THE FOUNDATION FOR CULTURE-AND-PERSONALITY RESEARCH IN THE PHILIPPINES

ROBERT LAWLESS

THE 128 TITLES ON WHICH THIS PAPER IS BASED ARE NOT inclusive but they do cover probably over a quarter of the total literature in this field, including almost all the better and most recent studies; therefore this paper should give a comprehensive overview of the work in Philippine culture-and-personality.

No adequate bibliography of the literature in this field has been published yet, but one is now being prepared by Leticia Lagmay and Allen L. Tan of the University of the Philippines. Containing nearly 400 titles and still expanding, this definitive bibliography unfortunately will not be annotated; and, as rightly so in such an inclusive listing, the poor works stand unsegregated next to the excellent. Perhaps our paper will provide somewhat of a guide for the uninitiated reader.

Along with scientific studies this paper will also review some non-scientific writings—simply because they *are* writings on Philippine culture-and-personality and because we feel that the student in this field can learn much from good literary work, for indeed the essayist and journalist often deal with culture-and-personality. (Fiction will not be covered, and there are to our knowledge no Philippine studies correlating culture-and-personality with art, with folklore, or with music.)

However, we shall judge these works in behavior science terms, and we feel no hesitancy in doing so. If a columnist writes on economics, he is expected to know some Keynes; and if he does not, he is rightly censured. Similarly if our popular writers are ignorant, for example, of the concept of culture relativity, we will feel justified in criticizing them.

First, let us define our topic. Culture-and-personality is concerned with the interrelations among culture, society, and individuals, with how society induces individuals to fill predetermined status positions and play prescribed culture roles, with how individuals in this interaction with culture affect society, and with correlations between culture artifacts and personality dynamics. A large part of this field deals with the administration and interpretation of psychological projective tests in relation to ethnographic information.

(But in this area nothing of significance has been published about the Philippines.)

An offspring of an interdisciplinal marriage, the field currently seems dominated by anthropologists insufficiently trained in psychology and to a lesser degree by psychologists inadequate in anthropology. Culture-and-personality studies often examine socialization processes and are usually interested in discerning national character.[1] George M. Guthrie, in writing about the Filipino child and Philippine society, provides a definition of national character adequate for our purposes:

> A national character type refers to a set of personality patterns which are preferred or favored in the culture concerned. It involves a shared pattern of interpersonal relationships which makes more predictable the behavior of others and more apparent the behavior expected of the participant. These patterns include not only the amount of dominance or extroversion, or any other need which one may express, but also a range of appropriate and inappropriate manifestations. They also include the gestural and expressive aspects of behavior. . . . This constellation of attitudes, expectations and gestures is implied in the term national character. (47:6-7)

The earliest writings that were concerned with Philippine culture-and-personality revolved around the Spanish allegation that Filipinos are inherently lazy. Jose Rizal, who, as a member of the Anthropological Society of Berlin, was the first Filipino anthropologist, answered this charge in 1890 with his famous essay, "The Indolence of the Filipino." (101) "Examining well," Rizal wrote, "all the scenes and all the men that we have known from childhood; and the life of our country, we believe that indolence does exist here." (101:218)

Claiming, however, that this indolence was a result of the climate and Spanish misgovernment and not inherent in the Filipino personality, Rizal searched documents to show that the Filipino was not indolent before the Spaniards came. This effort, made a decade before the 20th century, was brilliant, and no Filipino was to match it for over half a century. Rizal, of course, was partly wrong, or, more kindly, he was misoriented and without benefit of modern culture-and-personality concepts. As an educated Filipino, he underestimated his countrymen and wished them to emulate Europeans much as deracinated Filipinos today, including even some behavior scientists, evaluate their countrymen by American standards.

In 1905 James A. LeRoy wrote, "Judged by the standards of the temperate zone, [the Filipino] is undoubtedly lazy." (68:73) More sophisticated than Rizal's viewpoint and less defensive, this is, nevertheless, still inaccurate. Today, with contemporary studies such as those by Ethel Nurge (85) and

---

[1] For a recently published introduction to this field, see Victor Barnouw, *Culture and Personality*, Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1963.

Ralph Diaz and Horst and Judith von Oppenfeld (29) and with the conceptual handles of modern anthropology, we know that labeling Filipinos as lazy is an incredible value judgment, that Filipinos, as all people, simply expend their own amount of energy in their own way in pursuit of their own goals, and that to expect them to work in pursuit of Western values is not to say anything about any Filipino personality trait but merely to display one's own ethnocentrism and ignorance of the subject at hand.

True personality traits may approximate ideal norms, and every culture has ideal standards of behavior for its members. These may be easily articu· lated in a less fluid society, or they may be somewhat obscure in a rapidly changing one. Unfortunately those that list ideal norms usually have an implicit commitment to their own model and employ a certain license in their scholarship.

This license is perhaps best illustrated by Encarnacion Alzona's listing of traits (2). She begins with "courtesy," saying, "The use of courteous language is an ancient attribute of our people." (2:263) Here we see the need for cross-cultural norms for courtesy, as well as for laziness and conversely for industriousness. In what sense can we say a people are "courteous"? Indeed, is the word itself a useful description at all? Does the presence of honorific terms in a language denote a personality trait of courteousness or stratified superordinate-subordinate relations or some sort of historical linguistic idiosyncracy? If, in translating Tagalog into English, every *po* is rendered as "sir," the resultant English is unnatural (see the dialogues in 76). So do we have an illustration of courteous language or simply a poor translation? The point is that Alzona is making a cross-cultural value judgment with no cross-cultural norms or data. The mistake is legend.

Alzona's list continues through manliness, dignity, prudence, honesty, tolerance, belief in God, and so forth, ending with "democratic values" and the surprising statement that "these islands were settled by men in quest of freedom." (2:282) The authority for this statement is not clear, but in writing about ideals as opposed to reality perhaps there is greater allowance for imagination. At least Alzona terms these norms *ideal,* not actual, and perhaps in strict usage all norms are ideal, but many writers make no such distinction, writing about idealized behavior as though it were actual behavior.[2] (See 9, 12, 47, 57, 62, 73, 79, 91, 98.)

There are many popular writings about ideal behavior. We will consider only a representative few. Francisco B. Icasiano in 1941 wrote a set of essays describing different social situations and the expected ideal behavior (57). One well-known book, a translation from a work written in Spanish in 1935 by Teodoro M. Kalaw (62), lists "five preceptives from ancient morality": courage, chastity, courtesy, self-control, and family unity.

---

[2] See Jack P. Gibbs, "Norms: The Problem of Definition and Classification," *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. LXX, No. 5 (March 1965), pp. 586-594.

In search of a code of ethics reflecting Philippine personality, Emiliano Castro Ramirez, with admirable industry, collected 3,347 proverbs and classified them into 32 character traits (98). Prudence and foresight and personal discipline (self-control) are valued in the largest number of proverbs; the least number of proverbs deal with sportsmanship and cheerfulness. The most frequently mentioned proverbs are "A santol tree will not bear mabolo fruit" and "He who is too choosy may get the worst after all." (98:38) How these proverbs reflect character traits seems determined by simple mathematical ranking, and since there is no theoretical justification for this, we may question Ramirez' conclusion. Nevertheless, the collection of over 3,000 proverbs seems to us commendable in itself.

Another memorable collection is a cyclopedia of quotations from Filipinos, arranged alphabetically by subject from *ability* to *zarzuelas* (41). What these quotations are supposed to show is not quite clear. (The book is ambitiously titled *The Filipino Mind.*) They might lend themselves to some sort of content analysis but this would not say much about national character—only about what politicians say when they know their words are being recorded.

Paul Rodriguez Verzosa's list of proverbs (123) is a less ambitious collection than Ramirez's (98) but contains more high-handed interpretations.

Already we see emerging from these collections some norms grounded vaguely in concepts of courtesy, self-control, and family life, suggesting a world-view anchored by prescribed face-to-face behavior based on kinship ties.

These same concepts are reflected in popular writings on Philippine customs. In a series of well-written essays, I. V. Mallari discusses "vanishing" customs (79). Although enumerating many Philippine customs, this collection is difficult to utilize because the descriptions are highly idealized and there are no references to how or where the material was gathered. Armando J. and Paula Carolina Malay's book *Our Folkways* (77) is more useful than Mallari's collection because in the Malays' book the customs are specifically related to locales, but still we do not know how, when, and from whom the material was gathered.

Particularly evident in these writings is the concept of family unity, both as protection against the outside world and as a self-contained unit responsive to the needs of its members.

Family unity is also shown vividly in studies dealing with marriage. As one investigator remarks, "Marriage is an affair of the entire family." (96:141) And even though men and women marry late (3), much evidence shows that there is considerable parental control over the choice of mates. According to Donn V. Hart, "Now parents rarely force their children, particularly sons, to wed against their wishes." (50:70) But in some rural areas it is noted that a girl marries when her parents approve—despite her own

feelings (78:77). Also a relevant finding is that if a couple are away from the family, the courtship period is shorter (42).

In case studies of 53 students at Silliman University in 1966 (99), Harriet Reynolds finds that the choice of the couple is secondary to social and economic considerations and that among the students there is no "strong sense of resistance to some parental participation in mate selection." (99:215) The women, in particular, would not marry someone the parents disapproved of.

In line with this, Gelia Tagumpay Castillo's study (22) finds that youngsters are highly interested in getting a job they know will please their parents (22:15). But in another study she finds that "the number of respondents who are willing to go along with the parents' wishes without any compromise is rather negligible." (24:11) This is in answer to questionnaires, however, and may not reflect actual behavior.

In addition to family unity and parental authority, another feature of the Philippine family often mentioned is the equality of the sexes. Lourdes R. Quisumbing, supporting the theses that the family is a very stable institution and that women have equal status with men, writes, "Respect and appreciation of women is striking." (96:141)

Still another study shows that "sexual division of labor in the Philippines is not a rigid dichotomy." (24:10) In matters of the exalted position of women, Hart notes that Filipino women control the family purse because they are the earners of cash. They can sell ricecakes, pottery, and woven abaca. The men's work in the fields is consumed by the family or given to the landlord as rent with no surplus for sale (51:27).

A perceptive American observer wrote in 1905, "In no other part of the Orient have women relatively so much freedom or do they play so large a part in the control of the family." (68:49) And again one investigator finds that the "emancipation of women, in modern terms, has involved little conflict." (45)

Bartlett H. Stoodley's 1957 study (116) is still the best short description of the rural Tagalog family. Having gathered data through a number of operations, he sees the family structure built on a foundation of obligations. He finds also that children are highly prized and indulged (116:240), that toilet training and nursing are relaxed (116:241), that the authority is equal between the two parents (116:242), that sex-neutral kinship terms are employed, and that, in general description,

> ... the family is symmetrically multilineal, that neither female nor male roles are likely to be dominant, and that effective family roles are provided for a family extended to three generations in the direct line and to brothers and sisters, on both sides, and their spouses and children collaterally. (116:234)

Questionnaires to more than 200 students at Silliman University find that the interdependence of familism is still the dominant characteristic of modern college youth and that it is strongest among lower socio-economic groups (94). Filipino family cohesion is also manifest in urban corporations. According to an investigator, "Distributing corporate stock beyond the kin group has not been successful in most cases." (39:415)

At least one writer claims that close family ties make barrio government unworkable (124). Analyzing this problem in more scientific terms, Willis E. Sibley notes that the work partner choice in villages is within the kinship group and based on past interaction and expectations of personal and social treatment, overriding considerations of efficiency (111; see also 127:4).

Philippine familism has always impressed foreign observers. An American writes, "The family in the Philippines fulfills many welfare functions which in the United States and in European nations have been assumed by the Government. The Philippine family generally cares for its aged, sick and unemployed members and relatives." (100:135)

This echoes an observation made by a foreigner in 1905: "What a complex society, with its impersonal charity-organization, does out of a more remote piety, or out of cold-blooded enlightenment as to social needs, the non-industrial society does by a sort of family feudalism." (68:48)

In a thorough study Cayetano Santiago Jr. comments on this function of the family:

> The Filipino family is engaged in the extension of relief but is not function- ing as a social welfare agency. This is because it gives assistance not on the basis of helping the dependent relatives help themselves but merely to help them. Instead of minimizing dependency, which is the paramount aim of assistance to dependents, it, in a way, tends to encourage and develop dependency. (108:103)

Noting that chronic unemployment does not lead to chaos because of the family, Santiago believes, however, that this family function "has led to the development of mutual parasitism between parents and children." (108:118) He, nevertheless, claims that this study shows that dependency is cultural, not economic. An otherwise excellent study is somewhat marred by this final conclusion, for the evidence presented does not support it. In addition, the interrelations between culture and economics are much subtler than anything shown in this work. A later paper by E.P. Patañne relates dependency and aggression to poverty (95).

Three findings of Santiago especially pertinent to culture-and-personality are that family authority discourages free thinking since all older relatives have authority over children, that the family's protective attitude is a hazard to individual enterprise, and that children develop a lack of self-confidence since family decisions show little faith in youngsters.

The stress of this general dependency appears in a cross-cultural study of suicide patterns of Chinese and Filipinos in Manila (25). Suicide among the Filipino youths is often caused by the frustration of being controlled by elders. This is also no doubt related to the stress of changing and conflicting values in the urban areas.

In rural areas this stress is absent or at least has not been reported. The traditional rural family, with the authority structured by age, seems to lack the "generational gap" so often reported in urban findings. In a touching description of the role of a seven-year-old girl during the birth and subsequent death of her younger brother, Harold Conklin illustrates that among the rural people he studied no boundaries, except of degree, exist between child and adult knowledge (27).

While on the subject of the family, we can enter here an example of writing from the University of Santo Tomas, a doctoral dissertation characteristically based on casual observations with a strong theological orientation, less interesting for its opinions than for what it says about the distressingly low quality of behavior science in the oldest and largest Roman Catholic university in the Philippines:

> The Filipino family is in transition. It is confronted with factors that contribute to its disintegration, namely: (a) decline of the role of religion, (b) radical departure from the traditional type of the Filipino woman, and (c) de-emphasis of traditional family functions. The Filipino family, however, may be preserved with factors such as: (a) the return to God, (b) true feminism, and (c) restoration of family functions. (43:from synopsis)

The December 1965 *Unitas,* a quarterly published by the University of Santo Tomas, was a special issued entitled "The Anatomy of Philippine Psychology." This journal usually is filled with quasi-journalistic, theology-oriented articles dealing in opinions and casual observations and almost never containing any footnotes or bibliographies. But one article, decidedly superior to the others, has some interesting insights into the Filipino family. According to Adoracion Arjona:

> In our culture, the child-rearing practices do not put emphasis on self-reliance and independence training. The Filipino family is authoritarian and child-centered. The child grows under a hierarchy of authority imposing on certain rights and privileges. He is, therefore, given many opportunities to depend on adult guidance and indulgence. The consequence of this relation has set a high premium on conformity and obedience and the curtailment of initiative to plan, organize, and execute. (5:550)

Child-centeredness and authoritarianism are recurring themes in these writings. Noting this importance of children to the family, one descriptive article mentions that childlessness would make Filipinos very unhappily not because of the joy children bring but because "they thought that without

children, no one would serve them or support and take care of them during old age." (19:19) The high importance placed on family life and children is also reflected in a study of stereotypes of priests (32) in which priests are viewed as unmanly because they do not propagate a family. William Henry Scott's article (109) emphasizes that the Igorot baby learns early that he is wanted.

One investigator observed 62 children from mixed backgrounds and tends to conclude that authoritarian patterns show parents indulge younger children (58). Although this study was done in line with similar American studies, no cross-cultural data is presented.

A study of 111 middle-class families in rural and urban areas (97) shows that the children are exposed to a wide family circle and that many may care for them in much the same way as in traditional families. The important family factors in a child's development emerging from this study are prominence of over-protectiveness, close cooperation, far-reaching kinship system, hospitality, cohesiveness, and intimacy.

Miguela M. Solis, in attempting to determine differences in child-rearing in different socio-economic levels, investigated 250 children during their first year (113). Unfortunately, for logistical reasons, one criterion for the subjects was the employment stability of the family head. This may have biased the sample so that there is no true representation of the lowest socio-economic levels.

Almost all the family studies noted so far have been made by Filipinos. Too often in the behavior sciences in the Philippines, a foreign professor, competent in his field but studying in the country only a year or so, goes on to write articles and books with only little knowledge or understanding of the Philippine setting. This is especially true of American psychologists and psychiatrists, less true of sociologists, and notably absent among anthropologists, whose concept of culture relativity forearms them against ethnocentrism.

Guthrie, in his book on the Filipino child (47), betrays this fault many times. Another American observer who was in the Philippines for a short time, Lee Sechrest, makes conclusions from studies of persons committed to mental institutions (110). Without warning us of the limitations mentioned by Rodolfo R. Varias, who says it is questionable what can be learned from these patients because of cultural factors operating in their selection (122), Sechrest writes:

> The training of children seems oriented toward the denial or suppression of hostility, and yet there is an incompatible tendency toward arousal of hostility produced by the tendency to blame any misfortunes on other persons. Thus, if the writer's observations are correct, children are encouraged to blame others for their misfortunes, but they are proscribed from indicating their error in any open

way. Therefore, feelings of anger go unlabelled, unrecognized, and ultimately un-
controlled. There are few, if any, intermediate expressions of anger taught to
children and when hostility occurs, it occurs in rather extreme forms. (110:198)

As we noted earlier, one of the great interests of culture-and personality
is the socialization processes. The best studies in the Philippines of child-
rearing and socialization begin with Fe Domingo's 1961 paper (33). Using
Whiting's *Field Guide*,[3] Domingo, a University of the Philippines psychology
graduate, lived in a rural Tagalog barrio for one year conducting extensive
interviews and administering child thematic appreception tests to study so-
cialization in nine patterns of behavior: aggression, succorance, obedience,
achievement-orientation, responsible performance of duty, sociability, nur-
turance, dominance, and self-reliance.

The investigator finds that overt aggression is highly undesirable and is
channelled into gossiping and teasing, that most mothers are responsive,
that the child grows up with minimal restrictions but requests are highly
authoritarian. "It is [however] easy for the children to obey their parents
and elders" because of the simplicity of life in the barrio (33:123). Socia-
bility is desired but there is concern that aggression may rise from play; self-
improvement is rewarded but overt competition is not; responsibility training
is very relaxed and those responsible carry out tasks because of the tasks'
importance, not fear of punishment.

Domingo finds that little tolerance is felt for the child's attempt to do-
minate the parents, and dominance toward peers is not encouraged: "The
important thing is that they get along well." (33:183) (This theme has be-
come quite controversial as we shall see later.) The findings in nurturance
and self-reliance are ambivalent.

The overall characteristics of child-rearing are its "gradualness" (33:
206), the child's concern for the mother rather than fear of punishment,
and the child's feeling of being loved and relatively anxiety-free (33:204-205).
The Filipino outlook that "eventually this will be settled" is traceable, Do-
mingo suggests, to this anxiety-free upbringing (33:208). (This study, in-
cidentally, was carried out in the same barrio where Stoodley (116) did
his work on the Tagalog family.)

In relating child-rearing practices to adult personality traits, the authors
of *Mothers of Six Cultures* (81) write that the potential of ostracism is
developed through teasing:

> As soon as babies learn to want an object, women tease them by alternately of-
> fering and withdrawing it, until the children burst into frustrated tears. When
> this happens all the women present laugh, the object is given the child and he
> is assured that they are only playing. (81:209)

---

[3] John M. Whiting *et al., Field Guide for a Study of Socialization in Five Societies,*
Cambridge: Laboratory of Human Development, Harvard University, 1953.

This book is developed through factor analysis of the material in William and Corinne Nydegger's article in *Six Cultures* on child-rearing in Tarong, an Iloko barrio (88). The guidelines used are the same as in the Domingo study,[4] but the relationships of child-rearing to adult traits are more broadly drawn. Continuing their comments on teasing, the authors write:

> The child being subjected to this "game" also learns the proper response— to howl loudly with imitative fury, then laugh when the object is restored. The proper adult response to the constant kidding of others is to grin happily throughout; the relationship is clear. The notable fact is that before he is a year old, the Tarongan child is introduced to the method of social control most prominent in the adult world. (81:209-210)

Nurge, in a short article, finds that mothers are "uncompassionately amused at their offspring's frustration" at weaning when pepper is put on the breasts (86:138).

Other findings are that "Tarong mothers are medium in their expression of warmth and are emotionally stable. They are above average in punishment for aggression." (81:209) Group care for children is common, and sociability is encouraged (81:211). To live alone is considered immoral (81: 213), and kin closeness against outsiders is emphasized (81:215-216). Trouble is attributed to evil forces outside (81:216), and parents use fear of spirits to control the child. (For a detailed study of spirits in the Bicol region, see 72.)

The child's most unusual characteristic is his emotional stability and the extent to which others help him. Indeed, the stability is probably due in fact to the presence of others who help (81:220). This, the authors suggest, leads to the close mutual dependence of adults.

Responsibility is introduced early—all children over three have a chore —but self-reliance is not valued. The authors report:

> If children finally carry out tasks, even after several reminders, they are said to have obeyed. In this, as in most Tarongan socialization practices, the resultant learning pattern is directly applicable to the adult world. (81:221)

In substantial agreement Nurge writes, "The children do what they are told to do most of the time if the socializer is insistent enough. However, they do procrastinate a good deal." (87:76) This is from the most recently published of these modern, ecology-oriented child-rearing studies, Nurge's book *Life in a Leyte Village* (87). Also based on Whiting's *Guide*,[5] the field work was done during four months in 1955-56 in a rural barrio in northeastern Leyte.

---

4 *Ibid.*
5 *Ibid.*

Nurge finds that "tendencies to succorance are highly and fairly consistently rewarded for the first five years of life" by anyone near the child but that work has priority and therefore "the children of poorer parents will be less quickly and less frequently nurtured." (87:73)

Descriptive of the gradualness that Domingo notes, Nurge writes, "Children are regarded as helpless and lovable innocents who gradually grow up and, somehow, in the same slow process begin to exhibit certain natural maturative abilities. The cultural ideal prescribes that performance of these abilities should not be hurried." (87:74)

Along with Domingo, Nurge finds that play is desirable but the possible result of quarrels is feared. Nurge admits, however, that her material on sociability training is not clear (87:77).

Again in general agreement with Domingo's findings, Nurge writes, "Aggression in the play group is deplored and suppressed; against elders it is intolerable." (87:79) Along with aggression and dominance, self-reliance, responsibility and achievement are not emphasized:

> The child who is careless and spills rice or who hurts himself in stacking wood will be judged, not in reference to a level of competence, but by the results of his act. He is more apt to be scolded for the consequences of his inept action than for the ineptness itself. (87:75-76)

In speaking of obedience training and in general summary, Nurge writes:

> Obedience and respect from anyone younger to anyone older is a highly valued behavior system. Disobedience and disrespect are punished most of the time once the child has reached the age of five which is considered to be an "age of reason," a time when the child can discriminate among significant others and be held more responsible for his acts. For the first five years the child is greatly indulged, but even in this period a high premium is placed on submissive, deferent, and respectful behavior to older siblings, parents, and others. (87:76)

After the discussion of child-rearing *per se,* Nurge treats dyadic relations within the family (wife-to-husband, daughter-to-father, sister-to-sister, etc.) in the areas of succorance, aggression, achievement, and so forth (87: 87-129). This is no doubt a step in the right direction but it is only a step, and Nurge's treatment here is rather skimpy, a complaint that could be leveled against the entire book.

Most of these findings are supported in Agaton P. Pal's excellent survey of a Negros barrio: children are objects of affection (93:372), discipline is based on social sanction (93:373), younger children must obey older (93:374). "I had to mind my Elder Brother like my Father," remarks one Filipino (49:265).

Another study, somewhat similar to the Domingo-*Mothers*-Nurge studies, is interested in the differences in child-rearing practices between land

and water dwellers in Sulu (35). The importance of the ecology and the
basic household structure is apparent in this study.

Mary R. Hollnsteiner notes that forms of control for children are the
structure of the house and the injection of malevolent spirits and that the
child fears to be without others and without approval (53).

Child-rearing and socialization is a wide-open field for behavior scien-
tists. Despite the conclusive-sounding findings in the Domingo-*Mothers*-Nurge
studies, the reliability of the operations used as well as the generality of the
findings may be questioned. *Mothers of Six Cultures* suffers from an in-
adequate description of measurement procedures and a lack of justification
for samples selected. Generality beyond the boundaries of Domingo's studied
barrio cannot be justified, and Nurge's search for an isolated fishing village
makes justifying the generality of her findings impossible. But this is prob-
ably some of the best writing on Philippines culture-and-personality, and
certainly the best on child-rearing.

Much of the writing in this area is, of course, unprofessional. Included
here are journalists and authors whose main concern is with writing *per se,*
not with content—which results in a mastery of form but a loss of substance,
a slick superficiality and a lack of depth, indeed a lack of any real meaning.
But the unaware reader is likely to mistake cleverness for wisdom, neat
phrases for accuracy, and forceful wording for authority.

Typical of this school, and the only example we need bother with, is the
popular columnist Carmen Guerrero Nakpil, whose forte is to deplore the
"flaws" in the national character and to look for the "true" Filipino. She
laments the "borrowing" in Philippine culture: "We have indulged too long
in a wanton cosmopolitanism. We have been guilty of a cultural promiscuity
that has reduced us to impotence and sterility. We no longer understand our-
selves." (83:63) (For more of the same, see 82.)

Her specific complaints seem to be that "we are Oriental about family,
Spanish about love, Chinese about business, American about our ambitions"
(83:58); and as Leon Ma. Guerrero, her brother, says, "We accept Western
standards at their face value." (44:202) This is the familiar three-centuries-
in-a-convent-fifty-years-in-Hollywood slant popularized by foreign journalists
writing from one-day stopovers in Manila. The point is that Philippine cul-
ture can not be understood in the context of Chinese, American, or Spanish
culture; it has a context, a logic, and a future of its own.[6]

Unfortunately this misunderstanding also permeates some colleges. A
Jesuit scholar in an Ateneo de Manila University publication plays on the
same theme:

---

[6] For an excellent statement on judging Filipino culture on its own terms, see F.
Landa Jocano, "Rethinking Filipino Cultural Heritage," *Lipunan*, Vol. I, No. 1 (1965),
pp. 53-72.

> The Filipino today suffers from a form of cultural schizophrenia. He is ba-
> sically a Malay, yet he is in a state of restlessness and lack of direction brought
> about by the conflicting pressures of his Malay, Hispanic and American orienta-
> tion. (4:235)

It is understandable that Filipinos might have difficulty judging alien
traits by that alien culture's standards. No people are expected to do this.
In addition, the eminent anthropologist Robert B. Fox of the National Mu-
seum writes, "The theory that the present character of Filipino culture and
society has been due to 'waves of external influences' is vastly overdrawn."
(40:39) In a cogent survey Fox finds that the basis for current Philippine
culture artifacts and personality traits is indigenous (40).

Nakpil's concept of Philippine culture-and-personality finds its behavior
science counterpart in the works of Jaime Bulatao, a psychologist at Ateneo
de Manila University. His term for "cultural promiscuity" and "cultural
schizophrenia" is "split-level Christianity." (17A)

Bulatao, in an article on changing social values (13), betrays his total
Western orientation by calling, in essence, for an adoption of Western cul-
ture. He suggests that Philippine values have not changed enough and that
Filipinos need to develop "social consciousness and individual responsibility
to fill the demands of a mature democracy." (13:206) Loaded with value
judgments, the article speaks of developing "liberty, responsibility, economic
productivity, initiative" because such values are necessary for "national sur-
vival." (13:206-207) All these terms are understood, of course, in a Western
context.

According to Bulatao, Philippine society is "unbalanced' in values and
does not have a "mature" democracy. (We thought that bio-organismic
sociology had gone out of style with the demise of Herbert Spencer.[7]) In con-
clusion Bulatao writes, "I have sufficient faith in the democratic process to
believe that, given time, the democratic process itself will gradually work
out a solution."

This may be a case of blaming the foot for not fitting the shoe. Per-
haps Bulatao's time would be better spent examining whether Philippine so-
cial structure and personality is compatible with his idea of democracy and
perhaps discerning and encouraging uniquely Filipino institutions rather than
urging a wholesale overthrow of Philippine culture. (See, for example, in
103 an account of a barrio lieutenant's ineffectiveness when he is not a mem-
ber of the proper prestige group.)

In his Presidential Inaugural Address to the Psychological Association of
the Philippines (17), Bulatao puts forth perhaps the most unsound state-
ment in Philippine behavior science. Lamenting that "the psychology of the

---

[7] For a summary and evaluation of Spencer and others of the bio-organismic school,
see Pitirim A. Sorokin, *Contemporary Sociological Theories: Through the First Quarter
of the Twentieth Century*, New York: Harper & Row, 1964, pp. 194-218.

masses remains that of children," that the masses suffer from a "fixation at the . . . pre-industrial, pre-democratic" level, he asks, "What can we do to advance the cause of national maturity?" (17:3-4) Echoing Nakpil's remark that Filipinos do not understand themselves, Bulatao, incredibly enough, suggests "organizing discussion groups for self-understanding," (17:5) group therapy to introduce the masses to the wonders of industrial, democratic society.

Bulatao does not seem to realize that the democracy he speaks of is a historical development peculiar to a certain people, a certain place, and to certain conditions—namely the American middle-class as a product of several centuries of Western history.

On a scientific level Bulatao has interested himself in Philippine values. Unfortunately he uses American tests and transfers these whole and without alteration from their Western setting. Understandably their applicability in the Philippines is questionable, and their reliability has yet to be proved.

Using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, he comes up with several findings (15): provincial men and women are more similar than Manila men and women; the traditional element is stronger in women, and the city has a greater impact on men. The Filipino values small-group belongingness; he is social minded, prefers structured decisions to risk-taking, and is loyal to his primary group. In the obverse of this he feels the "need to maintain distance from strangers" (15:177) and has a "high-abasement, high-deference, low-affiliation drive." (15:177)

The Filipino, according to Bulatao's study, has a high achievement and nurturant need. The findings show the importance of authority and aggression, and since the culture does not allow frank verbal aggression, there are instead violent hostile acts, poison pen letters, and the like. The Filipino wants to submit to those in authority and dominate those below him; and the Filipino is sensitive to others.

Heterosexuality findings in Bulatao's study are ambiguous. All his conclusions may be questioned because of the probable cultural inappropriateness of the testing instrument and the lack of evidence for the generality of the findings. The study apparently has not been replicated, and there is no evidence for the instrument's reliability in Philippine culture or for the adequacy of Bulatao's techniques in general.

This questionableness of Western tests is illustrated by a paper using the Army General Classification Test and finding that 2 per cent of the officers in the Philippine Armed Forces are morons (30). Whatever our opinion of the military mind, we must admit this is a somewhat questionable finding no doubt traceable to the cultural inappropriateness of the instrument.

A study of occupation rankings concluded that "respondents have a plurality of value orientations." (121:397) If multi-value orientations are prevalent among Filipinos, how reliable then is an Edwards Personal Preference Schedule? Is it not better for Filipino psychologists to develop their own tools peculiar to their own culture and to their own culture's needs instead of relying ovinely on alien methods and concepts of questionable usefulness?[8]

Bulatao also has done considerable work with *hiya,* which he defines as "a painful emotion arising from a relationship with an authority figure or with society, inhibiting self-assertation in a situation which is perceived as dangerous to one's ego." (14:428) Bulatao speaks of "the unindividuated ego" and says:

> Because its security is found not within itself but within the group to which it is bound, it dares not let go of that group's approval. Furthermore, it dares not assert itself independently of the group for fear that it will fail and thus incur the group's "We told you so." (14:435)

However, these are neither operational definitions nor accounts of functional relations, but merely impressions and unsupported inferences from unqualified samples of undocumented behavior; and we are not at all certain just what *hiya* is and just how it functions.

Fox, explaining self-esteem and *hiya* (38), sheds light on those Filipino characteristics that Western-oriented observers label lack of sportsmanship, hospitality, politeness, modesty, and amok. The concept is social and operates through personal contact; the highest chances for loss of self-esteem come through contacts with non-kin (38:430). This implies fear, for if the "debtor" is shamed (by being asked for payment), violence may occur (38:433). A person with severe *walang hiya* (absense of shame) has no feeling of debt, no respect for kinship, authority, or age (38:434). An Indian observer report that *hiya* is the same word and has the same meaning in Hindu [*sic*] (112).

Writing of self-esteem among the Maranaw, investigators describe it as ideological, as an expression of the social system, as related to Maranaw society (in Manila blood enemies can be friends), and as sustained by social coercion (104).

In still another paper Bulatao sees four values reflected in newspaper society pages: social acceptance, friendship, philanthrophy, and power and authority as a "public affirmation of respect and loyalty to . . . authority figures . . . [or] to maintain the established social structure." (18:149)

In a brief profile of the Filipino, Bulatao finds him encompassing these characteristics:

---

[8] See Gloria D. Feliciano, "Limits of Western Social Research Methods in Rural Philippines: The Need for Innovation," *Lipunan,* Vol. I, No. 1 (1965), pp. 114-128.

Retiringness within the group; dependency, value for close emotional ties; fear of
face-to-face relations with strangers, preference for a system of strong personal
controls, authoritarianism; strong social taboos on public manifestations of sex;
suppressed, hostile needs, probably resulting from prohibitions and controls; need
for a highly structured, traditional environment. (14:436)

In relation to this, Charles R. Kaut, in a recent study, emphasizes the
importance in Tagalog society of prescribed behavior (63).

In summary then, according to Bulatao, the Filipino protects himself

... against the dangers of the harsh world outside the family by great careful-
ness, the care not to take unnecessary risks (traditionalism); the determination
to be careful of what other people say (*hiya*), not to antagonize others or create
potential enemies (smooth interpersonal relations), to seek the approval and pro-
tection of important people (authoritarianism). (16:26)

But Bulatao's studies are totally vulnerable in such mundane areas as sam-
pling, measurement reliability, response error, evidence for generality, and
internal consistency; however, what is most bothersome, and what we think
contributes heavily to his depressingly negative portrait of the Filipino, is
his commitment to an essentially alien ideology—we can not help but sus-
pect some implicit bias in his studies.

At least two other behavior scientists besides Bulatao have made impres-
sive attempts to get at the Filipino's world-view. Abraham L. Felipe, a
psychologist at the University of the Philippines, made an analysis of the
heroes in popular, post-World War II Tagalog short stories. Already men-
tioned is Pal of Silliman University and his extensive socio-anthropological
survey of a rural barrio in Negros (93). Felipe, in his study, concludes:

The world of the hero is both hostile to his needs and beyond his control.
Because of this, he shows toward it attitudes of passivity, resignation, conformity,
and compliance. Faced with a world that is unmanageable and particularly hostile
to his spontaneous impulses, the hero adjusts by inhibiting these impulses that
endanger his security even when he has to suffer in so doing. He is not only
able to tolerate suffering but also to be insensitive or unaware of it. The main
value he shows is the need to control impulses that are evil; and . . . evil is
represented [as coming] from the self—due to thoughts, heredity or simply "na-
ture." (36:from abstract)

Felipe's conclusions come from sound scientific methodology, the use of
thematic apperception technique analysis. This might be compared with a
literary attempt to analyze Filipino personality through Tagalog literature.
Bienvenido Lumbera comes up with some vague reference to a passive ac-
ceptance of the *status quo,* supposedly inherent in Filipino "nature" (71:168)
—which, of course, tells us nothing. "Identification of love with loyalty,
the need for human solidarity, and the desire for progress or prosperity" are
three themes Lumbera identifies (71:167); the last, the desire for change,

clashes with the passivity—which, according to Lumbera, "alternately vexes and amuses our sociologists." (71:168)

In Pal's work (93) the Filipino sees a universe integrated with super-natural things, humans, natural resources, and man-made things. These four elements are undifferentiated; an effect on one affects another, and the Filipinos'

> ...guide for behavior is their concept of man's place in the universe . . . . Behavior which promotes the values of the other elements enables a man to earn [grace], and behavior which devalues the other elements earns a person [curse]. (93:449-450)

Richard M. Willis's study, based on questionnaires to 101 college students, finds that "the national self-images stress good intentions instead of efficiency." (127:4) Filipinos rate themselves highly friendly, kind, and peace-loving, but not scientific, industrious, or thrifty.

Perhaps the most widely-read writer purporting to give a picture of the Filipino world-view, through an exploration of his values system and his behavior in social interaction, is Frank Lynch, director of the Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University. Although he is trained as an anthropologist and his writings are couched in behavior science terminology, much of his work is not scientific. Based on hunches and casual observations, several of his articles are difficult to evaluate because he often gives conclusion with no supporting data, confusingly interchanges terminology (see his uses of *value, pattern, norm, postulate* in 73), and proceeds with no apparent method. Perhaps these articles should be considered as informal essays.

So far the best criticism of Lynch's work has been a paper by anthropologist F. Landa Jocano of the National Museum (61). Lynch, in his most widely circulated essay (73), had isolated what he considered important values in Filipino behavior: social acceptance, economic security, and social mobility. Concentrating on social acceptance, Lynch had advanced the SIR (smooth interpersonal relations) thesis and its corollaries of shame and self-esteem.

Writing of the great attention this thesis has received (due partly to the easy readability of Lynch's work and the efficiency of the Institute in disseminating its views), Jocano says:

> The impact of the SIR thesis on the thinking of students of Filipino society . . . is undeniably great. Indeed, it has not only generated a tremendous amount of discussion among students but it has also led many, especially foreign observers and some scholars, to accept it as *the guideline* for understanding Filipino ways of thinking and behaving, and as *the measure* of what one can socially expect from a Filipino. Because SIR is fast becoming a stereotype image of Filipino personality and culture and because its proponents continue to write about it uncritically, these

questions are in order and need to be asked openly: How empirically valid is
SIR? How legitimate is its identification as the basic theme of Filipino culture?
Has it ever been tested in the field? (61:282-283)

Through questionnaires, focused interviews, and participant-observation,
Jocano tested the thesis against his research in rural central Panay and in
Sta. Ana, Manila; and, finding it wanting, he devastates the SIR thesis in
such areas as the use of unqualified samples, gross generalizing "out of
meager empirical data" (61:290), the confusion of norms for behavior, and
Lynch's habit of projecting his own model on the people instead of per-
ceiving the cultural model of the people themselves.

"Because of lack of data," Jocano continues, "we can not, as of date,
speak with confidence about the basic theme of Filipino culture," much less
about SIR as this theme (61:285). Indeed, Jocano finds his areas of study
"fraught with internal conflicts." (61:286). Instead of the usual impression
given by foreign observers of tranquility and swaying palms, inefficient lazi-
ness and smiling faces, the slick comfortableness of an SIR society, Jocano
pictures groups living in fear for their safety and fighting for survival amid
eternal conflict.

This seems a more accurate portrait, especially when viewed against the
backround of social unrest laid out, necessarily hazily, by the social historians.
Currently investigating revitalization movements[9] in the Philippines, David
R. Sturtevant, with refreshing metaphors and a virile style, has written sev-
eral articles that bear close study (117, 118, 119). These are preliminary
statements and primarily descriptive, but they open a virgin area for culture-
and-personality investigations in the Philippines as well as opportunities for
those gathering vitally needed data in peasant history. How are such move-
ments related to social interaction? to culture traits? to personality predis-
positions? to perceptions of leadership roles? to social stratification? to
social structure? And how are they related to the alleged Filipino trait of
social ingratiation?

One popular article on social acceptance claims that the Filipino's ability
to get along with others springs from his recognition of the others' worth
and dignity, from his regard for the feeling of others (89).

In relation to this and family unity, there is some evidence that land
is more important than the goodwill of kin. In a study of how sorcery is
used when government and religious controls fail, Richard W. Lieban notes
the incidence of disputes in areas of kinship (69).

---

[9] The term is from Antony F. C. Wallace "Revitalization Movements," *American
Anthropologist*, Vol. 58, No. 2 (April 1956), p. 264-281, who proposes it to replace
such terms as vitalistic movement, millenarian movement, agrarian unrest, peasant re-
volt, chiliastic movement, social movement, charismatic movement, cargo cult, nativistic
movement, sect formation, and so forth.

At any rate, although Lynch is modeling his studies after American so-
ciological works, he is coming to conclusions with only a fraction of the data
gathered by the American sociologists before *they* ventured conclusions. Any
body of data taken from a few, simple observations or operations is subject
to numberless interpretations. Concepts can be arrived at only when suf-
ficient data has been gathered by numerous operations, and then subjected
to examination from numerous angles. One thing seen for certain so far
in this review is that there is not enough valid data on which to base any
final conclusions about Philippine culture-and-personality.

Hollnsteiner, who is also from the Ateneo Institute of Philippine Cul-
ture, was one of the first investigators to deal with the Tagalog concept of
utang na loob (a debt of gratitude) (52). A comparative study of her work
and Kaut's (67) notes that "Hollnsteiner seems interested in cataloging and
listing, and then in describing arbitrary situations; Kaut, in dynamic processes
and selected, representative examples." (67:169) Hollnsteiner's work in
general lacks depth and professionalism. .

Pointing out the importance of *utang na loob,* Kaut writes:

> Because the system operates to define the limits of socially meaningful relations
> among individuals and, to a large degree, determines the nature of such relations,
> its understanding is crucial to an understanding of bilateral social organization
> and some of its structural basis in the Philippines. (64:256)

Translating *utang na loob* as "a debt of primary obligation" (64:256-
257), Kaut builds a picture of a rural Tagalog barrio in which all social re-
lations are based on an ever-increasing upside-down pyramid of *utang na loob*
governing each face-to-face interaction. Kaut emphasizes the social context
in which *utang na loob* operates and puts its development into three stages:
initiatory, unstable fluctuation, and a

> . . . culmination of a long, intimate, and active obligation association: complete
> reciprocity of mutual support and aid so that two individuals become complemen-
> tary *utang na loob* partners. In this stage, one is never exclusively in debt to the
> other but, rather, they are co-equally indebted. (64:266)

Except for these two preliminary studies, published six and seven years
ago, nothing has been done on this seemingly important aspect of Philippine
social structure.

Hollnsteiner, interested in another study in finding channels for deviants
from traditional norms who are needed for industrialization, lists two mechan-
isms enforcing conformity: *pakikisama* (roughly, getting along with others),
and the disallowing of privacy (53).

Franklin G. Ashburn finds *pakikisama* and *utang na loob* operating in
criminal gangs (6:141). In an insight into conflicting values of primary

loyalties, Ashburn notes that gang members thought that committing crimes while under the influence of alcohol relieved them of their *personal* respon- sibility but they did not expect the courts to find them not guilty because of it (6:140).

Another mechanism often found in the popular literature is *bahala na* (roughly, as God wills). Related to a fatalistic outlook, this character- istic appears in the numerous lists of Filipino "character flaws," such as Delfin Fl. Batacan's list (10:3-4), *wala kang paki-alam* (mind your own business), *pasikatan/palalu-an* (show-off), *bahala na/talaga ng Diyos*, fiestas, *amor propio* (self-esteem), poor sportsmanship, gossip, *ningas ku- gon* (short lived enthusiasm), and *masamang inggit/panunumpa* (jealous envy). But Richard L. Stone and Linda D. Nelson, through participant- observation and structured and unstructured interviews in Sulu, fail to find much of the man-subjugated-to-nature value, despite its currency in the popular literature (114). Nevertheless, a recent study of children showed fatalistic explanations of events prevalent among the subjects (37).

Bahala na is usually viewed as a predisposition to inaction, but it is perhaps more accurately seen as an explanation of a past event. Lieban, in analyzing among the Cebuanos the effects of fatalistic folk medical be- liefs on behavior, says:

> These beliefs do not stifle efforts to find a cure . . . even when treatment after treatment fails. Only the death of the patient is likely to establish the view that his previous treatments were wasted attemps to change a foregone conclusion. (70:179)

Lieban then asks whether

> . . . fatalistic beliefs are cognitive factors which in themselves actually discourage, as futile, actions designed to affect the outcome of an event, or whether such ac- tions are perceived as futile because of experienced incapacities to alter conditions or events—death itself in the Cebuano examples reviewed—incapacities which are then explained or rationalized fatalistically. (70:179)

The second interpretation applies in Lieban's paper and probably has a wider application. (For other views of *bahala na*, see 10:27, 47:116, 88:755, 91:115,118.)

Gathering other personality characteristics mentioned by investigators in various papers, we see that Hart, in his excellent study of the role of the plaza in culture change (51), notices that the more progressive the barrio, the more pretentious and ornate is the plaza. Further, the wealthy Filipinos living near the plaza have to maintain status and play the role expected of them. Hart observes:

> Most Filipino principalia, it would appear, prefer to display their wealth, to build elaborate houses, dress pretentiously, and impress visitors with their finan-

cial resources. One need but to dine with a wealthy Filipino family to realize
the tendency toward conspicuous consumption of wealth. (51:50)

LeRoy in 1905 also commented on the ostentatious display of wealth
(68:77). And Rizal's portrait of Capitan Tiago (102) is an 1890 picture
of the Filipino principalia.

Castillo reports that occupations with ceremonial titles ranked higher
in prestige than those with income (23). And in a study of prejudices,
George Weightman finds that Filipinos tend to prefer Caucasians to Orient-
als (126). Another study reveals that Filipinos think highly of Americans
(11).

Still collecting various characteristics, we note that one investigator
mentions non-interference, defining it as a behavior to avoid embarrassing
the victim and to avoid putting him under obligation (*utang na loob*) (92).
A study of proverbs also finds a stress on non-involvement (12). The
investigator's interpretation is that the Filipino fears satiation of his emotions
from too much involvement. In Pal's richly descriptive survey he notes
that "adaptation to, rather the mastery of nature, is the orientation of the
people's behavior." (93:454)

The only reference to what is popularly termed "legalism"—the Fil-
ipino's alleged preoccupation with form and lack of comprehension of sub-
stance—comes in a clinical study of a Filipino in California (54), who
gives over-technical answers to questions on the Wechsler Adult Intelligence
Scale. For example, in answer to the question why people born deaf
are usually unable to talk, he writes, "There is an impairment in the main
organs that connect the main nerve of the olfactory nerve and the nerve
connecting the eye to the brain." (54:286)

Josefina D. Constantino's paper (28) concentrates on another alleged
aspect of Filipino personality: "His disinterest in and inability to handle
ideas profitably." (28:20) According to the investigator, the Filipino has
a weak sense of the self and the other and so is non-observant. This is
not supported in any understandable psychological terms, and so her thesis
is unclear.

But "a weak sense of the self" suggests group identity, and here, for
once, the literature is quite clear. Hollnsteiner, along with others, notes
that privacy is disallowed and that the child fears to be alone (53). Non-
membership in a group leads to alienation, according to one study (46);
another also upholds the thesis of strong in-group loyalties against outsiders
(126).

In a description of a religious sect, we see graphically illustrated the
resistance of an in-group to outsiders. Discipline here is also controlled by
social sanctions, the threat of alienation (107; for an expanded treatment,
see 106).

The importance of peer influence and social setting is emphasized in a paper on ritual mourning (26). The investigator shows that there is a cultural set for stimuli, triggering responses in certain settings.

In a cross-cultural study of Filipino, American, and German youth, Stoodley finds

> ... that Filipino youth place higher emphasis on authority obedience than American youth, that they attribute less power and prerogative on the one hand and less submission on the other to structured relations of authority and obedience than German youth, that they see the individual as closely identified with the group and, as a result, make less distinction between group rights and individual rights than either German or American youth. (115:560-561)

Buenaventura M. Villanueva, investigating whether barrio people can govern themselves, reports that unilateral decisions are almost completely absent and that group consultations are the means of obtaining decisions (124:17). He further reports that the people tend to rely on outside help instead of self-help for barrio projects (124:21).

Along similar lines, employing samples from two Iloilo towns a study of attitudes towards the community school movement finds, "People are so dependent on their leader that they can not make outright decisions re-garding their own walfare." (20:18) The investigator, however, neglected to mention who decided what "their own welfare" was.

The current emphasis in behavior science on the processes of change [10] is reflected in Philippine literature in works other than those concerned with implementing grass-roots self-government.

In a study of crime (31), John F. Doherty places the blame on rapid social change for the seeming widespread disregard of institutional agencies. In traditional Philippine society controls are informal, and in the emerging nation-state, formal controls are resented, he explains.

Related to change, an analysis of 421 dreams of a sea people reveals that areas of cultural stress revolve around food, spirits, animals (but not sea animals), illness, and death. Fear of the unfamiliar and strange is emphasized (84). A study of Silliman students' attitude toward marriage finds, "Students themselves do not crave change." (99:226)

Supposedly a primary vehicle for change, as well as a means of forming personality and promulgating nation-wide attitudes, is education, especially education in government-supervised schools.

---

[10] In anthropology, for example, Laura Thompson peaks of the shift in focus from culture contact to culture change in "Is Applied Anthropology Helping to Develop a Science of Man?" *Human Organization*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (Winter 1965), pp. 277-287; in social psychology, see any recent issue of *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* for the emphasis on attitude change; and in sociology we have the focus on social change.

One of the themes in the autobiography collected by Hart is the high evaluation of formal education (50); Lumbera mentions "the constant stress on the value of an education" found in Tagalog literature (71:168). Another investigator, however, reports, "The notion that common sense and experience will prove superior to book learning in the end appears repeatedly in Filipino songs (105-129). Possibly, through historical experience, Filipinos have come to value education primarily as a means for avoiding distasteful labor and for gaining social prestige, but not for the sake of acquiring knowledge *per se*. More probably there is simply widespread knowledge that education is power.

Although Hart says the teacher has replaced the priest as a model for behaviour in the rural barrios, he doubts whether the school has done much for the life of the lowest peasant (51:21-26). Camilo Osias, in an earlier work, also stressed the importance of the teacher as a model (90:101). Writing a short and useful political survey of rural barrios, John H. Romani says that the big landlord and the manager of the sugar or rice mill are the leaders. And "the local school teacher and barrio priest are also leaders in certain areas of barrio life." (103:229) But we are not certain whether to equate "leader" with "model for behavior."

At any rate the alleged "magic" of education, one of the themes of middle-class America,[11] seems to have failed to change the Philippines. Two astute investigators observe:

> In historical perspective, it is clear that the shift from a Spanish to an American orientation had more impact on the organization and curricular aspects of the schools than on basic attitudes toward educational procedures. (55:133)

Another says that the school "for the most part is still highly authoritarian and insistent on rote learning." (17:6) And Stone and Nelson's recent study of missionary schools in Sulu finds "no clear indications that education changes value orientations at secondary and higher levels." (114-17)

Much of the difficulty in inducing culture change through education has been traced to the language problem. Formal education is in English, and having new ideas expressed in a foreign language does not hasten their acceptance. According to Alfredo V. Lagmay, "Even for the elite, the vernacular has a power over attitudes and feelings hardly possible of approximation by means of the English language." (66: 42) Collateral with the enforcement of English is the relative undevelopment of the vernacular for reflecting the world outside the home and barrio. Constantino comments, "Thinking in Tagalog and expressing oneself in English not only

---

[11] Leslie A. White, *The Science of Culture,* New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1949, pp. 344-347; Cora Du Bois, "The Dominant Value Profile of American Culture," *American Anthropologist,* Vol. 57, No. 1 (Dec. 1955), p. 1237.

leads to a lack of power in expression, but even to imprecision, and neces-
sarily to lack of self-confidence." (28:24)

This emphasis on democracy and formal education has resulted in a
number of rather strange writings on Philippine philosophy, character edu-
cation, nation-building, and so forth. One representative writer of this
type is Osias, who has been an important figure in Philippine education and
politics for several decades. In a rather extraordinary reading of personal
pronouns in Philippine languages, he stresses, in a textbook for teachers,
the interdependence of men and advances what he calls the "tayo concept"
as a unifying philosophy for Filipinos (91); this is based on Philippine
pronouns: *ako* (I), *kita* (we-two), *kami* (we exclusive), *tayo* (we inclusive).

From this sort of work to the early anthropologists is a long jump,
but a happy one. For some time anthropology was the only social discipline
interested in the Philippines, and at the apex of early anthropology is A. L.
Kroeber's *Peoples of the Philippines* (65), which first discusses the physical
characteristics of the people, their speech, the material artifacts, religion,
and art. His discussion of society, however, is based on early Spanish and
American misconceptions about ruling classes, plebians, and slaves. Kroe-
ber's book also contains a discussion of the Ifugaos' well-developed law
system and their lack of the nation-state concept. An excellent study at
the time of its publication, it is, however, based on investigations from the
1910s; much of the material needs updating. [12]

Among the most famous works by the pre-World War II anthropolo-
gists is Roy F. Barton's autobiographies of three Ifugaos (8). Interestingly
there is a test at the end of the book to quiz the reader on how well he
understands Ifugao culture.

The first book by a modern Filipino anthropologist is Marcelo Tangco's
The Christian Peoples of the Philippines (120). This book is most useful
as a collection of regional stereotypes, which take up about one half of
the book: "The Bisayan is the most carefree" (120:53); "Northern Ta-
galogs are good-natured, faithfully patient, easy to satisfy, humble and
modest, very hospitable, honest, kindhearted, and lovers of peace" (120:60);
"As a subordinate, [the Ilocano] has scarcely an equal as to loyalty and
obedience to his superior" (120:66); etc.; etc.

---

[12] Roy F. Barton, *Ifugao Law,* Berkeley: University of California, 1919; Laura W.
Benedict, "A Study of Bagobo Ceremonial, Magic, and Myth," *Annals,* New York
Academy of Sciences, Vol. 25, 1916; Fay C. Cole, *Traditions of the Tinguian,* Chicago:
Field Museum of Natural History, 1915; H. Otley Beyer, *Population of the Philippine
Islands in 1916,* Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1917.

These selections are justly placed among the classics of Philippine research, but
concepts have changed and new findings have been made, and much of this data is
now inaccurate.

Also these titles, along with Kroeber's book, are ethnographic in the strictest sense
and are not concerned with personality.

The book also contains many general cliches, such as, the Filipino is "easy going and apathetic to hard work" and other such gems as "The Filipino is very conservative" (120:33); "By nature the Filipino is not critical" (120:37); "He is well known for his peace-loving disposition" (120:41); and so on for almost every page.

Although published in 1951, most of the data seems to come from the Beyer collection of pre-World War II materials. The bibliography lists only nine titles dated after 1913 (and five of these are pre-1930)—perhaps indicative of the letdown among American anthropologists after the first blush of enthusiasm over having a colonial laboratory and also of the lack of trained Filipino investigators.

Likewise, very little has been done in the area of personality-and-culture and social stratification. Nurge writes, "Very little investigation [has] been made of social class in the Philippines." (87:40) What few studies there are have been confused by the writings on pre-Spanish accounts in describing a well-stratified feudal society for the Philippines—complete with nobility, freemen, serfs, and slaves. [13] This erroneous history has been thoroughly disseminated to schoolchildren through the textbooks of the most consistent and influential offenders, Eufronio Alip (1:61-63) and Gregorio F. Zaide (128:2).

Except for a tendency toward hearsay scholarship and a desire to support politically exploitable myths, scholars should have corrected this error soon after the Spaniards left. For one of the earliest exposés, see Charles K. Warriner's article published in 1960 (125). However, the error still appears, for example, in Lynch's article in 1965 (75). Fox is doing the most impressive work in this area so far (see 40 and recent studies soon to be published). The resultant rewriting of pre-Spanish history will considerably influence future thinking on culture-and-personality.

In contemporary studies, Lynch, through the reputational approach to social stratification, finds that class in a Bicol town is based on wealth and that the people know who has the money and that everyone is divided into the "big people" and the "little people." (74) What he is investig-

---

[13] In addition to describing Philippine social structure in the only terms they knew the Spaniards probably wanted to impress on their contemporaries that they had conquered a highly organized and politically respectable people.

The rewriting of history by conquerors is as old as history itself. H. G. Creel, in explaining the difficulties in untangling ancient Chinese history, writes (*Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse-tung*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953, p. 15), "The justification of conquest has always been an embarrassing business. It usually calls for a certain amount of mythology, washed down the throats of the people by means of propoganda. Recently this mythology has often taken the form of a doctrine of 'manifest destiny'; the Chou rulers called their doctrine that of 'the decree of Heaven.'"

And there is little doubt that the early Americans had their own reasons for emphasizing that the Filipinos had always been an appendage of some empire. History by conquerors can rarely be trusted.

ating, of course, are stereotypes. According to his analysis, the lower class, who learn to expect some help from the upper class, are content with their lot because deprivation is relative and they feel they have no right to riches Like much of Lynch's writings this is probably a bit too simple and pat. It fails to take cognizance of the explosive consumer revolution noted in other papers (see 54, 51, 66) in which the poor are made conscious of their deprivation through movies, advertising, transistor radios, the marketplace. But then this dynamic inflow of information and outflow of desires, discontent, drives, wishes, dissents, aspirations (see Sturtevant's articles 117, 118, 119) hardly fits Lynch's concept of a rather static, conservative, interdependent, SIR society. Nurge, seemingly more sensitive to the nuances of Philippine society, finds it difficult to divide her Leyte village into two classes (87:42).

Chester L. Hunt, in a Philippine college-level introductory sociology textbook (56), portrays a nation-wide division of social classes by income and associated behavior patterns. But much of the material is impressionistic and some of it seems inconsistent and at variance with other, more respected studies.

In a study of the social origins and career histories of Filipino entrepreneurs in manufacturing, John J. Carroll finds that individuals from the upper strata are "tremendously overrepresented." (21:110) There is apparently a low rate of socio-economic mobility.

A profile of sugar mill workers finds their society very stratified (34). Social class is important in obtaining employment (34:5) and has a hold on the person even after economic mobility (34:6-7). The investigator feels that most of the gambling and drinking found here is an attempted relief from what the worker views as stifling class strictures and discrimination in a highly regulated community (34:12).

In relation to this, a study of the development of awareness of social class among small children discovers that first-grade children are already conscious of class (80; see also 113). [14]

The schools and the marketplace are centers of class awareness, and the church also helps develop class consciousness. Hart writes:

> An informant said that one Sunday she was sitting on the family bench when an old woman from a distant barrio entered the church. There were no empty seats. My informant offered the old lady, wearied by the walk, a place on the family bench; the courtesy was shyly refused. Later my informant's aunt criticized her for this action, saying she had belittled herself and her family. (51)

---

[14] An American classic of this type (Gary A. Stendler, *Children of Brasstown*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949) finds little appreciable class awareness until the fourth grade.

(For further study of Philippine religion and its role in social interaction, see 48.) This is an historical function of the church as noted by Rizal (102) and LeRoy, who wrote, "The principalia exercised jealously the privilege of occupying seats of honour at the centre of the church." (68:50)

Indeed, a striking characteristic cropping up in the literature is the consistency of Philippine culture-and-personality through the centuries and in different situations.

In a paper that emphasizes the combining of the old and the new, the writer investigated two villages of the "New Christians" in La Union (9). These "New Christians" are Igorots who have abandoned their mountains to become lowlanders. The author's objective was to investigate how ancient customs have withstood the impact of modernization. Unfortunately the study is seriously marred by two flaws: We learn only of norms and not of actual behavior, and the author, obviously not a trained behavior scientist, speaks continually of "the superiority of modern civilization," (9:190) biasing her viewpoint so that she is unable to properly answer the question of her study.

But the consistency through time is evident: The "New Christians" still observe old religious customs (9); stereotyping is indigenous, not a carry-over from Spanish or American attitudes (11); concepts in education remain the same (55); folk medical practices persist (60); local speech patterns persist (66); family life remains much the same (96); religious beliefs are retained (59).

And also evident is the consistency through varied situations. Ashburn reports: "The conflict gang, whose members have few or no solid family ties has, in fact assumed the functions of the ritual kinship similar to the compadrazgo functions in 'legitimate' society." (6:154)

In a description of pre-Spanish times that could well do for today, Fox writes that small and scattered communities existed near the coast and rivers (settlement nucleation came with the Spaniards); the communities had a weak political structure and were socially divided by kin groups and united by fluid alliances. Leadership and authority was vested in older persons, and decisions were arrived at through consensus. The society was structured by generations in a bilateral extended family (40).

Striking similarities can be found in Rizal's novels in the late 1800s, LeRoy's observations (68), and Pal's (93) and Hart's (51) contemporary descriptions of Philippine life, of the gossipping, the gambling, the cock-fighting, the marketplace, the church, and the school. LeRoy wrote:

> There exists no such line of distinction between village and farm as may be found in countries which have reached some degree of industrial development. . . . The Filipino town comprises both town and country in the ordinary sense of these words. Under one government unit, the old pueblo of Spanish phraseology, are

included the main centre of population, which may range anywhere from a cluster of two hundred houses to a thriving rural city with perhaps a cathedral church, with secondary school and even a printing press, and the outlying rural districts, sometimes spreading over an area of forty or even more square miles, in which are various subordinate little centers of population, with from ten to several hundred houses in each, commonly called barrios. (68:41-42)

So, having gone from the barrios of the 1900 and earlier to the rural barrios and the cities of the 1960s and then back again through 128 selections, we feel we should know something about Philippine culture-and-personality but—we do not. This is logically the place for a summary and synthesis, a grand review of Philippine culture-and-personality as reflected in our 128 writings, but significantly we lack all confidence for doing so because of the very nature of the writings themselves. Instead we will review the general character of these selections and the state of current behavior science in the Philippines.

The quality of most of the writings is poor: the non-scientific ones are not good literature and the scientific ones lose our confidence through inadequate methodology, unreliable operations, and unjustifiable conclusions. The most outstanding features of contemporary research on Philippine culture-and-personality are the lack of professionalism, the uncritical use of Western tools, the abundance of premature conclusions, the lack of intrascholastic criticism, and the implicit commitment to democratic ideology.

Philippine behavior science is of course young, and perhaps professionalism will come with age, but seemingly the best professional behavior scientists produce very little, while the poorer amateurish ones produce a great deal. The professional organizations must reopen the question of membership standards and the Philippine journals must reexamine their publication standards.

A question that should be answered soon concerns the universality of American behavior science and the universal application of its methods. Are statistics reliable in the Philippines? What adaptations will have to be made? Are there such things as cultural sociology and cultural psychology? What significant studies can be made of the sociology of science in the Philippines? In other words, are Western behavior science principles universal [15] or are they assumptions based on samples inadequate and unrepresentative in time, space, and culture, and evolved by methods peculiar to a few relatively isolated Western societies? [16]

Another set of questions concerns the general condition, quality and quantity, of Philippine culture-and-personality data. Are broad conclusions

[15] For the sake of simplicity we are assuming here a homogeneity in Western behavior science that does not exist.

[16] See Charles K. Warriner, "The Prospects for a Philippine Sociology," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. IX, Nos. 1-2 (Jan.-April 1961), pp. 12-18.

justified now from the data available? Is there, indeed, any such creature as the "lowland Filipino"? Our feelings on this point are obvious throughout this paper. We believe that groups studied must be specified and that for some time still any paper purporting to speak of the "lowland Filipino" should be considered invalid.

Until the May 1966 Philippine Sociological Convention, the absence of criticism in the behavior sciences was striking. At that convention Jocano criticized Lynch (61) and Milton Barnett criticized Bulatao (7). But Lynch's rather obviously questionable SIR thesis had first come out in 1960 and had since then been reprinted several times and never seriously revised or challenged. Bulatao has been turning out papers just as long. Criticism is healthy and indeed necessary for the life of a science; and we look forward to more criticism, criticism that should advance professionalism, modify Western tools and introduce novel Philippine ones, and criticism to make those conclusion-prone writers think twice before they jump.

Ideological commitment of scientists usually refers to the intradisciplinary schools of thought. But behavior science in the Philippines is yet too undeveloped for this. In anthropology, for example, the Philippines is merely an outpost of the University of Chicago and the structure approach of Radcliffe-Brown *et al.* However, we can also speak of scientific commitments to political ideology or to a particular ideoculture. It is widely accepted, for example, that there is a distinctly communist psychology in the Soviet Union;[17] and we need look further than Seymour Martin Lipset, a "brand name" sociologist, to find a distinctly American sociology, committed to white, protestant, middle-class, democratic values.[18] The Philippine scientist's commitment must be to neither of these, and if the ideal of a politically uncommitted social science is impossible, then the Philippine commitment must be to a distinctly Philippine ideology, a Filipino ideoculture.

---

[17] For a specific example, see Herbert L. Pick, "Perception in Soviet Psychology," *Psychological Bulletin,* Vol. 62, No. 1 (July 1964), pp. 21-35; for a general survey, see K. V. Ostrovitjapov *et al.* (eds.), *Social Sciences in the USSR,* Paris: Mouton & Co., 1965, esp. pp. ix-x, 79-137.

[18] See Dusky Lee Smith, "Seymour Martin Lipset: Sociologist of Happiness," *Liberation,* Vol. XI, No. 4 (July 1966), pp. 25-33; for the nationalistic biases of American behavior scientists in general, see Francis L. K. Hsu, "American Core Value and National Character," in *Psychological Anthropology,* Francis L. K. Hsu (ed). Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1961, pp. 209-230.

References

1. Alip, Eufronio. *Political and Cultural History of the Philippines.* Manila: Alip and Sons (Rev. Ed.), 1950.

2. Alzona, Encarnacion. "Ideals of the Filipinos," in *Looking at Ourselves: A Study of Our Peculiar Social Traits as a People,* Delfin Fl. Batacan. Manila: Philaw Publishing, 1956, pp. 262-283.

3. Angeles, Noli de los. "Marriage and Fertility Patterns in the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIII, No. 4 (October 1965), pp. 232-248.

4. Araneta, Francisco. "The Problem of Cultural Diversity," *Philippine Studies,* Vol. 12, No. 2 (April 1964), pp. 232-243.

5. Arjona, Adoracion. "The Ningas Kugon and the Mañana Habit," *Unitas,* Vol. 38, No. 4 (December 1965), pp. 546-551.

6. Ashburn, Franklin G. "Some Recent Inquiries into the Structure-Function of Conflict Gangs in Manila City Jail," *Asian Studies,* Vol. 3, No. 1 (April 1965), pp. 126-144.

7. Barnett, Milton. "*Hiya,* Shame and Guilt: Preliminary Consideration of the Concepts as Analytic Tools for Philippine Social Science," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 4 (October 1966), pp. 276-282.

8. Barton, Roy F. *Autobiography of Three Pagans.* New York: University Books, 1963. (First published in London in 1938 as *Philippine Pagans: The Autobiographies of Three Ifugaos.*)

9. Basco, Carmen Vibar. "Two Bago Villages: A Study," *Journal of East Asiatic Studies,* Vol. V, No. 2 (April 1956), pp. 125-212.

10. Batacan, Delfin Fl. *Looking at Ourselves: A Study of Our Peculiar Social Traits as a People.* Manila: Philaw Publishing, 1956.

11. Berreman, Joel V. "Filipino Stereotypes of Racial and National Minorities," *Pacific Sociological Review,* Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 1958), pp. 7-12.

12. Buenaventura, Amparo S. "Selected Filipino Proverbs Reflecting Religious and Moral Values," unpublished paper read at the Philippine Sociological Convention, May 1966. (Abstract published in *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 4 [October 1966], p. 294.)

13. Bulatao, Jaime. "Changing Social Values," *Philippine Studies,* Vol. 10, No. 2 (April 1962), pp. 206-214.

14. —————. "Hiya," *Philippine Studies,* Vol. 12, No. 3 (July 1964), pp. 424-438.

15. —————. "Personal Preferences of Filipino Students," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XI, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1963), pp. 168-178.

16. —————. "Philippine Values: The Manileño's Mainsprings," in *Four Readings on Philippine Values,* Frank Lynch (ed.). Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press (2nd Rev. Ed.), 1964, pp. 7-26.

17. —————. "Psychotherapeutic Attitudes and Techniques in Nation Building," *Science Review,* Vol. 6, Nos. 1-2 (January-February 1965), pp. 196-206.

17A. —————. *Split-Level Christianity.* Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University, 1966.

18. —————. "The Society Page and Its Value System," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XII, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1964), pp. 139-151.

19. Bustrillos, Nena R. "Patterns of Fertility Behavior of Couples in Rural Laguna, 1966: A Preliminary Report," unpublished paper read at the Philippine Sociological Convention, May 1966. (Abstract published in *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 4 [October 1966], p. 292.)

20. Cabalfin, Nenita Advincula. "Parental Attitudes Toward the Community School Movement," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. IV, No. 1 (January 1956), pp. 12-19.

21. Carroll, John J. "Filipino Entrepreneurship in Manufacturing," in *Four Readings on Philippine Values,* Frank Lynch (ed.). Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press (2nd Rev. Ed.), 1964, pp. 87-113.

22. Castillo, Gelia Tagumpay. "Implications of Occupational Research on the Role of the Counselor in High School," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIII, No. 3 (July 1965), pp. 144-153.

23. —————. "Occupation Evaluation in the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. X, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1962), pp. 147-157.

24. —————. "Occupational Sex Roles as Perceived by Filipino Adolescents," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. IX, Nos. 1-2 (January-April 1961), pp. 2-11.

25. Catuncan, Milagros M. "The Etiology of Suicide in Manila and Suburbs," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. VII, No. 4 (October 1959), pp. 26-33.

26. Concepcion, Mercedes B. "Ritual Mourning: Culturally Specified Crowd Behavior," *Anthropological Quarterly,* Vol. 35, No. 1 (January 1962), pp. 1-9.

27. Conklin, Harold. "Maling, a Hanunoo Girl from the Philippines," in *In the Company of Man: Twenty Portraits by Anthropologists,* Joseph B. Casagrade (ed.) New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960, pp. 101-118.

28. Constantino, Josefina D. "The Filipino Mental Make-Up and Science," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 1 (January 1966), pp. 18-28.

29. Diaz, Ralph, and Horst and Judith von Oppenfeld. *Case Studies of Farm Families, Laguna Province, Philippines.* Laguna: University of the Philippines College of Agriculture, 1961.

30. Dionisio, Maximino R. "A Comparative Study of Personality Traits of Army Officers and Enlisted Men," unpublished M.A. thesis. University of the Philippines, Quezon City, 1957.

31. Doherty, John F. "Crime, a Symptom of Change," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIII, No. 1 (January 1965), pp. 14-18.

32. —————. "The Image of the Priest: A Study in Stereotyping," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XII, Nos. 1-2 (January-April 1964), pp. 70-76.

33. Domingo, Fe. "Child-Rearing Practices in Barrio Cruz-na-Ligas," unpublished M.A. thesis. University of the Philippines, Quezon City, 1961.

34. Duñgo, Nanette Garcia. "A Profile of the Sugar Mill Worker," unpublished paper read at the Philippine Sociological Convention, May 1966. (Abstract published in *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 4 [October 1966] p. 296.)

35. Eslao, Nena B. "Child-Rearing among the Samal of Manubul, Siasi, Sulu," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. X, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1962), pp. 80-91.

36. Felipe, Abraham L. "A Thematic Apperception Analysis of Popular Tagalog Short Stories," unpublished M.A. thesis. University of the Philippines, Quezon City, 1961.

37. Flores, Pura M. "Immanent Justice in Filipino Children and Youth," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. XII, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1964), pp. 151-159.

38. Fox, Robert B. "The Filipino Concept of Self-Esteem," in *The Philippines* (Vol. 1), Subcontractor's Monograph. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files, Inc., 1956, pp. 430-436.

39. ————. "The Filipino Family and Kinship," in *The Philippines* (Vol. 1), Subcontractor's Monograph. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files, Inc., 1956, pp. 415-424.

40. ————. "Prehistoric Foundations of Contemporary Filipino Culture and Society," *Comment*, No. 5 (First Quarter 1958), pp. 39-51.

41. Gagelonia, Pedro A. *The Filipino Mind: A Cyclopedia of Philippine Quotations*. Manila: Manlapaz Publishing Co., 1962.

42. Gatue, Belen Tan. "The Social Background of Thirty Chinese-Filipino Marriages," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. III, No. 3 (July 1955), pp. 3-13.

43. Gonzales, Pilar A. "Changes in the Filipino Family," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. III, No. 2 (April 1955), pp. 15-17.

44. Guerrero, Leon Ma. "What Are Filipinos Like?" in *Kathâ 1*, J. C. Tuvera *et al.* (eds.). Manila: Philippine Writers Association, 1955, pp. 195-204.

45. Guerrero, Sylvia, M. "An Analysis of Husband-Wife Roles among Filipino Professionals at the University of the Philippines Los Baños Campus," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. XIII, No. 4 (October 1965), pp. 275-281.

46. ————, and Gelia T. Castillo. "A Preliminary Study on Alienation," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. XIV, No. 2 (April 1966), pp. 85-93.

47. Guthrie, George M. *The Filipino Child and Philippine Society: Research Reports and Essays*. Manila: Philippine Normal College Press, 1961.

48. Hart, Donn V. "The Filipino Villager and His Spirits," *Solidarity*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (October-December 1966), pp. 65-71.

49. ————. "Halfway to Uncertainty: A Short Autobiography of a Cebuano Filipino," *Journal of East Asiatic Studies*, Vol. V, No. 3 (July 1956), pp. 255-277.

50. ————. "A Personal Narrative of a Samaran Filipina," *Asian Studies*, Vol. III, No. 1 (April 1965), pp. 55-70.

51. ————. *The Philippine Plaza Complex: A Focal Point in Culture Change*. New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies Culture Report Series, 1955.

52. Hollnsteiner, Mary R. "Reciprocity in the Lowland Philippines," in *Four Readings on Philippine Values*, Frank Lynch (ed.). Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press (2nd Rev. Ed.), 1964, pp. 22-49.

53. ————. "Social Control and Filipino Personality," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. XI, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1963), pp. 184-188.

54. Hooper, H. Elston. "A Filipino in California Copes with Anxiety," in *Clinical Studies in Culture Conflict*, Georgene Seward (ed.). New York: Ronald Press, 1958, pp. 265-290.

55. Hunt, Chester L., and Thomas R. McHale. "Education, Attitudinal Change and Philippine Economic Development," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. XIII, No. 3 (July 1965), pp. 127-139.

56. ————, *et al. Sociology in the Philippine Setting.* Manila: Alemar's Book Store, 1954.

57. Icasiano, Francisco B. *Horizons from My Nipa Hut.* Manila: Nipa Hut Publishing Co., 1941.

58. Inselberg, Rachel Marzan. "The Causation and Manifestations of Emotional Behavior in Filipino Children," *Philippine Educational Forum,* Vol. VIII, No. 2 (November 1958), pp. 9-16.

59. Jocano, F. Landa. "Conversion and the Patterning of Christian Experience in Malitbog, Central Panay, Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIII, No. 2 (April 1965), pp. 96-119.

60. ————. "Cultural Context of Folk Medicine: Some Philippine Cases," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 1 (January 1966), pp. 40-48.

61. ————. "Rethinking 'Smooth Interpersonal Relations,'" *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 4 (October 1966), pp. 282-291.

62. Kalaw, Teodoro M. *Five Perceptives from Our Ancient Morality.* Manila, 1951.

63. Kaut, Charles R. "Contingency in Tagalog Society," *Asian Studies,* Vol. III, No. 2 (April 1965), pp. 1-15.

64. ————. "Utang na Loob: A System of Contractual Obligation among Tagalogs," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology,* Vol. 17, No. 3 (Autumn 1961), pp. 256-272.

65. Kroeber, A. L. *Peoples of the Philippines.* New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1943.

66. Lagmay, Alfredo V. "Motivation Research in Philippine Advertising," *Marketing Horizons,* Vol. II, No. 1 (January 1965), pp. 40-43.

67. Lawless, Robert. "A Comparative Analysis of Two Studies on Utang na Loob," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 3 (July 1966), pp. 168-172.

68. LeRoy, James A. *Philippine Life in Town and Country.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905.

69. Lieban, Richard W. "Sorcery, Illness, and Social Control in a Philippine Municipality," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology,* Vol. 16, No. 2 (Summer 1960), pp. 127-143.

70. ————. "Fatalism and Medicine in Cebuano Areas of the Philippines," *Anthropological Quarterly,* Vol. 39, No. 3 (July 1966), pp. 171-179.

71. Lumbera, Bienvenido. "Literary Notes on the Philippine Personality," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XI, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1963), pp. 136-138.

72. Lynch, Frank. "An Mga Asuwang: A Bicol Belief," *Philippine Social Science and Humanities Review,* Vol. 14, No. 4 (December 1949), pp. 401-427.

73. ————. "Lowland Philippine Values: Social Acceptance," in *Four Readings on Philippine Values,* Frank Lynch (ed.). Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press (2nd Rev. Ed.), 1964, pp. 1-21.

74. ————. *Social Class in a Bikol Town.* Chicago: University of Chicago, 1959.

75. ————. *Trends Report of Studies in Social Stratification and Social Mobility in the Philippines.* Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1963.

76. ————, *et al. Understanding the Philippines and America: A Study of Cultural Themes.* Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1966.

77. Malay, Armando J., and Paula Carolina Malay. *Our Folkways.* Manila: Book-man, Inc., 1955.

78. Malay, Paula Carolina. "Some Tagalog Folkways," *Journal of East Asiatic Studies,* Vol. VI, No. 1 (January 1957), pp. 69-88.

79. Mallari, I.V. *Vanishing Dawn.* Manila: Philippine Education Co., 1954.

80. Mejia, Julia Gales. "A Comparison of Children's Awareness of Symbols of Social Class with That of the Adults in Dagupan West Central High School," unpublished M.A. thesis. University of the Philippines, Quezon City, 1953.

81. Minturn, Leigh, and William S. Lambert. *Mothers of Six Cultures: Antecedents of Child Rearing.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964, esp. pp. 17-22, 209-221.

82. Nakpil, Carmen Guerrero. "The Filipino Woman," in *Kathá 1,* J.C. Tuvera *et al.* (eds.). Manila: Philippine Writers Association, 1955, pp. 205-220.

83. ————. "The Hybrid Character of Contemporary Filipino Culture," *Comment,* No. 5 (First Quarter 1958), pp. 58-63.

84. Nimmo, Harry. "Themes in Badjaw Dreams," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 1 (January 1966), pp. 48-56.

85. Nurge, Ethel. "Economic Functions of the Child in the Rural Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. IV, No. 1 (January 1956), pp. 7-11.

86. ————. "Infant Feeding: The Suckling and the Weaning," *Silliman Journal,* Vol. 3, No. 2 (Second Quarter 1956), pp. 127-138.

87. ————. *Life in a Leyte Village.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1966.

88. Nydegger, William, and Corinne Nydegger. "Tarong," in *Six Cultures—Studies of Child Rearing,* Beatrice Whiting (ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963, pp. 697-867.

89. Orendain, Louise. "Pakikisama," *Marketing Horizons,* Vol. II, No. 6 (June 1963), pp. 45-46.

90. Osias, Camilo. *Barrio Life and Barrio Education.* Yonker-on-the-Hudson: World Book Co., 1921.

91. ————. *The Filipino Way of Life: The Pluralized Philosophy.* New York: Ginn & Co., 1940.

92. Pacana, Honesto Ch. "Notes on a Filipino Rule of Conduct: Non-Interference," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. VI, No. 1 (January 1953), pp. 29-30.

93. Pal, Agaton P. "A Philippine Barrio: A Study of Social Organizations in Relation to Planned Cultural Change," *Journal of East Asiatic Studies,* Vol. V, No. 4 (October 1956), pp. 331-486. (Also published by Ithaca: University of Cornell Press, 1957.)

94. ————, and Lino Q. Arquiza. "Deviations and Adherences in Philippine Familism," *Silliman Journal,* Vol. 4, No. 1 (First Quarter 1957), pp. 1-7.

95. Patanñe, E.P. "The Filipino Image," Solidarity, Vol. 1, (January-March 1966), pp. 11-14.

96. Quisumbing, Lourdes R. "Characteristic Features of Cebuano Family Life Amidst a Changing Society," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XI, No. 1-2 (January-April 1963), pp. 135-141.

97. ————. "Child-Rearing Practices in the Cebuano Extended Family," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XII, Nos. 1-2 (January-April 1964), pp. 109-114.

98. Ramirez, Emiliano Castro. "A Study of a Code of Ethics for Filipinos from Proverbs and Sayings," unpublished M.A. thesis. University of the Philippines, Quezon City, 1940.

99. Reynolds, Harriet. "Evaluation and Expectations Toward Mate Selection and Marriage of Filipino College Students," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 4 (October 1966), pp. 212-226.

100. Rivera, Generoso F., and Robert T. McMillan. *The Rural Philippines.* Manila: United States Mutual Security Agency Office of Information, 1952.

101. Rizal, Jose. "The Indolence of the Filipino" (1890), in *Jose Rizal: Life, Works, and Writings,* Gregorio F. Zaide (ed.). Manila: Villanueva Book Store, 1957, pp. 217-241.

102. —————. *The Social Cancer* (1886), Charles E. Derbyshire (trans.). Manila: Philippine Education Co., 1956.

103. Romani, John H. "The Philippine Barrio," *Far Eastern Quarterly,* Vol. XV, No. 2 (February 1956), pp. 229-237.

104. Saber, Mamitua, Mauyag M. Tamano, and Charles M. Warriner. "The Maratabat of the Maranaw," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. VIII, Nos. 1-2 (January-April 1960), pp. 10-15.

105. Sta. Maria, Felixberto C. "Philippine Folk Songs and Ballads: Through a Changing Culture," *Southern Folklore Quarterly,* Vol. 24, No. 2 (June 1960), pp. 121-134.

106. Sta. Romana, Julita Reyes. "The Iglesia ni Kristo: A Study," *Journal of East Asiatic Studies,* Vol. VI, No. 3 (July 1955), pp. 329-437.

107. —————. "Membership and the Norm of Discipline in the Iglesia ni Kristo," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. III, No. 1 (January 1955) pp. 4-14.

108. Santiago, Cayetano, Jr. "Welfare Functions of the Filipino Family in a Low Cost Housing Community in Quezon City: A Preliminary Study," unpublished M.A. thesis. University of the Philippines, Quezon City, 1953.

109. Scott, William Henry. "Boyhood in Sagada," *Silliman Journal,* Vol. 10, No. 4 (Fourth Quarter 1963), pp. 387-398.

110. Sechrest, Lee. "Symptoms of Mental Disorder in the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XI, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1963), pp. 189-206.

111. Sibley, Willis E. "Work Partner Choice in a Philippine Village," *Silliman Journal,* Vol. 9, No. 3 (Third Quarter 1957), pp. 196-206.

112. Singh, Tej Pratap. "Some Impressions on Indian and Filipino Value Systems," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIII, No. 4 (October 1965), pp. 210-215.

113. Solis, Miguela M. "Philippine Rearing Practices for Infants in Greater Manila," unpublished paper read at the Philippine Sociological Convention, May 1966. (Abstract published as "Child-Rearing Practices in the First Year of Life of 200 Filipino Babies" in *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 4 [October 1966], p. 291.)

114. Stone, Richard L., and Linda D. Nelson. "Education and Value Orientations Change in a Muslim Community in Sulu: A Preliminary Discussion," unpublished paper read at the Philippine Sociological Convention, May 1966. (Abstract published as "Variations in Value Orientations Among Students and Non-Students in Siasi, Sulu" in *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 4 [October 1966], p. 295.)

115. Stoodley, Bartlett H. "Normative Attitudes of Filipino Youth Compared with German and American Youth," *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 22, No. 5 (October 1957), pp. 553-561.

116. ————. "Some Aspects of Tagalog Family Structure," *American Anthropologist,* Vol. 59, No. 2 (April 1957), pp. 236-249.

117. Sturtevant, David R. "Guardia de Honor: Revitalization within the Revolution," *Asian Studies,* Vol. IV, No. 2 (August 1966), pp. 342-352.

118. ————." 'No Uprising Fails—Each One is a Step in the Right Direction,'" *Solidarity,* Vol. I, No. 4 (October-December 1966), pp. 11-21.

119. ————. "Sakdalism and Philippine Radicalism," *Journal of Asian Studies,* Vol. XXI, No. 2 (February 1962), pp. 199-213.

120. Tangco, Marcelo. *The Christian Peoples of the Philippines.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1951.

121. Tirvakain, Edward A. "Prestige Evaluation of Occupations in an Underdeveloped Country: The Philippines," *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. LXIII, No. 4 (January 1958), pp. 390-399.

122. Varias, Rodolfo R. "Psychiatry and the Filipino Personality," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XI, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1963), pp. 179-184.

123. Verzosa, Paul Rodriguez. *Psychology of Tagalog Proverbs.* Manila: Polygot Edition, 1950.

124. Villanueva, Buenaventura M. *The Barrio People.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines Community Devolpment Research Council, [c. 1960].

125. Warriner, Charles K. "Myth and Reality in the Social Structure of the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. VIII, Nos. 3-4 (July-October 1960), pp. 26-32.

126. Weightman, George. "A Study of Prejudice in a Personalistic Society: "An Analysis of an Attitude Survey of College Students—University of the Philippines," *Asian Studies,* Vol. II, No. 1 (April 1964), pp. 87-101.

127. Willis, Richard M. "Ethnic and National Images among Filipino University Students," unpublished paper read at the Philippine Sociological Convention, May 1966. (Abstract published as "Ethnic and Political Images Among Filipino University Students" in *Philippine Sociological Review,* Vol. XIV, No. 4 [October 1966], p. 292.)

128. Zaide, Gregorio F. *Philippine Political and Cultural History* (Vol. I). Manila: Philippine Education Co. (Rev. Ed.), 1957.