especially if un(der)employment is the only alternative. In addition, this indicator has some merit as it shows the distance to maximum employment in the production process. On the other hand, a large proportion of time spent outside the production process is used productively on within-household activities such as bringing up children, or invested in education. Besides, some people may voluntarily work part-time because they value the resulting leisure higher than the income foregone.⁵ Finally, in countries without a well-developed social security system most people engaged in informal activities have to work extremely long hours to earn a minimal income. The indicator can be corrected for this clearly undesirable phenomenon by postulating that its value for an individual cannot exceed 1.25, say. Furthermore, the present indicator should be supplemented by a measure of total productive time use.

The next two indicators, the current external balance as a measure of the national budget surplus or deficit and the Consumer Price Index (CPI) as a measure of the erosion of the value of the national currency, are less controversial.

5. When the society at large thinks that way and standard working-time is shortened, this is correctly reflected in our indicator; its value then remains unchanged. An analogous case applies if the age of compulsory attendance at school is raised.

The last main indicator in this list captures the trend in inequality of living standards. This raises the same question as when measuring the growth in aggregate living standards: should one stick to income or expenditure inequality, or construct a multi-dimensional indicator? The Achilles' heel of the latter approach lies in the selection of attributes, of attribute weights and of a proper weighing function.

Another alternative is to do for inequality trends what we recommend for economic and social change in general; include a separate indicator for each welfare component. This is feasible as the SESAME-framework contains the meso-distribution that underlies each macro-indicator. On the other hand, the limits of a manageable total number of indicators may then be hit. Besides, inequality is perhaps disproportionately stressed if the national summary table lists sundry such indices.

Therefore we opt for one 'main' inequality indicator. Analogous to our yardstick for aggregate living standards, the variable selected is real net adjusted disposable income per capita.⁶ Because a subgroup-specific CPI has been applied, this measure does take into account the consequences of relative price shifts on the distribution of real incomes. For the time being, it has not been attempted to correct for between-subgroup differences in family composition. The main reason is that "... there is no consensus about which equivalence scale is appropriate, and yet results are sensitive to scale choice" [Coulter et al., 1992].

Another refinement is that social transfers in kind from the government have been added to disposable income in each household group, following the 1993 SNA's guidelines [United Nations, 1993: Chapter VIII]. The inequality coefficient is thus computed for the distribution of constant price 'adjusted' disposable income, also called the **tertiary**

6. Berry [1985] favours using consumption expenditure instead of income, because it can be measured more reliably in surveys and varies less over a life-time. However, these arguments are no longer valid if between-subgroup inequality is assessed on the basis of a SESAME. For, in that case income figures are no longer a priori less plausible and life-cycle effects have largely been eliminated through the classification of households (according to socio-economic criteria).

income distribution.

The indicator only captures the trend in structural inequality, that is, changes in within-subgroup disparities are not taken into account.⁷ This is in conformity with the general SESAME approach. In view of its common usage, Gini's formula has been selected for the computation of the index. If desired, this index can be supplemented by a gap ratio, e.g. per capita income in the richest subgroup versus per capita income in the poorest subgroup. This serves to check whether a rise in the Gini-coefficient is not solely caused by what Fields [1979] calls "modern sector enlargement growth", that is, the absorption of an increasing share of the labour force into an ever-enlarging modern sector.

The series of supplementary indicators starts with Gross Domestic Product at constant market prices, the well-known indicator for the size of the economy. This should evidently be seen in relation to population size and total employment, which are presented next. The productivity of the workers is then expressed as the ratio of Net Domestic Product at constant factor cost (or, preferably, at constant basic prices) and full-time equivalent employment. Overall efficiency changes are best measured with a total factor productivity index, which is also on our list.

For an assessment of the change in financial strength of the country, the exchange rate movement should obviously be taken into account (see indicator 13 in Table 1). Another aspect which ought to be considered is the change in net worth. A large proportion of this balancing item consists of the value of fixed capital stock, which is shown next in Table 1. In some countries, the stock of non-produced assets, such as land, subsoil reserves, patents, etc. also represents a quite significant value. A major difficulty concerns the price tag for natural

7. As a consequence, the inequality indicator is influenced neither by incidental outliers nor by an unequal distribution of earnings over the working life. Otherwise, the latter effect, which can be quite substantial, leads to an exaggerated image of 'real' (changes in) stratification [Morley, 1981; Stoikov, 1975].

resources, as these have typically not changed owner during the reference period [Reich, 1993].

There is yet another important component of national wealth, namely the stock of human capital. In addition to indicator 3 discussed above, this kind of capital is operationalized in Table 1 as the share of the female potential labour force in the poorest subgroup with at least three years of (primary) education. This is a proxy for, or perhaps even a preferable alternative to, the literacy rate, as it suffers less from the shortcomings of that variable [Lind, 1992]. Our indicator focuses on females, not only from an emancipation perspective, but also because "In every society, the capabilities, income, and status of women exert a powerful influence on health. ... Policies to expand educational opportunities, particularly for girls, help households achieve healthier lives ... they create a virtuous cycle in which reduction of poverty and improvements in health reinforce each other." [World Bank, 1993: Chapter 2]. Notably, in countries with a very high literacy rate of females in the poorest subgroup this motive is less relevant, so that another indicator should be selected.

Further, it appears from the Indonesian SESAMEs that the budget share of rice drops dramatically with rising income. Tables 45-47 below demonstrate that Engel's law holds, both across subgroups and over time. This is also evidenced in a study for the Netherlands that compares expenditure patterns by socio-economic subgroup in 1938 and in 1987 [Den Bakker et al., 1994]. The budget share of rice in the poorest subgroup thus serves as a **quite reliable poverty indicator** in countries where the poor are not yet satiated with the staple food; for, the poor are notoriously difficult to 'count'.

The next indicator, the labour income share, considers the distribution among factors of production. Besides, an increase from an already high level of this share is often perceived as a loss in competitiveness of the nation. The labour income in this ratio includes an imputed remuneration for the self-employed and the denominator

excludes depreciation costs. Thus, 100% minus this share equals the proportion of pre-tax generated income that accrues to the production factor non-produced capital.

The importance of monitoring the government budget deficit is beyond dispute. The relevant indicator in Table 1 computes net borrowing of the government (balancing item of its capital account) relative to Net National Income (NNI). This ratio is also used in the Protocol on the excessive deficit procedure annexed to the Maastricht Treaty establishing European Monetary Union (EMU), except that there the denominator is not NNI but GDP. NNI, though, provides a better measure of the national financial resources. The same Protocol states that budgetary discipline will as well be examined on the basis of the government debt versus GDP ratio. Indeed, the stock of public liabilities is an important yardstick, although the quotient of a stock and a flow variable is a bit awkward; a juxtaposition of this debt and national net worth or a debt service ratio seem more informative.

The last variable in our provisional list is the saving ratio, which throws light on the future income generating potential of the nation.

All the above indicators have been computed by means of straightforward statistical methods, or are based on established economic theory; cf. the index of total factor productivity. A further condensation into one or a few composite indices seems hazardous as long as a theoretic rationale for the underlying weighing function is lacking.⁸ Instead, 15 to 20 indicators may be optimal for a quick review of the main trends. The next section reviews such indicators in the case of Indonesia.

8. Moreover, a single measure of socioeconomic development blurs our sight at the trade-offs involved and lumps together all kinds of measurement units [Hicks and Streeten, 1979; Khan, 1991]. In fact, these drawbacks apply to any index constructed by means of multivariate techniques, including e.g. Slottje [1991].

2. Indonesian Socio-economic Development, 1975-'80

2.1 Overall trends

Table 1 shows that conventionally defined economic growth in Indonesia equals an impressive 7.7% per annum during the period 1975-1980 (indicator 8).⁹ This amounts to a per capita growth rate of 5.4% (cf. indicator 9). The other indicators serve to modify and supplement this conclusion. To begin with, the above figure is even an underestimation of **the actual improvement in real income per capita: 8.2% per annum** (indicator 1), or more than 40% in five years time! The enormous terms-of-trade gain during this period plays an important role here.

Other factors behind this growth are illuminated by indicators 3, 4, 10, 11, 12 and 14. Employment increases by 4.2% (indicator 10) and as the potential labour force expands at a somewhat higher rate than the population at large (see Table 8 below), this implies a modest rise of the potential labour force participation rate (indicator 4). The other side of the picture is a substantial improvement of the labour productivity (indicator 11). In turn, this coincides with a shift of labour to better paying jobs and with the use of a fast augmenting fixed capital stock (indicator 14), so that multi-factor productivity growth is negligible (indicator 12). At the same time, the formal educational attainment of the labour force progresses at a slow pace (indicator 3). All in all, it appears that increases in the quantity and quality of labour are not the driving force behind the prosperous economic development in this period.

This reinforces our earlier conclusion [Keuning, 1993b; 1994b] that it is the oil boom which has enabled the expansion of fixed capital stock and of the production volume in general. Table 3 below shows that the export value increases by more than 32% annually, substantially above both the average use of commodities and the supply of imports. This also entails a spectacular, favourable turn of the current external

9. All growth rates in this paper are logarithmic.

balance (indicator 5). The oil price hike has come on top of a major (34%) devaluation of the Rupiah at the end of 1978 (indicator 13). When viewed over the whole quinquennium, though, this devaluation was a stern necessity, to compensate for the divergence between the domestic inflation rate and the rise in competitive world market prices. For the import price still rises less than the output price (for the same product group), while the export volume growth lags behind both output and import volume growth; cf. Keuning [1994b]. That paper also demonstrates that deliberate government policies, notably a higher oil product subsidy and a much lower mark-up rate in public utilities, have been successful in keeping the CPI (indicator 6) and the GDP-deflator (18%) way below the oil price rise (27%). Simultaneously, the enormous terms-of-trade gain has pushed up real National Income growth, both directly and indirectly through its impact on effective demand.

This pattern of economic growth has also influenced its sectoral distribution. The Labour Income Share (indicator 17) declines from an already low level (42%) in 1975 to only 38% in 1980. The share of the household sector, including unincorporated business, in Net National Income drops from 76% to 70%.¹⁰ The real growth of ('tertiary') income per capita in the household sector thus lags behind the increase in overall National Income per head: 6.3% versus 8.2%. At the same time, the distribution of this income among subgroups becomes clearly more unequal (indicator 7).

On the other hand, the situation in the poorest subgroup, as summarized in indicators 2 and 16, improves substantially.¹¹ Yet, this poverty reduction is smaller than the overall growth in living

10. The household income share is perhaps somewhat underestimated because of unrecorded, illicit payments from corporations to persons affiliated with the public sector. In turn, such moneys might have been spent on uncleared (luxury) imports or saved. As a consequence, corporate saving would have been smaller and the household income distribution more unequal.

11. The 1980 estimate for average calorie intake in the poorest subgroup (2262) is above the absolute poverty line (2130). Obviously, this does not hold for every Indonesian citizen, as our indicator of structural deprivation conceals significant within-subgroup heterogeneity [Downey, 1984: section 7.1]. Moreover, our level-estimate for both years may be somewhat too high, as wasted food has not been taken into account; refer also to Van Veen [1993: Volume 2, Table 7.2], whose estimate is 17% lower.

standards, which confirms our conclusion of increasing income inequality.

Concerning the use of income, the rise of the national saving rate (indicator 19) is striking. In the household sector this rate more than doubles, from 7% to 15%. A partial explanation is that particularly at the end of the reference period earnings are swelling. In general, government consumption rises faster than private consumption; in volume terms, +11% versus +7% per year. A fortiori, this applies to public expenditures on health and education (+16.5%). Yet, the educational attainment of adults (indicator 3) and the literacy rate of female adults in the poorest subgroup (indicator 15) hardly increases. This demonstrates once again that raising the educational level of the population requires a long-term policy.

The energy price hike also yields a vast increase in government resources, through the special oil corporations tax. This enables both an expansion of public expenditures and a reduction of the budget deficit. In 1980, the government is even able to generate a small surplus (indicator 18).

2.2 **Changes in economic structure**

The overall trends in Table 1 can be seen as the tips of the iceberg referred to earlier. It has also been stated above that a SESAME is probably best published in electronic form.¹² On paper, the complete system is less efficiently presented. In this study, it is attempted to see the trees and retain the wood by showing successively more details. Table 1 in Keuning [1994a] and Tables 2 and 3 in this paper present the most aggregate SAMs, Table 3 in Keuning [1994a] and Tables 4 and 5 in this paper provide about the maximum amount of detail that fits on a single page, and the Annex to this chapter discloses the full SAMs,

12. There may come a time when this data base includes all basic statistics plus the procedures that were needed to mould these on a consistent information system. Even then, though, the integration process itself will require much human judgment that cannot be computerized.

Table 2: An aggregate SOCIAL ACCOUNTING MATRIX for Indonesia, 1975 (billions of Rupiah)

ACCOUNT (Classification)	codes											TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
	Goods and Services (Product Groups)	Production (Industries)	Generation of Income (Primary Input Categories)	Allocation of Primary Income (Institutional Sectors)	Secondary Income Distribution (Institutional Sectors)	Use of Income (Institutional Sectors)	Capital (Institutional Sectors)	Fixed Capital Formation (Industries)	Rest of the World Current	Rest of the World Capital		
Goods and Services (Product Groups)	Trade and Transport Margins 0	Intermediate Consumption 8326							Exports 3253	11	24928	
Production (Industries)	Output 21621										21621	
Generation of Income (Primary Input Categories)		GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT, at factor cost 13295							Compensation of Employees from ROW 0		13295	
Allocation of Primary Income (Institutional Sectors)	Taxes on Production - Subsidies 392		NET GENERATED INCOME, at factor cost 12321	Property Income 721					Property Income from ROW 16		13423	
Secondary Distribution of Income (Institutional Sectors)				NET NATIONAL INCOME 11878	Current Taxes and Transfers 2116				Current Transfers from ROW 1		13993	
Use of Income (Institutional Sectors)			Consumption of Fixed Capital 973		NET DISPOSABLE INCOME 11877						12850	
Capital (Institutional Sectors)					GROSS SAVING 2911	Capital Transfers 715				Capital Transfers from ROW 394	4020	
Fixed Capital Formation (Industries)						Gross Fixed Capital Formation 3229					3229	
Financial Balance						NET LENDING of the Nation -105				NET LENDING of ROW 105	0	
Rest of the World Current	Imports 2945		Compensation of Employees to ROW 0	Property Income to ROW 826	Current Taxes and Transfers to ROW 0						3771	
Rest of the World Capital						Capital Transfers to ROW 0			CURRENT EXTERNAL DEFICIT 499		499	
TOTAL	24928	21621	13295	13423	13993	12850	4020	3229	3771	499		

Table 3: Average annual MACRO-ECONOMIC GROWTH rates in Indonesia, 1975-1980, on the basis of two aggregate Social Accounting Matrices

ACCOUNT (Classification)	codes	Goods and Services (Product Groups)	Production (Industries)	Generation of Income (Primary Input Categories)	Allocation of Primary Income (Institutional Sectors)	Secondary Income Distribution (Institutional Sectors)	Use of Income (In- stitutional Sectors)	Capital (Institutional Sectors)	Fixed Capital Formation (Industries)	Rest of the World Current	Rest of the World Capital	TOTAL
Goods and Services (Product Groups)	1	Trade and Transport Margins	Intermediate Consumption				Final Con- sumption Ex- penditure	Changes in Inventories	Gross Fixed Capital Formation	Exports		
Production (Industries)	2	Output					22.9%	41.3%	23.5%	32.1%		25.5%
Generation of Income (Primary Input Categories)	3		GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT, at factor cost									25.9%
Allocation of Primary Income (Institutional Sectors)	4	Taxes on Production -Subsidies		NET GENERATED INCOME, at factor cost	Property Income					Compensation of Employees from ROW		26.1%
Secondary Distribution of Income (Institutional Sectors)	5	-3.9%		26.4%	26.2%	Current Taxes and Transfers				Property Income from ROW		26.0%
Use of Income (Institutional Sectors)	6				NET NATIONAL INCOME	31.5%				Current Trans- fers from ROW		26.9%
Capital (Institutional Sectors)	7			Consumption of Fixed Capital		NET DISPOSABLE INCOME	GROSS SAVING	Capital Transfers			Capital Trans- fers from ROW	25.7%
Fixed Capital Formation (Industries)	8						33.2%	10.9%			22.6%	29.7%
Financial Balance	9							Gross Fixed Ca- pital Formation			NET LENDING of ROW	23.5%
Rest of the World Current	10	Imports		Compensation of Employees to ROW	Property Income to ROW	Current Taxes and Transfers to ROW						
Rest of the World Capital	11	24.2%			25.8%			NET LENDING of the Nation			Capital Trans- fers to ROW	24.6%
TOTAL		25.5%	25.9%	26.1%	26.0%	26.9%	25.7%	29.7%	23.5%	24.6%		

block by block.

These tables, combined with the price and volume changes presented in Keuning [1993b; 1994b], paint a fairly complete picture of the changes in economic structure. The present section only selects the highlights, in so far as they have not yet been discussed elsewhere. For instance, Tables A.1-3 show the fast growth of exports and inventories caused by the oil price hike. Another conclusion from these and the next tables is that output and consumption growth lag somewhat behind the increase in intermediate inputs and fixed capital formation. This is in conformity with the productivity stagnation that was found in Table 1.

Table 5 shows that the highest growth of output value has occurred in mining and manufacturing. Juxtaposition with the volume changes reveals that these growth rates are about the same for all major product groups (10-11%), except food crops and processed food (3%). This is partly compensated by a relatively high volume increase of food imports. In general, the import penetration is significantly larger in 1980 than five years earlier, when measured in volume terms. Interestingly, this does not apply to the value figures; the domestic inflation lies quite a bit above the rise in import prices. The domestic inflation would have been even much higher if the subsidy rate on oil and oil products had not been raised drastically; cf. rows I.g and II.g in Tables A.4-6.

The next three tables in the Annex present the intermediate input block. The share of imported inputs is a little higher in 1980 than in 1975. In volume terms, this increase is more pronounced. On the whole, intermediate input costs decline relative to the output value, although the average intermediate input *volume* change is higher than the output volume change. These diverging trends signify the terms-of-trade gains accruing to the primary inputs. For the rest, these tables plus the constant price table can be used in detailed analyses of changes in forward and backward linkages, etc.

It has already been noted that during the second half of the

seventies the labour income share declines from an already low level. Tables A.10-12 provide further industry details. In 1980, the labour income share varies from 1% in oil, etc. mining to 97% in personal and household services. In only 7 of the 22 industries more than half of value added accrues to labour. Between 1975 and 1980, the labour income share falls by more than five percentage points in hotels, upstream manufacturing, finance and food crops cultivation. Especially the decrease in the last-mentioned industry weighs heavily, as it accounted for more than a quarter of Indonesia's wage bill in 1975. On the other hand, in 14 of the 22 industries the labour income share rises: e.g. in quarrying, trade & transport services, land transport, fishery, wood & wood products manufacturing & construction, and utilities. The total wage bill rises fastest in quarrying, real estate & business services, oil etc. mining, and hotels. Food crops cultivation lags far behind. These diverging trends among industries are due to a) substantial differences in total value added growth and b) non-uniform changes of the allocation of value added to production factors. In addition, the yearly labour volume growth varies enormously: from 1% in food crops cultivation to 23% in real estate & business services.

Interestingly, the share of depreciation in gross value added declines as well, despite heavy investments during this period. This explained by an enormous rise in the remuneration of non-produced capital. The substantial growth of the depreciation share in utilities has to do with a simultaneous capacity expansion and profit squeeze in this industry.

These changes in economic structure are interlinked with shifts in the income distribution. This will be elaborated below. This section concludes with a review of the relationship between capacity expansion and economic growth by industry. The proportion of 1975 gross investment in every agricultural and mining branch is lower than the proportion of each of these industries in Indonesia's fixed capital stock at that time. On the other hand, capacity expansion in utilities and transport is relatively large. It has been investigated to what extent a high

investment in 1975 relative to the opening capital stock has exerted a positive influence on value added growth in the subsequent period. For that purpose, the difference between the 1975 share in total investment and in total depreciation, respectively, has been correlated with the 1975-1980 value added volume growth rate, using the data for all 22 industries. The resulting correlation coefficient is indeed positive, but rather low ($r=0.356$); this indicates again that value added growth is not only determined by incremental capital stock.

3. Shifts in Inequality in Indonesia, 1975-'80

3.1 Demographic developments

For a comprehensive analysis of medium-term socio-economic development, an information system that links economic and demographic changes is required. A SESAME fulfills this condition, by means of its demographic 'module'. The main purpose of this module is to show the interactions between economic and demographic shifts, including quantitative and qualitative changes of the potential labour force and as well those developments that affect consumption behaviour; e.g. a shifting age structure of the population. These data can be used, *inter alia*, for analyses of the impact of demographic changes on the income distribution [Wolfe et al., 1982]. A next step is to incorporate related figures on the use of time for paid and unpaid productive activities and for leisure [Kazemier and Exel, 1992]. Finally, the links between economic development and social processes such as (sub)urbanization, individualization and class formation (entrepreneurs, 'blue collars', 'white collars', etc.) can be depicted in the SESAME.

Tables 6-17 provide an illustration of such a SESAME-module. The first three of these tables show that between 1975 and 1980 population growth (2.3%) exceeds the increase in the number of households (2.1%). This means that the average household size is also larger in 1980; it is equal to 4.85 persons.¹³ At the same time, the increase in the potential labour force (2.9%) is larger than the population growth.¹⁴ Between 1971 and 1980, the share of the age group 15-24 years expands most [Biro Pusat Statistik, 1982a: Table 3]. The combination of these developments is somewhat puzzling. One would have expected that this relatively fast growth of the number of adolescents had led to many new households, that is, to generally smaller households. Perhaps, the means to found an own family were not available in many cases. This is also evidenced by the

13. In comparison, in the Netherlands it equals 3.21 in 1970, 2.78 in 1980 and 2.41 in 1990 [Van der Laan, 1993].

14. In conformity with the definition in use at the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics, the potential labour force has here been defined as the population of 10 years and over.

Table 6: Number of households, Population and Labour force by subsector in Indonesia, 1980, related to the 1980 SAM (*1000)

Household subsector	Number of Households	Population	Average House-hold Size	Potential Labour force				Employment (*1000 full-time equivalents)			Potential labour force participation rate		
				Male	Female	Total	per Housh	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Agricultural Employees	3578	15703	4.39	5067	5459	10525	2.94	4056	2180	6237	80%	40%	59%
Small Farmers	8191	38556	4.71	13870	14204	28074	3.43	10101	4183	14284	73%	29%	51%
Medium Farmers	2379	12307	5.17	4828	4730	9558	4.02	3440	1319	4759	71%	28%	50%
Large Farmers	2718	15428	5.68	6180	5918	12098	4.45	4180	1591	5771	68%	27%	48%
Rural Lower Level	5039	23664	4.70	7569	8029	15598	3.10	7868	3148	11016	104%	39%	71%
Rural Economically Inactive	1311	3848	2.93	1142	1714	2856	2.18	36	21	57	3%	1%	2%
Rural Higher Level	1499	8036	5.36	2582	2573	5155	3.44	2318	679	2997	90%	26%	58%
Urban Lower Level	3230	17057	5.28	5830	5881	11710	3.63	6007	2208	8215	103%	38%	70%
Urban Economically Inactive	726	2610	3.59	903	1122	2025	2.79	8	39	47	1%	3%	2%
Urban Higher Level	1592	9568	6.01	3332	3421	6753	4.24	2631	1121	3751	79%	33%	56%
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	30263	146777	4.85	51303	53050	104353	3.45	40646	16488	57134	79%	31%	55%

Table 7: Number of households, Population and Labour force by subsector in Indonesia, 1975, related to the 1975 SAM (*1000)

Household subsector	Number of Households	Population	Average House-hold Size	Potential Labour force				Employment (*1000 full-time equivalents)			Potential labour force participation rate		
				Male	Female	Total	per Housh	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Agricultural Employees	3540	14792	4.18	4793	5259	10052	2.84	3721	2006	5727	78%	38%	57%
Small Farmers	6369	29355	4.61	9834	10223	20057	3.15	7222	3311	10532	73%	32%	53%
Medium Farmers	3177	15871	4.99	5587	5540	11127	3.50	4006	1595	5601	72%	29%	50%
Large Farmers	3213	18044	5.62	6480	6140	12620	3.93	4383	1847	6229	68%	30%	49%
Rural Lower Level	4277	19562	4.57	6315	6875	13190	3.08	5420	2358	7778	86%	34%	59%
Rural Economically Inactive	1031	3216	3.12	1017	1455	2472	2.40	42	15	56	4%	1%	2%
Rural Higher Level	1419	7575	5.34	2478	2568	5046	3.56	1834	901	2734	74%	35%	54%
Urban Lower Level	2589	12877	4.97	4431	4524	8955	3.46	3813	1296	5109	86%	29%	57%
Urban Economically Inactive	438	1753	4.00	664	793	1457	3.32	7	32	39	1%	4%	3%
Urban Higher Level	1255	7552	6.02	2609	2680	5289	4.21	1713	817	2530	66%	30%	48%
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	27309	130597	4.78	44208	46057	90266	3.31	32160	14176	46336	73%	31%	51%

Table 8: Average annual changes in the Number of households, Population and Labour force by subsector in Indonesia, '75-'80, related to the 1975 and 1980 SAMs (%)

Household subsector	Number of Households	Population	Average House-hold Size	Potential Labour force				Employment (*1000 full-time equivalents)			Potential Labour force participation rate		
				Male	Female	Total	per Housh	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Agricultural Employees	0.2%	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%	0.7%	0.9%	0.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	0.6%	0.9%	0.8%
Small Farmers	5.0%	5.5%	0.4%	6.9%	6.6%	6.7%	1.7%	6.7%	4.7%	6.1%	-0.2%	-1.9%	-0.6%
Medium Farmers	-5.8%	-5.1%	0.7%	-2.9%	-3.2%	-3.0%	2.7%	-3.0%	-3.8%	-3.3%	-0.1%	-0.6%	-0.2%
Large Farmers	-3.3%	-3.1%	0.2%	-0.9%	-0.7%	-0.8%	2.5%	-0.9%	-3.0%	-1.5%	-0.0%	-2.2%	-0.7%
Rural Lower Level	3.3%	3.8%	0.5%	3.6%	3.1%	3.4%	0.1%	7.5%	5.8%	7.0%	3.8%	2.7%	3.6%
Rural Economically Inactive	4.8%	3.6%	-1.2%	2.3%	3.3%	2.9%	-1.9%	-3.1%	7.1%	0.1%	-5.4%	3.9%	-2.8%
Rural Higher Level	1.1%	1.2%	0.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%	-0.7%	4.7%	-5.6%	1.8%	3.9%	-5.7%	1.4%
Urban Lower Level	4.4%	5.6%	1.2%	5.5%	5.2%	5.4%	0.9%	9.1%	10.7%	9.5%	3.6%	5.4%	4.1%
Urban Economically Inactive	10.1%	8.0%	-2.1%	6.2%	6.9%	6.6%	-3.5%	2.8%	4.1%	3.9%	-3.3%	-2.8%	-2.7%
Urban Higher Level	4.7%	4.7%	0.0%	4.9%	4.9%	4.9%	0.1%	8.6%	6.3%	7.9%	3.7%	1.4%	3.0%
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	2.1%	2.3%	0.3%	3.0%	2.8%	2.9%	0.8%	4.7%	3.0%	4.2%	1.7%	0.2%	1.3%

fact that the household size increases most with the urban lower level and agricultural employees subgroups, and not at all with the higher level urban and rural subgroups.¹⁵

The distribution of the population over subgroups has gradually shifted. As expected, the proportion of the population in agricultural households declines, from 60% to 56%. On the other hand, the share in rural and urban non-agricultural households increased, from 23% to 24% and from 17% to 20%, respectively. Indonesia obviously urbanizes during this period, although **in 1980 the non-agricultural rural households still outnumber all urban households**. Moreover, agriculture is still the main source of living for the majority of the population.

In the cities, the ranks of the lower level and economically inactive households swell most. Nevertheless, the growth of the number of higher level households is also more than twice the national average. This is not the case in the countryside where the higher level subgroup hardly expands. Within agriculture, there is a very clear tendency towards smaller land-holdings. The proportion of medium and large farmers' households dwindles from 23% to 17%, while the share of small farmers rises from 23% to 27%. This is in conformity with Geertz' famous 'involution' theory for agricultural development in Indonesia.

In both years, the largest families are found among richer subgroups, that is, the higher level and large farmers' households (see the third column in Tables 6-8). This confirms Downey's [1984: 146] conclusion that "... subgroups who rank higher in various dimensions of socio-economic inequality are typically the ones with larger, not smaller, mean household sizes." The average household in the higher level urban subgroup even counts more than 6 persons; this includes indoor servants.

The average number of children under 10 declines from 1.48 per household in 1975 to 1.40 in 1980. At the subgroup level, however, the number of infants only becomes fewer with the farmers and higher level

15. Refer to Downey [1984] and Keuning [1994a] for the exact definition of household subsectors.

urban households. In these five years an interesting shift in the determinants of family size has taken place. In 1975, the positive correlation between average number of persons per household and average living standard of household subgroups was equally valid for the children under 10 as for all members of the household. In 1980, this is no longer the case. Particularly, the number of young children in the relatively rich medium and large farmers' subgroups has dropped, from 1.49 to 1.16 and from 1.69 to 1.22, respectively. As these are the only subgroups that shrink between 1975 and 1980, it seems that the exodus mainly concerns families with young children. Another remarkable change regards the youth in the rural and urban higher level subgroups. On average, the former numbers 1.92 in 1980, up from 1.78 in 1975, while the latter numbers 1.77 in 1980, down from 1.80 in 1975. Tentatively, it is inferred that family planning was practised more among the urban elites.

Due to the non-uniform changes in age structure, the spread of potential labour force growth rates is relatively small when compared to that of the number of households or the population as a whole; see Table 8, columns 1, 2 and 6. Particularly for the medium and large farmers, the potential labour force declines much less than the population at large. As a consequence, the large farmers' subgroup contains most potential labour force participants per household in 1980. Especially this applies to males; the medium and large farmers subgroups are the only ones that count more male than female adults, in both years. On the other hand, **in the economically inactive subgroups many more females than males are found.** For instance, an economically inactive, rural household contains on average 1.31 females and 0.87 males older than nine in 1980. This is explained by more females among the pensioners and by a large number of households headed by middle-aged females in this subgroup.¹⁶ The latter apparently depend on income transfers from husbands working (and living) a great distance away. The phenomenon of rural-urban 'circulation', instead of migration of complete families, is

16. On the other hand, among the young economically inactive (students living on their own) the grown-up males far outnumber the females, especially in the cities.

well documented in the case of Indonesia [Jones and Richter, 1981].

The next stage in this analysis of interactions between demographic and economic changes concerns the potential labour force participation rate (the last three columns in Tables 6-8). For this purpose, employment has been expressed in full-time equivalents (40 hours per week during the whole year). Overall, the participation rate increases, from 51% in 1975 to 55% in 1980. Surprisingly, this increase can be fully ascribed to males; reaching 79% in 1980, up from 73% in 1975. The female potential labour force participation rate remains stable at 31%.

By subgroup, substantial differences occur. The largest rise in participation rates has been estimated for the lower level non-agricultural subgroups, peaking above 100% for the males in 1980. This trend signifies, on the one hand, more work opportunities for this subgroup, but on the other hand, a continuing need to work long hours to earn a living. In this regard, it is illuminating that in 1980 the female participation rate is also among the highest in these subgroups. Supplementary evidence is provided by a comparison of unweighted and weighted employment growth, cf. Tables 8 and Keuning [1993b; Table 8]. Apparently, the lower level subgroups do not benefit from a general shift towards better paying jobs. Actually, although total employment increases more with the lower level subgroups than with the higher level subgroups (see the tenth column in Table 8), the reverse is the case for the more remunerative, *salaried* employment. Finally, the annual growth rate of total per capita labour income in the lower level subgroups (22.1% in rural areas and 23.2% in urban areas) hardly exceeds the national average (22.1%). All in all, it is concluded that the enormous expansion of working hours in the lower level non-agricultural subgroups was sheer necessity and not so much an indication of a relative improvement in their situation.

Further, the decline in labour force participation rates among the farmers is noteworthy. Among the medium and large farmers this coincides with a fall in the potential labour force. Table 23 below will show

that the employment growth in food crops cultivation is the smallest of all 22 industries. Particularly for females, employment opportunities lag behind. Since the participation rates increase in most other subgroups, the spread of these figures by (economically active) subgroup is also greater in 1980. The participation rate remains very low in households that primarily depend on transfers or property income.

Tables 9-17 subdivide the 1975 and 1980 potential labour force in each subgroup by sex and highest level of schooling attained.¹⁷ The last column summarizes this information and gives the average number of years of formal education. In the reference period, this figure has increased from 3.47 to 3.57 years; more specifically, from 4.06 to 4.15 years for males and from 2.90 to 3.11 years for females. So the women seem to be catching up slowly. On the whole, the proportion with a university degree remains very low, despite its doubling from 0.1% to 0.2%. The share that has completed at least senior high school rises from 3.3% to 4.7%, while the share with not more than primary education drops from 91.3% to 89.6%. Finally, the proportion without any formal education falls from 29.0% to 27.8%.

Huge and increasing differences exist between subgroups. For males aged 10 or more, the average number of years of schooling in 1980 varies from 3.05 for the agricultural labourers to 8.24 for the urban higher level households. There exists a clear correlation between this variable and the standard-of-living in each subgroup. In fact, during the second half of the seventies **the average educational level even falls among the economically inactive and in most agricultural subgroups**. For the economically inactive this is largely explained by a disproportional increase in the number of elderly. For the agricultural households this trend signifies that relatively well-educated people have left the farm. Meanwhile, the greatest increase in the level of schooling takes place in the urban lower level and both higher level subgroups. For females, the subgroup pattern and the trends are similar. Note that **the**

17. Refer to Downey [1984: Chapter 6] for a more comprehensive integration of schooling accounts into a SESAME-type framework.

Table 9: Distribution of Highest Levels of SCHOOLING Attained by the MALE Potential Labour Force in each Household Subgroup, Indonesia, 1980 (Row %)

Household subsector	Some Primary		Junior High		Senior High		Aca- demy	Uni- ver- sity	Average Number of Year	
	No Schoo	School	School	Graduate	Gene- ral	Voca- tional				Gene ral
Agricultural Employees	26.7%	51.3%	17.5%	2.2%	0.5%	0.7%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	3.05
Small Farmers	25.8%	48.6%	21.2%	2.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.16
Medium Farmers	23.7%	49.4%	21.9%	2.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.30
Large Farmers	21.8%	50.3%	22.2%	3.2%	0.7%	0.8%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	3.41
Rural Lower Level	16.3%	47.6%	26.7%	4.9%	1.4%	1.3%	1.7%	0.1%	0.0%	3.97
Rural Economically Inactive	31.6%	39.2%	20.0%	5.2%	1.1%	1.3%	1.3%	0.1%	0.1%	3.29
Rural Higher Level	5.8%	30.3%	27.4%	11.3%	3.4%	6.2%	13.6%	1.2%	0.9%	6.59
Urban Lower Level	8.3%	35.4%	30.5%	12.2%	2.6%	5.9%	4.4%	0.4%	0.3%	5.58
Urban Economically Inactive	11.8%	27.7%	25.1%	16.3%	2.8%	10.5%	4.5%	0.8%	0.5%	6.07
Urban Higher Level	2.1%	20.8%	22.7%	17.0%	2.9%	16.6%	10.6%	3.6%	3.7%	8.24
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	19.2%	44.2%	23.3%	5.7%	1.3%	2.8%	2.7%	0.4%	0.3%	4.15

Table 10: Distribution of Highest Levels of SCHOOLING Attained by the MALE Potential Labour Force in each Household Subgroup, Indonesia, 1975 (Row %)

Household subsector	Some Primary		Junior High		Senior High		Aca- demy	Uni- ver- sity	Average Number of Year	
	No Schoo	School	School	Graduate	Gene- ral	Voca- tional				Gene ral
Agricultural Employees	28.0%	46.0%	21.6%	2.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.8%	0.1%	0.0%	3.11
Small Farmers	27.6%	45.3%	24.1%	1.8%	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.10
Medium Farmers	25.3%	43.4%	27.1%	2.5%	0.7%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.34
Large Farmers	20.7%	44.5%	29.4%	3.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.8%	0.1%	0.0%	3.64
Rural Lower Level	18.6%	44.0%	29.3%	4.8%	1.2%	0.8%	1.3%	0.1%	0.0%	3.87
Rural Economically Inactive	21.2%	35.2%	28.7%	6.9%	1.9%	1.6%	4.1%	0.4%	0.0%	4.32
Rural Higher Level	9.8%	32.6%	29.6%	10.3%	4.0%	4.5%	8.0%	0.8%	0.4%	5.73
Urban Lower Level	9.2%	36.6%	33.7%	10.0%	2.7%	4.3%	2.9%	0.4%	0.1%	5.22
Urban Economically Inactive	8.4%	25.3%	32.1%	15.0%	4.2%	8.5%	5.1%	1.0%	0.4%	6.27
Urban Higher Level	3.0%	20.7%	25.1%	17.1%	4.0%	13.8%	8.8%	4.4%	3.1%	7.97
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	20.3%	41.1%	27.3%	5.2%	1.4%	2.0%	2.0%	0.4%	0.2%	4.06

Table 11: Shifts in the Distribution of Highest Levels of SCHOOLING Attained by the MALE Potential Labour Force in each Household Subgroup, Indonesia, 1975-1980 ('80% - '75%)

Household subsector	Some Primary		Junior High		Senior High		Aca- demy	Uni- ver- sity	Average Number of Year	
	No Schoo	School	School	Graduate	Gene- ral	Voca- tional				Gene ral
Agricultural Employees	-1.3%	5.3%	-4.1%	-0.6%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	-0.0%	0.1%	-0.06
Small Farmers	-1.8%	3.3%	-2.9%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07
Medium Farmers	-1.6%	6.0%	-5.2%	0.3%	-0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.04
Large Farmers	1.2%	5.8%	-7.3%	-0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	-0.0%	0.0%	-0.22
Rural Lower Level	-2.3%	3.6%	-2.6%	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	-0.0%	0.0%	0.10
Rural Economically Inactive	10.4%	4.1%	-8.7%	-1.7%	-0.7%	-0.3%	-2.8%	-0.4%	0.0%	-1.03
Rural Higher Level	-4.0%	-2.3%	-2.2%	1.0%	-0.6%	1.7%	5.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.85
Urban Lower Level	-0.9%	-1.2%	-3.2%	2.2%	-0.1%	1.6%	1.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.36
Urban Economically Inactive	3.4%	2.4%	-7.0%	1.3%	-1.5%	2.0%	-0.5%	-0.2%	0.0%	-0.20
Urban Higher Level	-0.8%	0.1%	-2.4%	-0.2%	-1.0%	2.8%	1.8%	-0.8%	0.6%	0.26
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	-1.1%	3.1%	-3.9%	0.5%	-0.1%	0.8%	0.7%	-0.0%	0.1%	0.09

Table 12: Distribution of Highest Levels of SCHOOLING Attained by the FEMALE Potential Labour Force in each Household Subgroup, Indonesia, 1980 (Row %)

Household subsector	Some Primary		Junior High		Senior High		Aca-	Uni-	Average	
	No Schoo	Primary School	Gene-	Voca-	Gene	Voca-				
Agricultural Employees	46.3%	40.8%	10.9%	1.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.08
Small Farmers	43.2%	39.5%	15.2%	1.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.30
Medium Farmers	41.0%	40.9%	15.7%	1.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.40
Large Farmers	38.8%	42.4%	16.0%	1.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.51
Rural Lower Level	36.2%	41.5%	18.0%	2.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.76
Rural Economically Inactive	57.0%	27.5%	11.9%	2.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.89
Rural Higher Level	18.1%	34.6%	28.4%	8.1%	2.0%	2.3%	6.0%	0.3%	0.2%	4.73
Urban Lower Level	22.2%	36.3%	25.9%	8.8%	1.2%	3.0%	2.3%	0.2%	0.1%	4.23
Urban Economically Inactive	30.8%	26.7%	21.7%	11.4%	1.8%	4.8%	2.2%	0.3%	0.1%	4.22
Urban Higher Level	9.5%	26.3%	26.3%	15.8%	2.5%	9.7%	7.9%	1.2%	1.0%	6.47
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	36.2%	38.3%	17.9%	3.8%	0.7%	1.4%	1.5%	0.1%	0.1%	3.01

Table 13: Distribution of Highest Levels of SCHOOLING Attained by the FEMALE Potential Labour Force in each Household Subgroup, Indonesia, 1975 (Row %)

Household subsector	Some Primary		Junior High		Senior High		Aca-	Uni-	Average	
	No Schoo	Primary School	Gene-	Voca-	Gene	Voca-				
Agricultural Employees	47.6%	36.8%	14.2%	0.9%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.09
Small Farmers	45.0%	38.5%	15.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.19
Medium Farmers	42.3%	37.9%	17.9%	1.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	2.40
Large Farmers	36.4%	40.6%	20.3%	1.8%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.70
Rural Lower Level	37.4%	39.3%	19.9%	2.2%	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.70
Rural Economically Inactive	46.8%	28.9%	18.1%	3.5%	1.0%	0.5%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.56
Rural Higher Level	23.8%	33.4%	26.3%	6.6%	5.6%	1.2%	3.0%	0.1%	0.0%	4.20
Urban Lower Level	25.6%	37.6%	25.4%	6.4%	1.4%	1.8%	1.6%	0.2%	0.0%	3.79
Urban Economically Inactive	26.4%	27.7%	25.7%	10.5%	2.2%	4.0%	2.9%	0.4%	0.2%	4.44
Urban Higher Level	12.2%	26.6%	27.1%	14.6%	3.7%	7.1%	6.9%	1.3%	0.5%	6.04
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	37.4%	37.0%	19.4%	3.2%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	0.1%	0.0%	2.90

Table 14: Shifts in the Distribution of Highest Levels of SCHOOLING Attained by the FEMALE Potential Labour Force in each Household Subgroup, Indonesia, 1975-1980 ('80% - '75%)

Household subsector	Some Primary		Junior High		Senior High		Aca-	Uni-	Average	
	No Schoo	Primary School	Gene-	Voca-	Gene	Voca-				
Agricultural Employees	-1.3%	4.0%	-3.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.00
Small Farmers	-1.8%	1.0%	-0.1%	0.6%	-0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.12
Medium Farmers	-1.2%	3.0%	-2.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	-0.0%	0.0%	0.00
Large Farmers	2.4%	1.8%	-4.4%	-0.2%	-0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.19
Rural Lower Level	-1.3%	2.2%	-1.8%	0.3%	-0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06
Rural Economically Inactive	10.2%	-1.5%	-6.2%	-1.3%	-0.5%	-0.1%	-0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.66
Rural Higher Level	-5.7%	1.1%	2.1%	1.5%	-3.5%	1.1%	3.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.53
Urban Lower Level	-3.4%	-1.3%	0.5%	2.3%	-0.2%	1.2%	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.44
Urban Economically Inactive	4.4%	-1.0%	-4.0%	1.0%	-0.4%	0.9%	-0.7%	-0.1%	-0.1%	-0.23
Urban Higher Level	-2.7%	-0.4%	-0.8%	1.2%	-1.2%	2.5%	1.0%	-0.1%	0.5%	0.43
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	-1.2%	1.3%	-1.5%	0.6%	-0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.11

Table 15: Distribution of Highest Levels of SCHOOLING Attained by the TOTAL Potential Labour Force in each Household Subgroup, Indonesia, 1980 (Row %)

Household subsector	Some Primary		Junior High		Senior High		Aca- demy	Uni- ver- sity	Average Number of Year	
	No Schoo	School	School	Graduate	Gene- ral	Voca- tional				Gene ral
Agricultural Employees	36.9%	45.9%	14.1%	1.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.55
Small Farmers	34.6%	44.0%	18.2%	1.8%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.73
Medium Farmers	32.3%	45.2%	18.8%	2.1%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.85
Large Farmers	30.1%	46.4%	19.1%	2.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.97
Rural Lower Level	26.5%	44.5%	22.2%	3.6%	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%	0.1%	0.0%	3.35
Rural Economically Inactive	46.9%	32.2%	15.2%	3.4%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.45
Rural Higher Level	11.9%	32.4%	27.9%	9.7%	2.7%	4.3%	9.8%	0.7%	0.5%	5.66
Urban Lower Level	15.3%	35.8%	28.2%	10.5%	1.9%	4.5%	3.4%	0.3%	0.2%	4.90
Urban Economically Inactive	22.3%	27.1%	23.2%	13.6%	2.2%	7.4%	3.2%	0.5%	0.3%	5.04
Urban Higher Level	5.9%	23.6%	24.6%	16.4%	2.7%	13.1%	9.2%	2.4%	2.3%	7.34
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	27.8%	41.2%	20.6%	4.8%	1.0%	2.1%	2.1%	0.3%	0.2%	3.57

Table 16: Distribution of Highest Levels of SCHOOLING Attained by the TOTAL Potential Labour Force in each Household Subgroup, Indonesia, 1975 (Row %)

Household subsector	Some Primary		Junior High		Senior High		Aca- demy	Uni- ver- sity	Average Number of Year	
	No Schoo	School	School	Graduate	Gene- ral	Voca- tional				Gene ral
Agricultural Employees	38.3%	41.2%	17.7%	1.8%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.58
Small Farmers	36.5%	41.8%	19.6%	1.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.63
Medium Farmers	33.7%	40.6%	22.5%	1.9%	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.87
Large Farmers	28.3%	42.6%	25.0%	2.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	3.18
Rural Lower Level	28.4%	41.5%	24.4%	3.4%	0.9%	0.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.26
Rural Economically Inactive	36.2%	31.5%	22.5%	4.9%	1.3%	0.9%	2.4%	0.2%	0.0%	3.29
Rural Higher Level	16.9%	33.0%	27.9%	8.4%	4.8%	2.8%	5.5%	0.4%	0.2%	4.95
Urban Lower Level	17.5%	37.1%	29.5%	8.2%	2.0%	3.1%	2.2%	0.3%	0.1%	4.50
Urban Economically Inactive	18.2%	26.6%	28.6%	12.5%	3.1%	6.0%	3.9%	0.7%	0.3%	5.28
Urban Higher Level	7.7%	23.7%	26.1%	15.8%	3.8%	10.4%	7.8%	2.8%	1.8%	6.99
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	29.0%	39.0%	23.3%	4.2%	1.2%	1.4%	1.5%	0.3%	0.1%	3.47

Table 17: Shifts in the Distribution of Highest Levels of SCHOOLING Attained by the TOTAL Potential Labour Force in each Household Subgroup, Indonesia, 1975-1980 ('80% - '75%)

Household subsector	Some Primary		Junior High		Senior High		Aca- demy	Uni- ver- sity	Average Number of Year	
	No Schoo	School	School	Graduate	Gene- ral	Voca- tional				Gene ral
Agricultural Employees	-1.4%	4.7%	-3.7%	-0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	-0.0%	0.0%	-0.03
Small Farmers	-1.9%	2.2%	-1.4%	0.6%	-0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.10
Medium Farmers	-1.5%	4.6%	-3.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.02
Large Farmers	1.8%	3.8%	-5.9%	-0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	-0.0%	0.0%	-0.21
Rural Lower Level	-1.9%	2.9%	-2.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.08
Rural Economically Inactive	10.7%	0.6%	-7.4%	-1.5%	-0.6%	-0.2%	-1.6%	-0.1%	0.0%	-0.84
Rural Higher Level	-5.0%	-0.6%	-0.0%	1.3%	-2.1%	1.4%	4.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.70
Urban Lower Level	-2.2%	-1.3%	-1.3%	2.3%	-0.2%	1.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.41
Urban Economically Inactive	4.1%	0.5%	-5.4%	1.1%	-0.9%	1.4%	-0.7%	-0.1%	-0.0%	-0.23
Urban Higher Level	-1.8%	-0.1%	-1.6%	0.5%	-1.1%	2.7%	1.4%	-0.5%	0.5%	0.35
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	-1.2%	2.2%	-2.7%	0.6%	-0.2%	0.7%	0.5%	-0.0%	0.1%	0.10

educational gap is less pronounced between sexes than between subgroups; e.g. in the urban higher level subgroup the average number of years of schooling of females equals 6.47 years, which exceeds the mean for males in all subgroups except both higher level ones.

Next, it is discussed how these patterns and trends can be related to changes in the distribution of (labour) income.

3.2 **Trends in generated income**

Tables 18-26 contain estimates for labour income, employment and the wage rate by type of labour and industry. A more detailed specification of labour incomes is given in Tables A.10-12 and the allocation of these revenues to households is presented in Tables A.13-15. Self-employed labour is included in all cases. These tables are only cursorily addressed here, because the results have been discussed more extensively elsewhere [Keuning, 1993b; 1994a; 1994b].

The figures for total employment by sex in Tables 21-23 are of course the same as those in Tables 6-8. Between 1975 and 1980 employment increases in all industries, but by far the least in food crops cultivation. As a consequence, the share of this industry in total employment drops from 47% to 39%. On the other hand, the share of estate crops cultivation increases from 4% to 5%, and of the government and related services from 5% to 7%.

By type of occupation, the fastest growth (+11% per annum) is found among jobs for the high-skilled: professionals, technicians, managers and supervisors. Their share in total employment increases from 4% to 5%. The share of manual workers increases from 20% to 23%, while that of agricultural labourers declines from 52% to 48%. These proportions show that Indonesia is still very much an agricultural society in 1980.

The share of urban jobs increases from 18% to 23%, the share of self-

TABLE 18: LABOUR INCOME IN INDONESIA, 1980, based on the detailed (131*128) SAM and a further disaggregation of labour income by sex (billions of Rupiah)

RECEIPTS	Codes	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES																				TOTAL		
		2Aa	2Ab	2Ba	2Bb	2Ac	2Ca	2Cb	2Ad	2Cc	2Cd	2Ce	2Ci	2Cg	2Da	2Db	2Dc	2Dd	2De	2Ea	2Eb		2Ec	2Ed
3070	3A,B	661	279	203	256	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4469
11	3C,D	20	2	25	1	65	127	442	1366	199	277	202	43	121	2	2	628	117	4	19	192	477	4343	
8	3E,F	18	6	13	3	75	19	57	63	16	60	70	21	3287	242	47	60	93	142	60	798	343	5501	
10	3G,H	7	2	2	0	41	8	60	236	30	66	70	22	35	31	8	26	36	92	43	2578	36	3441	
2991	3Aa-Ha	652	259	224	215	66	112	329	1003	99	116	151	27	1629	100	9	310	66	44	29	1525	408	10363	
109	3Ab-Hb	55	31	19	45	115	42	230	863	146	286	191	59	1814	175	48	404	179	195	94	2043	449	7382	
915	3A,C,E,G	365	68	76	107	181	91	350	1206	175	332	284	85	547	64	54	377	228	238	100	3543	312	9699	
2185	3B,D,F,H	342	221	166	153	0	62	208	459	70	70	58	1	2897	211	3	338	17	1	22	25	545	8056	
2466	3I	546	230	218	255	170	146	412	1606	162	350	286	82	2390	154	47	711	236	206	110	2676	622	14280	
634	3II	181	59	25	5	11	7	147	59	83	52	56	4	1054	121	10	4	10	33	13	691	235	3475	
3099	3A-H	707	289	242	260	181	154	558	1665	245	402	342	86	3443	275	57	715	246	239	123	3568	858	17755	
96%	Agricultural	94%	97%	84%	96%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%
0%	Manual, Transport operator etc.	3%	1%	10%	1%	36%	83%	79%	82%	81%	69%	59%	50%	4%	1%	4%	88%	47%	2%	16%	5%	56%	24%	
0%	Clerical, Sales and Services	3%	2%	5%	1%	41%	12%	10%	4%	6%	15%	20%	24%	95%	88%	83%	8%	38%	59%	48%	22%	40%	31%	
0%	Professional, Managerial etc.	1%	1%	1%	0%	23%	5%	11%	14%	12%	16%	20%	26%	1%	11%	13%	4%	15%	39%	35%	72%	4%	19%	
96%	Rural	92%	89%	92%	83%	37%	73%	59%	60%	40%	29%	44%	31%	47%	36%	15%	43%	27%	18%	23%	43%	49%	56%	
4%	Urban	8%	11%	8%	17%	63%	27%	41%	40%	60%	71%	56%	69%	53%	64%	85%	57%	73%	82%	77%	57%	52%	42%	
30%	Paid	52%	24%	31%	41%	100%	56%	63%	72%	71%	83%	83%	99%	16%	23%	95%	53%	63%	100%	82%	99%	36%	55%	
70%	Unpaid	48%	76%	69%	59%	0%	41%	37%	28%	28%	17%	17%	1%	84%	77%	5%	47%	7%	0%	18%	1%	64%	45%	
80%	Male	77%	80%	90%	98%	94%	95%	74%	96%	66%	87%	84%	95%	69%	56%	82%	99%	96%	96%	90%	81%	79%	80%	
20%	Female	23%	20%	10%	2%	6%	5%	26%	4%	34%	13%	16%	5%	31%	44%	18%	1%	4%	14%	10%	19%	27%	20%	
69%	Agricultural	15%	6%	5%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
0%	Manual, Transport operator etc.	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	3%	10%	31%	5%	6%	5%	1%	3%	0%	0%	14%	3%	0%	0%	4%	11%	100%	
0%	Clerical, Sales and Services	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	60%	4%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	15%	6%	100%	
0%	Professional, Managerial etc.	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	7%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%	1%	75%	1%	100%	
29%	Rural	6%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%	10%	1%	1%	1%	0%	16%	1%	0%	3%	1%	0%	0%	15%	4%	100%	
1%	Urban	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	1%	3%	9%	2%	4%	3%	1%	25%	2%	1%	5%	2%	3%	1%	26%	6%	100%	
9%	Paid	4%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	4%	12%	2%	3%	3%	1%	6%	1%	1%	4%	2%	2%	1%	37%	3%	100%	
27%	Unpaid	4%	3%	2%	2%	0%	1%	3%	6%	1%	1%	1%	0%	36%	3%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	100%	
17%	Male	4%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%	11%	1%	2%	2%	1%	17%	1%	0%	5%	2%	1%	1%	20%	4%	100%	
16%	Female	5%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%	30%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	20%	7%	100%	
17%	Total Labour Income	4%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	9%	1%	2%	2%	0%	19%	2%	0%	4%	1%	1%	1%	20%	5%	100%	

Distribution over Industries:

TABLE 22: EMPLOYMENT in Indonesia, 1975, related to the detailed (131+128) SAM and a further disaggregation of labour income by sex (x1000 worker equivalents)

EXPENDITURES		PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES																	TOTAL					
RECEIPTS	Codes	2Aa	2Ba	2Ab	2Bb	2Ac	2Ca	2Cb	2Ad	2Cc	2Cd	2Ce	2Cf	2Cg	2Da	2Db	2Dc	2Dd	2De	2Ea	2Eb	2Ec	2Ed	Column:2
45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	45-68
21483	1572	418	173	557	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24203
53	16	0	26	3	27	155	1212	2118	764	458	508	27	273	6	1	1408	124	3	11	348	1551	0	0	9090
20	19	12	13	6	11	28	102	136	45	96	99	18	7127	711	40	159	57	45	33	868	1658	0	0	11306
17	30	2	3	1	7	3	42	68	22	29	28	12	24	37	6	25	35	14	4	1243	84	0	0	1737
20996	1588	411	204	479	28	111	1065	1767	592	363	489	14	5055	484	17	901	87	9	28	1242	1953	0	0	37878
578	49	20	11	88	19	75	290	556	240	219	144	44	2370	270	31	691	129	53	22	1217	1341	0	0	8457
5680	983	117	85	289	45	78	780	1512	586	398	461	55	897	128	44	958	172	62	47	2409	1205	0	0	18887
15893	654	315	130	278	0	108	575	811	248	185	172	3	6528	626	3	636	45	0	2	50	2088	0	0	29348
15173	1137	392	197	554	45	158	679	1800	323	430	446	56	4269	321	42	1584	209	51	43	2103	2153	0	0	32165
6400	499	39	18	13	1	28	676	523	509	152	187	1	3156	433	6	8	8	11	5	356	1140	0	0	14171
21573	1637	432	215	567	45	187	1355	2323	832	583	633	58	7425	754	48	1592	217	62	48	2459	3293	0	0	46336
100%	96%	97%	81%	98%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	52%
0%	1%	0%	12%	1%	59%	83%	89%	81%	92%	79%	80%	47%	4%	1%	3%	88%	57%	4%	22%	14%	47%	0%	0%	20%
0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	7%	6%	5%	16%	16%	32%	96%	94%	10%	10%	27%	73%	69%	35%	50%	0%	0%	24%
97%	3%	5%	5%	16%	42%	40%	21%	24%	29%	36%	23%	76%	32%	36%	65%	43%	57%	40%	14%	55%	51%	41%	0%	82%
26%	60%	27%	39%	51%	100%	42%	58%	65%	70%	68%	73%	95%	12%	17%	93%	60%	79%	100%	96%	98%	98%	37%	0%	37%
74%	40%	73%	61%	48%	0%	58%	42%	35%	30%	32%	27%	5%	88%	83%	7%	40%	21%	0%	4%	2%	2%	63%	0%	63%
70%	69%	91%	92%	98%	99%	85%	50%	77%	39%	74%	70%	98%	57%	43%	87%	98%	96%	83%	89%	86%	86%	65%	0%	69%
30%	31%	9%	8%	2%	1%	15%	50%	23%	61%	26%	30%	2%	43%	57%	13%	1%	4%	17%	11%	14%	14%	35%	0%	31%
89%	6%	2%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	13%	23%	8%	5%	6%	0%	3%	0%	0%	15%	1%	0%	0%	4%	4%	17%	0%	100%
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	63%	6%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	8%	15%	0%	100%
1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	4%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	72%	5%	0%	100%
55%	4%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	3%	5%	2%	1%	1%	1%	13%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	5%	0%	100%
7%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	3%	7%	3%	3%	2%	2%	28%	3%	0%	8%	2%	1%	0%	0%	14%	16%	0%	100%
33%	6%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	5%	9%	3%	2%	3%	0%	5%	1%	0%	6%	1%	0%	0%	14%	7%	0%	0%	100%
54%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%	22%	2%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	100%
47%	4%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%	2%	6%	1%	1%	1%	0%	13%	1%	0%	5%	1%	0%	0%	7%	7%	0%	0%	100%
45%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	4%	4%	1%	1%	0%	22%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	8%	0%	100%
47%	4%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	3%	5%	2%	1%	1%	0%	16%	2%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	7%	0%	100%

Share in Total Employment of:

Agricultural
Manual, Transport operator etc.
Clerical, Sales and Services
Professional, Managerial etc.

Rural
Urban

Paid
Unpaid

Male
Female

Agricultural
Manual, Transport operator etc.
Clerical, Sales and Services
Professional, Managerial etc.

Rural
Urban

Paid
Unpaid

Male
Female

Total Employment

Distribution over Industries:

TABLE 24: WAGE RATES in Indonesia, 1980, related to the detailed (131*128) SAM and a further disaggregation of labour income by sex (x1000 Rupiah per worker equivalent)

EXPENDITURES		PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES																				TOTAL		
		Food Crops Cultivation	Other Crops Cultivation	Live-Stock	Forestry	Fishery	Oil, Gas, Coal & Metal Ore Mining	Quarrying	Food Processing	Wood Processing	Textile Manuf.	Paper & Metal Basic Manuf.	Chemicals	Utilities	Trade & Transport Services	Restaurants	Hotel	Land Transport	Other Transport & Communication	Banking & Insurance	Real Estate Services		Government, Social & Household Serv.	Personal & Household Serv.
RECEIPTS	Codes	2Aa	2Ba	2Ab	2Bb	2Ac	2Ca	2Cb	2Ad	2Cc	2Cd	2Ce	2Cf	2Cg	2Da	2Db	2Dc	2Dd	2De	2Ea	2Eb	2Ec	2Ed	Column:2
->		45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	45-66
Agricultural	3A,B	138	241	251	449	293	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	163
Manual, Transport operator etc.	3C,D	211	214	392	356	228	1301	376	297	421	170	454	261	811	350	177	714	364	500	1523	635	426	225	338
Clerical, Sales and Services	3E,F	226	281	968	529	277	3190	1108	570	621	286	882	584	1193	390	234	817	301	808	1716	890	674	175	398
Professional, Managerial etc.	3G,H	411	640	1245	631	506	5640	1531	921	1604	589	1916	2271	2825	1489	547	3450	700	879	4005	2841	1138	319	1157
Rural	3Aa-Ha	137	235	241	434	287	1896	371	276	403	141	430	251	1009	308	164	603	308	485	2255	690	765	186	236
Urban	3Ab-Hb	190	388	560	556	323	2504	720	502	656	255	620	588	1128	517	356	993	423	710	2185	1047	1073	225	557
Paid	3A,C,E,G	175	251	301	463	297	2241	614	349	507	201	558	452	1091	552	369	900	365	649	2192	840	917	205	452
Unpaid	3B,D,F,H	127	234	245	432	289	-	285	321	411	174	514	195	780	371	227	1000	363	466	4438	1409	718	205	228
Male	3I	151	269	254	463	297	2245	468	488	513	265	582	410	1105	487	300	892	365	632	2307	952	930	243	351
Female	3II	105	192	268	311	163	2195	156	190	163	125	400	246	826	270	205	996	256	608	1693	841	960	145	211
AVERAGE WAGE RATE	3A-H	138	242	257	441	292	2241	427	338	476	192	550	370	1086	391	250	904	364	631	2197	907	915	205	311
Ratio to Average Wage Rate by Labour Category:																								
Agricultural																								
Manual, Transport operator etc.																								
Clerical, Sales and Services																								
Professional, Managerial etc.																								
Rural																								
Urban																								
Paid																								
Unpaid																								
Male																								
Female																								
Ratio to Average Wage Rate by Industry:																								
Agricultural																								
Manual, Transport operator etc.																								
Clerical, Sales and Services																								
Professional, Managerial etc.																								
Rural																								
Urban																								
Paid																								
Unpaid																								
Male																								
Female																								
Average Wage Rate																								

TABLE 25: WAGE RATES in Indonesia, 1975, related to the detailed (131*128) SAM and a further disaggregation of labour income by sex (x1000 Rupiah per worker equivalent)

EXPENDITURES	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES																	TOTAL					
	Food Crops Cultivation	Other Crops Cultivation	Live-stock	Forestry	Fishery	Oil, Gas, Coal & Metal Ore Mining	Quarrying	Food Processing	Wood Processing	Textile Manuf.	Paper & Metal Prod. Manuf.	Chemicals & Basic Minerals Manuf.	Utilities & Services	Trade & Transport	Res-taurant	Hotel	Land Transport		Other Transport & Comm. nical.	Banking & Insurance	Real Estate & Bus. Serv.	Government, Soc. & Recr. Serv.	Personal & Household Serv.
	2Aa	2Ba	2Ab	2Bb	2Ac	2Ca	2Cb	2Ad	2Cc	2Cd	2Ce	2Cf	2Cg	2Da	2Db	2Dc	2Dd		2De	2Ea	2Eb	2Ec	2Ed
RECEIPTS	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	45-66
→	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90
Agricultural	68	91	139	247	129	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70
Manual, Transport operator etc.	56	83	-	201	106	481	113	116	163	94	174	106	402	120	93	155	131	174	736	342	188	94	132
Clerical, Sales and Services	51	115	189	213	120	768	174	179	211	197	268	181	346	108	83	222	119	297	956	316	308	84	125
Professional, Managerial etc.	141	159	270	217	281	1709	447	274	416	300	455	359	764	1140	203	311	245	437	2032	1555	516	175	490
Rural	67	91	134	235	131	494	104	113	149	74	138	102	344	85	83	153	117	135	607	242	349	70	91
Urban	79	128	282	313	115	1112	161	172	252	182	312	222	497	163	99	274	150	327	1281	666	444	97	211
Paid	69	95	140	245	127	751	145	126	200	113	228	147	468	188	119	228	132	269	1192	416	397	76	162
Unpaid	67	89	141	235	131	-	114	124	124	87	152	82	317	99	83	264	131	174	2632	930	356	84	84
Male	75	101	139	257	131	755	139	173	207	175	243	153	492	141	138	235	131	244	1281	460	404	98	134
Female	49	74	158	39	39	361	59	78	58	61	93	73	383	69	52	205	153	397	774	232	349	48	66
AVERAGE WAGE RATE	68	92	141	239	129	751	127	125	174	105	204	129	460	110	89	231	131	250	1184	434	396	81	113
Ratio to Average Wage Rate by Labour Category:	1.00	0.98	0.99	1.03	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.65
Agricultural	0.83	0.90	-	0.84	0.83	0.64	0.89	0.92	0.94	0.89	0.86	0.82	0.87	1.09	1.05	0.87	1.00	0.70	0.82	0.79	0.47	1.16	1.17
Manual, Transport operator etc.	0.75	1.24	1.34	0.89	0.93	1.02	1.37	1.43	1.22	1.87	1.32	1.40	0.75	0.96	0.93	0.98	0.90	1.19	0.80	0.73	0.78	0.79	1.11
Clerical, Sales and Services	2.09	1.72	1.92	0.91	2.19	2.28	3.52	2.18	2.40	2.85	2.24	2.78	1.66	10.35	2.28	1.35	1.87	1.75	1.70	3.58	1.30	2.16	4.34
Professional, Managerial etc.	1.00	0.99	0.95	0.98	1.02	0.66	0.82	0.90	0.86	0.71	0.68	0.79	0.75	0.77	0.94	0.66	0.89	0.54	0.51	0.56	0.88	0.86	0.81
Rural	1.17	1.39	2.00	1.31	0.90	1.48	1.27	1.37	1.45	1.72	1.53	1.72	1.08	1.48	1.11	1.18	1.14	1.31	1.08	1.53	1.12	1.20	1.66
Urban	1.01	1.02	0.99	1.03	0.99	1.00	1.14	1.01	1.15	1.07	1.12	1.14	1.02	1.71	1.34	0.99	1.00	1.08	1.00	0.96	1.00	0.94	1.44
Paid	1.00	0.96	1.00	0.98	1.02	-	0.90	0.99	0.72	0.83	0.75	0.63	0.69	0.90	0.93	1.14	1.00	0.70	2.20	2.14	0.90	1.03	0.75
Unpaid	1.11	1.09	0.99	1.08	1.02	1.01	1.10	1.38	1.19	1.66	1.19	1.18	1.00	1.28	1.56	1.02	1.00	0.98	1.07	1.06	1.02	1.22	1.18
Male	0.73	0.80	1.12	0.16	0.30	0.48	0.47	0.62	0.33	0.58	0.46	0.57	0.85	0.62	0.59	0.69	1.16	1.59	0.85	0.53	0.88	0.59	0.58
Female	0.93	1.24	1.90	3.38	1.76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00
Agricultural	0.43	0.63	-	1.53	0.81	3.65	0.85	0.88	1.24	0.71	1.32	0.80	3.05	0.91	0.71	1.17	0.99	1.32	5.58	2.60	1.42	0.71	1.00
Manual, Transport operator etc.	0.41	0.92	1.51	1.70	0.96	6.13	1.39	1.43	1.68	1.57	2.14	1.45	2.78	0.85	0.86	1.77	0.95	2.37	7.83	2.52	2.46	0.51	1.00
Clerical, Sales and Services	0.29	0.32	0.55	0.44	0.57	3.49	0.91	0.56	0.85	0.61	0.93	0.73	1.56	2.33	0.41	0.63	0.50	0.89	4.15	3.17	1.05	0.36	1.00
Professional, Managerial etc.	0.74	1.00	1.47	2.58	1.44	5.42	1.14	1.23	1.63	0.82	1.51	1.11	3.77	0.93	0.91	1.68	1.28	1.48	6.86	2.65	3.83	0.77	1.00
Rural	0.38	0.61	1.34	1.48	0.55	5.28	0.77	0.82	1.19	0.96	1.48	1.06	2.36	0.78	0.47	1.30	0.71	1.55	6.13	3.16	2.11	0.46	1.00
Urban	0.42	0.58	0.86	1.51	0.78	4.62	0.89	0.78	1.23	0.70	1.40	0.90	2.88	1.16	0.73	1.41	0.81	1.66	7.34	2.56	2.44	0.47	1.00
Paid	0.80	1.05	1.68	2.78	1.55	-	1.35	1.47	1.47	1.03	1.80	0.97	3.75	1.18	0.98	3.13	1.55	2.06	31.18	11.01	4.22	0.99	1.00
Unpaid	0.56	0.75	1.04	1.92	0.98	5.65	1.04	1.29	1.55	1.31	1.82	1.14	3.46	1.05	1.04	1.78	0.98	1.83	9.56	3.44	3.02	0.74	1.00
Male	0.75	1.12	2.39	0.59	0.59	5.47	0.90	1.17	0.87	0.92	1.40	1.11	5.95	1.04	0.79	3.11	2.31	6.01	11.72	3.51	5.28	0.72	1.00
Female	0.80	0.82	1.25	2.11	1.14	6.64	1.12	1.11	1.54	0.93	1.80	1.14	4.07	0.97	0.79	2.04	1.16	2.21	10.57	3.84	3.50	0.72	1.00
Average Wage Rate	0.80	0.82	1.25	2.11	1.14	6.64	1.12	1.11	1.54	0.93	1.80	1.14	4.07	0.97	0.79	2.04	1.16	2.21	10.57	3.84	3.50	0.72	1.00

employment remains very large, 62% down from 63%, and the share of females actually drops, from 31% to 29%. The minor decline in the share of self-employment is caused not so much by a shift to salaried jobs (this is only the case in 7 of the 22 industries), but by a higher employment growth rate in industries where the self-employed are under-represented. For instance, in all agricultural branches the share of self-employment becomes even (much) higher. The proportion of female employment falls in all manufacturing branches and in crops cultivation, but rises in all service industries except restaurants. Particularly, in the government and related services, the female share increases significantly, from 14% to 21%.

For a better understanding of the changes in labour income, the employment figures must be supplemented by data on wage rate developments; cf. Tables 24-26. By occupational category the spread of wage rates increases slightly while the urban-rural and paid-unpaid gaps remain about the same. Only between the sexes there is a tendency towards more equality.

The inter-industry wage rate differentials are quite similar in both years; the ranking of the 22 industries hardly changes, with most agricultural branches dropping a few places, all manufacturing branches improving their position a bit, and a rather stable order for the service branches except trade and transport services which move up from rank 17 to rank 12.

An interesting comparison can be made with Gittleman and Wolff (G&W) [1993], who analyze inter-industry wage differentials in several OECD-countries. Through a slight aggregation of both their data for the United States and our data for Indonesia, a similar classification of industries was obtained. It appears that the inequality in wage rates is larger in Indonesia than in the United States. In Indonesia, the unweighted variance of the logarithm of relative industry wage rates equals .572 in 1975 and .484 in 1980, while it equals .137 for a comparable classification of industries in the US in 1985. However,

analogous to G&W's conclusion for the OECD-countries, the trend is towards convergence. This is confirmed by the correlation coefficient of the series for both countries, which increases from .57 to .65. Finally, the rankings have been compared. It strikes that in both countries utilities come out on top while agriculture brings up the rear. On the other hand, manufacturing branches typically rank higher in the U.S. and this is mirrored by the place of services, except transport. For instance, government services etc. rank third in Indonesia in 1980 and ninth in the U.S. in 1985. An explanation for this divergence is found in the relatively big gap in average skill level between service and manufacturing branches in Indonesia.

These shifts in wage rates and employment lead to the changes in labour income as shown in Tables 18-20. The lower part of Table 20 shows that the proportions of the wage bill earned by agricultural workers, earned in rural areas and earned in food crops cultivation all drop substantially. Naturally, these changes are all manifestations of the same trend. Further, the share of salaried labour increases from 53% to 55% and the share of females rises from 18% to 20%.

The allocation of generated income to subsectors is presented in Tables A.13-15. The bulk of agricultural wages accrues to agricultural labourers, while farmers receive almost all agricultural mixed income. Net mixed income consists of two components: imputed labour income and non-produced capital income. As expected, the former part is mainly earned by small farmers and the latter part by large farmers. Most of the labour income of manual workers and most of the imputed wages of clerical, sales and service own-account workers end up with the non-agricultural lower level subgroups. The compensation of clerical, sales and service employees and of technicians, managers and supervisors predominantly accrues to the higher level subgroups.

The allocation of income from owner-occupied housing shows that urban households (18% of the total) generally live in much more expensive dwellings: 55% of the imputed rents have been booked to them. **About half**

of rural net capital income from non-agricultural activities serves as a subsidiary source of revenue in agricultural households. Overall, the sum of labour income and the capital income that accrues to households accounts for 59% of total generated income in 1980; in 1975 this figure was still 66%. Thus, the proportion received by the corporate sector increases significantly.

The next subsection combines these incomes from production with property income and transfers and reviews how these revenues are spent.

3.3 **Changes in the distribution of income and expenditure**

Tables 27-29 present the main income components by household subsector in both years. Further details on property income and transfer receipts are provided in Tables A.16-18. Clearly, the balance of property income and outlays is only significant in the higher level and economically inactive subgroups. Almost three quarters end up with the higher level urban households. Inter-household transfers are all received by the economically inactive and account for 30-40% of their income in 1980. Although government transfers to households are the fastest growing income component, their size remains very small. This is due to the absence of a social security system. Remittances from abroad are negligible in 1975 and still insignificant in 1980. In all subgroups the contribution of gross mixed income to total earnings stands out: varying from 28% for the higher level urban households to 96% for the large farmers.

The next three tables present per capita incomes. The average annual growth rate of total income per head varies from 19% for the rural economically inactive to 26% for the rural higher level households. For all other subgroups this rate equals roughly 21%. The last column of these tables gives net disposable income per head at constant 1980 prices. **Subtraction of a subgroup-specific inflation rate substantially increases the spread of the income growth rates: now the rural and urban**

Table 27: Household current income by subsector and income component, 1980 (billions of Rp.)

Household Subsector	Income Component SAM column	Compensation of Employees 3A,C,E,G	Gross Mixed Income *)			Pro- perty Income minus Outlay 4-6G	Current transfers from:			SOME SUBTOTAL		TOTAL Total	Net Dispo- sable Income at 1980 prices
			Imputed Labour Income 3B,D,F,H	Net Capital Income 3Ia-d	Depre- cia- tion 3K		House- hold Subgroups 4-6A-F	Govern- ment 4-6H	Rest of the World 10	Gross Mixed Income 3B,D,F,H-	Current Trans- fers 4-6A-F+H		
Agricultural Employees		1200	153	463	53	3	0	4	0	669	4	1878	1771
Small Farmers		514	1919	1887	174	7	0	11	0	3979	11	4511	4222
Medium Farmers		167	718	1038	74	3	0	3	0	1831	3	2004	1854
Large Farmers		149	919	2358	161	5	0	4	0	3438	4	3596	3274
Rural Lower Level		1525	1656	879	113	3	0	7	1	2648	8	4183	3951
Rural Economically Inactiv		10	6	253	28	123	189	1	0	287	190	609	568
Rural Higher Level		1377	434	330	40	292	0	2	3	804	5	2478	2350
Urban Lower Level		2071	1610	1583	304	22	0	3	4	3497	7	5596	5053
Urban Economically Inactiv		7	4	284	54	204	354	0	0	343	354	908	835
Urban Higher Level		2680	636	921	191	1849	0	0	0	1748	0	6278	5757
ALL HOUSEHOLDS		9699	8056	9996	1193	2510	542	36	8	19244	586	32039	29635

*) Including operating surplus from owner-occupied housing and land rent received minus land rent paid, from and to other households respectively.

Table 28: Household current income by subsector and income component, 1975 (billions of Rp.)

Household Subsector	Income Component SAM column	Compensation of Employees 3A,C,E,G	Gross Mixed Income *)			Pro- perty Income minus Outlay 4-6G	Current transfers from:			SOME SUBTOTAL		TOTAL Total	Net Dispo- sable Income at 1980 prices
			Imputed Labour Income 3B,D,F,H	Net Capital Income 3Ia-d	Depre- cia- tion 3K		House- hold Subgroups 4-6A-F	Govern- ment 4-6H	Rest of the World 10	Gross Mixed Income 3B,D,F,H-	Current Trans- fers 4-6A-F+H		
Agricultural Employees		407	73	117	16	0	0	1	0	206	1	614	1296
Small Farmers		196	616	402	44	0	0	1	0	1062	1	1259	2641
Medium Farmers		69	365	434	41	0	0	1	0	840	1	910	1874
Large Farmers		59	419	972	85	0	0	1	0	1476	1	1536	3029
Rural Lower Level		493	377	266	36	0	0	1	0	680	1	1174	2438
Rural Economically Inactiv		8	1	43	6	33	108	0	0	51	108	200	420
Rural Higher Level		298	156	72	11	88	0	0	0	239	0	625	1281
Urban Lower Level		551	322	527	86	0	0	0	0	934	0	1485	2884
Urban Economically Inactiv		4	1	33	8	43	130	0	0	43	130	219	451
Urban Higher Level		674	148	273	53	467	0	0	0	473	0	1615	3092
ALL HOUSEHOLDS		2759	2477	3141	385	631	238	6	0	6003	244	9637	19407

*) Including operating surplus from owner-occupied housing and land rent received minus land rent paid, from and to other households respectively.

Table 29: Average annual percentage change of household current income by subsector and income component, 1975-'80

Household Subsector	Income Component SAM column	Compensation of Employees 3A,C,E,G	Gross Mixed Income *)			Pro- perty Income minus Outlay 4-6G	Current transfers from:			SOME SUBTOTAL		TOTAL Total	Net Dispo- sable Income at 1980 prices
			Imputed Labour Income 3B,D,F,H	Net Capital Income 3Ia-d	Depre- cia- tion 3K		House- hold Subgroups 4-6A-F	Govern- ment 4-6H	Rest of the World 10	Gross Mixed Income 3B,D,F,H-	Current Trans- fers 4-6A-F+H		
Agricultural Employees		22%	15%	27%	24%	-	-	35%	-	24%	35%	22%	6.2%
Small Farmers		19%	23%	31%	27%	-	-	40%	-	26%	40%	26%	9.4%
Medium Farmers		18%	14%	17%	12%	-	-	29%	-	16%	29%	16%	-0.2%
Large Farmers		19%	16%	18%	13%	-	-	32%	-	17%	32%	17%	1.6%
Rural Lower Level		23%	30%	24%	23%	-	-	38%	-	27%	41%	25%	9.7%
Rural Economically Inactiv		4%	32%	35%	30%	26%	11%	40%	-	35%	11%	22%	6.1%
Rural Higher Level		31%	20%	30%	28%	24%	-	36%	-	24%	53%	28%	12.1%
Urban Lower Level		26%	32%	22%	25%	-	-	39%	-	26%	57%	27%	11.2%
Urban Economically Inactiv		11%	22%	43%	39%	31%	20%	45%	-	42%	20%	28%	12.3%
Urban Higher Level		28%	29%	24%	26%	28%	-	40%	-	26%	40%	27%	12.4%
ALL HOUSEHOLDS		25%	24%	23%	23%	28%	16%	37%	-	23%	18%	24%	8.5%

*) Including operating surplus from owner-occupied housing and land rent received minus land rent paid, from and to other households respectively.

Table 30: Household current PER CAPITA income by subsector and income component, 1980 (000 Rp)

Household Subsector	Income Component SAM column	Compensation of Employees 3A,C,E,G	Gross Mixed Income *)			Pro- perty Income minus Outlay 4-6G	Current transfers from:			SOME SUBTOTAL		TOTAL Total	Net Dispo- sable Income at 1980 prices
			Imputed Labour Income 3B,D,F,H	Net Capital Income 3Ia-d	Depre- cia- tion 3K		House- hold Subgroups 4-6A-F	Govern- ment 4-6H	Rest of the World 10	Gross Mixed Income 3B,D,F,H-	Current Trans- fers 4-6A-F+H		
Agricultural Employees		76	10	29	3	0	0	0	0	43	0	119	113
Small Farmers		13	50	49	5	0	0	0	0	103	0	117	110
Medium Farmers		14	58	84	6	0	0	0	0	149	0	163	151
Large Farmers		10	60	153	10	0	0	0	0	223	0	233	212
Rural Lower Level		64	70	37	5	0	0	0	0	112	0	177	167
Rural Economically Inactiv		2	2	66	7	32	49	0	0	75	49	158	148
Rural Higher Level		171	54	41	5	36	0	0	0	100	1	308	292
Urban Lower Level		121	94	93	18	1	0	0	0	205	0	328	296
Urban Economically Inactiv		3	2	109	21	78	136	0	0	131	136	348	320
Urban Higher Level		280	66	96	20	193	0	0	0	183	0	656	602
ALL HOUSEHOLDS		66	55	68	8	17	4	0	0	131	4	218	202

*) Including operating surplus from owner-occupied housing and land rent received minus land rent paid, from and to other households respectively.

Table 31: Household current PER CAPITA income by subsector and income component, 1975 (000 Rp)

Household Subsector	Income Component SAM column	Compensation of Employees 3A,C,E,G	Gross Mixed Income *)			Pro- perty Income minus Outlay 4-6G	Current transfers from:			SOME SUBTOTAL		TOTAL Total	Net Dispo- sable Income at 1980 prices
			Imputed Labour Income 3B,D,F,H	Net Capital Income 3Ia-d	Depre- cia- tion 3K		House- hold Subgroups 4-6A-F	Govern- ment 4-6H	Rest of the World 10	Gross Mixed Income 3B,D,F,H-	Current Trans- fers 4-6A-F+H		
Agricultural Employees		28	5	8	1	0	0	0	0	14	0	42	88
Small Farmers		7	21	14	1	0	0	0	0	36	0	43	90
Medium Farmers		4	23	27	3	0	0	0	0	53	0	57	118
Large Farmers		3	23	54	5	0	0	0	0	82	0	85	168
Rural Lower Level		25	19	14	2	0	0	0	0	35	0	60	125
Rural Economically Inactiv		2	0	14	2	10	34	0	0	16	34	62	130
Rural Higher Level		39	21	10	1	12	0	0	0	32	0	82	169
Urban Lower Level		43	25	41	7	0	0	0	0	73	0	115	224
Urban Economically Inactiv		2	1	19	4	24	74	0	0	24	74	125	257
Urban Higher Level		89	20	36	7	62	0	0	0	63	0	214	409
ALL HOUSEHOLDS		21	19	24	3	5	2	0	0	46	2	74	149

*) Including operating surplus from owner-occupied housing and land rent received minus land rent paid, from and to other households respectively.

Table 32: Average annual percentage change of household current PER CAPITA income by subsector and income component, 1975-'80

Household Subsector	Income Component SAM column	Compensation of Employees 3A,C,E,G	Gross Mixed Income *)			Pro- perty Income minus Outlay 4-6G	Current transfers from:			SOME SUBTOTAL		TOTAL Total	Net Dispo- sable Income at 1980 prices
			Imputed Labour Income 3B,D,F,H	Net Capital Income 3Ia-d	Depre- cia- tion 3K		House- hold Subgroups 4-6A-F	Govern- ment 4-6H	Rest of the World 10	Gross Mixed Income 3B,D,F,H-	Current Trans- fers 4-6A-F+H		
Agricultural Employees		20%	14%	26%	23%	-	-	34%	-	22%	34%	21%	5.1%
Small Farmers		14%	17%	25%	22%	-	-	35%	-	21%	35%	20%	3.9%
Medium Farmers		23%	19%	23%	17%	-	-	34%	-	21%	34%	21%	4.9%
Large Farmers		22%	19%	21%	16%	-	-	35%	-	20%	35%	20%	4.7%
Rural Lower Level		19%	26%	20%	19%	-	-	34%	-	23%	37%	22%	5.8%
Rural Economically Inactiv		1%	28%	32%	27%	23%	8%	36%	-	31%	8%	19%	2.5%
Rural Higher Level		29%	19%	29%	25%	23%	-	35%	-	23%	52%	26%	11.0%
Urban Lower Level		21%	27%	16%	20%	-	-	34%	-	21%	52%	21%	5.6%
Urban Economically Inactiv		4%	14%	35%	31%	23%	12%	37%	-	34%	12%	20%	4.4%
Urban Higher Level		23%	25%	20%	21%	23%	-	35%	-	21%	35%	22%	7.7%
ALL HOUSEHOLDS		23%	21%	21%	20%	25%	14%	34%	-	21%	15%	22%	6.1%

*) Including operating surplus from owner-occupied housing and land rent received minus land rent paid, from and to other households respectively.

elites realize by far the highest increments (11.0% and 7.7%, respectively), followed by the lower level non-agricultural households in these areas (5.8% and 5.6%). The agricultural subgroups except the smallest farmers rank next, all with a below-average growth rate (4.7%-5.1%), and the smallest farmers plus the rural and urban economically inactive households come last (3.9%, 2.5% and 4.4%, respectively). The ratio between the poorest and richest subgroup's real per capita income increases from 4.65 to 5.47. This confirms that inequality has risen in this period, and that the higher Gini-coefficient in 1980 is not only due to 'modern sector enlargement growth' [Fields, 1979]. The final section of this paper will look into the determinants of these shifts in the income distribution.

The share of government in Net National Disposable Income rises from 15.9% to 19.4%. The composition of the treasury's revenues drastically changes. In particular, the proportion obtained from (oil) corporations tax increases from 62% to 78%. This is counterbalanced by a diminishing relative importance of taxes less subsidies on production, contributing 3%, down from 16%. This decline is mainly caused by the much higher subsidies on oil products in 1980. The contribution of household income tax to current revenues increases marginally: from 5.9% in 1975 to 6.5% in 1980 (cf. Tables A.16-18).

Social transfers in kind are re-routed to the beneficiaries in Tables 33-35. These transfers concern government education and health expenditures, excluding a small amount for the training of civil servants. On average, they account for 3% of disposable income in 1980 and their growth exceeds the growth of household income, except for the urban economically inactive and higher level subgroups. Nevertheless, these two subgroups and the rural elite still receive the highest per capita transfers in 1980. On the other hand, the transfers do have a moderate equalizing effect on the income distribution because the ratio between the receipts of the rich and of the poor is smaller than the original income disparities.

Table 33: Social transfers in kind (education and health) from the government to each subsector, 1980

Income Component	(billions of Rupiah)				per Capita (thousands of Rupiah)			
	Net Disposable Income	Social Transfers in kind	Adjusted Disposable Income	Adjusted Disposable Income at 1980 prices	Net Disposable Income	Social Transfers in kind	Adjusted Disposable Income	Adjusted Disposable Income at 1980 prices
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Household subsector								
Agricultural Employees	1771	75	1846	1846	113	4.8	118	118
Small Farmers	4222	194	4416	4416	110	5.0	115	115
Medium Farmers	1854	65	1919	1919	151	5.3	156	156
Large Farmers	3274	85	3359	3359	212	5.5	218	218
Rural Lower Level	3951	140	4091	4091	167	5.9	173	173
Rural Economically Inactive	568	24	593	593	148	6.3	154	154
Rural Higher Level	2350	72	2422	2422	292	8.9	301	301
Urban Lower Level	5053	117	5170	5170	296	6.9	303	303
Urban Economically Inactiv	835	22	857	857	320	8.5	329	329
Urban Higher Level	5757	92	5849	5849	602	9.6	611	611
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	29635	887	30522	30522	202	6.0	208	208

Table 34: Social transfers in kind (education and health) from the government to each subsector, 1975

Income Component	(billions of Rupiah)				per Capita (thousands of Rupiah)			
	Net Disposable Income	Social Transfers in kind	Adjusted Disposable Income	Adjusted Disposable Income at 1980 prices	Net Disposable Income	Social Transfers in kind	Adjusted Disposable Income	Adjusted Disposable Income at 1980 prices
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Household subsector								
Agricultural Employees	589	12	601	1323	40	0.8	41	89
Small Farmers	1197	26	1223	2699	41	0.9	42	92
Medium Farmers	846	17	863	1911	53	1.1	54	120
Large Farmers	1372	23	1395	3081	76	1.3	77	171
Rural Lower Level	1114	22	1136	2486	57	1.1	58	127
Rural Economically Inactive	192	7	199	436	60	2.3	62	135
Rural Higher Level	588	14	602	1312	78	1.8	79	173
Urban Lower Level	1327	20	1347	2928	103	1.6	105	227
Urban Economically Inactiv	209	8	217	468	119	4.3	124	267
Urban Higher Level	1444	26	1471	3150	191	3.5	195	417
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	8878	176	9054	19795	68	1.3	69	152

Table 35: Average annual percentage change of Social Transfers in kind from the government in each Subsector, 1975-'80

Income Component	(growth rate - %)				per Capita (growth rate - %)			
	Net Disposable Income	Social Transfers in kind	Adjusted Disposable Income	Adjusted Disposable Income at 1980 prices	Net Disposable Income	Social Transfers in kind	Adjusted Disposable Income	Adjusted Disposable Income at 1980 prices
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Household subsector								
Agricultural Employees	22.0%	36.2%	22.4%	6.7%	20.8%	35.0%	21.2%	5.5%
Small Farmers	25.2%	39.8%	25.7%	9.8%	19.8%	34.4%	20.2%	4.4%
Medium Farmers	15.7%	26.9%	16.0%	0.1%	20.8%	32.0%	21.1%	5.2%
Large Farmers	17.4%	25.8%	17.6%	1.7%	20.5%	29.0%	20.7%	4.9%
Rural Lower Level	25.3%	36.9%	25.6%	10.0%	21.5%	33.1%	21.8%	6.1%
Rural Economically Inactive	21.7%	23.9%	21.8%	6.1%	18.1%	20.4%	18.2%	2.6%
Rural Higher Level	27.7%	32.9%	27.8%	12.3%	26.5%	31.7%	26.7%	11.1%
Urban Lower Level	26.7%	35.3%	26.9%	11.4%	21.1%	29.6%	21.3%	5.7%
Urban Economically Inactiv	27.7%	21.5%	27.5%	12.1%	19.7%	13.5%	19.5%	4.2%
Urban Higher Level	27.7%	25.1%	27.6%	12.4%	22.9%	20.4%	22.9%	7.6%
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	24.1%	32.3%	24.3%	8.7%	21.8%	30.0%	22.0%	6.3%

Household current expenditures are summarized in Tables 36-38, while the outlays of all institutional (sub)sectors are presented in Tables A.22-24. Detailed shifts in consumption patterns will be presented in the next subsection. Reviewing the composition of household outlays, the most remarkable change concerns **the doubling of the saving rate**, from 7% to 15%. The direct tax rate also increases significantly, albeit from a very low base: 1.4% in 1975 becomes 2.1% in 1980. Final consumption expenditure grows somewhat less, but still at an annual rate of 6.6% in real terms.

Differences in the growth rates by subgroup are of course influenced by the changes in subgroup size. Therefore, these growth rates are best analyzed on a per capita basis; cf. Tables 39-41. It strikes that **the ranking of subgroups according to the growth rate of real consumption expenditure is quite different from the ranking according to the growth rate of real disposable income**, discussed above. Especially the elites and the medium farmers tumble, while the other urban subgroups move upwards. Besides, the spread of growth rates is smaller for consumption than for income. Accordingly, the Gini-coefficient increases less for consumption than for income; from .207 to .230 (+2.1% per annum) for real actual consumption and from .246 to .286 (+3.0% per annum) for real adjusted disposable income.¹⁸ A higher Gini-coefficient for income than for consumption is normal and compensated by a much higher saving inequality.

The divergence between the subgroup growth rate patterns for income and for consumption is indeed mirrored by the growth rates of saving: above 35% per year for the rural and urban elites, medium farmers and lower level rural households outside agriculture, and negative for agricultural employees and both economically inactive subgroups. Moreover, the last three categories and the small farmers dissave in both years. Thus their consumption level is still not sustainable in 1980, despite an extraordinary per capita income growth in the second

18. Actual consumption includes social transfers in kind; cf. column (6) in Tables 33-35. The 1975 Gini-coefficient for consumption expenditure (excluding social transfers in kind) was the same as the one for actual consumption (.207), but its growth rate is a little higher: +2.5%.

Table 36: Household current expenditures by subsector and expenditure component, 1980 (billions of Rupiah)

Expenditure Component	Current taxes & transfers to:		Final consumption expenditure		Gross Saving	SUBTOTALS		TOTAL	Memorandum Items:		
	House-	Gov-	Domestic	Imported		Final Con-	Taxes&		Saving/	Final Consump-	
	holds	ment	Products	Products	Expenditure	Trans-	Disposable	tion at constant	Income	1980 prices	
Household subsector	SAM Rows:	4-6A-F	4-6H	1A-E	1F-I	7	1	4-6	Total	7/(1+7)	Total
Agricultural Employees		7	45	1781	107	-64	1887	52	1876	-0.03	1887
Small Farmers		16	99	4187	243	-35	4430	115	4511	-0.01	4430
Medium Farmers		18	58	1454	78	397	1532	76	2004	0.21	1532
Large Farmers		88	73	2313	122	1000	2435	161	3596	0.29	2435
Rural Lower Level		36	83	3452	224	388	3676	119	4183	0.10	3676
Rural Economically Inactive		1	12	577	37	-17	614	13	609	-0.03	614
Rural Higher Level		39	49	1409	102	880	1510	88	2478	0.37	1510
Urban Lower Level		130	109	4717	324	315	5042	240	5596	0.06	5042
Urban Economically Inactive		0	18	849	61	-21	910	18	908	-0.02	910
Urban Higher Level		208	122	3756	265	1926	4022	330	6278	0.32	4022
ALL HOUSEHOLDS		542	669	24496	1562	4769	26059	1211	32039	0.15	26059

Table 37: Household current expenditures by subsector and expenditure component, 1975 (billions of Rupiah)

Expenditure Component	Current taxes & transfers to:		Final consumption expenditure		Gross Saving	SUBTOTALS		TOTAL	Memorandum Items:		
	House-	Gov-	Domestic	Imported		Final Con-	Taxes&		Saving/	Final Consump-	
	holds	ment	Products	Products	Expenditure	Trans-	Disposable	tion at constant	Income	1980 prices	
Household subsector	SAM Rows:	4-6A-F	4-6H	1A-E	1F-I	7	1	4-6	Total	7/(1+7)	Total
Agricultural Employees		3	6	606	37	-38	643	9	614	-0.06	1413
Small Farmers		8	10	1285	59	-103	1344	18	1259	-0.08	2959
Medium Farmers		9	15	773	34	79	807	24	910	0.09	1780
Large Farmers		49	30	1066	58	333	1124	79	1536	0.23	2467
Rural Lower Level		20	5	1043	73	33	1116	24	1174	0.03	2436
Rural Economically Inactive		0	1	192	13	-7	205	2	200	-0.04	448
Rural Higher Level		21	5	508	42	49	550	26	625	0.08	1194
Urban Lower Level		49	24	1226	106	81	1332	72	1485	0.06	2680
Urban Economically Inactive		0	2	199	21	-3	220	2	219	-0.01	473
Urban Higher Level		78	40	1129	114	255	1243	118	1615	0.17	2657
ALL HOUSEHOLDS		238	136	8027	557	680	8583	374	9637	0.07	18706

Table 38: Average annual % change of household current expenditures by subsector and expenditure component, 1975-'80

Expenditure Component	Current taxes & transfers to:		Final consumption expenditure		Gross Saving	SUBTOTALS		TOTAL	Memorandum Items:		
	House-	Gov-	Domestic	Imported		Final Con-	Taxes&		Saving/	Final Consump-	
	holds	ment	Products	Products	Expenditure	Trans-	Disposable	tion at constant	Income	1980 prices	
Household subsector	SAM Rows:	4-6A-F	4-6H	1A-E	1F-I	7	1	4-6	Total	7/(1+7)	Total
Agricultural Employees		13%	41%	22%	21%	-10%	22%	34%	22%	12%	5.8%
Small Farmers		13%	47%	24%	28%	22%	24%	37%	26%	47%	8.1%
Medium Farmers		13%	28%	13%	17%	32%	13%	23%	16%	17%	-3.0%
Large Farmers		12%	18%	16%	15%	22%	15%	14%	17%	5%	-0.3%
Rural Lower Level		12%	58%	24%	22%	49%	24%	32%	25%	24%	8.2%
Rural Economically Inactive		11%	46%	22%	20%	-18%	22%	42%	22%	4%	6.3%
Rural Higher Level		12%	46%	20%	18%	58%	20%	24%	28%	30%	4.7%
Urban Lower Level		20%	31%	27%	22%	27%	27%	24%	27%	0%	11.2%
Urban Economically Inactive		20%	43%	29%	22%	-39%	28%	42%	28%	-10%	13.1%
Urban Higher Level		20%	22%	24%	17%	40%	23%	21%	27%	13%	8.3%
ALL HOUSEHOLDS		16%	32%	22%	21%	39%	22%	23%	24%	15%	6.6%

Table 39: Household current PER CAPITA expenditures by subsector and expenditure component, 1980 (000 Rp)

Expenditure Component	Current taxes & transfers to:		Final consumption expenditure		Gross Saving	SUBTOTALS		TOTAL	Memorandum Items:	
	Households	Government	Domestic	Imported		Final Consumption Expenditure	Taxes & Transfers		Saving/ Disposable Income	Final Consumption at constant 1980 prices
			Products	Products						
Household subsector										
SAM Rows:	4-6A-F	4-6H	1A-E	1F-I	7	1	4-6	Total	7/(1+7)	Total
Agricultural Employees	0	3	113	7	-4	120	3	119	-0.03	120
Small Farmers	0	3	109	6	-1	115	3	117	-0.01	115
Medium Farmers	1	5	118	6	32	124	6	163	0.21	124
Large Farmers	6	5	150	8	65	158	10	233	0.29	158
Rural Lower Level	2	4	146	9	16	155	5	177	0.10	155
Rural Economically Inactive	0	3	150	9	-4	160	3	158	-0.03	160
Rural Higher Level	5	6	175	13	110	188	11	308	0.37	188
Urban Lower Level	8	6	277	19	18	296	14	328	0.06	296
Urban Economically Inactive	0	7	325	23	-8	349	7	348	-0.02	349
Urban Higher Level	22	13	393	28	201	420	34	656	0.32	420
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	4	5	167	11	32	178	8	218	0.15	178

Table 40: Household current PER CAPITA expenditures by subsector and expenditure component, 1975 (000 Rp)

Expenditure Component	Current taxes & transfers to:		Final consumption expenditure		Gross Saving	SUBTOTALS		TOTAL	Memorandum Items:	
	Households	Government	Domestic	Imported		Final Consumption Expenditure	Taxes & Transfers		Saving/ Disposable Income	Final Consumption at constant 1980 prices
			Products	Products						
Household subsector										
SAM Rows:	4-6A-F	4-6H	1A-E	1F-I	7	1	4-6	Total	7/(1+7)	Total
Agricultural Employees	0	0	41	2	-3	43	1	42	-0.06	95
Small Farmers	0	0	44	2	-4	46	1	43	-0.08	101
Medium Farmers	1	1	49	2	5	51	2	57	0.09	112
Large Farmers	3	2	59	3	18	62	4	85	0.23	137
Rural Lower Level	1	0	53	4	2	57	1	60	0.03	125
Rural Economically Inactive	0	0	60	4	-2	64	0	62	-0.04	139
Rural Higher Level	3	1	67	6	7	73	3	82	0.08	158
Urban Lower Level	4	2	95	8	6	103	6	115	0.06	224
Urban Economically Inactive	0	1	114	12	-2	126	1	125	-0.01	270
Urban Higher Level	10	5	149	15	34	165	16	214	0.17	352
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	2	1	61	4	5	66	3	74	0.07	143

Table 41: Average annual percentage change of PER CAPITA expenditures by subsector and expenditure component, '75-'80

Expenditure Component	Current taxes & transfers to:		Final consumption expenditure		Gross Saving	SUBTOTALS		TOTAL	Memorandum Items:	
	Households	Government	Domestic	Imported		Final Consumption Expenditure	Taxes & Transfers		Saving/ Disposable Income	Final Consumption at constant 1980 prices
			Products	Products						
Household subsector										
SAM Rows:	4-6A-F	4-6H	1A-E	1F-I	7	1	4-6	Total	7/(1+7)	Total
Agricultural Employees	12%	40%	20%	20%	-9%	20%	33%	21%	12%	4.6%
Small Farmers	7%	41%	18%	23%	27%	18%	32%	20%	47%	2.6%
Medium Farmers	18%	33%	18%	22%	37%	18%	28%	21%	17%	2.1%
Large Farmers	15%	21%	19%	18%	25%	19%	17%	20%	5%	2.9%
Rural Lower Level	9%	54%	20%	19%	45%	20%	28%	22%	24%	4.4%
Rural Economically Inactive	8%	42%	18%	16%	-15%	18%	38%	19%	4%	2.7%
Rural Higher Level	11%	45%	19%	16%	56%	19%	23%	26%	30%	3.5%
Urban Lower Level	14%	25%	21%	17%	22%	21%	18%	21%	0%	5.6%
Urban Economically Inactive	12%	35%	21%	14%	-31%	20%	35%	20%	-10%	5.2%
Urban Higher Level	15%	18%	19%	12%	36%	19%	16%	22%	13%	3.6%
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	14%	30%	20%	18%	37%	20%	21%	22%	15%	4.3%

half of the seventies. It must be noted, though, that saving has been estimated as a residual and is therefore very sensitive to measurement errors in all (other) income and expenditure components.

More detailed results are shown in Tables A.22-24. For instance, the third line of the one but lowest block in these tables gives the changes in direct tax rates by (sub)sector. Apparently, the income tax rate increases a bit for all household subgroups except the richest one: higher level urban households. In 1980, this subgroup has the lowest tax rate, 1.9%, although the differences among subgroups are very small. Only the agricultural subgroups except the large farmers pay more than 2.0% of their current income. In 1975, the divergence among these rates was much larger. However, the quality of the basic data for these estimates does not allow drawing far-reaching conclusions without additional evidence.

These tables also present outlays of the two other sectors: corporations and government. The corporate tax rate rises substantially, from 32% to 40%, due to specific levies on the booming oil revenues. This has led to a declining share of the other categories of corporate outlays: dividends paid out to households, profits and such remitted abroad (including reinvested earnings) and saving.

The oil corporation tax is such a milch cow in this period that the government realizes an consumption expenditure growth above that of households and as well an above-average growth of saving, despite the swelling (interest) payments to abroad. Current transfers to households are also expanding, but remain negligible: 0.1% of household income in 1980. This is much lower than the contribution of social transfers in kind to disposable income of households: 3.0%.

Tables A.25-27 specify the capital account for two sectors: households and corporations combined and the government. Transfers from the latter to the former concern investment grants allocated to public enterprise. A large though declining share of government funds for

investment comes from foreign aid: 24% in 1980 versus 35% in 1975.

Figures on the allocation of investment among industries yield insight into the direction the Indonesian economy is heading, particularly when they are juxtaposed with the distribution of fixed capital stock at the beginning of the year [Keuning, 1991]. For instance, oil etc. mining accounts for roughly one fifth of the national capital stock value at the beginning of 1980, but receives only about one eighth of 1980 investment. The reverse applies to government services etc., with 6% of opening capital stock but 16% of fixed investment, and to housing services and the like (real estate & business services), with 15% of the opening stock and 21% of investment. Especially, the construction of dwellings and government offices expands (see columns 8Eb and 8Ec in Tables A.30 and A.III.11). In most of agriculture and particularly in estate crops cultivation, investment is small in proportion to the existing stock value. The same applies to food processing. Rapidly expanding industries are, in addition to those already mentioned: quarrying, hotels, utilities, chemicals & basic metals & non-metallic minerals manufacturing, and wood products manufacturing & construction. When viewed over the period 1975-1985, the highest growth rates of capital stock have been achieved in hotels (+25% per year), upstream manufacturing (+22%) and utilities (+22%) [Keuning, 1991: Table 3].

Regarding the ownership of fixed capital formation in both years, the overall proportion invested by the business sector (including public enterprise) increases slightly, from 65% to 67%; notably, its share rises in trade, transport, and oil etc. mining. This is counterbalanced by an increment in the share of government investment in virtually all other industries; cf. the block at the right-side of Table A.27.

Finally, the row for the financial balance in Tables A.25 and 26 clearly demonstrates the improvement in the liquidity position of the domestic sectors: even the government's Net Lending is positive in 1980, while Net Lending of the nation is not less than 4.6 trillion Rupiah.

Evidently, **most of the oil boom receipts were not absorbed domestically.**

3.4 **Shifts in the consumption by product groups**

This subsection focuses on household consumption. Tables A.19-21 contain the relevant blocks of the detailed SAMs, while Tables 42-50 present the same figures according to a different classification, tailored to consumption analysis. As expected, per capita non-food consumption is much more unequally distributed than per capita food consumption. The largest disparities are found for education services, durable consumer goods, transport services, and paper, books, etc. For each commodity item, with corn, cassava and firewood as the only clear exceptions, the 1980 ranking of subgroups according to consumption per head is topped by the higher level urban households, followed by the two other urban subgroups.

Obviously, **rice is not an 'inferior' good in Indonesia**: the highest per capita consumption and consumption growth are found among the upper strata. A very different pattern is found for **corn** and **cassava**: farmers eat much larger amounts of these food stuffs, especially in 1975. Another interesting item, from an environmental point of view too, is **firewood; its consumption per head in the poorest subgroups is not less than five times larger than that in the richest subgroups**. The 1975-1980 growth rate is also the largest for the agricultural households and way below average in urban areas. Other consumption items with below-average growth rates in all urban subgroups, and thus above-average growth rates in the poorer households, are: clothing and processed food. A reverse trend applies to: paper & books, transport, and other services. The latter product group encompasses e.g. lodging, finance, recreational services, and personal & household services.

The expenditure shares and changes thereof in Tables 45-47 are roughly in conformity with established economic theory: budget shares of (staple) food decline with increasing total per capita consumption. Yet,

Table 42: Per capita Consumption Expenditures by Commodity Item and Household Subgroup, 1980 (*1000 Rupiah)

Commodity (SAM row-codes)	Household Subgroup						Non-Agricultural						TOTAL
	Agricultural			Non-Agricultural			Rural			Urban			
	Labourers	Farmers	Labourers	Lower Economic Level	Higher Level	Higher Level	Lower Economic Level	Higher Level	Higher Level	Lower Economic Level	Higher Level	Higher Level	
Rice (1,8,23,30)	29.7	28.0	28.5	33.6	33.5	34.1	34.5	33.9	35.1	40.0	31.8		
Corn (1,23)	2.6	3.9	4.5	3.8	1.9	2.9	2.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	2.7		
Cassava, etc. (1,23)	4.2	5.4	6.2	6.0	4.0	4.1	4.8	2.5	2.3	2.5	4.5		
Beans, Bean Products (1,8,23,30)	3.6	3.1	3.4	4.3	3.9	4.1	4.1	6.4	7.0	7.7	4.3		
Vegetables, Fruits (1,23)	9.8	9.3	10.8	14.1	11.9	11.9	13.0	17.0	18.3	20.5	12.5		
Fish (5,27)	4.8	4.6	6.0	10.3	7.9	7.4	9.4	10.9	11.8	15.2	7.8		
Meat and Eggs (3,25)	4.2	4.0	5.6	8.9	6.5	6.5	7.2	14.6	17.9	19.8	7.8		
Oils and Fats (8,30)	1.8	1.7	1.8	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.2	3.0	3.1	3.3	2.2		
Sugar and Coconuts (2,8,24,30)	4.5	4.6	5.3	6.6	5.2	5.3	6.0	6.1	6.7	7.3	5.4		
Coffee, Tea, etc. (2,7,8,24,30)	3.4	3.3	3.7	4.6	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.2	3.7		
Processed Food (4,8,15,30,37)	13.0	11.1	9.6	12.1	17.1	16.7	17.2	38.4	45.0	46.1	18.8		
Tobacco Products (8,30)	7.4	5.5	6.5	9.4	9.9	9.3	11.2	16.1	16.1	16.5	9.5		
Clothing (10,12,32,34)	4.4	4.6	5.1	6.5	6.3	6.8	7.4	11.0	12.4	14.0	6.8		
Firewood (4)	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.6		
Other Fuels (11-13, 33,34)	2.7	2.4	2.4	3.3	4.1	5.2	5.1	10.3	12.3	14.4	4.9		
Durables (9,11,31,33)	2.7	2.5	2.9	4.6	6.0	7.4	12.7	15.1	26.0	42.4	8.5		
Paper, Books, etc. (11,33)	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.6	2.3	3.3	4.2	0.8		
Soap, etc. and Water (12,13,34)	1.5	1.6	1.7	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.4	4.4	5.0	5.3	2.4		
Other Manufactured Pro (2,9,10,11,21,24,31-33,44)	2.1	2.3	2.6	3.6	2.7	2.5	4.4	4.6	5.9	6.9	3.2		
Transport, etc (14,17,18,22,39,40)	2.1	2.1	2.3	3.0	5.5	5.5	9.7	30.2	34.8	42.3	9.7		
Housing (20)	6.1	5.9	6.4	7.9	8.1	8.2	9.0	29.5	36.3	44.6	12.6		
Medical Needs (12,21,34)	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.5	7.0	7.7	10.1	3.7		
Education (21)	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.9	1.8	5.1	7.0	10.8	15.2	3.2		
Other services (16,19-22,38,41,43)	4.2	3.7	3.8	5.3	5.9	6.3	10.7	20.7	26.1	37.2	9.3		
Food	81.5	79.1	85.4	106.5	97.6	98.7	104.7	137.0	151.6	167.0	101.4		
Non-food	38.7	35.8	39.1	51.4	57.7	60.8	83.2	158.6	197.2	253.4	76.1		
TOTAL	120.2	114.9	124.5	157.8	155.3	159.5	188.0	295.6	348.8	420.3	177.5		

Table 43: Per capita Consumption Expenditures by Commodity Item and Household Subgroup, 1975 (*1000 Rupliah)

Commodity (SAM row-codes)	Household Subgroup										TOTAL
	Agricultural					Non-Agricultural					
	Labourers	Farmers			Urban	Labourers	Farmers			Urban	
	Small	Medium	Large	Lower Economic Level	Higher Economic Level	Lower Economic Level	Higher Economic Level	Lower Economic Level	Higher Economic Level	Higher Level	
Rice (1,8,23,30)	13.5	12.4	13.8	16.6	14.9	16.0	15.9	15.4	15.8	16.3	14.5
Corn (1,23)	1.5	2.3	2.1	1.3	0.9	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.3
Cassava, etc. (1,23)	1.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	1.7	2.0	1.7	1.2	1.3	1.5	2.6
Beans, Bean Products (1,8,23,30)	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.6	2.0	2.3	2.6	3.0	3.8	1.7
Vegetables, Fruits (1,23)	3.8	4.3	5.3	6.5	5.0	6.0	6.2	6.8	7.1	10.1	5.6
Fish (5,27)	1.7	1.8	2.4	3.2	2.7	3.6	4.1	4.4	4.5	6.7	2.9
Meat and Eggs (3,25)	1.1	1.5	2.3	3.1	1.7	2.6	3.3	3.1	3.7	7.6	2.5
Oils and Fats (8,30)	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.6	0.8
Sugar and Coconuts (2,8,24,30)	1.5	1.8	2.1	2.8	1.9	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.4	3.1	2.1
Coffee, Tea, etc. (2,7,8,24,30)	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.7	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.9	1.3
Processed Food (4,8,15,30,37)	3.5	2.7	2.2	2.5	4.7	3.8	4.7	15.6	18.3	17.1	5.5
Tobacco Products (8,30)	2.0	1.9	2.3	3.1	2.9	2.5	3.7	4.7	3.3	6.2	2.9
Clothing (10,12,32,34)	1.2	1.7	1.5	2.5	2.6	2.4	3.3	6.4	8.2	10.6	3.1
Firewood (4)	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4
Other Fuels (11-13, 33,34)	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.7	2.6	3.9	6.0	1.3
Durables (9,11,31,33)	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.9	2.7	3.7	5.9	6.5	12.8	19.9	3.6
Paper, Books, etc. (11,33)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.6	1.1	1.9	0.4
Soap, etc. and Water (12,13,34)	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	2.3	2.3	2.9	1.1
Other Manufactured Pro (2,9,10,11,21,24,31-33,44)	0.6	0.5	0.5	1.2	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.7	2.2	0.9
Transport, etc (14,17,18,22,39,40)	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.7	2.5	2.0	2.8	7.7	8.3	12.1	2.9
Housing (20)	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.2	2.2	3.4	3.0	6.7	12.4	14.8	3.4
Medical Needs (12,21,34)	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.4	1.3	0.6	1.1	1.4	2.2	0.6
Education (21)	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.0	3.3	4.2	4.7	1.2
Other services (16,19-22,38,41,43)	1.6	1.5	1.9	2.5	2.7	2.6	4.0	5.8	7.0	11.4	3.1
Food	31.3	33.5	37.2	43.8	37.0	41.4	43.7	54.1	59.2	69.7	40.9
Non-food	12.1	12.2	13.6	18.4	20.0	22.7	28.9	49.2	66.8	95.0	24.8
TOTAL	43.4	45.7	50.8	62.3	57.0	64.1	72.6	103.4	125.9	164.8	65.7

Table 44: Average Annual Growth Rate of per capita Consumption Expenditures by Commodity and Household Subgroup, '75-'80 (%)

Commodity (SAM row-codes)	Household Subgroup												TOTAL	
	Agricultural						Non-Agricultural							
	Labourers		Farmers		Rural		Urban		Rural		Urban			
	Small	Medium	Large	Lower Level	Economic Inactive	Higher Level	Lower Level	Economic Inactive	Higher Level	Lower Level	Economic Inactive	Higher Level		
Rice (1,8,23,30)	16%	16%	15%	14%	16%	15%	16%	16%	15%	16%	16%	16%	18%	15.7%
Corn (1,23)	11%	10%	15%	21%	15%	26%	30%	15%	26%	30%	15%	10%	11%	13.7%
Cassava, etc. (1,23)	16%	7%	10%	10%	17%	14%	20%	14%	14%	20%	14%	11%	10%	10.7%
Beans, Bean Products (1,8,23,30)	21%	20%	16%	21%	17%	14%	12%	18%	14%	12%	18%	17%	14%	17.9%
Vegetables, Fruits (1,23)	19%	15%	14%	16%	17%	14%	15%	18%	14%	15%	18%	19%	14%	16.2%
Fish (5,27)	21%	19%	19%	23%	22%	14%	17%	18%	14%	17%	18%	19%	16%	19.5%
Meat and Eggs (3,25)	26%	20%	18%	21%	27%	18%	15%	31%	18%	15%	31%	32%	19%	22.9%
Oils and Fats (8,30)	26%	22%	21%	19%	21%	18%	17%	19%	18%	17%	19%	19%	15%	20.3%
Sugar and Coconuts (2,8,24,30)	21%	19%	18%	17%	20%	16%	18%	20%	16%	18%	20%	21%	17%	18.7%
Coffee, Tea, etc. (2,7,8,24,30)	22%	21%	23%	20%	22%	21%	19%	20%	21%	19%	20%	19%	16%	20.4%
Processed Food (4,8,15,30,37)	26%	28%	29%	31%	26%	29%	26%	18%	29%	26%	18%	18%	20%	24.7%
Tobacco Products (6,30)	26%	21%	21%	23%	25%	26%	22%	25%	26%	22%	25%	31%	20%	23.4%
Clothing (10,12,32,34)	26%	19%	24%	19%	18%	21%	16%	11%	21%	16%	11%	8%	5%	16.0%
Firewood (4)	30%	29%	28%	28%	27%	24%	27%	16%	24%	27%	16%	11%	15%	27.3%
Other Fuels (11-13, 33,34)	27%	33%	31%	32%	29%	30%	22%	27%	30%	22%	27%	23%	17%	27.1%
Durables (9,11,31,33)	17%	19%	17%	17%	16%	14%	15%	17%	14%	15%	17%	14%	15%	17.4%
Paper, Books, etc. (11,33)	-3%	-6%	-8%	-18%	3%	-7%	-5%	27%	3%	-7%	27%	22%	16%	12.4%
Soap, etc. and Water (12,13,34)	15%	16%	16%	16%	17%	14%	16%	13%	14%	16%	13%	15%	12%	15.5%
Other Manufactured Pro (2,9,10,11,21,24,31-33,44)	25%	31%	34%	22%	28%	25%	32%	25%	25%	32%	25%	24%	23%	26.8%
Transport, etc (14,17,18,22,39,40)	17%	10%	9%	12%	16%	20%	25%	27%	20%	25%	27%	29%	25%	23.9%
Housing (20)	25%	24%	23%	26%	26%	18%	22%	30%	18%	22%	30%	22%	22%	26.0%
Medical Needs (12,21,34)	44%	40%	36%	33%	43%	20%	36%	36%	20%	36%	36%	35%	30%	36.7%
Education (21)	9%	16%	17%	18%	19%	16%	33%	15%	16%	33%	15%	19%	24%	20.7%
Other services (16,19-22,38,41,43)	20%	18%	14%	15%	16%	18%	20%	26%	18%	20%	26%	26%	24%	21.9%
Food	19%	17%	17%	18%	19%	17%	17%	19%	17%	17%	19%	19%	17%	18.2%
Non-food	23%	21%	21%	20%	21%	20%	21%	23%	20%	21%	23%	22%	20%	22.4%
TOTAL	20%	18%	18%	19%	20%	18%	19%	21%	18%	19%	21%	20%	19%	19.9%

this rule does not apply, both over time and across subgroups in any year, to more luxury food items, such as meat & eggs and processed food. An interesting case is tobacco products, for which the highest 1980 budget share (more than 6%) is found among rural lower level and agricultural labourers' households and the lowest (less than 4%) among the urban elite. The share of smokers' requisites in national consumption rises from 4.5% to 5.3%.

The falling expenditure share of durable consumer goods in this period is largely due to a below-average price rise of these items. The proportion spent on transport declines among the agricultural households but increases rapidly in urban areas: in 1980, the former subgroups use less than 2% of their budget for this purpose and the latter more than 10%. Regarding housing, the 1980 expenditure shares are twice as high in all urban subgroups (10%) as in all rural subgroups (5%). Overall, the proportion set apart for medical needs rises very fast. Interestingly, the share of education expenditures declines a bit in most categories, but among rural and urban higher level households it becomes much higher. This may be related to an increasing tendency among the elites to send their children to private schools.

The bottom part of Table A.21 shows an interesting consequence of these shifts in expenditure patterns. Among the small and medium farmers, the consumption of imported products grows faster than that of domestically produced commodities, while the reverse applies to the other subgroups. Particularly among the urban elite, the consumption of Indonesian goods and services increases much more. In volume terms, a similar pattern was found; see Table A.III.8. Overall, only 6% of 1980 household consumption is imported. This proportion ranges from 5.0% for large farmers to 6.8% for rural higher level households.

Tables 48-50 provide another specific feature of the Indonesian SESAMEs: a partial linkage between the above monetary data and the real change in nutritional status by household subgroup.¹⁹ The 1975 calorie

19. Refer also to Sutomo [1989].

Table 48: Daily Calorie Intake per Capita by Commodity Item and Household Subgroup, 1980

Commodity (SAM row-codes)	Household Subgroup						Agricultural						Non-Agricultural						TOTAL
	Farmers			Labourers			Rural			Urban			Rural			Urban			
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large	Lower Economic Level	Economic Inactive	Higher Level	Lower Economic Level	Economic Inactive	Higher Level	Lower Economic Level	Economic Inactive	Higher Level				
Rice (1,8,23,30)	1181	1135	1150	1313	1317	1392	1348	1392	1348	1269	1305	1470	1248						
Corn (1,23)	190	271	350	281	131	179	163	179	163	17	19	16	188						
Cassava, etc (1,23)	261	330	374	389	221	195	241	195	241	74	70	61	255						
Beans (1,23)	39	34	53	80	52	59	58	59	58	73	83	93	55						
Bean Products (8,30)	16	13	11	10	16	16	16	16	16	31	32	33	17						
Vegetables, Fruits (1,23)	44	37	50	65	57	58	62	58	62	83	87	93	57						
Fish (5,27)	20	19	25	44	28	26	34	26	34	32	33	42	28						
Meat and Eggs (3,25)	14	12	16	30	19	16	21	16	21	33	51	54	22						
Oils and Fats (8,30)	63	60	62	80	74	73	75	73	75	99	103	105	74						
Coconuts, Brown Sugar (2,24)	155	177	194	225	156	174	174	174	174	100	107	105	163						
Sugar and Soft Drinks (8,30)	65	57	71	97	79	76	90	76	90	118	132	128	82						
Coffee, Tea, etc. (2,7,8,24,30)	10	10	11	15	11	11	11	11	11	9	10	10	11						
Wheat Flour, etc. (8,30)	38	43	53	97	61	55	66	55	66	55	59	58	56						
Other Processed Food (4,8,15,30,37)	163	142	139	171	268	228	265	228	265	336	226	406	218						
TOTAL	2262	2340	2560	2897	2490	2558	2625	2558	2625	2329	2320	2673	2474						

Table 49: Daily Calorie Intake per Capita by Commodity Item and Household Subgroup, 1975

Commodity (SAM row-codes)	Agricultural						Non-Agricultural						TOTAL
	Labourers		Farmers		Rural		Urban		Rural		Urban		
	Small	Medium	Large	Lower Level	Economic Inactive	Higher Level	Lower Level	Economic Inactive	Higher Level	Lower Level	Economic Inactive	Higher Level	
Rice (1,8,23,30)	971	1004	1171	1056	1181	1121	1041	1065	1083	1033			
Corn (1,23)	187	282	167	108	85	62	14	21	16	164			
Cassava, etc (1,23)	190	366	388	153	158	142	59	66	60	249			
Beans (1,23)	18	41	46	31	39	57	51	63	88	38			
Bean Products (8,30)	14	11	10	18	21	20	28	30	33	16			
Vegetables, Fruits (1,23)	35	48	59	48	58	60	67	68	91	51			
Fish (5,27)	13	17	24	17	22	26	23	23	33	19			
Meat and Eggs (3,25)	11	13	30	14	18	28	20	30	58	17			
Oils and Fats (8,30)	36	43	65	55	64	67	79	87	104	58			
Coconuts, Brown Sugar (2,24)	117	164	188	121	177	139	85	100	108	141			
Sugar and Soft Drinks (8,30)	40	53	83	55	60	75	77	79	97	60			
Coffee, Tea, etc. (2,7,8,24,30)	6	7	10	6	7	8	6	7	8	7			
Wheat Flour, etc. (8,30)	31	20	31	16	13	18	12	11	18	22			
Other Processed Food (4,8,15,30,37)	88	73	75	159	113	156	293	197	320	131			
TOTAL	1757	1996	2148	1856	2017	1979	1855	1845	2118	2006			

Table 50: Average Annual Growth of Daily Calorie Intake per Capita by Commodity Item and Household Subgroup, 1975-80 (%)

Commodity (SAM row-codes)	Household Subgroup			Agricultural						Non-Agricultural						TOTAL
				Farmers			Rural			Urban						
	Labourers	Small	Medium	Large	Lower	Economic	Higher	Level	Inactive	Level	Economic	Higher	Level	Inactive	Level	
Rice (1,8,23,30)	16.9%	4.5%	2.7%	2.3%	4.4%	3.3%	3.7%	4.0%	4.1%	4.0%	3.7%	4.0%	4.1%	6.1%	3.8%	
Corn (1,23)	0.3%	-0.7%	4.3%	10.4%	3.9%	14.8%	19.5%	3.9%	-1.1%	3.9%	19.5%	3.9%	-1.1%	-0.2%	2.8%	
Cassava, etc (1,23)	6.4%	-2.9%	0.5%	0.0%	7.3%	4.2%	10.5%	4.6%	1.2%	4.6%	10.5%	4.6%	1.2%	0.1%	0.4%	
Beans (1,23)	15.7%	9.4%	5.0%	11.2%	10.4%	8.3%	0.2%	7.3%	5.7%	7.3%	0.2%	7.3%	5.7%	1.1%	7.2%	
Bean Products (6,30)	2.7%	2.9%	-0.3%	0.7%	-1.6%	-5.7%	-4.1%	1.5%	1.2%	1.5%	-4.1%	1.5%	1.2%	-0.2%	1.1%	
Vegetables, Fruits (1,23)	5.0%	1.7%	0.5%	1.8%	3.6%	0.1%	0.9%	4.5%	5.1%	4.5%	0.9%	4.5%	5.1%	0.4%	2.3%	
Fish (5,27)	9.5%	7.6%	7.3%	11.8%	10.4%	3.1%	5.2%	7.0%	7.8%	7.0%	5.2%	7.0%	7.8%	5.1%	8.1%	
Meat and Eggs (3,25)	5.6%	-1.2%	-3.3%	-0.0%	6.2%	-2.7%	-5.4%	10.1%	10.7%	10.1%	-5.4%	10.1%	10.7%	-1.7%	4.7%	
Oils and Fats (8,30)	11.0%	6.7%	5.4%	4.3%	5.9%	2.6%	2.2%	4.4%	3.5%	4.4%	2.2%	4.4%	3.5%	0.2%	5.0%	
Coconuts, Brown Sugar (2,24)	5.6%	2.5%	3.3%	3.6%	5.1%	-0.3%	4.5%	3.3%	1.4%	3.3%	4.5%	3.3%	1.4%	-0.5%	2.9%	
Sugar and Soft Drinks (8,30)	9.8%	8.6%	6.0%	3.3%	7.2%	4.6%	3.6%	8.7%	10.2%	8.7%	3.6%	8.7%	10.2%	5.4%	6.3%	
Coffee, Tea, etc. (2,7,8,24,30)	9.7%	8.8%	10.5%	7.5%	9.8%	8.8%	6.8%	7.5%	6.3%	7.5%	6.8%	7.5%	6.3%	4.1%	7.5%	
Wheat Flour, etc. (6,30)	3.7%	16.1%	19.4%	22.6%	27.2%	28.2%	25.9%	29.9%	33.4%	29.9%	25.9%	29.9%	33.4%	23.5%	18.8%	
Other Processed Food (4,8,15,30,37)	12.4%	13.4%	14.6%	16.5%	10.5%	14.0%	10.6%	2.7%	2.8%	2.7%	10.6%	2.7%	2.8%	4.7%	10.1%	
TOTAL	5.0%	3.2%	3.5%	4.2%	5.9%	4.7%	5.7%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	5.7%	4.6%	4.6%	4.7%	4.2%	

figures are based on detailed quantity data in the Household Expenditure Surveys, which have been adjusted to achieve consistency with the above consumption values [Downey, 1984: Chapter 7]. This procedure implies that the price of each item may vary across subgroups. The classification of food items in these tables is slightly more detailed than in the previous ones. A connection with the SAM proper is made through the row codes.

The alimentation of the Indonesian population at large improves considerably between 1975 and 1980; from 2006 to 2474 calories per capita per day. This means that it passed the absolute poverty line (2130); see also foot note 11 above. The growth rate does not vary much by subgroup, with a downward exception for farmers, who topped the list in 1975. Indeed, the subgroup pattern of calorie intake significantly deviates from that of the other welfare attributes considered in this study; refer also to Downey [1988]. The large farmers are the biggest eaters, while the small farmers rank above the urban lower level and economically inactive households. This sequence is quite different from that for food expenditure.

This finding raises the question how many calories one gets for a Rupiah. As expected, this varies enormously by food item. In 1980 it ranges from 26 cal/Rp. for corn, 21 for tubers, 17 for coconuts & sugar & soft drinks and 14 for rice to less than 2 cal/Rp. for vegetables & fruits, fish, coffee & tea & spices and meat & eggs. The separately estimated consumption volumes and values by subgroup reveal that the urban subgroups typically eat more expensive varieties of the same product. For instance, for fish the calorie/Rupiah ratio ranges from 1.6 with the agricultural labourers to 1.0 with the urban elite. For tubers, the subgroup extremes are 23.5 cal/Rp. and 9.0 cal/Rp., and for rice these are 14.9 cal/Rp. and 13.4 cal/Rp. This reflects differences in quality, in the distance to the producers and in the mode of acquisition (own-produced, bought, wages in kind, and so on).

Yet, the most important factor in the average calorie/Rupiah ratio by

subgroup is the diet composition. Surprisingly, the proportion of total calorie intake derived from rice is the highest in the three urban subgroups: roughly 55% in 1980. Among the farmers this figure is below 50%. This discrepancy is more than compensated by the calories obtained from corn, tubers and, to a less extent, sugar & coconuts. As a consequence, the proportions obtained from almost all other food items are also the highest in urban areas.

All in all, the poorest subgroup obtains almost twice as many calories from a Rupiah as the richest (10.1 versus 5.8 in 1980). As a consequence, calorie intake is much less unequally distributed than consumption expenditure. Because of the inflation, the average calorie/Rupiah ratio in 1980 is half the 1975 quotient: 8.9 versus 17.9. The decline in this ratio is the slowest among the rural and urban elites.

The ranking of items according to calorie intake growth is not the same as that according to consumption value growth; for instance, expenditure on meat and eggs increases much more than that on fish, while the reverse applies to the calorie intake from these items. Naturally, this is related to a diverging price trend; see Keuning [1994b]. For the rest, processed food shows the largest increase and tubers, such as cassava, the smallest, both in value and in terms of calorie intake.

4. Analysis and Conclusions

Just like conventional national accounts, **SESAME provides both core macro-indicators and an underlying information system**. In this way, it simultaneously serves two categories of users: first, the general public, the media and the policy-makers, who want to know the main trends at a glance, and secondly, the investors, scientists and policy-advisers, who want to disentangle causes and consequences, make forecasts and do policy simulations. In turn, the second group must also convey their message in a summary form. Hence, it is important to note that SESAME-accounts and SESAME-based models yield values of identically defined core macro-indicators.

SESAME serves to meet the criticism that conventional national accounts, despite their wealth of information, take a too limited view at social, environmental and economic development. For that reason, SESAME details the monetary accounts, particularly those for labour income, and, more importantly, couples non-monetary information. In doing this, an integral system approach is maintained. This means that inter-relationships between monetary and non-monetary data are incorporated at a meso-level, including an additional plausibility check on the results. It also means that non-monetary macro-indicators are based on meso-data that are consistent with the rest of the system. To put it simply, **SESAME is meant as a synthesis of national accounts and the social indicators approach**, including UNDP's Human Development Index.

Keuning [1994a] has already spelled out the potential advantages of a SESAME and has juxtaposed it with alternative solutions to the same problem. This paper dealt with the selection of summary indicators and with an application to the case of Indonesia. Although section 2.1 provides some arguments that can assist in the selection of summary indicators, it is our conviction that the final list essentially represents a political choice. In that respect, Table 1 mainly serves an illustrative purpose. At the same time, this table has demonstrated the

feasibility of capturing much of the essence of social and economic development in less than twenty figures. More importantly, all indicators are connected through the underlying accounting system. This enables a further analysis of the factors behind the main trends.

For instance, Tables 51 and 52 decompose real income changes by household subgroup into a number of components. The former table deals with real labour income growth, according to the following formula:

$$\dot{\left(\frac{U_h}{J_h}\right)} = \dot{\left(\frac{H_h}{H_h}\right)} + \dot{\left(\frac{A_h}{H_h}\right)} + \dot{\left(\frac{L_h}{A_h}\right)} + \dot{\left(\frac{U_h/L_h}{W_h}\right)} + \dot{\left(\frac{W_h}{J_h}\right)} \quad h=1, \dots, 10, \quad (1)$$

where U = total (imputed) labour income,

J = (subgroup-specific) consumer price index (CPI),

H = number of households,

A = potential labour force,

L = employment,

W = average wage rate (labour input compensation deflator),

the subscript h indicates the household subgroup concerned, and the dot points to the logarithmic rate of change of the term in parentheses.

Because of the logarithms, column (6) of Table 51 is exactly equal to the sum of columns (1) through (5). The content of the first three columns should be clear from equation (1). Column (4) shows the effect on household income from the shift of its labour force participants to better (or worse) paying jobs; for, the denominator of the fourth term in equation (1) gives the change in labour income per full-time worker equivalent if all labour force participants in 1975 had kept the same job and newcomers had been employed in the usual jobs for the subgroup concerned. Column (5) shows the effect of changes in the terms-of-trade of labour supply versus commodity demand by household subgroups. For a correct comparison, the effect of moving to another job has now been excluded. Subgroup variations in column (5) are thus due to differences in wage rate developments by occupation and by industry and to differences in the subgroup-specific CPI.

Table 51: A Decomposition of Changes in REAL LABOUR INCOME by Household Subsector in Indonesia, 1975-1980

Rates of change	Potential labour force				Terms-of-trade				Real labour income				Deviation from national average growth rate			
	Number of Households (1)	per household (2)	participation rate (3)	upgrading effect (4)	trade (5)	income (6)	1-5 (6)	Number of Households (7)	Potential per household (8)	upgrading effect (9)	Labour Terms-of-trade (10)	Real labour income (11)	Deviation from national average growth rate (12)			
Household Subsector	0.2%	0.7%	0.8%	1.1%	2.2%	4.9%	-1.8%	-0.1%	-0.5%	-0.6%	-0.7%	-3.8%				
Agricultural Employees	5.0%	1.7%	-0.6%	-0.6%	0.6%	6.1%	3.0%	0.8%	-1.9%	-2.3%	-2.3%	-2.6%				
Small Farmers	-5.8%	2.7%	-0.2%	-0.3%	1.8%	-1.7%	-7.8%	1.9%	-1.5%	-1.9%	-1.1%	-10.5%				
Medium Farmers	-3.3%	2.5%	-0.7%	-0.1%	1.9%	0.3%	-5.4%	1.7%	-2.0%	-1.8%	-1.0%	-8.5%				
Large Farmers	3.3%	0.1%	3.6%	-0.4%	3.6%	10.2%	1.2%	-0.8%	2.3%	-2.0%	0.7%	1.5%				
Rural Lower Level	4.8%	-1.9%	-2.8%	-5.6%	0.7%	-4.8%	2.8%	-2.8%	-4.1%	-7.3%	-2.2%	-13.6%				
Rural Economically Inactive	1.1%	-0.7%	1.4%	6.0%	4.3%	12.1%	-1.0%	-1.5%	0.1%	4.3%	1.4%	3.3%				
Rural Higher Level	4.4%	0.9%	4.1%	-0.1%	3.8%	13.3%	2.4%	0.1%	2.8%	-1.8%	0.9%	4.5%				
Urban Lower Level	10.1%	-3.5%	-2.7%	-5.9%	1.5%	-0.5%	8.0%	-4.4%	-4.0%	-7.6%	-1.4%	-9.3%				
Urban Economically Inactive	4.7%	0.1%	3.0%	1.9%	2.9%	12.7%	2.7%	-0.7%	1.7%	0.2%	-0.0%	3.9%				
Urban Higher Level																
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	2.1%	0.8%	1.3%	1.7%	2.9%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				

Table 52: A Decomposition of Changes in NET ADJUSTED REAL DISPOSABLE INCOME per household by Household Subsector in Indonesia, 1975-1980

Per household figures	AVERAGE '75-'80 WEIGHTS				GROWTH RATES				Deviation from national average growth rate			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Household Subsector	0.77	0.22	0.01	4.7%	11.4%	26.2%	6.5%	-1.2%	2.0%	1.3%	-2.3%	-0.2%
Agricultural Employees	0.61	0.38	0.01	1.1%	10.1%	24.6%	4.8%	-3.3%	1.6%	1.2%	-1.2%	-1.8%
Small Farmers	0.48	0.52	-0.00	4.1%	7.3%	-19.5%	5.9%	-1.5%	0.6%	-2.5%	2.7%	-0.7%
Medium Farmers	0.33	0.70	-0.03	3.6%	5.2%	-8.4%	5.1%	-1.8%	-0.1%	-1.6%	1.9%	-1.5%
Large Farmers	0.77	0.22	0.00	7.0%	4.9%	0.0%	6.7%	0.1%	-0.2%	-0.9%	0.8%	0.1%
Rural Lower Level	0.04	0.32	0.64	-9.6%	14.8%	-4.6%	1.3%	-9.5%	3.1%	-1.3%	2.4%	-5.3%
Rural Economically Inactive	0.75	0.13	0.12	11.0%	13.8%	9.4%	11.2%	2.5%	2.8%	-0.1%	-0.6%	4.6%
Rural Higher Level	0.68	0.35	-0.03	8.8%	2.1%	-8.1%	6.9%	1.2%	-1.1%	-1.5%	1.8%	0.3%
Urban Lower Level	0.02	0.24	0.74	-10.6%	17.3%	-2.5%	2.0%	-10.0%	4.0%	-1.1%	2.7%	-4.6%
Urban Economically Inactive	0.56	0.17	0.27	7.9%	4.3%	9.1%	7.6%	0.7%	-0.4%	-0.1%	0.8%	1.0%
Urban Higher Level												
ALL HOUSEHOLDS	0.58	0.34	0.08	6.7%	5.5%	10.5%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

*) The formula in column (7) does not always apply exactly; similarly, column (12) is roughly equal to the sum of the previous four columns.

The five determinants in this table can be grouped into two categories: a) demographic factors, that is, the first two columns, and b) economic factors, that is, the next three columns. Only the last factor is a relative price effect, while the first four are volume effects, assuming that moving to another job reflects a different quality of the labour input. The sum of the first four components equals the labour input volume growth, or the weighted employment growth.

At the national level, real labour income increases at an annual rate of 8.8%. The economic factors clearly dominate: they account for 5.9%-points and the demographic factors for 2.9%-points. Again, the paramount influence of the terms-of-trade improvement appears, by itself contributing 2.9 percentage points. On top of this, a large part of the volume effect has also been induced by the terms-of-trade gain, as its domestic spending by oil corporations and the government boosted employment. All in all, **the oil price hike has substantially contributed to real labour income growth.** In Keuning [1994b], it has been estimated that about 35% of the direct terms-of-trade gain has accrued to labour, and 65% to (non-produced) capital. From a purely national welfare point of view, there is nothing like a terms-of-trade gain or productivity improvement. For, all other changes require an increased input of resources. Productivity growth is sluggish in this period, so that the real gain comes from the terms-of-trade effect.

The annual growth rate of real labour income varies enormously by subgroup: from -4.8% for the rural economically inactive to +13.3% for the urban lower level households. All factors distinguished in Table 51 play a role in this divergence; see the last six columns of this table. For instance, the below-average pay rise in the agricultural subgroups is largely caused by a decline in the number of households, except for the small farmers. In that category, a relatively meager wage rate growth and a push to lower paying jobs are the dominant factors. The latter effect can be related to the large number of new entrants on the labour market from this subgroup; among the small farmers the potential labour force growth is more than twice the national average.

The same applies to the urban economically inactive subgroup. Anyway, in both economically inactive subgroups labour income is only a minor source of living; see column (1) of Table 52.

The real labour income growth in the two lower level non-agricultural subgroups is connected to a large increase in the number of hours worked, leading to a very high labour force participation rate in 1980 (cf. section 3.1 above). Besides, the terms-of-trade change of their labour is relatively favourable. With the urban elite, the volume effect (more households, more hours worked per adult) dominates. Finally, in the rural higher level subgroup, a remarkable shift to higher paying jobs plays an important role. The bottom part of Tables A.13-15 shows that in this subgroup the share of generated income earned by clerical, sales and services own-account workers declines from 15% to 7%, while the share earned by professional, technical and managerial employees increases from 41% to 48%.

Finally, Table 52 combines this labour income with the two other components of changes in real tertiary income per household: 1) net non-produced capital income and 2) the balance of property income and transfers received minus paid, including social transfers in kind from the government. In the average Indonesian household, labour income accounts for 58%, capital income for 34% and the balance of property income and transfers received minus paid for 8%. The last category grows very fast, though, at a yearly rate of +10.5% per household, in real terms! Both other sources are also thriving: real labour income +6.7% (equal to column (6) minus column (1) in the previous table) and real capital income directly accruing to households +5.5%.²⁰

The spread of growth rates by subgroup is smaller for total tertiary income than for just labour income. The inter-subsectoral variation in growth rates of both other income components thus exerts a countervailing influence. Nevertheless, the growth rates of real tertiary income per

20. Real labour and non-produced capital income growth are here defined including productivity and terms-of-trade gains; refer also to Keuning [1994b].

household are still far from equal and the ranking of subgroups is about the same for total tertiary income growth as for labour income growth; the most significant difference is that qua total income growth the rural and urban elites top the list.

In the last five columns of this table, the deviation of each subgroup's income growth from the national average is ascribed to a deviating growth rate of every component and to the effect of a different weights structure. These four factors are shown in the terms in square brackets below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [(\overline{US}) (\dot{\tilde{U}}_h - \dot{\tilde{U}})] + [(\overline{NS}) (\dot{\tilde{N}}_h - \dot{\tilde{N}})] + [(\overline{TS}) (\dot{\tilde{T}}_h - \dot{\tilde{T}})] + \\
 & + [(\dot{\tilde{U}}_h) (\overline{US}_h - \overline{US})] + (\dot{\tilde{N}}_h) (\overline{NS}_h - \overline{NS}) + (\dot{\tilde{T}}_h) (\overline{TS}_h - \overline{TS})] \approx [\dot{\tilde{D}}_h - \dot{\tilde{D}}], \quad h=1, \dots, 10 \quad (2)
 \end{aligned}$$

with U = total (imputed) labour income,
 N = net non-produced capital income,
 T = balance of property income and transfers received minus paid,
 D = net adjusted disposable income,
 US = share of labour income in disposable income,
 NS = share of capital income in disposable income, and
 TS = share of the balance of property income and transfers
 received minus paid in disposable income ($US + NS + TS \equiv 1$),
 whereby a tilde plus a dot above a variable point to the real rate of
 change per household (e.g. $\dot{\tilde{U}}_h \equiv (U_h/H_h J_h)$), a dash above a variable
 points to the average 1975 and 1980 value and a dot below a variable
 refers to the national total.

In the agricultural labourers' subgroup, both capital income and the property income plus transfers balance rise quite fast, yet their real tertiary income growth is slightly below average. This is due to a below-average labour income growth (see column 8) and particularly to their very low weights of the two other categories (see columns 2, 3 and 11). The same factors play a role in determining real income growth of

the small farmers, albeit that the below-average labour income growth (as decomposed in the previous table) is the most important factor for them. A fortiori, this applies to the economically inactive. However, labour income accounts for only a small share of total receipts in these subgroups, and indeed the 'weights effect' partly compensates for their labour income growth lagging behind. Besides, they rank first qua capital income growth. The above-average income growth of the rural elites is mainly caused by their non-produced capital income growth, particularly that from agricultural activities (cf. Tables A.13-15). Finally, the urban elites fared very well thanks to the weights effect (high income share in fastest growing third category) and a relatively favourable labour income growth (mainly more employment as reflected in an above-average rise of the labour force participation rate; cf. Table 51).

As usual, an analysis like this raises new questions. A great deal of these questions can be answered with the SESAMEs. For example, following up the high labour income growth among the urban elites, their employment is growing so fast largely because they are the main suppliers of urban professionals, technicians, managers and supervisors, for which the demand increases quickly; cf. Tables A.III.6, A.13-15 and 23. The increasing job opportunities for urban high-skilled labour are principally induced by the expansion of government services; see Tables 21-23. In turn, that expansion is possible thanks to the swelling oil corporations tax receipts, which brings us back to **the main economic event of this era in Indonesia: the oil boom**. This boom created circumstances which were particularly favourable to the urban elite, that is, first a dramatic rise of profits, of which a large share accrues to this subgroup, and secondly, a big sweep in the demand for high-skilled urban labour, mainly supplied by this subgroup. In this way, **a comparison of two successive SESAMEs reveals the interdependence between the pattern of economic growth and distributional changes.**

List of References

- Al, P.G., B.M. Balk, S. de Boer and G.P. den Bakker, 1985, *The Use of Chain Indices for Deflating the National Accounts*. National Accounts Occasional Paper Series No. NA-04 (Voorburg, Statistics Netherlands).
- Anderson, V., 1991, *Alternative Economic Indicators*. (London, Routledge).
- Berry, A., 1985, "On Trends in the Gap between Rich and Poor in Less Developed Countries: Why We Know so Little", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 31, No. 4, pp. 337-354.
- Biro Pusat Statistik (Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics), 1982a, *A Brief Note on the 1980 Population Census*. Publication number A.P.LY.0661.8201 (Biro Pusat Statistik, Jakarta).
- Biro Pusat Statistik (Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics), 1982b, *Social Accounting Matrix Indonesia 1975. Volumes I and II*. Publication numbers 04420.8401/.8402 (Biro Pusat Statistik, Jakarta).
- Biro Pusat Statistik (Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics), 1986, *Social Accounting Matrix Indonesia 1980. Volumes I and II*. Publication numbers 04420.8602/.8603 (Biro Pusat Statistik, Jakarta).
- Bos, F., 1992, "Reasons for Preferring Net to Gross Figures of Income (and Product and Vice Versa)", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 38, Number 3, pp. 267-281.
- Chapron, J.-E., 1992, *The Standard of Living, the Satisfaction of Needs and Welfare: The Real Role and the Preferred Role of National Accounts*. Paper presented at the 22nd General Conference of the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth, Flims.
- Conniffe, D., 1992, "The Non-Constancy of Equivalence Scales", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 38, Number 4, pp. 429-443.
- Coulter, F.A.E., F.A. Cowell and S.P. Jenkins, 1992, "Equivalence Scale Relativities and the Extent of Inequality and Poverty", *Economic Journal*, Volume 102, September, pp. 1067-1082.
- De Haan, M., 1992, *Het Gebruik van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen in Indonesië* [The Use of Natural Resources in Indonesia]. M.A. Thesis (Erasmus University, Rotterdam).
- De Haan, M., S.J. Keuning and P.R. Bosch, 1993, *Integrating Indicators in a National Accounting Matrix including Environmental Accounts (NAMEA)*. National Accounts Occasional Paper Series No. NA-060 (Voorburg, Statistics Netherlands).
- Den Bakker, G.P., J. De Gijt and S.J. Keuning, 1994, "A Historical Social Accounting Matrix for the Netherlands (1938)", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 40, Number 2.
- Desai, M., 1991, "Human Development; concepts and measurement", *European Economic Review*. Volume 35, pp. 350-357.
- Downey, R.A., 1984, *Indonesian Inequality: Integrated National Accounting of Who Gets What*. Ph.D. Dissertation (Cornell University, Ithaca, U.S.A.).
- Downey, R.A., 1988, "Indonesian Food Inequality", *Sophia Economic Review*, Volume XXXIII, Number 2, pp. 103-119.
- Dunavölgyi, M. and G. Sándor, 1992, *Welfare Measurement within non-market circumstances; with special regard to Eastern Europe*. Paper presented at the 22nd General Conference of the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth, Flims.

- Foster, J., J. Greer and E. Thorbecke, 1984, "A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures", *Econometrica*, Volume 52, Number 3, pp. 761-766.
- Gittleman, M. and E.N. Wolff, 1993, "International Comparison of Inter-Industry Wage Differentials", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 39, Number 3, pp. 295-312.
- Hicks, N. and P. Streeten, 1979, "Indicators of Development: The Search for a Basic Needs Yardstick", *World Development*, Volume 7, Number 6, pp. 567-580.
- Jones, G.W. and H.V. Richter (eds.), 1981, *Population Mobility and Development*. Australian National University Development Studies Centre Monograph No. 27 (Australian National University, Canberra).
- Kazemier, B. and J. Exel, 1992, *The Allocation of Time in the Netherlands in the Context of the SNA: a Module*. National Accounts Occasional Paper Series, No. NA-052 (Statistics Netherlands, Voorburg).
- Keuning, S.J., 1991, "Allocation and Composition of Fixed Capital Stock in Indonesia: An Indirect Estimate Using Incremental Capital Value Added Ratios", *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, Volume 27, Number 2, pp. 91-119.
- Keuning, S.J., 1993a, "An Information System for Environmental Indicators in Relation to the National Accounts", in: W.F.M. de Vries, G.P. den Bakker, M.B.G. Gircour, S.J. Keuning and A. Lenson (eds.), *The Value Added of National Accounting*. (Statistics Netherlands, Voorburg).
- Keuning, S.J., 1993b, *Productivity Changes and Shifts in the Income Distribution; with an application to the case of Indonesia*. Paper presented at the Tenth International Conference on Input-Output Techniques, Sevilla, Spain, March/April.
- Keuning, S.J., 1994a, "The SAM and Beyond: Open, SESAME!". *Economic Systems Research*, Volume 6, Number 1.
- Keuning, S.J., 1994b, *Integrates Estimates of Productivity and Terms-of-Trade Changes from a Social Accounting Matrix at Constant Prices*, paper to be presented at the Twenty-third General IARIW-Conference, St. Andrew's, Canada, August.
- Khan, H., 1991, "Measurement and Determinants of Socioeconomic Development: a Critical Conspectus", *Social Indicators Research*, Volume 24, Number 2, pp. 153-175.
- Lind, N.C., 1992, "Some Thoughts on the Human Development Index", *Social Indicators Research*, Volume 27, Number 1, pp. 89-103.
- Morley, S.A., 1981, "The Effect of Changes in the Population on Several Measures of Income Distribution", *American Economic Review*, Volume 71, Number 3, pp. 285-294.
- Ravaillon, M., G. Datt and D. Van de Walle, 1991, "Quantifying Absolute Poverty in the Developing World", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 37, Number 4, pp. 345-361.
- Reich, U.P., 1993, "Applying the Notions of Capital and Income to Natural Depletable Resources in Economic Accounts", in: A. Franz and C. Stahmer (eds.), *Approaches to Environmental Accounting*. (Physica Verlag, Heidelberg).
- Ringen, S., 1991, "Households, Standard of Living, and Inequality", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 37, Number 1, pp. 1-13.
- Slottje, D.J., 1991, "Measuring the Quality of Life across Countries", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Volume 73, Number 4, pp. 684-693.

- Stoikov, V., 1975, "How Misleading are Income Distributions?", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 21, Number 2, pp. 239-250.
- Sutomo, S., 1989, "Income, Food Consumption and Estimation of Energy and Protein Intake of Households: a Study based on the 1975 and 1980 Indonesian Social Accounting Matrices", *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, Volume 25, Number 3, pp. 57-72.
- Thorbecke, E. and associates, 1992, *Adjustment and Equity in Indonesia*. (OECD Development Centre, Paris).
- United Nations, 1993, *Revised System of National Accounts*. Studies in Methods, Series F, No. 2, Rev. 4. (United Nations, New York).
- United Nations Development Programme, 1990, *Human Development Report*. (Oxford University Press, Oxford).
- Van Bochove, C.A. and H.K. Van Tuinen, 1986, "Flexibility in the Next SNA: the Case for an Institutional Core", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 32, Number 2, pp. 127-154.
- Van der Laan, P., 1993, "Social Key Data: Monitoring Living Conditions of the Population", *Netherlands Official Statistics*, Volume 8, Number 1, pp. 5-28.
- Van Veen, W., 1993, *Structuring Detailed Quantitative Information for Economy-wide Analysis; an application to Indonesia*. Research Memorandum 93-03 (Centre for World Food Studies, Amsterdam).
- Wolfe, B.L., J.R. Behrman and D.M. Blau, 1982, "The Impact of Demographic Changes on Income Distribution in a Developing Country", *Journal of Development Economics*, Volume 11, Number 3, pp. 355-377.
- World Bank, 1993, *World Development Report*. (World Bank, Washington D.C.).

TABLE A.0: An overview of the Appendix A.V tables in which the 1980 and 1975 detailed (131*128) SAMs and the growth rates are presented, block by block

ACCOUNT (Classification)	codes	Goods and Services (Product Groups)	Production (Industries)	Generation of Income (Primary Input Categories)	Distribution and Use of Income (Institutional Sectors)	Capital (Institutional Sectors)	Fixed Capital Formation (Industries)	Rest of the World Current	Rest of the World Capital	TOTAL
Aggregated SAM		1-44	45-66	67-90	91-102	103-104	105-126	127	128	
Detailed SAM										
Goods and Services (Product Groups)	1	Trade and Transport Margins A.4-6	Intermediate Consumption A.7-9		Final Consumption Expenditure A.19-21	Changes in Inventories A.19-21	Gross Fixed Capital Formation A.28-30	Exports A.1-3		A.1-3
Production (Industries)	2	Output A.4-6								A.4-6
Generation of Income (Primary Input Categories)	3		GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT A.10-12					Compensation of Employees from ROW A.13-15		
Distribution and Use of Income (Institutional Sectors)	4 93 5 .. 6 104	Taxes on Production - Subsidies A.4-6		GROSS GENERATED INCOME A.13-15	Property Income, Current Taxes and Transfers A.16-18			Property Income & Current Trans- fers from ROW A.16-18		A.10-12
Capital (Institutional Sectors)	7 105 .. 106				GROSS SAVING A.22-24	Capital Transfers A.25-27		Capital Trans- fers from ROW A.25-27		A.16-18
Fixed Capital Formation (Industries)	8 107 .. 128					Gross Fixed Ca- pital Formation A.25-27				A.25-27
Financial Balance	9 129					NET LENDING of the Nation A.25-27			NET LENDING of ROW A.25-27	A.25-27
Rest of the World Current	10 130	Imports A.4-6		Compensation of Employees to ROW A.13-15	Property Income, & Current Trans- fers to ROW A.22-24					A.25-27
Rest of the World Capital	11 131					Capital Trans- fers to ROW A.25-27		CURRENT EXTER- NAL BALANCE A.25-27		A.25-27
TOTAL		A.4-6	A.10-12	A.13-15	A.22-24	A.25-27	A.28-30	A.25-27	A.25-27	A.25-27

TABLE A.2: Total Demand for goods and services in Indonesia, 1975, based on a detailed (131*128) SAM (billions of Rupiah)

EXPENDITURES		Distribution of Total Demand over Categories										TOTAL		
		Inter- mediate Consump- tion	Final Consump- tion	Changes in	Gross Fixed Capital Formation	Exports	Inter- mediate Consump- tion	Final Consump- tion	Changes in	Gross Fixed Capital Formation	Exports			
RECEIPTS	SAM Codes	45-56	91-102	103-104	105-126	8A-8E	10	45-56	91-102	103-104	105-126	127	Column: TOTAL	Column: TOTAL
-->		1737	1954	6	0	0	15	46.8%	52.6%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	3712	100.0%
D	Food Crops	1	1737	1954	6	0	15	46.8%	52.6%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	3712	100.0%
D	Other Crops	2	442	102	-6	0	286	53.6%	12.3%	-0.7%	0.0%	34.8%	824	100.0%
O	Livestock Products	3	192	323	-7	0	7	37.3%	62.8%	-1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	515	100.0%
M	Forestry Products	4	286	53	0	0	211	52.0%	9.6%	0.0%	0.0%	38.3%	550	100.0%
E	Fish	5	129	383	0	0	36	23.6%	69.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	549	100.0%
S	Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	1Ca	242	0	53	0	2179	9.8%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	88.1%	2474	100.0%
T	Quarrying Products	1Cb	168	22	0	0	190	88.4%	11.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	190	100.0%
I	Processed Food	1Ad	404	2354	10	0	52	14.3%	83.5%	0.3%	0.0%	1.9%	2820	100.0%
C	WoodProd.&Construct.	9	316	30	0	1790	1	14.8%	1.4%	0.0%	83.8%	0.0%	2137	100.0%
C	Textiles	10	266	378	28	0	2	39.6%	56.2%	3.9%	0.0%	0.3%	672	100.0%
C	Paper&Metal Products	10	435	367	4	332	20	37.5%	31.7%	0.4%	28.7%	1.7%	1159	100.0%
O	Chemical&BasicMinerals	1Cf	591	211	17	0	233	56.2%	20.0%	0.6%	0.0%	22.2%	1052	100.0%
M	Electric.,Gas&Water	1Cg	126	69	0	0	0	64.7%	35.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	195	100.0%
M	Trade & Transp. Serv.	1Da	23	0	0	0	57	28.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	71.5%	80	100.0%
O	Restaurant Services	1Db	120	396	0	0	21	22.3%	73.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	537	100.0%
D	Lodging	1Dc	29	7	0	0	12	59.7%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	48	100.0%
I	Land Transport	1Dd	123	250	0	0	17	391	31.6%	64.1%	0.0%	4.4%	391	100.0%
T	OtherTransport&Comm.	1De	92	59	0	0	89	38.2%	24.6%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	240	100.0%
I	Banking & Insurance	1Ea	269	20	0	0	0	93.1%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	289	100.0%
E	RealEstate&Buss. Serv.	1Eb	109	449	0	0	0	19.5%	80.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	558	100.0%
S	Gov.mt.Soc&Recr. Serv.	1Ec	44	1671	0	0	8	2.5%	97.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1723	100.0%
-	Person.&Househ. Serv.	1Df	210	284	0	0	0	42.5%	57.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	494	100.0%
I	Food Crops	1Fa	25	25	0	0	0	49.3%	50.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50	100.0%
O	Other Crops	1Ga	106	2	1	0	0	97.4%	1.9%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	109	100.0%
M	Livestock Products	1Fb	25	4	1	0	0	63.1%	17.0%	19.9%	0.0%	0.0%	7	100.0%
P	Forestry Products	1Gb	1	0	0	0	0	89.4%	11.8%	-1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1	100.0%
O	Fish	1Fc	0	0	0	0	0	31.2%	81.2%	-12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0	100.0%
R	Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	1Ha	5	0	0	0	0	99.6%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	5	100.0%
T	Quarrying Products	1Hb	13	6	0	0	0	68.7%	30.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19	100.0%
E	Processed Food	1Fd	30	29	153	0	0	16.1%	83.8%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	182	100.0%
D	WoodProd.&Construct.	1Hc	3	1	0	0	0	62.9%	30.2%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5	100.0%
C	Textiles	1Hd	91	23	7	0	0	75.5%	18.6%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	121	100.0%
C	Paper&Metal Products	1He	623	164	7	1107	0	32.8%	8.6%	0.3%	58.2%	0.0%	1901	100.0%
O	Chemical&BasicMinerals	1Hf	863	102	59	0	0	84.2%	10.0%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1025	100.0%
M	Electric.,Gas&Water	1Hg	0	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	--	--	0	--
M	Trade & Transp. Serv.	1Ia	17	0	0	0	0	100.1%	0.0%	-0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	17	100.0%
O	Restaurant Services	1Ib	14	8	0	0	0	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22	100.0%
D	Lodging	1Ic	11	6	0	0	0	63.9%	36.2%	-0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	17	100.0%
I	Land Transport	1Id	4	15	0	0	0	20.5%	79.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19	100.0%
T	OtherTransport&Comm.	1Ie	40	25	0	0	0	56.1%	43.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	58	100.0%
I	Banking & Insurance	1Ja	2	0	0	0	0	88.5%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2	100.0%
E	RealEstate&Buss. Serv.	1Jb	46	0	0	0	0	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46	100.0%
S	Gov.mt.Soc&Recr. Serv.	1Jc	46	7	0	0	0	86.6%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	53	100.0%
-	Person.&Househ. Serv.	1If	37	17	0	0	7	60.3%	28.2%	0.0%	0.0%	11.4%	62	100.0%
Total Domestic		1A-1E	6352	9383	104	2122	3246	30.0%	44.2%	0.5%	10.0%	15.3%	21208	100.0%
Total Imported		1F-1J	1974	557	76	1107	7	53.1%	15.0%	2.0%	29.8%	0.2%	3721	100.0%
TOTAL		row:1	8326	9939	180	3229	3253	33.4%	39.9%	0.7%	13.0%	13.0%	24928	100.0%

TABLE A.3: Average annual growth rates of total DEMAND for goods and services in Indonesia, 1975, based on detailed SAMs

EXPENDITURES		Shift in the Distribution of Total Demand				TOTAL	
RECEIPTS	SAM Codes	Inter-mediate Consumption	Final Consumption Expend.	Changes in Inventories	Gross Fixed Capital Formation	Exports	TOTAL
-->		2A-2E 45-66	4-6A-F+H 91-102	7A-7B 103-104	8A-8E 105-128	103-104 127	Column: TOTAL
D	Food Crops	17%	17%	59%	--	18%	17%
D	Other Crops	27%	22%	--	--	31%	29%
O	Livestock Products	33%	25%	--	--	15%	29%
M	Forestry Products	25%	31%	--	--	32%	29%
E	Fish	13%	22%	--	--	26%	20%
S	Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	36%	--	56%	--	33%	34%
T	Quarrying Products	26%	22%	--	--	59%	25%
I	Processed Food	21%	21%	20%	--	25%	21%
C	WoodProd.&Construct.	27%	30%	--	27%	11%	27%
C	Textiles	24%	18%	0%	--	75%	22%
C	Paper&Metal Products	31%	23%	17%	23%	32%	26%
O	Chemical&BasicMinerals	34%	31%	--	--	33%	20%
M	Electric, Gas&Water	22%	15%	--	--	--	20%
M	Trade & Transp.Serv.	42%	106%	--	--	-12%	22%
O	Restaurant Services	22%	28%	--	--	8%	26%
D	Lodging	40%	49%	--	--	17%	38%
I	Land Transport	4%	25%	--	--	-33%	18%
T	OtherTransport&Comm.	26%	36%	--	--	25%	29%
I	Banking & Insurance	25%	45%	--	--	--	27%
E	RealEstate&Bus.Serv.	29%	28%	--	--	--	28%
S	Gov.mt.Soc&Recr.Serv.	25%	26%	--	--	-55%	26%
--	Person.&Househ.Serv.	29%	20%	--	--	--	25%
I	Food Crops	34%	8%	--	--	--	25%
I	Other Crops	12%	6%	37%	--	--	13%
M	Livestock Products	12%	23%	12%	--	--	7%
P	Forestry Products	12%	1%	--	--	--	11%
O	Fish	19%	44%	--	--	--	42%
R	Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	96%	--	141%	--	--	97%
T	Quarrying Products	22%	--	-14%	--	--	14%
E	Processed Food	24%	28%	56%	--	--	28%
D	WoodProd.&Construct.	1%	8%	-19%	--	--	3%
C	Textiles	5%	14%	-15%	--	--	6%
C	Paper&Metal Products	26%	8%	27%	17%	--	20%
O	Chemical&BasicMinerals	25%	24%	10%	--	--	24%
M	Electric, Gas&Water	--	--	--	--	--	--
M	Trade & Transp.Serv.	23%	--	--	--	--	28%
O	Restaurant Services	-12%	33%	--	--	--	17%
D	Lodging	13%	46%	--	--	--	31%
I	Land Transport	-21%	-3%	--	--	--	-5%
T	OtherTransport&Comm.	-7%	19%	--	--	--	8%
I	Banking & Insurance	59%	72%	--	--	--	61%
E	RealEstate&Bus.Serv.	37%	--	--	--	--	37%
S	Gov.mt.Soc&Recr.Serv.	-3%	14%	--	--	--	1%
P	Person.&Househ.Serv.	43%	18%	--	--	41%	38%
Total Domestic	1A-1E	25%	23%	50%	26%	32%	26%
Total Imported	1F-1J	26%	21%	15%	17%	41%	23%
TOTAL	row:1	26%	23%	41%	24%	32%	26%
	1-44						

TABLE A.5: Total supply of goods and services in Indonesia, 1975, based on a detailed (131*128) SAM (billions of Rupiah)

RECEIPTS		Codes		GOODS AND SERVICES																				TOTAL				
				1&23	2&24	1B&Ga	1A&Fb	1A&Fb	1B&Gb	1A&Fc	1C&Ha	1C&Hb	1A&Fd	1C&Hc	1C&Hd	10&32	11&33	12&34	13&35	14&36	15&37	16&38	17&39		18&40	19&41	20&42	21&43
I. DOMESTIC PRODUCTS (Columns 1Aa-1Df)																												
SAM ROWS:																												
a. Output, at factor costs				3302	689	444	357	396	2376	96	2385	2079	601	835	812	163	2373	531	47	638	331	289	557	1717	492	21621		
b. Trade Margin				360	89	57	117	138	0	40	291	26	56	190	171	30	-2146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-560	
c. Transport Margin				47	34	11	73	13	5	54	8	11	24	59	0	-170	0	0	0	-256	-93	0	0	0	0	0	-110	
d. Indirect Taxes min. Subsid.				2	2	2	3	2	83	1	75	23	4	10	9	1	23	6	1	9	1	0	1	6	2	277		
e. Total Supply, at market prices				3712	824	515	550	549	2474	190	2820	2137	672	1159	1052	195	80	537	48	391	240	289	558	1723	494	21208		
f. Proportional Margins ((b+c)/a)				12.3%	17.5%	15.4%	53.2%	38.1%	0.2%	88.1%	15.1%	1.7%	11.3%	22.9%	28.4%	18.5%	-97.6%	0.0%	0.0%	-40.2%	-28.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-3.2%	
g. Indirect tax rate (d/a)				0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%	3.9%	1.3%	3.1%	1.1%	0.8%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%	1.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	1.3%			
II. IMPORTED PRODUCTS (Columns 1Fa-1If)																												
SAM ROWS:																												
a. Imports, at c.i.f. prices				68	84	1	0	0	5	10	203	3	93	1452	769	0	17	22	17	19	58	2	46	53	23	2945		
b. Trade Margin				29	17	4	0	0	0	3	21	1	11	294	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	560	
c. Transport Margin				1	3	2	0	0	0	4	8	0	3	26	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	
d. Indirect Taxes min. Subsid.				-48	5	0	0	0	0	2	-50	1	15	128	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	
e. Total Supply, at market prices				60	109	7	1	0	5	19	182	5	121	1901	1025	0	17	22	17	19	58	2	46	53	62	3721		
f. Proportional Margins ((b+c)/a)				43.6%	24.2%	614.3%	107.9%	87.6%	7.0%	80.1%	14.0%	43.3%	14.2%	22.1%	28.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23.4%	
g. Indirect tax rate (d/a)				-70.4%	5.6%	12.2%	15.8%	12.5%	2.5%	16.2%	-24.5%	20.5%	16.2%	8.8%	4.2%	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	
III. DOMESTIC AND IMPORTED PRODUCTS																												
e. Total Supply, at market prices				3761	932	522	551	549	2479	210	3003	2142	793	3060	2077	195	97	559	65	409	297	291	605	1776	556	24928		
h. Share of Domestic Origin				99%	88%	99%	100%	100%	100%	91%	94%	100%	85%	38%	51%	100%	82%	96%	74%	95%	81%	99%	92%	97%	89%	85%		

TABLE A.6: Average annual growth rates of total SUPPLY of goods and services in Indonesia, 1975-1980, based on both detailed (131*128) SAMs

EXPENDITURES		GOODS AND SERVICES																	TOTAL							
		1A&Fa	1B&Ga	1A&Fb	1B&Gb	1A&Fc	1C&Ha	1C&Hb	1A&Fd	1C&Hc	1C&Hd	1C&He	1C&Hf	1C&Hg	1A&Ia	1D&Ib	1D&Ic	1D&Id		1D&Ie	1E&Ja	1E&Jb	1E&Jc	1D&Ij		
RECEIPTS	Codes	1&23	2&24	3&25	4&26	5&27	6&28	7&29	8&30	9&31	10&32	11&33	12&34	13&35	14&36	15&37	16&38	17&39	18&40	19&41	20&42	21&43	22&44	1-44		
I. DOMESTIC PRODUCTS (Columns 1Aa-1Df)																										
S&M ROWS:																										
a. Output, at factor costs	2Aa-2Df	17%	27%	29%	30%	19%	35%	27%	21%	27%	21%	27%	36%	23%	22%	26%	37%	24%	26%	27%	26%	26%	24%	26%	26%	
b. Trade Margin	1Ka	18%	33%	31%	31%	23%	24%	35%	21%	38%	23%	22%	33%	-24%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%	
c. Transport Margin	1Kb	20%	29%	30%	7%	32%	-35%	3%	21%	24%	37%	32%	28%	-	2%	-	-	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	
d. Indirect Taxes min. Subsid.	4-6H	58%	47%	30%	34%	20%	-56%	46%	22%	37%	27%	40%	-	-8%	44%	47%	68%	24%	31%	37%	43%	50%	50%	3%		
e. Total Supply,	TOTAL	17%	28%	28%	29%	20%	34%	25%	21%	27%	22%	26%	33%	20%	22%	26%	38%	19%	26%	27%	26%	25%	25%	26%		
at market prices																										
f. Proportional Margins (%'80-%'75)		0.6%	4.6%	1.4%	-12.1%	12.4%	-0.2%	-15.8%	-0.4%	0.9%	3.7%	-3.2%	-5.4%	-16.7%	-1.9%	-	-	-12.0%	5.8%	-	-	-	-	-	0.9%	
g. Indirect tax rate (%'80-%'75)		0.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	-3.9%	2.1%	0.1%	0.7%	0.2%	1.0%	-15.1%	-0.6%	1.9%	2.1%	5.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	1.5%	0.5%	1.3%	-0.9%		
II. IMPORTED PRODUCTS (Columns 1Fa-1If)																										
S&M ROWS:																										
a. Imports, at c.i.f. prices	10	15%	15%	40%	13%	38%	98%	19%	23%	2%	4%	20%	28%	-	28%	17%	31%	-5%	8%	61%	37%	0%	55%	24%		
b. Trade Margin	1Ka	-10%	-5%	-18%	9%	41%	-22%	21%	16%	8%	10%	17%	27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%	19%	
c. Transport Margin	1Kb	26%	3%	-51%	4%	-	6%	-4%	34%	-1%	18%	34%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%		
d. Indirect Taxes min. Subsid.	4-6H	-	7%	45%	18%	58%	38%	-14%	18%	-2%	13%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
e. Total Supply,	TOTAL	25%	13%	7%	11%	42%	97%	14%	28%	3%	6%	20%	24%	-	28%	17%	31%	-5%	9%	61%	37%	1%	38%	23%		
at market prices																										
f. Proportional Margins (%'80-%'75)		-28.7%	-14.9%	-59.0%	-23.2%	19.8%	-8.8%	-27.5%	-0.7%	12.2%	6.5%	-1.1%	-3.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-4.8%	
g. Indirect tax rate (%'80-%'75)		78.1%	-1.9%	3.2%	5.0%	20.8%	-2.9%	-13.1%	21.3%	-3.4%	8.7%	0.9%	-18.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0%	1.4%	-0.0%	-3.2%		
III. DOMESTIC AND IMPORTED PRODUCTS																										
e. Total Supply, at market prices		17%	27%	29%	28%	20%	35%	24%	22%	27%	20%	23%	29%	20%	23%	26%	37%	19%	27%	28%	26%	26%	27%	26%		
h. Share of Domestic Origin (%'80-%'75)		-0.6%	5.8%	0.9%	0.1%	-0.1%	-4.5%	3.6%	-2.1%	0.2%	7.4%	7.6%	10.8%	0.0%	-4.7%	1.4%	6.2%	3.2%	11.5%	-3.2%	-3.4%	2.1%	-8.4%	1.8%		

TABLE A.7: INTERMEDIATE CONSUMPTION OF DOMESTIC AND IMPORTED COMMODITIES IN INDONESIA, 1980, BASED ON A DETAILED (131*128) SOCIAL ACCOUNTING MATRIX (BILLION OF RIUPIAH)

RECEIPTS	EXPENDITURES														TOTAL									
	Food Crops Cult.	Other Crops Cult.	Live stock	Forestry	Fishery	Oil Mining	Quarrying	Food Processing	Wood & Constr. struc.	Textile	Paper & Metal Prod.	Chem. Basic Miner	Utilities & Transp. Serv.	Trade & Transp. Serv.		Real Estate	Govt. & Hh. Serv.							
Codes	2Aa	2Ba	2Ab	2Bb	2Ac	2Ca	2Cb	2Ad	2Cc	2Cd	2Ce	2Cf	2Cg	2Da	2Db	2Dc	2Dd	2De	2Ea	2Eb	2Ec	2Ed		
Food Crops	1271	0	17	0	1	0	0	2600	19	1	1	0	0	0	98	8	0	0	0	0	29	0	4046	
Other Crops	1Ba	2	0	0	0	0	0	1131	1	12	2	50	0	0	42	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1711	
Livestock Products	1Ab	3	569	0	0	0	0	33	0	32	1	2	0	0	273	14	4	0	0	0	28	0	985	
Forestry Products	1Bb	4	3	5	1	45	11	0	899	1	7	10	0	0	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1007	
Fish	1Ac	5	0	0	0	108	0	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	82	4	0	0	0	0	6	0	245	
Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	1Ca	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1031	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1455	
Quarrying Products	1Cb	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	542	0	1	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	606	
Processed Food	1Ad	8	0	0	0	0	0	544	3	1	1	16	0	0	401	26	0	0	0	0	1	42	1140	
WoodProd.&Construct.	1Cc	9	18	6	19	12	61	7	20	447	8	25	24	16	65	14	7	29	11	150	228	10	1212	
Textiles	1Cd	10	4	5	0	1	7	13	5	623	5	7	1	11	12	3	7	3	2	2	68	57	862	
Paper&Metal Products	1Ce	11	15	28	5	38	24	85	346	25	330	70	25	55	13	8	11	98	25	12	379	123	2005	
Chem.&BasicMinerals	1Cf	12	218	73	3	5	11	24	1719	38	211	315	95	31	40	9	22	14	5	11	138	179	3241	
Electric, Gas&Water	1Cg	13	0	2	1	3	1	0	7	8	11	44	73	41	44	12	4	7	13	4	53	43	388	
Trade & Transp.Serv.	1Da	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	56	87	0	0	15	0	182	
Restaurant Services	1Db	15	0	1	1	1	0	10	21	1	4	16	2	26	3	1	9	10	7	3	215	5	368	
Lodging	1Dc	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	0	1	17	1	29	0	0	2	7	9	3	103	5	213	
Land Transport	1Dd	17	1	4	0	3	0	6	1	1	4	9	1	26	1	1	17	4	9	3	50	2	152	
OtherTransport&Comm.	1De	18	0	1	0	2	0	31	11	1	2	12	2	76	6	6	9	75	23	7	91	11	371	
Banking & Insurance	1Ea	19	38	28	10	23	11	142	52	11	18	45	5	93	2	3	18	31	9	19	64	7	925	
RealEstate&Buss.Serv.	1Eb	20	0	2	2	6	1	8	53	1	4	16	2	335	2	3	28	30	19	15	68	43	455	
Govt.Soc.&Recr.Serv.	1Ec	21	0	1	0	1	10	3	4	0	1	4	0	12	2	1	3	4	7	2	99	2	155	
Person.&Househ.Serv.	1Ed	22	2	27	2	44	0	94	4	2	7	10	8	63	17	3	390	16	16	12	164	6	813	
Food Crops	1Fa	23	2	0	0	0	0	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	
Other Crops	1Ga	24	0	0	0	0	0	74	0	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197	
Livestock Products	1Fb	25	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Forestry Products	1Gb	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Fish	1Fc	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	1Ha	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	649	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Quarrying Products	1Hb	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Processed Food	1Fd	30	0	0	14	0	0	33	0	0	0	7	0	0	38	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
WoodProd.&Construct.	1Hc	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Textiles	1Hd	32	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	69	9	25	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	119	
Paper&Metal Products	1He	33	4	3	0	1	2	24	459	2	1446	32	0	7	3	0	0	25	0	1	97	217	2326	
Chem.&BasicMinerals	1Hf	34	50	45	1	21	14	120	715	181	309	713	58	55	16	6	212	203	2	2	114	62	2975	
Electric, Gas&Water	1Hg	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Trade & Transp.Serv.	1Ia	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	38	0	0	3	0	56	
Restaurant Services	1Ib	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	8	
Lodging	1Ic	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	10	1	21	
Land Transport	1Id	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
OtherTransport&Comm.	1Ie	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	0	0	0	5	1	0	3	0	23	
Banking & Insurance	1Ja	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	4	9	2	1	3	0	38	
RealEstate&Buss.Serv.	1Jb	42	0	0	0	0	0	250	4	0	0	0	0	8	0	2	0	6	4	2	13	0	288	
Govt.Soc.&Recr.Serv.	1Jc	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	40	0	40	
Person.&Househ.Serv.	1If	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	8	0	0	296	0	312	
TOTAL DOMESTIC PRODUCTS	1A-1E	1596	659	713	190	204	1169	31	4685	4140	768	637	1745	234	885	1104	122	587	425	155	245	1844	497	22636
TOTAL IMPORTED PRODUCTS	1F-1J	56	48	17	23	15	388	19	323	1186	376	1767	1464	58	99	65	16	232	294	11	7	588	281	7330
TOTAL		1652	707	730	213	219	1555	50	5009	5327	1142	2404	3210	293	985	1169	138	819	719	166	252	2433	778	29967
SHARE OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTS	SAM ROW:1	97%	93%	98%	89%	93%	75%	62%	94%	78%	67%	27%	54%	80%	90%	94%	72%	59%	94%	97%	76%	64%	76%	64%

TABLE A.8: INTERMEDIATE CONSUMPTION OF Domestic and Imported Commodities in Indonesia, 1975, based on a detailed (131*128) Social Accounting Matrix (billion of Rupiah)

RECEIPTS -->	Codes	EXPENDITURES																				TOTAL			
		Food Crops Cult.	Other Crops Cult.	Live stock	Forestry	Fishery	Oil Gas, Mining	Quarrying	Food Processing	Wood & Constr. struc.	Tek. title	Paper & Metal Prod.	Chem. Miner	Util. & Transp. Serv.	Trade	Res. tant	Hotel	Land Transp.	Other Transp.	Finance	Real Est. & B. Serv.		Govern. ment, etc.	Pers. Serv.	
		2Aa	2Ab	2Ba	2Bb	2Ca	2Cb	2Ad	2Ae	2Cf	2Ce	2Cg	2Da	2Db	2Dc	2Dd	2De	2Ea	2Eb	2Ec	2Ed	2Ee	2Ef	2Eg	
	1Aa	607	0	0	0	0	0	1045	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1737	
	1Ba	0	146	0	0	0	0	267	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442	
	1Ab	3	1	121	0	0	0	6	0	8	1	0	0	42	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	192	
	1Bb	4	1	2	0	44	0	4	205	0	16	8	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	
	1Ac	5	0	0	0	83	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	
	1Ca	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	234	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242	
	1Cb	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	148	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	
	1Cb	7	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	145	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	404	
	1Ad	8	0	5	0	0	0	210	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	
	1Cc	9	14	9	2	7	5	7	68	3	22	9	6	16	4	2	3	8	5	55	60	2	0	266	
	1Cd	10	6	1	0	1	2	0	3	197	3	3	0	4	2	1	2	0	0	22	13	0	0	435	
	1Ce	11	6	6	1	5	9	26	103	8	46	18	3	17	5	1	8	22	6	2	90	35	0	591	
	1Cf	12	36	11	1	3	5	11	235	8	44	38	22	27	10	31	20	1	1	28	55	0	0	128	
	1Cg	13	0	1	0	2	0	21	3	16	15	14	6	6	3	2	2	1	1	14	2	0	0	23	
	1Da	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	
	1Db	15	0	1	1	0	0	4	21	1	2	2	0	22	1	0	3	7	1	2	47	2	0	29	
	1Dc	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	1	4	0	0	12	0	0	123	
	1Dd	17	2	3	0	3	1	8	12	1	3	2	1	25	4	1	9	1	2	2	40	3	0	92	
	1De	18	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	1	2	2	1	13	2	1	11	6	0	0	36	0	0	269	
	1Ea	19	21	5	1	6	3	14	16	4	15	15	2	104	5	3	5	13	2	6	17	4	0	109	
	1Eb	20	0	0	1	1	0	2	13	1	6	3	1	32	4	1	4	5	2	18	5	0	0	44	
	1Ec	21	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	6	1	0	2	4	5	1	19	0	0	210	
	1Ed	22	1	6	1	8	0	6	2	1	3	3	2	21	2	0	110	4	2	2	25	6	0	25	
	1Fa	23	1	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	
	1Ga	24	0	0	0	0	0	59	0	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	1Gb	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	1Gc	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1Gd	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1Ha	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
	1Hb	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
	1Hc	30	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	
	1Hd	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	1He	32	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	71	1	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	91	
	1Hf	33	3	2	0	2	0	18	191	3	273	7	7	9	2	0	1	15	2	1	34	39	0	623	
	1Hg	34	42	20	0	4	4	21	288	29	139	107	30	25	9	38	22	1	1	33	39	0	0	863	
	1Ia	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1Ib	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	
	1Ic	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	
	1Id	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
	1Ie	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	1	0	21	0	0	4	
	1Ie	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	
	1Ja	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	1Jb	42	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	0	0	46	
	1Jc	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	46	
	1If	44	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	2	12	0	8	1	0	37	
	1A-1E		700	193	140	80	120	76	9	1652	845	259	181	400	43	305	332	20	181	123	40	75	451	6352	
	1F-1J		48	22	6	8	9	53	2	137	493	149	414	133	38	54	29	4	40	63	18	3	171	1974	
	TOTAL		747	216	146	88	128	129	11	1789	1339	407	595	533	81	359	361	24	221	186	58	78	622	8328	
	SHARE OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTS		94%	90%	96%	91%	93%	59%	86%	92%	63%	64%	30%	75%	53%	85%	92%	84%	82%	68%	69%	97%	73%	61%	76%

SAM ROW:1

TABLE A.9: Average annual growth rates of INTERMEDIATE CONSUMPTION of Domestic and Imported Commodities in Indonesia, 1975-1980, based on both detailed (131*128) SAMs

RECEIPTS -->	Codes	EXPENDITURES																								TOTAL
		Food												Non-Food												
		2Aa	2Ab	2Ba	2Bb	2Ca	2Cb	2Cd	2Cc	2Cd	2Ce	2Cf	2Cg	3Aa	3Ab	3Ba	3Bb	3Ca	3Cb	3Cd	3Ce	3Cf	3Cg			
	1Aa	15%	26%	41%	1%	18%	28%	11%	1%	26%	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	66	2			
	1Ba	19%	23%	31%	-	29%	-22%	11%	49%	34%	-26%	-	-59%	10%	60%	-	-27%	-	-	-	28%	-	17%			
	1Ab	43%	38%	31%	-	33%	-	27%	11%	34%	34%	-	-46%	31%	23%	-	0%	-	-	57%	-	-	27%			
	1Bb	27%	23%	25%	1%	22%	30%	4%	-16%	5%	5%	-	15%	32%	52%	-	-52%	-	-	29%	-	-	33%			
	1Ac	-	26%	-	5%	25%	-	-	0%	18%	18%	-	-	19%	63%	-	-1%	-	-	-28%	-	-	25%			
	1Ca	-	-	-	86%	-55%	-	-	-1%	30%	30%	37%	-	-	41%	-	-	-	-	29%	-	-	13%			
	1Cb	-	14%	-	24%	106%	26%	14%	22%	20%	20%	-	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36%			
	1Ad	-	58%	-	24%	18%	94%	37%	70%	-4%	-4%	-	-	20%	31%	-115%	16%	85%	17%	33%	-	-	26%			
	1Cc	6%	15%	20%	21%	9%	38%	20%	2%	19%	19%	19%	28%	29%	40%	15%	27%	17%	20%	27%	31%	-	21%			
	1Cd	-9%	27%	2%	-2%	27%	7%	23%	15%	15%	15%	36%	19%	32%	33%	39%	6%	-	81%	23%	30%	-	24%			
	1Ce	11%	33%	32%	42%	31%	24%	21%	40%	27%	27%	44%	23%	19%	35%	8%	30%	27%	35%	28%	25%	-	31%			
	1Cf	36%	38%	27%	12%	32%	40%	32%	31%	43%	43%	29%	3%	26%	41%	-7%	-8%	40%	48%	32%	24%	-	34%			
	1Cg	-	29%	21%	12%	8%	14%	-13%	-7%	23%	23%	51%	37%	54%	37%	16%	31%	45%	38%	27%	63%	-	22%			
	1Da	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60%	-	30%	-	-	79%	-	-	42%			
	1Db	-	2%	5%	30%	18%	0%	-1%	12%	42%	42%	28%	4%	14%	12%	25%	7%	36%	8%	31%	23%	-	22%			
	1Dc	-	7%	-14%	11%	54%	71%	12%	41%	88%	88%	19%	28%	29%	25%	85%	49%	18%	64%	43%	75%	-	40%			
	1Dd	-2%	7%	36%	-4%	37%	-43%	1%	6%	29%	29%	12%	1%	1%	4%	14%	34%	34%	6%	5%	-5%	-	4%			
	1De	-	-5%	0%	32%	68%	12%	0%	2%	41%	41%	22%	35%	25%	37%	43%	38%	27%	42%	18%	74%	-	28%			
	1Ea	12%	34%	55%	27%	59%	23%	19%	3%	22%	22%	22%	23%	-19%	1%	26%	16%	27%	24%	26%	13%	-	25%			
	1Eb	-32%	35%	25%	28%	18%	28%	5%	-6%	33%	33%	21%	45%	51%	66%	30%	27%	40%	27%	42%	42%	-	28%			
	1Ec	14%	30%	14%	-	24%	14%	6%	-3%	34%	34%	24%	15%	7%	62%	13%	0%	7%	26%	33%	30%	-	25%			
	1Df	14%	29%	19%	34%	27%	16%	9%	17%	26%	26%	32%	22%	43%	25%	25%	30%	39%	37%	38%	0%	-	28%			
	1Fa	16%	-	-	-	35%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1%	12%	-	-	-	-	38%	0%	-	28%			
	1Ga	-	15%	-25%	-	4%	-51%	20%	-	-12%	-	-	4%	4%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34%			
	1Fb	-	-	-12%	-	48%	-	-9%	-	-	-	-	43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%			
	1Gb	-	-	-	-	-	-11%	-	-	20%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-3%			
	1Ff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%			
	1Fc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%			
	1Ha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-24%	102%	102%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86%			
	1Hb	-	-	-	-	-20%	-5%	-	49%	33%	33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%			
	1Fd	-	-	92%	-	18%	-	74%	-	47%	47%	-	-8%	20%	34%	-	-	-	-	7%	-	-	24%			
	1Hc	-	-	-	-	-8%	-8%	43%	3%	33%	33%	-	-	-17%	-36%	-	-	-	-	15%	54%	-	1%			
	1Hd	-	-	-	-	0%	-2%	-1%	47%	31%	31%	-	6%	-51%	-39%	-	-	-	-	10%	-25%	-	5%			
	1Hh	3%	8%	-18%	-4%	6%	18%	-13%	33%	29%	29%	-65%	-6%	8%	-27%	-16%	11%	-25%	-2%	21%	34%	-	26%			
	1Hf	4%	16%	12%	36%	73%	18%	37%	16%	38%	38%	13%	16%	12%	34%	34%	45%	18%	22%	25%	9%	-	25%			
	1Hg	-	-	-	-	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	1Ia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	1Ib	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	1Ic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-44%	-	-	-	-	-	-13%	14%	-	23%			
	1Id	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	42%	-	-12%			
	1Ie	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-19%	-	-	-	-	-	0%	-36%	-	13%			
	1Ij	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-3%	-40%	-	-21%			
	1Ja	-	-	-	-	78%	-	-	-	-	-	-	80%	-	-	-	-	-	-	44%	-	-	-7%			
	1Jb	-	-	-	-	44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%	-	-	-59%			
	1Jc	-	-	-	-	-	-4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42%	-	-	-	-	23%	17%	-	37%			
	1Jd	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	-	-	-3%			
	1If	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	-	-	-	-	72%	-	-	43%			
	1A-1E	16%	25%	33%	17%	55%	24%	22%	25%	28%	28%	34%	21%	24%	36%	24%	25%	27%	24%	28%	27%	-	-	25%		
	1F-1J	3%	15%	23%	21%	40%	17%	19%	28%	48%	48%	8%	12%	16%	28%	35%	31%	-11%	20%	25%	25%	-	-	26%		
	TOTAL	16%	24%	32%	18%	50%	21%	28%	21%	28%	36%	26%	20%	23%	35%	26%	27%	21%	23%	27%	26%	-	-	26%		
	SAM ROW:1	3.0%	3.6%	1.4%	-1.8%	0.0%	16.3%	-24.3%	1.2%	14.6%	-20.7%	27.2%	4.9%	2.5%	4.6%	-10.2%	-7.2%	25.0%	0.5%	3.3%	3.1%	-	-	-0.8%		

TABLE A.10: GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT in Indonesia, 1980, based on a detailed (131*128) Social Accounting Matrix (billions of Rupiah)

RECEIPTS	P R O D U C T I O N A C T I V I T I E S																				TOTAL			
	2Aa	2Ab	2Bb	2Ac	2Ca	2Cb	2Ad	2Ce	2Cf	2Cg	2Da	2Db	2Dc	2Dd	2Ea	2Eb	2Ec	2Ed	Column:2					
EXPENDITURES																								
Food Crops Cultivation	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66		
Other Crops Cultivation	862	296	51	46	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Live stock	43	31	12	6	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Forestry	2103	328	201	146	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Fishery	63	8	15	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Oil, Gas, Coal & Metal Ore Mining	6	12	1	11	0	29	49	160	644	57	67	71	14	18	0	0	127	40	1	7	48	76	1435	
Quarrying	1	5	0	2	0	36	21	116	378	88	153	80	28	51	1	2	189	63	4	8	142	68	1436	
Food Processing	5	3	1	12	0	0	52	132	256	35	35	44	0	29	0	0	155	9	0	4	1	191	963	
Textile & Apparel	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	34	89	19	22	8	1	24	0	0	157	5	0	1	1	142	509	
Chemicals & Basic Metals	2	10	1	5	1	25	5	19	15	3	7	18	5	101	16	7	18	11	32	14	282	49	647	
Wood & Paper	1	6	2	5	1	50	10	23	37	11	48	49	16	353	45	38	29	80	110	44	511	109	1576	
Other Manufacturing	4	1	2	2	1	0	3	6	6	1	2	1	0	1479	77	0	6	1	0	0	2	82	1677	
Electricity, Gas, Heat & Water Supply	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	8	5	1	4	2	0	1354	106	1	7	2	0	3	2	103	1600	
Construction	1	3	1	1	0	12	4	7	47	2	5	15	7	1	1	1	2	5	10	4	1183	4	1314	
Transport, Information & Communication	0	3	1	1	0	29	4	24	85	13	52	51	15	24	2	6	11	29	81	23	1377	7	1838	
Trade, Hotels, Restaurants & Other Services	9	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	36	1	1	2	0	1	7	0	2	1	0	0	8	7	82	
Government	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	69	13	7	2	0	9	22	1	11	1	1	15	10	21	207	
Non-Government	2833	943	844	531	402	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5553
Unincorporated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1202
Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	269	82	38	27	31	0	374	119	10	62	3	2	13	23	1	1125	
Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	374	137	87	72	50	0	685	309	32	137	4	5	87	65	2	2115	
Non-Government	4	55	31	387	48	0	2	153	649	68	291	247	4	1162	24	12	89	7	59	94	73	3	3461	
Unincorporated	0	188	4	40	2	2867	6	256	151	20	82	884	28	238	0	25	10	146	591	12	3	0	5555	
Corporate	0	42	2	122	18	8422	0	97	18	42	127	150	3	269	2	6	0	0	40	0	0	0	9359	
Total	122	111	12	76	56	638	8	159	67	63	152	74	109	52	28	25	250	206	39	485	201	23	2956	
Labour	915	365	68	76	107	181	91	350	1206	175	332	284	85	547	64	54	377	228	238	100	3543	312	9699	
Unpaid	2185	342	221	166	153	0	62	208	459	70	70	58	1	2897	211	3	338	17	1	22	25	545	8056	
Total	3099	707	289	242	260	181	154	558	1665	245	402	342	86	3443	275	57	715	246	239	123	3568	858	17755	
Non-labour	2833	943	844	531	402	0	139	643	219	125	99	81	0	1059	428	42	199	8	7	1302	88	3	9996	
Unincorporated	4	285	37	549	69	11289	9	506	819	130	500	1281	34	1670	26	43	99	152	689	106	77	3	18375	
Corporate	2837	1229	881	1079	470	11289	148	1149	1038	254	599	1362	35	2728	454	85	298	160	696	1408	164	5	28370	
Unincorporated	122	85	11	37	47	0	7	94	14	31	25	4	2	19	27	12	167	10	1	447	18	11	1193	
Corporate	0	28	0	39	8	638	0	65	53	32	127	70	107	33	2	12	83	196	38	38	184	13	1764	
Gross Total	2959	1339	892	1156	526	11928	156	1308	1105	317	751	1436	144	2780	482	109	548	367	735	1893	366	29	31327	
Gross mixed income	5140	1370	1076	735	602	0	209	945	693	226	194	143	3	3974	666	57	704	35	9	169	131	559	17641	
Gross operating surplus	4	311	37	587	77	11928	10	571	871	162	627	1350	142	1703	28	55	182	348	727	1746	260	15	21741	
GROSS VALUE ADDED, at factor costs; Row:3	6059	2046	1182	1398	786	12109	310	1867	2770	562	1153	1778	230	6223	757	167	1263	612	974	2016	3933	886	49081	
Share of Labour Income	51%	35%	24%	17%	33%	1%	50%	30%	60%	44%	35%	19%	38%	55%	36%	34%	57%	40%	25%	6%	91%	97%	36%	
Share of Net Non-Labour Income	47%	60%	75%	77%	60%	93%	48%	62%	37%	45%	52%	77%	15%	44%	60%	51%	24%	26%	72%	70%	4%	1%	58%	
Share of Depreciation	2%	5%	1%	5%	7%	5%	3%	9%	2%	11%	13%	4%	47%	1%	4%	15%	20%	34%	4%	24%	5%	3%	6%	
TOTAL INPUT, at factors costs; Row: Total	7711	2753	1912	1611	1005	13664	360	6875	8097	1704	3558	4988	523	7208	1926	304	2082	1332	1139	2268	6366	1664	79048	
Net Value Added Share in Total Input	79%	74%	62%	87%	78%	89%	86%	27%	34%	33%	32%	36%	44%	86%	39%	55%	61%	46%	85%	89%	62%	53%	62%	

TABLE A.12: Average annual growth rates of components of GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT in Indonesia, 1975-1980, based on both detailed (131+128) SAMs

RECEIPTS -->	Codes	P R O D U C T I O N A C T I V I T I E S																				TOTAL	
		EXPENDITURES										ACTIVITIES											
		45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64		65
		Food Crops	Other Crops	Live stock	Forestry	Fishery	Oil, Gas, Coal & Metal Ore	Quarrying	Food Processing	Wood Processing	Textile & Apparel	Paper & Printing	Chemicals & Basic Metals	Utilities	Trade & Transport	Resaurants	Hotels	Land Transport	Other Transport	Banking & Insurance	Real Estate	Government	Personal & Household
		2Aa	2Ab	2Ba	2Bb	2Ac	2Ca	2Cb	2Ad	2Cc	2Cd	2Ce	2Cf	2Cg	2Da	2Db	2Dc	2Dd	2De	2Ea	2Eb	2Ec	2Df
		45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66
		Column:1	Column:2	Column:3	Column:4	Column:5	Column:6	Column:7	Column:8	Column:9	Column:10	Column:11	Column:12	Column:13	Column:14	Column:15	Column:16	Column:17	Column:18	Column:19	Column:20	Column:21	Column:22
		19%	33%	18%	17%	25%	28%	24%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
P	Agric.PaidRural	69	3Aa	20%	24%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%
R	Agric.PaidUrban	70	3Ab	31%	32%	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%
I	Agric.UnpaidRur	71	3Ba	32%	34%	28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%
M	Agric.UnpaidUrb	72	3Bb	33%	38%	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
A	ManualPaidRural	73	3Ca	46%	33%	10%	21%	56%	23%	28%	15%	20%	20%	90%	17%	19%	22%	19%	44%	23%	28%	26%	25%
R	ManualPaidUrban	74	3Cb	87%	44%	24%	50%	28%	31%	27%	23%	31%	34%	21%	28%	26%	52%	25%	34%	15%	30%	20%	25%
Y	ManualUnpaidRur	75	3Da	63%	29%	62%	-	46%	17%	24%	20%	14%	26%	17%	27%	11%	-	24%	16%	69%	27%	22%	23%
Ge	ManualUnpaidUrb	76	3Db	78%	45%	-	7%	7%	31%	41%	29%	31%	45%	8%	32%	26%	-	32%	22%	44%	6%	24%	30%
ne	Labor	77	3Ea	29%	24%	6%	49%	21%	24%	1%	10%	4%	17%	12%	17%	13%	25%	18%	38%	43%	20%	18%	20%
ra	Cler.PaidRural	78	3Eb	58%	34%	28%	42%	44%	18%	23%	12%	20%	32%	30%	30%	39%	35%	22%	34%	20%	23%	28%	27%
tion	Cler.UnpaidRur	79	3Fa	14%	40%	33%	-	15%	34%	28%	5%	6%	28%	-	19%	19%	30%	39%	22%	39%	23%	28%	27%
U	Cler.UnpaidUrb	80	3Fb	82%	-	-	-	2%	35%	31%	9%	24%	45%	-	33%	39%	54%	36%	24%	54%	-0%	23%	32%
T	Prof.PaidRural	81	3Ga	15%	-7%	19%	52%	77%	20%	45%	18%	33%	30%	32%	-5%	-	15%	34%	34%	40%	47%	27%	27%
of	Prof.PaidUrban	82	3Gb	49%	21%	27%	18%	32%	37%	36%	32%	36%	43%	13%	-0%	48%	39%	24%	16%	22%	29%	22%	28%
In	Prof.UnpaidRur	83	3Ha	28%	97%	-	-	-28%	19%	44%	4%	15%	42%	-	27%	19%	5%	49%	9%	-	11%	8%	26%
co	Prof.UnpaidUrb	84	3Hb	-	-	-18%	-	37%	39%	51%	38%	17%	21%	-	32%	31%	6%	31%	-5%	31%	1%	26%	32%
me	Non-Uninc.Agricult.	85	3Ia	20%	30%	26%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24%
E	Pro-Uninc.Housing	86	3Ib	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	-	30%
G	Uninc.OtherRural	87	3Ic	-	-	-	-	27%	17%	19%	14%	21%	23%	9%	16%	22%	47%	12%	-7%	19%	53%	20%	18%
O	Uninc.OtherUrban	88	3Id	-	-	-	-	12%	24%	27%	21%	28%	26%	-11%	19%	35%	41%	17%	-7%	27%	10%	-4%	22%
R	PrivateDom.Inc.	89	3Ie	20%	34%	27%	22%	25%	21%	23%	26%	26%	42%	-1%	19%	32%	61%	16%	4%	31%	14%	24%	23%
I	Public	90	3Ia	30%	27%	35%	23%	16%	30%	22%	26%	24%	41%	3%	3%	-	42%	16%	37%	32%	21%	9%	32%
E	Foreign	91	3Ib	21%	28%	23%	23%	34%	36%	31%	26%	25%	43%	-1%	24%	33%	41%	16%	-	31%	-	-	34%
S	Cons. of Fixed Capital	92	3Ic	18%	11%	25%	17%	18%	26%	29%	23%	20%	40%	30%	13%	35%	44%	25%	28%	23%	28%	18%	22%
Labour	Paid	3A,C,E,G	17%	27%	29%	21%	33%	42%	25%	28%	19%	26%	29%	24%	24%	29%	34%	22%	32%	23%	33%	26%	25%
	Unpaid	3B,D,F,H	14%	35%	32%	34%	29%	-	32%	30%	24%	18%	28%	0%	30%	28%	21%	28%	16%	34%	53%	7%	24%
	Total	3A-H	15%	31%	31%	31%	33%	37%	24%	28%	21%	24%	29%	24%	29%	26%	33%	25%	30%	23%	35%	26%	24%
Non-labour	Net Unincorporated	3Ie-d	20%	30%	26%	35%	20%	-	19%	23%	19%	26%	24%	-8%	18%	31%	42%	15%	-7%	24%	30%	12%	23%
	Net Corporate	3Ie,j	20%	30%	26%	35%	22%	35%	19%	23%	26%	26%	41%	2%	16%	32%	46%	16%	34%	32%	15%	23%	31%
	Net Total	3Ij	20%	30%	26%	35%	20%	35%	19%	23%	23%	26%	40%	2%	17%	31%	44%	16%	28%	32%	16%	28%	28%
	Unincorp. Depreciation	3Ka	18%	11%	25%	17%	15%	-	26%	19%	19%	20%	24%	20%	19%	35%	42%	25%	10%	23%	30%	20%	23%
	Corporate Depreciation	3Kb	18%	11%	25%	17%	18%	-	26%	21%	29%	20%	41%	31%	10%	37%	46%	25%	29%	23%	15%	29%	22%
	Gross Total	3Ij,K	20%	28%	26%	33%	20%	34%	19%	22%	24%	24%	40%	19%	17%	31%	44%	19%	28%	31%	28%	22%	27%
	Gross mixed income	3B,D,F,H,Ia,Ic-d,Ka	17%	30%	27%	33%	22%	-	22%	29%	20%	22%	26%	6%	26%	30%	40%	23%	7%	25%	32%	12%	23%
	Gross operating surplus	3Ib,Ie,j,Kb	20%	28%	26%	33%	22%	34%	19%	25%	24%	24%	41%	19%	16%	32%	46%	20%	31%	31%	28%	27%	30%
	GROSS VALUE ADDED, at factor costs: Row:3	3Ib,Ie,j,Kb	17%	29%	27%	33%	22%	34%	26%	23%	26%	21%	37%	21%	23%	30%	39%	22%	29%	29%	26%	23%	26%
	Share of Labour Income	%80-%75	-6.0%	3.2%	4.1%	-1.7%	5.8%	-0.0%	21.5%	1.4%	5.7%	-1.8%	0.1%	5.3%	14.7%	-3.2%	-13.0%	6.5%	3.0%	-7.7%	1.7%	1.8%	-3.2%
	Share of Net Non-Labour Income	%80-%75	6.0%	4.3%	-3.8%	8.5%	-3.4%	6.5%	-21.6%	-0.0%	-6.0%	1.1%	3.0%	9.5%	-23.7%	-14.2%	2.3%	9.9%	-9.1%	-0.9%	9.1%	-1.0%	4.5%
	Share of Depreciation	%80-%75	0.0%	-7.6%	-0.2%	-6.7%	-2.4%	-6.4%	0.0%	-1.4%	0.3%	0.7%	-3.0%	18.4%	-0.5%	0.8%	3.2%	2.7%	-2.1%	-1.4%	-0.7%	0.6%	-1.3%
	TOTAL INPUT, at factors costs: Row:Total	Row:Total	17%	27%	29%	30%	19%	35%	27%	21%	27%	21%	27%	23%	22%	26%	37%	24%	26%	27%	26%	24%	26%
	Net Value Added Share	%80-%75	1.2%	5.2%	-5.4%	11.4%	10.6%	-5.9%	-2.4%	2.2%	-1.4%	0.8%	-4.0%	1.3%	7.3%	5.3%	-4.7%	2.1%	5.6%	2.9%	-2.0%	-4.2%	0.6%

TABLE A.13: Distribution of GROSS GENERATED INCOME over Institutional Subsectors in Indonesia, 1980, based on a detailed (131*128) SAM (billions of Rupiah)

EXPENDITURES		SAM Codes		PRIMARY INPUT CATEGORIES																								TOTAL																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
				Agricultural						Manual						Clerical, Sales & Services						Professional, Managerial							Non-Produced Capital						Produced Capital																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
				Paid		Unpaid		Rural		Urban		Paid		Unpaid		Rural		Urban		Paid		Unpaid		Rural		Urban			Agricultural		Unincorporated		Corporate		Produced Capital																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
3Aa	3Ab	3Ba	3Bb	3Ca	3Cb	3Da	3Db	3Ea	3Eb	3Fa	3Fb	3Ga	3Gb	3Ha	3Hb	3Ia	3Ib	3Ic	3Id	3Ie	3Ja	3Jb	3Jc	3Jd	3Je	3Jf	3Jg	3Jh	3Ji	3Jj	3Jk	3Jl	3Jm	3Jn	3Jo	3Jp	3Jq	3Jr	3Js	3Jt	3Ju	3Jv	3Jw	3Jx	3Jy	3Jz																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
RECEIPTS	-->	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557	558	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567	568	569	570	571	572	573	574	575	576	577	578	579	580	581	582	583	584	585	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594	595	596	597	598	599	600	601	602	603	604	605	606	607	608	609	610	611	612	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621	622	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000

*) Row vector (10,3) minus transposed column vector (3,10).

TABLE A.15: Average annual growth rates of components of GROSS GENERATED INCOME in Indonesia, 1975-1980, based on both detailed (131*128) SAMs

EXPENDITURES		PRIMARY INPUT CATEGORIES																												TOTAL	
		Labour														Non-Produced Capital															
		Agricultural				Clerical, Sales & Services				Professional, Managerial				Unincorporated				Corporate				Produced Capital									
		Paid	Unpaid	Rural	Urban	Paid	Unpaid	Rural	Urban	Paid	Unpaid	Rural	Urban	Agri-	Hou-	Other	Domestic	Pri-	Pub-	Foreign	Produced	Capital	Cons.								
3Aa	3Ab	3Ba	3Bb	3Ca	3Cb	3Da	3Db	3Ea	3Eb	3Fa	3Fb	3Ga	3Gb	3Ha	3Hb	3Ia	3Ib	3Ic	3Id	3Ie	3Ja	3Jb	3Jc	3Jd	3Je	3K					
67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93					
RECEIPTS	SAM Codes	19%	41%	12%	25%	34%	57%	17%	17%	19%	53%	19%	40%	12%	73%	10%	20%	40%	31%	23%	12%	12%	40%	32%	27%	24%	22%	25%			
	4-6A	93	19%	41%	12%	25%	34%	57%	17%	17%	19%	53%	19%	40%	12%	73%	10%	20%	40%	31%	23%	12%	12%	40%	32%	27%	24%	22%	25%		
	4-6Ba	94	20%	13%	23%	23%	22%	27%	17%	32%	4%	23%	26%	39%	23%	32%	34%	50%	32%	42%	31%	23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%	22%	
	4-6Bb	95	22%	10%	13%	12%	16%	10%	9%	23%	2%	20%	19%	39%	18%	40%	31%	28%	18%	20%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%	16%	
	4-6Bc	96	22%	16%	15%	12%	23%	16%	18%	22%	8%	26%	23%	33%	16%	37%	27%	33%	17%	25%	24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	17%	
	4-6Ca	97	17%	-	19%	-	26%	-	28%	-	15%	-	32%	-	18%	-	5%	-	39%	31%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	25%	
	4-6Cb	98	13%	-	14%	-	7%	-	7%	-	7%	-	38%	-	1%	-	79%	-	39%	19%	35%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30%	32%	
	4-6D	99	17%	-	17%	-	11%	-	24%	-	35%	-	15%	-	31%	-	37%	-	43%	26%	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26%	28%	
	4-6Ea	100	-	22%	-	-	12%	-	28%	-	22%	-	35%	-	48%	-	7%	44%	39%	-	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%	26%	
	4-6Eb	101	-	-	21%	-	8%	-	-	23%	-	-	25%	-	-	-	20%	64%	29%	-	49%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39%	40%	
	4-6F	102	-	4%	-	7%	-	7%	-	29%	-	30%	-	23%	-	27%	-	43%	42%	28%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26%	27%	
	4-6G	103	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%	30%	
	4-6H	104	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29%	29%	
	Rest of the World (labour income received minus paid) *)	130	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total Households		19%	33%	18%	17%	25%	27%	23%	30%	20%	27%	27%	32%	27%	28%	26%	32%	24%	30%	18%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	23%	24%	30%	
	Corporations and Government		19%	33%	18%	17%	25%	27%	23%	30%	20%	27%	27%	32%	27%	28%	26%	32%	24%	30%	18%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	23%	24%	30%	
	GROSS GENERATED INCOME, fc: 4-6		19%	33%	18%	17%	25%	27%	23%	30%	20%	27%	27%	32%	27%	28%	26%	32%	24%	30%	18%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	23%	24%	30%	
	Shift in the Share in Total Generated Income (%80-%75):		-1%	28%	-0%	1%	3%	1%	-4%	0%	-0%	1%	-2%	0%	-4%	1%	-3%	-0%	3%	-1%	-3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	
	4-6A	93	-1%	28%	-0%	1%	3%	1%	-4%	0%	-0%	1%	-2%	0%	-4%	1%	-3%	-0%	3%	-1%	-3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	
	4-6Ba	94	1%	-6%	10%	13%	-2%	-0%	-4%	0%	-6%	-0%	-1%	1%	-1%	0%	6%	0%	9%	1%	6%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	-0%	
	4-6Bb	95	1%	-2%	-6%	-5%	-2%	-0%	-4%	0%	-3%	-0%	-2%	0%	-1%	0%	1%	-0%	-5%	-3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-2%	-3%	
	4-6Bc	96	0%	-2%	-4%	-6%	-0%	-0%	-1%	0%	-2%	-0%	-1%	0%	-2%	0%	0%	0%	-15%	-2%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-3%	-4%	
	4-6Ca	97	-1%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	12%	0%	-12%	0%	14%	0%	-4%	0%	-27%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	-0%	
	4-6Cb	98	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	-1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	4-6D	99	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	-3%	0%	2%	0%	23%	0%	-8%	0%	14%	0%	22%	0%	2%	-1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	4-6Ea	100	0%	-6%	0%	-2%	0%	-1%	0%	-6%	0%	-10%	0%	10%	0%	7%	0%	-35%	0%	10%	0%	-11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
	4-6Eb	101	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
	4-6F	102	0%	-12%	0%	-2%	0%	1%	0%	6%	0%	9%	0%	-11%	0%	-8%	0%	35%	0%	-2%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
	Total Households		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-7%
	Shift in the Distribution by Income Source (%80-%75):		-9%	3%	-1%	0%	3%	1%	-2%	0%	-0%	1%	-1%	0%	-2%	1%	-0%	-0%	8%	1%	-4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	4-6A	93	-9%	3%	-1%	0%	3%	1%	-2%	0%	-0%	1%	-1%	0%	-2%	1%	-0%	-0%	8%	1%	-4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	4-6Ba	94	-2%	-0%	-5%	-0%	-1%	0%	-1%	0%	-1%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	1%	-1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	4-6Bb	95	1%	-0%	-4%	-0%	0%	-0%	-1%	0%	-1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	1%	-2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	0%	0%
	4-6Bc	96	0%	-0%	-2%	-0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	0%	0%
	4-6Ca	97	-1%	0%	-1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	-5%	0%	7%	0%	-1%	0%	-1%	0%	5%	1%	-7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%
	4-6Cb	98	-1%	0%	-0%	0%	-1%	0%	-0%	0%	-1%	0%	0%	0%	-7%	0%	0%	0%	13%	-7%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	0%	0%
	4-6D	99	-1%	0%	-1%	0%	-2%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	-7%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	4%	-0%	-2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	0%
	4-6Ea	100	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	2%	0%	0%	-1%	0%	3%	0%	-10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	0%
	4-6Eb	101	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	-2%	0%	0%	-1%	0%	0%	-3%	0%	0%	0%	3%	-14%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	0%	0%
	4-6F	102	0%	-0%	0%	-0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	3%	0%	-2%	0%	-1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	-4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	0%
	Total Households		-1%	0%	-3%	-0%	0%	1%	-0%	0%	-1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	1%	-1%	-1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Corporations and Government		-1%	0%	-3%	-0%	0%	1%	-0%	0%	-1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	1%	-1%	-1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	TOTAL GROSS GENERATED INCOME		-1%	0%	-3%	-0%	0%	1%	-0%	0%	-0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	-0%	1%	-1%	-1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	*) Row vector (10,3) minus transposed column vector (3,10)																														

TABLE A.16: Distribution of TOTAL INCOME over Institutional Subsectors in Indonesia, 1980, based on a detailed (131*128) SAM (billions of Rupiah)

EXPENDITURES	INSTITUTIONAL SECTORS																Total Property Income and Transfers Domestic 4-6	Total Taxes on Products minus Subsidies 1	Total Gross Generated Income 3	Total Property Income Transfers from abroad 10	TOTAL INCOME
	Households						Non-Agricultural						Government 4-6H	Corporations 4-6G	Total 67-90						
	Agricultural		Rural		Urban		Lower Level		Higher Level		Econ Inact Level										
La-bou-ers 4-6A	Small 4-6Ba	Medium 4-6Bb	Large 4-6Bc	Low-ers 4-6Ca	High-ers 4-6Cb	Rural Econ Level 4-6D	Rural Econ Level 4-6Ea	Urban Econ Level 4-6Eb	Urban Econ Level 4-6F	Government 4-6H	Corporations 4-6G	Total 91-102	Total 1-44	Total 67-90	Total 10						
RECEIPTS	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	1-44	3	10	Total					
Codes																					
Agric. Labourers 4-6A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4		1869	0	1876					
Small Farmers 4-6Ba	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11		4493	0	4511					
Medium Farmers 4-6Bb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3		1998	0	2004					
Large Farmers 4-6Bc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4		3587	0	3596					
Lower Non-ag Rural 4-6Ca	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7		4173	1	4183					
Lower Non-ag Urban 4-6Cb	5	12	14	82	30	1	33	4	0	7	123	1		297	0	609					
Higher Non-ag Rural 4-6D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	292	2		2181	3	2478					
Higher Non-ag Urban 4-6Ea	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	3		5568	4	5596					
Econ. Inact. Urban 4-6Eb	1	4	4	6	6	0	6	126	0	201	204	0		350	0	908					
Higher Non-ag Urban 4-6F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1849	0		4428	0	6278					
Corporations 4-6G	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0		19984	75	20076					
Government 4-6H	45	99	58	73	83	12	49	109	18	122	7951	1147	298	154	22	10241					
Total Agricultural Households	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	22	0	11947	0	11987					
Total Non-agric. Rural Households	5	12	14	82	30	1	33	4	0	7	418	10	0	6651	4	7271					
Total Non-agric. Urban Households	1	4	4	6	6	0	6	126	0	201	2075	4	0	10345	4	12781					
Total Households	7	16	18	88	36	1	39	130	0	208	2510	36	0	28943	8	32039					
Corporations and Government	45	99	58	73	83	12	49	109	18	122	7968	1147	298	20138	97	30318					
TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL INCOME 4-6	52	115	76	161	119	13	88	240	18	330	10478	1183	298	49081	105	62357					
Share in Total Institutional Income:																					
Total Agricultural Households	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	24%	0%	19%					
Total Non-agric. Rural Households	10%	11%	18%	51%	25%	5%	38%	2%	0%	2%	4%	1%	0%	14%	4%	12%					
Total Non-agric. Urban Households	3%	3%	5%	4%	5%	0%	6%	53%	1%	61%	20%	0%	0%	21%	4%	20%					
Total Households	13%	14%	23%	55%	30%	5%	44%	54%	1%	63%	24%	3%	0%	59%	8%	51%					
Corporations	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	41%	71%	32%					
Government	87%	86%	77%	45%	70%	95%	56%	46%	99%	37%	76%	97%	100%	0%	21%	16%					
TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL INCOME	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%					
Distribution by Income Source:																					
Total Agricultural Households	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%					
Total Non-agric. Rural Households	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	91%	0%	100%					
Total Non-agric. Urban Households	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	16%	0%	0%	81%	0%	100%					
Total Households	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	8%	0%	0%	90%	0%	100%					
Corporations	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%					
Government	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	78%	11%	3%	2%	0%	100%					
TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL INCOME	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	2%	0%	79%	0%	100%					

TABLE A.17: Distribution of TOTAL INCOME over Institutional Subsectors in Indonesia, 1975, based on a detailed (131*128) SAM (billions of Rupiah)

EXPENDITURES		INSTITUTIONAL SECTORS																				TOTAL INCOME
		Households										Corporations					Total Property Income and Transfers Domestic 4-6	Total Taxes on Products minus Subsidies 1	Total Gross Generated Income 3	Total Property Income & Transfers from abroad 10		
RECEIPTS		Agricultural		Non-Agricultural		Rural		Urban		4-6G		4-6F		4-6H		91-102					1-44	67-90
-->		La-bou-ers		Lower Level		Higher Level		Lower Level		Higher Level		4-6A		4-6B			99	100	101	102		
		91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	91-102					1-44	67-90
Agricultural Households		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		614	0	614		
Non-agric. Rural Households		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1258	0	1259		
Non-agric. Urban Households		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		910	0	910		
Total Households		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1535	0	1536		
Corporations		3	7	8	47	17	0	19	2	0	4	33	0	141	88	59		1173	0	1174		
Government		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	0	0	0	88		537	0	200		
TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL INCOME 4-6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173		1485	0	625		
Total Agricultural Households		1	1	1	2	2	0	2	46	0	74	43	0	467	173	46		1147	0	219		
Total Non-agric. Rural Households		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467	0	30	467	1147		4495	18	1615		
Total Non-agric. Urban Households		6	10	15	30	5	1	5	24	2	40	1479	348	1932	30	37		495	18	4543		
TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL INCOME 4-6		6	10	15	30	5	1	5	24	2	118	2109	354	1932	37	37		13295	19	2333		
TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL INCOME		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4		4316	0	4320		
Share in Total Institutional Income:		32%	39%	33%	60%	72%	23%	73%	3%	0%	4%	121	2	230	4	230		1768	0	1998		
Total Agricultural Households		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%		0%	0%	0%		
Total Non-agric. Rural Households		32%	39%	33%	60%	72%	23%	73%	3%	0%	4%	121	2	230	4	230		1768	0	1998		
Total Non-agric. Urban Households		6%	8%	6%	3%	9%	0%	8%	64%	2%	63%	24%	0	641	0	641		2679	0	3319		
Total Households		38%	46%	39%	62%	81%	23%	82%	67%	2%	66%	30%	6	875	0	875		8763	0	9637		
Corporations		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0	5645	363	5645		4532	19	6877		
Government		62%	54%	61%	38%	19%	77%	18%	33%	98%	34%	69%	98%	68%	100%	68%		0%	6%	14%		
TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL INCOME		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%		
Distribution by Income Source:		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		0%	0%	0%		
Total Agricultural Households		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		0%	0%	0%		
Total Non-agric. Rural Households		0%	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0	12%	0	12%		0%	0%	0%		
Total Non-agric. Urban Households		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	15%	0	19%	0	19%		0%	0%	0%		
Total Households		0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	7%	0	9%	0	9%		0%	0%	0%		
Corporations		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0	1%	0	1%		0%	0%	0%		
Government		0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	62%	15%	83%	16%	83%		100%	6%	14%		
TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL INCOME		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13%	2%	17%	2%	17%		100%	100%	100%		

TABLE A.19: Final Consumption expenditures and CHANGES IN INVENTORIES of Subsectors in Indonesia, 1990, based on a detailed (131*126) SAM (billions of Rupiah)

RECEIPTS -->	EXPENDITURES												CHANGES IN INVENTORIES								
	SAMS Codes			Agricultural Households				Non-Agricultural Households				Households				House-holds and Corporat.	Go-vern-ment	TOTAL			
	1A-4A	4-Ba	4-Bb	Large		Medium		Small		Rural	Urban		Cor-pore-ations	Go-vern-ment	Agricul-ture				Non-Agric. Urban	Non-Agric. Urban	Total
				4-6Ca	4-6Cb	4-6Cc	4-6C	4-6Da	4-6Db		4-6D	4-6Ea				4-6Eb	4-6E	4-6F			
Food Crops	1A	1	403	1180	471	712	667	119	248	421	69	283	0	2746	1034	773	4553	0	116	116	103-104
Other Crops	1B	2	30	80	30	42	48	9	19	31	5	19	0	181	75	55	312	48	0	48	103-104
Livestock Products	1Ab	3	66	155	69	137	152	25	58	248	47	189	0	428	235	483	1144	100	0	100	103-104
Forestry Products	1Bb	4	33	81	24	26	43	7	15	11	6	6	0	164	65	18	247	6	0	6	103-104
Fish	1Ac	5	75	179	73	159	188	28	76	188	31	146	0	485	292	362	1139	0	0	0	103-104
Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	1Ca	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	886	0	886	103-104
Quarrying Products	1Cb	7	6	16	6	10	10	2	4	1	4	4	0	38	15	11	65	-5	0	-5	103-104
Processed Food	1Ad	8	629	1289	385	603	1129	177	414	1176	190	765	0	2906	1721	2131	6756	19	8	27	103-104
WoodProd.&Construct.	1Cc	9	10	26	9	17	19	3	11	21	4	14	0	62	33	39	134	50	0	50	103-104
Textiles	1Cd	10	70	177	63	99	150	28	58	188	33	133	0	410	234	351	995	27	0	27	103-104
Paper&Metal Products	1Ce	11	37	82	31	59	129	25	90	253	66	401	0	208	245	720	1173	10	0	10	103-104
ChemicBasicMinerals	1Cf	12	70	166	56	97	145	27	66	184	31	137	0	389	238	351	979	-5	0	-5	103-104
Electric, Gas&Water	1Cg	13	4	10	3	5	9	2	4	54	10	43	0	22	15	108	145	0	0	0	103-104
Trade & Transp. Serv.	1Da	14	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	11	2	8	0	4	4	20	28	0	0	0	103-104
Restaurant Services	1Db	15	123	247	56	64	233	37	70	417	75	287	0	491	340	759	1590	0	0	0	103-104
Lodging	1Dc	16	1	3	1	3	8	1	9	27	4	29	0	7	18	60	85	0	0	0	103-104
Land Transport	1Dd	17	20	49	17	26	76	13	37	329	59	242	0	111	126	631	868	0	0	0	103-104
OtherTransport&Comm.	1De	18	9	19	7	14	36	5	29	113	19	104	0	50	70	236	356	0	0	0	103-104
Banking & Insurance	1Ea	19	5	11	6	10	19	2	16	56	8	53	0	31	38	117	186	0	0	0	103-104
RealEstate&Bus. Serv.	1Eb	20	97	229	79	122	193	32	73	504	95	428	0	527	297	1027	1850	0	0	0	103-104
Gov.mt, Soc&Recr. Serv.	1Ec	21	47	107	33	49	121	19	74	298	62	300	5151	236	214	660	1109	0	0	0	103-104
Person.&Househ. Serv.	1Df	22	47	100	33	60	75	17	39	184	38	188	0	239	130	410	780	0	0	0	103-104
Food Crops	1Fa	23	4	9	3	5	6	1	2	5	1	4	0	21	9	10	40	3	0	3	103-104
Other Crops	1Ga	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	5	0	5	103-104
Livestock Products	1Fb	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	3	0	3	103-104
Forestry Products	1Gb	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103-104
Fish	1Fc	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	103-104
Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	1Ha	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103-104
Quarrying Products	1Hb	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	23	103-104
Processed Food	1Fd	30	58	121	35	54	104	17	39	106	17	72	0	268	159	195	623	2	0	2	103-104
WoodProd.&Construct.	1Hc	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	103-104
Textiles	1Hd	32	3	7	3	4	7	1	3	9	2	7	0	17	11	17	45	3	0	3	103-104
Paper&Metal Products	1He	33	9	23	9	15	25	5	18	56	16	65	0	57	48	136	242	28	0	28	103-104
ChemicBasicMinerals	1Hf	34	23	57	18	29	53	9	20	71	11	47	0	128	81	130	339	97	0	97	103-104
Electric, Gas&Water	1Hg	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103-104
Trade & Transp. Serv.	1Ia	36	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	1	4	0	2	2	10	14	0	0	0	103-104
Restaurant Services	1Ib	37	3	7	2	2	6	1	2	11	2	7	0	13	9	20	43	0	0	0	103-104
Lodging	1Ic	38	0	2	1	2	6	1	6	19	3	20	0	5	12	42	59	0	0	0	103-104
Land Transport	1Id	39	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	1	4	0	2	2	9	13	0	0	0	103-104
OtherTransport&Comm.	1Ie	40	1	3	1	2	6	1	6	22	4	20	0	6	13	46	67	0	0	0	103-104
Banking & Insurance	1Ja	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3	0	1	2	7	10	0	0	0	103-104
RealEstate&Bus. Serv.	1Jb	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103-104
Gov.mt, Soc&Recr. Serv.	1Jc	43	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103-104
Person.&Househ. Serv.	1If	44	3	9	4	5	5	1	2	5	2	8	0	20	8	15	44	0	0	0	103-104
Total Domestic	1A-1E	1-22	1781	4187	1454	2313	3452	577	1409	4717	849	3756	0	9735	5438	9323	24496	1133	124	1257	103-104
Total Imported	1F-1J	23-44	107	243	78	122	224	37	102	324	91	265	0	550	362	651	1562	162	0	162	103-104
TOTAL	Row:1	1-44	1887	4430	1532	2435	3676	614	1510	5042	910	4022	0	10285	5800	9974	26059	1295	124	1419	103-104

TABLE A.24: Average annual growth rates of TOTAL OUTLAYS by Subsectors in Indonesia, 1975-1980, based on both detailed (131*128) SAMs

EXPENDITURES	Agricultural Households										Non-Agricultural Households						Corporations			Households				TOTAL														
	Small					Medium Large					Rural			Urban			Government			Non-Agric.		Non-Total																
	4-6A	4-6Ba	4-6Bb	4-6Bc	4-6Bd	4-6Ca	4-6Cb	4-6Cc	4-6Cd	4-6Ce	4-6Ea	4-6Eb	4-6Ec	4-6Ed	4-6Ee	4-6F	4-6G	4-6H	4-6I	4-6J	4-6K	4-6L	4-6M		4-6N	4-6O	4-6P	4-6Q	4-6R	4-6S	4-6T	4-6U	4-6V	4-6W	4-6X	4-6Y	4-6Z	
RECEIPTS	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128
Food Crops	20%	18%	8%	11%	23%	18%	18%	23%	25%	19%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17%
Other Crops	23%	25%	16%	18%	25%	22%	23%	26%	26%	21%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	22%
F Livestock Products	28%	25%	12%	18%	31%	22%	17%	37%	39%	24%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	25%
I Forestry Products	32%	35%	24%	26%	32%	29%	30%	27%	27%	28%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	31%
N Fish	22%	24%	14%	20%	26%	18%	18%	24%	27%	21%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	22%	
A Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
L Quarrying Products	17%	22%	14%	14%	20%	18%	15%	16%	17%	10%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17%	
Processed Food	19%	26%	15%	17%	22%	23%	19%	23%	27%	22%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	22%	
C WoodProd.&Construct	27%	31%	20%	27%	28%	24%	31%	34%	33%	32%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	29%	
O Textiles	27%	26%	20%	16%	22%	25%	18%	17%	18%	11%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	19%		
N Paper&Metal Products	16%	24%	12%	11%	19%	16%	15%	24%	24%	20%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	20%		
S Chemic&BasicMinerals	29%	35%	24%	25%	32%	28%	28%	30%	30%	24%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	29%		
U Electric.,Gas&Water	6%	15%	3%	1%	14%	16%	5%	21%	21%	13%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	15%		
M Trade & Transp.Serv.	--	109%	87%	82%	104%	--	80%	132%	115%	121%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	114%		
P Restaurant Services	30%	35%	23%	22%	30%	34%	27%	25%	28%	27%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	28%		
T Lodging	24%	37%	18%	20%	40%	29%	46%	58%	55%	55%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	48%		
I Land Transport	15%	11%	-0%	6%	16%	24%	26%	30%	36%	29%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	24%		
O OtherTransport&Com	29%	25%	10%	13%	26%	25%	31%	39%	40%	37%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	32%			
N Banking & Insurance	47%	47%	18%	28%	39%	33%	41%	54%	51%	49%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	45%		
RealEstate&Buss.Serv.	27%	29%	18%	23%	30%	21%	23%	35%	30%	27%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	28%			
Gov.mt.Soc&Recr.Ser	22%	27%	12%	11%	25%	24%	27%	27%	34%	26%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	26%		
Person.&Househ.Serv.	17%	21%	9%	12%	15%	19%	13%	26%	29%	25%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	20%		
TOTAL Consumption	22%	24%	13%	15%	24%	22%	20%	27%	28%	23%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	23%		
PropertyOutl.&Transfers	34%	37%	23%	14%	32%	42%	24%	24%	42%	21%	32%	24%	23%	29%	22%	23%	29%	22%	23%	23%	29%	22%	24%	23%	29%	22%	23%	29%	22%	23%	29%	22%	24%	23%	29%	22%	30%	
GROSS Corpor.&Househ	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	
SA- Government	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	36%	
VING Total	-10%	22%	32%	22%	49%	-18%	58%	27%	-39%	40%	29%	36%	31%	56%	38%	39%	31%	56%	38%	39%	31%	56%	38%	39%	31%	56%	38%	39%	31%	56%	38%	39%	31%	56%	38%	39%	33%	
Prop.Outl.&Trans.toROW	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	
TOTAL OUTLAYS	22%	26%	16%	17%	25%	22%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	28%	27%	26%	
Shift of the Share in Total Outlays (%'80-'75)	-4.0%	-8.5%	-12.2%	-5.5%	-7.2%	-2.0%	-27.0%	0.4%	-0.1%	-12.9%	0.0%	-7.6%	-4.9%	-13.9%	-6.2%	-7.7%	-10.1%	-0.5%	-0.2%	-0.3%	-0.1%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.5%		
Final Consumption Expenditure	1.5%	1.4%	1.3%	0.1%	1.6%	1.4%	1.2%	0.4%	1.0%	-0.5%	7.7%	-3.7%	0.9%	1.5%	-0.0%	0.7%	4.0%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Property Outlays & Transfers to Hh. & Corp	2.8%	7.4%	11.1%	6.1%	6.4%	0.7%	27.6%	0.2%	-0.9%	14.9%	-1.5%	9.4%	4.5%	13.4%	7.4%	7.8%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Gross Saving	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		
Total Outlays	-0.4%	0.7%	-3.2%	-3.5%	0.5%	-0.1%	-0.7%	2.8%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	2.9%	-6.5%	-0.2%	3.8%	-2.9%	0%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%		
Shift of the Distribution over Subsectors (%'80-'75)	-0.2%	-0.4%	-0.5%	-2.6%	-1.0%	-0.0%	-1.1%	-1.2%	-0.0%	-1.9%	8.3%	0.5%	-3.6%	-2.1%	-3.1%	-8.9%	0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	-0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	-0.8%	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	-0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	-0.3%	-0.2%	0%			
Property Outlays & Transfers to Hh. & Corp	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%		
Property Outlays & Transfers to ROW	0.9%	3.3%	-0.1%	-4.9%	1.4%	0.1%	4.1%	-0.7%	-0.0%	0.3%	-11.0%	3.1%	-0.8%	5.6%	3.1%	7.9%	0%	-0.7%	-0.4%	-3.5%	-0.4%	-0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	4.7%	2.3%	-6.9%	-0.4%	0.4%	-7.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%			
Gross Saving	-0.7%	-0.4%	-2.3%	-3.5%	-0.4%	-0.2%	0.2%	-0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	4.7%	2.3%	-6.9%	-0.4%	0.4%	-7.0%	0%	-0.7%	-0.4%	-3.5%	-0.4%	-0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	4.7%	2.3%	-6.9%	-0.4%	0.4%	-7.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%			
Total Outlays	-0.7%	-0.4%	-2.3%	-3.5%	-0.4%	-0.2%	0.2%	-0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	4.7%	2.3%	-6.9%	-0.4%	0.4%	-7.0%	0%	-0.7%	-0.4%	-3.5%	-0.4%	-0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	4.7%	2.3%	-6.9%	-0.4%	0.4%	-7.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%			

TABLE A.25: Capital, Fixed Capital Formation, Financial and Rest-Of-the-World accounts for Indonesia, 1980, based on a detailed (131*128) Social Accounting Matrix (billions of Rupiah)

RECEIPTS -->	Codes	GOODS AND SERVICES	INCOME GENERATION	INCOME DIS-TRIBUTION AND USE	INSTITUTIONS CAPITAL	FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION	REST OF THE WORLD CURRENT	TOTAL	
									1
	1-46		67-90	91-102	103	104	105-126	127	128
	69-92				1295	124	10476	16161	
	93-104							0	
								105	
CA- Sec-	7A	105		11819	0	943		0	12662
PI- tors	7B	106		3456	0	393		1219	5068
TAL	7	105-106		15275	0	1236		1219	17730
	8Ab	107			35	296			331
	8Ba	108			100	149			249
	8Ab	109			68	2			71
	8Bb	110			86	65			150
	8Ac	111			92	3			95
	8Ca	112			1172	157			1329
	8Cb	113			53	9			62
	8Ad	114			160	6			166
	8Cc	115			381	39			421
	8Cd	116			248	15			264
	8Ce	117			351	3			354
	8Cf	118			380	51			431
	8Cg	119			91	362			452
	8Da	120			152	9			161
	8Db	121			131	0			131
	8Dc	122			118	4			122
	8Dd	123			495	479			974
	8De	124			357	345			702
	8Ea	125			88	6			94
	8Eb	126			2176	47			2223
	8Ec	127			234	1392			1627
	8Df	128			68	0			68
	8	107-128			7036	3439			10476
FINANCIAL BALANCE	9	129			4331	270		-4600	0
REST OF THE WORLD CURRENT	10	130	9886	0	2999			-3381	12885
REST OF THE WORLD CAPITAL	11	131			0	0		12885	-3381
TOTAL					12662	5068	10476	12885	-3381

Distribution of Gross Fixed Capital Formation of Institutional Sectors over Industries	House-holds & Corporations		Government	TOTAL
	House-holds & Corporations	Government		
	0.5%	8.6%		3.2%
	1.4%	4.3%		2.4%
	1.0%	0.1%		0.7%
	1.2%	1.9%		1.4%
	1.3%	0.1%		0.9%
	16.7%	4.6%		12.7%
	0.7%	0.3%		0.6%
	2.3%	0.2%		1.6%
	5.4%	1.1%		4.0%
	3.5%	0.4%		2.5%
	5.0%	0.1%		3.4%
	5.4%	1.5%		4.1%
	1.3%	10.5%		4.3%
	2.2%	0.2%		1.5%
	1.9%	0.0%		1.3%
	1.7%	0.1%		1.2%
	7.0%	13.9%		9.3%
	5.1%	10.0%		6.7%
	1.3%	0.2%		0.9%
	30.9%	1.4%		21.2%
	3.3%	40.5%		15.5%
	1.0%	0.0%		0.7%
	100%	100%		100%

Distribution of Gross Fixed Capital Formation by Industry over Institutional Sectors	House-holds & Corporations		Government	TOTAL
	House-holds & Corporations	Government		
	10.6%	89.4%		100%
	40.0%	60.0%		100%
	96.8%	3.2%		100%
	57.0%	43.0%		100%
	96.8%	3.2%		100%
	88.2%	11.8%		100%
	85.1%	14.9%		100%
	96.5%	3.5%		100%
	90.7%	9.3%		100%
	94.2%	5.8%		100%
	99.1%	0.9%		100%
	88.2%	11.8%		100%
	20.0%	80.0%		100%
	94.7%	5.3%		100%
	100.0%	0.0%		100%
	96.5%	3.5%		100%
	50.8%	49.2%		100%
	50.8%	49.2%		100%
	93.9%	6.1%		100%
	97.9%	2.1%		100%
	14.4%	85.6%		100%
	100.0%	0.0%		100%
	67.2%	32.8%		100%

TABLE A.26: Capital, Fixed Capital Formation, Financial and Rest-Of-the-World accounts for Indonesia, 1975, based on a detailed (131*128) Social Accounting Matrix (billions of Rupiah)

RECEIPTS -->	EXPENDITURE		GOODS AND SERVICES	INCOME GENERATION	INCOME DIS-TRIBUTION AND USE	INSTITUTIONS		FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION	REST OF THE WORLD		TOTAL
	Codes					House-holds & Corporations	Government		CURRENT	CAPITAL	
	1-44	45-104									
	1	3	1-44	67-90	91-102	7A	7B	8	10	11	
GOODS AND SERVICES	1-44	67-90	1-44	67-90	91-102	103	104	105-126	127	128	
INCOME GENERATION	3	69-92				180	0	3229	3253		
INCOME DISTRIBUTION AND USE	4-6	93-104							0		
CA- Sec- Households & Corpor.	7A	105			2343	0	538		19	0	2881
PI- tors Government	7B	106			567	0	177			394	1138
TOTAL	7	105-108			2911	0	715			394	4020
Food Crops Cultivation	8Ab	107				31	77				108
Other Crops Cultivation	8Ba	108				32	3				35
Livestock	8Ab	109				5	0				5
Forestry	8Bb	110				21	1				22
Fishery	8Ac	111				19	0				19
Oil, Gas & Metals Mining	8Ca	112				328	108				436
I Quarrying	8Cb	113				5	0				5
n Food Processing	8Ad	114				115	0				115
d WoodProd.Construction	8Cc	115				100	6				106
u Textile Manufacturing	8Cd	116				81	0				81
s Paper&MetalProd.Manuf.	8Ce	117				147	0				147
t Chem.&MineralsManuf.	8Cf	118				113	0				113
r tilities	8Cg	119				86	206				292
l Trade & Transport Serv.	8Da	120				65	24				88
e Restaurant	8Db	121				62	0				62
s Hotel	8Dc	122				25	0				25
Land Transport	8Dd	123				137	246				383
OtherTransport&Comm.	8De	124				177	256				432
Banking & Insurance	8Ea	125				26	0				26
RealEstate&Buss.Serv.	8Eb	126				477	2				479
Gov.mt.Soc&Recr.Serv.	8Ec	127				41	187				228
Person.&Househ.Serv.	8Df	128				21	0				21
TOTAL	8	107-128				2114	1116				3229
FINANCIAL BALANCE	9	129				587	-692			105	0
REST OF THE WORLD CURRENT	10	130	2945	0	826	0	0			499	3771
REST OF THE WORLD CAPITAL	11	131				2881	1138	3229	3771	499	499
TOTAL											

Distribution of Gross Fixed Capital Formation of Institutional Sectors over Industries		
House-holds & Corporations	Government	TOTAL
1.5%	6.9%	3.3%
1.5%	0.3%	1.1%
0.3%	0.0%	0.2%
1.0%	0.1%	0.7%
0.9%	0.0%	0.6%
15.5%	9.7%	13.5%
0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
5.4%	0.0%	3.6%
4.7%	0.5%	3.3%
3.8%	0.0%	2.5%
7.0%	0.0%	4.6%
5.3%	0.0%	3.5%
4.1%	18.5%	9.0%
3.1%	2.1%	2.7%
2.9%	0.0%	1.9%
1.2%	0.0%	0.8%
6.5%	22.1%	11.8%
8.4%	22.9%	13.4%
1.2%	0.0%	0.8%
22.8%	0.2%	14.8%
2.0%	16.8%	7.1%
1.0%	0.0%	0.7%
100%	100%	100%

Distribution of Gross Fixed Capital Formation by Industry over Institutional Sectors		
House-holds & Corporations	Government	TOTAL
29.1%	70.9%	100%
91.2%	8.8%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
95.2%	4.8%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
75.2%	24.8%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
94.2%	5.8%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
29.4%	70.6%	100%
73.2%	26.8%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
35.7%	64.3%	100%
40.8%	59.2%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
99.6%	0.4%	100%
18.1%	81.9%	100%
100.0%	0.0%	100%
65.5%	34.5%	100%

TABLE A.27: Average annual growth rates of elements in the Capital, Fixed Capital Formation, Financial and Rest-Of-the-World accounts in Indonesia, 1975-1980, based on both (131*128) SAMs

RECEIPTS -->	EXPENDITURE		GOODS AND SERVICES	INCOME GENERATION	INCOME DIS-TRIBUTION AND USE	INSTITUTIONS CAPITAL		FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION	REST OF THE WORLD CURRENT		TOTAL
	1-44	3				4-6	7A		7B	8	
GOODS AND SERVICES	1	1-46						8	10	11	
INCOME GENERATION	3	69-92						105-126	127	128	
INCOME DISTRIBUTION AND USE	4-6	93-104						24%	32%		
CA- Sec- Households & Corpor.	7A	105		32%							30%
PI- tors Government	7B	106		36%							30%
TAL	7	105-106		33%							30%
Food Crops Cultivation	8Ab	107				2%	27%				22%
Other Crops Cultivation	8Ba	108				23%	78%				39%
Livestock	8Ab	109				51%					52%
Forestry	8Bb	110				28%	82%				38%
Fishery	8Ac	111				32%					33%
Oil, Gas & Metals Mining	8Ca	112				25%	7%				22%
Quarrying	8Cb	113				47%					50%
Food Processing	8Ad	114				7%					7%
WoodProd.Construction	8Cc	115				27%	37%				28%
Textile Manufacturing	8Cd	116				22%					24%
Paper&MetalProdManuf.	8Ce	117				17%					18%
Chem.&MineralsManuf.	8Cf	118				24%					27%
Utilities	8Cg	119				1%	11%				9%
Trade & Transport Serv.	8Da	120				17%	-20%				12%
Restaurant	8Db	121				15%					15%
Hotel	8Dc	122				31%					31%
Land Transport	8Dd	123				26%	13%				19%
OtherTransport&Comm.	8De	124				14%	6%				10%
Banking & Insurance	8Ea	125				25%					26%
RealEstate&Buss.Serv.	8Eb	126				30%	66%				31%
Gov.mt.Soc&Recr.Serv.	8Ec	127				35%	40%				39%
Person.&Househ.Serv.	8Df	128				23%					23%
TOTAL	8	107-128				24%	23%				24%
FINANCIAL BALANCE	9	129				40%					--
REST OF THE WORLD CURRENT	10	130			26%						25%
REST OF THE WORLD CAPITAL	11	131									--
TOTAL						30%	30%	24%	25%		--

Shift in the Distribution of Gross Fixed Capital Formation of Institutional Sectors over Industries		
Households & Corporations	Government	TOTAL
-1.0%	1.7%	-0.2%
-0.1%	4.1%	1.3%
0.7%	0.1%	0.5%
0.2%	1.8%	0.8%
0.4%	0.1%	0.3%
1.2%	-5.1%	-0.8%
0.5%	0.3%	0.4%
-3.2%	0.2%	-2.0%
0.7%	0.6%	0.7%
-0.3%	0.4%	0.0%
-2.0%	0.1%	-1.2%
0.1%	1.5%	0.6%
-2.8%	-8.0%	-4.7%
-0.9%	-1.9%	-1.2%
-1.1%	0.0%	-0.7%
0.5%	0.1%	0.4%
0.6%	-8.1%	-2.5%
-3.3%	-12.9%	-6.7%
0.0%	0.2%	0.1%
8.4%	1.2%	6.4%
1.4%	23.7%	8.5%
-0.0%	0.0%	-0.0%
0%	0%	0%

Shift in the Distribution of Gross Fixed Capital Formation by Industry over Institutional Sectors		
Households & Corporations	Government	TOTAL
-18.5%	18.5%	0%
-51.2%	51.2%	0%
-3.2%	3.2%	0%
-38.1%	38.1%	0%
-3.2%	3.2%	0%
13.0%	-13.0%	0%
-14.9%	14.9%	0%
-3.5%	3.5%	0%
-3.6%	3.6%	0%
-5.8%	5.8%	0%
-0.9%	0.9%	0%
-11.8%	11.8%	0%
-9.3%	9.3%	0%
21.5%	-21.5%	0%
0.0%	0.0%	0%
-3.5%	3.5%	0%
15.1%	-15.1%	0%
10.0%	-10.0%	0%
-6.1%	6.1%	0%
-1.8%	1.8%	0%
-3.7%	3.7%	0%
0.0%	0.0%	0%
1.7%	-1.7%	0%

TABLE A.28: Origin of GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION in Indonesia, 1980, based on a detailed (131*128) Social Accounting Matrix (billions of Rupiah)

EXPENDITURES		Food Crops Cult.	Other Crops Cult.	Live-stock	Forestry	Fishery	Mining	Gas	Oil	Quarrying	Food Processing	Wood & Con-struct.	Textile	Paper & Metal Prod.	Chem.	Basic Miner.	Util. & Transp. Serv.	Trade	Re-sourc.	Hotels	Land Trans-port	Other Trans-port	Finance	Real Estate	Govt. Serv.	Per-s. & Hh. Serv.	TOTAL		
RECEIPTS	Codes	8aA	8Ba	8Ab	8Ac	8Ad	8Ca	8Cb	8Cc	8Cd	8Ce	8Cf	8Cg	8Da	8Db	8Dc	8Dd	8De	8Ea	8Eb	8Ec	8Ed	8Ee	8Ee	8Ee	8Ee	8Ee	8Ee	
1	1Aa	105	108	107	108	108	109	110	111	112	113	113	114	115	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	128	8	
2	1Ba	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1Ab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1Bb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	1Ac	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	1Ca	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	1Cb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	1Ad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	1Cc	280	204	69	100	32	459	35	62	121	76	122	208	281	85	81	86	535	330	74	2186	1402	19	6847	19	6847	19	6847	19
10	1Cd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	1Ce	5	25	1	26	23	89	6	11	17	19	8	22	71	52	29	377	85	11	31	97	10	1042	10	1042	10	1042	10	
12	1Cf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	1Cg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	1Da	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	1Db	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	1Dc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	1Dd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	1De	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	1Ea	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	1Eb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	1Ec	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	1Ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	1Fa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	1Ga	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25	1Fb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	1Gb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	1Fc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28	1Ha	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
29	1Hb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	1Fd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31	1Hc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	1Hd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
33	1He	46	20	1	25	40	781	21	93	282	189	224	200	100	23	21	62	287	9	7	128	40	2587	40	2587	40	2587	40	
34	1Hf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35	1Hg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	1Ia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
37	1Ib	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
38	1Ic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
39	1Id	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	1Ie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41	1Ja	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	1Jb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	1Jc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	1Jf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	Row:1	331	249	71	150	95	1329	62	166	421	264	354	431	452	161	131	974	702	94	2223	1627	68	10476	68	10476	68	10476	68	
She-	Wood Prod. & Construction	84.6%	81.9%	97.2%	66.2%	33.6%	34.6%	56.6%	37.2%	26.9%	28.6%	34.4%	48.3%	62.1%	59.0%	62.0%	70.7%	54.9%	47.1%	78.5%	88.3%	86.2%	27.3%	65.4%	27.3%	65.4%	27.3%	65.4%	
res	Paper & Metal Products	1.6%	10.0%	1.4%	17.3%	24.3%	6.7%	9.7%	6.8%	4.1%	7.2%	2.3%	5.2%	15.7%	32.5%	22.1%	22.3%	38.7%	12.1%	11.6%	1.4%	5.9%	14.9%	9.9%	14.9%	9.9%	14.9%	9.9%	
	Paper & Metal Products	13.9%	8.0%	1.4%	16.5%	42.1%	58.7%	33.5%	56.0%	67.0%	64.0%	63.3%	46.5%	22.1%	14.6%	15.9%	7.1%	6.4%	40.9%	9.9%	0.3%	7.9%	57.9%	24.7%	57.9%	24.7%	57.9%	24.7%	

TABLE A.30: Average annual growth rate of GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION by origin in Indonesia, 1975-1980, based on a detailed (131*128) Social Accounting Matrix

EXPENDITURES	Code	EXPENDITURES												TOTAL										
		Food Crops Cult.	Other Crops Cult.	Live Stock	Forestry	Fishery	Oil, Gas, Mining	Quarrying	Food Process	Wood & Con- struc.	Textile	Paper& Metal Prod.	Chem. Miner.		Utilities &Trans p.Serv	Trade	Res- tant	Ho- tel	Land- port	Other trans- port	Fi- nan- ce	Real Est.& B.Serv	Govern- ment, etc.	Pers. & Hh. Serv.
		8aA	8Ba	8Ab	8Bb	8Ac	8Ca	8Cb	8Ad	8Cc	8Cd	8Ce	8Cf	8Cg	8Da	8Db	8Dc	8Dd	8De	8Ea	8Eb	8Ec	8Ed	8Ee
		105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	128
Food Crops	1Aa																							
Other Crops	1Ba																							
Livestock Products	1Ab																							
Forestry Products	1Bb																							
Fish	1Ac																							
Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	1Ca																							
Quarrying Products	1Cb																							
Processed Food	1Ad																							
WoodProd.&Construct.	1Cc																							
Textiles	1Cd																							
Paper&Metal Products	1Ce																							
Chemical&BasicMinerals	1Cf																							
Electric, Gas&Water	1Cg																							
Trade & Transp.Serv.	1Da																							
Restaurant Services	1Db																							
Lodging	1Dc																							
Land Transport	1Dd																							
OtherTransport&Comm.	1De																							
Banking & Insurance	1Ea																							
RealEstate&Buss.Serv.	1Eb																							
Gov.mt.Soc&Recr.Serv.	1Ec																							
Person.&Househ.Serv.	1Ed																							
Food Crops	1Fa																							
Other Crops	1Ga																							
Livestock Products	1Fb																							
Forestry Products	1Gb																							
Fish	1Fc																							
Oil, Gas, Metal Ores	1Ha																							
Quarrying Products	1Hb																							
Processed Food	1Fd																							
WoodProd.&Construct.	1Hc																							
Textiles	1Hd																							
Paper&Metal Products	1He																							
Chemical&BasicMinerals	1Hf																							
Electric, Gas&Water	1Hg																							
Trade & Transp.Serv.	1Ia																							
Restaurant Services	1Ib																							
Lodging	1Ic																							
Land Transport	1Id																							
OtherTransport&Comm.	1Ie																							
Banking & Insurance	1Ia																							
RealEstate&Buss.Serv.	1Ib																							
Gov.mt.Soc&Recr.Serv.	1Ic																							
Person.&Househ.Serv.	1If																							
TOTAL	Row:1	22%	39%	52%	35%	33%	22%	50%	7%	26%	24%	18%	27%	8%	12%	15%	31%	19%	10%	26%	31%	39%	23%	24%
Sha- res	Wood Prod.& Construction	-3.1%	11.4%	6.0%	19.9%	16.0%	8.2%	48.2%	24.3%	15.0%	20.1%	28.1%	34.4%	-10.3%	-9.7%	44.4%	47.8%	-10.8%	-15.7%	24.1%	2.2%	3.4%	3.5%	9.9%
Shift	Paper & Metal Products	0.6%	-4.2%	-2.4%	-6.2%	-0.5%	0.9%	-0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	-0.2%	-1.4%	6.2%	9.2%	-19.9%	-31.9%	10.6%	5.4%	-9.6%	-1.7%	-0.3%	2.6%	-0.3%	
	Paper & Metal Products I	2.5%	-7.2%	-3.6%	-13.6%	-15.5%	-9.1%	-41.6%	-23.8%	-15.9%	-20.2%	-27.8%	-33.0%	4.1%	0.5%	-24.5%	0.2%	10.4%	-14.4%	-0.6%	-3.2%	-6.1%	-9.6%	

Statistics Netherlands
National Accounts Occasional Papers

- NA/01 Flexibility in the system of National Accounts**, Van Eck, R., C.N. Gorter and H.K. van Tuinen (1983).
This paper sets out some of the main ideas of what gradually developed into the Dutch view on the fourth revision of the SNA. In particular it focuses on the validity and even desirability of the inclusion of a number of carefully chosen alternative definitions in the "Blue Book", and the organization of a flexible system starting from a core that is easier to understand than the 1968 SNA.
- NA/02 The unobserved economy and the National Accounts in the Netherlands, a sensitivity analysis**, Broesterhuizen, G.A.A.M. (1983).
This paper studies the influence of fraud on macro-economic statistics, especially GDP. The term "fraud" is used as meaning unreporting or underreporting income (e.g. to the tax authorities). The conclusion of the analysis of growth figures is that a bias in the growth of GDP of more than 0.5% is very unlikely.
- NA/03 Secondary activities and the National Accounts: Aspects of the Dutch measurement practice and its effects on the unofficial economy**, Van Eck, R. (1985).
In the process of estimating national product and other variables in the National Accounts a number of methods is used to obtain initial estimates for each economic activity. These methods are described and for each method various possibilities for distortion are considered.
- NA/04 Comparability of input-output tables in time**, Al, P.G. and G.A.A.M. Broesterhuizen (1985).
It is argued that the comparability in time of statistics, and input-output tables in particular, can be filled in in various ways. The way in which it is filled depends on the structure and object of the statistics concerned. In this respect it is important to differentiate between coordinated input-output tables, in which groups of units (industries) are divided into rows and columns, and analytical input-output tables, in which the rows and columns refer to homogeneous activities.
- NA/05 The use of chain indices for deflating the National Accounts**, Al, P.G., B.M. Balk, S. de Boer and G.P. den Bakker (1985).
This paper is devoted to the problem of deflating National Accounts and input-output tables. This problem is approached from the theoretical as well as from the practical side. Although the theoretical argument favors the use of chained Vartia-I indices, the current practice of compiling National Accounts restricts to using chained Paasche and Laspeyres indices. Various possible objections to the use of chained indices are discussed and rejected.
- NA/06 Revision of the system of National Accounts: the case for flexibility**, Van Bochove, C.A. and H.K. van Tuinen (1985).
It is argued that the structure of the SNA should be made more flexible. This can be achieved by means of a system of a general purpose core supplemented with special modules. This core is a fully fledged, detailed system of National Accounts with a greater institutional content than the present SNA and a more elaborate description of the economy at the meso-level. The modules are more analytic and reflect special purposes and specific theoretical views.
- NA/07 Integration of input-output tables and sector accounts; a possible solution**, Van den Bos, C. (1985).
The establishment-enterprise problem is tackled by taking the institutional sectors to which the establishments belong into account during the construction of input-output tables. The extra burden on the construction of input-output tables resulting from this approach is examined for the Dutch situation. An adapted sectoring of institutional units is proposed for the construction of input-output tables.
- NA/08 A note on Dutch National Accounting data 1900-1984**, Van Bochove, C.A. (1985).
This note provides a brief survey of Dutch national accounting data for 1900-1984, concentrating on national income. It indicates where these data can be found and what the major discontinuities are. The note concludes that estimates of the level of national income may contain inaccuracies; that its growth rate is measured accurately for the period since 1948; and that the real income growth rate series for 1900-1984 may contain a systematic bias.

- NA/09 The structure of the next SNA: review of the basic options**, Van Bochove, C.A. and A.M. Bloem (1985).
There are two basic issues with respect to the structure of the next version of the UN System of National Accounts. The first is its 'size': reviewing this issue, it can be concluded that the next SNA should contain an integrated meso-economic statistical system. It is essential that the next SNA contains an institutional system without the imputations and attributions that pollute the present SNA. This can be achieved by distinguishing, in the central system of the next SNA, a core (the institutional system), a standard module for non-market production and a standard module describing attributed income and consumption of the household sector.
- NA/10 Dual sectoring in National Accounts**, Al, P.G. (1985).
Following a conceptual explanation of dual sectoring, an outline is given of a statistical system with complete dual sectoring in which the linkages are also defined and worked out. It is shown that the SNA 1968 is incomplete and obscure with respect to the links between the two sub-processes.
- NA/11 Backward and forward linkages with an application to the Dutch agro-industrial complex**, Harthoorn, R. (1985).
Some industries induce production in other industries. An elegant method is developed for calculating forward and backward linkages avoiding double counting. For 1981 these methods have been applied to determine the influence of Dutch agriculture in the Dutch economy in terms of value added and labour force.
- NA/12 Production chains**, Harthoorn, R. (1986).
This paper introduces the notion of production chains as a measure of the hierarchy of industries in the production process. Production chains are sequences of transformation of products by successive industries. It is possible to calculate forward transformations as well as backward ones.
- NA/13 The simultaneous compilation of current price and deflated input-output tables**, De Boer, S. and G.A.A.M. Broesterhuizen (1986).
A few years ago the method of compiling input-output tables underwent in the Netherlands an essential revision. The most significant improvement is that during the entire statistical process, from the processing and analysis of the basic data up to and including the phase of balancing the tables, data in current prices and deflated data are obtained simultaneously and in consistency with each other.
- NA/14 A proposal for the synoptic structure of the next SNA**, Al, P.G. and C.A. van Bochove (1986).
- NA/15 Features of the hidden economy in the Netherlands**, Van Eck, R. and B. Kazemier (1986).
This paper presents survey results on the size and structure of the hidden labour market in the Netherlands.
- NA/16 Uncovering hidden income distributions: the Dutch approach**, Van Bochove, C.A. (1987).
- NA/17 Main national accounting series 1900-1986**, Van Bochove, C.A. and T.A. Huitker (1987).
The main national accounting series for the Netherlands, 1900-1986, are provided, along with a brief explanation.
- NA/18 The Dutch economy, 1921-1939 and 1969-1985. A comparison based on revised macro-economic data for the interwar period**, Den Bakker, G.P., T.A. Huitker and C.A. van Bochove (1987).
A set of macro-economic time series for the Netherlands 1921-1939 is presented. The new series differ considerably from the data that had been published before. They are also more comprehensive, more detailed, and conceptually consistent with the modern National Accounts. The macro-economic developments that are shown by the new series are discussed. It turns out that the traditional economic-historical view of the Dutch economy has to be reversed.
- NA/19 Constant wealth national income: accounting for war damage with an application to the Netherlands, 1940-1945**, Van Bochove, C.A. and W. van Sorge (1987).

- NA/20 The micro-meso-macro linkage for business in an SNA-compatible system of economic statistics**, Van Bochove, C.A. (1987).
- NA/21 Micro-macro link for government**, Bloem, A.M. (1987).
This paper describes the way the link between the statistics on government finance and national accounts is provided for in the Dutch government finance statistics.
- NA/22 Some extensions of the static open Leontief model**, Harthoorn, R.(1987).
The results of input-output analysis are invariant for a transformation of the system of units. Such transformation can be used to derive the Leontief price model, for forecasting input-output tables and for the calculation of cumulative factor costs. Finally the series expansion of the Leontief inverse is used to describe how certain economic processes are spread out over time.
- NA/23 Compilation of household sector accounts in the Netherlands National Accounts**, Van der Laan, P. (1987).
This paper provides a concise description of the way in which household sector accounts are compiled within the Netherlands National Accounts. Special attention is paid to differences with the recommendations in the United Nations System of National Accounts (SNA).
- NA/24 On the adjustment of tables with Lagrange multipliers**, Harthoorn, R. and J. van Dalen (1987).
An efficient variant of the Lagrange method is given, which uses no more computer time and central memory than the widely used RAS method. Also some special cases are discussed: the adjustment of row sums and column sums, additional restraints, mutual connections between tables and three dimensional tables.
- NA/25 The methodology of the Dutch system of quarterly accounts**, Janssen, R.J.A. and S.B. Algera (1988).
In this paper a description is given of the Dutch system of quarterly national accounts. The backbone of the method is the compilation of a quarterly input-output table by integrating short-term economic statistics.
- NA/26 Imputations and re-routeings in the National Accounts**, Gorter, Cor N. (1988).
Starting out from a definition of 'actual' transactions an inventory of all imputations and re-routeings in the SNA is made. It is discussed which of those should be retained in the core of a flexible system of National Accounts. Conceptual and practical questions of presentation are brought up. Numerical examples are given.
- NA/27 Registration of trade in services and market valuation of imports and exports in the National Accounts**, Bos, Frits (1988).
The registration of external trade transactions in the main tables of the National Accounts should be based on invoice value; this is not only conceptually very attractive, but also suitable for data collection purposes.
- NA/28 The institutional sector classification**, Van den Bos, C. (1988).
A background paper on the conceptual side of the grouping of financing units. A limited number of criteria are formulated.
- NA/29 The concept of (transactor-)units in the National Accounts and in the basic system of economic statistics**, Bloem, Adriaan M. (1989).
Units in legal-administrative reality are often not suitable as statistical units in describing economic processes. Some transformation of legal-administrative units into economic statistical units is needed. This paper examines this transformation and furnishes definitions of economic statistical units. Proper definitions are especially important because of the forthcoming revision of the SNA.
- NA/30 Regional income concepts**, Bloem, Adriaan M. and Bas De Vet (1989).
In this paper, the conceptual and statistical problems involved in the regionalization of national accounting variables are discussed. Examples are the regionalization of Gross Domestic Product, Gross National Income, Disposable National Income and Total Income of the Population.

- NA/31 The use of tendency surveys in extrapolating National Accounts**, Ouddeken, Frank and Gerrit Zijlmans (1989).
This paper discusses the feasibility of the use of tendency survey data in the compilation of very timely Quarterly Accounts. Some preliminary estimates of relations between tendency survey data and regular Quarterly Accounts-indicators are also presented.
- NA/32 An economic core system and the socio-economic accounts module for the Netherlands**, Gorter, Cor N. and Paul van der Laan (1989).
A discussion of the core and various types of modules in an overall system of economy related statistics. Special attention is paid to the Dutch Socio-economic Accounts. Tables and figures for the Netherlands are added.
- NA/33 A systems view on concepts of income in the National Accounts**, Bos, Frits (1989).
In this paper, concepts of income are explicitly linked to the purposes of use and to actual circumstances. Main choices in defining income are presented in a general system. The National Accounts is a multi-purpose framework. It should therefore contain several concepts of income, e.g. differing with respect to the production boundary. Furthermore, concepts of national income do not necessarily constitute an aggregation of income at a micro-level.
- NA/34 How to treat borrowing and leasing in the next SNA**, Keuning, Steven J. (1990).
The use of services related to borrowing money, leasing capital goods, and renting land should not be considered as intermediate inputs into specific production processes. It is argued that the way of recording the use of financial services in the present SNA should remain largely intact.
- NA/35 A summary description of sources and methods used in compiling the final estimates of Dutch National Income 1986**, Gorter, Cor N. and others (1990).
Translation of the inventory report submitted to the GNP Management Committee of the European Communities.
- NA/36 The registration of processing in supply and use tables and input-output tables**, Bloem, Adriaan M., Sake De Boer and Pieter Wind (1993).
The registration of processing is discussed primarily with regard to its effects on input-output-type tables and input-output quotes. Links between National Accounts and basic statistics, user demands and international guidelines are examined. Net recording is in general to be preferred. An exception has to be made when processing amounts to a complete production process, e.g. oil refineries in the Netherlands.
- NA/37 A proposal for a SAM which fits into the next System of National Accounts**, Keuning, Steven J. (1990).
This paper shows that all flow accounts which may become part of the next System of National Accounts can be embedded easily in a Social Accounting Matrix (SAM). In fact, for many purposes a SAM format may be preferred to the traditional T-accounts for the institutional sectors, since it allows for more flexibility in selecting relevant classifications and valuation principles.
- NA/38 Net versus gross National Income**, Bos, Frits (1990).
In practice, gross figures of Domestic Product, National Product and National Income are most often preferred to net figures. In this paper, this practice is challenged. Conceptual issues and the reliability of capital consumption estimates are discussed.
- NA/39 Concealed interest income of households in the Netherlands; 1977, 1979 and 1981**, Kazemier, Brugt (1990).
The major problem in estimating the size of hidden income is that total income, reported plus unreported, is unknown. However, this is not the case with total interest income of households in the Netherlands. This makes it possible to estimate at least the order of magnitude of this part of hidden income. In this paper it will be shown that in 1977, 1979 and 1981 almost 50% of total interest received by households was concealed.

- NA/40 Who came off worst: Structural change of Dutch value added and employment during the interwar period**, Den Bakker, Gert P. and Jan de Gijt (1990).
In this paper new data for the interwar period are presented. The distribution of value added over industries and a break-down of value added into components is given. Employment by industry is estimated as well. Moreover, structural changes during the interwar years and in the more recent past are juxtaposed.
- NA/41 The supply of hidden labour in the Netherlands: a model**, Kazemier, Brugt and Rob van Eck (1990).
This paper presents a model of the supply of hidden labour in the Netherlands. Model simulations show that the supply of hidden labour is not very sensitive to cyclical fluctuations. A tax exempt of 1500 guilders for second jobs and a higher probability of detection, however, may substantially decrease the magnitude of the hidden labour market.
- NA/42 Benefits from productivity growth and the distribution of income**, Keuning, Steven J. (1990).
This paper contains a discussion on the measurement of multifactor productivity and sketches a framework for analyzing the relation between productivity changes and changes in the average factor remuneration rate by industry. Subsequently, the effects on the average wage rate by labour category and the household primary income distribution are studied.
- NA/43 Valuation principles in supply and use tables and in the sectoral accounts**, Keuning, Steven J. (1991).
In many instances, the valuation of transactions in goods and services in the national accounts poses a problem. The main reason is that the price paid by the purchaser deviates from the price received by the producers. The paper discusses these problems and demonstrates that different valuations should be used in the supply and use tables and in the sectoral accounts.
- NA/44 The choice of index number formulae and weights in the National Accounts. A sensitivity analysis based on macro-economic data for the interwar period**, Bakker, Gert P. den (1991).
The sensitivity of growth estimates to variations in index number formulae and weighting procedures is discussed. The calculations concern the macro-economic variables for the interwar period in the Netherlands. It appears, that the use of different formulae and weights yields large differences in growth rates. Comparisons of Gross Domestic Product growth rates among countries are presently obscured by the use of different deflation methods. There exists an urgent need for standardization of deflation methods at the international level.
- NA/45 Volume measurement of government output in the Netherlands; some alternatives**, Kazemier, Brugt (1991).
This paper discusses three alternative methods for the measurement of the production volume of government. All methods yield almost similar results: the average annual increase in the last two decades of government labour productivity is about 0.7 percent per full-time worker equivalent. The implementation of either one of these methods would have led to circa 0.1 percentage points higher estimates of economic growth in the Netherlands.
- NA/46 An environmental module and the complete system of national accounts**, Boo, Abram J. De, Peter R. Bosch, Cor N. Gorter and Steven J. Keuning (1991).
A linkage between environmental data and the National Accounts is often limited to the production accounts. This paper argues that the consequences of economic actions on ecosystems and vice versa should be considered in terms of the complete System of National Accounts (SNA). One should begin with relating volume flows of environmental matter to the standard economic accounts. For this purpose, a so-called National Accounting Matrix including Environmental Accounts (NAMEA) is proposed. This is illustrated with an example.

- NA/47 Deregulation and economic statistics: Europe 1992**, Bos, Frits (1992).
The consequences of deregulation for economic statistics are discussed with a view to Europe 1992. In particular, the effects of the introduction of the Intrastat-system for statistics on international trade are investigated. It is argued that if the Statistical Offices of the EC-countries do not respond adequately, Europe 1992 will lead to a deterioration of economic statistics: they will become less reliable, less cost effective and less balanced.
- NA/48 The history of national accounting**, Bos, Frits (1992).
At present, the national accounts in most countries are compiled on the basis of concepts and classifications recommended in the 1968-United Nations guidelines. In this paper, we trace the historical roots of these guidelines (e.g. the work by King, Petty, Kuznets, Keynes, Leontief, Frisch, Tinbergen and Stone), compare the subsequent guidelines and discuss also alternative accounting systems like extended accounts and SAMs.
- NA/49 Quality assessment of macroeconomic figures: The Dutch Quarterly Flash**, Reininga, Ted, Gerrit Zijlmans and Ron Janssen (1992).
Since 1989-IV, the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics has made preliminary estimates of quarterly macroeconomic figures at about 8 weeks after the end of the reference quarter. Since 1991-II, a preliminary or "Flash" estimate of GDP has been published. The decision to do so was based on a study comparing the Flash estimates and the regular Quarterly Accounts figures, which have a 17-week delay. This paper reports on a similar study with figures through 1991-III.
- NA/50 Quality improvement of the Dutch Quarterly Flash: A Time Series Analysis of some Service Industries**, Reininga, Ted and Gerrit Zijlmans (1992).
The Dutch Quarterly Flash (QF) is, just like the regular Quarterly Accounts (QA), a fully integrated statistic based on a quarterly updated input-output table. Not all short term statistics used to update the QA's IO-table are timely enough to be of use for the QF, so other sources have to be found or forecasts have to be made. In large parts of the service industry the latter is the only possibility. This paper reports on the use of econometric techniques (viz. series decomposition and ARIMA modelling) to improve the quality of the forecasts in five parts of the service industry.
- NA/51 A Research and Development Module supplementing the National Accounts**, Bos, Frits, Hugo Hollanders and Steven Keuning (1992).
This paper presents a national accounts framework fully tailored to a description of the role of Research and Development (R&D) in the national economy. The framework facilitates to draw macro-economic conclusions from all kinds of data on R&D (also micro-data and qualitative information). Figures presented in this way can serve as a data base for modelling the role of R&D in the national economy.
- NA/52 The allocation of time in the Netherlands in the context of the SNA; a module**, Kazemier, Brugt and Jeanet Exel (1992).
This paper presents a module on informal production, supplementing the National Accounts. Its purpose is to incorporate informal production into the concepts of the SNA. The relation between formal and informal production is shown in the framework of a Social Accounting Matrix (SAM). To avoid a controversial valuation of informal production, the module consists of two SAMs. One expressed in actual prices with informal labour valued zero, and one which expresses the embedded informal labour input measured in terms of hours worked.
- NA/53 National Accounts and the environment: the case for a system's approach**, Keuning, Steven J. (1992).
The present set of main economic indicators should be extended with one or a few indicators on the state of the environment. This paper lists various reasons why a so-called Green Domestic Product is not suitable for this purpose. Instead, a system's approach should be followed. A National Accounting Matrix including Environmental Accounts (NAMEA) is presented and the way to derive one or more separate indicators on the environment from this information system is outlined.

- NA/54 How to treat multi-regional units and the extra-territorial region in the Regional Accounts?**, De Vet, Bas (1992).
This paper discusses the regionalization of production and capital formation by multi-regional kind-of-activity units. It also examines the circumstances in which a unit may be said to have a local kind-of-activity unit in the extra-territorial region and what should be attributed to this "region".
- NA/55 A historical Social Accounting Matrix for the Netherlands (1938)**, Den Bakker, Gert P., Jan de Gijt and Steven J. Keuning (1992).
This paper presents a Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) for the Netherlands in 1938, including related, non-monetary tables on demographic characteristics, employment, etc. The distribution of income and expenditure among household subgroups in the 1938 SAM is compared with concomittant data for 1987.
- NA/56 Origin and development of the Dutch National Accounts**, Den Bakker, Gert P. (1992).
This paper describes the history of national accounting in the Netherlands. After two early estimates in the beginning of the nineteenth century, modern national accounting started in the 1930s on behalf of the Tinbergen model for the Dutch economy. The development spurred up after World War II to provide data to the government for economic planning purposes. In the 1980s, the development was towards a flexible and institutional approach.
- NA/57 Compiling Dutch Gross National Product (GNP); summary report on the final estimates after the revision in 1992**, Bos, Frits (1992).
This summary report describes the sources and methods used for compiling the final estimate of Dutch Gross National Product after the revision of the Dutch National Accounts in 1992. Attention is focused on the estimation procedures for 1988. A more extensive report is also available.
- NA/58 The 1987 revision of the Netherlands' National Accounts**, Van den Bos, C and P.G. Al (1994).
The 1987 revision that was completed in 1992 has improved the Dutch National Accounts in three ways. First, new and other data sources have been used, like Production statistics of service industries, the Budget Survey and Statistics on fixed capital formation. Secondly, the integration process has been improved by the use of detailed make- and use-tables instead of more aggregate input-output tables. Thirdly, several changes in bookkeeping conventions have been introduced, like a net instead of a gross registration of processing to order.
- NA/59 A National Accounting Matrix for the Netherlands**, Keuning, Steven and Jan de Gijt (1992).
Currently, the national accounts typically use two formats for presentation: matrices for the Input-Output tables and T-accounts for the transactions of institutional sectors. This paper demonstrates that presently available national accounts can easily be transformed into a National Accounting Matrix (NAM). This may improve both the transparency and analytic usefulness of the complete set of accounts.
- NA/60 Integrated indicators in a National Accounting Matrix including environmental accounts (NAMEA); an application to the Netherlands**, De Haan, Mark, Steven Keuning and Peter Bosch (1993).
In this paper, environmental indicators are integrated into a National Accounting Matrix including Environmental Accounts (NAMEA) and are put on a par with the major aggregates in the national accounts, like National Income. The environmental indicators reflect the goals of the environmental policy of the Dutch government. Concrete figures are presented for 1989. The NAMEA is optimally suited as a data base for modelling the interaction between the national economy and the environment.

- NA/61 Standard national accounting concepts, economic theory and data compilation issues; on constancy and change in the United Nations-Manuals on national accounting (1947, 1953, 1968 and 1993),** Bos, Frits (1993).
In this paper, the four successive guidelines of the United Nations on national accounting are discussed in view of economic theory (Keynesian analysis, welfare, Hicksian income, input-output analysis, etc.) and data compilation issues (e.g. the link with concepts in administrative data sources). The new guidelines of the EC should complement those of the UN and be simpler and more cost-efficient. It should define a balanced set of operational concepts and tables that is attainable for most EC countries within 5 years.
- NA/62 Revision of the 1987 Dutch agricultural accounts,** Pauli, Peter and Nico van Stokrom (1994).
During the recent revision of the Dutch national accounts, new agricultural accounts have been compiled for the Netherlands. This paper presents the major methodological and practical improvements and results for 1987, the base year for this revision. In addition, this paper demonstrates that a linkage can be established between the E.C. agricultural accounting system and the agricultural part of the standard national accounts.
- NA/63 Implementing the revised SNA in the Dutch National Accounts,** Bos, Frits (1993).
This paper discusses the implementation of the new United Nations guidelines on national accounting (SNA) in the Netherlands. The changes in basic concepts and classifications in the SNA will be implemented during the forthcoming revision. The changes in scope will be introduced gradually. Important changes scheduled for the near future are the incorporation of balance sheets, an environmental module and a Social Accounting Matrix.
- NA/64 Damage and insurance compensations in the SNA, the business accounts and the Dutch national accounts,** Baris, Willem (1993).
This paper describes the recording of damages to inventories and produced fixed assets in general, including damages as a result of legal product liability and of the liability for damage to the environment. In this regard, the 1993 System of National Accounts and the practice of business accounting are compared with the Dutch national accounts.
- NA/65 Analyzing economic growth: a description of the basic data available for the Netherlands and an application,** Van Leeuwen, George, Hendrie van der Hoeven and Gerrit Zijlmans (1994).
This paper describes the STAN project of the OECD and the Dutch national accounts data supplied to the STAN database, which is designed for a structural analysis of the role of technology in economic performance. Following an OECD analysis for other industrial countries, the importance of international trade for a small open economy such as the Netherlands is investigated. The STAN database is also available on floppy disk at the costs of DFL. 25, an can be ordered by returning the order form below (Please mention: STAN floppy disk).
- NA/66 Comparability of the sector General Government in the National Accounts, a case study for the Netherlands and Germany,** Streppel, Irene and Dick Van Tongeren (1994).
This paper questions the international comparability of data concerning the sector General Government in the National Accounts. Two differences are distinguished: differences due to lack of compliance with international guidelines and institutional differences. Adjustments to National Accounts data are reflected in a separate module which compares Germany versus The Netherlands. The module shows that total General Government resources as well as uses are substantially higher in the Netherlands.
- NA/67 What would Net Domestic Product have been in an environmentally sustainable economy?, Preliminary views and results,** De Boer, Bart, Mark de Haan and Monique Voogt (1994).
Sustainable use of the environment is a pattern of use that can last forever, at least in theory. This pattern is likely to render a lower net domestic product than the present economy. The coherence between reductions in pressure on the environment and changes in net domestic product is investigated with the help of a simple multiplier model. This model is based on a National Accounting Matrix including Environmental Accounts (NAMEA).

NA/68 A Social Accounting Matrix for the Netherlands, conceptual issues and results, (forthcoming) Timmerman, Jolanda (1994).
In this paper a Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) for the Netherlands is presented. Two years are covered: 1988 and 1990. The SAMs integrate statistics on the distribution of income, and consumption expenditure among various household groups in a national accounts framework. Simultaneously, labour income and employment are disaggregated into several labour categories.

NA/69 Analyzing relative factor inputs of Dutch exports: An application of the 1990 Social Accounting Matrix for the Netherlands (forthcoming), Reininga, Ted (1994).
In this paper the validity of neoclassical trade theory for explaining Dutch international trade patterns is studied. The analysis is carried out with the use of a Social Accounting Matrix for The Netherlands. This study corroborates the outcome of other recent analysis in this field: classical trade theory offers a better starting-point to understand Dutch trade patterns than neoclassical trade theory. Moreover, these recent studies point to the increasing relevance of insights derived from modern trade theory. The results presented here seem to support this point of view.

NA/70 SESAME for the evaluation of economic development and social change, Keuning, Steven J. (1994).
This paper elaborates on the concept of a System of Economic and Social Accounting Matrices and Extensions, or SESAME for short. The SESAME-concept serves to meet the criticism that conventional national accounts take a too limited view at social, environmental and economic development. SESAME details the monetary accounts and couples non-monetary information in an integral system approach. SESAME is meant as a synthesis of national accounts and the social indicators approach.

**Statistics Netherlands
National Accounts Department
Occasional Papers**

Please send me the following paper(s):
..... (For each copy DFL. 20 will be
incurred as a contribution to the costs).

Name:

Address:

Country: Organization:.....

Return to: Statistics Netherlands, National Accounts Department
 P.O. Box 959, 2270 AZ Voorburg
 The Netherlands
