A SURVEY OF STUDIES ON ANTI-SINOISM IN THE PHILIPPINES

ALLEN L. TAN

THE FIRST STUDY ON ETHNIC RELATIONS IN THE PHILIP-
pines was conducted in 1931, but despite this early beginning, studies
on ethnic relations between Filipinos and foreign nationals currently
number only ten. Only four of these deal with anti-Sinoism[1] *per se.*[2]
Studies on ethnic relationships in general have used the Social Distance
Scale as a standard instrument while two studies have aimed at un-
covering Filipino images of various ethnic groups. This paper shall there-
fore be divided into four parts: (1) social distance studies, (2) studies
on stereotypes and images, (3) studies on anti-Sinoism *per se,* and (4) syn-
thesis and conclusion.

Social Distance Studies

In 1931-1932 Serafin E. Macaraig (1948) conducted what is pro-
bably the first social distance study in the Philippines. He used 2,386
students and teachers for subjects; about half of them in Manila, a third
in Cebu, and the rest in Iloilo and Zamboanga. The subjects were asked
the following question:

> "Among the Spaniards, Spanish mestizos, American mestizos, Americans,
> Englishmen, Chinese, Chinese mestizos, Italians, Japanese, Hindus, French-
> men, Javanese, whom would you prefer:
>
> 1. for a husband or wife;
> 2. for a fellow member in a club;
> 3. as a neighbor in the same street;
> 4. as a business associate;
> 5. as a personal friend;
> 6. as a citizen of the Philippines;
> 7. as a visitor in the Philippines;
> 8. to be excluded from the Philippines;
> 9. as your sovereign people?" (Macaraig, 1948; p. 228).

The results showed that the most positive feelings were directed
towards the Filipinos, Americans, and Spanish mestizos. The Chinese
mestizo was third choice for citizenship while the Chinese, together with
the Japanese, were first choices for exclusion from the country.

---

[1] Other terms have been used in place of *anti-Sinoism,* e.g., *anti-Sinicism, anti-
Siniticism,* and *Sinophobia.* In this paper however, *anti-Sinoism* shall be used
throughout.

[2] This number does not include a number of historical studies on anti-Sinoism,
e.g., Wickberg (1965) and Horsley (1950). This paper is confined to social psy-
chological studies on contemporary anti-Sinoism.

Unfortunately, Macaraig devotes only one paragraph to interpreting the results in which he notes that Filipinos' first choice for economic, political, and social contacts were themselves and remarks, "The results could not have been otherwise because it would have shown lack of respect for their own people" (Macaraig, 1948; p. 229). One cannot help but wonder why Macaraig bothered to conduct the study if the results "could not have been otherwise."

Macaraig was silent on his methodology and hence, most objections to his study center around his choice of questionnaire. Abdul S. Kanwar (1956), for one, notes, "The questionnaire used by Macaraig is the outcome of his arbitrary judgments. It incorporates such items, . . . [the] nature and importance of which is not clearly comprehended in Philippine social patterns" (pp. 25-26).

Following up Macaraig's study, Benecio T. Catapusan administered in 1954 the traditional Bogardus social distance scale to 500 students in various colleges and universities in Manila.

The results were in general agreement with Macaraig's findings. While noting that "the Filipino-American relationship is cordial, friendly, and affectionate in many cases" (Catapusan, 1954, p. 8), Catapusan points out, "The social distance tests indicated hostile feelings [against Chinese] in a number of areas. This may be due to economic competition with Chinese businessmen, resentment of illegal activities such as arson and smuggling, and family difficulties arising from the practice of Chinese in an earlier day of taking a 'temporary' Filipino spouse. Finally, the triumph of the Communist regime in China has added new grounds for hostility" (p. 5). In his conclusion, Catapusan remarks, "It is still admitted that the high point of tension is the Filipino-Chinese relationship which is being met with repressive measures" (p. 8).

Probably the strongest objection that can be raised against Catapusan's study is the use of the Bogardus social distance scale as such on Filipinos. The Bogardus social distance scale is a cumulative type scale wherein items representing patterns of social relationships are chosen and arranged such that an answer to one item by a subject should enable the investigator to reconstruct the subject's answers to the rest of the items in the scale. For example, if one shows unwillingness to have a Negro in the neighborhood, then it would be expected that he will also be unwilling to marry a Negro. An inspection of the histogram chart presented by Catapusan (p. 7) clearly indicates that the Bogardus social distance scale loses its property of cumulativeness when administered to Filipinos. For example, only 65 subjects expressed willingless to have Chinese as mere speaking acquaintances while as many as 100 expressed willingness to have Chinese as regular friends. One probable explanation for this is that the Bogardus scale "reflects only American social patterns" (Kanwar, 1956; p. 26) and has been

"confounded by Philippine perceptions of social relationships [which are personalistic]" (Weightman, 1964; p. 94).

Published together with Catapusan's paper was a "comment" from Chester L. Hunt (1954) wherein he did a minimum of "commenting" and took the opportunity to present data from a social distance study he conducted. This data was later to be the basis of a longer paper (Hunt, 1956).

Using a variant form of the Bogardus social distance scale, Hunt attempted to measure the intensity of attitudes involving social distance rather than merely seeking an acceptance or rejection of a given situation. He used 200 University of the Philippines students as subjects and determined their attitudes towards ten different nationality groups, three regional groups, and five religious groups. The subjects were asked to rate these groups on eight different types of human relationships along a four-point scale ranging from 1 = desirable to 4 = extreme resistance.

The results, similar to a large extent with Macaraig's and Catapusan's findings, demonstrated that ". . . these students showed a preference for those who were assimilated to Western culture, followers of the Christian religion, and leaning toward the Caucasoid in physical appearance" (Hunt, 1956; p. 259). The Chinese were given a mean rating of 2.84 while the Chinese mestizos were rated somewhat more favorably at 2.56.

The eight items used by Hunt were not published; neither was any mention made of the rationale for the choice of the eight items. It is, therefore, difficult to judge the appropriateness of his scale. Doubts as to its validity are warranted however, in view of the fact that with a predominantly Tagalog sample, Americans were actually rated more favorably than Tagalogs. (1.52 against 1.54). Though often possible with stereotype studies (as with the Willis study which shall be discussed later in the paper), it very seldom happens in socal distance studies that an outgroup is rated more favorably than the ingroup. Furthermore, Hunt himself remarks, "Attitudes expressed in social distance tests are not necessarily manifested in overt behavior. One indication of this gulf is found in the fact that, although Chinese rate low in marriage preference, amalgamation between Filipinos and Chinese has taken place at a rather rapid rate" (Hunt, 1954; p. 9).

Kanwar reviewed the studies of Macaraig, Catapusan, and Hunt and concluded "In short; all the three surveys are inadequate attempts in the field of measurement of attitudes, and therefore, have little, if any, scientific value" (1956; p. 26). This led Kanwar to attempt the construction of a social distance scale for Filipinos following very closely the procedure used by Bogardus.[3] Forty judges, almost all of them

---

[3] For a good discussion on the construction of the Bogardus social distance scale, see Bogarbus (1925).

colleges graduates, were asked to rate thirty-one different patterns of relationships along a seven-point scale according to the degree of close-ness or intimacy of the relationship. The means and standard devia-tions of the ratings for each of the thirty-one items were then computed, and seven items with respectably small standard deviations whose means were closest to the points 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were picked for inclu-sion in the final form of the social distance scale. Inasmuch as the Kanwar study is not generally accessible, the items in the final scale are reproduced here.

1. would accept in marriage;
2. would accept as Ninong or Ninang;
3. would accept as parish priest or chaplain;
4. would accept as employee in the same office or student in the same classroom;
5. would accept as only temporary visitors to your country;
6. would have only as a speaking acquaintance;
7. would exclude from your country.

Using the above scale, 1,352 students and office workers were asked to rate sixteen different ethnic groups: American, Spaniard, French, Malayan, British, Australian, Chinese, Indonesian, Pakistani, Indian, Japanese, Vietnamese, Korean, Thai, Burmese, and Negro.

In line with previous studies, the results showed, "Filipino students and office workers seem to identify themselves more with the Americans than with Europeans and the Asian people" (Kanwar, 1956; p. 80). With regards to the Chinese, the only finding worthy of note was that "In spite of the fact that a considerable amount of social estrangement was demonstrated toward this group by the subjects, the Chinese, along with the Spaniards and the French, would still be preferred as *ninong* or *ninang* over all other groups except the American" (p. 81). This, Kanwar attributes to the "wealth" of the Chinese as enabling them to be "good" godfathers or godmothers.

Probably the greatest weakness of the Kanwar study was his failure to arrive at a cumulative social distance scale for Filipinos (cf. Cata-pusan). This failure is noted by Kanwar himself and is partially attri-buted to the fact that "Human behavior is not necessarily as logical and consistent as social scales" (p. 46). The very purpose of scale construction however, is to achieve a scale that can fit into the "logic" of the subjects. As Lawless and Tan (1966) have pointed out, it is always the social scientist who must adapt his instrument to the subjects and not the other way around.

To improve the precision of social distance studies, Kanwar offered a few practical suggestions that are applicable not only to his study but to the other studies discussed in this survey so far: (1) using a local language; (2) reducing fatigue on the part of the subjects as well as judges; and (3) creation of interest and a sense of responsibility on the part of the subjects, i.e., motivating the subjects to respond accurately.

Studies On Stereotypes And Images

A shift from social distance studies occurred in 1958 when Joel V. Berreman published the results of a study on stereotypes. Using 488 students and 200 non-school adults as subjects, Berreman attempted to determine their images of six ethnic groups: Chinese, Indians, Japanese, Spanish, American Whites, and American Negroes.

The twelve traits attributed most often to Chinese, together with the corresponding proportion of subjects attributing them, were as follows: business-minded — 81%; good in mathematics — 49%; industrious — 43%; good cooks — 43%; noisy, loquacious — 30%; thrifty — 30%; dirty, not clean — 25%; clannish — 18%; patient — 18%; very strong family ties — 17%; prolific — 16%; polygamous — 14%. To Berreman, "The traits of *business minded, industrious,* and *thrifty,* as well as *good in mathematics* are reflections of their business success. The last of these seems to spring from the belief that they are good at keeping accounts. *Clannish, very strong family ties,* and *polygamous* perhaps stem from their social and cultural separateness, while such traits as *dirty, noisy and prolific* appear to be rationalizations of dislike for them, as it does not appear to an observer that they differ from Filipinos in these respects" (Berreman, 1958; p. 8).

Of the six ethnic groups judged, the most consistent stereotypes shared by the subjects were towards the Chinese. This, Berreman implies, is due to restricted contact over time between Filipinos and Chinese with the latter having limited and relatively fixed roles.

As with most stereotypes studies, the Berreman study raises the question as to how meaningful is the information obtained and how much can be inferred from this information. First, what proportion of the subjects must share a stereotype in order that that stereotype may be considered significant? Second, given a set of stereotypes, what operations are to be performed on them in order to arrive at accurate and meaningful inferences? With the set of stereotypes mentioned previously, for example, there are many other possible interpretations that may be offered apart from Berreman's.

Regarding stereotypes as a measure of prejudice, George Weightman (1964) has suggested, "Stereotype studies [are] confounded often by a literal grasp of social realities in the Philippines . . . . Non-prejudiced as well as prejudiced people will agree that most Chinese businessmen are dishonest, Spaniards are 'high hat' . . . because *they are*" (p. 94). Furthermore, "extreme (by American standards) stereotypical verbalizations by a Filipino [often] tells one surprisingly little of how the speaker will respond to a specific Chinese" (p. 94).

Some of the questions raised at the Berreman study were avoided by Richard H. Willis (1966) with the use of the semantic differential

in arriving at Filipino images of various ethnic and national groups. Willis chose 50 male and 51 female University of the Philippines students as subjects and asked them to rate ten ethnic groups and nine national groups along sixteen bipolar scales.

Among the ten ethnic groups (Filipinos, Americans, Spaniards, Japanese, Communist and Nationalist Chinese, Russians, West and East Germans, and Philippine Chinese), the Philippine Chinese were perceived least favorably second only to the Communist Chinese. While being ranked highest on thrifty, they were ranked lowest on six of the sixteen scales (cultured, clean, brave, mature, strong, and honest). It is of interest to note that West Germans were rated most favorably followed by the Japanese, Americans and Filipinos.

The Willis paper was a preliminary report and as such, his data had not been fully analyzed. However, as with stereotypes, difficulties in the interpretation of results are present. One good instance of this appears when Willis discusses the Filipino self-image. Noting that the subjects rated themselves lowest on scientific, industrious, and thrifty while rating themselves highest on friendly, kind, and peace loving, Willis concludes that "In other words, the stress is on purity of motives rather than on achievement and striving" (p. 4).

In sum therefore, both the Berreman and Willis studies attempted to reveal Filipino perceptions of various ethnic groups. With regards to anti-Sinoism, the Berreman study seems to reveal a more favorable image from the Filipinos. In both studies however, the nature of the data raises difficulties in infering prejudice or hostility on the part of the subjects.

Studies On Anti-Sinoism Per Se

In 1960, the first attempt was made at a theoretical explanation of anti-Sinoism (Coller, 1960). Analyzing Philippine anti-Sinoism in the light of anti-Semitism in the West, Richard W. Coller points out several dynamic factors operating behind anti-Sinoism. First, the Filipinos' identification with the West and rejection of the Chinese as a symbol of the oriental elements in Filipino culture and physique in what Coller terms "group self-hatred." Second, the portrayal of Chinese as dangerous aliens controlling two-thirds of the retail trade. Third, the image of the Chinese businessman as a cause of the difficulties encountered in urban life by city migrants. Fourth, the threat that Chinese present to the old aristocracy. Fifth, the obstacles that Chinese present to the rising middle-class and the urban proletariat. Sixth, the portrayal of the Chinese as being sexually licentious. Seventh, a self-fulfilling prophecy relating to Chinese business ethics wherein legal restrictions lead Chinese businessman to engage in shady business deals and bribery. Eighth, the perception of Chinese as the most obvious representative of an un-

satisfactory economic system and as a scapegoat to blame for the ills of the nation. With increasing urbanization, and hence, impersonalism, Coller foresaw worsening Filipino-Chinese relations.

The Coller paper was impressionistic with little or no empirical data to support his contentions. His views are, however, very closely shared by Weightman in a paper published recently (Weightman, 1967). Weightman points to essentially the same factors mentioned in Coller's paper as being the causes behind Philippine anti-Sinoism. But whereas Coller considered urbanization as being in the core of anti-Sinoism, Weightman emphasized the "common human drive to dominate others" (Weightman, 1967; p. 229).

In an earlier paper, Weightman (1964) was less vague and presented empirical data gathered from a questionnaire administered in 1955. Sensing that studies on social distance and stereotypes had not been very meaningful in the Philippines, Weightman resorted to what he termed an "analysis of extreme cells." From a sample of 672 University of the Philippines students, Weightman picked out two subgroups representing anti-Chinese (49 subjects) and non-Anti-Chinese (85 subjects) views. The basis of this grouping was the respondents answers to two questions. (Responses to three questions were used at first but this narrowed down the number of subjects to 40 and 48 in the two groups respectively and Weightman felt that this would "weaken the statistical significance".)

An analysis of the two groups revealed that the anti-Sinoistic group, when compared to the non-anti-Sinoistic group, contained more girls and was generally younger. This group was also more urban and middle class with the poorest being the least anti-Sinoistic. While the anti-Sinoistic group included relatively more children of educators, professionals, and government officials and employees, both groups had more or less equal proportions of children of businessmen and laborers. It was concluded that, in short, those who showed the greatest antagonism toward Chinese were the most Westernized elements of Philippine society. Results also revealed that non-prejudiced people generally had a higher frequency of contact with Chinese and these contacts were generally more meaningful socially. Furthermore, the non-prejudiced group's antipathy towards Asians was not much greater than their antipathy toward Westerners. Among the prejudiced, however, there is a tendency to view Americans in a more favorable light than even various Filipino ethnic groups.

Though the Weightman study suffers from a number of shortcomings, it is significant for two reasons. First, it attempts to discover what types of people are prejudiced; not merely to establish the degree to which a sample or population is prejudiced. Second, it provides some indirect empirical verification for some of the hypotheses proposed by Coller, most notably his "group self-hatred" concept.

Returning to the *why* of the prejudice, Rodolfo A. Bulatao (1967) tested Rokeach's (1960) belief congruence theory of prejudice in anti-Sinoism in the Philippines. Two sets of subjects were asked to rate a number of hypothetical stimulus individuals; one set rated the stimulus individuals in terms of their willingness to have them as friends while the other set judged the stimulus individuals in terms of their willingness to have them as marriage partners. Each of the two sets of subjects consisted of 40 male and 40 female undergraduate students from four schools in Greater Manila. The stimulus individuals were described in terms of ethnic identification, sex, and belief on one of ten issues. With each set of 80 subjects, analysis of variance was performed on each of the ten issues resulting in twenty analyses of variance. The analyses showed that for all ten issues, the effect of belief congruence was more significant than the effect of ethnicity with sex having almost no effect on the friendship and marriage ratings of the subjects. With marriage ratings, the effect of ethnicity was somewhat stronger though the belief congruence effect was still dominant. The results also showed that on issues which the subjects considered to be important, the effect of belief congruence was stronger. It was also in these issues where the renegade effect was observed, i.e., the subjects punished members of their own ethnic groups who disagreed with them more than members of other groups who disagreed with them.

The main objection to the Bulatao study is that it does not take into account the possibility that the ethnicity factor and the belief congruence factor may not be fully isolated in actual behavior. This is so because the position or belief of the members of various ethnic groups on certain issues may in fact be *attributed* to these groups. Bulatao's test of the belief congruence theory does not rule out the possibility that subjects in actual situations may be attributing beliefs dissimilar to theirs to ethnic groups which they may be prejudiced against for reasons not taken into account by the belief congruence theory. In other respects, however, the Bulatao study does offer a refreshingly new approach to anti-Sinoism studies in the Philippines.

Synthesis And Conclusion

The social distance and stereotype studies surveyed in this paper all seem to reveal favorable attitudes towards Americans on the part of Filipinos coupled with a relatively large social distance from the Chinese. Along this same line, Coller has proposed the "group self-hatred" concept together with other various economic and political factors as the roots behind anti-Sinoism in the Philippines. Some of Coller's formulations found indirect support from Weightman's study on the characteristics of anti-Sinoistic *vis-a-vis* non-anti-Sinoistic students. Recently, however, Bulatao has attempted to minimize the effect of

ethnicity while pointing to the more significant effect of belief congruence in prejudice.

General acceptance of the conclusions from these studies on anti-Sinoism has been hindered by two important methodological limitations common to most of the studies. First, sampling has generally been restricted to urban areas and in many cases, to students. In view of the fact that there may be significant rural-urban differences in prejudice as proposed by Coller, getting subjects from rural areas may shed new light on the nature of prejudice in the Philippines. Second, the studies discussed in this survey have generally used pencil-and-paper measures. Other methods should be used to corroborate the findings from pencil-and-paper measures and a number of unobtrusive measures still remain to be used.[4]

In short, Philippine research on prejudice in general and anti-Sinoism in particular is an area wherein there is much to do but little has been done.

REFERENCES CITED

Berreman, Joel V.
    1958   "Filipino stereotypes of racial and national minorities," *Pacific Socio-
            logical Review*, Vol. I, pp. 7-12.

Bogardus, Emory S.
    1925   "Measuring social distance," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, Vol. IX,
            pp. 299-308.

Bulatao, Rodolfo A.
    1967   *A test of the belief congruence principle in prejudice against Chinese
            in the Philippines.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines, un-
            published Master's thesis.

Campbell, Donald T., W. H. Kruskal, and W. P. Wallace
    1966   "Seating aggregation as an index of attitude," *Sociometry*, Vol. XXIX,
            pp. 1-15.

Catapusan, Benecio T.
    1954   "Patterns of social relationships in the Philippines," *Philippine Social
            Sciences and Humanities Review*, Vol. XIX, pp. 3-8.

Coller, Richard W.
    1960   "A social-psychological perspective on the Chinese as a minority group
            in the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review*, Vol. VIII, no. 1-2,
            pp. 47-56.

Horsley, Margaret Wyant
    1950   *Sangley: the formation of anti-Chinese feeling in the Philippines —
            a cultural study of the stereotypes of prejudice.* New York: Colum-
            bia University, unpublished Doctoral dissertation.

Hovland, Carl I. and Robert R. Sears
    1940   "Minor studies on aggression: VI. Correlation of lynchings with
            economic indices," *Journal of Psychology*, Vol. IX, pp. 301-310.

Hunt, Chester L.
    1954   "Comments on 'Patterns of social relationships in the Philippines',"
            Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review, Vol. XIX, pp. 9-11.
    1956   "Social distance in the Philippines," *Sociology and Social Research*,
            Vol. XL, pp. 253-260.

---

[4] Hovland and Sears (1940) and Campbell, Kruskal, and Wallace (1966) provide good examples of the use of unobtrusive measures in research on prejudice.

Kanwar, Abdul S.
    1956   *A study of social distance between some Filipinos and sixteen other ethnic groups.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines, unpublished Master's thesis.

Lawless, Robert and Allen L. Tan
    1966   "A reconsideration of two cross-cultural studies: methods in Philippine research," *Lipunan,* Vol. II, [In Press.]

Rokeach, Milton, Patricia W. Smith and Richard I. Evans
    1960   "Two kinds of prejudice or one?" *In* Milton Rokeach, *The open and closed mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Weightman, George
    1964   "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, pp. 87-101.
    1967   "Anti-Sinicism in the Philippines," *Asian Studies,* Vol. V, pp. 220-231.

Wickberg, Edgar
    1965   *The Chinese in Philippine life.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Willis, Richard H.
    1966   *Ethnic and national images among Filipino university students.* Unpublished paper read at the 1966 Philippine Sociological Society convention.